STUDIES ON THE TEXTS OF THE DESERT OF JUDAH [68]

Mediating the Divine

Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism

By

ALEX P. JASSEN

BRILL

Mediating the Divine

Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

Edited by

Florentino García Martínez

Associate editors

Peter W. Flint

Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar

VOLUME 68

Mediating the Divine

Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism

By

Alex P. Jassen

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2007

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

A C.I.P. record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISSN: 0169-9962
ISBN: 978 90 04 15842 9

Copyright 2007 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing,
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical,
photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV
provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center,
222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

For Leslie

ועל כול נשין שופר שפרה ועליא שפרהא לעלא מן כולהן
ועם כול שפרא דן חכמא שגיא עמהא
ודלידיהא יאא

Over all women is her beauty supreme, her loveliness far above them all.
Yet with all this comeliness, she possesses great wisdom,
and all that she has is beautiful.

(Genesis Apocryphon 20:6–8)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface ix
Abbreviations xi

Chapter One. Introduction 1

PART ONE

PROPHETIC TRADITIONS IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Chapter Two. *Nābîʾ*, Pesher, and Predictive Prophecy in the Dead Sea Scrolls 25
Chapter Three. Prophets and Progressive Revelation: The Presentation of the Prophets as Lawgivers in the Dead Sea Scrolls 37
Chapter Four. Biblical Prophetic Epithets in Transition I: Prophetic 'Visionaries' 65
Chapter Five. Biblical Prophetic Epithets in Transition II: Prophetic 'Anointed Ones' 85
Chapter Six. The 'Man of God' and Prophetic 'Servants' from the Bible to Qumran 105
Chapter Seven. The Prophet at the End of Days: The Development of a Tradition 133
Chapter Eight. The Juridical Eschatological Prophet in the Dead Sea Scrolls 157
Chapter Nine. The Eschatological Prophet of Consolation in the Dead Sea Scrolls 177

PART TWO

MODIFIED MODES OF REVELATION IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Chapter Ten. Revelatory Exegesis: The Turn to Literary Prophecy 197

Chapter Eleven. Revelatory Exegesis in Second Temple Literary Traditions 213
Chapter Twelve. Sapiential Revelation: Wisdom and Prophecy in the Dead Sea Scrolls 241
Chapter Thirteen. Sapiential Revelation in Apocalyptic Literature Preserved at Qumran 259

PART THREE

PROPHECY AND REVELATION AT QUMRAN AND IN THE SECOND TEMPLE PERIOD

Chapter Fourteen. The Persistence of Prophecy in the Late Second Temple Period 279
Chapter Fifteen. Sapiential Revelation in Second Temple Judaism 309
Chapter Sixteen. Prophecy and Law in the Qumran Community .. 331
Chapter Seventeen. Revelatory Exegesis at Qumran 343
Chapter Eighteen. Sapiential Revelation at Qumran 363
Chapter Nineteen. Conclusions 377

Bibliography 389
Index of Ancient Sources 425

PREFACE

This book represents a revised version of my dissertation submitted to New York University (2006). I would like to thank a number of people who were very influential in my graduate studies and provided valuable direction as this work moved from a world of ideas into the completed product it is today. My advisor Professor Lawrence Schiffman has been a constant source of encouragement and support. Throughout all phases of work on this project, Professor Schiffman provided crucial guidance and helpful criticism. This book is much richer because of him. Professor Mark Smith read this work very carefully and his attention to detail and demand for precision were guiding principles throughout the writing process. Professor Moshe Bernstein has been a gracious guide in the languages and literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the professional world of Qumran studies. Professor Frank Peters gave much of his time to offer directed studies courses in early Christianity to a small group of interested students. From Professor Jeffrey Rubenstein, I have learned much in the field of the critical study of rabbinic literature. My interest in rabbinic Judaism and early Christianity has provided a larger context for many of the issues treated here. I would also like to thank Professor Daniel Fleming, who administered all of my comprehensive exams with great enthusiasm and encouragement. This put me in a good position to commence work on my dissertation in a timely manner. All of these individuals have provided me with an exceptional model of what it means to be both a teacher and scholar. I can only hope to strive to emulate this model.

I would also like to thank Professor Florentino García Martínez for accepting this book in the *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* series and for his helpful advice. Dr. Shani Berrin and Professor Bernard Levinson graciously read portions of chapters three and sixteen and offered many valuable suggestions for improvement. Any errors or shortcomings, of course, remain my own. The transformation of this work from dissertation to book has taken place within the supportive environment of the Department of Classical and Near Eastern Studies at the University of Minnesota. I wish to thank my new colleagues in

Classical and Near Eastern Studies and the University for providing me which such congenial surroundings for this undertaking. I would also like to thank my student Jim Martin who proofread the entire manuscript and prepared the source index.

I have been very grateful to have received funding from several different sources during the course of my research. New York University provided me with a generous Henry H. McCracken graduate fellowship. I was also the recipient of a Jacob K. Javits graduate fellowship from the United States Department of Education. In winter 2005–2006 I conducted research in Jerusalem with the assistance of a travel grant from the Orion Center for Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature at the Hebrew University. Thank you to each of these wonderful institutions for their generous support of my research.

Portions of several chapters were presented at the 2005 annual meetings of the Society of Biblical Literature (Philadelphia) and the Association for Jewish Studies (Washington D.C.), American Academy for Jewish Research Graduate Summer Seminar (2005), and a Coffee Hour presentation at the Orion Center at the Hebrew University (2006). Thank you to all those in attendance who provided helpful and constructive feedback.

My family deserves special acknowledgement for their support and encouragement. My parents Larry and Janet Jassen and my parents-in-law David and Ellen Azose all took a keen interest in my research, a welcome phenomenon for any graduate student. There are not enough words to express my gratitude toward my wife Leslie Azose. She put up with long days in the library and longer nights on the computer. She often acted as a sounding board for ideas and offered many valuable suggestions. To her I dedicate this work.

Minneapolis, November 2006
Alex Jassen

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	*Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
ACEBT	Amsterdamse Cahiers voor Exegese en bijbelse Theologie
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
APOT	*The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*. Edited by R.H. Charles. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.
ATDan	Acta theologica Danica
BA	*Biblical Archaeologist*
BAR	*Biblical Archaeology Review*
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
BASORSup	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research: Supplement Series
BBET	Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie
BBR	*Bulletin for Biblical Research*
BDB	*The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Edited by F. Brown, S. Driver and C. Briggs. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997.
BEATAJ	Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentum
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BHS	*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Edited by Karl Elliger and Willhelm Rudolph. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983.
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
Bib	*Biblica*
BJS	Brown Judaic Series
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament
BS	Biblical Seminar
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeistchrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeistchrift für die neutestamentaliche Wissenschaft
CBC	Cambridge Bible Commentary
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series

CCWJCW	Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World, 200 B.C. to A.D. 200
CIS	Copenhagen International Seminar
CJAS	Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity
CLA	*Cardozo Law Review*
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
DBSup	*Dictionnaire de la Bible: Supplément*. Edited by L. Piront and A. Robert. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1928–.
DCH	*Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Edited by David J.A. Clines. 5 vols. to date. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993–.
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (of Jordan)
DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
DSSAFY	*The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by James C. VanderKam and Peter W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998–1999.
DSSSE	*The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. 2 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997–1998.
DSSR	*The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. Edited by Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov. 6 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004–2005.
EDSS	*Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
ErIsr	*Eretz Israel*
ETR	*Etudes théologiques et religieuses*
FOTL	Forms of Old Testament Literature
GKC	*Hebrew Grammar*. W. Genesius. Revised by E. Kautzsch and translated by A.E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910.
HALOT	*The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament: Study Edition*. Ludwig Kohler and Walter Baumgartner. 2 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2001.
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HdO	Handbuch der Orientalistik
HDSS	*The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Elisha Qimron. HSS 29. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
HKAT	Hankommentar zum Alten Testament
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
IBHS	*An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Conner. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IDBSup	*Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume*. Edited by Keith Crim. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976.
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal*
IOS	*Israel Oriental Studies*

JANESCU	*Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JBLMS	Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
JBT	*Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Society*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
Joüon-Muraoka	*A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Paul Joüon. Translated and revised by T. Muraoka. 2 vols. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblio, 1993.
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JRASup	Journal of Roman Archaeology: Supplementary Series
JSIJ	*Jewish Studies Internet Journal*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods*
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism: Supplement Series
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOT / ASOR	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament / American Schools of Oriental Research
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JSP	*Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
KD	*Kerygma und Dogma*
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LHB / OTS	Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies
LSTS	Library of Second Temple Studies
LTQ	*Les Textes de Qumran: traduits et annotés*. Edited by J. Carmignac, P. Guilbert, and E. Cothenet. 2 vols. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1961–1963.
MHUC	Monographs of the Hebrew Union College
NCB	New Century Bible
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NJPS	*Tanakh: A New Translation of the Holy Scriptures According to the Traditional Hebrew Text*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1985.
NovT	*Novem Testamentum*
NovTSup	Supplements to Novem Testamentum
NTL	New Testament Library
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
OTL	Old Testament Library

OTP	*The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985.
OTS	Old Testament Studies
OtSt	*Oudtestamentische Studiën*
PAAJR	*Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research*
PEQ	*Palestine Exploration Quarterly*
PIBA	Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association
PTSDSSP	Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project
QD	Quaestiones disputatae
RB	*Revue Biblique*
RechBibl	Recherches bibliques
REJ	*Revue des études juives*
RevQ	*Revue de Qumran*
RHPR	*Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*
SAOC	Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSP	*Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers*
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SBLWAW	Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Ancient World
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SBTS	Sources for Biblical and Theological Studies
ScrHier	Scripta Hierosolymitana
SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series
Sem	*Semtica*
SFSHJ	South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism
SH	Studia Hellenistica
SIDIC	*SIDIC* (Journal of the Service international de documentation judeo-chrétienne)
SJCA	Center for the Study of Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SNTMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Studies
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
StPhA	*Studia Philonica Annual*
SSEJC	Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity
SSN	Studia Semitica Neerlandica
ST	*Studia theologica*
STAR	Studies in Theology and Religion
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. 9 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976.

TDOT	*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and Helmer Ringgren. 14 vols. to date. Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1974–.
TLOT	*Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Edited by Ernst Jenni and Claus Westermann. 3 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997.
TLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung*
TS	*Theological Studies*
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
TUGAL	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WTJ	*Westminster Theological Journal*
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*

PART ONE

PROPHETIC TRADITIONS IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION[1]

Prophecy is a central concern of the Dead Sea Scrolls, both in sectarian and non-sectarian documents.[2] Half a century of Qumran scholarship has yielded innumerable studies on these issues. When the bibliographic record is examined closer, however, an imbalance is immediately evident. Much work has been conducted on the prophetic scriptural 'canon' at Qumran, the important role of biblical prophets in pesher literature, and more recently the parabiblical prophetic texts.[3]

---

[1] All formatting and transliteration follow the *SBL Handbook of Style* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999). Citations from the Hebrew Bible follow NJPS and Apocrypha from NRSV, unless otherwise noted. Editions drawn upon for non-biblical texts are always indicated in the appropriate location. The Dead Sea Scrolls are presented according to the system employed in *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* (see Emanuel Tov, *Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the* Discoveries in the Judaean Desert *Series* [DJD XXXIX; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002], 18–21). In general, extensive citations and translations of Qumran manuscripts are drawn from the critical editions found in DJD or elsewhere (with bibliographic information cited). My own modifications can be found in the notes to the text and translation.

[2] In using the terms 'sectarian' and 'non-sectarian,' I am distinguishing between literature composed by the Qumran community and those documents that represent the larger literary heritage of Second Temple period Judaism and are preserved among the Dead Sea Scrolls. On these divisions in the Qumran corpus, see Devorah Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990* (ed. D. Dimant and L.H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), 23–58. My use of the term 'sectarian' here carries none of its sociological overtones.

[3] Research on the prophetic scriptures at Qumran is usually subsumed under more general treatments of the text and emerging canon of the Hebrew Bible. See Gershon Brin, "Tefisat ha-Nevuah ha-Mikra'it be-Kitve Qumran," in *"Sha'arei Talmon": Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (ed. M. Fishbane and E. Tov; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 101*–112*; George J. Brooke, "Prophecy," *EDSS* 2:695–696. Of the approximately 200 biblical manuscripts at Qumran, about one quarter is prophetic literature (following either the *Tanakh* or Old Testament). See James C. VanderKam and Peter W. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002), 148–149. For the Qumran community, however, the prophetic word was encapsulated in a wider range of scriptural texts. The most popular biblical books at Qumran (Psalms—thirty nine MSS, Deuteronomy—thirty MSS, Isaiah—twenty one MSS) were understood as literary records of the prophetic commu-

The study of sectarian attitudes toward prophecy and the possible prophetic context for their own activity, by contrast, is considerably rarer in the scholarly record.[4]

Without discounting the crucial importance of the primary areas of study, it becomes apparent that there remains much about prophets and prophecy at Qumran that is still unclear. The few scholarly surveys of prophecy at Qumran have demonstrated that "Qumran was altogether saturated with prophecy."[5] The discussion therefore must now move beyond the present state of research by exploring how the Qumran sectarians and contemporary Judaism conceptualized the meaning of prophecy and the revelatory experience in dialogue and in contrast with received biblical models. Inquiry into the portrait of prophecy and revelation should be accompanied by a complementary exploration of

---

nication to David, Moses, and Isaiah, respectively. On prophets and pesher, see, e.g., Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (ABRL; Garden City: Doubleday, 1995), 223–225. For further bibliography on pesher and prophecy, see below, pp. 29, n. 12. On parabiblical literature, see George J. Brooke, "Parabiblical Prophetic Narratives," in *DSSAFY*, 1:271–301; Monica L.W. Brady, "Prophetic Traditions at Qumran: A Study of 4Q383–391" (2 vols.; Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 2000); eadem, "Biblical Interpretation in the 'Pseudo-Ezekiel' Fragments (4Q383–391) from Cave Four," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 88–109. On the meaning of this term, see below, pp. 8–9.

[4] A survey of two recent comprehensive introductions to the Dead Sea Scrolls further emphasizes this point. Schiffman, *Reclaiming*; VanderKam and Flint, *Meaning*, reflect a general lack of interest in matters related to prophets and prophecy. The indices provide a useful way to gauge interest in these subjects. Schiffman has three entries for prophets. One refers to the biblical prophetic books and another to the portrait of the prophets in pesher literature. The third entry identifies five places where prophets are treated, with the general interest focused on the prophet expected at the end of days. VanderKam and Flint also display little interest in prophecy. The index lists only one relevant entry, treating prophetic apocrypha (on which, see the preceding note). A glance at the various bibliographies of Qumran scholarship yields similar results. I note here, however, that the 'Dead Sea Scrolls and Hebrew Bible' section of the 2006 International Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature devoted two sessions to papers treating prophecy and the Dead Sea Scrolls.

[5] Hans Barstad, "Prophecy at Qumran?" in *In the Last Days: On Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic and its Period* (ed. K. Jeppsen, K. Nielsen, and B. Rosendal; Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1996), 104. See also the assessment of Günter Stemberger that "spielt die Prophetie eine große Rolle" ("Propheten und Prophetie in der Tradition des nachbiblischen Judentums," *JBT* 14 [1999]: 145). See further Mordechai Rotem, "Ha-Nevuah be-Kitve 'Adat Qumran" (M.A. thesis, the Hebrew University, 1977), 1; Brin, "Tefisat," 102*; James E. Bowley, "Prophets and Prophecy at Qumran," in *DSSAFY*, 2:354–355.

potential ongoing prophetic activity at Qumran and in other segments of contemporary Judaism reflected within the Qumran corpus.

Previous research into these questions has been intermittent and limited in scope.[6] The most comprehensive treatments of any aspect of prophecy at Qumran come from earlier stages of Qumran research and are limited in their presentation of texts and issues.[7] More recent scholarly discussions of prophecy at Qumran have the advantage of taking into consideration significant advances in the study of prophecy in the Hebrew Bible and ancient Near East as well as a fuller corpus of Qumran texts. Only a few such articles, however, have appeared since 1991, when the full corpus of Qumran texts became available. Some of these treatments contain important new approaches while others provide syntheses of recent work. None, however, expands beyond a limited set of questions.[8] In spite of the intense interest in prophecy in

---

[6] See Otto Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (WUNT 6; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1960); Miller Burrows, "Prophecy and the Prophets at Qumran," in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg* (ed. B.W. Anderson and W. Harelson; New York: Harper, 1962), 223–232; Rotem, "Ha-Nevuah"; Brin, "Tefisat"; David N. Freedman, "Prophecy in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Faith: In Celebration of the Jubilee Year of the Discovery of Qumran Cave 1* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth and W.P. Weaver; Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998), 42–57; Barstad, "Prophecy"; Bowley, "Prophets"; Brooke, "Prophecy," 2:694–700; idem, "Prophecy and Prophets in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Looking Backwards and Forwards," in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism* (ed. M.H. Floyd and R.D. Haak; LHB / OTS 427; New York: T. & T. Clark, 2006), 151–165. Several additional general studies of prophecy in the Second Temple period briefly treat the Qumran material. See Rudolph Meyer, "Prophecy and Prophets in the Judaism of the Hellenistic-Roman Period," *TDNT* 6:820; David L. Petersen, *Late Israelite Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-Prophetic Literature and in Chronicles* (SBLMS 23; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 101–102; David E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 126, 132–135; Richard A. Horsley and John S. Hanson, *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movements at the Time of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Winston, 1985), 155–157; John Barton, *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986), passim; Markus N.A. Bockmuehl, *Revelation in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity* (WUNT 36; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1990), 42–56. Rebecca Gray, *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 105–107; William M. Schniedewind, *The Word of God in Transition: From Prophet to Exegete in the Second Temple Period* (JSOTSup 197; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995), 242–243; Stemberger, "Propheten," 145–149.

[7] Betz, *Offenbarung*; Rotem, "Ha-Nevuah."

[8] The most important recent work on prophecy can be found in Brooke, "Prophecy," 2:694–700; idem, "Prophecy and Prophets." Based on the observation that no Qumran text explicitly identifies active prophecy in the community nor do the Dead Sea Scrolls contain any contemporary prophetic oracles, Brooke argues that the understanding of prophecy must be expanded to encompass an evolving institution. Any dis-

the Qumran community and the pervasiveness of prophetic language in the Dead Sea Scrolls, no comprehensive treatment of prophecy and revelation in the Qumran corpus exists.[9]

Scope and Method

The present study identifies and classifies prophetic and revelatory phenomena in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In using the term 'prophecy,' I refer to the "transmission of allegedly divine messages by a human intermediary to a third party."[10] 'Revelation' indicates the means by which the prophet receives the alleged divine message. The Qumran community, like nearly all segments of Second Temple Judaism, viewed itself as based on a revealed religion. This self-perception was grounded in the belief that the present community represented the embodiment of biblical Israel, and therefore possessed the true meaning of the revelation at Sinai and all subsequent revelations to Moses and the prophets.[11]

---

cussion of prophecy at Qumran must include all modes of divine communication, not only those identified with distinctly prophetic terminology. The latter article applies this methodology in the analysis of the ways that ancient prophetic Scripture was reused in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Rewritten prophetic texts and pesher exegesis, Brooke argues, reflect the later author's attempt to appropriate the original prophetic voice and become an active participant in the prophetic revelatory experience. These processes, Brooke contends, were understood as prophetic by their practitioners and the Qumran community. My own method, as outlined below, shares many elements with Brooke's approach (as well as some overlapping conclusions). Bowley, "Prophets," represents another important work on prophecy at Qumran. Bowley's survey article provides a helpful classificatory schema for the presentation of prophets in the Dead Sea Scrolls. He observes that the prophets in the Qumran corpus fall into three general categories: ancient (biblical), contemporary, and future. The overwhelming majority of the uses of prophetic terminology are in reference to 'prophets of the past,' namely those prophets appearing in the Hebrew Bible. This tripartite division of the prophetic material from Qumran is likewise employed in the present study as the three chronological foci of prophecy at Qumran (see below).

[9] Indeed, the majority of the studies cited above were not intended as comprehensive treatments. Several of these studies begin with a disclaimer regarding their limitations. See Rotem, "Ha-Nevuah," א-ב; Brin, "Tefisat," 101*; Bowley, "Prophets," 2:355. Brooke, "Prophecy and Prophets," 152, comments that he offers a brief discussion of some pertinent issues, while Qumran scholarship awaits a "substantial monograph" devoted to the subject.

[10] Martti Nissinen, "Preface," in *Prophecy in Its Ancient Near Eastern Context: Mesopotamian, Biblical, and Arabian Perspectives* (ed. M. Nissinen; SBLSymS 13; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), vii.

[11] See, e.g., John J. Collins, "The Construction of Israel in the Sectarian Rule Books," in *Judaism in Late Antiquity 5,1: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of*

At the same time, the community recognized that it lived in a time far removed from Sinai, Moses, and the classical prophets. Thus, the Qumran community was forced to renew the world of the ancient prophets and revelation for its own time.

How did the Qumran community continue to mediate the divine word and will? The continued viability of prophecy and revelation manifests itself in three closely related ways, which form the three chronological foci of this study.[12]

(1) The majority of the community's engagement with prophecy and revelation can be found in the rewriting of the ancient prophetic experience. Thus, the starting point for any discussion of prophecy at Qumran involves the issue of how biblical models of prophecy and revelation were received and transformed by the Qumran community.

(2) The Qumran community believed that the eschatological age would usher in a new period of prophetic experience. This expectation, however, does not refer to some distant eschatological future. Rather, the community believed that it was living in the end of days, and that the final phase of history was imminent in its own time.[13] Thus, its eschatological prophetic expectations point to a time in the near future. The community conceived of some of its own members as active participants in this new age of prophecy. How did the community believe that prophecy and revelation would be experienced in the eschaton and how would it differ from biblical prophecy and contem-

---

the Dead Sea Scrolls: Theory of Israel (ed. J. Neusner, A.J. Avery-Peck, and B. Chilton; HdO 56; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2001), 25–42; James C. VanderKam, "Sinai Revisited," in *Biblical Interpretation*, 44–60.

[12] This tripartite classification can also be found in Barstad, "Prophecy"; Bowley, "Prophets."

[13] CD 20:14 states that the final end of days will occur forty years after the death of the Teacher of Righteousness. The opening column of the Damascus Document (CD 1:9–10) claims that the community was formed 390 years after the exile and was twenty years without the leadership of the Teacher. If the Teacher led the community for approximately forty years, this would place the eschaton at 490 years following the exile (cf. Daniel 9). Though the community's precise date for the exile is not certain, most scholarly understandings place the sectarian prediction of the eschaton sometime in the first century B.C.E. The predicted time for the eschaton, however, came and went without incident. 1QpHab 7:7–14 therefore interprets Hab 2:3 as an allusion to the fact that though the eschaton did not arrive at its expected time, the final end of days is still near. See further Annette Steudel, "אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran," *RevQ* 16 (1993–1994): 225–246; John J. Collins, "The Expectation of the End in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C.A. Evans and P.W. Flint; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 74–90.

porary prophetic activity? Moreover, what role would the eschatological prophet(s) play in the unfolding drama of the end of days and the messianic age?

(3) The Qumran community viewed itself as the heir to the ancient prophetic tradition. At the same time, the Dead Sea Scrolls rarely bear witness to contemporary prophetic activity that resembles its biblical antecedents. Thus, the study of prophecy at Qumran involves an inquiry into how the Qumran community (and related segments of Second Temple Judaism) reconfigured the ancient prophetic process and applied it in its own time. How did the Qumran community conceptualize the contemporary function and role of prophets and prophecy? Furthermore, how did revelatory models for Second Temple period prophets mediating the divine word evolve beyond those found in the Hebrew Bible?

Discussion of ancient (biblical) and future (eschatological) prophecy at Qumran is relatively straightforward. In general, the relevant texts contain immediately recognizable markers that indicate the context for the prophetic phenomena contained therein. Analysis of contemporary prophecy at Qumran, however, is significantly hindered by the nature of the evidence preserved in the Qumran corpus. With a few exceptions, the Dead Sea Scrolls rarely bear witness to direct information concerning the role and function of any presumed prophet in the late Second Temple period. Similarly, the Qumran corpus contains no presentation of the actual prophetic process in which the prophet receives divine revelation. Unlike the classical presentation of prophets in the Hebrew Bible, the Qumran documents and related Second Temple period texts rarely introduce any particular contemporary individual with a prophetic title or identify prophetic activity as such. For the most part, the Qumran material treating prophets and prophecy tends to view prophets only in general terms, with its interest falling generally on the classical canon of biblical prophets. This corpus provides little information for either the presumed activity or character of prophets in the late Second Temple period. Instead, the Qumran texts provide considerably more information for the treatment of the reception of biblical prophetic models in late Second Temple period Judaism.

Any discussion of prophecy and revelation in the Second Temple period or at Qumran therefore must begin by identifying the language of post-biblical prophecy and the modified context of its application. I suggest that these new rubrics of prophecy and revelation can be found

in the systematic re-presentation of the *ancient* prophets.[14] Examination of the sectarian documents provides a unique window into the conceptualization of prophecy and revelation within the Qumran community. The Qumran sectarians recontextualized the classical biblical prophets in the mold of their own conception of prophets and prophecy. The same can be said for the non-sectarian literature that is equally representative of the larger literary heritage of Second Temple Jewish society. These re-presentations of ancient prophets expand considerably the classical biblical portrait of prophecy and revelation and therefore provide a framework for identifying the modified modes of divine mediation operating at Qumran and in related segments of Second Temple Judaism.[15] William M. Schniedewind's assessment of Chronicles that it is "on the one hand, an interpretation of ancient prophecy and, on the other hand, a reflection of post-exilic prophecy itself,"[16] can be equally applied to the Qumran corpus.[17]

[14] As I have presented the issue here, the Qumran community consciously recontextualized the world of ancient prophecy found in the Hebrew Bible. When I claim that the Qumran community rewrote biblical models of prophecy, this does not mean that they were working from a defined canon of biblical books. Rather, they possessed several books that they viewed as authoritative accounts of the life and words of prophets from Israel's past.

[15] The Dead Sea Scrolls as well as biblical and Second Temple period material attest to several other models of divine mediation that are outside the purview of the present study. For example, magic and divination were relatively common at Qumran as mechanisms for accessing the divine realm. The use of lots is another related phenomenon. On magic and divination at Qumran, see, Armin Lange, "The Essene Position on Magic and Divination," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge, 1995: Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* (ed. F. García Martínez, M.J. Bernstein, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997), 377–433 George J. Brooke, "Deuteronomy 18.9–14 in the Qumran scrolls," in *Magic in the Biblical World: From the Rod of Aaron to the Seal of Solomon* (ed. T.E. Klutz; JSNTSup 245; London: T. & T. Clark International, 2003), 66–84. On mantic wisdom more specifically, see James C. VanderKam, "Mantic Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 4 (1997): 336–353. On lots, see Armin Lange, "The Determination of Fate by the Oracle of the Lot in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Mesopotamian Literature," in *Sapiential, Liturgical, and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet* (ed. D.K. Falk, F. García Martínez, and E.M. Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000), 39–48. The Dead Sea Scrolls also attest to individual attempts to access the divine realm. Prayer may have functioned as one such model. In this larger category may also be placed proto-mystical texts such as the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice (4Q400–407, 11Q17).

[16] Schniedewind, *Word*, 22.

[17] See, in particular, the important analysis of these methodological questions in Barton, *Oracles*, esp. 266–270. A similar methodology is often applied to prophetic books

Parabiblical Prophetic Literature

The method proposed here is greatly facilitated by a large collection of 'biblical based' texts that bear the classification 'parabiblical.'[18] This general designation is employed to refer to a post-biblical composition that represents an adaptation of the biblical text, story, or characters in varying degrees.[19] Among these parabiblical texts is another sub-class of

---

that are assigned to pre-exilic prophets, yet presumably composed significantly later (e.g., after the exile). See discussion in Michael H. Floyd, "Introduction," in *Prophets*, 2–3. This same approach may be applied to additional books, which are easier to date more precisely. The way that Ben Sira portrays the ancient prophets in his 'Hymn to the Fathers' (44:1–50:24) is grounded to some degree in Ben Sira's own conception of the role of a prophet and contemporary notions of prophecy. See further, Helge Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter: eine Untersuchung zum Berufsbild des vor-makkabäischen Sofer unter Berücksichtigung seines Verhältnisses zu Priester-, Propheten- und Weisheitslehrertum* (WUNT 2,6; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1980); Jésus Asurmendi, "Ben Sira et le prophètes," *Transeuphratène* 14 (1998): 91–102; Leo G. Perdue, "Ben Sira and the Prophets," in *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit: Essays in Honor of Alexander A. Di Lella, O.F.M.* (ed. J. Corley and V. Skemp; CBQMS 38; Washington D.C.; The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2005), 132–154; Pancratius C. Beentjes, "Prophets and Prophecy in the Book of Ben Sira," in *Prophets*, 135–150. Ben Sira's presentation of Isaiah is discussed below in ch. 12, pp. 255–257. The portrait of the classical prophets in Josephus' *Antiquities* is another relevant example. Josephus repeatedly identifies the ancient prophets as historians, a designation that draws upon his own prophetic identity. For bibliography on the classical prophets in Josephus, see below, n. 38. A non-prophetic example of this larger approach can be seen in the Jewish apocalypses composed after the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 C.E. 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, for example, are formed around the historical event of the destruction of the First Temple in 586 B.C.E. The presentation of the events surrounding the first destruction, however, should ultimately be understood as a reflection of ideological and theological currents in the immediate post-70 C.E. era. See George W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (2d ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 270–285; John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 194–125.

[18] For example, the Pseudo-Daniel and related texts (4Q242–246, 551–553), the Moses Apocryphon and related texts (1Q22, 2Q20, 4Q375–376), the Apocryphon of Jeremiah (4Q383–384, 385a, 387, 387a, 388a, 389–390), Pseudo-Ezekiel (4Q385, 385b, 385c, 386, 388, 391).

[19] See Brooke, "Parabiblical," 1:271–301. The overarching term 'parabiblical' was adopted by Emanuel Tov in order to publish together in the DJD series texts "closely related to texts or themes of the Hebrew Bible" (see idem, in Harold Attridge et al., *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* [DJD XIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994], ix). For a recent discussion of some of the limitations and drawbacks of this terminology, see Jonathan G. Campbell, "'Rewritten Bible' and 'Parabiblical Texts': A Terminological and Ideological Critique," in *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls 8–10 September 2003* (ed. J.G. Campbell, W.J. Lyons, and L.K. Pietersen; LSTS 52; London: T. & T. Clark, 2005), 50–53. My use of the term

texts that have been labeled 'pseudo-prophetic' since these documents represent reworked versions of scriptural books and figures that now appear in the prophetic canon or are identified as prophets in later interpretive traditions.[20]

Since these texts are located in the Second Temple period, but look back to the biblical period, there is great significance in the way that prophets and prophecy are re-presented in them as compared with the assumed biblical base upon which the authors of these texts are drawing. As products of late Second Temple Jewish society, these documents ultimately are most valuable for the information they provide on how prophecy was conceptualized and characterized by Jews in the Second Temple period. Moreover, Qumran scholarship is in general agreement that majority of these documents should be assigned a non-sectarian provenance. Thus, they represent larger currents within Second Temple Jewish society shared by the Qumran community.

Sectarian and Non-Sectarian Texts

Throughout this treatment of prophecy and revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls, I distinguish between literature composed by the Qumran community and texts that represent the larger literary production of Second Temple Judaism, which is reflected eclectically in the Qumran library. The sectarian documents are drawn upon exclusively in order to illuminate the world of the Qumran community. Even here, different Qumran texts attest to various stages in the development of the Qumran community.[21] By contrast, the non-sectarian documents shed

here is only intended as a broad categorization of several types of texts that draw upon biblical figures and literature.

[20] A related set of texts are the manuscripts identified by their editors as 'apocryphal prophecies' (1Q25, 2Q23, 6Q10–13, 6Q21). This assessment was made by editors based on certain language and imagery in these texts that resemble prophetic oracles. The overwhelming majority of these documents, however, are very fragmentary. It is therefore more appropriate to refrain from identifying these texts as somehow 'prophetic' (cf. Barstad, "Prophecy," 118, n. 64).

[21] The precise historical referent of the 'Qumran community' is still debated. Qumran scholarship has recognized that the community that produced and preserved the Dead Sea Scrolls underwent various stages in its historical and ideological development. Numerous documents (such as CD, 4QMMT) are identified as representative of early formative stages of the community. Likewise, some sectarian documents such as the Rule of the Community and the Damascus Document may indicate different parts of a parent movement to which the Qumran community also belonged. Furthermore, redaction-critical approaches to the numerous manuscripts of the Rule of the Commu-

light on both the Qumran community and wider segments of Second Temple Judaism. As the literary remnants of Second Temple Judaism, many of the non-sectarian documents found at Qumran have played a crucial role in reconstructing larger elements of the Second Temple period. This material also indicates that many of the views expressed in the narrowly sectarian documents find expression in wider segments of Second Temple Judaism.

The non-sectarian documents preserved within the Qumran library are also important for the reconstruction of the worldview of the Qumran community itself. With few exceptions, the non-sectarian texts preserved at Qumran represent literature that the Qumran community found agreeable.[22] In many cases, these texts reflect the literary and theological cradle within which the Qumran community was formed and nurtured. For example, books like Daniel and 1 Enoch were extremely influential in cultivating the sectarian worldview. Accordingly, together with the biblical antecedents, many of the non-sectarian texts are drawn upon in the treatment of the various prophetic models regnant within the Qumran community.[23] In many cases, the portrait of

---

nity and the Damascus Document have demonstrated that these texts underwent several compositional stages. In all likelihood, several of these compositional layers reflect developments within the sectarian community. Thus, the term 'Qumran community' ultimately refers to a movement in a fairly constant state of historical and religious development. See discussion in Philip R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"* (JSOTSup 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983) and more recently Gabriele Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998); John J. Collins, "Forms of Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Emanuel: Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. S.M. Paul et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003), 97–111; idem, "The Yahad and the 'Qumran Community,'" in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb* (ed. C. Hempel and J.H. Lieu; JSPSup 111; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2006), 81–96.

[22] There are a few examples of texts preserved within the Qumran library that seem to disagree with general sectarian ideology. See, e.g., the Apocryphal Psalm and Prayer (4Q448), which seems to be a prayer for the wellbeing of one of the Hasmonean kings, generally identified as Alexander Jannaeus (See Esther Eshel, Hanan Eshel, and Ada Yardeni, in Esther Eshel et al., *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* [DJD XI; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998], 403–425). The preservation of a prayer on behalf of a Hasmonean leader within the Qumran library seems strange in light of the sect's general hostility toward the Hasmonean leadership.

[23] Often, only small pieces of any particular text are extant among the Qumran finds. Nevertheless, the text as a whole almost certainly was once located within the Qumran library and held in some variable level of esteem by the community. For example, the study of inspired exegesis in ch. 11 draws heavily on Daniel 9, a portion of Daniel only partially represented within the Qumran biblical scrolls (4Q116 [4QDan[e]]).

prophecy and revelation in these non-sectarian documents provides the larger literary and theological context for the Qumran material.[24]

On the 'Decline' of Prophecy in the Second Temple Period

The application of the method described above presupposes a general assumption concerning the active reality of prophets and prophecy in Second Temple Judaism, and the nature of the post-biblical prophetic traditions in contrast with their biblical antecedents. In order for Second Temple period authors to write about ancient prophets as products of some distant prophetic past, there must be a general recognition that these prophets belong to a now dormant prophetic tradition. At the same time, the identification of continued prophetic traditions in Second Temple period Judaism presupposes that classical prophecy as represented in the Hebrew Bible never disappeared completely.

Scholars have long debated the question of the attenuation of prophecy in the post-biblical period. Much scholarship has assumed that prophecy ceased at some point in the early post-exilic period.[25] According-

---

Nevertheless, it is certain that Daniel 9 was known to the Qumran sect. The one major exception to this rule is 1 Enoch, which was not known to the Qumran community in its later more fully developed form. See discussion in ch. 13, pp. 261–263.

[24] Prophecy and prophetic phenomena in segments of Second Temple Judaism unrelated to the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran community is an important area of study that is outside the purview of the present study. In general, research on this issue, like in the Dead Sea Scrolls, has been limited. See, however, Aune, *Prophecy*, 103–152; John R. Levison, "Two Types of Ecstatic Prophecy according to Philo," *StPhA* 6 (1994): 83–89; idem, "Prophetic Inspiration in Pseudo-Philo's 'Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum,'" *JQR* 85 (1995): 297–329. See also the several articles (esp. Henze, Beentjes and Levison) found in Floyd and Haak, eds., *Prophets*. For bibliography on prophets in Josephus, see below, n. 38.

[25] See Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomenon to the History of Ancient Israel* (Cleveland: Meridian, 1965), 402–404 (on Wellhausen's ideological motivation, see Schniedewind, *Word*, 12–13); Meyer, "Prophecy," 6:812–816; Yehezkel Kaufmann, *Toldot ha-'Emunah ha-Yisra'elit* (4 vols.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1955), 4:378–403; J. Giblet, "Prophétisme et attente d'un messie prophète dans l'ancien Judaïsme," in *L'Attente d'un Messie* (ed. L. Cerfaux; RechBibl 1; Bruges: Desclés de Brouwer, 1958), 91; Frank M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), 223; Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of the Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 16; Petersen, *Late*, 2–6; idem, "Rethinking the End of Prophecy," in *Wünschent Jerusalem Frieden: Collected Communications to the XIIth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament, Jerusalem 1986* (ed. M. Augustin and K.-D. Schunck; BEATAJ 13; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1988), 65–71 (though, see below); Klaus Koch, *The Prophets, Vol. 2, The Babylonian and Persian Periods* (trans. M. Kohl; Philadelphia: Fortress,

ingly, a large amount of scholarly output has been devoted to explaining this phenomenon.[26] Other scholars, presupposing the general principle that prophecy was in decline in the late biblical period, have attempted

---

1983), 187–189; Robert R. Wilson, *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 306–307; Rex Mason, "The Prophets of the Restoration," in *Israel's Prophetic Tradition: Essays in Honour of Peter R. Ackroyd* (ed. R. Coggins, A. Phillips, and M. Knibb; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 140–142; Barton, *Oracles*, 266–273; Gerald T. Sheppard, "True and False Prophecy within Scripture," in *Canon, Theology, and Old Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Brevard S. Childs* (ed. G.M. Tucker, D.L. Petersen and R.R. Wilson; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 273–275; Benjamin D. Sommer, "Did Prophecy Cease? Reevaluating a Reevaluation," *JBL* 115 (1995): 31–47; Eric M. Meyers, "The Crisis in the Mid-Fifth Century B.C.E. Second Zechariah and the 'End' of Prophecy," in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom* (ed. D.P. Wright, D.N. Freedman and A. Hurvitz; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 713–723.

[26] See Kaufmann, *Toldot*, 4:378–403, who identifies the removal of prophecy as a divine response to Israel's sin (cf. Frederick E. Greenspahn, "Why Prophecy Ceased," *JBL* 108 [1989]: 39). Other explanations attempt to situate the decline of prophecy within a social and political context. Schniedewind, *Word*, 15–22, provides a useful survey of these major theories. Shemaryahu Talmon opines that prophecy was so intimately connected to the primary institutions of Israelite life during the monarchic period that it could not survive the destruction of these central institutions ("The Emergence of Jewish Sectarianism in the Early Second Temple Period," in *King, Cult, and Calendar in Ancient Israel* [Jerusalem: Magnes, 1986], 179–180). This view is partially argued as well by Sommer, "Prophecy," 46. Sommer (pp. 46–47, n. 64) and Schniedewind, *Word*, 15, maintain that a similar understanding can be found already in the rabbinic statements concerning the decline of prophecy (on which, see below). A closely related approach ties the origins and success of prophecy to the emergence and growth of the monarchy. Thus, the destruction of the monarchy likewise spelled the end of prophecy. See Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, 223–229; Hanson, *Dawn*, 16; Petersen, *Late*, 2–6; Sommer, "Prophecy," 45–46. See however, the criticism of this approach in Wilson, *Prophecy*, 89–90; Mason, "Prophets," 140–142; Sheppard, "Prophecy," 274–275. Wilson, *Prophecy*, 28–32 (followed by Petersen, "Rethinking," 69–70; Meyers, "Crisis," 722), has argued that four social conditions must be present for prophecy to exist in any given society. In the post-exilic period, these prerequisites were no longer present and thus prophecy ceased to exist in such a social context. A similar approach to the social context of prophecy can be found in David L. Petersen, "Israelite Prophecy: Change Versus Continuity," in *Congress Volume: Leuven 1989* (ed. J.A. Emerton; VTSup 43; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991), 190–203. Sheppard locates the decline within the context of Ezra's promulgation of the Torah of Moses ("Prophecy," 275–280). The scribal / sage circles responsible for the editing of the Torah, who enjoyed the recognition of the Persian leadership, excluded the prophetic material from this scriptural collection, thereby marginalizing prophecy within Jewish society. Prophetic circles then began editing their own earlier prophetic material. This canonical gulf produced a natural division between forms of prophetic activity (cf. Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy and Canon: A Contribution to the Study of Jewish Origins* [SJCA 3; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977], 99).

to identify the post-biblical institutions that took over the prophetic functions.[27]

In their discussion of the assumed cessation of prophecy in the Second Temple period, scholars are often guided by two features. First, the sum of Second Temple period literary evidence indicates that prophecy as it appears in the Hebrew Bible was not nearly as ubiquitous in Second Temple Judaism. When it appears, it rarely resembles biblical prophecy. Second, several documents from the Second Temple period advance the claim that prophecy had long since ceased. In the latter class, scholars have placed Ps 74:9,[28] 1 Maccabees,[29] Josephus,[30] Bar

---

[27] Most research in this area has focused on the assumed prophetic origins for apocalypticism. See the discussion with bibliography in ch. 10, pp. 200–201. The transformation from prophecy to exegesis should also be classified as an example of this phenomenon. See Schniedewind, *Word*. See also the comments of Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 13, who sees prophecy transforming into both apocalyptic and exegesis. Meyers, "Crisis," 722–723, has argued that prophetic tasks are taken up by the priesthood (which enjoyed Persian sanction).

[28] "No signs appear for us; there is no longer any prophet; no one among us knows for how long" (cf. Ps 77:9). Some scholars assign Psalm 74 a Maccabean dating while others argue for an exilic or early post-exilic dating, and see a reference to the Babylonian destruction of Jerusalem. See discussion in Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 60–150* (trans. H.C. Oswald; Minneapolis; Fortress, 1989), 97; Mitchell Dahood, *Psalms II:51–100* (AB 17; Garden City: Doubleday, 1968), 199. Part of the debate over the dating concentrates on v. 9. If the psalm is located in the early sixth century B.C.E., then prophets did in fact still exist (i.e., Jeremiah, Ezekiel). The Maccabean dating is often advanced on account of the apparent agreement with statements in 1 Maccabees (see below), which claim that prophecy had ceased. Craig A. Briggs, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907), 2:152, suggests that the psalm's original composition was in the early post-exilic period, though the psalm contains several later glosses, including v. 9, that should be dated to the Maccabean period. See further Meyer, "Prophecy," 6:813–814; J.J.M. Roberts, "Of Signs, Prophets, and Time Limits: A Note on Psalm 74:9," *CBQ* 39 (1977): 474–481. Roberts contends that this verse should not be understood as an absolute denial of the existence of individuals claiming to be prophets. Rather, this verse should be classified with similar statements in the exilic and early post-exilic context that seem to reflect a growing disillusion with prophets and lack of confidence in the prophetic voice.

[29] 1 Mac 9:27 states: "So was there a great affliction in Israel, the like whereof was not since the time that a prophet was not seen among them." 1 Mac 4:46; 14:41 likewise assume that prophecy is dormant since each passage points to a widespread belief that prophecy would only be resumed in the distant future. On these latter passages, see ch. 7.

[30] *Ag. Ap.* 1.41. Josephus states that Jewish history after Artaxerxes had been written, but not attributed sacred status "because of the failure of the exact succession of prophets." Though Josephus seems to argue for the cessation of prophecy in the early post-exilic period, he is the fullest source for the reality of ongoing prophetic activity in the Second Temple period. For an attempt to explain this discrepancy, see below.

1:21,[31] Prayer of Azariah 15,[32] *2 Bar.* 85:1,[33] as well as several statements in later rabbinic literature.[34] The appearance of such negative claims suggests that at least some segments of Second Temple Judaism questioned the continued viability of prophecy after the biblical period.[35]

Several problems pertinent to the use of these statements affect the understanding of prophecy in the Second Temple period. These texts are not representative of all segments of Second Temple Jewish

---

[31] "We did not heed the voice of the Lord our God in all the words of the prophets whom he sent to us." The past tense framework of this passage seems to indicate that the prophets belong to some time in the past (Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 57). Baruch is usually dated to the first half of the second century B.C.E. (prior to the Antiochan persecutions). See Carey A. Moore, *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah: The Additions* (AB 44; Garden City: Doubleday, 1977), 260.

[32] "In our day we have no ruler, or prophet, or leader…" On the date of the Prayer of Azariah, see Moore, *Daniel*, 44–46. Moore sees in the prayer (esp. v. 15) several allusions to the Antiochan persecutions, perhaps pointing to a mid-second century B.C.E. dating. W.H. Bennett proposes a later date (first century B.C.E.) for the entire addition, though suggests that v. 15 may come from the Maccabean period ("The Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children," *APOT* 1:629, 633).

[33] "Further, know that our fathers in former times and former generations had helpers, righteous prophets, and holy men" (A.F.J. Klijn, "2 Baruch," *OTP* 1:651). 2 Baruch is usually dated to sometime between 70–130 C.E. See above, n. 17.

[34] See *m. Soṭ.* 9:13; *t. Soṭ.* 13:2–3; *b. Sanh.* 11a; *b. Yom.* 9b; *b. Soṭ.* 48b; *Cant. Rab.* 8:9 3; *Seder Olam Rabba* 30. Discussion of these passages (and others) can be found in Ephraim E. Urbach, "Matai Pasqa ha-Nevuah?" *Tarbiz* 17 (1945–1946): 2–3, 9–11; repr. in Moshe Weinfeld, ed., *Miqra'ah be-ḥeqer ha-Miqra* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1979), 58–68; repr. in Ephraim E. Urbach, *Me-'Olamam šel Ḥakhamim: Qoveṣ Meḥkarim* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988), 9–20; Aune, *Prophecy*, 103–104; Greenspahn, "Prophecy," 37–49; Reinhold Then, *"Gibt es denn keinen mehr unter den Propheten?": Zum Fortgang der alttestamentlichen Prophetie in frühjudischer Zeit* (BEATAJ 22; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1990), 26–31; Sommer, "Prophecy," 34–35, 44–45; Jacob Neusner, "What 'The Rabbis' Thought: A Method and a Result: One Statement on Prophecy in Rabbinic Judaism," in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (ed. J.C. Reeves and J. Kampen; JSOTSup 184; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 303–320; idem, "In the View of Rabbinic Judaism, What, Exactly, Ended with Prophecy," in *Mediators of the Divine: Horizons of Prophecy, Divination, Dreams, and Theurgy in Mediterranean Antiquity* (ed. R.M. Berchman; SFSHJ 163; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 45–60. For medieval views, see the sources cited in Abraham J. Heschel, *Prophetic Inspiration after the Prophets: Maimonides and other Medieval Authorities* (Hoboken: Ktav, 1996), 1–2, n. 1.

[35] See further discussion in Floyd, "Introduction," 1–25. Greenspahn further argues that the appearance of pseudepigraphy in the Second Temple period indicates that authors could no longer claim direct divine revelation as had the earlier biblical prophets ("Prophecy," 37). This argument was previously advanced by R.H. Charles, "Introduction," *APOT* 2:ix. See further discussion in John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (HSM 16; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 68–70. Collins rejects this understanding of the role of pseudepigraphy.

society.[36] They narrowly attest to the view of the specific individuals or social groups responsible for their production. The fact that some people believed that prophecy had ceased is not evidence against its social reality. The authors of these texts constructed a reality based on their own theological and ideological worldview. For them, prophecy had indeed ceased. Their presentation of Second Temple Judaism thus always reflects this ideological assumption.

Despite the claim made by these passages, scholars point to several sources from the Second Temple period that seem to indicate the continued vitality of prophetic phenomena that claim continuity with biblical models.[37] Josephus is one of the more important of the corpora in this discussion.[38] Indeed, the ubiquity of prophets in Josephus' historical

---

[36] As noted by Aune, *Prophecy*, 103; Greenspahn, "Prophecy," 40.

[37] On late Second Temple period evidence, see Urbach, "Matai?" 3–6; Martin Hengel, *The Zealots* (trans. D. Smith; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989), 229–245; Aune, *Prophecy*, 103–106 (cf. older bibliography cited at p. 375, n. 12); Richard A. Horsley, "'Like One of the Prophets of Old': Two Types of Popular Prophets at the Time of Jesus," *CBQ* 47 (1985): 435–463; idem, "Popular Prophetic Movements at the Time of Jesus: Their Principal Features and Social Origins," in *New Testament Backgrounds: A Sheffield Reader* (ed. C.A. Evans and S.E. Porter; BS 43; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 124–148; repr. from *JSNT* 26 (1986): 3–27; Daniel B.R. Stawsky, "Prophecy: Crisis and Change at the End of Second Temple Period," *SIDIC* 20 (1987): 13–20; Brooke, "Prophecy," 2:695; Greenspahn, "Prophecy," 40–41; Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 58–60; Lester L. Grabbe, "Poets, Scribes, or Preachers? The Reality of Prophecy in the Second Temple Period," in *Knowing the End from the Beginning* (ed. L.L. Grabbe and R.D. Haak; JSPSup 46; London: T. & T. Clark, 2003), 192–215; repr. from *SBLSP* 37 (1998): 524–545; Stemberger, "Propheten," 145–174. See the critical response to the some of these studies in Sommer, "Prophecy." In general, Sommer argues that most appearances of prophecy in the Second Temple period reflect awareness that the participants were reviving older traditions which had previously been dormant. Sommer attributes the rise of prophetic phenomena in Josephus and the New Testament (see below) to the emerging belief in the immanence of the eschaton. Jewish tradition, Sommer contends, continued to maintain a belief in the resumption of prophecy at the end of days even if prophets were no longer active in the present (on which, see ch. 7).

[38] On contemporary prophecy in Josephus, see Meyer, "Prophecy," 6:823–827; Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Prophecy and Priesthood in Josephus," *JJS* 25 (1974): 239–262; Louis H. Feldman, "Prophets and Prophecy in Josephus," *SBL Seminar Papers, 1985* (SBLSP 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press), 424–441; Jean-Claude Ingelaere, "L'Inspiration Prophétique dans le Judaïsme: Le Témoignage de Flavius Josèphe," *ETR* 62 (1987): 236–245; Sid Z. Leiman, "Josephus and the Canon of the Bible," in *Josephus, the Bible, and History* (ed. L.H. Feldman and G. Hata; Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989), 55–56; Then, "*Gibt es denn keinen mehr unter den Propheten?*" 22–25; Gray, *Prophetic Figures*; Robert K. Gnuse, *Dreams and Dream Reports in the Writings of Josephus: A Traditio-Critical Analysis* (AGJU 36; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996), 22–24; Stemberger, "Propheten," 149–152; Lester L. Grabbe, "Thus Spake the Prophet Josephus…: The Jewish Historian on Prophets and Prophecy," in *Prophets*, 240–247.

narrative calls into question the simple interpretation of his statement that the "exact succession of prophets" had ended during the time of Artaxerxes. Frederick E. Greenspahn has even challenged the traditional interpretation of some of the passages cited above by suggesting that some do not indicate a belief in the cessation of prophecy.[39] Even if Greenspahn's rereading of these passages is not accepted, it is clear that many Jews (and later Christians) did not share the belief that prophecy had long since disappeared from their midst.[40]

Scholarship on this issue has reached something of an impasse. The several negative statements cited above indicate at the least that some segments of Second Temple Judaism recognized a breach in the classical prophetic institutions. The evidence provided by scholars arguing for prophetic continuity demonstrates the exact opposite social reality. Ultimately, it must be assumed that Second Temple Jewish social groups held several different viewpoints on the question of ongoing prophetic activity in their own time.

One issue still remains, however. Above, I noted that the description of active prophets and prophecy is relatively rare in Second Temple period literature. Indeed, even those scholars who argue for ongoing prophecy only marshal a small amount of unequivocal references to contemporary prophetic activity. Moreover, when prophecy does seem to appear in Second Temple documents, it only rarely resembles its biblical antecedents. Rather, prophecy appears in forms either unknown or not emphasized in the biblical record.

This situation underscores a basic assumption about prophecy in the Second Temple period: prophecy and prophetic phenomena persist well into the Second Temple period in some segments of Second

---

[39] Greenspahn argues that the passages in 1 Maccabees only indicate that prophets were not currently active, not that prophecy had ceased entirely ("Prophecy," 39–40; cf. Grabbe, "Reality," 198). Likewise, he contends that Josephus' statement in *Against Apion* merely claims that the reality of prophets should not be assumed in every generation as it once had, but not that prophecy had disappeared altogether. He further maintains that most of the passages cited can be understood similarly (cf. Roberts' understanding of Ps 74:9 noted above, n. 28). Greenspahn also marshals additional evidence from rabbinic literature that seemingly recognizes the continued reality of prophets and prophecy (pp. 44–46) (cf. Aune, *Prophecy*, 104). See, however, the criticism in Sommer, "Prophecy," 32–33.

[40] See Thomas Overholt, "The End of Prophecy: No Players without a Program," in *The Place Is too Small for Us: The Israelite Prophets in Recent Scholarship* (ed. R.P. Gordon; SBTS 5; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 532–533; repr. from *JSOT* 42 (1988): 103–115.

Temple Judaism, though in a modified manner. Accordingly, terms like 'cessation,' 'disappearance,' or even 'decline' are inappropriate. At the same time, it is incorrect to consider Israel's biblical prophetic heritage in the same context as Second Temple period prophecy. Both a real and an assumed distinction exist. The 'real' distinction is apparent from careful analysis of the relevant literature in which contemporary prophecy looks significantly different from biblical prophecy. This distinction is reinforced by the new language of prophecy that emerges in the Second Temple period. Individuals who mediate the divine word are rarely identified with classical biblical prophetic epithets. The 'assumed' distinction can be found in the numerous ancient witnesses to the transformed character of post-biblical prophecy. Second Temple period writers clearly distinguished prophetic phenomena in their own time from that which took place in the biblical period.

Perhaps the best example of these new prophetic conceptualizations can be found in the terminology that Josephus employs in reference to the prophets of his own day. With rare exceptions, Josephus introduces the biblical prophets with the term προφήτης ('prophet'), while contemporary prophets are distinguished by the title μάντις ('mantic').[41] In light of this phenomenon, Josephus' claim that the "exact succession of prophets" had ended during the period of Artaxerxes can be better understood. The reference here is not to the actual reality of prophetic activity. Rather, as Sid Z. Leiman observes in his analysis of this passage, Josephus merely claims that there is a "qualitative difference" between prophecy before and after Artaxerxes. This prophetic rupture renders any writings of the latter set of prophets unfit for inclusion into the sacred history.[42] Here as well, the evidence from Josephus points to the recognition of distinct periods in the span of prophetic continuity. Josephus, possibly the most important source for ongoing prophetic activity in the Second Temple period, is careful to mark a distinction

[41] This feature has been well documented in the scholarly literature. See Jannes Reiling, "The Use of ΨΕΥΔΟΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ in the Septuagint, Philo and Josephus," *NovT* 13 (1971): 156; Blenkinsopp, "Prophecy," 240, 262; Gray, *Prophetic Figures*, 23–26. Two exceptions are treated in David E. Aune, "The Use of ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ in Josephus," *JBL* 101 (1982): 419–421. An additional exception where the verb προφητείαν (*War* 1.68) is employed in reference to John Hyrcanus is observed by Sommer, "Prophecy" 40, n. 36.

[42] Leiman, "Josephus," 56. The term "qualitative difference" is Leimen's. A similar argument is advanced in Blenkinsopp, "Prophecy," 241; Gray, *Prophetic Figures*, 23–26; Gnuse, *Dreams*, 23.

between contemporary prophets and those belonging to Israel's biblical heritage.

Such a conclusion is consistent with biblical scholarship that recognizes that prophecy as it was performed and perceived in the pre-exilic period had come to an end at some point in the early post-exilic period. At the same time, new 'prophetic' models emerged that performed similar mediating functions, though they were distinguished from earlier prophecy.[43] David L. Petersen has thus described the situation in the Persian period as one in which:

> It may be necessary to speak about the end of classical Israelite prophecy while, at the same time, speaking about new, different, and varied behavior that is described as prophetic in a later time.[44]

The same understanding may be applied to the situation later in the Second Temple period; prophecy persists, though it is transformed.[45]

This understanding of the modified character of prophecy in Second Temple Judaism frames the approach to prophecy taken in the present study. I argue here that the Dead Sea Scrolls bear witness to a transformed prophetic tradition active both at Qumran and in some segments of Second Temple period Judaism reflected in the Qumran corpus. Any attempt to understand these prophetic traditions must begin by deciphering the new language of prophecy. The abundance of material in the Dead Sea Scrolls that recontextualizes and reconceptualizes the prophetic experience of the classical biblical prophets provides the

---

[43] Note, for example, that Malachi is never identified as a *nābî'*, though he is clearly part of the succession of prophets.

[44] Petersen, "Rethinking," 70–71. See the similar views expressed in Urbach, "Matai?" 8, 11; Meyer, "Prophecy," 6:828; Koch, *Prophets*, 2:187; Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy and Canon*, 94; Aune, *Prophecy*, 103; Overholt, "End of Prophecy," 534; Barton, *Oracles*, 106–112; Sheppard, "Prophecy," 280; Schniedewind, *Word*, 15; Sommer, "Prophecy," 40; Stemberger, "Propheten," 145.

[45] There has been some attempt to examine continuing traces of prophecy in later Judaism. See Gershom G. Scholem, "Revelation and Tradition as Religious Categories in Judaism," in *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality* (New York: Schocken, 1971), 282–303; Moshe Idel, *The Mystical Experience in Abraham Abulafia* (trans. J. Chipman; Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988); Sommer, "Prophecy," 37–41; Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 104–123; Elliot R. Wolfson, *Through a Speculum that Shines: Vision and Imagination in Medieval Jewish Mysticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994); Philip S. Alexander, "'A Sixtieth Part of Prophecy': The Problem of Continuing Revelation in Judaism," in *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed: Essays in Honour of John F.A. Sawyer* (ed. J. Davies, G. Harvey and W.G.E. Watson; JSOTSup 195; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 414–433; Heschel, *Prophetic Inspiration*.

opportunity to develop a model of prophecy for the Qumran community and related elements in Second Temple Judaism.

The Plan of the Present Study

This study is divided into three sections. The first section (chs. 2–10) analyzes the prophetic traditions found within the Dead Sea Scrolls and associated literature of Second Temple period Judaism. The ancient (biblical) and future (eschatological) prophets in these documents are identified and classified in order to determine their relationship to earlier biblical prophetic models. Careful attention is placed on the reception of biblical prophetic models and their transformation in the Qumran texts. The modifications, sometimes minor though more often considerable, form the central elements of the new language of prophecy.

In chapters 2–6, I examine the presumed role and function of the ancient prophets as reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the literary forms in which these prophets are presented. These chapters are constructed around the five primary prophetic designations drawn from the Hebrew Bible that appear in the Qumran corpus (*nābîʾ*, 'visionary' [חוזה], 'anointed one' [משיח], 'man of God' [איש האלהים] and 'servant' [עבד]).[46] Together with the examination of the social role assigned to these prophets, I treat the literary expansion of these prophetic titles as they develop from the Hebrew Bible to Qumran. In isolating features associated with the ancient prophets, it appears that two primary functions were assigned to the ancient prophets: the foretelling of the future and the mediation of divine law.[47] Both of these models differ in varying degrees from the general portrait of the prophet emerging out of the Hebrew Bible and thus attest to newer conceptions of the role of the prophet.

---

[46] Throughout this work, the Hebrew term נביא is presented in transliteration, while the other prophetic designations are translated literally. Though נביא is generally understood to mean 'prophet,' the use of this translation is imprecise. 'Prophet' is a general designation that applies to all the prophetic figures to be discussed here. The term נביא is used for specific types of prophets. To be sure, it is not always clear in the biblical or Second Temple texts why this specific designation is employed (see discussion below, pp. 26–27). The terminology employed by the texts under analysis will be followed.

[47] Note the similar models found in Rotem, "Ha-Nevuah."

Chapters 7–9 shift the focus from the conceptualization of the ancient prophets to speculation concerning the prophet expected at the end of days. Like the portrait of the prophets presented in the preceding chapters, the eschatological prophet is an artificial construct of the Qumran community, grounded in contemporary notions of the presumed function of the prophet at the end of days. In chapter seven, I trace the development of traditions concerning the eschatological prophet from their earliest biblical beginnings through their appearance in literature contemporary with the Dead Sea Scrolls. In tracking these developments, I am interested primarily in the eschatological responsibilities assigned to the prophet and the precise relationship between the prophet and other eschatological protagonists, such as the messiah. Chapters 8–9 focus exclusively on traditions concerning the eschatological prophet found within the documents composed by the Qumran community (the Rule of the Community [1QS], 4QTestimonia [4Q175], 11QMelchizedek [11Q13]).

The second section of this study (chs. 10–13) turns to newly emerging revelatory models represented in the Qumran corpus. Revelation of the divine word forms the basis of all prophetic phenomena. The Dead Sea Scrolls testify to the appearance of two nascent models of revelation that appear with increasing frequency in the Second Temple period: the inspired exegesis of prophetic Scripture (revelatory exegesis) and the cultivation of divine wisdom (sapiential revelation). In chapters 10–13, the re-presentation of the ancient prophetic revelatory experience as found in various Qumran documents is examined. In several of these texts, the divine word is revealed to the ancient prophets in a manner consistent with the biblical portrait of these prophets. In many places, however, the prophet receives the divine word through new modes of revelation. Revelatory exegesis and sapiential revelation are the two most common new models of revelation. In these chapters, I trace the development of these two revelatory models from their biblical antecedents through their emergence in the Second Temple period and at Qumran as viable means for the revelation of the divine word.

The third section of this study (chs. 14–18) examines the direct evidence in the Dead Sea Scrolls regarding ongoing prophetic activity within the larger Jewish world and at Qumran, in an attempt to define more closely the location of prophecy in the late Second Temple period and the character of its application. Some evidence testifies to the continued existence of prophets who are identified with designations similar to the classical prophets from Israel's biblical past. More often, how-

ever, divine mediation appears in alternate and modified modes. This examination therefore relies upon the earlier analysis in chapters 2–13, where various transformed prophetic and revelatory models at Qumran and in Second Temple Judaism are identified. In the remainder of this study, evidence for the application of these new prophetic and revelatory models is found in sectarian and non-sectarian contexts. The analysis here is consistent with conclusions arrived at in the earlier chapters. Contemporary 'prophetic' activity takes over the mediating function of ancient prophecy and the practitioners of these new modes of revelation view themselves in continuity with the ancient prophets.

In chapter fourteen, I examine documents within the Qumran corpus that contain references to prophetic activity outside of the Qumran community. In doing so, I focus exclusively on passages that identify individuals with the prophetic designation *nābî'*. As in the treatment of the ancient prophets, this analysis concentrates on the role assigned to these contemporary prophets and the context of their prophetic activity. The evidence provided by this chapter is two-fold. Explicit reference to contemporary prophecy employing traditional prophetic designations is limited. All such testimony is located in a non-sectarian context. Moreover, the majority of these references and allusions point to a widespread debate over the continued vitality of prophecy in Second Temple Judaism.

In chapter fifteen, I explore the contemporary application of sapiential revelation. In chapters 12–13, this model was identified as a new mechanism for the receipt of divine revelation. In chapter fifteen, I look at one example of a historical personage, Ben Sira, who traces his own prophetic self-consciousness to the receipt of sapiential revelation. I then look at one major non-sectarian literary text, 1Q/4QInstruction, that further attests to the widespread application of this revelatory model in Second Temple Judaism. 1Q/4QInstruction presupposes a system in which present-day sages continue to receive revelation through a sapiential revelatory process.

Chapters 16–19 examine the direct evidence in the Qumran corpus regarding ongoing prophetic activity at Qumran. I apply the new rubrics of prophecy and revelation identified in the first section of this study. Chapter sixteen follows closely the identification of a heightened juridical role for the ancient prophet by examining in greater detail the relationship between prophecy and law in the Qumran community, in particular the prophetic consciousness of contemporary sectarian legal activity. The leaders of the Qumran community saw their lawgiving

capabilities as the most recent stage in a progressive revelation of law that began with Moses and the biblical prophets.

Chapters 17–18, like chapter fifteen, further complement the earlier treatment of revelatory exegesis and sapiential revelation in chapters 10–13. In chapter seventeen, I examine the evidence in the sectarian scrolls for the belief that various sectarian leaders received divine revelation through the process of revelatory exegesis. I concentrate primarily on the presumed revelatory context of pesher exegesis. In chapter eighteen, I explore various sectarian claims to sapiential revelation, particularly in the Hodayot. Each of these chapters identifies the active revelatory framework for the inspired interpretation of Scripture and the cultivation of revealed wisdom at Qumran. Based on the treatment of these phenomena in chapters 10–13, it is clear that the Qumran community conceptualized these revelatory models in continuity with the classical means of revelation found among the biblical prophets.

At the same time, none of the texts surveyed in chapters 17–18 identifies these modified modes of revelation as prophetic or classify their practitioners as prophets. This phenomenon further underscores some of the general comments made above regarding prophecy in Second Temple Judaism. Like numerous wider segments of Second Temple Judaism, the Qumran community recognized the continued vitality of communication between the divine and human realms and the identification of specific individuals as mediators of the divine word. At the same time, they acknowledged a significant difference between these contemporary divine mediators and the prophets of the biblical past.

In the concluding chapter, I offer some general observations on prophecy and revelation at Qumran. Based on the evidence examined in this study, I consider whether it is appropriate to speak about prophets and prophetic activity at Qumran. Part of this discussion focuses on the Teacher of Righteousness, whom many Qumran scholars have suggested may be identified as a prophet. The survey of prophecy at Qumran does not yield any text where classical prophetic terminology is applied to any member of the Qumran community, including the Teacher of Righteousness. At the same time, the significant transformations that prophecy underwent in the Second Temple period have already been discussed. The reconfigured models of prophecy and revelation treated in the first section of this study are well represented within the literature of the Qumran community. Though the community never refers to it members or its leaders as prophets, it

considered itself to be in constant dialogue with the divine. In this sense, the community viewed itself in continuity with the classical prophets from Israel's biblical past and as the heir to this prophetic tradition. This prophetic self-consciousness accounts for the pervasiveness of prophetic language and imagery throughout the Qumran corpus.

In the conclusion, I consider as well the wider application of the results of the present study. Throughout this study, I trace the development of biblical prophetic and revelatory models through their transformation in the Qumran corpus. Many of the texts discussed were composed outside of the Qumran community and therefore reflect larger theological and literary currents in Second Temple Judaism. The Dead Sea Scrolls therefore bear witness to the continued vitality of forms of prophecy and revelation in numerous Second Temple period contexts. In conclusion, I consider some of the implications of the present work for the study of prophecy and revelation in other elements of Second Temple period Judaism, early Christianity, and rabbinic Judaism.

CHAPTER TWO

NĀBÎ', PESHER, AND PREDICTIVE PROPHECY IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

The purpose of the following five chapters is to explore the way that ancient (i.e., biblical) prophets and prophecy are conceptualized in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In particular, this analysis concentrates on the various roles and functions assigned to the prophets within the Qumran corpus. This approach follows upon the wealth of scholarship in biblical studies that has greatly illuminated the world of the ancient Israelite prophet and the larger cultural context. The nature of the present research, however, differs dramatically from its similar enterprise in biblical studies. Biblical scholars are interested in understanding how the prophet functioned within the larger society, for which the biblical texts and cognate literature provide immediate assistance.[1]

The Qumran library, as discussed in chapter one, rarely contains any explicit reference to contemporary prophets and their assumed prophetic roles. Rather, the overwhelming majority of references to individuals with prophetic designations are to prophets from Israel's biblical heritage. In discussing this phenomenon, I suggested that the re-presentation of biblical prophets in the Dead Sea Scrolls provides the clue to uncovering the role and function assumed for prophets at Qumran and wider segments of Second Temple Period Judaism. The con-

---

[1] Many of these studies attempt to locate a specific function associated with the *nābî'*, often drawing upon the wealth of comparative evidence, both internal to the Hebrew Bible (i.e., 1 Sam 9:9) and emerging out of significant ancient Near Eastern literary corpora (i.e., Mari). For research in the last quarter century, see in particular Wilson, *Prophecy*; David L. Petersen, *The Role of Israel's Prophets* (JSOTSup 17; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981); Schniedewind, *Word*; Joseph Blenkinsopp, *A History of Prophecy in Israel* (2d ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996); Benjamin Uffenheimer, *Early Prophecy in Israel* (trans. D. Louvish; Jerusalem: Magnes, the Hebrew University, 1999). See the general collection of articles reprinted in Gordon, ed., *The Place Is too Small for Us*. A summary of older scholarship on prophets is provided by Wilson (pp. 1–19). For the comparative Near Eastern evidence, see now the handy volume of texts in translation with limited commentary: Marti Nissinen with C.L. Seow and Robert K. Ritner, *Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East* (SBLWAW 12; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003).

ceptualization of the ancient prophet as found in these texts should ultimately be understood as a reflection of contemporary attitudes toward prophets and their larger social role.

The terminological categories presented in the scrolls function as guides in tracking these questions through the Qumran corpus. The prophetic designations employed in the scrolls are all biblical locutions. In this and the following chapter, all the uses of *nābîʾ* (נביא) in the scrolls in reference to prophets from Israel's biblical heritage are treated.[2] In the chapters that follow, this same research agenda is pursued for other prophetic designations found in the Dead Sea Scrolls ('visionary' [חזה], 'anointed one' [משיח], 'man of God' [איש האלהים], and 'servant' [עבד]). In addition to identifying the role and function of each of these prophetic epithets, I seek to identify the various ways in which the literary presentation of these terms reflects development from the biblical base from which they are drawn. This approach has a two-fold agenda. I am interested in sharpening the understanding of the prophetic terminology employed in late Second Temple period Jewish literature. Moreover, the difference between the contemporary prophetic designations and their biblical antecedents frames the changing conception of the prophet and prophetic traditions in the literature where these terms are employed.

Nābîʾ *(נביא) in the Dead Sea Scrolls*

Biblical scholars debate the extent to which Hebrew word *nābîʾ* contains any specialized prophetic meaning in the Hebrew Bible. Attempts to arrive at a better understanding of this prophetic designation generally follow from etymology, which unfortunately is ultimately inconclusive.[3]

---

[2] See the earlier limited treatments in Barstad, "Prophecy"; Bowley, "Prophets"; Peter W. Flint, "The Prophet David at Qumran," in *Biblical Interpretation*, 158–167.

[3] William F. Albright argued that the Hebrew word should be traced to the passive Akkadian cognate *nabû* ("to name, invoke") and the *nābîʾ* is 'one who is called by God' (*From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process* [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1946], 231–232). Albright's etymological observation has led many scholars to identify the Israelite *nābîʾ* as a divine spokesperson (see, for example, Klaus Koch, *The Prophets, Vol. 1, The Assyrian Period* [trans. M. Kohl; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983], 16). Daniel E. Fleming proposes that the closest Semitic parallel to Hebrew *nābîʾ* is the West Semitic *nābû*, which should be identified as an active participle from *nabû* ("The Etymological Origins of the Hebrew *nābîʾ*: The One Who Invokes God," *CBQ* 55 [1993]: 217–224). Rather than 'one who is named,' Fleming opines that the Semitic

Recent judicious studies of this term have concluded that already in the Hebrew Bible, *nābîʾ* had come to be used in a general sense for all types of prophets.[4] Even if the prophetic epithet had some restricted meaning at some point in the biblical period, none of this specialized sense is apparent in late biblical writings. On the contrary, *nābîʾ* emerges as a general designation for all prophets and often replaces more specific pre-exilic terms.[5]

The Dead Sea Scrolls further attest to the continued versatility of this prophetic designation. Based on the available evidence, *nābîʾ* is used in a general sense to refer to all types of prophets. In the non-biblical scrolls, the Hebrew word *nābîʾ* itself occurs fifty-seven times while its Aramaic counterpart appears five times.[6] The verbal root נבא occurs

cognate should be understood as 'one who invokes the gods.' Fleming then marshals biblical evidence in support of understanding the Israelite *nābîʾ* in this sense. Fleming notes, however, that even this new etymological approach does not fully illuminate the use of the word in its various stages of biblical usage. Fleming's 'passive' understanding of *nābîʾ* based on the Akkadian evidence has since been challenged by John Huehnegard, "On the Etymology and Meaning of Hebrew *nābîʾ*," *ErIsr* 26 (1999; Cross Volume): 88*–93*. Huehnegard contends that the comparative Semitic evidence does not demand a passive meaning for *nābîʾ*. Rather, all the available evidence continues to point to an active meaning. See also the earlier treatment of Wilson, *Prophecy*, 136–138 (cf. 256), who examines the etymological evidence, entertaining possible influence from both Semitic parallels (Akkadian *nabû*) and the Hebrew verbal root נבא. Wilson observes, however, that the recognition of these etymological origins says little about how the word was understood once it became part of common Hebrew usage (so also Blenkinsopp, *History*, 28). The evidence pertaining to the Hebrew verbal root נבא suggests some element of ecstatic prophecy. As Wilson likewise remarks, however, this is inconsistent with the general use of *nābîʾ* in the Hebrew Bible. Wilson therefore suggests that the understanding of *nābîʾ* must follow from examination of its usage with each specific prophet. Uffenheimer provides a detailed discussion of the etymological evidence tracing the Hebrew usage of *nābîʾ* (*Prophecy*, 16–21). While his conclusion that the *nābîʾ* "designates a messenger sent to announce the word of God to the community" (p. 21) does limit its application somewhat, it only serves to underscore the diversity in the biblical use of this prophetic designation.

[4] See Blenkinsopp, *History*, 28–30; Schniedewind, *Word*, 34–37; Floyd, "Introduction," 3.

[5] For example, the 'man of God' in Kings is generally identified as a *nābîʾ* in Chronicles. See below, ch. 4. See further, Schniedewind, *Word*, 36–37; Floyd, "Introduction," 3.

[6] This data is based on the entry נביא in Martin Abegg Jr., James E. Bowley, and Edward M. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance: Volume One: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* (2 vols.; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003), 2:502, 882. Of the occurrences in non-biblical manuscripts, five reflect citations (or paraphrases) of biblical texts: 4Q158 66 (Deut 18:18); 4Q175 5–7 (Deut 18:18–19); 4Q177 12–13 i 1 (Jer 18:18); 11Q19 54:8, 11, 15 (Deuteronomy 13); 61:2, 3, 4 (Deuteronomy 18). For full discussion of the use of Deuteronomy 18 in 4Q175, see below ch. 7, n. 7. There is also one נביאה mentioned,

ten times.[7] The nominal form נבואה is found in three places, though only one of these occurrences (11Q5) provides any discernable context.[8]

By far the most common application of the term *nābîʾ* is in reference to the prophets of the Hebrew Bible. The designation breaks down into two different usages. Certain prophets are introduced with the additional title הנביא. For example, texts that introduce a citation from Isaiah will often do so with: כאשר כתוב בספר ישעיה הנביא ("as it is written in the book of Isaiah the prophet"). This form occurs as well with Samuel, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah, and Daniel.[9] With the exception of Samuel, all of these prophets are also at times referred to by name without the additional designation נביא. There does not seem to be any discernable reason why the prophetic title is applied specifically to these prophets. In addition, it is not clear why these prophets are sometimes identified as הנביא while at other times they are merely referred to by name without any title.

The prophets of Israel's past are also treated in a general collective sense. For example, some texts refer to 'Moses and the prophets' or to 'the prophets.' The intended referent in passages of this nature is the collective group of prophets from Israel's biblical past.[10] In these

but the word appears in complete isolation on the manuscript (PAM 43.677 6 2). All that follows is a word beginning with *lamed*. See Dana M. Pike and Andrew C. Skinner, *Qumran Cave 4.XXII: Unidentified Fragments* (DJD XXXIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 104. Bowley, "Prophets," 2:358, likewise cites one instance of the term 'prophetess,' referring to 4Q458 15 2. He is following the reconstruction supplied in the Preliminary Concordance. In the *editio princeps*, Erik Larson deciphers the same word as הנבואה "the prophecy" (idem, in Stephen J. Pfann et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* [DJD XXXVI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000], 364). To be sure, the difference between a *yod* and *waw* is slight. In any event, the manuscript supplies no context for the word and as such this text does not contribute to the larger discussion. Likewise, the word *nābîʾ* appears three times within fragmentary manuscripts that are excluded from the present discussion (4Q379 2; 4Q382 31 5; 4Q570 30 1).

[7] CD 6:1 (par. 4Q267 2 6, 4Q269 4 i 2); 3Q4 3; 4Q385 2 5, 6, 7; 4Q385b 1 2; 4Q386 1 i 4; PAM 44.102 66 4.

[8] 4Q165 1–2 1; 4Q458 15 2; 11Q5 27:11.

[9] Isaiah: CD 4:14; 7:10; 4Q174 1–2 i 15; 5–6 2, 5; 4Q265 1 3; 4Q285 7 1; 11Q13 2 15; Jeremiah: 4Q383 6 1; 4Q385a 18 i a–b 2, 6; B 1; Ezekiel: CD 3:11; 4Q174 1–2 i 16; 4Q177 7 3; 4Q285 4 3; Zechariah: CD 19:7; Daniel: 4Q174 1–3 ii 3; Samuel: 11Q8 28 8, 13.

[10] Passages of this nature have sometimes been understood as allusions not to the historical prophets themselves, but rather to the books found within the prophetic canon (i.e., 'Prophets'). The Qumran corpus, however, contains a specific referential designation for the emerging collection of prophetic writings. Thus the term ספרי הנביאים is found in CD 7:17 (par. 4Q266 3 iii 18); 4Q397 14–21 10, 15 (4QMMT C 10, 17) (cf. 4Q177 5–6 9 as reconstructed by A. Steudel). In addition, several source citations are

passages, can a specific role assigned to the ancient prophets be determined? How do the scrolls conceive of the role of prophets in the Hebrew Bible? How does this compare with the self-perception of the biblical prophets? What role do the scrolls see the prophets of the past playing in the present time?

The Nĕbîʾîm *(נביאים) as Foretellers of Future Events*

Perhaps the most well-known characterization of the prophets in the Dead Sea Scrolls is as foretellers of future events. Indeed, with the publication of Pesher Habakkuk and the recognition of its genre and unique interpretive model, this role of the classical prophets was clarified. Their prophecies were not directed at their own time, but contained hidden secrets concerning the end time, within which the sect envisaged its own existence.[11] In particular, the ancient prophecies, when interpreted correctly, foretold events concerning the sectarians themselves.[12] Though it is clearly foundational to the sect's worldview

introduced with formulae like "as it is written in the book of PN the prophet" (4Q174 1–2 i 15, 16; 1–3 ii 13; 4Q176 1–2 4; 4Q177 5–6 5, 9, 11 (recons.); 7 3; 4Q265 1 3; 4Q285 4 3; 7 1), which also serve to distinguish between the prophetic book and the prophetic figure (Brin, "Tefisat," 101*–102*). Therefore, in passages lacking the introductory ספרי, the historical prophets are the intended referent of the term הנביאים. To be sure, already by this time the line between the historical prophets and their scriptural writing was beginning to be blurred. Thus, while the immediate referent is most likely the historical prophets, there is likely also an acknowledgement of the emerging scriptural tradition associated with these prophets.

[11] See the early observations of William H. Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BA* 14 (1951): 60; Karl Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer* (BHT 15; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1953), 150. See the recent treatment in Shani L. Berrin, "Qumran Pesharim," in *Biblical Interpretation*, 114–117.

[12] For general descriptions of pesher literature and its hermeneutical model, see Brownlee, "Interpretation," 60–76; Elliger, *Studien*, 118–164; Maurya P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretation of Biblical Books* (CBQMS 8; Washington D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979), 229–259; Devorah Dimant, "Pesharim, Qumran," *ABD* 5:244–251; Bilha Nitzan, *Megillat Pesher Ḥabakkuk* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1986), 29–80; John J. Collins, "Prophecy and Fulfillment in the Qumran Scrolls," *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (JSJSup 54; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997), 301–314; repr. from *JETS* 30 (1987): 267–278; Michael Fishbane, "Use, Authority, and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. M.J. Mulder; CRINT 2,1; 2d ed.; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004), 373; David E. Aune, "Charismatic Exegesis in Early Judaism and Early Christianity," in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*

and underpins the entire pesher enterprise, this characterization of the prophets is not a feature found in great abundance in sectarian literature (at least not explicitly).[13] In what follows, the initial evidence from Pesher Habakkuk is reexamined in order to define more precisely the role of the ancient prophets as forecasters of future events. Later chapters explore additional evidence from Qumran literature employing other prophetic terminology that further promotes this understanding.

Prophets in Pesher Habakkuk

Pesher Habakkuk (1QpHab) 2:5–10[14]

5 וכן פשר הדבר [על הבו]גדים לאחרית א
6 הימים המה עריצ[י הבר]ית[15] אשר לוא יאמינוא
7 בשומעם את כול הבא[ות ע]ל הדור האחרון מפי
8 הכוהן אשר נתן אל ב[לבו בינ]ה[16] לפשור את כול
9 דברי עבדיו הנביאים [אשר] בידם ספר אל את
10 כול הבאות על עמו וע[ל][17]

(ed. J.H. Charlesworth and C.A. Evans; JSPSup 14; SSEJC 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 133–137; Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 223–226; James H. Charlesworth, *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 1–16; Berrin, "Pesharim," 110–133.

[13] The fact that the ideological basis of pesher exegesis is only articulated in two passages does not mean that it is not foundational for the pesher method. Such a claim is argued by Aune, "Charismatic Exegesis," 136. In general, Second Temple period works of biblical interpretation are not forthcoming concerning their interpretive relationship with their scriptural base text. Pesher Habakkuk represents an exception.

[14] Maurya Horgan, in James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Pesharim, Other Commentaries and Related Documents* (PTSDSSP 6B; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck]; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 162–163. The text is basically the same as that of Nitzan, *Pesher Habakkuk*, 152. Their texts differ on the reconstruction of two lacunae (noted below).

[15] On this reconstruction, see Elliger, *Studien*, 12–13, 169.

[16] Nitzan restores **דעה** (*Pesher Ḥabakkuk*, 152; see also her summary of other suggested restorations).

[17] There have been numerous suggestions concerning this lacuna. Horgan follows earlier scholars in suggesting **עדתו** "his congregation" (*Pesharim*, 26). Others restore **ועל ארצו** (Shemaryahu Talmon, "Notes on the Habakkuk Scroll," *VT* 1 [1951]: 34; repr. in *The World of Qumran from Within: Collected Studies* [Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1990], 142–146; Michael Wise, Martin Abegg Jr., and Edward Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* [San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996], 116).

5 And likewise[18] *vacat*(?)[19] the interpretation of the passage [concerns the trai]tors at the end of
6 days. They are the violator[s of the cove]nant[20] who will not believe
7 when they hear all that is going to c[ome up]on the last generation from the mouth of
8 the priest, to whom God placed into [his heart discernme]nt to interpret all
9 the words of his servants the prophets [whom] through them[21] God enumerated
10 all that is going to come upon his people and up[on]

In interpreting Hab 1:5, the pesherist understands the traitors of the biblical passage as a three-fold allusion.[22] They are (1) those who, in collusion with the Man of Lies, fail to listen to the Teacher of Righteous-

[18] Horgan translates וכן here as "and thus." Though linguistically correct, this translation does not carry the full force of the employment of the word here. The pesher explanation of the constituent elements of Hab 1:5 appears in lines 1–4. Each of the elements of the biblical verse is identified as a contemporary historical event. Lines 5–10 build upon this explanation by providing another explanation of the verse with similar implications. Isaac Rabinowitz's translation "and likewise," is therefore preferred ("The Second and Third Columns of the Habakkuk Interpretation Scroll," *JBL* 69 [1950]: 41; cf. García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE* 1:13).

[19] There is a blank space in the manuscript here, which Horgan identifies as a *vacat*. The appearance of a *vacat* here is strange. Horgan proposes that since the scribe generally left a blank space after the lemma and prior to writing the word פשר, he did so here as well by accident (*Pesharim*, 25; following William H. Brownlee, "Further Corrections of the Translation of the Habakkuk Scroll," *BASOR* 116 [1949]: 15).

[20] García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE* 1:13. Horgan renders as "ruthless one of the covenant." The translation provided here defines more precisely the nature of the opposition to the covenant.

[21] I have translated בידם as "through them," rather than retain the cumbersome literal translation of "by their hand." Based on the biblical and Qumranic evidence cited below, it is certain that the prepositional phrase is employed to denote instrumentality (see below, p. 44). This point is observed here by Nitzan, *Pesher Ḥabakkuk*, 155. Frank M. Cross renders the clause as "by whose agency" (*The Ancient Library of Qumrân* [3d ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995], 91). Note the alternate restoration of בסודם suggested by Talmon, "Notes," 34. Why he thinks the generally agreed upon restoration is "awkward" is not clear.

[22] The lemma itself for this pesher is reconstructed. The presence of בוגדים in 1QpHab 2:1 and throughout the following pesher suggests that the word was found in the pesherist's *Vorlage*. MT does not have the word בוגדים but rather בגוים. See however, LXX (οἱ καταφρονηταί) (cf. Acts 13:41) and Peshitta (מרחא). For full treatment, see William H. Brownlee, *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran* (JBLMS 11; Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1959), 7; Ilana Goldberg, "Girsaʾot Ḥilufiʾot be-Pešer Ḥabakkuk," *Textus* 17 (1994): 17. On the three-fold structure of the pesher, see Elliger, *Studien*, 170; Lou H. Silberman, "Unriddling the Riddle: A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Pesher," *RevQ* 3 (1961): 336; Horgan, *Pesharim*, 23–24; Nitzan, *Pesher Ḥabakkuk*, 153.

ness (ll. 1–2) and (2) the disingenuous initiates in the "new covenant" (ll. 3–4).[23] The pesherist then directs his invective against (3) the "traitors at the end of days" (ll. 5–6), who are described as the "violator[s of the cove]nant."[24]

Like the traitors of the first pesher, the "violators" in the third pesher doubt the words of the "priest" concerning the end of days. The enigmatic priest here is no doubt the Teacher of Righteousness, who has already appeared in line two in similar fashion.[25] At this point the threefold pesher itself concludes. What follows are two subordinated clauses that describe in detail the ideological basis of pesher exegesis. While pesher-type exegesis is ubiquitous at Qumran, it is rare to find self-reflective remarks in the literature that clearly articulate the ideological basis for its application. The reference to the priest in line eight generates a relative pronoun that introduces a subordinate clause describing the Teacher of Righteousness (i.e., the priest). He is portrayed as one to

---

[23] Horgan understands the second pesher as a reference to the enemies of the sect in the period after the Teacher of Righteousness. She sees the distinction between the first two pesharim as one of chronology. The first pesher refers to enemies during the period of the Teacher of Righteousness. Therefore, the second pesher, which fails to mention the Teacher of Righteousness, must refer to a later period (*Pesharim*, 24; following Silberman, "Unriddling," 336). There is nothing in either pesher to suggest that these should be understood as distinct periods of time to be read in chronological sequence. The fact that the third pesher concerns traitors at the end of days does not demand that the other two pesharim fit into a chronological sequence (see further Nitzan, *Pesher Ḥabakkuk*, 153). The reference to individuals entering the "new covenant" surely alludes to individuals who had taken upon themselves to enter into the Qumran sectarian community. The fact that they are now deemed "traitors" suggests that they reneged on their initial promise and forfeited their alliance with the sect (Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 55).

[24] The restoration is based on the parallel in 4Q171 1–10 ii 14 (cf. 1–10 iii 12 [recons.]). See Horgan, *Pesharim*, 25; Nitzan, *Pesher Ḥabakkuk*, 152, for treatment and discussion of earlier suggested restorations. As Horgan observes, this clause may be understood as either an objective genitive (i.e., "violators toward the covenant") or a subjective genitive (i.e., "those of the covenant who are violators") (*Pesharim* [Princeton], 163, n. 18; cf. Nitzan, *Pesher Ḥabakkuk*, 154). If the former, then the intended group is an enemy of the sect; if the latter, then the referent is likely a divisive group within the sect itself. Perhaps the syntactical ambiguity is employed by the pesherist to include both groups.

[25] To be sure, it is only based on restoration that line two condemns the traitors for failing to believe the Teacher of Righteousness. The parallel with the present line supports such a restoration in line two. On the identification of the priest with the Teacher of Righteousness, see Barstad, "Prophecy," 106; Nitzan, *Pesher Ḥabakkuk*, 154; Aune, "Charismatic Exegesis," 134; Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 225. On the Teacher of Righteousness as a priest, see 4Q171 1–10 iii 15.

whom God has bestowed discernment in order to understand "all the words of his servants, the prophets" (l. 10).

The introduction of "the prophets" here allows the pesherist to articulate explicitly one major aspect in the sectarian characterization of the ancient prophets and prophecies. At the end of the passage just cited, a relative pronoun (restored)[26] introduces a second subordinate clause that further clarifies the role of the ancient prophets just mentioned. Three details in particular are related concerning the prophets: (1) God has employed them as agents to convey the divine message ("through them God enumerated…"). (2) The expression כול הבאות, "all that is going to come," in reference to the divine message conveyed by the prophets indicates that the prophets spoke about events in the distant future (how distant shall be seen momentarily). (3) These future events are, at the least, of a national character (על עמו).

The first element is not particularly novel; indeed, this model is what characterizes the prophets of the Hebrew Bible. It is the second element that separates the sectarian view of the prophets from other conceptualizations of the role of the ancient prophets. Most imagined that the ancient prophets operated and prophesied within a social and historical context. As such, their prophecies reflected the exigencies of their own time. Thus, for example, Jeremiah's prophecies are grounded in the tumultuous period of seventh-sixth centuries B.C.E. Jerusalem. To be sure, predictive prophecy is a central element of much of the prophetic literature in the Hebrew Bible and in later prophetic traditions.[27] These predictions are generated by some present need and generally refer to the near future.

In Pesher Habakkuk, the exclusive role of the ancient prophets was to tell of "all that is going to come" (כול הבאות). Previously in line seven of this passage, the same expression was employed to refer to

[26] Based on the similar construction in line eight.

[27] See Robert R. Wilson, "The Prophetic Books," in *The Cambridge Companion to Biblical Interpretation* (ed. J. Barton; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 213–215; Freedman, "Prophecy." On predictive prophecy in the Deuteronomistic History, see Gerhard von Rad, "The Deuteronomistic Theology of History in the Books of Kings," in *Studies in Deuteronomy* (trans. D.M.G. Stalker; SBT 9; London: SCM, 1953): 74–92; Ziony Zevit, *The Religions of Israel: A Synthesis of Parallactic Approaches* (London: Continuum, 2001), 481–489. This feature is also prominent in Josephus' understanding of prophecy. On which, see Blenkinsopp, "Prophecy"; Feldman, "Prophets"; Schniedewind, *Word*, 248–249. It is also found in Ben Sira, see Perdue, "Ben Sira."

events in the end of days (כל הבא[ות ע]ל דור אחרון).[28] The end of days envisioned in this passage is not some distant eschatological age. Rather, the sect believed that they themselves were living in the end of days and as such the expression denotes the present time.[29] Thus, the ancient prophetic pronouncements refer neither to their own time nor the near future; rather, they relate to the distant future, the period in which the sectarian community now lives.

The last piece of information supplied in this passage concerns the intended subject of the ancient prophecies. The text clearly states that the ancient prophets forecasted all that is to come upon "his nation" (l. 10). This would appear to refer to all of Israel, rather than just the sectarian community. The lacuna that follows likely contains another word or phrase that broadens or restricts the range of the prophecies. Though the lacuna cannot be reconstructed with certainty, plausible suggestions extend the focus of the prophecies specifically to the sectarian community itself ("his congregation") or to the non-Jews ("the gentiles").

Pesher Habakkuk (1QpHab) 7:1–2[30]

1 וידבר אל אל חבקוק לכתוב את הבאות על
2 על[31] הדור האחרון ואת גמר הקץ לוא הודעו

1 And God told Habakkuk to write down the things that are going to come upon
2 the last generation, but when that period would be complete[32] he did not make known to him (i.e., Habakkuk).

---

[28] "The last generation" refers to the people living in the end of days (Nitzan, *Pesher Habakkuk*, 154).

[29] See Elliger, *Studien*, 150. On the claim that the term 'end of days' was understood by the sectarians as referring to the present age, see Steudel, "אחרית הימים." This is also suggested by the characterization of the enemies of the sect as "traitors at the end of days" (ll. 5–6). The fact that they are condemned for not listening to the Teacher of Righteousness suggests that they are his contemporaries. As such, this passage places the Teacher of Righteousness and the sectarians in the end of days as well.

[30] Horgan, *Pesharim* (Princeton), 172–173.

[31] The second על is likely the result of dittography (Horgan, *Pesharim* [Princeton], 172, n. 101; Nitzan, *Pesher Ḥabakkuk*, 171). Horgan and Nitzan note that dots seem to have been placed above the word in order to indicate the dittography.

[32] On the difficulty in rendering גמר הקץ and a summary of earlier translations, see Horgan, *Pesharim*, 37.

The conceptualization of the ancient prophecies found in the opening lines of Pesher Habakkuk is further emphasized in this later passage. As in the previous passage, the ancient prophecies are singularly focused on providing meaning for the eschatological age. In the earlier passage, the prophet foretold "all that was to come" (כל הבא[ות) upon the sectarians in the eschatological age ([ע]ל דור אחרון). Similar language is employed here to express this understanding of the predictive task of the ancient prophet.[33]

This passage provides one additional aspect to the sectarian conception of the prophetic oracles. The hidden future meaning of the prophecy was not even known to the prophet. Pesher Habakkuk assumes here that Habakkuk delivered an oracle directed toward some future eschatological time without any awareness of the full meaning of his prophetic pronouncement.[34]

Summary

The Qumran sectarians, similar to various prophetic strands in the Hebrew Bible and later Judaism, envisioned the biblical prophets as foretellers of future events. The particular manner in which this was conceptualized among the Qumran community, however, marks the distinctly sectarian model. The prophets were predictors of the eschatological future, which the sect equated with its own time period. The self-reflective statements discussed above provide the basis for the numerous prophetic proof-texts cited throughout sectarian literature. As predictions of the future eschatological period within which the community was now living, the ancient prophecies contained important information concerning the unfolding of the present eschatological age.

The second passage cited above provides one additional element in the sectarian conception of the biblical prophets and their predictive prophecies. The prophets uttered these predictive prophecies without any awareness of the full contextual meaning of their prophecies. The

---

[33] Noted by Nitzan, *Pesher Ḥabakkuk*, 171.

[34] Dimant leaves open the possibility that the prophets may have been aware of the true meaning of their words ("Pesharim," 5:248). Indeed, there is some debate over the Pesharim's conceptualization of the full extent of the original prophet's understanding. See further discussion in Shani L. Berrin, *The Pesher Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169* (STDJ 53; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004), 13–14.

meaning would only be revealed in the appropriate future time in which the prophecies applied. Like the unaware prophet, the scriptural traditions within which the original prophecies are recorded never explicitly articulate the full meaning of the prophecies. In chapter seventeen, I examine more fully the interpretive process involved in decoding the ancient prophets and identify the characteristics that mark it as a revelatory experience. In particular, I focus on the importance of the inspired exegete who is able to discern the 'true' meaning of the ancient prophecies.

CHAPTER THREE

PROPHETS AND PROGRESSIVE REVELATION: THE PRESENTATION OF THE PROPHETS AS LAWGIVERS IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Alongside the portrait of the ancient prophets as (unaware) foretellers of future events, the Qumran corpus, including both sectarian and non-sectarian documents, attests to an equally (if not more) ubiquitous conceptualization of the ancient prophets and their primary responsibilities. Several documents within the Qumran corpus routinely represent the ancient prophets as mediators of divinely revealed law, often in cooperation with Moses. In this chapter, I examine these documents in order to generate a full portrait of the community's conceptualization of the ancient prophets as lawgivers and the relationship of this conceptual model to the contemporary lawgiving activity of the community.

I analyze seven passages (three sectarian, four non-sectarian) that re-present the ancient prophets as lawgivers. These texts provide the fullest portrait of the community's conceptualization of the role of the ancient prophets in the process of revealing divine law. My analysis of these texts concentrates on their reconfiguration of the role of the ancient prophets. In this sense, I am interested in the nature of the juridical responsibilities applied to the prophets, their relationship to Mosaic law, and the location of the prophets in the progressive revelation of law. The analysis of the non-sectarian documents demonstrates that the community's perspective was likewise shared by various wider segments of Second Temple Judaism, though the sectarian and non-sectarian models do not always agree in every detail. Following the method proposed in the introduction, the way that the portrait of the ancient prophets in the Dead Sea Scrolls differs from its biblical inspiration is critical to understanding how the relationship between law and prophecy began to be conceptualized at Qumran and in the late Second Temple period.

Before turning to the Qumran material, I examine the relationship between prophecy and law in the Hebrew Bible. The goal of this section is to identify biblical models for the role of prophets and prophecy in the formation of law, with which the Qumran community would

have been familiar. The identification of the various biblical models provides a literary control to compare against the instances where the Qumran corpus has deliberately reconfigured the biblical portrait of the prophets. This reconfiguration provides a model for identifying the independent contribution of the Qumran texts.

In chapter sixteen, I situate the Qumran corpus' presentation of the juridical responsibilities of the ancient prophets within the framework of the community's model for the formation and development of post-biblical law and assess the prophetic character of this process.

Law and Prophecy in the Hebrew Bible

The role of the biblical prophets in the formation of law in the Hebrew Bible is relatively limited. Discussion of biblical models for the relationship of law and prophecy must begin by distinguishing between the activity of Moses and the classical prophets. In the Pentateuch, especially in Deuteronomy, Moses is presented as the prophetic lawgiver *par excellence*. The law is revealed to Moses on Sinai and he continually turns to divine revelation in order to legislate and adjudicate unclear legal situations.[1]

The classical prophets, in contrast, function as mediators of divine law in the Hebrew Bible only in a limited capacity.[2] The relationship

[1] In addition to the revelation at Sinai, Moses is often presented as a prophetic lawgiver. Lev 24:10–23 and Num 15:32–36, describe, respectively, incidences in the desert where an individual is accused of blasphemy and gathering sticks on the Sabbath. In both instances, Moses is uncertain on how to proceed and the individual is placed in custody until God reveals to Moses the appropriate punitive measures. In Num 9:6–13, Moses turns to divine revelation in order to determine the proper procedure regarding individuals who could not offer the Passover sacrifice at the appropriate time, while a similar approach is taken in response to the query of the daughters of Zelophehad in Num 27:1–11. See also the numerous places where Moses receives legislative revelation in the Tent of Meeting (e.g., Lev 1:1). In Deuteronomy, the relationship between Moses' lawgiving responsibilities and prophetic capabilities is made even more explicit (e.g., Deut 9:15–22).

[2] Early source critical scholarship argued that the prophets and the prophetic tradition knew nothing of Pentateuchal law and thus never act as lawgivers. See, for example, Wellhausen, *Prolegomenon*, 399: "It is a vain imagination to suppose that the prophets expounded and applied the law" (see further pp. 392–410, 422–425). More recent scholarship, however, has corrected this fundamental misunderstanding by observing how the classical prophets interact with and are dependent upon Pentateuchal legal material. See, e.g., Kaufman, *Toldot*, 3:384–388; Robert Bach, "Gottesrecht und weltliches Recht in der Verkündigung des Propheten Amos," in *Festschrift für Günther Dehn: zum 75.*

between prophets and the law in the Hebrew Bible manifests itself in two capacities. The classical prophets are often portrayed as emphasizing the importance of various elements of the law (particularly idolatry and social justice) and exhorting Israel to its proper observance.[3] In this capacity, the prophets neither reveal new law nor reconfigure Pentateuchal law, but merely enforce its observance.

At the same time, the classical prophets also appear as independent lawgivers. This portrait, however, is encountered only episodically in biblical literature. Some late biblical texts ascribe to the prophetic class in general the task of transmitting divine law.[4] Elsewhere, individual prophets are portrayed as instituting laws, some of which serve to amplify Mosaic law and others which do not seem to be directly linked to Mosaic legislation.[5]

Geburtstag am 18. April 1957 dargebracht von der Evangelisch-Theologischen Fakultät der Rheinischen Friedrich Wilhelms-Universität zu Bonn (ed. W. Schnellmacher; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1957), 23–34; Anthony Phillips, "Prophecy and Law," in *Israel's Prophetic Tradition: Essays in Honour of Peter R. Ackroyd* (ed. R. Coogins, A. Philips, and M. Knibb; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 217–232; Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), 292–296; Gene M. Tucker, "The Law in the Eighth-Century Prophets," in *Canon, Theology, and Old Testament Interpretation*, 201–216.

[3] See Ephraim E. Urbach, "Halakhah ve-Nevuah," *Tarbiz* 18 (1946–1947): 1–2; Bach, "Gottesrecht," 23–34; Tucker, "Law," 204–214.

[4] See 2 Kgs 17:13b; Ezra 9:10–11; Dan 9:10; 2 Chr 29:25. 2 Kgs 17:13, though embedded in the homily on the fall of the northern kingdom, is generally assigned an exilic or even later date (see Marc Z. Brettler, "Ideology, History, and Theology in 2 Kings XVII 7–23," *VT* 39 [1989]: 268–282), which would explain its proximity to the other three passages that are clearly late biblical texts. The ascription of legislative activity to prophets in these passages is seemingly intended to demonstrate that the process of transmitting divinely revealed law did not cease with Moses. This point is most explicit in 2 Chr 29:25. Hezekiah's placement of the Levitical singers in the temple is supported by appeal to the ancient commandment (מצוה) of David and his prophets Gad and Nathan. As Sara Japhet observes, the situation described here clearly represents a cultic innovation ascribed to David (*I & II Chronicles: A Commentary* [OTL; Louisville, Westminster John Knox, 1993], 926). In order to prevent opposition to such an innovation, the Chronicler emphasizes that David's innovation was enacted with prophetic approbation. The reliance on post-Mosaic prophetic legislation is supported by the additional statement "for the commandment was from the Lord through his prophets," which explicitly claims that prophetic revelation of law continues even after Moses.

[5] The most prominent example of this is Ezekiel, who is portrayed as reinterpreting ancient laws (e.g., ch. 18) and promulgating new laws (esp. chs. 40–48). On reinterpretation of law in Ezekiel, see Bernard M. Levinson, *L'Herméneutique de l'innovation*: *Canon et exégèse dans l'Israël biblique* (Le livre et le rouleau 24; Brussels: Lessius, 2006), 43–48. On the legal system of chapters 40–48, see Steven S. Tuell, *The Law of the Temple in*

Thus, the relationship between prophets and the law in the Hebrew Bible manifests itself in two capacities. Prophets commonly exhort Israel to observe the covenantal laws properly. At the same time, prophets sometimes appear as independent mediators of revealed law, whereby they either transmit new law or reinterpret older law.[6] Examples of such prophetic activity, however, are quite exceptional in the Hebrew Bible.[7]

Prophets and the Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls

The decidedly non-juridical role of the classical prophets in the Hebrew Bible is dramatically transformed in the Dead Sea Scrolls, whereby the ancient prophets, alongside Moses, become active mediators of

Ezekiel 40–48 (HSM 49; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992). See also Isa 58:13 ("personal affairs" on the Sabbath); Jer 17:21–22 (carrying on the Sabbath), where the prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah, as divine spokesmen, each provide non-Pentateuchal legislation concerning Sabbath law. See Urbach, "Halakhah," 1–2; Menachem Elon, *Jewish Law: History, Sources, Principles* (trans. B. Auerbach and M.J. Sykes; 4 vols.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 3:1021–1027; Bernard S. Jackson, "The Prophets and the Law in Early Judaism and the New Testament," *Cardozo Studies in Law and Literature* 4 (1992): 126–127.

[6] Note that both types of prophets appear in 2 Kgs 17:13. In 13a, God sends "every prophet and every seer" to warn Israel and Judah to adhere to the law, which is identified in 13b as having been sent through the agency of "my servants, the prophets."

[7] The presentation of prophecy in Deuteronomy also deserves mention in this context. Deuteronomy 13 outlines a system for testing the legitimacy of any presumed prophet. The litmus test for such a prophet, however, is not whether he or she can demonstrate the ability to mediate the divine word. Even if the prophet is deemed a true prophet in that sense (i.e., his or her predictions come true), the prophet is branded as an illegitimate prophet and sentenced to die if he or she encourages the worship of foreign deities. Israel is exhorted to reject such a prophet and maintain absolute allegiance to God's commandments. The other Deuteronomic presentation of prophecy (Deut 18:15–22) likewise subordinates the word of the prophet to the word of the law. This pericope identifies the entire class of prophets as 'like Moses,' which consequently classifies the prophet as a "legist" (Bernard M. Levinson, "The First Constitution: Rethinking the Origins of Rule of Law and Separation of Powers in Light of Deuteronomy," *CLR* 27 [2006]: 1883–1884). As observed by Levinson, the primary function of this feature is to reduce the ecstatic and visionary character of prophecy and ensure that the prophetic word is subordinated to and aligned with the legal and political system outlined in Deuteronomy. Thus, all prophets are now constrained by the limitations of Torah law. Though Deuteronomy has identified all prophets with the lawgiving capabilities of Moses, it simultaneously excludes all prophets as authorized sources of post-Mosaic revealed law.

divinely revealed law. To be sure, the more common biblical model persists in some texts. For example, the Apocryphon of Jeremiah, a parabiblical composition related to the biblical text and character of Jeremiah,[8] presents Jeremiah as championing the proper observance of Mosaic law and the concomitant absolute avoidance of all idolatrous activity.[9]

The importance of this fragment lies in the contrast it creates with other Qumran texts that speculate about the relationship between the ancient prophets and the post-Sinaitic revelation of law. This text portrays the prophet Jeremiah in the role commonly associated with prophetic interaction with the law—as one who exhorts Israel to observe the law. By contrast, the overwhelming majority of Qumran texts, sectarian and non-sectarian, continue a trope that is found in far fewer biblical contexts—the prophet as mediator of divine law. Seven particular Qumran documents present this view of the ancient prophets.[10] The first four contain general statements concerning the juridical capacity of the prophets with little explication of any specific understanding of this role. The second set of texts provides a much fuller portrait of the conceptualization of the lawgiving responsibilities of the classical prophets.

[8] See Devorah Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (DJD XXX; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 91–260; Brady, "Prophetic Traditions."

[9] 4Q385a 18 i a–b 7–11 (*olim* frg. 16): "And he commanded them what they should do in the land of [their] captivity, [(that) they should listen] to the voice of Jeremiah concerning the things which God had commanded him [to do]and they should keep the covenant of the God of their fathers in the land [of Babylon and they shall not do] as they has done, they themselves and their kings and their priests [and their princes] [(namely, that) they]defiled[the na]me of God to[desecrate]" (Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XX*, 160).

[10] CD 5:21–6:1 represents an eighth text that contributes to this larger discussion. It is treated below in ch. 5, pp. 97–100, since it employs the prophetic designation 'anointed one.'

The Conceptualization of the Ancient Prophets as General Lawgivers

Sectarian Documents

The Rule of the Community (1QS) 1:1–3[11]

1 ל[ ]שים לחיו [ספר סר]כ היחד[12] לדרוש
2 אל ב[כול לב ובכול נפש][13] לעשות הטוב והישר לפניו כאשר
3 צוה ביד מושה וביד כול עבדיו הנביאים

1 To […]*šym* for his life [the Book of the Rul]e of the Community. In order to seek
2 God with [all the heart and soul] doing what is good and right before him, as
3 he commanded through Moses and through all his servants the prophets.

The language of doing what is "good and right" (**הטוב והישר**) is clearly drawn from Deuteronomy (6:18; 12:28; 13:19).[14] While the expression in the Hebrew Bible can mean merely 'good' or 'appropriate,' the

---

[11] Elisha Qimron and James H. Charlesworth in James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (PTSDSSP 1; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck]; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 6–7.

[12] For attempts to reconstruct the lacuna in line one, see Yigael Yadin, "Three Notes on the Dead Sea Scrolls," *IEJ* 6 (1956): 159; Jean Carmignac, "Conjecture sur la première ligne de la Règle de la Communauté," *RevQ* 2 (1959–1960): 85–87; Philip Alexander and Geza Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX: Serekh Ha-Yaḥad and Two Related Texts* (DJD XXVI; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 32; Sarriana Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997), 111–112. The lacuna is present in both of the 4QS manuscripts that contain the beginning of the Rule of the Community (4Q255 1 1; 4Q257 1 1).

[13] Restoring with Jacob Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim: me-Megillot Midbar Yehudah* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965), 59. This restoration is fairly certain based on the textual evidence preserved in the Cave 4 manuscripts. 4Q255 1 2: **לדרוש אל בכול לב ובכ[ול נפש]**; 4Q257 1 1–2: **[לדרוש אל בכול ל]ב ובכו[ל נפש]**. See also 1QS 5:8–9 for similar language. In general, this imagery seems to be drawn from biblical literature (2 Kgs 23:3; Jer 32:41).

[14] Noted by William H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline: Translation and Notes* (BASORSup 10–12; New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951), 7; P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline* (STDJ 1; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1957), 44–45; Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim*, 59. Deut 6:18 contains the phrase in the reverse order (**הישר והטוב**). Likewise, this order is found in the Samaritan Pentateuch on Deut 12:28 and in two places in the Temple Scroll (11Q19 59:16–17; 63:8). The other instances of the phrase in the Hebrew Bible (Jos 9:25; 1 Sam 12:23; 2 Kgs 10:3; Jer 26:14; Ps 25:8; 2 Chr 14:1; 31:20) all reflect the order of MT for Deut 12:28. Whatever the original order of the two lexemes, the phrase as a whole seems to reflect an idiomatic expression.

Deuteronomic use upon which the Rule of the Community draws generally refers to the adherence to Deuteronomic law.[15] This meaning continued to be applied in the Second Temple period and at Qumran as demonstrated by the use of the expression in the non-synoptic portion of the Temple Scroll (11Q19 59:16–17) and in 4QMiqṣat Maʿase HaTorah (4QMMT C 31).[16] In the Rule of the Community, the phrase similarly denotes proper observance of God's law; adherence to the Torah and its divine law is the very first exhortation to the members of the Qumran community.

The law which the sectarians are charged to follow is qualified with: "as he commanded through (ביד) Moses and through (וביד) all

---

[15] For the general meaning, see 1 Sam 12:23; Jer 26:14; Ps 25:8; 2 Chr 14:1; 31:20. For full discussion of the phrase in Deuteronomistic literature, see Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1–11* (AB 5; Garden City: Doubleday, 1991), 347. See also Exod 15:26; 1 Kgs 11:38 where the close phrase "doing what is right and good in the sight of the Lord" has a similar connotation. Weinfeld suggests that the phrase in Exodus may have undergone Deuteronomic reworking (*Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic School* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1972], 334).

[16] The Temple Scroll's Law of the King concludes with an admonition that outlines the benefits of observing God's law and the ruin that will result from failing to do so. After articulating the disastrous results of noncompliance with God's law, the text expresses the profit of faithful adherence by the king to the divine directives: ואם בחוקותי ילך ואת מצוותי ישמור ויעש הישר והטוב לפני, "But if he will walk in my statutes, and will observe my commandments, and will do what is right and good in my sight…" The expression is also found in synoptic portions of the Temple Scroll's Deuteronomic paraphrase (11Q19 53:7//Deut 12:28; 11Q19 55:14//Deut 13:19; 11Q19 63:8//Deut 12:27; 13:19; 21:9). In the third section of 4QMMT, the author encourages the addressee to observe all the "precepts of the Torah" (C 27). Compliance with this request, asserts the author, "will be counted as a virtuous deed of yours, since you will be doing what is righteous and good in his eyes (בעשותך הטוב והישר לפנו)" (C 31; 4Q399 [MS F] lacks הטוב and has לפניו). For the composite text, see Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqṣat Maʿaśe Ha-Torah* (DJD X; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 62. The shared language and imagery of the Law of the King and the 4QMMT is not coincidental. As scholars have long noted, the Law of the King represents a polemic against the presumed excesses and abuse of power displayed by the Hasmoneans (see Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* [3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, the Shrine of the Book, 1983], 1:345–346). Scholarship on 4QMMT has proposed that the document represents a letter sent by the early leadership of the Qumran community to their priestly brethren in Jerusalem. This is suggested by the personal pronouns employed in section B ("we," "you" [pl.]). The admonition in section C, however, is formulated as a dialogue between the community ("we") and one particular individual (you [sg.]). The constant comparison with the kings of old suggests that the addressee of the exhortation is a contemporary Hasmonean king (see Qimron and Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V*, 113–121). Thus, both documents may contain polemics against the same Hasmonean royal leadership concerning their assumed negligence in the observance of the law. The expression הטוב והישר appears one additional time in the scrolls (4Q502 163 2), though the text is far too fragmentary to supply any context.

his servants the prophets." God's law is not something commanded *to* Moses and the prophets but *through* (ביד) them. The prepositional phrase assumes that the prophets (and Moses) are the mediators of God's law. Indeed, examination of the expression 'through the prophets' (or a named prophet) in the Hebrew Bible further underscores this point. In the late biblical texts discussed above, the prepositional phrase has the specialized meaning of mediating divine law.[17] In the Rule of the Community, the classical prophets, together with Moses, are presented in this same role—as mediators of divine law. The ancient revelation through Moses *and* the prophets provides the framework for the present-time ability to observe (לעשות) the law properly. This passage, however, provides no explicit information concerning that way that the ancient prophets mediated the divine law or about the precise nature of the relationship between the lawgiving function of the prophets and that of Moses.

Pesher Hosea (4Q166) 2:1–6[18]

1 [לוא ידעה כיא] אנוכי נתתי לה הדגן [והתירוש]
2 [והיצהר וכסף] הרביתי וזהב /// עשו [לבעל פשרו]
3 אשר אכל[ו וי]שבעו וישכחו את אל המא[כלם וכול][19]
4 מצוותיו השליכו אחרי גום אשר שלח אליהם [ביד][20]
5 עבדיו הנביאים ולמתעיהם שמעו ויכבדום [
6 וכאילים יפחדו מהם בעורונם

1 *[She did not know that] I myself had given her the grain [and the wine]*
2 *[and the oil, and] (that) I had supplied [silver] and gold [...] (which) they made [into Baal.* The interpretation of it is]
3 that [they] ate [and] were satisfied, and they forgot God who [had fed them, and all]
4 his commandments, they cast behind them, which he had sent to them [through]

[17] 2 Kgs 17:13; Ezra 9:10–11; Dan 9:10; 2 Chr 29:25. On the expression in general in prophetic literature, see Japhet, *Chronicles*, 926–927.

[18] Horgan, *Pesharim* (Princeton), 116.

[19] See the alternate reconstructions of the lacuna in John Strugnell, "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,'" *RevQ* 7 (1970): 200; Andre Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (trans. G. Vermes; Cleveland: Meridian, 1962), 277; David C. Carlson, "An Alternative Reading of 4 Q p Osea[a] II, 3–6," *RevQ* 11 (1982): 417–421.

[20] Note that the preposition of instrumentality (ביד) common also to 1QS (and the biblical passages cited above) is restored in the lacuna. Some scholars restore בפי (John M. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4.I (4Q158–4Q186)* [DJD V; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968], 31).

5 his servants the prophets. But to those who led them astray they listened and honored them[ ].
6 And as if they were gods, they fear them in their blindness. *vacat*

This pericope from Pesher Hosea assumes a similar understanding of the prophets as found in the Rule of the Community. In expounding upon Hos 2:10, the pesherist proclaims that, in their arrogance, the people forgot God and his commandments. These commandments are further modified as "sent to them [through] his servants the prophets."[21] The object of the prophetic mediation is made explicit. The prophets transmit God's commandments (מצוותיו). Reference to the 'commandments' in the plural in the Qumran corpus generally refers to the Torah as a whole and its system of laws and regulations (e.g., CD 19:5; 4Q381 69 5).[22]

As in the Rule of the Community, the prophets are referred to as God's servants, and, if the reconstruction of ביד is correct, mediate the divine law with the same language assumed in the Rule of the Community (drawn from the biblical sources). As such, the strong consonance of language and themes between the two passages confirms the understanding of the meaning of "good and straight" in the Rule of the Community; namely, God's law. At the same time, Moses, who appears together with the prophets in the Rule of the Community, is absent from the present passage.

In the Rule of the Community, the revelation of law to the ancient prophets is identified as the means by which the sectarian community

---

Strugnell, "Notes," 200, prefers the longer בפי קול. Horgan correctly observes that ביד is far more common in the Hebrew Bible as an expression of the instrumentality of the prophets (*Pesharim*, 141). Indeed, several biblical examples have been discussed already. Moreover, ביד is further retained in the scrolls as the dominant preposition denoting prophetic instrumentality. As such, this restoration is preferred.

[21] The language itself seems to be drawn from Mal 2:4. Similar language also appears in 4Q390 1 6–7; 2 i 5 (on which, see below). This observation is made by Devorah Dimant, "New Light on Jewish Pseudepigrapha—4Q390," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls Madrid 18–21 March, 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11,1–2; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992), 2:422.

[22] See Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (SJLA 16; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975), 47–49; Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 241. Cf. the discussion of 4Q390 1, below. See, however, Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul: A Tradition Historical Enquiry into the Relation of Law, Wisdom, and Ethics* (WUNT 2,16; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1985), 171.

can properly observe the law. In contrast, in Pesher Hosea, the enemies of the sect are singled out for their failure to adhere to the precepts of the commandments. In each text, the prophets are further identified as the mediators of the commandments.

Non-Sectarian Texts

The portrait of the prophets from Israel's past as mediating God's commandments is also reflected in two decidedly non-sectarian documents: the Apocryphon of Jeremiah (4Q390) and Apocryphon of Moses (4Q375).[23] Both of these texts are classified as 'parabiblical' documents, with the more specific generic classification as 'pseudo-prophetic' because they adapt the biblical character and story (in varying degrees) of Jeremiah and Moses.[24] Texts of this nature provide unique insight into the contemporary conception of past events and individuals at the same time as they open up the social and historical world of their composers. These texts also provide evidence that the sectarian portrait of the ancient prophets was shared by additional segments of Second Temple Judaism.

[23] There is general agreement that both of these texts are non-sectarian. See Dimant, "Qumran Manuscripts," 45, 49. On 4Q390, see however, Ben Zion Wacholder, "Deutero-Ezekiel and Jeremiah (4Q384–4Q391): Identifying the Dry Bones of Ezekiel 37 as the Essenes," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 1997* (ed. L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Israel Museum), 445–461 (esp. 450). On the similarities between the larger collection of manuscripts and sectarian literature, see discussion in Brady, "Prophetic Traditions," 2:539–540. On 4Q375, see John Strugnell, "Moses-Pseudepigrapha at Qumran: 4Q375, 4Q376, and Similar Works," in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. L.H. Schiffman; JSPSup 8; JSOT / ASOR Monographs 2; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 247–248; idem, in Magen Broshi et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XIV, Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XIX; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 130–136.

[24] On this genre, see above, pp. 8–9.

The Apocryphon of Jeremiah (4Q390) 2 i 4–5[25]

4 ו]ביובל ההוא יהיו
5 מפרים את כול חקותי ואת כל מצותי אשר אצוה א[ותם ואשלח בי]ד[26] עבדי הנביאים

4 …and] in that jubilee they will be
5 violating all my statutes and all my commandments which I shall have commanded th[em and sent throu]gh[27] my servants, the prophets.

The Apocryphon of Jeremiah is presented as an *ex eventu* prophecy revealed to Jeremiah, which contains a review of history spanning from biblical times until the eschatological age. This particular passage is hampered by a lacuna in the precise location that fully articulates the role of the prophets with respect to the laws and commandments. While there is significant debate over how to reconstruct fully this lacuna, the extant text does provide enough information to arrive at some general understanding of the presumed prophetic activity. The laws and commandments referred to in the first half of the line are further qualified as elements that have been transmitted to Israel through the agency of the prophets.

As is readily apparent, this passage shows strong similarities with other passages examined thus far. The prophets, here labeled as God's servants (cf. 1QS 1:2–3, cited above), are entrusted with the task of transmitting the commandments to the people. The language employed to express this instrumentality (ביד) is identical to that which has already been seen in biblical literature and other Qumran documents.[28]

[25] Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 245–246. See her preliminary publication and discussion in eadem, "New Light." See also the edition and commentary of this portion of 4Q390 in Brady, "Prophetic Traditions," 2:484–493. This text is also briefly treated in Michael A. Knibb, "A Note on 4Q372 and 4Q390," in *The Scriptures and the Scrolls: Studies in Honour of A.S. van der Woude on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (ed. F. García Martínez, A. Hilhorst, and C.J. Labuschagne; VTSup 49; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992), 170–177.

[26] For discussion of the reconstruction of the lacuna, see Dimant, "New Light," 2:428. The restoration of ביד is certain since the final *dalet* is clearly visible on the manuscript.

[27] Again, I have translated the expression as "through" rather than retain the literal "in the hand of." In light of the present discussion of this prepositional phrase and its employment in prophetic contexts both in the Hebrew Bible and other Qumran literature, there is no need for such a literal translation.

[28] Note as well that elsewhere in the Apocryphon of Jeremiah (4Q385a 18 i a–b 7–11, cited above), the more common biblical model of the prophet as law enforcer is found.

The Moses Apocryphon (4Q375) 1 i 1–2[29]

1 [את כול אשר]יצוה אלוהיכה אליכה מפי הנביא ושמרתה
2 [את כול החו]קים האלה

1 [all that]thy God will command thee by the mouth of the prophet, and thou shalt keep
2 [all] these [sta]tutes

The two fragments of 4Q375 (Moses Apocryphon) are generally understood as instructions for testing and exposing a seducer prophet.[30] The ordeal concerning the prophet begins only in the middle of line four. The first three and a half lines form part of a larger exhortation to observe the commandments and return to God (ll. 1–4). Thus, the prophet mentioned in line one presumably refers to the general office of a true prophet. The speaker (Moses?) encourages the people to observe "[all that]thy God will command thee by the mouth (מפי) of the prophet, and thou shalt keep [all] these [sta]utes." Though the circumstances described assume a future time when they will be realized, the passage as it stands clearly has in mind the Israelite prophet in general. The prophet is depicted as mediating God's laws and statutes.[31]

The Prophets and Progressive Revelation

In the four texts surveyed thus far, the ancient prophets appear as mediators of divine law, similar to the role traditionally assigned to Moses. While these texts begin to reveal the community's understanding of the juridical role of the ancient prophets, very little information is supplied concerning the way that the prophets function as lawgivers and their precise relationship to Moses and Mosaic law. In each, a gen-

[29] Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.XIV*, 113. See the earlier publication, idem, "Moses-Pseudepigrapha," 224–234.

[30] Gershon Brin, "The Laws of the Prophets in the Sect of the Judaean Desert: Studies in 4Q375," in *Qumran Questions* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; BS 36; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 28–60; repr. from *JSP* 10 (1992): 19–51; repr. in *Studies in Biblical Law* (JSOTSup 176; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 128–163. See, however, Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.XIV*, 118. See discussion below, pp. 301–304.

[31] Note the use of the prepositional phrase מפי rather than ביד. As noted above, however, many scholars prefer such a restoration for the passage in 4Q166 (see above, n. 20). The preposition מפי also appears in 4Q377 2 ii 5 when referring to Moses' mediation of divine law.

eral claim is advanced regarding this prophetic status. None of these texts, however, provides any explicit information concerning the precise manner in which these prophets function in this capacity. A second set of texts provides this desired context. The prophets are explicitly identified as the second stage in the progressive revelation of the law, a process begun with Moses at Sinai.

Sectarian Texts

The Rule of the Community (1QS) 8:14–16[32]

14 כאשר כתוב במדבר פנו דרך •••• ישרו בערבה מסלה לאלוהינו
15 היאה מדרש התורה א[ש]ר צוה ביד מושה לעשות ככול הנגלה עת בעת
16 וכאשר גלו הנביאים ברוח קודשו

14 As it is written: "In the wilderness prepare the way of the Lord, make level in the desert a highway for our God" (Isa 40:3).
15 This (alludes to) the study of the Torah wh[ic]h he commanded through Moses to do, according to everything which has been revealed (from) time to time,
16 and according to that which the prophets have revealed by his holy spirit.

1QS 8:15–16 represents the most important text for comprehending the community's conceptualization of the lawgiving capacity of the ancient prophets. Before discussing the presentation of the prophets, it is critical to treat the immediate literary context of this passage. Columns eight and nine of the Rule of the Community describe the formation of the sectarian community and its withdrawal to the desert.[33] Upon recognizing that they possess the proper understanding, God will set aside this group as a bulwark of truth (1QS 8:1–12). This group is then

[32] Qimron and Charlesworth, *Rule of the Community*, 36–37.
[33] On this understanding of columns 8–9, see Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim*, 177; Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "La genèse littérire de la Règle de la Communauté," *RB* 76 (1969): 529–533; Cristoph Dohman, "Zur Gründung der Gemeinde von Qumran," *RevQ* 11 (1982): 81–96. Based on the evidence of 4QS[e], which lacks all text equivalent to 1QS 8:15b–9:11 (see below, n. 36), Sarianna Metso contends that 1QS 8:15b–9:12 is a secondary insertion. Metso further argues that 1QS 8:1–10, which is found in the Cave 4 manuscript, should now be understood merely as an introduction to the regulations of the *Maskil* (9:12), similar to the introductions that appear in columns one and five (Sarianna Metso, "The Use of Old Testament Quotations in the Qumran Community Rule," in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments* [ed. F.H. Cryer and T.L. Thompson; JSOTSup 290; CIS 6; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998], 223–224).

exhorted to retreat to the desert in order to "prepare there the way of the Lord" (1QS 8:12–13). This desired model is corroborated by appeal to Isa 40:3, "In the wilderness prepare the way of the Lord; make level in the desert a highway for our Lord," which is interpreted to refer to the study of the Torah (מדרש התורה) (1QS 8:15).

