

Qumranica Minora I

Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism

By

FLORENTINO GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ

Edited by

EIBERT J.C. TIGCHELAAR

Qumranica Minora I

Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

Edited by

Florentino García Martínez

Associate editors

Peter W. Flint

Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar

VOLUME LXIII

Qumranica Minora I

Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism

By

Florentino García Martínez

Edited by

Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON

2007

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication data

Detailed Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data are available on the Internet at <http://catalog.loc.gov>.

ISSN 0169-9962
ISBN 13: 978 90 04 15569 5
ISBN 10: 90 04 15569 4

© 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

CONTENTS

Foreword	vii
Acknowledgments	xiii
Abbreviations	xv

A. QUMRAN ORIGINS

1. Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis	3
2. A “Groningen” Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History	31
3. Was Judas Maccabaeus a Wicked Priest? Marginal Notes on 1QpHab VIII 8–13	53
4. The History of the Qumran Community in the Light of Recently Available Texts	67
5. 4QMMT in a Qumran Context	91
6. Old Texts and Modern Mirages: The “I” of Two Qumran Hymns	105

B. APOCALYPTICISM

7. Is Jewish Apocalyptic the Mother of Christian Theology?	129
8. Traditions common to <i>4 Ezra</i> and the Dead Sea Scrolls	153
9. The End of the World or the Transformation of History? Intertestamental Apocalyptic	169
10. Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls	195
11. Iranian influences in Qumran?	227

C. HISTORY OF RESEARCH

12. Fifty Years of Research on the Dead Sea Scrolls and Its Impact on Jewish Studies	245
13. New Perspectives on the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls	267

14. André Dupont-Sommer and the Dead Sea Scrolls	285
15. The Study of the Texts from Qumran: A Groningen Perspective	297
Index of Modern Authors	311
Index of Ancient Sources	315

FOREWORD

In 1991, the Groningen Qumran Institute, with Adam S. van der Woude and Florentino García Martínez, became responsible for editing the series *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*. The first new volume to be published in the series was a collection by Florentino García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic: Studies on the Aramaic Texts from Qumran* (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992). In the next fifteen years, the STDJ series published more than fifty volumes, including many dissertations and proceedings of conferences as well as bibliographies on the finds in the Desert of Judah. With Donald Parry, Florentino himself published the voluminous bibliography of the period between 1970 and 1995 (STDJ 19; Leiden: Brill, 1996) and, with other scholars, edited the proceedings of the First, Second, and Third Meetings of the International Organization for Qumran Studies (STDJ 15, 23 and 35; Leiden: Brill, resp. 1994, 1997 and 2000). All these years, he also served as secretarial editor of the *Revue de Qumrân*, and as executive editor and editor-in-chief of the *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period*. As an editor he has been responsible for the publication of many hundreds of articles and dozens of books, often generously suggesting to younger scholars how they could improve the content or presentation of their work.

Alongside all these editorial tasks, Florentino has presented an impressive flow of papers written in many different languages on virtually every aspect of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Many of these papers are now classics in the field, such as his presentation of the so-called “Groningen Hypothesis.” Other papers have remained somewhat more in the background, either due to the fact that they were written in Spanish or French, or because they were published in less widely distributed volumes. The co-editors of *STDJ* suggested to the series’ publisher (Brill) and Florentino that they should collect some of his classic articles together with a selection from the other papers. It goes without saying that such a collection of essays emphatically recognizes Florentino’s manifold contributions to Qumran studies as scholar, editor, organizer, friend and mentor to many younger colleagues. Although the field of Qumran studies is developing rapidly, we co-editors believe these essays contribute in various ways to Qumran scholarship. This present volume is the first of two volumes.

Whereas the second volume contains essays on specific texts and themes, this first volume contains papers of a wider importance, relating to the origins of the Qumran community, the developments of apocalyptic, and the history of scholarship on the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Florentino himself has always called attention to both the history of scholarship, and current and future developments within the field. The third section of this volume contains papers reflecting on the history, present and future of Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship. We are happy to be able to include in this section an English translation of a recent commemoration of André Dupont-Sommer, a scholar Florentino refers to in several of the papers collected in this volume. One needs read only the last paragraph of his homage to Dupont-Sommer to understand Florentino's sense of academic and personal indebtedness to the predecessors in the field, his view on scholarship as an ongoing process, and also the qualities he pursues in his own academic work and fosters in younger scholars: "*courage et fécondité d'une pensée.*" These characteristics manifest themselves in different ways in his own work. The indebtedness to predecessors in the field is often reflected by extensive bibliographies included in the notes; courage and productiveness of thought by his aspirations, clearly visible in the essays in the first two parts of the volume, to put forward his own views on the larger issues that determine our understanding of the texts and the people who produced, copied and read them.

The first section of this volume, entitled "Qumran Origins," contains five papers related to what Florentino himself labelled "A Groningen Hypothesis," but which afterwards became known as "The Groningen Hypothesis," an hypothesis on the origins and early development of the Qumran community as distinct from that of the Essenes. The first two essays in this volume are the two essential and best known expressions of this hypothesis, Florentino's own 1988 paper "Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis," published in *Folia Orientalia*, and the paper jointly published by Florentino García Martínez and Adam S. van der Woude, "A 'Groningen' Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History," which was first presented at the 1988 Groningen conference "The Texts of Qumran and the History of the Community." Another even earlier contribution discussing elements of the Groningen Hypothesis has often been unnoticed, either because it was published in Spanish, or because it appeared in a somewhat obscure Festschrift. This article, "¿Judas Macabeo Sacerdote Impio? Notas al margen de 1Q pHab viii.8–13," has now been translated into English

and is included in this volume. The fourth essay examines, ten years after the first article, to what extent the then newly published Qumran texts, in particular the Calendrical Documents, MMT, the Cave 4 Damascus manuscripts, and 4Q265 (then still referred to as the *Serekh-Damascus* document), shed new light on the existing hypotheses about the origins of the community. The fifth essay places MMT within the Qumran context, but at the same time within the Groningen Hypothesis. Strictly speaking, the sixth essay does not touch upon Qumran origins but has been placed here because it touches upon the figure of the Teacher of Righteousness, who is seen as the founder of the Qumran community.

The reader of this section on Qumran origins and the Groningen Hypothesis is also encouraged to read Florentino's brief response to the papers given at the Second Enoch Seminar in the session "The Groningen Hypothesis Revisited."¹ It would have made little sense to include "Response: The Groningen Hypothesis Revisited," without including the papers to which it responds. One sentence quoted from Florentino's paper is particularly characteristic of his view on scholarly progress: "It is not what I have said or intended to say that is important, but what others have perceived in the Groningen Hypothesis." Nonetheless, the initial formulations of the Groningen hypothesis as collected in this first section of this volume may serve as the starting point for an orientation to the post-1988 discussions of the origins of the Qumran community and the relationship between the Essenes and Qumran.

The second section, succinctly entitled "Apocalypticism", includes some of the most important contributions by Florentino García Martínez to the topic of apocalypticism. Here his position can be characterized as dismissive of the vague and inexact concept of apocalypticism of the 1950s and 1960s which resulted in "pan-apocalypticism", and equally critical of the precise definitions of the late 1970s and early 1980s that reduced apocalypticism to a literary genre, sometimes even eliminating the concept itself. As a third way, which for some time he believed to be a minority position, Florentino consistently argues for a historical approach to apocalypticism in which one traces the evolution of its main ideas by listening to texts that are the children of their own time and circumstances. The first article in this section expresses criticism of the various positions, including a 14-page discussion and critique

¹ In Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and Qumran Origins. New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 310–16.

of Käsemann's influential papers "Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie," and "Zum Thema der urchristlichen Apokalyptik." The last part of this article, as well as the remaining papers in this section, are demonstrations of the third way. These essays discuss characteristic ideas shared by texts generally called apocalyptic, as these themes appear in intertestamental apocalyptic literature and in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

The highlight of this second section is the paper "Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," which might seem to be no more than a lengthy survey of the matter, but which actually is a new and comprehensive explanation of the continuation and further development of earlier Jewish apocalypticism in the thoughts of the Qumran community. One might say this article is the definitive rebuttal of attempts to reduce apocalypticism to a literary phenomenon and an eloquent demonstration that the worldview of the Qumran community evolved from that of earlier Jewish apocalypics. One of the motifs included in that paper, to wit the influence of Zoroastrian thought upon the radicalization of apocalyptic ideas, is further developed in the final essay of this section. This recent paper, "Iranian Influences in Qumran?," is not merely a survey, as might perhaps be expected, but a courageous attempt to reopen a discussion that had long been closed as a response to pan-Iranistic approaches of the 1950s and 1960s.

When we discussed a possible collection of his essays with Florentino, he unassumingly suggested the title *Qumranica Minora*. It should be clear that these papers are by no means minor, but represent major contributions towards understanding the origins and character of the Qumran community, and as such belong to the classics of Qumran scholarship. Therefore, we have retained the original wording as much as possible, and apart from occasional corrections and stylistic harmonization, we have made no attempts to revise them. Exceptions have been made for textual references. Names, sigla, fragment and line numbers, and of course readings, have been subject to change during the editorial processes of the past fifteen years. Whereas, in general, we have maintained the names assigned to manuscripts or compositions as they were used in the original essays (e.g. *Serekh-Damascus Document*, which is now officially referred to as *Miscellaneous Rules*), we have updated the references to sigla, fragment and line numbers in accordance with the present DJD references. Thanks are due to Birgit van der Lans for practical computer assistance, to Wilfred G.E. Watson for translating from French and Spanish the papers in chapters 3, 7, 8, 9, and 14, to Mladen Popović

for preparing the indices, and, last but not least, to the publishing house Brill, which agreed to finance those translations. We trust that this new collection of studies, *Qumran Origins and Apocalypticism*, will make accessible the history of recent scholarship and contribute to the ongoing discussions on the texts from Qumran.

Eibert Tigchelaar
Groningen, 4 May 2006

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The following articles have been published previously and are re-published with permission.

“Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis,” *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1988): 113–36.

“A ‘Groningen’ Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History,” *RevQ* 14/56 (1990): 521–41 [= *The Texts of Qumran and the History of the Community. III. The History of the Community* (ed. F. García Martínez; Paris: Gabalda, 1990), 521–41].

“¿Judas Macabeo Sacerdote Impio? Notas al margen de 1Q pHab viii.8–13,” in *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l’honneur de M. Mathias Delcor* (AOAT 215; Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1985), 169–81; translated by W.G.E. Watson.

“The History of the Qumran Community in the Light of Recently Available Texts,” in *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments* (ed. F.H. Cryer and T.L. Thompson; JSOTSup 290; Copenhagen International Seminar 6; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 194–216.

“4QMMT in a Qumran Context,” in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (ed. J. Kampen and M.J. Bernstein; SBLSymS 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 15–27.

“Old Texts and Modern Mirages: The ‘I’ of Two Qumran Hymns,” *ETL* 78 (2002): 321–39.

“¿La apocalíptica judía como matriz de la teología cristiana?,” in *Orígenes del cristianismo. Antecedentes y primeros pasos* (ed. A. Piñero; Madrid: El Almendro, Universidad Complutense, 1991), 177–99; translated by W.G.E. Watson.

“Traditions communes dans le *IVe Esdras* et dans les MSS de Qumrân,” *RevQ* 15/57–58 (1991): 287–301 [= *Mémorial Jean Starcky. Vol. I* (ed. É. Puech and F. García Martínez; Paris: Gabalda, 1991), 287–301]; translated by W.G.E. Watson.

“¿Fin del Mundo o transformación de la historia? La apocalíptica intertestamentaria,” *Communio* 27 (1994): 3–33; translated by W.G.E. Watson.

“Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism* (ed. B. McGinn, J.J. Collins, and S.J. Stein; 3 vols.; New York: Continuum, 1998), 1:162–92.

“Iranian influences in Qumran?,” in *Apocalyptic and Eschatological Heritage. The Middle East and Celtic Realms* (ed. M. McNamara; Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2003), 37–49.

“Fifty Years of Research on the Dead Sea Scrolls and Its Impact on Jewish Studies,” in *Jewish Studies at the Turn of the 20th Century. Proceedings of the 6th EAJS Congress, Toledo, July 1998* (ed. J. Targarona Borrás and A. Sáenz-Badillos; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 1:231–51.

“New Perspectives on the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism*, (ed. F. García Martínez and E. Noort; VTSup 73; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 231–48.

“André Dupont-Sommer et les manuscrits de la mer Morte,” in *Séance du 14 novembre 2003 Hommage rendu à André Dupont-Sommer* (Paris: Institut de France, Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, 2003), 27–40; translated by W.G.E. Watson.

ABBREVIATIONS

- DJD I D. Barthélemy and J.T. Milik, *Qumran Cave I* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955)
- DJD III M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân. Exploration de la falaise. Les grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q. Le rouleau de cuivre* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan III; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962)
- DJD IV J.A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QP^a)* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan IV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1963)
- DJD V J.M. Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4.I (4Q158–4Q186)* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan V; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968)
- DJD VI R. de Vaux and J.T. Milik, *Qumrân grotte 4.II: I. Archéologie; II. Tefillin, Mezuzot et Targums (4Q128–4Q157)* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert VI; Oxford: Clarendon, 1977)
- DJD VII M. Baillet, *Qumrân grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert VII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982)
- DJD VIII E. Tov with the collaboration of R.A. Kraft, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr) (The Seiyâl Collection I)* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert VIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990)
- DJD IX P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J.E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4.IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert IX; Oxford: Clarendon, 1992)
- DJD X E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert X; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994)
- DJD XI E. Eshel et al., *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part I* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XI; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998)
- DJD XII E. Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XII ; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994)

- DJD XIII H. Attridge et al., *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts Part 1* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994)
- DJD XIV E. Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XIV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995)
- DJD XV E. Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.X: The Prophets* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997)
- DJD XVI E. Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XVI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000)
- DJD XVII F.M. Cross et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XII: 1–2 Samuel* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XVII; Oxford: Clarendon, 2005)
- DJD XVIII J.M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XVIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996)
- DJD XIX M. Broshi et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XIX; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995)
- DJD XX T. Elgvin et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XX; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997)
- DJD XXI S. Talmon, J. Ben-Dov, U. Glessmer, *Qumran Cave 4.XVI: Calendrical Texts* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001)
- DJD XXII G. Brooke et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996)
- DJD XXIII F. García Martínez, E.J.C. Tigchelaar, and A.S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11.II: 11Q2–18, 11Q20–31* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998)
- DJD XXV É. Puech, *Qumrân grotte 4.XVIII: Textes hébreux* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998)
- DJD XXVI P.S. Alexander and G. Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX. Serek ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXVI; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998)

- DJD XXVIII D. Gropp, E. Schuller et al., *Wadi Daliyeh II: The Samaria Papyri for Wadi Daliyeh; Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXVIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001)
- DJD XXIX E. Chazon et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXIX; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999)
- DJD XXX D. Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXX; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001)
- DJD XXXI É. Puech, *Qumrân grotte 4.XXII: Textes araméens, première partie: 4Q529–549* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXV; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001)
- DJD XXXIV J. Strugnell, D.J. Harrington, and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2, 4QInstruction (Mûsar LeMevîn): 4Q415ff* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXXIV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999)
- DJD XXXV J.M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XXV: Halakhic Texts* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXXV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999)
- DJD XXXVI S.J. Pfann, P.S. Alexander et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts; Miscellanea, Part 1* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXXVI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000)
- DJD XXXVIII J.H. Charlesworth et al., *Miscellaneous Texts from the Judaean Desert* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXXVIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000)
- DJD XXXIX E. Tov et al., *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XXXIX; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002)
- DSSSE F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998; Leiden: Brill/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000)
- DSST F. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated. The Qumran Texts in English* (trans. W.G.E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1994; 2d ed.; Leiden: Brill/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996)

A. QUMRAN ORIGINS

CHAPTER ONE

QUMRAN ORIGINS AND EARLY HISTORY: A GRONINGEN HYPOTHESIS*

What we are here calling: “A Groningen Hypothesis” is an attempt (yet another) coherently to relate to each other the apparently contradictory data furnished by the Dead Sea manuscripts as to the primitive history of the Qumran Community.

In essence, this hypothesis proposes:

- 1) to make a clear distinction between the origins of the Essene movement and those of the Qumran group;
- 2) to place the origins of the Essene movement in Palestine and specifically in the Palestinian apocalyptic tradition before the Antiochian crisis, that is at the end of the third or the beginning of the 2nd c. B.C.E.;
- 3) to place the origins of the Qumran group in a split produced within the Essene movement in consequence of which the group loyal to the Teacher of Righteousness was finally to establish itself in Qumran;
- 4) to consider the designation of the “Wicked Priest” as a collective one referring to the different Hasmonaean High Priests in chronological order;
- 5) to highlight the importance of the Qumran group’s formative period before its retreat to the desert and to make clear the ideological development, the halakhic elements, and the political conflicts taking place during this formative period and culminating in the break which led to the community’s establishing itself in Qumran.

This simple announcement already indicates the characteristic elements of this hypothesis and how it differs from the more generally accepted hypotheses:¹

* I should like to express my sincerest thanks to A. MacKinnon for his translation of the text of this paper.

¹ In the context of this “Colloquium” it is useless to insist on the multiplicity of hypotheses formulated to explain the origins of the Qumran group. The oldest hypotheses may be found conveniently assembled in M. Delcor and F. García Martínez, *Introducción a la*

- that which identifies the Qumran Community with the Essene movement and places the origins of the Essenes in the group of the Hasidim and in the opposition to the hellenization of Palestine preceding the revolt of the Maccabees;
- that which places the origins of the Essene movement in Babylon and fixes the origins of the Qumran group in a split occurring within the Essene movement at the time of Jonathan, shortly after the return to Palestine of some of the Babylonian Essenes.

I have already published in detail the objections which prevent my accepting in its entirety either of these two hypothesis,² so that there is no need to recapitulate them here. The first of these hypotheses (which is practically the *communis opinio*) put forward by G. Vermes and J.T. Milik, elaborated by G. Jeremias and perfected by H. Stegemann, reduces Essenism to the marginal phenomenon of Qumran and supposes an influence of the Antiochian crisis of which there is no trace in the Qumran texts. The second, associated with the name of Murphy-O'Connor, avoids both difficulties, but postulates a Babylonian origin, in a pagan context, for the Essene movement, a return to Palestine, and a break and installation in Qumran at the time of Jonathan, a supposition for which there is equally little evidence in the surviving Qumran texts.³

literatura esenia de Qumrán (Academia Christiana 20; Madrid: Cristiandad, 1982), 28–35. My objections to the more recent hypotheses of B.E. Thiering, *Redating the Teacher of Righteousness* (Sydney: Theological Explorations, 1979); *eadem*, *The Gospels and Qumran: A New Hypothesis* (Sydney: Theological Explorations, 1981); *eadem*, *The Qumran Origins of the Christian Church* (Sydney: Theological Explorations, 1983), and of R.H. Eisenman, *Maccabees. Zadokites. Christian and Qumran. A New Hypothesis of Qumran Origins* (StPB 34; Leiden: Brill, 1983); *idem*, *James the Just in the Habakkuk "Pesher"* (StPB 35; Leiden: Brill, 1986) has been expressed in my reviews of the works in *JSS* 14 (1983): 98–99, 194–99; and *JSS* 15 (1984): 210–11. The hypothesis of Norman Golb, who denies the relation between the manuscripts (= MSS) and the ruins of Qumran as well as the Essene origin of the Qumran MSS and postulates that all these come from Jerusalem and were hidden in the various caves by the defenders of the city in the period of the struggle against the Romans (66–70 C.E.) in my opinion neither respects the archaeological evidence nor explains the homogeneity of the content of the MSS, unless we suppose that they are all from the library of a similar group in Jerusalem, when the objections which arise against the usual explanation are opposed to his own hypothesis, cf. his articles: "The Problem of Origin and Identification of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 124 (1980): 1–24 and "Who Hid the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BA* 28 (1987): 68–82.

² F. García Martínez, "Essénisme Qumránien: Origines, caractéristiques, héritage," in *Correnti culturali e movimenti religiosi del giudaismo. Atti del V Congresso internazionale dell'AISSG (S. Miniato, 12–15 novembre 1984)* (ed. B. Chiesa; AISSG Testi e studi 5; Roma: Carucci, 1987), 37–57.

³ The relevant bibliographical references are to be found in García Martínez, "Essé-

Neither of these two more generally accepted theories, then, offer a completely satisfactory explanation of the Qumran origins or of the primitive history of the sect. Each of them undoubtedly includes elements which are valid and which must be retained in any complete account. The distinction between the Essene movement and the Qumran reality and the separation of the origins of Essenism from the Antiochian crisis of Murphy-O'Connor correspond to the data of the manuscripts, as does the placing of the origins of Essenism in Palestine in the Vermes-Milik-Stegemann theory. These elements are equally to be found in our hypothesis. But before proceeding to a detailed explication it is necessary to explain some of the assumptions underlying it.

(1) The first is that any theory which claims to interpret the texts must respect the real limits fixed by archaeology and palaeography. In our case this means that the period of the origins of Qumran must be dated before the pontificate of John Hyrcanus, the time at which the group of sectarians established itself in Qumran. Certainly the accepted opinion, based on the presentation prepared from the findings of the excavations by R. de Vaux in the Schweich Lectures,⁴ admits that the first sectarian occupation of the site goes back to the pontificate of Jonathan. But this conclusion contradicts the findings previously obtained and published by de Vaux⁵

nisme Qumrânien: Origines, caractéristiques, héritage." J. Murphy-O'Connor has recently stated and slightly modified his hypothesis in "The Damascus Document Revisited," *RB* 92 (1985): 223–46; reprinted in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1986* (SBLSP 25; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986): 369–83, but without solving the objections opposed to his hypothesis. P.R. Davies, "Qumran Origins," in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1986*, 361–68, offers an acute criticism of the traditional hypothesis, but his scepticism as to the pesharim information as a possible source of notes on the primitive history of the Community obliges him to stay on the level of the Murphy-O'Connor hypothesis. I have unfortunately not yet been able to obtain the recent thesis of P.R. Callaway, directed by C.A. Newsom and defended at Emory University, *The History of the Qumran Community: An Investigation of the Problem* (see Dissertation Abstracts International A, Vol. 47, No. 8, February 1987, p. 3071-A).

⁴ R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Schweich lectures of the British Academy, 1959* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), 5, 116–17.

⁵ "Il apparaît maintenant que le bâtiment a été construit sous le règne de Jean Hyrcan, il est en tout cas certain qu'il était occupé sous Alexandre Jannée" (*RB* 61 [1954]: 231); "La période Ib commence vraisemblablement sous Alexandre Jannée (103–107 av. J.C.); il est possible mais il n'est pas sur que la période Ia ait débutée sous Jean Hyrcan (134–104), car il semble qu'elle eut une courte durée et que le développement de la communauté exigea très vite une extension des bâtiments, qui trouveront alors leur plan définitif" (*RB* 63 [1956]: 538); "Il est certain que les bâtiments de la période Ib étaient occupés sous son règne. Il est possible que la première installation de la communauté dans la période la se soit faite déjà sous Jean Hyrcan mais ce point ne peut pas être définitivement établi" (*RB* 63 [1956]: 565); "La Communauté s'est installée à Khirbet Qumran à la fin du règne de Jean Hyrcan (134–104 av. J.C.) ou sous Alexandre Jannée (103–76 av. J.C.)" (*La Table Ronde* 107 [1956]: 77); "Elle nous apprend que sur

and the very arguments he advanced to support it.⁶ The fact is that de Vaux modified his opinion between the different “rapport(s) préliminaire(s)” and this presentation (which has come to be regarded as authoritative in the still continuing expectation of the publication of all the excavation material), not owing to the archaeological evidence but with the sole object of giving scope to the theories identifying a single Wicked Priest with Jonathan or with Simon; that is to say, not to close the door to the textual interpretation proposed by Milik and by Cross.⁷ In this connection the formulation used by de Vaux⁸ is revealing, in that this motive is evident, as it is in that of Cross⁹ himself based on the absence of Seleucid coins previous to Hyrcanus, apart from 3 bronzes, without precise dates, from Antioch III, IV and V. If it is borne in mind

l'emplacement d'une installation Israélite ruinée, la communauté s'est fixée a Khirbet Qumrân peut-être au temps de Jean Hyrcan, difficilement avant, et qu'elle y était sûrement sous Alexandre Jannée” (*RB* 66 [1959]: 102).

⁶ These arguments are:—the remains of this occupation are so scanty as to make it certain that the occupation was of short duration;—the absence of coins precludes a precise dating of this period of occupation;—the pottery remains are identical with those of the following period, indicating a continuity between periods Ia and Ib. Period Ib begins during the pontificate of Alexander Jannaeus; since “the modest nature of the buildings and the scarcity of archaeological material attest the fact that this first installation was of short duration” (*Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 5) its extension as far as the pontificate of Jonathan, some 50 years, is gratuitous and without justification.

⁷ J.T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (trans. J. Strugnell; London: SCM Press, 1959), 84–87 identifies the Wicked Priest with Jonathan; F.M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (London: Duckworth, 1958), 107–15, identifies him with Simon.

⁸ “The first installation. Period Ia, is certainly earlier than Alexander Jannaeus... Period Ia may possibly have begun under John Hyrcanus, 134–104 B.C., or one of his immediate predecessors, his father Simon, 143–134 B.C., or his uncle Jonathan, the High Priest from 152 to 143 B.C. Of these three candidates for the title of the Wicked Priest John Hyrcanus can first be set aside since his career and activities do not correspond well with what the documents tell us about the Wicked Priest. There remain Simon and Jonathan. The indications in the documents correspond well with what we know of the latter, and in fact G. Vermes and J.T. Milik have put forward sound arguments for identifying him with the Wicked Priest. F.M. Cross, however, has suggested, on no less solid grounds, that Simon is the figure referred to. The findings of archaeology suggest that Period Ia was of brief duration, and this makes it inadvisable to go back much earlier than the reign of John Hyrcanus and favours the candidacy of Simon rather than Jonathan” (*Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 116–17).