The מדרש התורה, "study of the Torah," is characterized as that "wh[ic]h he commanded through (ביד) Moses to do (לעשות) according to everything which has been revealed (from) time to time (ככול הנגלה עת בעת), and according to that which the prophets have revealed by his holy spirit (וכאשר גלו הנביאים ברוח קודשו)" (1QS 8:15–16). The presence of the prepositional phrase ביד illustrates Moses' intermediary role, similar to what was already seen for both Moses and the prophets. However, the question is what exactly did God (the assumed subject of צוה) command Moses? The syntactical ambiguity of the passage makes the identification of the relative pronoun אשר difficult: is it the מדרש התורה or just the תורה?[34]

There can be little doubt that the assumed antecedent is the Torah itself and not the larger process of interpreting the Torah. If the antecedent is "study of the Torah," then "to do" must refer to this exercise. P. Wernberg-Møller observes, however, that the use of the verb לעשות in 1QS always refers to the performance of the law, not its exposition, a characteristic prominently featured elsewhere at Qumran as well.[35] Moreover, elsewhere in 1QS, the Torah of Moses is said to be commanded by God in language similar to the current passage (1QS 5:8). Accordingly, this passage in 1QS presents Moses in his traditional role of lawgiver of the Torah.

Wernberg-Møller's understanding of the use of לעשות here provides a better appreciation of the remainder of the passage.[36] The Torah

---

[34] The former reading is preferred by Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings*, 92, n. 2; Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim*, 177.

[35] Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline*, 129. See 1QS 1:3, 7; 1QpHab 7:11; 8:1; 12:4; 4QpPs[a] 1–10 ii 15, 23. See the references collected by Stephen Goranson, "Others and Intra-Jewish Polemic in Qumran Texts," in *DSSAFY*, 182.

[36] Note, however, that one of the Cave 4 manuscripts (4QS[e]) lacks any material corresponding to the text of 1QS from "commanded through Moses" (1QS 8:15) until 1QS 9:12 (the statutes of the *Maskil*) (see 4Q259 1 iii 5–6). Metso argues that the text of 4QS[e] is earlier and the entirety of 1QS 8:15–9:11 is a secondary insertion (*Textual Development*, 71–73). Metso is following the suggestion of a number of earlier scholars. See eadem, "The Primary Results of the Reconstruction of 4QS[e]," *JJS* 44 (1993): 304, n. 10 (see also eadem, "Use," 226–228). Alexander and Vermes contend (also following earlier suggestions), that the shorter text of 4Q259 represents a secondary omission

of Moses, according to 1QS, is not self-sustaining in the sense that it can be observed in full without recourse to any external explication and amplification. The employment of לעשות introduces a two-fold model for how the Torah transmitted by Moses can, in the words of Naphtali Wieder, be "applied" in full by the sectarian community, a model presumably demanded for the rest of Israel as well.[37]

First, the community is exhorted to observe the law "according to everything which has been revealed (הנגלה) (from) time to time" (1QS 8:15). This expression articulates the sectarian belief that the proper understanding of the Torah is apprehended through a system of periodic legislative revelations.[38] This passage, however, seems to speak only in generalities, merely introducing the sectarian belief in progressive revelation as a mechanism for comprehending the Torah and its post-biblical application.[39] Indeed, wedged between Moses and the prophets, these periodic revelations seem to lack a recognized time-frame and easily identifiable audience. The primary function of the passage is to indicate that the Torah is deficient without the periodic revelations.

The next clause introduces the prophets, whose function is also described as providing a proper understanding of how to observe the Torah, in the same way as the periodic revelations: "to do … according to that which the prophets revealed (גלו) by his holy spirit" (1QS 8:16). How should the role of the prophets in this passage be understood?

(*Qumran Cave 4.XIX*, 148). The other Cave 4 manuscript with text corresponding to 1QS (4QS[d]) does not reflect this textual omission. 4Q258 [4QS[d]] 3 vi 7–8 (frg. 2 in Metso and Qimron-Charlesworth) runs entirely parallel to the material in 1QS (partially reconstructed), though still contains a somewhat shorter text than 1QS. Though the text of 1QS may reflect a later development, it still contributes greatly to the discussion of the conception of prophets in the sectarian documents, though perhaps at a later stage in the sect's history. The evidence of 4QS[e] will be important in various places throughout this study.

[37] Naphtali Wieder, *The Judean Scrolls and Karaism* (London: East and West Library, 1962), 78. Compare 1QS 1:1–3, which employs the identical language of "performing" (לעשות) the law of Moses. As already remarked, this passage seemingly provides no model for the actualization of the performance.

[38] On the Qumran community's belief in the progressive revelation of law, see Wieder, *Judean Scrolls*, 67–70; Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The Unwritten Law in the Pre-Rabbinic Period," in *Studies in Qumran Law* (SJLA 24; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977), 29–33; repr. from *JSJ* 3 (1972): 7–29; Schiffman, *Halakhah*, 22–32; idem, *Reclaiming*, 247–249.

[39] So Wieder, *Judean Scrolls*, 78; Schiffman, *Halakhah*, 26. Contra Michael A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (CCWJCW 2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 135.

More specifically, what is the precise relationship between their legislative revelation and the Torah transmitted by Moses?

The role of the prophets here is extremely nuanced and slightly different from that which has been seen in the texts already discussed. Though earlier in the Rule of the Community, Moses and the prophets seemingly share the role of transmitters of the Torah (or commandments) itself, here, that responsibility is the exclusive domain of Moses. The prophets are entrusted with a secondary task. The description of Moses is linked to the mention of the Torah. His role is marked with the same language of instrumentality seen in the previous passages (ביד). The prophets, on the other hand, are introduced not in this regard. Instead, their role is to illuminate the performance (לעשות) of the Torah and provide instruction on how to carry out this directive properly.

Accordingly, there is no indication that the prophets are expected to introduce any radically new legislation independent of Mosaic law. Rather, entrusted with the task of facilitating the performance of Torah law, the prophetic activity here most likely involves the explication of the proper application of the legislation in the Torah and incorporation of extra-biblical traditions.[40] The prophets are here conceptualized as possessing the proper understanding of the Torah of Moses and empowered to share this knowledge with Israel. This juridical knowledge is intimately connected with their prophetic status. Following a general statement on the sect's theory of progressive revelation, the prophets are described as the initial historical link in the succession of these periodic revelations. The revelatory experience at Sinai, consisting of the Torah of Moses, was incomplete with respect to the future legislative needs of Israel. The juridical activity of the prophets represents the first attempt to grapple with this problem.

[40] See Wieder, *Judean Scrolls*, 78–79; Baumgarten, "Unwritten Law," 30; Schiffman, *Halakhah*, 26; idem, *Reclaiming*, 248.

Non-Sectarian Texts

Non-Canonical Psalms (4Q381) 69 1–5[41]

1]לכם כי ת◦[ ]לם בראותו כי התעיבו עמי [הא]רץ
2 היתה]כל הארץ לנדת טמאה והפלה מראשונה
3 נ]ועץ אל לבו להשמידם מעילה ולעשות עליה עם
4]בכם וינתם[42] לכם ברוחו נביאים להשכיל וללמד אתכם
]◦ כם מן שמים ירד וידברעמכם להשכיל אתכם ולהשיב ממעשי ישבי
5 נתן ח]קים תורות ומצות בברית העמיד ביד] משה[◦◦◦

1]*lkm* because *t* [ ]*lm*. When he saw that the peoples of [the la]nd acted abominably
2]all the land [became] total unclean defilement. And marvelously, from the first
3 he to]ok counsel with himself to destroy them from upon it, and to make upon it a people
4]*bkm*, and he gave them to you by his spirit, prophets to instruct and to teach you
5sup]*km* from heaven he came down, and he spoke with you to instruct you, and to turn (you) away from the deeds of the inhabitants of
5 He gave la]ws, instructions and commandments by the covenant he established though [Moses]

The model envisaged by 1QS 8:15–16 is present in one fragment among the larger group of non-sectarian psalm-like compositions labeled by its editor Eileen Schuller as Non-Canonical Psalms.[43] This psalm begins with a historical narration (ll. 1–5) and then turns to second person direct speech. The prophets and Moses appear at the conclusion of this historical narration.

---

[41] Eileen Schuller, in Esther Eshel et al., *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (DJD XI; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 149–150. See the earlier publication, eadem, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: A Pseudepigraphic Collection* (HSS 28; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 200–203.

[42] This word seems to come from the root נתן. The intended form seems to be a third person, sg., masc., imperfect (waw-consecutive), with a pronominal suffix. See Schuller, *Qumran Cave 4.VI*, 151, for a brief discussion on the origins of this form. Though the preceding lacuna may contain explicit identification of the pronominal suffix, the syntactical arrangement of the line suggests that "them" is a proleptic suffix referring to the prophets. Moreover, the association of the prophets and the spirit is well known (and observed by Schuller).

[43] The Non-Canonical Psalms (4Q380–381) are generally classified as non-sectarian on account of the lack of any discernable sectarian terminology (Schuller, *Psalms*, 22–23; Dimant, "Qumran Manuscripts," 47). On the general features of the collection, see Schuller, *Psalms*, 1–25.

The historical narration is anchored by the notice concerning the "peoples of the land (עמי הארץ) (who) acted abominably" (l. 1). Schuller identifies this group with the pre-conquest inhabitants of the land of Canaan.[44] Their impurity prompts God's decision to destroy them and settle the land with a new nation, presumably Israel (l. 3). There is no actual mention of the emergence of the Israelites or their entrance into the land of Canaan. In fact, line five appears to refer to the establishment of the covenant at Sinai.[45] Based on this historical schema, the events narrated seemingly are intended to take place in the pre-Sinai period.[46]

After God has resolved to destroy the "peoples of the land" and create a new nation, the text states that "he gave them to you by his spirit, prophets to instruct and teach you" (l. 4). The sequence of the psalm suggests that these prophets were active in the pre-Sinai period. If this is the case, this is part of a larger tradition that places prophets in the early period of Israel's existence.[47] Though these prophets were active prior to the revelation at Sinai, it need not be assumed that their activity would be conceived of any differently from the post-Sinai prophets. Indeed, it is not uncommon when speaking about the period before Sinai to assume the existence of post-Sinai conditions.[48] The proximity in the psalm of this notice and the report about Sinai serve to heighten the 'Sinaitic' character of these prophets. Though the revelation at Sinai is related in line five, it is certainly in view in line four.

---

[44] Schuller, *Qumran Cave 4.VI*, 150; see also, eadem, *Psalms*, 204. In particular, Schuller points to Neh 9:24 for support (see pp. 210–212 for an alternate understanding of it as the pre-flood generation).

[45] Schuller, *Psalms*, 206.

[46] See Schuller, *Psalms*, 206, for further discussion of the chronological difficulties.

[47] Schuller, *Psalms*, 206. This is a well rehearsed tradition (see the citations collected by Schuller) that survives into later Judaism as well as Christianity and Islam. At the same time, Schuller observes that the psalm may not be maintaining a strict chronological sequence.

[48] Jubilees and rabbinic tradition are the best examples of this phenomenon. See e.g., *Jub.* 15:25; 16:9, 29; 18:19; 28:6; *Sifre* Deut. §345; *Gen. Rab.* 64:4; *Lev. Rab.* 2:10; *b. Qid.* 82a; *b. Yom.* 28b. Pre-Sinai individuals are often identified as having knowledge of law later revealed at Sinai as well as later legislative developments. For example, the patriarchs are depicted as observing all the Sinaitic (and rabbinic) commandments. See further, George F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim* (3 vols.; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927–1930), 1:275–276; Baumgarten, "Unwritten Law," 31, n. 74; Gary A. Anderson, "The Status of the Torah before Sinai," *DSD* 1 (1994): 1–29.

The psalm identifies the prophets as being sent "to instruct and teach (להשכיל וללמד)." The full import of this presumably technical expression is only apparent through analysis of the biblical base texts upon which 4Q381 is drawing and how it employs this biblical language and imagery.

As Schuller points out, the root 'to teach' (√למד) is common Deuteronomic terminology associated with Moses.[49] Throughout, the subject of Moses' instruction is the law.[50] In particular, he instructs the Israelites in the חקים (laws) and משפטים (rules) (Deut 4:1, 5, 14), with the sometime addition of the מצוה (instruction) (Deut 5:28; 6:1).[51] Of these three subjects of instruction, two of them are mentioned in the present psalm (l. 5) as transmitted to Israel through the agency of Moses (מצות, חקים).[52] The prophets in line four are therefore depicted as instructing Israel concerning these laws and rules similar to the same way that Moses appears in Deuteronomy and later in this fragment.

The other word used to describe the prophetic instruction (להשכיל) carries similar connotations. This is most apparent in the biblical base text upon which 4Q381 is likely drawing—Nehemiah 9.[53] The notice that God, through his spirit, sent the prophets to instruct (להשכיל) Israel (l. 4) is drawn from Neh 9:20, where God is lauded for bestowing upon Israel "your good spirit to instruct them (להשכילם)."[54] The full meaning and impact of this verse can only be ascertained within the framework of the larger literary structure of the confession in which it appears. The unit is constructed as a literary reversal, whereby the second half of the literary unit functions as a refracted reversal of the first half.[55] Neh 9:20 is parallel to the earlier notice of the revelation of the law at Sinai and its continued mediation and interpretation through Moses (vv. 13–14).

[49] Schuller, *Qumran Cave 4.VI*, 151. This root is employed in the Pentateuch only in Deuteronomy (Weinfeld, *Deuteronomic School*, 189, 303). Elsewhere, it refers to formal instruction in wisdom or in a skill (see HALOT 2:531).

[50] The one exception is Deut 31:19, 22, where Moses teaches the Israelites the Song of Moses.

[51] Compare NJPS ad loc. which understands "the instruction" as a larger category that encompasses the "laws" and the "rules."

[52] A third element, the תורות, also appears.

[53] Schuller, *Qumran Cave 4.VI*, 149. See the extensive list of parallel language and imagery in eadem, *Psalms*, 209–210.

[54] See Schuller, *Psalms*, 209; eadem, *Qumran Cave 4.VI*, 151.

[55] See John R. Levison, *The Spirit in First-Century Judaism* (AGAJU 29; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997), 195. On this feature in biblical literature, see Jon D. Levenson, *Esther: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 5–12.

Based on the parallel structure of this pericope, the instruction by the spirit in v. 20 is no doubt in legal matters, particularly elucidation of the divine commandments. Indeed, in his analysis of the role of the spirit in this passage, John R. Levison points to the other uses of the root שכל in Nehemiah in support of this understanding. The root is regularly employed to describe the "study and interpretation of Torah" (Neh 8:8, 13). So too, Levison argues, this same function should be assigned to the enlightening spirit in Neh 9:20.[56]

The reference in Nehemiah to the spirit as the driving force is the textual and literary foundation for the passage in 4Q381. The precise role of the spirit, however, has changed slightly. In 4Q381 the divine spirit is the agent by which God conveys the prophets to Israel. The prophets in 4Q381 assume the role played by the spirit in Neh 9:20. The biblical base text of 4Q381 provides further insight into the nature of the "instruction" the prophets are expected to perform. The instruction of the prophets, like the spirit in Nehemiah, is grounded in interpretation and elucidation of the Torah itself. This activity is intended to complement Moses' initial formulation of the law.[57]

The role of Moses and the prophets in this fragment can now be understood more clearly. Line five recounts how God transmitted "la]ws, instructions, and commandments by the covenant established

---

[56] Levison, *Spirit*, 196. The use of the root שכל to refer to the proper elucidation of the Torah is also found in God's exhortation to Joshua upon assuming the role of leader of Israel (Jos 1:7–8).

[57] This understanding of the expression "to instruct and to teach" in 4Q381 is reinforced by the combination of these same two words in the Rule of the Congregation (1QSa). The desired curriculum of the youth (ages 10–20) is outlined as: "they shall instruct him ([ויל]מדהו) in the Book of Hagi (בספר ההגי) and according to his age they shall enlighten him (ישכיליהו) in the statute[s of] the covenant" (1QSa 1:7). Though there is intense debate on the meaning of the Book of Hagi (CD 10:6; 13:2; 14:8), many scholars assert that it is a reference to the Torah (Isaac Rabinowitz, "The Qumran Authors' *SPR HHGW/Y*," *JNES* 20 [1961]: 111–114; Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim*, 256; Schiffman, *Halakhah*, 44; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 149; Steven D. Fraade, "Hagu, Book of," *EDSS* 1:327). The latter half of the passage in 1QSa seems to refer specifically to the sectarian teachings and rules and not general Torah. Schiffman suggests that it is "the practical application of the commandments," similar to the rabbinic instruction of children in the proper observance of the commandments (*The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation* [SBLMS 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989], 15). As in the rabbinic communities where the youth would be taught the Torah according to its rabbinic interpretation and application, Schiffman argues that the youth here would be initiated in the commandments according to their sectarian understanding. Thus, the youth curriculum stresses instruction (√למד) in the Torah (the Book of Hagi) and the illumination (√שכל) of its proper sectarian interpretation (the statutes of the covenant).

through [Moses]." As in line four, this passage displays a dependency on Nehemiah 9, in this case vv. 13–14.[58] The same sequence of divine laws is said to be transmitted "through (ביד) Moses your servant" (Neh 9:14). 4Q381 makes the initial mediation of the Torah and its laws the exclusive prerogative of Moses. This passage locates the prophetic legislative mission as independent of Moses and the Torah.

The prophets, sent with the aid of a divine spirit, are identified with the task of "instruction" and "illumination." The analysis of the use of these terms in 4Q381 in dialogue with their presumed biblical basis provides some contextual meaning for their application here. The prophets are not represented as transmitting the actual Torah, but are rather depicted as Torah instructors (ללמד). Their function in this capacity is to make the Torah intelligible and applicable in the present setting (להשכיל). Through this revelatory experience, the prophets continue the task of prophetic lawgiving begun with Moses at Sinai.

The Apocryphon of Jeremiah (4Q390) 1 4–7[59]

4 ויעשו גם הם את הרע בעיני ככל אשר עשו ישראל
5 בימי ממלכתו הרישונים מלבד העולים רישונה מארץ שבים לבנות
6 את המקדש ואדברה בהמה ואשלחה אליהם מצוה ויבינו בכול אשר
7 עזבו הם ואבותיהם

4 And they will do what is evil in my eyes, like all that the Israelites had done
5 in the former days of their kingdom, except for those who will come first from the land of their captivity to build
6 the Temple. And I will speak to them and I shall send them commandments, and they will understand everything that
7 they and their fathers had abandoned.

The Apocryphon of Jeremiah, as noted above, contains a review of history from biblical times through the eschatological age. 4Q390 1, as understood by Dimant, represents part of the final description of the biblical period and the initial period of the Second Temple.[60] In general, this fragment heaps immeasurable scorn upon the last phases of the monarchy and the majority of Jews in the Second Temple period.

[58] Schuller, *Qumran Cave 4.VI*, 151.
[59] Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 237–238. There are no contested restorations of the manuscript. Brady, "Prophetic Traditions," 2:470, provides the same text.
[60] Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 243.

In contrast to the disobedience that marks the "former days of their kingdom," the initial returnees from the Babylonian exile are presented as steadfast and resolute in their fidelity to the covenant and God's commandments.[61] This behavior and the divine favor that it engenders are seemingly linked to their desire to build the temple (ll. 5–6).

Up to this point, the apocryphal description of the returnees' activity is drawn primarily from the biblical record, specifically Ezra-Nehemiah.[62] The text, however, introduces an entirely new detail into their story. God declares that he will speak with the returnees and send them commandments (l. 6).[63] The locution ואדברה בהמה ואשלחה אליהם מצוה, "And I shall speak to them and I shall send them commandments," as noted by Dimant, paraphrases Deut 5:28 ("I will speak to you all of the commandments and the statutes and the law").[64] In Deuteronomy, God instructs Moses to dictate to Israel a set of laws and commandments that will be incumbent upon the first generation of Israelites who will enter the land of Israel under the direction of Joshua. The Apocryphon of Jeremiah has recontextualized the meaning and application of the Deuteronomic passage. As a set of laws intended for those entering the land of Israel, they fit well the new narrative created by 4Q390 1. Rather than directed at Joshua's generation, these divine laws are now intended for the first generation of returnees from the Babylonian exile.

---

[61] Florentino García Martínez argues that the larger contents of this fragment reflect the Hasmonean period ("Nuevos Textos No Biblicos Procedentes de Qumran," *Estudios Bíblicos* 49 [1991]: 130–134). At the same time, he understands the "returnees" as a reference to the period of Ezra (p. 134). This reading is echoed by Knibb, "Note," 174. See further discussion in Brady, "Prophetic Traditions," 2:466–469. At the same time, all agree that the circumstances of line six (the return) must be located in an early post-exilic context. The fact that the individuals have come to rebuild the temple seems to rule out the period of Ezra, when the temple had already been built. The most plausible historical context for this group is the initial wave of Babylonian exiles that returned to Jerusalem (with Sheshbazzar) or perhaps the second set of immigrants (with Joshua and Zerubbabel), who actually succeeded in building the temple. The language of returning to rebuild the temple is drawn from Ezra 1:5, which describes the first set of returnees.

[62] On the biblical base, see Dimant, "New Light," 2:422; eadem, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 240; Brady, "Prophetic Traditions," 2:479.

[63] The text seems to indicate that the dialogue is between God and the returnees. See, however, Brady, "Prophetic Traditions," 2:479, who understands the audience as the sinners mentioned earlier in the passage. Brady's interpretation does not alter my overall understanding of the passage.

[64] The latter half of the clause draws from Mal 2:4 (see below). See Dimant, "New Light," 2:422; eadem, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 240.

The laws transmitted in the Apocryphon of Jeremiah, however, are not merely a reproduction of those which God communicates to Moses in Deut 5:28. The Apocryphon of Jeremiah indicates that God will confer upon the returnees מצוה, rendered by Dimant as a collective noun "the commandments."[65] This word choice is no doubt drawn from Deut 5:28, where it refers to Mosaic legislation. In the Qumran corpus, Torah law, however, is more often identified with the terms מצות אל or מצוות. מצוה is the more general term for sectarian law.[66] There is little to recommend such a narrow understanding of the term here for the non-sectarian Apocryphon of Jeremiah. At the same time, it seems certain that the author of the Apocryphon of Jeremiah has chosen his words deliberately in order to refer to a set of laws conveyed to the returnees that is not merely a restatement of Mosaic legislation.[67]

The exact content of this new non-Mosaic law is not clear from the text. Perhaps it would have contained specific instructions on how to build the new temple, the project previously mentioned in the fragment.[68] Further in this fragment, the generations following the initial returnees are condemned for their failure to continue the exemplary conduct of the returnees. In particular, they are singled out for forgetting "statute and festival and Sabbath and covenant" (l. 8). The proximity of this generation to the returnees suggests that some of these elements would have been contained in the legislation received by the returning generation.[69] All of these four categories are well established features of Mosaic law. The current "commandments" would therefore likely include some amplification or supplement to this Mosaic legislation.

It is reasonably certain that the Apocryphon of Jeremiah envisions God's assigning the role of mediating the law to a prophetic agent. The imagery in the Apocryphon of Jeremiah of God's communicating laws to the returnees is drawn from the encounter between God

---

[65] Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 240–241. Wacholder, "Deutero-Ezekiel," 451; Brady, "Prophetic Traditions," 2:472, translate as a singular.

[66] See Schiffman, *Halakhah*, 47–49; Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 241.

[67] So argued by Dimant, "New Light," 2:422; eadem, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 241.

[68] Following his interpretation of this passage, Knibb opines that the "commandment" refers to Ezra's reforms ("A Note," 174). As noted above, the group of returnees cannot be identified with the period of Ezra since this group set out to build the temple. Since God speaks "to them" and sends the commandments "to them," it seems that this is same group that receives the commandments, thus precluding the period of Ezra.

[69] See Dimant, "New Light," 2:422; eadem, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 241.

and Moses in Deut 5:28. There, God entrusts Moses, the first of the prophetic lawgivers, with the responsibility of transmitting divine law to Israel. This lawgiving role would therefore be taken up by a later prophetic lawgiver active during the period of the return of the Babylonian exiles. Indeed, the language of 4Q390 1 6 also draws from Mal 2:4, where Malachi informs the Levites, "Know then that I have sent this commandment (מצוה) to you." Does the Apocryphon of Jeremiah envision Malachi as the prophetic lawgiver assigned the task of mediating new law to the early post-exilic community? This is of course consistent with the chronological context and content of Malachi's prophetic career as found in the biblical record. Indeed, the alignment of Moses and Malachi is a well-known trope found already in the epilogue to the biblical book (Mal 3:22 [Eng. 4:4]), where a later glossator places in Malachi's mouth an exhortation to observe the law of Moses.[70]

Summary

In the foregoing discussion, I have treated two sets of texts, each of which presents a relatively uniform portrait of the contemporary conception of the classical prophets and their relationship to the law. In the first four (1QS 1:2–3; 4Q166 2:2–3; 4Q390 2; 4Q375), the prophets are portrayed, sometimes together with Moses, as agents in the transmission and diffusion of divine law. This role for the prophets is not entirely new from the perspective of inherited biblical tradition. In a few late biblical passages, prophets are commissioned with the task of lawgiving (2 Kgs 17:13; Ezra 9:10–11; Dan 9:10; 2 Chr 29:25). These passages, however, present the minority biblical view. Thus, the Qumran texts have deliberately reconfigured the ancient prophets as lawgivers by drawing upon the language (ביד) and imagery of this late biblical tradition.

The precise role of the prophet in these Qumran passages, however, is not entirely clear. The texts do not provide enough information to determine the relationship of the prophetic lawgiving to that of Moses or of the prophetic legislation to Mosaic law. What is clear, however, is that the ancient prophets are conceptualized as active participants in the continued revelation of law after Moses. For the Qumran com-

[70] On the relationship of Malachi to Moses, see further, Dale C. Allison, *A New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993), 76–77, n. 179.

munity, the Torah can be observed in its totality only through the law revealed by Moses *and* the prophets.

The second set of texts supplies this desired context (1QS 8:15–16; 4Q381 69; 4Q390 1). In these passages, the prophets are presented as amplifying Mosaic law and actively engaged in the formation of non-Mosaic law. The sectarian texts, along with the non-sectarian works, schematize the development of legal traditions in ancient Israel as follows: Moses, as lawgiver and prophet *par excellence*, received the Pentateuchal law and transmitted it to Israel. Moses' role as lawgiver is intimately connected with his related status as prophet, which is marked through the use of technical terminology found in the Hebrew Bible for the prophetic transmission of divine law (ביד). In this respect, the Qumran community was in complete agreement with most other segments of Jewish society.[71]

The Qumran corpus identifies the second stage in this process with the revelation of law and its transmission though the agency of prophets. Their lawgiving activity, though intimately connected with that of Moses, is clearly singled out as an independent and secondary enterprise. Their activity seems to focus on facilitating the observance of Mosaic law through its further amplification and interpretation, a process conceptualized as drawing upon the prophetic ability to reveal the divine will through the agency of the holy spirit. At times, this process involves the introduction of legislation that stands outside of the immediate framework of Mosaic law.[72] Moreover, the Rule of the Community

---

[71] This portrait of Moses must be compared and contrasted with other presentations of Moses as prophet and lawgiver in the Second Temple period. For example, Philo identifies Moses' role as a lawgiver as part of his prophetic tasks (see *Congr.* 132; *Virt.* 51; *Spec. Laws* 2.104). Moses is also repeatedly referred to as a "lawgiver" (ὁ νομοθέτης) by Philo and Josephus. See Wayne A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Tradition and the Johannine Christology* (NovTSup 14; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967), 113, n. 2, 126 (Philo), 132–133, esp. n. 2 (Josephus). The Greco-Roman sources reflect a similar understanding of Moses as the lawgiver of the Jews. These sources, however, contain both positive and negative assessments of Moses' lawgiving role. See John G. Gager, *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism* (SBLMS 16; Nashville: Abingdon, 1972), 25–112. See, however, the Temple Scroll, where Moses' preeminent status as lawgiver is entirely absent. Moses' role as mediator of law is bypassed in order to create an unmediated divine revelation of law. On which, see below pp. 234–237.

[72] The view advanced here is predicated upon the understanding that the Second Temple period writers envisioned the ancient prophets not in conflict with Mosaic law and prophecy, but as continuing participants in the prophetic lawgiving task initiated by Moses. Hindy Najman observes a similar phenomenon with respect to pseudepigraphical works attributed to or associated with Moses. Najman argues that texts like Deuteronomy or Jubilees, which at first glance seem to supplant earlier Mosaic Scrip-

(8:16) and the Non-Canonical Psalms identify the holy / divine spirit as a fundamental agent of the prophetic legislative activity.[73] The classical prophets, as conceptualized within the Qumran corpus, represent the second link in the ongoing revelation of law to Israel.

---

ture and therefore subvert Mosaic authority, are actually participants in an ongoing Mosaic Discourse (*Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* [JSJSup 77; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004]).

[73] In 1QS 8:16, the spirit is the precise mechanism through which the prophets reveal the progressive revelation of law. It is not clear in this passage if the spirit is the actual agent for this transmission or the prophets themselves transmit the law while in a state of inspiration related to the receipt of the spirit. In 4Q381, the spirit is the agent through which God confers the prophets upon Israel. The close relationship between the receipt of the spirit and prophetic lawgiving is also present in CD 5:21–6:1, where the lawgiving prophets are identified as "one anointed ones with the holy (spirit)" (see below, pp. 97–100). The portrait of the holy / divine spirit in these passages is closely related to its more widespread function as an agent of interpretation of the Torah (see Levison, *Spirit*, 194). Indeed, one of the earliest examples of this phenomenon can be found in Nehemiah 9, which serves as the biblical base for 4Q381 69. Bibliography on the more numerous functions of the holy / divine spirit in the Dead Sea Scrolls is vast (see general overview of scholarship up to 1989 in Arthur E. Sekki, *The Meaning of Ruaḥ at Qumran* [SBLDS 110; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989], 7–69). The relatively widespread use of the holy / divine spirit in the scrolls was seen by many scholars as the missing link between the Hebrew Bible, in which the holy spirit is of little importance (Isa 63:10–11; Ps 51:13), and the New Testament, which witnesses a burgeoning interest in the holy spirit (as well as rabbinic Judaism). Closer analysis of the prophetic role of the holy / divine spirit and its relationship to biblical antecedents and later Jewish and Christian conceptions, however, is less common. See Edward L. Beavin, "Ruaḥ Hakodesh in Some Early Jewish Literature" (Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt University, 1961), 95–99; A.A. Anderson, "The Use of Ruaḥ in 1QS, 1QH and 1QM," *JSS* 7 (1962): 302; F.F. Bruce, "Holy Spirit in the Qumran Texts," *The Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society* 6 (1966–1968), 51; J. Pryke, "'Spirit' and 'Flesh' in the Qumran Documents and Some New Testament Texts," *RevQ* 5 (1965): 346; Rotem, "Ha-Nevuah," 18–19; Jacobus A. Naudé, "Holiness in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *DSSAFY*, 190 (see, however, Helmer Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [trans. E.T. Sander; New York: Crossroad, 1995], 90: "in Qumran there is also no reference to the spirit as the driving force in prophecy"). In general, the limited interest in this subject is likely tied to the uncertain nature of the relevant texts. Besides the three texts mentioned above, the divine / holy spirit appears in conjunction with prophecy in only a few passages (CD 2:12; 4Q270 2 ii 14; 4Q287 10:13; 11Q13 2:18; cf. 4Q410 1 7). I argue below that the interpretation of Isa 61:1 in 11QMelchizedek (11Q13 2:18) identifies the spirit as the element that enables the prophetic experience, an understanding that should be applied to other passages that identify prophets as having been anointed with the holy spirit (see pp. 92–97). These passages, however, do not reveal any further details concerning the prophetic role of the spirit. The spirit does appear as a mediating agent in several of the texts discussed in chapters 10–13, which examine the modified modes of revelation in Second Temple Judaism. In particular, the spirit often appears as an agent in the transmission of divine knowledge (sapiential revelation) in both general Second Temple literature and at Qumran (see pp. 374–375).

The foregoing discussion has sought to illuminate the conception of the ancient prophets as lawgivers as found within the Qumran sectarian community and closely related non-sectarian texts. The sectarian community and the larger Jewish world responsible for the composition of the non-sectarian literature housed at Qumran clearly envisioned the ancient prophetic class as active participants in the continued revelation of law.[74] These legislative prophets stand in a prophetic-legal tradition that stems back to Moses, the first of the prophetic lawgivers. The limited juridical activity of all subsequent prophets in the Hebrew Bible is replaced in the Qumran corpus by a classical prophetic class that is actively engaged in the ongoing revelation of law through the medium of the holy spirit. In chapter sixteen, it will be shown that this reconfiguration of the ancient prophets is intimately related to the larger framework of the relationship of law and prophecy at Qumran. The community viewed its own lawgiving activity in continuity with this ancient prophetic task. In this sense, sectarian legislative activity should be understood as a prophetic process.

[74] Some scholars have suggested that a similar view of the prophets may be found in Ben Sira. See Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 136. Ben Sira also locates the legal tradition among the scribal class, especially priestly scribes. See, for example, 45:17, where Aaron is described in terminology that resembles the description of the transmission of law through Moses in 45:5 (See Schnabel, *Law*, 52–55).

CHAPTER FOUR

BIBLICAL PROPHETIC EPITHETS IN TRANSITION I: PROPHETIC 'VISIONARIES'

The previous two chapters examined the conceptualization of the biblical *nābî'* found within the Qumran corpus. This chapter shifts the analysis to the use of 'visionary' (חוזה) in the Dead Sea Scrolls. As in the previous chapters, I am interested both in the way in which the ancient prophetic category of 'visionary' is reconfigured and the divergent literary forms in which the expression appears.[1]

This chapter contains two sections. In the first section, two passages (CD 2:12; 1QM 11:7–8) are examined where 'visionary' is employed in reference to ancient prophetic figures. This analysis concentrates on ways that the role and function of the ancient 'visionaries' is reconfigured in the Qumran corpus. In these passages, 'visionary' is used in literary parallelism to 'anointed one' (משיח), another prophetic designation. For these particular passages, these two terms are treated together.[2] This section also briefly discusses additional passages that are sometimes introduced as further examples of the prophetic use of the term 'visionary.' The second section discusses the several non-prophetic applications of the term חוזה in the Qumran corpus (4Q280, Hodayot) and tracks the development of 'visionary' from its biblical prophetic use to its non-prophetic employment in these passages.

The employment of חוזה at Qumran is dramatically different from its more specialized meaning in the Hebrew Bible, even when the term 'visionary' is retained as a prophetic title.[3] Moreover, the six explicit

[1] The nominal form חוזה appears in the non-biblical scrolls a total of ten times, while the Hebrew root appears three times (the Aramaic root appears with far more frequency due to its more common use in Aramaic as the primary verb for 'to see'). A number of these instances (4Q174 5 4; 4Q517 15 1; 4Q518 2 1), however, are too fragmentary and thus lack sufficient context to be included in the present discussion. The root also appears in 4Q424 3 3; 4Q481d 2 3 with the general meaning of 'to see.' 4Q163 15–16 2 is a citation of Isa 29:10.

[2] Ch. 5 contains a full analysis of the use of 'anointed' as a prophetic designation at Qumran.

[3] On the biblical meaning of this term, see J. Lindblom, *Prophecy in Ancient Israel*

instances of the expression (both prophetic and non-prophetic) reflect a new linguistic structure for the term 'visionaries.' The expression appears in the Hebrew Bible only in the absolute form, whether singular or plural (i.e., חזה, חזים).[4] The plural absolute form does appear in two of the fragmentary Qumran texts (4Q174 5 4; 4Q518 2 1). In the six cases discussed below, however, the word always appears in the plural as the first element in a construct phrase. It is then modified by a second element that further clarifies the role and status of these 'visionaries.' This new linguistic structure allows the texts to place an added value judgment on the 'visionaries.' There now appear both 'visionaries of truth' and 'visionaries of deceit.'[5]

(Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967), 90–95; Alfred Jepson, "חזה," *TDOT* 4:283–290; Wilson, *Prophecy*, 254–255; Petersen, *Role*, 51–69; Schniedewind, *Word*, 37–44.

[4] The one possible exception is MT 2 Chr 33:19, with its reference to "the words of חוזי." This can be understood as either a personal name or as a nominal form of חזה with a first person plural possessive suffix ("my visionaries"). LXX has τῶν ὁρώντων, reflecting a Hebrew *Vorlage* containing חזים. See also v. 18 which refers to the "words of the visionaries" (ודברי החזים). Some have suggested that the form in MT has suffered from haplography and should read חוזיו (see Wilhelm Rudolph, *Chronikbücher* [HAT 1/21; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1955], 316). Japhet prefers reading MT as a proper name, proposing that a glossator misunderstood "the word of the visionaries" in v. 18 as a title of a prophetic book (*Chronicles*, 1000). This was then transformed into a title with a proper name similar to 'the words of Jeremiah,' etc. William M. Schniedewind also accepts the authenticity of MT though proposes that both possible readings of חוזי are intended ("The Source Citations of Manasseh: King Manasseh in History and Homily," *VT* 41 [1991]: 459). Naming the prophet Hozai, according to Schniedewind, carefully plays upon the earlier notice that Manasseh was warned by the חוזים. Even if MT's reading is accepted, it is still entirely different from the construct forms that appear in the scrolls.

[5] In addition to the texts treated in this chapter where 'visionary' is applied either to ancient prophetic figures or contemporary sectarian groups, a few additional texts seem to reflect a heightened interest in ancient (and perhaps contemporary) visionary activity. The prominence of visionary language (i.e., √חזה) and imagery in these texts has led scholars to classify them as a collection of visionary texts: 4QVision and Interpretation (4Q410), 4QVisions of Amram[a-g] (4Q543–549?); 4QNarrative A (4Q458), 4QpapApocalypse (4Q489), 4QVision[a] ar (4Q556), 4QVision[c] (4Q557), 4QpapVision[b] ar (4Q558) (cf. 11Q5 22 13–14 [Apostrophe to Zion]; 4Q529). The so-called Vision of Samuel (4Q160) is inappropriately titled as such by Allegro in DJD 5. Allegro's title was influenced by the first fragment of the text, which recounts Samuel's first vision as described in 1 Samuel 3. Fragment one is only a small portion of a larger text that seems to take as its inspiration the story and character of Samuel (thus the more common title Samuel Apocryphon). For fuller discussion, see my "Literary and Historical Studies in the Samuel Apocryphon (4Q160)" (forthcoming). The majority of the actual visionary texts are extremely fragmentary, unfortunately, and therefore contribute little to the general understanding of the reception of 'visionary' activity at Qumran and in the Second Temple period. For example, the collection of manuscripts titled 4QVision[a–c],

Part One: Prophetic 'Visionaries' and 'Anointed Ones'

The Role of the Prophetic 'Visionaries' and 'Anointed Ones' in the Damascus Document and the War Scroll

Damascus Document (CD) 2:12–13

12 ויודיעם ביד משיחו⟨י⟩[6] רוח קדשו וחוזי[7]

4QNarrative A, 4QpapApocalypse contain only a few scattered words and features that point to a visionary context. These texts often have the speaker stating in the first person: "I saw" (חזית/ה) (e.g., 4Q489 1 2; 4Q558 68 1). In both cases, however, the word appears in complete isolation and it is not certain if the technical meaning of seeing in a vision is intended. These texts twice refer to prophecy. The word "the prophecy" (הנבואה) appears in isolation once (4Q458 15 2; see above, p. 27, n. 6), while elsewhere there is reference to the words of some unnamed prophet (4Q556 1 7). On these texts in general, see Erik W. Larson, "Visions," *EDSS* 2:957–958. Of these texts, the Visions of Amram (Émile Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII: Textes arameéns, première partie: 4Q529–549* [DJD XXXI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001], 282–405), which reconfigures the ancient visionary experience of Amram, is potentially most helpful for the present discussion. Throughout the document, Amram informs his children of several events that will take place in the future. Amram's knowledge of these events seems to come from his earlier visionary experiences (see 4Q546 9; 14). None of these passages, however, describes in detail the vision or the visionary experience. The fullest description of Amram's visions appears in 4Q544 1 (par. 4Q543 5–9; 4Q547 1–2 iii), which recounts his receipt of a vision while in a dream state, perhaps with the mediating agency of angels (Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII*, 381). Another potentially important text, 4QVision and Interpretation (4Q410), seems to contain a first-hand account of a vision followed by the visionary's own interpretation of its meaning (Annette Steudel, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI*, 316–319). Unfortunately, the text is extremely fragmentary and yields little information regarding this visionary experience or the nature of its interpretation. Indeed, it is not even clear if the text has reconfigured the experience of an ancient visionary or is perhaps a first-hand account of a contemporary visionary in the Second Temple period. 4QVision and Interpretation provides a tantalizing piece of what was likely a larger visionary text. Such a text would presumably contain fuller descriptions of other visions, additional interpretations, and a better portrait of the visionary figure or figures.

[6] On the suggested emendation here, see the discussion below, p. 98.

[7] This word was originally deciphered by Solomon Schechter as והוא (*Documents of Jewish Sectaries, Vol. 1, Fragments of a Zadokite Work* [New York: Ktav, 1970], 117; cf. p. 65). Chaim Rabin understood it as either וחוה or וחות (*The Zadokite Documents* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1954], 8–9). Both of these readings were proven to be incorrect based on Yadin's re-analysis of the manuscript (Yadin, "Three Notes," 158). Since Yadin, there is universal agreement that this word should be read as חוזי. Thus, Elisha Qimron, "The Text of CDC," in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (ed. M. Broshi; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1992), 13; Joseph M. Baumgarten and Daniel R. Schwartz, in James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Damascus Document,*

13 אמת⟨ו⟩[8] ובפרוש שמו[9] שמותיהם

12 …and he informed them through those anointed with his holy spirit and who view
13 his truth of the list[10] of their names.

War Scroll (1QM) 11:7–8[11]

7 ...וביד משיחיכה
8 חוזי תעודות הגדתה לנו ק[צי] מלחמות ידיכה

7 …And through your anointed ones,
8 visionaries of fixed times, you have told us the tim[es of] the wars of your hands.[12]

A number of features in these two texts suggest that the 'visionaries' in both belong to Israel's past and should be associated with its prophets. Both utilize the language of prophetic mediation in employing the expression ביד in reference to the activity of these individuals. In both passages, the 'visionaries' act as divine agents and mediate information originating from God. The passage in the Damascus Document is located within a larger discussion of "those called by name" throughout every generation to whom God vouchsafed the continued existence of Israel (CD 2:11). The text then states that God made known the list of these names through his divine agents.[13] Likewise, the War Scroll relates God's use of the 'visionaries' to transmit knowledge of the

War Scroll and Related Documents (PTSDSSP 2; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck]; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 14.

[8] Yadin, "Three Notes," 158, n. 4, proposes that this should be read as אמתו, suggesting that the initial *waw* of the next word better belongs at the end of this word. This suggestion is followed by Qimron, "CDC," 13; Schwartz and Baumgarten, *Damascus Document*, 15, n. 19, and is reflected in the present translation. The entire phrase under discussion is only partially preserved in the 4QD manuscripts, with the first half, וחוזי אמת, restored (4Q266 2 ii 12–13; see Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)* [DJD XVIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996], 37).

[9] The inclusion of this word seems to be a scribal error based on dittography. See 4Q266 2 ii 12–13: בפרוש שמותי]הם (Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII*, 39).

[10] On the translation of פרוש as "list," see Schiffman, *Halakhah*, 65–66 (esp. n. 288). Albert I. Baumgarten understands the full meaning of the root as 'to specify' ("The Name of the Pharisees," *JBL* 103 [1983]: 417–422). Thus, Schwartz and Baumgarten, *Damascus Document*, 15, translate פרוש here as 'detail.' Cf. Rabin, *Zadokite Documents*, 24.

[11] Jean Duhaime, in Charlesworth, ed., *War Scroll*, 118–119.

[12] I have retained Duhaime's literal translation of ידיכה as "of your hands" here. Like its similar use with reference to the prophets (see, e.g., l. 7) it indicates agency. Thus, the wars will be fought through divine agency.

[13] Schwartz and Baumgarten, *Damascus Document*, 15, n. 19.

times of war.[14] The prophetic character of the term 'visionaries' is also conditioned by its appearance in literary parallelism to the 'anointed ones,' a term that in both passages clearly is intended to refer to prophets.[15]

Can any specific prophetic role for these individuals be determined? In both passages, the prophets are employed in order to transmit some element of divinely guarded knowledge. In the Damascus Document, the prophets relate the list of names of those individuals who would be saved in the future. The War Scroll recounts how the prophets reveal details concerning future divinely fought battles. Both of these documents should be understood in a similar way to the statements concerning the classical prophets and their prophetic visions in Pesher Habakkuk.[16] These two texts further attest to the belief that the ancient prophets possessed special knowledge concerning futures events, particularly those central to the unfolding of sectarian history. While Pesher Habakkuk assigns that role to prophets bearing the more general title *nābîʾ*, here it is equally applied to prophetic 'visionaries' and 'anointed ones.'

In the War Scroll, the 'visionaries' and the 'anointed ones' are entrusted with a single task—they act as God's spokesmen in relating the times of the future battles. Indeed, the identification of the 'visionaries'

[14] On these two passages, see also Johannes Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT 2,104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 316–319.

[15] On CD, see Louis Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (Moreshet 1; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1976), 9–10; Carmignac, *LTQ*, 2:155; Marinus de Jonge and Adam S. van der Woude, "11QMelchizedek and the New Testament," *NTS* 12 (1966): 307; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 27; Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 74–75; John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: Jewish Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995), 118; Martin G. Abegg and Craig A. Evans, "Messianic Passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; H. Lichtenberger and G.S. Oegema; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 192; Geza G. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists in the Qumran Library* (STDJ 47; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003), 36. On 1QM, see Jean Carmignac, *La Règle de la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1958), 161; Yigael Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness* (trans. B. and C. Rabin; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), 310; Bastiaan Jongeling, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre des Manuscrits de Qumrân: Commentaire et Traduction* (SSN 4; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1962), 263; de Jonge and van der Woude, "11QMelchizedek," 307; Collins, *Scepter*, 118; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Qumran Messianism," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 86; Abegg and Evans, "Messianic Passages," 193; Xeravits, *King*, 77–78.

[16] See above, ch. 2.

as 'visionaries of fixed times' further serves to highlight this role. At a more general level, these prophets can be understood in the same way as the *nābîʾ* in Pesher Habakkuk.[17] The prophets are conceptualized as bearers of special information pertaining to the unfolding of eschatological history, in this case the end-time battle between the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness.[18] As in Pesher Habakkuk, these prophets and their prophetic pronouncements are singularly oriented toward the eschatological sectarian future. Pesher Habakkuk further asserts that the ancient prophet was unaware of the true meaning of the ancient divine word. It is not clear if the War Scroll assumes a similar position here.

A similar understanding of the 'visionaries' and 'anointed ones' can be applied to the passage in CD 2:12–13. This passage appears at the end of a long historical review of Israel's wayward actions and God's resultant antipathy. In response, God "raised up for himself those called by name so as to leave a remnant for the land and fill the face of the world with their descendents" (CD 2:11–12). God then sends the prophets (i.e., the 'visionaries' and 'anointed ones') to inform this special class of people the names of those individuals who would similarly be saved in the future.[19] The text here provides no more information about the contents of this list. While it is reasonable that it would refer to the sectarian community, there is no unequivocal evidence to this effect.

This list is revisited again later in the Damascus Document (CD 4:2–6) where more information concerning its actual contents is revealed.[20] The "priests," "Levites," and "Sons of Zadok" in Ezek 44:15 are interpreted respectively as "the penitents of Israel who departed from the land of Judah," "(those) that accompany them," and "the chosen ones of Israel, those called by name who stand in the end of days" (CD 4:2–4). This is no doubt a three-fold reference to the sectarian community.[21] Knibb suggests that the first two epithets, priests and Levites, allude to the initial developmental stages in the sect's formation, while the iden-

[17] The similarity between the passage in the War Scroll and Pesher Habakkuk is briefly noted by Yadin, *War Scroll*, 311.

[18] Xeravits, *King*, 78.

[19] Schwartz and Baumgarten, *Damascus Document*, 15, n. 19.

[20] On the shared context of CD 2:12 and 4:4–6, see Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 75, 95–96. See also Schechter, *Documents*, 67; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 27.

[21] Ginzberg, *Jewish Sect*, 15; Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 95; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 36.

tification of the "Sons of Zadok" as the chosen ones living in the end of days identifies this group as the general (current) sectarian community.[22] In what follows, the text makes an additional reference to the list from CD 2:12 seemingly in order to introduce its contents.[23] No such list, however, is reproduced in the extant text.[24] The contents of this list, if it ever existed in the ancient manuscripts, would likely have contained some detailed information concerning the members of the sect as alluded to in the interpretation of Ezek 44:15 and the unfolding of the community's present eschatological history.[25]

With this understanding of CD 4:2–6, let us return to CD 2:12 and the notice concerning the 'visionaries' and 'anointed ones.' These prophets are entrusted with a single task. Their role is to inform the current chosen people certain details concerning others in the future who will experience a similar fate. As is now known from CD 4:2–6, this latter class refers specifically to "those called by name who stand in the end of days," namely, the sectarian community. Thus, the ancient prophets here perform a function strikingly similar to that evinced in Pesher Habakkuk, as discussed in chapter two. They transmit in their own time information concerning the end of days, in particular the unfolding of sectarian history.

To be sure, a slightly different praxis seems to be operating both in the War Scroll and the Damascus Document. As observed above in

---

[22] Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 36. See also Betz, *Offenbarung*, 180–181; Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings*, 127; Cothenet, *LTQ*, 2:160, n. 3; Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "An Essene Missionary Document? CD II, 14-VI, 1," *RB* 77 (1970): 211; Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 95. Each of these treatments agrees that the "Sons of Zadok" refers to the present sectarian community. There is variation, however, with respect to which specific element of the community is intended.

[23] Davies observes that the language used to refer to the sectarian community in the interpretation of Ezek 44:15, קריאי השם, deliberately links this identification with the contents of the list (introduced by פרוש שמו שמותיהם) (*Damascus Covenant*, 95). Thus, it is certain that the names on the list refer to "those called by name who stand in the end of days," i.e., the members of the Qumran community.

[24] The medieval manuscript stops abruptly at this point without providing the promised text. No parallel text exists in the Qumran manuscripts. A number of suggestions have been proposed for this textual anomaly. See in particular, Murphy-O'Connor, "Document," 213–214; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 36–37; Schwartz and Baumgarten, *Damascus Document*, 19, n. 32; Maxine L. Grossman, *Reading for History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Study* (STDJ 45; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2002), 222–223.

[25] Grossman, *Reading*, 194–195. For more on the suggested contents of the list, see Isaac Rabinowitz, "A Reconsideration of 'Damascus' and '390 Years' in the 'Damascus' ('Zadokite') Fragments," *JBL* 72 (1954): 17, n. 24; Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 95–98; Murphy-O'Connor, "Document," 213–214.

the discussion of Pesher Habakkuk, the ancient prophets are characterized as transmitting knowledge about some future time through their contemporary prophetic pronouncements, the true meaning of which they are unaware. The present circumstances assume a more immediate, and perhaps informed, role for the prophets. In the Damascus Document, the prophets relate to the special class of people in antiquity specific information concerning another special class of people in the future. Likewise, in the War Scroll, the ancient prophets impart knowledge regarding the future eschatological war. There is no indication in either document that this was performed through the mediation of an encoded prophetic oracle, whether scriptural or not. Perhaps it is this precise minor variation that compelled the authors of the War Scroll and the Damascus Document to use different prophetic epithets ('visionaries' and 'anointed ones') than the term that is employed in Pesher Habakkuk (*nābîʾ*). While the specific praxis and terminology differ slightly, the assumed role for these ancient 'visionaries' and 'anointed ones' should be understood in the same way as the *nābîʾ* in Pesher Habakkuk.[26]

Part Two: The Non-Prophetic Application of 'Visionaries'

As remarked at the beginning of this chapter, the use of the term 'visionaries' in Qumran literature is not restricted to a designation for prophets. Rather, of the six occurrences of the title, four fall in

---

[26] The parallel use of the terms 'visionaries' and 'anointed ones' also appears in Baumgarten's reconstruction of 4Q270 2 ii 13–15 (*Qumran Cave 4.XIII*, 144–146; following Josef T. Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq et Milkî-rešaʿ dans les ancient écrits juifs et chrétiens," *JJS* 23 [1972]: 134). The word 'visionaries' in this passage is reconstructed by Baumgarten based on the parallel evidence of CD 2:12. This passage is located within a larger literary unit that Baumgarten identifies as a 'Catalogue of Transgressions' (4Q270 1 i 9–2 ii 21) ("Laws of the *Damascus Document* in Current Research," in *Damascus Document*, 53). This particular transgression seems to involve rebelling against the word of God by "preaching sedition" against the משיחי רוח הקדש and, following Baumgarten's reconstruction, "error" against the חוזי אמתו. The extant text draws upon the language of Deut 13:6 (see also CD 5:21–6:1, cited below, pp. 97–100). Baumgarten proposes that these terms refer to sectarian leaders rather than prophets. The similar employment of these terms in CD 2:12 and 1QM 11:7–8 as well as the use of Deut 13:6 strongly suggest that prophets are intended here. Moreover, this passage presumes that the object of this seditious speech is the ancient prophets, rather than some contemporary prophetic class. Unfortunately, the fragmentary nature of the manuscript precludes ascertaining any further information concerning the characterization of these prophets.

decidedly non-prophetic contexts. One occurs in 4Q280, while the other three appear in the Hodayot. Both of these documents display concern with contemporary sectarian dynamics. In these texts, the term 'visionaries' is employed to refer to both the sectarian leaders as well as their opponents.

4QCurses (4Q280) 2 5–7 ≈ 4Q286 7 ii 11–12; 4Q287 6 10–11[27]

5 וארורים עוש[י מחשבות רשעתמה][28]
6 [ומ]קימי מזמתכה בלבבמה לזום על ברית אל[ולמאוס את התורה ואת]
7 [דבר]י כול חוזי אמ[תו]

5 …And cursed be those who execu[te their wicked schemes]
6 [and those who] confirm your (evil)[29] purpose in their heart, by plotting evil against the covenant of God[and by despising the law and the]
7 [the word]s of all the visionaries of [his] tru[th]

The relevant portion of the manuscript is somewhat fragmentary and as such, a considerable portion of this restoration is conjectural. Nonetheless, there is sufficient evidence to read **חוזי** in line seven with the next word logically completed as **אמתו**. This fragment of 4Q280 contains an impassioned curse leveled against Melki-rešaʿ and his lot.[30] In particular, they are condemned for plotting against the "covenant of God" (l. 6). At this point, the text breaks off due to a lacuna. Milik, followed by Nitzan, surmised that this lacuna contains some further clarification of this opposition to the covenant, suggesting that the phrase "against the law" is contained within the lacuna and serves to clarify the nature of the cursed group's opposition to the covenant.[31] Accord-

[27] Bilha Nitzan, in Esther Chazon et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XXIX; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 5–6, with modifications following Paul J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchirešaʿ* (CBQMS 10; Washington D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981), 37–38. This section is closely paralleled in 4QBerakhot (4Q286 7 ii 11–12; 4Q287 6 10–11). See Nitzan, *Qumran Cave 4.VI*, 28, 57. On the relationship between 4Q280 and other Qumran documents (in particular, 1QS and 4QBerakhot), see Nitzan, *Qumran Cave 4.XX*, 3–4. See also the initial publication of these texts in Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq," 127–128 (4Q280), 130–131 (4Q286).

[28] Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq," 127; Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 41, restore **רשעתכה**, "your wicked schemes," based on the parallel use of the second person possessive suffix in line six (**מזמתכה**).

[29] Following Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 38. This makes the malicious intentions of these individuals more explicit.

[30] Partially parallel to the curse of Belial and his lot in 1QS 2:5–9. See Nitzan, *Qumran Cave 4.XX*, 2–4.

[31] Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq," 127.

ingly, the partially restored phrase at the beginning of line seven, "[…the word]s of all the visionaries of [his] tru[th]," would likewise be modified by "against" (restored at the end of l. 6).

While Milik is certainly correct that the lacuna contains some further clarification of the group's opposition to the covenant, his restoration only provides a partial understanding.[32] Paul J. Kobelski offers a more extensive restoration that better frames the contents of line seven. He restores the end of line six with ולמאוס את התורה ואת ("by despising the law and the…"), which would thus be attached to the following clause concerning the 'visionaries.'[33]

Kobelski's understanding clearly retains the same basic conceptual framework suggested by Milik and Nitzan. Both underscore the adversative nature of the cursed group. In addition, according to both interpretations, the text assumes some sort of close relationship between God's covenant and the visionaries of his truth. In particular, the contents of the covenant of God introduced in line six are delineated further in what would have been expressed in the lacuna that follows. The Torah and the words of the 'visionaries' are conceptualized as the covenant. This syntactic arrangement immediately brings to mind the previously observed relationship between the prophets and the law as expressed in the Rule of the Community (8:15–16), where the prophets are described as those who possess the correct interpretation of the Torah and disclose this information through periodic revelations.[34] Though this relationship is far more opaque in the present text, it is not unreasonable to assume a similar model operating in 4Q280.

The only remaining difficulty in this text is the identification of the referent of 'visionaries of truth.' Should these visionaries be conceptualized as prophets from the distant past (as in CD and 1QM) or contemporary sectarian leaders (as in 1QH[a])? While the texts hereto discussed are basically forthcoming in this regard, a certain degree of ambiguity exists in the present document. At first glance, 'visionaries of truth'

---

[32] Namely, it only suggests that the cursed group violated the Torah. This restoration provides no qualification as to the nature of this opposition.

[33] Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 38 (see discussion on pp. 41–42). See Nitzan, *Qumran Cave 4.VI*, 30, for additional suggested restorations for this phrase. Her objection that the clause as restored by Kobelski generally denotes opposition to the law (and presumably would be inappropriate for the present context) is not entirely clear. Is not the context of this entire section of the text the despising of the law as found among the lot of Melki-reša'?

[34] See above, ch. 3, for full discussion.

seems to indicate a prophetic context. Indeed, as Milik and Kobelski observe, this exact same phrase occurs in the Damascus Document in a passage that clearly has the classical prophets in view (CD 2:12).[35] Likewise, Nitzan emphasizes the resistance to the 'visionaries' exhibited by the cursed group. The rejection of the prophets is a theme that appears in other Qumran texts. As such, Nitzan similarly identifies the despised group of visionaries as prophets from Israel's past.[36]

Although some linguistic and thematic considerations point to the identification of the 'visionaries' with the classical prophets, internal evidence suggests otherwise. 4Q280 clearly addresses contemporary sectarian concerns, particularly opposition to the sectarian community. The curses contained within this text are all directed against the enemies of the sect. These include the disingenuous sectarian initiates (2 1a) and the lot of Melki-rešaʿ (2 1b–7a). The extremely fragmentary contents of fragment three evidently follow this model as well.[37] This same contemporary concern of the curses is reflected in the texts parallel to 4Q280 (1QS 1:16–3:12; 4QBerakhot). According to this model, the opposition of the cursed group in 4Q280 is directed against the sectarian community itself and their interpretation of the Torah.

According to this understanding, the "the words of all the visionaries of his truth" is not a reference to the ancient prophets who provide the proper interpretation for the Torah. Rather, these 'visionaries,' like the ones in the Hodayot (see below) are present-day leaders of the sect. Their words represent the sectarian interpretation of the Torah and its proper implementation. In this sense, they fulfill a role similar to that outlined above with respect to the prophets in 1QS 8:15–16; namely, they provide the proper sectarian interpretation of the Torah. In this case, however, the previously prophetic function has been transferred to the sectarian leaders. As such, they are presented in language similar to that of the classical prophetic lawgivers. The application of the term 'visionaries' to the contemporary sectarian leaders intentionally serves to identify them with the ancient prophets.[38]

[35] Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq," 129; Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 42. Milik also points to 1QM 11:7–8.

[36] Nitzan, *Qumran Cave 4.VI*, 30.

[37] Nitzan, *Qumran Cave 4.XX*, 2–3.

[38] This identification is heightened in additional sectarian literature treated in ch. 16.

'Visionaries' in the Hodayot: Contemporary Sectarian Groups

The Hodayot employ the expression 'visionaries' three times, all of which appear in the construct form and are further modified, as in the examples already treated. Thus, 1QH^a 10:15 (Sukenik 2:15)[39] makes reference to the "visionaries of truth" (חוזי נכוחות). The Hodayot also attest to a new type of 'visionary.' Breaking with the positive descriptions of the visionaries found in texts discussed thus far, 1QH^a 12:10, 20 (Sukenik 4:10, 20) condemn the "visionaries of deceit" (חוזי רמיה) and the "visionaries of error" (חוזי תעות). In each of these cases, there is no indication that the prophets from Israel's past or even contemporary prophets are intended by the use of 'visionaries.'[40] Similar to 4Q280, these expressions appear as designations for both the sectarian community and the sect's opponents. Moreover, there is strong evidence supporting the identification of the "visionaries of deceit / error" with the Pharisees.

1QH^a 10:13–16—"Visionaries of Truth"

The key to understanding these expressions in the Hodayot is the structuring elements of the larger hymnic unit. The textual unit in 1QH^a 10 where this term is employed is structured by a series of titles and roles that the hymnist (likely the Teacher of Righteousness) bestows upon himself, which are accompanied by a parallel description of the sectarians and their opponents.[41] Table one below outlines the literary structure of this hymnic unit:[42]

[39] The numbering system employed throughout for the Hodayot follows the reordering of the columns by Puech and Stegemann and now found in García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1:146–203; Abegg, *DSSR*, 5:3–77. When first introducing a Hodayot passage, I will note the original column numbering as determined by Sukenik and followed in most of the general commentaries on the Hodayot.

[40] See, however, Barstad, "Prophecy," 117–118.

[41] On the question of the authorship and *Sitz im Leben* of the Hodayot, see discussion in ch. 18, pp. 364–366. Throughout the treatment here, I refer to the author of this hymn as the "hymnist." It is likely, however, that the author should be identified as the Teacher of Righteousness.

[42] Wise, Abegg, Cook, *DSSR*, 5:18–19.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">1 [13]ותשימני נס לבחירי צדק ומליץ דעת ברזי פלא—
But you have appointed me as a banner for the righteous chosen ones and a knowledgeable mediator of wondrous secrets</td></tr>
<tr><td>ולנסות אוהבי מוסר
And to refine those who love correction</td><td>לבחון [14][אנשי] אמת
To put to test [the men] of truth</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">2 ואהיה איש ריב—למליצי תעות
And I have become a man of contention against the mediators of error</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">3 [15]ובעל [של]ום—לכול חוזי נכוחות
And a man of peace for all the who view truth</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">4 ואהיה לרוח קנאה—
And I have become a spirit of jealousy</td></tr>
<tr><td>[16][וכול]אנשי מרמה
And all the men of deceit</td><td>לנגד כול דורשי חל[קות]
Against all the seekers of smo[oth things]</td></tr>
</table>

Table 1: Literary Structure of 1QH^{a} 10:13–16

The hymnist first identifies himself as "a banner for the righteous chosen ones" (נס לבחירי צדק) and "knowledgeable mediator of wondrous secrets" (מליץ דעת ברזי פלא) (10:13). This two-fold title is accompanied by two infinitive clauses, each of which contains a positive epithet for some group. Thus, in this role, the hymnist is said "to put to the test [the men of] truth" (לבחון [אנשי] אמת) (10:13–14)[43] and "to refine those who love correction" (ולנסות אוהבי מוסר) (10:14).

The hymn then turns to articulating two opposing roles held by the hymnist. He is both a "man of contention" (איש ריב) against the "mediators of error" (מליצי תעות) (10:14) and a "man of [pea]ce" (בעל [של]ום)[44] for "all who view truth" (כול חוזי נכוחות) (10:15). The titles applied here to the hymnist are constructed out of two synonyms (איש, בעל) and two antonyms (ריב, שלום), which serve to situate the adversative nature

[43] The restoration [אנשי] follows Svend Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran* (ATDan 2; Aargus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960), 36. See also Jacob Licht, *Megillat ha-Hodayot: me-Megillot Midbar Yehudah* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1957), 67, who restores [דורשי]. See Holm-Nielsen for full review of other earlier suggested restorations.

[44] Following Licht, *Megillat ha-Hodayot*, 68.

of these two roles. The ensuing line closes this textual unit by providing a close literary parallel to the first clause. The hymnist contends that he has "become a spirit of jealousy" (ואהיה לרוח קנאה) (10:15). As in the first clause of the textual unit, this spirit is directed at the opponents of the sect who are identified with two derogatory titles: "seekers of smo[oth things]" (דורשי חל[קות]) and "men of deceit" (אנשי מרמה) (10:15–16). Thus, this entire textual unit is made up of four main clauses.

Structurally, these four clauses are set out in chiastic structure. The first and last clauses contain similar titles that are each accompanied by a twofold description of the intended object. Likewise, the middle two clauses are set out in complete literary parallelism. The grammatical structures employed for both clauses are identical, though at the same time the content places them in literary opposition. While the entire textual unit is linguistically framed with a chiastic structure, thematically it follows an ABAB model. The first and third clauses describe the sect itself, while the second and fourth clauses focus on the enemies of the sect. The "mediators of deceit" are identical to the "seekers of smooth things / men of deceit," while the "men of truth / lovers of learning" are parallel to the "visionaries of truth."

Two larger considerations indicate that the "visionaries of truth" are not prophetic figures, but rather designations for the sectarian community. The first is grounded in properly deciphering the identity markers employed for the two opposing groups in this textual unit. Unfortunately, this line of analysis often provides only frustratingly incomplete conclusions. It is difficult to identify epithets and sobriquets with absolute certainty. As the same time, a good deal of evidence recommends that the expression "visionaries of truth" should be understood as some designation for the sectarian community.

"Visionaries of truth" (חוזי נכוחות) is an expression that appears nowhere else in Qumran literature or the Hebrew Bible.[45] The structuring elements of the textual unit, however, identify these visionaries with the "men of truth" and the "lovers of instruction." The epithet "men of truth" appears in Pesher Habakkuk and elsewhere as a designation for the sectarian community (1QpHab 7:10).[46] Further evidence suggests

[45] Note, however, the close semantic phrase חוזי אמת⟨ו⟩, which is the most ubiquitous of the 'visionaries of X' phrases in the Qumran corpus.

[46] To be sure, the expression is partially reconstructed in the Hodayot passage. Some of the other suggested reconstructions would also mark the term as a sectarian

the identification of the "lovers of correction" (אוהבי מוסר) with the sectarian community.[47]

The opposing group is also introduced with a set of epithets that can reasonably be deciphered along the same lines of analysis. This group is identified as "mediators of error," "seekers of smooth things," and "men of deceit." These three expressions are replete with terminology generally applied to opponents of the sect. Moreover, the appearance of the sobriquet "seekers of smooth things" and the twofold use of the root תעה suggests the identification of this group with the Pharisees.[48] Even if this historical identification is not accepted, at the least, these expressions mark this group as enemies of the sect.[49]

A similar understanding of this textual unit has been reached by Carol Newsom in her exploration of the social dynamics lying behind this hymn and the Hodayot in general. As Newsom argues, this textual unit and the larger hymn in which it is found should be understood within the context of boundary making and identity formation.[50] In particular, Newsom observes that the Hodayot (this hymn included) "create(s) a symbolic world in which the leader's function is central to the process of defining those boundaries."[51] As observed, the identity of each group in the hymn is consistently defined in relation to the role of the hymnist. The hymnist is presented as the rightful leader of the 'good' community and a fitting opponent of the 'bad' group. The primary goal of this model is to reinforce the legitimacy and preeminence of the communal leader.[52] At the same time, the hymn simultaneously creates boundaries for the sectarian community. The designation of the limits of the sectarian community is achieved through its oppositional relationship to its enemies. Newsom's analysis of this hymn further situ-

---

designation (Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 36), since the critical element in the phrase is the identification of the group as 'X of his truth.' The expression also appears in 1QH[a] 6:2 (in isolation) and is sometimes reconstructed in 1QM 1:16. On the sectarian identity of the "men of truth" in Pesher Habakkuk, see Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 119; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 234; Nitzan, *Pesher Habakkuk*, 174.

[47] Mathias Delcor, *Les Hymnes de Qumran* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1962), 98.

[48] For full discussion of the identification of these terms with the Pharisees, see ch. 14, pp. 283–285 (דורשי חלקות) and pp. 293–294 (תעה).

[49] Carol A. Newsom is particularly critical of immediately identifying the "seekers of smooth things" here as the Pharisees (*The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* [STDJ 52; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004], 308–309). Even if the group is not the Pharisees, they are clearly opponents of the sect.

[50] Newsom, *Self*, 300–312.

[51] Newsom, *Self*, 300.

[52] Newsom, *Self*, 303.

ates it within the group dynamics of contemporary society, whereby the "visionaries of truth" is a designation for the sectarian community.

1QH^a 12:10, 20—"Visionaries of Deceit / Error"

In chapter fourteen, 1QH^a 12 is treated at length with respect to the literary structure as well as its assumed social dynamics.[53] As in 1QH^a 10, the hymn in 1QH^a 12 situates the sect and its leadership in opposition to the community's enemies. In particular, the hymn castigates the sectarian opponents for their misguided attempts to alter the law and seek divine justification for the ill-conceived course of action. The hymn describes the ensuing battle between the sectarian leadership (likely the Teacher of Righteousness) and their opponents. In doing so, the hymn applies a number of pejorative appellations to the enemies of the sect.

In this passage, a new type of 'visionary' is introduced. Among the many designations applied to the enemies of the sect are the epithets "visionaries of deceit" (**חוזי רמיה**) (l. 10) and "visionaries of error" (**חוזי תעות**) (l. 20). The term "visionaries" is here modified by two words, **רמיה** and **תעות**, each of which is a common *Leitwort* for the sect's opponents elsewhere in the Hodayot and in other Qumran literature.[54] In the discussion of this hymn, it is noted that many scholars understand the "visionaries of error" (l. 20) to be a designation for the "lying prophets" (**נביאי כזב**) mentioned in line sixteen.[55] I argue, however, based on the literary structure of the hymn, that both of the "visionary" expressions refer to the main opposition group of the hymn. Thus, the "visionaries of deceit" and the "visionaries of error" are equal designations for the enemies of the sect and the main antagonists of the hymnist. I further argue for the identification of this group with the Pharisees based on terminology and key words that appear in this hymn. As in the hymn just discussed, the importance of this observation lies not with the positive identification of a known social group. The use of the technical term 'visionaries' for the opponents of the sect provides further evidence for a non-prophetic use of this epithet. Rather, it designates a contemporary social group.

---

[53] See ch. 14, pp. 280–290, for text, translation, and analysis.

[54] See below, p. 283.

[55] See below p. 286, n. 29. Note also the opinion of Eliezer L. Sukenik that the "visionaries of deceit" (l. 10) should also be understood as prophets (p. 283, n. 15). This view also seems to be implicit in Wieder, *Judean Scrolls*, 135. This understanding does not seem to be found as widely as the interpretation of the "visionaries" in line twenty.

From Prophetic Visionary to Sectarian Visionary

The employment of 'visionaries' in the Hodayot is dramatically different from that which appears in the Hebrew Bible. In particular, the biblical usages all refer to prophetic activity. How is it that the Hodayot introduce this entirely new meaning? To be sure, the Hodayot are not directly dependent on biblical language and imagery at all times. At the same time, any post-biblical usage of 'visionaries' must reflect an awareness and acknowledgement of the limited biblical meaning. Accordingly, the origins of the non-prophetic sense of the expression in the Hodayot as well as the similar employment of the term in 4Q280 must be identified. In what follows, I offer an explanation for the semantic shift as reflected in 1QH[a] 10:15. The other non-prophetic uses of 'visionaries' resist explanation with the same line of analysis and are therefore left untreated. Perhaps the introduction of a non-prophetic use of 'visionaries' for contemporary social groups in one instance would have been enough to include the term in the post-biblical lexicon of sectarian terminology.

The literary development of the non-prophetic use of 'visionary' in 1QH[a] 10:15 is bound up with the larger interpretive model of the hymn as applied to Isa 30:10.[56] The biblical passage forms part of a larger condemnation of Israel for their rebelliousness (vv. 8–9). In particular, they are denounced for saying to the רואים ("seers") "Do not see," and to the חוזים ("visionaries") "Do not prophecy truth (נכוחות) to us." Rather, they ask the prophets to "speak to us falsehoods (דברו לנו חלקות), prophesy (חזו) delusions" (v. 10). The verse creates an oppositional relationship with respect to the roles of the prophet. The text stresses that Israel actively sought misguided prophesy. In particular, the prophets are told not to do exactly what they are expected to do under normal circumstances. Thus, when prophesying properly, the חוזים would have prophesied נכוחות. Isaiah is here censuring Israel for improper solicitation of the prophets. The next clause relates what Israel actually requested of the prophets. The "visionaries" are now asked to speak חלקות. In this verse, נכוחות and חלקות form oppositional characteristics of prophetic speech. In particular, the former is associated with proper prophetic activity while that latter forms a sarcastic invective against the misleading prophets and their solicitors.

[56] The dependency of 1QH[a] 10:15 on Isa 30:10 is well noted. See Licht, *Megillat ha-Hodayot*, 68.

The oppositional character of the biblical verse is retained in the *hodayah* and helps to frame the boundary-forming language and imagery of the hymn as noted above. The hymn draws upon the use of חלקות as nothing more than empty flattering words. The sectarians saw in their enemies this same characteristic. חלקות is generally understood as a pun on Pharisaic הלכות.[57] Clearly, the sect viewed Pharisaic הלכות in much the same way that Isaiah regarded the empty words of these prophets. Thus, the sect employed the Isaianic expression חלקות, retaining its basic sense.[58] Rather than "speak" חלקות, however, the opponents of the sect are now "seekers" (דורשי) of חלקות. The shift in the verbal root employed is likely bound up with the developing transformation of a prophet from one who speaks (דבר) the word of God to one who seeks (דרש) the written word of God.[59] Thus, the דורשי חלקות are presented in this hymn (and elsewhere) as the enemies of the sect.

The hymn also utilizes other elements of this biblical verse in formulating its oppositional model. In particular, it draws upon the model presented by the biblical verse. There, נכוחות forms the converse pair with חלקות. The term נכוחות represents that which the prophets should be relating to the people. As such, the term works well applied to the sectarian community. Thus, the sectarian community becomes the "visionaries of truth." The guiding element in this epithet is thus "truth," not "visionaries." In drawing on the verse from Isaiah, the hymnist employs both elements present in the biblical base text. Just as חלקות has been stripped of its original prophetic designation, חוזי נכוחות is now merely employed in opposition to the דורשי חלקות. The *hodayah* shows no indication of the prophetic connotations explicit in the biblical verse. Rather, 'visionary' now enters the common vocabulary of the Hodayot as a boundary-marking designation. As such, it joins other such terms as אנשי, מליץ, אוהבי and similar designations that are given entirely new contextual meanings in the Hodayot.

---

[57] See discussion below, ch. 14, pp. 283–285.

[58] In proposing this literary development, my argument is directed specifically at the use of the expression the Hodayot. For a fuller treatment of the application of the expression to the opponents of the sect, see Wieder, *Judean Scrolls*, 135–140.

[59] See the discussion of this phenomenon in chs. 11–12 (cf. Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Pharisees and Sadducees in Pesher Naḥum," in *Minḥah le-Naḥum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of his 70th birthday* [ed. M. Brettler and M. Fishbane; JSOTSup 154; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993], 276).

Summary

In this chapter, I have examined a series of texts that contain references to ancient prophetic 'visionaries.' The primary task in this chapter has been to locate the specific passages where 'visionary' is employed in order to refer to an ancient prophetic figure. This analysis has concluded that the term 'visionaries' is employed in the Dead Sea Scrolls in a prophetic and non-prophetic sense. In the prophetic sense, the term also underwent a linguistic shift in that it most often appears as the *nomen regens* of a construct phrase. In this case, the 'visionaries' are identified with a secondary attribute (i.e., 'visionaries of truth'). In the passages alluding to ancient prophetic 'visionaries,' a clear pattern emerges. These individuals are understood to have been endowed with the task of foretelling future events similar to the conceptualization of the prophets in Pesher Habakkuk. At times, this representation of the ancient 'visionaries' stands in literary parallelism with prophetic 'anointed ones,' who are entrusted with identical responsibilities.

The term 'visionaries' as part of a construct phrase is also used in entirely non-prophetic contexts. In these cases, the 'visionaries' may be identified as good or bad. The Hodayot use these expressions to refer to the Qumran community and its enemies. This use of the term is indebted to some degree to the prophetic use of 'visionary' in the Hebrew Bible. At the same time, it indicates that 'visionary' has entered the lexicon of sectarian terminological designations for itself and its opponents.

CHAPTER FIVE

BIBLICAL PROPHETIC EPITHETS IN TRANSITION II: PROPHETIC 'ANOINTED ONES'

The root משח is rarely used in the Hebrew Bible in reference to prophets and prophecy.[1] There are only three such occurrences (1 Kgs 19:16; Isa 61:1; Ps 105:15//1 Chr 16:22). Ps 105:15 employs the expression 'anointed ones' as an epithet for the patriarchs in literary parallelism to 'prophets.' 1 Kgs 19:16 and Isa 61:1 contain allusions to an anointing process evidently involving some prophets. The latter passage also contains an opaque reference to the descent of the spirit on the prophet.

While the biblical material is decidedly sparse, the Qumran corpus reflects a widening use of 'anointed' as a prophetic title.[2] There are nine (possibly eleven) texts that appear to employ the designation 'anointed ones' for prophets: 1Q30 1 2 [?];[3] CD 2:12; 6:1 (par. 4Q267 2 6; 6Q15 3 4); 1QM 11:7–8; 4Q270 2 ii 14;[4] 4Q287 10 13;[5] 4Q377 2 ii 5; 4Q521

---

[1] In particular, the root is commonly employed with respect to the anointing of a king. For discussion of this and other less common uses of the root, see J.A. Soggin, "מלך," *TLOT* 2:676–677; Klaus Seybold, "משח," *TDOT* 9:43–54.

[2] Seybold, "משח," 9:54.

[3] See Josef T. Milik, in Dominique Barthélemy and Josef T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), 132:]מ[שיח הקודש]. Most translations render this clause as "the holy messiah." Martin G. Abegg sees an allusion to the messianic banquet of 1QSa ("The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?" *DSD* 2 [1995]: 134). See, however, Fitzmyer, "Qumran Messianism," 86, who relates this passage to CD 6:1 (already noted by Milik), which contains a clear reference to prophets (see below). García Martínez and Tigchelaar decipher this passage as:]רוח הקודש[(*DSSSE*, 1:110).

[4] See above (p. 72, n. 26) for arguments in favor of reading this passage as a reference to prophets.

[5] The text is extremely fragmentary. 4Q287 10 13 (*olim* 4 13) was originally read (in the Preliminary Concordance) as נח]ה על משיחו רוח קוד[ש (so Émile Puech, "Messianisme, Eschatologie et Résurection dans les Manuscripts de la Mer Morte," *RevQ* 18 [1997]: 271). Nitzan notes that this reconstruction is "paleographically unlikely here" and "has no basis in the context of 4QBerakhot" (*Qumran Cave 4.VI*, 60). Most scholars agree that the *waw* of משיחו should be read as a *yod* (see James C. VanderKam, "Messianism in the Scrolls," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* [ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; CJAS 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993], 215–216, n. 9; Nitzan, *Qumran Cave 4.VI*, 60). Already in his initial presentation of 4Q287, Milik had suggested restoring the

2 ii+4 1;[6] 8 9 [?];[7] 9 3 [?];[8] 11Q13 2:18. While nine may seem like a paltry sum, it should be noted that the nominal form משיח occurs only twenty-eight times in the Qumran corpus. Thus, over one quarter of all uses of 'anointed' in the Qumran literature bears a prophetic sense.[9]

The general context of these texts suggests that 'anointed' should be understood as a prophetic designation rather than in a messianic or royal sense.[10] Part of the unifying character of these passages is the

---

text as: ולדבר ס[רה על משיחי רוח קוד]שו, in part influenced by the similar clause in 4Q270 discussed above (Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq," 134). Milik's reading is now endorsed by VanderKam and Nitzan (see the slightly different reading in Abegg, "Messiah," 140). The probable correspondence between 4Q287 and the passage in 4Q270 suggests that 4Q287 refers as well to prophets.

[6] The inclusion of the "anointed one" in 4Q521 is based on the analysis of this document in the discussion of the eschatological prophet in ch. 7. Following John J. Collins and others, the "anointed one" in 4Q521 2 ii+4 1 is the eschatological prophet. For full discussion, see pp. 144–148.

[7] 4Q521 8 9 contains the fragmentary:]ה וכל משיחיה . Commentators debate the meaning of "its / her anointed ones" in this passage. In the *editio princeps*, Émile Puech argues that the "anointed ones" are priests and that the feminine suffix refers to the priesthood ("Une Apocalypse messianique (4Q521)," *RevQ* 15 [1992]: 508–509). He bases this proposal on the reference to "his holy vessels" and the restored "temple" in line eight. Puech is followed by Abegg, "Messiah," 142; Xeravits, *King*, 108, 190. John J. Collins opines that the "anointed ones" here are prophets since the plural use of משיח elsewhere in the scrolls always denotes prophets ("The Works of the Messiah," *DSD* 1 [1994]: 100; idem, *Scepter*, 118; idem, "A Herald of Good Tidings: Isaiah 61:1–3 and its Actualization in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertexuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* [ed. C.A. Evans and S. Talmon; BIS 28; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997], 235, n. 39).

[8] 4Q521 9 3 is also extremely fragmentary:]בה תעזוב ב[י]ד משיח[. See Abegg and Evans, "Messianic Passages," 194; Puech, "Apocalypse," 510, for suggested restorations. Elsewhere, Puech opines that the "anointed one" in this passage is either a king or high priest, or perhaps both ("Some Remarks on 4Q246 and 4Q521 and Qumran Messianism," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls* [ed. D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1999], 557). Collins notes the ambiguity of this phrase and its potential prophetic meaning, though he hesitates at arriving at any definitive conclusion ("Works," 100; idem, *Scepter*, 118; idem, "Herald," 235, n. 39).

[9] It is not entirely clear if 4Q381 15 7 should be included in this list. In this text, the speaker identifies himself as the anointed of God (משיחך). In addition, this individual is said to have been taught by God and will then teach others. Does the use of anointed identify this individual as a prophet? Schuller entertains this possibility but is more inclined to understand it as a royal designation (*Psalms*, 101). As such, this text will not be discussed here. Schuller (p. 102) notes as well that משיחך could mean "from your discourse" (from the root ŚWḤ). This latter suggestion is endorsed by Fitzmyer, "Qumran Messianism," 96–97.

[10] Based on the earlier discussion, CD 2:12; 1QM 11:7 clearly have in view prophets. The prophetic character of CD 6:1 (par. 4Q267 2 6; 6Q15 3 4) is discussed below. 4Q377 2 ii 5 refers to something (lost in the lacuna) that is said "through the mouth of Moses his anointed one." In addition, the next mention of Moses refers to him as

consistent reference to anointing in the 'spirit' or the 'holy spirit.'[11] This provides additional support for understanding the term 'anointed ones' as a prophetic epithet.

As John J. Collins observes, "the Dead Sea Scrolls refer to prophets as 'anointed ones' on several occasions, and give no indication that this use was novel."[12] Collins' observation is telling. The biblical corpus uses 'anointed one' rarely for prophets and with a narrow meaning, yet the Qumran scrolls reflect a wide employment of this term without hesitation. How does this minor biblical expression emerge as a widespread designation in the Qumran corpus? Additionally, as noted, many of the Qumran texts mention the prophet as having been anointed with the 'spirit' or the 'holy spirit.' This too represents a post-biblical innovation in the prophetic use of 'anointed ones.' This chapter traces the development of 'anointed one' as a prophetic designation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and its literary progression from the narrow bib-

---

a "man of God," a decidedly prophetic title. Indeed, the entire passage is preoccupied with prophetic concerns. The non-messianic prophetic character is noted by Abegg, "Messiah," 140–141; Xeravits, *King*, 125. See the discussion of this text below, pp. 100–102. 11Q13 2:18 identifies the messenger of Isa 52:7 as the one "anointed with the spirit." This directly follows the similar identification of the mountains in the biblical passage as the "words of the prophets." In ch. 9, I demonstrate that the one "anointed with the spirit" is the eschatological prophet expected by the sectarian community. Collins makes the general observation that the use of משיח in the plural likely always refers to prophets and not messianic figures (*Scepter*, 118). John C. Poirier, however, contends that many of these passages refer to priests and not prophets ("The Endtime Return of Elijah and Moses at Qumran," *DSD* 10 [2000]: 230–231). On CD 2:12, Poirier suggests that the term "anointed ones" is complementary to "visionaries of his truth," rather than parallel. He also suggests that the "anointed one" in CD 6:1 (I assume he does not accept the emended text here) refers to Aaron and identifies his role alongside Moses (compare CD 5:18). For further support of this understanding of CD 6:1, he suggests that prophets are never identified as lawgivers and thus would be an improper fit in this passage. Earlier analysis in ch. 3 clearly discounts the force of this argument. Furthermore, the juxtaposition of Moses with the "anointed ones" seems to parallel the related alignment of Moses and the prophets as found in 1QS 1:2–3. For 1QM 11:7, Poirier minimizes the importance of "visionaries" as a prophetic epithet, and therefore also its parallel term "anointed ones." He cites a passage from (Pseudo-) Hecateaus of Abdera which depicts the high priest in terms characteristic of a visionary. (Pseudo-) Hecateaus' description of the high priest as a mediator of divine law and oracles is no doubt correct and reflects certain currents within contemporary Judaism. It does not, however, erase the mass of biblical and post-biblical (especially Qumran) evidence that employs 'visionary' as a prophetic expression.

[11] See CD 2:12; 6:1 (par. 4Q267 2 6; 6Q15 3 4); 4Q270 2 ii 14; 4Q287 10 13; 11Q13 2:18.

[12] Collins, "Herald," 227. See the earlier similar comments in Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "David, 'Being Therefore a Prophet…' (Acts 2:30)," *CBQ* 34 (1972): 337–338.

lical usage to its widespread and varied employment in the Qumran corpus. After establishing the literary character of the Qumranic application of this expression, two texts are examined (CD 5:21–6:1; 4Q377), which provide some indication as to the larger social function attributed to the ancient prophetic 'anointed ones.' The conclusions of this section should be read in conjunction with the analysis in the previous chapter of the role of the prophetic 'anointed ones' that appear in literary parallelism with the prophetic 'visionaries' (CD 2:12–13; 1QM 11:7–8).

Literary Forms: From the Bible to Qumran

The Prophets as 'Anointed Ones' in the Hebrew Bible

In recounting the history of the patriarchs, the psalmist presents God as declaring: "Do not touch my anointed ones (משיחי); do not harm my prophets (נביאי)" (Ps 105:15//1 Chr 16:22). The prophets are not explicitly identified as "anointed ones" here. Rather, "anointed ones" and "prophets" are employed as parallel descriptive terms for the patriarchs. The application of these two terms in this sense, however, reflects some presumed connection for them by the psalmist.[13] This is the only text, however, in which the plural nominal form 'anointed ones' appears in poetic parallelism with prophets. As such, this passage reveals little about the emergence of prophets as 'anointed ones.'

In the biblical context, it seems plausible that the employment of 'anointed' with respect to the prophets is grounded in an anointing ritual that some prophets experienced. Indeed, some evidence seems to support this assertion. In 1 Kings, God tells Elijah to "anoint (תמשח) Elisha son of Shaphat of Abel-meholah to succeed you as prophet" (1 Kgs 19:16), which suggests that Elijah would have anointed Elisha with oil just as kings were anointed. Indeed, the passage in which Elijah receives the divine order to anoint Elisha contains an additional directive to anoint Jehu as king of Israel. As commentators observe, however, Elijah never actually anoints Elisha in the ensuing transfer of power (1 Kgs 19:19–21).[14] Thus, the precise import of the divine

---

[13] See Japhet, *Chronicles*, 319. See also the application of the title *nābîʾ* to Abraham in Gen 20:7.

[14] Mordechai Cogan, *I Kings* (AB 10; Garden City: Doubleday, 2000), 454. Cogan

directive to anoint Elisha is left unclear. Does the text merely fail to report that Elijah actually anointed Elisha?[15] This seems unlikely since Elijah's transfer of authority to Elisha is otherwise told in full. Many scholars therefore argue that anointing in this passage merely stands for 'to appoint.'[16] This passage therefore does not seem to furnish evidence in support of the original suggestion that prophets underwent an actual anointing procedure.

The possible anointing of the prophet is further echoed in Isa 61:1, where the prophetic disciple declares that "the spirit (רוח) of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord has anointed (משח) me."[17] Presumably, the descent of the spirit onto the prophet (v. 1a) is a direct result of having been initiated as a prophet of God (1b). Unfortunately, no details are supplied concerning this anointing process. In particular, there is no indication that a traditional anointing procedure (with or without oil) is assumed. Instead, the evidence agrees with Joseph Blenkinsopp that "the anointing is metaphorical, conveying the idea of full and permanent authorization to carry out the prophet's God-given assignment."[18] A simple reading of the verse indicates that the anointing process itself does not consist of the descent of the spirit onto the individual. Rather, since the individual has been anointed for a specific task, this individual now bears the guidance of the holy spirit.

---

also notes that Elijah himself did not anoint Jehu. Rather, this is performed by one of Elisha's attendants (2 Kgs 9:6).

[15] Note Ben Sira 48:8, which assumes that Elijah actually anointed Elisha.

[16] See John Gray, *I & II Kings: A Commentary* (OTL; 2d ed.; London: SCM, 1970), 411.

[17] Isa 61:1–7 is generally understood to be the voice of a prophetic disciple. The earliest attestation of this reading is found in the Targum. See Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 56–66* (AB 19B; Garden City: Doubleday, 2003), 221. The allusion to an anointing process, not commonly associated with prophets, has led some scholars to find either a priestly or royal voice in this pericope. Pierre Grelot identifies the speaker as the high priest ("Sur Isaïe LXI: La première consecration d'un grand-prêtre," *RB* 97 [1990]: 414–431; followed by Puech, "Remarks," 229). William M. Schniedewind sees in this passage the voice of one of the exiled Judean princes in Babylon (*How the Bible Became a Book* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004], 159). Others have suggested a messianic context for this passage. Indeed, Jesus draws upon this passage and applies it to himself in Luke 4:18–19. See James A. Sanders, "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4," in *Christianity, Judaism, and other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty* (ed. J. Neusner; SJLA 12; 4 vols.; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975), 1:80; Collins, "Herald," 226–228; Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah*, 220, for full discussion of the various proposed understandings.

[18] Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah*, 223 (see also Bernhard Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia* [HKAT 3/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914], 424–425). This is also the general understanding of the majority of Medieval Jewish exegetes. See Rashi, Radaq ad. loc. This understanding is also reflected in the Targum which renders משח as רבי "exalted."

The three biblical allusions to prophets as 'anointed ones' provide conflicting and incomplete evidence.[19] While 1 Kgs 19:16 seems to imply that prophets underwent some anointing ritual, this process never actually takes place. Likewise, Isa 61:1 does not appear to be a reference to an actual anointing procedure. Rather, it denotes a symbolic divine appointment of the prophet for a special task. The allusion to prophets as 'anointed ones' in Ps 105:15 provides the strongest evidence for the association of prophets and 'anointed ones.' The original intent of the psalmist, however, was not necessarily to present the prophets as anointed individuals. Rather, the patriarchs are here represented as both prophets and 'anointed ones.' It is the secondary effect of the literary parallelism that generates the identification of prophets as 'anointed ones.' As in the two other biblical passages, there is no indication that the psalmist conceived of the prophets as having undergone an actual anointing procedure.[20]

The Prophets as 'Anointed Ones' in the Dead Sea Scrolls

The Dead Sea Scrolls attest to the widening use of the term 'anointed ones' for prophets, whereby the designation has entered into the post-biblical lexicon of prophetic terminology.[21] The use of 'anointed ones' as a designation for prophets is clearly grounded in the three biblical passages cited above. The Isaiah passage is particularly important for the transformation of 'anointed ones' at Qumran. Pesher exegesis on this verse in 11QMelchizedek (11Q13) provides explicit testimony concerning how this verse was understood by the Qumran community and the prophetic role of the 'anointed one' contained therein.

---

[19] This does not, however, point to a misunderstanding of the use of the term 'anointed' as a prophetic designation as argued by Poirier, "Return," 228–230. The fact that a term only appears a few places in biblical literature does not suggest that it is a non-existent category. Rather, it is merely heavily underdeveloped in contrast to later literature.

[20] Indeed, Arthur A. Anderson suggests that the anointing in the Psalms passage also only means that one is appointed for a specific task (*The Book of Psalms* [2 vols.; NCB; London: Oliphants, 1972], 2:729–730).

[21] Marinus de Jonge briefly discusses the development of the term 'anointed' from the biblical base to its Qumranic application ("The Use of the Word 'Anointed' in the Time of Jesus," *NovT* 8 [1966]: 142).

11QMelchizedek (11Q13) 2:15–20[22]

15 הזואת הואה יום ה[שלום[23] א]שר אמר[ביד ישע]יה הנביא אשר אמר[מה]נאוו
16 על הרים רגל[י] מבש[ר מ]שמיע שלום מב[שר טוב משמיע ישוע]ה [א]ומר לציון [מלך]אלוהיך
17 פשרו ההרים[המה] הנביאי[ם[24]]המה א[ ] מ[ ] לכול]
18 והמבשר הו[אה]משיח הרו[ח][25] כאשר אמר דנ[יאל[26] עליו עד משיח נגיד שבועים

[22] Florentino García Martínez, Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.II (11Q2–18, 11Q20–31)* (DJD XXIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 225–230. The *editio princeps* of 11Q13 can be found in Adam S. van der Woude, "Melchizedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI," *OtSt* 14 (1965): 354–373. Further textual analysis is located in Yigael Yadin, "A Note on Melchizedek and Qumran," *IEJ* 15 (1965): 152–154; de Jonge and van der Woude, "11QMelchizedek"; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11," in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London: G. Chapman, 1971), 245–267; repr. from *JBL* 86 (1967): 25–41; Jean Carmignac, "Le Document de Qumrân sur Melkisédek," *RevQ* 7 (1969–1971): 343–378; Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq," 96–109; Fred L. Horton Jr., *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (SNTMS 30; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 60–82; Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 3–23; Émile Puech, "Notes sur le manuscript 11QMelkî-sédeq," *RevQ* 12 (1987): 485–513; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 389–412; J.J.M. Roberts, in Charlesworth, ed., *Pesharim*, 264–273; Xeravits, *King*, 68–75.

[23] So Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq," 107; Puech, "Notes," 498; Roberts, *Pesharim*, 268. Van der Woude, "Melchizedek," 358, originally restored יום ה[הרגה, "the day of slaughter" (followed in de Jonge and van der Woude, "11QMelchizedek," 302; Horton, *Melchizedek*, 68). Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 6, suggests the restoration יום ה[ישועה, "the day of salvation." García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.II*, 232, point out that the latter is too long for the lacuna and the former has no connection to the passage in Isaiah (so noted by Fitzmyer, "Further Light," 264). Whether one reads "day of peace" or "day of salvation" the effect is still the same.

[24] Contra van der Woude, "Melchizedek," 366; de Jonge and van der Woude, "11QMelchizedek," 302; Fitzmyer, "Further Light," 265, who restore here: תביאו[תי] המה, "their yield." Carmignac, "Document," 356, remarks that the reconstruction ⟨ו⟩הנביאי[ם is much simpler. See also the alternate reconstruction proposed by Daniel F. Miner, "A Suggested Reading for 11Q Melchizedek 17," *JSJ* 2 (1971): 144–148.

[25] The restoration and understanding of this short phrase have undergone a long gestation period. Initially, van der Woude restored the text as המ[שיח הו[א] ("Melchizedek," 366). This reading locates this passage not in a prophetic context, but as a messianic reference. Yadin subsequently corrected the reading to מ[שוח הרו[ח] ("A Note," 152–153), a reading now generally accepted with the slight shift back to van der Woude's earlier reading משיח (de Jonge and van der Woude, "11QMelchizedek," 301, 306). The one notable exception is Timothy H. Lim, "11QMelch, Luke 4, and the Dying Messiah," *JJS* 43 (1992): 91, who defends Yadin's suggestion based on his reading of the PAM 42.979 (followed by Collins, "Herald," 230). Carmignac also suggests the possible reading מ[שיח הרוש ("Document," 357).

[26] The *editio princeps* merely restored a *dalet* here. Fitzmyer, "Further Light," 265–266,

שבעה ומבשר][27]
19 טוב משמי[ע ישועה]הואה הכתוב עליו אשר]
20 לנח[ם] ה[אבלים פשרו]ל[ה]שכילמה בכול קצי הע[ולם

15 This [ ] is the day of [peace ab]out which he said [through Isa]iah the prophet who said: "[How] beautiful
16 upon (the) mountains are the feet [of] the messen[ger who an]nounces peace, the mes[senger of good who announces salvati]on, [sa]ying to Zion: 'Your God [is king]'" (Isa 52:7).
17 Its interpretation: the "mountains" [are] the prophet[s]; they […] every […]
18 and the "messenger" i[s] the anointed with the spir[it], as Dan[iel] said [about him: "Until an anointed, a prince, it is seven weeks" (Dan 9:25). And "the messenger of]
19 good who announ[ces salvation]" is the one about whom it is written […]
20 "to comfo[rt] the [afflicted" (Isa 61:2). Its interpretation:] to [in]struct them in all the ages of the w[orld.

The present pesher forms part of a larger eschatological midrash with Melchizedek as a central figure.[28] More specifically, the text here contains a pesher interpretation of Isa 52:7. The "mountains" in this verse are understood by the pesher as a reference to prophets. The text continues by providing an interpretation of the "herald" in Isa 52:7, here identified as the משיח הרוח. Commentators immediately recognized the affinity with Isa 61:1.[29] While the object of the pesher is Isa 52:7, the

identified the presence of the *nun* on the manuscript which would make it nearly certain that "Daniel" should be restored. Two passages in Daniel contain the word משיח that would be appropriate here (Dan 9:25, 26). The appeal to Dan 9:25 is first found in Fitzmyer, and is followed by Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq," 107; Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 21. See, however, Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 457, who argue for the priority of Dan 9:26.

[27] The restoration of מבשר here seems certain based on the next line which contains the rest of the phrase as found in Isa 61:2. So van der Woude, "Melchizedek," 358; Carmignac, "Document," 351; Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 21; Puech, "Notes," 489; Roberts, *Pesharim*, 268 (contra Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq," 108).

[28] In addition to the literature cited above (n. 22), see Lim, "11QMelch," 90–92, for brief description of the text and its prominent features. See also the recent treatment of Xeravits, *King*, 69–70, who summarizes some of the larger issues concerning literary provenance and genre.

[29] Yadin, "A Note," 153; Fitzmyer, "Further Light," 265; Sanders, "Isaiah 61," 1:90–92; Collins, "Herald," 230. See in particular, Merrill P. Miller, "The Function of Isa 61:1–2 in 11QMelchizedek," *JBL* 88 (1969): 467–469; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 401–402. Isa 61:1–3 also seems to be in view in 1QH^a 23:14–15 and 4Q171 1–2 ii 8–11. See David Flusser, "Blessed are the Poor in Spirit…," *IEJ* 10 (1960): 1–13; Sanders, "Isaiah 61," 1:89–90.

pesher itself brings the interpretation back to Isa 61:1.[30] The herald of Isa 52:7 is conflated with the role of the prophetic disciple in Isa 61:1 as the messenger of God's "good tiding." Thus, the משיח הרוח should be identified as a prophetic figure and not as Melchizedek himself or a royal / messianic figure.[31]

The passage from Isa 61:1 has been significantly modified in 11QMelchizedek. The biblical passage seems to intimate that the spirit descended upon the prophet as a result of anointing. Indeed, this is further suggested by the clear division of these two elements into two distiches. The Qumran text has joined the two elements of these distiches and reinterpreted the biblical conception of the relationship between the prophet, the anointing, and the spirit. No longer does the spirit descend upon the prophet after having been appointed by God. Rather, the spirit itself is the anointing agent.

This understanding is generated by the syntactical arrangement of the phrase as it appears in 11QMelchizedek, and its related by-forms in the Qumran corpus. Though the word משיח would eventually become a fossilized designation for a royal / messianic figure, grammatically it is a passive participle from the root משח, meaning 'anointed.' The full expression in 11QMelchizedek, משיח הרוח, is a construct chain with a passive participle as the *nomen regens*.[32] Thus, most translators render this

---

30 For a suggestion as to the interpretive technique operating, see James A. Sanders, "The Old Testament in 11QMelchizedek," *JANESCU* 5 (1973; Gaster Festschrift): 381.

31 For the former, see Yadin, "A Note," 153; de Jonge and van der Woude, "11QMelchizedek," 306–307; Horton, *Melchizedek*, 78; Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 61; Collins, "Herald," 230; García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.II*, 232; Xeravits, *King*, 74, 182–183. See also *Tg. Ps-Jon.* on Num 25:12, where Isa 61:1 is understood as containing an allusion to the eschatological mission of Elijah. The latter suggestion was first proposed by Adam S. van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1957), 367. Sanders suggests that this figure should be identified with Melchizedek since he is the one who proclaims the "liberty" above in line six ("Isaiah 61," 1:91). See Collins, "Herald," 230, who refutes this claim, suggesting instead that this individual is the "prophetic precursor of Melchizedek." Sanders' proposal is likewise echoed in Fitzmyer, "Further Light," 265–266, who equates the herald with Melchizedek and identifies him as a priestly messiah. This understanding emerges partly from Fitzmyer's reconstruction of the end of line eighteen as a citation of Dan 9:25. There, reference is made to the משיח נגיד, a royal / messianic figure. To be sure, Fitzmyer's entire discussion is introduced as a tentative proposal. Friedrich W. Horn likewise understands this figure in a messianic sense ("Holy Spirit," *ABD* 3:265,). Another suggested proposal has been to identify the herald with the Teacher of Righteousness. So Flusser, "Blessed," 10. See discussion in Collins, "Herald," 231–232.

32 DCH 5:521.

clause as "anointed of the spirit," with the genitive prominently marked in the translation by 'of' (or 'de' in French).[33] While this is indeed an acceptable translation, it fails to express the full syntactic nuance of this construct chain.

Participles, both active and passive, regularly appear in the construct state governing a number of genitive clauses that would otherwise be expressed through a prepositional phrase.[34] In particular, Biblical Hebrew does not express the agent or instrument of a passive participle with a prepositional phrase (i.e., the *bet instrumenti* or *lamed auctoris*).[35] Rather, this relationship is expressed through the placement of the passive participle in a construct chain with a qualifying noun as the *nomen rectum*.[36]

Based on the preceding grammatical review of the syntactical range of passive participles in construct chains, the standard translation of **משיח הרוח** as "anointed *of* the spirit" should be rethought. **הרוח** functions here as a genitive governed by the passive participle. Specifically, it should be understood as a genitive of instrument. As such, the spirit functions here as the instrument of the anointing process. Accordingly, this entire phrase is best rendered as "anointed *with* the spirit."[37] Isa

---

[33] Carmignac, "Document," 359; Horton, *Melchizedek*, 68; Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 9; Puech, "Notes," 491; Lim, "11QMelch," 91; Collins, "Herald," 230; García Martínez, Tigchelaar and van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.II*, 230; DCH 5:521; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 393; Abegg and Evans, "Messianic Passages," 194; Xeravits, *King*, 72. One exception is Fitzmyer, "Further Light," 250, who renders the clause as I do. See also de Jonge and van der Woude, "11QMelchizedek," 303; Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq," 100, who render the phrase "anointed by the spirit."

[34] That is, a prepositional phrase would be used for non-participial constructions. See IBHS § 37.3c.

[35] Thomas O. Lambdin, *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971), 158. Lambdin introduces the participial phrase **האיש ההרוג** 'the slain man.' In English and other languages, a prepositional phrase is appended to indicate the agent of the killing. Thus, 'the man who was slain *by* his enemies' (equivalent to a *bet instrumenti* in Hebrew). Such a construction with a passive participle, Lambdin asserts, is "virtually unknown" in Hebrew (see Jud 17:2; Ps 115:5 for exceptions).

[36] IBHS § 37.3c (examples 20–23). Thus, Isa 53:4, **מכה אלהים**, contains a genitive of agent as the *nomen rectum* and is best rendered as "smitten by God." See also Gen 24:31; 26:29. This feature is also known as the 'genitive of author.' See GKC § 116l; Joüon-Muraoka § 121p. Likewise, Isa 1:7, **שרופות אש**, should be understood as a genitive of instrument and thus is translated as "burnt with / by fire." This expression appears in 4QNarrative A (4Q458) 1 5. See also Gen 41:6; Exod 28:11; Deut 32:24; Isa 14:19. GKC § 116l; Joüon-Muraoka § 121p, refer to this feature as 'genitive of cause.' In each of these clauses, the construct state generates the meaning that is elsewhere associated with a prepositional phrase.

[37] So Fitzmyer, "Further Light," 250.

61:1, upon which the present expression is based, marks the anointing as a separate experience from the descent of the spirit onto the prophet. Indeed, as noted above, it is quite possible that no actual anointing process took place. 11QMelchizedek has reoriented the elements of the biblical verse such that the spirit from v. 1b is now the instrument with which the prophet in v. 1a is anointed and commissioned as a prophet.[38]

Prophetic 'Anointed Ones' and the Spirit at Qumran

Aside from two exceptions (1QM 11:7–8; 4Q377 2 ii 5), the remaining four prophetic uses of 'anointed one' in the Qumran corpus appear in construct chains similar to that of 11QMelchizedek.[39] In all these cases, however, the *nomen regens* appears in the plural as משיחי.[40] In three of these passages the *nomen rectum* is the holy spirit. Thus, "his holy spirit" appears in CD 2:12 (משיחו⟨י⟩ רוח קדשו) and 4Q287 10 13 (משיחי רוח קודשו), while the text of 4Q270 2 ii 14 contains "the holy spirit" (משיחי רוח הקדש). This syntactic arrangement is identical to that which appears in 11QMelchizedek. Thus, these clauses are best rendered as "the ones anointed *with* his / the holy spirit." In these passages, the holy / divine spirit is employed as the instrument by which the prophets are anointed and thus carry out their prophetic tasks.

Accordingly, the expression משיח הרוח in 11QMelchizedek is an elliptical phrase best understood as "anointed with the (holy) spirit." This understanding should also be applied to CD 6:1 (משיחו⟨י⟩ הקודש). As in 11QMelchizedek, only one element of the phrase "holy spirit," is present, though the full expression is likely intended.[41] Thus, it seems plausible that "the holy" in CD 6:1 is elliptical for the larger expression "the holy spirit." In this respect, the occurrences where 'anointed one(s)' appears in isolation (1QM 11:7–8; 4Q377 2 ii 5; 4Q521 2 ii + 4 1;

[38] In this respect, this passage may be influenced by 1 Sam 10:10–13. The text states there concerning Saul that the "spirit of God (רוח אלהים) gripped him (ותצלח עליו)" (v. 10), whereupon he began to prophesy. This passage contains unequivocal evidence concerning the central role of the divine spirit in the prophetic experience.

[39] CD 2:12; 6:1 (par. 4Q267 2 6; 6Q15 3 4); 4Q270 2 ii 14; 4Q377 2 ii 5.

[40] On the suggested emendation of CD 2:12; 6:1 from משיחו to משיחי, see below, p. 98.

[41] See the discussion P. Wernberg-Møller's understanding of this passage, below, p. 98, n. 50. See also the similar expression in 1Q30 1 2 (see above, n. 3).

8 9; cf. 9 3) may likewise have in view the full expression "anointed with the holy spirit."[42]

The biblical evidence is exceedingly sparse in its use of 'anointed ones' as a designation for prophets. In contrast, the Qumran material reflects a growing interest in labeling the prophets (both ancient and eschatological) as 'anointed ones' and assumes that this epithet is somehow bound up with an actual anointing process. Whereas the biblical material is limited and confusing with respect to any supposed anointing procedure, the Qumran corpus is forthcoming in this regard. The Qumran texts surveyed clearly conceive of the prophet as being anointed with the holy spirit.

How should this dramatic shift in prophetic terminology from the biblical material to the Qumran literature be explained? The historical progression of these literary forms may be reconstructed as follows: the Second Temple period reflects a widening belief in the important role played by the holy spirit in the prophetic experience.[43] This same development is visible within the Qumran texts. Thus, in the minds of the Second Temple period and Qumranic authors, the holy spirit would have been a central element in the experience of the classical prophets and will likewise be an essential component of the eschatological prophet's mission.

The somewhat equivocal passage in Isa 61:1 provides an adequate biblical base for this understanding. As discussed above, this verse is understood as alluding to an anointing process whereby the divine spirit (later equated with the holy spirit) descends upon the prophet. As such, the prophets are individuals who have been anointed, in this case with the holy spirit. Indeed, this exact expression has already been seen a number of times in the Qumran corpus. The reference to the prophets in Ps 105:15 provides further basis for the expanding use of 'anointed ones' as a prophetic designation. In this passage, the term 'anointed ones' appears in literary parallelism to prophets. The Second Temple readers of this Psalm likely imagined the reference to anointing in this passage as an allusion to the now widespread understanding of the prophets as having been anointed with the holy spirit. 'Anointed ones' can function on its own, independent of any mention of the holy

[42] Following Collins' interpretation of למשיחו in 4Q521 2 ii 1 as prophetic (see below, pp. 144–148), this passage should be included as well.

[43] See Levison, *Spirit*.

spirit, as an epithet for prophets. As such, 'anointed ones' enters the post-biblical lexicon of prophetic designations.

The 'Anointed Ones' as Mediators of Divine Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls

The majority of the passages cited above that employ the designation 'anointed one(s)' for ancient prophets are extremely fragmentary, thus preventing any further analysis. Of those that provide meaningful context, two texts (4Q521, 11Q13) employ 'anointed one' as a title for the expected eschatological prophet, and are therefore treated in later chapters devoted to the eschatological prophet at Qumran. CD 2:12, 1QM 11:7–8, and 4Q270 2 ii 14 have already been treated in the previous chapter devoted to 'visionaries' on account of the parallel presentation of 'visionaries' and 'anointed ones' in these passages. In that discussion, I argued that the use of 'anointed ones' (and 'visionaries') in CD 2:12 and 1QM 11:7–8 should be associated with the predictive role assigned to the biblical prophets in Pesher Habakkuk. This leaves unexplained only the employment of 'anointed ones' in CD 6:1 and 4Q377 2 ii 5 as a prophetic designation. In these two passages, the prophetic role of mediating divine law, prominently applied to the *nābîʾ* at Qumran, appears as well with the prophetic 'anointed ones.' CD 5:21–6:1 and 4Q377 assume such a role for the prophets in general and Moses, respectively.

Damascus Document (CD) 5:21–6:1[44]

21 ותישם הארץ כי דברו סרה[45] על מצות אל ביד משה וגם
1 במשיחו⟨י⟩[46] הקודש

21 and the land became desolate, for they (i.e., the movers of the boundary) spoke defiantly against the commandments of God (sent)[47] through Moses and also
1 through the ones anointed with the holy (spirit).

---

[44] Qimron, "CDC," 19–21. See also Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 325–326.
[45] The language here is borrowed from Deut 13:6: כי דבר סרה על יהוה.
[46] On this emendation, see below.
[47] It is generally assumed that a clause such as אשר שלח or אשר נתנו (*niphʿal*) is assumed by ellipsis. See Cothenet, *LTQ*, 2:164; Schwartz and Baumgarten, *Damascus Document*, 23; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE* 1:559, Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 325.

This passage forms part of a larger condemnation of the actions of the "movers of the boundary" (CD 5:20). Three elements in the interpretation of this passage are critical to understanding its presentation of the role of the prophets. First, the expression that appears in the medieval manuscript as וגם במשיחו הקודש is generally understood as a scribal error for וגם במשיחי הקודש (and in CD 2:12), a reading corroborated by the Cave 4 and 6 manuscripts of the Damascus Document.[48] Moreover, the expression "anointed ones" is interpreted as an allusion to the ancient prophets.[49]

The second element involves the proper translation of the emended phrase. Most scholars translate the expression as "holy anointed ones." My earlier grammatical analysis of the clause משיח הרוח in 11QMelchizedek should be applied here as well. Following this earlier analysis, משיחי הקודש in CD 6:1 should be rendered as "those anointed with the holy," with the implication that the holy spirit is the intended agent of anointing.[50]

The third element involves the proper understanding of the preposition *bet* that precedes the clause under discussion. Several scholars interpret it as an adversative *bet*. According to this understanding, the

[48] See Qimron, "CDC," 13, 21. 4Q267 2 5–6: כי דברו עצה סרה על מצוות אל ב[י]ד [מוש]ה וגם במשיחי הקודש; 6Q15 3 3–4: [כי דברו סרה על אל ביד מש]ה וג[ם]במשיחי הקודש מצוות. See Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII*, 97 (4Q267) and Maurice Baillet, in idem, Josef T. Milik, and Roland de Vaux, *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân* (DJD III; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 130 (6Q15). 4Q269 4 i 1–3 preserves text parallel to CD 5:21–6:2, though is almost entirely fragmentary and reconstructed by Baumgarten based on the other passages: [כי דברו סרה על מצוות אל ביד מושה וגם במשיחי הקודש] (*Qumran Cave 4.XIII*, 127). Cf. 4Q270 2 ii 14 (Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII*, 144; see above) where the phrase appears as such, though in a different context. See also the use of similar phrases in 1Q30 12; 4Q287 10 13.

[49] See Ginzberg, *Jewish Sect*, 9–10 (on CD 2:12); Maurice Baillet, "Fragments du Document de Damas. Qumrân, Grotte 6," *RB* 63 (1956): 518, n. 4; Cothenet, *LTQ*, 2:166, n. 1; Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 75.

[50] This understanding is anticipated somewhat by the interpretation found in Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 130. He argued, based primarily on the evidence of CD 2:12, that the word רוח has dropped out and should be restored in CD 6:1. The absence of רוח in the relevant Qumran fragments of CD (4Q267 2 6; 6Q15 3 4), however, argues against its insertion into the Cairo text. If its absence were due to a scribal error, some traces of it should be present in the Qumran fragments, as is the case for the original reading משיחי. While Wernberg-Møller argued that רוח is missing from the text due to a scribal error, I am suggesting that it is merely assumed by virtue of ellipsis (similar to my understanding of משיח הרוח in 11QMelchizedek). Translations similar to my suggestion can also be found in Cothenet, *LTQ*, 2:166; Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 247; Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 56.

defiant speech is directed at both the commandments and against the prophets.[51] This interpretation has important consequences for understanding the relationship of the prophets to the commandments. Following this understanding, the commandments are mediated exclusively by Moses. The introduction of the prophets is merely intended to express the idea that they were rejected by the "movers of the boundary" alongside the commandments.

The *bet*, however, is better understood as a *bet instrumenti* that refers back to role of the prophets in mediating the commandments.[52] The reliance upon Deut 13:6 (כי דבר סרה על יהוה) suggests that the opposition to the commandments is supplied by the preposition על.[53] The *bet* preposition stands in parallelism to the instrumental ביד.

Based on the foregoing analysis, the best way to render the entire clause is: "for they spoke defiantly against the commandments of God, (sent) through Moses and also through the ones anointed with his holy (spirit)." This presentation of the prophets is close to the portrait that appears in the texts discussed in chapter three.[54] The image of Moses as the initial transmitter of the Torah here is entirely expected. The simple syntactical arrangement of the passage indicates that the prophets ("anointed ones") fulfill a secondary role in the diffusion of the מצות אל.

The equation of Moses' activity and that of the prophets in the transmission of the מצות אל provides an added insight in the sectarian conception of the relationship of prophetic laws to Mosaic law. Based on the other sectarian passages discussed in chapter three, the prophets in CD 6:1 are later prophets engaged in the continued revelation of divine law that is intended to amplify and illuminate Mosaic law. Their

---

[51] Schechter, *Documents*, 69; Ginzberg, *Jewish Sect*, 27–28; Baumgarten *Qumran Cave 4.XIII*, 97, 127; Schwartz and Baumgarten, *Damascus Document*, 23; Grossman, *Reading*, 125. This suggestion is also noted in Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 325.

[52] IBHS § 11.2.5d.

[53] See also Jer 32:45; Mal 3:13; Ps 31:19; 109:20. Moreover, though *bet* sometimes carries an adversative meaning, it rarely does so governed by √דבר. See also Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 325.

[54] To be sure, the language of instrumentality (ביד) found in the biblical and Qumran passages discussed in ch. 3 appears here only in the first half of this expression (for Moses). The agency of the prophets is identified only with the preposition *bet*. Chaim Rabin goes so far as to suggest emending the text to ביד (*Zadokite Documents*, 21). This emendation, however, is unnecessary. Even without the full form ביד, the preposition by itself can denote instrumentality. Indeed, this meaning is found governing the root דבר, all in prophetic contexts (Num 12:2, 6 [see however, BDB 89b]; 2 Sam 23:2; 2 Kgs 22:8; Hos 1:2; 2 Chr 18:27; 4Q292 2 4).

legislative activity clearly stands outside the framework of the original revelation of law at Sinai. This feature is reinforced in CD by the use of the conjunction וגם ("and also") rather than a simple conjoining *waw*. At the same time, the text identifies the prophetic lawgiving as part of the process of transmitting the original Mosaic Torah (מצות אל). In doing so, the Damascus Document makes the implicit claim that later law revealed through the agency of the prophets is tantamount to the initial revelation of law at Sinai.

4QApocryphal Pentateuch B (4Q377) 2 ii 4–6[55]

4 ארור האיש אשר לוא יעמוד וישמור ויע[שה]
5 לכול מצ[וות י]הוה[56] בפי מושה משיחו וללכת אחר יהוה אלוהי אבותינו המת[גלה][57]
6 לנו מהר סינ[י

4 *vacat* Cursed is the man who will not stand and keep and d[o]
5 all the comm[andments of the L]ord through the mouth of Moses, his anointed one, and to follow YHWH, the God of our fathers, who re[vealed himself]
6 to us from Mt. Sin[ai] *vacat*

The larger document in which this fragment appears is labeled by its principle editors Apocryphal Pentateuch B.[58] Moses is the central character in the text, which recounts various incidents at Sinai and in the desert. In the fragment under consideration, Moses is repeatedly

[55] The text and translation is a composite based on the editions found in James VanderKam and Monica Brady, in Eileen Schuller et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2* (DJD XXVIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 213–216; Émile Puech, "Le Fragment 2 de 4Q377: Pentateuque Apocryphe B: L'Exaltation de Moïse," *RevQ* 21 (2004): 469–475.

[56] The text here clearly indicates some element which the Israelites are exhorted to observe. The restoration here was originally suggested by Strugnell, as noted by VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII*, 215. They further observe that this proposed restoration fits the extant traces on the manuscript and the common Deuteronomic usage of the expression מצות יהוה. It is not clear, therefore, why they do not include the restoration within their own text. This restoration, however, is endorsed as certain by Puech, "Fragment," 472.

[57] VanderKam and Brady comment that the lacuna likely contained some verb describing God's communication with Israel at Sinai (*Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII*, 215). Strugnell restored המצוה "who commanded." Puech argues that the traces of the third letter do not resemble a *ṣade*, but are better understood as a *taw* ("Fragment," 472). He therefore, proposes המתגלה, "who revealed himself."

[58] John Strugnell, the original editor, had previously titled the manuscript as 4QMoses Apocryphon C based on the prominence of Moses in the text (4Q375–376 being A and B).

referred to in the third person. The text recounts a speech articulated to the entire congregation of Israel in a covenantal setting.[59] The speaker begins with an exhortation directed at the "congregation of the Lord" (l. 3).

The speaker then continues with the first element in the larger exhortation, which is bracketed by *vacats* at the beginning and end of the literary unit (ll. 4–6). The speaker pronounces a curse against all those who are not steadfast in their observance and fidelity. This is expressed in two areas: adherence to the law and commandments and absolute devotion to God. The first half of the curse is against all those "who will not stand and keep and d[o] all the comm[andments of the L]ord" (ll. 4–5). The second half is directed toward those who do not "follow YHWH, the God of our fathers, who re[vealed himself] to us from Mt. Sinai" (ll. 5–6). My interest here is primarily in the first half of this admonishment.

The restoration of the lacuna at the beginning of line five follows Strugnell's original reconstruction. This seems to be indicated by both context and the slight letter traces that are visible on the manuscript. The "commandments of YHWH," are further modified in line six, which describes how they were revealed to Israel. The commandments are clarified as those mediated "through the mouth of Moses, his anointed one." Two important points must be observed here. The syntactical arrangement of this clause is awkward. While it is clear that Moses is introduced as the agent in the transmission of the commandments, the clause lacks the requisite relative pronoun and verb (i.e., שלח as in 4Q166 or צוה as in 1QS 1:2–3). At the same time, the absence of a relative pronoun and verb does not diminish from the larger meaning of the clause. The mediating sense of the verb is fully expressed by the preposition בפי.[60] In addition, the preposition generally employed

[59] VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII*, 207. According to their interpretation, the speaker is identified, perhaps as Elibah, an otherwise unknown name (also Wise, Abegg, Cook, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 338). García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE* 1:542, read Elyabo. Puech reads the phrase not as a name but rather as a negative jussive: אליבוא "Qu'il ne vienne pas!" ("Fragment," 470). As Puech emphasizes, what VanderKam and Brady read as a *ḥet* is clearly a *waw* (based on PAM 41.842). This was apparently Strugnell's original reading as well. Whether the speaker is positively identified or not has no bearing on the larger understanding of the passage.

[60] Another possibility is that Strugnell's and Puech's reconstruction of the lacuna needs to be rethought. The inclusion of an additional phrase would require a much shorter way of introducing the commandments.

to express the prophetic mediation of divine law, ביד, is not found. בפי, however, carries the same force and is likewise found in a similar role in 4Q375 1 i 1 and proposed as a restoration for 4Q166.[61]

VanderKam and Brady observe that Moses is never presented in the Hebrew Bible as God's "anointed one," which renders the present use somewhat enigmatic.[62] Based on the understanding of the use of "anointed one" in CD 6:1, a parallel text noted by VanderKam and Brady, the prophetic title is likely applied to Moses here in order to emphasize his role as a mediator of divine law, on analogy with the general class of prophets. The present clause, as well as the larger exhortation that comprises this fragment, is devoted to the revelatory experience at Sinai. Using this historical event as a point of departure, the speaker exhorts Israel to observe the law properly. In making this argument, the speaker carefully distinguishes Moses' role as a lawgiver sanctioned by the highest of authorities. Later, in the examination of the reference to Moses as a "man of God" in line nine, I argue that the application of this prophetic title to Moses is intended to underscore the superior character of Moses' revelation and mediating role in the Sinai experience. It is within this capacity that Moses is the prophetic lawgiver *par excellence*. The identification of Moses as God's "anointed one" already in line five reflects this larger concern of the fragment.

Summary

The identification of prophets as 'anointed' is rare in the Hebrew Bible. Only three biblical passages provide evidence for such a classification. In contrast to the limited biblical corpus, the Dead Sea Scrolls reflect a rapid expansion of the use of 'anointed ones' as a prophetic designation. This new use of the term is grounded in an interpretive reading of Isa 61:1. In this passage, the prophetic disciple asserts that the divine spirit rests upon him on account of the fact that God has anointed him. This passage was then understood to mean that the prophet's status was intimately related to the process of divine anointing. Prophets therefore are conceptualized as having been anointed with the spirit

---

[61] See above, p. 44, n. 20. Cf. the biblical examples marshaled by VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII*, 215, where בפי is employed to express the mediating force of the prophets.

[62] See also Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 339–340.

and 'anointed one' has entered the post-biblical lexicon of prophetic terminology.

The majority of the prophetic 'anointed ones' are ancient prophets. These prophets are conceptualized with a range of prophetic tasks. In the previous chapter, I explored the use of 'anointed ones' in parallel with 'visionaries.' In this capacity, the prophetic 'anointed ones' possess special information regarding the future, similar to the portrait of the *nābîʾ* in Pesher Habakkuk. The 'anointed ones' in the Damascus Document and 4QApocryphal Pentateuch, however, are represented as lawgivers. This portrait corresponds with the abundance of evidence discussed in chapter three, where the ancient prophets are conceptualized as mediators of divine law. In chapter nine, a third application of this term is introduced, where it is used in reference to the prophet expected at the end of days.

CHAPTER SIX

THE 'MAN OF GOD' AND PROPHETIC 'SERVANTS' FROM THE BIBLE TO QUMRAN

The previous four chapters have been devoted to exploring the use and application of the prophetic titles *nābîʾ*, 'visionary,' and 'anointed one' in the Dead Sea Scrolls. I have tracked the development of the terms from their biblical contexts through their employment in the Qumran corpus. In particular, I have focused on the modified literary forms in which some of these terms appear. Thus, for example, the terms 'visionary' and 'anointed one' appear in the Qumran corpus as prophetic designations in ways generally unknown in their original biblical contexts. By contrast, *nābîʾ* reflects little literary development, since by the late biblical writings it had already come to be understood as a general designation for all types of prophets. Alongside the analysis of these literary forms, I have concentrated on the portrait of the ancient figures as they are recontextualized in the Qumran texts. The conceptualization of the ancient prophets spans across the various titles employed. Thus far, the ancient prophets have been assigned two primary tasks: to foretell the future and to mediate divine law.

The present chapter continues this same approach by focusing on the final two prophetic designations that appear in the Qumran corpus: 'man of God' and 'servants.' Both of these terms regularly appear in the Hebrew Bible as prophetic epithets. They likewise appear in several places in the Dead Sea Scrolls as prophetic designations. Unlike the use of 'visionary' and 'anointed one,' however, the employment of the terms 'man of God' and 'servants' in the Dead Sea Scrolls follows closely their application in the Hebrew Bible. In particular, the range in which the term 'man of God' is used in the Qumran corpus is closely related to its appearance in late biblical writings.

The Prophetic 'Man of God' (איש האלהים): From the Bible to Qumran

The 'Man of God' in the Hebrew Bible

The expression איש האלהים appears seventy-six times in the Hebrew Bible.[1] The individuals who are thusly identified include Moses,[2] Samuel,[3] David,[4] Elijah,[5] Elisha,[6] Shemaiah,[7] Hanan b. Igdaliah,[8] as well as five anonymous individuals.[9] There is a strong clustering of this term in the prophetic narratives found in the books of Kings, with a small smattering of uses in other Deuteronomistic literature and late biblical texts. Scholars have long speculated on the full meaning and implications of this term, though no consensus has been reached. In particular, the apparent overlap with the more general term *nābîʾ* often frustrates attempts to define more precisely what makes specific individuals 'men of God.' Likewise, etymological analysis (usually applied to the other prophetic titles) supplies little due to the restricted semantic range of the title.[10]

Scholarly attempts to ascertain the precise meaning of 'man of God' fall into two larger trajectories: those that view the expression as specific to prophetic activity and those that widen its possible referents beyond prophets. Among those that understand it as a prophetic title, some discount the possibility that there is any special meaning for the term. Rather, it is merely a synonym for the more general prophetic

---

[1] In general, see Raphael Hallevy, "Man of God," *JNES* 17 (1958): 237–244; Jay Holstein, "The Case of ʿīš hā-ʾĕlōhīm' Reconsidered: Philological Analysis Versus Historical Reconstruction," *HUCA* 48 (1977): 69; N.P. Bratsiotis, "איש," *TDOT* 1:234–235; Werner Lemke, "The Way of Obedience: I Kings 13 and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History," in *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God* (ed. F.M. Cross, W.E. Lemke and P.D. Miller; Garden City: Doubleday, 1976), 313–314.

[2] Deut 33:1; Jos 14:6; Ps 90:1; Ezra 3:2; 1 Chr 23:14; 2 Chr 30:16.

[3] 1 Sam 9:6–10.

[4] Neh 12:24, 36; 2 Chr 8:14.

[5] 1 Kgs 17:18, 24; 20:28 (?); 2 Kgs 1.

[6] 2 Kgs 4; 5:8, 14–15, 20; 6:6, 9–10, 15; 7:2, 17–19; 8:2, 4, 7, 8, 11.

[7] 1 Kgs 12:22; 2 Chr 11:1.

[8] Jer 35:4. This passage refers to "Hanan b. Igdaliah, the man of God." I understand the title to apply to Hanan, rather than his father.

[9] Jud 13:6, 8; 1 Sam 2:27; 1 Kgs 13; 2 Kgs 23:16–17; 2 Chr 25:7, 9.

[10] Some scholars have appealed to non-biblical philological parallels, though with little success. See Edouard Dhorme, "Première Traduction des Texts Phéniciens de Ras Shamra," *RB* 40 (1931): 36 (Ugaritic evidence); Lindblom, *Prophecy*, 60–61 (Akkadian evidence).

title *nābî'*.[11] On the other hand, most inquiry into the expression has assumed that there is some unique prophetic quality contained in the use of the title that distinguishes the individual from the general *nābî'*. Scholars point out that, unlike the other prophets, the 'man of God' appears throughout as one who performs miracles and does so with supernatural powers bestowed upon him by God.[12] Jay Holstein, however, argues that the title is merely an honorific title conferred on certain worthy men, "many of whom just happen to be prophets."[13]

The 'Man of God' in Late Biblical Tradition

Recent scholarship on the issue has suggested that typological definitions that assume homogeneity throughout the Hebrew Bible are misguided.[14] Rather, the term enjoys a range of meanings and applications in the different biblical corpora. This approach has greatly benefited from Schniedewind's recent treatment of the expression in Chronicles. Schniedewind observes that in Chronicles the more general term *nābî'*

---

[11] William F. Albright, "Samuel and the Beginnings of the Prophetic Movement," in *Interpreting the Prophetic Tradition: The Goldenson Lectures 1955–1966* (Library of Biblical Studies; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press; New York; Ktav, 1969), 155; Wilson, *Prophecy*, 140. This was also the view of the medieval Jewish exegetes. See Holstein, "Case," 74, n. 24, for the relevant citations.

[12] To be sure, I am synthesizing the conclusions of a great many scholars, not all of whom agree on every detail. This overarching typological understanding can be found in Kaufmann, *Toldot*, 1:479–483; Lemke, "Way," 313–314; Alexander Rofé, "The Classification of Prophetical Stories," *JBL* 89 (1970): 431; Uffenheimer, *Prophecy*, 19. Petersen, *Role*, 40–43, likewise understands the expression in this way, though restricts this particular use to the pre-Deuteronomistic prophetic legenda imbedded within the book of Kings and some of the Deuteronomic strata. Bratsiotis, "**איש**," 1:234–235, also agrees with the basic meaning but hesitates to apply it to all uses of the expression. Lindblom, *Prophecy*, 60, understands the expression in this way when applied to prophets. Lindblom, however, broadens the scope of the term to include non-prophets as well. See also Paul Juöun, "Locutions Hébraïques," *Bib* 3 (1922), 53, who suggests that the expression denotes the judgment that the person in question is a true prophet and that he speaks in the name of God, something not conveyed by the other prophetic titles.

[13] Holstein, "Case," 71. Holstein is particularly troubled by the application of the title to David (see below), who is not normally identified as a prophet. He further observes that the title never appears as a self attribution in contrast to *nābî'* which often does (p. 70). (see, however, Peterson, *Role*, 108, n. 15). The view that 'man of God' represents an honorific title used either in direct speech or by the narrator was first advanced by Juöun, "Locutions," 54–55. Juöun, however, understood it only as applied to prophets.

[14] See Petersen, *Role*, 40.

often replaces the title 'man of God.'[15] For example, Elijah, the 'man of God' *par excellence* in Kings, is called a *nābîʾ* when he appears in Chronicles (2 Chr 21:12).[16] Only one independent tradition of a prophetic 'man of God' appears in Chronicles.[17]

The only other uses of 'man of God' in Chronicles are references to Moses (1 Chr 23:14; 2 Chr 30:16) and David (2 Chr 8:14). Neither of these uses refers directly to any prophetic activity.[18] As such, the evidence clearly agrees with Schniedewind's conclusions that "the title 'man of God' could refer to a prophet in Chronicles, but it is not invariably a term for prophets."[19] Moreover, further evidence suggests that this is also a more general tendency in late biblical texts. As in Chronicles, Malachi refers to Elijah not as a 'man of God,' but as a *nābîʾ* (Mal 3:23).[20] Outside of Chronicles, the only late biblical uses of 'man of God' apply the title again to Moses (Ezra 3:2) and David (Neh 12:24, 36). As in Chronicles, there is no direct prophetic character to these passages.

If in fact 'man of God' loses its exclusive prophetic connotation in late biblical texts, what exactly does it mean? Must it be conceded along with Schniedewind that "no clear pattern for a specific social role emerges for the 'man of God'?"[21] Again, any attempts to create overarching typological definitions should be avoided. The diversity of meanings in late biblical uses precludes any such harmonizing definitions. At the same time, it is readily apparent that these late biblical texts repeatedly refer to two individuals as 'men of God': Moses and David. While it may be impossible to determine the larger social role of the 'man of God' in late biblical texts, the literary force of the application of the term to Moses and David is clearly discernable.

---

[15] Schniedewind, *Word*, 49. This phenomenon was previously observed by Lemke, "Way," 323, n. 77; Harry M. Orlinsky, "The Seer-Priest and Prophet in Ancient Israel," in *Essays in Biblical Culture and Bible Translation* (New York: Ktav, 1974), 60.

[16] Shemaiah is introduced with the title 'man of God' when the Chronicler is working directly from his Kings *Vorlage* (2 Chr 11:2//1 Kgs 12:22). In the non-synoptic treatment of Shemaiah, the Chronicler merely refers to him as a *nābîʾ* (2 Chr 12:5) and also assigns him the role of Rehoboam's historiographer (2 Chr 12:15). See further Schniedewind, *Word*, 49; Japhet, *Chronicles*, 659.

[17] The anonymous prophet in the reign of Amaziah (2 Chr 25:7–9) See Schniedewind, *Word*, 50; Japhet, *Chronicles*, 862, for full discussion of the use of 'man of God' here.

[18] See below for discussion of 1 Chr 23:14.

[19] Schniedewind, *Word*, 51.

[20] Schniedewind, *Word*, 49.

[21] Schniedewind, *Word*, 51.

Moses as 'Man of God'

Moses appears as a 'man of God' six times in the Hebrew Bible, with the overwhelming majority appearing in late biblical texts (Deut 33:1; Jos 14:6; Ps 90:1; Ezra 3:2; 1 Chr 23:14; 2 Chr 30:16).[22] Of these, two are found in superscriptions to poems (Deut 33:1; Ps 90:1) and contribute little to the discussion of Moses as a 'man of God.'[23] 1 Chr 23:14 introduces Moses as a 'man of God' seemingly to emphasize Moses' status as a prophet. The Chronicler underscores the fact that, though Moses is a prophet, his children acquire the same Levitical status as that of Aaron's lineage.[24]

The remaining three passages all center on a similar theme (Jos 14:6; Ezra 3:2; 2 Chr 30:16). Let us take the Joshua passage first, since it is probably the earliest, and likely influenced the other two passages.[25] Caleb contends here with Joshua that the city of Hebron and its environs was previously conferred to him by Moses.[26] Caleb conveys to Joshua that "You know what instructions the Lord gave at Kadesh-barnea to Moses, the man of God, concerning you and I" (Jos 14:6). The ultimate source of authority for Caleb is God himself, though the pronouncement is mediated through Moses. By referring to Moses as the 'man of God,' Caleb highlights the original divine source of Moses' ruling, "underlining the authority by which he makes his request."[27] The focus here is not merely on Moses the prophet, but Moses the

[22] Deut 33:1 and Ps 90:1 are both superscriptions, which makes it difficult to assign a precise dating. In all likelihood, these superscriptions come from a much later time than the composition of the text that follows.

[23] George Coats, *Moses: Heroic Man, Man of God* (JSOTSup 57; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), 179.

[24] Japhet, *Chronicles*, 415. Perhaps the Chronicler is using 'man of God' here in the way that many modern scholars understand it—one who has a special relationship to God. Thus, *even* the 'man of God' type prophet is here subordinated to the Levite. See, however, Coats, *Moses*, 179–180.

[25] In general, early biblical scholarship (Alt, Noth, Albright) argued for an early (usually pre-monarchic) dating for the description of the tribal boundary lists in Joshua 13–19. More recent scholarship (Kallai, Na'aman) argues for a monarchic dating. See discussion in Richard S. Hess, "Asking Historical Questions of Joshua 13–19: Recent Discussion Concerning the Date of the Boundary Lists," in *Faith, Tradition, and History: Old Testament Historiography in its Near Eastern Context* (ed. A.R. Millard, J.K. Hoffmeier and D.W. Baker; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 191–205. On the influence of the passage in Joshua, see Trent C. Butler, *Joshua* (WBC 7; Waco; Word, 1983), 173.

[26] On the complexities involved in understanding this pericope, see Butler, *Joshua*, 170–171.

[27] Butler, *Joshua*, 173. See also Coats, *Moses*, 180.

prophetic mediator of the divine command. The application of the title 'man of God' to Moses places him among the other individuals with special relationships to God.[28] Whereas they perform miracles and the like, Moses 'the man of God' legislates with divine patronage.

In all likelihood, the Joshua passage personifying Moses as the prophetic mediator of divine law served as the source for the remaining late biblical verses labeling Moses as a 'man of God' (Ezra 3:2; 2 Chr 30:16).[29] Chronicles recounts how during the Passover celebration in Hezekiah's time, the priests and Levites "took their stations, as was their rule according to the Teaching of Moses, 'man of God.' The priests dashed the blood [which they received] from the Levites" (2 Chr 30:16). As Japhet observes, elsewhere in Chronicles, the identification of the one who passes the blood to the priests is not clear (2 Chr 29:11; 35:11). Pentateuchal precedent (Lev 1:5), and later rabbinic law (*m. Pes.* 5:6; *b. Yom.* 27a), assign this role to the priests. The Chronicler here consigns the responsibility to the Levites.[30] Thus, it should come as no surprise that the Chronicler adds an additional degree of authority to this ruling. The appeal is not merely to the teaching of Moses (תורת משה). The inclusion of the qualification 'man of God' ultimately traces the authority for the law back to God himself.[31]

This same tendency is apparent in the application of the title to Moses in Ezra 3:2. As in Chronicles, this passage narrates the commencement of cultic practice. The text recounts how, upon becoming settled in Judah, "Jeshua son of Jozadak and his brother priests, and

---

[28] That Moses could even be considered in this elite group of miracle workers can be traced either to the biblical tradition of Moses' magical abilities (i.e., Exod 10:7) (Petersen, *Role*, 42–43) or the memory of Moses' healing power (Meindert Dijkstra, "The Law of Moses: The Memory of Mosaic Religion in and after the Exile," in *Yahwism after the Exile: Perspectives on Israelite Religion in the Persian Period* [ed. R. Albertz and B. Becking; STAR 5; Assen: Van Gorcum, 2003], 89).

[29] Butler, *Joshua*, 173.

[30] Japhet, *Chronicles*, 950. See there her attempt to resolve this difficulty. This point is also observed by Judson R. Shaver, *Torah and the Chronicler's History Work: An Inquiry into the Chronicler's References to Laws, Festivals, and Cultic Institutions in Relationship to Pentateuchal Legislation* (BJS 196; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 117, in his larger study of Mosaic traditions in Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles that have no apparent antecedent in the Pentateuch (pp. 89–117). See Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 533–534, for discussion of the larger phenomenon of pseudo-attributive exegesis.

[31] Coats, *Moses*, 180. Whether the appeal to this 'higher' authority is here related to the contradiction with Pentateuchal law is unclear. As Japhet observes, the Chronicler may well have been referring to a specific interpretation of Pentateuchal law and would thus not find the contradiction as unsettling as the modern reader does.

Zerubbabel son of Shealtiel and his brothers set to and built the altar of the God of Israel to offer burnt offerings upon it as is written in the Teaching of Moses, the man of God" (Ezra 3:2). Similar to its use in Chronicles, the appeal to Moses as the 'man of God' provides the divine authority for the actions of Joshua and Zerubbabel.[32]

The full range of applications of the title 'man of God' to Moses resists any typological definition. A significant number of passages, however, draw upon the expression as a basis for legislative authority. The Deuteronomistic use in Joshua becomes the foundation for its wider use in the post-exilic applications of the title. In all, the qualification of Moses as a 'man of God' draws divine authority for the immediate legal pronouncement or action.

David as 'Man of God'

The tradition of Moses as a 'man of God' in late biblical texts developed from earlier traditions imbedded within the Deuteronomistic history. David, on the other hand, emerges as a 'man of God' only in late biblical literature (Neh 12:24, 36; 2 Chr 8:14). The three applications are used in conjunction with some aspect of David's administrative appointments for the cult. In each case, the texts states that the action was carried out according to the "ordinance of David (מצות דויד), the man of God." In Chronicles, David appoints the division of the priests as well as the attendant Levites. Likewise, Nehemiah recounts David's promotion of certain Levites as temple singers. The primary function of this title as applied to David in these two works is to lend authority to the Davidic organization of the cult. At the same time, the employment of the title with respect to David reflects the developing tradition of David as a prophet.

The use of the title 'man of God' for David in Chronicles and Nehemiah is clearly grounded in the similar application of the title to Moses. This dual application is part of the Chronicler's larger program of the typological alignment of Moses and David with respect to the foundation of the cult.[33] As Japhet observes, 1 Chr 8:13 locates the establishment of the sacrificial cult with Moses. Verse fourteen presents

[32] David J.A. Clines, *Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther* (NCB; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 65; Coats, *Moses*, 180.

[33] Simon J. de Vries, "Moses and David as Cult Founder in Chronicles," *JBL* 107 (1988): 619–639.

David as presiding over administrative appointments.[34] This division of labors is also present in the Ezra-Nehemiah traditions.[35] Japhet situates this entire trope as "the end result of a long process of legitimization of Second Temple institutions."[36] The use of the title closely associates David with Moses. David's actions are seen not as independent, but merely as the culmination of a process that began with Moses. The system conceived in Moses is realized in David, with the highest possible accreditation—divine.[37] The application of the title 'man of God' to David does more than merely bind him to Moses. The prophetic nuance of the term is clearly in mind as well. David's authority does not only emerge from his relationship to Moses. Rather, David himself is conceived of as forging a special relationship with God, further solidifying the authoritative character of the institutions grounded in the מצוה of David.

The aligning of David with Moses is clearly based in a concern to legitimize Second Temple institutions. The employment of a prophetic title with respect to David serves to authenticate further these institutions as divinely sanctioned. The application of this term to David must also be situated within the developing tradition of David as a prophet, a tradition that only emerges in late biblical writings but can be traced well into Second Temple Judaism and Christianity.[38] Scholars have observed that Chronicles seems to conceive of David as actively prophesying: "…according to the commandment of David and Gad the king's seer and Nathan the prophet, for the commandment was by the Lord through his prophets" (2 Chr 29:25).[39] In the books of Samuel, David always receives God's word mediated through a prophet; in Chronicles, David receives the divine word directly (1 Chr 22:8; 28:4–

[34] Japhet, *Chronicles*, 628.
[35] Japhet, *Chronicles*, 628. Japhet points to Ezra 8:20; Neh 12:24, 36, 45–46.
[36] Japhet, *Chronicles*, 628.
[37] This is paraphrasing William Johnstone, *1 and 2 Chronicles: Volume 1, 1 Chronicles 1–2 Chronicles 9, Israel's Place among the Nations* (JSOTSup 253; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 367.
[38] See, for example, Josephus *Ant.* 6.166; Acts 1:16; 2:25–31, 34; Heb 11:32 and the discussion of 11QPs[a] in ch. 12, pp. 250–255. See discussion in Fitzmyer, "David"; Then, "*Gibt es denn keinen mehr unter den Propheten?*" 189–225; Flint, "David," 158–167.
[39] To be sure, there is some debate over whether David is to be included in the expression "his prophets" at the end of the verse. Most scholars assume that he is. See Sara Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought* (BEATAJ 9; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1989), 468, n. 62.

7, 19).[40] As such, the application in Chronicles of the prophetic title 'man of God' to David fits this shift. Likewise, Nehemiah follows the same tradition.[41] As Petersen observes with respect to the typological alignment of David with Moses in Chronicles, "it was but a short step for the Chronicler to give David, his favorite authority figure, the same rank with which the Deuteronomist had dignified Moses."[42]

While the roots of this feature are somewhat obscure, the implications are clear. David as a prophet further serves to legitimize various Second Temple institutions. Indeed, the verse that explicitly places David among the prophets does so in order to provide justification for the role of the Levites in the Temple (2 Chr 29:25).[43]

With Moses, David is associated with the most authoritative of lawgivers. This typological alignment extends to the characterization of Moses as a prophet. David is not called *nābîʾ*, the term employed by the Chronicler for a prophet. The application of the title 'man of God' to David intimately connects the prophetic character of David to Moses, who is called a 'man of God' for other reasons. Thus, David is placed on par with Moses both as a lawgiver and as the ideal prophet. As such, Davidic legislation is merely the culmination of a process began by Moses. Likewise, once David was considered a prophet, it is only natural that Davidic institutions should enjoy full divine support and sanction.

'Man of God' in the Dead Sea Scrolls

The expression 'man of God' appears only four times in the non-biblical scrolls from Qumran.[44] Moses seems to be the intended referent

---

[40] See also Ps 18:1; 36:1 where David is referred to as a "servant of God."

[41] Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988), 340. James Newsome identifies this tendency with other Davidic kings and traces the phenomenon to the Chronicler's conception of the king as the regent of God and ruling with a divine mandate ("Toward a New Understanding of the Chronicler and his Purpose," *JBL* 94 ([975]: 203–204). Cf. Japhet, *Ideology*, 469, n. 62, who criticizes Newsome's extension of this phenomenon to the entire Davidic dynasty.

[42] Petersen, *Role*, 43.

[43] See Japhet, *Chronicles*, 926.

[44] Among the preserved biblical texts, the expression appears nearly every expected time. 6QpapKgs (Baillet, *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân*, 109–110) reflects 2 Kgs 8:2. For v. 4, the Qumran text has simply "Elisha" rather than 'man of God' as in MT. As Baillet observes, LXX has "Elisha the man of God." Only the first half of Deut 33:1 is preserved in 4QDeut[l]. 4QSam[a] has 'man of God' just as MT for 1 Samuel 9.

in three uses (4Q377 2 ii 10; 4Q378 26 2; 4Q378 3 i 4), while once the expression appears to be applied to David (4Q381 24 a + b 4). The employment of the title in the Dead Sea Scrolls evidently continues the same model presented by the late biblical writings. The expression is not used in the specialized sense it acquires in the Samuel-Kings corpus. Biblical 'men of God' such as Elijah or Elisha are never referred to in the non-biblical scrolls with their traditional appellation.

The application of the title to Moses is clustered in two related texts: Apocryphal Pentateuch B and the Joshua Apocryphon. The section in which the title first appears in the Joshua Apocryphon (4Q378 3 i 4) contains a fragmentary "admonitory speech characterized by Deuteronomistic terminology and allusions" with Joshua as the presumed speaker.[45] Unfortunately, the expression "man of God" is in complete isolation and lacks an immediate context.[46] In her notes on this fragment, Newsom suggests Moses as the most likely referent, though does not dismiss the possibility that other biblical 'men of God' are intended.[47] The thoroughly Deuteronomic character of the fragment favors the identification of Moses as the intended "man of God."[48]

[45] Carol Newsom, "The 'Psalms of Joshua' from Qumran Cave 4," *JJS* 39 (1988): 62.

[46] See Carol Newsom, in George J. Brooke et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD XXII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 243. See also the preliminary publication by Newsom "4Q378 and 4Q379: An Apocryphon of Joshua," in *Qumranstudien: Vorträge und Beiträge der Teilnehmer des Qumranseminars auf dem internationalen Treffen der Society of Biblical Literature, Münster, 25.-26. Juli 1993* (ed. H.-J. Fabry, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 39. The phrase itself is partially restored (the initial *ʾalep* and *yod* are reconstructed) though the reconstruction is fairly certain.

[47] Newsom, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII*, 244.

[48] See Newsom, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII*, 244, for examples of textual and thematic links to Deuteronomy. Newsom suggests two larger models for understanding the literary character of the Joshua Apocryphon—the text either 'rewrites' the canonical text of Joshua or contains Joshua's farewell speech modeled after that of Moses in Deuteronomy ("Psalms," 58). Newsom (p. 62) further suggests that the passage under analysis seems to contain Joshua's address to Israel after the death of Moses. As such, it would seem strange for Joshua to refer to himself as a 'man of God.' Rather, the extant text repeatedly draws the reader back to the admonitory contents of Deuteronomy articulated by Moses (e.g., Deuteronomy 28, 31). In all likelihood, Joshua is here referring back to Moses. There are numerous possible scenarios for these circumstances. In rearticulating the admonitions found in Deuteronomy, Joshua reminds the people that they had already heard them once before from Moses (this would work best if the text is 'rewritten Bible'). Or, the reference to Moses has nothing to do with the admonitions and is rather a general allusion to Moses, surely appropriate since Moses had just recently died.

At the same time, the fragmentary nature of the text precludes drawing any larger implications.

The Apocryphon of Joshua (4Q378) 26 1–3[49]

]ויוד[ע] דעת עליון ומ[	1
]ה ה[ג]יד לנו איש האלהים מפי [	2
]ועדת עליון הק[ש]יבו לקול מ[ושה	3

1]And he[50] kno[ws] the knowledge from the Most High and *m*[
2]*h* the man of God made known to us according to [
3]and the congregation of the Most High gave ear to the voice of M[oses.

The identification with Moses, despite the name falling mostly in the lacuna, is far more certain the second time the title 'man of God' appears in the Joshua Apocryphon. Even with the lacunae, the general sense of the passage is apparent. Line two recounts how the "man of God" dictated (הגיד) something to "us," presumably Israel.[51] The next line narrates how "the congregation of the Most High listened to the voice of M[oses." Thus, it is likely that line three continues the narrative sequence begun in line two. Following this reconstruction, these two lines describe how Moses spoke to Israel (l. 2) and they listened to him (l. 3). As such, Moses seems to be the intended "man of God" in line two.[52]

The text here provides more opportunity to explore further the meaning of 'man of God.' What exactly Moses makes known in line two is not clear. The text, however, does provide some information as to the source of Moses' speech. Moses relates something "from the mouth of…" This expression should be reconstructed as "from the mouth of the Lord" and thus refers to Moses' mediating a divine directive.[53] The prophetic sense of this passage is further underscored by the extant

---

[49] Newsom, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII*, 261; eadem, "Apocryphon of Joshua," 56.

[50] Newsom's translation follows closely the sense of the biblical passage (Num 24:16) drawn upon here ("who knows…"). The present translation is preferred since it is not clear how much of the surrounding content of Num 24:16 was employed in this text.

[51] Newsom observes that the word read as "to make known" (הגיד) could also be reconstructed as חסד, though she clearly favors the former reading ("Apocryphon of Joshua," 57). Indeed, the latter reconstruction would render the larger phrase syntactically difficult.

[52] So also VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII*, 216.

[53] See Num 4:27; Deut 18:18.

text of line one: "and he knows the knowledge of the Most High." This phrase originally introduced an oracle of Balaam, though here seems to refer to Moses.[54] Line two provides an example of Moses' intimate knowledge of God by recounting how he made known some information that he received directly from the mouth of God. As such, the 'man of God' in this fragment is clearly a prophet who receives the word of God directly and therefore possesses intimate knowledge of the divine.[55] This knowledge is not intended to be private, but rather the prophet is here pictured relating the divine word to the people. Moreover, the prophetic pronouncement does not fall upon deaf ears; the text presents the people as listening to (and perhaps obeying) the divine directive.

4QApocryphal Pentateuch B (4Q377) 2 ii 10–12[56]

The final application of the title 'man of God' to Moses appears in a relatively complete text (4Q377 2 ii 10). I have already had occasion to discuss the larger framework of this fragment and document as well as to cite the opening lines of the present fragment.[57] I remarked that the fragment contains an admonition compelling its audience to observe the law properly. This goal is accomplished through the formation of an exhortation attributed to an ancient speaker (Elibah?) who admonishes the people of Israel by recounting the historical experience of the Sinai revelation and Moses' central role in the revelatory process. The passage discussed above contains one of the elements of this larger exhortation. The speaker charges Israel to observe the law by cursing all those who fail to heed the commandments of Moses and to remain faithful to God.

After a *vacat*, the text switches its orientation from Moses to the revelatory experience of all Israel at Sinai. The text recounts how God

---

[54] Num 24:4 (LXX),16. See Newsom, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII*, 262. In a later chapter, I offer some suggestions as to why this verse is transferred from Balaam to Moses. See ch. 12, pp. 100–102. Whether one should then restore ומ]שה in line one is highly uncertain. Newsom suggests that perhaps the remainder of Num 24:16 belongs here (ומחזה שדי יחזה).

[55] Note the repeated uses of the root ידע. It appears twice in line one. See also the use of ה[ג]יד in line two (note Newsom's translation of "make known"). The expression עדת עליון in line three seems to be punning on the phrase דעת עליון in line one.

[56] Text of 4Q377 cited below follows VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII*, 213–214, with modification from Puech, "Fragment," 470.

[57] See pp. 249–250.

"spoke to the assembly of Israel face to face as a man speaks with his friend" (ll. 6–7). The concept of someone speaking face to face with God is generally applied to Moses (Exod 33:11; Num 12:8; Deut 34:10). 4QApocryphal Pentateuch follows Deut 5:4 in attributing this revelatory experience to all of Israel at Sinai. In doing so, it uses the language applied to Moses in Exodus (33:11), though now associated with all of Israel.[58] The text continues by describing certain aspects of the Sinai revelation (ll. 7–10).

4QApocryphal Pentateuch recounts two separate revelatory experiences that took place at Sinai—that of Moses and of the people. In this respect, 4QApocryphal Pentateuch follows the model presented by the biblical text itself. In Exod 20:1, it is God who articulates the Decalogue. The text, however, does not state to whom the divine declaration is directed.[59] This ambiguity is further reflected in the biblical text when Israel, out of fear, demands that Moses mediate the divine word (Exod 20:18–21; Deut 5:4–5). Thus, the revelation at Sinai was effected both through direct divine communication and through Moses' mediation, though the exact distribution is not entirely clear.[60] The tension between the direct experience of the nation and that of Moses is highlighted at the end of the narrative unit: "So the people remained at a distance, while Moses (**ומשה**) approached the thick cloud where God was" (Exod 20:21). The conjoining *waw* here is clearly adversative, underscoring the unique (and perhaps superior) role of Moses in mediating the divine law.

The circumstances of the biblical account seem to be further reflected in the following portion of 4QApocryphal Pentateuch. The speaker continues by further clarifying Moses' role at Sinai.[61]

10 **ומושה איש האלוהים עם אלוהים בענן ויכס**
11 **עליו הענן כיא ◦[ ][62] בהקדשו וכמלאכ ידבר מפיהו כיא מי מבש[ר]כמוהו**
12 **איש חסדים**[63]

---

[58] VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII*, 215.

[59] See Nahum Sarna, *Exodus: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1991), 109.

[60] Rabbinic tradition (*b. Mak.* 24a; *b. Hor.* 8a) reports that God spoke the first two commandments to Israel, while the rest were related by Moses. Sarna argues that this understanding is implicit in the biblical text (*Exodus*, 109).

[61] VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII*, 207.

[62] Puech proposes restoring here [**נ]כבד הוא** ("Fragment," 472). Cf. the comments of VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII*, 216.

[63] Note the defective spelling here. See, for example, 4Q377 2 i 8, which has **איש**

10 *vacat* And Moses, the man of God, was with God in the cloud, and the cloud covered
11 him because [ ] when he was sanctified,[64] and like a messenger he would speak from his mouth, for who is a heral[d][65] like him,
12 a man of faithfulness.

The location of this narrative immediately brings to mind Exod 20:21 (cited above) which draws a clear distinction between the role of Moses and actions of Israel. Immediately preceding the *vacat*, the speaker recounts that "they (i.e., the nation) stood at a distance," language drawn from Exodus (20:18, 21). Following the narrative sequence of the biblical text, the description of Moses would thus be grounded in the statement that Moses entered the thick cloud (Exod 20:18). Indeed, the notice that Moses was "with God" (l. 10) is readily identifiable with the notice that God was in the thick cloud which Moses approached. At the same time, the exact language of 4QApocryphal Pentateuch is drawn from the later description of Moses' tenure in the cloud (Exod 24:15–18). While in 4Q377 the cloud covers Moses, in the biblical passage the entire mountain is enveloped by the cloud (Exod 24:15–16).[66] Presumably, the relative similarity between the "thickness" (ערפל) and the cloud permits such a literary development.

The application of the title 'man of God' to Moses in 4QApocryphal Pentateuch should be understood within this literary context—the tension between the two revelatory experiences related in Exodus 20. The direct revelation experienced by all Israel is in no way diminished. In fact, 4QApocryphal Pentateuch follows Deuteronomy in democratizing the special nature of Israel's prophecy, likening it to that of Moses (ll. 6–7). Simultaneously, however, the role of Moses in the promulgation and dissemination of the Sinaitic covenant is heightened. 4QApocryphal Pentateuch emphasizes that all the commandments were mediated through the prophet Moses (l. 5). The special role of Moses as both a prophet and lawgiver is highlighted when Moses is reintroduced following a description of the communal revelation. While the people

חסידים. Though this text is in isolation on this line, it seems to refer to Moses (see the reference to Miriam in l. 9).

[64] On the sanctification of Moses while in the cloud on Sinai, see also *'Abot R. Nat.* B 1. See also *Jub.* 1:2–3.

[65] Note the alternate possible translation "who is of flesh..." I prefer the present translation because it highlights Moses' prophetic characteristics, which seems to be a concern of this fragment.

[66] VanderKam and Brady, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII*, 216.

stand at a distance, Moses is "with God in the cloud, and the cloud covered him" (ll. 10–11). This description draws the reader both to Exod 20:18–21 and 24:15–18. In each, Moses' central role involves receiving the divine directive (Exod 20:21; 24; 16). In each case, Moses' activity is contrasted with that of the Israelites (Exod 20:21; 24:17).

The use of the appellation 'man of God' for Moses in 4QApocryphal Pentateuch follows closely the similar application of the title to Moses in late biblical writings and in the Joshua Apocryphon. Moses as the 'man of God' is the foremost mediator of the divine word and law. His authority derives primarily from the nature of his prophetic experience. Thus, in exhorting the Israelites to observe the commandments, the speaker in 4QApocryphal Pentateuch emphasizes that they come from "the mouth of Moses, the anointed" (l. 5). Likewise, in describing the actual divine revelation, the speaker identifies Moses as a "man of God" (l. 10). As in late biblical traditions, this identification further serves to underscore the divine origin of the law and bestows an added authority upon all legislative activity.

Non-Canonical Psalms (4Q381) 24 a + b 4[67]

4 תהלה לאיש האלו[הי]ם יהוה אלהים]

1 A praise of[68] the man of G[o]d. The Lord God

Following the model of biblical psalm superscriptions, it can be assumed that this line marks the beginning of an independent psalmic unit.[69] The identification of the 'man of God' in this passage is grounded in the biblical literary foundations of the psalm. The psalm as a whole (ll. 4–11), as Schuller demonstrates, is heavily informed by the

[67] See Schuller, *Qumran Cave 4.VI*, 109–112. Cf. the earlier publication in eadem, *Psalms*, 111–122. In the original publication, Schuller refers to the fragment only as "24" (though uses A and B in referencing each specific section). Schuller's edition in DJD has "24 a + b." Aside from minor details, the restoration of the fragment is essentially the same in the two publications.

[68] The preposition ל here, as in the biblical Psalms superscriptions, is ambiguous. Does it mean "belonging to," "by," or perhaps "regarding?" See discussion in Peter C. Craigie, *Psalms 1–50* (WBC 19; Waco: Word, 1983), 33–35. It is not clear which meaning should be applied in 4Q381. Accordingly, it seems best to retain Schuller's vague translation ("of"), which maintains the ambiguity while allowing for the range of possible meanings.

[69] תהלה appears in Ps 145:1 and also in 4Q380 1 ii 8; 4 1. See Schuller, *Qumran Cave 4.VI*, 110–111. Note also the *vacat* in line three. The text of Ps 145:1 as preserved in the Cave 11 Psalms Scroll (11Q5 16:7) has תפלה rather than תהלה. See James A. Sanders,

language and imagery of Psalm 18//2 Samuel 22.[70] The superscription in 4Q381, however, is not dependent on this biblical psalm. Rather, the formulation of the superscription immediately suggests Ps 90:1, which attributes Psalm 90 to Moses: "a prayer (תפלה) of Moses, the man of God."

The biblical evidence provides conflicting testimony regarding the potential identity of the 'man of God' in 4Q381. On the one hand, the superscription to Psalm 90 forms the literary base of the non-canonical psalm superscription. The absence of Moses from the non-canonical superscription is highly suggestive and clearly deliberate. Therefore, one cannot merely assume that Moses here is the intended 'man of God.' Rather, the purposeful omission of Moses recommends the identification of the 'man of God' with some other individual.

In her treatment of the superscription, Schuller cites several possibilities for the identity of this 'man of God.'[71] A number of considerations favor David as the intended 'man of God.' The most glaring reason is the heavy dependence on Psalm 18//2 Samuel 22.[72] This psalm describes certain events in David's life and is credited to him in the superscription.[73] In addition, Schuller points to the possibility that 4Q381 as a whole is a royal collection. As such, the title 'man of God' would immediately indicate David (the only king referred to as such) and thus explain the lack of a proper name in the psalm superscription.[74]

How should the replacement of Moses as the 'man of God' in the biblical superscription with David as the 'man of God' in the apocryphal composition be explained? This phenomenon is strikingly similar to the typological alignment of David with Moses observed in

---

The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QPs^a) (DJD IV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), 37; Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997), 113.

[70] Schuller, *Psalms*, 121–122; eadem, *Qumran Cave 4.VI*, 110. The interpretive relationship with Psalm 18//2 Samuel 22 is further explored by Esther G. Chazon, "The Use of the Bible as a Key to Meaning in Psalms from Qumran," in *Emanuel*, 88–89.

[71] Schuller, *Psalms*, 28–29. They are David, Moses, a prophetic figure like Elijah, Elisha, or Samuel, and a more general Holy Man.

[72] Schuller, *Psalms*, 28. See also Chazon, "Use," 89.

[73] On this psalm and its relationship to David, see Craigie, *Psalms 1–50*, 171–172; Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 1–59* (trans. H.C. Oswald; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 257–258.

[74] Schuller, *Psalms*, 28. She notes the attribution of psalms to Manasseh and the anonymous King of Judah.

Chronicles and other late biblical writings as discussed above. As an isolated superscription, however, the use of the expression provides little insight into its larger role in the literature. Indeed, the rest of the psalm is fragmentary and resists any facile association with the superscription.

Summary

The extant Dead Sea Scrolls contains few references to prophetic 'men of God.' Of the four examples, three seem to refer to Moses while one is mostly likely David. Absent from the Qumran use is any reference to the range of individuals identified as 'men of God' in the Deuteronomistic history. This limited encounter with the prophetic epithet follows closely the developments within the biblical corpus. Late biblical literature prefers more general prophetic terminology for prophets like Elijah and Elisha. In these late biblical texts, Moses begins to emerge as the preeminent 'man of God.' This title is applied to David on account of a general tendency in some late biblical texts to align the characters of Moses and David. The Qumran evidence seems to be in continuity with this late biblical usage of the prophetic title. For the most part, however, the Qumran usages appear in fragmentary manuscripts and lack the context needed to determine any specialized meaning for the Qumranic 'man of God.' The few traces of contextual evidence highlight features already known about biblical prophets in general and their recontextualization within the Dead Sea Scrolls.

The Prophetic 'Servant' (עבד): From the Bible to Qumran

'Servant' as a Prophetic Designation in the Hebrew Bible

The term **עבד**, 'servant,' has a wide and varied use in the Hebrew Bible.[75] Among its numerous applications is its usage as a prophetic designation.[76] This takes on a number of different forms. Certain individual prophets are identified with the epithet, 'servant of YHWH,' a title which appears a total of twenty-four times in the Hebrew Bible, with

[75] See BDB 713–714; HALOT 1:774–775; Helmer Ringgren et al., "עבד," *TDOT* 10:326–405; Claus Westermann, "עבד," *TLOT* 2:819–832.

[76] Ringgren, "עבד," 10:395.

the overwhelming majority applied to Moses.[77] Intimately connected with this expression is the general designation of an individual prophet as 'his servant,' with the obvious referent being God.[78]

Joseph Blenkinsopp has suggested that the expression 'servant of YHWH' is employed in the Deuteronomic texts "for a specially designated intermediary, the model for which was the ministry of Moses himself."[79] The application of this epithet to Moses appears in a wide range of uses, though the overwhelming majority consists of "formulaic references to him as lawgiver and mediator of God's commands."[80] Post-exilic texts reuse this phrase in a similar way, though they substitute Elohim for YHWH.[81]

Joshua, as Moses' immediate successor, Blenkinsopp argues, would naturally bear this title as well. Likewise, later prophets, including David, are conceived of as perpetuating Moses' original mission and thus are also referred to as servants.[82] While this helps explain why certain prophets are designated as 'servants of YHWH,' it fails to illuminate the full range of meaning for this prophetic title. To be sure, some consistency in the application of the title to Moses can be identified. Even with Moses, however, and clearly with all the other prophets, the epithet 'servant of YHWH' and its derivatives carry a wide semantic range.[83]

More common than the personalized prophetic servant, however, is the general reference to the prophets as 'my servants, the prophets,' with God as the speaker.[84] In this capacity, the prophets perform a number of tasks. Indeed, it would be difficult to identify a unique role

---

[77] HALOT 2:775; Schniedewind, *Word*, 51–52. The expression is applied to Moses nineteen times, to Joshua and David twice each, and once for the servant in Isaiah.

[78] 1 Kgs 14:18; 15:29; 2 Kgs 9:36; 10:10; 14:25; Isa 30:3. See also 1 Kgs 18:36 where Elijah refers to himself as a servant. Numerous other individuals are referred to in this way as servants, though in a non-prophetic context. See Ringgren, "**עבד**," 10:394.

[79] Blenkinsopp, *History*, 189. See also Walther Zimmerli and Joachim Jeremias, *The Servant of God* (SBT 20; London: SCM, 1952), 24; Coats, *Moses*, 182–183; Schniedewind, *Word*, 52.

[80] Ringgren, "**עבד**," 10:394; See also Coats, *Moses*, 184, who understands the Deuteronomic passages in a similar fashion.

[81] Dan 9:11; Neh 10:30; 1 Chr 6:34; 2 Chr 24:9 (cf. Ps 105:26). See Ringgren, "**עבד**," 10:394; Coats, *Moses*, 185; Schniedewind, *Word*, 52.

[82] Blenkinsopp likewise fits the designation of David as a "servant of YHWH" into this interpretive model (*History*, 189–190).

[83] Zimmerli and Jeremias, *Servant*, 37–51.

[84] BDB 714; Ringgren, "**עבד**," 10:395. See also the variant forms noted by Schniedewind, *Word*, 52, n. 63.

associated with the general use of 'servants' as a prophetic designation. Thus, Ringgren contends that the prophetic servants "are Yahweh's spokespersons through whom he warns Israel and makes his will known."[85] This is an extremely general definition that does little more than underscore the varied nature of the use of 'servants' as a prophetic epithet. At the same time, some similar uses of the expression appear together in different corpora of biblical literature.[86]

Prophetic Servants in the Dead Sea Scrolls

The Qumran corpus displays the same variance reflected in biblical literature. 'Servant' is found eighty-nine times in the non-biblical scrolls. Among this wide range of uses, several texts employ the term as a prophetic epithet. As is so often the case, the Qumran texts evince the direct influence of the biblical models. In examining the Qumran material, attention will be directed toward two elements: the literary forms in which the title 'servant' appears as a prophet designation and the semantic range of this epithet in its various Qumranic usages.[87]

Literary Forms

James Bowley observes that 'servant' never appears in isolation as a prophetic epithet in the Dead Sea Scrolls, but is always accompanied by the title *nābîʾ*.[88] Indeed, in seven places, the prophets are stylized as 'servants,' where the literary presentation is based on the biblical texts. These passages employ the expressions 'his servants, the prophets'

---

[85] Ringgren, "עבד," 10:395.

[86] For example, in Jeremiah, the prophetic servants are sent to warn Israel. The majority of the texts from the Deuteronomistic history refer to these prophets as mediators of the divine word. Likewise, some post-exilic texts represent them as mediators of divine law. It was noted above that all four post-exilic references to Moses as a "servant of Elohim" allude to his lawgiving. In all these cases, however, there is no consistent and sustained approach throughout one corpus to the exclusion of another. See Ringgren, "עבד," 10:395.

[87] One particular text is difficult to qualify in this regard. 4Q292 2 4 seems to contain a blessing that will be enacted by "your servants, the prophets." However, the fragmentary character of the manuscript provides little context and makes drawing any conclusions extremely difficult. The Rule of the Congregation (1QSb 1:17) contains the preserved text "all the times of his servants" directly followed by a lacuna, which is often reconstructed with "the prophets."

[88] Bowley, "Prophets," 2:358.

(1QS 1:3; 1QpHab 2:9; 7:5; 4Q166 2:5), 'my servants, the prophets' (4Q390 2 i 5), and 'your servants, the prophets' (4Q292 2 4; 4Q504 1–2 iii 12–13).[89] In explaining this phenomenon, Bowley suggests that "the epithet was not so closely associated with the prophets that it need no further identification."[90] While Bowley's observation is correct, it requires further refinement. In the discussion of the use of the term 'anointed one' as a prophetic designation, it was noted how the Qumran corpus dramatically expands the basic biblical meaning of this expression. Thus, the scrolls attest to a whole new range of meanings and applications. With 'servants,' the Qumran literature stays close to the biblical linguistic and semantic range. The texts transport the fossilized biblical expression 'my servants, the prophets' into their own compositions while retaining its basic structure, though slightly modified for a new narrative context ('his / your servants, the prophets').[91] In this respect, these passages yield exactly what would be expected from texts that are drawing closely upon biblical literary models.

Bowley is correct that the term 'servants' has not entered into the lexicon of independent Qumranic prophetic designations in the same way as 'anointed ones.' At the same time, 'servant' does appear independent of *nābîʾ* in arguably prophetic contexts. Here as well, the Qumran texts are merely drawing upon biblical literary antecedents. It was noted above that Moses is repeatedly designated as the 'servant of YHWH' in the Hebrew Bible. So too, in a few instances, the Dead Sea Scrolls reprise this role for Moses by drawing upon this biblical designation.

Dibre Hammeʾorot (4Q504) contains repeated references to Moses as God's servant. Thus, God is praised for facilitating Israel's ability to listen "to all that you commanded through Moses, your servant" (4Q504 1–2 v 15). This passage draws its literary form from Deut 30:2 in addition to borrowing elements from Neh 9:14.[92] In particular, the words "Moses, your servant" are drawn from the passage in Nehemiah and serve to underscore the role of Moses as the prophetic lawgiver, a

[89] The expression appears as well in 4QReworked Pentateuch (4Q365 2 8), though as a biblical citation.

[90] Bowley, "Prophets," 2:358.

[91] The Apocryphon of Jeremiah (4Q390 2 i 5), which contains a divine narrator, retains the exact formula from the biblical base text.

[92] James R. Davila, *Liturgical Works* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 262; Esther G. Chazon, "Teʿudat Liturgit me-Qumran ve-Hašlakhoteha: 'Dibre Hammeʾorot'" (Ph.D. diss., the Hebrew University, 1993), 277–279.

feature commonly associated with the biblical application of 'servant of YHWH' to Moses.[93]

4Q504 6 12 is reconstructed as "the face of Moses [your] servant."[94] James Davila sees here an allusion to Exod 34:35, the description of Moses' mysterious veil.[95] Nitzan, however, understands as the biblical base Exod 33:19, which relates Moses' direct experience with God.[96] Neither of these presumed biblical base texts contains any reference to Moses as the 'servant of YHWH.' Indeed, it was noted above that this expression is found predominately in the Deuteronomic corpus and in variant forms in post-exilic literature. At the same time, the Qumranic usages are entirely consistent with the context in which one would find references to Moses as the 'servant of YHWH' and prophetic 'servants' in general. The author of Dibre Hamme'orot has conflated the Exodus imagery of Moses' face with the Deuteronomic language of Moses as a divine servant.[97]

The application of the biblical expression 'servant of YHWH' to Moses is likewise found in the Joshua Apocryphon. As part of a larger prayer, Joshua is introduced as "the attendant (משרת) of your servant Moses" (4Q378 22 i 2). Joshua often appears in the Hebrew Bible as Moses' attendant (משרת), though in these cases Moses is never further identified as a divine servant.[98] Only Jos 1:1 contains in the same verse a reference to Moses as God's servant (ויהי אחרי מות משה עבד יהוה) and to Joshua as Moses' attendant (יהושע בן נון משרת משה). Even this passage, however, does not contain the alignment of these two titles as found in

[93] Chazon, "Teʿudat Liturgit," 279. Bilha Nitzan reconstructs 4Q504 4 8 in a similar fashion (*Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* [trans. J. Chipman; STDJ 12; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994], 105). See further discussion in Chazon, "Teʿudat Liturgit," 166–167. See however, Maurice Baillet, *Qumrân grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)* (DJD VII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 154. A similar phrase is reconstructed by Chazon (p. 209) at 4Q504 3 ii 19 (l. 16 according to Chazon). However, "your servant" does not appear in this phrase. Moreover, additional text appears after "Moses" that precludes such a reconstruction.

[94] Baillet, *Qumrân grotte 4.III*, 58; Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 94, n. 70; Chazon, "Teʿudat Liturgit," 156; Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 246.

[95] Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 247. Cf. Chazon, "Teʿudat Liturgit," 156. Presumably, Davila is drawn by the reference to Moses' face in the Qumran passage.

[96] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 94, n. 70. In particular, Nitzan reconstructs in the immediately preceding lacuna [ותעבור על], language drawn from Exod 33:19. Here also, Moses' face is an integral component of the biblical verse.

[97] "Moses your servant" appears (partially reconstructed) as well in complete isolation in a fragmentary portion of Dibre Hamme'orot (4Q505 122 1). See Baillet, *Qumrân grotte 4.III*, 168. Chazon raises the possibility that this fragment is parallel to 4Q504 9 12 ("Teʿudat Liturgit," 156).

[98] Newsom, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII*, 259.

the Joshua Apocryphon. At the same time, the juxtaposition of these two epithets in Jos 1:1 provides the most likely biblical base for the similar representation in the Joshua Apocryphon.

David is twice referred to in the Hebrew Bible as a 'servant of YHWH' (Ps 18:1; 36:1). Blenkinsopp argues that this representation is nothing more than later biblical authors seeing a direct continuum between the prophetic mission of Moses and that of his successors, including David. David is likewise identified as a 'servant' in the War Scroll's paraphrase of the battle with Goliath (1QM 11:1–3; 1 Sam 17:46–47).[99] Two major differences exist between the biblical text and its paraphrase in the War Scroll: (1) the change in voice from the first person of the biblical text to the third person narrative in the War Scroll;[100] (2) the reference in the War Scroll to David as God's servant, a feature lacking in the biblical account. The literary basis for this second element is clearly the identification of David as God's servant in Pss 18:1 and 36:1. Why, however, does the War Scroll apply this designation to David specifically in the paraphrase of the encounter with Goliath?

Two answers present themselves. The War Scroll may reflect a tendentious interpolation by the author in order to highlight the belief that David was a prophet. This explanation, however, is somewhat difficult. There does not seem to be anything in the War Scroll's account of David and Goliath that highlight's David's prophetic character and would thus serve as the impetus for drawing upon the readily available prophetic designation for David.

If there is no direct relationship between the portrayal of David in prophetic terminology and the surrounding narrative, some other explanation should be sought for the identification of David as God's servant. This passage may merely represent part of a larger trend in Second Temple Judaism of highlighting David's prophetic character, a feature likewise encountered at Qumran in the Psalms Scroll (11Q5 27:2–11).[101] In this respect, the introduction of David in the War Scroll would accordingly be accompanied by an epithet that identifies him as a prophet. 'Servant' provides an appropriate choice as it is already applied to David in biblical literature (Ps 18:1; 36:1). The designation of David as a servant may merely represent an author's or scribe's tendency to refer to David as a prophet.

[99] Carmignac, *La Règle*, 157.
[100] Carmignac, *Règle*, 157.
[101] See below, ch. 12, pp. 250–255.

Semantic Range

The biblical uses of 'servant' as a prophetic designation reflect a wide semantic range. While no consistent sense is found in these texts, the term 'servant' is often employed in diverse literary corpora with similar connotations.[102] This same varied application is found in its several uses in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Thus, the Qumran corpus attests to diversity in meaning, though with some measure of consistency. In doing so, the Qumran applications are grounded in the biblical models.

Of the various functions of the prophetic servants in the Hebrew Bible, one prominent role is as mediators of divine law. In particular, this feature appears in numerous texts that speak of prophets in general, and is especially prominent in post-exilic texts (1 Kgs 17:13; Ezra 9:11; Dan 9:6, 10).[103] In addition, the post-exilic references to Moses as the 'servant of Elohim' all focus on his role as a lawgiver.[104]

The last five chapters have observed the conceptualization of the classical prophets in the Qumran corpus as mediators of divine law. They are described, at times alongside Moses, as transmitting God's law and providing its proper interpretation. Two sectarian texts that characterize the classical prophets (נביאים) as mediators of divine law refer to them with the additional epithet 'servants' (1QS 1:2–3; 4Q166 2:5).[105] This same language is employed as well in one of the non-sectarian texts discussed (4Q390 2 i 5). These documents are clearly drawing upon the biblical terminology that employs 'servants' as an additional designation for prophetic lawgivers.

The other consistent employment of 'servants' as an additional prophetic epithet in the Qumran corpus is found in the description of the classical prophets as bearers of special knowledge relating to the future course of sectarian history and eschatological events. Thus, the paradigmatic statements in Pesher Habakkuk on the relationship between the ancient prophetic pronouncements and their decoding by the Teacher of Righteousness both refer to the prophets as 'servants' (1QpHab 2:9; 7:5). In the same way, the prophetic 'servants,' along with Moses,

[102] See above, n. 86.
[103] On these passages, see above pp. 42–46.
[104] Dan 9:11; Neh 10:30; 1 Chr 6:34; 2 Chr 24:9.
[105] CD 6:1 is excluded from this discussion as it draws upon different biblical language, referring to the prophets as "anointed ones" rather than נביאים.

appear in Dibre Hamme'orot as possessors of secret knowledge concerning the eschatological future (4Q504 1–2 iii 14–15).[106]

These documents may contain an allusion to the general understanding of the prophetic 'servants' as divine spokespersons and transmitters of the divine will. More specifically, Amos 3:7 makes reference to the prophetic 'servants' as the recipients of divine knowledge. In particular, God never acts before first revealing his סוד ("mystery") to the prophets. To be sure, while Pesher Habakkuk understands the ancient prophets as bearers of special knowledge, it is clear that the prophets are not aware of the knowledge contained within their own pronouncements. At the same time, the biblical model of the prophets as having special access to divine knowledge and as transmitters of the divine word and will to Israel finds important points of contact with the presentation in the Qumran corpus.

Summary

The Qumranic application of 'servants' as a prophetic epithet follows closely the wide variance in linguistic forms and semantic range found within the biblical corpus. The prophetic epithet 'servant' is employed in a broad array of uses in the Hebrew Bible. Moreover, certain prophetic individuals, in particular Moses, are identified with this epithet. Many of the references to Moses as God's servant focus on his role as mediator of divine law.

The diversity reflected in the biblical material is mirrored in the Qumran literature. The scrolls attest to the same multiplicity of literary forms with respect to prophetic servants. Thus, the most common biblical expression, 'my servants, the prophets' is likewise the most frequently represented form in the scrolls (though slightly modified). This evidence agrees with Bowley's observation that 'servants' has not emerged as an independent prophetic designation in the scrolls in the same way that was noted above for 'anointed ones.' Rather, the Qumranic uses follow closely the biblical models. Thus, Moses is also referred to on various occasions as God's servant, drawing upon similar conceptual contexts as those found in the biblical antecedents. Like-

[106] On this passage, see below, ch. 17, pp. 358–361.

wise, David, another 'servant of YHWH' in the Hebrew Bible, appears with this prophetic title in the War Scroll.

In addition to following the biblical models with respect to literary forms, the Qumran corpus clearly draws upon the semantic range found within the biblical application of 'servant' as a prophetic designation. The two primary uses of 'servant' as a prophetic title in the scrolls concern the conceptualization of ancient prophets as mediators of divine law and as possessors of secret knowledge pertaining to the end of days. Both of these applications can be traced to readily available biblical models. To be sure, these two restricted uses of the expression are hardly representative of the full range of biblical meanings. There is no reason, however, to expect all, or even a great majority, of the biblical applications to be represented within the Qumran corpus.

The last five chapters have been devoted to examining prophetic terminology in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Let us draw together some conclusions from this lengthy analysis. The treatment of prophetic terminology has focused on two related aspects. I identified the standard prophetic terminology as found in the Hebrew Bible and analyzed how these terms are employed in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In doing so, I tracked the linguistic and semantic developments of these expressions as they move through biblical literature into the Qumran corpus. At times, the Qumranic use differs little from the biblical base. For example, *nābîʾ* and 'servant,' each used extensively in the Qumran corpus, reflect the same variance that marks their application in biblical literature.

By contrast, 'visionary' differs dramatically from its biblical use. The term appears in biblical literature exclusively in the absolute as a reference to prophetic 'visionaries.' The Qumran corpus expands the linguistic range by using this term in various construct forms, whereby the *nomen rectum* provides some assessment of the character of the 'visionaries.' Additionally, 'visionary' appears a number of places as a nonprophetic designation for contemporary communal leaders. The application of the epithet 'anointed one' to prophets in the Dead Sea Scrolls represents the widest variance between biblical and Qumranic usage. Appearing only three times in prophetic contexts in the Hebrew Bible, 'anointed one' is ubiquitous in the Qumran corpus as a title for prophetic figures. This phenomenon is traced to a developing interpretive tradition associated with Isa 61:1 and the rise of the holy spirit as a prophetic agent in the Second Temple period.

The close relationship between biblical and Qumranic literary forms is likewise found in the treatment of the 'man of God' in the scrolls. Based on the analysis above, the use of this prophetic title at Qumran follows closely developments within late biblical literature. The close proximity of the Qumranic application of 'man of God' and its appearance in late biblical literature highlights an important feature relating to prophetic traditions at Qumran. As has been seen in these chapters, and will continue to be seen throughout this study, prophetic traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls are heavily informed by developments within late biblical literature. At times, this relationship evinces a direct literary connection. More often, however, late biblical traditions about prophets and prophecy provide a historical and social context for the appearance of many of these traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Qumran community.

The second goal of these five chapters has been to explore the way in which the Qumran sectarians and contemporary Judaism as reflected in the scrolls conceptualized the role and function of prophets from Israel's biblical heritage. This larger study began with a methodological assumption that the presentation of ancient prophets in the Dead Sea Scrolls is reflective of attitudes toward prophets and prophecy regnant within the Qumran community and late Second Temple period Judaism. The new and modified contexts and roles in which biblical prophets are depicted in the scrolls are ultimately a reflection of the function of prophets in late Second Temple Judaism. This thesis was explored further within the Qumran corpus using the prophetic titles as the main structuring elements. The biblical prophets are often associated with roles that are vastly different from those in which they appear in the Hebrew Bible.

Across the spectrum of prophetic terminology, prophets are portrayed in two dominant roles: as predictors of future events and as mediators of divine law. The predictive element of prophecy is present throughout the Hebrew Bible. Its appearance in the Dead Sea Scrolls, however, is decidedly eschatological. In addition to the portrait of biblical prophets found in pesher literature, other presentations in Qumran literature of ancient prophets as foretellers of future events underscore the eschatological orientation of these predictions. This understanding of ancient prophets serves as part of the ideological basis of pesher-type exegesis as well as further applications within Second Temple Judaism of ancient prophecies to contemporary and eschatological situations. The third part of this study demonstrates that this characterization of

the ancient prophetic word is critical to understanding the prophetic character of some forms of biblical interpretation at Qumran and in Second Temple Judaism.

The other role assigned to the ancient prophet, lawgiver, is more surprising. Biblical literature is relatively silent on the relationship between prophets and the transmission of law. Besides the presentation of Moses as lawgiver *par excellence*, only a few late biblical texts show any interest in applying a lawgiving role to the larger prophetic class. The Dead Sea Scrolls, both sectarian and non-sectarian, contain numerous examples of this association. The prophets are conceptualized as the second stage after Moses in the progressive revelation of law. Chapter sixteen explores the implications of this phenomenon with respect to the role of the prophetic word in the formation of law within the Qumran community and late Second Temple Judaism. I argue that the community viewed its own legislative activity as the third stage in the progressive revelation of law and therefore conceived of itself as the direct heir to the ancient prophets. In this sense, lawgiving for the community was a prophetic act.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE PROPHET AT THE END OF DAYS: THE DEVELOPMENT OF A TRADITION

The Qumran corpus attests to the general belief that the eschatological age will usher in a new phase of prophetic history. The presentation of eschatological prophecy, like the Qumran treatment of the ancient prophets, is primarily a construct of the Qumran community, grounded in the reception of biblical modes of discourse and informed by contemporary conceptions of prophets and prophetic activity. Moreover, the community believed that it was living in the end of days, and that the final phase of the end of history was imminent in its own time.[1] Thus, for the community, this new stage of prophetic history would soon unfold. In particular, the Qumran corpus attests to the sectarian anticipation of a singular prophet who would appear at the end of days and play a significant role in the unfolding drama of the messianic age. Moreover, it is likely that the community believed that this future prophet would be drawn from its own ranks.

Qumran scholarship has long attempted to ascertain the centrality of the expectation of a prophet in Qumran theology, the eschatological character of the prophet, the larger function and role of this prophet, and the relationship of this figure to antecedents in the Hebrew Bible and contemporary constructions as identified in related Jewish and early Christian literature.[2] Such scholarly treatment of this subject has

---

[1] See above, pp. 5–6.

[2] See Ginzberg, *Jewish Sect*, 207–256; Naphtali Wieder, "The 'Law-Interpreter' of the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Moses," *JJS* 4 (1953): 158–175; idem, "The Idea of a Second Coming of Moses," *JQR* 46 (1955–1956): 356–364; van der Woude, *Vorstellungen*, 75–89, 182–185; Howard M. Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet* (JBLMS 10; Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1957); Giblet, "Prophétisme," 117–128; Rudolph Schnackenburg, "Die Erwartung des 'Propheten' nach dem Neuen Testament und den Qumran-Texten," in *Studia Evangelica, Vol. 1: Papers Presented to the International Congress on 'The Four Gospels in 1957' Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1957* (ed. K. Aland et al.; TUGAL 73; Berlin: Akademie–Verlag, 1959), 622–639; Ringgren, *Faith of Qumran*, 173–176; Rotem, "Ha-Nevuah," 63–65; Petersen, *Late*, 100–102; Aune, *Prophecy*, 121–126; Horsley, "Prophets," 437–443; Ferdinand Dexinger, "Der 'Prophet

often been thwarted by the nature of the source material (both Qumran and elsewhere) in which the eschatological prophet appears, in Collins' words, as "a shadowy figure."[3] Moreover, the eschatological prophet is found with far less frequency than the eschatological messianic figures (royal and priestly). The difficulty with respect to the paucity of source material is exacerbated by the shared context where these figures appear. Since these figures often appear together (i.e., 1QS 9:11 [The Rule of the Community]; 4Q175 [4QTestimonia]), speculation on the eschatological prophet generally appears as a footnote within larger discussions of Qumran messianism and rarely receives independent treatment. Accordingly, the character and role of the eschatological prophet in sectarian thought and in the larger contemporary Jewish world is still not fully understood. The majority of studies devoted in any part to the examination of the eschatological prophet are generally episodic in their treatment and insufficient in their scope.

The following three chapters examine the central texts that testify to the community's belief in the appearance of a prophet in the eschatological future. Three texts are particularly important in this discussion: The Rule of the Community (1QS 9:11), 4QTestimonia (4Q175), and 11QMelchizedek (11Q13). The first two use the terminological category of *nābîʾ* (נביא) to refer to the future prophet, while in the third the prophet is designated by the epithet 'anointed one' (משיח).

---

wie Mose' in Qumran und bei den Samaritanern," in *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Mathias Delcor* (ed. A. Caquot et al.; Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1985), 97–111; idem, "Reflections on the Relationship between Qumran and Samaritan Messianology," in *Qumran-Messianism*, 87–99; Émile Puech, *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, resurrection, vie éternelle* (2 vols.; Paris: J. Gabaldi, 1993), 2:669–681; idem, "Messianism, Resurrection, and Eschatology at Qumran and the New Testament," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant*, 240–242; idem, "Messianisme"; Collins, *Scepter*, 75, 112–113, 116–122; Florentino García Martínez, "Messianic Hopes," in F. García Martínez and J. Trebolle Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs, and Practices* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), 186–188; Hartmut Stegemann, "Some Remarks to 1QSa, to 1QSb, and to Qumran Messianism," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 504–505; Bowley, "Prophets," 2:366–370; Barstad, "Prophecy," passim; Todd S. Beall, "History and Eschatology at Qumran: Messiah," in *Judaism in Late Antiquity 5,2: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. A.J. Avery-Peck, J. Neusner, and B.D. Chilton; HdO 57; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2001), 142–143; Brenda J. Shaver, "The Prophet Elijah in the Literature of the Second Temple Period: The Growth of a Tradition" (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 2001), passim; Xeravits, *King*, esp. 217–219; Poirier, "Return."

[3] Collins, *Scepter*, 116 (cf. p. 75).

As in the material discussed in previous chapters, I pay close attention to defining the role and function of prophets and prophecy in the end of days. This analysis focuses on three related elements:

(1) The nature of prophetic activity in the eschaton: In each text, the use of explicit prophetic terminology (i.e., *nābîʾ*, 'anointed one') leaves little doubt that the individual expected at the end of days is understood to be a prophet. The few texts that introduce this eschatological prophet, however, provide little information concerning the prophetic character of this individual. My analysis of these texts, therefore, focuses on the particular features that mark this individual as a prophet. What prophetic role is envisioned for this prophet and how does it relate to the portrait of the ancient (biblical) prophets found in the Dead Sea Scrolls? Moreover, how does the prophetic character of the eschatological prophet in the Dead Sea Scrolls differ from earlier (biblical) and contemporary (Second Temple) models of prophecy at the end of days?

(2) The role of the eschatological prophet in the unfolding drama of the end of days and the relationship between the prophet and the messianic figures: Later Jewish and Christian tradition identifies the eschatological prophet as the individual who would announce the arrival of the messiah and heralds the onset of the messianic age. Scholars have often argued that this fully elaborated understanding is not found at earlier points in the development of the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Jewish traditions.[4] There is significant debate as to whether the Qumran texts provide earlier evidence for the role of the prophet as one who announces the arrival of the messiah. I will argue below, however, that the relevant texts from Qumran bear witness to a developing

[4] The extent to which the prophet / Elijah appears as one who announces the arrival of the messiah prior to the evidence of the New Testament is much debated in the scholarly literature. This issue was the subject of a series of scholarly discussions in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* in the early 1980s. Morris Faierstein rejected an earlier scholarly consensus that viewed this feature as widespread in Judaism contemporary with the New Testament and instead argued that it appears for the first time in the New Testament ("Why do the Scribes say that Elijah Must Come First?" *JBL* 100 [1981]: 75–86). This conclusion was immediately challenged by Dale C. Allison, "Elijah Must Come First," *JBL* 103 (1984): 256–258, though Faierstein's view was subsequently defended by Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "More About Elijah Coming First," *JBL* 104 (1985): 295–296. Faierstein's understanding is now expressed in the majority of recent treatments on the subject (e.g., Collins, *Scepter*, 116–117; Shaver, "Elijah," 166–167, 188). The alternative position is defended by Puech, "Messianism," 242–244; idem, "Remarks," 565.

tradition. Though the later Christian and Jewish conceptions of the end-time prophet are not fully represented in the Qumran corpus, the Dead Sea Scrolls provide a critical intersection of various traditions in fluctuation.

For this reason, care must be taken in the use of technical terminology. Throughout the following three chapters, a clear distinction is made between the appearance of the messiah and the more general conception of the emergence of the eschatological age. Any reference to the prophet as a messianic harbinger or herald indicates the fully developed tradition of the prophet as one who appears prior to the appearance of the messiah and announces his arrival. This understanding of the role of the eschatological prophet is most pronounced in later rabbinic and Christian traditions. At the same time, the prophet sometimes appears merely as an eschatological or messianic precursor. In this capacity, the prophet merely appears prior to the eschatological age or the messiah. The prophet, however, is not entrusted with the singular task of announcing their arrival. Rather, the prophet is generally responsible for other eschatological tasks.

(3) The identity of the prophet: In the second half of chapter nine, some suggestions are offered as to the further identification of the eschatological prophet in sectarian thought with individuals already known from elsewhere in sectarian and non-sectarian literature. In particular, this discussion concentrates on the often repeated claim that the Teacher of Righteousness represents the prophet whom the sect expected to appear at the end of days.

Full analysis of these three issues is extremely hindered by the decidedly opaque character of the presentation of the eschatological prophet. In addition, beliefs concerning the eschatological prophet at Qumran are clearly grounded in traditions found within the Hebrew Bible that continue into Second Temple Jewish literature. For this reason, the treatment of the eschatological prophet at Qumran begins in this chapter by considering the biblical and Second Temple period texts that provide the literary and theological context within which the Qumran evidence is formed and cultivated. This material provides important evidence for ascertaining any contextual meaning for the Qumran traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The variance and development from the biblical foundations provides crucial insight into the independent creativity of the Qumran traditions and their location within the chronological spectrum of wider Jewish and Christian beliefs concerning the prophet at the end of days. As such, this treatment is not

intended to be exhaustive or even comprehensive. Rather, it is conditioned by the questions and considerations presented by the evidence to be discussed from the Dead Sea Scrolls.

One further point must be made regarding this comparative enterprise. A good deal of the evidence concerning the eschatological prophet sometimes cited as parallel to the Qumran material comes from a later time period and is thus generally unhelpful for immediate historical context. For example, the heightened role of the eschatological prophet in the New Testament, rabbinic Judaism, and later Christianity is sometimes cited in discussions of this nature.[5] As many critics have observed, however, such evidence comes from a considerably later context and does not directly contribute to the understanding of the literary and theological world of the Qumran sectarians and their contemporaries.[6] In this respect, the following analysis proceeds with caution and remains sensitive to the literary and chronological divide that exists among the respective literary corpora under discussion. This chapter focuses exclusively on literary traditions that are unmistakably pre-Qumran (or contemporary) and as such provide the literary and theological backdrop for the Qumran traditions.

Hebrew Bible: Malachi

The earliest attestation of an eschatological prophet is found in the Hebrew Bible.[7] A preparatory role for the prophet is envisaged in the book of Malachi, where it is once assigned to an anonymous messenger

---

[5] See, for example, the treatment of this subject found in Puech, *Croyance*, 2:669–681. Puech attempts to generate meaning for each document based on its larger literary and historical context. However, he is far too generous in his use of sources ranging from the Hebrew Bible through rabbinic literature and the church fathers. Some of the literary corpora that he draws upon are from a much later time-frame and fail to inform the world of Qumran. There can be no doubt that the New Testament and rabbinic literature preserve traditions rooted in the Second Temple period. Nonetheless, these texts must be drawn upon with careful consideration of their later historical and theological context. An especially egregious example of this phenomenon can be found in Teeple, *Prophet*, who indiscriminately draws upon a wealth of biblical, Second Temple period, classical rabbinic sources, and later medieval rabbinic texts (i.e., the Zohar). Such phenomenological treatments of the eschatological prophet are important in their own regard, but fail to provide a sufficient historical context specifically for the Qumran material.

[6] See, e.g., Shaver, "Elijah," 188.

[7] To be sure, additional biblical traditions (esp. Joel 3:1–5) attest to future prophetic

(Mal 3:1) and later to the prophet Elijah (Mal 3:24).[8] In the former, the anonymous messenger serves to pave the way for God's arrival, perhaps in conjunction with the imminent eschatological Day of the Lord.[9] In general, commentators understand the messenger of v. 1 as a prophet.[10] Petersen has argued that the figure is the 'theophanic angel' from earlier E traditions (esp. Exod 23:20–21), who is now conceptualized as a prophetic figure.[11] Petersen therefore suggests that the deliberate

---

activity, though not necessarily eschatological. Petersen locates these traditions as part of the pre-history of the eschatological context of Malachi (Petersen, *Late*, 38–42). The late biblical portrait of an eschatological prophet generally derives from an interpretive reading of Deut 18:18: "I will raise up a prophet for them from among their own people, like yourself." In its original contextual meaning, this passage refers to the institution of biblical prophets that claim Moses as their primogenitor. This passage is later interpreted as a reference to a prophetic class far in the future, i.e., the eschatological age. Deut 34:10 is also an important passage for this interpretation. The statement "Never again did there arise in Israel a prophet like Moses," was read as "Not yet did there arise…" The implication of this new understanding is that the ultimate successor of Moses' prophetic office had not yet appeared. This prophetic figure was expected to arrive in the eschatological age. On the eschatological rereading of the Deuteronomic passages, see Teeple, *Prophet*, 49–50; Dexinger, "Prophet," 99–102; Aune, *Prophecy*, 125–126; Poirier, "Return," 237. The eschatological interpretive framework of Deut 18:18 is clearly manifest in the use of this passage in the Qumran corpus. See the treatment below of 4QTestimonia. This understanding of Deut 18:18 is not restricted to the Qumran literature. It is also found in the New Testament (John 1:21; Acts 3:22) and later rabbinic (though limited) and Samaritan literature. On the later development of this interpretive tradition, see Teeple, *Prophet*, 50–68; Dexinger, "Messianology," 90–98. This reading is also found in Islamic thought. See the Quran, Sura 3:164, where Muhammad is described as a prophet sent by Allah "from among themselves," which seems to be an allusion to the promise in Deuteronomy that the prophet will be raised "from among your own people."

[8] On the proposed date and provenance of the book, see Andrew Hill, *Malachi* (AB 25D; New York: Doubleday, 1998), 15–18, 51–84.

[9] Petersen, *Late*, 42; Beth Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi: The Divine Messenger* (SBLDS 98; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 129–135; Hill, *Malachi*, 264; Shaver, "Elijah," 78–79. To be sure, the Day of the Lord is nowhere explicitly mentioned in Mal 3:1. However, as Hill, *Malachi*, 264, observes, the messenger's audience in the preceding verses asks for God to mete out justice. The use of the definite article here (המשפט) leads Hill to assume that the Day of the Lord is in Malachi's view. In addition, the understanding of the redactional role of the epilogue at the end of the chapter (see below) assumes at least that the redactor understood 3:1 in this way.

[10] See, e.g., Petersen, *Late*, 42; Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi*, 134–135. A good summary of pre-modern interpretations can be found in Pieter A. Verhoff, *The Books of Haggai and Malachi* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 277–278.

[11] Petersen, *Late*, 43–44. See, in particular, the textual proximity of Mal 3:1 and Exod 23:20 as noted by Petersen. See further treatment in Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi*, 130–133.

alignment of the messenger with the angel of the Exodus traditions underscores the current messenger's role as a 'covenant enforcer.'[12]

Mal 3:24 is understood to represent part of an editorial appendix (3:22–24) to the entire book of Malachi.[13] In 3:24, the later editor has reinterpreted the circumstances of 3:1 such that now the anonymous prophet is identified as Elijah.[14] The prophet's preparatory role is expanded beyond the cursory introduction of the messenger in v. 1. Elijah will emerge prior to the eschatological Day of the Lord when God's destruction will reign over the land (v. 23). He is entrusted with the task of reconciling fathers and sons (v. 24). By successfully completing this mission, Elijah will ensure that the Day of the Lord will not be marked by complete and utter devastation (v. 24).[15]

It should also be observed what role Elijah does not possess in these passages. Malachi does not identify the eschatological Elijah as a harbinger for the messiah or the messianic era; indeed, no messiah is in view in Malachi. Instead, in both instances, the prophet only has the task of preparing the way for some eschatological event. In Mal 3:24, this preparation is conceptualized as the reconciliation of families. Moreover, the anonymous prophetic messenger in v. 1, identified with Elijah in v. 24, likely championed the observance of the covenantal regulations in the pre-eschatological age.

The Wisdom of Ben Sira

Closer to the period of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the eschatological role of the prophet (Elijah) found in Malachi is rehearsed again in the book

---

[12] Petersen, *Late*, 43.

[13] See Hill, *Malachi*, 363–366, and bibliography cited there. Commentators do not agree, however, on the dating of this appendix. Hill locates its composition in the Persian period, perhaps around the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (pp. 389–390); Shaver situates the appendix in the Hellenistic period ("Elijah," 111). Cf. Verhoff, *Malachi*, 338; Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi*, 252–252, 259–260, who argue for the unity of this final section with the entire book.

[14] J. Louis Martyn, "We Have Found Elijah," in *Jews, Greeks and Christians Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity: Essays in Honor of William David Davies* (ed. R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs; SJLA 21; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976), 188; Petersen, *Late*, 44; Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi*, 261–270; Hill, *Malachi*, 383; Shaver, "Elijah," 107–108. See Verhoff, *Malachi*, 340, for a summary of different approaches to this question from distinct confessional contexts.

[15] For the shared context of the prophet's activity with related prophetic traditions, especially Joel, see Petersen, *Late*, 44–45.

of Ben Sira (48:10).[16] The Hebrew manuscript here is in a bad state of preservation, though bears a certain degree of correspondence with the Greek text:

Hebrew Text [MS B]:[17]

> הכתוב נכון לעת להשבית אף לפנ[י חרון] ... להשיב לב אבות על בנים ולהכין ש[בטי ישרא]ל[18]
>
> As it is written, you are ready at the appointed time to bring an end to anger befo[re the wrath], to return the heart of fathers to (their) sons, and to restore the t[ribes of Israe]l.

Greek Text:

> Ὁ καταγραφεὶς ἐν ἐλεγμοῖς ἐις καιροὺς κοπάσαι ὀργὴν πρὸ θυμοῦ ἐπιστέψαι καρδίαν πατρὸς πρὸς υἱὸν καὶ καταστῆσαι φυλὰς Ιακωβ
>
> You are destined, it is written, in time to come to put an end to wrath before the day of the Lord, to turn back the hearts of parents toward their children, and to reestablish the tribes of Israel.[19]

That Ben Sira has in mind the epilogue from Malachi is certain from the shared set of themes and the introduction of the entire discussion with "it is written" (הכתוב, καραγραγεὶς).[20] Elijah's role from Malachi as the precursor to the eschatological Day of the Lord is repeated.[21] Moreover, he is now assigned the secondary task "to reestablish the tribes

---

[16] On the portrait of Elijah in Ben Sira, see Robert T. Siebeneck, "May Their Bones Return to Life!—Sirach's Praise of the Fathers," *CBQ* 21 (1959): 426–427; Stadelmann, *Ben Sira*, 197–200; J. Lévêque, "Le Portrait d'Elie dans l'Eolge des Pères," in *Ce Dieu qui Vient: études sur l'Ancien et Nouveau Testament offertes au professeur Bernard Renaud à l'occasion de son soixante-cinquième anniversaire* (ed. R. Kuntzmann; Paris: Cerf, 1995), 215–222; Asurmendi, "Ben Sira," 96, 98; Shaver, "Elijah," 124–161; Perdue, "Ben Sira," 147–149; Beentjes, "Prophets," 141–142.

[17] See Shaver, "Elijah," 141–149, for treatment of the textual issues involved in the reconstruction of the original Hebrew text.

[18] Restoration following Moshe Z. Segal, *Sefer ben Sira ha-Šalem* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1958), 330. See further *The Book of Ben Sira: Text, Concordance, and an Analysis of the Vocabulary* (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language and the Shrine of the Book, 1973), 60.

[19] Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39; Garden City: Doubleday, 1987), 530.

[20] Segal, *Ben Sira*, 331; Skehan and Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 534; Lévêque, "Portrait," 223 (contra Shaver, "Elijah," 141–152). Only the first half of the biblical verse is cited; the remainder is borrowed from Isa 49:6 (see below). Note also that the Syriac translation actually contains the expression "Day of the Lord." The appearance of this phrase locates the Syriac version in closer proximity to the scriptural text of Malachi. Further text critical discussion is found in Lévêque, "Portrait," 223–224.

[21] Though with slight interpretive alterations. See Lévêque, "Portrait," 224–225.

of Israel," presumably a reference to the ingathering of the exiles and the associated logistical difficulties.[22] As with the recycled passage from Malachi, this second role is pregnant with eschatological overtones.[23] In addition, Puech has argued that the fragmentary Hebrew text in verse eleven testifies to the belief that Elijah will aid in the resurrection of the dead, another event that marks the onset of the eschaton.[24]

Many scholars have noted that Ben Sira's seemingly intense eschatological speculation here is out of place with the larger non-eschatological orientation of the book as a whole and wisdom literature in general.[25] As such, Brenda J. Shaver opines that the eschatological traditions associated with Elijah were so widespread in Ben Sira's time that he was compelled to include them in his own encomium for Eli-

[22] This imagery seems to be borrowed from Isa 49:6 (see Martyn, "Elijah," 188; Shaver, "Elijah," 146–147). Stadelmann argues that Ben Sira has combined the Elijah-Prophet of Malachi with the Servant-Prophet from Isaiah (*Ben Sira*, 200). Note, however, that Ben Sira has changed "Jacob" in the Isaiah passage to "Israel." Beentjes suggests that Ben Sira deliberately altered the Isaiah passage in order to call attention to the earlier mention of the Northern Kingdom (47:23) ("Prophets," 142). Later rabbinic tradition, also based on Malachi, assigns to Elijah the task of examining and certifying the fitness of families with dubious pedigree (*m. Ed.* 8:7; *b. Qid.* 72b). Joseph Klausner proposes that there is some element of this more developed tradition already here in Ben Sira (*The Messianic Idea in Israel* [trans. W.F. Stinespring; London: G. Allen and Unwin, 1956], 454–455; cf. Segal, *Ben Sira*, 332).

[23] Siebeneck, "Bones," 426. See the somewhat later Psalms of Solomon (17:28), where the ingathering of the exiles is the prerogative of the messiah. See also *Tg. Ps.-Jon.* on Deut 30:4.

[24] The Hebrew text of 48:11 only preserves: אשר ראך ... יה. The Greek and Syriac both contain some allusions to death and revivification, though do not seem to identify Elijah as one who will resurrect the dead. Puech suggests that two *tafs* are visible in the second half of the clause. He therefore reconstructs, following the general tenor of the Greek and Syriac: כי תתן חיים ויחיה, "for you give life and he will live." See Puech, *Croyance*, 1:74–75; idem, "Ben Sira 48:11 et la Résurrection," in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins Presented to John Strugnell on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday* (ed. H.W. Attridge, J.J. Collins and T.H. Tobin; Lanham: University Press of America, 1990), 86–87. Later rabbinic tradition also assumes that Elijah will facilitate the resurrection of the dead (*m. Soṭ.* 9:15; *y. Šabb.* 1:3 3c; *Pesiq. Rab. Kah.* 76a).

[25] See G.H. Box and W.O.E. Oesterley, "Sirach," *APOT*, 1:501; Burton L. Mack, *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira's Hymn in Praise of the Fathers* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 200; Horsley, "Prophets," 440; John J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1997), 104; Shaver, "Elijah," 148. Moreover, Ben Sira does not seem to espouse a general belief in life after death or resurrection (see John J. Collins, "The Root of Immortality: Death in the Context of Wisdom," in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages*, 353–360; repr. from *HTR* 71 [1978]: 177–192). Thus, if Puech's reconstruction is correct, its appearance here is also difficult to explain within Ben Sira's theological system.

jah.[26] If this is true, then already by the beginning of the second century B.C.E., the tradition of a prophet (Elijah) who will act as a precursor for the eschatological age was well known and widely accepted.

This belief clearly draws upon the scriptural tradition located in Malachi. Elijah will appear before the onset of the eschatological age in order to attempt to mitigate the devastation that will be caused by God's appearance on the Day of the Lord. Elijah's tasks, however, are now extended beyond those previously assumed. He is now expected to facilitate the ingathering of the exiles and possibly resurrect the dead. The possible inclusion of resurrection would locate Ben Sira within a developing tradition in the second century B.C.E., in which the belief in resurrection of the dead becomes more widespread.[27] Again, it should be noted here, as with Malachi, that no messianic context is assumed.

Non-Sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls

The Qumran corpus contains two additional texts that speculate about the nature of the eschatological prophet: 4Q558 (4QpapVision[b] ar) and 4Q521 (4QMessianic Apocalypse). Both were unknown prior to the discovery of the scrolls, though were most likely not produced by the Qumran community. As products of the larger world of Second Temple Judaism, they provide important new contributions to understanding the wider context of the expectation of an end-time prophet in Second Temple Judaism and the relationship of these trends to the community's own beliefs. Each of these texts shares elements with the traditions found in Malachi and Ben Sira and is likely directly influenced by

---

[26] Shaver, "Elijah," 148. Cf. the similar proposal in Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 104, that Ben Sira is merely repeating the scriptural traditions associated with Elijah. Not all commentators agree that Ben Sira contains muted eschatological and messianic speculation. See, e.g., Thierry Maertens, *L'éloge de pères: Ecclésiastique XLIV–L* (Bruges: Abbaye de Saint-André, 1956), 195–196, who sees eschatological content throughout the entire praise of the fathers. Siebeneck argues for an implict messianism throughout the section ("Bones," 424–427). Likewise, Asurmendi points to some eschatological features in the hymn, though the main part of this discussion focuses on the eschatological portrait of Elijah ("Ben Sira," 98–99).

[27] On the belief in resurrection in Second Temple Judaism, see discussion in John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 394–398. Some scholars even suggest that 48:10 is a later addition dated to Maccabean times (see Mack, *Wisdom*, 199–200).

the Malachi tradition. The prophet is explicitly identified in 4Q558 as Elijah and this identification seems also to be implicit in 4Q521. At the same time, 4Q521 introduces numerous features that are unrelated to the presentation of Elijah in Malachi and Ben Sira.

4Q558 (4QpapVision^b ar) 54 ii 4

The role assigned to Elijah in Malachi and Ben Sira is likewise found in this fragmentary Aramaic text usually dated to the first century B.C.E..[28] 4Q558 does not evince any sectarian language or imagery and is therefore best classified as non-sectarian.[29]

The text (4Q558 54 ii 4) states: לכן אשלח לאליה קד]ם, "therefore I will send Elijah be[fore…]," This particular line as well as the entire text is unfortunately exceptionally fragmentary, precluding any far reaching conclusions. Based on the extant text, this one line seems to assume for Elijah the preparatory role first located in the scriptural tradition found in Malachi.[30]

In his original presentation of the text, Jean Starcky claimed that Elijah is here represented as the forerunner of the messiah.[31] This argument was based both on the presence of the highly suggestive word קדם, "before," and careful analysis of the surrounding context.[32] Starcky's interpretation, however, is extremely speculative and ultimately

---

[28] This fragment was first published in Jean Starcky, "Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumrân," *RB* 70 (1963): 497–498 (though not in critical form). The text of this particular fragment can also be found in Klaus Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: Ergänzungband* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 93; Puech, *Croyance*, 2:676–677; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 413–415. See also treatment in Collins, *Scepter*, 116; Shaver, "Elijah," 164–168 (following Beyer's text); Xeravits, *King*, 120–121 (following text of García Martínez and Tigchelaar). On the dating, see Beyer and Puech.

[29] See Dimant, "Qumran Manuscripts," 54.

[30] Starcky, "étapes," 498; Puech, *Croyance*, 2:677; idem, "Messianism," 241; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 414–415; Julio Trebolle Barrera, "Elijah," *EDSS* 1:246. See further Markus Öhler, *Elia im Neuen Testament* (BZNW 88; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997), 17, who contends that this passage represents an Aramaic paraphrase of the respective verses in Malachi (previously suggested by Petersen, *Late*, 101).

[31] Starcky, "étapes," 498. This understanding is followed by Puech, *Croyance*, 2:678; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 415. Cf. Öhler, *Elia*, 18, for an alternate theory on the meaning of this text.

[32] In particular, Starcky suggests that the text should be reconstructed in full as קד]מוהי, with the pronominal suffix pointing to the messiah. Furthermore, reference to "the eighth as an elected one" (l. 2), argues Starcky, alludes to David, who was the eighth son of Jesse.

too weak.[33] Moreover, Starcky's use of this text in reconstructing the messianic development of the sect is not without its difficulties. The sectarian provenance of this text is unlikely and as such this document should not be used as evidence for narrowly sectarian beliefs concerning the role of the eschatological prophet.

4Q558 should, however, be situated within the same literary tradition as Malachi and Ben Sira that attests to the more general Jewish conceptions of the eschatological prophet. As a text found in the Qumran corpus, it represents a tradition located within Second Temple Judaism and clearly known within the Qumran community. Like Malachi and Ben Sira, 4Q558 attests to the belief in the preparatory role played by the eschatological prophet, in this case identified as Elijah. However, what precise content followed the all important word קדם is unknown. Starcky's suggestion that a reference to the Davidic messiah should be found in the lacuna is theoretically possible. This understanding, however, cannot be corroborated by any contemporary evidence. It is better to remain within the framework of the scriptural antecedents and contemporary traditions. In sum, it seems more likely that 4Q558 draws upon the scriptural tradition related to Elijah in Malachi (and continued in Ben Sira) that identifies him as the prophet who would emerge before the arrival of the Day of the Lord and the associated eschatological experience.[34]

4Q521 (4QMessianic Apocalypse)

4QMessianic Apocalypse (4Q521) represents an additional text that contributes to the larger understanding of the character and role of eschatological prophecy in the late Second Temple period and within the Qumran community. The manuscript survives in sixteen fragments, most of which are too fragmentary to be reconstructed with any great certainty.[35] The one extant manuscript is dated based on paleographic

---

[33] See the criticism in Shaver, "Elijah," 166–167.

[34] So also the restrained remarks of Puech, "Messianism," 241. Cf. Xeravits, *King*, 187.

[35] This text has been the subject of a significant amount of scholarly discussion (primarily because of its literary connections to some passages in the New Testament; see Matt 11:5–6; Luke 7:22–23). See Jean Starcky et al., "Le travail d'édition des fragments manuscripts de Qumrân," *RB* 63 (1956): 66. Starcky merely mentioned the document and did not publish any of its contents. The text was first published in Puech, "Apocalypse," 475–522. See also *Croyance*, 2:627–692; *Qumran Cave 4.XVIII: Textes hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)* (DJD XXV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 1–

considerations to the first half of the first century B.C.E.[36] The absence of any decidedly sectarian language in the document suggests that it was not composed by the community, though Puech has argued for the identification of numerous literary points of contact with the Hodayot.[37] In all likelihood, these similarities are the result of a related use of biblical language and motifs.[38]

The critical issue in understanding the importance of the manuscript lies in the identification of the term משיחו in column two, line one and its parallel expression קדושים in line two:

1. [for the hea]vens and the earth shall listen to his anointed one(s) (משיחו).
2. [and all w]hich is in them shall not turn away from the commandments of the holy ones (קדושים).

Two particular issues surround the understanding the term משיחו in line one. As several scholars note, the orthography of this term can allow the possessive suffix to be read as either the singular or the plural.[39] Thus, this passage may envision multiple "anointed ones."

38; "Some Remarks," 551–565. Further presentations of portions of the manuscript with textual analysis can be found in Michael O. Wise and James D. Tabor, "The Messiah at Qumran," *BAR* 18, no. 2 (1992): 60–65; eidem, "4Q521 'On Resurrection' and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition: A Preliminary Study," in *Qumran Questions*, 151–160; repr. from *JSP* 10 (1992): 149–162; Roland Bergmeier, "Beobachtungen zu 4 Q 521 f. 2, II, 1–13," *ZDMG* 145 (1995): 38–48; Jean Duhaime, "Le Messie et les Saints dans un Fragment apocalyptique de Qumrân (4Q521 2)," in *Ce Dieu qui vient: Melanges offerts à Bernard Renaud* (ed. R. Kuntzman; Paris: Cerf, 1995), 265–274; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 343–389; Andre Caquot, "Deux Textes messianiques de Qumrân," *RHPR* 79 (1999): 163–170; Shaver, "Elijah," 168–185; Xeravits, *King*, 98–110. Besides Puech, the most active scholarly treatment on 4Q521 comes from John J. Collins. See his numerous works on the subject (with mostly overlapping content) in: "Works"; *Scepter*, 117–122; "Jesus," 112–115; "Herald," 233–238.

[36] Puech maintains the text was copied between 100–80 B.C.E., allowing for its actual composition sometime earlier ("Apocalypse," 480; cf. "Remarks," 552). Radiocarbon analysis of the text has assigned a date of 39 B.C.E. – 66 C.E. See Gregory L. Doudna, "Dating the Scrolls on the Basis of Radiocarbon Analysis," in *DSSAFY*, 1:460, 470.

[37] See Collins, "Works," 106; idem, *Scepter*, 122; idem, "Herald," 238; Geza Vermes, "Qumran Forum Miscellanea I," *JJS* 43 (1992): 303–304; Dimant, "Qumran Manuscripts," 48. For Puech's arguments, see "Apocalypse," 515–519; idem, *Qumran Cave 4.XVIII*, 36–38.

[38] So also Xeravits, *King*, 100.

[39] See discussion in Puech, "Apocalypse," 487, n. 14; idem, "Remarks," 554–555; García Martínez, "Messianic Hopes," 168; Duhaime, "Messie," 267–268; Caquot, "Deux Textes," 165; Collins, "Jesus," 114–115; idem, "Herald," 237; Shaver, "Elijah,"

Indeed, the plural form of the parallel expression 'holy ones' in line two recommends this understanding.

The second issue involves the proper identification of the "anointed one(s)." Puech argues that משיחו should be understood in its common messianic sense.[40] This understanding is rejected by Collins who offers a dramatically different interpretation.[41] In particular, he is troubled by the application of the prophetic role of Isa 61:1 to God in column two, line twelve (ענוים יבשר). Thus, Collins suggests that God is acting here through a prophetic agent. The most immediate candidate for this role is the "anointed one(s)" found in line one. Indeed, the "anointed one" in Isa 61:1 refers to the prophetic disciple who functions in the capacity of a divine prophetic agent.[42] Likewise, though God is presented throughout this text as the one who will resurrect the dead (2 ii 12; 7 6), several Jewish traditions indicate that this task will in fact be carried out by Elijah in the eschatological age.[43] Collins therefore asserts that the resurrection of the dead described in this text will also take place through the assistance of a prophetic agent. Moreover, a later fragment of 4Q521 contains a fragmentary passage which seems to indicate that the "anointed one(s)" acts as God's agent: תעזוב ב[י]ד משיח], "you have left, by the [ha]nd of[ ]the anointed one" (9 3).[44]

The next question regarding this text involves the precise role of this prophet(s) in the unfolding drama of the end of days. The only element explicitly identified with the prophetic "anointed one(s)" is the notice in line one concerning the absolute allegiance of the heavens and earth and the parallel expression in line two that nothing within them shall turn away from the commandments of the "holy ones." Beyond this, the remainder of column two describes God's actions at

171; Xeravits, *King*, 101–102. Qimron identifies about thirty examples with this orthography (e.g., מצוותו in 1QpHab 5:5; מאחרו in 1QS 1:17; 6:3) (*HDSS* §322.14).

[40] Puech, "Apocalypse," 497; "Remarks," 564. This claim is bolstered by his understanding of the contents of the next column (2 iii). 2 iii 6, though extremely fragmentary, contains the word שבט. Puech renders this word as "scepter," a common keyword for the royal messiah.

[41] Collins' arguments are advanced in numerous publications. See "Works," 98–106; *Scepter*, 117–122; "Jesus," 112–115; "Herald," 233–238.

[42] Collins, "Works," 100; idem, "Jesus," 113. Moreover, the identification of prophets as 'anointed ones' is indebted to an interpretive reading of Isa 61:1 (see above, ch. 5).

[43] See Collins, "Works," 101–102; *Scepter*, 119. See the discussion of the possible reference to resurrection in Ben Sira, above, p. 141.

[44] Note the use of ביד here, a word which is repeatedly employed to indicate prophetic agency (see ch. 3).

the end of days. Based on Collins' reinterpretation of this column, a new picture emerges for the eschatological prophet(s). The majority of the acts ascribed to God in this column, argues Collins, will in fact be carried out by God's prophetic agent in the end of days. In particular, as noted, Collins observes that the tasks of heralding good news to the afflicted (l. 12) and resurrection of the dead (l. 12) are more appropriately associated with the eschatological prophet. Indeed, it seems that all of the eschatological salvific acts in lines 12–13 attributed to God should be understood as responsibilities carried out by the prophetic agent. This includes healing the wounded, satisfying the poor, leading the uprooted, and enriching the hungry. In this respect, the notice that the heavens and the earth will obey the "anointed one(s)" is provided even more importance. As the prophetic agent acting on God's behalf, the "anointed one(s)" requires the absolute obedience of all terrestrial and celestial beings to carry out the assigned tasks.

The relationship of the eschatological prophet in 4Q521 to the earlier Elijah tradition in Malachi is more fully illuminated in column three. This column is understood by Puech as a "prose interpretation of the former poetic paragraph."[45] Line one contains a first person declaration, "I will set them free." Line two preserves what appears to be a paraphrase of Mal 3:24: "for it is sure: fathers are coming upon their sons" (נכון באים אבות על בנים).[46] The remainder of the column, unfortunately, is extremely fragmentary and difficult to interpret.[47] Who is the speaker in line one? It cannot be God, since the immediately preceding

[45] Puech, "Remarks," 560.

[46] See discussion in Shaver, "Elijah," 180. The use of a different verb (באים) recommends against the identification of this passage as an explicit citation of Malachi. Note also that the passage from Malachi is introduced here with נכון just as in Ben Sira. Shaver observes, however, that in Ben Sira it is an adjective used in reference to Elijah ("you are ready"), while here is seems to function as a substantive ("for it is sure").

[47] Puech, however, has a dramatically different interpretation of this column. He understands the first two lines as references to the eschatological Elijah. Lines 3–6, however, allude to the arrival of the royal messiah. This claim is advanced based on the use of the term שבט in line six, which Puech understands as a messianic reference. The prophet in lines 1–2, therefore, appears in this text as a messianic herald ("Apocalypse," 497–498). Collins, followed by others, rightly observes that שבט here mostly likely does not mean scepter and should not be interpreted with the messianic sense that Puech attaches to it. Rather, שבט within the context of a late Second Temple period citation of Mal 3:24 likely means "tribe," since this word is used in this way by Ben Sira in his own citation and expansion of Mal 3:24 ("Works," 103; idem, "Jesus," 114, n. 44; Duhaime, "Messie," 269; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 367; Shaver, "Elijah," 181–182; Xeravits, *King*, 105).

clause refers to "the law of your lovingkindness," which clearly represents first person speech directed toward God. The most likely candidate for the speaker in line one is the eschatological agent of salvation from column two. Though the remainder of the speaker's statement in line one in uncertain, the reference to "freeing" likely alludes back to the various eschatological functions carried out by the prophet in column two. The paraphrase of Malachi 3:24 in line two serves to furnish scriptural support for the claim made in line one. Malachi 3:24 provides the basis for the belief that a prophet, particularly Elijah, would arrive on the eve of the eschaton in order to execute certain tasks. The citation from Malachi in column three together with the allusion to resurrection of the dead in column two suggest that the particular prophetic figure envisioned in 4Q521 is either Elijah or an Elijah-like individual.

The presentation of the eschatological prophet in 4Q521 is clearly grounded in the Malachi tradition. As in Malachi, Elijah appears as the primary eschatological protagonist. Moreover, the general character of Elijah's eschatological responsibilities is preserved in 4Q521. 4Q521, however, has expanded the traditional role of the eschatological prophet significantly. First, this text presents the possibility that multiple eschatological prophets are expected. Second, the specific tasks assigned to the prophet in 4Q521 are considerably greater than the limited role envisioned in Malachi. Moreover, the prophet in 4Q521 is the principal eschatological protagonist in the events at the end of days. The prophet neither precedes a second eschatological figure nor announces any future eschatological event.[48] Rather, the prophet takes center stage in the Day of Judgment as God's primary agent.

---

[48] Some scholars focus on the specific role of the prophet in column two, line twelve: ענוים יבשר. Thus, Shaver identifies that prophet as one "who will proclaim that the day of salvation is at hand" ("Elijah," 184; cf. Collins, "Herald," 237). The assumption that the prophet will function as a herald of the coming day of salvation is based on an incorrect analogy with 11Q13 (see ch. 9). 4Q521 applies the term "herald" to the prophet in a restricted sense as one who will bring news to the afflicted. By the time this notice appears in 4Q521, however, the eschatological Day of Judgment is well underway. The heralding function in 4Q521 is one among many functions associated with the prophet at this time.

1 Maccabees

Additional evidence concerning the role of the eschatological prophet is provided by two passages in 1 Maccabees. 1 Mac 4:42–46 and 14:41 both allude to the future arrival of a prophet who will adjudicate complex legal issues that cannot be immediately resolved. Scholars are divided, however, on whether these passages refer to an eschatological prophet or merely a prophet in the historical future.[49] Several scholars contend that the expression "until a prophet shall arise" in 1 Mac 14:41 merely points to some future time, not necessarily the eschatological age.[50] The majority of commentators, however, understand the future prophet in these two passages as an eschatological figure.[51] This latter position seems more likely, since the book as a whole categorically rejects any possibility for contemporary prophetic activity or its resumption in the near future (e.g., 1 Mac 9:27).

The first reference to the eschatological prophet appears in 1 Maccabees 4. This chapter describes the Hasmonean purification of the temple. Having regained authority over the temple, Judah and the Hasmonean army are presented with the task of purifying the altar (vv. 42–43). They recognize that the altar had been profaned and are

---

[49] Scholarship on 1 Maccabees generally assumes that the community / individual responsible for the production of this book considered prophecy to be dormant in the present age. See especially 1 Mac 9:27. See also the discussion above, ch. 1.

[50] See Ragnar Leivestand, "Das Dogma von der prophetenlosen Zeit," *NTS* 19 (1972–1973): 295–296; Barton, *Oracles*, 107–108; Joseph Sievers, *The Hasmoneans and their Supporters: From Mattathias to the Death of John Hyrcanus* (SFSHJ 6; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 127, n. 91; Horsley, "Prophets," 438–439. Aune argues that the prophets in 1 Maccabees are "clerical prophets," and clearly not eschatological (*Prophecy*, 105; cf. Sommer, "Prophecy," 37, n. 25).

[51] Meyer, "Prophecy," 6:815; Klausner, *Messianic Idea*, 260; Jonathan A. Goldstein, *I Maccabees* (AB 41; Garden City: Doubleday, 1976), 285; Dexinger, "Prophet," 99; Herbert Donner, "Der verläßliche Prophet: Betrachtungen zu I Makk 14,41 ff. und zu Ps 110," in *Prophetie und geschichtliche Wirklichkeit im alten Israel: Festschrift für Siegried Herrmann zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. R. Liwak and S. Wagner; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1991), 89–98. Even Barton, *Oracles*, 109, finds it difficult not to read 1 Mac 14:41 as an allusion to an eschatological prophet. Marc Philonenko has recently suggested that the prophet in 1 Mac 14:41 should be understood as a Mosaic figure ["Jusqu'à ce que se lève un prophète digne de confiance (1 Machabées 14,41)," in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity: Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of his Seventy-Fifth Birthday* [ed. I. Gruenwald, S. Shaked and G.G. Stroumsa; TSAJ 32; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993], 95–98]. See also W. Wirgin, "Simon Maccabaeus and the *Prophetes Pistos*," *PEQ* 103 (1971): 35–41, who suggests that the prophet is Samuel.

unsure on how to proceed. As such, they decide that they will dismantle the altar and store its stones on the Temple Mount. This course of action is described as providing a temporary solution "until a prophet should come to give an oracle concerning them" (v. 46).

What was the exact difficulty presented by the altar such that Judah and the army were uncertain on proper procedure? As Jonathan Goldstein observes, Deut 12:2–3 mandates that all altars within the land of Israel used for idolatrous practices must be destroyed. At the same time, Deut 11:4 proscribes destruction of the altar of the Lord. They reasoned that, although they could no longer use the altar, they must not destroy it.[52]

The legal reasoning followed up to this point, however, provided no direction on the final status of the stones. They were merely hid away in a suitable place, suggesting that the stones no longer served any purpose. Thus, Judah and the Hasmonean army reasoned that they should leave the question in abeyance until some future time in which a prophet should arrive. This prophet was expected to provide some instruction on how to proceed with the stones. The juridical function of the future prophet is clear. This prophet will provide legal instruction for a question in which Judah and the army could not answer through use of Scripture and judicial reasoning.[53]

The second relevant passage from 1 Maccabees provides a similar context for understanding the assumed role of the prophet. 1 Maccabees 14:41 recounts the coronation of Simon as high priest and leader (ἡγούμενον). This appointment is described as in effect "until a true prophet shall arise" (ἕως τοῦ ἀναστῆναι προφήτην πιστὸν). As in the previous passage, the present circumstances represent a compromise for the less than optimal situation. Such an explicit negative statement suggests

[52] Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 285. Cf. Meyer, "Prophecy," 6:815; Barton, *Oracles*, 108.

[53] Cf. Aune, *Prophecy*, 105, who suggests that the prophet here is similar to the temple prophet who would be consulted in difficult cultic matters (see Hag 2:11–13) and therefore not associated with an eschatological prophet. Aune is likely correct that the prophet here should be identified with this role. The reuse of such a late prophetic model, however, does not preclude the possibility of an eschatological orientation. The roles associated with the classical prophets are not generally assigned to the eschatological prophet. Thus, it is not unreasonable to assume that some of the responsibilities associated with the clerical prophets in late biblical texts would also be assigned to future eschatological prophets. Parallel rabbinic traditions concerning these stones (*m. Mid.* 2:6) identify this prophet as Elijah, who is well known in rabbinic literature for his role as arbiter of difficult cases in the eschatological age. See Wirgin, "Simon Maccabaeus," 36.

that the decree as it appears was not originally composed by ardent supporters of Simon.

Why, however, was Simon's appointment considered somehow deficient? The inclusion of the proviso should be understood in the context of contemporary sectarian dynamics as reflected in the chapter. 1 Mac 14:25–27 describes how the "people" (ὁ δῆμος), overwhelmed by Simon's extraordinary accomplishments (as described earlier in the chapter), drafted a document to be inscribed on bronze tablets that recounts his fantastic exploits and his appointment as leader and high priest.[54] In general, scholars accept the authenticity of this document as an accurate representation of the events narrated.[55] Much of the document (following the general posture of the chapter) is dedicated to glorifying Simon's many accomplishments on behalf of the Jews (e.g., vv. 29–34, 36–37).[56] Wedged in between these honorific praises is the notice that "the people" (ὁ λαὸς) appointed Simon as leader and high priest (v. 35).[57] Its placement here suggests that the surrounding praise is intended to justify this dual appointment. The text reports that Simon's position as high priest was conferred by Demetrius (v. 38) and that his leadership was recognized by Rome (v. 40), likely also serving to justify Simon's appointment.[58]

Based on Goldstein's reconstruction of the original text, the past-time recounting portion of the document ends here.[59] Verse forty-one contains the present actions ("and be it resolved by…") that result from the glowing recommendation found in the document ("whereas…"),

---

[54] On this document in general, see Menachem Stern, *Ha-teʿudot le-Mered ha-ḥašmona'im* (Tel Aviv: Kibbutz Hame'uhad, 1983), 132–139; Sievers, *Hasmoneans*, 119–127; Jan Willem van Henten, "The Honorary Decree for Simon the Maccabee (1 Macc 14:25–49) in its Hellenistic Context," in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (ed. J.J. Collins and G.E. Sterling; CJAS 13; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 116–145; Edgar Krentz, "The Honorary Decree for Simon the Maccabee," in *Hellenism*, 146–153.

[55] See F.M. Abel, *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris: J. Gabaldi, 1949), 254–262; Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 501–509; Sievers, *Hasmoneans*, 120–122.

[56] See van Henten, "Decree," 120–121.

[57] For reasons that will soon become apparent, the "people" here (ὁ λαὸς) seem to be different from the "people" (ὁ δῆμος) (v. 25) who composed the document. The latter term is a general designation for the Jews. See van Henten, "Decree," 137, n. 13. In addition, this term excludes priests and Hasmonean opponents. See Sievers, *Hasmoneans*, 125.

[58] Goldstein observes that the ratification of Simon's appointment by these foreign leaders would have been necessary for many to consider Simon's reign legitimate (*I Maccabees*, 505).

[59] See discussion of other divisions of the text in van Henten, "Decree," 138, n. 23.

for which the document was originally created.[60] The description of Simon's great achievements now compels the "Jews and the priests" to ratify Simon's appointment as leader and high priest. This second confirmation of Simon as leader, however, is accompanied by an additional proviso that his appointment is only in effect until the arrival of a future prophet (v. 41).

Why is Simon's second affirmation in v. 41 accompanied by this proviso? It is likely that the appointment depicted in the document (v. 35) describes his confirmation as leader and high priest by his own followers, who presumably would not hesitate to appoint Simon as both high priest and leader. The Jews and the priests in v. 41 (cf. vv. 44, 47), either the same as the "people" in v. 25, or part of a larger coalition including all these segments of society, represent another group that accepted Simon's leadership.[61] This group, however, is depicted as ratifying Simon's appointment only after learning of his good deeds and recounting how he had already been anointed as leader and high priest. They were therefore certainly not among the initial group to rally around Simon and appoint him, as described in v. 35.[62] Their after-the-fact affirmation of Simon's new leadership position and the ambivalence reflected in the proviso that accompanies their confirmation of Simon suggest that they were not entirely comfortable with Simon's present appointment. The exact nature of their opposition, however, is less clear.

---

[60] Translations of v. 41 are usually rendered as: "Also that the Jews and priests resolved that Simon should be their governor and high priest for ever, until there should arise a faithful prophet." Goldstein argues that the textual tradition here is corrupt. Most standard editions contain the text καὶ ὅτι, "and because," at the beginning of v. 41, which serves to continue the narrative sequence with its description of Simon's coronation as leader and high priest (*I Maccabees*, 507). Goldstein, however, finds this understanding difficult based on the resultant awkward narrative sequence. Simon's appointment has already been confirmed in v. 35. The notice in v. 41 therefore should rather be located in close proximity to v. 35, where the appointment is first introduced. Goldstein, following one ancient manuscript (miniscule 71) and other modern commentators, proposes that ὅτι should be omitted. See further Abel, *Livres*, 260; Stern, *Te'udot*, 138; van Henten, "Decree," 138, n. 24. For the manuscript evidence, see Werner Kappler, *Maccabaeorum libri I–IV: Fasc. 1: Maccabaeorum liber I* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936), 138. Further textual corruption seems to be evident in the extant Greek text καὶ εὐδόκησαν (= וקבלו "and they resolved"). Goldstein contends that the Greek reflects a misreading of an original Hebrew וקבלו meaning "be it resolved" (cf. Esth 9:23, 27) (= εὐδοκησατόσαν), a much better fit within the present literary context. The reconstructed text now reads: καὶ εὐδοκησατόσαν, "and be it resolved by…"

[61] See van Henten, "Decree," 120; Kretnz, "Decree," 148–149.

[62] Sievers, *Hasmoneans*, 125–126.

Several contemporary and later sources affirm that much of the dissatisfaction with Hasmonean leadership centered on their unification of the two institutions of royal and clerical leadership.[63] The merger of these two offices, which had always been two separate positions, was seen by many as an overzealous usurpation of power. The document found in 1 Maccabees 14 contains repeated allusions to the unifications of these two offices. The text states that already "the people" sanctioned Simon's appointment as leader (ἡγούμενον) and high priest (ἀρχιερέα) (v. 35). Moreover, Demetrius confirms Simon as high priest in addition to the Romans' bestowing upon him the rank of "friend" (vv. 38–39)

Many individuals or groups vehemently contested the Hasmonean acceptance of both royal and clerical authority and continued to voice their strident opposition to Hasmonean leadership.[64] At the same time, some may have reluctantly accepted Simon's leadership for the time being. This situation seems to be suggested by the circumstances described in 1 Mac 14:41 and the surrounding context.[65] The "People / Jews and the priests" all accept Simon as both the high priest and leader of the Jewish people. Still uneasy about the unification of royal and clerical leadership, however, they add the proviso.[66] Simon's appointment will be reevaluated upon the arrival of a future true prophet.

The role of the future prophet will not be narrowly to assess the correctness of Simon's confirmation. Indeed, by the time that the future prophet arrives, Simon will likely no longer be alive. It was probably assumed, however, that the dual leadership model initiated by Simon's

---

[63] See Daniel R. Schwartz, "On Pharisaic Opposition to the Hasmonean Monarchy," in *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity* (WUNT 60; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1992), 44–56. See also John J. Collins, "'He Shall Not Judge by What His Eyes See': Messianic Authority in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 2 (1995): 150–151.

[64] See Sievers, *Hasmoneans*, 124–125.

[65] Sievers opines that the entire document recounting Simon's coronation is "the fruit of a compromise" (*Hasmoneans*, 125; cf. p. 122). On other elements in this chapter that reflect an attempt to curb some of Simon's power and prestige, see John H. Hayes and Sarah R. Mandel, *The Jewish People in Classical Antiquity: From Alexander to Bar Kokhba* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998), 83.

[66] Sievers, *Hasmoneans*, 126, suggests that some of the priests in v. 41 would have been long-time supporters of Simon. Others, he contends, "may have joined Simon's side only reluctantly." Goldstein likewise sees a compromise taking place, though suggests that the proviso is aimed at those who longed for a descendent of David to reclaim the royal seat of authority (*I Maccabees*, 508). See also Aune, *Prophecy*, 105. Though Aune rejects the eschatological context, he does argue that the proviso "is a way of stopping short of completely idealizing the Hasmonean program of restoration and reconstruction."

tenure would continue throughout the Hasmonean dynasty. Thus, the task of the future prophet will have nothing to do with Simon. Rather, this prophet will be entrusted with the responsibility to adjudicate on the permissibility of unifying in one individual the powers of the royal leader and high priest.[67] This unification had never previously existed and its present implementation was without precedent. The Hasmonean supporters readily accepted this new form of leadership while many others voiced their vehement opposition. Another group found a middle ground. For the time being, they accepted Simon as leader and high priest and the dual leadership model assumed therein. At the same time, they awaited the future arrival of a prophet who would be able to adjudicate the feasibility and legality of this new arrangement.

1 Maccabees contains two passages that refer to the future arrival of a prophet. Though neither text explicitly identifies this individual as the prophet at the end of days, much evidence suggests that these passages do in fact envisage an eschatological prophet. The prophet in these passages, however, is much different than the other portraits of the eschatological prophet treated thus far. The prophet in 1 Maccabees is not identified as a participant in the unfolding drama of the end of the days. None of the general eschatological tasks assigned to the prophet in Malachi, Ben Sira, and 4Q558 are applied to the prophet in 1 Maccabees. Moreover, the tradition of the prophet in 1 Maccabees seems to be entirely unrelated to the interpretive reading of Deut 18:18 or the identification of the prophet with Elijah.

The prophet in 1 Maccabees is assigned a juridical function. In both passages, the Jewish community was faced with a difficult legal question for which neither legal precedent nor logic could determine a conclusive answer. Accordingly, they left the question in abeyance until a prophet would arrive in the future and adjudicate the law. Thus, the passages in 1 Maccabees introduce a new element into responsibilities of the prophet at the end of days—legal decisor.[68]

---

[67] This same understanding of the passage is suggested by Teeple, *Prophet*, 24. However, he provides no explanation for his interpretation. See also Stern, *Teʿudot*, 138–139. Sievers views the opposition to Simon's appointment as stemming primarily from priests and, therefore directed specifically at Simon's priestly powers (*Hasmoneans*, 127).

[68] This tradition finds close points of contact with the later rabbinic idea of Elijah as the prophet who would return at the end of days and adjudicate difficult legal cases. See, e.g., *b. Ber.* 35c; *b. Šabb.* 108a. See further, Shaver, "Elijah," 209–210.

Summary

The belief in the emergence of a prophet prior to the onset of the eschaton was likely not universal in Second Temple period Judaism. The limited amount of texts surveyed testifies to this effect. A consistent thread, however, is found in Ben Sira, 4Q558, and 4Q521, that is clearly grounded in the scriptural tradition located in Malachi 3. In Malachi, the prophet, identified as Elijah, is a precursor to the imminent eschatological Day of the Lord. Later, in Ben Sira, additional eschatological functions are associated with Elijah, including the ingathering of the exiles and perhaps the resurrection of the dead. The fragmentary evidence found at Qumran (4Q521, 4Q558) attests to the continued viability of this tradition and its awareness among the sectarian community. In none of these texts, however, does Elijah (or the eschatological prophet) appear as the harbinger of the messiah, whereby Elijah emerges prior to the arrival of the messiah in order to announce his arrival. Such a tradition will not appear unequivocally until the New Testament.[69]

The Second Temple period texts discussed thus far do not attest to the belief that the appearance of the messiah would be preceded by an announcement of this imminent arrival by a prophetic herald.[70] At the same time, this belief is clearly rooted in the earlier Jewish traditions concerning Elijah in the eschatological age. Pre-NT Judaism consistently assumes that Elijah will in fact appear prior to the eschatological period. Though he will not formally announce its future appearance, Elijah's presence suggests that the arrival of Day of the Lord is not far. For the authors of the Gospels, Jesus and his messianic ministry represent another element of the eschatological age. Thus, the emergence of Elijah as the messianic harbinger does not represent a momentous shift from contemporary Jewish beliefs. In the analysis of the sectarian material from the Dead Sea Scrolls, further evidence for developments in this tradition will be seen. Though the prophet does not appear in the full role as messianic harbinger as in the New Testament, the portrait of the prophet in the Dead Sea Scrolls is closer to later Christian and Jewish traditions than the passages treated in this chapter.

---

[69] Matt 11:7–15; Mark 6:14–16; 9:9–13; 17:10–13; John 1:19–21.

[70] See bibliography above, n. 4.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE JURIDICAL ESCHATOLOGICAL PROPHET IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Introducing the Prophet: The Rule of the Community (1QS) 9:11 and 4QTestimonia (4Q175)

1QS 9:11 is the *locus classicus* for all discussion of the eschatological prophet at Qumran.[1] After recounting the origins of the community and enumerating some general ordinances for the sectarians, the Rule of the Community asserts that these rules are in effect: **עד בוא נביא ומשיחי אהרון וישראל**, "until the coming of (the) prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel." 1QS 9:11 clearly identifies three eschatological figures, the prophet, the Messiah of Aaron, and the Messiah of Israel, locating them all within an eschatological context.[2] Beyond this basic assumption, the text is prohibitively opaque.[3] This passage provides no details about the character and role of this eschatological prophet.

The difficulty surrounding the laconic nature of this text is compounded by the manuscript evidence of one of the 4QS manuscripts (4QS[e]), which lacks this passage as well as the entire surrounding textual unit.[4] At the same time, the text of 1QS is reflected in varying degrees

---

[1] 1QS 8–9 is often understood as a 'sectarian manifesto' and thus the original core of the Rule of the Community. On this understanding, see above, p. 49, n. 33. See also the dissenting view as noted there.

[2] This passage, along with several others that appear in the Qumran manuscripts and the Cairo Damascus Document, has become foundational for the study of the development of messianism at Qumran, in particular the sect's assumed dual-messianism. Bibliography on messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls is vast. See, in particular, the various articles found in Charlesworth, Lichtenberger, Oegema, eds., *Qumran-Messianism* and the bibliography compiled by Abegg, Evans, and Oegema supplied therein (pp. 204–214) and Collins, *Scepter*.

[3] As Xeravits, *King*, 19, observes: "its intention is not to tell the reader anything about them … the author did not present any further details."

[4] The textual equivalent to 1QS 8:15b–9:11 is missing in this manuscript (4Q259 1 iii). See Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX*, 144–145; Metso, *Textual Development*, 53–54; eadem, "Use," 223–224. See also the discussion above, p. 50, n. 36.

in other 4QS manuscript traditions.[5] Scholars have proposed a number of suggested reconstructions for the lines of textual development between 4QS[e] and the other manuscripts.[6] Several scholars argue that 4QS[e] reflects an earlier textual (and thus theological) state of the Rule of the Community.[7] Even if this approach is correct, however, the text of 1QS still represents an authoritative textual tradition at Qumran, though perhaps at some later stage in the community's development.[8]

The second important textual evidence from Qumran concerning the eschatological prophet is the understanding of Deut 18:18–19 as refracted through 4QTestimonia (4Q175), a prominent sectarian document that attests to the community's eschatological worldview.[9] Let us begin with the passage from Deuteronomy:

---

[5] The evidence of the other Cave 4 manuscripts is equivocal. The bottom of column seven in 4Q258 4a i+4b breaks off at 1QS 9:10 with the next column beginning at 1QS 9:15. The available space does not permit the entirety of the text found in 1QS. It is not clear, however, what specifically is lacking (i.e., the messianic passage). See Philip S. Alexander, "The Redaction History of the *Serekh Ha-Yaḥad*: A Proposal," *RevQ* 17 (1996; Milik Volume): 445; Xeravits, *King*, 19–21. However, it is important to note that this manuscript does not evince the larger textual gap that is present in 4Q259.

[6] See, in particular, the treatments of this question found in James H. Charlesworth, "From Messianology to Christology: Problems and Prospects," in *The Messiah: Development in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 26–27; idem, "Challenging the *Consensus Communis* Regarding Qumran Messianism (1QS, 4QS MSS)," in *Qumran-Messianism*, 120–134; VanderKam, "Messianism," 212–213; Collins, *Scepter*, 82–83; James H. Charlesworth and Brent A. Strawn, "Reflections on the Text of Serek Ha-Yaḥad Found in Cave IV," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 425–426; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 25–26; Xeravits, *King*, 19–21. Some scholars have suggested that the text of 4Q259 reflects evidence of scribal error, which would make 1QS the only accurate representation of this portion of the Rule of the Community (A.R.C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning* [NTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966], 226; Abegg, "Messiah," 131; cf. Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 324). See discussion in Charlesworth, "Challenging," 125; Xeravits, *King*, 20. Charlesworth suggests that the scribe of 4QS[e] deliberately omitted this portion of the text perhaps due to objections relating to its messianic posture (p. 125) or some other element (pp. 125–127).

[7] Josef T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (SBT 26; London: SCM, 1959), 123–124; Starcky, "étapes," 482; Wise and Tabor, "Messiah," 60; Metso, "Primary Results"; eadem, "Use," 223–224; Collins, "Messianic Authority," 147–148; Charlesworth, "Challenging," 127, 130–132; Xeravits, *King*, 21. This breaks with earlier assessments that identified this section of 1QS as the earliest portion of the Rule of the Community (see above, n. 1).

[8] Charlesworth, "Challenging," 127. See in particular, Stegemann, "Some Remarks," 504–505, who locates the messianic traditions found in 1QS 9:11 and 4Q175 at the latest stage in the development of Qumran messianism (after 100 B.C.E.).

[9] First published by John M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," *JBL* 75 (1956): 182–187. See also idem, *Qumrân Cave 4.I*, 57–60, together with Strugnell, "Notes," 225–229; Carmignac, *LTQ*, 2:273–278. The text has recently

> I will raise up a prophet for them from among their own people, like yourself; I will put my words in his mouth and he will speak to them all that I command him; and if anybody fails to heed the words he speaks in my name, I myself will call him to account. (Deut 18:18–19)

There is nothing in this text that assumes an eschatological orientation. Quite the contrary, it refers to the post-Mosaic succession of prophets and its literary context is bound up with polemics against the mantic and magical activities enumerated in the preceding verses.[10] The orientation of this passage is radically altered in 4QTestimonia (4Q175), where it serves as a prooftext for the arrival of an eschatological prophet.[11] This sectarian document contains a set of four scriptural passages with no intervening commentary or interpolation of any kind.[12] It is this latter feature that has impeded the illumination of this document's meaning.[13] The key to understanding the text is to ascertain the nature of the relationship of the citations to one another.

The first three scriptural passages are generally understood to refer to three distinct eschatological figures. My interest here lies primarily in the first of these four citations. The text first cites Exod 20:22 according to the textual tradition found in the Samaritan Pentateuch, which represents a conflation of MT Deut 5:25–26 and 18:18–19.[14] The text cited

---

been republished with an extensive critical apparatus by Frank M. Cross, in Charlesworth, ed., *Pesharim*, 312–319.

[10] See S.R. Driver, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy* (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895), 227–228; Teeple, *Prophet*, 49; Jeffrey Tigay, *Deuteronomy: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996), 175–177.

[11] On the larger interpretive model as applied to Deut 18:18, see above p. 137, n. 7.

[12] Exod 20:22 according to the Samaritan tradition (= MT Deut 5:25–26 and 18:18–19); Num 24:15–17; Deut 33:8–11; Apocryphon of Joshua (4Q379 22 ii 7–14). I use the word 'scriptural' here instead of 'biblical' primarily since the last passage from the Apocryphon of Joshua is non-canonical. On the textual character of these passages, see the detailed treatment found in Cross, *Pesharim*, 320–327.

[13] Beyond the questions treated here, scholars have long labored to decipher the exegetical properties operating in this document. The most thorough treatment of this question can be found in George J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 311–317.

[14] This textual tradition is also present in the paleo-Hebrew Exodus manuscript from Qumran (4QpaleoExod[m]). Though poorly preserved, the section representing Exodus 20 reflects the Samaritan type text (a feature found throughout this manuscript). For the text, see Patrick W. Skehan, Eugene Ulrich, and Judith E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4.IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD IX; Oxford: Clarendon, 1992), 101–103 and further discussion in Judith E. Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: 4QpaleoExod[m] and the Samaritan Tradition* (HSS 30; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 307. Among the non-biblical scrolls, the conflation of the Exodus and Deuteronomy

in 4QTestimonia seems to have in view the eschatological prophet. The opening textual unit of 4QTestimona reads as follows:[15]

> (1) And the Lord spoke to Moses saying, "I have heard the sound of the words of (2) this people which they spoke to you. They have well (said) all that they have spoken. (3) Would that they were of such heart to fear me and to keep all of (4) my ordinances always that it may be well with them and with their children forever. (5) I will raise up a prophet for them from among their own kindred like you and I will put my words (6) in his mouth, and he will speak to them all that I command him. If there is someone (7) who does not heed my words which the prophet speaks in my name, I myself (8) will call him to account."