⁹ In analysing the evidence of the coins found he is obliged to admit that: “The absence of Seleucid coppers of pre-Hyrcanus date becomes increasingly difficult to explain with each year one mounts before Hyrcanus’ accession. It becomes decisive evidence against any dating of beginnings at Qumran more than a half dozen years before Hyrcanus, since Seleucid coppers did not cease to circulate on the day Hyrcanus began to mint coppers even among nationalist Jews” (*The Ancient Library*, 43–44).

that Hyrcanus probably only began to coin money from 110 B.C.E.,¹⁰ it becomes evident that the argument contradicts not only the identification of the Wicked Priest with Jonathan but also the very identification with Simon proposed by Cross and that the half-dozen years postulated by the latter are no more than a way out—by which the character can enter!¹¹

(2) Another important methodological presupposition is that the break between the Qumran group and the Essene movement from which it derives must have been preceded by a period of time which may have been long or short but in any case sufficient to permit the ideological development differentiating the Qumran group from the Essene body in which it originated and culminating in the separation. A good many of the problems encountered in the investigation of the origins of Qumran derive from the false assumption that it is the incorporation of the Teacher of Righteousness in the Essene movement that marks the moment of establishing the Community in Qumran. Hence the objection frequently made to the partisans of a literal interpretation of the known chronological dates of CD that this would oblige them to place settlement at Qumran at a date impossibly advanced and incompatible with the archaeological data. Or the awkwardness for Murphy-O'Connor of incorporating in his theory the 20 years which precede the

¹⁰ According to B. Kanael, "The Beginning of Maccabean Coinage," *IEJ* 1 (1950–51): 170–75. The problem is that the numismatic experts cannot agree. Some, such as A. Ben David, "When did the Maccabees begin to strike their first Coins?," *PEQ* 124 (1972): 93–103 and U. Rappaport accept that Hyrcanus was the first Hasmonaean to coin his own money, while others, led by Y. Meshorer, roundly deny that Hyrcanus coined any money, which casts a different light on the attribution of the single coin of Hyrcanus found in Qumran according to de Vaux, and maintain that the first Hasmonaean to coin money was Jannaeus, cf. Y. Meshorer, *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period* (Jerusalem: Am Hassefer, 1967), 41–52. An important argument to this effect is constituted by the publication of a coin of Antiochus VIII, issued in the 20th year of his reign (in 106 or 102 B.C.E.), cf. Y. Meshorer, "The Beginning of the Hasmonaean Coinage," *IEJ* 24 (1974): 59–61, if we accept the hypothesis that this coin was minted in Jerusalem. In any case the principal problem as regards an advanced date lies in the extreme scarcity of Seleucid bronze coins.

¹¹ E.M. Laperrousaz, who has made a critical analysis of the archeological arguments of de Vaux, arriving at a different conclusion as regards the end of Period Ib, admits that it is impossible to give a precise date for the beginning of the Qumran settlement. Period Ia: "Nous estimons, quant à nous, impossible, à partir des seuls éléments fournis par l'archéologie—plus exactement par la fouille des ruines de Qoumrân—de situer avec précisions, à l'intérieur du dernier siècle de la "Période hellénistique" de la Palestine, la Période Ia de Qoumrân" (*Qoumrân. L'établissement Essenien des bords de la Mer Morte. Histoire et archéologie du site* [Paris: Picard, 1976], 33). The same conclusion in his article "Qumran," in *DBSupl.* Vol. 51, col. 752.

entry on the scene of the Teacher of Righteousness and during which the members of the Essene movement are “like blind men groping to find their way.” Given that Murphy-O’Connor places the Essene return to Palestine after 165 B.C.E. and settlement in Qumran in 152 B.C.E. he is obliged to interpret the 20 years as designating half a generation and of understanding this half-generation as covering only 10 years.¹² These problems are eliminated if we recognize the importance and the extent of this pre-qumranic phase or formation period, an extraordinarily fruitful period from which were to proceed the writings which establish the ideological bases of the break with the Essene movement and during which there develop the conflicts which are to issue in the sectarian group’s trek to the desert.¹³

(3) A third presupposition of our hypothesis is that the non-biblical literature found in the various caves of Qumran is related either to the Qumran sect or to the ideological movement in which the sect has its roots. Evidently not all the non-biblical manuscripts encountered are of qumranic origin: the palaeographical dating of certain manuscripts formally rules out their having been composed or copied in Qumran and the long editorial history of various works equally makes it clear that the oldest levels were written in a period prior to the establishing of the Community beside the Dead Sea. But in view of the character of the Qumran Community it seems to me out of the question that it

¹² “To take the ‘twenty years’ literally would place the appearance of the Essenes on the Palestinian scene around 172 B.C., but biblical precedent suggests that this figure is rather to be understood as a round number signifying half a generation... In this perspective the interval between the appearance of the Essenes and the assumption of leadership by the Teacher of Righteousness would be only about ten years—time enough for a youth to grow to full stature as man and so to justify the assertion that it was about half a generation” (J. Murphy-O’Connor, “The Essenes and their History,” *RB* 81 [1974]: 224–25).

¹³ In “The Damascus Document Revisited,” 240, Murphy-O’Connor makes an important observation which apparently contradicts this assumption: “Much of this material (referring to *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees* and the *Testament of the XII Patriarchs*) antedates the foundation of Qumran, but it is not necessary to conclude that it therefore reflects the prehistory of the Essene movement. On the basis of an objective consideration of all the evidence, it is more probable that it was the Teacher of Righteousness who served as the conduit by which such materials entered the Qumran branch of the Essene movement.” That is, that this literature would form part of the prehistory of the Teacher of Righteousness but not of the Essene movement prior to and independent of it. But, since this personage is decisive in the formation of qumranic thought (cf. “The Damascus Document Revisited,” 240: “It would be a grave mistake to underestimate, of the influence of this personage on those Essenes who followed him”) his “prehistory” may be considered as the prehistory of the sect he originated.

should have preserved and made use of works incompatible with its own ideology. The library of the community should not be seen as a modern library, as a kind of repository of the knowledge of the time; the total absence of “profane” works is indicative of this. Nor, considering the exclusive character of the community and the repeated prohibitions of contact with non-members, does it seem to me possible that the community should have kept the religious literature of alien or clearly hostile groups. Even allowing for the ample space necessary to permit an inevitable ideological evolution and recognising that there is nothing that might be considered as a Qumran “canon,” a situation like that of the old libraries of Roman Catholic seminaries in which a special inaccessible section contained the works that the Church had placed on the Index of Prohibited Books is inconceivable in Qumran.

This assumption implies that if the fact of its having being found in Qumran is no guarantee of the Qumranic origin of a given work, it does assure us that the work in question was understood by the Community as compatible with its own ideology (and even more important, with its halakhah), that is as coming from the Essene movement or from the apocalyptic tradition which inspired it. Which amounts to saying that the non-biblical literature found as part of the Qumran library may be classified as follows:

- sectarian works, representing the thought and the halakhah of Qumran in its most developed and typical form;
- works of the formative period, presenting a vision still not so clearly differentiated from the Essenism which is its ultimate source but containing indications of future developments and offering an already characteristic halakhah;
- works which reflect Essene thought and accord with what the classical sources teach us about Essenism or which can be attributed to it;
- works belonging to the apocalyptic tradition which give rise to Essenism and which have been considered as part of the common heritage.

(4) A last assumption, though by no means the least important, is that of the composite character of the basic works and of the possible evolution of the thought reflected in them. This assumption implies the recognition that very many of the best preserved writings incorporate elements from the different period or stages, reinterpreted in the light of historical evolution as well as the acceptance that ideas central in the Community, such as determinism, messianism or eschatology, may

present themselves in different forms in different documents of the community or in different versions of the same document. To mention only the two best-known examples: The “foundation manifesto” of 1QS, originating in the formative pre-qumranic period and transformed for adaptation to the successive historical, theological and organizational developments in the community already settled in Qumran; the Essene nucleus of CD, completed with a series of halakhic prescriptions of the formative period, clearly reinterpreted once the community had been formed, and at a date certainly after the death of the Teacher of Righteousness.¹⁴

This assumption implies the application to the study of the Qumran texts of the same critical methods of historical, literary or redaction analysis as are applied to other texts (such as the Old or New Testament) with a similarly long history of development. On the other hand, the assumption recognizes that the evolution of thought is not necessarily linear and direct and that it is possible for different concepts to have co-existed at the same time. It is this that determines the type of evidence that the hypothesis takes into consideration and the critical way in which this evidence is considered.

The hypothesis here presented about the origins of Qumran is based on these assumptions and makes a clear distinction between the problem of the origins of the Essene movement and that of the origins of the Qumran sect.¹⁵ Information as to the origins of the Essene movement must be sought in the classical accounts of the Essenes, in the Essene works preserved at Qumran and in Essene documents incorporated in later Qumran works.

¹⁴ Mentioned in CD XX 14. On the composite character of CD, cf. P.R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant. An Interpretation of the “Damascus Document”* (JSOTSup 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983) who builds on the previous work of Murphy-O’Connor. On the differences between the two, see my review of Davies’s work in *JSS* 11 (1983): 189–194.

¹⁵ D. Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. M. Stone; CRINT II/2; Assen: van Gorcum / Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 483–550, concludes (547) the presentation of the history of the sect by distinguishing among the origins of the sectarian doctrines, which she places in an indeterminate trend in the 3rd to 2nd c. B.C.E., and the historical and political circumstances which lead to the actual creation of the sect which she does not specify. Even if her conclusion correctly disentangles the ideological origins of the sect from the Antiochian crisis and places those origins in Palestine at a previous date, it does not succeed in identifying the actual territory in which the sectarian doctrines arise (“a wider trend existing in Judaism”) and, above all, maintains the identification of the Essene movement with the sectarian group, thus vitiating all her historical reconstruction.

The study of this material allows us to conclude that Essenism

- is a Palestinian phenomenon,
- dates from before the Antiochian crisis,
- has its root in the apocalyptic tradition.

Information as to the origins of Qumran and the early history of the Community is to be found in the works of the pre-qumran formation period, in the documents of this period incorporated in later sectarian works and in the same sectarian works that (like the pesharim) refer expressly to the period of the origins. A study of the material reveals to us the halakhic, ideological, and political motives bringing about the schism within the Essene movement which is to culminate in the settlement at Qumran and makes it possible to trace at least in outline the conflicts which opposed the Teacher of Righteousness to the various Hasmonaean High Priests.

ORIGINS OF THE ESSENE MOVEMENT

Josephus, who tells us more than anyone else about the Essene movement, first brings them onto the political scene in Palestine in the time of Jonathan together with the Sadducees and Pharisees.¹⁶ This seems to imply that he sees the Essene movement, like that of the Pharisees and Sadducees, as a typically Palestinian phenomenon. This emerges even more clearly in the presentation of the sects in *Ant.* 18.11 where he tells us that these three Hebrew “philosophies,” “which have existed since ancient times” are rooted in “their own traditions,” a notion which Philo in his *Apologia* expresses by saying that they go back to Moses. Josephus (*Ant.* 15.371) certainly characterizes the Essenes as a group “which practises the way of life taught to the Greeks by Pythagoras,” a statement that has been used to fix the origins of the movement in neo-Pythagorean doctrines. But, as has often been pointed out,¹⁷ all that Josephus is doing here is giving his pagan readers a point of reference, to enable them to understand a Palestinian phenomenon, just as he

¹⁶ *Ant.* 13.171–172.

¹⁷ See the references in L.H. Feldman, *Josephus and Modern Scholarship 1937–1980* (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1984), 590–92.

compares the Pharisees (*Vita* 12) to the Stoics.¹⁸ In neither case is there any question of an extra-Palestinian origin.

On the other hand, the fact that Josephus first (*Ant.* 13.171–172) introduces the Essenes, Pharisees and Sadducees at the time of Jonathan, has often been cited as proof of the Maccabean origin of the sects. If this were the correct interpretation of the text, the statement already quoted from *Ant.* 18.11, that they had existed ἦσαν ἐκ τοῦ πάνυ ἀρχαίου or, as Pliny puts it (*Historia Naturalis* 5.73), *per saeculorum milia* would make no sense. But the fact is that Josephus¹⁹ does not say that the sects came into existence at that period, but that the Essenes, like the Pharisees and Sadducees, are sects already ἦσαν in existence in Jonathan's time, which logically suggests that they originated at some earlier date.

But it is not only the classical statements about the Essenes that indicate their Palestinian origin, the pre-qumranic Essene texts themselves indicate as much.

In referring to the Murphy-O'Connor interpretation we suggested that the arguments he uses to postulate a Babylonian origin for the group reflected in the most ancient levels of the *Damascus Document* were unconvincing.²⁰ We may add here that a series of items in these pre-qumranic levels of the CD themselves point to a Palestinian origin, such as a series of halakhic prescriptions referring specifically to the city of Jerusalem and in complete accord with the *halakhoth* of 11QTemple²¹ for which the most logical thing is to suppose a Palestinian context, as for the *halakhoth* which determine the presentation of offerings in the temple.²²

Even clearer than these indirect indications is the synthesis of *1 En.* 90. Within the historical panorama representing the second of the visions

¹⁸ Hippolytus in an obviously apologetic tirade will invert the terms and make Pythagoras and the Stoics depend on the Essenes: "The Essene practices concerning the Deity are more ancient than those of all the nations, which proves that all those who have spoken of God or of the Creation have received their doctrines from no other source than Jewish Law. Of those, above all Pythagoras and the Stoics of Egypt are those who have learnt in the school of the Essenes" (*Refutatio* 9.27).

¹⁹ As noted in Feldman, *Josephus and Modern Scholarship*, 564, 594.

²⁰ The recent works of L.H. Schiffman, "Legislation Concerning Relation with Non-Jews in the Zadokite Fragments and in Tannaitic Literature," *RevQ* 11/43 (1983): 379–89 and *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code* (BJS 33; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983) confirm this point, since they prove that the legislation regulating relations with gentiles is substantially in agreement with the traditional halakhah and does not demand a Babylonian context.

²¹ Compare CD XII 1–2 with 11QT^a XLV 11–12 for example.

²² CD XI 17–21.

of the *Book of Dreams* known as the *Animal Apocalypse* and in the description of the period running from Alexander the Great to the Maccabean rising, the author describes the birth of a group which marks the end of the third period and the beginning of the fourth of those dividing history from the exile to the eschatological era. This group arises at the completion of the first 58 periods of history. The 12 periods remaining before the messianic kingdom are taken up by the persecution of these lambs and the martyrdom of one of them, together with the last Maccabean revolt, and the battles of Judas. That is, the writer places the origin of the group with which he identifies himself in Palestine and in a period prior to the Antiochian crisis. R. Beckwith in a series of articles²³ set out to prove that the precise date at which these lambs arose was 251 B.C.E. D. Dimant, using a different basis for calculation arrived at the date 199 B.C.E.²⁴ Here there is no need to enter into details. The important thing is to note that the *Book of Dreams*, which though not a qumranic work²⁵ is certainly connected with the sect, testifies, as do the classical statements about the Essenes, to the Palestinian and pre-Maccabean origins of the group from which the Qumran Community will come.²⁶

But the most important proof, in my opinion, lies in the demonstration that characteristic and fundamental ideas of Essenism and of the Qumran sect can already be found in one form or another within the

²³ R. Beckwith, "The Significance of the Calendar for Interpreting Essene Chronology and Eschatology," *RevQ* 10/38 (1980): 167–202; *idem*, "The Earliest Enoch Literature and its Calendar," *RevQ* 10/39 (1981): 365–403; *idem*, "The Pre-History and Relationships of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes. A Tentative Reconstruction," *RevQ* 11/41 (1982): 3–46.

²⁴ D. Dimant, "Jerusalem and the Temple in the Animals' Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85–90) in the Light of the Thought of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Shaton* 5/6 (1981–1982): 177–93 (Hebrew); *eadem*, "The History according to the Animals' Apocalypse," *MYM* 2 (1982): 18–37 (Hebrew); *eadem*, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," 544–45.

²⁵ The date of composition is generally placed between 165 and 160 B.C.E., which makes it possible to consider it as a work of the formation period; but, in spite of the many relations it presents with qumranic literature highlighted by D. Dimant, its pro-Maccabean position seems to imply a non-sectarian origin. In Qumran there have been found remains of four copies of the work: 4QEn^f is from the third quarter of the 2nd c. B.C.E., 4QEn^e was written in the first half of the 1st c. and 4QEn^{cd} in the last third of the 1st c. B.C.E., cf. J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 5, 178, 225.

²⁶ A similar argument might be constructed from Jub, 23.26: "In those days, the children shall begin to examine the laws and to study the commandments, returning to the way of righteousness." *Jubilees*, too, is a work related to sectarian thought and many copies, written in the first half of the 1st c. B.C.E., have been found in Qumran, but neither may be considered as a qumranic work, cf. J.C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 258–83.

Palestinian apocalyptic tradition and that this tradition is independent and precedes the Antiochian crisis.

This second element (nowadays generally accepted) has been established thanks to the discovery of the Aramaic fragments of Enoch from Cave 4 of Qumran which have made it clear that both the *Book of the Watchers* and the *Astronomical Book* go back at least as far as the 3rd c. B.C.E. and that there is no connection between the origin of the most ancient Apocalypses and the Antiochian crisis.

The idea that certain elements characteristic of the Essene movement and of the Qumranic sect are to be found in this Palestinian apocalyptic tradition is one which I have frequently put forward²⁷ and which has been confirmed by the conclusions of other researchers.

Thus P. Sacchi²⁸ has clearly demonstrated that the determinism characteristic of the Essene movement, according to the classical sources²⁹ and so prominent in the sectarian writings³⁰ comes from the idea of an original sin which antedates history, an essential idea in the most ancient apocalyptic tradition.

J. Blenkinsopp, analysing the interpretation as a key to the development of sectarianism³¹ has proved that the Essene interpretation culminating

²⁷ F. García Martínez, "Essenisme Qumràni: Orignes, caractéristiques, héritage," note 2, as well as *idem*, "Orígenes apocalípticos del movimiento esenio y orígenes de la secta qumránica," *Communio* 18 (1985): 353–68 [a summary of *idem*, "Orígenes del movimiento esenio y orígenes qumránicos: Pistas para una solución," in *Il Simposio Biblico Español* [ed. V. Collado Bertomeu and V. Vilar Hueso; Valencia-Córdoba: Fundación Bíblica Española, 1987], 527–56); *idem*, "Encore l'Apocalyptique," *JSS* 17 (1986): 224–32, *idem*, "Les Traditions Apocalyptiques à Qumran," in *Apocalypses et Voyages dans l'au-delà* (ed. C. Kappler; Paris: Cerf 1987), 201–35; *idem*, "La Apocalíptica y Qumrán," in *Il Simposio Biblico Español*, 603–13.

²⁸ P. Sacchi, "Il 'Libro dei Vigilanti' e l'Apocalittica," *Henoah* 1 (1979): 42–78; *idem*, "L'apocalittica e il problema del male," *Parola di Vita* 25 (1980): 325–47; *idem*, "Ordine cosmico e prospettiva ultraterrena nel postesilio. Il problema del male e l'origine dell'apocalittica; Peccato d'origine e libertà dell'uomo," *Henoah* 5 (1983): 31–58; *idem*, "Riflessioni e proposte per una possibile storia dell' apocalittica," in *Tempo e apocalisse. Atti dell'incontro 19–20 settembre 1981 al monastero di Montebello, a cura di Sergio Quinzio* (Milazzo: SPES, 1985), 9–34; *idem*, "Testi palestinesi anteriori al 200 a.C.," *RivB* 32 (1986): 183–204; *idem*, "Enoc etiopico 91,15 e il problema della mediazione," *Henoah* 7 (1985): 257–69; *idem*, "L'apocalittica del I secolo: Peccato e Giudizio," in *Correnti culturali e movimenti religiosi del giudaismo*, 59–77.

²⁹ *Ant.* 13.172: "The sect of the Essenes declares that fate is the Lord of all and that nothing happens to men which is not in conformity with his decision"; cf. also *Ant.* 18.18.

³⁰ See recently H. Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde* (SUNT 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 184–200 and the previous monograph of E. Merrill, *Qumran and Predestination: A Theological Study of the Thanksgiving Hymns* (STDJ 8; Leiden: Brill, 1975), which concentrates on 1QH.

³¹ J. Blenkinsopp, "Interpretation and the Tendency to Sectarianism: An Aspect of

in Qumran in the concept which we have defined as “eschatologization of the Prophets”³² is the prolongation of the transformation of the prophetic interpretation realized within the Apocalyptic Tradition. It is in this tradition that we come across the recourse to the secret books of the Heavenly Tablets as a hermeneutic procedure, a recourse so often mentioned in the classical descriptions of the Essenes (*War* 2.176, 142, 159), as in Essene writings³³ and those truly sectarian.³⁴

C. Rowland has underlined the centrality in the apocalyptic tradition of the communion with the angelic world.³⁵ This element is found in Josephus’s description of the Essenes (*War* 2.142) according to which “the names of the angels” make up an important part of their secret knowledge and reappears in texts such as 1QM VII 6, 1QS XI 7–8 or the *Angelic Liturgy* of Qumran.

Hamerton-Kelly³⁶ has likewise proved that the idea of the eschatological Temple develops within the apocalyptic tradition beginning with the ideology of the Temple of Ezekiel and that it is this ideology that accounts for the Essene rejection of the Temple and of the cult practised there, reflected by *Ant.* 18.19 and *Quod omnis probus* 75, as well as the ambiguities of this Essene position. That in writings of the formative period of the Community, such as 11QTemple XXIX 9–10 this idea of the eschatological Temple clearly appears allows us to understand its presence in other sectarian texts such as 1QM II 1–6 and 4Q174 and to explain the transitory and vicarious character of other concepts of the Temple reflected in the Qumranic writings.³⁷

Second Temple History,” in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition* (ed. E.P. Sanders; 3 vols.; London: SCM Press, 1980–1982), 2:1–26.

³² F. García Martínez, “Profeet en profetie in de geschriften van Qumran,” in *Profeten en profetische geschriften* (ed. F. García Martínez, C.H.J. de Geus, and A.F.J. Klijn; Kampen: Kok, 1986), 119–32.

³³ Cf. F. García Martínez, “Las Tablas Celestes en el Libro de los Jubileos,” in *Palabra y Vida. Homenaje a José Alonso Díaz en su 70 cumpleaños* (ed. A. Vargas Machuca and G. Ruiz; Madrid: UPCM, 1984), 333–49, which highlights the dependence of *Jubilees* on 1 *Enoch* in this aspect.

³⁴ Cf. F. Nötscher, “Himmlische Bücher und Schickalsglaube in Qumran,” *RevQ* 1/3 (1959): 405–11.

³⁵ C. Rowland sees in it the very essence of apocalyptic, cf. *The Open Heaven: A Study of Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity* (London: SPCK, 1982), 113.

³⁶ R.G. Hamerton-Kelly, “The Temple and the Origins of Jewish Apocalyptic,” *Vetus Testamentum* 20 (1970): 1–15.

³⁷ I have developed at length this aspect in my “La ‘nueva Jerusalén’ y el Templo futuro en los MSS de Qumrán,” in *Salvación en la Palabra: Targum—Derash—Berith: en memoria del profesor Alejandro Díez Macho* (ed. D. Muñoz León; Madrid: Ediciones Christianidad, 1986), 563–90.

This rapid resumé demonstrates that the best way to understand a good many of the characteristic elements of Essene thought is to place them in the context of the apocalyptic tradition of the 3rd c. B.C.E. To determine the precise date at which the Essene movement emerges as a separate entity from the apocalyptic background seems to me impossible. The concrete findings of our enquiry permit us only to state with confidence that these origins are to be found at a date prior to the Antiochian crisis and that the indications in *1 Enoch* and in CD point to the end of the 3rd c. B.C.E. or the beginning of the 2nd c. B.C.E. as the period of the origins of the Essene movement.

ORIGINS OF THE QUMRAN SECT

At the origins of the particular development within Essenism which is to issue in the formation of the Qumran sect can be found the powerful figure whom, for lack of a specific name, we call by the title attributed to him by the sectarian writers: the Teacher of Righteousness. CD I 5–12 is quite categorical to this effect:³⁸ the “root of the plantation” which God makes grow from Israel and from Aaron in the time of wrath, the only men in Israel who understand their iniquities and acknowledge their sin, that is the members of the Essene movement,

recognized their iniquity and knew that they were guilty men, and they were like the blind and those who grope (their) way for twenty years. But God understood their deeds, that they sought Him with a perfect heart and He raised for them a teacher of righteousness to lead them in the way of His heart and to make known to the last generation what He had done to the last generation, the congregation of traitors. (CD I 8–12)

This function of the Teacher of Righteousness is a dual one: to lead the faithful along the way of righteousness and to make known to all the imminence and the effects of the Divine Judgement. The first element underlines the function of halakhic interpretation of his activity as characteristic,³⁹ the second the intensity of eschatological hope in his message.

³⁸ Equally categorical is 4Q171 1, 3–4 iii 15–17: “this prediction refers to the Priest, the Teacher of Righteousness, whom God chose to stand before Him, establishing him to build for him the congregation of his elect and direct his path in truth.”

³⁹ The single other use of the verb *לְרַבֵּן* in CD is found in the quotation from Num 24:17 in CD VIII 19, where it is said that this star is the Interpreter of the Law.

Eschatology is precisely one of the elements not brought out in the classical description of Essenism, but in the sectarian writings of Qumran it is prominent and shows a clear development.⁴⁰ This element is just as fundamental within the apocalyptic tradition and has enormous importance in such works as *Jubilees* and the *Book of Dreams*. These works show, as we said, close relations with the sectarian works, even though a distinct origin must be ascribed to them, and both were written during the formative period of the community. This fact permits us to see in them the guiding line that characterises the development of eschatological hope at the prophetic levels of the OT through apocalyptic eschatology, culminating in the eschatological hope that characterises the Teacher of Righteousness and will characterise the community he created.⁴¹ From this CD presentation it may be deduced that the eschatological element constituted an important aspect of the polemic that gave rise to the sect.

However, I think that the first element indicated in the CD text cited was even more important and of decisive influence in constituting the group a sect. In the pluralistic Judaism of the time, the path of sectarian formation was not marked out by differences of ideology or eschatology but goes back to the level of the halakhah regulating practical life. It is in the halakhah, then, that we must look for the causes of the break.

Fortunately we have available two documents which show some of the halakhic problems in question. The first, chronologically, is the *Temple Scroll* (11QTemple). The second, and the more explicit, is a halakhic letter known as *Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (Some of the precepts of the Torah) or *MMT* which defines the reasons for separation of the Qumran Sect.

The *Temple Scroll* is a work whose composition may be attributed to the Teacher of Righteousness, which in any case comes from the formative period of the sect and which dates from before the establishment of the Community at Qumran.⁴² This makes it particularly adequate

⁴⁰ The most recent attempt to trace this development is that of P.R. Davies, "Eschatology at Qumran," *JBL* 104 (1985): 39–55. Davies supposes that the eschatology of *Jubilees*, CD, and 4QDibHam represents Essene eschatology in so far as this is distinct from Qumran eschatology and characterizes the Qumran group as a schismatic group claiming to have fulfilled Essene expectations.

⁴¹ This development has been highlighted by J. Duhaime, "La Règle de la Guerre de Qumran et l'Apocalyptique," *Science et Esprit* 36 (1984): 67–88, who explains the transformation of the eschatological hope within the Qumran community in relation to the sacerdotal origins of the sect which had appropriated apocalyptic thought.

⁴² Each of these assertions would merit a detailed proof which we cannot here offer; cf. Delcor and García Martínez, *Introducción a la literatura esenia de Qumrán*, 187–206. The

to provide information as to the halakhic aspects important during the formative phase and to indicate the points on which the Teacher of Righteousness might enter into conflict with the rest of Essenism and with the other elements of the Judaism of the time.

An analysis of its content shows us that its principal components are:

- prescriptions as to feasts and as to the sacrifices at each feast according to a sectarian calendar,
- prescriptions as to the Temple and the city and the norms of purity applying to these,
- the statute of the King,
- various halakhoth relating particularly to problems of purity, tithes and marriage.

The other work (*MMT*)⁴³ is slightly later, presuming that it was written after the Qumran group's break had occurred,⁴⁴ but is perfectly adequate to elucidate the causes of the break, saying expressly in its epilogue:

We have separated ourselves from the majority of the peo[ple...] from intermingling in these matters and from participating with them in these [matters]⁴⁵

basic reason to postulate a prequmranic origin for its composition is the existence in Strugnell's group of fragments of a copy palaeographically datable about 150 B.C.E., cf. B.Z. Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran: the Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Monographs of the Hebrew Union College 8; Cincinnati: HUCP, 1983), 206 and my review in *Biblica* 66 (1985): 290–94.

⁴³ This work, six fragmentary copies of which were preserved in Cave 4 (4Q394–399) has not yet been edited, but its content was made public in a lecture by J. Strugnell and E. Qimron at the 1984 IES Congress. It is a halakhic letter from the leader of the Qumran community addressed to the leader of his opponents; its purpose is to define the reasons why the sect has separated from the rest of the people and to persuade its opponents to accept the viewpoints of the community. The work, as far as it can be reconstructed by collating the various documents, consists of the following sections: Introduction, which has not been preserved; calendar, partially preserved, to be published by Milik; list of the sect's special halakhoth (some 20 have been preserved; Strugnell and Qimron include in their publication a list of 12 of them); Epilogue (which contains some qumranic theological principles and discusses the reasons why the sect has separated itself from the rest of the people, at the same time suggesting to its opponents that they should return to the true path), cf. J. Strugnell and E. Qimron, "An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran," in *Biblical Archaeology Today. Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, April 1984* (ed. J. Amitai; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1985), 400–407.

⁴⁴ "MMT may, then, be the earliest Qumranic work, being apparently written immediately after the separation of the Sect" (Strugnell and Qimron, "An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran," 401).

⁴⁵ Hebrew text in Strugnell and Qimron, "An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran," 402.

which proves that the halakhoth included in the document represent points on which the sectarians were not disposed to temporize, considering them important enough to cause them to separate from the majority of the people.

The programmatic character of this halakhic letter is equally evident in the standard manner in which the different halakhoth are introduced: “And (also) concerning X we say that.”

An analysis of the twelve halakhoth published by Strugnell shows a surprising thematic correspondence with 11QTemple.⁴⁶ According to *MMT* the controversy between the sect and its opponents centres on:

- the cultic calendar,
- prescriptions as to the Temple and the city and the norms of purity applying to these,⁴⁷
- halakhoth relating to tithes, impurity and marriage statutes.⁴⁸

The one outstanding element in 11QTemple which does not seem to be reflected in *MMT* is that of the halakhoth making up the Torah of the King, a fact easy to explain if we bear in mind that the halakhic letter seems to be addressed not to the political power of Jerusalem nor to the Hasmonaean rulers but to the religious group from which the sect has separated.⁴⁹

⁴⁶ As long as the complete text of the work remains unknown it is impossible to determine the degree of relation to 11QTemple halakhoth. The Strugnell-Qimron description of the themes suggests the point of contact we indicate in the following two notes.

⁴⁷ Halakhoth 1 to 7 of the list published: 1. Prohibition on accepting sacrifices from Gentiles. 2. Cutting the throats of pregnant animals (11QTemple LIII 5). 3. The one banished from the assembly (1QSa II 5–9; 1QM VII 3–6; 4Q491 1–3 6). 4. The red heifer (11QTemple LXIII 1–8). 5. Exclusion of blind and deaf from the sanctuary (11QTemple XLV 12–13). 6. Purity of running liquids. 7. Prohibition against bringing dogs into Jerusalem (11QTemple XLVII 1–14), cf. Strugnell and Qimron, “An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran,” 401–402.

⁴⁸ Halakhoth 8 to 12 of the published list: 8. The fruits of the fourth year, for the priests. 9. The cattle tithe, for the priests (11QTemple LX 1–5). 10. Regulations for the period of purification from leprosy (11QTemple XLV 17ff.). 11. Impurity of the human bones (11QTemple L 5–9; LI 4–6). 12. Prohibition of marriage between priests and Israelite women (11QTemple LXV–LXVI). According to the authors of the paper the original probably contained other matrimonial halakhah in the text following on this latter halakhah, cf. Strugnell and Qimron, “An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran,” 402.

⁴⁹ It is interesting to note that this element is also absent from the summary of CD VI 11–VII 4 which provides a good parallel, as regards the content of the two elements here indicated as characteristic, presented as prescriptions for those which were admitted to the Covenant: Calendar and festivals (VI 18–19) prescriptions relating to the Temple (VI 15–16), to the cult (VI 10), impurity (VI 17–18), tithes (VI 20). The summary add other prescriptions, which suppose the established community (VI 14–15; VII 1–4).

The two texts, then, both indicate that the fundamental disputes within the Essene movement during the formative period of the sect were centred on the question of the calendar and the consequent organization of the festive cycle, and in a particular way of understanding the biblical prescriptions relating to the Temple, the cult and the purity of persons and things.

That the first of these elements (disputes about the calendar) had been a decisive factor in the formation of the sect and one of the causes that provoked the Qumran split has been recognized since the early days of research on the MSS.⁵⁰ CD III 14–15 specifies that “his holy sabbaths and his glorious festivals” are the first of the secret things in which all Israel has erred and which God has revealed to those with whom he has established his Covenant, and CD VI 18–19 specifies among the commitments of those entering into the Covenant “to observe the Sabbath according to its interpretation and the feasts and the day of fasting according to the finding⁵¹ of those who have entered into the New Covenant.” Well then, calendar problems, like eschatology, are not reflected in the classical descriptions of the Essene movement⁵² with the important exception of the Essene group of the Therapeutae, one of whose most striking characteristics is, together with complete dedication to the contemplative life, the adoption precisely of a pentecostal calendar of feasts similar to that followed at Qumran.⁵³ This allows us

⁵⁰ It suffices to re-read S. Talmon’s classic article “The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect of the Judaean Desert,” *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4 (1965²): 162–99.

⁵¹ The textual correction proposed by S. Schechter, *Documents of the Jewish Sectaries* (2 vols.; Cambridge, 1910) 1:xxxix (reprint [New York:] KTAV, 1970), 71, reading כמציחה, “according to the precepts” for כמציחה of the MSS, accepted, among others by Talmon, “The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect of the Judaean Desert,” 166, and A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les Écrits Esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte* (Paris: Payot, 1959), 147, seems unnecessary. The expression, which is parallel to פירושה, used in line 18 to mean the correct interpretation of the Sabbath and in line 20 for the correct interpretation of “the holy things” (tithes) underlines the peculiar character of the group’s calendar of festivals.

⁵² With the one (possible) exception of the addition preserved by the Slavonic translation of Josephus in *J.W.* 2.147, which says that in addition to observing the Sabbath they also observe “the seventh week, the seventh month and the seventh year,” a detail which would relate them to the system of computing known from *Jubilees*, cf. M. Philonenko, “La notice de Josephus slave sur les Esséniens,” *Semitica* 61 (1956): 69–73. But the value of the Slavonic Josephus is a much-discussed question and its importance problematic.

⁵³ Philo, *De vita contemplativa*, 65. On the basic calendar cf. the commentary of P. Geoltrain, “Le traité de la Vie Contemplative de Philon d’Alexandria Introduction, traduction et notes,” *Semitica* 10 (1960): 24–25; also A. Jaubert, *La notion d’alliance dans le Judaïsme aux abords de l’ère chrétienne* (Paris: Du Seuil, 1963), 477–79, J. van Goudoever, *Fêtes et Calendriers Bibliques* (Paris: Duchesne, 1967³). See also the article by J.M.

to suppose that the Essene movement accepted the festive calendar of the rest of the Judaism of the time and that the adoption of a distinct calendar was one of the factors which determined the constitution as a sect within the Essene movement of both the Qumran group and that of the Therapeutae.

A. Jaubert postulated that the origins of the sectarian calendar were to be found in an ancient sacerdotal calendar,⁵⁴ but Beckwith has demonstrated that the real origins of this calendar are to be found within the apocalyptic tradition and reflect some of this tradition's characteristic preoccupations.⁵⁵

As in the case of eschatology, *Jubilees* furnishes us with a point of connection. More, it shows us that the calendar served not only to regulate the cult but as a basis for the chronology which allowed the "computation of the ages" and which stimulated the periodization of history and the calculation of the "last times," elements of obvious influence on the development of the eschatological hope characterizing the Qumran sect.

Together with the argument as to the calendar, both 11QTemple and *MMT* mention a series of halakhoth relating to ritual purity, the cult of the Temple and, to a lesser extent, the matrimonial halakhah, as the central areas in which took shape the argument between the movement from within which the Qumran sect would emerge and the rest of Judaism. These sectors are, from then on, fundamental sectors in all religious life and are regulated by the prescriptions of the biblical text. So much so that in essence the problem of the origins of the sectarian halakhah is reduced to a problem of interpretation of the biblical text.

Baumgarten, "4QHalakhah^a 5, the Law of Hadash and the Pentecontad Calendar," *JJS* 27 (1976): 39–42. On the Essene character of the Therapeutai, cf. G. Vermes, "Essenes and Therapeutai," *RevQ* 3/12 (1962): 594–604 and the second volume of the new Schürer, 591–97.

⁵⁴ A. Jaubert, "Le Calendrier des Jubilés et la secte de Qumran. Ses Origines bibliques," *VT* 3 (1953): 250–64; *eadem*, *La date de la Cène. Calendrier biblique et liturgie chrétienne* (Paris: Lecoffre, Gabalda, 1957); *eadem*, "Fiches de Calendrier," in *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Paris-Gembloux: Duculot / Leuven: University Press, 1978), 305–11. Jaubert's hypothesis has been defended by J.C. VanderKam, "The Origin, Character and Early History of the 364-day Calendar. A Reassessment of Jaubert's Hypothesis," *CBQ* 41 (1979): 390–411, who attempted to show that this ancient calendar was used in the Temple cult until 167 B.C.E., a date at which it is supposed to have been replaced by a luni-solar Seleucid calendar, cf. J.C. Vanderkam, "2 Maccabees 6, 7a and the calendrical change in Jerusalem," *JSS* 12 (1981): 51–74, but see P.R. Davies's refutation, "Calendrical Change and Qumran Origins: An Assessment of VanderKam's Theory," *CBQ* 45 (1983): 80–89.

⁵⁵ Cf. Beckwith, "The Earliest Enoch Literature and its Calendar," 379–87.

How is it possible to explain the emergence within the Essene movement of this particular way of interpreting the biblical prescriptions laid down by the sectarian halakhah? The answer to this question is no other than the Teacher of Righteousness's consciousness of having received by divine revelation the correct interpretation of the biblical text, an interpretation which is thus inspired and prescriptive, and the acceptance by some of the members of the community of this interpretation as a revelation. The rejection by the rest of the members of the Essene movement of this interpretation and of the particular halakhah deriving from it would end by making it impossible for them to stay together.

The sectarian texts show that the biblical text is seen as a mystery whose significance is made clear only through a revealed interpretation.⁵⁶ Hence the conviction that the Book of the Law remained sealed and that not even David could read it, that is, that it remained "hidden and was not revealed until Zadok arose" (CD V 5), and that those who wanted to enter into the Alliance had to pledge themselves to be converted to the Law of Moses "according to all that was revealed to the Sons of Zadok" (1QS V 9). If the Teacher of Righteousness was capable of re-writing a part of the Pentateuch in 11QTemple, even daring to present this new Torah as God's Torah, this was only possible in the conviction that this interpretation of the biblical text was done under the direct operation of divine revelation (see 1QH^a X 13–14; XII 27–28 for example).

This inner conviction is accepted as an objective fact by the group of his partisans, who endow his interpretation of the biblical text with the character of revelation, thus mandatory:

Its prediction concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God made known all the mysteries of the words of His servants the Prophets. (1QpHab VII 4–5)

Hence those who do not accept this interpretation are considered enemies:

They are the men of violence and the breakers of the Covenant that will not believe when they hear all that [is to happen to] the last generation from the Priest [in whose heart] God set [understanding] that he might

⁵⁶ R.E. Brown, "The Pre-Christian Semitic Concept of Mystery," *CBQ* 20 (1958): 417–43, pointed out some time ago that it is only in qumranic literature that the category of "mystery" is used in discussing the interpretation of Scripture.

interpret all the words of His servants the Prophets, through whom He foretold all that would happen to His people and [His land]. (1QpHab II 6–10)

The sectarian texts referring to this fundamental break⁵⁷ invariably place it in the context of a discussion of the correct interpretation of the biblical text, which is expressed as “not believing the words of the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of God” (1QpHab II 1–3) or “not hearkening to the Interpreter of Knowledge” (4Q171 1–2 i 19).

A characteristic text is 1QpHab V 9–12. It is a pesher to Hab 1:13, a text which mentions some traitors, a wicked man and a righteous one. The Qumran interpretation runs:

Its prediction concerns the House of Absalom and the members of its council who were silent at the time of the reproof of the Teacher of Righteousness and gave him no help against the Liar who flouted the Law in the midst of their whole [congregation].

The basic elements of the pesher are that the Liar “rejects the Law” in the midst of all the community to which he and the Teacher of Righteousness belong (כל עררם) and that the majority of this community accepts the position of the Liar until the just rebuke of the Teacher of Righteousness reduces them to silence. This text reflects, in my opinion, in a sober, concise manner, the outcome of the long period of tensions characterising the formative phase of the Qumran Community. The Teacher of Righteousness’s consciousness of having received through divine revelation the correct interpretation of the Law led him to propound a series of ideological and legal positions (imminence of the last days, a particular festive calendar, the imperfection of the existing Temple and cult compared with what they should be, etc.) and of particular halakhoth conditioning daily life (*MMT*, 11QTemple) and to wish to impose on all members of the Essene community this understanding of the Law. The failure of this attempt was due, according to the sectarian texts, to the influence of the Liar, the leader of the Essene movement who “led many astray with deceitful words, so that

⁵⁷ These texts designate the movement to which belonged not only the Teacher of Righteousness and his partisans but also his enemies as “The House of Absalom” (1QpHab V 9–12), the members of the movement who do not accept the Teacher of Righteousness as “Charlatans” (CD XX 10–13; 4Q162 II 6, 10), “Traitors” (1QpHab II 1–5), and the leader of the movement opposed to the Teacher of Righteousness as “Charlatan” (CD I 13–17; XX 11–12) and particularly as “Liar” (CD I 15; IV 19; VIII 13; XX 15; 1QpHab II 1–3; V 9–12; X 9–13; 4Q171 1–2 i 18–ii 1; 3–10 iv 14–15).

they chose foolishness and hearkened not to the Interpreter of Knowledge” (4Q171 1–2 i 18–19). The result was to be the break between the adepts of the Teacher of Righteousness and the rest of the Essenes who remained faithful to the Liar.

In the actual decision to retire to Qumran other elements must have played a part, such as the necessity for a physical separation from the rest of Judaism, so as to be able to practise their own halakhah and the prophetic tradition of preparation for the coming of the Lord in the Wilderness. But the ideological origins of the break within the Essene movement are to be found in the different interpretation of the Law laid down by the sectarian halakhah and in the strong eschatological expectation of the Teacher of Righteousness. The “manifest of foundation”⁵⁸ expresses it in these terms:

And when all these happen in Israel, for the Community, according to all these rules they shall separate from the habitation of ungodly men and shall go into the wilderness to prepare the way of Him; as it is written. Prepare in the wilderness the way of . . . make straight in the desert a path for our God (Isa 40:3). This is the study of the Law which He commanded by the hand of Moses according to all that has been revealed from age to age and the Prophets have revealed by His Holy Spirit. (1QS VIII 12–16)

EARLY HISTORY OF THE COMMUNITY

Now that it is clear what were the ideological sources of the split that gave rise to the Qumran Community, we must attempt to elucidate the historical circumstances in which the split took place and the further development of the group which remained faithful to the Teacher of Righteousness. Unfortunately the available historical sources from outside Qumran itself totally ignore the activities of this tiny group of desert exiles, so that our knowledge of the history of the Community depends entirely on such information as we can extract from the Qumran manuscripts themselves.

The problem is that the texts preserved, apart from the pesharim, are not profuse in historical detail and that the peculiar character of the pesharim, the texts which include the greatest number of references

⁵⁸ This is how Murphy-O'Connor defines the most ancient level of the *Rule of the Community* which in a way outlines the programme of the future sect and comes from the formative period.

to the early history of the Community, makes the task of achieving a reasonable historical reconstruction extremely difficult and problematic. Nevertheless the pesharim remain the only Qumran texts which, indirectly, throw light on the history of the sect.⁵⁹ The hermeneutical principle underlying the pesharim is precisely that it is the history of the Community (which believed itself to be living in the last days) which reveals the mysterious significance of the utterances of the prophets.⁶⁰ Hence, if we wish to have some idea of this history our only recourse is to turn to the cryptic statements of the pesharim, to “decode” them and to compare them with the rest of the information in the period to be gathered from Flavius Josephus or the Books of the Maccabees.

This in fact is the method used by the majority of researchers since the years immediately following the discoveries and, notwithstanding the problems, it has produced a series of findings which, in my opinion, may now be considered as established. Among these we may mention, for example, the discovery of the quality of High Priest (de jure or de facto) of both the Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest (Stegemann), the identification as separate persons of the Liar and the Wicked Priest (Jeremias), the consideration of the Liar as the head of the Essene movement from which the group faithful to the Teacher of Righteousness broke away (Murphy-O'Connor), etc.

But the central problem constituted by the identification of the person designated “The Wicked Priest” has continued to elude the efforts of the researchers. While recognising that this person provides the key to the early history of the Community since he is the highest authority in the country (“he ruled over Israel” 1QpHab VIII 9–10) and makes it possible to connect the history of the sect with political and religious history through his persecution of the Teacher of Righteousness, efforts to identify him convincingly have failed owing to the fact that the many allusions to him in the pesharim contain elements so various that it is impossible to apply all of them to any one High Priest of the 2nd c. B.C.E. It is thus that according to whatever characteristic is favoured as most

⁵⁹ The texts may be found conveniently collected in M.P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 8; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979); the most complete study of the Habakkuk pesharim is that of W.H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk* (Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 24; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979); the most recent, B. Nitzan, *Peshar Habakkuk. A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea (1QpHab)* (Jerusalem 1986) (Hebrew).

⁶⁰ Cf. García Martínez, “Profeet en profetie in de geschriften van Qumran.”

important, at the expense of the others, different results and different identifications are arrived at, from Menelaus⁶¹ to Jonathan (the candidate with the greatest number of defenders),⁶² including Simon,⁶³ Alexander Jannaeus⁶⁴ and Hyrcanus II,⁶⁵ to confine ourselves to the candidates who fit the archaeological dating of the first occupation of Qumran. All these hypotheses rest on the unsubstantiated presupposition that all mentions of “Wicked Priest” refer to one and the same person. To A.S. van der Woude belongs the credit of having proved convincingly that this is not the case.⁶⁶ His suggestion that we should see in the designation “Wicked Priest” a description referring to the various Hasmonaean High Priests from Judas Maccabaeus to Alexander Jannaeus and in precise chronological order, offers a simple elegant solution which at once respects the totality of the data of the *Pesher Habakkuk* and the limits to interpretation imposed by the archaeological dating of the Qumran settlement.

His hypothesis has, moreover, the advantage of fixing the precise chronological framework for the development of the early history of the Community.

⁶¹ A. Michel, *Le maître de justice d'après les documents de la Mer Morte: la littérature apocryphe et rabbinique* (Avignon: Aubanel, 1954), 232–58.

⁶² For example, G. Vermès, *Les manuscrits du désert de Juda* (Paris 1955), 92–100; G. Vermès, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Qumran in Perspective* (London: Collins, 1977), 150–52; Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, 84–87; G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 36–78, H. Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* (Bonn 1971), 39–129.

⁶³ Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*, 127–60.

⁶⁴ J. Carmignac, *Les Textes de Qumrân, traduits et annotés II* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1963), 51–53.

⁶⁵ A. Dupont-Sommer, “Observations sur le Commentaire d’Habacuc,” *RHR* 137 (1959): 125–76; *idem*, *Les Écrits Esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte* (Paris, 1983⁴) 361–68.

⁶⁶ A.S. van der Woude, “Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Commentary,” *JJS* 33 (1982): 349–59. W.H. Brownlee, “The Wicked Priest. The Man of Lies, and The Righteous Teacher—The Problem of Identity,” *JQR* 73 (1982): 1–37, equally affirms the plurality of Wicked Priests and identifies as such John Hyrcanus, Aristobulus I and Alexander Jannaeus. Recently I. Frölich, “Le genre littéraire des Pesharim de Qumran,” *RevQ* 12/47 (1986): 383–98, has identified as Wicked Priests Alexander Jannaeus, Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II. My study “Judah Macabeo Sacerdote Impio? Notas al margen de 1QpHab viii.8–13,” in *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l’honneur de M. Mathias Delcor* (ed. A. Caquot, S. Légasse, and M. Tardieu; AOAT 215; Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1985), 169–81, confirms van der Woude’s hypothesis proving that even Judas Maccabaeus may have been indicated as one of the Wicked Priests.

If this hypothesis is accepted,⁶⁷ it is possible to be a little more precise as to the historical circumstances in which the split within the Essene movement took place, now that it is possible to determine precisely the period when the Teacher of Righteousness was active. Of all the Wicked Priests mentioned by the *Peshar Habakkuk*, only three appear in direct relation to the founder of the Qumran Community: Jonathan (161–143/42 B.C.E., 1QpHab IX 16–X 1), Simon (143/42–135/34 B.C.E., 1QpHab XI 2–8) and John Hyrcanus (135/34–104 B.C.E., 1QpHab XI 2–8) and only this last persecuted the Teacher of Righteousness after his move to Qumran:

Its prediction concerns the Wicked Priest who pursued the Teacher of Righteousness to the house of his exile that he might confuse him with his venomous fury. And at the time appointed for rest, for the Day of Atonement, he appeared before them to confuse them, and to cause them to stumble on the Day of Fasting, their Sabbath of repose. (1QpHab XI 4–8)

These data show us that the formative period of the sect runs through the Pontificates of Jonathan and Simon and that this period is characterized not only by the elaboration of the ideological and political principles previously mentioned, but also by conflicts with the political and religious might of Jerusalem. It also shows us that the break with the Essene movement became complete during the long Pontificate of John Hyrcanus, but this break and the settlement in Qumran did not mean a reconciliation with the political power. On the contrary, John Hyrcanus persecuted the Teacher of Righteousness in his desert retreat and his successor, Alexander Jannaeus, was also to be qualified as a Wicked Priest.

The causes of these conflicts with political authority were undoubtedly of a religious nature, but the texts do not permit us to elucidate them precisely. The positive assessment offered by 1QpHab VIII 8–13 of the first period of the activity of Judas Maccabaeus and its condemnation of his conduct once in power,⁶⁸ permit us to suppose that

⁶⁷ As far as is known to me, no work has convincingly proved that this hypothesis is mistaken. Murphy-O'Connor, "The Damascus Document Revisited," 245, confines himself to accusing van der Woude of "an overly literal interpretation of pesharim texts" and of "rather naïve faith in the historical worth of details provided by Josephus."

⁶⁸ García Martínez, "¿Judas Macabeo Sacerdote Impio? Notas al margen de 1QpHab viii.8–13," 174–77.

the origin of the opposition (which precedes the intervention of the Teacher of Righteousness) is connected with the Maccabean uprising. If the parallel of the Hasidim group's position vis-à-vis Judas Maccabaeus is valid⁶⁹ it is possible to imagine that the problem of the legitimation of the High Priest may have been an important element. In any case, the condemnation of Alcimus in 1QpHab VIII 16–IX 2 rules out an identification of the group of the Hasidim (who at the outset at least accepted Alcimus) with the Essene group joined by the Teacher of Righteousness.

Other possible motives for the conflicts the founder of the Qumran Community had with the Hasmonaean High Priests may be traced by analyzing the halakhot attributed by rabbinical tradition to Jonathan (*m. Parah* 3:5) or to Hyrcanus (*m. Ma'as. Š.* 5:15) and comparing them with the corresponding Qumranic *halakhot*. The requirements of the “Torah of the King” (11QTemple) presented as a programme in the face of the historical reality of the Hasmonaean dynasty, could only have aggravated the existing tensions and made the conflicts more acute. At all events, even if the causes of these conflicts remain obscure, their reality, so forcibly expressed in the *Pesher Habakkuk*, permits us to differentiate the group faithful to the Teacher of Righteousness from the rest of the Essene movement; both Philo and Josephus insist that all those with political power, with no exception, admired and respected the Essenes (*Quod omnis probus* 89–91), paid them homage and loaded them with favours (*Hypothetica* 18), a totally different picture from that presented by the *Pesher Habakkuk*.