The second textual unit (ll. 8–13) represents a citation of Num 24:15–17, which is understood to refer to the royal messiah (and perhaps also priestly messiah). The third citation (ll. 13–20) is taken from Deut 33:8–11, which is interpreted as an allusion to the priestly messiah.[16] The

accounts of the Sinai theophany is also found in 4QBiblical Paraphrase (4Q158 6; Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4.I*, 3). The appearance of this textual tradition at Qumran in a wide range of documents (i.e., biblical and non-biblical) suggests that the textual harmonization contained therein is not a sectarian (i.e., Samaritan) textual modification. This understanding is already advanced in Marilyn F. Collins, "The Hidden Vessels in Samaritan Traditions," *JSJ* 3 (1972): 98–99, n. 3, and more recently in Eugene Ulrich, "The Text of the Hebrew Scriptures at the Time of Hillel and Jesus," in *Congress Volume: Basel 2001* (ed. A. Lemaire; VTSup 92; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2002), 87, n. 2, who identifies the textual tradition as an "expanded Jewish edition (often simply equated with the SP) of Exod 20:18b." The textual character of Exodus 20 in the Samaritan tradition is treated at length in Robert T. Anderson and Terry Giles, *Tradition Kept: The Literature of the Samaritans* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005), 34–46.

[15] Cross, *Pesharim*, 313.

[16] For this understanding of the first three passages, see Raymond Brown, "The Messianism of Qumran," *CBQ* 19 (1957): 53; Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings*, 317; van der Woude, *Vorstellungen*, 184; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "'4QTestimonia' and the New Testament," in *Essays*, 84; Repr. from *TS* 18 (1957): 513–537; Florentino García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ 9; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992), 174; VanderKam, "Messianism," 226; Collins, "Messianic Authority," 150; Bowley, "Prophets," 2:368–369; Puech, "Messianisme," 283; Dexinger, "Messianology," 93; Fitzmyer, "Qumran Messianism," 98; Annette Steudel, "Testimonia," *EDSS* 2:937; Beall, "History," 143; Cross, *Pesharim*, 309; Xeravits, *King*, 58. Allegro considers the reference in 4Q175 to the various roles of the messiahs—the prophetic, priestly, and royal ("References," 187). See however, the dramatically different presentation in John Lübbe, "A Reinterpretation of 4QTestimonia," *RevQ* 12 (1986): 187–197. Lübbe argues that the primary focus of 4Q175 is not to espouse messianic beliefs, but rather functions as a polemic against those who fail to obey God's word. Lübbe's non-messianic interpretation of the text follows that of Marco Treves, "On the Meaning of the Qumran Testimonia," *RevQ* 2 (1960): 569–571 (see further, Abegg, "Messiah," 132–132). To be sure, Lübbe does not deny the existence of messianic elements in the text; he merely argues that these should be understood as "subordinate" to its more immediate purpose.

decidedly non-messianic character of the fourth citation (ll. 21–30) from the Apocryphon of Joshua (4Q378–379) has led to a number of creative suggestions concerning its place in a set of messianic prooftexts.[17]

As is readily apparent, 4QTestimonia is closely related to 1QS 9:11. Commentators have noted that the scribal hand of the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia is identical.[18] With respect to content, the three eschatological figures in 4QTestimonia are the same as those that appear in 1QS 9:9–11.[19] Moreover, they appear in the same order (prophet, royal messiah, priestly messiah). Like the Rule of the Community, however, 4QTestimonia is unforthcoming about its eschatological framework.

The Eschatological Character of the Prophet in the Rule of the Community (1QS) and 4QTestimonia (4Q175)

These two texts are extremely vague regarding the prophet's function in the impending eschatological age. What is the exact eschatological relationship between this prophet and the messianic figures? The textual proximity within which they appear clearly points to some intended close relationship. Accordingly, some scholars conflate the eschatological role of all three characters and thus identify the prophet as messianic.[20] Such treatments, however, fail to indicate what it means for a prophet to possess this characteristic. While it is clear that the prophet

[17] The citation from the Apocryphon of Joshua contains an expansion of Joshua's curse against any future rebuilder of Jericho (Jos 6:26). For possible explanations, see Allegro, "References," 186–187; García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 175; Collins, "Messianic Authority," 150.

[18] See Allegro, "References," 182; Cross, *Pesharim*, 309. Xeravits goes so far as to suggest that 4Q175 was composed by the scribe in order to find biblical support for the theological position advanced in 1QS (*King*, 58). This scribe also seems to have been responsible for 4QSam[c] and the corrected portions of 1QIsa[a]. See Eugene Ulrich, "4QSam[c]: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2 Samuel 14–15 from the Scribe of the Serek Hay-yaḥad (1QS)," *BASOR* 235 (1979): 22.

[19] Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings*, 317; García Martínez, "Messianic Hopes," 186; VanderKam, "Messianism," 226; Collins, *Scepter*, 74; Bowley, "Prophets," 2:368–369; Fitzmyer, "Qumran Messianism," 98; Xeravits, *King*, 58. See, however, the more tempered remarks in Fitzmyer, "4QTestimonia," 84.

[20] See, e.g., Brownlee, *Manual of Discipline*, 35–36, who identifies the prophet as the messiah and the latter two figures as the messianic followers. See also the view of Allegro, above, n. 16. In general, however, other scholars merely suggest a messianic character for the prophet. See Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 322; García Martínez "Messianic Hopes," 186; Dexinger, "Messianology," 89–90.

is closely aligned with the messianic figures, the passage's syntax and terminology distinguish these two sets of eschatological individuals and thus serve to set apart their respective roles.[21] As such, many scholars assume that the prophet is to serve as an eschatological precursor.[22] Here too, however, such a characterization leaves unclear the exact role of the prophet in the unfolding drama of the eschaton.

In attempting to determine the precise character of the relationship between the prophet and the other messianic figures, scholars are forced to rely on the minimal internal evidence read in conjunction with earlier and contemporary Jewish evidence regarding the eschatological prophet. As remarked already, neither 1QS 9:11 nor 4QTestimonia is especially transparent in their presentation of the eschatological character and role of the prophet. For both passages, the crucial question is whether any importance should be attached to the order in which their eschatological protagonists appear. Is the literary placement of the prophet before the messiahs in both texts intended to be a reflection of the assumed chronological appearance of these three figures? To be sure, the evidence in this regard is somewhat equivocal.[23] The consistency with which the prophet appears first in both the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia, however, is highly suggestive.[24] The literary arrangement of the text seems to indicate that the prophet appears prior to arrival of the two messiahs. The literary proximity of these two sets of eschatological figures suggests that the messiahs would follow shortly after the prophets. The precise role that this prophet plays in this capacity, however, is still uncertain. The internal evidence found in 1QS 9:11 and 4QTestimonia is inconclusive.

A fuller understanding is possible by comparing the earlier and contemporary scriptural and related traditions treated in the previous chapter. Scholars are correct that no pre-NT Second Temple period text testifies to the belief that a prophet, specifically Elijah, would appear in order to announce the arrival of the messiah. Indeed, the

---

[21] See Brown, "Messianism," 61; Puech, "Messianisme," 283. Brown notes that the prophet is not present at the messianic banquet in 1QSb and therefore should not be understood as messianic. Puech further observes that the text clearly identifies the prophet by employing the title *nābîʾ* rather than the messianic epithet 'anointed one.'

[22] First proposed by van der Woude, *Vorstellungen*, 86. See also Vermes, *Introduction*, 166; Petersen, *Late*, 101; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 139–140; Puech, *Croyance*, 2:674; idem, "Messianisme," 282; García Martínez, "Messianic Hopes," 188; Xeravits, *King*, 217, 219.

[23] Cf. Shaver, "Elijah," 188–189.

[24] As suggested by Wieder, "Law-Interpreter," 168.

earlier survey of the relevant literature supports this claim. It is crucial to recognize, however, that the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia represent the latter part of various literary and theological developments. In each of the texts surveyed, the prophet is expected to arrive on the eve of the eschaton in order to carry out a number of tasks. This tradition is first found in the Hebrew Bible and can be traced through Second Temple Jewish literature. In the biblical tradition, Elijah is assigned the task of reconciling fathers and sons so that destruction will not reign on the Day of the Lord. This original belief is expanded in the late Second Temple period as evinced by the tradition recorded by Ben Sira. The prophetic role of Elijah is expanded to include the ingathering of the exiles and perhaps resurrection of the dead. 4Q521 widens the eschatological responsibilities of the prophet even further.

As noted above, the appearance of these traditions in Ben Sira, who is otherwise uninterested in eschatological speculation, attests to a widespread belief within contemporary Judaism. As such, the addition of the ingathering of the exiles and resurrection of the dead in Ben Sira (as suggested by Puech)[25] should be associated with the development of traditions concerning the role of the eschatological prophet between the date of the appendix to Malachi and the early second century B.C.E. (the date for Ben Sira). Along with the passage in Ben Sira, the belief in resurrection is attested in the book of Daniel (12:2), which is generally dated to the mid-second century B.C.E. The resurrection of the dead would represent a possible addition to the eschatological traditions concerning Elijah, which is bound up with theological developments of the second century B.C.E. Even if Puech's interpretation of the text is not correct, the inclusion of the ingathering of the exiles in Ben Sira bears witness to a tradition in the process of expansion and elaboration.

Do the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia represent another link in a developing tradition concerning the eschatological character of the prophet? The literary traditions upon which the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia are drawing clearly envision the arrival of a prophet at the beginning of the eschatological age. Each of these texts, Malachi 3, Ben Sira 48:10, 4Q558, locates this prophet chronologically before the onset of the eschaton. Within this context, it would seem unnatural for the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia to reverse

[25] See above, p. 141, n. 24.

the eschatological understanding of the prophet in this way. Rather, these texts have reoriented the traditional understanding of the role of the eschatological prophet, much in the same way as Ben Sira. None of the earlier traditions contains any messianic speculation in its presentation of the eschatological prophet. The presentations in Malachi and Ben Sira focus solely on traditional eschatological elements already found in the Hebrew Bible, without any introduction of a messiah into this eschatological framework. The last two centuries B.C.E., however, represent a substantial expansion in messianic speculation and evince the formation of more complex images of an eschatological age with a redeeming messiah playing a significant role.[26] This increased messianic speculation is clearly manifest in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran community.

The eschatological portrait found in the Dead Sea Scrolls testifies to this development. The image of the eschatological prophet in the Dead Sea Scrolls is grounded in the scriptural traditions and their heirs in Second Temple Judaism, and introduces new developments consistent with contemporary eschatological speculation. For the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia, unlike their scriptural inspiration, the messiah is now a central reality of this eschatological world. As such, messianic beliefs are now grafted onto already existing eschatological traditions. Already, it has been seen how Ben Sira added new elements to Malachi's presentation of the eschatological prophet. So too, the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia retain the traditional understanding of the prophet as one who emerges prior to the eschaton and performs a number of preparatory tasks. For the Qumran community, the central element of this eschatological age is now the appearance of the two messiahs. Thus, the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia blend the scriptural tradition that a prophet would be the first to appear in the eschatological age with the developing belief that this eschatological age would be marked by the emergence of two messianic figures.[27]

---

[26] On which see Collins, *Scepter*; idem, "Messianic Authority," 147–152.

[27] Cf. Allison, "Elijah," 257. Allison argues that a Second Temple period reader would have clearly incorporated messianic beliefs into any understanding of the scriptural concept of the Day of the Lord. Thus, this reader would understand a passage such as Mal 3:24 in a messianic context on account of the presence of the concept of the Day of the Lord. 1QS and 4Q175 are assimilating contemporary messianic speculation into traditional scriptural models of the eschatological age.

In light of this discussion, the evidence agrees with those scholars who assign importance to the literary presentation of the three eschatological figures and thus assign the prophet a preparatory role. However, this figure should not be conflated with later Jewish and Christian traditions concerning the eschatological prophet. There is nothing explicit in either the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia that suggests that the prophet would function as the herald of the messiah or messianic age.[28] While the prophet does appear before the messiahs, this makes no claims about the precise role of the prophet in this pre-eschatological age. Much of the preparatory role associated with the prophet in the scriptural and related texts is likely also present in the Qumran traditions.

In all likelihood, the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia represent the early phases of a tradition that will eventually reach a crescendo in the New Testament and rabbinic literature where the prophet is a full-fledged messianic herald. The prophet comes before the messiahs in the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia and presumably performs various actions in preparation for the imminent arrival of the messiahs. While traces of the prophet as messianic herald seem to be present at Qumran, little more can be said based on the available evidence.

The Eschatological Role of the Prophet

The identification of the preparatory role of the eschatological prophet in the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia greatly clarifies the eschatological character of the future prophet. However, I resisted assigning to this prophet a role similar to the one assumed for Elijah in the New Testament and rabbinic literature, namely the messianic herald. A second related difficulty now presents itself: what will this prophet actually do? What precise role will this prophet play in the unfolding of the eschatological age? In answering this question, it should be assumed that the Qumran texts have in view the pertinent scriptural traditions. For example, the conciliatory role of the

[28] Contra Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 324, who suggests that the prophet here (1QS) will "announce" the arrival of the messiahs. This clearly seems to be influenced by later traditions concerning Elijah. Cf. Xeravits, *King*, 219, who describes the prophet in 1QS as the herald of the two messianic figures.

prophet (Elijah) in Malachi is likely still associated with the prophet at Qumran, even if it is not explicitly stated and even if the prophet is not identified as Elijah. My interest here is focused on the emerging eschatological functions specific to the Qumran corpus, though still grounded in the scriptural and related traditions. Like Ben Sira, which incorporates the Malachi tradition while simultaneously adding new elements, the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia greatly expand the eschatological role of the prophet. For this question as well, my understanding is generated through close reading of the two passages in conjunction with the assistance of contemporary Jewish evidence.

The Rule of the Community

The notice in 1QS 9:11 concerning the future arrival of the prophet and two messiahs is located within a larger literary unit narrating the formation of the sectarian community and its early development (1QS 9:3–6).[29] After recounting the circumstances that led to the formation of the sect, the text provides a two-fold exhortation concerning the proper observance of Torah and sectarian law as administered by the early communal leaders. The Sons of Aaron, a reference to the leaders of the sect, have absolute control in matters relating to משפט and הון, "law and property" (l. 7).[30] This is actualized in their careful consideration of every minute element of sectarian behavior (l. 7) and their insistence against the mingling of sectarian and non-sectarian property (ll. 8–9). In addition to exhorting the sectarians to comply with the rulings of the Sons of Aaron, the text proceeds to warn against the abandonment of the Torah in favor of following one's own inclinations (ll. 9–10). The allusion to not departing from "any counsel" of the Torah likely refers not to the rejection of the Torah, but rather to observance of its precepts according to an improper interpretive model (i.e., non-sectarian).[31]

A number of elements suggest that this entire set of circumstances is related to the early legislative activity of the sect. The laws here are

[29] See Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim*, 187; Leaney, *Rule*, 224.

[30] On this understanding of the Sons of Aaron, see 1QS 5:21. Sons of Aaron is usually understood as equivalent to Sons of Zadok. See Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 134; Leaney, *Rule*, 177; Gary A. Anderson, "Aaron," *EDSS* 1:1.

[31] Cf. Guilbert, *LTQ*, 1:63.

uniquely focused on matters that serve to establish borders between communities. The clear division between sectarian and non-sectarian property functions as a boundary-marking device between these two groups and marks the exclusive sectarian community. The insistence that the community members follow the strict interpretation of the Torah as administered by the communal leaders serves the same function. It validates the sectarian understanding of the Torah while simultaneously negating all other 'false' interpretations. Presumably, these were defining issues in the rupture between the sectarian community and Jewish society as a whole.[32] In addition, the Teacher of Righteousness is prominently absent in this literary unit. This may suggest that the legislative activity described therein dates from a period before the arrival of the Teacher. The opening lines of the Damascus Document state that the sect was without the Teacher for approximately the first twenty years of its existence. In this context, the general communal leaders, here identified as the Sons of Aaron, would have provided the necessary instruction and guidance.

Thus, the critical gestation period of the sectarian community as articulated in this pericope is marked by two central and related elements. The first is the insistence on absolute fidelity to the legal rulings of the sectarian leaders. Secondly, the members of the community should not veer from the proper understanding of the Torah as dictated by the inspired exegetes inhabiting the sectarian community. It is at this point that the text states that the משפטים הרשונים, "the first precepts" (l. 10) are in effect until the emergence of the prophet and the two messiahs. What are these "first precepts" and what is their relationship to the eschatological age envisaged in this passage? A number of plausible suggestions have been offered for the identity of these judgments.[33]

The most reasonable explanation is to understand them within the context of this larger literary unit. The immediately preceding lines narrate the legal structure of the early sectarian community and the associated requirements demanded of each of its members. While these rulings are assumed to be in effect throughout the life of the community, they are explicitly singled out as precepts associated with the early period of the community's existence.

---

[32] Some of these same exercises are rehearsed for the entry of an individual into the sect. See 1QS 5 where similar language is employed.

[33] See Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 135; Guilbert, *LTQ*, 1:63; Schiffman, *Halakhah*, 51–52; Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 197; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 76, 139.

This understanding of the expression is reinforced by the use of the phrase “first precepts” in the Damascus Document. In CD 20:31–32, these “first precepts” will be instructed (והתיסרו) to those individuals who remain steadfast in their sectarian conviction. The regulations are further qualified there as those: “in which the men of the Community were judged (נשפטו).”[34] The change to a simple perfect identifies the precepts as originating in the past. Moreover, the Teacher of Righteousness seems to play no role in the formation of these laws.[35] The laws are further alluded to in CD 4:8 where the “first ones” refers not to the law but rather some ancient group, likely the early members of the community, who were instructed (התוסרו) in the proper observance of the Torah.[36] Reading CD 4:8 in conjunction with CD 20:31–32, the instruction provided to the “first ones” is now recontextualized as the “first precepts” directed toward the early sectarian members.[37]

The reference to sectarian instruction in the “first precepts” in CD 20:32 is complemented by a second clause detailing an additional directive for the steadfast sectarians. They should also “listen (והאזינו) to the voice of (the) Teacher of Righteousness.”[38] Two sets of laws are delineated here for sectarian instruction: the “first precepts” which were originally instructed to the early community members and those laws which emanate from the legislative voice of the Teacher of Righteousness.[39]

---

[34] For similar language, see 4Q270 7 i 15–16.

[35] Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 76.

[36] Davies understands the “first ones” in CD 4:8 as a reference to the early members of the community (*Damascus Covenant*, 197). See, however, Murphy-O’Connor, “Document,” 215, who suggests that they are the Mosaic generation.

[37] This understanding of the relationship between CD 20:31–32 and 4:8 can be found in Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 197.

[38] The two verbs והתיסרו and והאזינו are parallel here and each has at its subject the steadfast sectarians identified in line twenty-seven. The use of the converted perfect here sets these two main clauses apart from the relative clause which identifies the “first precepts” as instruction related to the early community members. In this clause, the perfect is employed (אשר נשפטו). This is a deliberate literary strategy that serves to distinguish the two distinct groups. See, however, the translation supplied in Baumgarten and Schwartz, *Damascus Document*, 37, where והאזינו is rendered as the complementary pair of נשפטו.

[39] In this sense, my understanding of the meaning of this phrase bears a certain resemblance to that of Schiffman, *Halakhah*, 51–52. Schiffman proposes that ראשונים is best understood as “original” and the entire phrase designates sectarian law, the origin of which is assumed to be found within Scripture. By contrast, Pharisaic law is viewed as having no basis in Scripture. Thus, the expression “original precepts” underscores the antiquity of the sectarian legal system in distinction to that of the Pharisees and

Philip R. Davies opines that the "first precepts" in the Damascus Document are presented in such a way that they "were once operative, but have now been superceded." As legislation intended for the original sectarian community they are now obsolete in the new community under the direction of the Teacher.[40] This understanding, however, is untenable. If the laws and precepts were no longer valid, there would be no reason for their instruction. Rather, the "first precepts" are presented in the Damascus Document as complementary, or perhaps even equally important, to the laws which emanate from the inspired legislation of the Teacher of Righteousness. The original laws and the new Teacher laws are both part of the instruction intended for devoted community members. These individuals are singled out for their unique fidelity to sectarian law, which is identified as "these laws," the Torah, and the "voice of the Teacher of Righteousness" (CD 20:27–28).

Notwithstanding my rejection of Davies' interpretation, he correctly points out that a certain degree of tension may have existed between the "first precepts" and the new laws associated with the legislative activity of the Teacher of Righteousness. These legislative stages may reflect different time-frames in the sect's own development. The community, reconstituted around the Teacher of Righteousness, likely felt that the laws associated with the pioneer community lacked continued relevance and vitality. CD 20 summarily rejects this notion. Both of these sets of laws are equally valid and applicable for the present community. As such, those who pledge their absolute obedience to observe *all* sectarian law must receive instruction in the "first precepts" *and* the law emanating from the Teacher of Righteousness.

With this understanding of the "first precepts" in CD 20, let us return to 1QS 9. The tension inherent in the Damascus Document serves as the backdrop to the circumstances related in the Rule of the

---

other contemporary sects. In support of this understanding of the use of ראשונים, Schiffman marshals a good deal of support from similar terminology found in rabbinic literature. My understanding of the meaning of "first precepts" is likewise situated within competing legal systems, though this is seen as a purely internal situation. Nonetheless, Schiffman correctly notes that "first precepts" refers to an assumed earlier set of legal rulings. The only difference is the nature of the later set of rulings. I suggest that these are the laws promulgated by the Teacher of Righteousness. Schiffman argues that they allude to the contemporary presumed non-scriptural jurisprudence of the Pharisees and the like.

[40] Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 197.

Community. As noted above, the larger literary unit recounts the early history of the sect by focusing specifically on the central legal requirements demanded of each member. These laws form the cornerstone of the "first precepts" imparted to pioneers of the community. The Rule of the Community continues by asserting that these "first precepts" remain in effect until the arrival of the prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel (l. 11). There seems to be an implicit polemic operating here. As already suggested, some members of the community likely believed that the "first precepts" lack relevance in the new stages of the community. If law is now the sole prerogative of the Teacher, what is the need for the continued observance of regulations established specifically for the members of the pioneer community?[41] The author of the present passage addresses this question by emphasizing that all sectarian law, even that which was enacted by the pre-Teacher leaders, remains fully in force in the present age. The author then proceeds, unlike the Damascus Document, to assert that there will be a time in which these laws are no longer necessary—at the onset of the eschaton.

According to the Rule of the Community, the eschatological age will witness a dramatic shift in the application of law.[42] This legal framework associated with the "first precepts" will be erased in the eschatological age and presumably be replaced by a new set of laws and ordinances.[43] There is no indication, however, that any laws which emanate from the legislative activity of the Teacher will also be nullified (nor explicit Torah law). That this legal shift will take place in the eschatological age is also suggested by two of the messianic references that appear in the Damascus Document (CD 12:23–13:1; 14:18–19).

Who will execute the removal of the former laws and the implementation of the new law? Based on the passage in the Rule of the Community, this task will fall to one of the three eschatological figures identified in line eleven. Most scholars assume that this role should be assigned to the eschatological prophet.[44] The internal evidence of 1QS 9:11, how-

---

[41] This tension is even more heightened if the Rule of the Community is to be understood as a law book which codifies the legislation associated with the Teacher of Righteousness. See Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 197; Michael A. Knibb, "Rule of the Community," *EDSS* 2:796.

[42] On general Jewish attitudes toward the transformation of the law in the eschatological age, see W.D. Davies, *Torah in the Messianic Age and / or Age to Come* (JBLMS 7; Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1952); Teeple, *Prophet*, 14–28. Teeple's study has the added benefit of being able to take into consideration the Dead Sea Scrolls.

[43] For non-Qumran evidence, see Davies, *Torah*; Teeple, *Prophet*, 23–27.

[44] So Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings*, 94–95; Teeple, *Prophet*, 25; Licht, *Megillat ha-*

ever, does not yield a definitive candidate.[45] The answer must await the full analysis of 4QTestimonia, which provides more explicit evidence.

4QTestimonia (4Q175)

The assumed juridical role of the eschatological prophet in 1QS 9:11 is likewise found in 4QTestimonia, where this association is made explicit. As discussed in the general treatment of 4QTestimonia, the first citation in this text comes from the Samaritan version of Exod 20:22, which represents a conflation of MT Deut 5:25–26 (Eng. 28–29) and 18:18–19. Together, these biblical verses function as a prooftext for the future eschatological prophet. In this composite text, the role of the prophet is patently clear.

The larger biblical pericope assumed by 4QTestimonia appears immediately after the theophany at Sinai. The Israelites, wishing to continue to receive the revealed word of God but terrified by the Sinaitic experience of a direct revelatory encounter, call upon Moses to act as an intermediary (MT Deut 5:23–24).[46] This suggestion meets with favor by God who extols the highly virtuous behavior of the Israelites (4Q175 1–4//MT Deut 5:25–26). In particular, they are praised for their heightened eagerness and fidelity for observing the divine word and will (4Q175 1–2//v. 25). God then continues by expressing his desire that the present Israelite devotion will translate into a perpetual faithful observance of all the divine laws and statutes (4Q175 3–4//v. 26).[47] God therefore enlists the assistance of Moses in order to actualize this wish. Moses' role as divine spokesman for the Israelites is now transformed by God into his new responsibility as mediator of divine law.[48] Indeed, the following verses describe Moses receiving instruction in all the laws that will be incumbent upon the Israelites after they enter the land of Canaan (vv. 28–29).

Serakhim, 190; Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Messianic Figures and Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Messiah*, 120; cf. VanderKam, "Messianism," 212.

[45] Indeed, the priestly messiah is also a reasonable candidate for these legal duties. See, for example, 4Q161 8–10 iii 23; CD 6:11. Cf. Geza Vermes, *An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: SCM, 1999), 166; Collins, "Messianic Authority," 160–161.

[46] See Duane L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1–11* (WBC 6A; Waco: Word, 1991), 133.

[47] On this understanding of the biblical verses, see Driver, *Deuteronomy*, 88; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy*, 325.

[48] See the chiastic structure of this pericope as outlined in Christensen, *Deuteronomy*, 132.

The textual tradition cited in 4QTestimonia, which stands behind the Samaritan Pentateuch, provides an additional interpretive element in the understanding of this biblical pericope. For MT, Moses alone serves as the prophetic mediator of divine law. The Samaritan text combines the texts of MT Deut 5:25–26 with MT Deut 18:18–19. As has already been noted, the latter passage forms part of the general statement on the institution of post-Mosaic prophecy since Moses cannot mediate the divine word forever. Therefore, Deut 18:18 establishes a permanent prophetic office which will carry out the tasks once assigned to Moses. This prophet will be like Moses and act as the mouthpiece of God. Based on MT alone, this future prophet does not seem to have any juridical responsibilities.

The alignment of MT 5:25–26 and 18:18–19 provides an added element to the post-Mosaic prophetic function. MT Deut 5:25–26 establishes Moses as the mediator of law for Israel in addition to his other prophetic responsibilities. Here too, an immediate problem arises on account of the fact that Moses cannot carry out this responsibility forever. The alignment of this text with MT Deut 18:18–19 provides the solution. Moses' lawgiving responsibilities will also be administered by the future class of prophets. This prophet will be the recipient of divine messages, which will then be relayed directly to the Israelites (4Q175 5–6). God insists that the prophet faithfully relate the divine directive (4Q175 6). The immediate context of the tradition preserved in the Samaritan Pentateuch is concerned with Israel's continued faithful adherence to the law after departing from Sinai. This task now falls to the prophet 'like Moses' who will appear in the future.[49]

4QTestimonia, following closely related interpretive traditions, relocates MT Deut 5:25–26 and 18:18 in an eschatological context. A central task of the prophet 'like Moses' in the Samaritan textual tradition is to continue the lawgiving responsibilities of Moses. 4QTestimonia, by transforming the entire literary unit into an eschatological context, assumes the juridical function of the prophet in the eschatological era. The inclusion of the entire textual tradition as found in the Samaritan Pentateuch (Exod 20:22) points to a deliberate exegetical agenda on the part of the author of 4QTestimonia. Both the Samaritan and

[49] Anderson and Giles opine that the textual alignment serves to validate further the prophetic credentials of Moses (*Tradition*, 45). While this may be a consequence of the new textual tradition, it does not seem like the text's purpose. Moses' prophetic status is quite secure even without the inclusion of MT Deut 18:18.

Masoretic textual traditions for Deut 5:25–26 and 18:18–19 are represented at Qumran.[50] 4QTestimonia could easily have cited Deut 18:18–19 according to the MT tradition. If the author was working exclusively with a Samaritan type text (and thus unaware of the MT tradition), then it is equally possible that only the text equivalent to Deut 18:18–19 could have been quoted. The deliberate inclusion of the entirety of the textual tradition as represented in SP Exod 20:22 suggests that the author of 4QTestimonia intends to include the first half of this tradition as it appears in dialogue with the latter half. In doing so, the author of 4QTestimonia uses the scriptural tradition reflected in the Samaritan text in order to highlight the juridical function of the prophet expected at the end of days.

The present understanding of the role of the eschatological prophet in 4QTestimonia is further corroborated by John Lübbe's literary analysis of the text. Though Lübbe eschews any primary messianic intention for 4QTestimonia, his analysis provides additional support for the juridical context of the prophet in the first citation.[51] Lübbe observes that there are three participants in the conflated biblical passage cited in 4QTestimonia—the commended people of Israel, the prophet like Moses, and those who disobey the prophet. These three figures correspond directly to the three elements in the opening lines of the Rule of the Community—the rule itself (i.e., the *serekh*), "Moses and his servants the prophets," and "all that he has rejected."[52]

For the purposes of the present analysis, only the second element in each of these lists is critical. Lübbe remarks on the rarity of the phrase, 'Moses and the prophets,' and suggests that its formation is drawn from Deut 18:18. All later prophets are viewed as operating in the image of Moses, the paradigmatic prophet identified in Deut 18:18.[53] If this suggested literary correspondence between 4QTestimonia and 1QS 1:1–10 is correct as identified by Lübbe, then the earlier analysis of the role of Moses and the prophets in 1QS 1:3 should be recalled. Moses and the prophets are presented in this passage transmitting to

---

[50] For the Samaritan evidence, see above, n. 14. For the MT Deuteronomy traditions, Deut 5:25–26 is independently found in 4QDeut[j,l] and Deut 18:18–19 is likewise found in 4QDeut[f]. These manuscripts do not seem to reflect the harmonization present in the Samaritan text.

[51] On Lübbe, see above, n. 16.

[52] Lübbe, "Reinterpretation," 190–191.

[53] Lübbe, "Reinterpretation," 191.

Israel knowledge on how to observe "the good and the straight," an expression identified as a reference to the divine law. In this sense, the allusions to the eschatological prophet in 4QTestimonia and the ancient biblical prophets (including Moses) in the Rule of the Community mirror each other. Each presents the mediation of divine law as the prerogative of the prophet.

The identification of the juridical function of the eschatological prophet in 4QTestimonia permits some speculation on the individual who will facilitate the eschatological transformation of the law envisioned in the Rule of the Community. The similarities between the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia recommend that related eschatological responsibilities should be assumed for the prophet in each text. Just as the prophet in 4QTestimonia will assume the prophetic-juridical role first administered by Moses, the prophet in the Rule of the Community will be entrusted with juridical responsibilities. More specifically, this prophet will facilitate the abandonment of the "first precepts" in favor of law intended for the end of days.

Summary

1QS 9:11 and 4QTestimonia, like much of the Second Temple period evidence regarding the eschatological prophet, provide little information concerning the role and responsibilities of the prophet expected at the end of days. Similar to the other texts discussed, these two documents do not systematically present the prophet, and therefore remain opaque in their details. A careful reading of these two texts in conjunction with their scriptural antecedents and contemporary Jewish traditions has attempted to clarify the understanding of the eschatological prophet.

I have argued that these two texts present for the first time the concept of the prophet as precursor to the messiah(s). This follows earlier traditions that locate the emergence of the prophet prior to the onset of the eschaton. At the same time, these texts do not clarify the precise relationship between the prophets and the messiahs. While various preparatory tasks may be intended, the prophet is nowhere singled out as a messianic herald as found in later Jewish and Christian traditions. The Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia should be located as the beginning stages of a developing tradition which is fully realized in later texts.

Neither 1QS 9:11 nor 4QTestimonia seem to assign the prophet any explicit task. I have suggested that this prophet would have continued to perform the responsibilities associated with his emergence as found in the scriptural antecedents. Some of the post-Hebrew Bible traditions, particularly 1 Maccabees, begin to identify a juridical role for the prophet at the end of days.[54] 4QTestimonia, following the exegetical tradition represented by the alignment of MT Deut 5:25–26 and 18:18–19, provides a general understanding of the prophet as lawgiver. No further details are offered. In the sectarian context of 1QS 9:11, the eschatological prophet seems to be entrusted with the task of transforming law at the end of days. The "first precepts," which I suggested are the pre-Teacher communal rulings, are identified by the Rule of the Community as remaining viable only until the emergence of the prophet and the messiahs. Presumably, at that time these laws will become obsolete under the legislative direction of the expected prophet.

[54] There may be inklings of similar traditions in the other texts. As noted above, the messenger in Malachi is sometimes understood as a "covenant enforcer." See above, pp. 138–139. In addition, the prophet (Elijah) in Ben Sira will gather together the tribes. Based on the rabbinic parallels, this may have involved certain juridical responsibilities. See above, p. 141, n. 22.

CHAPTER NINE

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL PROPHET OF CONSOLATION IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

The sectarian conception of the eschatological prophet appears in one additional document: 11QMelchizedek (11Q13). In chapter five, several lines of this text were discussed. This analysis focused on how the text draws on Isa 61:1 and the implications for understanding the development of 'anointed one' as a prophetic epithet in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The משיח הרוח in this document is the prophet anointed with the spirit, who will carry out various functions in the eschatological age. For this reason, the text is critical to the discussion of the belief in the eschatological prophet at Qumran and the assumed role for this prophet in the unfolding of the eschatological drama. In what follows, a brief introduction to the contents of the text is provided, paying close attention to the immediate context where this prophet appears. This analysis will facilitate the understanding of the character and role of this eschatological prophet. The relationship between the prophet in this text and the presentation of the eschatological prophet as found in the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia is then addressed. At this point, the possible identity of the eschatological prophet will be discussed.

11QMelchizedek (11Q13)

11QMelchizedek is generically classified as a thematic pesher, the building blocks of which are a series of passages from Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, and the Psalms.[1] The eschatological framework is marked by the pesher interpretation of passages from Leviticus and Deuteronomy as allusions to the end of days (ii 4) and the final defeat of Belial and the salvation of the righteous.[2] Moreover, the text as a whole places

[1] For bibliography on the text, see above, p. 91, n. 22.

[2] Fitzmyer, "Further Light," 251; García Martínez "Messianic Hopes," 185. See, however, Carmignac, "Document."

the predicted events in the tenth jubilee, envisioned within this document as the final eschatological jubilee. The pesher formula, the specific contents of the text, and appearance of several sectarian terms all mark 11QMelchizedek as a product of the Qumran community.[3]

Two primary eschatological protagonists appear in the main extant portion of 11QMelchizedek. The first is Melchizedek, who is presented as the main character throughout most of column two.[4] Melchizedek appears here as a heavenly figure, a designation that is strengthened by the application of the biblical "Elohim" to Melchizedek (ll. 10, 24–25).[5] In general terms, Melchizedek is an "exalted, heavenly figure" who "will lead the hosts of the righteous in the eschatological age."[6] More specifically, he is entrusted with a number of miraculous tasks that identify him as the agent of God's eschatological salvation of the righteous. At the onset of the eschatological jubilee, he will proclaim liberation for all captives (l. 6). Some scholars also assign Melchizedek a priestly role based on the reference in line eight to redemption on the Day of Atonement.[7] The cornerstone of Melchizedek's eschatological mission is the final battle with Belial. Melchizedek, together with his armies

---

[3] There seems to be general scholarly consensus on the sectarian origin of 11Q13. See Dimant, "Qumran Manuscripts," 42. Milik argued that 11Q13 formed part of a larger sectarian historical-theological work that also included 4Q180–181 ("Milkî-ṣedeq," 109–112), which he identified as the Pesher on the Periods. Milik's theory failed to garner much scholarly acceptance. See, in particular, the severe criticism found in Devorah Dimant, "The 'Pesher on the Periods' (4Q180) and 4Q181," *IOS* (1979): 77–102; Ronald V. Huggins, "A Canonical 'Book of Periods' at Qumran?" *RevQ* 15 (1992; Starcky Volume): 421–436.

[4] The most thorough treatment of the image of Melchizedek in this document is Horton, *Melchizedek*, 74–82. See also de Jonge and van der Woude, "11QMelchizedek," 304–308; Carmignac, "Document," 363–369; Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 56–59; García Martínez, "Messianic Hopes," 185; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 403–410; Xeravits, *King*, 75, 195–196.

[5] In line ten, "Elohim" in Ps 82:1 is identified as Melchizedek. In lines 24–25, "your God" (אלהיך) in Isa 52:7, based on the reconstruction, is likewise interpreted as Melchizedek. See van der Woude, "Melchizedek," 368; de Jonge and van der Woude, "11QMelchizedek," 304; Fitzmyer, "Further Light," 252; Horton, *Melchizedek*, 75–77; Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 59–61; Puech, "Notes," 511–512; Collins, "Herald," 229; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 403; Xeravits, *King*, 75. See however, Carmignac, "Document," 364–367, who argues against the identification of Melchizedek as a divine heavenly being. Carmignac is now followed by Paul Rainbow, "Melchizedek as a Messiah at Qumran," *BBR* 7 (1997): 179–194, who contends as well that all the heavenly epithets generally applied to Melchizedek should be understood as referring to God.

[6] Xeravits, *King*, 75.

[7] So van der Woude, "Melchizedek," 369; Fitzmyer, "Further Light," 259; Puech, "Notes," 512–513; García Martínez, "Messianic Hopes," 185; Xeravits, *King*, 195. See further discussion in Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 64–71; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 404–

(l. 9) and divine assistants (l. 14), will fight a fierce battle with Belial and his evil minions. Ultimately, Melchizedek successfully vanquishes Belial and frees all those who are trapped under his dominion (l. 13).

With the final destruction of Belial, Melchizedek's victory ushers in a period of peace and salvation uniquely directed at the righteous.[8] This period is identified as the "day of [peace" (יום ה]שלום)[9] which had previously been predicted by Isaiah (l. 15). At this point, Melchizedek's centrality in the eschatological age seems to shift to another eschatological figure—the prophet. This transfer is conceptualized through the introduction of a pesher on Isa 52:7. The biblical passage reads as follows: "How beautiful upon (the) mountains are the feet of the messenger who announces peace, the messenger of good who announces salvation, saying to Zion: your God is king." This passage, after it has been decoded through pesher exegesis, describes the circumstances after the successful destruction of Belial and his lot.[10]

The first element in the biblical verse is the reference to the "mountains." This is decoded as an allusion to "the prophets" (l. 17).[11] Unfortunately, the lacuna that follows precludes any further understanding of the presentation of the prophets.[12] The eschatological context of the text as a whole, and this passage in particular, suggests that the classical biblical prophets are not in view. Rather, "prophets" here refers to those who will appear in the eschatological age.[13] Even with this sharper understanding, there is little more that can be said about these general prophets and their eschatological function. Following Bowley, it should be emphasized that the passage supports the belief in multiple eschatological prophets.[14]

---

405. See also 4Q401 11, which seems to present Melchizedek as a "priest in the assemb[ly of God."

[8] de Jonge and van der Woude, "11QMelchizedek," 305; García Martínez, "Messianic Hopes," 185.

[9] On this restoration, see above, p. 91, n. 23.

[10] For the full text and translation (with analysis) of lines 15–20, see ch. 5, pp. 91–95.

[11] See the discussion of this restoration and the alternate proposals as found above, p. 91, n. 24.

[12] A number of plausible restorations have been suggested for the lacuna here. See, for example, Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq," 107; Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 20–21; Puech, "Notes," 489. The lack of any context for these restorations recommends against assigning any role to the prophets based on speculative reconstructions.

[13] See also Bowley, "Prophets," 2:370.

[14] Bowley, "Prophets," 2:370.

The next pesher strand focuses on another element found within the Isaiah passage—the activity of the herald. In the original biblical passage (Isa 52:7), the herald will first proclaim peace (מבשר משמיע שלום) and is further described as a messenger of good who will announce salvation (מבשר טוב משמיע ישועה). The latter task will be carried out by proclaiming to Zion, "your God is king" (אמר לציון מלך אלוהיך). The dual use of מבשר within the biblical text provides the exact opportunity for the application of a two-fold pesher.[15]

The full understanding of the eschatological role of the herald from Isa 52:7 is now interpreted in the pesher by recourse to two additional passages found later in the book of Isaiah (Isa 61:1–2). The first mention of the herald in Isa 52:7 is understood implicitly in light of Isa 61:1, which identifies the herald as one anointed with the spirit. The appeal to Isa 61:1 is made based on a number of elements in the verse that fit the present context. The main task of the prophetic disciple in Isa 61:1 is to "announce good news (לבשר) to the oppressed." Thus, the prophet in this passage is functionally a herald (מבשר), hence the immediate lexical connection with Isa 52:7.[16] 11QMelchizedek, however, identifies this herald by the more specific designation furnished by the interpretation of Isa 61:1—the one anointed with the spirit.[17] No additional information concerning the specific task of this individual in the present eschatological circumstances is provided. Rather, the text, according to a widely followed reconstruction, cites another scriptural passage from Daniel (9:25) that locates this "anointed one" as a figure who will arrive at the end of seven weeks.[18] The conclusion of the seven weeks marks the end of a period of exile and difficult times and the beginning of a new epoch of salvation, a concept well suited to the present circumstances in 11QMelchizedek.

---

[15] In the biblical passage, the initial מבשר is a nominal participle, while the second מבשר is a verbal participle. In 11QMelchizedek, however, the passage itself is parsed according to the division generated by the dual use of מבשר. Thus, each phrase introduces the מבשר as if it is a nominal participle, with each clause receiving individualized pesher exegesis (l. 18//ll. 18–20). This division, however, does not seem to indicate that the author of 11QMelchizedek conceived of two heralds in this passage. Rather, this arrangement is better understood as a literary device that allows a separate pesher exegesis for each element in the verse.

[16] De Jonge and van der Woude, "11QMelchizedek," 306.

[17] See above, pp. 93–95, for a reconstruction of the lines of development from the original verse to the present expression.

[18] On the reconstructed Daniel passage, see above, p. 91, n. 26.

The laconic reference to the anointed prophet of Isa 61:1 and the citation of the passage from Daniel suggest that this first pesher is merely intended to introduce the second protagonist in the text (i.e., the prophet) and identify the eschatological context of the protagonist's mission. That this individual is a prophet is certain based on the allusion to Isa 61:1, which almost certainly should be understood as the words of the prophetic disciple both in its original biblical context and in 11QMelchizedek.[19] In addition, the application of the prophetic title "anointed one" to this figure lends even greater support to understanding this individual as a prophet.[20] The passage from Daniel locates the emergence of the prophet in the immediate context of the period of eschatological salvation achieved by Melchizedek.

The second reference to a herald in Isa 52:7 (**מבשר טוב משמיע ישועה**) is given new meaning also through a double pesher exegesis. The interplay between the lemma and pesher serves to illuminate the eschatological mission of the prophetic herald. Immediately prior to the lacuna in line nineteen, the herald from Isa 52:7 is described as "the one about whom it is written," and then a lacuna intervenes. The text resumes with a citation of the last element in Isa 61:2, where one of the responsibilities of the prophetic disciple is "to comfort the mourners" (l. 20). It is reasonable to assume that the other prophetic tasks found in Isa 61:2 were somehow repeated in the lacuna at the end of line nineteen. As such, the herald of good tidings who announces salvation is further identified with the prophetic disciple of Isa 61:1, understood as a herald as well. This entire element is now provided with an additional pesher exegesis. The extant passage from Isa 61:2 ("to comfort the mourners"), or perhaps the entirety of the passage including the portion in the lacuna, is interpreted to mean that the herald will "instruct them in all the ages of the world" (l. 20). At this point, the text contains a large lacuna that covers the majority of the next line and part of the following line as well. When the text resumes, pesher exegesis is applied to the final section of Isa 52:7. However, the context seems to have changed dramatically, most likely returning to a description of Melchizedek.[21]

---

[19] For this understanding of Isa 61:1, see above, p. 89, n. 17.

[20] Yadin, "A Note," 153; de Jonge and van der Woude, "11QMelchizedek," 306–307; Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 61; Collins, "Herald," 230; García Martínez, Tigchelaar and van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.II*, 232; Xeravits, *King*, 74, 182–183. Contra those who understand the herald as either Melchizedek or a priestly messiah. See p. 93, n. 31, for a discussion of these various theories.

[21] Xeravits, *King*, 182.

The eschatological mission of the prophet as outlined in this pesher exegesis is two-fold. These two functions develop in a chronological sequence throughout lines 18–20. Scholarly discussions of this text often assume that the prophet's first task is to announce the imminent arrival of Melchizedek. Thus, for example, Xeravits identifies this prophet as the prophetic herald of Melchizedek, the other eschatological character in the text.[22] Based on this understanding of the prophet's role, Xeravits observes that this belief approximates the role of Elijah as the messianic herald found in the New Testament.[23] The strongest evidence usually supplied in support of this understanding is the fact that the prophet is constantly identified by the functional title of 'herald' (מבשר).[24] Accordingly, Xeravits and others assume that the prophet will first announce the arrival of Melchizedek himself. Beyond the identification of the prophet as a מבשר, there is little textual evidence in the body of description concerning the prophet (ii 15–21) that supports this understanding.

The extant text is not entirely forthcoming concerning what exactly the prophet will proclaim. Notwithstanding this debility, the text provides enough information in order to isolate the object of the prophetic announcement. The lemma from Isa 52:7 introduces the herald as one who will announce salvation (ישועה) (ll. 18–19). Though the word itself never appears in the preceding description of Melchizedek's activity, salvation is clearly a dominant theme throughout the battle against Belial waged by Melchizedek and his armies.[25] In addition, it was noted above that it is likely that some element from the beginning of Isa 61:2 should be found in the lacuna at the end of line nineteen.[26] The two other elements that the herald proclaims in the biblical passage are the "year of the Lord's favor" (שנת רצון ליהוה) and "the day of vengeance of our God" (ויום נקם לאלהינו). The former clause has already appeared in line nine in the description of the eschatological situation surrounding

---

[22] Xeravits, *King*, 218. See also the similar understanding found in de Jonge and van der Woude, "11QMelchizedek," 307; Horton, *Melchizedek*, 79; Collins, "Herald," 230; Dexinger, "Messianology," 88–89. Collins describes the prophet in general terms as one who preaches good news ("Jesus," 113).

[23] Xeravits, *King*, 219.

[24] See, e.g., Dexinger, "Messianiology," 88.

[25] Note as well that some scholars reconstruct 2:18 as יום ה]ישועה. See above, p. 91, n. 23.

[26] See, for example, Milik, "Milkî-ṣedeq," 109, who suggests that the end of Isa 61:2 and beginning of 61:3 should be restored here. Accordingly, the lemma in line twenty is a repetition of the scriptural citation already furnished in the previous line. Cf. Xeravits, *King*, 74.

Melchizedek's release of the captives as "the time for the year of grace of Melchizedek" (הקץ לשנת הרצון למלכי צדק).

The language of the latter clause in Isa 61:2 is likewise employed to describe the martial activity of Melchizedek against Belial in line thirteen (ומלכי צדק יקום נקם משפטי אל). The language and imagery of both these passages are clearly drawn from Isa 61:2.[27] One or both of the original elements from Isa 61:2 should be present in the lacuna at the end of line nineteen. Accordingly, the initial task of the herald is to announce in general terms the present salvation. If the reconstruction is correct, the herald then proceeds to describe in more detail the eschatological activity of Melchizedek. The primary responsibility of the prophet here is to proclaim the eschatological activity of Melchizedek, not Melchizedek himself. As observed above, Melchizedek functions throughout this text as the heavenly agent of God's eschatological salvation of the righteous. This scenario plays out as a modified Day of the Lord, whereby Melchizedek performs many of the tasks traditionally assigned to God. Indeed, this eschatological framework is identified as taking place on the "day of peace" (l. 15). The prophet's function is to arrive on this day and inform the righteous of the events that will soon take place.

Line twenty introduces the next function of the prophetic herald. The final section of the passage cited from Isa 61:2 provides the scriptural foundation. The prophet is identified as the one who will "comfort the mourners," which is understood through pesher exegesis to mean that the prophet will instruct these mourners in all the ages of the world. Who are these mourners and why must the prophet educate them concerning the ages of the world? The best explanation of this passage is to understand the "mourners" as those righteous individuals who have survived the eschatological upheaval engendered by Melchizedek's martial activity against Belial. Thus, the prophet comforts them by providing instruction about the vicissitudes of the divine relationship with the human world. The object of the prophet's instruction, the "ages of the world," suggests this understanding. The prophet assures them that this is all part of the divine plan for the phases of the world and its inhabitants.[28]

---

[27] As noted by Miller, "Function," 468.

[28] Xeravits notes the sapiential context of the root שכל used here (*King*, 218; "Wisdom Traits in the Qumranic Presentation of the Eschatological Prophet," in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* [ed. F. García Martínez;

Based on the chronological placement of these two tasks, it should be assumed that the first task precedes the activity of Melchizedek, while the second follows the devastation generated by his struggle with Belial. In the former, the prophet announces the general framework of the eschatological salvation that will soon follow. In the latter, the prophet will provide support for those righteous individuals who were privileged enough to survive the eschatological battle.

At first glance, the responsibilities of the eschatological prophet as envisioned in this text seem to differ dramatically from those found in the earlier biblical and contemporaneous Jewish traditions (Malachi, Ben Sira, 4Q558, 4Q521). In Malachi, the eschatological prophet Elijah arrives prior to the onset of the eschaton in order to reconcile sons and fathers so that they will avoid divine retribution on the coming Day of the Lord. Ben Sira repeats this role for Elijah, though he conceptualizes it as the process of calming the divine wrath prior to the Day of Judgment. In addition, the prophet's functions are extended to include the ingathering of the exiles and possibly also resurrection of the dead.

The prophet's role in 11QMelchizedek seems to draw on the eschatological mission of Elijah in Malachi, though modified for the present context based on the eschatological reading of Isa 61:1–2. Elijah's role in Malachi and Ben Sira is to come to the aid of the individuals most affected by the impending Day of the Lord. More specifically, he must do all that he can in order to ensure that they are not annihilated. In Ben Sira, the task is to calm the wrath of God. Here as well, Elijah functions as a pacifier, whose efforts mitigate the destructive forces of the eschatological Day of the Lord. In general terms, this is the role envisioned for the prophet in 11QMelchizedek. The prophet arrives prior to the onset of the eschaton, as is the case in the earlier traditions. The prophet is expected to alleviate the anxiety of the righteous survivors and assist them as they pass through the eschatological battles and forge a new existence in the present world. To be sure, this is a

BETL 168; Leuven: Leuven University Press, Peeters, 2003], 190–191). He suggests that the use of שכל here relates to the pedagogical task of the *Maskilim* in Daniel. In Daniel, the *Maskilim* are entrusted with the task of teaching, though the specific content of their instruction is never outlined. Xeravits follows a number of scholars in assuming that the content would concern apocalyptic concepts. More specifically, they would instruct their students concerning how to survive in the difficult situation generated by the current circumstances. This comes close to my understanding of the instructive task of the prophet in 11Q13.

much different responsibility from that assumed for Elijah in Malachi and Ben Sira. At the same time, it seems to be drawn from the general portrait of Elijah as found in these two earlier documents, and is thus likely part of a larger Jewish conception of the character of the eschatological prophet.

The Identity of the Eschatological Prophet

The three sectarian texts treated in chapters 8–9 (Rule of the Community, 4QTestimonia, 11QMelchizedek) share numerous similarities in their presentation of the function of the prophet in the eschatological age. Each document details specific tasks that will be performed by the prophet prior to the arrival of additional eschatological protagonists. The Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia underscore the prophet's juridical role. The prophet in 11QMelchizedek has two primarily responsibilities. The prophet first announces the impending eschatological tumult associated with Melchizedek's battle with Belial. After this conflict, the prophet shifts into the role of comforting the "mourners" who have survived the eschatological upheaval created by Melchizedek's martial activity. Though the respective roles of the prophet differ in the Rule of the Community, 4QTestimonia and 11QMelchizedek, all these texts draw their portrait of the eschatological prophet from shared scriptural and contemporary traditions.

The points of contact between these three prominent sectarian documents suggest that each has in view one and the same eschatological prophet. Scholars have long taken for granted that the prophet in 1QS 9:11 is identical to that of 4QTestimonia. Indeed, the presentation of the shared context of these two documents supports this claim. The singular prophet "anointed with the spirit" in 11QMelchizedek seems to be this same figure.[29] The diversity in roles assumed throughout these three texts should be understood as different responsibilities envisioned for the prophet at the end of days. The juridical task of the prophet in Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia is not mutually exclusive

---

[29] This view has also been suggested in previous Qumran scholarship. See de Jonge and van der Woude, "11QMelchizedek," 307; Kobelski, *Melchizedek*, 61; García Martínez, "Messianic Hopes," 186; García Martínez, Tigchelaar, van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.II*, 232. Contra Poirier, "Return," 239, who suggests that the eschatological prophet is never referred to as 'anointed.'

from the function as prophet of consolation and encouragement found in 11QMelchizedek.

Can anything more be said about the identity of the eschatological prophet? The answer to this question involves two related identities: the prophetic identity and the historical identity. The former term refers to the identification of the eschatological prophet with some prophet known from Israel's prophetic past. In later Jewish and Christian traditions, the eschatological prophet is nearly always Elijah. Is a similar understanding found in the Qumran texts? Another possibility besides the expectation of the return of an actual historical personage is the belief that the eschatological prophet will be a *redivivus* figure. In this model, the prophet will not be the historical prophet himself, for example, but rather a new individual who bears a certain degree of resemblance in form and action to the historical prophet. The question of the historical identity of the prophet concentrates on whether the eschatological prophet can be identified with a known historical figure at Qumran. This discussion focuses on the often repeated claim that the Teacher of Righteousness represents the prophet expected at the end of days.

Prophetic Identity

At first glance, the most likely candidate for the role of eschatological prophet in the Rule of the Community, 4QTestimonia and 11QMelchizedek is Elijah himself or an Elijah-like figure (*redivivus*).[30] Indeed, much of the basis for the portrait of the eschatological prophet in the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia emerges from earlier traditions associated with Elijah. This association is clearly retained in the New Testament and in rabbinic literature. At the same time, neither the Rule of the Community nor 4QTestimonia contains any direct reference to Elijah. Furthermore, 11QMelchizedek identifies the prophet as one 'anointed with the spirit' without actually referring to the prophet by any specific name. This silence is highly suggestive.[31] More importantly, the eschatological prophet is always anonymous in the narrowly

[30] So Strugnell, "Moses-Pseudepigrapha," 234; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte*, 332–342; García Martínez, "Messianic Hopes," 162, 183–184. See also the discussion of the early treatment of this issue by Millar Burrows found in Wieder, "Law-Interpreter," 170.

[31] Noted by Wieder, "Law-Interpeter," 170–171.

sectarian texts. This pregnant silence suggests that the sectarians, while sharing with contemporary Judaism more general notions concerning the eschatological prophet, possessed their own tradition concerning the prophetic identity of this individual.

It is likely that by this time the expectation of an eschatological prophet had expanded beyond its initial focus on Elijah, though clearly preserving certain elements originally associated with Elijah.[32] Indeed, Elijah is nowhere is sight in 1 Maccabees. Only in later rabbinic traditions are the responsibilities associated with the prophet in 1 Maccabees assigned to Elijah. The Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia represent part of the widening scope of the conceptualization of the eschatological prophet. Both of these texts are directly dependent on the eschatological reading of Deut 18:18, with its allusion to a future prophet 'like Moses.'[33] The convergence of the eschatological traditions in the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia around the prophet in Deut 18:18 suggests that these two texts assume that the prophet expected at the end of days is a prophet 'like Moses,' a Moses *redivivus*.[34]

Geza G. Xeravits arrives at the same conclusion concerning the prophetic identity of the anointed herald in 11QMelchizedek. He observes that only one individual is characterized in the Qumran corpus as both a מבשר and a משיח. 4QApocryphal Pentateuch B (4Q377), a text discussed in chapters 4–5, uses both of these epithets in describing Moses (2 ii 5, 11). This lends great support to the understanding of the anointed prophetic herald in 11QMelchizedek as a Moses *redivivus*.[35]

---

[32] See discussion in Poirier, "Return," 237–238.

[33] See Wieder, "Law-Interpeter," 170.

[34] Cf. Yigael Yadin, "The Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews," in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. Rabin and Y. Yadin; ScrHier 4; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1958), 53–54; Teeple, *Prophet*, 51–55; G.R. Driver, *The Judean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), 482. See also Wieder, "Law-Interpreter," 169, who notes that the prophet expected in John 1:20, which is closest to the current notion of an eschatological prophet, is not understood as Elijah, but rather the prophet like Moses based on Deut 18:18. Further treatment of Moses as the expected prophet can be found in Poirier, "Return," 236–242. Poirier contextualizes this belief within related traditions concerning the endtime return of the prophet like Moses. Interestingly, later Jewish tradition would also assign the future Moses the role of messianic forerunner in much the same way that the function of the eschatological prophet was expanded in later Jewish and Christian tradition to include the responsibility as messianic herald. On this future role of Moses, see Wieder, "Idea," 357–360.

[35] Xeravits, *King*, 183. See further treatment in Poirier, "Return," 239–240. This point is likewise observed by Bowley, "Prophets," 2:370. Xeravits also notes that 11Q13 i 12 contains the name "Moses," though the fragmentary context precludes any further conclusions.

Thus, the Qumran corpus has preserved evidence of the expectation of the future arrival of both Elijah and a Moses-like prophet among the non-sectarian (4Q558, 4Q521) and sectarian texts (1QS, 4Q175, 11Q13), respectively.

The sectarian expectation of a prophet like Moses indicates that no one particular individual is expected. A Moses *redivivus* could be any future individual. Indeed, Miller Burrows (followed by Wieder) long ago observed concerning 1QS 9:11 that the text expects the arrival not of "the prophet" (**הנביא**), but rather "a prophet" (**נביא**).[36] As Wieder opines, "no particular prophet by name is meant, but a prophet, whose task will be to resume the work of Moses as authoritative teacher of the Law."[37]

Historical Identity

Can anything more be said concerning the historical identity of this Moses-like prophet expected at the end of days? Qumran scholarship has suggested two particular figures as the end-time prophet: the Teacher of Righteousness and the Interpreter of the Law. Both of these identifications are flawed for several reasons. The precise identity of the prophet, it will be argued below, is still unknown among the Qumran community. Rather, the prophet is identified by the approximate title "one who will teach righteousness at the end of days" (CD 6:11). In this sense, the prophet at the end of days will continue the mission of both Moses and the historical Teacher of Righteousness.

The identification of the prophet as the Teacher of Righteousness has found many proponents, with the most fully developed argument proposed by Geza Vermes. Vermes contends that the paucity of speculation concerning the eschatological prophet at Qumran suggests that the community believed that the prophet had already arrived. Vermes therefore suggests that the Teacher of Righteousness was the future prophet expected by the community. Upon his arrival, the hope for the future appearance of the prophet disappeared among the sectarians.[38]

---

[36] This observation is noted and commented upon in Wieder, "Law-Interpreter," 170–171. See also Stegemann, "Some Remarks," 505.

[37] Wieder, "Law-Interpreter," 171.

[38] Vermes, *Introduction*, 166. Furthermore, Vermes argues that the "man" in 1QS 4:20–22 is another designation for the eschatological prophet. This figure, observes Vermes, seems to refer to the Teacher of Righteousness in the Pesher on Psalm 37. Vermes' general understanding of the eschatological prophet appeared already in several earlier

Vermes' understanding, however, does not address a number of important questions. For Vermes' theory to work, all speculation concerning the future arrival of a prophet must date to the period prior to the appearance of the Teacher. The text of 1QS 9:11, however, possibly dates, on both a paleographic and redactional basis, to a later period in the sect's history.[39] Moreover, if the emergence of the Teacher ended all expectation of an eschatological prophet, then the period prior to the appearance of the Teacher of Righteousness should be marked at the least by some expectation of the future arrival of a prophet. Otherwise, the equation of the Teacher with the prophet would be unexpected. The early Qumran documents (e.g., 4QMMT) and those that

---

editions of his introduction to the Dead Sea Scrolls. The identification of the prophet as the Teacher is likewise found in Rabin, *Zadokite Documents*, 23; Paul Winter, "Notes on Wieder's Observation on the *dwrš htwrh* in the Book of the New Covenanters of Damascus," *JQR* 45 (1954): 39–47; William H. Brownlee, "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament," *NTS* 3 (1956–1957): 17; Giblet, "Prophétisme," 127–128; Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings*, 95; van der Woude, *Vorstellungen*, 75–89, 186; Teeple, *Prophet*, 54; Betz, *Offenbarung*, 61–68, 88–99; Gert Jeremias, *Die Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 75–89; Driver, *Scrolls*, 480–484; Aune, *Prophecy*, 131; Michael O. Wise, "The Temple Scroll and the Teacher of Righteousness," in *Mogilany 1989: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Jean Carmignac* (ed. Z.J. Kapera; Krakow: The Enigma, 1991), 152; Poirier, "Return," 241. See also Brooke, "Prophecy," 2:697, who notes that 4Q253a 1 i 5 (Commentary on Malachi) seems to interpret Mal 3:16–18 as a reference to the Teacher of Righteousness. Wieder makes an argument similar to Vermes', though in support of his equation of the prophet with the Interpreter of the Law ("Law-Interpreter," 171). He proposes that the prophet is absent in the CD 12:23–13:1 (which mentions the two messiahs) since by that time the prophet (i.e., the Interpreter of the Law) had already arrived. Milik also argues for the identification of the anointed herald in 11QMelchizedek with the Teacher of Righteousness ("Milkî-ṣedeq," 126).

[39] As noted in a few places (see pp. 50, n. 36, 157–158), the text of 1QS 8:15b–9:12 is lacking in one of the Cave 4 manuscripts (4QS[e]). If this is the case, then its basic contents presumably date to a later period in the development of sectarian theology (especially messianism). A late gloss concerning the eschatological prophet would be strange if the community believed that the prophet had already arrived in the person of the Teacher of Righteousness. If the late gloss dates to a period after the death of the Teacher (hence, renewed eschatological speculation), then the text would likely contain some indication that the community believed that Teacher of Righteousness had previously arrived as the prophet. This approach is more difficult for 4QTestimonia. The manuscript was copied in the first quarter of the first century B.C.E. by the same scribe who copied 1QS (Cross, *Pesharim*, 308). The precise time of its composition, however, is unknown. If its composition is close in time to the full version of the Rule of the Community represented in 1QS, then the speculation concerning the eschatological prophet would be out of place. It is possible, however, that the text was composed prior to the arrival of the Teacher of Righteousness and continued to be copied by later scribes. If so, the eschatological speculation in the text would not be misplaced.

retell the early history of the sect (e.g., CD) contain no reference to the eschatological prophet. Indeed, they are remarkably silent on this issue.

Once the Teacher had died, it would be expected that the sectarians would once again long for the eschatological prophet. Moreover, this speculation should also reflect a new understanding of the role of the prophet within the context of the actual life and activity of the Teacher. Neither of these features, however, is found in the small corpus of texts at Qumran that provide insight into the sectarian belief in the eschatological prophet. Most importantly, the Qumran texts should contain some kind of indication that the Teacher of Righteousness was understood by the community as the eschatological prophet.[40] This is absent in the various presentations of the Teacher as well as in the passages that refer to the general eschatological prophet. In addition, CD 19:35–20:1 refers to a time-frame "from the day the unique teacher (מורה היחיד) was gathered in until there arises the messiah from Aaron and from Israel." If the "unique teacher" is the Teacher of Righteousness, then the Teacher clearly lived in a period distinct from that of the two messiahs.[41] The Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia, however, locate the arrival of the eschatological prophet in close proximity to the two messiahs.[42]

The similarities between the Teacher and the eschatological prophet, however, are no coincidental matter. The Teacher is repeatedly portrayed as 'like Moses,'[43] while the eschatological prophet is the prophet 'like Moses' for the end of days. This precise feature accounts for the literary and thematic points of contact between these two figures. Nonetheless, the Teacher and the eschatological prophet are clearly delineated as separate figures.[44]

---

[40] So noted by Collins, *Scepter*, 113; Bowley, "Prophets," 2:367.

[41] See Grossman, *Reading*, 3, n. 4. Some scholars emend the text from יחיד ("unique") to יחד ("community"). See Rabin, *Zadokite Documents*, 37; Cothenet, *LTQ*, 2:179. Unfortunately, no parallel 4QD manuscripts exist for this passage.

[42] See García Martínez, "Messianic Hopes," 188. Of course, this leaves open the possibility that the Teacher was expected to return at the end of days (which would be different from Vermes' understanding). On this theory and its rejection, see below, p. 193, n. 52. See also the similar arguments adduced by Collins, *Scepter*, 113; idem, "Herald," 232.

[43] On the alignment of the Teacher with Moses, see Betz, *Offenbarung*, 61–68; Allison, *New Moses*, 84–85, n. 196.

[44] See Collins, *Scepter*, 113; idem, "Herald," 232.

The eschatological Interpreter of the Law is another candidate sometimes suggested for the identity of the prophet.[45] The Interpreter of the Law (דורש התורה) is referred to three places in the Qumran corpus (CD 6:7; 7:18; 4Q174 i 11–12). The first appearance of this individual in the Damascus Document (CD 6:7) clearly refers to some individual from the past, perhaps even the founder of the original community. The other two passages present this individual as an eschatological figure.[46] In both passages, the Interpreter of the Law is presented as complementary to the royal messiah. Accordingly, the eschatological Interpreter of the Law is best understood as a priestly messianic figure and not the prophet assumed in the Rule of the Community, 4QTestimona, or 11QMelchizedek.[47]

One curious feature about the Qumran community's portrait of the eschatological prophet is the absence of any such speculation in the Damascus Document. Indeed, the Damascus Document's reference to the dual-messiahs does not allude at all to the prophet expected to accompany these messiahs according to the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia. Though the Damascus Document does not provide any explicit testimony regarding the eschatological prophet, it does provide an important clue to the identity of this prophet within the landscape of sectarian figures.

The Well Midrash in CD 6 identifies a number of figures from the community's historical past as well as some individuals expected to arrive in the future. In particular, the text identifies the 'ruler' from Num 21:18 as the Interpreter of the Law (דורש התורה) (CD 6:7). The primary task of this individual is to provide legislation for all those who "dig" in the "well." This legislation remains in effect until the arrival of "one who will teach righteousness at the end of days" (יורה

[45] This view is advanced by Van der Woude, *Vorstellungen*, 55; Starcky, "étapes," 497; Driver, *Scrolls*, 484; de Jonge, "Intermediaries," 39–40; Lübbe, "Reinterpretation"; Wieder, "Law-Interpreter," 170–171; García Martínez, "Messianic Hopes," 186–187; cf. Trebolle Barrera, "Elijah," 1:246, who suggests that the Interpreter of the Law is Elijah.

[46] See Wieder, "Law-Interpreter," 158–175; Collins, *Scepter*, 104; idem, "Messianic Authority" 159–160.

[47] See Brooke, *Exegesis*, 141; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 388–389; VanderKam, "Messianism," 227–228; Collins, *Scepter*, 114–115; idem, "Messianic Authority," 159; Stegemann, "Some Remarks," 504; Puech, "Some Remarks," 563–564; Beall, "History," 142; Xeravits, *King*, 169–171. The fact that the Interpreter of the Law is an Elijah-like figure, as argued by Wieder "Law-Interpreter," does not negate the likelihood that this individual should be identified with the priestly messiah. Indeed, the future Elijah is often described as assuming priestly duties (Poirier, "Return," 228–236).

צדק באחרית הימים) (CD 6:11).[48] This eschatological teacher possesses a juridical role similar to the prophet as found in 1QS and 4Q175. Most scholars identify the historical Interpreter of the Law in CD 6:7 as the Teacher of Righteousness.[49] Davies, however, observes that the entire Well Midrash in CD 6:3–11 focuses on the historical genesis of the sect's parent community.[50] Accordingly, Davies opines that the Interpreter of the Law should be "placed at the very origins of the remnant community," even prior to the arrival of the Teacher of Righteousness. Accordingly, the historical Interpreter of the Law in CD 6:7 is an early leader of the community, perhaps even the founder of the initial sectarian community.[51] If this understanding is correct, then the role of the eschatological teacher is even closer to that envisioned for the prophet in the Rule of the Community. The Rule of the Community mandates that the community must adhere to the "first precepts" until the arrival of the eschatological prophet. These "first precepts" were identified as those laws enacted by the early communal leaders which would later be placed in contrast to the more recent law promulgated by the Teacher of Righteousness. As in 1QS 9:11, CD 6:7–11 demands that these laws must be observed until the appearance of the "one who will teach righteousness at the end of days." Accordingly, this sectarian

---

[48] See Baumgarten and Schwartz, *Damascus Document*, 23, n. 58. Cf. Ginzberg, *Jewish Sect*, 226, who understands the eschatological teacher as Elijah.

[49] Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 49; García Martínez, "Messianic Hopes," 187; Collins, *Scepter*, 148; idem, *Apocalypticism*, 147; Xeravits, *King*, 49. Cf. Ginzberg, *Jewish Sect*, 263.

[50] Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 119–125. Cf. Grossman, *Reading*, 125; Xeravits, *King*, 48.

[51] Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 123–124; idem, "The Teacher of Righteousness and the 'End of Days,'" *RevQ* 13 (1988): 313–317; repr. in *Sects and Scrolls: Essays on Qumran and Related Topics* (SFSHJ 134; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 89–94. Xeravits contests Davies' understanding based on the absence of any well-defined pre-Teacher authoritative figure in the formative period of the sect as described in CD 1:1–11 (*King*, 48). However, such a statement could hardly be expected in the opening lines of the Damascus Document, which clearly presents the Teacher of Righteousness as the preeminent divinely sanctioned leader of the sect. The rhetorical effect of this presentation is to negate all previous communal leaders, thereby fully empowering the mission and person of the Teacher. It is unlikely, however, that the sect possessed no authoritative leaders prior to the arrival of the Teacher. The sect absconded from mainstream Judaism based on numerous disagreements over Jewish law and observance and established their own sectarian legal agenda (see Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The New *Halakhic Letter* (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect," *BA* 53 [1990]: 64–73; idem, *Reclaiming*, 83–95). These developments surely took place under the direction of some form of sectarian leadership. Indeed, earlier I suggested that the Sons of Aaron in 1QS 9:7, comprised as least part of this early leadership which effected legal policy for the parent community. The identification of these initial leaders as Sons of Aaron fits well the priestly character of the initial schismatic movement.

eschatological teacher is none other than the eschatological prophet expected in the other Qumran documents.[52]

Though Vermes' identification of the eschatological prophet with the Teacher of Righteousness has been rejected, it is certain that the Damascus Document intended to align the end-time prophet with the historical Teacher. The language employed in order to describe the eschatological prophet in the Damascus Document (יורה צדק) draws a comparison between the present leader of the community (מורה הצדק) and its eschatological prophetic leader.[53] In all likelihood, this eschatological expression in CD 6:11 does not denote one specific expected individual, but rather refers to a general role. Who exactly will carry out this function is still unknown in the present pre-eschatological reality. The alignment of this individual with the historical Teacher of Righteousness is intended to identify the future individual as the eschatological heir to the leadership and legislative role of the historical Teacher of Righteousness. As noted by Marinus de Jonge, the new interpretation of the law that will emerge in the eschaton mirrors the historical Teacher's reformulation of the law for the Qumran community.[54] Like the historical Teacher of Righteousness, the eschatological prophet will continue the prophetic lawgiving responsibilities of Moses. Perhaps the community believed that one of its own members would carry out these tasks at the appropriate time.

Vermes was originally troubled by the limited appearance of the eschatological prophet in the writings of the Qumran sect. The phenomenon, however, is best explained within the larger literary and theological context of the Qumran writings. The larger survey of the

[52] As is readily apparent, I do not endorse here the other half of Davies' theory. Davies argues that the one who teaches righteousness at the end of days is actually the historical Teacher of Righteousness who has returned in the eschatological age. For the exposition of this hypothesis, see Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 124; idem, "Teacher of Righteousness," 313–317. Davies is now joined in this view by Wise, "The Temple Scroll," 121–147. The understanding that the Teacher would arise again in the future, a theory already proposed by Schechter in his edition of the Damascus Document, was at one point universally agreed among Qumran scholarship. For a survey of these early views, see Collins, *Scepter*, 102–104. See now the rejection of this theory as articulated in Michael A. Knibb, "The Teacher of Righteousness—A Messianic Title?" in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (ed. P.R. Davies and R.T. White; JSOTSup 100; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 51–65; Collins, *Scepter*, 102–112.

[53] The literary expression in CD 6:11 is drawn primarily from Hos 10:12, which is similarly used in rabbinic tradition. See Ginzberg, *Jewish Sect*, 212–219.

[54] De Jonge, "Intermediaries," 39.

eschatological prophet in biblical and post-biblical Judaism has revealed that the pre-Qumran and contemporary sources also reflect a narrow interest in the eschatological prophet. Only a few allusions to this prophet exist in the relevant literature. Even when the prophet is introduced, it is in a limited and opaque fashion. This same presentation is found within the Qumran corpus. The Qumran sectarians, like their contemporary Jews, likely did not think as much about the issue as did later Jews and Christians.

The Eschatological Prophet and Prophecy at the End of Days

The foregoing analysis has outlined the primary tasks associated with the eschatological prophet in the Rule of the Community, 4QTestimonia, and 11QMelchizedek. At the same time, there is nothing in these three texts that is particularly prophetic about the eschatological prophet. No information is provided in the texts regarding any mediating function of the prophet. The lawgiving capacities of the prophet in the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia are not identified as related in any way to the receipt of new revelation. Similarly, the prophet of consolation in 11QMelchizedek never turns to God for direction regarding his tasks in the eschaton. To be sure, these texts are extremely opaque and leave much to be reconstructed. At the same time, very little evidence is provided with which to reconstruct a full prophetic portrait of the eschatological prophet. To some degree, this individual is prophetic only in so far as he is patterned after the historical prophets Moses and Elijah.

In the texts examined thus far, the prophet expected at the end of days has a clearly delineated set of tasks that facilitate in the unfolding of events surrounding the eschaton. It is not clear, however, what role the individual's status as a prophet plays in carrying out these tasks. The texts are far too limited in their presentation. Furthermore, the relevant literature does not treat at any length expectations concerning other forms of prophecy in the end of days. The community expected a new phase of prophetic activity at the end of days, as outlined in the three texts discussed above. Did the community believe that the end of days and the messianic age would also witness a resumption of prophetic activity and prophets similar to those that appear in the Hebrew Bible? Would the prophet who appears together with the royal and priestly messiahs remain an important mediator of the divine word? Would this singular prophet be followed by additional prophets?

Unfortunately, the Dead Sea Scrolls provide virtually no information regarding these questions.

Summary

Now that the central texts treating the eschatological prophet have been discussed, some of the initial questions introduced at the beginning of chapter seven can now be revisited. The three primary texts outlining the sectarian belief in the prophet at the end of days, 1QS 9:11, 4QTestimonia, and 11QMelchizedek, are unfortunately very unforthcoming about the specific responsibilities associated with the eschatological prophet. The Rule of the Community together with 4QTestimonia assign the prophet specific juridical tasks. While this general identification is found in 4QTestimonia, no further details are provided. The Rule of the Community, in contrast, follows some contemporary Jewish traditions that identify the end of days as a period in which Jewish law would undergo certain transformations. In the Rule of the Community, the prophet will administer abandonment of early sectarian legal institutions at the end of days. The prophet in 11QMelchizedek possesses dramatically different tasks. This prophet, like Elijah in Malachi, appears before or together with the unfolding events of the eschaton in order to announce the imminent eschatological salvation that awaits the righteous. In the aftermath of the defeat of Belial by Melchizedek, the prophet primarily administers to the needs of the righteous survivors. Beyond these details, these three texts provide little additional information.

As stated above, scholars debate the extent to which Second Temple Judaism believed that the arrival of the messiah would be preceded by the heralding activity of Elijah, as is found in later Christian and rabbinic traditions. 1QS 9:11, 4QTestimonia, treated in chapter eight, and 11QMelchizedek, treated in this chapter, present a fairly consistent portrait of the eschatological prophet and of this prophet's role in the unfolding eschatological drama at the end of days. In each text, the prophet emerges prior to the appearance of the main eschatological protagonist. In the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia, the prophet appears before the emergence of the royal and priestly messiahs, while 11QMelchizedek locates the arrival of the prophet slightly before or coinciding with the appearance of Melchizedek. None of these three texts, however, explicitly assigns the task of messianic herald

to the prophet. The actual relationship of the prophet to the messiahs in the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia is never fully articulated. In 11QMelchizedek, the prophet is entrusted with the task of publicizing the eschatological framework of Melchizedek's mission, which will usher in a new age of salvation for the righteous; however, the prophetic task is not narrowly to announce the arrival of Melchizedek.

The later Christian and Jewish traditions, however, are not present in the extant Qumran texts. Rather, the Rule of the Community, 4QTestimonia and 11QMelchizedek follow Malachi, Ben Sira, and likely also 4Q558 by locating the prophet as one who will arrive on the eve of the eschaton and will be entrusted with specific preparatory eschatological tasks. 11QMelchizedek comes closest to the later traditions since the prophet's primary pre-eschaton responsibility is to announce the imminent onset of the eschatological activity of Melchizedek.

The similar presentation of the prophet in the Qumran texts and later Christian and Jewish traditions locates these beliefs and traditions on a developing theological and literary continuum. Just as the Rule of the Community, 4QTestimonia and 11QMelchizedek represent further developments in the traditions in relation to Malachi and Ben Sira, so too the New Testament, building upon pre-existing Jewish traditions, extends even further the future role of the eschatological prophet. In particular, the conception of the prophet as one who arrives prior to a messianic figure appears explicitly for the first time in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

The identity of the prophet is also revealed through careful analysis of these three texts. Though all draw upon the Elijah traditions found in Malachi and related texts, the Rule of the Community, 4QTestimonia, and 11QMelchizedek do not identify the prophet expected by the community as Elijah or an Elijah-like figure. Rather, a Moses *redivivus* seems to be the most likely candidate for the eschatological prophet. Moreover, earlier attempts to identify the eschatological prophet with either the Teacher of Righteousness or the Interpreter of the Law are flawed. Rather, it seems likely that the community did not yet know the exact identity of the prophet. At the same time, the future prophet, who is identified in the Damascus Document as one who will "teach righteousness at the end of days," is deliberately aligned with the historical Teacher of Righteousness. The prophet at the end of days will assume part of the leadership of the eschatological sectarian community and continue the task begun by Moses and carried forward by the Teacher of Righteousness.

PART TWO

MODIFIED MODES OF REVELATION IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

CHAPTER TEN

REVELATORY EXEGESIS: THE TURN TO LITERARY PROPHECY

The following four chapters shift the object of analysis from prophecy to revelation—the means by which a presumed prophet receives the divine word. The evidence examined thus far has demonstrated how prophecy was dramatically transformed in the Second Temple period and at Qumran. Similarly, models of revelation experienced significant changes. The method applied in the following four chapters is similar to that employed in the previous chapters. The Dead Sea Scrolls, both sectarian and non-sectarian texts, speculate on how revelation was experienced. These chapters continue to focus exclusively on the re-presentation of the biblical prophets and the rewriting of their prophetic experience. This chapter therefore begins with a discussion of biblical modes of divine revelation and how they are transformed in late biblical and post-biblical literature.

These four chapters trace the origins and developments of two of the most ubiquitous revelatory models in the Dead Sea Scrolls: revelatory exegesis and sapiential revelation. The former term refers to the inspired interpretation of older prophetic Scripture while the latter designates the receipt of divinely revealed wisdom as a revelatory experience. Revelatory exegesis and sapiential revelation were conceptualized as continued modes of communicating with the divine. At the same time, Second Temple period authors made a clear distinction between the prophets of Israel's biblical past and the present-day inspired individuals who continued to experience divine revelation. The most important element in this discussion is the terminology employed in these texts. Rarely are the individuals who are associated with these new revelatory models explicitly identified as prophets with terms such as *nābîʾ* and the like. The application of modified modes of revelation to ancient prophetic figures, however, indicates that these revelatory models were understood as closely related to the experience of the ancient prophets. Based on the texts preserved in the Qumran corpus and associated literature, the two new revelatory models introduced are representative of the modified character of revelation and

inspiration in late Second Temple Judaism and in the Qumran community.[1]

In approaching these issues in this manner, the focus of analysis is expanded to include individuals that are not universally identified as prophets. Thus, figures such as Enoch and Daniel, though sometimes identified as prophets in Jewish and Christian tradition, are clearly much different from the classical biblical prophets. At the same time, the revelatory models associated with each of them locate Enoch and Daniel as inspired individuals who are recipients of modified means of divine revelation. Thus, Daniel and Enoch are good examples of the shifting concept of prophetic figures and revelation in the Second Temple period.

Further analysis of the active reality of revelatory exegesis and sapiential revelation in the Second Temple period reinforces this understanding. In chapter fifteen, I examine several contemporary revelatory claims based on the cultivation of revealed wisdom. These texts recognize the close points of contact with the classical prophetic tradition, yet hesitate to identify this activity as prophecy and its practitioners as prophets. Rather, recognizing their own inspired character, these revelatory encounters are identified as modified modes of prophetic revelation. Chapters 17–18 illustrate the presence of this same feature in the Qumran community. The proponents of these modes of revelation clearly envision them as viable means of continuing to mediate the divine word. Yet, they do not identify themselves as prophets.

Divine Revelation in Transition

The Hebrew Bible presents various ways in which the divine word and will are revealed to Israel. The biblical institution of prophecy represents one of the more prominent and pervasive mechanisms for the transmission of the divine message.[2] In the classical presentation

[1] To be sure, the Second Temple period witnessed the rise of several additional modes of divine revelation. My interest here, however, is exclusively in the models that are conceptualized as heirs to prophetic revelation.

[2] For discussion of non-prophetic revelatory models in the Hebrew Bible, see Walther Eichrodt, *Theology of the Old Testament* (trans. J.A. Baker; 2 vols.; OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967), 2:15–45; John R. Bartlett, "Revelation and the Old Testament," in *Witness to the Spirit: Essays on Revelation, Spirit, Redemption* (ed. W. Harrington; PIBA 3; Dublin: Irish Biblical Association; Manchester: Koinonia, 1979), 11–31 (see bibliography

of prophets as found in the Hebrew Bible, the prophet is a special individual to whom God divulges a particular message, which the prophet then communicates to an intended audience.[3] One of the defining characteristics of the prophet in this model is his or her receipt of the divine word through some revelatory experience.[4]

Prophetic revelation is facilitated through various methods, though often the exact means by which a prophet receives the divine word is not explicit in the biblical text. The identification of prophets by such terms as חזה ('visionary') and ראה ('seer') suggests that revelation was experienced through some visual encounter.[5] Revelatory dreams should

---

at n. 2); Leo G. Perdue, "Revelation and the Hidden God in Second Temple Literature," in *Shall not the Judge of all the Earth Do What Is Right? Studies on the Nature of God in Tribute to James L. Crenshaw* (ed. D. Penchansky and P.L. Redditt; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 201–205. On God's 'self-revelation' through history, see Rolf Rentdorff, "Offenbarung und Geschichte," in *Offenbarung im jüdischen und christlichen Glaubensverständnis* (ed. P. Eicher, J.J. Petuchowski, and W. Strolz; QD 92; Freiburg: Herder, 1981), 21–41; James Barr, "The Concepts of History and Revelation," in *Old and New in Interpretation: A Study of the Two Testaments* (London: SCM, 1966), 65–102.

[3] See, for example, the language of Deut 18:18: "I will raise up a prophet from among their own people, like yourself. I will put my words in his mouth and he will speak to them all that I command him."

[4] To borrow the language of Lester L. Grabbe, "divine revelation is a sine qua non of prophecy" (*Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages: A Socio-Historical Study of Religious Specialists in Ancient Israel* [Valley Forge: Trinity, 1995], 83) On the centrality of divine revelation in the prophetic experience, see further von Rad, *Old Testament Theology*, 2:59–63; Lindblom, *Prophecy*, 108–122. More recently, see the important typological definitions of prophecy and the prophetic experience found in David L. Petersen, "Defining Prophecy and Prophetic Literature," in *Prophecy in its Ancient Near Eastern Context*, 33–46.

[5] See Lindblom, *Prophecy*, 54–55; Jepson, "חזה," 4:283–288; Petersen, *Role*, 85; Grabbe, *Priests*, 108. Beyond this purely etymological argument, divine revelation is often conceptualized as a visual experience. See, for example, Gen 35:7 (cf. Gen 28:10–22); Num 12:6; 1 Sam 2:27; Isa 1:1. Visions and dreams are understood as divine speech. Many early biblical scholars understood these two terms ('visionary,' 'seer') as representative of early prophetic models in Israel marked by the appeal to magic and divination. The *nābîʾ*, by contrast, is a later prophetic character who experiences direct revelation resulting from ecstatic behavior. See discussion in Uffenheimer, *Prophecy*, 480–484 (see bibliography at n. 1). Uffenheimer rejects this linguistic dichotomy, instead contending that the Hebrew Bible makes no distinction between the prophetic method of the *nābîʾ*, 'visionary,' or 'seer.' The association of 'visionaries' and 'seers' with early divinatory models and the *nābîʾ* with ecstatic revelation is clearly informed by an evolutionary understanding of the relationship between magic/divination and religion / prophecy. Contemporary scholarship on this issue continually challenges any strict dichotomy between these sets of terms and associated evolutionary model. Rather, the once clearly delineated lines between magic and religion and divination and prophecy are continually becoming blurrier and more difficult to define. For additional discussion of this methodological issue, see my "Magic and the Bible Reconsidered," *Judaism* 54 (2005): 272–275.

be classified as further examples of visionary revelation.[6] Numerous prophetic texts also refer to the direct transfer of the divine word through an oral medium.[7] Within each of these categories, revelation can be an experience initiated by God or the result of human attempts to enter into dialogue with the divine. In the latter model, the prophet often engages in various ecstatic acts in order to solicit the divine word. While in this altered state, the individual receives revelation through one of the means outlined above.[8]

The Hebrew Bible itself bears witness to a transition in how prophetic revelation was experienced and conceptualized. For example, apocalyptic visions become an important medium for revelation in Zechariah and Daniel. In apocalyptic literature, revelation is "mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial insofar as it involves another supernatural world."[9] In addi-

---

[6] Note Deuteronomy 13, which classifies the "dreamer of dreams" alongside the prophet. To be sure, dreams are often the object of disdain in other places in Deuteronomy and throughout the prophetic canon. See, for example, Jer 23:25–32; Zech 10:2.

[7] This is sometimes indicated by the expression that God "opened someone's ear" (1 Sam 9:15; 2 Sam 7:27; 1 Chr 17:25; cf. Isa 22:14). See Hans-Jürgin Zobel, "גלה," *TDOT* 2:482–483. A common trope is the notice that God places words into the mouth of the prophet (Deut 18:18; Jer 1:9; Hos 6:5). See Lindblom, *Prophecy*, 55; Petersen, *Role*, 85–86. Elsewhere, the text merely states that the word of God came to a specific prophetic individual. See, for example 1 Sam 3:7, 21; Jer 1:4. See W.H. Schmidt, "דבר," *TDOT* 3:111–115. More rarely, the text is more explicit concerning the manner of the oral revelation. See the description of God's revelatory communication with Moses in Num 12:7–8. Zobel draws a sharp distinction between revelation experienced through visual and auditory means ("גלה," 2:481–482). The biblical texts themselves, however, are not forthcoming about the exact relationship between visual and oral revelation. To be sure, most texts describe the prophetic experience using one of these models. Several prophetic experiences, however, contain elements of both revelatory encounters. See Num 12:6 where God asserts that he *speaks* with the prophet in a *dream*. Balaam is described as one who hears God's speech through visions (Num 24:6, 16). See also 2 Sam 7:17; Isa 2:1; 21:2 (cf. Grabbe, *Priests*, 108). The strict division between visionary and oral revelation likely obscures what was originally a much more mixed experience (cf. Lindblom, *Prophecy*, 55–56).

[8] This phenomenon is generally classified under the rubric 'ecstatic prophecy.' For recent treatment, see Simon B. Parker, "Possession Trance and Prophecy in Pre-Exilic Israel," *VT* 28 (1978): 271–285; Robert R. Wilson, "Prophecy and Ecstasy: A Reexamination," *JBL* 98 (1979): 321–337; Petersen, *Role*, 25–34; Grabbe, *Priests*, 108–112. See as well Lindblom, *Prophecy*, for an older treatment and summary of earlier perspectives. Additional means of divine revelation that are sometimes associated with prophets include clerical prophecy (lots, the Urim and Thummim), and interpreted signs and symbols. On the latter, see further Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 447–457.

[9] This is the standard definition of the apocalyptic genre formulated in John J. Col-

tion, the process of reading earlier Scripture emerges as an important revelatory model in apocalyptic.[10] Dreams are increasingly ubiquitous in the revelatory experience in many later biblical texts, particularly apocalyptic.[11] The experience of the apocalyptic seer, like the classical prophet, is grounded in the belief that God communicates with special humans through defined revelatory means.[12] Apocalypticism expands the 'media of revelation,' beyond the carefully restricted model of classical Israelite prophecy.[13] Apocalypticism conceptualizes its own modes of revelation as legitimate and effective means through which God continues to reveal the divine word to special individuals and thus continues the prophetic experience.[14]

The phenomenon of apocalypticism and its relationship to prophecy underscores an important point in the study of divine revelation in

---

lins, "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre," in *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (ed. J.J. Collins; Semeia 14; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), 9.

[10] The classic example of this phenomenon is Daniel 9, a text treated at length below. Further treatment of reading, writing, and interpretation as revelation in apocalyptic can be found in Armin Lange, "Interpretation als Offenbarung: zum Verhältnis von Schriftauslegung und Offenbarung in apokalyptischer und nichtapokalyptischer Literatur," in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism*, 17–33.

[11] As such, this reverses the earlier distrust of dreams as a mode of revelation found in much of the Hebrew Bible (see n. 6). See the brief discussion of this shift in Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 83.

[12] On these and other shared features, see Lester L. Grabbe, "Introduction and Overview," in *Knowing the End from the Beginning*, 22–24 and idem, "Prophecy and Apocalyptic: Time for New Definitions—and New Thinking," in the same volume (pp. 107–133) for a fuller presentation of this thesis. See further John J. Collins, "Prophecy, Apocalypse, and Eschatology: Reflections on the Proposals of Lester Grabbe," in the same volume (pp. 50–51).

[13] The use of 'apocalyptic' and associated terms follows the paradigmatic definitions developed by Paul D. Hanson, "Apocalypticism," *IDBSup*, 29–31. 'Apocalypticism' refers to the entire ideological edifice of the apocalyptic worldview (see further discussion in the articles cited in the previous note). On the general features of apocalypticism and apocalyptic literature, see the articles in *Semeia* 14 and Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*. The term 'media of revelation' is taken from Collins, *Daniel* (1984), 6–19. Apocalyptic also differs in many respects from classical prophecy in what Collins identifies as the 'content of the revelation.' For discussion of the difference in content between classical prophecy and apocalyptic, see Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 75–76; idem, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 23–25; Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 29–30; George W.E. Nickelsburg, "Revelation," *EDSS* 2:770; Grabbe, "Prophecy."

[14] Cf. Nickelsburg, "Revelation," 2:770: "they [i.e. apocalyptic texts] present their authors as persons who stand in the prophetic tradition and receive direct revelation." In arguing for the connection between apocalypticism and continued modes of divine revelation, I am not taking a definitive stance on the possible prophetic origins of apocalypticism. For the most recent discussion of the relationship between prophecy and apocalyptic, see Grabbe and Haak, eds., *Knowing the End from the Beginning*.

late biblical and Second Temple literature—shifting revelatory models. The literary and historical evidence indicates that Second Temple Judaism recognized the continued existence of divine revelation. The classical conception of communication between the inspired individual and God, however, was greatly expanded beyond the limited models found among the classical prophets. Thus, for example, dreams and visions, the reading and writing of sacred Scripture, and the cultivation of divine wisdom all represent new models of divine revelation. To be sure, classical prophetic revelatory models still persisted. More commonly, however, the prophetic experience and its attendant revelatory encounter with the divine manifested itself in these new and significantly modified paradigms.[15] The continued vitality of divine revelation in Second Temple Judaism points to the persistence of the prophetic revelatory experience in this period, though in transformed modes.

With some notable exceptions, the overwhelming majority of scholarship on revelation in Second Temple Judaism has concentrated on how revelation is experienced in apocalyptic literature.[16] This phenomenon is easily explainable on account of the prominent place that revelation plays in the apocalyptic experience. The intense focus on apocalyptic, however, obscures the much larger phenomenon of multiple forms of revelation in Second Temple Judaism and at Qumran.

---

[15] It is not my intention here to explore why these new revelatory models emerged and gradually replaced the more dominant standard modes of prophetic communication. This is a much larger question that is beyond the purview of the present study. On which, see Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, esp. 1–2, 11–13, who proposes that "theological problems of delayed deliverance and historical theodicy" (p. 1) forced Jews in the Hellenistic period to question seriously the classical modes of divine communication. Collins traces the emergence of indirect forms of revelation to the developing notion of a distant God (*Apocalyptic Vision*, 75). My interest in the present chapter is only to track the development of new revelatory modes and transformations within the biblical models.

[16] See Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 67–93; idem, *Daniel* (1984), 6–19; Paulo Sacchi, "Historicizing and Revelation at the Origins of Judaism," in *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (trans. W.J. Short; JSPSup 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 200–209; Randal A. Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation and Judgment* (SBLEJL 8; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 15–52 (on 1 Enoch), 53–98 (on Ben Sira); George W.E. Nickelsburg, "The Nature and Function of Revelation in 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and some Qumranic Documents," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997* (ed. E.G. Chazon and M. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1999), 91–120; Lange, "Interpretation," 17–33. More general treatments can be found in Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 1–126; Alexander, "Continuing Revelation"; Perdue, "Revelation." For treatments of these themes in later Jewish literature, see bibliography in p. 18, n. 45.

The study of revelation exclusively within apocalyptic literature generates a methodological problem when treating the Qumran community itself. Though the Dead Sea Scrolls preserve many apocalyptic works and the Qumran sect was clearly apocalyptic in its orientation, sectarian apocalyptic texts cannot be found among the Dead Sea Scrolls, nor are there significant traces of apocalyptic literary patterns embedded within larger sectarian documents.[17] This unique feature of the Dead Sea Scrolls assumes that the Qumran community was heavily influenced by apocalyptic thinking, though did not itself share in certain aspects of the apocalyptic experience. Revelation at Qumran was informed by apocalyptic models, though never followed the precise parameters of apocalyptic revelation.

Revelatory Exegesis in Second Temple Judaism

The Second Temple period witnessed a dramatic shift in the conceptualization of the revelatory experience. Evidence throughout the Second Temple period testifies to the emerging understanding of the prophet not merely as one who receives the oral word of God, but rather one whose prophetic character is thoroughly literary. Divine revelation for such a 'prophet' is experienced through the reading, writing, and interpretation of Scripture. This development can already be witnessed among various biblical prophets, in particular Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah.[18] 'Prophetic' figures appear in post-exilic biblical

---

[17] On this phenomenon see John J. Collins, "Was the Dead Sea Sect an Apocalyptic Community," in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages*, 261–285; repr. from Schiffman, ed., *Archaeology and History*, 25–51; idem, *Apocalypticism*, 9–11. See, however, García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, who argues for the sectarian composition of the Pseudo-Daniel material (4Q242–246), Elect of God (4Q534), and the New Jerusalem texts (1Q32, 2Q24, 4Q232, 4Q554–555, 5Q15, 11Q18). Besides the more general problem of the appropriateness of a sectarian provenance for these documents, it is doubtful whether these texts can reasonably be identified as apocalyptic (George W.E. Nickelsburg, "Apocalyptic Texts," *EDSS* 1:34; cf. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 147).

[18] Blenkinsopp identifies Ezekiel as a significant turning point in the biblical conceptualization of prophecy (*Prophecy and Canon*, 71). Prior to Ezekiel, prophecy is primarily an oral phenomenon. Prophets receive the word of God through revelation and then transmit this divine message to the people. While these oracles are placed into written form at some later date, they are still uniquely oral in their inception and actualization. By contrast, Ezekiel begins to emerge as a literary figure. This is particularly pronounced in his act of swallowing a scroll (Ezek 3:1–3). See further, Joachim Schaper, "The Death of the Prophet: The Transition from the Spoken to the Written Word of

texts who lack the defining characteristic of the classical prophets—the receipt of the word of God by means of a revelatory experience. Their prophetic character is indicated by their ability to *interpret* properly earlier prophetic oracles and pronouncements.[19]

The transition from prophet to scribe to exegete, to paraphrase Schniedewind's title for this phenomenon in Chronicles, has long been recognized and discussed in the context of Second Temple Judaism.[20] In addition to the Jewish material, scholars have recognized the appearance of this phenomenon in many Greco-Roman and Christian texts.[21]

God in the Book of Ezekiel," in *Prophets*, 63–79 (esp. 64–65). This shift is also indicated in Zechariah's vision of the flying scroll (Zech 5:1–4) and the writing on the wall in Daniel 5. See further discussion in Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 13–14. See also the discussion of Zech 13:2–6, which contains an outright rejection of prophets and prophecy, in Martti Nissinen, "The Dubious Image of Prophecy," in *Prophets*, 35–38. Nissinen claims that the author of this text deliberately cited from earlier prophetic Scripture in order to demonstrate that the interpretation of Scripture now represents the only means of accessing the word of God. On Deutero-Isaiah, see Benjamin D. Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998). Jer 23:33–40 is another good illustrative example. See the discussion of this passage (in light of later pesher method) in Armin Lange, "Reading the Decline of Prophecy," in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations* (ed. K. de Troyer and A. Lange; SBLSymS 30; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 181–191.

[19] It is not my intention here to explain why this phenomenon occurred at this time, but merely to identify its features and relationship to earlier prophetic revelation. See discussion in Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy and Canon*, 99–101; Sheppard, "Prophecy," 275–280; Petersen, *Late*, 29; Meyers, "Crisis," 720–722.

[20] Schniedewind, *Word*. See Meyer, "Prophecy," 6:819; Hengel, *Zealots*, 234–235; Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy and Canon*, 128–132; Aune, *Prophecy*, 133, 339–346; idem, "Charismatic Exegesis," 126–150; Barton, *Oracles*, 179–213; John J. Collins, "Jewish Apocalypticism against its Hellenistic Near Eastern Environment," in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages*, 69–72; repr. from *BASOR* 220 (1975): 27–36.

[21] For the Greco-Roman context, see Mary Beard, "Writing and Religion: Ancient Literacy and the Function of the Written Word in Roman Religion," in *Literacy in the Roman World* (ed. M. Beard et al.; JRASup 3; Ann Arbor; Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1991), 35–58; Lange, "Interpretation," 25–30; Jacqueline Champeaux, "De la parole à la l'écriture: Essai sur le langage des oracles," in *Oracles et prophéties dans l'antiquité: Acts du Colloque de Strasbourg 15–17 juin 1995* (ed. J.-G. Heintz; Paris: de Boccard, 1997), 405–438; Peter T. Struck, *Birth of the Symbol: Ancient Readers at the Limits of their Texts* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004). For Christianity, see Edouard Cothenet, "Les prophétes chrétiens comme exégètes charismatiques de l'écriture et l'interprétation actualisante des pesharim et des midras," in *Prophetic Vocation in the New Testament and Today* (ed. J. Panagopoulos; NovTSup 45; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977), 77–107; E. Earle Ellis, *Prophecy & Hermeneutic in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1993), 25–26, 130–138; Aune, *Prophecy*, 339–346; idem, "Charismatic Exegesis," 143–148. In a paper presented at the 2005 annual meeting of the Association for Jewish Studies, entitled, "The Fall and Rise of Charismatic Intepretation," Azzan Yadin argued that

The sum of these studies has generated a fairly coherent, albeit broad, understanding of this phenomenon. For these 'prophets,' the prophetic revelatory experience in the early Second Temple period often consists of reading and interpreting earlier prophetic traditions. This would, of course, include the entire Pentateuch, which was understood as God's revealed word. Just as important, however, is the entire registry of earlier prophetic literature, both prophetic books (e.g., Jeremiah) and individual oracles and prophetic exempla embedded within larger literary traditions (e.g., Elijah traditions). Each of these compositions claims to preserve in literary form some original divine communication. In their original context, these prophetic compositions contain traditions relating to the prophets' own time and circumstances. As repositories of the originally divinely communicated word of God, these literary traditions are themselves divine communiqués.[22]

These figures further claim for themselves inspiration in varying degrees.[23] As inspired readers of Scripture, these later interpreters are not merely asserting that they possess a 'correct' understanding of the earlier traditions. Rather, as inspired interpreters, they can now contend that they are presenting the 'true' meaning of these ancient prophecies as they relate to the present circumstances. This secondary exegetical process is now understood as an equally viable, sometimes the only viable, realization of the prophetic experience.[24] Finally, scholars have noted that this interpretation often contains an eschatological orientation.[25]

The terminological definitions supplied by these scholars generally fit the precise data under examination, yet often fail to encompass the full range of the revelatory phenomena in the Second Temple period.[26] For this reason, this experience is referred to as revelatory exegesis. The use

---

a similar understanding of the revelatory character of scriptural interpretation can be seen in rabbinic literature. (Thank you to Dr. Yadin for sharing with me a preliminary version of this paper and for providing bibliography on the Greco-Roman sources.) This is particularly present in the story of Moses' visit to R. Aqiba's *bet midrash* (*b. Men.* 29b). The Talmud, Yadin argues, identifies R. Aqiba as an inspired reader of Scripture and conceptualizes this process as quasi-prophetic. More precisely, R. Aqiba's reading and reapplication of ancient Scripture should be understood as the formation of a new revelation, what Yadin classifies as 'textual revelation.'

[22] See Silberman, "Unriddling," 330–331; Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 482.

[23] Meyer, "Prophecy," 6:819; Aune, "Charismatic Exegesis," 127–128.

[24] Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy and Canon*, 132; Aune, "Charismatic Exegesis," 128–129.

[25] Aune, "Charismatic Exegesis," 128.

[26] See discussion in Aune, "Charismatic Exegesis," 126–129.

of the latter term underscores the careful reading and interpretation of Scripture that characterizes the process that will be examined. The choice of 'revelatory' as an appropriate explanation for this exegetical experience is conditioned by its ability to identify this entire process as revelation. I contend that the interpretive process was understood by its practitioners as a revelatory experience. For them, the ancient prophecies are the word of God embedded in written form. The process of reading, writing, and interpretation is thus a revelatory experience. In some contexts, this interpretation is characterized by a pneumatic or charismatic experience. In the majority of cases, the later interpreter is not classified as a prophet. Rather, the interpreter is identified by other terminological categories which preclude the designation as a prophet, yet underscore the role as a mediator of the revealed divine word in continuity with the ancient prophets.

In what follows, I examine the phenomenon of revelatory exegesis as it was known in the Qumran community and Second Temple Judaism. This chapter begins by exploring the initial appearance of this feature in two later books of the Hebrew Bible—Chronicles and Ezra. These books are chosen for two specific reasons. Both are products of early Second Temple Judaism and therefore attest to several trends in the transition from the biblical world to Second Temple Judaism. The evidence treated thus far has demonstrated how several prophetic elements in the Dead Sea Scrolls are closely related to developments in late biblical literature. Moreover, each book provides a useful template with which to proceed into the examination of later Second Temple revelatory traditions. Both introduce inspired individuals who received divine revelation through literary means. These individuals are recognized as heirs to the older prophetic tradition and their revelatory models are identified in continuity with ancient prophetic revelation. These individuals, however, are never explicitly classified as prophets. The inspired individuals in Chronicles and Ezra presage the appearance of similar individuals and activity in later Second Temple Judaism and at Qumran.

The next chapter turns to later Second Temple period literary traditions found at Qumran. The literature preserved in the Dead Sea Scrolls opens up the larger context of revelatory exegesis in Second Temple Judaism and Qumran. This chapter further examines the representation of ancient prophets and their revelatory experience. In particular, the revelation of Daniel and Jeremiah is reconfigured as a process of reading and interpreting ancient prophetic Scripture. The sec-

ond half of this chapter discusses the actual process of rewriting ancient prophetic Scripture in Second Temple Judaism. Drawing upon the template of revelatory exegesis, I argue that the contemporary reformulation of ancient Scripture in several parabiblical texts was understood as a revelatory process. This discussion concentrates on the Temple Scroll and the Pseudo-Ezekiel texts as exemplars of this phenomenon.

Literary Prophecy in Late Biblical Literature

Revelatory Exegesis in Chronicles

The study of prophecy in Chronicles has too often been neglected in the larger treatments of Israelite prophecy. In part, this is symptomatic of the general disregard for Chronicles previously displayed by much of biblical scholarship. Chronicles, however, bears witness to many of the features that mark the transition from biblical Israel to Second Temple Judaism. This is especially the case with respect to attitudes toward prophecy and the persistence of the revelatory experience in the early Second Temple period. This field has now been greatly enriched by a number of full scale treatments of the subject.[27]

Studies on prophecy in Chronicles begin with a basic assumption that is shared by most general approaches to Chronicles. Though the work purports to be a history of monarchic Israel, it is in reality more revealing about the social and political realities of Persian period Yehud, the time and place of its composition. When the presentation in Chronicles is basically identical with its source text (Samuel-Kings), Chronicles offers little new information about prophecy. In the non-synoptic sections, however, Chronicles introduces a new class of

---

[27] See, for example, Petersen, *Late*; Rosemarie Micheel, *Die Seher- und Prophetenüberlieferungen in der Chronik* (BBET 18; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1983); Yairah Amit, "Tafqid ha-Nevuah veha-Nevi'im be-Mišnato šel Sefer Divre Hayyamim," *Beth Miqra* 93 (1983): 113–133; ET: "The Role of Prophecy and Prophets in the Chronicler's World," in *Prophets*, 80–101. Cristopher T. Begg, "The Classical Prophets in the Chronistic History," *BZ* 32 (1988): 100–107; Then, "*Gibt es denn keinen mehr unter den Propheten?*" passim; Harry F. van Rooy, "Prophet and Society in the Persian Period according to Chronicles," in *Second Temple Studies 2: Temple and Community in the Persian Period* (ed. T.C. Eskenazi and K.H. Richards; JSOTSup 175; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 163–179; Schniedewind, *Word*; Pancratius C. Beentjes, "Prophets in the Book of Chronicles," in *The Elusive Prophet: The Prophet as a Historical Person, Literary Character and Anonymous Artist* (ed. J.C. de Moor; OTS 45; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2001), 45–53.

inspired individuals who experience revelation in different forms and whose words are identified as prophetic. At the same time, these figures are never classified with standard prophetic terminology. For example, the speech of Azariah, one of these 'prophetic' figures, is referred to by the Chronicler as prophecy (2 Chr 15:8), though Azariah himself is never identified as a prophet.

Schniedewind has identified five inspired individuals who lack prophetic titles but are still presented as transmitting divine messages to Israel.[28] They include the soldier Amasai (1 Chr 12:19), Azariah b. Oded, possibly the high priest (2 Chr 15:1–8), Jahaziel the Levite (2 Chr 20:14–17), Zechariah the priest (2 Chr 24:17–22), and Pharaoh Neco (2 Chr 35:20–22).[29] There are a number of features that unite all five of these individuals and their prophetic speeches. While none of them is introduced with any official prophetic title, all appear together with some sort of inspiration formula that identifies the source of their speech. For Amasai, Azariah, Jahaziel, and Zechariah, the divine spirit envelopes each individual and thus serves as the source of their inspiration. Pharaoh Neco attributes his inspiration directly to divine communication.[30] Thus, part of the process in which these individuals receive the divine word is conceptualized as prophetic, though they are not prophets.[31]

While the central role of the spirit and inspiration locates these individuals in continuity with earlier prophetic revelatory models, they

---

[28] Most treatments of prophets in the non-synoptic portions of Chronicles group all the 'new' prophets together and analyze them accordingly. See, for example, Micheel, *Prophetenüberlieferungen*, 39–70; van Rooy, "Prophecy and Society," 169–172. Schniedewind, however, argues that a qualitative difference exists between the figures with prophetic titles (i.e., *nābî'*, 'seer') and those without (*Word*, 86–108).

[29] Schniedewind labels these individuals "inspired messengers." Their identification as inspired derives from the role of the divine spirit in their revelatory encounter. At the same time, these individuals are not identified in their respective texts as 'messengers' (מלאכים). Schniedewind employs this designation based on 2 Chr 36:15–16, where the text refers to both prophets (נביאים) and messengers (מלאכים). He correctly notes that this passage assumes the existence of non-prophetic divine mediators. At the same time, the lack of such terminology for the inspired individuals in Chronicles recommends against identifying these figures as messengers. Perhaps 'inspired individuals' is more precise terminology.

[30] See the chart in Schniedewind, *Word*, 123. The terminological limitations of Micheel's study are apparent here as she only treats Azariah, Jahaziel, and Zechariah. The speeches of Amasai and Pharaoh Neco, lacking any definite prophetic identification, are overlooked.

[31] Schniedewind, *Word*, 124. Indeed, each of these individuals is identified by some other professional task.

are never portrayed as receiving a divine oracular message (excluding perhaps Pharaoh Neco) through the common revelatory means. Each of the inspired prophetic figures, Amasai, Azariah, Jahaziel, and Zechariah, does not receive independent oracles. Rather, the spirit guides them in their inspired interpretation of earlier prophetic and revelatory literature. Amasai's oracular blessing of David is grounded in a reworking of prophetic traditions from Samuel. Likewise, Azariah's words are a pastiche of earlier prophetic oracles (Hos 3:4; Amos 3:17; Zech 8:9–11) and an appropriation of material from Deuteronomy 4. Jahaziel draws upon a wealth of prior prophetic language. Zechariah's primary point of departure is the 'commandments of the Lord.' In each instance, the ancient prophetic material is recontextualized and "revitalized … anew for the post-exilic community."[32]

These four individuals testify to the emergence of a new form of revelation in post-exilic Israel—the inspired interpretation of earlier prophetic biblical literature. The inspiration attributed to each of these individuals is not related to their receipt of a divine message through traditional revelatory means. Rather, as inspired individuals, they search through the recorded history of God's prior revelations and find additional revelation in this received corpus. The Chronicler is careful not to identify these individuals as prophets or to equate them with the classical prophets from Israel's past. The Chronicler, however, intentionally singles out these individuals for their prophetic qualities, thereby asserting that they somehow carry on the now truncated prophetic office.

Ezra and Revelatory Exegesis

The book of Ezra represents another good indicator of some of the developments taking place in the early Second Temple period.[33] Ezra is introduced first and foremost as a scribe skilled in the Torah of Moses

[32] Schniedewind, *Word*, 129. See pp. 111–112 (Amasai); 114–115 (Azariah); 117 (Jahaziel); 120 (Zechariah). Schniedewind's understanding of Azariah is heavily dependent on Michael Fishbane, "Inner-Biblical Exegesis: Types and Strategies of Interpretation in Ancient Israel," in *The Garments of Torah: Essays in Biblical Hermeneutics* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 14–16.

[33] This argument for close contact between Ezra and Chronicles does not assume a common authorship for these works. Most modern scholars working with Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah now recognize that these two books come from separate authors (see Sara Japhet, "The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew," *VT* 18 [1968]: 330–371). I am suggesting, however,

(Ezra 7:6). Ezra's scribal expertise characterizes his entire mission. He is one who can properly interpret the Torah of Moses. Alongside this original scribal presentation, the text introduces Ezra by claiming that the "hand of YHWH his God was upon him" (Ezra 7:6; cf. LXX), an expression that is later further applied to Ezra.[34] Commentators on this passage have correctly observed that this expression serves to underscore the divine provenance of the Persian king's graciousness to Ezra and the success that Ezra will enjoy in his subsequent mission.[35]

The employment of this expression, however, fulfills a secondary task as well that is bound up with earlier biblical applications of the phrase "the hand of YHWH was upon PN." The imagery of the hand of YHWH upon a specific individual is drawn from the prophetic tradition. Numerous passages in classical prophetic texts employ this expression as a general description of the prophetic experience (1 Kgs 18:46; Ezek 33:22) or more commonly to mark the source of the prophet's divine inspiration.[36] Thus, Ezra 7:6 applies to the scribe Ezra language and imagery drawn from the classical prophetic tradition.[37] Within prophetic literature, this expression as applied to the prophet emphasizes the divinely guided character of the individual's inspiration. Here

the Ezra and Chronicles reflect similar currents in the post-exilic Jewish community and are thus valuable witnesses to the development of prophetic traditions in the early Second Temple period.

[34] Ezra 7:9, 28; cf. 8:18, 22, 31; Neh 2:8, 18. Cf. Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, 138.

[35] H.G.M. Williamson, *Ezra-Nehemiah* (WBC; Waco: Word, 1985), 93; Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah*, 138.

[36] 2 Kgs 3:15; Ezek 1:3; 3:14, 22; 8:1; 37:1; 40:1; cf. Isa 8:11; Jer 15:17. On the prophetic context of this expression, see Lindblom, *Prophecy*, 134–135, 174–175; J.J.M. Roberts, "The Hand of Yahweh," *VT* 21 (1971): 244–251; Peter R. Ackroyd, "יד," *TDOT* 5:421; Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20* (AB 22; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 41–42; Leslie C. Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19* (WBC 28; Waco: Word, 1994), 23–24. Scholarly research on the use of this expression has attempted to determine the exact nature of the prophetic experience associated with the receipt of the "hand of YHWH." Most early commentators opine that it is grounded in the ecstatic character of the prophet's revelatory experience. See, for example, George A. Cooke, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936), 6; Walther Zimmerli, *Ezechiel* (BKAT 13/1; Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1969), 49; Lindblom, *Prophecy*, 174–175. Roberts points to Near Eastern parallels where similar expressions indicate a pathological illness, a feature sometimes associated with the biblical prophets. More recently, Wilson has suggested that the understanding of this expression should not be associated with any internal physical transformation. Rather, it should be grouped with other biblical phrases that indicate divine possession of the prophet ("Prophecy and Ecstasy," 325).

[37] Few commentators recognize the connection between Ezra and the prophetic passages. See Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy and Canon*, 129; cf. Schniedewind, *Word*, 16.

too, Ezra's status as a "skilled scribe" is grounded in his receipt of the divine hand.

Ezra himself is never referred to as a prophet nor is he ever identified by any closely associated prophetic title.[38] The application of the above cited expression to Ezra, however, locates him within the succession of prophetic figures. The juxtaposition of these two elements within the initial introduction of Ezra suggests that they are intended to complement each other. Ezra, as a scribe and major exponent of the Torah of Moses, represents a newly emerging class of leadership in Israel. These scribes are slowly taking over many of the tasks that were once fulfilled by the prophets. Their revelatory medium, however, is much different from the classical prophets. The scribe, like the inspired messenger in Chronicles, communicates with the divine through careful reading and interpretation of Scripture, the revealed and accessible word of God.

Summary

The evidence of Chronicles and Ezra reinforces several assumptions with which this chapter began. Revelation as experienced by the classical prophets in the Hebrew Bible underwent dramatic transformations in the post-exilic context. Chronicles and Ezra demonstrate that revelation and inspiration took place outside of the exclusively prophetic context. In the following chapter, this feature becomes central to the revelatory experience of late Second Temple Judaism. Revelation is reconfigured as a process of reading, interpreting, and rewriting ancient prophetic Scripture.

[38] In contrast, see 2 Esdras, which assigns a greater prophetic identity to Ezra. The opening of 2 Esdras explicitly identifies Ezra as a prophet (1:1). One manuscript (Codex Legionensis) refers to him as both a priest and prophet. Ezra is further identified as a prophet in 12:42.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

REVELATORY EXEGESIS IN SECOND TEMPLE LITERARY TRADITIONS

The Book of Daniel and the Pseudo-Daniel Corpus

Daniel is a difficult book to situate within the present discussion. On the one hand, it is found within the canon of the Hebrew Bible, which warrants its inclusion in the discussion of the biblical evidence. On the other hand, its time of composition (mid-second century B.C.E.) places it among later Second Temple literary traditions.[1] For these reasons, it serves as a fitting bridge between the Hebrew Bible evidence and the Second Temple period literature. In this liminal status, Daniel informs both the biblical and post-biblical contexts. Daniel is also an important text for the larger framework of this discussion since it enjoyed widespread popularity at Qumran. The biblical book of Daniel was found at Qumran in eight manuscripts.[2] In addition, the Dead Sea Scrolls contain a number of apocryphal works inspired by the canonical Daniel stories.[3] That the biblical book of Daniel was well received

---

[1] For discussion of the dating of Daniel and the history of its composition (specifically the relationship between chapters 1–6 and 7–12), see Collins, *Daniel*, 24–38.

[2] See Barthélemy, *Qumran Cave 1*, 150–152 (Cave 1); Eugene Ulrich, in idem et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles* (DJD XVI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 239–290 (Cave 4); Baillet, *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân*, 114–116 (Cave 6). On the manuscripts in general, see Eugene Ulrich, "The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (ed. J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint; VTSup 83,2; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2001), 573–585.

[3] Material related to Daniel includes 4QPrayer of Nabonidus (4Q242), 4QPseudo-Daniel[a-b] (4Q243–244), 4QPseudo-Daniel[c] (4Q245), 4QApocryphon of Daniel (4Q246), 4QFour Kingdoms[a-b] (4Q552–553), 4QDaniel-Susanna? (4Q551). On this collection of texts, see Klaus Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 223–225; García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 116–179; Brooke, "Parabiblical," 1:290–297; John J. Collins, "Daniel, Book of, Pseudo-Daniel," *EDSS* 1:176–178; Flint, "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran," in *The Book of Daniel*, 329–367. Some of the Pseudo-Daniel texts were first published, along with the Prayer of Nabonidus, in Josef T. Milik, "'Prière de Nabonide' et autres écrits d'un cycle de Daniel: Framents araméens de Qumrân 4," *RB* 63 (1956): 407–415. See now Collins

among the Qumran community is evinced both by the manuscript evidence and the repeated use of Daniel, through citation and allusion, in various sectarian works.[4] In what follows, I will examine material both from the canonical book of Daniel and the apocryphal compositions found only at Qumran.

The inclusion of Daniel in a treatment of prophetic figures in Second Temple literature requires some initial explanation. Notwithstanding the canonical exclusion of Daniel from the class of prophets as evinced in the Masoretic Text, Daniel's prophetic status was secure in Second Temple Judaism. Daniel is identified as a prophet in sectarian Qumran literature and is repeatedly classified as such by Josephus.[5] Furthermore, the scriptural and apocryphal Daniel compositions treated below consistently identify a prophetic framework for Daniel's activity. All of these features indicate that Daniel was considered a prophet in certain segments of Second Temple Judaism, in particular Qumran.[6] At the same time, the revelatory experience of the scriptural and apocryphal Daniel differs dramatically from the models associated with the classical prophets. As such, Daniel is a good example of the shifting conception of a prophet and the prophetic experience.

Daniel 9

The *locus classicus* for all treatments of revelatory exegesis in the Second Temple period is Daniel 9. Daniel reads and recontextualizes Jeremiah's prophecy that Israel would suffer exile for seventy years (Jer 25:9–12).[7] Daniel's reuse of earlier scriptural material from Jeremiah has received significant attention within biblical scholarship on the book of

---

(4Q242), Collins and Flint (4Q243–245), Puech (4Q246) in *Qumran Cave 4.XVII*, 83–184. The remainder of the texts (4Q551–553) will be published by Puech in DJD 37.

[4] On Daniel in general at Qumran, See John J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Routledge, 1997), 12–18.

[5] For Qumran, see 4Q174 1–3 ii 3. Cf. 11Q13 2:18 (partially reconstructed; see above, p. 91, n. 26). For Josephus, see *Ant.* 9.267–269; 10.245–246, 249, 267–276.

[6] For general treatment of Daniel's prophetic status, see Klaus Koch, "Is Daniel also among the Prophets?" in *Interpreting the Prophets* (ed. J.L. Mays and P.J. Achtemeier; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 237–248; Barton, *Oracles*, 35–37.

[7] Jeremiah is not the only earlier prophetic scripture drawn upon in Daniel. Hab 2:3 seems to stand behind Dan 8:17; 10:14; 11:27, 35 (see Collins, "Expectation," 82). The use of Jeremiah's prophecy in Daniel extends beyond merely citing and borrowing earlier scripture. It is a systematic reinterpretation of Jeremiah's oracle, which draws upon established modes of scriptural interpretation.

Daniel.[8] Many scholars point to Daniel's reinterpretation of Jeremiah's 'seventy years' prophecy when discussing the phenomenon of revelatory exegesis in Second Temple Judaism.[9] The defining characteristic of this reinterpretation is the complete recontextualization of Jeremiah's original prophecy and its singular application to the historical circumstances of the second century B.C.E. My interest in this text follows from these previous scholarly approaches. Daniel 9, a document composed in the second century B.C.E., presents Daniel's reading and interpretation of earlier prophetic Scripture as a revelatory experience.

Daniel 9 opens with a superscription detailing the date according to the regnal years of the present king. This same formula can likewise be found at the beginning of each of Daniel's other visions and dreams.[10] This dating formula serves to unite all the visions in Daniel 7–12, including chapter nine. Following the superscription, Daniel asserts that he "consulted the writings (בינתי בספרים) concerning the number of years that, according to the word of the Lord (דבר יהוה) that had come to Jeremiah the prophet, would be the term of Jerusalem's desolation—seventy years" (Dan 9:2).

This passage must be understood within the context of the other revelatory experiences ascribed to Daniel in the latter half of the book. Each vision or dream is prefaced by a statement found at the beginning of the respective chapter affirming how this revelation is experienced.[11] Daniel, with angelic assistance, then proceeds to interpret properly the meaning of the dream or vision. This model is retained

---

[8] See Pierre Grelot, "Soixante-dix semaines d'années," *Bib* 50 (1969): 169–186; Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 482–489; Lester L. Grabbe, "'The End of the Desolations of Jerusalem': From Jeremiah's 70 Years to Daniel's 70 Weeks of Years," in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee* (ed. C.A. Evans and W.F. Stinespring; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 67–72; Gerald H. Wilson, "The Prayer of Daniel 9: Reflection of Jeremiah 29," *JSOT* 48 (1990): 91–99; Anntti Laato, "The Seventy Yearweeks in the Book of Daniel," *ZAW* 102 (1990): 212–223; John Applegate, "Jeremiah and the Seventy Years in the Hebrew Bible," in *The Book of Jeremiah and its Reception—Le Livre de Jérémie et sa Réception* (ed. A.H.W. Curtis and T. Römer; BETL 128; Leuven: Leuven University Press, Peeters, 1997), 106–108.

[9] See, for example, Meyer, "Prophecy," 6:819–820; Hengel, *Zealots*, 234–235; Barton, *Oracles*, 180–181.

[10] Dan 7:1; 8:1; 10:1; 11:1.

[11] Dan 7:1—"Daniel saw a dream and a vision of his mind on his bed"; Dan 8:1–2—"A vision appeared to me, to me, Daniel, after the one that had appeared to me earlier. I saw a vision…"; Dan 10:1—"An oracle was revealed to Daniel, who was called Betlshazar. The oracle was true, but it was a great task to understand the prophecy; understanding came to him through a vision."

in chapter nine, though the respective elements are dramatically different. Rather than alluding to a vision or dream he has experienced, Daniel here claims that he "consulted the writings." As with the dreams and visions encountered in other chapters, Daniel's consultation of the prophetic writings is conceptualized as a revelatory experience.[12] The root employed here (בין) is found elsewhere in the book to describe Daniel's receipt of revelation through visions and dreams.[13]

The "writings" here most likely refers to prophetic scriptural writings or perhaps only to portions of the book of Jeremiah.[14] This model assumes that the reading and contemplation of Scripture is a revelatory experience commensurate with any other known revelatory means. Ancient prophetic oracles imbedded within scriptural traditions are understood as viable conduits for the divine word.

Daniel's prophetic claim here rests on an additional assumption. Within the book's pseudepigraphic framework, the allusion to the destruction of Jerusalem and its subsequent period of desolation refers to its devastation at the hands of the Babylonians in the sixth century B.C.E. The second century B.C.E. author of Daniel, however, presumably has in mind the present ruin that has befallen Jerusalem at the hands of the Seleucids. The author of Daniel understands the ancient prophecies of Jeremiah not as references to Jeremiah's own time or near future. Jeremiah is actually speaking about the contemporary setting of the pseudonymous second century B.C.E. author.[15] This particular feature is not prominent in the biblical material surveyed up to this point. Ancient prophecies in Chronicles, for example, are not reoriented in

[12] This point is generally recognized within scholarship on this chapter. See Raymond Hammer, *The Book of Daniel* (CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 94; John E. Goldingay, *Daniel* (WBC 30; Waco: Word, 1989), 231; Collins, "Jewish Apocalypticism," 70; idem, "Prophecy and Fulfillment," 305.

[13] Dan 1:17; 8:5; 9:23; 10:11; cf. 8:27. The use of this verbal root also underscores the sapiential character of Daniel's activity.