If we must briefly sum up the significance of this “Groningen Hypothesis,” let us say that it permits us to place the origins of the Essene movement in the Palestinian apocalyptic tradition of the late 3rd and early 2nd c. B.C.E., helps us to understand how and why within this Essene movement the influence of the Teacher of Righteousness gave rise to a fringe group and makes it clear how after opposing the High Priests Jonathan and Simon, this group eventually broke with the original Essene Community and retired to the desert.

⁶⁹ The Hasidim, who had been the first to join the revolt of the Maccabees (1 Macc 2:42), abandoned Judas in the hour of conflict with Alcimus (1 Macc 7:14) who, however, executed 60 of them (1 Macc 7:16), provoking his subsequent rejection.

In the solitude of Qumran the members of this group continued for more than a century and a half to live in accordance with the interpretation of the Law and in the eschatological hope with which the Teacher of Righteousness had marked their origins, reflecting at the same time on this period of their origins in their readings of the biblical text.

CHAPTER TWO

A “GRONINGEN” HYPOTHESIS OF QUMRAN ORIGINS AND EARLY HISTORY*

Since the first detailed publication of the so-called “Groningen Hypothesis” about the Origins and Early History of the Qumran Community has just appeared¹ and is easily available, it would be pointless to repeat here the arguments set out there in great detail. It seems more useful to develop some of the assumptions underlying our hypothesis and to make clear the historical consequences that follow from their acceptance. Therefore this paper will deal with:

- the composition and character of the library from Qumran;
- the hypothesis of Norman Golb who postulates that the scrolls come from different libraries of Jerusalem and that they represent the literature of the whole of the Judaism of the time.
- after summarizing the contents of the “Groningen hypothesis,” the paper will spell out some of the consequences that can be deduced in order to obtain a historical reconstruction of the early history of the community.

1. COMPOSITION AND CHARACTER OF THE LIBRARY FROM QUMRAN

One of the basic assumptions of our hypothesis is that all the manuscripts recovered from the caves of Qumran are remnants of the library of the group which used to live in and around Khirbet Qumran. Evidently not all the manuscripts found at Qumran are of qumranic origin; nobody would ever dream of claiming a qumranic origin for any one of the biblical manuscripts that make up a sizeable part of the remnants from the various caves; besides, the palaeographical dating of certain manuscripts formally rules out their having been composed or copied in Qumran, and the long editorial history of various works

* Co-authored by F. García Martínez and A.S. van der Woude.

¹ F. García Martínez, “Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis,” *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1988): 113–36.

equally makes it clear that the oldest levels were written in a period prior to the establishing of the community beside the Dead Sea. But it is our contention that:

- 1) the texts found in the caves are not a disparate collection of loose elements without any connection; on the contrary, they are part of a whole and form a unity that we can describe as a religious library, and
- 2) that this library belongs to and reflects the interests of the group of Qumran, which amounts to saying that it is a sectarian library.

The first element is grounded on an analysis of all the manuscripts published so far and on the available descriptions of most of the still unpublished texts.² Their contents are, in spite of the huge number of works involved, surprisingly homogeneous: biblical texts, apocryphal and pseudepigraphical compositions (previously known or completely new) which are a sort of haggadic extension of the biblical texts, halakhic discussions which are equally derived from the biblical text, hymns, prayers and liturgical compositions, and a whole series of new compositions which in their theological or halakhic orientations reflect a peculiar religious outlook and may be conveniently termed “sectarian.”

All these elements, except sectarian works, are precisely the sort of compositions we should expect in a religious library of the time. This library, of course, should not be seen as a modern library, as a kind of repository of all the knowledge of the time; it is a specifically religious library, in which “profane” knowledge has no place: no historical works,³

² See F. García Martínez, “Lista de MSS procedentes de Qumrán,” *Henoah* 11 (1989): 149–232. This list which follows and supplements the list published by J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Major Publications and Tools for Study* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977²), 11–39; 174–77, also contains references to the preliminary publication or description of a good number of the still unpublished fragments of cave 4 of the lots of Milik, Strugnell and Starcky-Puech. H. Stegemann estimates at about 823 the total of MSS found in all the caves, and at about 580 the total coming from cave 4 (see his “Some Aspects of Eschatology in Texts from the Qumran Community and in the Teaching of Jesus,” in *Biblical Archaeology Today. Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, April 1984* (ed. J. Amitai; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1985), 408–26, at 421). Our list includes 668 of the alleged total of 823, 426 of them being 4Q MSS. An examination of the descriptions of the MSS of the original list of distribution of texts between the first team of editors shows that the presumed contents of the about 100 4Q MSS not included in our “List of MSS” does not alter the picture that the evidence already available provides, many of them being only scraps of texts.

³ *4QbHis ar* from Starcky-Puech’s lot seems closely related to the biblical text of Daniel.

no works of medicine⁴ or other "sciences" have been discovered,⁵ the astronomical and calendrical documents of Milik's lot⁶ are closely related to the festive calendar and the priestly courses, typically religious problems, and even the "horoscopes"⁷ have a clearly religious orientation. The only text which at first sight does not fit into this pattern in 3Q15, the *Copper Scroll*, which we will discuss later.

That all the manuscripts coming from the various caves are part of the same library is shown by the fact that the collections of all the caves, except cave 7,⁸ present the same pattern of biblical, apocryphal and sectarian works, that the *same* apocryphal or sectarian compositions are found in different caves,⁹ and that even some of the manuscripts coming from different caves have been copied by the same scribe.

That this library is not the library of one person but of a group is not only evident in the huge number of manuscripts recovered but is clearly proved by the fact that many copies of the same work are present, as much in the case of biblical texts as in apocryphal or sectarian compositions.¹⁰

⁴ J. Naveh has proved that the so-called *4QTherapeia* published by J. Allegro is not a medical document but a writing exercise. See J. Naveh, "A Medical Document or a Writing Exercise? The So-called 4QTherapeia," *Israel Exploration Journal* 36 (1988): 52–55, pl. 11.

⁵ *4QpapGénéalogique ar* of Starcky-Puech's lot is a genealogy of biblical times that run until the epoch of the Judges; another "topographical" work from the same Starcky-Puech lot, with a series of names from Syria and Lebanon to the Negev, seems to be related to the traditions of the division of the promised land and can in no way be considered as a "scientific" topographical treatise.

⁶ 4Q317 (4QAstrCrypt), related to the calendars of 4QEnastr^a, and 4Q319–337 (4QMishmarot).

⁷ 4Q186 (DJD V, 88–91) and *4QMes ar*, published by J. Starcky, "Un texte messianique araméen de la grotte 4 de Qumrân," in *Mémorial du cinquantenaire. École des langues orientales anciennes de l'Institut Catholique de Paris: 1914–1964* (Travaux de l'Institut Catholique de Paris 10; Paris 1964), 51–66, that according to É. Puech is part of one of the MSS designated als *4QNoah^c*.

⁸ The cave is not only peculiar because all the MSS found there are biblical texts (in so far they have been identified), but also because all of them are papyri and especially because all of them are written in Greek.

⁹ For example, *Jubilees* appears in caves 1, 2, 3, 4 and 11; The *New Jerusalem* texts in caves 2, 4, 5 and 11.

¹⁰ From Cave 4 only, for example, have been recovered 20 copies of Psalms, 17 of Isaiah, 16 of Deuteronomy, etc.; 5 of Tobit, 6 of *Jubilees*, 6 of 4QSecond Ezekiel, etc., and also 8 copies of *Damascus Document*, 10 of the *Serek*, 8 of the *ShirShabb*, 6 of 4QMMT, etc. Strictly speaking, the argument of the multiplicity of the copies of the same work applies only to caves 1, 2, 4 and 11 (in the case of cave 5 it is not completely sure that the two copies of Lamentations are from different MSS); the contents of caves 3, 6 and 7 could represent individual libraries, but the character of the collection of texts coming

That this library belongs to the group living at Khirbet Qumran is not only suggested by the physical proximity between the caves and the Khirbeh but proved by the relation (or the identity)¹¹ established between the material remains of the caves and Khirbet Qumran.

That this group was a clearly sectarian group is proved by the contents of the sectarian works found in its library. These compositions not only show a different theological outlook, a different calendar, a different halakhah, etc., but also reveal a highly structured and tightly organized community whose members are not only aware of being different from the rest of the Judaism of the time, but present themselves as having consciously *separated* from the rest of that Judaism. Even more, the texts show that the community prohibits contacts with non-members and considers all others as the “sons of darkness,” or, as G. Vermes put it: “that the sectaries regarded themselves as the true Israel, the repository of the authentic traditions of the religious body from which they have seceded.”¹²

Considering the exclusive character of the community and the repeated prohibition of contacts with non-members, it does seem impossibly that the community should have kept the religious literature of alien or clearly hostile groups, not even for polemical purposes or in order to refute their enemies.¹³ Even allowing for the ample space

from these caves (with the exception of those coming from cave 7) is the same as that of the collections coming from the caves 1, 2, 4 and 11; we can therefore consider all the MSS as a unity.

¹¹ R. de Vaux concludes: “L’utilisation des grottes n’est pas seulement contemporaine de Khirbet Qumran, elle lui est liée organiquement. Il est déjà significatif qu’elle commence et qu’elle s’achève en même temps que l’occupation principale du Khirbeh, mais il y a d’autres preuves. Khirbet Qumrân est au centre de la région où les grottes sont dispersées et certains d’entre elles, les grottes 4Q et 5Q, 7Q et 10Q, sont, situées à proximité immédiate des ruines. L’identité de la poterie des grottes et de celle du Khirbeh quant à la pâte et aux formes et, spécialement, le grand nombre des jarres cylindriques qui ne sont pas encore attestées en dehors de la région de Qumrân supposent que cette céramique vient d’un même lieu de fabrication: or, on a mis au jour dans le Khirbeh un atelier de potier,” *DJD III*, 32.

¹² G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (3d ed.; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), XVII.

¹³ As N. Golb seems to postulate in his answer to E.-M. Laperrousaz: “Les tenants des diverses tendances qui caractérisent le judaïsme pré-rabbinique avaient évidemment besoin de posséder les écrits de leurs opposants, tout comme je dois posséder la ‘note’ précédente pour rédiger cette réponse,” “Réponse à la ‘Note’ de E.-M. Laperrousaz,” *Annales ESC* 1987, 1313. Such an “ecumenical” understanding may hold for some unknown “tendency” of pre-rabbinical Judaism, but it was certainly not the position of the Qumran community and is clearly contradicted by the explicit affirmations of the texts.

necessary to permit an inevitable ideological evolution and recognising that there is nothing that might be considered as a Qumran "canon," in view of the exclusive character of the Qumran community it seems out of the question that they should have preserved and made use of works incompatible with their own ideology. And, indeed, among all the texts preserved there is no trace of any book than can be attributed to an *opposing* religious group.¹⁴

That to this group belong not only the clearly sectarian texts but all the texts of the library is shown by the fact that manuscripts coming from different caves, some of them biblical, some of them difficult to characterize, were copied by the same scribes who copied typically sectarian texts: for example, 1QS and 4Q175 were written by the same scribe who copied 4QSam^c,¹⁵ and 1QpHab and 11QTemple^b were written by the same hand.¹⁶

The consequences of this assumption are far reaching. Here we should only underline two of them: the possibility of classifying all the non-biblical texts, and the fact that the date of the settlement at Qumran provides us with a *terminus ante quem* for the composition of the non-sectarian compositions found in the caves.

Our assumption implies that although the fact of its having being found in Qumran is no guarantee of the Qumranic origin of a given work, it does assure us that the work in question was understood by the community as compatible with its own ideology and its own halakhah, that is as coming from the Essene movement or from the apocalyptic tradition which inspired it. Which amounts to saying that

¹⁴ Theoretically it is also possible to postulate that the MSS come from different libraries of the same sectarian group. This could account for the pattern of contents discerned and for the presence of the same sectarian works. But this hypothesis would not solve any problems; besides, although we know of other Essene settlements in the Judaean desert and of the presence of Essene groups in Jerusalem and other cities, nothing is known of the existence of other settlements of the same sectarian group that wrote the Qumran texts; finally, this hypothesis does not provide a good explanation of the fact that the material remains found in all the caves are closely related to the material remains found in the excavations of the Khirbet Qumran, and that MSS coming from different caves are clearly written by the same scribe. Therefore the origins of all the MSS can better be explained as coming from only one library, the library of the Qumran sectarians.

¹⁵ See E. Ulrich, "4QSamuel^f: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2 Samuel 14–15 from the Scribe of the Serek Hay-yahad (1QS)," *BASOR* 235 (1979): 2.

¹⁶ See J.P.M. van der Ploeg, "Une halakhah inédite de Qumrân," in *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Paris-Gembloux: Duculot/Leuven: University Press, 1978), 107.

the non-biblical literature found as part of the Qumran library may be classified as follows:

- sectarian works, representing the thought or the halakhah of Qumran in its most developed and typical form
- works of the formative period, presenting a vision still not so clearly differentiated from the Essenism which is its ultimate source but containing indications of future developments and offering an already characteristic halakhah.
- works which reflect Essene thought and accord with what the classical sources teach us about Essenism or which can be attributed to it
- works belonging to the apocalyptic tradition which gave rise to Essenism and which were considered as part of the common heritage.

Our assumption implies also that all the works found in Qumran that cannot be classified as strictly sectarian must have been composed *before* the split that gave rise of the Qumran group, because otherwise they would never have been accepted by the sect. Of course, in the case of many works, either because of the fragmentary state in which they have reached us or because they do not show any of the identifiable characteristics of the sectarian compositions, it is impossible to specify to which category they belong and we cannot exclude their having been composed by members of the sect at a later period. Nevertheless this conclusion provides us with a *terminus ante quem* for dating all works whose non-sectarian character can be determined, and this can be relevant at the moment one tries precisely to date the composition of works, e.g., *Jubilees*, amply represented in several caves.¹⁷ It can also be of interest when one tries to explain why only some of the so-called Old Testament Apocrypha or Pseudepigrapha, e.g., Ben Sira, Tobit and the Epistle of Jeremiah, are represented in the caves¹⁸ and not other compositions of the same sort.

2. ON THE HYPOTHESIS OF NORMAN GOLB

This understanding is by no means a new or exclusive feature of our hypothesis. In fact this is the way in which the great majority of schol-

¹⁷ 1Q17–1Q18; 2Q19–2Q20; 3Q5; 4Q176 frags. 19, 20, 21; 4Q216–4Q224; 11Q12.

¹⁸ Ben Sira: 2Q18, 11Q5 XXI; Tobit: 4Q196–4Q200; Epistle of Jeremiah: 7Q2.

ars have understood the composition of the Qumran library since the beginning of the discoveries. But recently it has been severely attacked and depicted as nonsense by Norman Golb in both its elements: that the manuscripts derive from a library, and that this library belongs to the sectarian group of Qumran. Golb denies all relationship whatsoever between the manuscripts and the ruins of Qumran as well as their Essene or sectarian origin, and postulates that all the manuscripts come from different libraries of Jerusalem and that they represent the literature of the Judaism of that time as a whole.¹⁹ Therefore it seems necessary to deal with the arguments on which Golb's hypothesis rests.²⁰

These arguments are of different sorts: a) some of them dispute the connection of the scrolls with the Essenes, b) others try to sever the relation between the manuscripts of the caves and the group living in Qumran, c) others aim to establish a relationship between the texts and Jerusalem, and finally d) others seek to present the manuscripts as the literature not of a sectarian group but of Judaism as a whole.

a) To the first category belongs Golb's emphasis on the celibacy of the Essenes and their peace-loving and non-military nature (188.196* as described in the classical sources, in contrast both with the presence of graves of women around the Khirbeh (189) and the military fortress character of the Khirbeh on one hand (188), and the fact that none of the Qumran texts espouse strict celibacy and other Qumran texts (such

¹⁹ Although elaborated independently and formulated somehow differently, the theory of Golb closely resembles the old theory of K.H. Rengstorf. According to Rengstorf the MSS have no connection with the Essenes or with any other sect, they are part of the library of the temple of Jerusalem brought to the caves for safekeeping at the time of the Jewish Revolt. See K.H. Rengstorf, *Hirbet Qumran und die Bibliothek vom Toten Meer* (Studia Delitzschiana 5; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1960).

²⁰ N. Golb has presented his hypothesis in several publications: "The Problem of Origin and Identification of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 124 (1980): 1–24; "Who Hid the Dead Sea Scrolls?," *BA* 28 (1987): 68–82; "Les manuscrits de la mer Morte: Une nouvelle approche du problème de leur origine," *Annales ESC* 1985, n° 5, 1133–49; "Réponse à la 'Note' de E.-M. Laperrousaz," *Annales ESC* 1987, n° 6, 1313–20; "The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Perspective," *The American Scholar* 58 (1989): 177–207, but all of them contain basically the same arguments, although not in the same order. The fundamental presentation is the article in *PAPS*; the articles in *BA* and *Annales* are more of a popular sort, and the *American Scholar* version constitutes the most up-to-date version, which takes the latest developments into consideration. We will primarily use this latest presentation of his views (referring to it simply by page number in our text), and we should like to thank Prof. Golb for kindly sending us a copy of this article.

* All page numbers in the body text refer to Golb, "The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Perspective."

as 1QM) are of a combative militaristic character on the other. Arguments of this sort are of no relevance to our hypothesis, which makes a clear distinction between the Essenes and the Qumran group,²¹ and do not need to be discussed here.

b) More relevant are the three arguments that seek to sever the connection between the manuscripts and the group living in Qumran.

1) *The Khirbeh was a fortress in which no manuscript remnants were found* (188.197). The implications of this argument are that as a fortress,²² the Khirbeh could not have been the residence of a religious Essene-like group,²³ could not have been a centre of learning, and, of course, could not be the place where an important library was located. As (a) proof of this assumption is adduced the fact that when excavated the Khirbeh did not produce a single scrap of parchment.²⁴

But to substantiate this assertion Golb is forced to confound several elements of the archaeological excavations and to forget others equally important. The fortress-like elements present at the Khirbet Qumran complex derive from the first construction of the site as an Israelite stronghold in the 8th c. B.C.E., and especially from the latest transformation of the site after the Roman destruction into a military outpost of the Roman army, which gave the Khirbeh a new character.²⁵ But in the periods from the end of the 2nd c. B.C.E. until the Roman destruction of the site (the periods Ib and II of de Vaux) the most characteristic elements of the complex are not the walls of the tower, but the complex water system, the workshops, the meeting places and common

²¹ As Golb himself seems to recognize, "The Dead Sea Scrolls," 189.

²² "II se révèle, au contraire, être une forteresse d'importance stratégique dans le désert de Judée, et, on peut le déduire de l'attaque armée en 69 ou en 70, c'était encore une forteresse en ce temps-là," *Annales* 1985, 1140.

²³ "When Khirbet Qumran was excavated, however, various elements of a fortress-like complex were revealed, and the archaeologist working at the site determined that it had been stormed by Roman soldiers after a hard-fought battle that included the undermining of the walls and setting at least part of the site on fire. The resisters would thus have had to be members of an armed troop—precisely unlike the Essenes as they are described in the classical sources" ("The Dead Sea Scrolls," 188).

²⁴ "That in the Qumran fortress there was a manuscript-writing room where Essene monks composed and copied texts, although none of the autograph manuscripts that might attest to this literary creativity has ever been found, and although the room identified as this 'scriptorium' was not found to contain a single scrap of parchment when excavated" ("The Dead Sea Scrolls," 197).

²⁵ The periods I and III of occupation, see R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Schweich lectures of the British Academy, 1959* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973), 1–3, 41–44.

rooms, and all the other elements that indicate that the site was designed "for the carrying on of certain communal activities."²⁶ Although the Khirbeh was constructed as a stronghold in the 8th c. B.C.E. and was adapted by the Romans as a military post after the destruction, the site during the two centuries of sectarian occupation cannot be described as a military fortress. Golb not only seems to forget at this point the presence of a potter's workshop and other workshops, the mill, the elaborate and carefully constructed water system, and other remains which indicate a communal purpose for the buildings, but, even more important, that after the destruction by the Romans the whole site was transformed by them into a military post and that this perfectly explains the fact that no manuscripts were found in the Khirbeh. Is it so strange that the new Roman occupants would have cleaned up their quarters, eliminating at the same time possible remnants of manuscripts or other documents that the former occupants *could* have forgotten?

Besides, if the Khirbeh was a fortress, what could be the explanation for the big cemetery of more than a thousand tombs? This argument, already used by R. de Vaux²⁷ against the theory of K.H. Rengstorf, who saw the Khirbeh as an agricultural estate, is equally valid against Golb's view of the Khirbeh as a fortress.

2) *The absence of documentary records in the caves* (193–95.204). The point of this argument is not completely clear, because Golb uses it to illustrate his contention with the example of the finds of Murabba'at. Apparently for Golb the Murabba'at texts are only the proof that documentary records can survive,²⁸ but the example adduced implies far reaching consequences. Golb is perfectly aware of the difference between an archive and a library, and in fact, himself employs this distinction when talking about Jerusalem as the origin of the scrolls. In Jerusalem were archives (which were destroyed in August 66 C.E.) where the documentary records were kept, and also libraries (which in his hypothesis were not destroyed) where the literary documents, in Golb's hypothesis,

²⁶ As de Vaux put it (*Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 10), noting that "this establishment was not designated as a community residence" because "the number of rooms which should have served as dwellings is restricted as compared with the sites designed for group activities to be pursued."

²⁷ R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 105–106.

²⁸ "Thus, the Bar Kokhba documents made clear—or should have made clear that original Hebrew autographs of a documentary character, such as personal and administrative letters or deeds and contracts, could indeed survive from antiquity in the Judaean wilderness" ("The Dead Sea Scrolls," 194).

were preserved, and only the contents of the libraries would have been brought to the caves for safekeeping. This should explain, in his opinion, why no documentary records were found in the caves. But if the parallel with the Murabba'at findings (in which documentary records and scribal copies of literary texts were found together, and not, as Golb affirms [193–94], only documentary records) has any force, it should equally be applied to Jerusalem (where the refugees came from) and it should prove that in Jerusalem the separation between archives and libraries was not so clear-cut as Golb himself affirms.

Anyway, the meaning of Golb's argument seems to be that if the manuscripts were related to the Khirbeh we should have found in the caves the records of the sect together with the literary documents.²⁹ This not being the case, the connection of the texts and the Khirbet should be abandoned.

The existence of archives at Qumran seems certain, and is specifically required by the sectarian texts themselves. That the religious literature and the profane deeds, letters or the sect's administration should have been kept and hidden together in the same place, is on the contrary a rather gratuitous assertion, and one, we may add, that seems to ignore the purity restrictions imposed upon religious literature. Nobody can fathom the reasons why the men of Qumran decided to proceed in the way they did and hid in different places their archives and their library, but the purity concerns of the group are far too evident to be dismissed and in any case the distinction between their archives and their library must be maintained. That the chance of the discoveries has not provided us with specimens of the Qumran archives is certainly regrettable, but no more regrettable than the complete loss of the temple or the royal archives or, for that matter, all other archives of Judaea of the 2nd and 1st c. B.C.E.

The point is that if the absence of documentary records can be an objection to the manuscripts coming from a library, the objection must equally apply to its coming from another library, from the temple library or from unspecified libraries of Jerusalem.

²⁹ "If the scrolls were from Qumran and if, when it was heard that Roman troops were approaching, these scrolls were gathered up in haste from the chambers of the site and from its scriptorium—where one may assume that official letters and other documents of the sect were also produced—how could such documents have been so carefully excluded from the hiding process?" ("The Dead Sea Scrolls," 194).

3) *The discoveries of manuscripts near Jericho in antiquity* (191–92). For Golb the allusion of Origen to the finding “in a jar near Jericho” of Hebrew and Greek books, as well as the reference of Patriarch Timotheus I of Seleucia to the discovery of Hebrew manuscripts in a cave “near Jericho,” “adversely affects the claim of organic connection between the Qumran settlement and the manuscripts of the nearby caves, instead pointing to another cause for the hiding of manuscripts in the Judaean desert in antiquity” (192). How the reports of these findings can adversely affect this is not completely clear, because we do not know what sort of manuscripts were found there,³⁰ nor of what date. Not even Golb has suggested that the finding of biblical and other manuscripts in Murabba‘at, Nahal Hever, Wadi Seiyal or Khirbet Mird “adversely affects” the connection of the Qumran manuscripts with the Qumran community. What the argument seems to mean is that the geographical distance between Jericho and Qumran makes it difficult to accept the interpretation some scholars gave to the phrase “near Jericho” as referring to Qumran;³¹ this interpretation can be discussed, but its relevance to severing the relation of the Qumran manuscripts with the group of the Khirbeh can be dismissed.

After examining the arguments put forward by Golb in order to sever the relationship between the scrolls and the Khirbeh we must conclude that he has failed to prove the soundness of this assumption; we can therefore consider the manuscripts as coming from the library of the group living in the Khirbeh.

c) For Golb “the very phenomena that constitute grave anomalies in the Qumran-Essene hypothesis are those facts that point emphatically to the scrolls’ Jerusalem origin” (199). But he underlines as more important the following elements:

³⁰ Origen seems to imply that one of the Greek texts used for the Hexapla was involved, and the Patriarch Timotheus refers to “books of the Old Testament and others in Hebrew script.”

³¹ “After these statements became known, Qumran scholars proposed that they implied there had been earlier discoveries *at Qumran itself*. Timotheus as well as Origen had only spoken imprecisely of the discoveries having taken place ‘near Jericho’” (“The Dead Sea Scrolls,” 192).

1) *The discovery at Masada of a copy of ShirShabb.*³² The argument of Golb seems straightforward: *ShirShabb* was supposed to be a Qumranic work that has now turned up at the excavations of Masada; we know that the defenders of Masada were Judaeans *sicarii* augmented by refugees coming from the siege of Jerusalem; *ergo* the manuscript was brought from Jerusalem.³³ But he is confusing in fact two quite distinct issues: the origin of the composition and the way it reached Masada.

As for the first, the fact that a copy of *ShirShabb* was found at Masada does not prove or disprove that the composition is a sectarian work, in the same way that the finding of a copy of CD in the Cairo Genizah does not prove or disprove its sectarian character. The arguments as to the origin and sectarian character of the work are independent of the place of discovery. The arguments that prove the Qumranic origin of the *ShirShabb* adduced by C. Newsom³⁴ are: the characteristic use of לְמַשְׁכִּיל in the introductory formulas and, especially, the striking parallels with 4QBerakhot, to which others can be added.³⁵ Golb does not seem to object to the characterization of *ShirShabb* as “sectarian,” at least he does not propose that the work was written by the *sicarii* or by any other “orthodox” Jew. He simply denies that the work has “a unique connection with Qumran” on the basis of the finding of a copy at Masada, confusing the issue of the origin with the issue of the way in which the work reached the place where it was found later on.

As for the way in which an exemplar of *ShirShabb*, which we consider a Qumranic work, reached Masada, many explanations are possible: “By assuming that it was taken there by a member of the Qumran

³² “Without recourse to the special explanation of a bond between Masada and Essenes from Qumran, the discoveries at Masada thus forcefully imply the act of removal of manuscripts from Jerusalem during the revolt. They indicate that Hebrew literary texts were deemed precious enough to warrant rescue during periods of danger” (“The Dead Sea Scrolls,” 187).

³³ “The one cogent inference that may be drawn from the presence of first-century Hebrew manuscripts at Masada is that Jewish *sicarii* who inhabited that site possessed scrolls that they had brought there after taking the fortress in 66 A.D. while other Jews look scrolls with them (in addition to basic possessions) when they withdrew from Jerusalem to that site. In the Masada excavations, surviving remnants of these possessions were discovered, including even such texts as the ‘Angelic Liturgy’ that, before the Masada discoveries, were erroneously *believed* to have had a unique connection with Qumran” (“The Dead Sea Scrolls,” 187).

³⁴ C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press 1985), 3–4.

³⁵ See the review of the book of Newsom by F. García Martínez in *Biblica* 69 (1988): 144–46 and F. García Martínez, “Estudios Qumránicos 1975–1985. Panorama Crítico IV,” *EstBib* 46 (1988): 541–42.

community who participated in the revolt against Rome, presumably after the destruction of the community center at Khirbet Qumran;³⁶ "that the rebels occupied the Qumran area after its evacuation by the Community and subsequently transferred Essene manuscripts to their final place of resistance;"³⁷ even the one that Golb could have favoured, namely that it was brought to Masada by a *sectarian* refugee from the siege of Jerusalem. The point is that we do not know precisely how the work reached Masada, but that this ignorance does not affect its sectarian character. And the sectarian character of the scroll implies that, whatever way it took to reach Masada, it came from a sectarian library. The presence of the work in caves 4 and 11 proves to us that the work had a place in the library of Qumran.

2) *The contents of the Copper Scroll (3Q15)* (195–98). It is well known that since the moment of its discovery, 3Q15 has been one of the most difficult texts to interpret and the one that has elicited more speculation not only about the precise contents of the work (historical document or folkloristic fantasy), but also about its palaeographical dating (the opinion of the editor Milik and that of Cross, both recorded in the official edition,³⁸ are not exactly the same), the origin of the treasures described and their exact locations.³⁹ In our opinion, and despite the hesitations of de Vaux, it seems fairly certain that the archaeological context in which the Copper Scroll was discovered demands a classification of the work as coming from the Qumran Library and therefore connected with the Qumran group, although the huge number of Greek loanwords 3Q15 contains set it clearly apart from the rest of the documents. Of course, this assertion does not explain the literary genre of the work, nor (if the treasures are real, as the dry realism of its style and the fact that it is recorded in copper seem to suggest) what was the origin of these treasures. But claiming a Jerusalem origin for the work does not explain these elements either, and, although a Jerusalem origin could explain why a certain number of the caches are located in and around

³⁶ C.A. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*, 74, n. 11.

³⁷ G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 221; E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)* (rev. and ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Black; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: Clark, 1973–1987), 3.1:463.

³⁸ DJD III, 215–21.

³⁹ For a good survey of the problems and the proposed solutions, see B. Pixner, "Unravelling the Copper Scroll Code: A Study on the Topography of 3Q15," *RevQ* 11/43 (1983): 323–65.

Jerusalem, it does not explain the caches located in the area around Qumran and Jericho, nor the ones in the Yarmuk area.

In the present state of our knowledge too many uncertainties remain about the correct interpretation of the topographical terms of the scroll, about the language of the text,⁴⁰ even about the exact number of the treasures involved, to permit us to solve all the riddles that it presents and especially the question of its character and provenance. The Golb hypothesis does not advance new elements to solve these riddles, nor does it supply us with new answers to the many puzzles of the text. It is our contention that the obscurities still surrounding this mysterious Copper Scroll make it impossible to use this piece of evidence to reduce the value of all the accumulated evidence, even less to serve as a cornerstone of any new hypothesis.

d) Golb's arguments to prove that the Qumran manuscripts are not the remains of a sectarian library but represent the literature of the whole of the Judaism of the epoch are the following:

1) *The small number of sectarian texts.*⁴¹ This purely quantitative argument forgets a basic fact, namely that we have not recovered integrally the library in its original form. But even without paying attention to the possible losses and the accidental character of its recovery, the total number of copies of strictly sectarian works is only smaller, as should be expected, to the total number of copies of biblical books, and besides, what is more important, the sectarian works recovered cover all aspects of the literary spectrum: theological treatises, biblical commentaries, rules for internal organization, procedures and penal codes, purity laws, halakhic decisions and discussions, prayers, liturgical and hymnic compositions, etc., in short, the clearly sectarian works recovered cover all aspects of the religious thought and life of a sectarian community.

2) *The scrolls present too many contradictory outlooks and points of view to allow the idea of an origin within any one circle of sectarians* (190.200). With this argument Golb is apparently also referring to a twofold problem: the differ-

⁴⁰ See the conclusion of Y. Thorion, "Beiträge zur Erforschung der Sprache der Kupfer-Rolle," *RevQ* 12/46 (1986): 163–76.

⁴¹ "Only a small fraction of the totality of scrolls contained laws or doctrines that might be termed notoriously heterodox, let alone Essenic—even when compared with texts of early rabbinic Judaism (such as the Mishnah and Tosefta), which postdated the Qumran Scrolls by as much as two to three centuries" ("The Dead Sea Scrolls," 189–90).

ences appearing between clearly sectarian texts, such as CD and IQS,⁴² and the variety of apocryphal and apocalyptic compositions.⁴³ This second element is not relevant to our hypothesis which does not attribute the composition of the apocalyptic or Essene works to the sect; in any case, the differences in outlook and points of view of the apocalyptic and apocryphal writings are hardly larger than the differences already apparent within the biblical texts, and if the sectarians were ready to incorporate all the biblical books of the Hebrew Bible we do not see any reason why they could not incorporate all the books of the tradition they sprang from. As we have already said, they would certainly not keep works incompatible with their own ideology, which means that the different "outlooks and points of view" of the apocalyptic and apocryphal writings which disturb Golb were not perceived as fundamentally opposed to the ideological tenets of the group; they were, as in the case of the biblical texts, part of their heritage and pre-history.

The first element of the argument is more to the point and constitutes an element that has nurtured the discussions around the scrolls since the beginning of the discoveries. It is clearly out of the question to present here all the solutions offered to the problem, and we shall limit ourselves to giving our own opinion. We take as an established fact the long redactional history of CD, the pre-Qumran origin of the composition and the later adaptation in the Qumran context⁴⁴ and we attribute the first redaction of CD to the formative period of the sect; we also consider it an established fact that CD and IQS legislate for two sorts of communities; we are even ready to accept that the "camps communities" for which CD legislates existed before or at the same time that the community for which IQS legislates took shape,⁴⁵ which implies that the

⁴² "There are remarkable contradictions between ideas of the one scroll and the other [*CD* and *IQS*], and these conflicts alone disturb the concept of a single homogeneous sect living in antiquity at the Qumran site" ("The Dead Sea Scrolls," 190).

⁴³ "Nor can [be seriously believed] the suggestion that the Essenes, said by both Josephus and Philo to have numbered no more than four thousand souls, were the very ones responsible for the outpouring of imaginative texts constituting the apocryphal and apocalyptic literature of the Palestinian Jews. This is too vast a literature, with too many contradictory outlooks and points of view, to allow the idea of its origin within any one circle of sectarians" ("The Dead Sea Scrolls," 191).

⁴⁴ Amply demonstrated in the works of J. Murphy-O'Connor and P.R. Davies.

⁴⁵ The number of copies of *CD* found in cave 4 suggests that the interest in the work was not only antiquarian. We will never know the precise relationship between the two kinds of communities, nor will we ever be able to ascertain whether the legislation of *CD* was later modified in view of the experience of a desert community, or if the legislation for a desert community of *IQS* was later adapted to the groups of sectarians living

members of the sectarian group could live in two sort of communities. But it is our contention that at the basic level of ideology, calendar and halakhah, the two works are not, as Golb asserts, contradictory, but that they share the same sectarian outlook in spite of the different concrete legislations they offer.⁴⁶ Therefore their differences cannot be adduced as a proof that the library could not have belonged to a sectarian group.

3) *It is inconceivable that all the literature of early Judaism has disappeared and only the literature of a small fringe group has been preserved.*⁴⁷ The ingenuity of the argument is disarming. A look at the Materials for the Dictionary. Series I. 200 B.C.E.–300 C.E. of The Academy of the Hebrew Language—The Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language⁴⁸ shows that, indeed, almost all the materials between 100 B.C.E. and 70 C.E. are provided by the Qumran manuscripts. How this fact can affect the attribution of this library to a sectarian group is by no means clear, unless one supposes that all accidental discoveries of manuscripts must be representative of the whole literature of the time.

We must thus conclude that Golb has also failed to prove that the Qumran manuscripts represent all the literature of the Judaism of the time. This was an impossible task; if not for other reasons, at least because the characteristic elements of rabbinic Judaism are not present in the scrolls, as Golb himself seems to recognize.⁴⁹ He explains their absence by the chronological distance between pre-70 Judaism and post-70 rabbinism. But not even Golb would deny (we assume) that there is a link between the pre-70 Pharisees and the post-70 Rabbis.

not in the desert but in towns or camps, or if both legislations for the two branches of sectaries coexisted all the time.

⁴⁶ As G. Vermes put it: “Yet despite these many dissimilarities, at the basic level of doctrine, aims and principles, a perceptible bond links the brethren of the desert with those of the towns,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 16.

⁴⁷ This element is more clearly and forcefully formulated in the French article of *Annales* of 1985: “Dans cette théorie, les manuscrits fondamentaux de la littérature hébraïque du 1er siècle appartenant aux autres juifs de Palestine, qui à l’époque ne comptaient pas moins de deux millions d’hommes, auraient disparu. D’autre part, ceux des prétendus qoumrano-esséniens, qui auraient fait partie d’un groupe qui selon Philon et Josèphe ne comptait pas plus de quatre mille âmes, sont représentés à travers les siècles par quatre découvertes au moins, ce qui porte à plus d’un millier le nombre de manuscrits ‘esséniens,’” 1142.

⁴⁸ Distributed in microfiches, Jerusalem 1988.

⁴⁹ “The scrolls were written a century and more before the age of the Tannaitic masters who modeled rabbinic Judaism in the wake of the destruction of the Second Temple, and thus reflect aspects of religious and social thinking not characteristic of rabbinic Judaism (“The Dead Sea Scrolls,” 200).

Now, the characteristic ideas and halakhah of the Pharisees are equally absent in the manuscripts. How is it possible, if the scrolls represent all the aspects of the actual state of Judaism at that time, that the ideas and the halakhah of the Pharisees, the group that forms the basis of later rabbinic Judaism are not represented?

It is surely not the intention of Golb to assert that the basic tenets and the halakhah "of the Tannaitic masters who moulded rabbinic Judaism in the wake of the destruction of the Second Temple" (200) were non-existent before 70, and that the Tannaitic masters invented Judaism *ex nihilo*, but this is the inescapable conclusion of his hypothesis and shows how wrong it is.

3. HISTORICAL RECONSTRUCTION OF THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE COMMUNITY

Assuming thus that the Dead Sea Scrolls derive from the library of the sectarian group of Qumran, we can legitimately ask what these scrolls tell us about the origins and the history of this group. As a matter of fact, these are precisely the sort of questions all the theories propounded since the beginning of research into the scrolls have tried to answer, and, in spite of some aberrant proposals, many of the findings obtained can be considered as established. But a growing discomfort with the identification of the Qumran group as Essenes,⁵⁰ the dissatisfaction with the proposal to place the origin of the group in a Babylonian context,⁵¹ and the need to integrate the new data supplied by lately published texts,⁵² have moved us to formulate a new attempt to integrate coherently the apparently contradictory elements furnished by the scrolls.

This "Groningen hypothesis" tries specifically to answer two questions: where are the origins of the ideas, the doctrinal roots, of the group to be found? and: what do we historically know of the early years of the group?

⁵⁰ As postulated in the prevailing consensus, elaborated by A. Dupont-Sommer, G. Vermes and J.T. Milik, perfected by G. Jeremias and H. Stegemann, and represented in such a recent work as T.S. Beall, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SNTSM 58; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

⁵¹ Best represented in the works of J. Murphy-O'Connor and P. Davies. For the latest expression of their views see J. Murphy-O'Connor, "The Damascus Document Revisited," *RB* 92 (1985): 223-46; and P.R. Davies, *Behind the Essenes. History and Ideology of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (BJS 94; Atlanta: Scholars Press 1987).

⁵² Such as 4Q394-399 (4QMMT).

This hypothesis is the combination in an integrated whole of the insights of A.S. van der Woude as to the application to more than one single Hasmonaean ruler of the designation “Wicked Priest” in the *Peshar Habakkuk*,⁵³ which are solidly anchored in the known political and religious history of Palestine in the early years of the Qumran group, and the proposal of F. García Martínez clearly to distinguish between the origins of the Qumran group and the origins of the parent group, the Essene movement, and to trace back to the Apocalyptic Tradition of the third c. B.C.E. the ideological roots of the Essenes.⁵⁴ In essence, this hypothesis proposes:

- 1) to make a clear distinction between the origins of the Essene movement and those of the Qumran group;
- 2) to place the origins of the Essene movement in Palestine and specifically in the Palestinian apocalyptic tradition before the Antiochian crisis, that is at the end of the third or the beginning of the second c. B.C.E.;
- 3) to seek the origins of the Qumran group in a split which occurred within the Essene movement in consequence of which the group loyal to the Teacher of Righteousness was finally to establish itself in Qumran;
- 4) to consider the designation “Wicked Priest” as a generic one referring to different Hasmonaean High Priests in chronological order;
- 5) to highlight the importance of the Qumran group’s formative period before its retreat to the desert and to make clear the ideological development, the halakhic elements, and the political conflicts that took place during this formative period and culminated in the break which led to the community’s establishing itself in Qumran.

The “Groningen hypothesis” seeks information as to the origins of the Essene movement in the classical accounts of the Essenes, in the Essene works preserved at Qumran and in Essene documents incorporated in later Qumran works. The study of this material allows us to conclude that Essenism:

⁵³ A.S. van der Woude, “Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Commentary,” *JJS* 33 (1982): 349–59.

⁵⁴ F. García Martínez, “Orígenes del movimiento esenio y orígenes qumránicos: Pistas para una solución,” in *Il Simposio Biblico Español* (ed. V. Collado Bertomeu and V. Vilar Hueso; Valencia-Córdoba: Fundación Bíblica Española, 1987), 527–56; *idem*, “Essénisme Qumránien: Origines, caractéristiques, héritage,” in *Correnti culturali e movimenti religiosi del giudaismo. Atti del V Congresso internazionale dell’AISG (S. Miniato, 12–15 novembre 1984)* (ed. B. Chiesa; AISG Testi e studi 5; Roma: Carucci, 1987), 37–57.

- is a Palestinian phenomenon that dates from before the Antiochian crisis, as shown by Josephus and *1 En.* 90, and
- has its ideological roots in the apocalyptic tradition in which we find determinism, the type of biblical interpretation, the angelology, the idea of the eschatological temple, etc., that emerge as characteristics of the Essene ideology;
- follows halakhic positions that now can best be described as Sadducean.

It seeks further information as to the origins of the Qumran group and the early history of the community in the works of the pre-Qumran formation period, in the documents of this period incorporated in later sectarian works and in the same sectarian works that (like the pesharim) refer expressly to the period of the origins. The study of this material allows us to conclude that the fundamental disputes within the Essene movement during the formative period of the sect were centred on the question of the calendar and the subsequent organization of the festive cycle, and on a particular way of understanding the biblical prescriptions relating to the temple, the cult and the purity of persons and things. This particular halakhah is rooted in the Teacher of Righteousness's consciousness of having received by divine revelation the correct interpretation of the biblical text, an interpretation which is thus inspired and prescriptive, and the acceptance by some of the members of the community of this interpretation as a revelation. The rejection of this interpretation and of the particular halakhah deriving from it by the rest of the members of the Essene movement would end by making it impossible for them to stay together. This consciousness of having received through divine revelation the correct interpretation of the Law led the Teacher of Righteousness to propound a series of ideological and legal positions (imminence of the last days, a particular festive calendar, the imperfection of the existing temple and cult compared with what they should be, etc.) and of particular halakhoth conditioning daily life and to wish to impose on all members of the Essene movement this understanding of the Law. The failure of this attempt was due, according to the sectarian texts, to the influence of the Liar, the leader of the Essene movement who "led many astray with deceitful words, so that they chose foolishness and hearkened not to the Interpreter of Knowledge" (4Q171 1-2 i 18-19). The result was to be the break between the adepts of the Teacher of Righteousness and the rest of the Essenes, who remained faithful to the Liar.

The “Groningen hypothesis” tries also to elucidate the historical circumstances in which the split took place and the further development of the group which remained faithful to the Teacher of Righteousness. The central problem constituted by the identification of the person designated “The Wicked Priest” has continued to defy the efforts of the scholars. While recognising that this person provides the key to the early history of the Community since he is the highest authority in the country (“he ruled over Israel” 1QpHab VIII 9–10) and makes it possible to connect the history of the sect with political and religious history (because he is said to have persecuted the Teacher of Righteousness), efforts to identify him convincingly have failed owing to the fact that the many allusions to him in the pesharim contain elements so various that it is impossible to apply all of them to any one High Priest of the second c. B.C.E. P. Davies has even gone so far as to deny all historical reality to the figure.⁵⁵ All hypotheses so far proposed rest on the unproven presupposition that all mentions of the “Wicked Priest” refer to one and the same person. The suggestion of Van der Woude that we should see in the designation “Wicked Priest” a description referring to the various Hasmonaean High Priests from Judas Maccabaeus to Alexander Jannaeus and in precise chronological order, offers a simple elegant solution which at once respects the totality of the data of the *Pesher Habakkuk* and the interpretative limits imposed by the archaeological dating of the Qumran settlement, and has, moreover, the advantage of fixing the precise chronological framework for the development of the early history of the community. The data of 1QpHab show us that the formative period of the Qumran group runs through the pontificates of Jonathan and Simon and that this period is characterized not only by the elaboration of the ideological and political principles previously mentioned, but also by conflicts with the political and religious might of Jerusalem. It also shows us that the break with the Essene movement became complete during the long pontificate of John Hyrcanus, but this break and the settlement in Qumran did not mean a reconciliation with the political power. On the contrary, John Hyrcanus persecuted the Teacher of Righteousness in his desert retreat and his successor, Alexander Jannaeus, was also to be qualified as a Wicked Priest.

⁵⁵ “We may accept the ‘Teacher of Righteousness’ as an historical individual, but not the ‘Wicked Priest.’ The latter is possibly an amalgam of several figures, no one of whom, moreover, may have dealt directly with the ‘Teacher’ (nor maybe even with his community), but who would have been the targets of the community’s polemic,” *Behind the Essenes*, 28.

A recent attempt to investigate the history of the Qumran community concludes that we can hardly arrive at anything more than "a general chronological framework against which to understand the history alluded to in the other documents—roughly from the first quarter of the second century to 90 B.C.E." and that there were "conflicts between the Liar, the Wicked Priest, and the Teacher, but nothing more than that."⁵⁶ And Davies has strongly voiced his scepticism as to the pesharim information as a possible source for the group's history.⁵⁷ But if our hypothesis is taken seriously we can extract a good deal more information from the available texts than currently thought:

- we can take at face value the chronological information of CD about the origins of the movement joined after some time by the Teacher of Righteousness;
- we can understand the positive assessment of the first period of the activity of Judas Maccabaeus (the first Wicked Priest) and the condemnation of his conduct once in power;
- we can exclude the identification of the parent group with the Hasidim on the basis of the condemnation of Alcimus (the second Wicked Priest);
- we can specify that the formative period of the sectarian group was in progress at least during the pontificates of Jonathan and Simon (the third and fourth Wicked Priests), giving in this way a more precise date to the documents coming from this period;
- we can conclude that the core of original members of the group was made up of dissatisfied priests of the highest circles, which accounts for the Sadducean character of their halakhah;⁵⁸
- we can fix the establishment of the group in Khirbet Qumran during the pontificate of John Hyrcanus⁵⁹ (the fifth Wicked Priest) and the

⁵⁶ P.R. Callaway, *The History of the Qumran Community: An Investigation* (JSPS 3; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), 210.

⁵⁷ A leitmotiv in his *Behind the Essenes*, e.g.: "Until we understand how these commentaries work—and that means as midrashim—we have no warrant to plunder them for historical data" (p. 27); "So the *peshar* phenomenon at Qumran may well be a development late in the history of the community and have little to do with the activities of the 'Teacher.' Certainly it may have little to do with real history."

⁵⁸ See L.H. Schiffman, "The Temple Scroll and the Systems of Jewish Law of the Second Temple Period," in *Temple Scroll Studies* (ed. G.J. Brooke; JSPS 7; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 239–55 and the rather idiosyncratic article of H. Burgmann, "11QT: The Sadducean Torah," in the same volume, 257–63.

⁵⁹ The accepted opinion, based on the presentation of de Vaux in his *Schweich Lectures*, admits that the First sectarian occupation of the site goes back to the pontificate

- death of the Teacher of Righteousness during the same pontificate and before the pontificate of Alexander Jannaeus;⁶⁰
- we can consequently determine the period (about 40 years after the death of the Teacher)⁶¹ when the group expected that all the wicked would be consumed and the subsequent efforts to cope with the delay of the end;
 - we can precisely date the composition of the 1QpHab in the last years of the life of Alexander Jannaeus (the sixth Wicked Priest), still alive at the moment of the first redaction of the pesher.

Of course, not all the problems the scrolls present are solved by our “Groningen hypothesis.” The history of the ideas of the religious movement that ultimately gave birth to the Qumran group and their relation with the rest of post-exilic Judaism still need to be written, as well as the development of these ideas once the group settled at Qumran. The texts are there, writings belonging to the apocalyptic tradition, to the Essene movement and to the Qumran sect, and our hypothesis suggests that this intellectual history can indeed be written from these sources. Again, a detailed history of the life of the group needs to be reconstructed. If our hypothesis has convinced you that it is indeed possible to write this history from the texts of the group’s library, or at least that a total scepticism is unwarranted, its utility as a stimulus to historical inquiry will have been proved.

of Jonathan, but, as we think we have proved, this opinion is contradicted by the findings previously obtained and published by de Vaux himself and by the very arguments he advanced to support it, see F. García Martínez, “Orígenes del movimiento esenio y orígenes qumránicos: Pistas para una solución,” 535–38; *idem*, “Qumran Origins and Early History,” 114–15, 130–31.

⁶⁰ See A.S. van der Woude, “Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests?,” 357–58.

⁶¹ According to CD XX 14–15; 4Q171 1–2 ii 6–7.

CHAPTER THREE

WAS JUDAS MACCABAEUS A WICKED PRIEST? MARGINAL NOTES ON 1QPHAB VIII 8–13*

Already in 1949, at the beginning of Qumran research, the possibility was raised of understanding the expressions “Wicked Priest” and “Teacher of Righteousness” as supra-individual names referring more to the function than to actual persons.¹ However, this suggestion by Bo Reicke, which would ultimately lead to a general acceptance of more than one “Teacher of Righteousness,” remained without an echo in respect of the “Wicked Priest.” Certainly, in 1950 A. Dupont-Sommer proposed the identification of two specific historical people as Wicked Priests.² However, only in 1952 did W.H. Brownlee³ systematically develop the possibility of understanding the term “Wicked Priest” as a title applicable to specific individuals and as a result ascribe the various historical allusions in the *Pesher Habakkuk* to the Wicked Priests John Hyrcanus, Aristobulus I and Alexander Jannaeus, also identifying the “last priests of Jerusalem” with Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II. This paper by Brownlee unleashed an immediate and crushing reply from

* Professor M. Delcor, the master of Qumran studies, has always been able to keep the requisite openness and readiness to reconsider his own opinions in the light of new arguments. In 1951 [*Les Manuscrits de la mer Morte: Essai sur le Midrash d’Habacuc* (Lectio Divina 7; Paris: Cerf, 1951) and “Le Midrash d’Habacuc,” *RB* 58 (1951): 521–48] his detailed study of 1QpHab led him to identify the Wicked Priest as Alexander Jannaeus, an identification corroborated by 4QpNah. In 1978 [in his article “Littérature essénienne,” *DBSup* 9:828–959] he accepted his identification as Jonathan, an identification favoured by the archaeological data (col. 907). This openness, typical of his thinking, leads us to present to him here, in homage, new arguments from a different perspective, certain that in turn they will be generously listened to.

¹ Bo Reicke, “Die Ta’āmire-Schriften und die Damaskus-Fragmente,” *Studia Theologica* 2 (1949): 60: “Zum Teil sind beide wahrscheinlich überindividuelle Gestalten, nämlich die Träger des wahren, beziehungsweise des falschen, hohenpriesterlichen Amtes im allgemeinen.”

² Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II; cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, “Le “Commentaire d’Habacuc” découvert près de la Mer Morte,” *RHR* 137 (1950): 129–71.

³ W.H. Brownlee, “The Historical Allusions of the Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash,” *BASOR* 126 (1950): 10–20.