[14] Some scholars view the term "writings" as an allusion to a larger collection of Scripture (R.H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1929], 225; Grelot, "Soixante-dix," 169; Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel* [AB 23; Garden City, Doubleday, 1978], 245–246; Andre Lacocque, *The Book of Daniel* [trans. D. Pellauer; Atlanta: John Knox, 1979], 179). Others suggest that it merely refers a collection of prophetic scripture (James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* [ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927], 360; Collins, *Daniel*, 348). Wilson contends that it alludes to the contents of Jeremiah 27–29 ("Prayer," 91–99).

[15] Cf. Meyer, "Prophecy," 6:820; Barton, *Oracles*, 181; Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 482–483; Grabbe, "End," 68; Applegate, "Seventy," 107.

this way. While certain elements of the ancient prophecies are recontextualized for the present circumstances, the entirety of the prophecy is never reapplied to an entirely different chronological framework as occurs here in Daniel.

Following Daniel's consultation with the scriptural writings, he immediately recognizes the gravity of the current situation as expressed by Jeremiah. He then proceeds to offer supplication (לבקש) and prayer to God (9:4–19).[16] Some commentators have suggested that Daniel's prayer and fasting here are means by which he solicits divine assistance in comprehending the full meaning of Jeremiah's prophecy.[17] Nowhere in Daniel's penitential prayer, however, does he solicit God's help in fully understanding Jeremiah's prophecy. By the way in which he reacts, Daniel seems to have grasped fully the meaning of Jeremiah's words as they apply to Daniel's own time. The fasting and supplication that follow represent Daniel's response to having understood the full extent of Jeremiah's oracle and his attempt to hasten the redemption predicted by the prophet.[18]

---

[16] The originality of Daniel's prayer within this chapter has long been debated by commentators. See discussion in Bruce W. Jones, "The Prayer in Daniel ix," *VT* 18 (1968): 489; Andre Lacocque, "The Liturgical Prayer in Daniel 9," *HUCA* 47 (1976): 119–142; Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 487–489; Wilson, "Prayer," 91–99; Collins, *Daniel*, 347–338. The originality of the prayer, however, is not important for the present discussion.

[17] See, e.g., Montgomery, *Daniel*, 360; Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 241; Hengel, *Zealots*, 234–235. Lacocque proposes that the prayer is a "sort of initiation rite," that serves as prerequisite for the receipt of divine secrets (*Daniel*, 177). Barton also understands Daniel's fasting as preparatory to his receipt of divine revelation (*Oracles*, 124–125; cf. Hammer, *Daniel*, 97; Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 248). Barton, however, differs from similar treatments by proposing that Daniel's reflection on Scripture should likewise be understood as an attempt to prepare himself for the divine revelation that will follow.

[18] S.R. Driver, *The Book of Daniel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900), 128; Collins, *Daniel*, 349. Though fasting is preparatory to revelation in Daniel 10, notes Collins, its presence here is strictly penitential. The fullest treatment on this subject is Wilson, "Prayer," 91–99. Wilson proposes that Daniel's prayer is in dialogue with the contents of Jeremiah 29, which is understood as part of the "writings" that Daniel consulted. The fulfillment of Jeremiah's seventy years oracle, observes Wilson (pp. 95–96), is contingent upon the performance of certain conditions by Israel (see Jer 29:12–14). The fulfillment of these conditions is emphasized in Daniel's prayer. Wilson therefore suggests that Daniel's prayer serves as an attempt to demonstrate that Israel has carried out their requirements in full and that Jeremiah's predicted redemption should be imminent. Wilson's understanding can also be found in Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 488–489.

While still praying, Daniel receives an additional revelation, this time mediated by "the man Gabriel" (9:20–21). Gabriel, already known to Daniel from an earlier vision (8:16), proceeds to declare that his present role is to impart knowledge and understanding to Daniel (9:22). Gabriel then announces to Daniel that "a word (דבר) went forth as you began your plea, and I have come to tell it, for you are precious" (9:23). A number of terms in this verse elude immediate identification. What is the "word" that went forth at the beginning of Daniel's supplication? The majority of commentators propose that the "word" in v. 23 is Gabriel's interpretation of Jeremiah's prophecy as articulated in vv. 24–27.[19] The application of the term דבר here to Gabriel's revelatory interpretation serves to link this interpretation with the original "word of the Lord" (דבר יהוה) that came to Jeremiah the prophet in v. 2 (cf. 9:25). Like Jeremiah's experience, Gabriel's revelatory exegesis is further conceptualized as the word of God.[20]

Gabriel explains to Daniel that he has come to tell him this "word." This declaration assumes that Daniel's previous understanding of Jeremiah's "word" is somehow deficient. Gabriel has appeared in order to elucidate its 'real' meaning. He then exhorts Daniel: "so comprehend the word (ובין בדבר) and understand the vision (והבן במראה)" (Dan 9:23). דבר here should be understood in the same context as its earlier usage in this verse. Furthermore, the same verbal root is used here (בין), which Daniel earlier applied to his own reading of Scripture (and other dreams and visions). Thus, Daniel is charged by Gabriel to understand Jeremiah's original prophetic "word" through the interpretive prism of Gabriel's revelatory "word." This demand is balanced by a complementary directive to "understand the vision." The vision refers to Gabriel's words that follow in verses 24–27. The "word" and "vision" in Gabriel's instruction are presented as complementary terms, a parallelism strengthened by the identical verbal root employed for both.[21] As in the first half of the verse, Gabriel's new reading of Jeremiah's original oracle is an equally accurate representation of the revealed divine word.

---

[19] Montgomery, *Daniel*, 371; Porteous, *Daniel*, 139; Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 242; Lacocque, *Daniel*, 191; Collins, *Daniel*, 352.

[20] See also LXX on 9:23 that further qualifies the "word" as the "command of the Lord." The translation provided by Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 242, "its answer was given," obscures the connection between Jeremiah's word and Gabriel's word.

[21] See Collins, *Daniel*, 352.

In what follows, Gabriel radically alters the original meaning of Jeremiah's prophecy.[22] Jeremiah's words are now provided with both a new context and new meaning. Seventy years become seventy weeks of years (490 years) (9:24). Jeremiah's predictive prophecy is provided with eschatological significance (9:26–27).[23] Through this process, Gabriel has rewritten Jeremiah's original prophecy and identified its contemporary meaning. Following the time-frame identified in the biblical book, this contemporary context would be sometime later in the sixth century, the period in which Daniel is situated. In reality, the author of Daniel has in mind his own historical circumstances in the second century B.C.E. Thus, the actual 'true' meaning of Jeremiah's prophecies relates to the vicissitudes of the second century B.C.E.

Daniel 9 bears witness to two newly emerging forms of revelatory exegesis, each of which becomes increasingly popular in the Second Temple period, especially at Qumran. The first is represented by Daniel's initial reading of Jeremiah's prophecy.[24] Jeremiah's prophetic words are no longer applied to the prophet's own historical context. For Daniel, the 'true' referent of these ancient prophecies is the devastation that has befallen Jerusalem in the author's own time. In actuality, this assumed devastation is the tumult surrounding the Antiochan persecutions in the second century B.C.E. Interpretation of this nature is not uncommon. Indeed, later Jewish and Christian exegesis routinely interprets ancient prophecy in light of contemporary circumstances. This approach differs, however, since it detaches the ancient prophecies from their original historical and social context. The present interpretation represents the 'true' meaning and application of the ancient prophecies.

The second exegetical aspect can be found in Gabriel's visionary interpretation of Jeremiah's prophecy. This method differs from Daniel's reading of the prophecy with respect to two important elements. In Daniel's approach, the entire prophecy of Jeremiah is recontextualized and applied to contemporary circumstances. Jeremiah's words,

---

[22] Like Daniel's prayer, Gabriel's interpretive vision is often thought to be a secondary insertion (possibly of an older oracle). See the treatment of this issue in Grabbe, "End," 67–72.

[23] On the exegetical method, see Collins, "Prophecy," 306–307.

[24] Most commentators do not distinguish between Daniel's reading of Jeremiah and Gabriel's interpretation. My two-fold understanding of the scriptural exegesis in Daniel 9 is predicated on the divergent interpretive phenomena evinced by the activities of Daniel and Gabriel.

while seemingly describing the crisis of sixth century Jerusalem, actually allude to Daniel's own time, which, filtered through the pseudepigraphic lens of the book, points to the events of the second century B.C.E. Gabriel, by contrast, is not content with the written word of Jeremiah. Gabriel's method assumes that Jeremiah's written word contains additional meaning that is not readily apparent in the literary record. The meaning must be generated through careful exegesis of the prophetic scriptural writing.

Gabriel's approach also differs in its relationship to the content of Jeremiah's original prophecy. Daniel's own interpretation of Jeremiah applies the entirety of Jeremiah's original prophecy to the present circumstances. Gabriel, however, is interested in only one element of Jeremiah's prophetic word. Jeremiah's reference to a period of seventy years is detached from its original framework and it alone is recontextualized and expanded by Gabriel. The entirety of Jeremiah's prophetic pronouncement is inconsequential compared to the pregnant meaning found within this one expression.[25]

The interpretive approaches of Daniel and Gabriel, however, share a number of common features. Each assumes that Jeremiah's ancient prophecies lack meaning in their original context and are properly applied to the reality of a later time. For each, the process of reading and interpreting Jeremiah's prophetic word is itself a revelatory experience. Daniel's appropriation of Jeremiah's prophecy is described in the same manner as his other visions and dreams. Likewise, the entire interpretation of Gabriel is cast as a visionary experience. Thus, there can be little doubt that each reading of Scripture is understood as a method of divine revelation equal to that of the other visions and dreams experienced by Daniel. At the same time, reading alone does not uncover the true meaning of the scriptural prophecies. Rather, this process requires an interpretive guide, a role fulfilled in Daniel by Gabriel.[26]

The text of Daniel, however, makes no claim as to the ideological basis for the interpretive approach employed. The roots of this method stem from the understanding that Jeremiah's original prophetic pro-

---

[25] This exegetical method, ubiquitous in the Pesharim, is generally understood as 'atomization.' See discussion in Berrin, *Pesher Nahum*, 12–13; Lange, "Reading," 186–189.

[26] On the importance of interpretation and the interpreter in revelatory exegesis, see Collins, "Jewish Apocalypticism," 70. As will be discussed in ch. 17, the role of the interpreter in the Qumran community was performed by the Teacher of Righteousness.

nouncement represents the word of God. The 'true' meaning of this divine revelation, however, is not readily apparent from a superficial reading of the scriptural text. The careful interpretation and reapplication of the textual record found in Daniel 9 actualizes this original divine communication. Accordingly, contemporary reading of Scripture is nothing more than uncovering the original divine voice within the prophetic word.[27]

Pseudo-Daniel[a-c] *(4Q243–245)*

4Q243–244 represent two closely related Pseudo-Daniel manuscripts.[28] The existence of textual overlap between these two manuscripts confirms that they belong to one original composition.[29] A third related Pseudo-Daniel manuscript is represented by 4Q245. The lack of textual correspondence between 4Q243–244 and 4Q245, however, suggests that they come from two different original documents.[30]

The reconstructed text of 4Q243–244 contains the *ex eventu* prophecy of Daniel, encompassing a review of history from the time of the flood all the way through the Hellenistic period and into the eschatological age.[31] This review is dictated by Daniel in the presence of a foreign king, most likely identified as Belshazzar (see 4Q243 2 2).[32] In presenting this survey of history, all events predating the Hellenistic age are recorded in the past tense, while the Hellenistic and eschatological periods are formulated in the future tense. Daniel's review of Hellenistic

[27] Cf. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 484.

[28] On this collection of texts in general, see bibliography cited above in n. 3.

[29] Collins and Flint, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII*, 133–134; Flint, "Daniel Tradition," 344–345, nn. 30–31.

[30] Collins and Flint, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII*, 154–155. Milik initially suggested that 4Q245 may belong to the same document as the other two manuscripts ("'Prière de Nabonide,'" 411). This proposal was followed by Beyer, *Ergänzungsband*, 223–225. The classification of these manuscripts is slightly confusing. In general, superscripted lower case letters indicate multiple copies of one original text. Thus, the identification of 4Q243–245 as 4QPsDan[a-c] suggests that they belong to one composition. If Collins and Flint are correct in their assessment of the separate textual character of 4Q245, then this manuscript should be identified by a different siglum (i.e., 4Q243–244 = 4QPsDan A[a-b]; 4Q245 = 4QPsDan B).

[31] On *ex eventu* prophecy in Second Temple Jewish literature, see Collins, *Daniel* (1984), 11–12.

[32] On this identification, see Milik, "'Prière de Nabonide,'" 411. For a general description of the contents of the text, see Collins and Flint, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII*, 133; Flint, "The Daniel Tradition," 339–340; Brooke, "Parabiblical," 1:293.

history, therefore, is cast as a prediction of future events. As in various places in the biblical book, Daniel is portrayed as an individual whose primary task is to report knowledge concerning the future course of world history.

In the biblical account, the source of Daniel's knowledge about the future is always indicated. In particular, Daniel's ability is traced back to the receipt of revelation mediated primarily through dreams or visions. 4Q243–244, however, contains no reference to any of these revelatory means.[33] To be sure, the text of 4Q243–244 is extremely fragmentary and a reference to dreams and / or visions may be contained within the unpreserved portions of the document. Does the extant text, however, identify some discernable revelatory source of Daniel's precise knowledge of future events that is consistent with the biblical portrait of Daniel's revelation?

Some evidence is found within the fragmentary remains of this text. 4Q243 6 1–4 twice alludes to some written work. These references are located within a fragmentary portion of the manuscript such that little context can be provided for their appearance. The few surrounding words indicate that the author refers to some information found in these written documents. Line two contains ובה כתיב[, "and in it was written." Likewise, line four is deciphered as [א]שתכח כתי[ב, "[i]t is found writte[n."[34] Both of these clauses indicate that the written work serves as the basis for some type of current statement. In line two, it seems that a statement was made and supported by an appeal to the written word. The subject of the verb in line four may refer to some statement or information, the origins of which are traced back to the original written work. The lacuna following this clause, therefore, may contain a prepositional phrase that names the title of a work (ב + title). This would perhaps be followed by some allusion to the actual contents of this work that the author wishes to present. However each of these lacunae should be reconstructed, it is clear that they are pointing to the existence of some written work upon which the author of 4Q243 is drawing.

What is the role of this presumed written work in the present Pseudo-Daniel composition? It was noted above that the extant text contains no

[33] As noted by Collins and Flint, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII*, 135.

[34] The editors have translated this clause as "it was written" (Collins and Flint, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII*, 101). The Aramaic root שכח in the *itpe'al*, however, carries the sense of "to be found." See HALOT 2:1993.

reference to a vision and / or dream through which Daniel could have received knowledge concerning the future course of world history. The reference to this written work, however, stands toward the beginning of the reconstruction of the original text. More specifically, it is found in the initial portion of the text identified by Collins and Flint as the 'court setting.'[35] This set of passages serves as an introduction to the review of history that follows. It is within this setting that Daniel would offer some indication regarding the source of his revealed knowledge. The location of this fragment has compelled Collins and Flint, in their DJD edition, to speculate that the contents of 4Q243–244 represent Daniel's 'exposition' of the writing alluded to in 4Q243 6 1–4.[36] Thus, all of Daniel's knowledge concerning future events is traced back not to a revelatory dream or vision, but to a written document.[37]

The fragmentary state of this passage and of the larger manuscript makes it difficult to say anything definitive about the exact character and contents of this written document and its precise relationship to the predictions offered by Daniel. Following the biblical model offered in related apocalyptic works, it seems likely that the book contains revelations transmitted to a figure more ancient than Daniel and preserved for posterity in this written composition. Collins and Flint propose Enoch, who is mentioned in 4Q243 9, as a possible candidate for the receipt of the original revelation.[38]

The possible identification of a recipient of the original revelation is less important that the larger phenomenon operating here. Daniel's review of history, particularly the predictive aspect found in the Hellenistic and eschatological sections, must draw upon some divinely revealed corpus of knowledge. 4Q243 6 1–4 offers a plausible scenario in which this process was conceptualized. Daniel's knowledge of future history is based on his reading of some repositories of ancient revelation. Daniel does not merely cite this ancient work verbatim. Following the biblical model of Daniel's expository interpretation of dreams,

---

[35] Collins and Flint, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII*, 138–139.

[36] Collins and Flint, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII*, 135.

[37] The phenomenon of pseudepigraphical characters tracing their knowledge back to pseudepigraphical books is treated in Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Pseudepigrapha in the Pseudepigrapha: Mythical Books in Second Temple Literature," *RevQ* 21 (2004): 429–438.

[38] Collins and Flint, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII*, 135. As they indicate, the original revelation may have been mediated through an angel. For other examples of original divine revelation to Enoch transmitted through literary media, see Schiffman, "Pseudepigrapha," 431–433. See further discussion in ch. 13.

visions, and prophetic Scripture, it seems that Daniel's use of this written work entails a process of reading and interpretation. More specifically, the interpretive aspect involves the reapplication of ancient scriptural prophecy to present and future events.

4Q245 also contains reference to a written composition.[39] As in the other Pseudo-Daniel texts, this passage is extremely fragmentary and difficult to locate within the larger context of the work. The opening fragment of 4Q245 contains a list of the names of various high priests and kings (4Q245 1 i). Many of these names are priests who post-date the period when Daniel is assumed to have lived. Likewise, the contents of fragment two can reasonably be identified as predictions concerning events that will take place in the eschatological age. If Daniel is the supposed author of 4Q245, or at least the presumed speaker, then how could he have known the names of priests far off in the future and about the eschatological course of history? Though 4Q245 does not contain the full review of future history found in 4Q243–244, the predictive elements are still fully present.

The answer to this question may be found in the opening lines of the first column which contains the list of priests and kings. Line four mentions the כתב די יהיב, "the book / writing that was given." The lacuna prevents any fuller understanding of this line and the larger text never refers back to this writing. Collins and Flint suggest that the book alluded to here is the 'Book of Truth' identified in Dan 10:21 as revealed by the angel Gabriel to Daniel.[40] If this is the case, then 4Q245 provides additional evidence that the apocryphal Daniel was represented as basing much of his predictive prophecy on a written composition. Again, it is not certain how exactly Daniel engaged with this written document. As already suggested, he likely treated it like any other transmitted corpus of divine revelation.

The fragmentary allusions to written compositions and their role in the prediction of future historical and eschatological events in 4Q243–244 and 4Q245 point to the persistence of the belief that ancient prophets continued to experience divine revelation through the medium of reading and interpreting earlier prophetic literary traditions. The fact that it is here associated with the biblical prophet-visionary Daniel should come as no surprise. Daniel 9 is the classic example of

[39] The correspondence between the two sets of Pseudo-Daniel documents in this respect has been noted by Collins and Flint, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII*, 156.
[40] Collins and Flint, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII*, 156.

the heightened role of revelatory exegesis in Second Temple Jewish literature. Other apocryphal Daniel works continue to envision Daniel interpreting dreams and visions (i.e., 4Q246). Pseudo-Daniel[a-c] follows the model presented by Daniel 9 and is therefore an additional witness to the widespread belief in Second Temple period Judaism that God continued to communicate with special individuals through the medium of scriptural prophetic writings.

Apocryphon of Jeremiah C

The Apocryphon of Jeremiah is the name given to a collection of texts that seem to take as their inspiration the character of Jeremiah. The manuscripts are generally divided into three separate apocryphal Jeremiah compositions: 4Q383 (A); 4Q384 (B); 4Q385a, 387, 387a, 388a, 389, 390 (C). These apocryphal Jeremiah texts are often discussed in conjunction with a related collection of pseudo-prophetic material—the Pseudo-Ezekiel manuscripts (4Q385, 385b, 385c, 386, 388, 391).[41]

The contents of the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C are scattered throughout six manuscripts of varying degrees of fragmentary status (4Q385a, 387, 387a, 388a, 389, 390). Unlike related parabiblical pro-

[41] 4Q384 was published by Mark Smith, *Qumran Cave 4.XIV*, 137–152. Jeremiah is never mentioned in the manuscript and there is little within the text aside from the reference to Tahpanhes (7 2; cf. Jer 43:7) that can be associated with Jeremiah. The identification of this manuscript among the apocryphal Jeremiah collection, therefore, is speculative (as noted by Smith). The remainder of the Apocryphon of Jeremiah manuscripts are found in Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 129–260. Brady also supplies a critical edition of the entire collection ("Prophetic Traditions"). The decipherment and editing of this collection of manuscripts has gone through a long gestation period. Strugnell and Dimant originally proposed that the entire set of texts revolves around the biblical figure of Ezekiel ("4QSecond Ezekiel," *RevQ* 13 [1988]: 45–58; "The Merkabah Vision in *Second Ezekiel* (4Q385 4)," *RevQ* 14 [1990]: 341–348). Dimant later argued that the texts assigned to Second Ezekiel contain three separate documents: Pseudo-Ezekiel, Pseudo-Moses, and an Apocryphon of Jeremiah ("New Light," 2:405–448). She later abandoned the classification Pseudo-Moses and assigned all these manuscripts to the Apocryphon of Jeremiah (*Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 2–3). Further publication of the Apocryphon of Jeremiah manuscripts can be found in Dimant, "Apocryphon," 11–30; eadem, "Ṣiṭeṭah Me-Naḥum 3:9–10 be-Qeṭaʿ 4Q385 6 me-Qumran," in *Ha-Miqra be-Roʾe Mefareshav: Sefer ha-Zikaron le-Sarah Kamin* (ed. S. Japhet; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1995), 31–37; eadem, "Neʾum ʿal ha-ʿEver me-Tokh ha-Ḥibbur Pseudo-Moses 4Q389 2," in *ʾOr le-Yaʿakov: Meḥkarim be-Mikra uba-Megillot Midbar Yehudah le Zekher Yaʿakov Shalom Licht* (ed. Y. Hoffman and F. Polak; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute; Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1997), 220–226; eadem, "A New Apocryphon of Jeremiah from Qumran: A Presentation," *Henoch* 22 (2000): 169–196.

phetic texts such as Pseudo-Ezekiel, the Apocryphon of Jeremiah contains links to the scriptural text of Jeremiah based in allusion and style alone. Notwithstanding the fragmentary character of the collection of manuscripts, Dimant has reached certain conclusions regarding the structure and content of the original document and its intended location within chronological time-frame of Jeremiah's ministry.

Dimant locates the beginning of the work in 4Q389 1, based on the identification of a specific date, the reference to a group meeting involving a public reading, and the third person narrative structure.[42] She identifies the historical context of this literary presentation with a public gathering during the Babylonian exile. The fragment itself mentions Jeremiah, though it locates him in Egypt, following the biblical tradition (l. 5). The fragment continues by stating that in the thirty-sixth year of the exile, a certain document was read before the Judean exiles in Babylonia (ll. 6–7). Dimant suggests that this fragment alludes to a letter sent by Jeremiah to the Judean exiles and read to them at a national gathering in Babylonia. This discourse, based on the preserved material in the six manuscripts, consists of a review of history from biblical times all the way through to the eschatological age.[43] The document closes, according to Dimant's editorial assessment, with a narrative description of Jeremiah's actions immediately following the Babylonian destruction in 586 B.C.E. (4Q387 2 ii).[44]

As in the Pseudo-Daniel texts discussed above (4Q243–244), the focal point of this pseudo-prophetic work is an *ex eventu* prophecy, which includes a review of history dictated by a prominent prophet from Israel's past. Also like Pseudo-Daniel, the grammatical tense in which the review is presented shifts around the historical period in which the prophet lived. Thus, all biblical events are narrated in the past tense, while the course of Second Temple and eschatological history is cast in the future tense. This grammatical structure is, no doubt, intended to lend a greater deal of verisimilitude to an apocryphal work composed long after the life of the ancient author to whom it is attributed. As in the Pseudo-Daniel texts, it also presents a problem concerning the source of the prophet's knowledge concerning this future history. As prophets, both Daniel and Jeremiah have access to divinely revealed

[42] Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 99.
[43] See the diagram provided in Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 100.
[44] Based on the extant fragments, the original document would have likely contained roughly forty columns of about eighteen lines each (Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 99).

knowledge. For Pseudo-Daniel, I suggested, this revelatory knowledge is imbedded within an ancient literary collection upon which Daniel was thought to draw.

The Apocryphon of Jeremiah is not as revealing in its solution to this problem. Dimant opines that the content of the letter which serves as the framework of the entire review of history was divinely revealed to Jeremiah. She observes that much of the work is structured grammatically as a first person discourse addressed to either a single second person object or a collective addressee.[45] She therefore suggests that the review of history represents a divine discourse directed at Jeremiah. The question of the revelatory method is therefore answered by positing an oracular experience. This divine speech is now recorded by Jeremiah in a letter and transmitted to the Judean exiles in Babylonia.

Dimant's proposal that the review of history came to Jeremiah in an oracular context is partially correct. The receipt of the 'word of God' in this manner is a common feature of the biblical book of Jeremiah and appears at times in the apocryphal work as well. The Qumran apocryphal Jeremiah texts, however, do not present themselves merely as Jeremiah's transcription of the original divine communications. Rather, Jeremiah's own prophetic voice is regularly present. Most importantly, the extant text of the Apocryphon of Jeremiah regularly draws upon scriptural traditions both from the book of Jeremiah and other biblical passages.[46]

The presence of several biblical allusions and citations indicates that the author of the Apocryphon of Jeremiah also envisioned the prophet Jeremiah as reading and interpreting these scriptural traditions. The ubiquity of this phenomenon in the document further suggests that Second Temple authors (and readers) conceptualized Jeremiah among the many biblical prophets who experienced divine revelation through the process of reading and recontextualizing earlier prophetic scriptural collections. In general, the evidence provided by the fragmentary Apocryphon of Jeremiah is scanty and incomplete. One particular fragment, however, illustrates well the presence of revelatory exegesis within Jeremiah's revelatory experience.

---

[45] Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 96.

[46] See the extensive treatment of the use of Scripture in these manuscripts found in Brady, "Biblical Interpretation."

4Q385a 17 ii is located by Dimant in the section where Jeremiah reviews the history of the eschatological age.[47] The contents of this fragment represent a prophetic oracle leveled against foreign nations, particularly Egypt. Jeremiah's knowledge of the eschatological history of Egypt, however, is not known from a divinely transmitted oracular experience. Rather, this fragment represents a full-scale rereading of Nah 3:8–10 and its reapplication to events in the eschatological period.[48]

Nah 3:8–10 forms part of Nahum's oracle against Egypt imbedded within the larger oracular invective against Nineveh. The immediate object of the prophetic speech here is Nineveh. The destitute character and eventual destruction of "No-Amon" (Thebes) are introduced as an analogy to the experience of Nineveh. In developing the analogy, Nahum levels a secondary prophetic invective against Egypt that underscores its baseness and ultimate vulnerability. Never, however, is Egypt the direct object of the prophet's speech.

In 4Q385a 17 ii, Jeremiah, the putative speaker in this fragment, adopts the prophetic voice of Nahum. Accordingly, there is no citation formula for the passage from Nahum.[49] Nahum's original prophecy is transferred from its original context, assigned to Jeremiah, and enlivened with new meaning within Jeremiah's address to the Judean exiles. 4Q385a 17 ii recontextualizes the prophecy of Nahum in two fundamental ways.[50]

Nahum's original oracle is clearly concerned with the historical event of Nineveh's fall, with its attendant contemporary theological implications. 4Q385a 17 ii infuses Nahum's specific oracle in 3:8–10 with

[47] Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 100. This fragment is the focal point of eadem, "Ṣiṭeṭah," 31–37.

[48] To be sure, the reference to Nahum 3:8–10 could merely be a citation of the scriptural text according to a much different textual form. Dimant, however, correctly notes that the presence of biblical and non-biblical elements here suggests that this text is not a biblical citation ("Ṣitetah," 36).

[49] Dimant, "Ṣiṭeṭah," 36.

[50] I am not interested in the slight difference in wording between the scriptural text and its application in 4Q385a 17 ii. Some of these changes may reflect deliberate exegetical readings, while others are merely textual variants. This discussion is greatly facilitated by the presence of some of the same textual variants in the use of this passage in Pesher Nahum (4Q169 3–4 iii 8-iv 4). There is no overlap, however, in the exegetical reading of the biblical passages as found in 4Q385a and Pesher Nahum (on which, see Berrin, *Pesher Nahum*, 66–70, 267–285). Specific examples of the textual divergence between Nah 3:8–10 and 4Q385a are recorded in Dimant, "Ṣiṭeṭah," 33–36; eadem, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 157–158; Brady, "Biblical Interpretation," 101, n. 23.

eschatological import. As Dimant observes, the close proximity of the expressions, "the days of their life" in line two and the "Tree of Life" in line three, suggests the creation of an eschatological scene.[51] Following the reference to the Tree of Life in line three, the manuscript contains a blank half line that Dimant interprets as a division marker. Dimant further suggests, however, that the close juxtaposition of lines 1–3 and lines 4–9 points to the shared context of these two sections.[52] The eschatological framework generated by the opening lines of the fragment creates the context for the rewriting of the oracle from Nahum.

The actual contents of Nahum's oracle are transformed in one major way in 4Q385a. As indicated above, Nahum's diatribe against Egypt is a secondary oracle found within the larger invective against Nineveh. Only Nineveh is addressed in the second person address in Nahum. Egypt's shortcomings are introduced by the prophet only to compare its deplorable state to the equally appalling Nineveh. In 4Q385a, the prophet (Jeremiah) addresses Egypt directly: "where is your portion, O Amon, which [d]wells by the Nile[s]..." (l. 4). Further second person references also seem to be directed against Egypt. The shift removes Nineveh entirely from the purview of the oracle, which now focuses entirely on Egypt.[53]

How should this two-fold transformation of Nahum's original oracle be understood? Dimant suggests that the focus on Egypt in this fragment likely points to contemporary concerns of the author regarding Ptolemaic Egypt.[54] The actual historical context may refer to the historical reality of Antiochus IV's invasion of Egypt (170–169 B.C.E.).[55] Drawing upon Nahum's oracle, the author of 4Q385a transforms the scriptural prophecy into an eschatological prediction of Egypt's eventual downfall.

---

[51] Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 157. Dimant notes that none of the biblical contexts for the expression "Tree of Life" fit the present use. She therefore points to *1 En.* 24:4, where the act of eating from the Tree of Life is performed by the righteous in the end of days. According to Dimant, this provides the contextual meaning of expression "the days of their life."

[52] Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 158.

[53] See Brady, "Biblical Interpretation," 101.

[54] Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 158–159.

[55] Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 158–159. Allusion to Antiochus' military maneuvers may also be found in 4QHistorical Text A (4Q248; *olim* 4QActs of a Greek King). See Magen Broshi and Esther Eshel, "The Greek King is Antiochus IV (4QHistorical Text = 4Q248)," *JJS* 48 (1997): 120–129; eidem, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI*, 192–200.

4Q385a 17 ii represents one of the few places within the Apocryphon of Jeremiah in which the revelatory process is illuminated. A scriptural prophetic passage from Nahum is read and recontextualized by the prophet Jeremiah. The particular focus of the scriptural oracle is transformed and the entire oracle is now infused with eschatological meaning. As in Daniel and the Pseudo-Daniel texts, a later prophet, Jeremiah, is conceptualized as reading earlier scriptural prophecies and providing them with new meaning. Whereas in the biblical book of Daniel, allusion to the earlier prophetic Scripture is made explicit, Nahum's original prophecy is cited in full, though now in its new rewritten form. This entire process is performed within the framework of the prophet's receipt of divine revelation and the appeal to this revelation as a precondition for the prophet's present predictive statements. The predictive oracle leveled against Egypt in this fragment implicitly claims to be the divine word as mediated through the prophet. Jeremiah's claim to be revealing here the divine word of God rests on the revelatory exegesis involved in his reading of Nahum's earlier oracle.

Rewritten Bible, Pseudepigrapha, and Revelatory Exegesis

The authors of the majority of the sources examined thus far were generally aware of their interpretive process. They recognized that by presenting their prophetic protagonists as reading, interpreting, and recontextualizing ancient prophetic literature, they have expanded the revelatory process to include the added dimension of revelatory exegesis. Scriptural prophecies now represent a vast repository of divine revelation, access to which is reserved for the inspired exegete. The relative ubiquity of this portrait in the late biblical and Second Temple evidence reflects a widespread belief that the inspired reading of Scripture and its reapplication to contemporary circumstances was understood as a prophetic experience by the authors of these texts. Did these same authors consider their own rewriting of ancient prophetic Scripture part of this same revelatory process?[56]

In exploring this question further, I focus on two particular examples where earlier revealed Scripture is rewritten in the Second Temple

---

[56] Cf. Brooke, "Prophecy," 2:696; idem, "Prophets and Prophecy," 154–156, for a similar understanding of the phenomena treated here.

period: the collection of Pseudo-Ezekiel texts and the Temple Scroll. These two documents represent a rewriting of the prophetic story of Ezekiel and the revelation of Deuteronomic law to Moses, respectively.[57] The protagonists of both texts are therefore great prophets from Israel's biblical past who received extensive divine revelation, the sum of which is recorded in the biblical books of Deuteronomy and Ezekiel.

Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Pseudo-Prophetic Literature

Parabiblical prophetic texts rework and rewrite biblical prophetic texts and stories.[58] While some of these texts bear little resemblance to their presumed scriptural inspiration, others follow closely the order and content of the prophetic composition that serves as the scriptural basis. The authors of this new composition, clearly distinguished from the scriptural text, deliberately rework the ancient prophecies and rewrite them for a contemporary context. Based on the treatment of revelatory exegesis thus far, is there any basis for suggesting that the authors of such a composition thought of themselves as inspired interpreters of Scripture, like the prophetic characters in their stories? If this can be demonstrated, then the authors of these texts should be identified as active participants in the revelatory exegetical encounter and in succession with the ancient prophets.

The collection of manuscripts known as Pseudo-Ezekiel provides a good literary context in which explore this question.[59] The Pseudo-Ezekiel texts have drawn a significant amount of scholarly attention. Much of this, however, has been directed at the explicit testimony found therein concerning the belief in resurrection and possible connections

[57] In using the term 'rewritten' here, I am not necessarily arguing for their generic classification as 'rewritten Bible.' For discussions of the technical limits of this genre, see Philip S. Alexander, "Retelling the Old Testament," in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF* (ed. D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 99–121; Moshe J. Bernstein, "'Rewritten Bible': A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?" *Textus* 22 (2005): 169–196. For this analysis, genre is less important than the actual phenomena reflected in the texts. There is no doubt that the two texts treated here are closely related to the scriptural text that serves as their textual and thematic foundation. I am interested here in the way that the contemporary authors understood their own literary activity in relation to the original revelatory formation of the base text.

[58] See ch. 1, pp. 8–9.

[59] On this collection of manuscripts, see above, p. 225, n. 41.

with later Christian Ezekiel apocrypha.[60] Less attention, however, has been paid to the relationship between the Qumran text and its scriptural foundations.[61]

In her publication of these manuscripts, Dimant ordered the fragments of Pseudo-Ezekiel according to their formal characteristics.[62] In doing so, she classified together those fragments exhibiting similarities in language, imagery, and style.[63] In Pseudo-Ezekiel, Dimant isolates four primary literary units within the extant manuscripts. Each of these appears as a series of divine discourses and dialogues between God and a prophetic figure, generally recognized as Ezekiel since he is often identified by name.[64] These four literary units combine Ezekiel's reworked prophecies together with new independent literary elements introduced by the author. The first of these, a reworked version of Ezekiel's Vision of the Dry Bones (Ezek 37:1–14), is found in multiple manuscripts (4Q385 2 + 3, 4Q386 1 i, 4Q388 7). Dimant also identifies a non-biblical vision concerning Israel and the Hellenistic kingdoms (4Q386 1 ii–iii) and a unit alluding to the 'quickening of time' (4Q385

[60] On resurrection, see Puech, *Croyance*, 2:605–616; Devorah Dimant, "Resurrection, Restoration, and Time Curtailing in Qumran, Early Judaism, and Christianity," *RevQ* 19 (2000): 527–548. On similarities with later Christian apocrypha, see Strugnell and Dimant, "4QSecond Ezekiel," 47, n. 8; Benjamin G. Wright, "The Apocryphon of Ezekiel and Pseudo Ezekiel," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery*, 462–480.

[61] One notable exception is Brady, "Biblical Interpretation."

[62] Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 7–9.

[63] See criticism of Dimant's method in Brady "Prophetic Traditions," 1:9–15; eadem, "Biblical Interpretation," 91–94. Brady is highly critical of Dimant's atomized approach to the entire collection of manuscripts. Dimant's approach examines each fragment in isolation, proceeds to identify formal elements, and then associates the sum of these formal elements with a hypothetical larger work. Brady asserts that the claim that each collocation of literary features suggests the existence of a separate original work is unnecessarily reductionist. She further notes that many of the rigid formal classifications developed by Dimant fail to sustain themselves even within individual manuscripts. Brady's criticism of Dimant's approach is well founded and should be taken into consideration in more general treatments of this collection of manuscripts. Brady argues that all of these manuscripts originally belonged to one super-parabiblical composition. These issues, however, are ancillary to the questions addressed in the present study. I am interested in the individual literary phenomena as they are found in each textual unit. It matters little if each literary unit comes from one or numerous larger documents. The few units under analysis here are likely representative of the literary character of portions of the hypothetical larger work.

[64] See 4Q385 1 1; 3 4; 4 5; 4Q385b 1 1 (cf. the use of "Son of Man" in 4Q385 2 5; 12 4; 4Q386 1 ii 2). See Strugnell and Dimant, "4QSecond Ezekiel," 47; Brady, "Biblical Interpretation," 95.

4). Dimant further isolates a reworked version of Ezekiel's Merkabah vision (4Q385 6). These four literary units, argues Dimant, are intended to replicate the order of chapters 37–43 in the scriptural Ezekiel.[65] To these four, the reworked version of Ezekiel's prophecy against the foreign nations (Ezek 30:1–5) as found in 4Q385b should also be added.[66]

Each of these literary units follows closely the biblical base text from which it is formed. At the same time, they are not merely copies of the biblical Ezekiel. Rather, the biblical text is reformulated in order to express specific contemporary theological concerns. For example, Ezek 37:1–14, the Vision of the Dry Bones, in its original biblical context is generally understood as a prophetic metaphor for the future restoration of Israel. In her analysis of the exegetical framework of the appearance of the vision in Pseudo-Ezekiel, Dimant demonstrates that the author "decodes the figurative language of the original prophecy" and thereby "produces a kind of commentary."[67] In infusing the vision with a new literary context, the author "transforms the vision … into a vision about the resurrection of individuals as the eschatological recompense reserved for the righteous of Israel alone."[68] The original prophecy now testifies to the contemporary concern with bodily resurrection. A similar transformation of the Merkabah vision (Ezekiel 1) is found in its appearance in the Pseudo-Ezekiel collection (4Q385 6).[69]

What is the relationship between Pseudo-Ezekiel and its scriptural base? The speaker in Pseudo-Ezekiel consistently speaks in Ezekiel's autobiographical voice. This is marked both by form (first person) and style (replication of Ezekiel's style).[70] As Dimant notes, "in this manner the author appropriates the voice of the biblical Ezekiel."[71] This is especially pronounced in the two visions that follow closely the scriptural text. The author is doing far more than merely imitating Ezekiel. In carefully threading his own contemporary exegetical model within the scriptural text, "the author attempts to extend the prophetical author-

[65] See Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 9–10.

[66] Dimant likely excluded this section from her discussion of the other four units (pp. 10–11) since they all seem to be grouped together according to the order of the scriptural book. See, however, Brady, "Biblical Interpretation," 95–96.

[67] Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 32.

[68] Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 32. See similar statements in Puech, *Croyance*, 2:612–614.

[69] See Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 50–51.

[70] Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 10; Brady, "Biblical Interpretation," 94.

[71] Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 10.

ity of Ezekiel to his own interpretations and additions."[72] Ezekiel is still presented as the prophetic voice articulating these visions and prophecies. They are, however, no longer the exact prophecies as presented in the scriptural Ezekiel. The author of Pseudo-Ezekiel has inserted within an ancient prophetic framework various contemporary concerns. Through this process of interpretive reading, the contemporary author is laying claim to the 'true' meaning of Ezekiel's ancient prophecies.

In this sense, the evidence agrees with Hindy Najman's recent assessment of the biblical and post-biblical literature that claims Moses as its author or locates Moses as a central figure. The pseudepigraphic framework for such documents, argues Najman, does not indicate that the latter day author was somehow subverting the authority of Moses. Rather, the contemporary author claims that the words now attributed to Moses are in line with what Moses would have said in the present context.[73] In Pseudo-Ezekiel, the pseudepigraphic framework is taken one step further. It does not merely assign authorship of the latter-day composition to Ezekiel. Rather, it infuses Ezekiel's own words with contemporary meaning and relevance. Following Najman, this author assumes that his own words are part of an 'Ezekielian Discourse,' with which Ezekiel would have agreed. In Pseudo-Ezekiel, the author interlaces the contemporary word with the ancient prophetic word. This serves to appropriate Ezekiel's prophetic voice while simultaneously placing the contemporary word in Ezekiel's ancient voice. In doing so, the contemporary author frames his own word as part of an ancient revelation, the full meaning of which is only now revealed.

The Temple Scroll and Divine Pseudepigrapha

The Temple Scroll exhibits a similar phenomenon as observed for the Pseudo-Ezekiel collection, though with a different set of prophetic voices. The pseudepigraphic character of the Temple Scroll has been well known since its initial publication. As Yigael Yadin first observed, the Temple Scroll removes the mediating voice of Moses from the Deuteronomic lawgiving. Deuteronomy is presented in Mosaic first person speech, in which he relates to Israel all the laws that had been commanded to him by God. In the Temple Scroll, the first person

[72] Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 10.
[73] See Najman, *Seconding Sinai*.

speech of Moses becomes the first person speech of God. Thus, God divulges to Israel all of the commandments directly.[74]

A second interpretive strategy is found in the Temple Scroll in its deliberate reformulation of the laws of Deuteronomy. To be sure, some of the Deuteronomic laws are replicated without alteration from their biblical base.[75] At the same time, several of the Deuteronomic laws are reworked by the author of the Temple Scroll in order to reflect various contemporary legal and ideological concerns. One example will suffice. The Law of the King (11Q19 56:12–59) is among the most discussed passages in the Temple Scroll's reworking of Deuteronomy.[76] Yadin noted that several elements of the biblical Law of the King (Deut 17:14–20) are modified in the Temple Scroll. The limited set of laws in the biblical text is dramatically expanded in the Temple Scroll to include several additional stipulations.[77] This expansion of the Law of the King to include several additional laws is generally understood as an implicit polemic directed against the Hasmonean kings.[78] Accord-

---

[74] See Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1:71–73. See as well Moshe Weinfeld, "God versus Moses in the Temple Scroll—"I Do Not on My Own Authority but on God's Authority," (*Sifrei Deut.* sec. 5; *John* 12:48f.)," *RevQ* 15 (1991; Starcky Volume): 175–180; Bernard M. Levinson and Molly M. Zahn, "Revelation Regained: The Hermeneutics of כי and אם in the Temple Scroll," *DSD* 9 (2002): 295–246 (esp. 306–309); Aharon Shemesh and Cana Werman, "Halakhah at Qumran: Genre and Authority," *DSD* 10 (2003): 111–112. For discussion of the possible presence and role of Moses in the Temple Scroll, see Moshe J. Bernstein, "Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls: Categories and Functions," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives*, 13–15; Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Temple Scroll and the Halakhic Pseudepigrapha of the Second Temple Period," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives*, 121–131.

[75] See the annotated list found in Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1:46–70.

[76] The Law of the King is generally thought to reflect an independent literary stratum that was later incorporated into the Temple Scroll. See Andrew M. Wilson and Lawrence Wills, "Literary Sources of the Temple Scroll," *HTR* 75 (1982): 287–288.

[77] The bibliography on the Law of the King is vast. See Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1:344–346; Moshe Weinfeld, "The Temple Scroll or 'The Law of the King,'" in *Normative and Sectarian Judaism in the Second Temple Period* (LSTS 54; London: T. & T. Clark, 2005), 158–185; repr. from *Shnaton* 3 (1978/1979): 214–237; Mathias Delcor, "Le Status du roi d'après le Rouleau du Temple," *Henoch* 3 (1981): 47–68; Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The King, His Guard and the Royal Council in the Temple Scroll," *PAAJR* 54 (1987): 237–259; idem, "The Laws of War in the Temple Scroll," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 299–311; Philip R. Callaway, "Extending Divine Revelation: Micro-Compositional Strategies in the Temple Scroll," in *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium of the Temple Scroll: Manchester, December 1987* (ed. G.J. Brooke; JSPSup 7; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 156–159; Michael O. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Cave 11* (SAOC 49; Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1990), 110–121.

[78] See Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1:345–346; Delcor, "Status du roi," 47–68. See Wise, *Critical Study*, 110–121, for an alternate view on the role of the pericope.

ingly, the Law of the King is presented in such a way so as to underscore how the Hasmonean king was in flagrant violation of these royal laws. Similar to the way that the author of Pseudo-Ezekiel reworked various portions of the biblical Ezekiel text in order to present various theological perspectives, the author of the Temple Scroll interlaces the Deuteronomic text with his own legal innovations, which themselves serve an additional ideological agenda. Further legal variation can be found elsewhere throughout the Deuteronomic paraphrase.[79]

The Temple Scroll's relationship to its base text is similar in many respects to the Pseudo-Ezekiel material. For both compositions, the biblical base text is present throughout and guides the structure of the rewritten composition. The Temple Scroll, however, differs in two crucial elements. First, the majority of the Temple Scroll's rewriting consists of a reformulation of the legal material found in Deuteronomy, what some scholars have termed a "halakhic pseudepigraphon."[80] The author never alerts the reader to the legal reformulation of the biblical text; it is always implicit.[81] Second, the Temple Scroll does not adopt Moses for its pseudepigraphic voice. Rather, bypassing Moses, it appropriates the divine voice, thereby construing itself as a "divine pseudepigraphon."[82] In doing so, the author identifies the Temple Scroll not as a commentary on the Torah, but as the Torah itself.[83]

The Temple Scroll reflects a situation where the rewriting of ancient revealed Scripture is understood as an extension of the original divine revelation. The pseudepigraphic framework should not be understood as an attempt to distinguish the legal additions from the core biblical legal material. Nor should the Temple Scroll be understood as a replacement of the Torah, as Yadin suggested.[84] Rather, the Temple

[79] See Weinfeld, "Temple Scroll," 159; Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Deuteronomic Paraphrase of the Temple Scroll," *RevQ* 15 (1992): 556–558.

[80] This term was first coined by Moshe Goshen-Gottstein in *Ha'Aretz*, Oct. 25, 1967. See Schiffman, "Halakhic Pseudepigrapha," 121.

[81] See further Shemesh and Werman, "Halakhah," 110–111.

[82] This terminology is adopted from Schiffman, "Halakhic Pseudepigrapha," 121–131 (esp. 125, 130–131).

[83] See Shemesh and Werman, "Halakhah," 111.

[84] Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1:392; idem, "Is the Temple Scroll a Sectarian Document," in *Humanizing America's Iconic Books: Society of Biblical Literature Centennial Addresses 1980* (ed. G.M. Tucker and D.A. Knight; Chico: Scholars Press, 1982), 156–157. Additional discussion of this question can be found in Baruch A. Levine, "The Temple Scroll: Aspects of its Historical Provenance and Literary Character," *BASOR* 232 (1978): 17–21; Ben Zion Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher*

Scroll extends the legal revelatory framework of Deuteronomy in order to incorporate a host of new laws and legal situations.[85] The author infuses the original biblical text with these new laws, thereby suggesting that they are somehow implied within the framework of the Deuteronomic text. More importantly, by now speaking with the divine voice, the ultimate source of Deuteronomy, the author implicitly claims to have access to the original revelation at Sinai.[86]

Summary

The treatment of revelatory exegesis in the Hebrew Bible and Qumran literature has identified the growing importance of this experience as a viable realization of the revelatory process in the Second Temple period. Late biblical texts such as Chronicles and Ezra already point to the emergence of a new class of inspired individuals whose claim to divine revelation does not rest on the belief that they received the oracular word of God. Each of these individuals is identified as somehow divinely inspired. Though they are never introduced as prophets, they are located within the prophetic tradition and therefore somehow 'prophetic.' The prophetic voice of these individuals is identified by their ability to read earlier prophetic Scripture and generate meaning for the present time-frame. The new meaning found within these ancient prophetic oracles is conceptualized as the word of God and the process of reading and interpretation is regarded as a revelatory experience.

The ideological basis of this interpretive model is the belief that scriptural prophecies preserve original divine communications. As a record of divine communication, these ancient prophetic pronouncements contain meaning beyond the original historical context in which they were uttered. To be sure, many of the texts surveyed were not forthcoming in every detail concerning revelatory exegesis and its ideological basis. At times, certain features can be inferred based on the material presented in each text. Elsewhere, certain elements are assumed based on analogy with the other literature surveyed.

---

of Righteousness (MHUC; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983), 1–9; Schiffman, "Halakhic Pseudepigrapha," 121–131.

[85] Callaway, "Extending," 161.

[86] See Schiffman, "Paraphrase," 545.

The biblical Daniel and the other post-biblical texts found at Qumran contain evidence for the continued belief in the prophetic context for the interpretation of scriptural prophecies. In particular, Daniel 9 reflects evidence of the further refinement of the revelatory exegetical process. In this chapter, Daniel is represented as recontextualizing the entirety of Jeremiah's seventy years prophecy and applying it to the events of his own time (i.e., the author's own time). This stage of reading and interpretation contains no alteration to Jeremiah's original words. Later in Daniel 9, the angel Gabriel provides a second model of revelatory exegesis. Gabriel is not interested in the entirety of Jeremiah's prophecy. Rather, he reformulates it in two specific ways. First, he focuses specifically on one element of Jeremiah's original words—the prediction that the exile would last seventy years. Second, unlike Daniel's original reading, Gabriel rewrites Jeremiah's words such that the seventy years is now understood as seventy weeks of years (490 years). The exegetical models found in Daniel 9, the reapplication of ancient prophecies to contemporary circumstances, the atomizing interpretation of prophetic oracles, and the complete reformulation of the ancient prophetic word are all features that mark the appearance of revelatory exegesis throughout the Second Temple period and at Qumran.

Further evidence of the alignment of revelatory exegesis with ancient prophetic revelatory means can be found in some pseudo-prophetic literature preserved at Qumran. In rewriting the prophetic careers of Daniel and Jeremiah, the parabiblical prophetic compositions portray the divine word as being revealed to these prophets through the medium of scriptural reading and interpretation. In Pseudo-Daniel's case, this follows the model presented by the biblical Daniel as evinced by Daniel 9. The portrait of Jeremiah, however, as a prophetic interpreter of scriptural prophecy is entirely new.

The type of texts in which revelatory exegesis is prominently featured provides an additional insight into the literary context in which this phenomenon manifests itself. The portrait of Daniel, Pseudo-Daniel and apocryphal Jeremiah as inspired interpreters of prophetic Scripture is found in a collection of texts with apocalyptic features.[87] The second half of the biblical book of Daniel (chs. 7–12) is clearly apocalyptic. Moreover, the eschatological orientation of the Pseudo-Daniel texts

[87] On apocalyptic, see the discussion above, pp. 200–203.

and the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C suggests that these works as well should be located within the literary framework of apocalypticism (i.e., apocalyptic speculation), even though they do not contain all the standard elements of apocalyptic.[88] If this generic classification is correct, then these texts reflect an important trend in the study of revelatory exegesis in Second Temple literature found at Qumran. The study of revelatory exegesis in the early Second Temple period focused on two early post-exilic historical works (Chronicles, Ezra). By the late Second Temple period, revelatory exegesis is now a prominent feature of apocalyptic literature.[89] This fits well with earlier research on revelatory exegesis that has identified the eschatological character of it application.[90]

The brief treatment of the Pseudo-Ezekiel manuscripts and the Temple Scroll has attempted to highlight an additional way in which revelation is continued in Second Temple Judaism. Both documents seem to stem from a non-sectarian composition.[91] Accordingly, they point to various currents within Second Temple Jewish society. By appropriating the prophetic voice of Ezekiel within the framework of reworking the biblical text of Ezekiel, the author of Pseudo-Ezekiel presents his own contemporary formulations as part of the original revelation to Ezekiel. This literary strategy likely stands behind much of the pseudepigraphic literature that stays close to the biblical base text. Likewise, the Temple Scroll extends the original revelation to a new set of laws and legal institutions through the appropriation of the divine voice. The revelatory framework of this approach cannot be any clearer. The author is not merely claiming that his words constitute part of the original revelation to the ancient prophet. Rather, the use of the divine voice indicates that the contemporary author is completely aware of every aspect of the ancient revelation as it left the divine mouth. This approach as well

[88] On the distinction between apocalypticism and apocalyptic, see above, p. 201.

[89] 4 Ezra 12 is another good example of revelatory exegesis in an apocalyptic context. It is not treated here, however, since its time frame is significantly later and is less helpful in providing a context for the Qumran literature. 4 Ezra is usually dated to after the destruction of the Second Temple (sometime between 70–130 C.E.). See above, p. 7, n. 17.

[90] See Aune, "Charismatic Exegesis," 128.

[91] On Pseudo-Ezekiel, see Strugnell and Dimant, "4Q Second Ezekiel," 46; Dimant, "Qumran Manuscripts," 48. Concerning the Temple Scroll, Yadin argued for a sectarian provenance. This view was then rejected in Levine, "Temple Scroll," 5–23; Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The *Temple Scroll* in Literary and Philological Perspective," in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Volume 2* (ed. W.S. Green; BJS 9; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980), 143–158. See also the response of Yadin, "Temple Scroll," 153–169.

seems to be present in additional literature from the Second Temple period, most notably the book of Jubilees.[92]

In his larger treatment of revelatory exegesis in Judaism and Christianity, Aune has questioned whether it is appropriate to identify this process in continuity with classical prophetic activity.[93] Aune suggests that the process of revelatory exegesis is closer to divination than it is to prophecy. In particular, Aune points to the indirect revelatory character of this feature as opposed to the direct revelatory experience of prophecy.[94] Aune is correct that revelatory exegesis reflects technical features more commonly found within a divinatory context. Indeed, the discussion of revelatory exegesis began by remarking that 'prophetic' figures in Second Temple Judaism experienced revelation in forms dramatically different from the direct revelation of the classical prophets from Israel's biblical past. Unlike Aune, however, I have argued that the indirect revelation manifest in revelatory exegesis indicates that Second Temple Judaism and the community at Qumran recognized the viability of a unique type of scriptural interpretation as a continuous mode of receiving the divinely revealed word. Moreover, the application of this phenomenon to prominent biblical prophets indicates that revelatory exegesis was conceptualized as continuing with the framework of the prophetic experience. The inspired interpretation of Scripture began to be understood in direct continuity with the world of the ancient prophets. Contemporary revelation became encapsulated within the process of revelatory exegesis.

---

[92] See Schiffman, "Halakhic Pseudepigrapha," 126–128; Shemesh and Werman, "Halakhah," 111–112.

[93] See Aune, *Prophecy*, 339–340; idem, "Charismatic Exegesis," 128–129. Aune is reacting specifically to the positions advanced in Meyer, "Prophecy," 6:817–818; Hengel, *Zealots*, 240–241.

[94] Aune, *Prophecy*, 339–340, adduces four reasons for this position.

CHAPTER TWELVE

SAPIENTIAL REVELATION: WISDOM AND PROPHECY IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

The Qumran texts, both sectarian and non-sectarian, attest to the rise of another alternate form of revelation in the Second Temple period. In this model, the gap between the divine and human realms is bridged by the transmission of knowledge from God to certain humans. The content of this knowledge, though different in each context, generally pertains to matters relating to the divine order of the universe and the course of God's sovereignty over the world. In each instance, it is clear that this divine knowledge is transmitted exclusively to select human beings. To be sure, some contexts presuppose the existence of a mediating force, sometimes angelic or often literary. Many cases, however, envision a direct unmediated revelation of knowledge from God to those individuals deemed worthy to be recipients of this divine wisdom. This phenomenon is referred to throughout as sapiential revelation.

The earliest attestation of sapiential revelation as a mode of divine discourse is found in several wisdom texts of the Hebrew Bible. These early developments, however, find fullest expression in the literary heritage of the Second Temple period and in particular the Qumran corpus. This should come as no surprise since the Second Temple period witnessed the rise of many alternate models of divine communication. In what follows, the existence of sapiential revelation is tracked from its earliest appearance in the Hebrew Bible, through its expansion in the Second Temple literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls. I am particularly interested in the reception of this phenomenon in the Second Temple and Qumran literature that reworks earlier prophetic traditions and in the way in which earlier prophetic traditions are recontextualized as sapiential revelatory experiences. As suggested, this approach provides unique access into how prophecy and revelation was understood within a Second Temple Jewish context. Contemporary Second Temple period authors refashioned earlier prophetic revelatory experiences in light of their own understanding of how revelation occurs. This approach will be extended later in this study in order to iden-

tify specific examples of sapiential revelation in Second Temple period Judaism (ch. 15) and within the Qumran community (ch. 18).

The Origins of Knowledge in Hebrew Bible Wisdom Literature

Wisdom in the Hebrew Bible, broadly defined, represents the pursuit of a full awareness and understanding of the nature of the ordered universe, what Gerhard von Rad repeatedly refers to as the "understanding of reality."[1] This knowledge refers both to mundane worldly matters and to the inner workings of the divine realm. Ultimately, the former is seen as a byproduct of the latter. In this sense, biblical wisdom is particularly focused on acquiring insight into the divine realm. Biblical wisdom books and other wisdom strands in the Hebrew Bible prioritize different elements which are viewed as uniquely important in the pursuit of knowledge.[2] The method by which knowledge of the divine realm is pursued and acquired within the sapiential context is rarely explicit in wisdom literature.[3]

One approach commonly found in some biblical sapiential traditions, however, identifies elders as repositories of all knowledge.[4] Another approach assumes that humans, with their own intellectual fac-

---

[1] Gerhard von Rad, *Wisdom in Israel* (trans. J. Martin; New York: Abingdon, 1973), passim.

[2] See James L. Crenshaw, *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction* (2d ed.; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998), 50–52.

[3] Crenshaw notes that biblical wisdom literature is surprisingly silent regarding "reflection on the learning process itself" (*Education in Israel: Across the Deadening Silence* [ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1998], 115). Perhaps as a result of the lack of any systematic treatment on this subject within the wisdom corpus, the standard scholarly works on biblical wisdom literature lack comprehensive discussion of this issue. The fullest treatments can be found in Crenshaw, *Education*, 115–130; Rainer Albertz, "The Sage and Pious Wisdom in the Book of Job: The Friends' Perspective," in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (ed. J.G. Gammie and L.G. Perdue; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 251–252; Matthew J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (STDJ 50; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003), 42–46; Alexander Rofé, "Revealed Wisdom: From the Bible to Qumran," in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May 2001* (ed. J.J. Collins, G.E. Sterling and R.A. Clements; STDJ 51; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004), 1–11.

[4] See, e.g., Job's friends' appeal to the wisdom of elders (Job 15:10) and Proverbs' presentation of knowledge as instruction from parent to child (e.g., Prov 1:8). See also Deut 32:7. See Albertz, "Sage," 251; Rofé, "Revealed Wisdom," 4–5; Goff, *4QInstruction*, 45.

ulties, can look out into the natural world and arrive at some greater understanding of the universe and God's role within it.[5] An important element in these two sapiential models is the absence of divine direction in the intellectual pursuits of the prospective sage.[6]

These two approaches stand in direct contrast to other wisdom models that positively affirm the hopelessness of searching for wisdom within the natural universe. This latter approach asserts that all wisdom lies with God alone, who, at his discretion can reveal it to select individuals.[7] The only way in which one can acquire this understanding is through a sapiential encounter with the divine.[8] In some cases, this experience occurs through a mediating agent.[9] This sapiential encounter, however, is rarely conceptualized as a prophetic revelatory experience. Rather, it is part of the exclusive domain of the sage.

The revelatory encounter of Balaam (Numbers 22–24) is exceptional on account of its fusing of sapiential and prophetic elements. The pre-

---

[5] See, e.g., Job 4:8; 8:8; 12:11; 34:3–4; 15:17; 5:27. See Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology, Vol. 1, The Theology of Israel's Historical Tradition* (trans. D.M.G. Stalker; New York: Harper, 1962), 418–429; Crenshaw, *Education*, 120–124; Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 2–3; Albertz, "Sage," 251; Goff, *4QInstruction*, 43–45. I am defining this category in its broadest terms, encompassing all aspects of empirical knowledge. In addition to general human experience, this category would also include the belief that divine knowledge is imbedded in God's historical acts and the process of creation. See Perdue, "Revelation," 214–215 (see further bibliography above, p. 198, n. 2). On the role of creation in the sapiential process, see von Rad, *Wisdom*, 144–176; Roland E. Murphy, "Wisdom and Creation," *JBL* 104 (1985): 3–11; Leo G. Perdue, *Wisdom & Creation: The Theology of Wisdom Literature* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1994).

[6] So Crenshaw, *Education*, 120: "knowledge resulted from human inquiry rather than divine initiative."

[7] See Psalm 73; Prov 16:1–2; cf. 21:30; Job 4:12–21; 12:12–13; 15:2–16; 28; 32; 33:13–18; 42:2–6. On these various texts, see Ithamar Gruenwald, "Knowledge and Vision: Towards a Clarification of Two 'Gnostic' Concepts in the Light of their Alleged Origins," *IOS* 3 (1973): 69–70; James F. Ross, "Psalm 73," in *Israelite Wisdom: Theological and Literary Essays in Honor of Samuel Terrien* (ed. J.G. Gammie et al.; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), 161–175; Stephen A. Geller, "'Where is Wisdom?' A Literary Study of Job 28," in *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel* (ed. J. Neusner et al.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 155–188; Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 13–14.

[8] See Crenshaw, *Education*, 127–130. Rofé further suggests that traces of this posture can be found elsewhere throughout the Hebrew Bible ("Revealed Wisdom," 8–9). For example, knowledge and discernment gained through divine revelation is prominently featured in the stories of Joseph, Bezalel, Solomon, and Daniel.

[9] For example, Job 4:12–21 and 33:13–18, identify dreams and visions as the medium through which God reveals his knowledge. Job 15:8 locates the capacity to listen in on the council of God as the mediating agent. Proverbs, of course, is famous for its hypostasized Lady Wisdom as the mediator of all divine wisdom.

sentation of Balaam in Numbers recounts his development from foreign diviner to international visionary.[10] The introduction to Balaam's third and fourth oracles (24:4, 16), as found below in table two, highlights in literary parallelism the visual and aural character of his divine communication:[11]

Num 24:4cd // 16cd	*Num 24:4ab // 16ab*
[C]**מחזה שדי יחזה** And beholds visions from the Almighty,	[A]**נאם שמע אמרי-אל**[12] Word of him who hears God's speech
[D]**נפל וגלוי עינים** Prostrate, but with eyes unveiled	[B]**וידע דעת עליון**[13] Who obtains knowledge from the Most High[14]

Table 2: The Introduction to Balaam's Third and Fourth Oracles (Num 24:4, 16)

The initial clause of each unit identifies the media of Balaam's prophetic experience. Thus, verses 4a // 16a indicate that Balaam heard some form of divine speech. Verses 4c//16c reveal that God also communicated to Balaam through visions. Based on the literary parallelism, the second part of each unit serves to amplify in some way the description

[10] On the Balaam traditions, see Baruch A. Levine, *Numbers 21–36* (AB 4A; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 137–275. See also William F. Albright, "The Oracles of Balaam," *JBL* 63 (1944): 207–234.

[11] See also the notice that the "spirit of God was upon him" in Num 24:2. As Levine observes, the application of a distinctly Israelite prophetic function to Balaam completes his transformation from foreign diviner to prophet (*Numbers 21–36*, 191).

[12] This clause is not found in SP, but is present in MT and LXX.

[13] This expression is found only in the fourth oracle in MT (v. 16). Many early commentators argued for its inclusion in v. 4 based on the parallel text in v. 16. See George B. Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers* (ICC; New York: Scribner, 1920); Albright, "Oracles," 217, n. 59. The clause is extant in one manuscript (Kennicott MS). See further Levine, *Numbers 21–36*, 193, who accepts this emendation and includes it in his translation (cf. notes in *BHS* ad loc.). Albright also suggests that the word **דעת** should be vocalized as plural, which would create a closer parallelism with the plural **אמרי**.

[14] The Hebrew expression could be understood either as a subjective genitive (i.e., knowledge belonging to God) or as an objective genitive (i.e., knowledge from God). See Jacob Milgrom, *Numbers: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1990), 207. I follow NJPS here in rendering it as the latter.

of Balaam's communication with God.[15] Verses 4d // 16d state that God has opened Balaam's eyes. This draws upon the same visual language as verse 24:4c//16c in order to emphasize the mechanics of Balaam's receipt of visions. Thus, the notice that Balaam possesses knowledge from God in verses 4b // 16b indicates the mechanism through which Balaam was able to hear the divine speech (vv. 4a // 16a).

The notice that Balaam possesses knowledge from God (וידע דעת עליון) highlights the sapiential character of his revelation. As commentators note, this expression assumes a context where God reveals elements of his usually guarded knowledge to select individuals.[16] Similar to the models identified above in various biblical wisdom texts, Balaam is a recipient of revealed divine wisdom. There is one major difference between the encounter with Balaam and the other passages thus far discussed. By framing the introduction to Balaam's oracle in his way, the text has underscored the sapiential elements in Balaam's visionary experience. Not only does he see visions, but his receipt of divine wisdom is conceptualized as an integral aspect of his revelatory experience. Balaam is here provided with sage-like characteristics that contribute to his identification as a visionary. The case of Balaam is exceptional in that it creates an explicit connection between the encounter of receiving divinely revealed wisdom and the prophetic experience. Outside of this example, the divine disclosure of knowledge to humans is rarely conceptualized as a prophetic experience.

Sapiential Revelation in Second Temple Literature

In the foregoing discussion, three distinct models within Hebrew Bible wisdom literature were identified concerning the ultimate source of wisdom and the means by which humans can gain access to this knowledge. In doing so, no immediate claims were made as to the chronological development of these three models. Many of the texts that privilege sapiential revelation, however, are assumed to have come from a

---

[15] See Philip J. Budd, *Numbers* (WBC 5; Waco: Word, 1984), 255, who suggests that the third clause in MT 24:4 ("prostrate, but with eyes unveiled") is a gloss that attempts "to describe the way in which Balaam receives his vision." This understanding, however, does not affect the analysis of the text as it presently appears.

[16] On the sapiential context of this expression, see Gray, *Numbers*, 368–369; Levine, *Numbers 21–36*, 194–196; Rofé, "Revealed Wisdom," 10.

late compositional framework and also seem to polemicize against the other models.[17]

Even if sapiential revelation is not the latest model to enter the wisdom traditions, it is certainly the most pervasive and persistent in later Jewish sapiential literature. While the other two models do continue in early post-exilic and later Second Temple traditions, sapiential revelation becomes an increasingly important and central expression of the way in which God continues to communicate with human beings.[18]

The continued presence of sapiential revelation in Second Temple Jewish literature provides an important avenue for exploring the modified character of prophetic revelation in Second Temple Judaism. In the Hebrew Bible, the belief that God communicates to select individuals through the transferal of knowledge is a feature of Israelite sapiential traditions. Revelation in this sense is not something generally associated with prophets. Indeed, as noted above, the sapiential context of Balaam's revelation is the exception in the Hebrew Bible.

The presence of this revelatory encounter with the divine, however, becomes increasingly important as the standard prophetic revelatory models began to wane in the Second Temple period. Sapiential revelation was removed from its exclusive wisdom context and provided with a new prophetic framework. The receipt of divine knowledge is often conceptualized as a prophetic revelatory process. As already demonstrated in earlier portions of this study, the conceptualization of the biblical prophets and the ancient prophetic experience provides an

[17] See, e.g., Job 32:9, where Elihu brackets his own appeal to divine knowledge with a scathing attack on the authority of human elders as the ultimate source of wisdom. In doing so, he denies their legitimacy. See further, Albertz, "Sage," 251–252; Rofé, "Revealed Wisdom," 8. Rofé likewise identifies traces of this polemic in Qoheleth (4:13–14) and in the story of Susanna where Daniel receives a spirit of understanding sent by God through an angel. He is then able to intervene on Susanna's behalf against the elders. Other elements in Job also seem to reject the veracity of experiential knowledge. Albertz points to Job 13:1–2 where Job equates his own experience with that of his friends. While the friends' experience may point to some particular understanding, Job asserts that his own reality is equally valid in asserting a different understanding. See also Job 21:29, where Job inquires of his friends whether they also took into account the decidedly different experience of travelers. In Job 28, Job, after searching throughout the human world, affirms that knowledge can only be found with God.

[18] See J. Coert Rylaarsdam, *Revelation in Jewish Wisdom Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946), esp. ix–x. On the preservation of earlier models, see, e.g., *1 En.* 2:1–5:4 (Preamble to the Book of Watchers) with its appeal to empirical knowledge. See also 4Q541 9 i (4QApocrLevi^{b}? ar), which seems to locate wisdom as something passed from father to son (following the biblical model of Proverbs).

important gauge on developing prophetic traditions in Second Temple Judaism in general and at Qumran in particular. In what follows, therefore, I analyze the application of sapiential revelation to biblical prophets as found within the Qumran corpus and related literature. These texts present biblical prophets, from Moses to Isaiah, communicating with the divine through models previously restricted to the sapiential movement.

The analysis divides along two larger generic classifications. The first group of texts is classified as 'apocryphal-sapiential texts.' This section focuses on Moses in the Joshua Apocryphon (4Q378), David in 'David's Compositions' from the Cave 11 Psalms Scroll (11Q5 27), and Isaiah in Ben Sira (48:20–25).[19] The classification 'apocryphal' is intended to highlight the fact that each of these texts rewrites and recontextualizes certain elements pertaining to the revelatory experience of a biblical prophet. 'Sapiential' underscores the interest in wisdom and the receipt of knowledge as found in each of these documents. The use of both of these terms emphasizes the mixed genre of the texts surveyed and the diverse literary forms found within each passage. The second stage of analysis (ch. 13) examines the portrait of Enoch and Daniel in the apocalyptic texts bearing their names. These two documents are chosen for their centrality in the apocalyptic corpus and their importance among the Qumran manuscripts. Though not attesting directly to sectarian perspectives, these documents were held in high esteem by the community and represent part of the larger worldview in which the Qumran community envisioned its own existence.

The texts are divided in this way on account of the formal presentation of sapiential revelation as found within each generic literary division. To some extent, all the texts treated present a similar model for the sapiential context of revelation. There are certain unifying features, however, that mark the sapiential revelatory encounter in apocalyptic literature that are not found in the other classes of literature. Presumably, this literary distinction testifies to different modes of thought within the communities that produced these texts.

The present discussion serves as a backdrop to the later examination of the phenomenon of sapiential revelation in Second Temple Judaism (ch. 15) and among the leadership and members of the Qumran community (ch. 18). Before this question can be approached, however, some

[19] 4Q541 (4QApocrLevi^{b}? ar) esp. 3 4; 7; 9 i, represents another possibly relevant text. It is too fragmentary, however, for any serious analysis.

control must be gained over the modes and methods in which sapiential revelation took place. In this respect, I am interested in a number of fundamental questions. I first identify the revelatory context of the transmission of divine knowledge to human beings in the Second Temple period. In what way is this phenomenon conceptualized as a prophetic revelatory experience? Second, I examine the exact manner in which this revelation is said to take place. Is the revelation mediated through a secondary agent or transmitted from God to humans in unmediated form? Finally, what exactly is the content of this revelation and to whom is it transmitted? In addition to developing typologies for sapiential revelation in the Second Temple period, I also note the points of contact and divergence with the biblical models.

One additional point must be made prior to the analysis of the relevant texts. In the previous chapter, I noted the constant tension between the classification of revelatory exegesis as a mode of divine revelation and the identification of its practitioners as prophets. Indeed, the majority of the texts surveyed are careful not to make this identification. Like revelatory exegesis, sapiential revelation is a new form of divine revelation that gains prominence in the Second Temple period. Its practitioners are identified as inspired individuals who mediate the divine word. Indeed, several classical prophets are identified as recipients of sapiential revelation. At the same time, a clear distinction is present between classical Israelite prophecy and revelation encountered through the receipt of revealed wisdom. For example, Enoch and Daniel are two of the more prominent participants in this revelatory process. Though there is much precedent for identifying each of these figures as prophets, their methods of revelation clearly mark them as different from the classical Israelite prophets. Rather, their status as recipients of sapiential revelation identifies them as inspired individuals who are understood as the successors of the ancient prophetic class.

Apocryphal-Sapiential Texts from Qumran

Moses—Apocryphon of Joshua (4Q378) 26 1–3

In chapter six, the portrait of Moses in 4Q378 26 1–3, the Apocryphon of Joshua, was discussed.[20] This discussion was particularly interested in the presentation of Moses with the prophetic epithet 'man of God.' Line two recounts how Moses, identified as the 'man of God' (cf. Ps 90:1), spoke to Israel. Israel, referred to as the "congregation of the Most High," is described as listening to the words of Moses. The source of Moses' speech in line two is identified as "from the mouth of," which should most likely be restored as "from the mouth of God." This fragmentary text contains two markers that identify Moses here as a prophet, acting as God's spokesman—the prophetic title 'man of God' and the depiction of Moses speaking "from the mouth of God."

The exalted prophetic status of Moses is constantly emphasized in the Hebrew Bible and in post-biblical literature. Here as well, Moses is singled out on account of his unique status as God's prophetic spokeman. This particular text, however, adds an additional piece of information concerning the ultimate source of Moses' prophetic character. Line one, following Num 24:16, reads "and he knows the knowledge from the Most High." The larger context of this fragment suggests that the intended subject here is Moses. What does it mean that Moses has knowledge from the Most High?

This particular expression is employed in the Hebrew Bible to introduce the third and fourth prophetic pronouncements of Balaam (Num 24:4 [LXX], 16). At first glance it may seem strange to apply to Moses a verse describing Balaam's prophetic ability. This verse, however, does more than merely introduce Balaam's oracle. As noted above in this chapter, it serves to identify part of the sapiential context of Balaam's revelation. As one fully knowledgeable of the Most High, he is identified as a participant in the sapiential revelatory experience.[21] The application of this expression to Moses in 4Q378 similarly identifies Moses as a recipient of revelation like Balaam.[22]

[20] See pp. 115–116.

[21] See also the use of this expression in 1QS 4:22 in order to describe the instruction of the *Maskil* in divine wisdom (see below, pp. 372–373).

[22] The alignment of the prophetic capabilities of Moses and Balaam is not without precedent in ancient interpretive traditions. See *Sifre* Deut. §357. Deut 34:10 asserts that "Never again did there arise in Israel a prophet like Moses." The Sifre continues by

Moses' prophetic character was not in such jeopardy that it needed to be emphasized to such an extant by the author of 4Q378. Indeed, in the Second Temple period, Moses was considered the greatest of all the prophets. 4Q378, however, is interested in locating another framework for Moses' prophetic experience. Moses' presence on Sinai and his subsequent interaction with God provided him with direct divine revelation. 4Q378 introduces another element of Moses' prophetic capability. Moses is here described as the beneficiary of sapiential revelation. As a 'man of God,' he speaks "from the mouth of God," an experience which is conceptualized as based on his understanding of the "knowledge of the Most High."

Unfortunately, the fragmentary nature of this text precludes arriving at any further understanding of the presentation of sapiential revelation found therein. No information, for example, is supplied concerning how God revealed this divine knowledge to Moses. While no mediating force is present in the extant text, its absence is far from certain. Caution must also be reserved with respect to determining the content of the revelation. Moses is described as conveying some divine information to Israel that he gained through a sapiential revelatory experience. The extant text, however, reveals little about the content of Moses' speech. Mention is made of "great signs," the restraint of God's wrath (l. 5), and "acts of kindness" (l. 6). There is a temporal designation of "until its ages remember" (l. 6). It is likely that God is the subject of the action in lines 5–6. Beyond this, there is little more that can be said concerning the temporal or spatial context of these lines.

David—Psalms Scroll (11QPs[a]) 27

The status of David as a prophet was a mildly contested issue within Judaism of late antiquity. For the Qumran community, and presumably many other segments of contemporary Judaism, David was a prophet

claiming "but among the nations, such a prophet did arise, namely Balaam, the son of Beor." The Sifre further identifies elements of Balaam's prophecy that surpass those of Moses. This tradition may also have been known and approved as well by Jerome (as claimed by the seventeenth-eighteenth Church historians Herman Witsius [*Miscellaneorum Sacrorum*, 1692] and J.F. Buddeus [*Historia Ecclesiastica*, 1715]). See discussion of the rabbinic and Christian sources on Balaam in Jay Braverman, "Balaam in Rabbinic and Early Christian Tradition," in *Joshua Finkel Festschrift* (ed. S.B. Hoenig and L.D. Stitskin; New York: Yeshiva University Press, 1974), 41–50 (esp. 43, 45–46).

like the other prophetic figures from the ancient past.[23] This is explicitly expressed in the prose epilogue to the Psalms Scroll from Cave 11, titled by James Sanders as 'David's Compositions' (11Q5 27:2–11).[24]

> (2) And David, the son of Jesse, was wise (חכם), and a light like the light of the sun (ואור כאור השמש), and literate (סופר'), (3) and discerning (ונבון) and perfect in all his ways before God and men. And the Lord gave (4) him a discerning and enlightened spirit (ויתן לו 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄 רוח נבונה ואורה). And he wrote (5) 3,600 psalms; and songs to sing before the altar over the whole-burnt (6) perpetual offering every day, for all the days of the year, 364; (7) and for the offering of the Sabbath, 52 songs; and for the offering of the New (8) Moons and for all the Solemn Assemblies and for the Day of Atonement, 30 songs. (9) And all the songs that he spoke were 446, and songs (10) for making the music over the stricken, 4. And the total was 4,050. (11) All these he composed through prophecy which was given to him from before the Most High (כול אלה דבר בנבואה אשר נתן לו מלפני העליון).

This passage has garnered much scholarly attention, though most has focused on the calendrical model presented by the text.[25] The text, however, has been considered less for its contribution to the development of prophecy in the Second Temple period and at Qumran.[26] There can be no doubt that 'David's Compositions' explicitly testifies to the belief that David was a prophet and that the Psalms were composed under prophetic inspiration.[27] This passage, however, also

---

[23] On David as a prophet, see Fitzmyer, "David"; Ben Zion Wacholder, "David's Eschatological Psalter 11Q Psalms[a]," *HUCA* 59 (1988): 41, n. 77; Then, "*Gibt es denn keinen mehr unter den Propheten?*" 189–225; Flint, "David," 158–167. On the late biblical evidence, see the discussion above, pp. 112–113. David's prophetic status at Qumran is assured by the pesher exegesis applied to Psalms, understood as a prophetic scriptural collection authored by David (see also the Jewish and Christian sources cited above, p. 112, n. 38).

[24] Sanders, *Psalms Scroll*, 92.

[25] See Sanders, *Psalms Scroll*, 91; William H. Brownlee, "The Significance of 'David's Compositions,'" *RevQ* 5 (1966): 569–574; Patrick W. Skehan, "*Jubilees* and the Qumran Psalter," *CBQ* 37 (1975): 343–347; Wacholder, "Psalter," 35–41; Flint, *Psalms Scrolls*, 172–201; idem, "Prophet David," 162–164; James C. VanderKam, "Studies on 'David's Compositions' (11QPs[a] 27:2–11)," *ErIsr* 26 (1999; Cross Volume): 212*–220*; Ulrich Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter Rezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPs[a] aus Qumran* (STDJ 49; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003), 256–257.

[26] Even Flint, "David," 162–164, devotes the majority of his treatment of this text to the calendar question. See, however, the brief discussion in Daniel J. Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran* (London: Routledge, 1996), 24–25.

[27] So Sanders, *Psalms Scroll*, 92; Wacholder, "Psalter," 41; Then, "*Gibt es denn keinen mehr unter den Propheten?*" 214; Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 165; Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*,

contains important information concerning how David experienced his prophecy.

Much of the language employed in the depiction of David locates him as a paradigmatic sage at home within Israel's wisdom circles. Thus, he is "wise" (חכם), "a light like the light of the sun" (ואור כאור השמש) "literate" (סופר),[28] and "discerning" (נבון). Most importantly, God provided David with "a discerning and enlightened spirit" (ויתן לו 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄 רוח נבונה ואורה).[29] By virtue of having this discerning and enlightened spirit, David was able to compose the 4,050 psalms as described in the following lines. Based on the text as presented up to here, David is portrayed a sage *par excellence*.[30] Were the text to conclude here, David's literary output would appear to be the direct result of his sapiential acumen.

The text, however, continues, adding one additional line that fully contextualizes the portrait of David provided in lines 2–3. After enumerating the full list of psalms composed by David, the text states that "All these he composed through prophecy which was given to him from before the Most High" (כול אלה דבר בנבואה אשר נתן לו מלפני העליון). This passage is intended to form an inclusio with the clause that immediately precedes the list of psalms: ויתן לו 𐤉𐤄𐤅𐤄 רוח נבונה ואורה. Each claims some divine gift to David using similar language (√נתן). Each identifies the immediate source of inspiration. Line eleven asserts that David composed the psalms with prophetic guidance. This notice is intended to qualify and be qualified by the description of David as a sage in lines 2–3. This correspondence is reinforced by the apparent word play between נבואה and נבונה. David's prophetic capabilities as

---

24–25; Bowley, "Prophets," 2:360; Stemberger, "Propheten," 146; Brooke, "Prophecy," 2:696; Flint, "David," 164.

[28] I am following Sanders' original translation. This word is more generally understood as a "scribe" (so Wacholder, "Psalter," 33). The sapiential context is implied by both translations.

[29] On the scriptural basis for applying these epithets to David, see Sanders, *Psalms Scroll*, 92; Wacholder, "Psalter," 33–34; Dahmen, *Psalmen*, 253–254. I see no need, however, to follow Wacholder's suggestion that the David referred to here is an "eschatological David."

[30] The sapiential portrait of David is likely part of a larger comparison with Solomon found throughout this passage. Scholars have long noted that the number of David's psalms (4,050) is intended to supersede that of Solomon, who, according to 1 Kgs 5:12 composed 3,000 proverbs and 1,005 songs. See Sanders, *Psalms Scroll*, 92. According to the Greek tradition, however, Solomon actually composed 5,000 songs in addition to the 3,000 proverbs (see LXX 1 Kgs 4:32).

identified in line eleven are the direct result of the sapiential revelation granted to him in line three.[31]

The sapiential context of David's prophetic capabilities is further highlighted by the larger context in which 'David's Compositions' appears in the Psalm Scroll. In his analysis of 'David's Compositions,' VanderKam argues that the location of this passage within the Psalms Scroll is deliberate and intended to shed light on the fuller meaning of this literary unit.[32] 'David's Compositions' is immediately preceded at the top of column twenty-seven by a citation of 2 Sam 23:7, which forms the conclusion of David's 'Last Words' (2 Sam 23:1–7). The bottom of column twenty-six, unfortunately, is not extant on the scroll, precluding any definitive answer on what exactly from the biblical text preceded 'David's Compositions.' The presence of the citation from 2 Sam 23:7, however, makes it very likely that most, if not all, of the last words of David from 2 Sam 23:1–7 were included at the bottom of column twenty-six.[33] The juxtaposition of these two units is surely not by accident.

As VanderKam observes, 2 Sam 23:1–7 "extols David's virtues" in such a way similar to the praise found in 'David's Compositions.'[34] One similarity is especially important. In 2 Sam 23:2, David claims as his source of inspiration that "the spirit of the Lord has spoken through

[31] The blending of sapiential and prophetic elements is often glossed over by commentators or missed entirely (see, e.g., Schniedewind, *Word*, 242). VanderKam expresses an alternative position that the psalms "are introduced by words praising David's sublime wisdom and concluded by a line that claims prophetic inspiration for his works … to enhance the status of David in areas—wisdom and prophecy—that were not sufficiently documented or detailed in the biblical portraits of the king" ("Studies," 218*). VanderKam is correct that neither of these elements is well documented in the biblical account of David. Why, however, was the author of 'David's Compositions' compelled to present David as both a prophet and a sage? The appeal to revelation is clearly intended to support the calendrical model presented within the text. If this is the case, simply referring to David as a prophet would have sufficed. See, however, Brownlee, "Significance," 572; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 206; Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 136, who note the consonance of sapiential and prophetic language in the text.

[32] VanderKam, "Studies," 212*–213*.

[33] As suggested by Sanders, *Psalms Scroll*, 93; VanderKam, "Studies," 212*–213*. See also Wacholder, "Psalter," 32, who argues that 'David's Compositions' is a pesher on David's last words in 2 Samuel 23. Brownlee argues that this textual arrangement suggests the existence of an original Samuel text that contained David's 'Last Words' followed by 'David's Compositions' ("Significance," 569). The editor of the Psalms Scroll, contends Brownlee, transposed these two pericopes into the Psalms Scroll from this original Samuel text. The lack of any supporting textual evidence in the Qumran Samuel scrolls or any other ancient witness argues against Brownlee's suggestion.

[34] VanderKam, "Studies," 212*–213*.

me; his message is on my tongue." Rofé has suggested that this particular passage should be understood within the same revelatory context as the other sapiential biblical passages discussed above.[35] The source of David's inspiration is his direct access to divine knowledge and wisdom mediated through a heavenly agent. This passage thus provides additional contextual meaning for the sapiential revelatory character ascribed to David in 'David's Compositions' that follows. Most importantly, it provides some biblical base for the seemingly unfounded characterization of David as found in 'David's Compositions.' Nowhere in the Hebrew Bible is David described in such clear terms as having prophetic (or sage-like) capabilities. If 2 Sam 23:2 were to be found somewhere at the bottom of column twenty-six, it would provide an important biblical source for the portrait of David that follows.[36]

The sapiential revelation of David in 11QPs[a] 27 allows us to draw larger conclusions about how the revelatory experience was expected to take place. Unlike the fragmentary 4Q378, 'David's Compositions' identifies an explicit medium through which the divine wisdom is transmitted. David is furnished with a spirit sent directly from God that carries with it discernment and enlightenment. The divine spirit is here conceptualized as the medium through which God reveals himself to David.[37]

It is difficult to determine to what extent the substance of David's sapiential prophecy here is reflective of the assumed general content of sapiential revelation. On the one hand, David's sapiential revelation results in the formation of 4,050 psalms. On the other hand, the calendrical framework underpinning the list of compositions clearly points to polemical concerns. By claiming divine inspiration for David's psalms, one is also claiming divine sanction of the solar calendar that stands behind the arrangement of the psalms. Why, however, was it not sufficient for the author of 'David's Compositions' to claim that David

---

[35] Rofé, "Revealed Wisdom," 10–11.

[36] VanderKam also points to the appearance of the Hymn to the Creator (col. 26:9–15) in the immediately preceding portion of the scroll ("Studies," 213*). He notes that this hymn is also replete with wisdom terminology that has some resonance with 'David's Compositions.'

[37] For general bibliography on the spirit at Qumran, see above, p. 62, n. 73. The role of the spirit as the agent in the transmission of divinely revealed knowledge is already present with Balaam (see above, p. 244, n. 11). This function of the spirit persisted well into the Second Temple period (Levison, *Spirit*, 168–183). Indeed, the spirit plays a critical role in the sectarian sapiential revelatory process (see below, pp. 374–375).

had written these psalms under a more general prophetic inspiration? Is there some specific reason why David must be presented as recipient of sapiential revelation?

One speculative suggestion presents itself. As observed above, the primary pursuit of wisdom in the Hebrew Bible is a full understanding of the natural order of the word, both of mundane matters and heavenly elements. God's divulgence of wisdom is one of the ways in which one gains complete access to this knowledge. At the most basic level, 'David's Compositions' assigns to David the composition of all manner of psalms under the inspiration of sapiential revelation. More specifically, however, David's psalms function as structuring elements for one's daily existence in the world. As psalms to be recited on specific days and keyed to the solar calendar, they frame one's understanding of the calendar and its application in Jewish thought and practice.

Isaiah—Ben Sira 48:20–25

Few fragments of Ben Sira were found among the Qumran manuscripts.[38] Nonetheless, the book was clearly known at Qumran and its contents to some degree accepted by the community members.[39] Ben Sira provides an additional context for understanding how the ancient biblical prophets were filtered through the sapiential context of late Second Temple Judaism. In particular, Ben Sira treats many of the biblical prophets in his Praise of the Fathers (44:1–50:24).[40] Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve Prophets are all considered. Ben Sira devotes a considerable amount of space to Isaiah and his activ-

---

[38] One manuscript was found in Cave 2 (2Q18) (Baillet, *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân*, 75–77). Ben Sira 51:13–30 is found in cols. 21–22 of the Cave 11 Psalms Scroll. Ben Sira is better represented in the manuscript finds from Masada (Mas1h = Ben Sira 39:27–43:30). On Ben Sira at Qumran, see Émile Puech, "Le Livre de Ben Sira et les Manuscripts de la Mer morte," in *Treasures of Wisdom: Studies in Ben Sira and the Book of Wisdom, Festschrift M. Gilbert* (ed. N. Calduch-Benages and J. Vermeylen; BETL 143; Leuven: Leuven University Press, Peeters, 1999), 411–426. On Ben Sira at Masada, see Yigael Yadin, *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1965).

[39] See Manfred R. Lehmann, "Ben Sira and Qumran Literature," *RevQ* 3 (1961–1962): 103–116; Jean Carmignac, "Les Rapports entre L'Ecclésiastique et Qumrân," *RevQ* 3 (1961–1962): 209–218, for shared traditions found in Ben Sira and the Qumran corpus and more recently, Puech, "Livre," 419–424, for allusions and citations of Ben Sira within the Qumran corpus.

[40] On this section in general, see bibliography above, p. 7, n. 17.

ities during the reign of Hezekiah (48:20–25).[41] For Ben Sira, Isaiah's prophetic revelation consists of the cultivation of revealed wisdom. In more general terms, the receipt of divine knowledge in Ben Sira is always a revelatory encounter.[42] The case of Isaiah, however, underscores the prophetic character of this experience.

Ben Sira describes Isaiah as looking into the future (חזה אחרית) (v. 24), the only such prophet who receives this treatment.[43] Isaiah's vision contains knowledge of "what should be (נהיות) till the end of time and hidden things (נסתרות) that were not yet fulfilled" (v. 25).[44] Never, however, does Ben Sira provide any information on the character of Isaiah's actual revelatory experience. How exactly would Isaiah gain understanding of the נהיות and the נסתרות? The only other use of these complementary terms in Ben Sira indicates that God transmits to Isaiah knowledge of these elements through the medium of revealed wisdom.[45] In 42:19, God, as wisdom, "makes known (מחוה) the past and the future (נהיות), and reveals (מגלה) the deepest secrets (נסתרות)." The combination of נהיות and נסתרות is not found in the Hebrew Bible and it is located in Ben Sira only in 42:19 and in the description of Isaiah's vision.[46] Moreover, the verbs employed in 42:19 are both of a revelatory nature.[47] Thus, Isaiah's revelation of the נהיות and נסתרות in 48:25 would likely proceed in the same manner. God will disclose the expected content through the medium of sapiential revelation.[48]

---

[41] All translations of Ben Sira come from Skehan and Di Lella, *Ben Sira*. The Hebrew text is drawn from *The Book of Ben Sira*.

[42] See Argall, *1 Enoch*, 53–98. See the extended discussion of this issue in ch. 15, pp. 310–315.

[43] See Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 67; Arie ver der Kooij, "'Coming' Things and 'Last' Things: Isaianic Terminology as Understood in the Wisdom of Ben Sira and in the Septuagint of Isaiah," in *The New Things: Eschatology in Old Testament Prophecy: Festschrift for Henk Leene* (ed. F. Postma, K. Spronk, and E. Talstra; ACEBT 3; Maastricht: Shaker, 2002), 135–137.

[44] See the similar sectarian terms *nigleh* and *nistar* as treated in ch. 16. See also the use of נהיות עולם in 4Q418 190 3.

[45] See James K. Aitken, "Apocalyptic, Revelation, and Early Jewish Wisdom Literature," in *New Heaven and New Earth: Prophecy and Millennium: Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston* (ed. P.J. Harland and C.T.R. Hayward; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1999), 190.

[46] See Beentjes, "Prophets," 143–144.

[47] Aitken, "Apocalyptic," 190.

[48] Cf. Matthias Henze, "Invoking the Prophets in Zechariah and Ben Sira," in *Prophets*, 130–131, who suggests that the end time events predicted by Isaiah refer to the as yet unfulfilled eschatological age. Henze further proposes these prophecies are in view in Ben Sira's earlier plea to "let your prophets be found trustworthy" (36:21).

Isaiah's access to divine revelation is recontextualized by Ben Sira as a sapiential revelatory encounter. Isaiah is described by Ben Sira as possessing secret knowledge concerning the future course of the world events. The receipt of this special wisdom is traced back to an immediate encounter with the divine. As seen above with Moses and David, Isaiah's prophetic status is reinforced by his receipt of divinely revealed wisdom. In addition, this passage provides more insight into the assumed content of sapiential revelation. Isaiah's revelation pertains to knowledge concerning the future. Of all the prophets in Ben Sira's Praise of the Fathers, only Isaiah is represented as predicting future events, and only Isaiah is conceptualized as the recipient of sapiential revelation.[49]

Summary

In this chapter, I have tracked the development of revealed wisdom from the Hebrew Bible through its appearance in apocryphal literature of the Second Temple period represented at Qumran. Sapiential texts in the Hebrew Bible present various models for the cultivation of wisdom. In one model, wisdom is revealed directly from God to select humans. In this model, however, no prophetic element is assumed. With the exception of the presentation of Balaam, no recipient of revealed wisdom is identified as a prophet or visionary. The location of revealed wisdom was transformed in the Second Temple period and began to be associated with prophetic revelation. I labeled this experience as sapiential revelation. In the three apocryphal passages examined above, divine knowledge is revealed from God to special individuals. In each of these passages, the recipient of this knowledge is a prophet from Israel's biblical past. Furthermore, these texts describe the transfer of knowledge as part of a prophetic revelatory experience. The following chapter turns to apocalyptic literature, where similar models of sapiential revelation are found.

[49] Ver der Kooij further notes that the term נהיות (τὰ εσόμενα) is likewise found in several near contemporary instances of revelatory exegesis (see Dan 2:45; Sibylline Oracles 3:164, 299, 822) ("Things," 137).

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

SAPIENTIAL REVELATION IN APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE PRESERVED AT QUMRAN

Apocalyptic literature preserved at Qumran testifies to an interest in prophecy and sapiential revelation similar to the apocryphal-sapiential texts discussed in the previous chapter.[1] The apocalyptic texts often portray ancient inspired figures as experiencing revelation through the divine transfer of knowledge. To be sure, many of the recipients of revelation in apocalyptic literature are not generally understood as prophets within the biblical framework. For example, Enoch, a popular personality in apocalyptic literature, is never presented in the Hebrew Bible as a prophet. Furthermore, apocalyptic literature does not identify Enoch as a prophet in the same manner as the classical prophets. At the same time, apocalyptic seers are clearly located as heirs to the classical prophets. This feature underscores the mixed heritage of apocalyptic literature and obscure character of apocalyptic seers. Apocalyptic is closely related to prophecy and fashions itself as one of the new ways in which God continues to reveal himself. Its revelatory framework, however, is clearly different from prophecy and its practitioners are rarely explicitly identified as prophets.

In the case of Enoch, for example, George W.E. Nickelsburg has proposed that the opening chapters of 1 Enoch replicate the style of a prophetic oracle and the Epistle of Enoch (chs. 92–105) is carefully constructed to imitate biblical prophetic literary forms.[2] Randal A. Argall

---

[1] Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 84; idem, "The Sage in the Apocalyptic and Pseudepigraphic Literature," in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages*, 345; repr. from Gammie and Perdue, eds., *Sage*, 343–354. On revelation in general in apocalyptic, see above, pp. 201–202. The generic distinction between sapiential texts and apocalyptic texts is far too rigid. To be sure, some texts contain material of a purely sapiential or apocalyptic character. Many apocalyptic texts, however, display a profound interest in sapiential concerns. Indeed, revealed wisdom is often a structuring element of apocalyptic literature. For a recent discussion of the blurring of these generic lines, see Torleif Elgvin, "Wisdom With and Without Apocalyptic," in *Sapiential, Liturgical, and Poetical Texts from Qumran*, 15–38.

[2] On the opening chapters, see George W.E. Nickelsburg, "'Enoch' as Scientist, Sage, and Prophet: Content, Function, and Authorship in 1 Enoch," *SBL Seminar Paper, 1999* (SBLSP 38; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999), 225. On the Epistle of

(followed by Nickelsburg) has further argued that Enoch's commission (chs. 14–16) is modeled after the call-narratives of biblical prophets.[3] This deliberate literary presentation, argues Nickelsburg, "strongly suggests that he sees his [i.e. Enoch's] role as analogous to that of the ancient prophets."[4] While there is much that separates Enoch from classical Israelite prophets, there seems to be an attempt by the authors of 1 Enoch to highlight the points of contact. Enoch, however, is never identified as a prophet in 1 Enoch or in the closely related Enoch traditions found at Qumran. Though he may display certain 'prophetic' characteristics, the Qumran community and most segments of Second Temple Judaism clearly did not think of him as a prophet.[5] At the same time, his receipt of sapiential revelation locates him in the new class of inspired individuals who continue to receive the divine word through modified modes of revelation.

A number of features mark the apocalyptic experience as different from that which has been encountered in the texts, biblical and non-biblical, surveyed in the previous chapter. In all these texts, wisdom is revealed from God to humans. At times, a divinely appointed medium is employed to actualize this transfer. Thus, the divine spirit, angels, and visions appear in many texts mediating sapiential revelation. The agents, however, are merely the means by which God is able to divulge the heavenly wisdom to select humans. In addition, the content of these revelatory experiences pertains to a more general understanding of how the natural world functions. To be sure, these texts reflect a wide variance in the actual content of the sapiential revelation. At the same time, the relevant texts generally share a non-eschatological framework. These two features, the method and content of the sapiential revelation, are dramatically different in apocalyptic literature.

In what follows, I examine the appearance of sapiential revelation in two central apocalyptic texts that are each featured prominently among the Qumran manuscripts—Daniel and 1 Enoch. Both texts were popu-

---

Enoch, see Nickelsburg, "The Apocalyptic Message of *1 Enoch* 92–105," *CBQ* 39 (1977): 309–328; idem, "Enoch," 220–221.

[3] Argall, *1 Enoch*, 29–30; Nickelsburg, "Enoch," 225.

[4] Nickelsburg, "Apocalyptic Message," 318. Nickelsburg, however, notes that the "nature and mode of revelation and inspiration" differ from the classical prophets. This point has already been made above.

[5] See, however, Jude 14–15, quoting *1 En.* 1:9, which is understood as Enoch's "prophecy" against the heretics mentioned in Jude. Such explicit testimony, however, is not found in the Enochic texts or in other traditions preserved at Qumran.

lar at Qumran, as evinced by the multiple manuscripts finds. 1 Enoch and Daniel represent well the heritage of apocalyptic literature from the late Second Temple period as well as the apocalyptic proclivity of the Qumran sectarian community.

Revealed Wisdom and Revelation in 1 Enoch

1 Enoch at Qumran[6]

Portions of 1 Enoch were among the first apocalyptic literature produced. The present Ethiopic text is generally understood to represent a composite of five original Enochic compositions.[7] The earliest of these texts are usually dated to the third and second centuries B.C.E.[8] Recent scholarship on 1 Enoch has argued that 1 Enoch is the product of a distinct social group within Second Temple Judaism, usually identi-

[6] Where Aramaic manuscript evidence exists for 1 Enoch, I cite the translation of the Aramaic text following Josef T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976). All translations of Ethiopic 1 Enoch come from George W.E. Nickelsburg and James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004). In general, Milik draws upon the Ethiopic text in order to reconstruct the lacunae in the Aramaic text.

[7] (1) The Book of Watchers (1–36); (2) The Book of Parables (37–71); (3) The Astronomical Book (72–82); (4) The Dream Visions (83–91); (5) The Epistle of Enoch (92–105). Chapters 106–107 are also an independent composition, which recounts the birth of Noah (cf. 1QapGen 2; 1Q19). Some of these Enochic booklets are themselves composite works. The Book of Dreams contains the earlier Animal Apocalypse (85–90). The Epistle contains the earlier Apocalypse of Weeks (93:1–10; 91:11–17). On the Enochic texts in general and the history of their composition, see Michael E. Stone, "The Books of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century B.C.E.," in *Emerging Judaism: Studies on the Fourth & Third Centuries B.C.E* (ed. M.E. Stone and D. Satran; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 61–75; repr. from *CBQ* 40 (1978): 479–492; Ephraim Isaac, "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *OTP* 1:5–12; Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 43–84; James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 110–178; George W.E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36, 81–108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001).

[8] Aside from the Parables, the other four sections are all assigned pre-Maccabean or Maccabean dates. The Astronomical Book is usually dated to the late third or early second century B.C.E. Likewise, the Book of Watchers is assigned a date prior to the Maccabean revolt. The Animal Apocalypse, embedded in the Book of Dreams, is generally dated to time of the Maccabean revolt. See the precise dates suggested in VanderKam, *Enoch*, 110–178, as well as the more general treatments cited in the previous note.

fied as Enochic Judaism.[9] Portions of four out of these five booklets were discovered among the Qumran library in eleven manuscripts.[10] No manuscript evidence for the Book of Parables (chs. 37–71) or chapter 108 exists at Qumran. Whether Milik's late dating for the Parables is accepted, it is clear that it was not known to the Qumran community.[11] The Book of Giants, found at Qumran in six manuscripts, represents a literary tradition closely related to the Enochic tradition.[12]

The Qumran manuscript evidence must direct any discussion of Enoch and its influence within the Qumran community. While Daniel and Ben Sira, for example, likely existed at Qumran close to the later forms in which they are now known, this is certainly not the case for Enoch. Any treatment of Enoch must focus exclusively on the portions of the text for which manuscript evidence exists. At the same time, parts of the Ethiopic text not represented at Qumran can generally be relied upon if portions of the larger booklet are found at Qumran.[13]

---

[9] See, in particular, the discussion in Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 64–67. Even if Enochic Judaism is not as widespread as suggested by some recent scholarship, it seems likely that 1 Enoch was actually composed by a community of like-minded individuals, rather than just a singular author.

[10] For the Qumran Enoch manuscripts, see Milik, *Enoch*. Additional Qumran Enoch fragments are published by Loren Stuckenbruck and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar and Florentino García Martínez, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI*, 3–171. For recent discussion of the possible Cave 7 Greek manuscripts, see Peter W. Flint, "The Greek Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7," in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (ed. G. Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 224–233; George W.E. Nickelsburg, "The Greek Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7: An Unproven Identification," *RevQ* 21 (2004): 631–634.

[11] Milik argued that the Book of Parables was a late Christian composition produced in the third century C.E. (*Enoch*, 89–98). Milik's late dating and ascription of Christian provenance is not universally accepted. See James C. VanderKam, "Some Major Issues in the Contemporary Study of 1 Enoch: Reflections on J.T. Milik's *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*," in *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* (JSJSup 62; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000), 359–361; repr. from *MAARAV* 3 (1982): 85–97; Isaac, "1 Enoch," 1:7. At the same time, most commentators locate the composition of this section in the first century C.E. See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 7.

[12] See Loren Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Giants from Qumran* (TSAJ 63; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997); Puech, *Qumran Cave 4.XXVII*, 9–115. Milik suggested that the Book of Giants was the fifth section of the original Enochic collection, fulfilling the role later played by the Book of Parables (*Enoch*, 57–58). Though Milik's proposal has not been widely accepted, it is clear that the traditions in the Book of Giants are related to those that appear in the Enochic collection. See further VanderKam, "Reflections," 361–362; John C. Reeves, "Giants, Book of," *EDSS* 1:309–311.

[13] For example, the Book of Watchers as a larger Enochic booklet is well attested at Qumran though not for every passage. Unless other forms of analysis deem any

Portions of Enoch that existed within the Qumran library testify to a series of developments regarding sapiential revelation that took place within an apocalyptic framework. Moreover, the text was presumably a popular book in the Qumran community.[14] As such, it bears witness to important early trends within early apocalyptic literature that were likely influential in fashioning the apocalyptic worldview of the Qumran community.[15] 1 Enoch, like its biblical predecessors and contemporary literature, according to Nickelsburg, "is also concerned with divinely revealed wisdom."[16] 1 Enoch, however, presents at times a strikingly different model of the means by which this knowledge is transmitted. The content of this knowledge in 1 Enoch also differs from that which has already been seen.[17]

Enoch and Sapiential Revelation

Like many of the biblical wisdom texts, 1 Enoch acknowledges that all knowledge and understanding resides exclusively with God. Thus, Enoch praises God's absolute control over wisdom: "Wisdom does not escape you, and it does not turn away from your throne, nor from your presence. You know and see and hear all things, and there is nothing

particular passage to be late, it should be assumed that it would have existed within the Qumran manuscripts and was therefore known to the Qumran community.

[14] On Enoch in the Qumran corpus and community, see Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 18–24; George W.E. Nickelsburg, "The Books of Enoch at Qumran: What We Know and What We Need to Think About," in *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65 Geburtstag* (ed. B. Kollman, W. Reinbold, and A. Steudel; BZNW 97; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999), 99–113; idem, *1 Enoch*, 76–78. Milik observes that the Enoch manuscript evidence indicates that Enochic texts were copied with less frequency in the later stages of the Qumran community's existence (*Enoch*, 6–7). He suggests that this phenomenon implies that the community gradually lost interest in the Enochic writings over time. Boccaccini proposes that the Qumran community represents a schismatic offshoot of the larger Enochic community, which itself should be identified with more widespread Essenism (*Beyond*). The possible relationship between the group(s) responsible for the production of 1 Enoch and the Qumran community is further explored in several articles collected in Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and Qumran Origins*.

[15] See Nickelsburg, "Enoch," 1:251.

[16] George W.E. Nickelsburg, "Revealed Wisdom as a Criterion for Inclusion and Exclusion: From Jewish Sectarianism to Early Christianity," in *"To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Christians, Jews, "Others," in Late Antiquity* (ed. J. Neusner and E.S. Frerichs; Chico: Scholars Press, 1986), 74.

[17] In general, I am not as concerned with identifying and classifying the content of revelation in 1 Enoch. For closer analysis of this feature, see Argall, *1 Enoch*, 17–52. My interest here is primarily in the mechanics of revelation and the sapiential character of its application.

that is hidden from you" (*1 En.* 84:3; cf. 9:4–11). Like other sapiential texts, 1 Enoch also conceives of God as disclosing this knowledge to select human beings through a sapiential revelatory experience.[18] Thus, in the Apocalypse of Weeks, after the apostate generation of the seventh week appears, "the chosen will be chosen, as witnesses of righteousness from the everlasting plant of righteousness" will emerge. From God, they will "receive sevenfold wisdom and knowledge" (*1 En.* 93:10//4Q212 1 iv 13).[19]

How is this sapiential revelatory experience conceptualized? The opening verses of the introduction to the Book of the Watchers provide a framework for the receipt of the revealed wisdom and Enoch's role in its further dissemination:

> And taking up] his parable [he] said, "[Enoch, a just man to whom a vision from God was disclosed: The vision of the Holy One and of heaven was shown to me], and from the word of [the Watchers] and the holy one [I heard] it all; [and because I heard from them, I knew and I understood everything; not for] this generation, but for a far-off generation I shall speak. [And concerning the elect I now say, and about them I took up my parable and said.]" (4Q201 1 i 2–4//*1 En.* 1:2–3)[20]

This introduction identifies Enoch as a recipient of divinely revealed wisdom gained as a result of a direct encounter with God and his mediating celestial agents. Though Enoch is described as having learned "everything," no details are provided concerning the exact contents of this revealed wisdom. The focus on future generations likely points to a heightened eschatological content for this knowledge.

This introduction also serves to identify the intended audience of Enoch's newfound wisdom. While Enoch's sapiential experience is partly guided by his own attempt to amass divine knowledge, he is here further entrusted with the task of transmitting this wisdom and understanding to future generations. Presumably, this is the intended audience of the Enochic books. The focus here on the receipt of revealed wisdom by future eschatological communities is further reinforced by

---

[18] See Gruenwald, "Knowledge," 70–71.

[19] Following the Aramaic text: שבעה פ[עמי]ן חכמה ומדע תתיה[ב להון] (Milik, *Enoch*, 265). The Ethiopic text continues here with "concerning all his creation." Nickelsburg opines that the Ethiopic text represents a later insertion after 91:11–17 was removed from its original context and situated directly following 93:10 (*1 Enoch*, 436). The sevenfold knowledge concerning creation found in 91:11–17 was then read back into the immediately preceding literary unit. On the presumed original framework of the knowledge in 93:10, see Nickelsburg, "Revealed Wisdom," 75; idem, *1 Enoch*, 448.

[20] Milik, *Enoch*, 141–142.

the final verses of the introduction to the Book of Watchers: "Then wisdom will be given to all the chosen; and they will all live, and they will sin no more through godlessness or pride" (5:8). The expression "to give wisdom," observes Argall, is a technical phrase that presupposes Enoch's revelatory experience.[21] Thus, the beginning and end of the introduction to the Book of Watchers emphasize Enoch's unique role in imparting revealed wisdom to future generations and the salvific power of this knowledge. Unlike 1:2–3, the latter verse provides no explicit description of how Enoch's initial revelation is experienced.

The opening verses of the introduction to the Book of Watchers provide some clues concerning the source of Enoch's revelation. Enoch's wisdom is cultivated through a visionary experience. Thus, Enoch's "eyes were opened by God" and he "had a vision of the Holy One" (cf. Num 24:4). This visionary encounter likely refers to the whole series of Enoch's heavenly visions described in later chapters (chs. 14–15).[22] Enoch's status as a visionary is further emphasized at the end of his initial journey (chs. 17–19), which itself forms the conclusion to the first portion of 1 Enoch.[23] In language intended to mirror 1:2, Enoch claims "I, Enoch, alone saw the visions, the extremities of all things. And no one among humans has seen as I saw" (19:3).[24]

The prophetic revelatory character of Enoch's visions in 1:2–3 is further underscored by the application to Enoch of language and imagery associated with Moses.[25] The opening line of the introduction, "The words of the blessing with which Enoch blessed the righteous chosen," draws upon Deut 33:1, the superscription to Moses' farewell blessing to Israel. Thus, 1 Enoch places Enoch's revelation at least equal to that of Moses, perhaps even greater since Enoch's prophecy would have predated that of Moses.[26]

The most important literary element in this introduction is the dependency on the oracles of Balaam, a feature noted by nearly all commentators.[27] Just as Balaam "took up his discourse," so too Enoch "took up his discourse" (καὶ ἀναλαβὼν τὴν παραβαλὴν αὐτοῦ; ונסב]

---

[21] Argall, *1 Enoch*, 20.
[22] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 139.
[23] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 289.
[24] See Argall, *1 Enoch*, 31.
[25] See discussion in Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 135–136.
[26] Argall, *1 Enoch*, 18.
[27] See, for example, VanderKam, *Enoch*, 115–119; Argall, *1 Enoch*, 19–20; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 137–139.

מתלוה]י).[28] This follows the earlier correspondence with the visionary language of Balaam's revelation identified above. These literary points of contact with Balaam are no coincidence. Rather, they are intended to authenticate Enoch's revealed wisdom by appeal to a visionary whose own receipt of wisdom is strikingly similar to Enoch's.[29] As noted in the previous chapter, Balaam is the only prophet whose prophetic character is framed within the context of the sapiential revelatory experience. Like Balaam, Enoch is both a sage and a recipient of revelation. As a sage, Enoch receives his wisdom through channels normally reserved for prophets. As an inspired individual, Enoch's revelation is suffused with sapiential elements and eschatological speculation.

The introduction to the Book of Watchers identifies two contexts for Enoch's receipt of divinely revealed wisdom—Enoch's own cultivation of sapiential revelation and the dissemination of this knowledge to further generations. Enoch's personal revelatory experience is recounted in different places throughout the book. The basic framework is as follows: chapters 12–16 describe how Enoch's days were spent with the Watchers and the holy ones in the heavenly throne room.[30] The ensuing chapters recount Enoch's various travels through the cosmos and the associated visions.[31] Finally, Enoch views the heavenly tablets with their description of "all the actions of people and of all humans" (81:2). At this point, Enoch reports that his guides on the celestial journey "brought me and set me on the earth in front of the gate to my house" (81:5). He is then instructed to compose an account of his celestial journeys that will be read by future (righteous) generations (81:5–82:3). The sum of Enoch's testimony is encapsulated in the speech he delivers to his son Methuselah concerning the content of Enoch's literary output (82:1–2).[32] When exactly and through what means does Enoch's revelatory experience take place?

---

[28] On the translation of מתל here as 'discourse,' rather than the more common 'parable,' see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 138–139. In addition, Nickelsburg prefers the singular form attested in the Greek (MS Akhmim) rather than the plural assumed in the Qumran manuscript (p. 137; cf. Milik, *Enoch*, 142).

[29] VanderKam, *Enoch*, 118.

[30] Nickelsburg, "Revealed Wisdom," 77.

[31] See Martha Himmelfarb, "From Prophecy to Apocalypse: The Book of Watchers and Tours of Heaven," in *Jewish Spirituality from the Bible through the Middle Ages* (ed. A. Green; New York: Crossroad, 1986), 145–170.

[32] On the literary framework of 81:5–82:3 and the content of the revelation, see Argall, *1 Enoch*, 21–24. The Qumran manuscripts of the Astronomical Book unfortunately did not yield any fragments from this section.

Throughout the testimony that Enoch composes recounting his revelatory experiences, mention is often made of how this wisdom was cultivated. The clearest statement to this effect in found in the introduction to the Apocalypse of Weeks:

> Enoch [took up] his discourse, saying: ['Concerning the children of righteousness and about the elect of the world who have grown] up from a plant of truth [and of justice, behold, I will speak and will make (it) known unto you], my sons, I Enoch, I have been shown [everything in a heavenly vision, and from] the word of the Watchers and Holy Ones I have known everything; [and in the heavenly tablets I] have read everything [and understoo]d. (4Q212 1 iii 18–22 // *1 En.* 93:1–2)

This literary unit parallels the opening verses of the introduction to the Book of Watchers discussed above (1:2–3).[33] The literary dependency on Balaam's oracles was noted in the treatment of the earlier passage. Here as well, Enoch's visionary experience is likened to that of Balaam.[34] In 1:2–3, Enoch merely identifies the source of his wisdom as emanating from God, though never provides any further details concerning the exact manner in which this revealed knowledge was cultivated. Accordingly, the literary correspondence between Balaam and Enoch is somehow deficient. Balaam's oracular knowledge is traced back to his "knowledge of the Most High" (Num 24:16); 1 Enoch is less revealing.[35] The introduction to the Apocalypse of Weeks fills in this gap. Parallel to the recognition of Balaam's divine knowledge, the source of Enoch's revelation is more closely identified as his careful examination of the heavenly tablets.[36] The heavenly tablets are identified together with the words of the Watchers and holy ones as the ultimate source of Enoch's revealed wisdom.[37]

This passage fulfills an important function as the introduction to the Apocalypse of Weeks. As seen with similar *ex eventu* prophecies in Pseudo-Daniel and the Apocryphon of Jeremiah, the prophet must make some claim regarding the source of his knowledge concerning events that post-date the historical prophet. A similar concern to identify the source of the revelation is found here at the beginning of

---

33 A feature observed by most commentators. See VanderKam, *Enoch*, 153; Argall, *1 Enoch*, 40–41; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 138.

34 See VanderKam, *Enoch*, 153; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 138.

35 See the chart provided in Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 138.

36 This slight distinction is noted by Argall, *1 Enoch*, 41.

37 VanderKam, *Enoch*, 150–151 (cf. Nickelsburg, "Apocalyptic Message," 326).

Enoch's review of history.[38] Throughout the Apocalypse, Enoch employs language intended to emphasize further the revealed character of his special knowledge.[39] In the introduction, Enoch cites both the angelic word and the heavenly tablets as the revelatory basis for this understanding of the future. More curious, however, is the role of the heavenly tablets as the primary source for his newfound knowledge.[40]

Enoch's appeal to the revelatory character of the heavenly tablets in the introduction to the Apocalypse of Weeks is grounded in their centrality throughout Enoch's prior revelatory experience. At the end of his revelatory journey, Enoch describes one final divine revelation in which one of God's angels instructs him: "look, Enoch, at these heavenly tablets, and read what is written on them, and learn every individual fact" (81:1). After heeding the divine directive, Enoch declares that he "learned everything" concerning all people and the future course of the world (81:2). As the final revelation on his journey, these passages frame the entire revelatory character of Enoch's journey and reinforce the divine origins of Enoch's own literary description of this encounter.[41] In doing so, this literary unit presents the heavenly tablets as the ultimate source of Enoch's revelatory knowledge.

This same notion is echoed elsewhere in the book of Enoch, where knowledge gained from the tablets and the celestial agents is equated with wisdom obtained directly from God: "For I know the mysteries [of the Lord which] the Holy Ones have told me and showed me, [and which] I read [in the tablets] of heaven" (4Q204 5 ii 26–27 // *1 En.* 106:19).[42] The literary framework showing how wisdom was revealed to Enoch is indicated in Enoch's introduction to his own documentation of this knowledge for future generations: "…I swear to you that I know this mystery. For I have read the tablets of heaven, and I have seen the writing of what must be, and I know the things that are written in them and inscribed concerning you" (103:1–2). As in the introduction to the Apocalypse of Weeks, Enoch points to his revelatory encounter with the heavenly tablets as the basis for his claim to have special knowledge regarding the ultimate fate of the righteous.

---

[38] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 441.

[39] Nickelsburg, "Apocalyptic Message," 315–317.

[40] For recent discussion and bibliography on the heavenly tablets in 1 Enoch, see Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 62–63, n. 55.

[41] Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 339.

[42] The translation here again follows the Aramaic against the Ethiopic. See discussion in Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 539.

Collins correctly observes that Enoch's wisdom is presented as "derived from heavenly revelation."[43] In this limited sense, the revelatory experience of Enoch is similar to that which is found in the biblical wisdom books and assumed for Moses and David in 4Q378 and 11Q5 and for Isaiah in Ben Sira. Knowledge is transmitted from the divine realm to a select human individual through the medium of revelation. Enoch's own revelation differs, however, in the manner of transmission. Enoch does not merely receive the revelation directly from God or even his heavenly agents. To be sure, angels are often present in Enoch's revelation. More consistently, however, Enoch gains access to the divine mysteries and special wisdom through access to the heavenly tablets. All the knowledge that God wishes to impart to those select individuals is somehow located within the heavenly tablets. By gaining access to the tablets and learning of their contents, Enoch has experienced the full range of sapiential revelation. He does not enjoy an unmediated audience with God, who would reveal divine secrets to Enoch. Rather, he must undergo this process through the intervening medium of the tablets.

Enoch, Revelation, and the Righteous Community

Enoch's revelatory experience mirrors that which is envisioned for his righteous descendents.[44] Indeed, this is to be expected since Enoch himself is the prototype for this future righteous group.[45] Throughout Enoch's 'instruction' for these future generations, he repeatedly alludes to several written works that he composed.[46] The written works, much like the book of 1 Enoch for the community that produced it, are intended to provide a context for the sapiential revelation of these later generations. This model is encapsulated in Enoch's discourse to his son Methuselah after returning from his heavenly journey:

> Now my son Methuselah, I am telling you all these things and am writing (them) down. I have revealed all of them to you and have given you the books about all these things. My son, keep the book written by your father so that you may give (it) to the generations of the world. Wisdom

---

[43] Collins, "The Sage in Apocalyptic and Pseudepigraphic Literature," in *The Sage*, 341.

[44] See Nickelsburg, "Enoch," 223.

[45] Collins, "Sage," 342.

[46] See discussion in Schiffman, "Pseudepigrapha," 431–432.

> I have given to you and to your children and to those who will be your children so that they may give this wisdom which is beyond their thought to their children for the generations. (82:1–2)

Enoch describes his literary contribution to later generations as the bestowal of wisdom cultivated during his time in the heavenly throne room and while on his numerous journeys through the cosmos (cf. 93:2). Enoch, the beneficiary of direct sapiential revelation, composes books that now function as a source of revealed wisdom for future generations (82:1–5; 92:1).[47] Presumably, this literary wisdom is the knowledge bestowed upon the righteous at the end of the seventh week (93:10).[48]

Elsewhere after describing his sapiential revelatory experience, Enoch remarks that this same knowledge is now accessible in written form (his own writing) for all future righteous generations. After recounting his own knowledge of the mysteries and describing how sinners will compose false treatises, he expresses his own understanding of how his literary output will be properly transmitted:

> Would that they would write all my words in truth, and neither remove nor alter these words, but write in truth all that I testify to them. And again I know a second mystery, that to the righteous and pious and wise my books will be given for the joys of righteousness and much wisdom. Indeed, to them the books will be given, and they will believe in them, and in them all the righteous will rejoice and be glad, to learn from them all the paths of truth. (104:11–13)

In this passage, future righteous generations who desire to gain access to revealed wisdom will do so through various written works. This notion is likewise explicitly found in the passage cited above where Enoch introduces his literary production to his son Methuselah. Enoch's literary description of his own acquisition of knowledge will serve as the core element of the sapiential curriculum.

The sapiential revelatory experience described in 1 Enoch in many ways is indebted to earlier wisdom literature found within the Hebrew Bible. It also contains many points of contact with contemporary sapiential traditions. Each of these traditions assumes that wisdom ulti-

[47] Nickelsburg, "Revelation," 97. See also the later 37:4–5 where the Book of Parables (chs. 37–71) is described as a collection of revealed wisdom intended for some future group. See Nickelsburg, "Revealed Wisdom," 78.

[48] See Argall, *1 Enoch*, 42.

mately resides with God alone and that full attainment of this divine knowledge can only take place through revelation. 1 Enoch differs, however, in three specific aspects—content, form, and audience. Biblical wisdom is focused on gaining some degree of understanding of the order of the world and God's particular role in this reality. The evidence surveyed above taken from Qumran and Ben Sira attests to similar, through slightly modified, interests. Absent from either of these wisdom traditions is any eschatological contemplation. Eschatological speculation is one of the hallmarks of apocalyptic literature, and the sapiential traditions contained therein. Enoch's wisdom is at times focused on specifically cosmological and earthy matters.[49] More often, it spans across a wide range of so-called earthly matters alongside newly emerging eschatological concerns.[50] Within this vast scope, the redacted 1 Enoch as well as several places in its earlier compositional history are uniquely focused on eschatological speculation and forecasting the nature of the final salvation.[51]

With respect to form, Enoch, unlike other recipients of sapiential revelation, does not experience an unmediated sapiential revelation from God. Enoch's revelation is sometimes encountered through the agency of the divine celestial beings. More often, his receipt of divine wisdom is mediated through a literary intermediary—the heavenly tablets. The later righteous community (the Enochic community?) is also granted access to revealed wisdom. They, too, experience this revelation through a literary medium. Divine knowledge is disclosed to them through Enoch's own literary compositions.[52]

Finally, 1 Enoch differs to some extent in its conceptualization of the audience to whom sapiential revelation is directed. Enoch is a beneficiary of revealed wisdom on account of his exalted status. The future generations who will gain access to Enoch's writings and thus to divine knowledge are singled out as appropriate recipients because they are deemed to be righteous. Knowledge is reserved for select individuals. To be sure, biblical wisdom traditions and the non-apocalyptic Second Temple models are selective to a certain extant. Apocalyptic revealed knowledge, however, is far more restrictive than its antecedents in deter-

[49] See the brief treatment of this phenomenon in Nickelsburg, "Revelation," 96–97.
[50] See Nickelsburg, "Enoch," 221–223; idem, "Revelation," 97–98.
[51] Nickelsburg, "Enoch," 223.
[52] For further on the literary medium of revelation, see Argall, *1 Enoch*, 94–97.

mining who can gain access to revealed knowledge.[53] Revealed wisdom is both a prerequisite for entrance into this select community and a benefit of having been initiated as a member.[54]

Revealed Wisdom and Revelation in Daniel

The apocalyptic model of revelation in 1 Enoch is likewise found in the presentation of revealed wisdom in Daniel. Some of its elements, however, are far more muted than 1 Enoch, and are much closer to more general attitudes toward sapiential revelation. The model of Daniel as a recipient of sapiential revelation should be understood in conjunction with the discussion in chapter eleven of Daniel as an active participant in the process of revelatory exegesis (Daniel 9). Both of these traditions come together in the book of Daniel in order to identify the new modes of revelation that Daniel experiences. Daniel is the paradigmatic example of the newly emerging Second Temple period prophetic figure. His revelation is experienced through the reading and rewriting of earlier prophetic traditions as well as the receipt of revealed wisdom. These newer revelatory models are integrated into the dreams and visions that Daniel experiences.

The often repeated claim that God is the revealer of mysteries to humans finds expression in Daniel's hymn of praise to God as thanks for providing him with the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream. Daniel extols God, "for wisdom and praise are his" (2:20). He proceeds to describe how God has complete dominion over the natural world as "he gives wisdom to sages and knowledge to the insightful" (2:21). More specifically, he thanks God, "for you have given me wisdom and power" (2:23).[55] This passage brings to mind the earlier notice that God granted Daniel "insight into all visions and dreams" (1:17). At the conclusion of Daniel's hymn, he is taken before Nebuchadnezzar and proceeds to interpret his dream properly. Before beginning with the interpretation, Daniel emphasizes that his understanding emerges from the knowledge

---

[53] Indeed, Elgvin, "Wisdom With and Without Apocalyptic," 16, suggests that this phenomenon should be included among the distinctive features that mark a text as apocalyptic.