K. Elliger.⁴ Elliger's objections are based on a different appraisal of the verbal tenses and a refusal to give credence to the information from Josephus on which Brownlee relies, both more or less subjective elements. The only really serious obstacle that Elliger stresses is the inconsistency supposed by inserting Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II between Aristobulus I and Alexander Jannaeus. This obstacle is real and Elliger's critique is presented with such irony and force that it is not surprising that Brownlee's hypothesis fell into oblivion. Scholars who later discussed the topic either ignored or rejected it, with a reference to Elliger.

It is to A.S. van der Woude's credit not only to have arrived independently at a new formulation of the hypothesis of several Wicked Priests but also of having provided it with solid methodological foundations and of having drawn out the consequences in respect of the *Pesher Habakkuk*, introducing the principle of the chronological sequence of the Wicked Priests within that series. In fact, the Dutch scholar, in the *Festschrift* for Y. Yadin,⁵ proves that the burden of the proof belongs to those who postulate that the expression "Wicked Priest" refers to only one individual. Methodologically, the expression cannot be restricted to only one person as long as no proofs to the contrary are provided. These proofs do not exist. On the contrary, a whole series of indications, noted by Van der Woude, show that the expression is not limited to denoting only one individual but serves to indicate the Wicked Priests Judas Maccabaeus and Alexander Jannaeus.

All these characters, with the exception of Judas Maccabaeus, have previously been proposed as candidates for the title of Wicked Priest in the opinions of different scholars, so that their inclusion in the series of Wicked Priests should not present insoluble problems. The case of Judas Maccabaeus is different, whom Van der Woude is the first and only person to consider as one of the Wicked Priests. This difference is due, no doubt, to the fact that all scholars correctly consider the Wicked Priest to have been a High Priest; a *conditio sine qua non* which they all fulfil, with the exception of Judas Maccabaeus.

Stated in another way: in order to accept that the author of 1QpHab calls Judas Maccabaeus a Wicked Priest as well, it is necessary to prove

⁴ K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer* (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 15; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1953), 288–93.

⁵ A.S. van der Woude, "Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Commentary," *JJS* 33 (1982): 349–59.

that the author of the work could consider him as a High Priest. Is this possible? In my opinion, the answer is in the affirmative and without reservation.

Before presenting the arguments that justify this opinion it is necessary to stress that it is not necessary to prove that Judas Maccabaeus was, historically speaking, a High Priest, but that nothing is against the author of 1QpHab having considered him to be such. Historical events are one thing and traditions, interpretations, ideas, etc., which a specific group forms of history and reflects in its writings are another. Another fact to take into account is the distinction between being a High Priest *de jure*, that is one named as such to exercise the function through legitimate authority, and the exercise *de facto* of the function through substitution, undue appropriation, etc.

With these finer points in mind, my argument develops in the following steps:

JUDAS MACCABAEUS COULD IN FACT HAVE ACTED AS HIGH PRIEST

Even the work by Schürer-Vermes, which considers it very unlikely that Judas Maccabaeus exercised the functions of High Priest, openly acknowledges the possibility.⁶ In fact, Judas is the undisputed leader of the nation and to him belongs the honour of the purification of the Temple in 164 B.C.E. 2 Maccabees attributes it to Judas and his men (2 Macc 10:1); 1 Maccabees notes that it is Judas who chooses the priests who perform the purification (1 Macc 4:42) and decides the perennial celebration of the commemorative festival of dedication (1 Macc 4:49); Josephus specifies that it is actually he who sanctifies the Temple, purifies it, destroys the desecrated altar, builds the new one and brings in the new paraphernalia (*Ant.* 12.318). In fact we do not know for certain who acted as High Priest during the purification of the Temple and after, until the installation of Alcimus in 162 B.C.E., but it is unthinkable that the High Priest *de jure*, Menelaus, exercised the functions *de facto* while Judas had power. Menelaus represented specifically the Hellenistic movement and it was he who “persuaded the king’s father to force the Jews to

⁶ “It is not in itself inconceivable that Judas also usurped the functions of the High Priest.” E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)* (rev. and ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Black; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: Clark, 1973–1987), 1:170, n. 31.

forsake the religion of their fathers,”⁷ provoking the Maccabean revolt, as Lysias specifies when advising Antiochus Eupater to carry it out. This fact, which is indisputable, leaves open the possibility that it was actually Judas Maccabaeus who in fact performed the functions.

A RELIABLE TRADITION STATES NOT ONLY THAT JUDAS
MACCABAEUS IN FACT PERFORMED THESE FUNCTIONS
BUT ALSO THAT HE WAS CALLED HIGH PRIEST

In the Talmud,⁸ an ancient and still variable tradition⁹ attributes the High Priesthood even to Matatias, the father of Judas. The clearest expression of this tradition is to be found in Josephus: “When he (Alcimus) died, the people entrusted the High Priesthood to Judas” (*Ant.* 12.414); “The decree was signed by Eupolemos, son of John, by Jason, son of Eleazar, by Judas as High Priest of the nation and by his son Simon, the commander” (*Ant.* 12.419); “He (Judas) had been High Priest for three years when he died” (*Ant.* 12.434). It is true that these statements by Josephus seem historically incorrect, since Judas died before Alcimus, and they are contradicted by *Ant.* 20.237, where it states that on the death of Alcimus no-one succeeded him and that the office of High Priest remained vacant for seven years until the appointment of Jonathan. Whatever the case may be about this last statement, about the disputed interregnum in the High Priesthood and the historical foundation of the statements of Josephus, what interests us here is that the tradition that attributes the High Priesthood to Judas Maccabaeus was well established in his time.

THIS TRADITION IS CONTEMPORARY WITH OR EARLIER THAN 1QP^HAB

The categorical way in which the tradition appears in Josephus undoubtedly supposes that it was earlier. I think that I can prove that it is earlier than 1QP^HAB thanks to a text from 2 Maccabees which, in my opinion, implies that Judas was appointed acting High Priest by Nicanor to replace Alcimus during the period of peaceful relations between both

⁷ *Ant.* 12.384.

⁸ *b. Meg.* 11a according to the traditional text. The Munich Codex omits “the Hasmonaean and his sons,” moves Simeon the Just to the next sentence, and inserts Yochanan ben Matatias as High Priest.

⁹ Cf. *Diqduqe Soferim*, ad loc. The Parma Codex uses wording that seems to attribute the High Priesthood to the whole family: “Matatias and his sons High Priest.”

leaders. The text in question tells us that “Alcimus, on seeing the friendship that they had, went to Demetrius with a copy of the agreement that they had signed, and told him that Nicanor had ideas against the politics of the Government, as he had appointed Judas, the conspirator against the Empire, to replace him” (2 Macc 14:26). F.-M. Abel prefers to read, with Codex Alexandrinus: τὸν γὰρ ἐπίβουλον τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ Ἰουδαν διάδοχον ἀνάδειξεν, referring αὐτοῦ to βασιλείας and interpreting διάδοχον as a title, so that he translates “since the very opponent of his kingdom, Judas, he had promoted to diadochus,”¹⁰ specifying in a note that “in the court of the Lagides, diadochus is the last class of noble courtiers.” However, the correct text, attested by the Venice Codex and confirmed by the Lucianic recension and the Latin version is: τὸν γὰρ ἐπίβουλον τῆς βασιλείας Ἰουδαν αὐτοῦ διάδοχον ἀναδείξει,¹¹ which can only be interpreted as Nicanor having appointed Judas as the “successor” of Alcimus. Evidently, this should not be considered as appointing a successor in the sense that Nicanor would have deposed Alcimus and named Judas Maccabaeus as High Priest *de jure*, something that lay outside his authority unless he counted on the authorisation of Antiochus, but it means that he named him as a *de facto* deputy of Alcimus. This meaning of διάδοχος as a deputy is widely attested in the papyri¹² and is known by the author of 2 Maccabees, who in 4:29 writes: καὶ ὁ μὲν Μενέλαος ἀπέλιπεν τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης διάδοχον Λυσίμαχον τὸν ἑαυτοῦ ἀδελφόν, “Menelaus left his brother Lysimachus as deputy in his office of High Priest.”

Although the date of composition of 2 Maccabees is a debated issue, most commentators date it to the 2nd c. B.C.E. and in no case can it be lowered to a date later than the 1st c. B.C.E. This means that the text quoted tells us that the tradition that attributed the High Priesthood *de facto* to Judas is contemporary with or earlier than 1QpHab. Methodologically, then, it cannot be excluded that the author of 1QpHab knew this tradition and shared it.

With the way now clear, we can move on to examine in detail the text of 1QpHab VIII 8–13 on which Van der Woude bases his identification of the first Wicked Priest with Judas Maccabaeus, commenting on characteristic expressions:

¹⁰ F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris: Gabalda, 1949), 464.

¹¹ The Lucianic recension specifies: διάδοχον ἀναδείξει ἑαυτοῦ.

¹² Cf. Abel, *Les Livres des Maccabées*, 339.

Its prediction (of Hab 2:5–6) refers to the Wicked Priest, who is counted among the adherents of the truth at the start of his elevation; but when he ruled over Israel his heart became conceited and he deserted God and betrayed the laws for the sake of wealth. He stole and hoarded wealth from brutal men who had rebelled against God and he seized public money adding upon himself a blameworthy sin; and he committed repulsive acts of every type of filthy licentiousness.

1. נקרא על שם האמת

The interpretations of this expression, literally “to be called by the name of truth,” reflect the whole gamut of imaginable hypotheses. For Dupont-Sommer,¹³ it is equivalent to being called by the name of Yahweh; for Delcor,¹⁴ it is equivalent to being called by the name of “faithfulness,” an allusion to the Jewish name of Alexander Jannaeus, Jonathan, David’s faithful friend; for others, it is equivalent to being called by his own name, which would only indicate nothing more than an allusion to the custom of changing one’s name when beginning to exercise the functions of High Priest or to being called with the correct title, understanding it as the correct title of High Priest and not the title of king,¹⁵ or that initially he was called כוהן הראש, “High Priest,” and later כוהן הרשע, “Wicked Priest,”¹⁶ or simply that he was a legitimate priest.¹⁷ However, the context makes it clear enough that what is stated in the *peshet* is the contrast between a before and an after, between a period distinguished by the “truth” in the beginning, and another distinguished by “betrayal” of the laws because of wealth, or that the emphasis should not be on the “name” but on the “truth.” Taking this into account, Cross suggests as a possibility that the phrase simply means that, initially, the Wicked Priest had a good reputation.¹⁸ This possibility is changed into a positive statement by Jeremias¹⁹ (based on the fact that שם in the Hebrew Bible,

¹³ Dupont-Sommer, “Le ‘Commentaire d’Habacuc’ découvert près de la Mer Morte,” 145.

¹⁴ Delcor, *Essai sur le Midrash d’Habacuc*, 25, 64.

¹⁵ Thus J. Carmignac, *Les Textes de Qumrân, traduits et annotés II* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1963), 107, n. 10, as a possibility, referring to Hyrcanus II.

¹⁶ Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer*, 198.

¹⁷ M.P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 8; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979), 41.

¹⁸ F.M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (London: Duckworth, 1958), 107, n. 67a.

¹⁹ G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 39.

and especially ὄνομα in the LXX, often has the meaning of “reputation, rumour”) by Murphy O’Connor²⁰ and by Stegemann.²¹ However, these interpretations forget that the term “truth” (אמת) is loaded with theological meaning in the writings from Qumran²² and is even used as a name of the Community²³ or its members,²⁴ so that its meaning here cannot be diluted. In the Hebrew Bible, נקרא על שם means to be counted among the members of a tribe or family,²⁵ so that in view of the meaning of אמת, the only correct interpretation of the phrase seems to be the one proposed by Brownlee:²⁶ the Wicked Priest was counted among the adherents of the truth, was considered as a member of the truth party. What this first statement tells us is that this Wicked Priest, with regard to the first part of his life, was completely acceptable to the members of the Community or its predecessors, who considered him as one of their own. This forces us to go back to a period before the break of the Qumran movement with the Jerusalem priesthood. As Van der Woude correctly notes,²⁷ this statement is only intelligible if it refers to the period before the confrontation. A positive evaluation of the adversary, once the break had occurred, could only refer to the period during which they had made common cause with him. This period, as we will see when analysing the second of these expressions, can only be the Maccabean uprising. Certainly we know very little about the prehistory of the Qumran movement, its formative period before it settled in Qumran. But it is commonly accepted that its origins have their roots in the movement of the Pious Ones, the Hasidim of the period the Maccabean revolt, or in any case, that the respective positions of both movements are closely related. Given that the setting of our text is the start of the Maccabean revolt, a period before the formation of the

²⁰ J. Murphy-O’Connor, “The Essenes and their History,” *RB* 81 (1974): 231, n. 73.

²¹ H. Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* (Bonn 1971), 217.

²² F. Nötscher, “Wahrheit als theologischer Terminus in den Qumran Texten,” in *Vom alten zum neuen Testament. Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Bonner Biblische Beiträge 17; Bonn: Hanstein, 1962).

²³ יחד אמת, 1QS II 24, 26; מוסד אמת, 1QS V 5; בית תמים ואמת, 1QS VIII 9.

²⁴ אנשי (ה) אמת, 1QpHab VII 10; 1QH II 14; XIV 2; בני אמת, 1QM XVII 8; 1QH VI 29; VII 30; IX 35; X 27; XI 11.

²⁵ Gen 48:6; Ezra 2:61; Neh 7:63;

²⁶ “Was considered a member of the Truth party” or “Was reckoned among the adherents of the truth,” cf. W.H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Peshet of Habakkuk* (Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 24; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), 135.

²⁷ Van der Woude, “Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Commentary,” 354–55.

Essene-Qumran movement or at least before it settled in Qumran, the expression “to be counted among the adherents of the truth” cannot refer to belonging formally to the sect or group of Qumran, but must be interpreted as “to be counted among,” “to be acceptable to” the group or movement of the period in question to which the later Qumran group ascribes its origins or to which it can attribute the same estimation of the term “truth,” i.e. to the Hasidim movement. And of the important people of the period who “rule over Israel,” the only one who can be counted among the Hasidim at the beginning of its rise is Judas Maccabaeus.

The texts are extremely well known. The Hasidim, who were the first to join the Maccabean revolt (1 Macc 2:42), abandoned Judas at the moment of conflict with Alcimus (1 Macc 7:14) who, however, executed 60 from among them (1 Macc 7:16) provoking their further estrangement. If any doubt were left that the Hasidim could have considered Judas Maccabaeus as one of their own, it is removed by reading 2 Macc 14:6. Alcimus, addressing Demetrius, says: “These Jews who are called Hasidim, whose leader is Judas Maccabaeus (ὄν ἀφηγεῖται Ἰουδας ὁ Μακκαβαῖος) are fomenting war and provoking sedition, preventing the kingdom from enjoying peace.” Nothing similar can be said of the other members of Hasmonaean dynasty.

2. בתחלת עומדו

Unlike the previous statement this has hardly provoked any discussion. And yet its meaning is not obvious due to the many nuances that the verb עמד can have. Most interpreters understand it as “the beginning of his service,” with no further qualifications or, specifically, the start of his office as High Priest. Horgan even translates “at the beginning of his course.”²⁸ However, as Brownlee²⁹ notes, it is difficult to consider accession, coming on stage, exercise of an office as a continual process in which a beginning can be indicated.

The verb עמד, especially in the last books of the Bible, is used with two meanings that can throw light on our text. In one series of texts the verb is used to denote a king (Dan 8:22, 23; 11:2, 3, 4; Sir 47:12), or a priest (Ezra 2:63; Neh 7:65) or a prophet (Sir 47:1) coming into power

²⁸ Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, 17, 41.

²⁹ Brownlee, *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*, 137.

or taking up office. However, other texts give it the meaning of rising in a military sense, what we would call an uprising. The fact is that in most of these cases the verb is constructed with the preposition על: 2 Chr 20:23; Dan 8:25; 11:14, but Ps 106:30 uses the verb without a preposition: “then Phinehas stood up and intervened and the plague ceased.” This text is interesting because the psalmist has substituted the verbs that occur in the original biblical account (Num 25) for עמד to denote Phinehas rising up standing up and because the character of Phinehas “the zealous one” plays an important role in the wording of the Maccabean uprising in 1 Maccabees, the only ancient text that stresses the military, zealot nature of Phinehas standing up. When explaining the action of Matatias at the start of the revolt, the author of 1 Maccabees specifies: “full of zeal for the law he did what Phinehas did to Zimri, son of Salu” (1 Macc 2:26) and when relating his testament evokes the zeal of “Phinehas, our father, who for his zeal received the promise of an eternal priesthood” (1 Macc 2:54). Is it mere coincidence that the author of 1 Maccabees uses the same verb as in Ps 106:30 to denote the rising up of Matatias: “In those days, Matatias rose up (ἀνέστη)” (1 Macc 2:1) or of Simon: “Then, Simon rose up and fought for his nation” (1 Macc 14:32)? Or that to indicate Judas’ accession to power (1 Macc 3:1), Jonathan (1 Macc 9:31) and Simon (1 Macc 13:14) use the fixed formula [ἀνέστη ἀντί]?

In Qumran, עמד, alongside its general meaning, often has the same sense as in the late books of the Hebrew Bible, especially in CD and the *pesharim*. Thus, it is used to denote the eschatological coming of the shoot of David (4Q174 1–2 i 13; 4Q161 8–10 17), the messiah of Aaron and Israel (CD XII 23; XX 1), the Prince of the Congregation (CD VII 20) or he who teaches justice (CD VI 10), as well as to introduce historical characters from the past such as Zadok (CD V 5), the Zadokites (CD IV 4) or the Man of Lies (CD I 14). However, in other texts this rising up has a clear polemical character: 4Q169 3–4 i 3; 4Q175 23–25 and especially CD V 17–VI 1. In view of the nuance that the word has in these texts and in 1 Maccabees, I think it is more correct to translate עמדו בתחלת עומדו as “at the beginning of his rising,” understanding it as a twofold allusion to the two aspects denoted by עמד: a reference to introduction, presenting a person as a public figure, and the conflicting character, of rising up, of his entry on stage. This amounts to saying that the period in which this Wicked Priest took up office is a period of conflict and that his entry takes on the characteristics of a military uprising

which, considering the period, can only be the Maccabean uprising. This characteristic, then, agrees perfectly with what we know of Judas Maccabaeus.

3. וכאשר משל בישראל

The searching analysis of all these cases in which משל is used in Qumran and in biblical texts by Stegemann,³⁰ whose conclusions we can only approve and share, saves us treating it at length. Its meaning here is simply to exercise political power.

However, there is one aspect to which not enough attention has been paid but which ultimately is what has conditioned the actual wording of this part of the pesher: the use in the biblical lemma of the term משל.³¹ Whether you vocalise *mašal* with the MT or *mošel* as the pesher seems to require, what is certain is that this group of consonants has determined the choice of the term used in the pesher and has conditioned its wording, so that its exact meaning, as distinct from מלך for example, cannot be forced, in spite of the use of מלכותו בישראל in 4Q169 3–4 IV 3. Therefore, it seems incorrect to conclude, as Milik does, that the use of משל provides a *terminus ante quem* to situate the figure of the Wicked Priest in a period in which the High Priests had not yet taken the title of kings, as they did from Aristobulus I,³² or that its use postulates for the Wicked Priest a period in which he was only a religious leader and afterwards began to govern politically, as Dupont-Sommer does, seeing here a decisive trait to identify the Wicked Priest with Hyrcanus II.³³ In view of the lemma, the only thing that can be concluded from the wording of the *pesher* is that the person alluded to exercised political power in Israel, as is the case for all the members of the Hasmonaean dynasty.

4. רם לבו ויעזוב את אל וי[ב]נוד בחוקים בעבור הון

“On account of riches” includes the central theme of the biblical quotation exactly as worded in the MS³⁴ and applies it to the Wicked Priest

³⁰ Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde*, 100–105 and nn. 323–50.

³¹ On its possible meaning cf. the Excursus in Brownlee, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk*, 143.

³² J.T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (trans. J. Strugnell; London: SCM Press, 1959), 65–66.

³³ A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les Écrits Esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte* (Paris: Payot, 1959), 362.

³⁴ For an explanation of the differences with MT cf. W.H. Brownlee, *The Text of*

in a series of generic statements worded under the twofold influence of Deut 8:1–14 and the quotation. From Deut 8:14 comes the arrogance, the abandonment of God (to forget him, in the MT) and the allusion to the precepts, commandments and decrees, summarised as דְּרִוּקִים. From the quotation comes the verb יִבְנוֹד and the threefold division. Therefore, it is useless to look for a precise portrait of the Wicked Priest in question in the expressions used.

5. וַיִּנְזֹל וַיִּקְבוֹץ הוֹן אֲנָשֵׁי חַמְסֵי אֲשֶׁר מִרְדּוּ בְּאֵל

The main discussion about this description of the actions of the Wicked Priest has focused on determining whether חַמְסֵי אֲנָשֵׁי represents a specific group of people and, if so, which. For Silberman³⁵ and Elliger³⁶ it only specifies the type of riches: riches from thieves and assassins; whereas for Brownlee³⁷ it is definitely a group, specifically the Samaritans, and Carmignac thinks of an allusion to the Pharisees.³⁸ In my opinion, the author indicates a definite group whose identification can be reached thanks to a detail that until now has gone unnoticed: the use of the verb מִרְדַּד to define it. Brownlee is forced to look beyond Israel for this group because in the biblical quotation the terms כּוֹל הַגּוֹיִם and כּוֹל הָעַמִּים appear. Since the next sentence speaks of “the riches of the peoples,” the riches of violent men must be the riches of the nations. However, this is not necessary. In the biblical quotation both expressions are strictly parallel and all that the author of the *pesher* has taken is the fact of the double expression which he has made use of to distinguish two types of riches that the Wicked Priest appropriates. The first of these types of riches is possessed by the Israelites, as I think is clear from the further specification “who rebelled against God,” which would be out of place if the riches were of the peoples. The text of 11QP^sa XXII 6–7, quoted by Brownlee, in which it is connected with the Hellenising group of Jerusalem in the period of Judas Maccabaeus, points towards the correct solution of the problem and not towards the Samaritans, as Brownlee supposes. In fact, מִרְדַּד is a verb that is used very rarely in the

Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran (JBL Monograph Series 11; Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1959), 45–49.

³⁵ L.H. Silberman, “Unriddling the Riddle, a Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Peshier,” *RevQ* 3/11 (1961): 348–49.

³⁶ Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer*, 199–200.

³⁷ Brownlee, *The Midrash Peshier of Habakuk*, 140–42.

³⁸ Carmignac, *Les Textes de Qumrân, traduits et annotés II*, 107 n. 12.

Qumran writings. Leaving aside 4Q181 2 and 4Q509 233 2, which are difficult to read and without context, it only occurs here, in 1QpHab VIII 16 and in CD VIII 4. This last text is decisive since, as Murphy O'Connor³⁹ has proved, in it document A calls “rebels” (מורדים) the Hellenising group that is opposed to the Maccabean revolt, the Princes of Judah, ἄρχοντες Ιουδα of 1 Macc 2:18 (according to the reading of Codex Alexandrinus). The group of persons, then, whose riches the Wicked Priest stole and heaped up, is no other than the Hellenising aristocracy of Jerusalem, the violent men who rebelled against God. This group, which 1 Macc 6:21 calls τινες τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἐξ Ἰσραηλ “some of the wicked men of Israel,” and Josephus calls φυγάδες τῶν Ἰουδαίων, “renegade Jews” (*Ant.* 12.362), was in fact despoiled of their riches by Judas Maccabaeus.⁴⁰ 1 Maccabees specifies that when part of the garrison of Accra, besieged by Judas, succeeded in breaking the encirclement and together with these “wicked of Israel” turned to Antiochus V to ask for help, together with a statement of their philo-Hellenism, presents his complaints for the dispossession of his goods caused by Judas:

When are you thinking of doing justice and avenging our brothers? We submitted ourselves to your father willingly, we acted according to his instructions and obeyed his orders to the letter. The result is that our fellow countrymen have besieged the acropolis and treat us like foreigners. Even more, they have killed those who plundered us, sacked our properties and not only have they extended their hands against us but also against all your territory (1 Macc 6:22–25; cf. Josephus *Ant.* 12.362–366).

6. ודון עמים לקח לוסיף עליו עין אשמה

The second type of riches which the Wicked Priest appropriated are the “riches of the peoples.” Silberman⁴¹ has wished to see here an allusion to sacking the treasure of the Temple, based on the fact that in Lev 22:16 עין אשמה is used to specify the sin that the priests committed in appropriating the holy portion that the Israelites offer in the Temple.

³⁹ J. Murphy O'Connor, “The Critique of the Princes of Judah,” *RB* 79 (1972): 213,

⁴⁰ So already Van der Woude, “Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Commentary,” 355, who, on the basis of the equivalence of 1 Macc 6:18–27 with our text, had concluded that the violent men were to be identified as members of the Hellenistic party.

⁴¹ Silberman, “Unriddling the Riddle, a Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Peshet.”

But, apart from the unlikely meaning that the accusation would have in this case, the influence of the wording of the quotation seems crucial to me. Also, the same expression is used in 1QS V 15 to describe the members of the sect who become partners in work or in the wealth with non-members, with no specific relation to the Temple, and in 4Q512 15 i 1, in a context of purification. Therefore I think that the phrase must be understood, with most scholars, as a condemnation of this Wicked Priest becoming rich due to his campaigns outside the country. In the same way that the nations join together (אִסְפֹּר) against the corrupt man for riches, the riches of the peoples add (לוֹטִיף) a blameworthy sin to their robbing the riches of violent men.

If the terms chosen by the author indicate something more than the condemnation of wealth, I think the nuance has to be sought in the light of 4Q169 3–4 ii 6 and 1QpHab IV 11, where the intervention of the Kittim is connected with the *guilty* counsel or with the counsel of the house of *guilt* of the “the seekers of easy interpretations,” as a way of subtly indicating that the external campaigns of this Wicked Priest have the same type of guilt as the intervention of the peoples provoked by the counsel of those looking for easy interpretations will have. At all events, it is true that although it is a general characteristic that fits most of the Hasmonaean High Priests, it also applies perfectly to Judas Maccabaeus and his external campaigns. 1 Maccabees limits itself to noting that Judas takes for himself the spoils of the conquered,⁴² but Josephus informs us, in the case of the battle against Gorgias, that Judas, in spite of having exhorted his troops not to look anxiously for booty, “knowing that the soldiers of Gorgias had been defeated without a fight, returned and seized the spoils, and taking a large amount of gold, silver, purple and jacinth, went back home” (*Ant.* 12.309, 312; cf. similarly *Ant.* 12.328, 353).

7. ודרכי ת[וע]בות פעל בכול נדת שמאה

As Jeremias⁴³ notes, after examining the two closest parallels, 1QM XIII 5 and 1QS IV 10, this final sentence is nothing more than a general description, without specific details, of the evil of the Wicked Priest. Although in the light of the “Ritual of Purification” (4Q512) in which

⁴² Cf. 1 Macc 5:3, 28, 35, 51, 68; 7:47; 2 Macc 8:25, 30–31.

⁴³ Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, 41.

the term נדה frequently occurs, I think that the connotation of sexual impurity for נדה in the Qumran texts cannot be categorically excluded, nothing suggests that such a nuance is present here. Here, this Wicked Priest is described simply as the opposite of משכיל, who in 4Q511 18 ii 7 is presented as hating נדה מעשי נדה.

Although, as we have seen, several of the elements contained in the *pesher* are of a general nature and, as such, applicable to a whole series of people, the precision and exclusive nature of others dispel all doubt and allow one to state that Judas Maccabaeus is the Wicked Priest to whom this text refers. The glorious hero of the liberation, the restorer of the desecrated Temple, in spite of having been counted among the adherents to the truth at the start of his uprising, from the particular viewpoint of the Qumran sect, ended up as no more than a traitor to the laws who performed abominable acts, a Wicked Priest.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE HISTORY OF THE QUMRAN COMMUNITY IN THE LIGHT OF RECENTLY AVAILABLE TEXTS

The topic I have been given is “The History of the Qumran Community.”¹ This title implies as a starting point that there has been a Qumran Community. I fully agree with this starting point, and I do not think it is necessary to discuss here the theories that deny all connection between the scrolls and the people who lived in the Khirbet, such as the theory of Norman Golb who postulates that the scrolls come from different libraries of Jerusalem and that they represent the literature of the whole of the Judaism of the time.² I think I refuted long ago the arguments put forth by Golb in his first series of articles,³ and I have failed to discover any new solid piece of evidence to support his theory in his latest book, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls*.⁴ Suffice it to say that Golb’s theory fails to

¹ Paper read at the Copenhagen Qumran Seminar. I have kept the form of the oral presentation, adding only some bibliographical references. I want to thank the organizers of the Seminar for the most congenial atmosphere in Schaeffergarden, all the participants for the animated and fruitful discussions, and especially Professor T.L. Thompson for the revision of my English text.

² Among the various presentations of his hypothesis, I can list: N. Golb, “The Problem of Origin and Identification of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 124 (1980): 1–24; “Who Hid the Dead Sea Scrolls?,” *Biblical Archaeologist* 28 (1987): 68–82; “Les manuscrits de la mer Morte: Une nouvelle approche du problème de leur origine,” *Annales ESC* 1985, n° 5, 1133–49; “Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?,” *The Sciences* (1987): 40–49; “The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Perspective,” *The American Scholar* 58 (1989): 177–207; “Khirbet Qumran and the Manuscripts of Judaeon Wilderness: Observations on the Logic of their Investigation,” *JNES* 49 (1990): 103–14; “Die Entdeckungen in der Wüste Judäas—neue Erklärungsversuche,” in *Qumran: Ein Symposium* (ed. J.B. Bauer, J. Fink, and H.D. Galter; Grazer Theologische Studien, 15; Graz: Institut für ökumenische Theologie und Patrologie, 1993), 87–116; “Khirbet Qumran and the Manuscripts Finds of the Judaeon Wilderness,” in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (ed. M.O. Wise *et al.*; Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 51–70.

³ F. García Martínez and A.S. van der Woude, “A “Groningen” Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History,” in *The Texts of Qumran and the History of the Community. III. The History of the Community* (ed. F. García Martínez; Paris: Gabalda, 1990), 521–41 [= *RevQ* 14/56 (1990): 521–41].

⁴ N. Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of the Qumran Manuscripts* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1995).

explain the archaeological facts (such as the unprotected water supply, the presence of the cemeteries and so on), it is not compatible with the absence of compositions to which could be ascribed a Pharisaic origin, and it does not explain the homogeneous character of the collection as a whole or of the collection of each cave in spite of the diversity of compositions there included. In the words of Geza Vermes: “The soft underbelly of the Jerusalem hypothesis is revealed, apart from the patent weakness of the archaeological interpretation, for Qumran is not a fortress, by the composition of the manuscript collection itself, definitely pointing towards a *sectarian* library.”⁵

I do not think it necessary either to discuss the widely-publicized theories of R. Eisenman⁶ and B. Thiering.⁷ The chronological framework that these theories require has been completely disproved by the two latest Carbon 14 analyses of the manuscripts done with the Accelerator Mass Spectrometry, the one done by the Institut für Mittelenergiephysik of Zurich and published in 1991,⁸ and the one done by the Arizona Accelerator Mass Spectrometer Facility of the University of Arizona, Tucson, which will shortly be published, and which contained not only a larger number of samples but samples taken from historically more sensitive manuscripts such as 1QpHab, 4QpPs^a, 4QS^d and 4QD^{a,b}.

In my opinion, only four hypotheses need to be considered: three that in one way or another connect the community of Qumran with the Essenes, and a fourth that connects the community with the Sadducees.

The first is the old hypothesis that simply identifies the community of Qumran with the Essenes; it was put forth first by Sukenik,⁹ was developed by Dupont-Sommer¹⁰ and Vermes,¹¹ and adopted and established

⁵ G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (rev. [3d] ed.; London: SCM Press, 1994), 21.

⁶ R.H. Eisenman, *Maccabees. Zadokites. Christian and Qumran. A New Hypothesis of Qumran Origins* (StPB 34; Leiden: Brill, 1983); *idem*, *James the Just in the Habakkuk “Peshet”* (StPB 35; Leiden: Brill, 1986).

⁷ B.E. Thiering, *Redating the Teacher of Righteousness* (Australian and New Zealand Studies in Theology; Sydney: Theological Explorations, 1979); *The Gospels and Qumran* (Sydney: Theological Explorations, 1981); *The Qumran Origins and the Christian Church* (Sydney: Theological Explorations, 1983); *Jesus the Man: A New Interpretation of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Doubleday, 1992).

⁸ G. Bonani, et al., “Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Atiqot* 20 (1991): 27–32.

⁹ E.L. Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot I* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1948), 16–17.

¹⁰ A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte* (4th ed.; Paris: Payot, 1983), 349–68.

¹¹ In his various publications on the topic, since his dissertation of 1953, “Les manu-

by Milik¹² and Cross.¹³ At present it has entered the standard text-books and is so well known and firmly established that many have forgotten that it is, and remains, a simple hypothesis. I will call this hypothesis the “traditional Essene hypothesis.”

The second is the so-called “Groningen hypothesis,”¹⁴ which recognizes the many elements in common between the Qumran community and the Essenes as described in the classical sources, but at the same time takes seriously the sensible differences between these two entities. This hypothesis considers the Qumran community as a break-away group from the Essenes, the result of a split motivated by the refusal of the majority of the Essenes to accept the halakhic and ideological positions put forth by the Teacher of Righteousness as result of his conviction of having received by revelation the correct interpretation of the biblical text. In this way, this hypothesis tries to account for the similarities with the parent group (the Essenes) as well as for the differences with it that result from the acceptance of the halakhic positions of the Teacher of Righteousness.

The third theory is the Essene hypothesis as “revised and augmented” by Hartmut Stegemann,¹⁵ which considers the Qumran Essenes as the main Jewish Union in late Second Temple times and which sees the Essenes’ Qumran settlement as “a study centre for all members, wherever they usually lived.” In Stegemann’s own words:

The final conclusion of this study is that the Essenes were indeed the main Jewish Union of late Second Temple times. They were founded about 150 B.C.E. by a former high priest of the temple in Jerusalem. He was

scrits du désert de Juda.” The most recent presentation of Vermès’s views can be found in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*, 100–41.

¹² J.T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (trans. J. Strugnell; 2d ed.; London: SCM Press, 1963), 80–98.

¹³ F.M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (3d ed.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 54–87.

¹⁴ F. García Martínez, “Orígenes del movimiento esenio y orígenes qumránicos: Pistas para una solución,” in *Il Simposio Bíblico Español* (ed. V. Collado Bertomeu and V. Vilar Hueso; Valencia-Córdoba: Fundación Bíblica Española, 1987), 527–56; *idem*, “Qumran Origins and Early History: A ‘Groningen Hypothesis,’” *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1989): 113–36; F. García Martínez and A.S. van der Woude, “A ‘Groningen’ Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History.”

¹⁵ H. Stegemann, “The Qumran Essenes: Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress* (ed. J. Trebelle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992), 1:83–166; *idem*, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus: Ein Sachbuch* (Freiburg: Herder, 1993) [all quotations are taken from the English article].

traditionally-minded in every respect, and he was disposed to include all Israel in his Union. Regrettably, what he could accomplish was limited in his times by unfavourable political circumstances and by rival religious groups. Nevertheless, the Essenes became spiritually the leading group of Palestinian Judaism in their times, after more than a century of their existence praised by contemporary Jewish authors as “the best of all Jews.” In this way they became a very impressive model of the privileges of a mainly Torah-oriented Judaism for all times. (165)

The fourth hypothesis postulates a Sadducean origin for the Qumran sect.¹⁶ Basing his argument on the undeniable Sadducean character of some of the halakhot of *MMT*, Schiffman claims a Sadducean Zadokite origin for the Qumran sect. He does not claim “that the Dead Sea sect as we know it is Sadducean, only that its origins and the roots of its halakhic tradition lie in the Sadducean Zadokite priesthood.” In the view of Schiffman, the Hasmonaean priests imposed Pharisaic views on the Temple community; a group of pious Sadducees protested the imposition and formed a sectarian group which seceded from participation in the ritual of the Jerusalem Temple. In the words of Schiffman:

The earliest members of the sect must have been Sadducees unwilling to accept the status quo in the aftermath of the Maccabean revolt. The Maccabees, by replacing the Zadokite high priesthood with their own, reduced the Zadokites to a subsidiary position for as long as Hasmonaean rule lasted (87–88) . . . After they failed in their initial attempts, exemplified in the *Halakhic Letter*, to reconcile and win over the Hasmonaean and the remaining Jerusalem Sadducees to their own system of Temple practice, the Qumran Zadokites gradually developed the sectarian mentality of the despised, rejected, and abandoned outcast. Accordingly, they began to look upon themselves as the true Israel, condemning and despising all others (88–89) . . . they still were leaderless until, at some point, the Teacher of Righteousness arose to lead them. It was he who gave the sect shape and direction. Eventually he led the group from its Sadducean origins toward its intensely apocalyptic, sectarian mentality and toward the many beliefs that differentiated the sect from the Sadducees. (95)

I assume that all these hypotheses are well known, and that everyone is able to weigh the arguments put forth in their defence. I do not think

¹⁶ L.H. Schiffman, “Miqsat Ma’ase ha-Torah and the Temple Scroll,” *RevQ* 14/56 (1990): 435–57; *idem*, “The New Halakhic Letter (4QMMT) and the Origins of the Dead Sea Sect,” *Biblical Archaeology* 53 (1990): 64–73; *idem*, “The Sadducean Origins of the Dead Sea Scroll Sect,” in *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. H. Shanks; New York: Random House, 1992), 35–49; *idem*, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 83–95 (89) [quotations are taken from this latest book].

it will be useful to indulge in polemics, to discuss these arguments yet again, or to evaluate the pros and cons of each one of these hypotheses one by one.

I intend to follow here another way suggested some years ago by Timothy Lim.¹⁷ At the end of an article in which he analyzes both the theory of N. Golb and the “Groningen Hypothesis,” Lim concludes:

This article has sought to examine the state of the question by way of assessing two important hypotheses, but it has proven impossible to take into account the newly released material. It will be of great interest to see which elements will withstand the test of time and the demands of the new evidence. (466)

To my knowledge, this has not yet been realized. Stegemann, who knows well all this material, thinks that:

Unfortunately, very little of this additional material does much to enrich our knowledge of the Essenes much more than Philo, Josephus, and the Qumran scrolls published so far have already done. (165)

It is obvious that I do not fully agree with Stegemann, and I think the test proposed by Lim could be fruitfully applied. My intention here is precisely to begin this application, and to assess the four selected theories in view of the newly-released material. Put differently, I intend to examine which of these four theories is the most congruent with the evidence now available. Of course, I cannot review all the documents in the time I have at my disposition. I will therefore concentrate on those documents that appear to be the most promising for shedding some light on the problem, namely: *4QMMT*; *4QDamascus*; *4QSerek-Damascus* and the different *Calendars*.

1. CALENDARS AND PRIESTLY ROSTERS

I think we should start with the *Calendars* and *Priestly Rosters*, not only because they reveal one of the weakest spots in some of the theories (Stegemann, for example, recognizes the Calendar as the first *problem* in his reconstruction) but because we encounter the same *solar* calendar in two of the most important texts that have recently become accessible: *4QMMT*^a (4Q394) and *4QS*^c (4Q259). If we leave out for the moment the two calendars just mentioned (4Q394 and 4Q259), we have 15 manuscripts

¹⁷ T.H. Lim, “The Qumran Scrolls: Two Hypotheses,” *SR* 21 (1992): 455–66.

in Cave 4 which contain the remains of eight (or nine) calendrical compositions that are clearly different one from another. These have been provisionally designated 4QCalendrical Document A-H (or 4QMishmarot A-H) and listed under the Q numbers 4Q320–330.¹⁸

These compositions are of different sorts: some of them are intended to synchronize the dates of the widely-used *lunar* calendar with the *solar* calendar which these texts consider the right one. Others are intended to synchronize the *solar* calendar with a six-year cycle of the 24 priestly courses which do weekly service in the Temple. Yet others are intended to record which priestly course is in service at the beginning of each month of the cycle, or at the beginning of each season, or at the end of each season, or in which priestly course each sabbath of the year falls, or in which priestly course the Passover falls. Others are festal calendars that indicate in which priestly course fall the traditional Old Testament feasts, or some special feast envisioned, for example, in the *Temple Scroll*, fall. Finally, others are intended to record the date within this system on which historical events occurred.

These eight calendars are not only different because of their contents. They can also be distinguished on the basis of their different literary forms, and even on the basis of their different scribal characteristics. Some of them (4Q320, 4Q321–321a and 4Q325) are well-written copies of complex literary compositions with various clearly distinct parts; others (4Q328–329, 4Q329a and 4Q330) seem to be simple lists, something like our pocket calendars; some others (at least three or four of the six copies of Calendrical Document C¹⁹) have been carelessly written in a semi-cursive script, or have other writing on the back, which indicates that they are probably autograph copies intended for personal use. It will be useful here to provide a very short description of each of these different compositions.²⁰

¹⁸ The different numbers resulting from my count and the Q numbers are the result of later subdivision of some of the material of the original plates: 4Q320 and 4Q329 have been divided into two different manuscripts, and 4Q324 into four. [The manuscripts have now been published in DJD XXI, and references are to the Q numbers and titles of the official DJD edition]

¹⁹ The sigla and names have in part been changed in DJD XXI. Cf. DJD XXI, 2, Table 1: Present and Former Sigla.

²⁰ The Hebrew text is now easily available in the first volume of B.Z. Wacholder and M.G. Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four: Fascicle One* (Washington: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991), 60–101. The only complete translation I know is in Dutch, in F. García Martínez and

4QCalendrical Document/Mishmarot A (4Q320), formed of small leather bands and possibly written at the end of the 2nd c. B.C.E., contains three clearly different sections: the first offers a synchronism of the *solar* calendar of 364 days represented by the priestly courses with a *lunar* calendar of 354 days during a cycle of three years; the synchronism is shown indicating with numbers which day of the solar month corresponds to the last day of the lunar months of either 29 or 30 days. It also shows in which priestly course this correspondence occurs. The second section is very fragmentary, but seems to compose a jubilee cycle in which the roster of priests on duty at the end of each month was schematically listed. The third section is a festal calendar covering a six-year cycle, indicating on which day of the week of which priestly course the well-known feasts of the Old Testament fall.

4QCalendrical Document/Mishmarot B (4Q321) has been copied in a manuscript of small dimensions with only eight or nine lines per column, written in a beautiful Herodian hand dating from the turn of the era.²¹ It contains two clearly different parts. The first offers a synchronism of the *solar* calendar with the *lunar* calendar and with the priestly courses, using two key days of the lunar month; the new moon designated with the previously-unknown word *דוקה* and the full moon, for which no especial name is used. The second part notes which priestly course is on duty at the beginning of each month during the six-year cycle, and in which priestly course the main feast falls without indicating in which day of the week this happens.

4Q322–324. Although the [former] designation 4QCalendrical Document C^{a-f} implies we have here six copies of the same composition, I am rather inclined to consider them as six compositions of the same type

A.S. van der Woude, *De rollen van de Dode Zee: Ingeleid en in het Nederlands vertaald* (2 vols.; Kampen: Kok, 1994–1995), 2:463–94.

²¹ This manuscript was published in 1991 in S. Talmon and I. Knohl, “A Calendrical Scroll from Qumran Cave IV: Mish B^a (4Q321),” *Tarbiz* 60 (1991): 505–21 [Hebrew], and has been the subject of various studies: M. Albani, “Die lunaren Zyklen im 364-Tage-Festkalender von 4QMischerot/4QS^d,” *Forschungstelle Judentum: Mitteilungen und Beiträge* 4 (1992): 3–47; C. Martone, “Un calendario proveniente da Qumran recentemente pubblicato,” *Henoch* 16 (1994): 49–75; M.O. Wise, “Observations on New Calendrical Texts from Qumran” in *Thunder in Gemini* (M.O. Wise; JSPTSup 15; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 222–32; M.O. Wise, “Second Thoughts on *dwq* and the Qumran Synchronistic Calendars,” 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), 98–120.

and literary genre because there are no overlaps either in the calendrical data or in historical allusions. As has been said previously, four of these manuscripts seem to be personal copies, a designation that could possibly also apply to the other two copies: the one written on papyrus²² and the one written in the so-called “Cryptic writing.”²³ These compositions are characterized by using the priestly rosters as a calendrical element in order to indicate when certain historical facts happened. The historical allusions (facts and/or names) are not like those of the *pesharim*, which have been completely theologized. Nor are they like the historical allusions of later compositions such as the *Megillat Ta’anit*, which serve as the bases for annual celebrations. The preserved fragments offer no value judgments concerning the events mentioned. They simply record when something happened. The fragmentary nature of the remains palpably reduces their usefulness for historical reconstruction. The only thing we can say is that these *calendars* (or rather *annali*) chronicle the facts of the years preceding the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey, as the names of all the protagonists mentioned correspond to known important figures of the period from Alexandra Salome until Aemilius Scaurus.

4QCalendrical Document/Mishmarot D (4Q325) is similar to one of the parts of the Calendrical Documents A and B, in which the priestly course is indicated wherein the sabbaths and some feasts fall. The difference is that the feasts recorded are apparently only the pentecostal feasts of firstlings, the feast of the new barley (שַׁעֲרֵי־בָרֶכֶת), the new wheat, wine, oil (reconstructed) and wood.

4QCalendrical Document C (4Q326) and 4QCalendrical Document D (4Q394 1–2) are very similar to 4QCalendrical Document/Mishmarot D, in which there is a record of the dates of the sabbaths and feasts. The difference is that apparently in these calendars these dates are not related to the priestly courses. The second of these calendars is well known because the editors of *4QMMT* have published it as part of one of the copies of *MMT* (4Q394).²⁴

4QMishmarot F and G (4Q328 and 4Q329) record which priestly courses are on duty at the beginning of each year and at the beginning

²² [Formerly 4Q324b (4QCalendrical Document C^c), but now published by J. Fitzmyer, DJD XXXVI, 275–80, as 4Q331 (4QpapHistorical Text C)]

²³ [Formerly 4Q324c (4QCrypt A Calendrical Document C^f), but now distributed to six different manuscripts, 4Q324d–i, by S. Pfann, DJD XXVIII, pls. LIX–LXII].

²⁴ Which it is not, as I think I have proved in “Dos Notas sobre 4QMMT,” *RevQ* 16/62 (1993): 293–97.

of each month (4Q328) that starts a new season (תקופה) of the same six-year cycle, or (4Q329) at the end of the month in which each season begins.

4QMishmarot H (4Q329a) is a simple sheet which records in which priestly course Passover falls in each year of the cycle.

4QMishmarot I (4Q330) is so fragmentary that it is impossible to ascertain the type of calendar used.

These are the calendrical materials now available. What can we conclude from these materials regarding our problem? To which of the four hypotheses do they lend more support?

We can start by noting that the use of the priestly courses as a principle of reckoning the time indicates the strong priestly roots of these calendars and of the people who used them. This fact is congruent with all four theories, as all of them underline the importance of the priestly component of the community and the continued strong interest in cultic matters even after the break with the Temple of Jerusalem. But the fact that these priestly courses are used as the frame of a *solar* calendar of 364 days and that all the calendars found are *solar* calendars seem to be compatible only with the Groningen Hypothesis.

The descriptions have shown that not one of the calendars found can be considered as representing the *lunar* calendar followed by other Jews and used in the temple cult. This is not exactly the situation one would expect if the scrolls were brought from the different libraries of Jerusalem and represented the whole of the literature of the period; a fact which underlines the homogeneity of the collection and its "sectarian" character, and further disqualifies Golb's hypothesis.

It also disqualifies the "traditional Essene" hypothesis and the hypothesis of the "Essene Union" in so far as in the classical descriptions of the Essenes there is no hint at all that they followed a different calendar from the rest of the people.²⁵ This is a well-known objection to these theories, and remains a main obstacle to the simple identification of the community of the Scrolls with the Essenes as known from the classical sources in spite of the desperate efforts of Stegemann²⁶ to minimize the force of the argument.

²⁵ These descriptions are easily available in G. Vermes and M.D. Goodman (eds.), *The Essenes According to the Classical Sources* (Oxford Centre Textbooks 1; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989).

²⁶ H. Stegemann, "The Qumran Essenes: Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times," 114–22.

The same argument even more clearly disqualifies the Sadducean hypothesis. It is true that we have even less information on the Sadducees than we have on the Essenes, but the complete silence of the rabbinical writings on the issue is certainly significant. After all, we know of several cases of alternating Sadducean and Pharisaic dominance in the Temple, and on none of these occasions is the calendar problem brought to the fore.

Besides, our calendars offer us a concrete proof that they are not congruent with the Sadducean hypothesis. The feast of the first fruits of barley is clearly fixed on the 26th of the first month, a Sunday, and is considered the starting point for counting the dates of the other pentecostal festivals. These calendars differ on this detail from the position taken by the Boethusians (or Sadducees) as shown by *m. Men.* 10.3, according to which the Sadduceans held that the festival was to be celebrated the day after the first sabbath following Passover, and not (as in these calendars) on the day following the first sabbath after the whole festival. This example, by the way, is extremely interesting: it shows that both the Boethusians and the community of Qumran (on the evidence of the *Temple Scroll*) interpreted שבת in the biblical expression ממהרת השבת (of Lev 23:11 and 15) in the same manner (as opposed to the Pharisees). For the Pharisees, שבת would mean “a day of rest” and they fixed the feast of the “Omer on the 16th of Nisan, after the “day of rest” that was the first day of Passover (the 15th of Nisan). For the Boethusians and the community of Qumran, שבת means “Saturday,” and ממהרת השבת thus means Sunday. But the different dates postulated for the festival by the Boethusians and by the calendars of the community clearly show that a common interpretative tradition on halakhic matter does not necessarily mean that the two groups arrived at the same conclusion, and even less, of course, that the two groups are identical.

Another interesting point is that the people who wrote and used these calendars knew that others followed a different calendar, and they accordingly tried to synchronize both. Nevertheless, they present their own calendar as a matter of fact. There is no hint of polemic in the way these calendars are presented, not even regarding the ones that synchronize the *solar* with the *lunar* calendar. We are far from a situation like the one found in *Jubilees*, which strongly advocates one calendar and condemns in no uncertain terms anyone who does not follow it. Nothing of the sort is found in these Cave 4 calendrical texts. The polemics that necessarily relate to the adoption of a different calendar seem to be forgotten. It seems to me that although this fact does not disqualify any

of the hypotheses under consideration, it is nevertheless less congruent with “Main Union Essenes” of Stegemann’s hypothesis than with the other theories, in so far as it is easier to understand such a lack of polemics in a situation of isolation than in a situation of continuous interaction and contact.

As far as can be ascertained, the events recorded in the calendars with historical allusions do not refer to the inner history of the group, but to the political and military history of Palestine. Therefore, they seem to be of no help in reconstructing the history of the community. If anything at all can be concluded from these limited references, it is that all the persons named seem to belong to the period between Alexandra Salome and Pompey. This could mean that the Antiochean crisis, that is of such importance to both the “traditional Essene hypothesis” and the new revised Essene hypothesis of Stegemann, was not very important to the writers of these calendars, a situation that would be more congruent with the Groningen hypothesis, which clearly separates the origins of the community from the Antiochean crisis, and rather locates the move to Qumran at the end of the second century B.C.E.

2. MIQSAT MA'ASE HA-TORAH

The second document I wanted to examine is the *Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah*, fully available since last summer²⁷ and considered to be the point of departure for the “Sadducean” hypothesis.²⁸

As is well known, this document has been fragmentarily preserved in six different manuscripts (4Q394–399) which (thanks to overlapping) have been put together in a “composite text.” This composite has been generally accepted, although the precise location of one sizeable fragment remains a matter of dispute, even between the two editors of the composite: Qimron and Strugnell.²⁹

²⁷ E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, DJD X (all quotations are taken from this edition).

²⁸ Although, in fact, the revival of the old Sadducean hypothesis goes back to the publication of the *Temple Scroll* in which are reflected two of the controversies about purity between Sadducees and Pharisees recorded in the Mishnah; see J.M. Baumgarten, “The Pharisaic-Sadducean Controversies about Purity and the Qumran Texts,” *JJS* 31 (1980): 157–70.