[54] Cf. Nickelsburg, "Revealed Wisdom," 74–79.

[55] "Power" renders the Aramaic גבורתא. LXX has φρόνησιν "practical wisdom." See further, Collins, *Daniel*, 150.

revealed to him from God (2:28). The contents of this interpretation are further qualified as relating to the "end of days" (2:28).

In this pericope, many of the trademark features of apocalyptic sapiential revelation are encountered. Daniel seeks special knowledge from God, who obliges his request. Daniel is only able to enjoy the benefit of this revealed knowledge on account of his membership in the class of sages and knowledgeable ones. This insight, later singled out for its uniquely divine origins, is transmitted to Daniel in a revelatory night vision. The knowledge that Daniel received in this vision contains the exact interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream. Later, however, further information concerning the exact contents of this revealed knowledge is provided. Nebuchadnezzar's dream, and therefore Daniel's own vision, relate matters pertaining to the end of days.[56]

In the second half of the book, Daniel himself is the primary recipient of visions and dreams.[57] In chapter seven, Daniel experiences a series of revelations concerning the beasts of the sea and the appearance of "one like a human being" (7:1–14). Unable to decipher the meaning of these visions properly (7:15), Daniel seeks counsel from "one of the attendants" (7:16). The attendant here is most likely an angel and perhaps also a member of the heavenly council.[58] The attendant performs the same role that Daniel had previously executed as a sage and dream interpreter in Nebuchadnezzar's court. The attendant speaks to Daniel and makes known to him the proper interpretation of the vision (7:16). Like Daniel had done previously for Nebuchadnezzar, the attendant acts as the revelatory intermediary transmitting to Daniel the full understanding of the divine knowledge encoded within the vision. The revelatory experience of Daniel in chapter seven is mirrored in chapter eight. Baffled by the contents of his vision (8:1–14), Daniel again seeks some understanding of its meaning (8:15). As in chapter seven, a heavenly figure, here described as "one in the likeness of a human being," appears in order to provide instruction for Daniel.[59] This individual proceeds to elucidate fully the meaning of the vision, emphasizing in

[56] Many scholars have noted that the biblical term אחרית הימים (end of days) need not only refer to an eschatological time-frame. This usage, however, seems to dominate post-exilic usage and is clearly present in the employment of the term in Daniel. See Collins, *Daniel*, 161.

[57] On the dating of Daniel and the relationship of chs. 1–6 to 7–12, see above, p. 213, n. 1.

[58] Collins, *Daniel*, 277, 311.

[59] On the angelic character of this figure, see Collins, *Daniel*, 304–310.

particular that the vision relates to the end of days (8:17). Throughout the remainder of the book, angelic figures continue to impart divine wisdom to Daniel (9:22; 10:11; 12:8–9).[60] The role of angelic intermediaries is different from Enoch. Daniel requires angelic assistance in order to understand the visions and dreams. For Enoch, angels are merely his guides on the otherworldly journeys.

As already seen in 1 Enoch, the revealed wisdom cultivated by Daniel is expected to be passed on to later righteous and enlightened generations. Thus, the final address to Daniel instructs him to "keep the words secret and seal the book until the time of the end" (12:4; cf. 12:9). Daniel is told here to compose in written form the contents of his revelation and hide them until they will be read by later generations. The final verses of the book describe what will take place in this expected end time. At this point, most of the wicked will continue to act wickedly and not understand. Knowledge, however, will increase (ותרבה הדעת) (12:4),[61] and the wise will understand (והמשכילים יבינו) (12:10). Daniel's initial revelations and their proper interpretations are now canonized in literary form. The *Maskilim*, representing the later righteous generation, are to be the ones who conceive of Daniel's revealed wisdom as the basis for their own understanding. As seen in 1 Enoch, a two-fold revelatory experience is envisioned. First, the ancient figure receives the revelation. This earlier revelatory experience is then made available to later generations through a literary medium assumed to have been composed by the ancient figure himself. The revealed wisdom, however, is restricted to a select group of individuals, here identified as the *Maskilim*.[62]

The eschatological orientation of revealed wisdom places Daniel's sapiential revelation within the same apocalyptic framework as 1 Enoch. The two works share an assumption that knowledge is revealed exclusively to select individuals who are members of an enlightened and

[60] Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 75.

[61] Following MT (and Theodotion and Jerome). See, however, Collins, *Daniel*, 399, "and evil will increase," following the Old Greek.

[62] Collins is correct that the command to seal up the revelation in a book does not presuppose that the content of this knowledge is esoteric and reserved for special individuals (*Daniel*, 341–342). Rather, it is necessitated by the pseudepigraphic character of the book. At the same time, the epilogue to Daniel clearly restricts access to this knowledge to the *Maskilim* and those that join them in the end of days. To be sure, the *Maskilim* are described as instructing the common people (11:34). This does not, however, assume that they will disclose to them the full range of revealed wisdom.

righteous class. Like 1 Enoch as well, the content of Daniel's revelatory wisdom relates to eschatological speculation. The literary medium found in 1 Enoch, however, is less pronounced in Daniel.[63] Daniel's visions generally do not assume the presence of a literary medium similar to the heavenly tablets available to Enoch. Rather, Daniel's revealed wisdom is mediated through the agency of angelic figures. These angelic characters, however, are far more active intermediaries than the heavenly agents found in non-apocalyptic wisdom literature.

The literary medium does appear in the second phase of the revelatory experience. The group that is heir to Daniel's revelatory knowledge, the *Maskilim*, gain access to this wisdom through Daniel's written record of his visions and revelation. The larger phenomenon of sapiential revelation locates 1 Enoch and Daniel within the same wisdom traditions discussed above. These particular features, however, mark a particular sapiential-apocalyptic framework for the phenomenon of sapiential revelation.

Summary

Revealed wisdom in the Hebrew Bible is a feature of the Israelite sapiential traditions. Confronted with the difficulty of accessing divine knowledge, some wisdom circles responded by emphasizing the divine origin of all knowledge concerning the natural world and God's role within it. The Second Temple period witnessed a dramatic shift in the way in which this sapiential experience was conceptualized as an encounter with the divine. The receipt of divinely revealed knowledge began to be understood as a revelatory experience in continuity with ancient prophetic revelation.

In exploring this phenomenon, two related literary corpora were examined. The first consists of three apocryphal compositions that reconceptualize the prophetic experience of three prophets from Israel's biblical past—Moses (Apocryphon of Joshua), David (Psalms Scroll) and Isaiah (Ben Sira). The prophetic status of each of these figures was well established in the Second Temple period. Their prophetic character derived from their experience of divine revelation both in

[63] The primary exception is Daniel 9, which is discussed at length in ch. 11. This chapter, however, is not interested in revealed wisdom like Daniel's other visions treated here.

the Hebrew Bible and in Second Temple literature that continues their prophetic story. In the literature surveyed, however, their prophetic status is inextricably linked to their receipt of divinely revealed knowledge. The transmission of revealed wisdom is presented as the precise mechanism of their revelatory encounter and conceptualized as the sum of their prophetic experience.

The treatment of sapiential revelation in apocalyptic literature concentrated on Enoch and Daniel. The sapiential revelatory experience in these two texts shares many characteristics with the non-apocalyptic texts. The receipt of revealed wisdom is further conceptualized in continuity with classical modes of prophetic revelation. Enoch and Daniel are portrayed as heirs to the classical prophetic tradition. Whereas the classical biblical prophets received the word of God through numerous modes of direct revelation, Enoch and Daniel are recipients of revelation through the sapiential encounter with the divine. For Enoch, the transmission of this knowledge is facilitated by celestial beings, a feature found in other works as well, and through the literary medium of the heavenly tablets. This latter feature is unique to the apocalyptic context. This literary medium is further emphasized in the continued transmission of the apocalyptic seer's newfound revealed knowledge. Both Enoch and Daniel preserve their knowledge for future generations through the creation of literary compositions. Enoch received his revelation through a literary medium. So too the future righteous generations will reenact that revelatory experience through the reading of the Enochic corpus.[64]

I began chapter ten by observing that the Hebrew Bible itself testifies to the emergence of new revelatory models within which the divine word is transmitted to the Israelite prophet. With the gradual attenuation of classical prophecy and the attendant modes of revelation, alternate revelatory media became increasingly prominent and important in Second Temple Judaism. The transition from classical prophecy did not signify the end of communication between the human and divine realms. Rather, the revelatory framework in which the divine word was transmitted began to manifest itself in dramatically different ways.

[64] A literary medium for the revelation of wisdom seems also to be found in 4Q541 7 1–2 (4QapocrLevi[b]? ar). The literary medium in which divine wisdom is revealed is similar to Philo's use of the Logos as a medium for the transmission of divine wisdom. See Harry A. Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (2 vols.; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947), 1:253–282.

Nonetheless, this revelatory encounter was conceptualized as the continuation of classical Israelite prophecy.[65]

This set of assumptions and conclusions is the result of the examination of how individuals from Israel's prophetic past and their prophetic experience are re-presented within various Second Temple period texts represented at Qumran. As suggested in previous chapters, the portrait of prophets and prophecy in much of Second Temple period literature greatly informs the contemporary understanding of the role of the prophet and the nature of divine revelation. The study of revelation within this methodological framework proves to be no exception. These four chapters have tracked this phenomenon within the framework of two newly emerging revelatory models. Revelatory exegesis and sapiential revelation appear as two of the more ubiquitous media for divine revelation in the Second Temple period. Their prominence in the non-sectarian Qumran corpus is bound up with their increasing importance within the Second Temple Judaism and the Qumran community itself. Second Temple Judaism and Qumran in particular saw these two revelatory models as a way in which the seemingly dormant institution of biblical prophecy and divine revelation persisted into the late Second Temple period.

Two additional questions should be addressed before concluding: the relationship of these revelatory media to apocalypticism and their exact relationship to classical prophecy. At the outset, I remarked that most scholarly treatments of revelation in the Second Temple period have focused on its appearance within apocalyptic literature. I suggested that this phenomenon is grounded in the foundational role that revelation plays within apocalyptic. Indeed, the present study has certainly born out these same conclusions. More importantly, however, the last four chapters have demonstrated that revelation in Second Temple Judaism cuts across generic classificatory models. Had this analysis been restricted to apocalyptic literature, revelatory exegesis and sapiential revelation would still have been encountered. At the same time, their appearance within the apocalyptic corpus represents only a small segment of their full application in the Second Temple period. The focus on the revelatory phenomena locates apocalyptic revelation within the larger context of Second Temple Judaism and its continued interest in the transmission of the divine word and will to the human realm.

---

[65] See further, Gruenwald, "Knowledge," 68.

Finally, I argued that the gradual attenuation of classical prophecy in the early post-exilic period does not indicate that Second Temple Judaism or the Qumran community recognized its complete disappearance. The previous four chapters have demonstrated that the Qumran community and contemporaneous Judaism were still interested in understanding the mechanics of prophecy and revelation and its current application. At the same time, the evidence suggests that they clearly recognized a significant distinction between the world of the classical prophets and any prophetic encounter experienced in the present.

This suggestion seems to find expression in the precise terminology employed when referring to the place of these new revelatory models as heirs to the classical prophetic experience. For example, the inspired interpreters in Chronicles are clearly prophetic in their orientation; yet Chronicles develops an entirely new vocabulary for referring to their prophetic experience. Similarly, Ezra the scribe is introduced with language drawn from the prophetic tradition, yet he is never referred to as a prophet. Similar appearances of this phenomenon can be found in the late Second Temple period. For example, Nickelsburg concludes his study of the literary presentation of Enoch in the style of the biblical prophets by observing that Enoch himself is never referred to as a prophet in 1 Enoch.[66] Enoch is merely presented within the succession of prophets. At the same time, the author avoids using the term 'prophet' in direct reference to Enoch.[67]

This terminological feature marks an important component of this study. Second Temple Judaism and the Qumran community clearly recognized the continued vitality of prophecy and revelation in their own age. More importantly, the contemporary prophetic experience was conceptualized as a continuation of the biblical institutions. At the same time, they were fully aware that the modes for the transmission of the divine word had changed dramatically.

---

[66] Nickelsburg, "Apocalyptic Message," 327.

[67] Cf. the earlier treatment of prophetic terminology in Josephus where similar distinctions are made. See above, ch. 1, p. 17.

PART THREE

PROPHECY AND REVELATION AT QUMRAN AND IN THE SECOND TEMPLE PERIOD

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

THE PERSISTENCE OF PROPHECY IN SECOND TEMPLE JUDAISM

The present chapter shifts the analysis from the construction of prophecy and revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls to the explicit evidence in the Qumran corpus for ongoing prophetic activity in the late Second Temple period.[1] This chapter is particularly interested in texts that seem to indicate the reality of contemporary prophecy in close continuity with biblical prophetic antecedents. These texts are identified based on the appearance of decidedly prophetic terminology (i.e., the term נביא or the root נבא). Since this chapter is interested in larger currents within Second Temple society, the primary focus will be the evidence provided by Dead Sea Scrolls about the social reality outside of the Qumran community. In addition to the non-sectarian texts, polemics within the sectarian literature often provide insight into the larger non-Qumran social context. If one reads through the sectarian polemics, these texts are a valuable source for understanding elements of Second Temple prophecy.

The corpus gathered together here underscores some of the assumptions associated with similar contemporary 'prophetic' texts: (1) there are not that many; (2) they are extremely opaque in their presentation of prophets and prophetic phenomena. Accordingly, I shall examine each document independently to determine its contribution to the study of ongoing prophetic activity and then seek to locate the larger corpus within the more general understanding of prophecy in the late Second Temple period.[2]

---

[1] This subject is briefly treated in Bowley, "Prophets," 2:371–376; Stemberger, "Propheten," 145–149.

[2] Another text not treated here is 4QVision and Interpretation (4Q410), which seems to contain the first-hand account of a prophetic visionary from the Second Temple period (see above, pp. 66, n. 5). The fragmentary nature of the text, however, precludes any fuller understanding of this visionary experience.

Sectarian Polemics, Lying Prophets, and Pharisees

Explicit references to possible contemporary prophetic activity are relatively uncommon in the literature produced by the Qumran community. Only two sectarian documents, the Hodayot and the Damascus Document, contain allusions to possible prophetic activity employing biblical prophetic language. In these documents, the term נביא (1QH[a]) and the verbal root נבא (CD) are employed. For both, the referent of the presumed prophetic activity is not the Qumran community itself. Rather, each passage is part of a larger polemic against the enemies of the sect. It is these opponents who are singled out for their prophetic activity. In contrast, explicit prophetic terminology applied to the Qumran community is expressed nowhere in the sectarian literature.[3] Nonetheless, each of the passages that identifies the sectarian opponents as 'prophets' implicitly makes the parallel claim that the author of the text has authentic access to the divine word and will. The absence of explicit prophetic claims for the Qumran community does not indicate that the community did not possess any prophetic self-awareness. Rather, the community's prophetic claims are articulated in language that does not draw upon explicit biblical prophetic language. The later discussion of the Qumran community (chs. 16–19) indicates that the key to identifying ongoing prophetic activity in the Qumran community involves the application of the new rubrics of prophecy and revelation provided by the Qumran corpus, as treated in the first two parts of this study.

Lying Prophets in the Hodayot (1QH[a] 12:5–17 [Sukenik 4:5–17])[4]

> (5) *vacat* I give thanks to you, O Lord, for you have made my face shine by your Covenant, and [ ] (6) [ ] I seek you, and as an enduring dawning, as [perfe]ct light, you have revealed yourself to me. But these, your people [are spouters of falsehood] (והמה עמכה [מטיפי כזב]) (7) fo[r] they flatter themselves with words, and mediators of deceit lead them astray,

[3] Noted by Bowley, "Prophets," 2:371.

[4] Wise, Abegg, Cook, with Gordon, *DSSR* 5:26–27. The Cave 4 Hodayot manuscripts preserve some fragmentary text parallel to the Cave 1 material (4Q430 1 2–5//1QH[a] 12:14–17; 4Q432 8 1//1QH[a] 12:11). See Schuller, *Qumran Cave 4.XX*, 197 (4Q430), 224 (4Q432). Only one possible variant exists between the two manuscripts, though it is not found in the portion of the text presented here (4Q430 1 7//1QH[a] 12:18).

> so that they are ruined without knowledge (כי[א] דברים החליקו למו ומליצי רמיה התעום וילבטו בלא בינה). For[ ] (8) their works are deceitful, for good works were rejected by them. Neither did they esteem me, even when you displayed your might through me. Instead they drove me out from my land (9) as a bird from its nest. And all my friends and acquaintances have been driven away from me; they esteem me as a ruined vessel. But they are mediators of (10) a lie and visionaries of deceit (והמה מליצי כזב וחוזי רמיה). They have plotted wickedness against me, so as to exchange your law (להמיר תורתכה), which you spoke distinctively in my heart, for smooth words (בחלקות). (11) directed to your people. They hold back the drink of knowledge from those that thirst, and for their thirst they give them vinegar to drink, that they might observe (12) their error, behaving madly at their festivals and getting caught in their nets. But you O God, reject every plan (13) of Belial, and your counsel alone shall stand, and the plan of your heart shall remain forever. They are pretenders; they hatch the plots of Belial, (14) they seek you with a double heart, and are not found in your truth. A root producing poison and wormwood is in their scheming. (15) With a willful heart they look about and seek you in idols. They have set the stumbling block of their iniquity before themselves, and they come (16) to seek you through the words of lying prophets corrupted by error (מפי נביאי כזב מפותי תעות). With mo[c]king lips and a strange tongue they speak to your people. (17) so as to make a mockery of all their works by deceit.

In an earlier chapter, I treated the use of the term 'visionary' (חזה) in this hymn.[5] My interest in the hymn here focuses on the appearance of the expression נביאי כזב, "lying prophets," in line sixteen, where it apparently refers to opponents contemporary with the author of the hymn. These "lying prophets" are one of two non-sectarian groups identified in the hymn. The hymn focuses primarily on the enemies of the sect and their misdirected attempts at changing the law (ll. 9–11) and at justifying this behavior by asserting divine sanction for their actions (ll. 13–16). Among the methods employed by this group is consultation with the "lying prophets" (ll. 16–17). In order to understand properly this particular passage and further clarify the role of the two sectarian groups in general and the prophetic group in particular, it is necessary to decipher the larger context of the hymn.

The larger hymn in which this passage appears is found in 1QH[a] 12:5–13:4.[6] The hymn is divided into two distinct sections. The first

[5] See ch. 4, p. 80.

[6] This is the generally agreed upon division of the textual material. This unit is classified as a secondary addition by Jürgen Becker, *Das Heil Gottes: Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht,

(12:5–29) relates a bitter conflict between the leader of the sect (most likely the Teacher of Righteousness) and his enemies.[7] The text then turns to a description of the failings of human beings and the resultant shortcomings of the individual (12:29–13:4).[8] The first half is very important for the purposes of the study of prophecy in Second Temple Judaism. Throughout this first half, the hymnist constantly asserts that his enemies lack access to God and that he alone functions as the legitimate mediator of the divine word and will.[9] Thus, unlike most of the texts treated in this study, this hymn is the record of an actual individual's claim to divine revelation.[10]

The hymn opens by drawing a comparison between the rejected leader of the sect (ll. 8–9) and his enemies (ll. 6–8). These opponents are presented in parallel literary fashion. Two deprecating titles (מליצי רמיה [l. 7],[11] [מטיפי כזב] [l. 6])[12] appear, each of which is accompanied by a

---

1964), 54–55. Redactional elements are likewise identified by Sarah J. Tanzer, "The Sages at Qumran: Wisdom in the *Hodayot*" (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1987), 135. Tanzer classifies this hymn as a 'hybrid' since it contains some elements more commonly found in the Community Hymns. These elements, Tanzer argues, come from the hand of a later redactor who introduced literary features from the Community Hymns into the Teacher Hymns. On these classifications and Tanzer's redaction-critical observations, see ch. 18. Extended discussion of this hymn can be found in Licht, *Megillat ha-Hodayot*, 90–91; Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 79, 89–90; Michael C. Douglas, "Power and Praise in the Hodayot: A Literary Critical Study of 1QH 9:1–18:14" (2 vols.; Ph.D. diss., The University of Chicago, 1998), 1:99–112; Newsom, *Self*, 311–325.

[7] For the present discussion, the actual authorship of the hymn is not important. The conflict reflected in the hymn could relate to the entire Qumran community, the Teacher of Righteousness, or even a later sectarian leader. Below, I follow other scholars who identify the Teacher of Righteousness as the author. See ch. 18, pp. 364–366. On the polemical character of the hymn, see discussion in Licht, *Megillat ha-Hodayot*, 90.

[8] This thematic division can be found in Licht, *Megillat ha-Hodayot*, 90–91.

[9] Paul Schulz, *Der Autoritätsanspruch des Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (Meisenhaim am Glan: Anton Hain, 1974), 170. See also, Douglas, "Power," 1:106, who argues that the second half of the hymn also serves to validate the hymnist's claims of the authority.

[10] See Nickelsburg, "Revelation," 110–111.

[11] On the use of the word מליץ here and in lines 9–10, see Wieder, *Judean Scrolls*, 147–148.

[12] A lacuna appears at the end of line six. Based on the literary parallelism present throughout this hymn (and in col. 10, discussed above, ch. 4), a pejorative designation for the sect's enemies would be expected here. The suggestion offered (מטיפי כזב) follows Eliezer L. Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot: Seqira Šeniah* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1950), 43; Hans Bardtke, "Die Loblieder von Qumran II," *TLZ* 81 (1956): 394; Dupont-Sommer, "Hymnes," 42; Delcor, *Hymnes*, 138–139. To be sure, Holm-Nielsen is correct that this restoration is somewhat arbitrary (*Hodayot*, 81). The suggestion of מטיפי כזב is not based on any textual evidence, but is proposed due to the appearance of this expression elsewhere (ll. 9–10) to describe the enemies of the sect. See also Dupont-

verb relating how this group misled the general Jewish public (החליקו [l. 7] למו, [ה]תעום). Many of these keywords appear throughout the hymn that follows. רמיה (or מרמה) is employed as a *Leitwort* to characterize the opponents (ll. 10, 17, 21).[13] Likewise, the roots תעה and חלק appear again in this hymn (ll. 10, 16, 20) and in other sectarian literature. The *hodayah* describes in poetic language some conflict between the sect and its opponents. At this point, the speaker merely draws the battlefield by identifying all the participants in this dispute. No explicit information is supplied concerning the nature of this quarrel.[14]

The combative relationship between the hymnist and the sect's opponents is present again in lines 9–10 with the same parallel literary structure. The enemies are characterized as מליצי כזב (ll. 9–10) and חוזי רמיה (l. 10).[15] As in line seven, this parallel literary structure indicates that the text refers to the same group. In particular, this group is castigated for attempting (with the help of Belial) to alter the law on behalf of the general public (l. 10). The text states that they wish to exchange (להמיר)[16] the accepted law "for smooth things" (בחלקות).[17]

Sommer, *Essene Writings*, 211, where he disagrees with his earlier restoration and instead renders the lacuna as "prophets of falsehood," no doubt influenced by line sixteen. This understanding is unlikely since it does not account for the two groups of enemies implicit in the hymn (see below). It does not matter what the enemies are called, so long as the lacuna contains a name designating the sect's opponents. I translate והמה עמכה as "but these, your people," with מטיפי כזב functioning as the predicate adjective. For further discussion of the possible interpretations of this clause, see Menachem Mansoor, *The Thanksgiving Hymns: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction* (STDJ 3; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1961), 107; Licht, *Megillat ha-Hodayot*, 92.

[13] Line twenty-one states that no רמיה is in God. This is intended, however, to mirror the repeated use of the word to describe the opponents.

[14] To be sure, the speaker does claim how he was driven out of the land. This may be purely symbolic. Either way, the divergent character of this small literary unit (ll. 6–9) and the one that follows is clear. The latter clearly articulates a fully developed debate over the application and formation of law. Much of the impetus for presenting the text as I have comes from the shared language and imagery between these two literary units. See further, Newsom, *Self*, 313.

[15] See, however, Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot*, 44, who suggests that this is a reference to prophets, presumably the same as the "lying prophets" in line sixteen. A similar understanding is assumed in Wieder, *Judean Scrolls*, 143. This interpretation, however, is untenable in light of my larger understanding of the opposing groups in the hymn. See below.

[16] On this meaning of the root מור, see HALOT 1:560; DCH 4:187. See also 1QH[a] 2:36; 14:20.

[17] The translation of חלקות follows the original suggested translation of Brownlee, "Interpretation," 59. The word itself has been rendered in a myriad of ways, no doubt owing to its less than straightforward employment: e.g., "hypocrisies" (Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 77), "flattering teachings" (García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE* 1:169),

This latter expression appears two other times in the Hodayot, as the more well known phrase דורשי חלקות "seekers of smooth things" (1QH[a] 10:15, 32). There, the group, depicted as an enemy of the sect and its leader, is described in language strikingly similar to the present passage.[18] In particular, they are characterized as אנשי רמיה, using the *Leitwort* that appears throughout column twelve.[19] As such, this group in column ten is most likely the same one that appears in column twelve as the ardent opponents of the sect and its leader.[20]

The expression דורשי חלקות provides a more precise understanding of what is at stake in the present hymn. Scholarly discussion of this term and its precise meaning has generally focused on its assumed identification with the Pharisees. The term דורשי חלקות appears a number of other times in Qumran literature.[21] In particular, the use of חלקות is often thought to be a pun on Pharisaic הלכות and contains an implicit condemnation of the Pharisaic exegetical approach.[22] In addition, the

"flattering words" (Wise, Abegg and Cook, *Dead Scrolls*, 95), "séductions" / "seductive words" (Delcor, *Hymnes*, 140; Carmignac, *LTQ*, 1:206; Newsom, *Self* , 313). On the difficulties with translating this word, see Berrin, *Pesher Nahum*, 92–99.

[18] See in particular, 10:31–35 where the hymnist thanks God for freeing him from the clutches of this group. This fits well with 12:8–9, which recounts how the group rejected the leader and expelled him from the land.

[19] In 10:16, they are maligned as "men of deceit" (אנשי רמיה) and in 10:31, they are deemed "mediators of falsehood" (מליצי כזב) (cf. 10:14). Both of these expressions serve to link to the group in these passages with the opponents of the sect outlined in column twelve.

[20] See further Douglas, "Power," 1:107, 116–118.

[21] CD 1:18; 4Q163 23 iii 10; 4Q169 3–4 i 2, 7; 3–4 ii 2, 4; 2–4 iii 3, 7; cf. 4Q266 2 i 21. For full discussion, see Wieder, *Judean Scrolls*, 135–140; David Flusser, "Perušim, Ṣaddukim, ve-ʾIssiʾim be-Pesher Naḥum," in *Sefer Zikaron le-Gedaliahu Alon: Meḥkarim be-Toldot Yisraʾel ube-Lašon ha-ʿIvrit* (ed. M. Dorman, S. Safrai and M. Stern; Jerusalem: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 1970), 136–137; trans. in "Pharisäer, Sadduzäer und Essener im Pescher Nahum," in *Qumran* (ed. K.E. Grözinger; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1981), 121–166; Baumgarten, "Name," 421–422 (esp. n. 42); idem, "Seekers after Smooth Things," *EDSS* 2:857–858; Goranson, "Others," 2:542–544; Gregory L. Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum: A Critical Edition* (JSPSup 35; CIS 8; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 491–511; Berrin, *Pesher Nahum*, 92–99; James C. VanderKam, "Those Who Look for Smooth Things, Pharisees, and Oral Law," in *Emanuel*, 465–477.

[22] Brownlee, "Interpretation," 60; Johann Maier, "Weitere Stücke zum Nahumkommentar aus der Höhle 4 von Qumran," *Judaica* 18 (1962): 234–237; Baumgarten, "Unwriten Law," 32, n. 78; Schiffman, "Pharisees and Sadducees," 276–277; idem, *Reclaiming*, 250; idem, "The Pharisees and their Legal Traditions according to the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 8 (2001): 266; Goranson, "Others," 2:542; VanderKam, "Smooth Things," 466. Some have objected that the term הלכות cannot be positively identified with Pharisaic legal practices and thus one should not immediately assume that the

historical circumstances alluded to in Pesher Nahum (3–4 i 2), known as well from Josephus (*Ant.* 13.379–383), suggest the identification of this sobriquet with the Pharisees.[23] As such, the opponents described in the passage from the Hodayot as the enemies of this sect are most likely the Pharisees.[24]

What exactly are the enemies / Pharisees characterized as doing? As already stated, this group is depicted in the hymn as attempting to subvert the proper application of the Torah. The hymnist describes the Torah as something that God has implanted in his heart. The hymnist thus presents the proper understanding of the Torah and its application as his sole prerogative. By contrast, his enemies desire to "exchange" the Torah for their "smooth things." This does not imply the complete abandonment of the Torah. Rather, proper understanding of the motivation of this group is grounded in the full meaning of "smooth things" within the context of Pharisaic activity. As Schiffman and others have noted, the application of "seekers of smooth things" to the Pharisees is intended to highlight the sectarian community's understanding of the Pharisees as "false interpreters of the Torah who derive incorrect legal rulings from their exegesis."[25] "Smooth things" refers specifically to the misguided exegetical basis of Pharisaic law upon which their entire legal edifice is established. Thus, the present hymn is uniquely focused on condemning the Pharisees for their assumed illegitimate and mistaken interpretation and application of Torah law.

After outlining the main goals of the oppositional group, the hymn continues by articulating how this group proceeded to lead astray the

---

דורשי חלקות are the Pharisees. See, e.g., John P. Meier, "Is There *Halaka* (the Noun) at Qumran," *JBL* 122 (2003): 150–155; Newsom, *Self*, 308–309 (see further, Doudna, *4Q Pesher Nahum*, 491–511). See also the alternative explanations of Cross, Jeremias, and Stegemann as treated in Baumgarten, "Name," 421, n. 42. Cf. Anthony J. Saldarini, "Pharisees," *ABD* 5:301, who understands the term as a reference to a larger group of sectarian enemies, of which the Pharisees are included.

[23] First noted by John M. Allegro, "Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect," *JBL* 75 (1956): 92. For the more recent treatment of the term of this pericope, see Anthony J. Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 278–280; Schiffman, "Pharisees and Sadducees," 276; Charlesworth, *Pesharim*, 97–98; Berrin, *Pesher Nahum*, 91–96 (with bibliography cited there); VanderKam, "Smooth Things," 466.

[24] So Brownlee, "Interpretation," 59–60; Licht, *Megillat ha-Hodayot*, 74; Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 251; VanderKam, "Smooth Things," 477. See, however, Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 81–82; Newsom, *Self*, 308–309, who both reject this identification.

[25] Schiffman, "Pharisees and Sadducees," 277. Cf. idem, "Pharisees," 269; Wieder, *Judean Scrolls*, 135; Goranson, "Others," 2:542.

nation with their erroneous teachings (ll. 11–13). The hymn frames the oppositional relationship between the sect and its leader and the enemies of the sect within the context of the appeal to divine sanction (ll. 12–16).[26] The hymnist reaffirms his complete confidence in God that the enemies will eventually falter. This is expressed through the general statement that God despises the base schemes of the sect's opponents, seemingly indicating that they will eventually be destroyed. At that point, God's original design, no doubt grounded in the hymnist's own understanding of the Torah and God's full support of his leadership, will finally resume in Israel.

The hymn balances this presentation by relating how the opponents also seek divine sanction for their actions. Thus, the hymn continues by relating a number of methods by which the enemies of the sect attempt to mediate the divine word and gain divine approval of the application of their interpretation of the Torah. The means by which they seek (דרש) out God, however, are categorically condemned by the hymnist. First, they inquire of God through גלולים "idols" (l. 15). In all likelihood, idolatry, the archetypal sin of Israel, is employed here in a non-literal sense to convey the gravity of the opponents' wrongdoing.[27]

The second strategy of the opponents is to consult God through the agency of prophets, characterized as "false, attracted by delusion" (l. 16). After this short notice about the prophets, the text then returns to describing the missteps of the original group (l. 16b).[28] Nothing else is revealed concerning the role and function of the prophetic group in this exchange.[29] The brief description of prophetic activity, however,

[26] See the division of these literary units found in Newsom, *Self*, 313.

[27] Castigation of the sect's enemies for actual idol worship is not a common theme in the scrolls. See Carmignac, *LTQ*, 1:207. The language is drawn from Ezek 14:3–4 (Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot*, 45).

[28] Contra Brin, "Laws," 32, n. 4, who argues that the text continues by further describing the prophets. Though the shift in subject is not explicit, the inclusion of the pronoun (והם) may serve to facilitate the interpretation offered here. In addition, the subject of the next clause acts "with deceit" (רמיה), a term associated with the original group of enemies. Even though the subject shifts back to the first group, prophetic terminology is still employed (i.e., God's word in l. 17 and the "vision of knowledge" in l. 18).

[29] At first glance the prophets seem to reappear in line twenty. After condemning the malevolent actions of the enemies of the sect and their accomplices the prophets, the hymnist articulates a prayer expressing his wish for their final destruction: "You will cut off in ju[dgm]ent all the people of deceit (אנשי מרמה) and the visionaries of error (וחוזי תעות) will be found no longer" (l. 20). The identification of the first group with the main opposition group of the hymn is certain based on the textual consonance

provides three explicit pieces of information concerning the prophets: (1) they are sought out (√דרש) by the enemies / Pharisees; (2) they are "attracted by delusion"; (3) they are "false." Each of these notices allows us to arrive at a better understanding of the identity of the prophets and their larger social context.

The use of the root דרש here is clearly deliberate. The root is employed three times in lines 14–16 to describe the attempts by the enemies / Pharisees to obtain divine sanction for their alteration of the law.[30] In doing so, the hymnist draws upon two different biblical uses of this root. The root דרש is commonly used in the Hebrew Bible, particularly Deuteronomy, in reference to the consultation of God on purely legal matters. In this framework, the inquiry does not involve prophetic mediation.[31] This seems to be part of the context for the use of דרש to describe each of the ways in which the enemies / Pharisees attempt to obtain some divine sanction for their legislative activity.

The further use of the root in the hymn in line sixteen, however, carries an added nuance. דרש is commonly found in the Hebrew Bible to describe the consultation of God for matters considered beyond human comprehension (usually in a distressing situation). In most of these instances, this inquiry is performed through the agency of a prophetic intermediary.[32] The prophets in the hymn also seem to be fulfilling this biblical prophetic function. In the biblical context, however, these inquiries are not of a legal nature. Thus, the hymn has conflated

with the characterization of this group in the present hymn and elsewhere in the Hodayot. However, what is the referent of the second designation? Some scholars suggest that the employment of תעות is an allusion back to the depiction of the prophets as "attracted by delusion (תעות)" (l. 16) (Carmignac, *LTQ* 1:206). Above, however, I proposed that the role of the word תעות is to tie the prophets back to the larger opposition group, rather than characterize the prophets themselves (cf. Delcor, *Hymnes*, 143; James R. Davila, "Heavenly Ascent in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *DSSAFY*, 2:478). Indeed, as already seen (ch. 4, pp. 76–82), the non-prophetic use of 'visionaries' is consistent with its wider application in Qumran literature. Moreover, the general poetic structure employed throughout this hymn suggests that, here as well, the sect's opponents would be depicted with parallel derogatory designations. This is achieved through the employment of two keywords (תעות, מרמה) borrowed from earlier in the hymn.

[30] Moreover, it contrasts with the use of the root in line six, where it is the hymnist who seeks out God, properly, of course.

[31] On this use, see Siegfried. Wagner, "דרש," *TDOT* 3:296–298.

[32] See Claus Westermann, "Die Begriffe für Fragen und Suchen im AT," *KD* (1960): 21–22; Wagner, "דרש," 3:302–303; G. Gerleman and E. Ruprecht, "דרש," *TLOT* 1:347–348.

two applications of the biblical root דרש. The prophets here fulfill a role commonly associated with biblical prophets, though now with an added juridical aspect.[33]

This feature provides an added element to how the sect envisioned the role of the prophets within the social framework of their enemies (i.e., the Pharisees). According to the hymn, consultation of the prophets is specifically in order to obtain divine sanction for the "exchange" of the Torah for Pharisaic legal interpretation ("smooth things"). The hymnist does not seem to have any objection to the appeal to prophets for divine guidance in legal matters. The hymn has a problem with the prophets themselves and their influences ("lying," "attracted by delusion"). The presentation of the ancient prophets repeatedly as mediators of law and Torah interpreters has already been observed in a sectarian context.[34] Furthermore, the sect saw its own legislative activity in continuity with earlier prophetic lawgiving.[35] Thus, it seems that the characterization of the enemies / Pharisees as soliciting prophetic intervention on legal matters accurately reflects the actual practice of the enemies / Pharisees.[36] At the same time, it provides additional evidence for the approval of this practice in a sectarian context.

The brief statement concerning the prophets also allows us to arrive at some understanding of their identity. Two distinct groups are identified in this passage: the original enemies of the sect (identified as the Pharisees) and a class of prophets who prophesy on behalf of the former group.[37] The prophets are described as seduced "by delusion" (תעות).

[33] The use of דרש in the hymn is curious in light of its more common meaning in reference to sectarian legal activity. Schiffman argues that the root is employed in reference to the formation of law through the exegetical process of reading Scripture (*Halakhah*, 57–60). At the same time, this exegetical process was considered an inspired encounter with the text, whereby the exegete could claim that the conclusions ultimately derive from contemporary revelation. For the enemies in the hymn, דרש resembles only the second half of this process. The enemies / Pharisees have already formulated the laws. Now, they bypass Scripture and appeal directly to God through prophetic agency.

[34] See above, ch. 3.

[35] See below, ch. 16.

[36] Note that the view of the the Pharisaic legal activity here is contrary to the general understanding of the Pharisaic-rabbinic rejection of any role for the prophetic word in the legal process.

[37] See Licht, *Megillat ha-Hodayot*, 90, who identifies two groups in the larger hymn: the sect and the circle of the "lying prophets." Licht has conflated the primary enemies of the sect as identified at the outset of the hymn and the prophets who are consulted by this group. Though they are related, the hymn clearly distinguishes them from

This same verbal root was used above to describe the actions of the first group in misdirecting the general public (l. 7) and is employed elsewhere in Qumran literature to describe the deceitful and misleading stewardship of the Pharisees.[38] As such, the hymnist felt the prophets were victims of this same disingenuous leadership.

A third piece of information is provided in this passage, though it does not say anything about the prophet themselves. The sectarian characterization of the prophets as "false" highlights two larger social phenomena concerning prophets in the Second Temple period. It underscores a general concern with competing revelatory claims. Part of the debate between the sect and its enemies is conceptualized as a question of how one should properly consult the divine and who ultimately has access to the divine word. The hymnist is entirely confident that he has knowledge of the divine will and enjoys divine favor. Implicit in this claim, and indicated by the oppositional literary structure, is the accusation that the prophets do not possess either of these features. Thus, Bowley suggests that the hymnist deliberately refrained from referring to himself with prophetic terminology similar to that of his opponents. The enemies were prophets with claims to prophetic revelation. The hymnist, by contrast, establishes his word as the explicit divine voice, unmitigated by prophetic mediation.[39]

The hymn contains an added element of prophetic conflict directed at the enemies / Pharisees who appeal to the prophets and therefore can claim access to the divine word. The revelatory access of the enemies / Pharisees is clearly condemned as deficient since they consult with "lying prophets." Furthermore, they fail to recognize the true revelation of the divine word and will: "for they said 'the vision of knowledge (חזון הדעת), it is not correct'" (ll. 17–18). This hymn therefore, following Nickelsburg, "indicates a competing set of revelatory claims and a conflict between opposing self-defined seers."[40] Though Nickelsburg does not elaborate on this statement, I suggest that there are actually three groups in conflict here. First, there is the sect led by the

one another. See Davila, "Heavenly Ascents," 2:477–478, who carefully parses out the different groups located in the hymn.

[38] See the discussion below of CD 5:15–6:2.

[39] Bowley, "Prophets," 2:372–373.

[40] George W.E. Nickelsburg, *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins: Diversity, Continuity, and Transformation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 97. See the similar statements found in Davila, "Heavenly Ascents," 2:477–478. Davila, however, understands the "visionaries" in lines ten and twenty as prophetic "visionaries."

hymnist (Teacher of Righteousness), who is confident in his revelatory access. Second, the enemies / Pharisees, who never actually engage in prophetic activity here, but appeal to a third party to do so. At the same time, they display a concerted interest in mediating the divine will. It is likely that for this reason that they are twice identified with language normally reserved for prophets (i.e., "visionaries"). The third group is the "lying prophets," who are depicted attempting to access the divine on behalf of the enemies / Pharisees.

Moreover, the hymnist has no reluctance to refer to the enemies / Pharisees as 'prophets,' employing the standard biblical term **נביא**. Following biblical precedent, in particular Deuteronomy, the prophets are still identified as prophets even if their specific prophetic activity marks them as 'false.'[41] The use of 'lying' (שקר) in the Hodayot does more than merely mark that group as prophetic adversaries. Rather, as suggested, this hymn reflects a conflict between the sect, who saw themselves as active recipients of the divine word, and the enemies of the sect, who do not enjoy this same access. Neither they, nor do the would-be prophets who attempt to prophesy on their behalf, possess such access.

"Movers of the Boundary" and Prophecy in the Damascus Document (CD 5:20–6:2)[42]

20 ובקץ חרבן הארץ עמדו מסיגי הגבול ויתעו את ישראל
21 ותישם הארץ כי דברו סרה על מצות אל ביד משה וגם
1 במשיחו⟨י⟩ הקודש וינבאו שקר להשיב את ישראל מאחר
2 אל

20 And at the time of the desolation of the land, the movers of the boundary arose and they led Israel astray

[41] This feature is found throughout the biblical presentation of prophetic conflict. So-called 'false prophets' are assigned such a status based primarily on the unacceptable character of their message, not their revelatory claims. See discussion in James L. Crenshaw, *Prophet Conflict: Its Effect upon Israelite Religion* (BZAW 124; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1971), 1–4. In contrast, Crenshaw notes, the Septuagint often translates the Hebrew term **נביא** as ψευδοπροφήτης ("pseudo-prophets") when it considers the individuals to be false prophets. See Jer 6:13; 26:7, 8, 11, 16; 27:9; 28:1; 29:1, 8; Zech 13:2. A similar feature can be found in Josephus as well (e.g., *War* 2:261–264 [Theudas]; *Ant.* 10.97 [the Egyptian]). See further, Blenkinsopp, "Prophecy," 246; Feldman, "Prophets," 435.

[42] Qimron, "CDC," 19–21. See also Baumgarten and Schwartz, *Damascus Document*, 22–23. A portion of this text was treated in ch. 5, pp. 97–100. See the analysis provided there.

21 and the land became desolate, for they (i.e., the movers of the boundary) spoke defiantly against commandments of God (sent) through Moses and also
1 through the ones anointed with the holy (spirit). And they prophesied falsehood, so as to lead Israel away from
2 God.

In this passage, the ancient prophets are introduced in the general condemnation of the "movers of the boundary" (CD 5:20), who reject the Torah that had been transmitted through Moses and the prophets.[43] The text then contains a second invective against the sectarian enemies. They are characterized as prophesying falsely, thereby leading the people away from God. As in the Hodayot, sectarian polemics depict the opponents of the community with prophetic language (√נבא), seemingly acknowledging some prophetic activity within this group.

The importance of this passage lies in the ability to situate the historical allusions within a proper chronological time frame and locate the identity of the prophesying group within the historical record. This can only be achieved by looking at the larger literary context of the present passage. At this point, the specific actions of the prophesying group can be considered together with the question of why these actions are described with prophetic language.

CD 5:15 begins a historical review of God's intervention in human affairs.[44] This section recounts Israel's past missteps before God remembered his covenant with Israel and established the sectarian community.[45] The review first narrates the conflict between Moses and Aaron, the emissaries of the Prince of Light, and Jannes and his brother, the agents of Belial (CD 5:17–19). Clearly, such a passage is situated early in Israel's historical past. The next textual unit lacks any such historical specification. It is placed in the "period of the desolation of the land" (CD 5:20). At first glance, the symbolic language would locate the historical narrative that follows in the period of the Babylonian exile, the most logical referent of the "period of the desolation of the land."[46] As

[43] See the earlier discussion of this passage in ch. 5 (pp. 99–100).

[44] More precisely, lines 15–17 serve as the preamble to the historical review that begins at line seventeen (as a redactional link, these lines simultaneously conclude the previous unit) (Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 119; cf. Murphy-O'Connor, "Document," 223).

[45] Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 45–46.

[46] Murphy-O'Connor, "Document," 224; Wacholder, *Dawn*, 127; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 45–47. See similar imagery in CD 3:10.

such, the "movers of the boundary" who lead Israel astray, speak defiantly against the law, and prophesy falsely would likely refer to a group living during the period of the Babylonian exile, perhaps even precipitating it by their own actions.[47]

A number of considerations suggest an alternate understanding, one that views the historical referent standing behind this textual unit (CD 5:20–6:2) as located in the more recent past.[48] The events narrated in CD 5:20–6:2 are reflections of contemporary historical circumstances and social concerns. This understanding is further underscored by the presence in this textual unit of many keywords elsewhere used as sobriquets for contemporary groups (specifically, opponents of the sect). The main players during this "period of desolation" are the "movers of the boundary" (מסיגי הגבול).[49] The "boundary" is generally understood to mean the law and therefore, this group is censured for violation of the law.[50] This group is further condemned for leading Israel astray (ויתעו את ישראל) and speaking defiantly against the law. In all likelihood, they are also the intended subject of the false prophesy in 6:1.[51] The missteps of the "movers of the boundary" are presented as the impetus for God's remembrance of the covenant and its renewal in the sectarian community (CD 6:2–11).

The identification of these "movers of the boundary" is critical to determining the historical period assumed in this textual unit. This expression appears again in the Damascus Document and elsewhere in the Qumran literature.[52] Unfortunately, the fragmentary character of

---

[47] Murphy-O'Connor, "Document," 224; Davies, *Damascus Covenant*, 75; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 45.

[48] Charles, "Fragments of a Zadokite Work," *APOT* 2:800, 812; Dupont-Sommer, *Essene Writings*, 130; Hartmut Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* (Bonn: 1971), 162–165; Schiffman, "Pharisees and Sadducees," 276; Charlotte Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Traditions, and Redaction* (STDJ 29; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998), 167; Grossman, *Reading*, 122, n. 77. The specific historical circumstances, however, are of less significance. The importance lies in the placement of this unit in the historical period immediately preceding the formation of the sect (which is narrated in the next textual unit).

[49] 4Q266 3 ii 7 has מסגי גבול. 4Q271 1 2 has משיגי הגבול with a *samek* written in the margin directly above the *sin*. 4Q267 2 4 has the same form as CD 5:20.

[50] Wieder, *Judean Scrolls*, 140–141; Cothenet, *LTQ* 2:165; Rabin, *Zadokite Documents*, 4–5; Nitzan, *Qumran Cave 4.XX*, 8. See also the non-Qumran passages cited by Rabin. See below for a fuller discussion of this expression.

[51] Rabin, *Zadokite Documents*, 20; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 47.

[52] CD 19:15–16//8:3 cites in full Hos 5:10, upon which the expression is dependent; 4Q266 1 a–b 4; 4QCurses (4Q280 3 2) has the form משיגי הגב[ו]ל with a *samek* written

these passages precludes arriving at any definitive conclusions.[53] Closely related to this phrase, however, is the earlier condemnation of those that move (ולסיע) the boundary (CD 1:16 [par. 4Q266 2 i 19]).[54] This passage should be situated in the Damascus Document's recurring motif of "moving the boundary," (i.e., violating the law).[55] Here also, the "boundary" refers to the law. Presumably, this expression is employed in order to criticize the enemies of the sect for their faulty interpretation of the law. Through this mistaken approach to the law, they "move" the established boundaries of the law.[56] There seems as well to be an implicit condemnation of what in later rabbinic terminology is characterized as creating a fence around the Torah (לעשות סיג לתורה), which refers to the various extra-biblical rabbinic laws (*m. Abot* 1:2).

The passage in CD 1 goes on to clarify the treacherous actions of those that move the boundary as: "they sought smooth things" (דרשו בחלקות) (CD 1:18). This characterization ensures that the intended historical referent in CD 1 is the Pharisees, who are thus also the "movers of the boundary."[57] Based on this evidence, the "movers of the boundary" in CD 5:20 may be tentatively identified with the Pharisees and the historical events situated in the recent past from the perspective of the author of the Damascus Document.[58]

The tentative identification of the group in CD 5:20 with the Pharisees is confirmed by the ensuing description of this group as leading Israel astray: ויתעו את ישראל. The key to interpreting the historical context of this phrase lies in the use of the root תעה. This root appears in the *hiph'il* form numerous times in the sectarian literature. In par-

directly about the *sin*. A cancellation mark is visible as well (cf. 4Q271 1 2; see above, n. 49). On the orthography, see Nitzan, *Qumran Cave 4.XX*, 8.

[53] The expression appears in complete isolation in 4Q471 1 2 and 4Q280 3 2. The similar phrase in 4QInstruction (4Q416 2 iv 6; 4Q418 9 + 9a–c 7) and 4QInstruction-like Composition B (4Q424 3 9) seems to unrelated to the expression in CD. Both are likely dependent on a similar reading of Hosea.

[54] 4Q266 2 i 19 has ו]להסיע. The language of this phrase is taken from Deut 19:14 where the root סוג is employed, as in the other passages from the Damascus Document. Ginzberg questions whether the text in CD should therefore be emended (*Jewish Sect*, 6). This seems unlikely in light of the 4QD parallel.

[55] Charles, "Fragments," 2:801; Cothenet, *LTQ*, 2:153; Baumgarten and Schwartz, *Damascus Document*, 13, n. 12; Nitzan, *Qumran Cave 4.XX*, 8. cf. Ginzberg, *Jewish Sect*, 6.

[56] See further Nitzan, *Qumran Cave 4.XX*, 8. Cf. Charles, "Fragments," 2:801.

[57] See Charles, "Fragments," 2:801; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 24; Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 250–251; VanderKam, "Smooth Things," 467. For the identification of the "seekers after smooth things" with the Pharisees, see above.

[58] Schiffman, "Pharisees," 266.

ticular, the *hiph'il* is often employed to describe the misguided direction provided by the Pharisaic leaders to their followers. Thus, the Spouter of the Lie (מטיף הכזב) (1QpHab 10:9) and the Man of the Lie (איש הכזב) (4QpPs[a] 1–10 i 26–27), two titles generally thought to refer to the same individual, are both presented in the Pesharim as leading their followers astray with language drawing upon the *hiph'il* תעה.[59] The Spouter / Man of the Lie is often identified as a Pharisaic leader.[60] Furthermore, in the first column of the Damascus Document, the Man of Mockery (איש הלצון) is condemned for preaching (הטיף) falsehood and leading (ויתעו) Israel into chaos (CD 1:14–15). That the misguided followers of this individual are the Pharisees is certain by the two Pharisaic sobriquets applied to them. They are accused of "moving the border" (CD 1:16) and are further censured for their "seeking smooth things" (CD 1:18).

Finally, Pesher Nahum interprets Nah 3:4 as a reference to "those who lead Ephraim astray" (מתעי אפרים) and with their false teaching (בתלמוד שקרם) and lies "will lead many astray" (יתעו רבים) (4Q169 3–4 ii 8). Ephraim is a well-known code-word for the Pharisees and "talmud" here refers to the exegetical process practiced by the Pharisees in order to generate law.[61] In all these examples, the *hiph'il* form of the root תעה is employed to denounce the faulty direction of the Pharisaic leadership. These Pharisaic teachers and leaders are presented as offering misdirected advice to their followers, often with respect to observance of the law.

With this understanding, let us return to column five of the Damascus Document and the textual unit that immediately follows the description of the prophesying "movers of the boundary." The infidelity

---

[59] See Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 228; Charlesworth, *Pesharim*, 94–96.

[60] Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 251; idem, "Halakhah and Sectarianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (ed. T.H. Lim; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000), 140; VanderKam, "Smooth Things," 469. On this figure, see further 1QpHab 2:2; 5:11; CD 20:15.

[61] On Ephraim, see Joseph D. Amoussine, "Éphraïm et Manassé dans le Péshèr de Nahum," *RevQ* 4 (1963): 389–396; Horgan, *Pesharim*, 161; Lawrence H. Schiffman, "New Light on the Pharisees," in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reader from the Biblical Archaeology Review* (ed. H. Shanks; New York: Vintage, 1993), 221; Goranson, "Others," 2:543, 545; Charlesworth, *Pesharim*, 106; Berrin, *Pesher Nahum*, 109–111. On "talmud," see Horgan, *Pesharim*, 184; Schiffman, "New Light," 221–222. On the Pharisaic context of this passage, see further, Ben Zion Wacholder, "A Qumran Attack on the Oral Exegesis? The Phrase אשר בתלמוד שקרם in 4 Q Pesher Nahum," *RevQ* 5 (1966): 351–366; VanderKam, "Smooth Things," 476. See bibliography in Horgan, *Pesharim*, 184.

of the "movers of the boundary" is presented as the immediate impetus for God's remembrance of his covenant and his subsequent selection of men of understanding from Aaron and wise men from Israel that would lay the foundation for the sectarian community (CD 6:2–3). The "penitents of Israel" who make up the members of the sect are characterized as "diggers of the well," based on a pesher on Num 21:18. The "well" is then equated with the Torah. As such, the description of the origins of the sectarian community links their formation with obedience to the law that the "movers of the boundary" neglected and distorted.

Now that the historical identity for the prophesying "movers of the boundary" as the Pharisees has been established along with the second century B.C.E. time frame, it is possible to determine the character of this presumed prophetic activity. As is the case with the use of the root נבא in the Hodayot, the Damascus Document provides little information about the assumed prophetic performance. Nothing is supplied regarding the potential mechanics of the prophecy or its revelatory framework. As in the Hodayot, all that can possibly be ascertained is the general content of the prophetic word. In the Hodayot, it is clear that the enemies / Pharisees consult the prophets in order to obtain divine guidance in legal matters. In the Damascus Document, however, the text is not as explicit. At the same time, the literary framework of the passage suggests the juridical context of prophetic activity.

The literary unit in CD 5:20–6:2 is structured around the condemnation of the sectarian enemies, who are here identified as the "movers of the boundary." The application of this particular sobriquet to the enemies is to be seen as a deliberate literary device here. As indicated above, the expression indicates, from the perspective of the Qumran community, disapproval of its enemies' approach to the application and amplification of Torah law, whereby they alter the fixed boundary of the law. This frames the ensuing literary unit as an attack on the juridical process of the enemies of the sect, presumably the Pharisees.

After the introduction of the enemies as the "movers of the boundary," the text follows with a twofold condemnation of the actions of the sect. First, the enemies are denounced for rejecting the "commandments of God," a sectarian term for Torah law.[62] The Torah is further characterized as something transmitted through the agency of Moses, the first of the prophetic lawgivers, and the prophets of Israel's past.

[62] See above, p. 59, n. 66.

Just as the enemies themselves engage in an incorrect interpretation of the law through their moving of the boundary, so too they reject the proper understanding of the law as transmitted through prophetic agency. This characterization carries an additional sectarian polemic, since the Qumran community viewed itself as the heir of the revelatory juridical tradition practiced by the ancient prophets.[63]

This process of lawgiving and authorized legal interpretation and application is placed in immediate contrast to the further activity of the "movers of the boundary" / Pharisees. Rejecting the Torah as transmitted through Moses and the prophets (i.e., the interpretive juridical tradition), they instead prophesy falsehood.[64] In the context of the sectarian polemic, it seems likely that their prophetic word would contain some alternative understanding of Torah and its application. More importantly, the application of prophetic terminology to this Pharisaic activity indicates that the Pharisees would have viewed their legal understanding as emanating from divine guidance.[65] The sect rejected both the legal conclusions and their claim to divine origin. Thus, while characterizing the Pharisaic activity with prophetic language, the sectarian author marks this prophetic performance as ineffective and illegitimate.

Prophecy in the Hodayot and the Damascus Document

The reference to contemporary prophecy in the Damascus Document shares some of the same features identified in the Hodayot, though with slight modifications. In the Hodayot, the enemies / Pharisees appeal to prophetic intervention in order to authorize their act of exchanging the law for "smooth things." So too, the prophetic activity in the Damascus Document involves cultivating divine sanction for contemporary juridical functions. Both documents (1QH[a] and CD) associate this process with a group that is best identified with the Pharisees. In the Hodayot, however, the Pharisees themselves do not engage in the prophecy activity; instead they solicit the aid of a closely related group. In contrast, the Damascus Document depicts the Pharisaic leaders actively engaging in some sort of prophetic behavior.

---

[63] See below, ch. 16.

[64] Accordingly, the conjunction of וינבאו should be understood as an adversative *waw*.

[65] See Wieder, *Judean Scrolls*, 143.

These two texts share common prophetic language and a mutual concern with prophetic conflict and competing claims of divine access. Both texts employ prophetic language (√נבא) in reference to the enemies. In both instances, the prophets are identified as illegitimate. The critical question is whether the two texts should be understood as an indication of actual prophetic activity within the Pharisaic community or if they merely reflect polemical language.

In his treatment of the accusation of false prophecy in sectarian literature, Wieder highlights a similar polemical motif employed by Karaite writers in their descriptions of rabbinic leaders. In particular, Wieder identifies this Karaite polemic in their objection to the rabbinic belief that their legal rulings possessed a divine origin.[66] Based on this understanding, argues Wieder, the term 'prophet' is only employed in order to express the assumed divine origin of the legislative activity. This use of the term is equally applicable to its appearance in the two documents treated here. Both documents engage in polemics concerning access to the divine realm. More specifically, the conflict centers on each group's claims to continued divine revelation in matters of law. The sect, in opposition to its enemies, viewed its own interpretation of the Torah as divinely inspired and even equal to the divine word, a feature particularly emphasized in the passage from the Hodayot. Accordingly, by identifying their enemies as 'false' or 'lying' prophets, they are able to highlight their opponents' claims to divine access and simultaneously reject such assertions as illegitimate.

While the polemical framework of both passages is clearly present, their assumed prophetic context should be noted. As indicated above, the sectarian texts, unlike other Second Temple literature (i.e., LXX, Josephus), retain the designation נביא and the root נבא in reference to the activity of their opponents. Indeed, this term fulfills a polemical objective. This polemic, however, would have no force unless the sectarian enemies actually did appeal to some form of prophetic mediation in order to seek divine guidance in legislative matters. The sectarian polemic therefore accurately preserves some sense of the social reality of the opponents. For the sect, however, the trouble with this appeal to prophecy was two-fold: the enemies of the sect did not possess genuine access to the divine and their attempt to do so for legal guidance further underscores the illegitimacy of their entire legislative edifice.

[66] Wieder, *Judean Scrolls*, 143–146 (esp. 143–144).

Accordingly, these opponents are identified as 'lying' and 'false.' They may look and act like prophets, but the legitimacy of their prophetic claims is ultimately denied.

If one reads through the sectarian polemic, these two texts provide some insight into the social reality of contemporary activity in late Second Temple period Judaism. Unfortunately, there is no available description of the opponents' prophetic activity. The sectarian polemic is only concerned with the presumed content of this prophetic performance.

At the same time, these two documents do contribute to a more general knowledge concerning the social location of prophecy in Second Temple Judaism. If the identification of the Pharisees in these two texts is correct, both documents attest to a heightened interest in prophecy within Pharisaic circles. In the Hodayot, the Pharisees appeal to a separate prophetic group. In the Damascus Document, the Pharisees themselves engage in prophetic activity. This comports with the general identification of prophetic activity among the Pharisees as documented by Josephus.[67] Unfortunately, little more can be said on account of the opaque presentation of the prophets in the Damascus Document and Hodayot.

In conclusion, two larger social issues implied by these two texts should be noted. First, the Hodayot assume the existence of a prophetic class who could be consulted on difficult matters that required divine guidance. The text provides little information about this group and their assumed larger social role. Second, it is important to note once more the heightened portrait of prophetic conflict in both documents and the increased concern with true and false prophecy. Together, these texts point to a deep conflict in Second Temple Judaism regarding competing claims to prophetic authority.

[67] *Ant.* 14.172–176; 15.3–4, 370; 17.41–45; *War* 6.300–309. On Pharisaic prophets in Josephus, see Meyer, "Prophecy," 6:823; Horsley and Hanson, *Bandits*, 157–160; Gray, *Prophetic Figures*, 148–163. Gray's discussion demonstrates that, in general, the Pharisaic prophets were identified as such based on their ability to predict the future. Nothing close to the portrait of the prophets in the Hodayot and Damascus Document is found in Josephus' presentation.

Prophetic Conflict in Second Temple Judaism

The Qumran texts treated thus far reflect a debate between the community and its opponents regarding access to the divine realm and prophetic capability. Prophetic conflict of this nature is not limited to sectarian versus non-sectarian arguments. Rather, three additional non-sectarian documents preserved within the Dead Sea Scrolls further attest to heightened concerns with illegitimate prophets and competing revelatory claims in Second Temple Judaism. Two of these texts (the Temple Scroll, the Moses Apocryphon) contain a detailed set of laws based on Deuteronomic laws relating to prophecy. These texts to some extent imagine an ideal situation in which the classical Israelite institutions, including prophecy, would be fully operational.[68] Thus, it cannot be certain how representative these texts are of more general concerns with false prophecy in Second Temple Judaism. Preoccupation with false and illegitimate prophets is also present in a third text (4QList of Prophets [4Q339]). This text contains several elements that indicate that its concerns with false prophets are grounded in contemporary social reality.[69]

The Temple Scroll (11Q19) 54:8–18

A large portion of the Temple Scroll is a rewritten version of the Deuteronomic law code (51:11–66). Many of these laws are preserved with minor variations, save for the common textual variants or scribal errors. At the same time, several laws in the Temple Scroll reflect a deliberate alteration of the biblical text, whether for exegetical or ideological purposes. The former examples provide important evidence for contemporary modes of biblical interpretation. The latter examples

[68] This is clearly the case for the Temple Scroll, which often legislates regarding seemingly dormant institutions. As such, it presents itself as a comprehensive Torah for an ideal society (Schiffman, "Deuteronomic Paraphrase," 543–567, esp. 545). A parallel phenomenon can be seen in various early strands of rabbinic literature. For example, large portions of the Mishnah contain legislation regarding sacrifices, priestly duties, and purity laws (see Jacob Neusner, "Map Without Territory: Mishnah's System of Sacrifice and Sanctuary," in *Method and Meaning in Ancient Judaism* [BJS 10; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1979], 133–154). This argument is not as certain for the Moses Apocryphon on account of the lack of sufficient text.

[69] The evidence provided by these texts for ongoing prophetic activity in Second Temple Judaism is also discussed in Brooke, "Prophecy and Prophets," 158–160. Brooke's conclusions are similar to those suggested here.

are understood as reflections of the larger issues and concerns affecting the author(s) of the Temple Scroll and contemporary Judaism.[70]

Laws regarding false prophets are found twice in Deuteronomy (13:2–6, 18:18–22). Both of these sets of laws are found in the rewritten portions of the Temple Scroll. Deut 13:2–6 appears completely in 11Q19 54:8–18. The beginning of the rewriting of Deut 18:18–22, unfortunately, was once contained at the bottom of column fifty, which is no longer extant. Text equivalent to Deut 18:20–22 is found in 11Q19 51:1–5.[71] The mere fact that these passages are found in the Temple Scroll is not necessarily evidence that false prophecy was a problem in the time-period of the text's composition. Indeed, the majority of the Deuteronomic laws were retained and rewritten even if no contemporary exigency existed. Moreover, as noted above, the formulation of the laws of false prophets in the Temple Scroll may be intended for an ideal time when all Deuteronomic law would be enforced.

The two sets of Deuteronomic laws regarding prophets and false prophets do not seem to reflect any evidence of tendentious rewriting. To be sure, these texts differ slightly from the biblical base text. The majority of these variations, however, are exegetical refinements to the biblical texts or actual textual variants.[72] Thus, the laws regarding false prophets in the Temple Scroll provide no assistance in attempting to reconstruct concerns with false prophets in the Second Temple period. The presence of these two passages in the Temple Scroll, however, would have provided individuals in the Second Temple period a contemporary context for the application of the Deuteronomic laws regarding false prophets.

---

[70] The best example of the rewriting of the text based on contemporary concerns is the Law of the King. See bibliography cited above, p. 235, n. 77. On the Deuteronomic law code in the Temple Scroll and its relationship to Deuteronomy, see Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1:308–385; Schiffman, "Deuteronomic Paraphrase," 543–567; Dwight D. Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT* (STDJ 14; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995).

[71] See Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 2:275–276.

[72] For the former, see MT האות והמופת (Deut 13:2) rendered in the Temple Scroll as האות או המופת (ll. 8–9). As Schiffman explains, the Temple Scroll clarifies the ambiguity in the biblical text by explicitly stating that either a sign or a miracle is sufficient. The conjunctive *waw* in Deuteronomy could be understood to mean that both are required. For the latter example, MT דברי (13:4) is found in the Temple Scroll as דבר (l. 11). See further Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 2:243–245; Schiffman, "Deuteronomic Paraphrase," 554–555. On the use of אם in 11Q19 54:8 in place of MT כי (Deut 13:2), see Levinson and Zahn, "Revelation."

The Apocryphon of Moses (4Q375)[73]

The laws regarding false prophets found in Deuteronomy 13 are expounded upon as well in 4Q375. This text, labeled by its editor as the Apocryphon of Moses, survives in two fragments. Strugnell's attempt to date the text and identify its provenance is inconclusive.[74] Brin is able to arrive at a far more definite conclusion. Based on Strugnell's paleographical examination (providing the *terminus ad quem*) and his own linguistic and ideological analysis, Brin dates the text to "around the Hasmonean Period."[75]

The first column of fragment one describes in detail the procedure for identifying and prosecuting a seducer prophet. I am following the general understanding of Brin, that 4Q375 is interested in countering the activities of prophets who lead the public to apostasy. As such, it is following the biblical model presented in Deut 13:2–6.[76] In particular, the fragment introduces the notion that a prophet may arise who preaches apostasy (ll. 4–5). The text proceeds to declare that such a prophet must be put to death (l. 5). Presumably, if there is no opposition, he is put to death. If the tribe from which he hails declares his innocence, however, he still must undergo an ordeal intended to decide his fate (ll. 5–9). The text states that he must appear before the priest

[73] For the text, see Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.XIV*, 111–120; idem, "Moses-Pseudepigrapha"; Brin, "Laws." A small piece of this manuscript (1 i 1–2) was discussed above, p. 48.

[74] Strugnell eschews any suggestion of a sectarian origin, observing that the linguistic features mark it only as late Biblical Hebrew (*Qumran Cave 4.XIV*, 130–131). He also observes that the text assumes the availability of the priestly sardonyxes (mentioned in 4Q376), which, according to Josephus, were no longer in use by the Hasmonean period. If the document is describing prescriptions for actual legal proceedings, then it must have been composed at a time when these stones were still available. Strugnell, however, finds no other datable elements in the text. As such, the text could reasonably come from the Persian, Ptolemaic, or early Hasmonean period (p. 131).

[75] Brin, "Laws," 56. Strugnell's paleographic analysis is found in idem, "Moses-Pseudepigrapha," 224–228; idem, *Qumran Cave 4.XIV*, 111–112, 121–122. Brin (pp. 56–60) also assigns the text a sectarian origin and views it as a polemic against the official leadership of Jerusalem, who had branded the leader of the Qumran community as a seducer prophet. See, however, Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.XIV*, 131.

[76] Brin, "Laws," 53–54. See, however, Strugnell, "Moses-Pseudepigrapha," 246; idem, *Qumran Cave 4.XIV*, 129, 131, who views the main goal of 4Q375 as differentiating between true and false prophets (similar to Deut 18:15–22). Strugnell's understanding is followed by Brooke, "Parabiblical," 1:274. As will be apparent from the following discussion, several elements in the text favor Brin's understanding. The importance of 4Q375 for the question of prophetic continuity is briefly treated in Stemberger, "Propheten," 147–149.

(ll. 8–9).[77] The text breaks off here. The next column on the fragment contains a description of sacrificial procedures usually associated with the Day of Atonement.[78] Strugnell suggests that the contents of this fragment should be read as a continuation of column one and thus describe the details of the ordeal for which the prophet was brought before the high priest.[79] Again, unfortunately, the text breaks off before a resolution is reached.[80]

The focal point of this text is a prophet who has seduced the general public to turn away from God, presumably meaning failure to adhere to the law.[81] 4Q375 (and perhaps 4Q376) contains a detailed description of the process one undergoes to determine the guilt of any potential seducer prophet.[82] 4Q375 is based on the ordeal as described in Deut 13:2–6.[83] Neither Deuteronomy nor 4Q375 impugns the prophetic character of the seducer prophet. Neither text condemns the prophet for speaking in the name of God, nor brands the prophet as a false prophet. Rather, both texts identify the individual as a prophet, using the word **נביא**. There is no concern with ascertaining the reliability of the prophet's oracular ability (as in Deut 18:15–22). The perceived danger is the prophet's advocacy of defiance of God's law. For this alone the seducer prophet is prosecuted. In fact, Deuteronomy explic-

[77] It is generally agreed that the high priest is intended. See Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.XIV*, 114; Brin, "Laws," 46.

[78] See Brin, "Laws," 47–53, for full analysis of this section and an attempt to decipher its relationship to the contents of column one.

[79] Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.XIV*, 116. In particular, Strugnell observes that only the first three lines of column two are lacking (the amount of blank space below line nine in column one marks it as the last line in the column). As such, it is unlikely that the subject matter of column one would have been completed in these lines and an entirely new subject begun (cf. Brin, "Laws," 29–30). Strugnell also suggests that the conclusion to this fragment may be found in 4Q376 1 ii. He restores 1 ii 7–8: "and he (i.e., Aaron) shall study a[ll the laws of] Yahweh for all [cases of prophecy … those laws that have been con]cealed from thee" ("Moses-Pseudepigrapha," 228; cf. Brin, "Laws," 47). Such a reconstruction ties the otherwise unconnected contents of column two back to the ordeal of column one.

[80] See, however, the reconstruction suggested by Strugnell (cited in the previous note) and the interpretation of its significance in Brin, "Laws," 49–53.

[81] The contents of the preamble (ll. 1–4) to the ordeal of the seducer prophet (discussed above, p. 48) demand absolute obedience to the law as dictated by a general prophet. This feature suggests that the prophet found in the remainder of the fragment promotes negligence in observance of the law.

[82] There is no indication that the main concern is to test the genuineness of any potential prophet.

[83] For full discussion of the relationship between 4Q375 and Deuteronomy 13, see Brin, "Laws."

itly states that the prophet is condemned even if his or her predictions come true, which in other circumstances would validate one's ability to prophesy (Deut 13:3). Likewise, in 4Q375, what makes the individual a seducer prophet is not the appropriation of the role of a divine mediator. Rather, as a prophet, this individual offers improper instruction and preaches apostasy among the people.

Moreover, when the prophet's fellow clan members offer a defense of the prophet, they are less concerned with validating the individual's genuineness as a prophet. Rather, they first contend that the prophet is "righteous" (צדיק) (4Q375 1 i 6). Such a claim is clearly in response to the accusation that the prophet is preaching apostasy from God; they challenge the veracity of the accusation.[84] Secondarily, the tribe asserts that the prophet is "faithful" (נאמן) (4Q375 1 i 7), meaning that the prophet's predictions come true.[85] Even with this clause, the tribal intervention is not guided by a desire to vouch for this individual's prophetic ability. Rather, they are claiming that the individual is falsely accused. Like Deuteronomy 13, 4Q375 is concerned with the abuse of power that comes with one's role as a divine mediator.

In his analysis of the presentation of prophecy in the Moses Apocryphon, Strugnell argues that if the Moses Apocryphon is assigned a sectarian provenance, then "it would imply the presence of prophecy there."[86] If the text is non-sectarian, Strugnell's observation could be extended to wider segments of Second Temple Judaism. The earlier proviso regarding the extent to which this text accurately reflects the social concerns of the time in which it was composed, however, should be recalled. Accordingly, it is uncertain if the existence of a detailed set of rubrics concerning seducer prophets indicates a genuine and tangible concern in Second Temple Judaism.

At the same time, the rewriting of Deuteronomy 13 in the Apocryphon of Moses differs considerably from the similar phenomenon in the Temple Scroll. 4Q375 reflects a much more detailed reformulation of Deuteronomy 13. In particular, 4Q375 provides a full procedure in order to identify the seducer prophet as well as the procedural requirements needed in order to execute this prophet. The pervasiveness of

[84] So Brin, "Laws," 37: "The statement about his being a righteous (person) had no special connections with his prophetic career, and it may have meant that the accusation against him was not true." Contra Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.XIV*, 114.

[85] See Brin, "Laws," 37–40.

[86] Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.XIV*, 131.

this concern, as it is expressed in the detailed rubrics, suggests that this document does not have in view one or two stray prophets. Rather, 4Q375 establishes an institutional response to a problem generated by a prominent social class. Even if the primary role of this law is expected to be enforced in its entirety only in some ideal feature, the existence of such a detailed set of rubrics surely suggests that this was a genuine and tangible concern.

4QList of False Prophets (4Q339)[87]

4Q339 contains a list of named individuals, all of whom are known from the Hebrew Bible as prophets. The list opens with the title "[fa]lse prophets who arose against Israel" (נביאי [ש]קרא די קמו ב[ישראל]).[88] It then proceeds to identify eight such prophets, beginning with Balaam son of Beor. Aharon Shemesh notes, however, that Balaam is nowhere identified as a false prophet; in fact, the Hebrew Bible testifies to the genuineness of his prophetic ability.[89] Moreover, he was clearly seen as such by the Qumran community.[90] As such, Shemesh understands the inclusion of Balaam in this list as similar to the earlier understanding of 4Q375. Balaam is not condemned as a false prophet like that of Deuteronomy 18. It is for this reason that Balaam, better classified as a seducer prophet, is here included. Prophesying falsely indicates a malicious attempt to turn Israel away from

---

[87] The Aramaic text was first published in Magen Broshi and Ada Yardeni, "'Al ha-Netinim (4Q430) u-Nevi'e Šeqer (4Q339)," *Tarbiz* 62 (1994): 50–54. This publication appears in revised form as "On *Netinim* and False Prophets," in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies on Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield* (ed. Z. Zevit, S. Gitin, and M. Sokoloff; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 33–37. See also their edition in *Qumran Cave 4.XIV*, 77–79. Other contributions to the understanding of this text can be found in Elisha Qimron, "Le-Pišrah Šel Rešimat Nevi'e ha-Šeqer," *Tarbiz* 63 (1993): 273–275; Aharon Shemesh, "A Note on 4Q339 'List of False Prophets,'" *RevQ* 20 (2000): 319–320; Klaus Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Totem Meer: Band 2* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 128.

[88] The *editio princeps* has "arose in Israel." Shemesh, however, observes that Balaam, the first individual on the list, was not Israelite and thus could not arise "in Israel" ("Note," 319–320). Thus, he points to the adversative nature of קם ב, and suggests the translation "against Israel." Indeed, the rest of the false prophets on the list were certainly enemies of Israel.

[89] Shemesh, "Note," 319–320.

[90] Based on CD 7:18–21, which contains a pesher interpretation on one of Balaam's prophecies. Balaam was also seen as a genuine prophet in rabbinic tradition. See the references cited in Broshi and Yardeni, *Qumran Cave 4.XIV*, 78, n. 5, and discussion above, p. 249, n. 22.

God.[91] The other prophets found in the list include the Old Man from Bethel (1 Kgs 13:11–31), Zedekiah son of Chenaanah (1 Kgs 22:1–28; 2 Chr 18:1–27), Ahab son of Koliath (Jer 29:21–24), Zedekiah son of Maaseiah (Jer 29:21–24), Shemaiah the Nehlemite (Jer 29:24–32), Hananiah son of Azur (Jeremiah 28).

The importance of this list for the study of prophecy in Second Temple Judaism hinges on the reconstruction of the final line (l. 9). The only visible marks on the line are *ʿayin*, *waw*, and *nun*. In their initial publication, Magen Broshi and Ada Yardeni did not offer any reconstruction.[92] Their revised edition, however, is far bolder in reconstructing this line. They correctly observe that no biblical false prophet has a patronymic that ends in עון. Already, Elisha Qimron recognized this and suggested that a later figure is in view.[93] Thus, Qimron, followed by Broshi and Yardeni in their later edition, reconstructs this final word as שמעון and the entire name as יוחנן בן שמ]עון.[94] This would be none other than John Hyrcanus I, whose prophetic character is attested by Josephus.[95]

In their DJD edition, however, Broshi and Yardeni offer an alternative restoration: נביאה די מן גב]עון].[96] They understand this line as further clarifying the identity of Hananiah son of Azur (from l. 8) who was from Gibeon.[97] Such an interpretation, however, is in complete incongruity with the rest of the list. Only the Old Man from Bethel (l. 3) and Shemaiah the Nehlemite (l. 7) are identified by their place names because that is the way they are introduced in the Hebrew Bible. No other individuals are further distinguished by their place of residence. Rather, each line on the list offers a proper name and patronymic. Broshi and Yardeni offer no justification for their understanding, except that it is "simpler."[98]

Rather, it is simpler to assume that an additional name should be reconstructed in line nine. To be sure, this need not necessarily be John Hyrcanus, but it is likely a post-biblical figure. Qimron originally

[91] Shemesh, "Note," 319.
[92] Broshi and Yardeni, "Nevi'e Šeqer," 51.
[93] Qimron, "Le-Pišrah," 275.
[94] Qimron, "Le-Pišrah," 275. See also Broshi and Yardeni, "False Prophets," 36–37. This reconstruction is also suggested by Rofé in *Ha'aretz*, April 13, 1994. It is followed by Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 325.
[95] Qimron, "Le-Pišrah," 275. See also Broshi and Yardeni, "False Prophets," 36–37. On Josephus' claims, see *War* 1.68–69.
[96] This reconstruction is followed by García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 2:708.
[97] Broshi and Yardeni, *Qumran Cave 4.XIV*, 79.
[98] Broshi and Yardeni, *Qumran Cave 4.XIV*, 79. In support of this new reading, they

suggested that the entire list as it appears was written with the final individual in mind.[99] The inclusion of a present figure in a list of famous biblical false prophets would do much to malign the character of that individual and impugn his prophetic abilities.[100]

Whether or not the false prophet in line nine is John Hyrcanus I, 4Q339 provides evidence for ongoing prophetic activity in the late Second Temple period as well as opposition to such prophets. Unlike the Temple Scroll and the Moses Apocryphon, 4Q339 does not contain legislation for some presumed ideal time.[101] Rather, it is concerned with the revelatory claims of contemporary prophets. From the perspective of the author(s) of this text, these contemporary prophets are illegitimate and should be classified with the false prophets from the Hebrew Bible.

Summary

Five documents have been drawn upon in the examination of potential contemporary prophetic activity in the Dead Sea Scrolls. As noted above, no text employs standard prophetic terminology in order to identify sectarian activity as prophecy. The passage from the Hodayot contains sectarian revelatory claims, though this is not explicitly identified as prophetic. The relative paucity of such claims in the sectarian literature indicates that the Qumran community distinguished its own mediating functions from its prophetic antecedents.

These five texts, however, illuminate the prophetic self-awareness of various social elements outside of the Qumran community. The application of prophetic terminology to contemporary social groups assumes the existence of ongoing prophetic activity in late Second Temple period Judaism. At the same time, these texts do not contain detailed information concerning the forms in which this prophecy appeared or the nature and context of its application. The two sec-

point to a forthcoming article by Qimron in *Tarbiz* (I am not certain if this article was ever published). The text and the different suggested reconstructions are discussed briefly by Brooke, "Parabiblical," 1:274–275.

[99] Qimron, "Le-Pišrah," 275.

[100] Qimron, "Le-Pišrah," 275. See also Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 323–324.

[101] See, however, Matthew Morgenstern, "Language and Literature in the Second Temple Period," *JJS* 48 (1997): 140–141, who argues that this text is entirely an "aca-

tarian documents provide a small glimpse into the juridical context of some of this prophetic activity. The primary goal of each of the texts, however, is not to document prophetic activity. Rather, the notice concerning prophetic activity is only secondarily introduced in the larger framework of debate over access to the divine realm in juridical matters. Likewise, the non-sectarian documents treated contain no presentation of present-day prophets or a description of contemporary prophetic activity.

All five of these texts contain heightened elements of prophetic conflict and concerns with false and illegitimate prophecy. In the sectarian texts, this conflict is represented as a debate between the community and its opponents over access to the divine realm and the attendant claims to divine authority for legal rulings. The non-sectarian documents reflect a more widespread concern with illegitimate prophets in Second Temple Jewish society. The Temple Scroll retains in rewritten form the prophetic laws found in Deuteronomy. The Moses Apocryphon (4Q375) seems to contain an ordeal for identifying and trying a prophet who preaches apostasy. It is not clear, however, how representative these two texts are concerning real concerns in Second Temple Judaism regarding prophets. In contrast, the List of False Prophets (4Q339) is clearly focused on contemporary revelatory and prophetic claims. By opening with Balaam, identified as an authentic prophet in the Hebrew Bible, the text indicates that its concern is not with false prophets. Rather, it is directed against prophets in the past who posed a threat to Israel through their prophetic activity. This list reaches a crescendo in the final name on the list, which likely contains the name of a prophet from the late Second Temple period, perhaps even John Hyrcanus I. This prophet is castigated in the text not for being a false prophet, but for prophesying in such a manner that he is deemed an enemy of Israel.

These documents therefore point to a widespread concern with illegitimate prophets and prophecy and the concomitant opposition to various strands of prophetic activity. Biblical scholarship is in general agreement that a similar conflict regarding competing claims to prophecy and revelation characterized the early Second Temple period.[102] In all likelihood, similar concerns with revelatory claims and dis-

---

demic document" and therefore does not accurately reflect contemporary social concerns with false prophecy.

[102] See Petersen, *Late*, 27–38 (esp. 37–38); Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 12–13; Lange, "Read-

trust of prophets continued to exist within various circles in late Second Temple Judaism.[103] The resumption of such concerns in the late Second Temple period indicates that prophecy was an active reality for at least some segments of Second Temple Judaism.

The opposition to contemporary prophetic activity, as reflected in the Qumran texts, focuses on the content of the prophetic message and the claim to possess the true word of God. The presence of two sectarian documents containing such anti-prophetic invectives as well as non-sectarian documents concerned with illegitimate prophets suggests a heightened interest among the Qumran community in determining God's genuine mediators. As a community that viewed itself and its leaders as possessing a unique connection with the divine realm, it would be especially interested in ensuring that illegitimate prophets are identified as such.

ing," 181–184; Nissinen, "Dubious Image." Schniedewind notes, however, that prophetic conflict is entirely absent in Chronicles (*Word*, 247–249).

[103] See Meyer, "Prophecy," 6:812–813; Blenkinsopp, "Prophecy," 259–260; Aune, *Prophecy*, 127–128, 137–138; Ingelaere, "L'Inspiration," 242; Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 58–59; Schniedewind, *Word*, 248; Stemberger, "Propheten," 147.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

SAPIENTIAL REVELATION IN SECOND TEMPLE JUDAISM

The previous chapter was devoted to examining evidence for prophetic activity in the Second Temple period as reflected in the Qumran corpus. Part of the reason for the limited corpus of relevant texts involves the fact that this analysis was restricted to texts that contain explicit prophetic language and thus can unequivocally attest to the status of prophecy in the late Second Temple period. Such textual examples, however, only tell part of the story. I began this study by suggesting that one must not be bound by the prophetic language and imagery of the Hebrew Bible in order to understand prophecy and revelation in Second Temple Judaism. Indeed, the portrait of the ancient prophets within the Qumran corpus is not merely a replica of that which appears in the Hebrew Bible. Rather, prophecy and its revelatory framework began to be conceptualized in new and modified forms.

The present chapter represents a sequel to chapters 12–13, which treated the application of sapiential revelation to ancient prophetic figures. Numerous contexts were observed, spanning across genre divisions, in which the revelatory experience of individuals from among Israel's classical prophets was reconceptualized as a sapiential revelatory experience. The majority of the Qumran texts treated in those chapters are generally classified as non-sectarian. Thus, the appearance of the receipt of revealed wisdom as a revelatory experience is likely part of larger transformations that took place in Second Temple Judaism concerning how divine revelation was received. At the same time, the preservation and cultivation of these texts within the Qumran library points to an equal interest in these phenomena among the sectarian community. In chapter eighteen, I explore the application of this revelatory model within sectarian literature and the implications of this feature for the question of divine revelation in the Qumran community.

This chapter expands the area of focus to include the larger world of Second Temple Judaism. I am interested in non-sectarian litera-

ture preserved at Qumran that attests to wider currents in Second Temple Judaism which were well known to the Qumran community. The preservation of this literature in the Qumran corpus indicates that the community shared its worldview to some degree. I examine one historical and one literary example, each of which indicates that sapiential revelation was conceptualized as one of the heirs to ancient prophetic modes of revelation. I first discuss the question of Ben Sira's prophetic self-awareness and its sapiential orientation.[1] I then look at 1Q/4QInstruction, one of the most important wisdom texts in the Qumran corpus. I consider whether the sapiential encounter as described in this document was conceptualized as a revelatory experience.

Ben Sira as Prophet

The conceptualization of the receipt of wisdom as a revelatory encounter is explicit in Ben Sira's portrait of the requisite path of the sage and his own self-consciousness as a sage and as heir to the ancient prophets.[2] Ben Sira often deliberates on the proper path of a prospective sage and the model of the ideal sage.[3] These considerations are most apparent in Ben Sira's hymn where he compares the ideal sage with a skilled worker (38:24–39:11). The section treating the ideal sage (39:1–11) opens with a precise résumé of the educational track that the promising sage must travel.

This pedagogical process unfolds in three successive stages.[4] The first involves the purely educational track of the prospective sage. Intellectual immersion in sacred Scripture, general wisdom, and experiential knowledge marks the beginning of the path (39:1–4). This alone, however, does not suffice. Rather, the prospective sage must also actively pray and display prudent obedience to God (39:5).[5] At this point, the

[1] By 'prophetic self-awareness,' I mean the extent to which Ben Sira viewed his own sapiential activity in continuity with the ancient prophets and the manner in which this sapiential activity was conceptualized by Ben Sira as a means of divine revelation.

[2] For research on Ben Sira's prophetic self-awareness, see bibliography above, p. 7, n. 17. On revelation in Ben Sira, see Argall, *1 Enoch*, 53–98.

[3] See discussion in John G. Gammie, "The Sage in Sirach," in *The Sage*, 368–369.

[4] The identification of three successive stages in 39:1–11 follows Mack, *Wisdom*, 93–101.

[5] Note that prayer is often presented as a preparatory act for the receipt of revelation. See p. 217, n. 17.

potential sage has done everything humanly possible in order to cultivate wisdom; it now remains in God's hands.[6]

The second stage involves the divine bestowal of knowledge and understanding. God, as the ultimate purveyor of all wisdom, must deem the sage worthy to receive divine knowledge: "Then, if it pleases the Lord Almighty, he will be filled with the spirit of understanding (πνεύματι συνέσεως)" (39:6a).[7] The apogee of the sage's educational experience is the receipt of revealed knowledge mediated through the divine spirit. The now initiated sage professes gratitude to God in prayer: "He will pour forth his words of wisdom and in prayer give thanks to the Lord" (39:6b). According to Burton L. Mack, the "prayer here is not merely the mark of general piety, but a personal claim to inspiration."[8] The sage identifies God as the source of his newfound wisdom and attributes his understanding to divine munificence. Commentators further note that the presentation of the sage's sapiential initiation draws upon language and imagery similar to the receipt of the divine spirit that marks the onset of prophetic inspiration.[9] The ensuing lines provide a three-fold model for how the sage becomes a conduit through which this knowledge is transmitted to the larger community (39:7–11).[10] Like the ancient prophets, the sage receives the divine word after a preparatory process and then proceeds to transmit the revealed world to others. Unlike the ancient prophet, however, revelation for the sage is a thoroughly sapiential experience.

The hymn to the ideal sage clearly regards God as the ultimate source of all knowledge. The prospective sage, no matter what prior education has been attained, must await the receipt of the divine spirit of knowledge in order to be initiated fully as a sage. The exact circumstances by which this receipt of revealed wisdom takes place are clearly

---

[6] Box and Oesterley, "Sirach," 1:456; Perdue, "Ben Sira," 138. Purdue further argues that the emphasis on the divine selection of the sage opposes the revelatory framework associated with apocalypticism as found, for example, in Daniel and Enoch (pp. 133–134, 139–140).

[7] All translations follow Skehan, and Di Lella, *Ben Sira*. Note that "spirit of understanding" (πνεύματι συνέσεως) may reflect an original Hebrew רוח נבונה, the same expression that was used to describe David's sapiential revelation in the Psalms Scroll (see pp. 250–255).

[8] Mack, *Wisdom*, 98.

[9] Mack, *Wisdom*, 98–99; Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 59. Rudolph Smend further observes that Ben Sira employs similar language to describe Elisha's receipt of prophetic inspiration (48:12) (*Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach* [3 vols.; Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1906], 2:254).

[10] See Skehan and Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 452.

different from classical revelatory models.[11] At the same time, the experience here is still one of divine revelation to select individuals. It is the exact content and revelatory framework that has changed. Visions and oracles are not the media of transmission, but rather divinely revealed knowledge and wisdom.

Ben Sira's conception of the ideal sage should be understood within the context of his own self-reflective remarks elsewhere in the book.[12] In an autobiographical note, Ben Sira claims about himself:

> [I] said to myself, "I will water my plants, my flower bed I will drench"; and suddenly this rivulet of mine became a river, then this stream of mine, a sea. Again will I send my teachings forth shining like the dawn, to spread their brightness afar off; Again will I pour out instruction like prophecy (ὡς προφητείαν),[13] and bequeath it to generations yet to come. (24:31–33)

Ben Sira seems to identify himself as an example of the ideal sage described in chapter thirty-nine. As an ideal sage, Ben Sira views his own sapiential realization as the result of divine revelation.[14] Also as the ideal sage, Ben Sira describes his own responsibilities to transmit this knowledge.[15] Most importantly, Ben Sira compares his own sapiential experience here to prophecy. The syntax of this passage, however, yields two possible understandings of the precise nature of this relationship. The expression "like prophecy" can refer to either the process of "pouring out" or the content of the "instruction." If it is the latter, then Ben Sira merely equates the character of his sapiential instruction with the ethos of ancient prophetic discourse. If it is the former, however,

[11] Mack, *Wisdom*, 99.

[12] The close connection between 39:6 and 24:21–33 for Ben Sira's prophetic self-awareness is thusly noted by Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 134–135; Anthony R. Ceresko, "The Liberative Strategy of Ben Sira: The Sage as Prophet," in *Prophets and Proverbs: More Studies in Old Testament Poetry and Biblical Religion* (Quezon City: Claretian, 2002), 58; Perdue, "Ben Sira," 139.

[13] The Syriac has "in prophecy."

[14] Skehan and Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 338.

[15] See further 50:27 where Ben Sira uses similar language in order to describe the process of composing his book: "Of Yeshua ben Eleazar Ben Sira who poured them out from his understanding heart" (noted by Smend, *Weisheit*, 2:224). This serves to connect further the portrait of the ideal sage and Ben Sira's prophetic self-awareness. Some commentators even emend the text here from "who poured them out" (אשר ניבע) to "who prophesied them" (ניבא). See, e.g., Smend, *Weisheit*, 2:493–494; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 89, n. 199. This emendation, however, is rejected by Skehan and Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 557, based on lack of any supporting textual evidence. Indeed, the consonance with 39:6 recommends against emendation. See also Argall, *1 Enoch*, 89, n. 227, who notes another possible emendation: "which was written in [this] book" (אשר נכתב בספר).

Ben Sira views his receipt of divine knowledge and subsequent transmission of this revealed knowledge as a process very closely related to the activity of the ancient prophets.[16] According to both understandings, Ben Sira indicates the close proximity of his sapiential activity and ancient prophecy. In doing so, Ben Sira conceives of himself here as analogous to the ancient prophets and therefore in continuity with the prophetic tradition.[17]

Much scholarly discussion has focused on how to label Ben Sira's prophetic self-awareness. He is generally located at some point on a continuum between prophet and sage.[18] Such scholars are correct in their hesitation to label Ben Sira a prophet like the classical prophets from Israel's past. Indeed, he never actually makes this assertion for himself.[19] Rather, he claims to have received divine revelation within a sapiential context.[20]

For Ben Sira, the experience of divine mediation has shifted classical prophetic models into sapiential revelation. Revelation is no longer the exclusive domain of the prophet, but has entered the realm of the sage. In the context of Ben Sira's assertion, this claim takes on added meaning, since for Ben Sira, wisdom is equated with the Torah.[21] Indeed, the hymn to the ideal sage begins with an exhortation to study thoroughly all the Torah and prophets (38:34–39:1) and Torah is the

---

[16] This latter understanding seems to be implied by the Syriac text ("in prophecy"). This may reflect a more original text or a later translator's interpretation of the meaning of the text. Another possibility is proposed by Henze, "Invoking," 133, who suggests that Ben Sira believed "that his own instructions, like prophecy, are of ongoing value."

[17] See Stadelmann, *Ben Sira*, 259. Ben Sira's claim of prophetic continuity is also noted by Smend, *Weisheit*, 2:224; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 134–135; Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy and Canon*, 129; Mack, *Wisdom*, 225–226, n. 11; Gammie, "Sage," 370–371; Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 59; Purdue, "Ben Sira," 152–153; Beentjes, "Prophets," 148–149. See also Ceresko, "Ben Sira," 57–58, who assigns an even greater prophetic identity to Ben Sira than most commentators.

[18] Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 134; Mack, *Wisdom*, 126–127; Gammie, "Sage," 370–371; Perdue, "Ben Sira," 138.

[19] As noted by Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 56; Beentjes, "Prophets," 149.

[20] See further, Beentjes, "Prophets," 149, who argues that Ben Sira's comparison of his activity to prophecy is intended to emphasize his status as an "inspired mediator" with "divine legitimacy." For attempts at explaining why Ben Sira displays such a heightened interest in his prophetic self-awareness, see the summary of interpretations (and his own) in Ceresko, "Ben Sira," 59–64.

[21] See Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 160–162; Schnabel, *Law*, 69–92; Skehan and Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 75–76; Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 63–64.

focal point of the entire hymn (38:23–29).[22] Thus, Ben Sira's receipt of sapiential knowledge marks the revelation of Torah to sages as a revelatory experience in continuity with the revelation of the word of God to the ancient prophets.[23] All teachings of Ben Sira and similar sages are therefore authorized as the revealed word of God.[24] Ben Sira's claim of personal sapiential revelation and his location of this experience within the development of the ideal sage point to the reality of sapiential revelation in Second Temple wisdom circles.[25]

Revealed Wisdom and Revelation in 1Q/4QInstruction

The Qumran document known as 1Q/4QInstruction is another important witness to the reality of sapiential revelation in the Second Temple period and the mechanics of its application.[26] The text itself survives in one copy from Cave 1 (1Q26) and seven copies from Cave 4 (4Q415–418, 4Q423).[27] The large number of manuscripts found at Qumran testifies to the esteem with which the text was likely viewed

---

[22] See Schnabel, *Law*, 52–55; Perdue, "Ben Sira," 137.

[23] Cf. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 60; Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 59.

[24] Perdue, "Ben Sira," 141.

[25] See Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 57–68, for additional treatment of prophetic inspiration in wisdom literature. See also Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 210–218, for a survey of similar themes in non-Jewish sapiential literature.

[26] This text was previously referred to as Sapiential Text A. It is also known as *Musar le-Mevin*. The text can be found in John Strugnell, Daniel J. Harrington, and Torleif Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: 4QInstruction (Musar leMevin): 4Q415ff.* (DJD XXXIV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999). This volume also contains a reissue of 1Q26, which was originally published in DJD 1 by Milik. Strugnell and Harrington provide an extensive introduction to the text (with bibliography) (pp. 1–40). This document has also been the subject of significant recent full length studies. See Armin Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995); Torleif Elgvin, "An Analysis of 4QInstruction" (Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University, 1997); Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2001); Goff, *4QInstruction*. See also Torleif Elgvin, "The Reconstruction of Sapiential Work A," *RevQ* 16 (1995): 559–580; idem, "Wisdom, Revelation, and Eschatology in an Early Essene Writing," *SBL Seminar Papers, 1995* (SBLSP 34; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 440–463; idem, "The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation," in *Qumran*, 113–150.

[27] 4Q415–418 are written in early Herodian hand (30–1 B.C.E.), while 4Q423 comes from a late Herodian hand (1–50 C.E.). Elgvin proposes that 4Q418 (4Q418a; *olim* 4Q418 1–2) should be divided into two separate manuscripts (thus producing seven Cave 4 copies) ("Wisdom," 440; idem, "Reconstruction," 559–580). The arrangement of the manuscripts in Strugnell and Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV*, 34:1–2, only par-

by the Qumran community.[28] Though the text itself was well received at Qumran, it is generally assumed not to be a sectarian composition. Some scholars, however, suggest that its origin can be found in the presectarian predecessors of the community on account of several linguistic and thematic connections between the text and some sectarian literature.[29] Most scholars explain this similarity as a result of the influence that 1Q/4QInstruction undoubtedly exerted on sectarian literature and ideology. Accordingly, Strugnell and Harrington propose that the most likely scenario is that the text emerges "from a general offshoot of Jewish wisdom, of uncertain date and not sectarian at all."[30]

The text is important for the study of sapiential revelation on account of what Matthew J. Goff identifies as, "its prominent appeals to revelation."[31] All knowledge in 1Q/4QInstruction is ultimately traced back to God through a system of revelation. Knowledge of all matters, worldly and heavenly, is grounded in a system of divine revelation.[32]

---

tially agrees with Elgvin. Tigchelaar sees in 4Q418 the remnant of three manuscripts, thus producing eight total Cave 4 copies (*To Increase Learning*, 15–17, 70–123).

[28] Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 117–118; Strugnell and Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV*, 2; Elgvin, "Mystery to Come," 113–114. Both Collins and Elgvin emphasize that the presence of one copy in Cave 1 may further point to the important status the text had within the community.

[29] Elgvin, "Wisdom," 460–463. Elgvin notes, however, that many prominent features of sectarian ideology and orientation (i.e., Teacher of Righteousness, temple and cult, purity, etc.) are lacking in 1Q/4QInstruction. He therefore proposes two explanations: the text comes from a proto-sectarian community or is representative of the larger Essene movement. Elgvin (p. 456) also suggests that reference to the Vision of Hagu in 4Q417 recommends a sectarian provenance. His argument here is misguided. Elgvin repeatedly refers to the reference in 4QInstruction as the "Book of Hagi." 4QInstruction never alludes to the book, but only the "Vision of Hagu." This is one of many shared elements between 1Q/4QInstruction and sectarian writings with respect to terminology and imagery. It does not, however, demand that the document is a sectarian or even pre-sectarian composition.

[30] Strugnell and Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV*, 22. This is based on the terminological and linguistic analysis provided there. The location of 1Q/4QInstruction in a larger non-sectarian sapiential context is also proposed by Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 194–207, 247–248. The most comprehensive comparison of 1Q/4QInstruction with sectarian texts is found in Lange, *Weisheit*, who focuses in particular on the themes of the preexistent order of creation and predestination in 1Q/4QInstruction and the sectarian documents. Lange concludes the 1Q/4QInstruction should not be assigned a sectarian provenance, but exerted considerable influence on sapiential strands in sectarian literature.

[31] Goff, *4QInstruction*, 30. The importance of revelation in this document is likewise explored in Elgvin, "Wisdom," 440–463; idem, "Mystery to Come," 113–150.

[32] The division of wisdom in 1Q/4QInstruction into 'worldly' and 'heavenly,' following Goff, *4QInstruction*, is admittedly artificial. Below, I argue in agreement with

More specifically, this revelatory model follows the sapiential revelatory experience already witnessed in other contexts.

The document is presented as a series of instructions from a teacher to a student, who is identified by the title מבין ("one who understands").[33] The title of the teacher is never stated, though Strugnell and Harrington assume that the teacher would be referred to as a משכיל.[34] The text deals with two types of knowledge, heavenly matters and ethical instruction in business, family, and related matters.[35] Strugnell and Harrington suggest that this scenario reflects a real life pedagogical setting in the Second Temple period, perhaps within a wisdom circle analogous to the sort assumed for Ben Sira.[36] Thus, the sapiential revelatory framework found in 1Q/4QInstruction likely reflects a reality in which sages and disciples appealed to revealed wisdom and saw themselves as active participants in the revelatory experience.

The fundamental statement concerning revealed wisdom in 1Q/4QInstruction can be found in the opening lines of 4Q417 1 i 1–13 (par. 4Q418 43):[37]

Florentino García Martínez, "Wisdom at Qumran: Worldly or Heavenly?" in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism*, 9–14, that 1Q/4QInstruction traces all knowledge back to God, thus effectively making it 'heavenly' knowledge. I use the terms 'worldly' and 'heavenly' here to refer to matters relating to mundane matters (ethics, etc.) and apocalyptic (eschatological) concerns, respectively.

[33] See Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, "The Addressees of 4QInstruction," in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran*, 62–75.

[34] Strugnell and Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV*, 19. This suggestion is based on the prominent role of the משכיל in the Qumran community as an instructor of wisdom. See further, Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 245–246.

[35] A good summary of the contents of the text can be found in Daniel J. Harrington, "Wisdom at Qumran," in *Community of the Renewed Covenant*, 137–152.

[36] Strugnell and Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV*, 20. I use the term 'wisdom circle' here rather than 'school' since there is much that is not known about the exact social setting of 1Q/4QInstruction. Strugnell and Harrington wonder what type of a school would provide instruction to only one student, a situation seemingly reflected in the document. Elgvin likewise argues that the document assumes the existence of an active sapiential community ("Wisdom," 443–446; idem, "Mystery to Come," 116–117). A more restrained view is advanced in Tigchelaar, "Addressees," 67–68.

[37] Strugnell and Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV*, 154–155. Further treatment can be found in Lange, *Weisheit*, 50–68; Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 53–54. Harrington suggests that this particular column may have been located close to the beginning of the original manuscript, perhaps sandwiched between the eschatological passage that is assumed to open the document (4Q416 1) and the purely sapiential passages that follow (4Q416 2 i–iv) (*Wisdom Texts*, 54). Some physical features recommend the identification of 4Q416 1 as the beginning of the document. In particular, the presence of an extensive right-hand margin suggests that this was the first column of the original manuscript (Strugnell and Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV*, 83). The fragmentary

> (1) [and] thou, O underst[a]nding one[… (2) [ ] … gaze thou on, [and on the wondrous myster[ies of the God of the Awesome Ones thou shall ponder. The beginnings of] (3) [ ] [ ] And gaze [on the mystery that is to come, and the deeds of old, on what is to be and what is to be] (4) [in what…] for ev[er… [(5) is, and to what is to be in what]… in every[ ] act and a[ct] (6) [And by day and by night meditate upon the mystery that is to] come (רז נהיה), and study (it) continually. And then thou shalt know truth and iniquity, wisdom (7) [and foolish]ness thou shalt [recognize], every ac[t]in all their ways. Together with their punishment(s) in all ages everlasting, and the punishment (8) of eternity. Then thou shalt discern between the [goo]d and [evil according to their] deeds. For the God of knowledge is the foundation of truth (כי אל הדעות סוד אמת) and by[38] the mystery to come (9) he has laid out its (i.e., truth's) foundation (וברז נהיה פרש את אושה), and its deeds [he has prepared with all wis]dom and with all[c]unning has he fashioned it (לכול חכ[מה ולכל ע]רמה יצרה), and the domain of its deed (creatures) (10) with a[ll] its secrets [has he…] … [ ] he [ex]pounded for their un[der]standing every d[ee]d / cr[eatu]re so that man could walk (11) in the [fashion (inclination)] of their / his understanding, and he will / did expound for m[an…] and in a proper understanding he kn[ows the se]crets of (12) his plan (ובכושר מבינות נוד[עו נס]תרי מחשבתו), together with how he should walk[p]erfec[t in all] his [ac]tions. These things investigate / seek early and continually. And gain understanding [about a]ll (13) their outcomes. And then thou shalt know about the glory of [his] m[ight, toge]ther with his marvelous mysteries and the mighty acts he has wrought.

There is much in this fragment that is difficult to decipher, as is apparent from the editors' own sometime polysemous translation and the many necessary reconstructions.[39] It is possible, however, to arrive at a general understanding of its basic framework and assumptions. This literary unit is cast as instruction from the teacher to the disciple (l. 1). The content of this lesson, in words of the editors, "consists of exhortations to understand human deeds and their rewards, that is, first to

---

column is replete with eschatological and cosmological speculation (Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*, 41). See, however, Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, "Towards a Reconstruction of the Beginning of 4QInstruction (4Q416 Fragment 1 and Parallels)," in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, Leuven University Press, 2002), 99–126, for an alternative view on the reconstruction of the beginning of the document. This assumed placement of 4Q417 1 i 1–13 toward the beginning of the document serves to underscore the centrality of its themes for remainder of the text.

[38] Strugnell and Harrington render the *bet* here as by/on. See below for my understanding of this preposition.

[39] Many of the reconstructions offered here, however, are certain based on textual overlap with 4Q418 43 (cf. 4Q418 45).

understand God's fearful mysteries and then His past, present, and future punishment of those deeds."[40] The disciple is instructed in order to comprehend good and evil and God's role within the human world. As is readily apparent, such concerns are similar to those found in biblical and post-biblical wisdom literature. There are, however, some traces of eschatological speculation in this passage. For example, the concern with "punishment(s) in all ages everlasting, and the punishment of eternity" (ll. 7–8) points to a heightened eschatological interest.[41]

How exactly is the disciple expected to gain access to this wisdom and knowledge?[42] At the outset the text provides some guidance: "[by day and by night meditate (הגה) upon the mystery that is to] come (רז נהיה), and study (דורש)[43] (it) continually.[44] And then thou shalt know truth and iniquity, wisdom [and foolish]ness thou shalt [recognize], every ac[t]in all their ways" (ll. 6–7). Intense study of the רז נהיה, a term that will be treated in greater detail below, is identified as the means that "will bring knowledge of the world and creation, of correct behavior in the present, and of the rewards and punishment accompanying the eschatological vision."[45]

The text proceeds to explain why the רז נהיה is the means to achieving this full understanding of God's mysteries: "for the God of knowledge is the foundation of truth (כי אל הדעות סוד אמת) and by the mystery to come he has laid out its (i.e., truth's) foundation (וברז נהיה פרש את אושה), and its deeds [he has prepared with all wis]dom and with all[c]unning has he fashioned it (לכל חכ[מה ולכל ע]רמה יצרה])" (ll. 8–9). The רז נהיה is originally employed by God in the creative process to establish truthful order and wisdom in the world. The רז נהיה, however, continues to exist within the created world as a repository of wisdom. God, as the ultimate purveyor of knowledge, has made insight into the divine mysteries accessible through the medium of the רז נהיה. Lines 10–12 continue to emphasize how God has revealed knowledge to humans

[40] Strugnell and Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV*, 156.
[41] Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*, 54.
[42] Elgvin, commenting on this passage, proposes an analogy with sectarian models in which God reveals himself through encoded messages in Scripture ("Wisdom," 452). He contends that access to these divine secrets "is gained through study of Scripture." This understanding, however, is unnecessary since the text itself provides an answer to this problem. Moreover, the sectarian models are not entirely analogous.
[43] Strugnell and Harrington correctly observe that an imperative form is needed here and translate accordingly (*Qumran Cave 4.XXIV*, 157).
[44] Cf. Ps 1:2.
[45] Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*, 54.

which can easily be accessed through the model of study outlined by the sage in the opening lines.[46] The employment of רז in this sense fits well with its general use in Second Temple period literature as material revealed from God to humans.[47]

God as a repository of knowledge is a theme encountered in numerous literary contexts. Locating knowledge within the divine framework sets the stage for the transmission of this knowledge to humans and helps to understand the larger passage. The sage instructs the disciple to meditate upon the רז נהיה since God has established it as the medium by which divine knowledge is transmitted to humans. More specifically, intense study of the רז נהיה grants humans access to divinely revealed wisdom. By gaining access to this divine repository of wisdom, the disciple will gain a full understanding of God's plan: "in a proper understanding he kn[ows the se]crets of his plan" (ובכושר מבינות נוד[עו נס]תרי מחשבתו) (ll. 11–12).

The revelatory model in this literary unit finds additional expression in several others passages in 1Q/4QInstruction where God conveys wisdom to the disciple through the medium of the רז נהיה. Thus, this text often contains the expression "he (i.e., God) has revealed to your ear (i.e., "informed you")[48] through the mystery that is to come (גלה /אל/ אוזן/אוזניכה ברז נהיה)" and the related phrase "God revealed to the ears of the understanding ones through the mystery that is to come" (גלה אל אוזן מבינים ברז נהיה).[49] In their DJD edition, Strugnell and Harrington always translate the preposition ב as "about," which marks the רז נהיה as the immediate object of the divine revelation. This preposition, however, is better understood as a *bet instrumenti*, whereby the רז נהיה is the agent of the divine revelation.[50] This understanding is further

---

[46] Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*, 55.

[47] See, e.g., Dan 2:28; *1 En.* 106:19. See Goff, *4QInstruction*, 31–32. Goff further emphasizes that a similar sense can be found in the related expression רזי פלא both in 1Q/4QInstruction and in other Second Temple period literature (pp. 35–36).

[48] On this idiom, see Zobel, "גלה," 2:482–483.

[49] For the former phrase, see 1Q26 1 4 (par. 4Q423 5 2–3); 4Q418 184 2–3; 190 2; 4Q423 7 7; cf. 4Q416 2 iii 18 (par. 4Q418 10 1) where it is one's parents who act as the revealers. For the latter, see 4Q418 123 ii 4.

[50] The translation offered by Strugnell and Harrington would be more appropriate if the preposition על were used here (see IBHS §11.2.13g; for גלה with this meaning, see Lam 2:14; 4:22). The preposition *bet* does not convey this meaning. The use of the preposition *bet* with the verbal root גלה where God is the subject indicates instrumentality (see Job 36:15). Revelation through a prophetic medium is also expressed by the combination of גלה and *bet* (see 1QS 8:15; וכאשר גלו הנביאים ברוח קודשו). See also the treatment of the use of ביד and *bet* as a preposition of prophetic agency in various bib-

reinforced by the context of some of the passages in which other information appears as the primary object of the divine communication.[51] The situation is not merely one in which God implants the רז נהיה in select humans. Rather, as in the passage cited above, full access to the divine mysteries is achieved through contemplative study of the רז נהיה (cf. 4Q418 77 2–3). The imagery here merely implies that God provides select enlightened individuals access to רז נהיה.

Elsewhere, the relationship between God and the enlightened individual is described in similar imagery, though without the mediating force of the רז נהיה: "But as for you, he has [op]ened up for you insight, and gave you authority over his storehouse" (4Q418 81 9).[52] The medium of the רז נהיה seems to be presupposed here as well. Without even approaching the question of the identity of the רז נהיה, the sapiential revelatory model presented in this passage and elsewhere in 1Q/4QInstruction is quite clear. God reveals knowledge to select humans through the medium of the רז נהיה.

What exactly is the רז נהיה and precisely how does it function within the sapiential revelatory experience? In answering this question, I pay close attention to three related elements: the chronological range, intellectual scope, and real world referent for the רז נהיה.

Scholars have grappled with this problem since the initial identification of the expression in the Cave 1 manuscript of the Book of Mysteries (1Q27). Roland de Vaux first translated the phrase as 'le mystère

lical and Qumranic texts in ch. 3. Thus, the *bet* prefix on רז נהיה should be understood as a *bet instrumenti*. The רז נהיה is not the actual object of the revelation, but rather its divine agent. Cf. Lange, *Weisheit*, 56 ("durch"); Goff, *4QInstruction*, 59 ("through"), who also translate as a *bet instrumenti* (though with no discussion).

[51] To be sure, many of the passages are extremely fragmentary and are ultimately inconclusive with respect to this question (so 4Q418 184 2; 4Q423 7 7). In 4Q423 5 2–3 (par. 1Q26 1 4) the remainder of the fragment contains several pieces of presumably revealed information. 4Q418 190 2–3 is fragmentary. The end of line three, however, is reconstructed as "things to come in eternity," which would make a perfect candidate for revealed knowledge. 4Q418 123 ii 3 reads: "everything which is to come to pass in it, why it has come to pass, and what will come to pass in it" followed by a lacuna. Immediately, following the lacuna, the text has "his time." The phrase about the רז נהיה is now introduced by a relative pronoun (אשר). This syntactical arrangement suggests that the introduction of the notice about revelation through the רז נהיה is intended to provide the source of revealed knowledge in the previous lines. Accordingly, the רז נהיה cannot be the object of revelation, but must be its agent of transmission.

[52] See Elgvin, "Mystery to Come," 124; Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 230–235, for brief treatment of this passage and its immediate context.

passé.'[53] Shortly thereafter, Isaac Rabinowitz argued that this verbal form here should be rendered with a future sense, an understanding followed by Milik in his edition of 1Q27 and by Barthélemy for 1Q26, both of which appeared in DJD 1.[54] The appearance of the expression in the Rule of the Community (1QS 11:3–4) was also subject to this same debate.[55]

The discussion laid dormant until the publication of the Cave 4 copies of 4QInstruction and 4QMysteries, where this term occurs over thirty times. The current discussion continues to concentrate on whether to assign a past or future sense to the *niphʿal* participle נהיה. The majority of translations emphasize the future sense, producing a translation close to "the mystery to come."[56] A few scholars, however, follow de Vaux's original suggestion and render the phrase with a past meaning.[57]

With respect to the chronological timeframe, grammatical analysis alone cannot fully determine meaning.[58] The participle נהיה can accurately be rendered as a perfect, which would connote a past time, and as a participle, carrying with it a future (or present) meaning.[59] Context alone must suffice in order to arrive at a full understanding of the chronological range of the רז נהיה.[60] Here as well, however, the same

[53] Roland de Vaux, "La Grotte des manuscripts hébreux," *RB* 66 (1949): 605.

[54] Isaac Rabinowitz, "The Authorship, Audience, and Date of the De Vaux Fragment of an Unidentified Work," *JBL* 71 (1952): 22; Barthélemy and Milik, *Qumran Cave 1*, 102, 104.

[55] See discussion in Elgvin, "Mystery to Come," 132.

[56] Strugnell and Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV*; Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*, 49; idem, "The *Rāz Nihyeh* in a Qumran Wisdom Text (1Q26, 4Q415–418, 423)," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 549–553; Andre Caquot, "Les texts de sagesse de Qoumrân (Aperçu prélimenaire)," *RHPS* 76 (1996): 9; Elgvin, "Analysis," 78; idem, "Wisdom," 450, n. 46; Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 121–125; Goff, *4QInstruction*, 34. Cf. Leaney, *Rule*, 252.

[57] See Lawrence H. Schiffman, "4QMysteries[b]: A Preliminary Edition," *RevQ* 16 (1993): 203; idem, "4QMysteries[a]: A Preliminary Edition and Translation," in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots*, 210; idem, in Torleif Elgvin et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1* (DJD XX; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 36; Rofé, "Revealed Wisdom," 2. Cf. Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim*, 228.

[58] Accordingly, some scholars eschew any temporal meaning in their translations. See García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, passim, ("The Mystery of Existence"); Lange, *Weisheit*, 57 ("Geheimnis des wardens").

[59] See the philological discussion in Harrington, "*Rāz Nihyeh*," 550–551; Elgvin, "Mystery to Come," 133; Goff, *4QInstruction*, 54–61. Scholars agree that the term רז is a Persian loanword meaning "mystery." It is found throughout Daniel and also appears in the Aramaic fragments of Enoch (e.g., 4Q204 [4QEn[c]] 5 ii 26–27).

[60] Cf. the similar approach found in John J. Collins, "The Mysteries of God: Cre-

tension between past, present and future is found. In some places, רז נהיה refers to God's past creative force (4Q417 1 i 8–9; 18–19) while in other places it has a clear future (often eschatological) force (1Q27 1 i 3–4; 4Q417 2 i 10–12). In some places, both of these elements are present (1Q27 1 i 3–4; 4Q417 1 i 3–4; 4Q417 1 i 1–27; 4Q418 123 ii 3–4).

Harrington observes that the passage cited above (4Q417 1 i) identifies the רז נהיה with knowledge of the past (l. 3: "deeds of old"), present (l. 3: "what is") and future (l. 3. "what is to be").[61] Accordingly, following Goff, this expression refers to the "divine mastery [that] extends throughout the chronological scope of the created order."[62] I suggest, therefore that the grammatical framework of the רז נהיה is intentionally ambiguous precisely because it should not be restricted to one timeframe. Rather, it has in view God's absolute might over the entire created world throughout all time. This concept is not expressed in any of the translations surveyed above. In this respect, it seems best to retain the intentionally indefinite term in the original Hebrew or in transliteration.[63]

The intellectual scope of רז נהיה is equally broad. A wide range of wisdom is located within the רז נהיה. The רז נהיה applies to mundane worldly affairs such as poverty (4Q416 6 4), eating (4Q418 184 2), instructions to a farmer (4Q418 103 ii; 4Q423 3 2; cf. 4Q423 5 5), and family matters relating to both one's parents (4Q416 2 iii 18) and wife (4Q416 2 iii 21). It is also important for knowledge concerning matters generally classified as apocalyptic or eschatological, such as general knowledge of God (4Q417 1 i 8–9; 4Q417 2 i 2–3) and human existence (4Q416 2 iii 9; 4Q417 2 i 18; 4Q418 77 2), good and evil (4Q417 1 i 6–8), the ways of truth (4Q416 2 iii 14; 4Q417 2 i 8–9), and punishment of the wicked (4Q417 2 i 10–11). 1Q/4QInstruction differs

ation and Eschatology in 4QInstruction and the Wisdom of Solomon," in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism*, 290.

[61] Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*, 54. Cf. the survey of the use of the root היה in the *niph'al* in Second Temple period texts in Goff, *4QInstruction*, 55–58. While some refer exclusively to the future, the majority emphasize the entire chronological scope of the created order.

[62] Goff, *4QInstruction*, 33; cf. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 122.

[63] Goff likewise recognizes the inherent grammatical difficulties in translating the expression. His solution, however, does not follow from his own strictures (*4QInstruction*, 34). He suggests that the best possible translation, following Collins, is "the mystery that is to be." This translation, however, does not connote the full chronological range that Goff himself identifies for the expression.

from other sapiential texts in its fusion of mundane and apocalyptic knowledge within the רז נהיה.[64] All wisdom is ultimately traced back to God through the medium of the רז נהיה . In this sense, the knowledge is neither 'worldly' nor 'heavenly.' By locating knowledge of all matters within the divinely revealed רז נהיה, 1Q/4QInstruction identifies the source of all understanding within the divine sphere.[65]

With the chronological range and intellectual scope of the רז נהיה identified, is it possible to identify it with any known literary work or other real world referent? Harrington answers this question in the affirmative, suggesting that the רז נהיה may have been an extrabiblical literary work such as the manual of the *Maskil* in 1QS 3:13–4:26, the Book of Hagi, or the Book of Mysteries.[66] Elgvin proposes that the רז נהיה is connected with biblical or narrowly sectarian literature.[67] The suggestion that the רז נהיה is a biblical work, however, has little to recommend it. Torah is rarely in view in 1Q/4QInstruction and the language associated with the רז נהיה provides no explicit biblical context. The other works suggested by Harrington are equally problematic. Based on what is known about the Book of Mysteries, it does not contain the full range

[64] Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*, 54; Strugnell and Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV*, 33; Goff, *4QInstruction*, 40–42; García Martínez, "Wisdom at Qumran," 5–15. There have been numerous attempts to explain this phenomenon. Elgvin suggests that two distinct layers, one sapiential and one eschatological, are present and reflect different literary phases of the texts ("Wisdom," 443; idem, "Analysis," 80–81). The apocalyptic layer, represented by the רז נהיה is a reinterpretation of an earlier purely sapiential text. This approach is far too rigid in its desire for generic compatibility (see discussion in Goff, *4QInstruction*, 40–42; García Martínez, "Wisdom at Qumran," 9). A more nuanced approach to the generic blending is found in Elgvin, "Wisdom With and Without Apocalyptic," 23–30. Lange argues that 1Q/4QInstruction is responding to a "crisis of wisdom" that has weakened the widely held understanding that God created the world with wisdom (*Weisheit*, 57–61). Thus, 1Q/4QInstruction places a heavy emphasis on the intersection of wisdom with God's creation and dominion over the world. The presence of multiple apocalyptic elements in 1Q/4QInstruction does not necessitate the identification of this document as an apocalyptic text. As many scholars observe, 1Q/4QInstruction lacks the major structuring elements of an apocalypse (Elgvin, "Wisdom," 451; idem, "Mystery to Come," 130–131; Goff, *4QInstruction*, 52–53). At the same time, certain apocalyptic elements in the text point to its composition by a community deeply rooted in apocalyptic thinking.

[65] García Martínez, "Wisdom at Qumran," 13–14.

[66] Harrington, "*Rāz Nihyeh*," 552–553. Harrington remarks that 4Q418 184 2 contains the fragmentary clause "by the hand of Moses," which may suggest an association with the Torah, though he notes that the textual reading is uncertain as is the importance of the connection.

[67] Elgvin, "Mystery to Come," 131.

of divine knowledge associated with the רז נהיה.[68] The same is true for the handbook of the *Maskil*, which can hardly contain all the knowledge assumed to be found in the רז נהיה. A similar difficulty is presented by the Book of Hagi, which is understood either as the Torah or some compendium of sectarian legal interpretations.[69] The רז נהיה is never said to contain legal information, whether sectarian or not.

The verbal forms and prepositions employed in conjunction with the רז נהיה provide some insight into its full meaning. Of the fourteen instances where the רז נהיה appears with adequate context, all but one is preceded by a preposition. Of these, eleven contain a *bet* prefix, while a *mem* prefix is found in one case. These prepositions have a number of different functions. In some instances, the *bet* functions as a *bet instrumenti*, such that the רז נהיה is identified as the means by which one is able to carry out the specified task (4Q415 6 4; 4Q416 2 iii 9; 4Q417 1 i 8). For example, the sage exhorts the disciple to: וברז נהיה דרוש מולדיו, "by the רז נהיה study its origins (i.e., of the mystery)" (4Q416 2 iii 9).[70] Since the רז נהיה is identified here as an independent entity, the context fails to provide any further insight. A similar difficulty is presented by the numerous places where God (or one's parents) is said to גלה אזן ברז נהיה, "to uncover the ear (i.e., "to make known") by the רז נהיה" or related expressions. As suggested above, the *bet* functions here as a preposition of agency. The רז נהיה is here identified as an undefined body of information that assists in the divine revelation of knowledge.

More helpful, however, are the other instances where the prepositional phrase that contains the רז נהיה functions as the object of the verb. In one place, the sage instructs the disciple to הגה ברז נהיה, "meditate upon the רז נהיה" (4Q417 1 i 6). Elsewhere, the disciple is exhorted to הבט ברז נהיה, "gaze upon the רז נהיה" (4Q416 2 i 5 [par. 4Q417 2 i 10–11]; 4Q417 1 i 18). The sage is similarly told to וקח ברז נהיה, "and grasp the רז נהיה" (4Q418 77 4).[71] Finally, the רז נהיה appears once without a preposition, functioning as a true accusative. There, the sage

[68] Moreover, criticism of Harrington's suggestion has noted that the רז נהיה is never cited as a separate written document. See Goff, *4QInstruction*, 38.

[69] See the discussion of this term above, p. 56, n. 57.

[70] On the combination of the preposition ב with דרוש, see Strugnell and Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV*, 117. They suggest that the *bet* should be understood here as "in the context of," "in light of," "following the hermeneutic guidance of," or "together with."

[71] Note the use of the ב in these clauses. It does not contain a sense of agency. Rather, it acts as an accusative marker. This is a common meaning of ב with verbs of perception (see, e.g., 1 Sam 6:19; IBHS § 11.2.5 f.)

admonishes the disciple דרוש רז נהיה, "study the רז נהיה" (4Q416 2 iii 14; cf. 4Q417 1 i 6).[72]

Thus, four verbs remain that directly interact with the רז נהיה: 'meditate' (הגה), 'study' (דרש), 'grasp' (לקח), and 'gaze' (נבט). The first two verbs are entirely compatible with conceiving of the רז נהיה as a written document in a narrow sense. Indeed, Lange understands the use of 'meditate' (הגה) as a citation of Ps 1:2 where the object of this verb is the Torah.[73] 'Study' (דרש) has a wide range of referents including both literary and non-literary sources.[74] The same ambiguity exists for 'grasp' (לקח). 'Gaze' (נבט), however, is not a root commonly employed in reference to a written document. Rather, one 'gazes' at things seen in visions and the like.

In line with the understanding of the chronological and intellectual scope of the term as articulated above combined with the grammatical evidence, I suggest that the רז נהיה refers to an undefined body of divine knowledge found in multiple sources.[75] These could include literary or oral works, but likely also refers to empirical knowledge gained through independent contemplation and consideration of natural forces. The רז נהיה is the full range of all perceivable knowledge pertaining to the past, present, and future.

The portrait of revelation presented in the foregoing discussion finds additional expression in the continuation of the long passage cited above (4Q417 1 i 13–18):

> (13) … but thou (14) O understanding one, study (inherit?) thy reward, remembering the re[quital, for] it comes. Engraved is the / thy ordinance / destiny, and ordained is all the punishment. (15) For engraved is that which is ordained by God against all the ini[quities of] the children of שות, and written in his presence is a Book of Memorial (16) for those who keep his word. And that is the Vision of Hagu for the Book of Memorial (והוא חזון ההגוי לספר זכרון). And he gave it as an inheritance to Man / Enosh (לאנוש) together with a spiritual people. F[o]r (17) according

[72] It is possible that this is a scribal error and should be read as דרוש ברז נהיה since this exact phrase appears just a few lines prior (l. 9). In line nine, however, a clear accusative (מולדיו) is present, while line fourteen contains no indication that another accusative is in view. 4Q417 1 i 6 may also be included in this larger list since the רז נהיה seems to be the implicit object of this verb (Strugnell and Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV*, 154).

[73] Lange, *Weisheit*, 60.

[74] See discussion of this root and bibliography above, pp. 287–288.

[75] Contra Goff, *4QInstruction*, 38, who opines that the presence of the root 'gaze' (נבט) suggests that the רז נהיה was experienced exclusively through some visionary medium. To do so would negate the entire range of other verbs.

> to the pattern of the Holy Ones is his (man's) fashioning. But no more had meditation been given to a (?) fleshy spirit, for it knew/knows not the difference between (18) [goo]d and evil according to the judgment of its [sp]irit.

The presence of the initial exhortation to the disciple (l. 1) indicates that this section begins a new literary unit.[76] Unlike the earlier passage, this section is marked by several explicit apocalyptic features. The appeal to heavenly literature found here, particularly the Book of Memorial, is characteristic of apocalyptic literature.[77] This passage also mentions the **בני שות** (l. 15). In all likelihood, the reference here is to Balaam's eschatological prophecy that Israel will destroy the Sons of Seth (Num 24:17), a title for the enemies of Israel.[78] The apocalyptic framework that guides this literary unit is replicated elsewhere throughout 1Q/4QInstruction, where it is similarly blended with sapiential elements.[79]

As in the earlier passage, the sage exhorts the disciple to amass a certain body of knowledge, in this case pertaining to reward and punishment, specifically the punishment of the wicked.[80] The sage here also provides direct guidance concerning how this understanding can be attained. Thus, the sage points to the Book of Memorial and the Vision of Hagu. Both of these terms and their relationship to one another have proven problematic for scholars treating 1Q/4QInstruction.

Based on this passage alone, the contents of the Book of Memorial can be ascertained fairly certainly. Line fourteen exhorts the disciple to achieve a full understanding of the divine system of reward and punishment. In particular, the sage claims that all reward and punishment has been set ("engraved" and "ordained") by God. In order to demonstrate this claim, the sage refers to the Sons of Seth, whose iniquities have ensured that their eschatological recompense is "engraved" and "ordained" (l. 15). By contrast, "those who keep his word" are recorded in the Book of Memorial (ll. 15–16). It is not clear if this also implies that the Book of Memorial contains the names of those who do not obey God's word. If this is the case, the Book of Memorial would provide

[76] Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*, 55. Contra Elgvin, "Mystery to Come," 139, who identifies the beginning of this literary unit toward the end of line eleven (l. 13 for him).

[77] Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*, 55–56; Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 123;.

[78] Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*, 55; Goff, *4QInstruction*, 91–92.

[79] For example, the first column of the original composition already points to the apocalyptic persuasion of the text as a whole (4Q416 1).

[80] Goff, *4QInstruction*, 88.

a close parallel to the Enochic Heavenly Tablets, which contain the summary of all human deeds, good and bad, and their consequences.[81] Either way, the introduction of the Book of Memorial responds to the initial exhortation of the sage, where he encourages the disciple to contemplate eschatological reward and punishment. The contents of the Book of Memorial provide part of the answer to this query.

The next clause is more difficult to interpret. The Book of Memorial is seemingly equated with the Vision of Hagu: "and that is the Vision of the Hagu for the Book of Memorial" (והוא חזון ההגוי לספר זכרון) (l. 16).[82] If these two items are closely related and perhaps identical, then what does it mean that the Vision of Hagu is for the Book of Memorial? Strugnell and Harrington suggest that חזון ההגוי should be understood as "act / moment of vision / seeing." This process is the revelatory mechanism by which one gains access to the Book of Memorial.[83] Elgvin and Lange, by contrast, interpret the Vision of Hagu as a reference to an actual book. For Elgvin, this book contains information concerning the salvation history of the world and is similar to the רז נהיה.[84] Lange sees in the book knowledge of the order of all worldly existence, which provides the faculties for the full understanding of the רז נהיה.[85] Each of these suggestions is in general terms plausible, though some difficulties still exist.[86] Ultimately, it must be accepted that the exact contents of the Vision of Hagu are not explicitly identified in 1Q/4QInstruction. At the same time, the Vision of Hagu is closely related, or perhaps identical, to the Book of Memorial.

The precise role of the Book of Memorial and the Vision of Hagu in the sapiential revelatory experience, however, is certain. The Book of Memorial, somehow in conjunction with the Vision of Hagu, contains the divine record of reward and punishment. It is introduced here by the sage because he had just previously exhorted his disciple to contemplate this subject. The text proceeds to provide further information concerning the Book of Memorial and Vision of Hagu. The text

[81] Noted by Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 123; Goff, *4QInstruction*, 93.

[82] On the equation of the two terms, see Collins, *Jewish Wisdom*, 125; Lange, *Weisheit*, 51; Elgvin, "Analysis," 258; Goff, *4QInstruction*, 92–93. Some earlier editions of the text (e.g., Lange) do not contain the *lamed* in the text. Its presence on the manuscript, however, seems certain.

[83] Strugnell and Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV*, 164.

[84] Elgvin, "Analysis," 94.

[85] Lange, *Weisheit*, 62.

[86] See Goff, *4QInstruction*, 81.

reports that וינחילנו לאנוש עם עם רוח (l. 16).[87] Most of the elements here are ambiguous and open to different interpretations. Both the subject and object of וינחילו are uncertain. The most reasonable interpretation here understands God as the subject.[88] The Vision of Hagu is the most appropriate object since in line seventeen it is singled out as something not given to the "fleshy spirit." אנוש is also ambiguous, meaning possibly all of mankind, Enosh, or Adam.[89] I prefer here to follow the lead of Strugnell and Harrington and leave this matter undetermined. Thus, God gave the Vision of Hagu to some segment of humanity and a "spiritual people." The Vision of Hagu, however, is withheld from another segment of society—the "fleshy spirit." This situation is explained due to the fact that they cannot distinguish between good and evil (ll. 17–18).[90]

The presentation of revealed knowledge in 1Q/4QInstruction must be situated within the larger context of sapiential revelation in the Second Temple period. As the repository of all wisdom and understanding, God can divulge it to humans at his will. This model corresponds to the biblical portrait of the sage's cultivation of wisdom. In the Second Temple period, however, the divine revelation of knowledge is recontextualized and now identified as a revelatory experience in continuity with earlier models of prophetic revelation. This model is assumed throughout 1Q/4QInstruction. Humans have direct access to this divine knowledge through the revelatory experience. This revelation, however, is not direct. In some cases, the רז נהיה acts as a mediating agent. Through the רז נהיה, God can place knowledge and understanding directly into the prospective sage. Elsewhere, heavenly books serve as repositories of revealed wisdom. Like revelation experienced through the רז נהיה, this knowledge is restricted to special individuals. The presence of both of

[87] The text here seems to have undergone revision by a later glossator. See discussion in Strugnell and Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV*, 164. Without the gloss, the text is translated "he bequeathed it together with the spirit to Man / Enosh." The corrected text is rendered "And he gave it as an inheritance to Man / Enosh together with a spiritual people."

[88] This understanding follows Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 52; Strugnell and Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV*, 151; Goff, *4QInstruction*, 87–88. See alternate transcriptions of the text in Elgvin, "Analysis," 256; Lange, *Weisheit*, 51.

[89] Mankind: Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*, 56; Elgvin, "Analysis," 93; idem, "The Mystery to Come," 142–143; Enosh: Lange, *Weisheit*, 87; Jörg Frey, "The Notion of 'Flesh' in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage," in *Sapiential, Liturgical, and Poetical Texts*, 218; Adam: Goff, *4QInstruction*, 96–99.

[90] On the "fleshy" people, see Frey, "Notion," 210–220.

these mediating agents, one of which may even be literary, corresponds with the framework for sapiential revelation identified within apocalyptic contexts, such as 1 Enoch.[91]

1Q/4QInstruction never refers to the participants in the sapiential revelatory process as prophets and only generally draws upon standard prophetic language. At the same time, the model for the cultivation of wisdom in 1Q/4QInstruction follows closely the sapiential revelatory framework identified in several other biblical and Qumranic texts. Like Ben Sira, who claims continuity with the ancient prophets, the sages and disciples in 1Q/4QInstruction conceptualize the continued existence of divine-human communication taking place within a sapiential context.

Summary

This chapter has attempted to extend the earlier discussion of nascent revelatory models in Second Temple Judaism. Sapiential revelation was one of the more prominent modes of mediation associated with the ancient prophets. The application of this revelatory encounter to the ancient prophets accurately reflects the social reality of ongoing forms of revelation in Second Temple period Judaism. I have examined one historical personage and one literary example, which indicate that the receipt of divine knowledge was conceptualized as a revelation experience. For Ben Sira, his prophetic self-awareness is fashioned around his receipt of revealed knowledge. Ben Sira identifies himself in continuity with the ancient prophets, though never claims that he is actually a prophet. In addition, I suggested that sapiential revelation is operative in 1Q/4QInstruction. The author(s) of this text envisions the sage and disciple as participants in a sapiential revelatory experience. Thus, 1Q/4QInstruction recognizes the important role played by the cultivation of wisdom in the continuing revelatory encounter with the divine. In both of these cases, ancient prophetic revelation finds a new home in these modified modes of divine mediation.

[91] See above, ch. 13.

CHAPTER SIXTEEN

PROPHECY AND LAW IN THE QUMRAN COMMUNITY

The present chapter represents the sequel to chapter three. In that chapter, I analyzed seven texts that reconfigure the role and function of the classical prophets. In these texts, the prophets are identified as lawgivers.[1] The contrast between the biblical models and their reconfiguration in the Qumran corpus is striking. Prophets in the Hebrew Bible rarely appear as lawgivers. Though they often champion the observance of the covenant and its laws, their prophetic capabilities are rarely employed to mediate newly revealed divine law. In contrast, the Qumran texts routinely represent the ancient prophets as mediators of divinely revealed law, sometimes in cooperation with Moses, while elsewhere independent of Moses. The presentation of the ancient prophets as lawgivers at Qumran therefore suggests a deliberate attempt to assign juridical responsibilities to the ancient prophets.

In chapter three, I argued that the presentation of the prophets as lawgivers in these seven texts is intended to highlight their role as the second stage in the progressive revelation of law. For the Qumran community, as well as the majority of Second Temple Judaism, Moses was both a prophet and lawgiver who received on Sinai the divinely revealed law, which comprises the Torah. The community, like all contemporary and later Jewish movements, was presented with the problem of the seemingly limited application of biblical law and institutions.[2] All Second Temple Jewish groups found some way to account

---

[1] To these seven texts should also be added several additional texts treated in chapters 4–6 that also present the ancient prophets as lawgivers (though with different prophetic designations). CD 5:21–6:1 is the most important of these texts, since it presents an almost identical understanding of the ancient prophets (see pp. 97–100). See as well the prominent place of the law in some uses of 'visionary' (ch. 4), the application of the late biblical meaning of 'man of God' to Moses and David in the Qumran corpus (ch. 6), and the repeated use of 'servants' in several of the references to prophets as lawgivers (ch. 6). See also the heightened juridical role assigned to the prophet at the end of days in 1QS 9:11 and 4QTestimonia (ch. 8).

[2] See Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Rabbinic *Halakhah*," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an*

for their own legislative activity within the framework of the primacy of the Torah and the revelation at Sinai.[3] The Qumran community advocated the belief in a progressive revelation of law, whereby select individuals after Moses receive updated formulations of law through divine revelation. The texts surveyed in chapter three clearly locate the classical prophets as the immediate successors to Moses as the recipients of legislative revelation. This model therefore accounts for the somewhat surprising portrait of the prophets in the Qumran corpus as active participants in the diffusion of law through revelatory means.

The theory of progressive revelation finds fullest expression in the sect's self-perception of its own legislative activity. Sectarian leaders thought of themselves as recipients of present day revelation providing instruction on how to fulfill Mosaic law and regarding the development of non-Mosaic legislative activity.[4] This revelation was achieved not by direct communication with the divine, but rather through the inspired exegesis of Scripture. The sectarian leaders were considered to have been endowed with the necessary tools to read ancient Scripture under such inspiration and receive juridical instruction.[5]

International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001 (ed. J.R. Davila; STDJ 46; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003), 11; Shemesh and Werman, "Halakhah," 104.

[3] On the various systems in Second Temple Judaism, see Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Temple Scroll and the Systems of Jewish Law in the Second Temple Period," in *Temple Scroll Studies*, 239–255; Shemesh and Werman, "Halakhah," 104–129. On the Pharisaic-rabbinic appeal first to the 'traditions of the fathers' and then to the more fully developed rabbinic concept of a dual Torah, see Ephraim E. Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs* (trans. I. Abrahams; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1975), 286–314.

[4] On progressive revelation in the Qumran community, see bibliography cited above, p. 51, n. 38. The community's understanding is encapsulated in the sectarian concepts of the *nigleh* ("revealed" law) and the *nistar* ("hidden" law) (1QS 5:7–13). The former refers to Scripture and its basic meaning that is available to everyone (Schiffman, "Temple Scroll," 241), while the latter indicates laws and interpretations that were only known to the sect through the receipt of revelation. For discussion of these terms and their role in the sectarian legal system, see Schiffman, *Halakhah*, 22–32 (with summary of earlier explanations for the terms); Aharon Shemesh and Cana Werman, "Hidden Things and their Revelation," *RevQ* 18 (1998): 409–427; earlier version in *Tarbiz* 66 (1997): 471–482. On the possible understanding of these terms as additional references to intentional and unintentional sins, see discussion in Elisha Qimron, "'Al Šegagot ve-Zedanot be-Megillot Midbar Yehudah: 'Iyyun be-Menuḥim ha-Meššamešim le-Ṣiyunam," in *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1990), 108–110; Gary A. Anderson, "Intentional and Unintentional Sin in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells*, 54–57.

[5] See Schiffman, "Rabbinic *Halakhah*," 12; Shemesh and Werman, "Halakhah," 108–109.

What, however, is the precise relationship envisioned between the sectarian community as possessors of revealed law and the classical lawgiving prophets, who in previous times had received revealed law and disseminated it accordingly? Did the present day sectarian lawgivers conceive of themselves as latter-day prophetic lawgivers? The portrait of the ancient prophets from Israel's biblical heritage is not merely an attempt by Second Temple Jews to uncover the context and contours of their prophetic past. Rather, the classical prophets are imagined in language and imagery that would be familiar with a contemporary understanding of the function of a prophet and the continuing role of the ancient prophets. The consistency in the representation of the classical prophets as mediators of revealed law in the sectarian and related nonsectarian texts indicates a heightened role for the prophetic word in the formulation of law both at Qumran and in some segments of wider Second Temple Judaism.

In general, scholarly discussion of the revelatory character of Qumran law discounts the importance of the prophetic framework from which it emerges. For example, Aharon Shemesh and Cana Werman contend that the revelation of law to the sectarian leaders is not a 'prophetic' experience. They base this assertion on the observation that law is not merely revealed directly to the sect. Rather, the sectarian leaders receive the exegetical tools necessary to determine the law through their reading of Scripture. The emphasis on "human intellectual activity," argue Shemesh and Werman, negates this process as a part of a larger 'prophetic' encounter.[6] Their observation that the formulation of law at Qumran involves the combination of divine revelation and human creative exegesis is correct. In this chapter, however, I suggest that this feature does not diminish from its prophetic qualities and context.

The deliberate alignment of the community's legislative program with the similar activity of the ancient prophets is intended to identify the sectarian system of lawgiving as a contemporary realization of classical prophetic models. The community viewed itself as the heir to the ancient prophetic lawgivers and saw its own legislative program as the most recent stage in the prophetic revelation of divine law. This entire model served to authorize the sectarian appeal to the contempo-

[6] Shemesh and Werman, "Hidden Things," 418. See further, eidem, "Halakhah," 105.

rary prophetic word in the interpretation of Torah and the formation of post-biblical law. The portrait of the classical prophets is reworked in order to conform to the sectarian conception of the prophetic task of lawgiving. Simultaneously, the sectarian system of lawgiving is represented as a contemporary realization of the classical prophetic models.

Prophetic Lawgivers and Sectarian Lawgivers

The evidence provided by 1QS 8:15–16 provides an appropriate context in which to discuss the relationship of the classical lawgiving prophets and the contemporary sectarian recipients of revealed law. Earlier treatment of this passage focused on the presentation of Moses and the ancient prophets found therein. As I have repeatedly emphasized, 1QS 8:15–16 portrays Moses and the classical prophets as the first two stages in the revelation of law to Israel. The passage begins by introducing the Torah of Moses. The text continues by identifying two aspects of post-Mosaic juridical activity that serve to facilitate the application and observance (לעשות) of the Mosaic Torah: periodic revelations and the explicit revelatory activity of the prophets. The latter of the two is easily identified with the classical prophets: "and according to that which the *prophets* revealed (גלו) by his holy spirit" (1QS 8:16). The prophets are pictured as actively disseminating revealed knowledge concerning the meaning of the Torah and the application of its commandments.

The language and imagery employed in this passage represent a deliberate attempt by the author of the Rule of the Community to locate the sectarian receipt of revealed law within the historical landscape of progressive revelation. More specifically, this passage, in dialogue with others in the sectarian corpus, reflects a concerted effort by the Qumran community to present its own participation in the progressive revelation of the law as the third stage in this process. The community viewed itself as the immediate heir to the classical prophetic lawgivers and its experience as a direct continuation of this prophetic activity. In this sense, the community conceived of its lawgiving activity as a prophetic encounter. Let us turn to the evidence itself, beginning with 1QS 8:15–16.

The employment of the root גלה in both clauses of 1QS 8:15–16 is seemingly intended to refer to the basic sectarian understanding of biblical and post-biblical law, the so-called *nigleh*, as opposed to the *nis-*

tar.[7] The *nigleh* usually refers to the general understanding of Scripture and its explicit laws (1QS 5:11–12). This understanding, however, does not work with the present passage. The *nigleh* is by its nature immediately intelligible to all Israel. Its application would therefore be located in Moses' initial transmission of the Torah and would not require periodic revelations or prophetic revelatory activity in order to illuminate the application of the Torah (לעשות).

The key to understanding this passage lies in the alternate use of *nigleh* found in some places in the sectarian corpus. Alongside the standard model of the *nigleh* and *nistar*, column five of the Rule of the Community presents a much different understanding of the meaning of these terms while delineating the requirements of the initiates into the Council of the Community:

> He shall take upon his soul by a binding oath to return to the Torah of Moses (תורת מושה), according to all that he commanded (ככול אשר צוה), with all heart and with all soul, according to everything which has been revealed (הנגלה) from it to the Sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant and seek his will and according to the multitude of the men of their covenant. (1QS 5:8–9)[8]

In this passage, the *nigleh* is the proper understanding of the Torah that has been revealed specifically to the Sons of Zadok, the sectarian community.[9] That this *nigleh* is the exclusive domain of the sectarians is strengthened by the text of the 4QS manuscripts, which reflects a truncated version of lines 9–10: "everything revealed (כל הנגלה) from the T[orah] to [the multitude of] the council of me[n] of the Community" (4Q256 4 7–8; 4Q258 1 6–7).[10] The activity of the council thereby stands together with the divinely revealed *nigleh*. This is not the *nigleh* that is known to all of Israel as Scripture. Rather, 1QS 5 envisions two notions of the *nigleh*, one referring to revelation to all of Israel (ll. 11–12) and the

---

[7] On these terms, see above, n. 4.

[8] Qimron and Charlesworth, *Rule of the Community*, 20–23.

[9] Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 95; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 109. On the Sons of Zadok, see Schiffman, *Halakhah*, 72–75; idem, *Reclaiming*, 113–117. See also 1QS 5:2 and the pesher on Ezek 44:15 in CD 3:21–4:4.

[10] This text follows 4Q258 (4QS^{d}). 4Q256 (4QS^{b}) is defective and requires far more reconstruction. I have followed the reconstruction of Qimron and Charlesworth for the lacuna immediately preceding the reference to the Council of the Community (לרוב, "to the multitude of"). Alexander and Vermes suggest here על פי, "in accordance with." See Qimron and Charlesworth, *Rule of the Community*, 62–63, 72–73, Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX*, 94, 97; Metso, *Textual Development*, 80.

other to the sectarians alone (ll. 8–9).[11] Schiffman opines that the *nigleh* of 1QS 5:8–9 is equivalent to the *nistar* of 1QS 5:11–12; that which is hidden to all of Israel is revealed to the sectarians.[12]

As outlined in table three below, linguistic and thematic correspondence recommends the application of the meaning of the *nigleh* in 1QS 5:8–9 to 1QS 8:15–16.

1QS 8:15–16	*1QS 5:8–9*
התורה ... ביד מושה The Torah … through Moses	תורת מושה The Torah of Moses
א[ש]ר צוה That he commanded	ככול אשר צוה According to all that he commanded
לעשות ככול הנגלה עת בעת To do according to everything that has been revealed (from) time to time	לשוב אל ... בכול לב ובכול נפש לכול הנגלה ממנה To return … with all heart and with all soul, according to everything that has been revealed from it
וכאשר גלו הנביאים ברוח קודשו And (to do) as the prophets revealed through his holy spirit.	(לכול הנגלה ממנה) לבני צדוק (According to everything that has been revealed from it) to the Sons of Zadok (4QS^{b,d}: to [the multitude of] the Council of the me[n] of the Community)

Table 3: 1QS 8:15–16 Compared to 1QS 5:8–9

Each passage begins with the Torah and identifies God as the one who "commanded" it (1QS 5:8 ככול אשר צוה//1QS 8:15 א[ש]ר צוה).[13] In both passages, the *nigleh* is said to elucidate the Torah of Moses (1QS 5:8 תורת מושה//1QS 8:15 תורה ... ביד מושה). This immediately

[11] Licht first recognized that the meaning of *nigleh* in this passage is different from that which appears in 1QS 5:11–12 (*Megillat ha-Serakhim*, 131). He is followed by Schiffman (see following note).

[12] Schiffman, *Halakhah*, 24. He points to CD 3:13–14 with the phrase "to reveal to them the hidden things" (לגלות להם הנסתרות). This argument is also found in Wieder, *Judean Scrolls*, 67; Baumgarten, "Unwritten Law," 30.

[13] See Metso, *Textual Development*, 80, who argues that the phrase in 5:8 (missing in 4QS^{b,d}) is a later insertion.

marks the *nigleh* as independent of the Torah, and therefore not the more common meaning of *nigleh* as the Torah itself. Most importantly, the *nigleh* serves to facilitate the observance of the Torah of Moses (1QS 5:8 לשוב אל//1QS 8:15 לעשות).[14] These two passages differ in one fundamental element. 1QS 8:15–16 identifies the general periodic revelations (הנגלה עת בעת) and prophetic revelatory activity (וכאשר גלו הנביאים ברוח קדשו) as how one properly observes the Torah. Parallel to this element, 1QS 5:8–9 indicates that the sect believed that the proper understanding and observance of the Torah is embedded in the revelations to the sectarian community, identified as the "Sons of Zadok" (1QS) or the "multitude of the Council of the men of the community" (4QS^{b,d}).

The foregoing discussion has demonstrated two important points. First, the *nigleh* of 1QS 8:15–16 is not Scripture and its explicit meaning. Rather, *nigleh* is used in this passage to refer to the formally hidden material that is revealed only to the members of the sect, equivalent to the more general use of *nistar*. Second, the Rule of the Community has established a close relationship between the sect's self-awareness of its receipt of revealed law and the similar process as experienced by the classical prophets. In 1QS 8 the Torah is explicated by the general appeal to periodic revelations and the more specific reference to the prophetic participation in this process. In 1QS 5, the explanation of the Torah is conducted by the sectarian communal leaders, to whom the law and its interpretation have been revealed.

This understanding of the relationship between 1QS 5 and 1QS 8 and the respective revelatory roles of the sectarian leaders and the ancient prophets is reinforced by 1QS 9:12–13, another passage in the Rule of the Community with important literary connections to 1QS 8:15–16 as well as textual proximity in some manuscript traditions. As indicated in the initial discussion of 1QS 8:15–16, one of the Cave 4 copies (4QS^{e}) lacks text equivalent to 1QS 8:15b–9:12 (4Q259 1 iii 5–6). 4QS^{e} was originally dated by Josef Milik as the earliest manuscript of the Rule of the Community, though this dating was challenged by Frank M. Cross who has located its copying after 1QS.[15] The question still

[14] See Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim*, 182.

[15] See Milik et al., "travail d'édition," 60. 4QS^{e} is dated by Frank M. Cross to ca. 50–25 B.C.E. ("Appendix: Paleographical Dates of the Manuscripts," in Charlesworth, *Rule of the Community*, 57). This dating is accepted by Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX*, 133–134. 1QS is usually dated to around 100 B.C.E. See Knibb, "Rule of the Community," 2:795.

remains unresolved.[16] 4QS^e is generally thought to reflect a recension of the Rule of the Community different from 1QS and perhaps earlier.[17] 1QS 9:12–13 must therefore be treated in two different contexts: 4QS^e, where 9:12–13 immediately follows 8:15b and 1QS where these two passages are separated by the intervening text, though closely linked by other literary features.

Let us first examine the evidence provided by the 1QS recension. Before proceeding with the general list of the requirements of the *Maskil*, the Rule of the Community describes his task in general terms:

> He shall do God's will (לעשות את[18] רצון אל), according to everything which has been revealed from time to time (ככול הנגלה לעת בעת). He shall learn all the understanding which has been found according to the times and the statute of the endtime. (1QS 9:12–13 [par. 4Q259 1 iii 8–10])[19]

The statutes of the *Maskil* fulfill the role of explicating the Torah and enabling the observance of its laws and regulations. As illustrated in table four below, this passage, like 1QS 5:8–9, reflects deliberate correspondences with the presentation of the prophetic lawgivers in 1QS 8:15–16:

1QS 8:15–16	*1QS 9:13–14*
התורה ... לעשות The Torah … to do	לעשות את רצון אל To do God's will
ככול הנגלה עת בעת According to everything which has been revealed (from) time to time	ככול הנגלה לעת בעת According to everything which has been revealed from time to time
וכאשר גלו הנביאים ברוח קודשו And (to do) as the prophets revealed through his holy spirit.	ולמוד את כול השכל הנמצא He shall learn all the understanding which has been found…

Table 4: 1QS 8:15–16 Compared with 1QS 9:13–14

[16] So Metso, *Textual Development*, 48.
[17] See Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX*, 134. Metso and Qimron and Charlesworth argue that 4QS^e is an earlier recension (Metso, "Primary Results," 303–308; eadem, *Textual Development*, 69–74; Qimron and Charlesworth, *Rule of the Community*, 54). See, however, Alexander, "Redaction History," 445, n. 17. See earlier discussion, p. 50, n. 36, pp. 157–158.
[18] 4QS^e lacks this word.
[19] Qimron and Charlesworth, *Rule of the Community*, 1:40–41.

In 1QS 9, performance (לעשות) of God's will (רצון אל) is here facilitated, similar to 1QS 8, by two means: ככול הנגלה לעת בעת and ולמוד את כול השכל הנמצא לפי העתים. The former phrase alludes to the deliberate literary and thematic correspondence between this clause and 1QS 8:15–16.[20] Based on my understanding of the closely related expression in 1QS 8:15, the clause here refers to the general system of deciphering Scripture and formulating law through periodic revelations. In 1QS 8:15, this notice is further qualified by the identification of prophetic involvement in this process. In 1QS 9, the role of the prophets is replaced by the sect and its exegetical enterprise (ולמוד את כול השכל הנמצא לפי העתים).[21] This fits well with the sect's own understanding of inspired exegesis as the way that the sectarian leaders gained access to the progressive revelation of law. Their revelatory activity, like the prophets before them, represents the realization of the progressive revelation of law through periodic revelations.

1QS 8 and 9 both locate the proper understanding of the Torah and its laws in the general model of periodic revelations by employing nearly identical language (1QS 8:15 ככול הנגלה עת בעת//1QS 9:13 ככול הנגלה לעת בעת). The specific context for this periodic revelation in 1QS 8 is the prophetic activity of transmitting revealed law. 1QS 9 explains the periodic revelation as the larger framework for the sectarian revelatory process of determining law through inspired exegesis of Scripture. 1QS 9:13 therefore provides additional evidence for the deliberate alignment of the classical prophets and the sectarian leaders as recipients of revealed law.

The recension of the Rule of the Community represented by 4QS[e] provides a truncated version of this tradition, which may reflect an earlier more underdeveloped version. If one reads along with 4QS[e], the Torah of Moses is no longer accompanied by explanation grounded in periodic revelations and prophetic revelatory activity. Rather, immediately following the allusion to the Torah of Moses, the text introduces the list of statutes incumbent upon the *Maskil* (אלה הח[וקים] למש[כיל] להתהלך בה[ם) (4Q259 1 iii 6–7 [par. 1QS 9:12]). The textual tradition represented by 4QS[e] identifies the sectarian exegetical process as

[20] See Licht, *Megillat ha-Serakhim*, 195; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 142; Qimron and Charlesworth, *Rule of the Community*, 37, n. 212. Note, however, that 1QS 8:15 has עת בעת.

[21] On the understanding of this expression as a reference to the sectarian exegetical process, see Schiffman, *Halakhah*, 33–36.

described in 1QS 9:12–13 as the most immediate manner in which the Mosaic Torah in 1QS 8:15a is explained and amplified. Periodic revelation is situated exclusively in its sectarian context in 4QS^{e}. It is only in the (later?) recension of 1QS that the sectarian activity is explicitly identified with the identical process earlier envisioned for the classical prophets.

1QS 8:15–16 in dialogue with similar literary units in 1QS 5:8–9 and 1QS 9:13–14 generates a close relationship between the portrait of the classical prophets' revelation of law and the similar sectarian activity. Sectarian literature further historicizes the nature of this relationship. The three stages identified in the progressive revelation of the law, Moses, the prophets, and the sect, are closely linked in the pesher on Amos 5:26–27 and Num 24:17 in the Damascus Document (CD 7:14–21). The "booth of the king" and the "*kywn* of the images" in Amos are interpreted respectively as the "books of the Torah" and "the books of the Prophets." This leads directly into the pesher on Numbers where the "star" (also in Amos 5:26) and "staff" are interpreted as the sectarian leaders the Interpreter of the Law and the Prince of the Congregation, respectively.[22] The Damascus Document here envisions a direct link between the Mosaic tradition, the prophets, and the present sectarian community. Of the two sectarian leaders identified here, the Interpreter of the Law represents the community's primary engagement with the progressive revelation of the law. The Interpreter of the Law in the Damascus Document is an inspired exegete whose readings of Scripture serve as the source for revealed sectarian law.[23] The Amos-Numbers pesher locates the juridical activity of the Interpreter of the Law in direct continuity with the Torah and the prophetic tradition.

This model corresponds well with the sect's own conception of the numerous points of rupture in the history of Israel, and its location within this historical framework. The introduction to the Damascus

---

[22] Note that this text does not appear in MS B of CD.

[23] See Wieder, "Law-Interpreter," 161–167; Schiffman, *Halakhah*, 57–58; Michael A. Knibb, "Interpreter of the Law," *EDSS* 1:383–384. The Interpreter of the Law appears in CD 6:7, where the "staff" (= המחוקק = "lawgiver") in Num 21:18 is understood as the Interpreter of the Law. Based on CD's exegetical reading of the biblical verse, Schiffman identifies the role of the Interpreter of the Law in this passage as consisting of the formation of sectarian law through the reading of Scripture. Schiffman also points to 1QS 5:7–12, where inquiry (דרש) into the Torah results in the full understanding of the *nistar* (compare Wernberg-Møller, *Manual of Discipline*, 95). The Interpreter of the Law is also a title for an eschatological figure (see above, p. 191).

Document charts the relationship between God and the righteous within Israel. In particular, the sect envisions itself as the first righteous link in the history of Israel since the exile. In this sense, the community continues the task of the pre-exilic prophets, the last faithful adherents of God's covenant and the last authoritative recipients of divinely revealed law. Communication between God and Israel had been severely disrupted by Israel's constant apostasy throughout the pre-exilic and post-exilic period. The formation of the Qumran community represents the first attempt to repair the rupture created by Israel's apostasy and the experience of exile.

The sect presumably also envisioned a breach in the progressive revelation of law to Israel. During the period of Israel's apostasy and exile, there likely would have been no widespread revelation of law except perhaps to the few righteous people in every generation. Accordingly, the sect envisioned itself, the first righteous post-exilic community, as the first beneficiary of a full-scale revelation of law following the period of Moses and the prophets. The Damascus Document repeatedly condemns the rest of Israel for abandoning God law, thereby rendering them unfit to receive the periodic revelations of law (see, e.g., CD 3:10–12; 8:17–19).[24] The reconstitution of the progressive revelation of the law within the sect provides an important link between the present Qumran community and the last faithful adherents of the covenant. Indeed, the Damascus Document identifies the revelation of the "hidden things" (CD 3:13–14) as the first divine act following the forging of the sectarian community and the reestablishment of the covenant between God and Israel as a purely sectarian covenant.

Summary

The presentation of the ancient prophets as lawgivers in the Qumran documents is not merely an exact replica of the biblical portrait of these prophets. Rather, the Qumran corpus consistently reworks the biblical role of the classical prophets and refashions them as mediators of

[24] Even David did not know the true law (CD 5:2–5). The law was finally revealed with the appearance of Zadok. Baumgarten suggests that this Zadok is the Zadokite priest Hilkiah who discovered the 'scroll of the law' during the period of Josiah ("Unwritten Law," 31; following Ginzberg, *Jewish Sect*, 21). Thus, the sect envisioned the previous watershed point in the receipt of divine law as an act carried out by one of their ancestral Zadokite priests.

divinely revealed law. While other functions of the biblical prophets are emphasized in the Qumran texts (i.e., exhortation, prediction, social critiques), the heightened juridical responsibilities mark a significant distinction between the biblical and Qumranic presentations of the classical prophets.

The sectarian system of legal hermeneutics provides the explanation for this literary project. The Qumran community authorized its own interpretation of the Torah and development of post-biblical law through the appeal to the progressive revelation of law. In authorizing this system, the sect pointed to the classical prophets as the ancient basis for contemporary sectarian practice. The role of Moses as prophetic lawgiver, according to the Qumran community, was continued in the program of the prophets from Israel's biblical heritage. The community recontextualized the activity of the classical prophets as an earlier stage of the process upon which it now bases its entire legal system. The constant and consistent portrait of the ancient prophets as mediators of divinely revealed law authorizes the identical sectarian pursuit.

In conjunction with the reorientation of the ancient prophetic role, the sectarian texts reflect a deliberate attempt to highlight the points of contact between the present sectarian practice and that of the classical prophets. The sect viewed its own receipt of divinely revealed law through progressive revelation as a prophetic encounter in continuity with what they believed the ancient prophets were similarly engaged. Israel's apostasy and the resultant rupture, however, created a historical gap between the prophets and the sect. The Qumran corpus bridges this gap by closely aligning the activity of the sect and its prophetic predecessors. In doing so, the Qumran literature identifies the present receipt of revealed law as the latest stage in the prophetic revelation of law.

CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

REVELATORY EXEGESIS AT QUMRAN

One of the hallmarks of biblical interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls is the prominence of pesher exegesis. In examining the mechanics of pesher interpretation at Qumran, scholars generally focus on identifying the literary features and techniques of pesher exegesis and defining the limits of the pesher genre.[1] Scholarship has often emphasized the distinction that exists between the pesher mode of scriptural exegesis and earlier and later models of Jewish biblical interpretation and commentary.[2] Accordingly, some scholars look outside of the Jewish context for some phenomenological correspondence with pesher interpretation.[3] Many point to the pan-Near Eastern practice of dream interpretation as the inspiration and foundation of pesher exegesis.[4] There have been, however, some attempts to locate elements of pesher exegesis purely within a Jewish framework and recognize its continuity with earlier and near contemporary approaches to Scripture.[5] These

[1] See bibliography above, p. 29, n. 12.

[2] See, for example, Naphtali Wieder, "The Dead Sea Scrolls Type of Biblical Exegesis among the Karaites," in *Between East and West: Essays Dedicated in Memory of Bela Horovitz* (ed. A. Altman; London: East and West Library, 1958), 75, who remarks that the pesher method is *sui generis* in the history of Jewish biblical interpretation. See also Burrows, "Prophecy," 227; Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 223–225.

[3] See Collins, "Prophecy," 304, who observes some similarities between pesher and the Egyptian *Demotic Chronicle*. While Collins notes the correspondence, he cautions against the possibility of any direct literary influence.

[4] Betz, *Offenbarung*, 77–78; Silberman, "Unriddling," 332–335; Asher Finkel, "The Pesher of Dreams and Scriptures," *RevQ* 4 (1963): 357–370; Isaac Rabinowitz, "'Pēsher/Pittārōn': Its Biblical Meaning and its Significance in the Qumran Literature," *RevQ* 8 (1973): 219–232; Collins, "Prophecy," 303; Berrin, "Pesharim," 123–126.

[5] Many scholars emphasize the similarities between pesher and the use of Hebrew Bible prophecies in the New Testament. See bibliography in Horgan, *Pesharim*, 249, n. 83; Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 223–224; Berrin, "Pesharim," 116, n. 16. Other scholars note the important correspondences with rabbinic midrash. See Brownlee, "Interpretation," 71–76; Silberman, "Unriddling," 327–330; Finkel, "Pesher," 357–370; Devorah Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. M.E. Stone; CRINT 2; Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 506–507; Paul Mandel, "Midrashic Exegesis and its Precedents," *DSD* 2 (1995): 149–168; Berrin, "Pesharim," 114–115, 121. See also Wieder, "Dead Sea Scrolls," 75–106, who outlines numerous similarities with medieval Karaite models of biblical interpreta-

approaches generally focus on the literary method of pesher exegesis and its points of correspondence with other known interpretive traditions.[6]

All of these approaches have served to illuminate the origins and mechanics of the pesher method. This chapter explores an additional background for the pesher approach, which provides the ideological basis for the unique approach to Scripture found within pesher texts. This chapter draws upon the treatment of revelatory exegesis in chapters 10–11 in order to locate pesher exegesis within this phenomenological landscape of biblical interpretation. In doing so, I argue for the application of the framework and foundations of revelatory exegesis to the method of pesher interpretation at Qumran.[7] In this sense, the pesher method emerges as a viable mechanism for mediating the divine word and will to the Qumran community and marks another significant turn to literary prophecy in the Second Temple period.[8]

---

tion. The various modes of interpretation practiced in Daniel (beyond dream interpretation) are also often understood to contain a close relationship with the pesher method. See Elliger, *Studien*, 156–157; Silberman, "Unriddling," 330–331; Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 78–80; idem, "Prophecy," 304–307; Horgan, *Pesharim*, 254–256; Aune, "Charismatic Exegesis," 131–132. Note as well that the Aramaic root פתר is used in Daniel to describe the process of dream interpretation. On Daniel 9 and pesher, see below, n. 10.

[6] Another relevant historical parallel can be found in Josephus' self-conscious prophetic statements in *War* 3.352–353. Josephus interprets the meaning of his recent dreams through his careful reading and interpretation of Scripture. See discussion in Gray, *Prophetic Figures*, 35–79; Gnuse, *Dreams*, 21–33.

[7] Scholarship on pesher literature has generally not emphasized the important points of continuity between biblical prophetic traditions and the ideological basis of pesher exegesis. A notable exception is Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 67–87, who explores the biblical basis of pesher-type exegesis in the indirect modes of revelation that appear in the Second Temple period. See also Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 28–30, who briefly discusses the place of the pesher method in the context of biblical prophetic literature. The overemphasis on identifying the exegetical features of pesher has obfuscated its important function as a means of revelation. See, however, George J. Brooke, "Qumran Pesher: Toward the Redefinition of a Genre," *RevQ* 10 (1981): 483–504, who argues that pesher exegesis is marked both by an exegetical desire to interpret the biblical text and the belief that the interpreter possesses a special ability to reveal the true meaning of the prophetic text. See further discussion of these competing themes in Berrin, "Pesharim," 123–130.

[8] The relationship of Josephus' testimony regarding the use of Scripture in Essene prophecy to the Qumran Pesharim and more general cases of revelatory exegesis is difficult to determine. Concerning Essene prophecy, Josephus states: "There are some among them, who profess to foretell the future, being versed from their early years in holy books, various forms of purification and apophthegms of prophets; and seldom, if ever, do they err in their predictions" (*War* 2.159; translation following H. St.

In chapters 10–11, I examined several texts where the inspired reading and reformulation of earlier prophetic Scripture is conceptualized as a revelatory experience. This phenomenon was explored in two specific contexts. In the first, various Second Temple period biblical and parabiblical texts found at Qumran (Daniel, Pseudo-Daniel, and Apocryphon of Jeremiah) re-present the revelatory experience of some prophets as taking place through a literary medium. The prophets are conceptualized as reading and interpreting older prophetic oracles and infusing them with new meaning to suit the needs of the latter-day individual. For example, in Daniel 9, Daniel receives the divine word by reading Jeremiah's older prophecy and applying it to the present historical circumstances. This process is identified as equivalent to Daniel's visions and dreams, which are the more common modes of revelation found in Daniel.

The second part of the discussion of literary prophecy focused on the more systematic rewriting of ancient prophetic scripture as represented in texts like Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Temple Scroll. I argued that the authors of these documents deliberately chose to interweave their own literary and exegetical modifications into the earlier text in order to

---

J. Thackeray, *Josephus: The Jewish War, Books I–III* [LCL: Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1927], 385) In addition, Josephus mentions three predictions articulated by Essene prophets (*War* 1.78 [Judas], *War* 2.113 [Simon], *Ant.* 15:373 [Menahem]). It is generally presumed that their prophecies are somehow grounded in their knowledge of Scripture, though this is never explicitly stated. Many scholars assume that the method of Essene prophecy as described by Josephus should be identified with pesher exegesis as preserved in the Qumran library (Finkel, "Pesher," 357; Blenkinsopp, "Prophecy," 247; Aune, *Prophecy*, 133–134; Horsley and Hanson, *Bandits*, 153–157). This identification has recently been discussed and rejected by Gray, *Prophetic Figures*, 105–107. Gray identifies three major difficulties. First, Josephus claims that the Essene prophets predicted future events. Pesher, notes Gray, is actually an interpretation of ancient prophecies based on contemporary historical circumstances. For the Pesharim, all predictions refer to the present eschatological age. Second, Gray observes, the Pesharim contain general predictions regarding the eschaton. The three Essene prophecies recounted by Josephus are specific in character and their orientation is not eschatological. Third, Josephus claims that the Essenes rarely erred in their predictions. Josephus would have known that the majority of the predictions found within pesher documents did not come true. To this list, I would add as well that the passage in Josephus says little about the precise way in which Scripture was utilized by the Essene prophets. The lack of precise data provided by Josephus makes a systematic comparison with biblical interpretation in the Qumran community impossible. Barstad's analysis of this relationship concludes that no text "unambiguously supports the information provided by Josephus" (Barstad, "Prophecy," 120). This same conclusion was previously reached by Rotem, "Ha-Nevuah," 68–73.

identify the present rewritten text as the now complete and therefore 'true' meaning of the original prophetic word. In doing so, these latter-day authors appropriated the prophetic voice of the original author and laid claim to be transmitting the divine word.

In discussing the ideological basis for this phenomenon, I suggested that the authors of these documents considered the original prophecies as ancient divine communiqués now preserved in literary form.[9] This approach is further grounded in the conceptualization of the ancient prophets as foretellers of future events, as discussed in chapter two. For the Qumran community, the ancient predictive prophecies were actually directed at the historical circumstances surrounding the formation and development of the Qumran community. The ubiquity of revelatory exegesis in the Second Temple period suggests that this view was shared by other groups outside of the Qumran community. For all these groups, the ancient prophetic task of foretelling the future indicates that the true meaning of these prophecies was to be found in contemporary circumstances. A later reader, guided by the appropriate inspiration, could read these scriptural traditions and continue to uncover the divine word. The reawakening of the divine speech marks the revelatory encounter of this later reader. Throughout these texts, this experience is identified as equivalent or similar to classical modes of prophetic communication and its practitioners are singled out for their prophetic capabilities.

In this chapter, I argue that pesher exegesis reflects both of these elements of revelatory exegesis. In the first part of this chapter, I examine the self-reflective statements in Pesher Habakkuk regarding the role of the Teacher of Righteousness as the inspired interpreter of the ancient prophetic word. The portrait of the Teacher in these passages as one who reformulates the ancient prophetic word in light of contemporary historical circumstances identifies him as a participant of the revelatory exegetical process. Moreover, these same passages in Pesher Habakkuk suggest that this entire process was viewed by the community as commensurate with the original prophetic activity of Habakkuk.

In the second part of this chapter, I examine three passages in sectarian literature where an original biblical passage has been reformulated in order to conform to its new sectarian interpretation. I suggest that

[9] Cf. Silberman, "Unriddling," 331; Freedman, "Prophecy," 44–45; Gruenwald, "Knowledge," 68.

this process is analogous to the rewriting of Deuteronomy and Ezekiel in the Temple Scroll and Pseudo-Ezekiel, respectively. In these texts, as discussed in the second half of chapter eleven, the modifications to the biblical text by the later author indicate that this author viewed these elements as part of the original prophetic communication to Moses and Ezekiel. This entire process serves to locate the later author as the rightful heir to the ancient prophet and the later author's words as similarly prophetic. I argue that this same approach stands behind the three texts discussed below. By altering the actual biblical text based on its new interpretation, each of these texts conflates the interpretation with the original revealed word.

Part One: Pesher, Prophecy, and Revelation

As encountered in chapter two, the portrait of the ancient prophets in Pesher Habakkuk provides the ideological foundations of pesher exegesis. The fundamental basis of pesher exegesis is the belief that the ancient prophecies found within Scripture do not actually speak about the historical context of the prophet to whom they are attributed. Rather, they imagine the contemporary circumstances of the late Second Temple period, in particular the historical events surrounding the formation, growth, and eschatological realization of the Qumran sectarian community. Furthermore, the true meaning of these ancient oracles was not even known to the prophetic figures who pronounced them.

This approach to prophecy in Pesher Habakkuk provides part of the ideological basis of pesher exegesis. The ancient prophetic pronouncements are now considered literary vestiges of ancient divine communications. The 'true' meaning of these ancient prophecies is known only to the contemporary inspired exegete who, by virtue of this status, is equipped with the tools to decipher these encoded ancient prophecies. The Qumran community acknowledged the Teacher of Righteousness as one such inspired exegete. In attributing this status to the Teacher of Righteousness, the Qumran community located him in a long line of inspired interpreters of Scripture, whose ability to interpret the contemporary meaning of ancient prophetic Scripture is realized as a revelatory encounter. Like the inspired interpreters in Chronicles, Ezra the scribe, the biblical Daniel, Pseudo-Daniel, the apocryphal Jeremiah and Josephus, the Teacher of Righteousness experienced divine revela-

tion through a literary medium.[10] Let us turn to the evidence itself that presents this 'prophetic' portrait of pesher interpretation.

Just as Pesher Habakkuk presents a developed portrait of the ancient prophets, it likewise reflects upon the related role of the Teacher of Righteousness as an inspired interpreter. In one of the two passages discussed in chapter two, Pesher Habakkuk asserts that the 'true' meaning of the ancient prophecies was not revealed to the prophet to whom the oracles was first delivered (1QpHab 7:1–2). This passage is followed by a reference to the intended time-frame of the ancient prophetic pronouncements and the means through which their interpretation will become known.

Pesher Habakkuk (1QpHab) 7:3–5[11]

3 ואשר אמר למען ירוץ הקורא[12] בו
4 פשרו על מורה הצדק אשר הודיעו אל את
5 כול רזי דברי עבדיו הנביאים

3 *vacat* And when it says, "So that he can run who reads it" (Hab 2:2),
4 its interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God made known
5 all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets.

The pesher introduces the Teacher of Righteousness, who is the recipient of exclusive knowledge concerning the meaning of the prophetic words. The formulation of this passage and the presentation of the Teacher's knowledge must be understood in opposition to the immediately preceding statement that introduces the seemingly unintelligible nature of the prophetic pronouncements. To the ancient prophet (here Habakkuk), God did not make known (l. 2: הודעו) the true understanding of the divine oracles. By contrast, God now makes known (l. 4:

[10] The connection between the prophetic figures in the Chronicles and pesher interpretation is noted by Schniedewind, *Word*, 245. Many scholars have remarked on the similarities between pesher and the form of interpretation found in Daniel 9. See Elliger, *Studien*, 156; Betz, *Offenbarung*, 80–81; Burrows, "Prophecy," 228; Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 29; Horgan, *Pesharim*, 255–256, n. 99; Collins, *Apocalyptic Vision*, 78–80; idem, "Prophecy," 304–307; Lange, "Interpretation," 18–22. On the observed similarities between Josephus' inspired interpretation of Scripture (*War* 3.352–353) and pesher interpretation, see Blenkinsopp, "Prophecy," 247.

[11] Horgan, *Pesharim* (Princeton), 172–173. See above, p. 35, for text and translation of ll. 1–2.

[12] MT has קורא (Brownlee, *Text*, 40–41). See below, n. 16, for an explanation of this variant.

הודיעו) to the Teacher of Righteousness the meaning of the prophetic word.[13] That which God did not divulge to the ancient prophet (l. 2: גמר הקץ) is now revealed to the Teacher of Righteousness (l. 5: כול רזי דברי עבדיו הנביאים).[14]

This passage does not provide any explicit information concerning how the divine mysteries are divulged to the Teacher of Righteousness. At first glance, the similar language employed for the divine dialogue with the prophets and with the Teacher of Righteousness (√ידע; *hiph'il*) suggests that the medium employed for these two modes of revelation is likewise closely related. Upon closer examination, however, the exegetical method applied to the biblical verse provides some insight regarding the literary form in which divine revelation is mediated to the Teacher of Righteousness.

In attempting to ascertain the relationship between the biblical lemma and the pesher exegesis, commentators have focused on the interpretation of the biblical expression, ירוץ, "he can run." As commentators have observed, this word has been understood in the pesher as an allusion to 'interpretation' or 'explanation.'[15] Based on the pesher section, it is clear that this interpretative process focuses on the words of the ancient prophets. The nature of this interpretation is clarified by the second half of the biblical verse, הקורא בו, "who reads it." The understanding of the prophetic word is actualized through a process of reading, here strengthened by divine guidance. This divinely directed process is reserved exclusively for the Teacher of Righteousness, who is the 'reader' assumed in the biblical passage.[16]

---

[13] The similarity is language is likewise noted by Nitzan, *Pesher Habakkuk*, 171.

[14] On this proposed equivalency, see Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 112.

[15] The precise exegetical basis for this understanding is debated. It is generally agreed upon that the pesher has ignored the contextual meaning of the biblical root ('to run') in favor of an alternate root that could also fit the morphological form of the biblical word. Silberman points to the talmudic interpretation of Jer 23:29, where the verbal root פצץ 'crush, shatter' is understood as the interpretation of a text (*b. Sanh.* 31a) ("Unriddling," 344–345). He suggests that the root of ירוץ here may be treated as רצץ, meaning 'to crush, shatter,' providing a parallel phenomenon to the talmudic interpretation. Silberman's second suggestion is the Aramaic root תרץ, meaning 'to make level,' though with the sense of 'to interpret' (*b. Yeb.* 11b–12a). See also Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 111, who proposes the root רצה in the *hiph'il*, which would mean 'to arrange subjects for debate, to discourse.' As Brownlee notes, however, this would require the form יריץ.

[16] This likely explains the presence of a definite article in הקורא (not in MT; see above, n. 12). According to the pesher, the biblical verse has in mind one particular reader—the Teacher of Righteousness.

This status seems to be related to a similar characterization of the Teacher of Righteousness in the Pesher on Psalms (4Q171 1–10 iv 26–27), where the biblical phrase "and my tongue is the pen of a ready scribe (סופר מהיר)" (Ps 45:2) is interpreted as a reference to the Teacher of Righteousness: "[its interpretation] concerns the Teacher [of Righteousness, who … bef]ore God with purposeful speech (במעני לשון)…"[17] The scribal role of the psalmist has been reassigned to the Teacher of Righteousness. In this capacity, the Teacher performs some act before God. While the precise action is not clear due to the lacunae, it is certain that it involves speech. I suggest here that this fragment refers to the interpretive process, whereby the Teacher of Righteousness provides the correct understanding of the ancient prophetic pronouncements. If the "tongue" of the psalmist is understood as a conduit for the divine word, then the pesher suggests that it is the Teacher who is now mediating God's message. The assignment of "purposeful speech" would then refer to the Teacher's ability to interpret properly the divine message as encoded in ancient Scripture.

The foregoing interpretation of 1QpHab 7:4–5 (and the Pesher on Psalms) and the characterization of the Teacher of Righteousness found therein must be understood in the context of the earlier presentation of the Teacher in column two of Pesher Habakkuk. Two pesher units in this column interpret the term "traitors" (בוגדים) in Hab 1:5 as a reference to the enemies of the sect.[18] In the first passage (1QpHab 2:1–3), the traitors, along with the Man of the Lie, are denounced for failing to believe the words of the Teacher of Righteousness.[19] The

---

[17] Horgan, *Pesharim* (Princeton), 20–21. For additional approaches to the reconstruction of the manuscript, see Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4.I*, 49; Strugnell, "Notes," 217. The similarity between this passage and Pesher Habakkuk is noted by Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 112.

[18] On the literary relationship between the two interpretations of the biblical passage, see analysis in Rabinowitz, "Habakkuk," 42. On the question of whether the term בוגדים, "traitors" was present in the *Vorlage* of the pesherist, see p. 31, n. 22.

[19] Following the text of Horgan, *Pesharim* (Princeton), 162–163 (eadem, *Pesharim*, 24): כי לוא [האמינו בדברי] מורה ה צדקה, "They did not [believe the words of] the Teacher of Righteousness." The verbal clause that describes the relationship between the traitors (and the Man of Lies) and the Teacher of Righteousness is lost in the lacuna. There is general agreement that it is somehow related to heeding the words of the Teacher of Righteousness. Horgan's restoration is also found in Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 55; García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1:12. See also Elliger, *Studien*, 167; Rabinowitz, "Habakkuk," 38–39; Nitzan, *Pesher Habakkuk*, 153 (שמעו דברי אל). Rabinowitz points to a similar phrase in 2 Chr 35:22 as well as CD 20:28 (וישמעו לקול מורה). Horgan, however, argues that the appearance of the root אמן in lines two and six demonstrates that there

words of the Teacher of Righteousness are more specifically identified as emerging from the "mouth of God" (מפיא אל). The text here provides no further information regarding how the Teacher was privy to the divine words.

The mechanism by which the Teacher of Righteousness gains access to the divine word is more fully articulated in the second pesher on the "traitors" (1QpHab 2:5–10). This passage was discussed previously in chapter two in the treatment of its conceptualization of the ancient prophets.[20] The term "traitors" (בוגדים) in the biblical passage is again interpreted as a reference to the enemies of the sect, who are more specifically characterized as the "violators of the covenant" (עריצ[י הבר]ית). As in the passage earlier in the column, the enemies refuse to believe when they hear from the priest (i.e., Teacher of Righteousness) all the things that will take place in the end of days (ll. 6–7). The text digresses in order to convey the source of the Teacher of Righteousness' knowledge of these matters: "God places into [his heart discernme]nt to interpret all the words of his servants the prophets" (נתן אל ב[לבו בינ]ה לפשור את כול דברי עבדיו הנביאים) (ll. 8–9).

The portrait of the Teacher of Righteousness presented in this passage articulates the sectarian understanding of the status of the Teacher as an inspired interpreter of scriptural prophecies. As in 1QpHab 7:4–5, the Teacher of Righteousness is represented as one who possesses the ability to decipher properly the meaning of the ancient prophetic oracles. The interpretive method of the Teacher, though not explicit in 1QpHab 7:4–5 or 2:1–3, seems to be achieved through the process of a divinely guided reading of prophetic Scripture. The nature of this divine guidance is expressed in the 1QpHab 2:6–7 by stating that God gave the Teacher of Righteousness "discernment,"[21] with which the Teacher interprets the prophets.[22] Thus, God does not merely decode the prophecies for the Teacher of Righteousness. Rather, he provides him with the tools (the pesher) necessary to uncover the hidden meaning of the ancient prophetic oracles (the words).[23] This divine munifi-

---

is a deliberate use of this word throughout the pesher, no doubt influenced by the presence of the word in the biblical lemma.

[20] See ch. 2, pp. 30–31, for text and translation with analysis.

[21] See the various possible reconstructions for this word, p. 30, n. 16. Most agree that some noun of cognition should be restored here.

[22] Aune notes that Neh 2:12; 7:5 allude to God's assistance of Nehemiah using the expression "to put into the heart" ("Charismatic Exegesis," 136).

[23] Horgan, *Pesharim*, 237.

cence guides the Teacher of Righteousness as he decodes the mysteries of the prophets.

The corpus of pesher texts found at Qumran provides both important evidence for the phenomenon of revelatory exegesis in Second Temple Judaism and its continued prophetic context. Scholars have correctly observed that the formal literary and exegetical features of pesher likely have their roots in the practice of dream interpretation in Jewish and non-Jewish contexts.[24] These formal characteristics have been adapted from the framework of dream interpretation and applied to the process of deciphering a written text. This connection closely resembles the relationship between Daniel 9 and the other visions and dreams in the biblical book. In Daniel 9, the mechanics of interpreting dreams and visions throughout the book of Daniel are applied to the written word of the prophet Jeremiah.[25] This interpretive process in equated with the other revelatory media found in the biblical book and identified as a viable mode for the transmission of the divine word. In Pesher Habakkuk, the Teacher of Righteousness appears as a latter-day Daniel, applying the mechanics of dream (and vision) interpretation to the process of reading prophetic Scripture.

Pesher Habakkuk relies heavily upon revelatory language in its description of the role of the Teacher of Righteousness as an inspired interpreter of Scripture. Thus, for example, the Teacher receives knowledge "from the mouth of God." This seemingly unmediated mode of divine communication actually takes place through the Teacher of Righteousness' inspired reading of Scripture with the appropriate exegetical tools. The language here, however, is intended to underscore the revelatory character of this experience. The precise media of revelation employed in pesher exegesis finds its historical and phenomenological antecedents in the various examples of revelatory exegesis discussed earlier in this study.[26] In all these contexts, the interpretation of ancient prophetic Scripture emerges as a new mode of divine revelation. The Teacher of Righteousness is identified in Pesher Habakkuk as the only one who properly understands Habakkuk's words. In this sense, the

---

[24] See above, n. 4.

[25] Cf. Silberman, "Unriddling," 330–331; Aune, *Prophecy*, 134; Berrin, "Pesharim," 124–125.

[26] In my discussion of these texts, I noted that many come from apocalyptic contexts and often contain apocalyptic themes. The Pesharim as well are infused with themes commonly found in apocalyptic literature. See Collins, "Jewish Apocalypticism," 27–36; Nitzan, *Pesher Habakkuk*, 19–28.

Teacher of Righteousness both carries on the ancient prophetic role of Habakkuk and perfects it. Pesher interpretation was understood by its practitioners as a viable means of gaining access to the divine word and therefore the present-day realization of the ancient prophetic task. Prophecy continues in the Qumran community through the inspired interpretation of Scripture.[27]

Part Two: The Prophetic Word between Text and Interpretation

The relationship between the ancient prophets and their contemporary interpreters as articulated in Pesher Habakkuk occupies a unique place in the history of Jewish biblical interpretation. To be sure, the notion that any particular ancient text has in mind the contemporary time of the interpreter is ubiquitous in Jewish and Christian scriptural interpretation.[28] Pesher exegesis goes one step further than other interpretive methods by assuming that the ancient prophecies lacked meaning in their original context. The prophetic words refer uniquely to the historical circumstances surrounding the life and times of the pesherist. Once this meaning is deciphered, the scriptural text within which the prediction is embedded ceases to retain its own contextual meaning and is now identified with the contemporary understanding. In this method of interpretation, the line between text and interpretation is obfuscated and ultimately disappears. To borrow the language of Pesher Habakkuk, the scriptural text itself is no longer the *words* of the prophets, but rather the *mysteries* of the prophet. As such, the prophets can now be identified with the 'true' meaning of their utterances (not understood by them) rather than the veiled allusions they originally articulated.

Pesher Habakkuk provides several examples of scriptural citations that differ in varying degrees from the evidence of the ancient textual witnesses.[29] Some of these variant textual traditions seem to reflect

---

[27] The prophetic revelatory character of pesher exegesis is observed in varying degrees in scholarly treatments. See Dimant, "Qumran," 508; Collins, "Prophecy," 303; Berrin, "Pesharim," 123–126.

[28] See Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 223. On the relationship between the approach found in pesher and that of rabbinic interpretative traditions, see Meira Polliack, "Wherein Lies the Pesher? Re-Questioning the Connection between Medieval Karaite and Qumranic Modes of Biblical Interpretation," *JSIJ* 3 (2004): 11–13.

[29] See Elliger, *Studien*, 48–58; Brownlee, *Text*; Goldberg, "Girsa'ot."

deliberate alterations of the biblical text in order to bring the text closer to its interpretation in the pesher.[30] Some other passages in the Qumran corpus seem to reflect a similar approach to the malleability of the scriptural text, whereby the text is identified by its interpreted meaning. The original biblical text is reformulated to agree with its newfound 'true' meaning. This phenomenon corresponds in large part to the rewriting process in the Temple Scroll and Pseudo-Ezekiel. The three passages treated below represent examples of attempts to appropriate the original prophetic voice of the biblical text by reformulating it according to its newly deciphered meaning. In all these texts, the blurring of the line between the original prophetic voice and its reformulation authorizes the new meaning of the text as part of the original revelation and identifies the authors of these texts as active mediators of the divine word.

4QMiscellaneous Rules (4Q265) 7 7–8[31]

7 [ב]היות בעצת היחד חמשה ע[שר אנשים כאשר ספר אל ביד עבדיו]
8 [הנ]ביאים נכונה עצת היח[ד באמת למטעת עולם

7 [When] there will be in the council of the communit[y] fift[een men, as God foretold through his servants,]
8 [the p]rophets, the Council of the Community will be established [in truth as an eternal plant.

This passage comes from a larger text now referred to as Miscellaneous Rules (*olim* Serekh Damascus), so titled because of its unique blending of various different literary genres and legal rules.[32] After concluding the list of Sabbath laws (6 1–7 6), the text turns to the Council of the Community, also known from the Rule of the Community (1QS 6:9–13; 8:1–10).[33] The text is extremely fragmentary at this point and requires

[30] There is debate over how widespread this phenomenon is in Pesher Habakkuk and other pesher texts. See Finkel, "Pesher," 367–369. More recently, see discussion in Shani L. Berrin, "Lemma / Pesher Correspondence in Pesher Nahum," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery*, 346, n. 19.

[31] Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII*, 69–71.

[32] The variegated character of this text is discussed in Joseph M. Baumgarten, "Scripture and Law in 4Q265," in *Biblical Perspectives*, 25–32; Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Serekh-Damascus," *EDSS* 2:868–869.

[33] See also 1QpHab 12:4; 1Q14 (Pesher on Micah) 10 6; 4Q171 (Pesher on Psalms) 1–10 ii 15. See further Edmund F. Sutcliffe, "The General Council of the Qumran Community," *Bib* 40 (1959): 971–983.

extensive reconstruction to be rendered intelligible. Line seven clearly refers to the reality of the Council of the Community. Likewise, line eight describes the establishment of this Council. The beginning of line eight contains the word "the prophets." Full reconstruction of these two lines hinges on the relationship between the Council of the Community and the prophets (or perhaps Prophets).

Vermes proposes that הנביאים should be understood as the scriptural prophetic collection and that the text demands that the fifteen men in the Council be "[perfectly versed in all that is revealed of the Law and the Pr]ophets."[34] While one might indeed expect such expertise from the members of the Council, this is nowhere else mandated. Moreover, it has already been suggested that references to the scriptural prophetic collections are introduced by ספר.[35] The inclusion of this word would make the reconstruction prohibitively long.[36]

In the *editio princeps* of 4Q265, Baumgarten understands הנביאים not as a reference to the scriptural collection, but rather to the historical prophets. In particular, the full text now relates how God foretold the establishment of the Council of the Community, "through his servants, the prophets." In support of this interpretation, Baumgarten points to Pesher Isaiah's interpretation of Isa 54:11 ("And I will make you a foundation of sapphires"): "[its interpretation is th]at they have founded (אשר יסדו) the Council of the Community (עצת היחד), [the] priests and the peo[ple] a congregation of his elect, like a stone of lapis lazuli among the stones" (4Q164 1 2–3).[37] This understanding represents the decoded meaning of Isaiah's own words. Moreover, the eschatological character of the interpretation fits the general character of pesher exegesis. Thus, one can properly say that Isaiah foretold the establishment of the Council of the Community; he just did not know it.[38]

---

[34] Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (New York: Allen Lang, Penguin, 1997), 155.

[35] See above, p. 28, n. 10. This would especially be the case here since the reconstruction suggested by Vermes closely follows the similar clause in 4QMMT.

[36] To be sure, one could tinker with some of the other elements in the reconstruction to fit it into the required space.

[37] Joseph M. Baumgarten, in idem et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XXV: Halakhic Texts* (DJD XXXV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 72. See also his earlier remarks in idem, "Scripture," 27. For text of Pesher Isaiah, see Horgan, *Pesharim* (Princeton), 110–111.

[38] See also 1QpHab 12:4, where "Lebanon" in Hab 2:17 is interpreted as a reference to the Council of the Community. In this passage, however, the prophetic word does not refer to the establishment of the council.

Let us examine further the relationship between Pesher Isaiah and 4Q265. Both texts treat the establishment of the Council of the Community (עצת היחד). Pesher Isaiah interprets the passage in Isaiah to refer to prior establishment (√יסד) of the Council. In 4Q265, the establishment (√כון) of the Council is introduced as an event previously portended by the ancient prophets, mediating God's word. Though different roots are employed to refer to the establishment of the Council of the Community, it is likely that the "prophets" referred to in 4Q265 alludes to the passage from Isa 54:11 as understood through pesher exegesis.

This understanding of Isaiah's words represents an intermediate stage in the conflation of text and interpretation that marks the development of the prophetic tradition in the Qumran community. Isaiah's original words (in 54:11) cease to have any original contextual meaning. Rather, they now acquire the meaning generated by the inspired exegesis. There is no recognition of multiple interpretive layers to the biblical text, similar to the distinction between *peshat* and *derash* that emerges in later rabbinic tradition.[39] Once the biblical passage has been properly interpreted, it can only be read and understood in this way. The author of 4Q265 attributes to the author of Pesher Isaiah the appropriation of the prophetic voice of Isaiah. The pesher interpretation is identified as part of the original divine revelation. In this sense, the inspired formulator of this interpretation emerges as a mediator of the word of God and the reformulation of the biblical text reflects the active mediation of the divine word.

Damascus Document (CD) 9:8–10[40]

8 על השבועה אשר
9 אמר לא תושיעך ידך לך איש אשר ישביע על פני השדה
10 אשר לא לפנים השפטים או מאמרם הושיע ידו לו

[39] On these categories in rabbinic tradition, see David W. Halivni, *Peshat and Derash: Plain and Applied Meaning in Rabbinic Exegesis* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).

[40] Baumgarten and Schwartz, *Damascus Document*, 42–43. Fragmentary parallel text appears in 4Q267 9 i 4–5, with no variants (Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII*, 105–106).

8 …Concerning oaths: as to that which
9 he said, "Let not your hand help you," a man who causes (another) to swear in the open field
10 that is not in the presence of the judges or by their bidding has let his hand help him.

This passage contains a brief law regarding the performance of an oath that is articulated not in the presence of judges.[41] The law is introduced here with a citation formula (אשר אמר), which would normally indicate that a scriptural citation follows.[42] The text that follows (לא תושיעך ידך לך), however, is not based on any known scriptural verse. Early commentators opined that the textual citation comes from a no longer extant sectarian work.[43] Ginzberg, however, had already noted similarities between this passage and 1 Sam 25:26 (והושע ידך לך), though he did not suggest the Damascus Document is actually citing the biblical passage.[44] More recent commentators have argued that this is in fact intended to be a biblical citation from 1 Samuel. 1 Sam 25:25–26, 31–33 enjoins against taking up one's hand in violence. For the Damascus Document, it serves as the scriptural basis for a related proscription against taking up one's hand for unauthorized oaths.[45]

CD 9:8–10 provides an interesting feature in the several passages in the Damascus Document that contain allusions and citations to Scripture. The sectarian interpretation of the biblical passage is formulated in language that suggests that this interpretation is the actual text of Scripture. Thus, the same phenomenon observed above in 4Q265 is found to some degree in the Damascus Document in a legal context. The reformulation of 1 Sam 25:26 to conform with its role in the law of oaths represents another example of a later author's attempt to extend the original revelation to include present circumstances.

---

[41] On oaths and vows in general, see Lawrence H. Schiffman, "The Law of Vows and Oaths (Num. 30,3–16) in the Zadokite Fragments and the Temple Scroll," *RevQ* 15 (1991): 199–214.

[42] See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," in *Essays* 10–11; repr. from *NTS* 7 (1960–1961): 297–333.

[43] Ginzberg, *Jewish Sect*, 189–190; Rabin, *Zadokite Documents*, 45. Ginzberg proposed the Book of Hagi as the source.

[44] Ginzberg, *Jewish Sect*, 190. See also Schechter, *Documents*, 78; Cothenet, *LTQ*, 2:188.

[45] See Baumgarten and Schwartz, *Damascus Document*, 42–43; Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII*, 106; Moshe J. Bernstein and Shlomo A. Koyfman, "The Interpretation of Biblical Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Forms and Methods," in *Biblical Interpretation*, 74. Cf. Charles, "Fragments," 2:823.

4QDibre Hamme'orot (4Q504) 1 + 2 iii 9–14[46]

9 כיא אותנו בחרתה לכה
10 [לעם מכול]הארץ עלכן שפכתה אלינו את חמתכה
11 [ואת קנא]תכה בכול חרון אפכה ותדבק בנו
12 [ ] [] [] ותיכה אשר כתב מושה ועבדיכה
13 הנביאים אש[ר ש]לחתה ל[קר]תנו הרעה באחרית
14 הימים

9 … Because you have chosen us [from all]
10 the earth [to be your people,] therefore have you poured out your anger
11 [and jealou]sy upon us in all the fury of your wrath. You have caused
12 [the scourge] of your [plagues][47] to cleave to us which Moses wrote, and your servants
13 the prophets, that you wou[ld se]nd evil against us in the end of
14 days.

Dibre Hamme'orot (Words of the Luminaries), within which this passage appears, is a collection of prayers to be recited over the course of each week.[48] In form, the prayers themselves are often likened to the genre of biblical psalms known as 'communal laments.'[49] Psalms of communal lament contain historical reviews of Israel's past—often highlighting instances of God's salvific intervention—which serve in a preparatory role for the ensuing petition.[50] Dibre Hamme'orot contains a similar review of history from Adam to the present age combined with petitionary prayers. The present passage is embedded within the historical review that details Israel's election and the suffering experienced as a result of this relationship.[51] The text vacillates between

[46] Baillet, *Qumrân grotte 4.III*, 141–142. See also Dennis T. Olson, in James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Pseudepigraphic and Non-Masoretic Psalms and Prayers* (PTSDSSP 4A; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck]; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 128–129. Translation follows Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 352. See further Chazon, "Te'udat Liturgit," 251–253; Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 256–258.

[47] This reconstruction is suggested by Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 352 (cf. Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 257).

[48] For recent general discussion of the text, see Chazon, "Te'udat Liturgit"; Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, passim; Daniel K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998), 59–94; Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 239–242.

[49] Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 242.

[50] See Hermann Gunkel, *Introduction to Psalms: The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel* (trans. J.D. Nogalski; Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998), 91–92.

[51] The pericope itself is divided into two sections. The first outlines the nature of Israel's election (ll. 4–5). The text then explains that Israel's suffering stems from God's desire to chastise his chosen people (ll. 6–12). This is likened to a father reprimanding

describing the nature of this special relationship and narrating the constant punishment that God has leveled upon the Israelites. This suffering is explained as general chastisement (ll. 6–7), the result of presumed negligence in fidelity to the covenant (l. 9), and holding Israel to a higher standard (ll. 10–11).[52]

After recounting the final divine reprimand, the text relates all the aforementioned incidents had already been written about by Moses and the prophets (l. 12). It is not entirely clearly if the antecedent of this clause is the immediate preceding phrase or the entire set of passages. Either way, the text clearly states that these things had been written about previously by Moses and the prophets.

What follows is another relative clause that serves to clarify what exactly Moses and the prophets wrote. There is a significant scholarly debate on how to understand the antecedent of the relative pronoun **אשר** in line thirteen. Baillet understood it in a temporal sense.[53] Davila offers an alternative interpretation. He maintains that the antecedent of the relative pronoun is the prophets. Such an understanding renders "the prophets" the object of "you sent."[54] The main syntactic difficulty with this interpretation is that the verb already has a clear direct object—**הרעה**, "the evil." In order for Davila's understanding to work, he is forced to make this term begin a new clause and identify **לקרתנו** as something akin to a purpose infinitive: "in order for evil to [mee]t us in the last days." To be sure, this construction works grammatically. The assumed antecedent of this purpose clause, however, is now seemingly all the way back in the enumeration of the divine chastisements. In this case, this clause has nothing to do with the mention of Moses and the prophets.

The most syntactically harmonious reading is suggested by Nitzan.[55] She understands the two relative pronouns in lines 12–13 as intimately related to one another. The first **אשר** introduces the notion that the

---

his son (ll. 6–7). The passage mentioning Moses and the prophets serves as an addendum to the second section of the pericope.

[52] This understanding of line nine is based on Nitzan's reconstruction of the beginning of the line as "[executing vengea]nce for your covenant." This suggestion is followed by Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 256–257. The assumed dependence on Lev 27:25 suggests that the vengeance is in response to some lapse in covenantal adherence.

[53] "[Lors]que Tu as [en]voyé au [devant] de nous le malheur à la fin des temps" (Baillet, *Qumrân grotte 4.III*, 142). This translation is followed by Olson, *Psalms and Prayers*, 129.

[54] Davila, *Liturgical Works*, 257 (cf. Brin, "Tefisat," 104*).

[55] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 352.

events narrated have already been written down by Moses and the prophets. The antecedent of the following אשר is the content of the aforementioned writing. The substance of this writing is "that you wou[ld se]nd evil against us in the end of days" (l. 13). As such, the first relative pronoun introduces an addendum that serves to clarify and contextualize the entire pericope. The disaster that has befallen Israel has already been documented by Moses and the prophets. The text then proceeds with a summary statement recapitulating the basic contents of this written prediction.

Dibre Hamme'orot clearly refers to a written text of Moses and the prophets. Where is this written text? Chazon points to Deut 31:29 in light of the clear textual affinities with the present passage.[56] This proposal, however, only accounts for Moses and not the prophets. Moreover, the passage in 4Q504 employs הרעה to refer to specific evils that have befallen Israel in the end of days. These are the events found earlier in the passage. The evil in Deut 31:29 is used in a general sense.

It is likely that 4Q504 should be understood in a way similar to the earlier treatment of 4Q265. The reference to a document written by Moses and the prophets is not intended to signify a scriptural text, at least not in its straightforward meaning. Indeed, no scriptural text contains the assumed referent of the passage in 4Q504. Rather, 4Q504, like 4Q265, may imagine a scriptural text as it is now understood through inspired exegesis. No explicit scriptural text is in view in 4Q504 (at least for the prophets). At the same time, Moses and the prophets are attributed predictions concerning the end of days. As discussed above, pesher exegesis transforms the simple meaning of the biblical passage (the so-called *peshat* of rabbinic tradition) and assigns it eschatological significance.

Thus, I suggest that 4Q504 does imagine a scriptural text, actually multiple ones (thus, Moses *and* the prophets). The reference to this text in lines 12–13, however, is to this scriptural text *after* its proper interpretation by the hands of the inspired exegete. Unfortunately, the extant remains of the Qumran library have not yielded any textual evidence for such an interpretation. Based on analogy with similar phenomena elsewhere in the Qumran corpus, it seems that the prophetic word identified in 4Q504 (here including Moses) is no longer the veiled

[56] Chazon, "Teʿudat Liturgit," 253.

allusion originally uttered by the historical prophet. Rather, it is now equated with the decoded meaning; this is the real prophetic word.

The foregoing discussion has identified the conflation of text and interpretation in 4QMiscellaneous Rules, the Damascus Document, and Dibre Hamme'orot. This feature is the result of a unique approach to scriptural interpretation practiced in Second Temple Judaism and at Qumran. The deliberate reformulation of the ancient biblical text in order to agree with the contemporary interpretation represents the efforts of some Jews in the Second Temple period to find ways to mediate the divine word and continue the ancient prophetic task.

The inclusion of Dibre Hamme'rot in this discussion points to a wider context for this activity beyond the Qumran community. Unlike 4QMiscellaneous Rules and the Damascus Document, which are clearly products of the Qumran community, the provenance of Dibre Hamme'orot is debated. If it is a sectarian document, then it provides an additional example of a phenomenon unique to the Qumran community. Many scholars agree, however, that the text should not be assigned a sectarian provenance.[57] If its composition is located outside of Qumran, then an even wider context in Second Temple Judaism must be assumed for the blending of text and interpretation identified within this passage and its implications for understanding prophetic continuity.

Summary

As has been repeatedly emphasized in this study, the Qumran corpus does not contain any text with explicit prophetic language that would point to the presence of prophecy at Qumran. This phenomenon mirrors the larger situation of Second Temple Judaism, in which only a small collection of texts contain evidence for activity resembling prophecy as found in the Hebrew Bible. Notwithstanding this limited evidence, several segments in Second Temple Judaism recognized the persistence of prophecy and in fact believed that they themselves continued to mediate the divine word. They did acknowledge, how-

[57] See discussion in Esther G. Chazon, "*Is Divrei ha-me'orot* a Sectarian Prayer?" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: E.J. Brill; Jerusalem: Magnes, the Hebrew University, Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992), 3–17; Falk, *Prayers*, 61–63.

ever, that the character of prophecy and the nature of revelation had changed dramatically.

In Second Temple Judaism, revelatory exegesis represents one of the more pervasive ways in which prophecy and revelation was reformatted. The process of reading, interpreting, and rewriting ancient prophetic Scripture was recognized as a viable means for transmitting the divine word embedded in these scriptural traditions. Several texts in the Hebrew Bible already bear witness to this transition. Later in the Second Temple period, the experience of ancient prophets was reconfigured to conform with emerging models of prophecy and revelation. Thus, the ubiquitous rewriting of prophetic scripture in the Second Temple period represents the application of this new conceptualization of prophecy.

This same situation exists in the Qumran community. Pesher Habakkuk indicates that the community viewed the Teacher of Righteousness as the inspired interpreter of the hidden meaning of the ancient prophetic pronouncements. This process involved the Teacher's uncovering of the 'true' meaning of prophetic Scripture while in a state of inspiration. This process, according to Pesher Habakkuk, reflects the Teacher's receipt of the divine message "from the mouth of God." This expression points to the prophetic understanding of the Teacher's activity. Unlike the classical prophecy of the Hebrew Bible, however, prophetic revelation has become a literary experience.

A related phenomenon is taking place in the reformulation of biblical texts in order to agree with their interpretations. The authors of these texts locate themselves as participants in the divine-human dialogue and claim to possess knowledge of the most up-to-date application of the ancient revelation. They extend the intended audience of the divine revelation beyond the ancient prophets by including themselves. In this sense, they too profess to have access to the word of God.

CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

SAPIENTIAL REVELATION AT QUMRAN

Chapters 12–13 surveyed a wide range of texts found within the Qumran library that bear witness to a newly emerging model of revelation. These texts identify the receipt of divine wisdom as a revelatory experience. This treatment began by discussing the various biblical models for the acquisition of divine wisdom. In particular, I noted the pervasiveness of the belief that God bestows knowledge upon certain individuals. With rare exceptions, however, this experience was not aligned with the biblical prophetic traditions. By the late Second Temple Period, several texts identify these sapiential traditions with prophetic phenomena. The entire experience is conceptualized using language and imagery normally applied to prophetic encounters. Several texts preserved among the Dead Sea Scrolls attest to this new mode of revelation, which I designated as sapiential revelation.

In chapters 12–13, the prophetic revelatory framework for sapiential revelation was established by exploring the application of its processes to ancient biblical prophetic and inspired figures (Moses, David, Isaiah, Enoch, and Daniel). In chapter fifteen, I examined evidence for the active reality of sapiential revelation in wider segments of Second Temple Judaism outside of the Qumran community. Thus, Ben Sira's prophetic self-awareness was identified as an example of an individual conceiving of his receipt of divine wisdom as analogous to prophetic revelation. Similarly, the social group standing behind the composition of 1Q/4QInstruction envisioned the divine conveyance of knowledge as a revelatory process.

In this chapter, I turn to the evidence of sapiential revelation within the Qumran community. In doing so, I draw upon the models of sapiential revelation outlined in chapters 12–13. This analysis centers around three prominent sectarian documents: the Hodayot, the Damascus Document, and the Rule of the Community. The bulk of this examination focuses on the evidence provided by the Hodayot. Several passages in the Hodayot, as well as a few in the Damascus Document and the Rule of the Community, indicate that the Qumran community envisioned for itself an active role for sapiential revelation. These texts

testify to the sectarian belief in the continued occurrence of revelation through the receipt of divine wisdom. Moreover, some of these texts preserve evidence of specific individuals who were the beneficiaries of this sapiential revelation.

The Hodayot

Authorship and Sitz im Leben

Any treatment of the role of the Hodayot in reconstructing sectarian thought and practice must begin with the question of authorship and *Sitz im Leben*.[1] With the initial publication of the Hodayot, many scholars argued that the entire collection came from the hand of one author, who was identified as the Teacher of Righteousness.[2] This initial assertion was subsequently rethought by many scholars who argued for far more complexity in the composition of the text.[3]

Much recent scholarship on the Hodayot has followed the approach articulated by Gert Jeremias.[4] Jeremias agreed with those scholars who denied literary unity and singular authorship. At the same time, Jeremias found that certain generic and literary features point to the existence of two independent literary units within the Hodayot. The hymns contained in 1QH[a] 10–17 (Sukenik 2–9) were identified as a lit-

[1] For a much fuller discussion of these issues, see Douglas, "Power," 1:1–76.

[2] Eliezer L. Sukenik, *Oṣar ha-Megillot ha-Genuzot: Še-be-Yede ha-'Universitah ha-'Ivrit* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, the Hebrew University, 1954), 34 (idem, *Megillot Genuzot*, 33); Milik, *Ten Years*, 40; Carmignac, *LTQ*, 1:129–145. Further bibliography from early Qumran scholarship can be found in Mansoor, *Hymns*, 45, n. 1; Jeremias, *Lehrer*, 168–169, n. 6.

[3] See Licht, *Megillat ha-Hodayot*, 22–27; Hans Bardtke, "Considérations sur les Cantiques de Qumrân," *RB* 63 (1956): 220–233 (esp. 232–233); (unified authorship, though not the Teacher of Righteousness [perhaps the *Mebaqqer* or the *Maskil*]); Dupont-Sommer, "Hymnes," 10–12 (no unified authorship, though the voice of the Teacher can be detected at some points; cf. Delcor, *Hymnes*, 20–23; Émile Puech, "Hodayot," *EDSS* 1:366–367). Basing himself primarily on the analogy of the form-critical study of biblical Psalms, Holm-Nielsen argued that the individual hymnic units in the Hodayot are the product of numerous different authors, who composed these hymns in various different *Sitze im Leben* (*Hodayot*, 316–331) These authors came from within the Qumran community. At the same time, the experiences reflected in the hymns are not those of the individual authors. Rather, the recurring first person speech ('I') in the hymns reflects the larger sectarian community. Accordingly, the hymns are representative of the larger experiences and theological ethos of the wider Qumran community.

[4] Jeremias, *Lehrer*, 168–267.

erary unit whose authorship was assigned to the Teacher of Righteousness. The hymns in the surrounding columns were associated with the larger sectarian community. The former set of hymns was identified by Jeremias as the Teacher Hymns, based on the assertion that these hymns were composed by the Teacher of Righteousness and reflect his real-life experience and personal ideology. In particular, Jeremias saw in these hymns claims to authority similar to those asserted by the Teacher of Righteousness in other sectarian documents. In addition, the personal experiences of the author of these hymns correspond with much of what is known about the biography of the Teacher as recorded in the Damascus Document and the Pesharim.[5] Jeremias titled the other set of hymns the Community Hymns. The 'I' of these hymns reflects the experience and outlook of the larger Qumran community. Jeremias' two-fold classification of the Hodayot has received relatively widespread support in subsequent Qumran scholarship.[6] The independent character of the Teacher Hymns also seems to be reinforced by the evidence of the Cave 4 Hodayot manuscripts.[7]

Based on the model presented by Jeremias and refined by later scholars, the Hodayot contain a heightened personal element. The Teacher

[5] Jeremias, *Lehrer*, 176–177. For example, the description of the exile of the hymnist in 1QH[a] 12 corresponds with the portrait of the Teacher of Righteousness in the Pesharim.

[6] On Jeremias' influence, see Douglas, "Power," 1:66–67, n. 138; Newsom, *Self*, 196–197. The force of Jeremias' argument has recently been significantly strengthened by Douglas' literary critical analysis of the Teacher Hymns. Attempting to fill in a perceived gap in Jeremias' approach, Douglas argues at length for the literary unity of the hymns in columns 10–17. He suggests that the hymns found in columns 9 and 17:38–18:14 function as the introduction and conclusion for the intervening material. Accordingly, this entire collection represents a well-defined and structured unit. His arguments for authorship follow the same two basic claims made by Jeremias in favor of identifying the Teacher of Righteousness as the author of this collection (pp. 319–370). Additional recent discussion of authorship can be found in Newsom, *Self*, 287–300.

[7] See Eileen Schuller, "The Cave 4 Hodayot Manuscripts: A Preliminary Description," *JQR* 85 (1994): 137–150. 4QH[c] (4Q429) contains text that corresponds to 1QH[a] 13–14. Based on the physical description of the extant text, the full manuscript of 4QH[c] would have been 150 columns long. Schuller (pp. 143–144), following the suggestion of Stegemann, therefore opines that this manuscript may have contained only the Teacher Hymns. To be sure, Schuller considers the possibility that this manuscript represents an excerpted text. Douglas, however, notes that this fact would provide conclusive proof that the ancient readers possessed a set of criteria for distinguishing between different layers in the larger collection ("Power," 1:82). Schuller (pp. 148–150) also observes that the extant contents of 4QH[a] (4Q427) lend support to Stegemann's suggestion that the complete manuscript would have contained only the Community Hymns. Other Cave 4 manuscripts include material from both sets of hymns.

Hymns depict real-life experiences of the Teacher of Righteousness and provide unparalleled insight into his personal construction of reality. So too, the Community Hymns provide a unique opportunity to penetrate the social world of the Qumran community and its ideological foundations. Moreover, Newsom has argued that even the Teacher Hymns provide insight into the larger world of the community, since the ethos of the leader of the community undoubtedly mirrors the community that he leads.[8]

In the analysis that follows, I draw upon the Hodayot as a basis for understanding the sectarian model of sapiential revelation. In sketching the parameters of this model, both the Teacher and Community Hymns are analyzed, with the assumption that both are representative of sectarian tendencies. Accordingly, I refer to the author of these hymns with the anonymous title 'hymnist,' in order to represent accurately the cacophony of authorial voices that stands behind the composition of these hymns. In the next chapter, the unique prophetic claim of the Teacher of Righteousness is addressed more directly. At this point, the individual voice of the Teacher Hymns is of central importance.

Sapiential Revelation in the Hodayot

The Hodayot are written in a style that accentuates the divine favor bestowed upon the hymnist. Much of the presentation of this relationship focuses on the hymnist's acknowledgement that the sum of his understanding of the world emerges from the receipt of divinely revealed wisdom. Indeed, the Hodayot constantly emphasize that all knowledge is divine in origin and that the hymnist is the most common beneficiary of this divine wisdom.[9] The ubiquity of divine wisdom in the Hodayot and its relationship to biblical antecedents and other Qumran texts has been observed in Qumran scholarship and has received significant treatment.[10]

---

[8] Newsom, *Self*, 197–198.

[9] See Licht, *Megillat ha-Hodayot*, 42. This feature, Licht argues, explains the hymnist's constant gratitude toward God for receiving such knowledge.

[10] See Bartdke, "Considérations," 220–233; Licht, *Megillat ha-Hodayot*, 42–43; Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 282–289; Mansoor, *Hymns*, 65–74; Gruenwald, "Knowledge"; Rotem, "Ha-Nevuah," 43–51; Schnabel, *Law*, 201–202; Tanzer, "Sages"; Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*, 78–80; Edward M. Cook, "What Did the Jews of Qumran Know about God and How Did They Know It," in *Judaism in Late Antiquity 5,2*, 2–22; Matthew J. Goff, "Reading Wisdom at Qumran: 4QInstruction and the Hodayot," *DSD* 11 (2004): 263–288. Early scholarship on this question was interested in exploring any possible gnostic

The sapiential context of the Hodayot goes beyond the portrait of wisdom in other related Qumran texts. The Hodayot repeatedly emphasize the revelatory framework of the transmission of divine knowledge.[11] The hymnist does more than merely acknowledge the divine origin of this knowledge. Rather, his receipt of divine wisdom is conceptualized as a revelatory experience.[12] In particular, the portrait of wisdom in the Hodayot follows the model of sapiential revelation introduced earlier in chapters 12–13. Like the sapiential revelatory experiences envisioned for Moses, David, Isaiah, Enoch, and Daniel, the hymnist is presented as a participant in a sapiential experience that identifies its practitioners as recipients of divine revelation.

In what follows, I gather together the textual evidence that supports this model. Several passages in the Hodayot contain a general statement on the divine origins of the hymnist's knowledge. Throughout, the Hodayot envision the transmission of this wisdom as an immediate encounter between God and the hymnist. At times, this transmission is mediated by external agents such as the holy / divine spirit. Moreover, the content of this revealed wisdom is similar to other sapiential revelatory traditions that have been discussed. In addition to following a model of sapiential revelation, the Hodayot contain internal evidence that identifies the receipt of wisdom as a revelatory encounter.

The Hodayot, like the biblical sapiential texts treated in chapter twelve, identify God as the source of all knowledge,[13] often identifying him as the "God of knowledge" (אל הדעות).[14] This term is also well known from 1Q/4QInstruction.[15] Throughout the Hodayot, the hymnist makes the general claim that he is the recipient of this divine wisdom.[16] This statement is sometimes articulated as a claim belonging to a wider group.[17] At times, the hymnist contends that God has actually

---

elements in the wisdom passages in the Hodayot (see, e.g., Mansoor). Tanzer argues that sapiential elements are much stronger in the Community Hymns than in the Teacher Hymns.

[11] For further discussion of other possible sources of revelation in the Hodayot, see Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 286–287.

[12] See Harrington, *Wisdom Texts*, 79–80.

[13] 1QH^a 5:8–9; 6:25; 7:12; 9:7–8, 26; 10:17; 11:22–23; 13:26; 17:16; 17:17; 18:7; 19:16–17; 21:4–8; 26:1. See Mansoor, *Hymns*, 70–71.

[14] See Mansoor, *Hymns*, 67–68; Schnabel, *Law*, 199.

[15] On this term in these two texts, see Goff, "Reading," 272–273.

[16] 1QH^a 6:12–14; 12:27–28; 15:26–27 (par. 4Q428 9 1); 17:31; 18:7, 14, 20–21; 19:16–17 (par. 4Q427 1 1), 27–28; 20:11–13 (par. 4Q427 8 ii 17–18); 20:32–34; 22:7; 23:5–7.

[17] 1QH^a 18:27; Frg. 10 9; 19:9–10; 27:7–8.

placed wisdom within his body.[18] Elsewhere, the hymnist asserts that he possesses the "spirit of knowledge" (רוח דעה),[19] the "counsel of truth" (סוד אמת)[20] and the "spring of understanding" (מעין בינה),[21] all sapiential elements revealed to the hymnist by God. Several of these passages draw upon the common biblical language of revelation, using verbal roots such as גלה and יפע (*hiph'il*).[22]

Other elements in the portrait of divinely revealed knowledge follow common patterns found in the sapiential revelatory process. The content of the hymnist's revealed wisdom focuses on elements familiar from biblical sapiential literature and further found in later sapiential texts from the Second Temple period. Thus, this knowledge relates various elements central to human existence in addition to the wonders of God and the divine realm, which are presented employing the common sapiential term "mystery" (רז).[23] In addition, parallel to related developments in Second Temple period sapiential traditions, proper understanding of the Torah becomes an essential component of revealed wisdom.[24] Furthermore, the Hodayot often present the transmission of this knowledge as a process mediated by the holy spirit.[25] The revelation of this knowledge is reserved for an exclusive group of select individuals.[26]

---

[18] 1QH[a] 5:24–25; 6:8; 9:21; 10:18; 16:1; frg. 4 7, 12; 20:32–34; frg. 5 9–11.

[19] 1QH[a] 6:25.

[20] 1QH[a] 13:9, 26; 19:4, 16. This expression is reconstructed in 5:8. See also 19:9–10. On this term, see Cook, "What," 5. This expression is also found in 1Q/4QInstruction (see Goff, "Reading," 272–273).

[21] 1QH[a] 13:26.

[22] For גלה, see 5:8–9 (par. 4Q428 2 1–2); 9:21; 19:17; 20:32–34; frg. 4 7, 12; frg. 2 ii 8; frg. 5 9–11; 26:1. Cf. Carmignac, *LTQ*, 1:140. For יפע, see 12:6, 23; 17:31; 23:5–7. See further Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 80–81; Delcor, *Hymnes*, 138; Rotem, "Ha-Nevuah," 51–56.

[23] On the content of the revealed wisdom, see Licht, *Megillat ha-Hodayot*, 42–43; Mansoor, *Hymns*, 68–72. For the use of "mystery," see, 1QH[a] 9:21; 12:27–28; 15:26–27 (par. 4Q428 9 1). On the sapiential revelatory context of the use of "mystery" in the Hodayot, see Licht, *Megillat ha-Hodayot*, 42; Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 287; Mansoor, *Hymns*, 71–72.

[24] See Licht, *Megillat ha-Hodayot*, 42–43; Mansoor, *Hymns*, 69. Mansoor points to the importance of the covenant in many wisdom passages. On the growing importance of the Torah in sapiential contexts, see p. 313, n. 314.

[25] 1QH[a] 5:24–25; 6:12–14; frg. 3:14; cf. 8:15. On the spirit in the Hodayot, see Mansoor, *Hymns*, 74–77. See also below, pp. 374–375.

[26] 1QH[a] 13:9–10; 19:9–10. See further, Licht, *Megillat ha-Hodayot*, 42; Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 288; Mansoor, *Hymns*, 68–69.

The revelatory framework of the hymnist's receipt of divine wisdom finds fullest expression in the hymn found in 1QH^{a} 12:5–13:4.[27] The first half of the hymn, as discussed above, recounts a bitter conflict between the leader of the Qumran community and the sect's opponents. Based on the discussion of the presumed authorship of the Hodayot, the Teacher of Righteousness is most likely the author of the hymn.[28]

Earlier analysis of the hymn focused on the nature of the opposition between the sect and its enemies. This conflict centered on opposing understandings of the Torah and its application. The enemies of the sect, who were identified as the Pharisees, are condemned for attempting to impose their illegitimate interpretation of the Torah. The hymnist contends that the enemies / Pharisees appealed to divine sanction in order to reinforce this program. In particular, the enemies / Pharisees sought the intermediation of a group of prophets, who are condemned by the hymnist as "lying prophets." Furthermore, the enemies / Pharisees are denounced with sobriquets that are intended to emphasize the visionary framework of this hymn—"visionaries of deceit" and "visionaries of error." The portrait of the enemies / Pharisees turning to prophets in order to authorize their legislative activity is balanced in the hymn by the hymnist's own claims to divine revelation. The hymnist repeatedly emphasizes that only he, and not the enemies / Pharisees, enjoys access to the divine and is the only legitimate divine mediator.

The polemical character of this hymn is grounded in the opposing interpretation of the Torah. The nature of this conflict, however, extends beyond this initial characterization. At its core, as argued above, this hymn reflects competing claims concerning divine revelation. The enemies / Pharisees assert that they possess access to God through the agency of the related prophetic group, who themselves must have boasted of such a claim. As noted above, the hymnist never identifies himself with prophetic terminology that mirrors the language employed for the two non-sectarian groups. Rather, by highlighting his personal unmediated access to God and revelation, the hymnist implicitly asserts that his revelatory claims surpass anything belonging to his enemies.

More precise information concerning the character of the hymnist's revelation and its relationship to his opponents' claim is provided by

[27] See also earlier treatments of this hymn above, pp. 80, 280–290.
[28] See further, Newsom, *Self*, 179.

many of the structuring elements of the first half of the hymn, in particular the opening and closing units. These elements identify the sapiential character of the revelatory claims.[29] At the beginning of the hymn, the hymnist exclaims: "I seek you (אדרושכה) and as an enduring dawning, as [perfe]ct light (לאור] תו[ם),[30] you have revealed yourself to me (הופעתה לי)"[31] (l. 6). As discussed in the earlier treatment of this hymn, the root דרש is applied to the activities of the enemies / Pharisees three times in the hymn in order to express their attempts to access divine revelation. The hymnist clearly affirms his own revelatory claims.

The manner in which the hymnist denounces his opponents throughout the hymn provides some insight into the nature of his own revelation. Throughout, the hymnist condemns the enemies / Pharisees with sapiential language. Thus, according to the hymnist, his enemies are "without knowledge" (בלא בינה) (l. 7) and the leaders withhold from their followers the "drink of knowledge" (משקה דעת) (l. 11).[32] In the face of their flagrant opposition, God's counsel (ועצתכה) remains everlasting (l. 13). In particular, the enemies / Pharisees reject the "vision of knowledge" (חזון דעת) (l. 18). Following Delcor, this expression signifies the status of the hymnist as the exclusive beneficiary of revealed wisdom.[33] Moreover, this wisdom, similar to other revealed knowledge, is likely of an eschatological character.[34]

The first half of the hymn closes with the hymnist outlining the nature of his relationship with God. The hymnist returns to the revelatory language with which he began the hymn: "You … revealed yourself to me in your strength as perfect light" (ותופע לי בכוחכה לאורתום) (l. 23).[35] The hymn concludes with the hymnist's most explicit claim

[29] See, however, Tanzer, "Sages," 115, who classifies this hymn as one in which the presence of wisdom in limited.

[30] Restoration follows Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot*, 43; Licht, *Megillat ha-Hodayot*, 91 (see Abegg, *DSSR* 5:26). Dupont-Sommer restored here לאו]רותי[ם, treating it as a dual form that signifies the morning ("poin[t du jo]ur") ("Hymnes," 42; cf. Bardtke, "Loblieder," 394). He associated this passage with Josephus' statement (*War* 2.128) that the Essenes prayed daily. On the difficulty with this reconstruction, see Mansoor, *Hymns*, 122–123. The restoration offered by Sukenik should be preferred. Holm-Nielsen understands this expression as a "technical term for the perfect revelation which the members have shared" (*Hodayot*, 80). See also the related imagery in the description of David in 'David's Compositions' (see pp. 250–255).

[31] On the use of this verbal root for divine revelation, see above, n. 22.

[32] See Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 82.

[33] Delcor, *Hymnes*, 143. Cf. similar expression in *1 En.* 37:1.

[34] See Nickelsburg, "Revelation," 2:771.

[35] This similarity is noted by Licht, *Megillat ha-Hodayot*, 91; Douglas, "Power," 1:105.

concerning the nature of this revelatory experience. Unlike his enemies' rejection of divinely revealed knowledge, the hymnist is an active recipient of sapiential revelation: "For you have given me understanding (כי הודעתני) of the mysteries of your wonder, and in your wondrous council you have confirmed me" (ll. 27–28).[36] The sapiential character of this declaration frames the entire revelatory encounter as recounted in the hymn. The hymnist affirms that he has been the beneficiary of divine revealed wisdom, which is represented as a revelatory experience that far surpasses the prophetic character of his opponents.

Sapiential Revelation in Other Sectarian Texts

Claims of sapiential revelation appear in other texts in the sectarian library. In many of these passages, these assertions are far more muted than those that appear in the Hodayot. For example, the revelatory language that is found in the Hodayot is often missing in these other passages. At the same time, these passages may be understood as additional examples of the sectarian conceptualization of the receipt of divine wisdom as a revelatory encounter.

The opening lines of the Damascus Document recount the formation of the Qumran community and the introduction of the Teacher of Righteousness as its leader. In particular, this event is precipitated by a collective acknowledgment of sin (CD 1:8–9). This process is expressed employing two verbs of cognition (ויבינו, ידעו). Subsequently, God "raised up" the Teacher of Righteousness, who informed (ויודע) this community what will take place in the last generation (CD 1:11–14). Nickelsburg has noted that this passage contains all the elements of a divine revelation of wisdom.[37] The Teacher of Righteousness clearly received some revealed knowledge from God concerning his eschatological judgment. This was then revealed to the sectarian community through the mediation of the Teacher.[38]

More explicit sapiential revelatory claims can be found in the Rule of the Community. Scholars have noted a heightened appeal to revealed

[36] Cf. Delcor, *Hymnes*, 147; Mansoor, *Hymns*, 67.

[37] Nickelsburg, "Revealed Wisdom," 79; idem, "Revelation," 107–108.

[38] For additional treatment of knowledge in the Damascus Document, see Albert-Marie Denis, *Les thèmes de connaissance dans le document de Damas* (SH 15; Louvain: universitaires de Louvain, 1967).

wisdom in the hymn that appears in the end of the document.[39] Immediately after articulating his role in the instruction of the community, the hymnist affirms the divine origin of his knowledge and understanding. Thus, he states: "for from the fountain of his knowledge (ממקור דעתו) he has released his light. My eye beheld his wonder, and the light of my heart beheld the mystery of what will occur and is occurring forever" (כיא ממקור דעתו פתח אורו ובנפלאותיו הביטה עיני ואורת לבבי ברז נהיה והויא עולם) (1QS 11:3–4).[40] Several terms found in other sapiential revelatory contexts appear. The term "fountain of knowledge" appears in several hymns as a marker of revealed wisdom.[41] Likewise, the divine release of light finds points of contact with the sapiential revelatory claims in 1QH[a] 12 and the description of David in 'David's Compositions.'[42] The imagery of divine knowledge pervading the body of the hymnist is found in several Hodayot with revelatory claims.[43] The רז נהיה is well known from 1Q/4QInstruction, a feature discussed at length in chapter fifteen. The eschatological character of the revealed knowledge in this passage is likewise certain. Similar themes pervade the remainder of the hymn (see 11:5–6, 11, 17–18). In particular, the hymnist exclaims that God is one "who opens for knowledge the heart of your servant" (1QS 11:15–16).

The earlier Treatise on the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community also identifies certain individuals as recipients of divinely revealed wisdom. God is the "God of knowledge" (אל הדעות), who possesses knowledge of all future events (1QS 3:15). The instruction of the *Maskil* focuses on the predestined character of humans. Those who are among the Sons of Truth are the beneficiaries of revealed divine knowledge (4:1–6). Likewise, at the appointed time, God will purify the world from the Spirit of Deceit and cleanse humans with the holy spirit (4:20–21). This is done in order that all the righteous and the upright may receive divinely revealed wisdom (דעת עליון) (4:22).[44]

---

[39] See Bo Reicke, "Traces of Gnosticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls?" *NTS* 1 (1954–1955): 139–140; Nickelsburg, "Revealed Wisdom," 80; Rofé, "Revealed Wisdom," 1–3.

[40] Qimron and Charlesworth, *Rule of the Community*, 47.

[41] See Douglas, "Power," 1:69.

[42] On 1QH[a] 12, see above. On David, see ch. 12, pp. 250–255.

[43] See above, n. 18.

[44] See Gruenwald, "Knowledge," 72–73. See also the use of the expression דעת עליון in several sapiential contexts previously discussed (Num 24:16; 4Q378 26 1–3; see above, pp. 115–116, 249–250).

In addition, the sapiential revelatory model assumed in this hymn likely represents the same means through which the *Maskil* was first instructed in the content of the treatise. Like the Teacher of Righteousness in the opening of the Damascus Document, the *Maskil* in the Rule of the Community seems to play an important role in the mediation of divine knowledge. The *Maskil* himself would have been the beneficiary of sapiential revelation. During this process, a full understanding of the spirits of humans would have been divulged to him (cf. 1QS 9:13). He then transmits to all people the knowledge he has gained through his own revelatory encounter (cf. 1QS 9:17–18).[45] The portrait of the *Maskil* presented here is consistent with the use of this term in Daniel to denote an individual who receives revelation concerning divinely guarded mysteries.[46] Moreover, the initiation of the *Maskil* and his subsequent transmission of knowledge to the community resemble the path of Ben Sira's ideal sage.[47]

Summary

The foregoing discussion has demonstrated the pervasiveness of revealed wisdom at Qumran. In this sense, the evidence gathered here agrees with Rofé's assertion that "a characteristic of Qumran theology is the notion of revealed wisdom, i.e., that humanity received wisdom by revelation."[48] This treatment, however, has identified another element to this model. Based on the analysis in chapter 12–13, for the Qumran community, the receipt of revealed wisdom was now conceptualized as a revelatory experience in continuity with ancient prophetic practice. In this capacity, biblical models of divine revelation were transformed and sapiential revelation was understood as a modified mode of mediation. The conception of revelation in the Second Temple period now encompassed the divine transmission of revealed knowledge. Active participants in this process are identified as heirs to the biblical prophetic tradition.

---

[45] On revealed knowledge as the source of authority for the *Maskil*, see Carol A. Newsom, "The Sage in the Literature of Qumran: The Functions of the *Maskil*," in *The Sage*, 375.

[46] So noted by Leaney, *Rule*, 118.

[47] See above, pp. 310–312.

[48] Rofé, "Revealed Wisdom," 1.

Analysis of the sectarian literature has located various arenas in which sapiential revelation was experienced. Several of the documents, in particular, the Damascus Document and the Teacher Hymns in the Hodayot, identify the Teacher of Righteousness as the most prominent practitioner of sapiential revelation. Likewise, the description of the *Maskil* in the Rule of the Community seems to place him within this same context. Most importantly, however, the Treatise on the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community as well as the Community Hymns in the Hodayot, underscore the democratization of sapiential revelation. The Rule of the Community makes the explicit claim that all the Sons of Truth are recipients of sapiential revelation. Furthermore, scholarship on the Hodayot has argued that the Community Hymns reflect more general tendencies within the Qumran community. Though no explicit individual voice is present, these hymns likely represent the theological ethos of the community at large. Accordingly, the ubiquity with which sapiential revelation appears in these hymns points to the likelihood of its pervasiveness within the community.[49]

In the treatment of sapiential revelation in the Hodayot, I noted that several themes associated with the sapiential revelatory process find important points of contact with the models of sapiential revelation identified in earlier chapters. The addition of the other sectarian documents reinforces this understanding. Sapiential revelation at Qumran concentrates on elements common from biblical wisdom traditions. In addition, these sapiential traditions have been infused with an eschatological orientation found in wider Second Temple literature.

I noted above that several of the passages from the Hodayot identify the holy spirit as the agent for the transmission of the revealed wisdom. Inquiries into the role of the holy spirit at Qumran on the whole recognize its important function in the dissemination of knowledge.[50] In general, this feature is rarely identified with the function of the holy spirit as a means of prophetic activity. Sapiential revelation at

[49] Indeed, Tanzer's analysis of sapiential traditions within the Hodayot suggests that these elements are far more common in the Community Hymns. See above, n. 10.

[50] Beavin, "Ruaḥ Hakodesh," 91–95; Anderson, "Use of Ruaḥ," 302; Pryke, "'Spirit' and 'Flesh,'" 345, n. 1; Bruce, "Holy Spirit," 51–52; Mathias Delcor, "Doctrines des Esséniens: D) Esprit Saint," *DBSup* 9 (1978): 973; H.-J. Fabry, "רוח," *TDOT* 13:399; Robert W. Kvalvaag, "The Spirit in Human Beings in Some Qumran Non-Biblical Texts," in *Qumran*, 177–178. This role is noticeably absent, however, in Naudé, "Holiness," 190–191. See earlier discussion of the prophetic role of the holy spirit, above, p. 62, n. 73.

Qumran, however, functions as a modified mode of ancient prophetic revelation. The mediating function of the holy spirit in passages where it facilitates the transmission of revealed knowledge should therefore also be associated with its more common prophetic function.

In the Hodayot, the spirit appears as the mechanism through which this divine knowledge is transmitted, what Licht refers to as a "vessel for the transport of knowledge."[51] The enlightened human being then becomes privy to some clandestine knowledge of the divine realm. As such, the spirit, like the 'word of God' in classical prophetic terminology, bridges the gap between the divine and human realms. The spirit is the means through which divine elements are revealed to certain privileged individuals. The enlightening role of the holy spirit plays itself out in two ways. Most often, it is the holy spirit itself which transmits the knowledge from the divine realm to humans.[52] At times, however, it is not the holy spirit itself which mediates the knowledge. Rather, by virtue of having undergone some transformative process involving the holy spirit, the individual is now able to receive some exclusive wisdom. In this sense, the holy spirit acts as the primer, without which all ensuing enlightening experiences would be impossible.[53]

---

[51] Licht, *Megillat ha-Hodayot*, 174.

[52] The best example of this phenomenon can be found in 1QH[a] 20:11–13. The holy spirit is introduced with the *bet instrumenti*, indicating that it is the exact medium by which all the associated activity takes place. See Kvalvaag, "Spirit," 177. A similar role for the holy spirit can be detected in Dibre Hamme'orot (4Q504 4 4–5//4Q506 131–132 9–11). This particular passage also bears some similarity to 1QH[a] 9:20–21 (noted by Baillet, *Qumrân grotte 4.III*, 156).

[53] See 1QH[a] 6:12–13: "I know, thanks to your insight that in your kindness toward m[a]n [you] have enlar[ged his share with] your holy spirit. Thus, you make me approach your intelligence" (restoration follows García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1:152–153). See also the comments of Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 221, concerning the restoration of the lacuna with a verb that governs the holy spirit. Other suggestions include "to cleanse" (Licht) and "to stretch out" (Holm-Nielsen). In this passage, it is not the holy spirit itself which grants the hymnist understanding. Rather, by virtue of having been "enlarged" through the agency of the holy spirit, the hymnist can now enjoy the exclusive divine knowledge.

CHAPTER NINETEEN

CONCLUSIONS

Prophecy at Qumran

This study began with a set of general questions: how did the Qumran community and wider segments of Second Temple Judaism reflected within the Qumran corpus continue to seek access to the word of God and succeed in mediating the divine will? More specifically, was prophecy, as it is known from biblical and cognate literature, an active reality at Qumran and in related segments of Second Temple Judaism? The solution to these questions involves a more thorough examination of the reception of biblical models of prophecy and revelation in the Qumran corpus. What revelatory models existed in the Qumran community for the transmission of the divine word? In what ways did the Qumran community recognize continuity between contemporary modes of divine mediation and ancient prophecy? Did any individuals within the Qumran community view themselves as prophets and were they viewed as such by others?

In introducing these questions in chapter one, I noted that two related difficulties exist in any attempt to answer these queries. Though I argued for the rejection of the classical argument for the cessation of prophecy in the early post-exilic period, I also suggested that Second Temple period witnessed a dramatic change in the way that Jews conceptualized the prophetic experience. Prophets and prophecy began to appear with less frequency in Second Temple period literature. When they do appear, they rarely resemble familiar biblical models. A similar situation is reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Qumran corpus is rarely forthcoming concerning contemporary prophetic activity. Furthermore, no Qumran text employs explicit prophetic language in reference to individuals or phenomena within the Qumran community. The overwhelming majority of the material treating prophets refers to the ancient prophets from Israel's biblical past. Indeed, the Dead Sea Scrolls seem to reflect a lack of interest in contemporary prophetic activity. This lack of interest is surprising considering the

pervasiveness of language and imagery culled from biblical prophetic literature.

In attempting to develop a method for approaching these questions, I suggested that this inquiry must look beyond the terminological limitations of the Qumran material. The portrait of the ancient prophets found within the Qumran corpus should be understood as a reflection of contemporary conceptions of prophecy and revelation at Qumran and in Second Temple Judaism. The Qumran community and related segments of Second Temple Judaism reconfigured the classical models of prophecy and revelation and rewrote the portrait of the ancient prophets. The presentation of the ancient prophets and their revelatory experience in these texts clarifies nascent conceptions of the function of a prophet and the modified modes of divine revelation regnant at Qumran and in wider segments of Second Temple Judaism.

Alongside the portrait of the ancient prophets, the Qumran corpus speculates on the nature of prophecy in the end of days. To some degree, this construction of eschatological prophecy may reflect contemporary conceptions of prophecy, especially since the Qumran community believed that it was living in the final phase of history. To be sure, the relevant texts present a very limited portrait of prophecy in the eschatological age. At the same time, these texts attest to a new phase of prophetic history that the Qumran community believed was imminent. This study of prophecy in the Dead Sea Scrolls, therefore, has unfolded in three chronological foci: ancient (biblical), future (eschatological), and contemporary.

In the first part of this study, I focused on texts that employ prophetic titles borrowed from biblical literature (*nābî*', 'visionary,' 'anointed one,' 'man of God,' 'servant') in their re-presentation of ancient prophets and prophecy. Analysis of the presentation of ancient prophecy focused on two specific elements. First, I was interested in the way that these biblical prophetic titles underwent literary development. While some of the prophetic epithets closely resemble their biblical uses (e.g. *nābî*', 'servant,' 'man of God'), others are dramatically different ('visionary,' 'anointed one'). Second, I examined the way that the role and character of the ancient prophets were modified relative to the dominant biblical models known to the authors of the respective texts. As I have repeatedly suggested, this transformation is critical to understanding contemporary Second Temple period conceptions of prophecy. In these texts, the ancient prophetic task is reconfigured in two primary ways. First, the prophets are presented as foretellers of future events, partic-

ularly the historical circumstances of the Qumran community. Second, the ancient prophets repeatedly are portrayed in a lawgiving capacity. The former of these roles already appears in the Hebrew Bible, while the latter is relatively uncommon in the biblical presentation of the prophets. The pervasiveness of these two functions in the Qumran prophetic literature suggests these two roles increasingly became associated with prophecy in the Second Temple period and at Qumran.

The rewriting of the ancient prophetic experience likewise informs the understanding of new models of revelation at Qumran and related segments of Second Temple Judaism. In many cases, the ancient prophets are presented as receiving revelation in models familiar from biblical literature. Alongside these classical models of revelation, several texts recontextualize the ancient prophetic revelatory experience. Thus, the ancient prophets appear as recipients of divinely revealed knowledge (sapiential revelation), which is conceptualized as a revelatory encounter commensurate with more common modes of divine revelation. Likewise, several texts present the ancient prophets as reading, interpreting, and rewriting earlier prophetic scripture (revelatory exegesis). The ubiquity of these two revelatory models in the presentation of the ancient prophetic experience suggests that the authors of these texts viewed revelation and inspiration as an evolving process. In the Second Temple period and at Qumran, revelatory exegesis and sapiential revelation appeared as new modes of divine revelation as classical models of prophetic revelation began to wane.

The reconfiguration of ancient prophecy and revelation provides the template for new rubrics of prophecy and revelation at Qumran and in Second Temple Judaism. In the third section of this study, these new rubrics were applied to seemingly prophetic and revelatory phenomena in the Qumran corpus. The new rubrics of prophecy and revelation applied to the ancient prophets find full expression in the sectarian and non-sectarian writings preserved in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Contemporary 'prophetic' activity takes over the mediating function of ancient prophecy and the practitioners of these new modes of revelation view themselves in continuity with the ancient prophets.

For example, the receipt of divine wisdom is conceptualized as a revelatory experience in 1Q/4QInstruction. Ben Sira identified this same process as analogous to prophecy. At Qumran, the authors of the Hodayot considered the receipt of divinely revealed knowledge as a viable means of communication with the divine realm. Similarly, the authors of parabiblical literature such as the Pseudo-Ezekiel texts and

the Temple Scroll appropriated the voice of the ancient prophet by reading, interpreting, and reformulating the ancient prophetic word. In doing so, these contemporary authors claimed to possess the true meaning of the ancient revealed word of God. This same approach to ancient prophecy can be found in the Pesharim and related sectarian texts. The contemporary inspired exegete viewed the ancient prophecies as embedded repositories of divine communiqués. By deciphering the 'true' meaning of these prophecies, the latter-day exegete is identified as the intended recipient of the ancient prophetic word. Revelatory exegesis and sapiential revelation emerge as the primary ways in which Jews in the Second Temple period and at Qumran continued to access the word of God and mediate the divine will. In this sense, they emerged as the heirs to ancient prophetic revelatory models.

Continuity with the ancient prophets can also be seen in the sectarian understanding of the role of prophecy and revelation in the formation of post-biblical law. My analysis of the presentation of the ancient prophetic lawgivers revealed that the community believed that the ancient revelation of law occurred in two stages. The initial revelation of law came to Moses, who was conceptualized as the prophetic lawgiver *par excellence*. Unlike most other Jewish groups, the Qumran community understood the classical prophets as recipients of the second stage of the progressive revelation of law. When the sectarian literature is examined more closely, it becomes apparent that the Qumran community viewed itself as the third stage in the progressive revelation of law. More importantly, the Qumran community understood itself as the immediate successor of these ancient prophetic lawgivers. This prophetic self-awareness authorized the sectarian formulation of law.

It is now possible to address to the question of whether it is appropriate to speak about active prophecy at Qumran. Qumran scholarship has generated a wide range of answers to this question. Many scholars presume that active prophecy was alive in the Qumran community.[1] They further identify the Teacher of Righteousness as a prophet, similar to the classical prophets from Israel's biblical past.[2] The majority of such treatments focus on the role of the Teacher as an inspired

[1] See A. Michel, *Le maître de justice d 'après les documents de la mer Morte: la littérature apocryphe et rabbinique* (Avignon: Maison Aubanel père, 1954), 267–269; Dupont-Sommer, "Hymnes," 13–16; Teeple, *Prophet*, 52; Jeremias, *Lehrer*, 141; Schultz, *Autoritätsanspruch*, 214; Petersen, *Late*, 101–102; Aune, *Prophecy*, 132–133; Meyers, "Crisis," 721.

[2] The fullest discussion of the Teacher of Righteousness as a prophet can be

interpreter of ancient prophetic scripture.[3] Since he deciphers for the first time the 'true' meaning of these ancient prophetic pronouncements, he therefore should be identified as a recipient of prophetic communication from God. Indeed, Pesher Habakkuk claims that the word of the Teacher of Righteousness comes from "the mouth of God" (1QpHab 2:2–3). Furthermore, God reveals to the Teacher the "mysterious revelations" of the ancient prophets (1QpHab 7:4–5). Thus, Pesher Habakkuk identifies the Teacher as a prophet in constant communication with God. Some of these scholars further point to the close relationship between the author of the Hodayot and God. The hymnist receives revealed knowledge through the agency of the holy spirit. If the Teacher of Righteousness composed portions of the Hodayot, then they preserve the first-hand accounts of his prophetic self-consciousness.[4]

Other Qumran scholars argue that it is incorrect to identify active prophecy at Qumran.[5] Notwithstanding the Teacher of Righteousness' role as an interpreter of ancient prophetic scripture, he should not be classified as a prophet.[6] Indeed, no text among the Dead Sea Scrolls explicitly applies classical prophetic terminology to the Teacher of Righteousness or any other community member.[7]

If biblical terminology and definitions of prophecy are applied to the Qumran corpus, then it is clear that there is no evidence for active prophecy at Qumran. This approach, however, is misguided because it applies prophetic models to Qumran that were by that time already

---

found in Michel, *Le maître de justice*, 267–269; Dupont-Sommer, "Hymnes," 13–16; Betz, *Offenbarung*, 88–92; Jeremias, *Lehrer*, 141; Rotem, "Ha-Nevuah," 27–37; Aune, *Prophecy*, 132–133.

[3] Dupont-Sommer, "Hymnes," 13; Teeple, *Prophet*, 52; Betz, *Offenbarung*, 89; Petersen, *Late*, 101–102; Aune, *Prophecy*, 132–133. Cf. Jackson, "Prophets," 129, who argues that the Teacher claimed for himself, "a form of prophetic authority."

[4] Dupont-Sommer, "Hymnes," 13–14; Aune, *Prophecy*, 132–133; Douglas, "Power," 1:21. See also Jeremias, *Lehrer*, 141, who identifies two additional prophetic characteristics for the Teacher of Righteousness: (1) the Teacher was selected by God to speak to the people; (2) individuals who listen to the Teacher are rewarded and those that do not are punished.

[5] Burrows, "Prophecy," 225; Horsley and Hanson, *Bandits*, 155–157; Brin, "Tefisat," 112*.

[6] Elliger, *Studien*, 155; Rotem, "Ha-Nevuah," 32; Barton, *Oracles*, 197; Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 49; Stemberger, "Propheten"; E.P. Sanders, "The Dead Sea Sect and other Jews: Commonalities, Overlaps and Difference," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*, 13; Cook, "What," 11–12.

[7] See Schniedewind, *Word*, 242–243; Bowley, "Prophets," 371; Cook, "What," 11. This point is also observed by other scholars who nevertheless identify the Teacher as a prophet. See, for example, Michel, *Le maître de justice*, 269.

long dormant. Rather, this inquiry must follow the conceptions of prophecy and revelation promoted by the Qumran community itself. If the new rubrics of prophecy and revelation identified throughout this study are applied to the Qumran corpus, there can be little doubt that the Qumran community believed that it continued to mediate the divine word. Moreover, it viewed its own mediating activity in continuity with the similar pursuits of the ancient prophets. The prophetic experience for the Qumran community had evolved beyond the classical models found in the Hebrew Bible. Thus, functionally, prophecy was alive at Qumran.

At the same time, no Qumran text classifies any of its members as prophets or identifies prophetic activity in its midst with classical prophetic terminology. This phenomenon may best be explained in light of similar larger trends in contemporary Second Temple Judaism. As discussed in chapter one, many Second Temple period texts attest to the continued vitality of prophecy in the post-biblical period. These same texts, however, generally distinguish between contemporary prophecy and the prophecy from Israel's biblical heritage. According to these texts, prophecy persisted in Second Temple Judaism, though in new and modified forms. As discussed, some texts mark this experience with different terminology.[8] Thus, the fact that no individual in the Qumran community is identified with prophetic terminology should not preclude us from finding prophetic figures in the community.

It is within the foregoing conceptual framework that the question of the Teacher of Righteousness' prophetic status should be addressed. To the Qumran community, the Teacher of Righteousness was not a *nābî'*, but he was a legitimate mediator of the divine word and will. For the Qumran community, the interpretation of ancient prophecies, as practiced by the Teacher, was a revelatory experience. Likewise, the Teacher Hymns repeatedly identify the hymnist as a recipient of sapiential revelation. In addition, the Teacher of Righteousness was the lawgiver *par excellence* of the community. He was among the small coterie of sectarian recipients of the most recent stage in the progressive revelation of law. Furthermore, the description of the eschatological prophet as one who will "teach righteousness at the end of days" is intended to highlight the correspondence between the historical Teacher and the future prophet. The eschatological prophet will carry out the tasks that the

---

[8] See above, pp. 17–18.

historical Teacher performed for the Qumran community in the earlier phase of history. The Teacher of Righteousness is a historical reflex of the prophet expected at the end of days. Each is also regarded as a 'new Moses.' Based on these newly defined rubrics of prophecy, the Teacher of Righteousness carried out the prophetic task in both form and function.

The terminological limitations involved in the examination of contemporary prophecy recede when examining the community's conceptualization of prophecy in the end of days, which for the community would usher in a new phase of prophetic history. The few texts that discuss eschatological prophecy employ explicit prophetic titles (*nābîʾ*, 'anointed one'). At the same time, the presentation of the eschatological prophet in these texts is decidedly opaque. As observed, there is very little about the prophet at the end of days that is particularly 'prophetic.'

The eschatological prophet, as articulated in the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia, was expected to arrive prior to the emergence of the priestly and royal messiahs. For the community, the eschatological age would witness the reconfiguration of several biblical institutions. Thus, there is a certain degree of correspondence between the sect's conceptualization of the ancient prophetic task and its model for the activity of the eschatological prophet. Similar to the portrait of the ancient prophets as lawgivers, the eschatological prophet in the Rule of the Community and 4QTestimonia was expected to carry out several juridical functions in the end of days. For the Qumran community, the prophet would oversee the transformation of the sectarian system of law. Like the prophets of old, the eschatological prophet would be a divinely sent lawgiver. In 11QMelchizedek, the prophet appears prior to Melchizedek's eschatological battle with Belial and assists in the resumption of human history following the vanquishing of all evil.

In all these texts, the prophet does not seem to fulfill the functions more traditionally associated with prophets. Rather, the prophet is closer in form and function to related eschatological protagonists such as the priestly and royal messiahs. In this respect, it is not clear if the end of days would also witness the resumption of prophets and prophetic activity that more closely resembles classical prophecy. It is likely that such an expectation was unnecessary. For the Qumran community and related segments of Second Temple Judaism, the word of God had never left Israel. The Qumran community and its leaders continued to seek access to the divine will and successfully mediated the word of God.

Epilogue: Widening the Scope

Throughout this study of prophecy and revelation at Qumran, I have treated sectarian texts together with those produced outside of the Qumran community. The Qumran library housed texts from various strands of Second Temple Judaism. As such, these documents attest to larger theological and literary currents in Second Temple Judaism. In my examination of these texts, I was interested in their ability to provide a context for the Qumran material. These texts, however, have a life of their own and warrant independent treatment of their models of prophecy and revelation. Furthermore, many of these Second Temple period texts are the products of distinct social groups. Thus, the presentation of prophecy and revelation in this literature provides critical information regarding possible prophetic activity in various segments of Second Temple Judaism and the character of its application.

A similar approach may be undertaken for literature that has no connection to the Qumran community. The Dead Sea Scrolls and the associated Qumran community represent only a small segment of the multiplicity of Jewish traditions in the Second Temple period. Significant advances in the understanding of prophecy and revelation warrant the reexamination of these issues in different Second Temple period literary and historical contexts.[9]

The analysis and conclusions found in the present study may also serve as a backdrop to the (re)examination of prophecy and revelation in later historical developments: early Christianity and rabbinic Judaism. Like the Qumran community, rabbinic Judaism and early Christianity identified themselves as based on revealed religions. Both saw themselves as the ultimate expression of the original revelation to Israel on Sinai. Moreover, both Judaism and Christianity view their continued existence and development as part of the ongoing revelation of the divine word and will. In this respect, the same set of questions that was introduced in chapter one is equally applicable to the study

[9] The notion expressed by Nickelsburg, "Apocalyptic Message," 328 (in regard to wisdom traditions), almost 30 years ago that "The precise contours of the prophetic consciousness and the specific ways in which it and its expression differ from 'classical prophecy' and its many different expressions is a broad topic in need of a detailed investigation" seems to have gone unanswered in many areas in the study of Second Temple Judaism. I have attempted to remedy this problem with respect to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Qumran corpus. Much work remains to be done in other areas of Second Temple Judaism (see, however, bibliography above, p. 11, n. 24).

of early Christianity and rabbinic Judaism. How did these communities continue to access the word of God and provide a divine context for their identity? Did either of these communities envision an active role for prophecy in this process? Furthermore, how can the new rubrics of prophecy in the Second Temple period identified in the present study affect the study of prophecy in Judaism and Christianity?

Let me offer a few observations based on the present study and directions for further exploration. Several comprehensive treatments of prophecy and revelation in early Christianity have appeared.[10] Some of these studies have taken into consideration the evidence provided by the Dead Sea Scrolls in addition to biblical antecedents. As George J. Brooke notes, the prophetic character of Jesus and early Christianity is most often compared with the presentation of the classical prophets in the Hebrew Bible. The Qumran material, however, provides a much better body of comparative material.[11] One example where this is certainly true is in the study of eschatological prophecy.

I have already had occasion to comment on the debate in New Testament scholarship regarding the antiquity of the Jewish tradition that the arrival of the messiah would be announced by a prophetic herald.[12] While some scholars locate this belief already in pre-New Testament first century Judaism, others argue that it appears for the first time in the New Testament. Scholars advocating the former position are forced to turn to significantly later texts (i.e., church fathers, rabbinic literature) or offer a strained interpretation of earlier texts (i.e., Malachi, Ben Sira, 4Q558). As is so often the case, the Dead Sea Scrolls help alleviate the scholarly consternation at the lack of reliable first century textual evidence. The relevant texts successfully provide a context for the New Testament traditions.

No Qumran text explicitly identifies the role of the prophet as a messianic herald. In this respect, the Qumran corpus supports those scholars who view the New Testament tradition as the first appearance of a messianic herald. The evidence provided by the Dead Sea Scrolls, however, does testify to a developing tradition. Unlike earlier scriptural and related portraits of the eschatological prophet (Malachi, Ben Sira), the Qumran texts locate the appearance of the prophet prior to the

---

[10] Most recently, see Aune, *Prophecy*; Horsley, "Prophets."

[11] George J. Brooke, review of M.D. Hooker, *The Signs of a Prophet: The Prophetic Actions of Jesus*, *DSD* 4 (1997): 360–361.

[12] See above, p. 135, n. 4.

arrival of the primary eschatological protagonists (the royal and priestly messiah, Melchizedek) and assign the prophet a number of preparatory tasks. This portrait generates an intermediate stage between older scriptural and Jewish traditions and the presentation of the eschatological prophet in the New Testament.

The Qumran texts relating to the eschatological prophet may also provide an opportunity to reexamine the ministry of Jesus, in an attempt to locate it further in its first century Jewish context. In the discussion of the literary development of the term 'anointed one' as a prophetic epithet, I noted that this use is virtually absent in the Hebrew Bible. In the Dead Sea Scrolls, where this title is also applied to the messiahs, the expression is employed in over one quarter of its uses as a prophetic designation. Moreover, two of the representations of the eschatological prophet refer to this individual as the 'anointed one' (11QMelchizedek, 4Q521). In 11Melchizedek, the prophet has a crucial role in the new era ushered in by the destruction of Belial and evil. In 4Q521, the prophet acts as God's agent in carrying out several eschatological tasks, such as preaching salvation to the afflicted and resurrecting the dead.

In light of this evidence, it is worthwhile to reexamine the application of the title 'anointed' (χρίστος) to Jesus. To be sure, the title, corresponding to the Hebrew משיח, clarifies the messianic character of Jesus. The identification of Jesus as an 'anointed one,' however, may also carry a prophetic sense. More specifically, it may highlight his role as the prophet expected at the end of days. It is well known that the New Testament presents Jesus as an eschatological prophet, who fulfills the Deuteronomic expectation of a future prophet like Moses (John 1:17; Acts 3:22). Furthermore, part of Jesus' eschatological message focuses on the role of the law in the end of days, which, Jesus claims, will not be altered until this time (Matt 5:17–18). Following this claim, Jesus continues with several new interpretations of the law and its application. In addition, Jesus applies to himself the prophetic identity of the prophetic disciple in Isa 61:1, seemingly imbuing it with eschatological import (Luke 4:16–20). Each of Jesus' prophetic characteristics finds points of contact with the portrait of the eschatological prophet in the sectarian documents. In addition, some of the eschatological tasks associated with the prophet in 4Q521 are similar to roles assigned to Jesus, a feature noted often in Qumran and New Testament scholarship. The Qumran evidence recommends that the application of the title 'anointed' to Jesus should be examined both for its messianic character as well as

its possible use for Jesus' prophetic identity. Since the Dead Sea Scrolls represent the largest corpus of texts that use the term 'anointed one' as a prophetic designation, they provide an appropriate starting point for this investigation.

Unlike in early Christianity, prophecy in rabbinic Judaism has received far less adequate treatment.[13] Early rabbinic traditions testify to a diversity of opinions regarding the continued existence of prophecy and the context of its application. These traditions point to an ongoing debate within rabbinic Judaism regarding the role of prophecy, both ancient and contemporary. This debate must be understood in continuity with the multiplicity of prophetic forms and phenomena in Second Temple Judaism. Two particular examples are pertinent to the present study. Chapters 10–11 and seventeen examined at length the ubiquity of revelatory exegesis in Second Temple Judaism and at Qumran. With revelatory exegesis, the process of reading, interpreting, and rewriting the ancient prophetic word is conceptualized as a revelatory experience. As is well known, rabbinic literature is replete with creative interpretations of biblical texts (midrash) for both legal and homiletical purposes. The rabbinic concept of an Oral Torah traces all of these extra-biblical traditions back to an original divine revelation to Moses on Sinai. Thus, the rabbis conceived of the midrashic process as a way to uncover the original revealed word of God. Did the rabbis similarly understand this revelatory process in continuity with ancient prophetic modes of revelation? Did they believe that the midrashic reading and interpretation of Scripture served as a contemporary means of accessing the divine will and mediating the word of God?

Similarly, the examination of sectarian legal hermeneutics may have consequences for related explorations of prophecy and law in rabbinic Judaism. Rabbinic legal hermeneutics, for the most part, proscribe the appeal to contemporary revelation and prophetic phenomena as support for the formulation of law.[14] Like many other aspects of rabbinic

---

[13] See Stemberger, "Propheten," 155–162. For discussion of medieval Jewish views, see Heschel, *Prophetic Inspiration*, which contains a translation of two articles previously published in Hebrew ("Prophetic Inspiration in the Middle Ages" and "Did Maimonides Believe that He Had Attained the Rank of Prophet").

[14] See, e.g., *Sifra*, Beḥuqotai § 13; *y. Meg.* 1:4 70d; *b. Šabb.* 104b; *b. Meg.* 2b; *b. B. Meṣiʿa* 59b (par. *y. Moʿed Qaṭ* 3:1 81c–d); *b. Tem.* 16a. For full discussion of the (non) role of prophecy in rabbinic law, see Urbach, "Halakhah," 1–27; idem, *The Sages*, 304–308; Elon, *Jewish Law*, 1:240–265; Stemberger, "Propheten," 157–160; Jackson, "Prophet," 133–138.

tradition, however, this was not a consensus opinion.[15] Furthermore, some rabbinic statements reduce the potential juridical role of the classical prophets by denying the force of *midrash halakhah* (legal exegesis) based on passages from the prophetic scriptural canon, though also with notable dissent.[16] With important exceptions, rabbinic Judaism marginalizes the role of post-Mosaic prophecy and revelation in the formation of halakhah.

The multiple voices in rabbinic literature have important biblical and Second Temple period antecedents. Accordingly, the marginalized role for prophecy and revelation, both old and new, in the formation of halakhah should be reexamined in light of the advances made in the study of comparative legal traditions from the Second Temple period.

---

[15] See, for example, *b. 'Erub.* 13b where a heavenly voice mediates the disputes between the Houses of Hillel and Shammai.

[16] See, e.g., the rabbinic statement אין דנין דברי תורה מדברי קבלה, "we do not adjudicate the words of Torah from words of tradition (i.e., prophetic literature)" (*b. Nid.* 23a; see *b. Ḥag.* 10b; *b. B. Qam.* 2b for a similar formulation). See further Urbach, "Halakhah"; "דברי קבלה," in *Enṣiklopedyah Talmudit* (ed. M. Bar-Ilan and S.Y. Yeiven; 23 vols.; Jerusalem: Mossad ha-Rav Kook, 1947–), 7:112–114. For dissenting views, see, e.g., *b. Giṭ.* 36a, where Jer 32:44 is drawn upon to express the need for witnesses to sign a deed. A larger list of passages is discussed in Ginzberg, *Jewish Sect*, 185–186.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"דברי קבלה." Pages 106–114 in vol. 7 of *Enṣiklopedyah Talmudit*. Edited by M. Bar Ilan and S.Y. Yeiven. 23 vols. Jerusalem: Mossad ha-Rav Kook, 1947–.

Abegg Jr., Martin G., James E. Bowley, and Edward M. Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance: Volume One: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran*. 2 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003.

Abegg, Martin G. "The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?" *DSD* 2 (1995): 125–144.

Abegg, Martin G., and Craig A. Evans. "Messianic Passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 191–203 in *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth, H. Lichtenberger, and G.S. Oegema. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Abel, F.M. *Les Livres des Maccabées*. Paris: J. Gabaldi, 1949.

Ackroyd, Peter R. "יד." Pages 393–426 in vol. 5 of *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. 14 vols. to date. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–.

Aitken, James K. "Apocalyptic, Revelation, and Early Jewish Wisdom Literature." Pages 181–193 in *New Heaven and New Earth: Prophecy and Millennium: Essays in Honour of Anthony Gelston*. Edited by P.J. Harland and C.T.R. Hayward. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1999.

Albertz, Rainier. "The Sage and Pious Wisdom in the Book of Job: The Friends' Perspective." Pages 243–261 in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by J.G. Gammie and L.G. Perdue. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Albright, William F. *From the Stone Age to Christianity: Monotheism and the Historical Process*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1946.

———. "The Oracles of Balaam." *JBL* 63 (1944): 207–234.

———. "Samuel and the Beginnings of the Prophetic Movement." Pages 149–176 in *Interpreting the Prophetic Tradition: The Goldenson Lectures 1955–1966*. Library of Biblical Studies. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press. New York. Ktav, 1969.

Alexander, Philip S. "'A Sixtieth Part of Prophecy': The Problem of Continuing Revelation in Judaism." Pages 414–433 in *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed: Essays in Honour of John F.A. Sawyer*. Edited by J. Davies, G. Harvey and W.G.E. Watson. JSOTSup 195. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

———. "The Redaction History of Serekh Ha-Yaḥad: A Proposal." *RevQ* 17 (1996): 437–456.

———. "Retelling the Old Testament." Pages 99–121 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*. Edited by D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Alexander, Philip S., and Geza Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX: Serekh ha-Yaḥad and Two Related Texts*. DJD XXVI. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

Allegro, John M. "A Recently Discovered Fragment of a Commentary on Hosea from Qumran's Fourth Cave." *JBL* 78 (1959): 142–147.

———. "Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect." *JBL* 75 (1956): 89–95.

———. "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature." *JBL* 75 (1956): 182–187.

Allegro, John M., with Arnold A. Anderson. *Qumran Cave 4.I (4Q158–4Q186)*. DJD V. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.

Allen, Leslie C. *Ezekiel 1–19*. WBC 28. Waco: Word, 1994.

Allison, Dale C. *A New Moses: A Matthean Typology*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993.

———. "Elijah Must Come First." *JBL* 103 (1984): 256–258.

Amit, Yairah. "Tafqid ha-Nevuah veha-Nevi'im be-Mišnato šel Sefer Divre Hayyamim." *Beth Miqra* 93 (1983): 113–133. ET: "The Role of Prophecy and Prophets in the Chronicler's World." Pages 80–101 in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by M.H. Floyd and R.D. Haak. LHB / OTS 427. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2006.

Amoussine, J.D. "Éphraïm et Manassé dans le Péshèr de Nahum." *RevQ* 4 (1963): 389–396.

Anderson Robert T., and Terry Giles, *Tradition Kept: The Literature of the Samaritans*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2005.

Anderson, A.A. *The Book of Psalms*. 2 vols. NCB. London: Oliphants, 1972.

———. "The Use of Ruaḥ in 1QS, 1QH and 1QM." *JSS* 7 (1962): 293–303.

Anderson, Gary A. "Aaron." Pages 1–2 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

———. "Intentional and Unintentional Sin in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 49–64 in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*. Edited by D.P. Wright, D.N. Freedman, and A. Hurvitz. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995.

———. "The Status of the Torah before Sinai." *DSD* 1 (1994): 1–29.

Applegate, John. "Jeremiah and the Seventy Years in the Hebrew Bible." Pages 91–110 in *The Book of Jeremiah and its Reception—Le Livre de Jérémie et sa Réception*. Edited by A.H.W. Curtis and T. Römer. BETL 128. Leuven: Leuven University Press, Peeters, 1997.

Argall, Randal A. *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation and Judgment*. SBLEJL 8. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

Asurmendi, Jésus. "Ben Sira et le prophètes." *Transeuphratène* 14 (1998): 91–102.

Attridge, Harold, et al. *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1*. DJD XIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

Aune, David E. "Charismatic Exegesis in Early Judaism and Early Christianity." Pages 126–150 in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth and C.A. Evans. JSPSup 14. SSEJC 2. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

———. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
———. "The Use of ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ in Josephus." *JBL* 101 (1982): 419–421.
Bach, Robert. "Gottesrecht und weltliches Recht in der Verkündigung des Propheten Amos." Pages 23–34 in *Festschrift für Günther Dehn: zum 75. Geburtstag am 18. April 1957 dargebracht von der Evangelisch-Theologischen Fakultät der Rheinischen Friedrich Wilhelms-Universität zu Bonn*. Edited by W. Schnellmacher. Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1957.
Baillet, Maurice. "Fragments du Document de Damas. Qumrân, Grotte 6." *RB* 63 (1956): 512–523.
———. *Qumran grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)*. DJD VII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.
Baillet, Maurice, Josef T. Milik, and Roland de Vaux. *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân*. DJD III. Oxford: Clarendon, 1962.
Baillet, Maurice, Josef T. Milik, Frank M. Cross, Patrick Skehan, John M. Allegro, John Strugnell, Jean Starcky, and Claus-Huno Hunzinger. "Le travail d'édition des fragments manuscripts de Qumrân." *RB* 63 (1956): 49–67.
Barr, James. "The Concepts of History and Revelation." Pages 65–102 in *Old and New in Interpretation: A Study of the Two Testaments*. London: SCM, 1966.
Barstad, Hans. "Prophecy at Qumran?" Pages 104–120 in *In the Last Days: On Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic and its Period*. Edited by K. Jeppesen, K. Nielsen, and B. Rosendal. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1996.
Bardtke, Hans. "Considérations sur les Cantiques de Qumrân." *RB* 63 (1956): 220–233
———. "Die Loblieder von Qumran II." *TLZ* 81 (1956): 590–604.
Barthélemy, Dominique, and Josef T. Milik. *Qumran Cave 1*. DJD I. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955.
Bartlett, John L. "Revelation and the Old Testament." Pages 11–31 in *Witness to the Spirit: Essays on Revelation, Spirit, Redemption*. Edited by W. Harrington. PIBA 3. Dublin: Irish Biblical Association. Manchester: Koinonia, 1979.
Barton, John. *Oracles of God: Perception of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986.
Baumgarten, Albert I. "The Name of the Pharisees." *JBL* 103 (1983): 417–422.
———. "Seekers after Smooth Things." Pages 857–858 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
Baumgarten, James M. "Laws of the *Damascus Document* in Current Research." Pages 51–62 in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*. Edited by M. Broshi. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1992.
———. *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)*. DJD XVIII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
———. "Scripture and Law in 4Q265." Pages 25–33 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*. Edited by M.E. Stone and E.G. Chazon. STDJ 28. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998, 25–32.

———. "The Unwritten Law in the Pre-Rabbinic Period." Pages 13–35 in *Studies in Qumran Law*. SJLA 24. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977. Repr. from *JSJ* 3 (1972): 7–29.

Baumgarten, James M., et al. *Qumran Cave 4.XXV: Halakhic Texts*. DJD XXXV: Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.

Beall, Todd S. "History and Eschatology at Qumran: Messiah." Pages 125–146 in *Judaism in Late Antiquity 5,2: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by A.J. Avery-Peck, J. Neusner, and B.D. Chilton. HdO 57. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2001.

Beard, Mary. "Writing and Religion: Ancient Literacy and the Function of the Written Word in Roman Religion." Pages 35–58 in *Literacy in the Roman World*. Edited by M. Beard et al. JRASup 3. Ann Arbor; Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1991.

Beavin, Edward L. "Ruaḥ Hakodesh in Some Early Jewish Literature." Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt University, 1961.

Becker, Jürgen. *Das Heil Gottes: Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament*. SUNT 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.

Beentjes, Pancratius C. "Prophets and Prophecy in the Book of Ben Sira." Pages 135–150 in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by M.H. Floyd and R.D. Haak. LHB / OTS 427. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2006.

———. "Prophets in the Book of Chronicles." Pages 45–53 in *The Elusive Prophet: The Prophet as a Historical Person, Literary Character and Anonymous Artist*. Edited by J.C. de Moor. OTS 45. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2001.

Begg, Cristopher T. "The Classical Prophets in the Chronistic History." *BZ* 32 (1988): 100–107.

Bergmeier, Roland. "Beobachtungen zu 4 Q 521 f. 2, II, 1–13." *ZDMG* 145 (1995): 38–48.

Bernstein, Moshe J. "Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls: Categories and Functions." Pages 1–26 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12 14 January, 1997*. Edited by E.G. Chazon and M.E. Stone. STDJ 31. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1999.

———. "'Rewritten Bible': A Generic Category Which Has Outlived its Usefulness?" *Textus* 22 (2005): 169–196.

Bernstein, Moshe J., and Shlomo A. Koyfman, "The Interpretation of Biblical Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Forms and Methods." Pages 61–87 in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Edited by M. Henze. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

Berrin, Shani L. "Lemma / Pesher Correspondence in Pesher Nahum." Pages 341–350 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceeding of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J.C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000.

———. *The Pesher Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169*. STDJ 53. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004.

———. "Qumran Pesharim." Pages 110–133 in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Edited by M. Henze. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
Betz, Otto. *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte*. WUNT 6. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1960.
Beyer, Klaus. *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.
———. *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: Band 2*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.
———. *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer: Ergänzungsband*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994.
Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Ezra-Nehemiah*. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988.
———. *A History of Prophecy in Israel*. 2d ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996.
———. *Isaiah 56–66*. AB 19B. Garden City: Doubleday, 2003.
———. *Prophecy and Canon: A Contribution to the Study of Jewish Origins*. SJCA 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977.
———. "Prophecy and Priesthood in Josephus." *JJS* 25 (1974): 239–262.
Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
———. ed. *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
Bockmuehl, Markus N.A. *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*. WUNT 36. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1990.
Bowley, James E. "Prophets and Prophecy at Qumran." Pages 344–378 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by J.C. VanderKam and P.W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998–1999.
Brady, Monica L.W. "Biblical Interpretation in the 'Pseudo-Ezekiel' Fragments (4Q383–391) from Cave Four." Pages 88–109 in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Edited by M. Henze. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
———. "Prophetic Traditions at Qumran: A Study of 4Q383–391." 2 vols. Ph.D. diss. University of Notre Dame, 2000.
Bratsiotis, N.P. "אִישׁ." Pages 222–235 in vol. 1 of *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. 14 vols. to date. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–.
Braverman, Joshua. "Balaam in Rabbinic and Early Christian Tradition." Pages 41–50 in *Joshua Finkel Festschrift*. Edited by S.B. Hoenig and L.D. Stitskin; New York: Yeshiva University Press, 1974.
Brettler, Marc Z. "Ideology, History, and Theology in 2 Kings XVII: 7–23." *VT* 39 (1989): 268–282.
Briggs, Craig A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*. ICC. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907.
Brin, Gershon. "The Laws of the Prophets in the Sect of the Judaean Desert: Studies in 4Q375." Pages 28–60 in *Qumran Questions*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. BS 36. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995. Repr. from *JSP* 10 (1992): 19–51. Repr. pages 128–163 in *Studies in Biblical Law*. JSOTSup 176. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
———. "Tefisat ha-Nevuah ha-Mikra'it be-Kitve Qumran." Pages 101*–112* in

"Sha'arei Talmon": Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon. Edited by M. Fishbane and E. Tov. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
Brooke George J., et al. *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*. DJD XXII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
——. "Deuteronomy 18.9–14 in the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 66–84 in *Magic in the Biblical World: From the Rod of Aaron to the Seal of Solomon*. Edited by T.E. Klutz. JSNTSup 245. London: T. & T. Clark International, 2003.
——. *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context*. JSOTSup 29. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
——. "Parabiblical Prophetic Narratives." Pages 271–301 in vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by J.C. VanderKam and P.W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998–1999.
——. "Prophecy." Pages 694–700 in vol. 2 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
——. "Prophecy and Prophets in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Looking Backwords and Forwards." Pages 151–165 in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by M.H. Floyd and R.D. Haak. LHB / OTS 427. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2006.
——. "Qumran Pesher: Toward the Redefinition of a Genre." *RevQ* 10 (1981): 483–504.
——. Review of M.D. Hooker, *The Signs of a Prophet: The Prophetic Actions of Jesus*. *DSD* 4 (1997): 360–362.
Broshi, Magen, and Ada Yardeni, "'Al ha-*Netinim* (4Q430) u-Nevi'e Šeqer (4Q339)." *Tarbiz* 62 (1994): 45–54.
——. "On *Netinim* and False Prophets." Pages 29–37 in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies on Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield*. Edited by Z. Zevit, S. Gitin, and M. Sokoloff. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
Broshi Magen, et al. *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*. DJD XIX. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.
Broshi, Magen, and Esther Eshel. "The Greek King is Antiochus IV (4QHistorical Text = 4Q248)." *JJS* 48 (1997): 120–129.
Brown, Raymond. "The Messianism of Qumran." *CBQ* 19 (1957): 53–82.
Brownlee, William H. "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls." *BA* 14 (1951): 54–76.
——. *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline: Translation and Notes*. BASORSup 10–12. New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951.
——. "Further Corrections of the Translation of the Habakkuk Scroll." *BASOR* 116 (1949): 14–16.
——. "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament." *NTS* 3 (1956–1967): 12–30.
——. *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk*. SBLMS 24. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.
——. "The Significance of 'David's Compositions.'" *RevQ* 5 (1966): 569–574.

———. *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran*. JBLMS 11. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1959.
Bruce, F.F. "Holy Spirit in the Qumran Texts." *The Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society* 6 (1966–1968): 49–55.
Budd, Philip J. *Numbers*. WBC 5. Waco: Word, 1984.
Burrows, Millar. "Prophecy and Prophets at Qumran." Pages 223–232 in *Israel's Prophetic Heritage: Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg*. Edited by B. Anderson and W. Harrelson. New York: Harper, 1962.
Butler, Trent C. *Joshua*. WBC 7. Waco. Word, 1983.
Callaway, Philip R. "Extending Divine Revelation: Micro-Compositional Strategies in the Temple Scroll." Pages 149–162 in *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium of the Temple Scroll: Manchester, December 1987*. Edited by G.J. Brooke. JSPSup 7. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
Campbell, Jonathan G. "'Rewritten Bible' and 'Parabiblical Texts': A Terminological and Idealogical Critique." Pages 43–68 in *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Collquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls 8–10 September 2003*. Edited by J.G. Campbell, W.J. Lyons, and L.K. Pietersen. LSTS 52. London: T. & T. Clark, 2005.
Champeaux, Jacqueline. "De la parole à la l'écriture: Essai sur le langage des oracles." Pages 405–438 in *Oracles et prophéties dans l'antiquité: Acts du Colloque de Strasbourg 15–17 juin 1995*. Edited by J.-G. Heintz. Paris: de Boccard, 1997.
Caquot, Andre. "Deux Textes messianiques de Qumrân." *RHPR* 79 (1999): 163–170.
———. "Les Textes de Sagasse de Qoumrân (Aperçu préliminaire)." *RHPR* 76 (1966): 1–34.
Carlson, David C. "An Alternative Reading of 4 Q p Osea[a] II, 3–6." *RevQ* 11 (1982): 417–421.
Carmignac, Jean "Conjecture sur la première ligne de la Règle de la Communauté." *RevQ* 2 (1959–1960): 85–87.
———. "Le Document de Qumrân sur Melkisédek." *RevQ* 7 (1969–1971): 343–378.
———. "Les Rapports entre L'Ecclésiastique et Qumrân." *RevQ* 3 (1961–1962): 209–218.
———. *La Règle de la Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres*. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1958.
Carmignac, J., P. Guilbert, and E. Cothenet. *Les Textes de Qumran: traduits et annotés*. 2 vols. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1961–1963.
Ceresko, Anthony R. "The Liberative Strategy of Ben Sira: The Sage as Prophet." Pages 53–71 in *Prophets and Proverbs: More Studies in Old Testament Poetry and Biblical Religion*. Quezon City: Claretian, 2002.
Charles, R.H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1929.
———. ed. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.
Charlesworth, James H., and Brent A. Strawn. "Reflections on the Text of Serek Ha-Yaḥad found in Cave IV." *RevQ* 17 (1996): 403–435.

Charlesworth, James H. "Challenging the *Consensus Communis* Regarding Qumran Messianism (1QS, 4QS MSS)." Pages 120–134 in *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth, H. Lichtenberger, and G.S. Oegema. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

———. "From Messianology to Christology: Problems and Prospects." Pages 21–52 in *The Messiah: Development in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

———. "Isaiah 40:3 and the Wilderness Community." Pages 117–132 in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992*. Edited by G.J. Brooke. STDJ 15. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994.

———. ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1983–1985.

———. *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

———. ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. PTSDSSP. 6 vols. to date. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck). Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994–.

Chazon, Esther G. "Is *Divrei ha-me'orot* a Sectarian Prayer?" Pages 3–17 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*. Edited by D. Dimant and U. Rappaport. STDJ 10. Leiden: E.J. Brill. Jerusalem: Magnes, the Hebrew University, Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992.

———. "Teʿudat Liturgit me-Qumran ve-Hašlakhoteha: 'Dibre Hammeʾorot.'" Ph.D. diss., the Hebrew University, 1993.

———. "The Use of the Bible as a Key to Meaning in Psalms from Qumran." Pages 85–96 in *Emanuel: Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by S.M. Paul, R.A. Kraft, and L.H. Schiffman. VTSup 94. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003.

Christensen, Duane L. *Deuteronomy 1–11*. WBC 6A. Waco: Word, 1991.

Coats, George. *Moses: Heroic Man, Man of God*. JSOTSup 57. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.

Cogan, Mordechai. *I Kings*. AB 10. Garden City: Doubleday, 2000.

Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

———. *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*. HSM 16. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.

———. "The Construction of Israel in the Sectarian Rule Books," Pages 25–42 in *Judaism in Late Antiquity 5,1: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Theory of Israel*. Edited by J. Neusner, A.J. Avery-Peck, and B. Chilton. HdO 56. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2001.

———. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

———. *Daniel: With an Introduction to Apocalyptic Literature*. FOTL 20. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.

———. "The Expectation of the End in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 74–90 in *Eschatology, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by C.A. Evans and

P.W. Flint; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
———. "'He Shall Not Judge by What His Eyes See': Messianic Authority in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *DSD* 2 (1995): 145–164.
———. "A Herald of Good Tidings: Isaiah 61:1–3 and its Actualization in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 225–240 in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertexuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*. Edited by C.A. Evans and S. Talmon. BIS 28. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997.
———. "Daniel, Book of, Pseudo-Daniel." Pages 176–178 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
———. "Forms of Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 97–111 in *Emanuel: Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by S.M. Paul, R.A. Kraft, and L.H. Schiffman. VTSup 94. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003.
———. "Introduction: Towards the Morphology of a Genre." Pages 1–20 in *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*. Edited by J.J. Collins. Semeia 14. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.
———. "Jewish Apocalypticism against its Hellenistic Near Eastern Environment." Pages 69–72 in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. JSJSup 54. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997. Repr. from *BASOR* 220 (1975): 27–36.
———. *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.
———. "The Mysteries of God: Creation and Eschatology in 4QInstruction and the Wisdom of Solomon." Pages 287–305 in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. Edited by F. García Martínez. BETL 168. Leuven: Leuven University Press, Peeters, 2003.
———. "Prophecy and Fulfillment in the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 301–314 in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. JSJSup 54. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997. Repr. from *JETS* 30 (1987): 267–278.
———. "Prophecy, Apocalypse, and Eschatology: Reflections on the Proposals of Lester Grabbe." Pages 44–52 in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships*. Edited by L.L. Grabbe and R.D. Haak. JSPSup 46. London T. & T. Clark, 2003.
———. "The Root of Immortality: Death in the Context of Wisdom." Pages 351–368 in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. JSJSup 54. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997. Repr. from *HTR* 71 (1978): 177–192.
———. "The Sage in the Apocalyptic and Pseudepigraphic Literature." Pages 339–350 in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. JSJSup 54. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997. Repr. pages 343–354 in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by J.G. Gammie and L.G. Perdue. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
———. *The Scepter and the Star: Jewish Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1995.
———. "Was the Dead Sea Sect an Apocalyptic Community?" Pages 261–285 in *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. JSJSup 54. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997. Repr. pages 25–51 in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. Edited by

L.H. Schiffman. JSPSup 8. JSOT / ASOR Monographs 2. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
———. “The Works of the Messiah.” *DSD* 1 (1994): 98–112.
———. “The Yahad and the ‘Qumran Community.’” Pages 81–96 in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*. Edited by C. Hempel and J.H. Lieu. JSPSup 111. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2006.
Collins, Marilyn F. “The Hidden Vessels in Samaritan Traditions.” *JSJ* 3 (1972): 97–116.
Cook, Edward M. “What Did the Jews of Qumran Know about God and How Did They Know It.” Pages 2–22 in *Judaism in Late Antiquity 5,2: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls: World View, Comparing Judaisms*. Edited by J. Neusner, A.J. Avery-Peck, and B. Chilton. HdO 57. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2001.
Cooke, George. A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936.
Cothenet, Edouard. “Les prophétes chrétiens comme exégètes charismatiques de l’écriture et l’interprétation actualisante des pesharim et des midras.” Pages 77–107 in *Prophetic Vocation in the New Testament and Today*. Edited by J. Panagopoulos. NovTSup 45. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977.
Crenshaw, James L. *Education in Israel: Across the Deadening Silence*. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1998.
———. *Old Testament Wisdom: An Introduction*. 2d ed. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998.
———. *Prophetic Conflict: Its Effect upon Israelite Religion*. BZAW 124. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1977.
Cross, Frank M. *The Ancient Library of Qumrân*. 3d ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
———. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.
Dahmen, Ulrich. *Psalmen- und Psalter Rezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QPs*[a] *aus Qumran*. STDJ 49. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003.
Dahood, Mitchell. *Psalms II: 51–100*. AB 17. Garden City: Doubleday, 1968.
Davies, Philip R. *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the “Damascus Document”*. JSOTSup 25. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983.
———. “The Teacher of Righteousness and the ‘End of Days.’” *RevQ* 13 (1988): 313–317. Repr. pages 89–94 in *Sects and Scrolls: Essays on Qumran and Related Topics*. SFSHJ 134. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
Davies, W.D. *Torah in the Messianic Age and / or Age to Come*. JBLMS 7. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1952.
Davila, James R. “Heavenly Ascent in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 461–485 in vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by J.C. VanderKam and P.W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998–1999.
———. *Liturgical Works*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
Delcor, Mathias. “Doctrines des Esséniens: D) Esprit Saint.” Pages 972–974 in vol. 9 of *Dictionnaire de la Bible: Supplément*. Edited by L. Piront and A. Robert. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1928–.

———. *Les Hymnes de Qumran*. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1962.
———. "Le Status du roi d'après le Rouleau du Temple." *Henoch* 3 (1981): 47–68.
Denis, Albert-Marie. *Les thèmes de connaissance dans le document de Damas*. SH 15. Louvain: universitaires de Louvain, 1967.
Dexinger, Ferdinand. "Der 'Prophet wie Mose' in Qumran und bei den Samaritanern." Pages 97–111 in *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Mathias Delcor*. Edited by A. Caquot et al. Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1985.
———. "Reflections on the Relationship between Qumran and Samaritan Messianology." Pages 83–99 in *Qumran-Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth, H. Lichtenberger, and G.S. Oegema. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
De Vries, Simon J. "Moses and David as Cult Founder in Chronicles." *JBL* 107 (1988): 619–639.
Dhorme, Edouard. "Première Traduction des Texts Phéniciens de Ras Shamra." *RB* 40 (1931): 32–56.
Dijkstra, Meindert. "The Law of Moses: The Memory of Mosaic Religion in and after the Exile." Pages 70–98 in *Yahwism after the Exile: Perspectives on Israelite Religion in the Persian Period*. Edited by R. Albertz and B. Becking. STAR 5. Assen: Van Gorcum, 2003.
Dimant, Devorah. "An Apocryphon of Jeremiah from Cave 4 (4Q385^{B} = 4Q385 16)." Pages 11–30 in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992*. Edited by G.J. Brooke. STDJ 15. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994.
———. "Ne'um al ha-'Ever me-Tokh ha-Ḥibbur Pseudo-Moses 4Q389 2." Pages 220–226 in *'Or le-Ya'akov: Meḥkarim be-Miqra uba-Megillot Midbar Yehudah le Zekher Ya'akov Shalmon Licht*. Edited by Y. Hoffman and F. Polak. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University, 1997.
———. "A New Apocryphon of Jeremiah from Qumran: A Presentation." *Henoch* 22 (2000): 169–196.
———. "New Light on Jewish Pseudepigrapha—4Q390." Pages 405–448 in vol. 2 of *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls Madrid 18–21 March, 1991*. Edited by J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner. 2 vols. STDJ 11,1–2. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992.
———. "The 'Pesher on the Periods' (4Q180) and 4Q181." *IOS* (1979): 77–102.
———. "Pesharim, Qumran." Pages 244–251 in vol. 5 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D.N. Freedman. 5 vols. Garden City: Doubleday, 1992.
———. *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts*. DJD XXX. Oxford: Clarendon, 2001.
———. "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance." Pages 23–58 in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Paper on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990*. Edited by D. Dimant and L.H. Schiffman. STDJ 16. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.
———. "Qumran Sectarian Literature." Pages 483–550 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by M.E. Stone. CRINT 2. Assen: Van Gorcum. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

———. "Resurrection, Restoration, and Time Curtailing in Qumran, Early Judaism, and Christianity." *RevQ* 19 (2000): 527–548.
———. "Ṣiṭaṭah me-Nahum 3:9–10 be-Qeṭaʿ 4Q385 6 me-Qumran." Pages 31–37 in *Ha-Miqra be-Ro'e Mefareshav: Sefer ha-Zikaron le-Sarah Kamin*. Edited by S. Japhet. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1995.
Dohman, Christoph. "Zur Gründung der Gemeinde von Qumran." *RevQ* 11 (1982): 81–96.
Donner, Herbert. "Der verläßliche Prophet: Betrachtungen zu I Makk 14,41 ff. und zu Ps 110." Pages 59–98 in *Prophetie und geschichtliche Wirklichkeit im alten Israel: Festschrift für Siegried Herrmann zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by R. Liwak and S. Wagner. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1991.
Doudna, Gregory L. *4Q Pesher Nahum: A Critical Edition*. JSPSup 35. CIS 8. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
———. "Dating the Scrolls on the Basis of Radiocarbon Analysis." Pages 430–471 in vol. 1 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by J.C. VanderKam and P.W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998–1999.
Douglas, Michael C. "Power and Praise in the Hodayot: A Literary Critical Study of 1QH 9:1–18:14." 2 vols. Ph.D. diss., The University of Chicago, 1998.
Driver, G.R. *The Judean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.
Driver, S.R. *The Book of Daniel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900.
———. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Deuteronomy*. ICC. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1895.
Duhaime, Jean. "Le Messie et les Saints dans un Fragment apocalyptique de Qumrân (4Q521 2)." Pages 265–274 in *Ce Dieu qui vient: Melanges offerts à Bernard Renaud*. Edited by R. Kuntzman. Paris: Cerf, 1995.
Duhm, Bernhard. *Das Buch Jesaia*. HK 3/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914.
Dupont-Sommer, Andre. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Preliminary Study*. Translated by E.M. Rowley. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
———. *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. Translated by G. Vermes. Cleveland: Meridian, 1962.
———. "Le Livre des Hymnes découvert près de la Mer Morte (1QH)." *Sem* (1957): 5–120.
Eichrodt, Walther. *Theology of the Old Testament*. Translated by J.A. Baker. 2 vols. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967.
Elgvin, Torleif, et al. *Qumran Cave 4.XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1*. DJD XX. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.
Elgvin, Torleif. "An Analysis of 4QInstruction." Ph.D. diss., the Hebrew University, 1998.
———. "The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation." Pages 113–150 in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*. Edited by F.H. Cryer and T.L. Thompson. JSOTSup 290. CIS 6. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
———. "The Reconstruction of Sapiential Work A." *RevQ* 16 (1995): 559–580.

———. "Wisdom, Revelation, and Eschatology in an Early Essene Writing." Pages 440–463 in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1995*. SBLSP 34. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

———. "Wisdom With and Without Apocalyptic." Pages 15–38 in *Sapiential, Liturgical, and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Oslo 1998*. Edited by D.K. Falk, F. García Martínez, and E.M. Schuller. STDJ 35. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000.

Ellier, Karl. *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer*. BHT 15. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1953.

Ellis, E. Earle. *Prophecy & Hermeneutic in Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993.

Elon, Menachem. *Jewish Law: History, Sources, Principles*. Translated by B. Auerbach and M.J. Sykes. 4 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994.

Eshel Esther, et al. *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1*. DJD XI. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

Faierstein, Morris. "Why do the Scribes say that Elijah Must Come First?" *JBL* 100 (1981): 75–86.

Falk, Daniel K. *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. STDJ 27. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998.

Feldman, Louis H. "Prophets and Prophecy in Josephus." Pages 424–441 in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1985*. SBLSP 27. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.

Finkel, Asher. "The Pesher of Dreams and Scriptures." *RevQ* 4 (1963): 357–370.

Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985.

———. "Inner-Biblical Exegesis: Types and Strategies of Interpretation in Ancient Israel." Pages 3–18 in *The Garments of Torah: Essays in Biblical Hermeneutics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.

———. "Use, Authority, and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran." Pages 339–377 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading & Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by M.J. Mulder. CRINT 2, 1. 2d ed. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "'4QTestimonia' and the New Testament." Pages 59–89 in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*. London: G. Chapman, 1971. Repr. from *TS* 18 (1957): 513–537.

———. "David, 'Being Therefore a Prophet…' (Acts 2:30)." *CBQ* 34 (1972): 332–339.

———. "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11." Pages 245–267 in *Essays in the Semitic Background of the New Testament*. London: G. Chapman, 1971. Repr. from *JBL* 86 (1967): 25–41.

———. "More About Elijah Coming First." *JBL* 104 (1985): 295–296.

———. "Qumran Messianism." Pages 73–110 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

———. "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament." Pages 3–58 in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*. London: G. Chapman, 1971; Repr. from *NTS* 7 (1960–1961): 297–333

Fleming, Daniel E. "The Etymological Origins of the Hebrew *nābîʾ*: The One

Who Invokes God." *CBQ* 55 (1993): 217–224.
Flint, Peter W. "The Daniel Tradition at Qumran." Pages 359–397 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Edited by J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint. VTSup 83,2. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2001.
———. *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms*. STDJ 17. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997.
———. "The Greek Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7." Pages 224–233 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by G. Boccaccini. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
———. "The Prophet David at Qumran." Pages 158–167 in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Edited by M. Henze. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
Floyd, Michael H. "Introduction." Pages 1–25 in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by M.H. Floyd and R.D. Haak. LHB / OTS 427. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2006.
Flusser, David. "Blessed are the Poor in Spirit…" *IEJ* 10 (1960): 1–13.
———. "Perušim, Ṣaddukim, ve-ʾIssiʾim be-Pesher Naḥum." Pages 133–168 in *Sefer Zikaron le-Gedaliahu Alon: Meḥkarim be-Toldot Yisraʾel ube-Lašon ha ʿIvrit*. Edited by M. Dorman, S. Safrai and M. Stern. Jerusalem: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 1970. German Translation in "Pharisäer, Sadduzäer und Essener im Pescher Nahum." Pages 121–166 in *Qumran*. Edited by K.E. Grözinger. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1981.
Fraade, Steven D. "Hagu, Book of." Page 327 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
Frey, Jörg. "The Notion of 'Flesh' in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage." Pages 197–226 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998*. Edited by D.K. Falk, F. García Martínez, and E.M. Schuller. STDJ 35. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000.
Gager, John G. *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*. SBLMS 16. Nashville: Abingdon, 1972.
Gammie, John G. "The Sage in Sirach." Pages 355–372 in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by J.G. Gammie and L.G. Perdue. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997–1998.
García Martínez, Florentino, Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, and Adam S. van der Woude. *Qumran Cave 11.II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31*. DJD XXIII. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
García Martínez, Florentino, and Julio Trebolle Barrera. *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs, and Practices*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.
García Martínez, Florentino. "Nuevos Textos No Biblicos Procedentes de Qumran," *Estudios Bíblicos* 49 (1991): 97–34.
———. *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran*. STDJ 9. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992.
———. "Wisdom at Qumran: Worldly or Heavenly?" Pages 1–15 in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. Edited by

F. García Martínez. BETL 168. Leuven: Leuven University Press, Peeters, 2003.
——. ed. *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. BETL 168. Leuven: Leuven University Press, Peeters, 2003.
Geller, Stephen A. "'Where is Wisdom?' A Literary Study of Job 28." Pages 155–188 in *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel*. Edited by J. Neusner, B.A. Levine, and E.S. Frerichs. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
Gerleman G., and E. Ruprecht, "דרש." Pages 346–351 in vol. 1 of *The Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann. 3 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997.
Giblet, J. "Prophétisme et attente d'un messie prophète dans l'ancien Judaïsme." Pages 85–130 in *L'Attente d'un Messie*. Edited by L. Cerfaux. RechBibl 1. Bruges: Desclés de Brouwer, 1958.
Ginzberg, Louis. *An Unknown Jewish Sect*. Moreshet 1. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1976.
Glazier-McDonald, Beth. *Malachi: The Divine Messenger*. SBLDS 98. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
Gnuse, Robert K. *Dreams and Dream Reports in the Writings of Josephus: A Traditio-Critical Analysis*. AGJU 36. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996.
Goff, Matthew J. "Reading Wisdom at Qumran: 4QInstruction and the Hodayot." *DSD* 11 (2004): 263–288.
——. *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*. STDJ 50. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003.
Goldberg, Ilana. "Girsaʾot Ḥilufiʾot be-Pesher Ḥabakkuk." *Textus* 17 (1994): 9–24.
Goldingay, John E. *Daniel*. WBC 30. Waco: Word, 1989.
Goldstein, Jonathan A. *I Maccabees*. AB 41. Garden City: Doubleday, 1976.
Goranson, Stephen. "Others and Intra-Jewish Polemic in Qumran Texts." Pages 534–551 in vol. 2 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by J.C. VanderKam and P.W. Flint. 2 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998–1999.
Gordon, Robert P., ed. *The Place Is too Small for Us: The Israelite Prophets in Recent Scholarship*. SBTS 5. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
Grabbe, Lester L. "'The End of the Desolations of Jerusalem': From Jeremiah's 70 Years to Daniel's 70 Weeks of Years." Pages 67–72 in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee*. Edited by C.A. Evans and W.F. Stinespring. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
——. "Introduction and Overview." Pages 2–43 in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships*. Edited by L.L. Grabbe and R.D. Haak. JSPSup 46. London T. & T. Clark, 2003.
——. "Poets, Scribes, or Preachers? The Reality of Prophecy in the Second Temple Period." Pages 192–215 in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships*. Edited by L.L. Grabbe and R.D. Haak. JSPSup 46. London: T. & T. Clark, 2003. Repr. from *SBLSP* 37 (1998): 524–545.
——. *Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages: A Socio-Historical Study of Religious Specialists in Ancient Israel*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1995.

———. "Prophecy and Apocalyptic: Time for New Definitions—and New Thinking." Pages 107–133 in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships*. Edited by L.L. Grabbe and R.D. Haak. JSPSup 46. London T. & T. Clark, 2003.

Gray, George B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers*. ICC. New York: Scribner, 1920.

Gray, John. *I & II Kings: A Commentary*. OTL. 2d ed. London: SCM, 1970.

Gray, Rebecca. *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Greenberg, Moshe. *Ezekiel 1–20*. AB 22. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983.

Greenspahn, Frederick E. "Why Prophecy Ceased." *JBL* 108 (1989): 37–49.

Grelot, Pierre. "Soixante-dix semaines d'années." *Bib* 50 (1969): 169–186.

———. "Sur Isaïe LXI: La première consecration d'un grand-prêtre." *RB* 97 (1990): 414–431.

Gropp, Donald M., et al. *Wadi Daliyeh II and Qumran Cave 4.28: Miscellanea, Part 2*. DJD XXVIII. Oxford: Clarendon, 2001.

Grossman, Maxine L. *Reading for History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Study*. STDJ 45. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2002.

Gruenwald, Ithamar. "Knowledge and Vision: Towards a Clarification of Two 'Gnostic' Concepts in the Light of their Alleged Origins." *IOS* 3 (1973): 63–107.

Gunkel, Hermann. *Introduction to Psalms: The Genres of the Religious Lyric of Israel*. Translated by J.D. Nogalski. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1998.

Halivni, David W. *Peshat and Derash: Plain and Applied Meaning in Rabbinic Exegesis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Hallevy, Raphael. "Man of God." *JNES* 17 (1958): 237–244.

Hammer, Raymond. *The Book of Daniel*. CBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Hanson, Paul D. *The Dawn of the Apocalyptic*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.

Harrington, Daniel J. "The *Rāz Nihyeh* in a Qumran Wisdom Text (1Q26, 4Q415–418, 423)." *RevQ* 17 (1996): 549–553

———. "Wisdom at Qumran." Pages 137–152 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam. CJAS 10. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993.

———. *Wisdom Texts from Qumran*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Hartman Louis F., and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Book of Daniel*. AB 23. Garden City, Doubleday, 1978.

Hayes, John H., and Sara R. Mandel, *The Jewish People in Classical Antiquity: From Alexander to Bar Kokhba*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998.

Hempel, Charlotte. *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Traditions, and Redaction*. STDJ 29. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1998.

Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.

———. *The Zealots*. Translated by D. Smith. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1989.

Henten, Jan Willem van. "The Honorary Decree for Simon the Maccabee (1 Macc 14:25 49) in its Hellenistic Context." Pages 16–45 in *Hellenism in the*

Land of Israel. Edited by J.J. Collins and G.E. Sterling. CJAS 13. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.

Henze, Matthias. "Invoking the Prophets in Zechaiah and Ben Sira." Pages 120–134 in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by M.H. Floyd and R.D. Haak. LHB / OTS 427. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2006.

Heschel, Abraham J. *Prophetic Inspiration after the Prophets: Maimonides and other Medieval Authorities*. Hoboken: Ktav, 1996.

Hess, Richard S. "Asking Historical Questions of Joshua 13–19: Recent Discussion Concerning the Date of the Boundary Lists." Pages 191–205 in *Faith, Tradition, and History: Old Testament Historiography in its Near Eastern Context*. Edited by A.R. Millard, J.K. Hoffmeier, and D.W. Baker. Winona Lake: Eisenbraus, 1994.

Hill, Andrew. *Malachi*. AB 25D. New York: Doubleday, 1998.

Himmelfarb, Martha. "From Prophecy to Apocalypse: The Book of Watchers and Tours of Heaven." Pages 145–170 in *Jewish Spirituality from the Bible through the Middle Ages*. Edited by A. Green. New York: Crossroad, 1986.

Holm-Nielsen, Svend. *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran*. ATDan 2. Aargus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960.

Holstein, Jay. "The Case of 'īš hā-ʾĕlōhīm' Reconsidered: Philological Analysis Versus Historical Reconstruction." *HUCA* 48 (1977): 69–81.

Horgan, Maurya P. *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretation of Biblical Books*. CBQMS 8. Washington D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979.

Horn, Friedrich W. "Holy Spirit." Pages 260–280 in vol. 3 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D.N. Freedman. 5 vols. Garden City: Doubleday, 1992.

Horsley, Richard A. "'Like One of the Prophets of Old': Two Types of Popular Prophets at the Time of Jesus." *CBQ* 47 (1985): 435–463.

Horsley, Richard A., and John S. Hanson. *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movements in the Time of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Winston, 1985.

Horton Jr., Fred L. *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. SNTMS 30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Huehnergard, John. "On the Etymology and Meaning of Hebrew *nābîʾ*." *ErIsr* 26 (1999; Cross Volume): 88*–93*.

Huggins, Ronald V. "A Canonical 'Book of Periods' at Qumran?" *RevQ* 15 (1992; Starcky Memorial): 421–436.

Idel, Moshe. *The Mystical Experience in Abraham Abulafia*. Translated by J. Chipman. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988.

Ingelaere, Jean-Claude. "L'Inspiration Prophétique dans le Judaïsme: Le Témoignage de Flavius Josèphe." *ETR* 62 (1987): 236–245.

Jackson, Bernard S. "The Prophets and the Law in Early Judaism and the New Testament." *Cardozo Studies in Law and Literature* 4 (1992): 123–166.

Japhet, Sara. *I & II Chronicles*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993.

———. *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and its Place in Biblical Thought*. BEATAJ 9. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1989.

———. "The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew." *VT* 18 (1968): 330–371.

Jassen, Alex P. "Literary and Historical Studies in the Samuel Apocryphon (4Q160)." (forthcoming).
———. "Magic and the Bible Reconsidered." *Judaism* 54 (2005): 272–275.
Jepson, Alfred. "חזה." Pages 283–290 in vol. 4 of *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. 14 vols. to date. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–.
Jeremias, Gert. *Die Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*. SUNT 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.
Johnstone, William. *1 and 2 Chronicles: Volume 1, 1 Chronicles 1–2 Chronicles 9, Israel's Place among the Nations*. JSOTSup 253. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
Jones, Bruce W. "The Prayer in Daniel ix." *VT* 18 (1968): 488–493.
Jonge, Marinus de, and Adam S. van der Woude. "11QMelchizedek and the New Testament." *NTS* 12 (1966): 301–326.
Jonge, Marinus de. "The Role of Intermediaries in God's Final Intervention in the Future According to the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 28–49 in *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology, and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Collected Essays of Marinus de Jonge*. NovTSup 63. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991; repr. from Pages 44–63 in *Studies on the Jewish Background of the New Testament*. Edited by O. Michel et al. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1969.
———. "The Use of the Word 'Anointed' in the Time of Jesus." *NovT* 8 (1966): 132–148.
Jongeling, Bastiaan. *Le Rouleau de la Guerre des Manuscrits de Qumrân: Commentaire et Traduction*. SSN 4. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1962.
Juöun, Paul. "Locutions Hébraïques." *Bib* 3 (1922): 53–73.
Kappler, Werner. *Maccabaeorum libri I–IV: Fasc. 1: Maccabaeorum liber I*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936.
Kaufmann, Yehezkel. *Toldot ha-'Emunah ha-Isra'elit*. 4 vols. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1955.
Knibb, Michael. "Interpreter of the Law." Pages 383–384 in vol. 2 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
———. "A Note on 4Q372 and 4Q390." Pages 170–177 in *The Scriptures and the Scrolls: Studies in Honour of A.S. van der Woude on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Edited by F. García Martínez, A. Hilhorst, and C.J. Labuschagne. VTSup 49. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992.
———. "The Teacher of Righteousness—A Messianic Title?" Pages 51–65 in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History*. Edited by P.R. Davies and R.T. White. JSOTSup 100. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.
———. *The Qumran Community*. CCWJCW 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
Kobelski, Paul J. *Melchizedek and Melchireša'*. CBQMS 10. Washington D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981.
Koch, Klaus. "Is Daniel also among the Prophets?" Pages 237–248 in *Interpreting the Prophets*. Edited by J.L. Mays and P.J. Achtemeier. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
———. *The Prophets*. 2 vols. Translated by M. Kohl. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

Kooij, Arie ver der. "'Coming' Things and 'Last' Things: Isaianic Terminology as Understood in the Wisdom of Ben Sira and in the Septuagint of Isaiah." Pages 135–140 in *The New Things: Eschatology in Old Testament Prophecy: Festschrift for Henk Leene*. Edited by F. Postma, K. Spronk, and E. Talstra. ACEBT 3. Maastricht: Shaker, 2002.

Kraus, Hans-Joachin. *Psalms 1–59*. Translated by H.C. Oswald. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

———. *Psalms 60–150*. Translated by H.C. Oswald. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.

Krentz, Edgar. "The Honorary Decree for Simon the Maccabee." Pages 146–153 in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*. Edited by J.J. Collins and G.E. Sterling. CJAS 13. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.

Kvalvaag, Robert W. "The Spirit in Human Beings in Some Qumran Non-Biblical Texts." Pages 161–180 in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments*. Edited by F.H. Cryer and T.L. Thompson. JSOTSup 290. CIS 6. Sheffield: 1998), 161–180.

Laato, Anntti. "The Seventy Yearweeks in the Book of Daniel." *ZAW* 102 (1990): 212–223.

Lacocque, A. "The Liturgical Prayer in Daniel 9." *HUCA* 47 (1976): 119–142.

———. *The Book of Daniel*. Tranlated by D. Pellauer. Atlanta: John Knox, 1979.

Lambdin, Thomas O. *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971.

Lange, Armin. "The Determination of Fate by the Oracle of the Lot in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Mesopotamian Literature." Pages 39–48 in *Sapiential, Liturgical, and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet*. Edited by D.K. Falk, F. García Martínez, and E.M. Schuller. STDJ 35. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000.

———. "The Essene Position on Magic and Divination." Pages 377–433 in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge, 1995: Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten*. Edited by F. García Martínez, M.J. Bernstein, and J. Kampen. STDJ 23. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997.

———. "Interpretation als Offenbarung: zum Verhältnis von Schriftauslegung und Offenbarung in apokalyptischer und nichtapokalyptischer Literatur." Pages 17–33 in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. Edited by F. García Martínez. BETL 168. Leuven: Leuven University Press, Peeters, 2003.

———. "Reading the Decline of Prophecy." Pages 181–191 in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations*. Edited by K. de Troyer and A. Lange. SBLSymS 30. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.

———. *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran*. STDJ 18. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.

Larson, Erik W. "Visions," Pages 957–958 in vol. 2 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Leaney, A.R.C. *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning*. NTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966.
Lehmann, Manfred R. "Ben Sira and Qumran Literature." *RevQ* 3 (1961–1962): 103–116.
Leiman, Sid Z. "Josephus and the Canon of the Bible." Pages 50–58 in *Josephus, the Bible, and History*. Edited by L.H. Feldman and G. Hata. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989.
Leivestand, Ragnar. "Das Dogma von der prophetenlosen Zeit." *NTS* 19 (1972–1973): 288–299.
Lemke, Werner. "The Way of Obedience: I Kings 13 and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History." Pages 301–326 in *Magnalia Dei: The Mighty Acts of God*. Edited F.M. Cross, W.E. Lemke, and P.D. Miller. Garden City: Doubleday, 1976.
Levenson, Jon D. *Esther: A Commentary*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.
Levine, Baruch A. *Numbers 21–36*. AB 4A. New York: Doubleday, 2000.
———. "The Temple Scroll: Aspects of its Historical Provenance and Literary Character." *BASOR* 232 (1978): 5–23.
Levinson, Bernard M. "The First Constitution: Rethinking the Origins of Rule of Law and Separation of Powers in Light of Deuteronomy." *CLR* 27 (2006): 1853–1888.
———. *L'Herméneutique de l'innovation*: *Canon et exégèse dans l'Israël biblique*. Le livre et le rouleau 24; Brussels: Lessius, 2006.
Levinson, Bernard M., and Molly M. Zahn, "Revelation Regained: The Hermeneutics of כי and אם in the Temple Scroll." *DSD* 9 (2002): 295–246.
Levison, John R. "Prophetic Inspiration in Pseudo-Philo's 'Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum.'" *JQR* 85 (1995): 297–329.
———. *The Spirit in First-Century Judaism*. AGJU 29. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997.
———. "Two Types of Ecstatic Prophecy according to Philo." *StPhA* 6 (1994): 83–89.
Licht, Jacob. *Megillat ha-Hodayot: me-Megillot Midbar Yehudah*. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1957.
———. *Megillat ha-Serakhim: me-Megillot Midbar Yehudah*. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965.
Lim, Timothy H. "11QMelch, Luke 4, and the Dying Messiah." *JJS* 43 (1992): 90–92.
Lindblom, J. *Prophecy in Ancient Israel*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.
Martyn, J. Louis. "We Have Found Elijah." Pages 181–219 in *Jews, Greeks and Christians Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity: Essays in Honor of William David Davies*. Edited by R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs. SJLA 21. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976.
Lübbe, John. "A Reinterpretation of 4Q Testimonia." *RevQ* 12 (1986): 187–197.
Mack, Burton L. *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira's Hymn in Praise of the Fathers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.
Maertens, Thierry. *L'éloge de pères: Ecclésiastique XLIV–L*. Bruges: Abbaye de Saint André, 1956.

Maier, Johann. "Weitere Stücke zum Nahumkommentar aus der Höhle 4 von Qumran." *Judaica* 18 (1962): 234–237

Mandel, Paul. "Midrashic Exegesis and its Precedents." *DSD* 2 (1995): 149–168.

Mansoor, Menachem. *The Thanksgiving Hymns: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction.* STDJ 3. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1961.

Meeks, Wayne A. *The Prophet-King: Moses Tradition and the Johannine Christology.* NovTSup 14. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1967.

Meier, John. "Is There *Halaka* (the Noun) at Qumran." *JBL* 122 (2003): 150–155

Metso, Sarianna. "The Primary Results of the Reconstruction of 4QS[e]." *JJS* 44 (1993): 303–308.

———. *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule.* STDJ 21. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997.

———. "The Use of Old Testament Quotations in the Qumran Community Rule." Pages 217–231 in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments.* Edited by F.H. Cryer and T.L. Thompson. JSOTSup 290. CIS 6. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Meyer, Rudolph. "Prophecy and Prophets in the Judaism of the Hellenistic-Roman Period." Pages 812–828 in vol. 6 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. 9 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1974.

Meyers, Eric M. "The Crisis in the Mid-Fifth Century B.C.E. Second Zechariah and the 'End' of Prophecy." Pages 713–723 in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom.* Edited by D.P. Wright, D.N. Freedman, and A. Hurvitz. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995.

Micheel, Rosemarie. *Die Seher- und Prophetenüberlieferungen in der Chronik.* BBET 18. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1983.

Michel, A. *Le maître de justice d 'après les documents de la mer Morte: la literature apocryphe et rabbinique.* Avignon: Maison Aubanel père, 1954.

Milgrom, Jacob. *Numbers: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation.* Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1990.

Milik, Josef T. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.

———. "'Prière de Nabonide' et autres écrits d'un cycle de Daniel: Framents araméens de Qumrân 4." *RB* 63 (1956): 407–415.

———. "Milkî-ṣedeq et Milkî-rešaʿ dans les ancient écrits juifs et chrétiens." *JJS* 23 (1972): 95–144.

———. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea.* SBT 26. London: SCM, 1959.

Miller, Merrill P. "The Function of Isa 61:1–2 in 11QMelchizedek." *JBL* 88 (1969): 467–469.

Miner, Daniel F. "A Suggested Reading for 11Q Melchizedek 17." *JSJ* 2 (1971): 144–148.

Montgomery, James A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel.* ICC. New York: Scribner, 1927.

Moore, Carey A. *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions*. AB 44. Garden City: Doubleday, 1977.
Moore, George F. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927–1930.
Morgenstern, Matthew. "Language and Literature in the Second Temple Period." *JJS* 48 (1997): 130–145.
Murphy, Roland E. "Wisdom and Creation." *JBL* 104 (1985): 3–11.
Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "An Essene Missionary Document? CD II, 14-VI, 1." *RB* 77 (1970): 201–229.
———. "La genèse littérire de la Règle de la Communauté." *RB* 76 (1969): 528–549.
Najman, Hindy. *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. JSJSup 77. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004.
Neusner, Jacob. "In the View of Rabbinic Judaism, What, Exactly, Ended with Prophecy." Pages 45–60 in *Mediators of the Divine: Horizons of Prophecy, Divination, Dreams, and Theurgy in Mediterranean Antiquity*. Edited by R.M. Berchman. SFSHJ 163. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.
———. "Map Without Territory: Mishnah's System of Sacrifice and Sanctuary." Pages 133–154 in *Method and Meaning in Ancient Judaism*. BJS 10. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1979.
———. "What 'The Rabbis' Thought: A Method and a Result: One Statement on Prophecy in Rabbinic Judaism." Pages 303–320 in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Edited by J.C. Reeves and J. Kampen. JSOTSup 184. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
Newsom, Carol A. "4Q378 and 4Q379: An Apocryphon of Joshua." Pages 35–85 in *Qumranstudien: Vorträge und Beiträge der Teilnehmer des Qumranseminars auf dem internationalen Treffen der Society of Biblical Literature, Münster, 25.-26. Juli 1993*. Edited by H.-J. Fabry, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
———. "The 'Psalms of Joshua' from Qumran Cave 4." *JJS* 39 (1988): 56–73.
———. "The Sage in the Literature of Qumran: The Functions of the *Maskil*." Pages 373–382 in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by J.G. Gammie and L.G. Perdue. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
———. *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*. STDJ 52. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004.
Newsome Jr., James D. "Toward a New Understanding of the Chronicler and his Purpose." *JBL* 94 (1975): 201–217.
Nickelsburg, George W.E. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36, 81–108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.
———. *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins: Diversity, Continuity, and Transformation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
———. "The Apocalyptic Message of *1 Enoch* 92–105." *CBQ* 39 (1977): 309–328.
———. "Apocalyptic Texts." Pages 29–35 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
———. "The Books of Enoch at Qumran: What We Know and What We Need

to Think About." Pages 99–113 in *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65 Geburtstag*. Edited by B. Kollman, W. Reinbold, and A. Steudel. BZNW 97. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1999.

———. "'Enoch' as Scientist, Sage, and Prophet: Content. Function, and Authorship in 1 Enoch." Pages 203–230 in *SBL Seminar Papers 1999*. SBLSP 38. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999.

———. "The Greek Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 7: An Unproven Identification." *RevQ* 21 (2004): 631–634.

———. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*. 2d ed. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.

———. "The Nature and Function of Revelation in 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and some Qumranic Documents." Pages 91–120 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997*. Edited by E.G. Chazon and M. Stone. STDJ 31. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1999.

———. "Revealed Wisdom as a Criterion for Inclusion and Exclusion: From Jewish Sectarianism to Early Christianity." Pages 73–92 in *"To See Ourselves as Others See Us": Christians, Jews, "Others," in Late Antiquity*. Edited by J. Neusner and E.S. Frerichs. Chico: Scholars Press, 1986.

———. "Revelation." Pages 770–772 in vol. 2 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Nickelsburg, George W.E., and James C. VanderKam. *1 Enoch: A New Translation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.

Nissinen, Martti. "The Dubious Image of Prophecy." Pages 26–41 in *Prophets, Prophecy and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by M.H. Floyd and R.D. Haak. LHB / OTS 427. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2006.

———. "Preface." In *Prophecy in Its Ancient Near Eastern Context: Mesopotamian, Biblical, and Arabian Perspectives*. Edited by M. Nissinen. SBLSymS 13. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.

Nissinen, Martti, with C.L. Seow and Robert K. Ritner. *Prophets and Prophecy in the Ancient Near East*. SBLWAW 12. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Nitzan Bilha, et al. *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2*. DJD XXIX. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.

———. *Megillat Pesher Ḥabakkuk*. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1986.

———. *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*. Translated by J. Chipman. STDJ 12. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994.

Öhler, Markus. *Elia im Neuen Testament*. BZNW 88. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997.

Orlinsky, Harry M. "The Seer-Priest and Prophet in Ancient Israel." Pages 39–65 in *Essays in Biblical Culture and Bible Translation*. New York: Ktav, 1974.

Overholt, Thomas. "The End of Prophecy: No Players without a Program." Pages 527–538 in *The Place Is too Small for Us: The Israelite Prophets in Recent Scholarship*. Edited by R.P. Gordon. SBTS 5. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995. Repr. from *JSOT* 42 (1988): 103–115.

Parker, Simon B. "Possession Trance and Prophecy in Pre-Exilic Israel." *VT* 28 (1978): 271–285.

Parry. Donald W., and Emanuel Tov. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*. 6 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004–2005.

Perdue, Leo G. "Ben Sira and the Prophets." Pages 135–154 in *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit: Essays in Honor of Alexander A. Di Lella, O.F.M.* Edited by J. Corley and V. Skemp. CBQMS 38. Washington D.C. The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2005.

———. "Revelation and the Hidden God in Second Temple Literature." Pages 201–222 in *Shall not the Judge of all the Earth Do What Is Right? Studies on the Nature of God in Tribute to James L. Crenshaw*. Edited by D. Penchansky and P.L. Redditt. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000.

———. *Wisdom & Creation: The Theology of Wisdom Literature*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1994.

Petersen, David L. "Defining Prophecy and Prophetic Literature." Pages 33–44 in *Prophecy in its Ancient Near Eastern Context: Mesopotamian, Biblical, and Arabian Perspectives*. Edited by M. Nissinen. SBLSymS 13. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.

———. "Israelite Prophecy: Change Versus Continuity." Pages 190–203 in *Congress Volume: Leuven 1989*. Edited by J.A. Emerton. VTSup 43. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1991.

———. *Late Israelite Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-Prophetic Literature and in Chronicles*. SBLMS 23. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.

———. "Rethinking the End of Prophecy." 65–71 in *Wünschent Jerusalem Frieden: Collected Communications to the XIIth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament, Jerusalem 1986*. Edited by M. Augustin and K.-D. Schunck. BEATAJ 13. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1988.

———. *The Role of Israel's Prophets*. JSOTSup 17. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981.

Pfann, Stephen J., et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1*. DJD XXXVI. Oxford: Clarendon, 2000.

Phillips, Anthony. "Prophecy and Law." Pages 217–232 in *Israel's Prophetic Tradition: Essays in Honour of Peter R. Ackroyd*. Edited by R. Coogins, A. Philips, and M. Knibb. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Philonenko, Marc. "Jusqu'à ce que se lève un prophète digne de confiance (1 Machabées 14,41)." Psages 95–98 *in Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity: Presented to David Flusser on the Occasion of his Seventy Fifth Birthday*. Edited by I. Gruenwald, S. Shaked, and G.G. Stroumsa. TSAJ 32. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993.

Pike, Dana M., and Andrew C. Skinner. *Qumran Cave 4.XXII: Unidentified Fragments*. DJD XXXIII. Oxford: Clarendon, 2001.

Poirier, John C. "The Endtime Return of Elijah and Moses at Qumran." *DSD* 10 (2000): 221–242.

Polliack, Meira. "Wherein Lies the Pesher? Re-Questioning the Connection between Medieval Karaite and Qumranic Modes of Biblical Interpretation." *JSIJ* 3 (2004): 151–200.

Pryke, J. "'Spirit' and 'Flesh' in the Qumran Documents and Some New Testament Texts." *RevQ* 5 (1965): 345–360.

Puech, Émile. "Une Apocalypse messianique (4Q521)." *RevQ* 15 (1992): 475–522.

———. "Ben Sira 48:11 et la Résurrection." Pages 81–90 in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins Presented to John Strugnell on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*. Edited by H.W. Attridge, J.J. Collins, and T.H. Tobin. Lanham: University Press of America, 1990.

———. *La Croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, resurrection, vie éternelle*. 2 vols. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1993.

———. "Le Fragment 2 de 4Q377: Pentateuque Apocryphe B: L'Exaltation de Moïse." *RevQ* 21 (2004): 499–475.

———. "Hodayot." Pages 365–369 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

———. "Le Livre de Ben Sira et les Manuscripts de la Mer morte." Pages 411–426 in *Treasures of Wisdom: Studies in Ben Sira and the Book of Wisdom, Festschrift M. Gilbert*. Edited by N. Calduch-Benages and J. Vermeylen. BETL 143. Leuven: Leuven University Press, Peeters, 1999.

———. "Messianisme, Eschatologie et Résurection dans les Manuscripts de la Mer Morte." *RevQ* 18 (1997): 255–298.

———. "Messianism, Resurrection, and Eschatology at Qumran and the New Testament." Pages 235–256 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam. CJAS 10. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993.

———. "Notes sur le manuscript 11QMelkî-sédeq." *RevQ* 12 (1987): 485–513.

———. *Qumrân Grotte 4.XVIII: Textes Hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)*. DJD XXV. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.

———. *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII: Textes arameéns, première partie: 4Q529–549*. DJD XXXI. Oxford: Clarendon, 2001.

———. "Some Remarks on 4Q246 and 4Q521 and Qumran Messianism." Pages 545–565 in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by D.W. Parry and E. Ulrich. STDJ 30. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1999.

Qimron, Elisha. "'Al Šegagot ve-Zedanot be-Megillot Midbar Yehudah: ʿIyyun be Menuḥim ha-Meššamešim le-Ṣiyunam." Pages 103–111 in *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies*. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1990.

———. "Le-Pišrah šel Rešimat Nevi'e ha-Šeqer." *Tarbiz* 63 (1993): 273–275.

———. "The Text of CDC." Pages 9–49 in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*. Edited by M. Broshi. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1992.

Qimron, Elisha, and John Strugnell. *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqṣat Maʿaśe Ha-Torah*. DJD X. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.

Rabin, Chaim. *The Zadokite Documents*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1954.

Rabinowitz, Isaac. "The Authorship, Audience, and Date of the De Vaux Fragment of an Unidentified Work." *JBL* 71 (1952): 19–32.

———. "'Pēsher / Pittārōn': Its Biblical Meaning and its Significance in the Qumran Literature." *RevQ* 8 (1973): 219–232.

———. "The Qumran Authors' *SPR HHGW / Y*." *JNES* 20 (1961): 109–114.

———. "A Reconsideration of 'Damascus' and '390 Years' in the 'Damascus' ('Zadokite') Fragments." *JBL* 72 (1954): 11–35.

———. "The Second and Third Columns of the Habakkuk Interpretation Scroll." *JBL* 69 (1950): 31–49.

Rad, Gerhard von. "The Deuteronomistic Theology of History in the Books of Kings." Pages 74–92 in *Studies in Deuteronomy*. Translated D.M.G. Stalker. SBT 9. London: SCM, 1953.

———. *Old Testament Theology*. Translated by D.M.G. Stalker. 2 vols. New York: Harper, 1962.

———. *Wisdom in Israel*. Translated by J. Martin. New York: Abingdon, 1973.

Rainbow, Paul. "Melchizedek as a Messiah at Qumran." *BBR* 7 (1997): 179–194

Reeves, John C. "Giants, Book of." Pages 309–311 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Reicke, Bo. "Traces of Gnosticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls?" *NTS* 1 (1954–1955): 137–142

Reiling, Jannes. "The Use of ΨΕΥΔΟΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ in the Septuagint, Philo and Josephus." *NovT* 13 (1971): 147–156.

Rentdorff, Rolf. "Offenbarung und Geschichte." Pages 21–41 in *Offenbarung im jüdischen und christlichen Glaubensvertändnis*. Edited by P. Eicher, J.J. Petuchowski, and W. Strolz. QD 92. Freiburg: Herder, 1981.

Ringgren, Helmer. *The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Translated by E.T. Sander. New York: Crossroad, 1995.

Ringgren, Helmer, et al. "עבד." Pages 326–405 in vol. 10 of *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. 14 vols. to date. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–.

Roberts, J.J.M. "The Hand of Yahweh." *VT* 21 (1971): 244–251.

———. "Of Signs, Prophets, and Time Limits: A Note on Psalm 74:9." *CBQ* 39 (1977): 474–481.

Rofé, Alexander. "The Classification of Prophetical Stories." *JBL* 89 (1970): 427–440.

———. "Revealed Wisdom: From the Bible to Qumran." Pages 1–11 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May 2001*. Edited by J.J. Collins, G.E. Sterling, and R.A. Clements. STDJ 51. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2004.

Rooy, Harry F. van. "Prophet and Society in the Persian Period according to Chronicles." Pages 168–179 in *Second Temple Studies 2: Temple and Community in the Persian Period*. Edited by T.C. Eskenazi and K.H. Richards. JSOTSup 175. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.

Ross, James F. "Psalm 73." Pages 161–175 in *Israelite Wisdom: Theological and Literary Essays in Honor of Samuel Terrien*. Edited by J.G. Gammie et al. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978.

Rotem, Mordechai. "Ha-Nevuah be-Kitve ʿAdat Qumran." M.A. thesis, the Hebrew University, 1977.

Rudolph, Wilhelm. *Chronikbücher*. HAT 1/21. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1955.

Rylaarsdam, J. Coert. *Revelation in Jewish Wisdom Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946.
Sacchi, Paulo. "Historicizing and Revelation at the Origins of Judaism." Pages 200–209 in *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History*. Translated by W.J. Short. JSP-Sup 20. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
Saldarini, Anthony J. "Pharisees." Pages 289–303 in vol. 5 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D.N. Freedman. 5 vols. Garden City: Doubleday, 1992.
———. *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
Sanders, E.P. "The Dead Sea Sect and other Jews: Commonalities, Overlaps and Difference." Pages 7–44 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*. Edited by T.H. Lim. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000.
Sanders, James A. "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4." Pages 75–106 in vol. 1 of *Christianity, Judaism, and other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*. Edited by J. Neusner. SJLA 12. 4 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.
———. "The Old Testament in 11QMelchizedek." *JANESCU* 5 (1973; Gaster Festschrift): 373–382.
———. *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11*. DJD IV. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965.
Sanderson, Judith E. *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: 4QpaleoExod[m] and the Samaritan Tradition*. HSS 30. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
Sarna, Nahum. *Exodus: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1991.
Schaper, Joachim. "The Death of the Prophet: The Transition from the Spoken to the Written Word of God in the Book of Ezekiel." Pages 63–79 in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by M.H. Floyd and R.D. Haak. LHB / OTS 427. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2006.
Schechter, Solomon. *Documents of Jewish Sectaries, Vol. 1, Fragments of a Zadokite Work*. New York: Ktav, 1970.
Schiffman, Lawrence H. "4QMysteries[a]: A Preliminary Edition and Translation." Pages 207–260 in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield*. Edited by Z. Zevit, S. Gitin, and M. Sokoloff. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
———. "4QMysteries[b]: A Preliminary Edition." *RevQ* 16 (1993): 202–233.
———. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Rabbinic *Halakhah*." Pages 3–24 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls as Background to Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from an International Conference at St. Andrews in 2001*. Edited by J.R. Davila. STDJ 46. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003.
———. "The Deuteronomic Paraphrase of the Temple Scroll." *RevQ* 15 (1992): 543–567
———. *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation*. SBLMS 38. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
———. *The Halakhah at Qumran*. SJLA 16. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.
———. "The King, His Guard and the Royal Council in the Temple Scroll." *PAAJR* 54 (1987): 237–259.
———. "The Law of Vows and Oaths (Num. 30,3–16) in the Zadokite Fragments and the Temple Scroll." *RevQ* 15 (1991): 199–214.

———. "The Laws of War in the Temple Scroll." *RevQ* 13 (1988): 299–311.
———. "Messianic Figures and Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 116–129 in *The Messiah: Development in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
———. "The New *Halakhic Letter* (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect." *BA* 53 (1990): 64–73.
———. "New Light on the Pharisees." Pages 217–226, 308–309 in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Reader from the Biblical Archaeology Review*. Edited by H. Shanks. New York: Vintage, 1993.
———. "The Pharisees and Sadducees in Pesher Naḥum." Pages 272–290 in *Minḥa le-Naḥum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of his 70th Birthday*. Edited by M. Brettler and M. Fishbane JSOTSup 154. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
———. "The Pharisees and their Legal Traditions according to the Dead Sea Scrolls." *DSD* 8 (2001): 262–277.
———. "Pseudepigrapha in the Pseudepigrapha: Mythical Books in Second Temple Literature." *RevQ* 21 (2004): 429–438.
———. *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran*. ABRL. Garden City: Doubleday, 1995.
———. "Serekh-Damascus." Pages 868–869 in vol. 2 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
———. "The Temple Scroll and the Halakhic Pseudepigrapha of the Second Temple Period." Pages 121–131 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997*. Edited by E.G. Chazon and M.E. Stone. STDJ 31. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1999.
———. "The Temple Scroll and the Systems of Jewish Law in the Second Temple Period." Pages 239–255 in *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the International Symposium on the Temple Scroll: Manchester, December 1987*. Edited by G.J. Brooke. JSPSup 7. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
———. "The *Temple Scroll* in Literary and Philological Perspective." Pages 143–158 in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Volume 2*. Edited by W.S. Green. BJS 9. Chico: Scholars Press, 1980.
Schmidt, W.H. "דבר." Pages 84–125 in vol. 3 of *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. 14 vols. to date. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–.
Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul: A Tradition Historical Enquiry into the Relation of Law, Wisdom, and Ethics*. WUNT 2,16. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1985.
Schnackenburg, Rudolph. "Die Erwartung des 'Propheten' nach dem Neuen Testament und den Qumran-Texten." Pages 622–639 in *Studia Evangelica, Vol. 1: Papers Presented to the International Congress on 'The Four Gospels in 1957' Held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1957*. Edited by K. Aland et al. TUGAL 73. Berlin: Akademie–Verlag, 1959.

Schniedewind, William M. *How the Bible Became a Book*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
———. "The Source Citations of Manasseh: King Manasseh in History and Homily." *VT* 41 (1991): 450–461.
———. *The Word of God in Transition: From Prophet to Exegete in the Second Temple Period*. JSOTSup 197. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995.
Scholem, Gershom G. "Revelation and Tradition as Religious Categories in Judaism." Pages 282–303 in *The Messianic Idea in Judaism and Other Essays on Jewish Spirituality*. New York: Schocken, 1971.
Schuller, Eileen. "The Cave 4 Hodayot Manuscripts: A Preliminary Description." *JQR* 85 (1994): 137–150.
———. *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: A Pseudepigraphic Collection*. HSS 28. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
Schulz, Paul. *Der Autoritätsanspruch des Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*. Meisenhaim am Glan: Anton Hain, 1974.
Schwartz, Daniel R. "On Pharisaic Opposition to the Hasmonean Monarchy." Pages 44–56 in *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity*. WUNT 60. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1992.
Segal, Moshe Z. *Sefer ben Sira ha-Šalem*. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1958.
Sekki, Arthur E. *The Meaning of Ruaḥ at Qumran*. SBLDS 110. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
Seybold, Klaus. "משח." Pages 43–54 in vol. 9 of *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. 14 vols. to date Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–.
Shaver, Brenda J. "The Prophet Elijah in the Literature of the Second Temple Period: The Growth of a Tradition." Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 2001.
Shaver, Judson R. *Torah and the Chronicler's History Work: An Inquiry into the Chronicler's References to Laws, Festivals, and Cultic Institutions in Relationship to Pentateuchal Legislation*. BJS 196. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
Shemesh, Aharon, and Cana Werman. "Halakhah at Qumran: Genre and Authority." *DSD* 10 (2003): 104–129.
———. "Hidden Things and their Revelation." *RevQ* 18 (1998): 409–427. Repr. and trans. in *Tarbiz* 66 (1997): 471–482.
Shemesh, Aharon. "A Note on 4Q339 'List of False Prophets.'" *RevQ* 20 (2000): 319–320.
Sheppard, Gerald T. "True and False Prophecy within Scripture." Pages 262–282 in *Canon, Theology, and Old Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Brevard S. Childs*. Edited by G.M. Tucker, D.L. Petersen, and R.R. Wilson. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
Siebeneck, Robert T. "May Their Bone Return to Life!—Sirach's Praise of the Fathers." *CBQ* 21 (1959): 411–428.
Sievers, Joseph. *The Hasmoneans and their Supporters: From Mattathias to the Death of John Hyrcanus*. SFSHJ 6. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
Silberman, Lou H. "Unriddling the Riddle: A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Pesher." *RevQ* 3 (1961): 323–364.
Skehan, Patrick W. "*Jubilees* and the Qumran Psalter." *CBQ* 37 (1975): 343–347.

Skehan, Patrick W., Eugene Ulrich, and Judith E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4.IV: Paleo Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts*. DJD IX. Oxford: Clarendon, 1992.

Skehan, Patrick W., and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. AB 39. Garden City: Doubleday, 1987.

Smend, Rudolph. *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach*. 3 vols. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1906.

Soggin, J.A. "מלך." Pages 676–677 in vol. 2 of *The Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann. 3 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997.

Sommer, Benjamin D. "Did Prophecy Cease? Reevaluating a Reevaluation." *JBL* 115 (1995): 31–47.

———. *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.

Stadelmann, Helge. *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter: eine Untersuchung zum Berufsbild des vor makkabäischen Sofer unter Berücksichtigung seines Verhältnisses zu Priester-, Propheten- und Weisheitslehrertum*. WUNT 2,6. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1980.

Starcky, Jean. "Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumrân." *RB* 70 (1963): 481–505.

Stawsky, Daniel B.R. "Prophecy: Crisis and Change at the End of Second Temple Period." *SIDIC* 20 (1987): 13–20.

Stegemann, Hartmut. *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde*. Bonn: 1971.

———. "Some Remarks to 1QSa, to 1QSb, and to Qumran Messianism." *RevQ* 17 (1996): 479–505.

Stemberger, Günter. "Propheten und Prophetie in der Tradition des nachbiblischen Judentums." *JBT* 14 (1999): 145–174.

Stern, Menachem. *Ha-teʿudot le-Mered ha-Ḥašmonaʾim*. Tel Aviv: Kibbutz Hameʾuhad, 1983.

Steudel, Annette. "אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran." *RevQ* 16 (1993–1994): 225–246.

———. "Testimonia." Pages 936–938 in vol. 2 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Stone, Michael E. "The Books of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century B.C.E." Pages 61–75 in *Emerging Judaism: Studies on the Fourth & Third Centuries B.C.E.* Edited by M.E. Stone and D. Satran. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989. Repr. from *CBQ* 40 (1978): 479–492.

Struck, Peter T. *Birth of the Symbol: Ancient Readers at the Limits of their Texts*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.

Strugnell, John, and Devorah Dimant. "4QSecond Ezekiel." *RevQ* 13 (1988): 45–58.

———. "The Merkabah Vision in *Second Ezekiel* (4Q385 4)." *RevQ* 14 (1990): 341–348.

Strugnell, John, Daniel J. Harrington, and Torleif Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: 4QInstruction (Musar leMevin): 4Q415ff.* DJD XXXIV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.

Strugnell, John. "Moses-Pseudepigrapha at Qumran: 4Q375, 4Q376, and Similar Works." Pages 221–256 in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman. JSPSup 8. JSOT / ASOR Monographs 2. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.

———. "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan.'" *RevQ* 7 (1970): 163–276.

Stuckenbruck, Loren. *The Book of Giants from Qumran*. TSAJ 63. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.

Sukenik, Eliezer L. *Megillot Genuzot: Seqira Šeniah*. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1950.

———. *Oṣar ha-Megillot ha-Genuzot: Še-be-Yede ha-'Universitah ha-'Ivrit*. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, the Hebrew University, 1954.

Sutcliffe, Edmund F. "The General Council of the Qumran Community." *Bib* 40 (1959): 971–983.

Swanson, Dwight D. *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT*. STDJ 14. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. "The Emergence of Jewish Sectarianism in the Early Second Temple Period." Pages 165–201 in *King, Cult, and Calendar in Ancient Israel*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1986.

———. "Notes on the Habakkuk Scroll." *VT* 1 (1951): 33–37 Repr. pages 142–146 in *The World of Qumran from Within: Collected Studies*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1990.

Tanzer, Sarah J. "The Sages at Qumran: Wisdom in the *Hodayot*." Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1987.

Teeple, Howard M. *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*. JBLMS 10. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1957.

Tigay, Jeffrey. *Deuteronomy: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1996.

Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. "The Addressees of 4QInstruction." Pages 62–75 in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998*. Edited by D.K. Falk, F. García Martínez, and E.M. Schuller. STDJ 35. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000.

———. *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction*. STDJ 44. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2001.

———. "Towards a Reconstruction of the Beginning of 4QInstruction (4Q416 Fragment 1 and Parallels)." Pages 99–126 in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*. Edited by C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger. BETL 159. Leuven: Peeters, Leuven University Press, 2002.

Tov, Emanuel, et al. *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the* Discoveries in the Judaean Desert *Series*. DJD XXXIX. Oxford: Clarendon, 2002.

Trebolle Barrera, Julio. "Elijah." Page 246 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Treves, Marco. "On the Meaning of the Qumran Testimonia." *RevQ* 2 (1960): 569–571.
Tuell, Steven S. *The Law of the Temple in Ezekiel 40–48*. HSM 49. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
Tucker, Gene M. "The Law in the Eighth-Century Prophets." Pages 201–216 in *Canon, Theology, and Old Testament Interpretation*. Edited by G.M. Tucker, D.L. Petersen, and R.R. Wilson. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
Uffenheimer, Benjamin. *Early Prophecy in Israel*. Transled by D. Louvish. Jerusalem: Magnes and the Hebrew University, 1999.
Ulrich, Eugene. "4QSam^{c}: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2 Samuel 14–15 from the Scribe of the Serek Hay-yaḥad (1QS)." *BASOR* 235 (1979): 166–188.
———. "Daniel, Book of, Hebrew and Aramaic Text." Pages 170–174 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
———. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
———. "The Text of Daniel in the Qumran Scrolls." Pages 573–585 in *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*. Edited by J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint. VTSup 83,2. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2001.
———. "The Text of the Hebrew Scriptures at the Time of Hillel and Jesus." Pages 85–108 in *Congress Volume: Basel 2001*. Edited by A. Lemaire. VTSup 92. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2002.
Urbach, Ephraim E. "Halakhah ve-Nevuah." *Tarbiz* 18 (1946–1947): 1–27. Repr. pages 21–49 in *Me-'Olamam shel Ḥakhamim: Qoveṣ Meḥkarim*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988.
———. "Matai Pasqa ha-Nevuah?" *Tarbiz* 17 (1945–1946): 1–11. Repr. pages 58–68 in M. Weinfeld, ed. *Miqra'ah be-ḥeqer ha Miqra*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1979. Repr. pages 9–20 in E.E. Urbach, *Me-'Olamam shel Ḥakhamim: Qoveṣ Meḥkarim*. Jerusalem: Magnes, 2002.
———. *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*. Translated by I. Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1975.
Vaux, Roland de. "La Grotte des manuscripts hébreux." *RB* 66 (1949): 586–609.
VanderKam, James C. *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. CBQMS 16. Washington D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.
———. "Mantic Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *DSD* 4 (1997): 336–353.
———. "Messianism in the Scrolls." Pages 211–234 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam. CJAS 10. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993.
———. "Sinai Revisited," Pages 44–60 in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Edited by M. Henze. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
———. "Some Major Issues in the Contemporary Study of 1 Enoch: Reflections on J.T. Milik's *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4*." Pages 354–365 in *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*. JSJSup 62. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2000. Repr. from *MAARAV* 3 (1982): 85–97.

———. "Studies on 'David's Compositions' (11QPs[a] 27:2–11)." *ErIsr* 26 (1999; Cross Volume): 212*–220*.
———. "Those Who Look for Smooth Things, Pharisees, and Oral Law." Pages 465–477 in *Emanuel: Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by S.M. Paul, R.A. Kraft, and L.H. Schiffman. VTSup 94. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003.
VanderKam, James C., and Peter W. Flint. *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002.
Verhoff, Pieter A. *The Books of Haggai and Malachi*. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
Vermes, Geza. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. New York: Allen Lane, Penguin, 1997.
———. *An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.
———. "Qumran Forum Miscellanea I." *JJS* 43 (1992): 303–304
Wacholder, Ben Zion. "David's Eschatological Psalter 11Q Psalms[a]." *HUCA* 59 (1988): 23–72.
———. *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness*. MHUC. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983.
———. "Deutero-Ezekiel and Jeremiah (4Q383–4Q391): Identifying the Dry Bones of Ezekiel 37 as the Essenes." Pages 445–461 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceeding of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J.C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000.
———. "A Qumran Attack on the Oral Exegesis? The Phrase אשר תלמוד בשקרם in 4 Q Pesher Nahum." *RevQ* 5 (1966): 351–366.
Wagner, Siegfried. "דרש." Pages 293–307 in vol. 3 of *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. 14 vols. to date. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–.
Weinfeld, Moshe. *Deuteronomy 1–11*. AB 5. Garden City: Doubleday, 1991.
———. *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic School*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.
———. "God versus Moses in the Temple Scroll—"I Do Not on My Own Authority but on God's Authority." (*Sifrei Deut.* sec. 5. *John* 12:48f.)." *RevQ* 15 (1991; Starky Volume): 175–180.
———. "The Temple Scroll or 'The Law of the King.'" Pages 158–185 in *Normative and Sectarian Judaism in the Second Temple Period*. LSTS 54. London: T. & T. Clark, 2005. Repr. from *Shnaton* 3 (1978/1979): 214–237.
Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomenon to the History of Ancient Israel*. Cleveland: Meridian, 1965.
Wernberg-Møller, P. *The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction*. STDJ 1. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1957.
Westermann, Claus. "עבד." Pages 819–832 in vol. 2 of *The Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Edited by E. Jenni and C. Westermann. 3 vols. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997.
———. "Die Begriffe für Fragen und Suchen im AT." *KerD* (1960): 21–22
Wieder, Naphtali. "The Dead Sea Scrolls Type of Biblical Exegesis among the Karaites." Pages 75–106 in *Between East and West: Essays Dedicated in Memory*

of Bela Horovitz. Edited by A. Altman; London: East and West Library, 1958.
———. "The Idea of a Second Coming of Moses." *JQR* 46 (1955–1956): 356–364.
———. *The Judean Scrolls and Karaism*. London: East and West Library, 1962.
———. "The 'Law-Interpreter' of the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Moses." *JJS* 4 (1953): 158–175.
Williamson, H.G.M. *Ezra-Nehemiah*. WBC 16. Waco: Word, 1985.
Wilson, Andrew M., and Lawrence Wills, "Literary Sources of the Temple Scroll." *HTR* 75 (1982): 275–288.
Wilson, Gerald H. "The Prayer of Daniel 9: Reflection of Jeremiah 29." *JSOT* 48 (1990): 91–99.
Wilson, Robert R. "The Prophetic Books." Pages 212–225 in *The Cambridge Companion to Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by J. Barton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
———. "Prophecy and Ecstasy: A Reexamination." *JBL* 98 (1979): 321–337
———. *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.
Winter, Paul. "Notes on Wieder's Observation on the *dwrš htwrh* in the Book of the New Covenanters of Damascus." *JQR* 45 (1954): 39–47.
Wirgin, W. "Simon Maccabaeus and the *Prophetes Pistos*." *PEQ* 103 (1971): 35–41
Wise, Michael O., and James Tabor, "4Q521 'On Resurrection' and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition: A Preliminary Study." Pages 151–160 in *Qumran Questions*. Edited by J.H. Charlesworth. BS 36. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995. Repr. from *JSP* 10 (1992): 149–162.
———. "The Messiah at Qumran." *BAR* 18, no. 2 (1992): 60–65.
Wise, Michael O., Martin Abegg Jr., and Edward Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996.
Wise, Michael O. *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Cave 11*. SAOC 49; Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1990.
———. "The Temple Scroll and the Teacher of Righteousness." Pages 121–147 in *Mogilany 1989: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Offered in Memory of Jean Carmignac*. Edited by Z.J. Kapera. Krakow: Enigma, 1991.
Wolfson, Elliot R. *Through a Speculum that Shines: Vision and Imagination in Medieval Jewish Mysticism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
Wolfson, Harry A. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947.
Wright, Benjamin G. "The Apocryphon of Ezekiel and Pseudo Ezekiel." Pages 462–480 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 1997*. Edited by L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J.C. VanderKam. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, the Israel Museum, 2000.
Xeravits, Geza G. *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists in the Qumran Library*. STDJ 47. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2003.
———. "Wisdom Traits in the Qumranic Presentation of the Eschatological Prophet." Pages 183–192 in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. Edited by F. García Martínez. BETL 168. Leuven: Leuven University Press, Peeters, 2003.

Yadin, Azzan. "The Fall and Rise of Charismatic Intepretation." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Jewish Studies. Washington D.C., December 2005.

Yadin, Yigael. "A Note on Melchizedek and Qumran." *IEJ* 15 (1965): 152–154.

———. *The Ben Sira Scroll from Masada*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1965.

———. "Is the Temple Scroll a Sectarian Document?" Pages 153–169 in *Humanizing America's Iconic Books: Society of Biblical Literature Centennial Addresses 1980*. Edited by G.M. Tucker and D.A. Knight. Chico: Scholars Press, 1982.

———. *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*. Translated by B. and C. Rabin. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.

———. "The Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews." Pages 36–55 in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by C. Rabin and Y. Yadin. ScrHier 4. Jerusalem, Magnes, 1958.

———. *The Temple Scroll*. 3 vols. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, the Shrine of the Book, 1983.

———. "Three Notes on the Dead Sea Scrolls." *IEJ* 6 (1956): 158–162.

Zevit, Ziony. *The Religions of Israel: A Synthesis of Parallactic Approaches*. London Continuum, 2001.

Zimmerli, Walther, and Joachim. Jeremias, *The Servant of God*. SBT 20. London: SCM, 1952.

Zimmerli, Walther. *Ezechiel*. BK 13/1. Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1969.

Zimmermann, Johannes. *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran*. WUNT 2,104. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.

Zobel, Hans-Jürgin. "גלה." Pages 476–488 in vol. 2 of *The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. 14 vols. to date Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–.

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

Hebrew Bible

Genesis
20:7 88n
24:31 94n
26:29 94n
28:10–22 199n
35:7 199n
41:6 94n

Exodus
10:7 110n
15:26 43n
20 159n, 160n
20:1 117
20:16 119
20:18 118, 160n
20:18–21 117, 119
20:21 118
20:22 159, 171–173
20:24 119
23:20–21 138–139
24:15–18 119
28:11 94n
33:11 117
33:19 125
34:35 125

Leviticus
1:1 38n
1:5 110
24:10–23 38n
27:25 359n

Numbers
4:27 115n
9:6–13 38n
12:2 99n, 117
12:6 99n, 199n, 200n
12:7–8 200n
15:32–36 38n
21:8 295
21:18 191, 340n
22–24 243
24:2 244n
24:4 116n, 200n, 244–245, 249, 265
24:15–17 159n, 160
24:16 115n, 116n, 200n, 244–245, 249, 267, 372n
24:17 326, 340
27:1–11 38n

Deuteronomy
4 209
4:1 55
4:5 55
5:4 117
5:4–5 117
5:25–26 159–161, 171–173, 175
5:28 55, 58–60
5:28–29 171
6:1 55
6:16 42
6:18 42n
9:6 127
9:10 127
9:15–22 38n
11:4 150
12:23 150
12:27 43n
12:28 42, 43n
13 7n, 40n, 301, 303
13:2–6 301
13:3 303
13:6 72n, 97n, 99
13:19 42, 43n
17:14–20 235
18 27n, 200n

18:15–22 40n, 301
18:18 27n, 115n, 138n, 154, 159n, 172n, 187n, 199n, 200n
18:18–19 158–159, 171–173, 175
21:9 43n
28 14n
30:2 124
30:4 141n
31 114n
31:19 55n
31:22 55n
31:29 360
32:7 242
32:24 94n
33:1 109, 113n, 265
33:8–11 159n, 160
33:19 106n
34:10 117, 138n, 249n

Joshua
1:1 126
1:7–8 56n
6:26 161n
9:25 42n
13–19 109n
14:6 106n, 109–110

Judges
13:6 106n
13:8 106n
17:2 94n

1 Samuel
2:27 106n, 199n
3 66n
3:7 200n
3:21 200n
6:19 324n
9 113n
9:6–10 106n
9:9 25n
9:15 200n
10:10–13 95n
12:23 42n, 43n
17:46–47 126
25:25–26 357
25:26 357
25:31–33 257

2 Samuel
7:17 200n
7:27 200n
22 120
23:1 253
23:2 99n, 254
23:1–7 253

1 Kings
4:32 252n
5:12 252n
11:38 43n
12:22 106n, 108n
13 106n
14:18 122n
15:29 122n
17:13 127
17:18 106n
17:24 106n
18:36 122n
18:46 210
19:16 85, 88
19:19–21 88–89, 90
20:28 106n

2 Kings
1 106n
3:15 210n
4 106n
5:8 106n
5:14–15 106n
5:20 106n
6:6 106n
6:9–10 106n
6:15 106n
7:2 106n
7:17–19 106n
8:2 106n, 113n
8:4 106n, 113n
8:7 106n
8:8 106n
8:11 106n
9:36 122n
10:3 42n

10:10 122n
14:25 122n
17:13 39n, 40n, 44n, 60
22:8 99n
23:3 42n
23:16–17 106n

Isaiah
1:1 199n
1:7 94n
2:1 200n
8:11 210n
14:19 94n
21:2 200n
22:14 200n
29:10 65n
30:3 122n
30:8–9 81
30:10 81
40:3 50
49:6 140n, 141n
52:7 92–93, 178n, 179–182
53:4 94n
54:11 355–356
58:13 40n
61:1 62n, 85, 89, 90, 92–95, 102, 129, 146, 177, 386
61:1–2 180–183, 184
61:2–3 182n
61:1–7 89n
63:10–11 62n

Jeremiah
1:4 200n
1:9 200n
6:13 290n
15:17 210n
17:21–22 40n
18:18 27n
23:25–32 200n
23:29 349n
23:33–40 204n
25:9–12 214
26:7 290n
26:8 290n
26:11 290n
26:14 42n, 43n
27–29 216n
27:9 290n
28:1 290n
29 217n
29:1 290n
29:8 290n
29:12–14 218
32:41 42n
32:44 388n
32:45 99n
35:4 106n
43:7 225n

Ezekiel
1 233
1:3 210n
3:1–3 203n
3:14 210n
3:22 210n
8:1 10n
14:3–4 286n
18 39n
30:1–5 233
37:1–14 232, 233
37:1 210n
37–43 233
40:1 210n
40–48 39n
44:15 70–71

Hosea
1:2 99n
2:10 45
3:4 209
5:10 292n
6:5 200n

Joel
3:1–5 137n

Amos
3:7 128
3:17 209
5:26 340
5:26–27 340

Nahum
3:8–10 228–230
3:4 294

Habakkuk
1:5 30, 350
2:3 214n
2:17 355n

Haggai
2:11–13 150n

Zechariah
5:1–4 204n
8:9–11 209
10:2 200n
13:2 290n
13:2–6 204n

Malachi
2:4 45n, 58n, 60
3 137–139, 155, 163, 175n, 184, 185, 195–196, 385
3:1 138–139
3:13 99n
3:22 60
3:22–24 139
3:23 108
3:24 138–139, 147–148, 164n

Psalms
1:2 318n, 325
18 120
18:1 113n, 126
25:8 42n, 43n
31:19 99n
36:1 113n, 126
45:2 350
51:13 62n
73 243n
74:9 13, 16n
77:9 13n
82:1 178n
90:1 106n, 109, 249
105:15 85, 88, 90
105:26 122n
109:20 99n
115:5 94n
145:1 119n

Proverbs
1:8 242n
16:1–2 243n
21:30 243n

Job
4:8 243n
4:12–21 243n
5:27 243n
8:8 243n
12:11 243n
12:12–13 243n
13:1–2 246n
15:2–16 243n
15:8 243n
15:10 242n
15:17 243n
21:29 246n
28 243n, 246n
32 243n
32:9 246n
33:13–18 243n
34:3–4 243n
36:15 319n
42:2–6 243n

Lamentations
2:14 319n
4:22 319n

Qoheleth
4:13–14 246n

Esther
9:23 152n
9:27 152n

Daniel
1–6 213n, 273n
1:17 216n, 272
2:12 163

2:20 272
2:21 272
2:23 272
2:28 273, 319n
2:45 257n
5 204n
7–12 213n, 215, 238, 273n
7:1 215n
7:1–14 273
7:15 273
7:16 273
8:1–14 273
8:1 215n
8:5 216n
8:15 273
8:16 218
8:17 214n, 274
8:27 216n
9 5n, 10n, 11n, 201n, 214–221, 224n, 225, 238, 272, 275n, 344n, 345, 352
9:2 215, 218
9:10 39n, 44n, 60
9:11 122n, 127n
9:4–19 217
9:20–21 218
9:22 218, 274
9:23 216n, 218
9:24 218, 219
9:24–27 218
9:25 92n, 93n, 180
9:26 92n
9:26–27 219
10 217n
10:1 215n
10:11 216n, 274
10:14 214n
10:21 224
11:1 215n
11:27 214n
11:35 214n
12:4 274
12:8–9 274
12:10 274

Ezra
1:5 58n
3:2 106n, 108, 110–111
7:6 210
7:9 210n
7:28 210n
8:18 210n
8:20 112n
8:22 210n
8:31 210n
9:9–10 39n, 44n, 60
9:11 127

Nehemiah
2:8 210n
2:12 351n
2:18 210n
7:5 351n
8:8 56
8:13 56
9 55, 62n
9:13–14 55, 57
9:14 124
9:20 55,56n
9:24 54n
10:30 122n, 127n
12:24 106n, 108, 111, 112n
12:36 106n, 108, 111, 112n
12:45–46 112n

1 Chronicles
6:34 122n, 127n
12:19 208
16:22 85, 88, 90
17:25 200n
22:8 112
23:14 106n, 108
28:4–7 113
28:19 112, 113

2 Chronicles
8:13–14 111–112
8:14 106n, 108, 111
11:1 106n
11:2 108n
12:5 108n
12:15 108n

14:1 42n, 43n
15:1–8 208
18:27 99n
20:14–17 208
21:12 108
24:9 122n, 127n
24:17–22 208
25:7–9 108n
25:7 106n
25:9 106n
29:25 39n, 44n, 60, 112, 113
29:11 110
30:16 106n, 108, 110
31:20 42n, 43n
33:19 66n
35:20–22 208
35:11 110
35:22 350n
36:15–16 208n

New Testament

Matthew
5:17–18 386
11:5–6 144n
11:7–15 155n

Mark
6:14–16 155n
17:10–13 155n

Luke
4:16–20 386
4:18–19 89n
7:22–23 144n

John
1:17 386
1:19–21 155n
1:20 187n
1:21 138n

Acts
1:16 112n
2:25–31 112n
2:34 112n
3:22 138n, 386
13:41 31n

Hebrews
11:32 112n

Jude
14–16 260n

Apocrypha

Additions to Daniel: Prayer of Azariah
15 15

Susanna 246n

Ben Sira 140–142, 154–155, 163–164, 175n, 184, 185, 196, 202n, 255–257, 275, 310–314, 373, 379, 385
24:21–33 312
36:21 256n
38:23–29 314
38:24–39:1 313
38:24–39:11 310
39:1–4 310
39:1–11 310
39:5 310
39:6 311, 312n
39:7–11 311
39:27–43:30 255n
43:19 256
44:1–50:24 8n, 255
45:5 63n
45:17 63n
47:23 141n
48:8 89n
48:10 140–142, 163
48:11 141
48:12 311
48:20–25 247, 255–257
50:27 312n
51:13–30 255n

Baruch
1:21 13

1 Maccabees 149–154, 175, 187
4 149
4:42–46 149–150
4:46 13n150
9:27 13n, 149
14:25–27 151
14:25 152
14:35–38 151
14:35 152–153
14:38–39 153
14:40 151
14:41 13n, 149, 150–154
14:44 152
14:47 152

2 Esdras
1:1 211n
12:42 211n

4 Ezra 8n
12 239n

Pseudepigrapha

1 Enoch 202n, 261–272, 311n, 329
1–36 261n
1:2 265
1:2–3 264, 265, 267
1:9 260n
2:1–5:4 246n
5:8 265
9:4–11 264
12–16 266
14–15 265
14–16 260
17–19 265
19:3 265
24:4 229n
37–71 261n, 262, 270n
37:1 370n
37:4–5 270n
72–82 261n
81:1 268
81:2 266, 268
81:5–82:3 266
82:1–2 266, 270
82:1–5 270
83–91 261n
84:3 264
85–90 261n
91:11–17 261n, 264n
92–105 259, 261n
92:1 270
93:1–2 267
93:1–10 261n
93:2 270
93:10 264n, 280
103:1–2 268
104:11–13 270
106–107 261n
106:19 268, 319n
108 262

2 Baruch 8n
85:1 14

Jubilees
1:2–3 118n
15:25 54n
16:9 54n
16:29 54n
18:19 54n
28:6 54n

Psalms of Solomon
17:28 141n

Sibylline Oracles
3:164 257n
3:299 257n
3:822 257n

Dead Sea Scrolls

CD (Damascus Document)
1:1–11 192n
1:8 294
1:8–9 371

1:9–10 5n
1:11–14 371
1:14–15 294
1:16 293, 294
1:18 284n, 293
2:12 62n, 65, 72n, 75, 85, 86n, 87n, 88, 95, 98
2:12–13 67–68, 70
3:10 291n
3:10–12 341
3:11 28n
3:13–14 336, 341
3:21–4:4 335n
4:3–6 70–71
4:8 168
4:14 28n
5 294
5:2–5 341n
5:15 291
5:15–17 291n
5:17–19 291
5:18 87n
5:20 98, 292n, 293
5:20–6:2 290–296
5:21–6:1 41n, 62n, 72n, 88, 97–100, 331n
6:1 28n, 85, 86n, 87n, 95, 102, 127n
6:2–3 295
6:2–11 292
6:3–11 192
6:7 191–192, 340n
6:11 171, 188, 191–193
7:10 28n
7:14–21 340
7:17 28n
7:17–21 304n
7:19 191
8:3 292n
8:17–19 341
9:8–10 356–357
10:6 56n
12:23–13:1 170, 189n
13:2 56n
14:8 56n
14:18–19 170
19:5 45
19:7 28n
19:15–16 292n
19:35–20:1 190
20:14 5n
20:15 295
20:27 168
20:27–28 169
20:28 350n
20:31–32 168

1QIsa[a] 161n

1QpHab (Pesher Habakkuk) 30–35, 347–353
2:1 30n, 32
2:1–3 350, 351
2:1–4 31n
2:2 32, 294n
2:2–3 381
2:3 5n, 32
2:5–6 32, 34n
2:5–10 30–31, 351
2:6–7 351
2:8 32
2:8–9 351
2:9 124, 127
2:10 33, 34
5:5 146n
5:11 294n
7:1–2 34, 348n
7:2 348, 349n
7:3–5 348–349
7:4 349n
7:4–5 350, 351, 381
7:5 124, 127, 349n
7:7–14 5n
7:10 78n
7:11 50n
8:1 50n
12:4 50n, 354n, 355b

1Q14
10 6 354n

1Q19 261n

1QapGen
2 261n

1Q22 8n

1Q25 9n

1Q26 314, 321
1 4 319n, 320n

1Q27 320–321
1 i 3–4 322

1QS (Rule of the Community)
1:1 50n
1:1–3 42, 51n
1:1–10 173
1:2–3 47, 60, 87n, 101, 127
1:3 124, 173
1:7 50n, 147n
1:16–3:12 75
2:5–9 73n
4:13–4:26 323
3:15 372
4:20–21 372
4:20–22 188
4:22 249n, 372
5 167n, 335, 337
5:2 335n
5:7–12 340n
5:7–13 332n
5:8 50, 336–337
5:8–9 42n, 335–337, 338, 340
5:11–12 335, 336
5:21 166n
6:3 147n
6:9–13 354
8 339
8–9 49n, 157n
8:1–10 49n, 354
8:1–12 49
8:12–13 50
8:14–16 49
8:15 50n, 51, 319, 336–337, 339, 340
8:15–16 49, 50, 53, 60, 75, 334–340
8:15b–9:11 49n, 50n, 157n, 337
8:16 51, 61n, 74, 334
9 169, 339
9:3–6 166
9:7 166, 192n
9:8–9 166
9:9–10 166
9:9–11 161
9:10 158n, 167
9:11 134, 157, 158n, 161–165, 166–171, 174–175, 177, 185–188, 189, 195–196, 383, 331n
9:12 50n
9:12–13 337–340
9:13 339, 373
9:15 158n
9:17–18 373
11:3–4 320, 372
11:5–6 372
11:11 372
11:17–18 372

1QSa 162n
1:7 56n

1Q30 85, 95, 98n

1Q32 200n

1QM (War Scroll)
1:16 79n
11:1–3 126
11:7 87n
11:7–8 65, 68, 72n, 75, 85, 86n, 88, 95

1QH^a (Hodayot)
364–371, 374–375, 381
2:36 283n
5:8–9 367n, 368n
5:24–25 368n
6:2 79n

6:8 368n
6:12–13 375n
6:12–14 367n, 368n
6:25 367n, 368n
7:12 367n
9 365n
9:7–8 367n
9:20–21 375n
9:21 368n
9:26 367n
10–17 364, 365n, 367n
10:13–16 76–80
10:14 284n
10:15 78, 81, 284
10:15–16 78
10:16 284n
10:18 368n
10:31 284n
10:31–35 284n
10:32 284
11:22–23 367n
12 365n, 372
12:5–17 280–290
12:5–29 282
12:5–13:4 281, 369–371
12:6 282, 287n, 368n, 370
12:6–8 282
12:6–9 283n
12:7 282, 283, 289, 370
12:8–9 282, 284n
12:9–10 282n, 283
12:9–11 281
12:10 80, 283
12:11 280n, 370
12:11–13 286
12:12–16 286
12:13 370
12:13–16 281
12:14–16 287
12:14–17 280n
12:15 286
12:16 80, 281, 283, 287n
12:17 283
12:17–18 286n, 289
12:18 280n, 370
12:20 80, 283, 286n
12:21 283
12:23 368n, 370
12:27–28 367n, 368n, 371
12:29–13:4 282
13–14 365n
13:9 368n
13:9–10 368n
13:26 367n, 368n
14:20 283n
15:26–27 367n, 368n
16:1 368n
17:16 367n
17:17 367n
17:31 367n, 368n
17:38–18:14 365n
18:7 367n
18:27 367n
19:4 368n
19:9–10 367n, 368n
19:16 368n
19:16–17 367n
19:27–28 367n
20:11–13 367n, 375n
20:32–34 367n, 368n
21:4–8 367n
22:7 367n
23:5–7 367n, 368n
23:14–15 92n
26:1 367n, 368n
27:7–8 367n
frg. 2 ii 8 368n
frg. 3 14 368n
frg. 4 7 368n
frg. 4 12 368n
frg. 5 9–11 368n
frg. 8 15 368n
frg. 10 9 367n

2Q18 255n

2Q20 8n

2Q23 9n

2Q24 200n

3Q4
3 28n

4Q33 (4QDeut[f]) 173n

4Q37 (4QDeut[j]) 173n

4Q39 (4QDeut[l]) 113n, 173n

4Q51 (4QSam[a]) 113n

4Q53 (4QSam[c]) 161n

4Q116 (4QDan[e])
10n

4Q158
6 160n
66 27n

4Q160 66n

4Q161
8–10 iii 23 171n

4Q163
15–16 2 65n
23 iii 10 284n

4Q164
1 2–3 355–356

4Q165
1–2 1 28n

4Q166 (Pesher Hosea)
2:1–6 44–45
2:2–3 60
2:5 124, 127

4Q169
3–4 i 2 284n, 285
3–4 i 7 284n
3–4 ii 2 284n
3–4 ii 4 284n
3–4 ii 8 294
3–4 iii 3 284n
3–4 iii 7 284n
3–4 iii 8–iv 5 228n

4Q171 (Pesher on Psalms[a])
1–2 ii 8–11 92n
1–10 i 26–27 394
1–10 ii 14 32n
1–10 ii 15 354n
1–10 ii 23 50n
1–10 iii 12 32n
1–10 iii 15 32n, 50n
1–10 iv 26–27 350

4Q174 (Florilegium)
1–2 i 14 29n
1–2 i 15 28n, 29n
1–2 i 16 28n
1–3 ii 3 28n, 29n
5 3 65n
5 4 66
5–6 2 28n
5–6 5 28n

4Q175 (Testimonia)
27n, 134, 158–165, 171–175, 177, 185–188, 192, 195–196, 331n, 383
1–4 171
1–8 160–161
5–6 172
5–7 27n
8–13 160
13–20 160
21–30 161

4Q176
1–2 4 29n

4Q177
5–6 5 29n
5–6 9 28n, 29n
5–6 11 29n
7 3 28n, 29n
12–13 i 1 27n

4Q180–181 178n

4Q201
1 i 2–4 264

4Q204
5 ii 26–27 268, 321n

4Q212
1 iii 18–22 267
1 iv 13 264

4Q232 200n

4Q242–246 8n, 203n, 213n, 214n

4Q243–245 221–225

4Q243
2 2 221
6 1–4 222, 223
9 223

4Q245
1 i 224
1 i 4 224
2 i 224

4Q246 225

4Q248 229n

4Q253a
1 i 5 189n

4Q255
1 1 42n
1 2 42n

4Q256
4 7–8 335

4Q257
1 1 42n
1 1–2 42n

4Q258
1 6–7 335
3 vi 7–8 51n
4a i + 4b 158n

4Q259 159
1 iii 157n, 158
1 iii 5–6 50n, 337
1 iii 6–7 339
1 iii 8–10 338

4Q265
1 3 28n, 29n
6 1–7 6 354
7 7–8 354–356

4Q266
1 a–b 4 292n
2 i 19 293
2 i 21 284n
2 ii 12–13 68n
3 ii 17 292n
3 iii 18 28n

4Q267
2 4 292n
2 6 28n, 85, 86n, 87n, 95n, 98n
9 i 4–5 256n

4Q269
4 i 1–3 98n
4 i 2 28n

4Q270
1 i 9–2 ii 21 72n
2 ii 13–15 72n
2 ii 14 62n, 85, 87n, 95, 98n
7 i 15–16 168n

4Q271
1 2 292n, 293n

4Q280
2 1 75
2 1–7 75
2 5–7 73
2 6 74
2 7 74
3 2 292n, 293n

4Q285
4 3 28n, 29n
7 1 28n, 29n

4Q286
7 ii 10–12 73

4Q287
6 10–11 73
10 13 62n, 85, 87n, 95, 98n

4Q292
2 4 99n, 124

4Q339 299, 304–306, 307
3 305
7 305
7 305
9 306

4Q375–376 (Moses Apocryphon)
8n, 46, 299, 301–304, 307

4Q375
1 i 301
1 i 1 102
1 i 1–2 48, 301
1 i 1–4 48, 302n
1 i 4–5 301
1 i 4–9 301
1 i 5–9 301
1 i 6 303
1 i 7 303
1 i 8–9 302
2 i 302

4Q376 301, 302
1 ii 7–8 302n

4Q365
2 8 124n

4Q377 (Apocryphal Pentateuch B)
2 ii 4–6 100–102
2 ii 5 48n, 85, 86n, 95, 187
2 ii 10 114
2 ii 10–12 116–119
2 ii 11 187

4Q378 (Apocryphon of Joshua)
3 i 4 114–115
22 i 2 125n
26 1–3 115–116, 249–250, 269, 275, 372n
26 2 114
26 5–6 250

4Q379
2 28n

4Q380
1 ii 8 119n
4 1 119n

4Q381 (Non-Canonical Psalms)
15 7 86n
24 a +b 4 114, 119–121
69 1–5 53–57
69 5 45

4Q382
31 5 28n

4Q383–384, 385a, 387, 387a, 388a, 389–390 (Apocryphon of Jeremiah)
8n, 225, 345

4Q383
6 1 28n

4Q384
7 2 225n

4Q385a
17 ii 228–230
17 ii 1–3 229
17 ii 4–9 229
18 i a–b 2 28n
18 i a–b 6 28n
18 i a–b 7–11 41n, 47n
B 1 28n

4Q387
2 ii 226

4Q389
1 226
5 226
6–7 226

4Q390
1 57, 58, 61
1 4–7 57
1 5–6 58
1 6–7 45n
1 6 60
1 8 59
2 60
2 i 4–5 47
2 i 5 45n, 124n, 127

4Q385, 385b, 385c, 386, 388, 391 (Pseudo-Ezekiel)
8n, 225, 231–235, 345, 347, 354, 379

4Q385
1 1 232n
2+3 232
2 5 28n, 232n
2 6 28n
2 7 28n
3 4 232n
4 232
4 5 232n
6 233
12 4 232n

4Q385b
1 1 232n
1 2 28n

4Q386
1 i 232
1 i 4 28n
1 ii–iii 232
1 ii 2 232n

4Q388
7 232

4Q397
14–21 10 28n
14–21 15 28n

4QMMT
C 10 28n
C 17 28n
C 27 43n
C 31 43

4Q400–407 7n

4Q401
11 179n

4Q410 66–67n, 279n
1 7 62n

4Q415–418, 418a, 418c, 4Q423, 1Q26 (1Q/4QInstruction)
363, 367, 310, 314–329, 372, 379

4Q415
6 4 324

4Q416
1 316n, 326n
2 i 5 324
2 i–iv 316n
2 iii 9 322, 324, 325n
2 iii 14 322, 324, 325n
2 iii 18 319n, 322
2 iii 21 322
6 4 322

4Q417
1 i 1 326
1 i 1–13 316–319
1 i 1–27 322
1 i 3–4 322
1 i 6 324, 325
1 i 6–7 318
1 i 6–8 322

1 i 7–8 318
1 i 8 324
1 i 8–9 318, 322
1 i 10–12 318
1 i 11 326n
1 i 11–12 318
1 i 13–18 325–328
1 i 14 326
1 i 15 326
1 i 15–16 326
1 i 16 327–328
1 i 17 328
1 i 17–18 328
1 i 18 324
1 i 18–19 322
2 i 2–3 322
2 i 10–11 322, 324
2 i 10–12 322
2 i 18 322

4Q418
10 1 319n
43 316, 317n
34 317n
77 2 322
77 2–3 320
81 9 320
103 ii 322
123 ii 3–4 322
123 ii 4 319n
184 2 322, 323n
184 2–3 319n
190 2 319n
190 3 256n

4Q423
3 2 322
5 2–3 319n, 320n
5 5 322
7 7 319n, 320n

4Q424
3 3 65n

4Q427 365n
1 1 367n
8 ii 17–18 367n

4Q428
2 1–2 368n
9 1 367n, 368n

4Q429 365n

4Q430
1 2–5 280n
1 7 280n

4Q432
8 1 280n

4Q448 10n

4Q458 66n
1 5 94n
15 2 28n, 67n

4Q481d
2 3 65n

4Q489 66n
1 2 67n

4Q502
163 2 43n

4Q504 (Dibre Hamme'orot)
1–2 iii 4–5 358n
1–2 iii 6–7 359
1–2 iii 6–12 358n
1–2 iii 9 359
1–2 iii 9–14 358–360
1–2 iii 10–11 359
1–2 iii 12 359
1–2 iii 12–13 124, 359, 360
1–2 iii 13 359–360
1–2 iii 14–15 128
1–2 v 15 124
3 ii 19 125n
4 4–5 375n
4 8 125n
6 12 125
9 12 125n

4Q505
122 1 125n

4Q506
131–132 9–11 375n

4Q517 15 1 65n

4Q518 2 1 65n, 66

4Q521 144–148, 155,184, 188, 386
2 ii 1 96n
2 ii 1–2 145–147
2 ii + 4 1 86, 95
2 ii 12 146, 147, 148
2 ii 12–13 147
2 iii 146n
2 iii 1–2 147–148
2 iii 6 146n
7 6 146
8 9 86, 96
9 3 86, 96, 146

4Q529 66

4Q534 203n

4Q541
3 4 247n
7 247n
7 1–2 276n
9 i 246n, 247n

4Q543
5–9 67n

4Q543–549 66n

4Q544
1 67n

4Q546
9 67n
14 67n

5Q547
1–2 ii 67n

4Q551–553 8n, 213n, 214n

4Q554–555 200n

4Q556–558 66n

4Q556
1 7 67n

4Q558 142, 154, 155, 163, 184, 188, 196, 385
54 ii 2 143n
54 ii 4 143–144
68 1 67n

4Q570
30 1 28n

5Q15 203n

6Q4 (6QpapKgs) 113n

6Q10–13 9n

6Q15
3 4 85, 86n, 87n, 95n
3 3–4 98n

6Q21 9n

11Q5 (Psalms Scroll[a]) 28, 112n
16:7 119n
21–22 255n
26 253
26:9–15 254n
27:2–11 126, 250–255, 269, 275, 311, 372
27:3 253
27:11 28n, 253
22:13–14 66n

11Q8
28 8 28n
28 13 28n

11Q13 (Melchizedek)
134, 177–185, 185–188, 195–196, 383, 386
1:12 187n
2 178
2:4 177
2:6 178
2:8 178
2:9 179, 182
2:10 178
2:13 183
2:13–15 179
2:14 183
2:15 28n
2:15–20 91–95, 179
2:15–21 182
2:17 179
2:18 62n, 87n
2:18–20 180n, 182n
2:19–20 181, 183
2:24–25 178

11Q17 7n

11Q19 (Temple Scroll)
234–237, 345, 347, 354, 380
50 300
50:1–5 300
51:11–66 299
53:7 43n
54:8 27n
54:8–9 300n
54:8–18 299–300
54:11 27n, 300n
54:15 27n
55:14 43n
56:12–59 235–236
59:16–17 42n, 43
61:2 27n
61:3 27n
61:4 27n
63:8 42n, 43n

11Q18 200n

PAM 41.842 101n

PAM 42.979 91n

PAM 43.677
6 2 28n

PAM 44.102
66 4 28n

Josephus

Against Apion
1.41 13n

War
1.68 17n
1.78 345n
2.113 345n
2.128 370n
2.159 344n
2.261–264 290n
3.352–353 344n, 348n
6.300–309 298n

Antiquities
6.166 112n
9.267–269 214n
10.97 290n
10.245–246 214n
10.267–276 214n
13.379–383 385
14.172–176 298n
15:3–4 298n
15.370 298n
15.373 345n
17.41–45 298n

Philo

De congressu eruditionis gratia
132 61n

De virtutibus
51 61n

De specialibus legibus
2.104 61n

Rabbinic Literature

Mishnah
Pesaḥim
5:6 110
Soṭa
9:13 14n
9:15 141n
ʻEduyyot
8:7 141n
ʾAbot
1:2 293n

Tosefta
Soṭa
13:2–3 14n

Jerusalem Talmud
Šabbath
1:3 3c 141n
Megillah
1:4 70d 387n
Moʿed Qaṭan
3:1 81c–d 387n

Babylonian Talmud
Berakhoth
35c 154n
Šabbath
104b 387n
108a 154n
ʻErubin
13b 388n
Yoma
9b 14n
27a 110
28b 50n
Megillah
2b 387n
Ḥagigah
10b 388n
Yebamot
11b–12a 349n
Soṭa
48b 14n
Giṭṭin
36a 388n
Qiddušin
72b 141n
82a 54n
Baba Meṣiʿa
59b 387n
Baba Qamma
2b 388n
Sanhedrin
11a 14n
31a 349n
Makkoth
24a 117n
Horayyot
8a 117n
Menaḥoth
29b 205n
Temurah
16a 387n
Niddah
23a 388n
Abot de Rabbi Nathan
B 1 118n

Midrash Halakhah
Sifre Numbers
§13 387n
Sifre Deuteronomy
§345 50n
§357 249n

Midrash Aggadah
Genesis Rabbah
64:4 50n
Leviticus Rabbah
2:10 50n

Canticles Rabbah
8:9 3 14n
Seder Olam Rabba
30 14n
Pesiqta de Rab Kahana
76a 141n

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
Num 25:12 93n
Deut 30:4 141n