²⁹ See Appendix 2 (201–202), “Additional Textual Observations on 4QMMT” by E. Qimron, and Appendix 3 (203–206), “Additional Observations on 4QMMT” by J. Strugnell. Strugnell has voiced his criticism even before the official publication of the book; see J. Strugnell, “MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition,” in *The*

The document, whose introduction has been lost, consists of two or perhaps three sections with distinct contents: a calendrical, legal and hortatory section. It seems clear that the legal and hortatory sections are structurally united and form a whole as parts of the same original composition. Both are written in the same style, with the same opposition between the “we” and the “you,” and both have a sort of inclusion between the beginning and the end (lines B 1–2 and C 30 of the “composite text”) with strictly parallel sentences.

It is less certain that the first part, the calendar, was originally part of the same composition. In Strugnell’s opinion³⁰ it is not as polemical as the other parts; it is not addressed to any “opponents” and it is only attested in one of the copies (4Q394) and not in another (4Q395), which seems, however, to preserve the beginning of the composition. The limited text that has survived (only the fragmentary remnants of three lines have been preserved), the facts that the manuscript with the remains of the calendar seems to be the oldest of all the copies of *MMT*, and the absence of an introduction to the composition as a whole, do not allow us, in my opinion, to exclude the calendar as an original part of the composition, as one of the key elements of the composition, and as one of the elements in which the “we” group of the composition has separated itself from the others. Furthermore, it was, in fact, included in one of the copies of the composition, in much the same way as a calendar had been included in 4Q259, one of the copies of 4QS. We are at the least entitled to conclude that the group who wrote the composition and who continued to copy it, had accepted and had followed this *solar* calendar of 364 days.

The legal part of the composition is consistently redacted in a plural form. It offers itself as the expression of the halakhic positions, not of a single individual, but of a group which speaks of itself in the plural “we.” This group thinks in a different way than another group which is always referred to in the third person plural, “they,” and which, in the hortatory section, is identified as “the majority of the people.” This group is clearly different from those addressed by the composition, to whom the document refers in the legal section, with the use of the second person plural, “you.” However, in the hortatory sections of the doc-

Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 57–73.

³⁰ DJD X, 203.

ument, we find a curious mix of singular and plural forms. Although we find one example of the plural you-form, referring to the addressee, the addressee of this section is normally referred to in the singular you-form, a person who apparently occupied a pre-eminent position.

This use of “we,” “you” and “they” underlines the programmatic character of the composition as well as its polemical nature. The group which exposes its ideas in the document (the “we” group, to use Qimron’s terminology)³¹ has apparently broken with another (larger) group (the “they” group) which is understood to interpret some legal precepts wrongly. The “we” group address its composition not to this dissenting group, but to yet another group (the “you” group) and its leader (the singular “you”).

The hortatory section makes it clear that the “we” group expects to win the “you” group over to its side, so that in the end the “you” group will recognize that the halakhic positions defended by the “we” group are indeed the correct ones, as opposed to the positions of the “they” group. The reasons given are, on the one hand, that the “you” group knows the probity of the “we” group and, on the other hand that the “you” group has enough knowledge of Scripture to be able to recognize that the legal interpretations proposed by the “we” group are the right ones. This means that the interpretations of the “we” and “you” groups are not very distant from one another, and that the existing differences between the “we” and the “you” group (which are never spelled out in the text) are judged to be easily bridged over.

It is interesting to note the assumption of the text that this recourse to Scripture will lead the “you” group not only to appreciate the correctness of the halakhic interpretations of the “we” group, but also that its interpretation of sacred history is the correct one, that the accomplishment of the blessings and curses shows that the present time is to be understood as “the last days,” and, accordingly, that in this period, it is necessary to be protected from Belial. For our purposes, the most interesting question connected with this fascinating document is the identification of the three groups. Everybody agrees that the “they” group must be the Pharisees, an identification which does not need to occupy us here.

It is obvious that the “we” group is related to, or identical with, the Qumran community. The just-mentioned theological ideas of the

³¹ DJD X, 175.

hortatory section are common to the Qumran writings. Even more telling is the huge number of halakhic positions which deviate from traditional halakhah but agree with halakhic positions known to us thanks to the *Temple Scroll* and the *Damascus Document*.³² For example: the eating of offerings on the same day as the sacrifice, the selection of hides, the understanding of the foetus as distinct from the mother, the tithes for herd and flock, the process of purification of lepers and the impurity of the human bones.

It is equally obvious that some of the halakhic positions defended in the composition are positions taken by the Sadducees in their polemic against the Pharisees. The two most clear and telling examples adduced by Schiffman are the discussion as to the purity of those preparing the cow (the red-heifer) for the purification offering and the discussion on the purity of the liquid streams (the pouring of liquids from one vessel to another).³³ In these two cases we have specific information in rabbinic texts (in *m. Parah* 3.7 and in *m. Yad* 4.7, respectively) about the positions of the Sadducees and the Pharisees, and there is no doubt that the halakhic position of the “we” group in these cases agrees with the halakhic position that has been attributed to the Sadducees, while the opposite position of the “they” group agrees with that attributed to the Pharisees.

On other halakhot also adduced by Schiffman as proof of the Sadducean character of the halakhah of *MMT*,³⁴ the particularly “Sadducean” character is less clear or has been disputed.³⁵ I think that the following sweeping conclusion drawn by Sussmann is unwarranted:

Thus, I would venture to say that those of the sect’s halakhot which are not explicitly identified by the rabbinic sources as Sadducean may be assumed to be such, since these rulings were followed by the members of the sect, whose halakhic views are otherwise known to be Sadducean. (196)

³² First summarized by Y. Sussmann, “The History of Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Preliminary Talmudic Observations on *Miqsat ma’ase ha-torah* (4QMMT),” *Tarbiz* 59 (1989–90): 11–76 (Hebrew) (partially translated into English and published as Appendix 1 in *DJD* X, 179–200), and studied in detail by E. Qimron in the chapter “The Halakha,” *DJD* X, 123–77.

³³ L.H. Schiffman, “Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Case of the *Tevul Yom*,” *DSD* 1 (1994): 285–99.

³⁴ See the works cited in n. 16.

³⁵ For example, in a series of articles published collected and edited by Z.J. Kapera, *Qumran Cave Four: Special Report: 4QMMT* (Krakow: Enigma, 1991); P.R. Davies, “Sadducees in the Dead Sea Scrolls?,” 85–94; R. Eisenman, “A Response to Schiffman on *MMT*,” 95–104; J.C. VanderKam, “The Qumran Residents: Essenes not Sadducees!,” 105–108.

Nevertheless, *MMT* clearly favours at first sight the hypothesis of Sadducaean origins for the Community, although, in my opinion, it remains short of having been proven for the following reasons:

- 1) The identity of a few halakhic positions should not be confounded with the identity of two groups. Two different groups can perfectly easily have in common some halakhic traditions. The “we” and the “you” groups of *MMT*, which are presented as distinct, nevertheless apparently share the same halakhic traditions, although these are opposed to the traditions of the “they” group. Of course, there is no reason why two groups should disagree in everything. In this particular case, the opposite should be expected. After all, the Qumran community uses the self-designation “sons of Zadok,” referring to its priestly ancestry, while the Sadducees seem to derive their name from Zadok.
- 2) It seems difficult to reconcile the few indications about the Sadducees known from rabbinic writings with the more elaborate descriptions of the Sadducees that are provided by Josephus and the New Testament. This has led even the defenders of the Sadducaean hypothesis to distinguish between different types of Sadducees: those described by Josephus and the ones described in the Mishna. It is clear that the ideological tenets of the Sadducees as described by Josephus contradict several of the most characteristic tenets of the Qumran writings. As VanderKam says:³⁶

Perhaps, for the sake of clarity in English, we could use *Zadokians* for the people to whom the Mishna refers. They may have been very much like the Essenes or even identical with them. That they were Sadducees of the type known from the New Testament and Josephus is obviously wrong.

- 3) A serious obstacle to the Sadducaean hypothesis is formed by the presence of the remnants of the *solar* calendar in at least one of the manuscripts. This obstacle becomes a stumbling block if, as I think, the calendar of the original composition is one of the elements that separates this “we” group from “the majority of the people”³⁷ or from “the council (or multitude) of the congregation” (as Wacholder and Abegg prefer to reconstruct the sentence).³⁸ As I have mentioned

³⁶ J.C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 95.

³⁷ According to the reconstruction of the editors, Qimron and Strugnell, DJD X, 59

³⁸ B.Z. Wacholder and M.G. Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea*

in the previous section, this last argument also holds against the “Essene” hypothesis in both of its forms, and strongly supports the “Groningen hypothesis.”

An important element in deciding which of these three hypotheses best supports the new data of *MMT* is the understanding of *MMT* as a Qumranic or a pre-Qumranic document. As is well known, the editors of the texts disagree on this issue. Qimron³⁹ bluntly asserts that it is a Qumran text; Strugnell⁴⁰ considers a pre-Qumranic setting for the document more likely.

A Qumranic setting would appear congruent with the traditional “Essene” hypothesis. The “we” group would be the Essenes, who address the document, in the words of Cross:⁴¹

to a leader and group admired for wisdom and understanding by the authors. This is most easily understood as a collateral line of Zadokite priests who have not joined the Essene community and its priests of the Zadokite house.

But the problem with this interpretation is very similar to the problem of the Sadducean interpretation: the difficulty of reconciling the profile of the “we” group as reflected in *MMT* with what Josephus tell us about the Essenes.

I have addressed the issue of the Qumranic or pre-Qumranic setting of *MMT* in my contribution to the late SBL meeting in Chicago,⁴² and my conclusion was that of the two topics I had discussed (the expressions אהרית הימים and מעשי התורה), one pointed to a pre-Qumranic setting for the composition while the other did not demand a Qumranic setting for it. This makes a pre-Qumranic setting most likely indeed, on the condition, however, that this pre-Qumranic setting is understood as related to the future Qumran community. Otherwise the elements noted to be held in common with other Qumranic writings would remain without explanation. And this is precisely the understanding of the document as put forward by the “Groningen Hypothesis.” This hypothesis consid-

Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four: Fascicle Three (Washington: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1995), xxiv–xxv and 287.

³⁹ DJD X, 175

⁴⁰ DJD X, 114–21.

⁴¹ Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 185.

⁴² F. García Martínez, “4QMMT in a Qumran Context,” in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (ed. J. Kampen and M.J. Bernstein; SBLSymS 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 15–27.

ers *4QMMT* as having originated within the formative period of the Qumran community, when the group, which in its later context we call the Qumran community, had already been formed, had adopted the calendar, and was following the halakhah we know from other Qumran compositions. The group had then also started to develop some of the characteristic theological ideas that we meet in a much more developed form in these same Qumranic compositions, but it had not yet occupied the Qumran settlement.

3. CAVE 4 DAMASCUS DOCUMENT COPIES

The third document I want to examine is the *Damascus Document*, because the 4Q copies now available in preliminary transcriptions in the first volume of Wacholder and Abegg⁴³ have greatly modified our understanding of the original composition as a whole. On the basis of content, the original composition can now easily be divided into three different parts: 1) An extended admonition directed to the members of the group that forms an introduction to the subsequent laws. 2) A compendium of legal norms, some of them of biblical origin, others representing the halakhic interpretation of biblical laws followed within the group, and yet other specific norms which apply to the life of the group. 3) A collection of sectarian rules (for the meetings of the camps, for the Inspector and for the Many) followed by a penal code, which regulates the infractions of the community discipline and the process of expulsion of the sinner, and which is concluded by the ceremony of expulsion from the community.

1) The first part, the initial admonition, is a long exposition on the history of salvation in which the history of the group is embedded: the result without any doubt of a long redactional process. It is best known by the two copies of the Cairo Genizah. The new fragments add only a call to the sons of light to separate from “those who move the boundary,” to listen to the voice of Moses and to remain faithful to all the precepts, especially “not advancing or delaying their festivals” (4Q266 2 i 2). If

⁴³ Wacholder and Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four: Fascicle One*. [All references to the 4Q manuscripts are now to the official DJD XVIII edition by J.M. Baumgarten.] The references to the Genizah copies are taken from the edition of E. Qimron and M. Broshi (eds.), *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992).

frag. 2 of 4Q270 is to be placed at this point, as it seems to me,⁴⁴ this introduction will have contained a list of sins that reappear later on in the specific laws: sexual offenses (including improper use of one's wife), tithes, the money of ransom for their souls, skin diseases, and so forth. These new elements do not substantially change the understanding of the old Admonition known from the copies of the Cairo Genizah, but prove at least that the opinions of those who have considered the Admonition and the Laws to be two independent and unrelated compositions were wrong.

2) The new fragments have shed much more light on the second part of the composition. They have not only proved that the original order was severely truncated in the Genizah copy, but also that the extension and variety of this section is not well represented in this copy. Basically, this second part is a collection of legal lore, globally ordered by themes, and sometimes even provided with rubrics which determine their contents. But we do not find a systematic treatise of sectarian halakhah or an exposition of biblical laws in the order in which they appear in the biblical text. Indeed, we are confronted with an anthology of legal norms extracted from different collections of halakhic materials in which laws intended for all Israel are mixed with norms intended to regulate the life of sectarian assemblies in the cities or in the camps, or to regulate the conduct of sectarian functionaries.

Sometimes it is possible to fathom the reason for putting together different norms. For example, the reference to the oath of the covenant has motivated the insertion of the norms that regulate entrance into the group. The norms on the testimony before judges have motivated the inclusion of the rules for the judges of the community. The prohibition of sacrifices gives the possibility to include other prescriptions concerning the temple and the city of the temple. But in many other cases, it seems impossible to ascertain the reason of the sequence for the laws in the compendium.

The themes that can be recognized putting together the elements furnished by the copies of Cave 4 with CD A are the following, and appear in this order (I indicate only the main topics and mention only

⁴⁴ Because it ends with the beginning of a discourse in the first person, strictly parallel to the beginning of the other three discourses of the admonition, 4Q270 2 ii 19–20: “And now, listen to me all you who know justice and fulfil the law. I shall give you paths of life, but the ways of the pit I shall open for the wicked and their deeds.”

the manuscript in which the norms are better preserved): norms against cheating your fellow communitarians, about women and the selection of a wife (4Q271 3); norms about tithes, sacrifices of pagans and the metals used by them (4Q271 2); norms about unfaithful women and bitter waters (4Q270 4); norms about the disqualification of priests (4Q266 5 ii); norms about skin diseases and child birth (4Q266 6 i-ii); norms about wines and other produce of the fields (4Q266 6 iii); norms about oaths (CD XV); instruction for the entrance into the covenant (CD XV–XVI); norms about oaths of women (CD XVI); about the freewill-offerings (CD XVI); about reproof and witnesses (CD IX); norms about judges in the congregation and about purification with water (CD X); norms about the sabbath (CD X–XI); about relations with Gentiles (CD XII) and dietary and purity norms (CD XII).

3) The third part (which begins in CD XII 19 with the heading: “Rule for the assembly of the cities of Israel”) is more homogeneous and contains sectarian legislation: a rule for the assembly of the camps (CD XII 23–XIII 7); for the Inspector of the camps (XIII 7–XIV 2); for the session of all the camps, determining the “priest who is named at the head of the many” and the “Inspector who is over all the camps” (CD XIV 3–12); norms to provide for the needs of the “many” (CD XV 12–18); a penal code which defines the punishments for the transgressions of the community discipline and which is partially parallel to the penal code of 1QS, but adds other transgressions, which are punished by expulsion from the community (4Q266 10 ii and 4Q270 7 i). This third part (and the whole composition) ends with a description of the ceremony of exclusion of unfaithful members, a ceremony which is to be celebrated in the third month (4Q266 11 and 4Q270 7 ii).

This short summary shows the enormous richness of the new fragments of the *Damascus Document* and the potential they have to modify our understanding of the history of the Community. It also makes clear that it is impossible to deal with all of them in the available space. I will concentrate on one topic: the penal code that had not been preserved in the Genizah copies.

This penal code is in part parallel to the penal code of 1QS, although some of the penalties imposed for the same transgressions of community discipline are different in both forms of the penal code. Also, this penal code mentions some transgressions which are punished by expulsion that are not mentioned in 1QS, and which throw new light on the community discipline, such as committing a sexual offence with one’s

wife, despising the communal law, or murmuring against “the fathers of the assembly.”⁴⁵

4. 4Q_{SEREK} DAMASCUS

But to fully understand these differences and their implications for the history of the community, I should mention first another composition (4Q265) in which the same penal code appears: a composition known under the title 4Q_{Serek} Damascus (4QSD).⁴⁶ This composition has been preserved in only one copy, a manuscript from the end of the first c. B.C.E. From the 25 fragments assigned to this manuscript, only four are of such a size as to allow one to draw some conclusions about their contents.

In spite of the small amount of material preserved, it is clear that the composition is a combination of the *Serek* and the *Damascus Document*. This is shown by the common elements, as well as by the differences from both compositions. For example, by the remains of a procedure of entrance into the community, which seems very close to the procedure of 1QS VI, insofar as several years are involved and the questioning is done by the “many,” but is not the same we find in CD. Similar also to 1QS VIII 1 is the specification of 4QSD that the council of the community has to be formed by 15 members. On the contrary, however, frag. 2 is very similar to the sabbath code of CD, although not completely identical. For example: in both documents, it is forbidden to extract an animal which has fallen in the water. However, while CD XI 16–17 forbids using a rope or other tool for helping a person who has fallen into the water, 4QSD allows throwing him his garment and lifting him out with it. Also different is the limit that an animal should walk on the sabbath: 2000 cubits in 4QSD against only 1000 cubits in CD XI 5–6.

The penitential code is found in 4Q265 4 i–ii. Its most notable characteristic is that the punishment takes the form of temporary expulsion

⁴⁵ But the offence of murmuring against “the mothers” merits only a 10-day punishment.

⁴⁶ Partially published and studied by J.M. Baumgarten, “The Cave 4 Versions of the Qumran Penal Code,” *JJS* 43 (1992): 268–76. The full Hebrew text of the fragments can be found in Wacholder and Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four: Fascicle Three*, 72–78. [References are now to the final edition by J.M. Baumgarten in DJD XXXV, where the text has been called 4QMiscellaneous Rules]

and deprivation of half of the food ration, an element which is otherwise only mentioned once in the penal code of 1QS (in VI 25), and which is *completely absent* from the penal code of 4QD, which mentions temporary expulsion and temporary punishment, without specifying which sort of punishment is foreseen, but indicating that the punishment (whatever it may be) is always shorter than the temporary expulsion.

It is obvious that the three forms of the penal code are closely related. The similarities and the differences can be explained according to different theoretical models. The three depend on a common source: a penal code unknown to us, which is modified to apply it to the needs of the community to which it is addressed. One of the penal codes is the source used by the redactor of the other two. They represent three successive phases of the same code. Furthermore, if the development model is the more likely, it will be necessary to be precise as to the direction in which this development has occurred. This requires establishing which is the older form of the penal code, as well as whether the development is directed from a more lenient to a more rigorous form of penal code or from the more rigorous to a more lenient. Once we have established which of the penal codes is the oldest, we should weigh the possibility that at some point in the long redactional history of the compositions, the penal code could have been modified under the influence of a code which had originated at a later date.

In order to assess which one of these theoretical possibilities is the more likely, it is necessary to analyze three factors: the offences reported in the three codes (which ones present in one code are missing in the others, as well as why they are missing); the penalties imposed for the same offence in each code, the differences between the penalties and the reasons behind these differences; and the differences that appear (as scribal corrections) in 1QS which modify the penalties recorded for some offences.

The model I am using at the moment is the one in which both 4QD and 1QS are dependent on a common source (a penal code belonging to the parent movement of the Qumran sect) and according to which 4QSD knows both 4QD and 1QS and modifies them in the direction of a more lenient position.

It is obvious that the code of 1QS is the more rigorous of all three codes regarding the length of the penalties imposed and, in at least one case, the type of penalty (food deprivation). It is equally obvious that the penal code of 4QD includes a series of offences that lead to expulsion. These offences are not included in 1QS. Similarly, this penal

code applies to a community of married men and women (consider the expulsion for sexual offences with one's wife, but also norms for selecting wives, a selection which requires the approval of the Inspector) and in which the "fathers" and the "mothers" are persons of unequal authority. It seems equally obvious that 4QSD can only apply to a community in which the members share the food they take. This sort of punishment seems to be the development of a tendency started in 1QS.

Which of the four hypotheses sketched out above is the most congruent with this penal code? As far as it implies a closely-structured community, it does not seem to lend any support to the Sadducean hypothesis. On the contrary; the fact that the penal code of 4QD does not mention the deprivation of food as a form of punishment certainly does not favour the "Essene" hypothesis, which considers "common meals" as one of the closer parallels of the Qumran community with the Essenes as described in the classical sources. If my model for explaining the relationships between the different forms of the penal code can be accepted, it would support the "Groningen hypothesis."

5. CONCLUSION

In summary I do not think the Sadducean hypothesis can be maintained in the light of the new evidence, nor do I think that this evidence recommends the revised and augmented "Essene" hypothesis that has been put forward by Stegemann. The question as to whether the teacher-group consisted of Essenes or a break-away group from the Essenes remains the key question for the explanation of the history of the Community. And I think the evidence now available clearly points to the fact that the teacher-group was not formed of Essenes that we know from our classical sources, but was rather a break-away group from this parent Essene movement, as it is understood in the Groningen Hypothesis.

In an article published in 1990 I summarized the understanding of the origins of the Qumran community in this way:⁴⁷

The study of this material [the writings of the pre-Qumran formation period] allows us to conclude that the fundamental disputes within the Essene movement during the formative period of the sect were centred

⁴⁷ García Martínez and Van der Woude, "A 'Groningen' Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History," 538.

on the question of the calendar and the subsequent organization of the festive cycle, and on a particular way of understanding the biblical prescriptions relating to the temple, the cult and the purity of persons and things. This particular halakhah is rooted in the Teacher of Righteousness's consciousness of having received by divine revelation the correct interpretation of the biblical text, an interpretation which is thus inspired and prescriptive, and the acceptance by some members of the community of this interpretation as a revelation. The rejection of this interpretation and of the particular halakhah deriving from it by the rest of the members of the Essene movement would end by making it impossible for them to stay together.

It is my conviction that the texts which have been recently made available confirm the understanding of the history of the Qumran community suggested by the "Groningen Hypothesis" more than by any other of the four hypotheses considered here.

CHAPTER FIVE

4QMMT IN A QUMRAN CONTEXT¹

The reading of different forewords and appendices of the long awaited volume of the *editio princeps* of *MMT*² by Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell has left me with the impression of being witness to the quarrels of a couple who, after the love has become sour, are fighting for the custody of the only child. The judge has assigned the custody of this child to Qimron (he is the only owner of the copy-rights of the book!) but Strugnell has cared longer for the child and at the end he knows better.

One of the most telling disagreements of the two editors is the differing ordering of one of the two main fragments of 4QMMT^c (4Q398), the papyrus copy to which we owe most of the hortatory section of the document. The paragraph formed by fragments 11 to 13 is placed by Strugnell at the beginning of the hortatory section in his initial transcription of the individual manuscripts in the DJD edition,³ before the passage formed by fragments 14 to 17.⁴ Qimron, on the other hand, in the composite text locates it below the right part of frags. 14–17, thereby forming the bottom portion of col. i of this fragment.⁵ As the editors explain in Appendices 2 and 3 respectively, this placement in the Composite Text was suggested by Menahem Kister on the basis of its content and supported by Bezalel Porten on material grounds.⁶ Supported by Hartmut Stegemann, Strugnell, while recognizing that the context seems to favour this position, argues that the material shape of the manuscript demands that frags. 11–13 should be located before frags. 14–17,

¹ Paper read at the SBL meeting, Chicago, November 1994. I have kept the form of the oral presentation, adding only some bibliographical references. I want to thank John Kampen for the revision of the English text.

² DJD X.

³ Designated as fragment 1 in the description of the manuscript, DJD X, 28. See the text at DJD X, 36.

⁴ Designated as fragment 2 in the description of the manuscript.

⁵ In the composite text frags. 14–17 are listed as C 9–16 and 25–32 while frags. 11–13 comprise C 18–24.

⁶ DJD X, 201–206.

a place which would be “just as plausible on grounds of context.”⁷ The arguments of both sides are very strong indeed. In favour of Qimron’s position is, as Strugnell recognizes, the smooth flow of thought from the quotation of Deuteronomy on the blessings and curses to the blessings and curses of the days of Solomon and subsequent Israelite history, thereby linking frags. 11–13 with the preceding text. Stylistic motifs such as the repetition of “remember” in C 23 and 25 and of “delivered from troubles” in C 24 and 26, which link the fragment to the following text, can also be cited. The shape of the two main fragments appears to support Strugnell’s position.

In his Appendix 3 of the *editio princeps* Strugnell states further:

This volume does not contain a chapter on the theology and tradition-history of Section C, a counterpart perhaps to Qimron’s lengthy treatment of the legal background of the laws. A running commentary on some details in Section C is included, but not a thorough attempt to understand the relations between the language and theological traditions of this section and those of works which we expect to be near it chronologically and in thought, i.e. Daniel, *1 Enoch*, the *Divre Hamme’orot*, the *Damascus Document*, and the *Temple Scroll*. Such an important study remains to be done.⁸

He then concludes:

In any case, I suspect that this problem will not be solved until the missing chapter on the theological background of Section C is written, perhaps to give us an answer to this major difficulty.⁹

Let me state clearly at the beginning: I am not attempting to provide here such an important study in this essay. Nor do I intend to resolve the problem of the ordering of the fragments. This is ultimately a material problem and, as Qimron says, only a microscopic inspection of the fibres can conclusively prove which one of the two possibilities is correct.¹⁰ My purpose is more simple: I want to examine some of the concepts of the hortatory section of *MMT* from the perspective of the Qumran writ-

⁷ DJD X, 205. See now also J. Strugnell, “MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition,” *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Ulrich and J.C. VanderKam; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 67–70.

⁸ DJD X, 205.

⁹ DJD X, 206.

¹⁰ DJD X, 202.

ings, to see whether they point to a *Qumranic* or to a *pre-Qumranic* setting for the document. This question is based on Strugnell's inference that his ordering of the fragments is important precisely because it reveals the pre-Qumranic character of *MMT*.

It is clear from the list of related works which Strugnell quotes (no one of them is of undisputed Qumranic origin) that he is inclined to place the hortatory section (if not the legal section) of *MMT* in a pre-Qumranic setting. This inclination is apparent already in his chapter on the literary character and historical setting of *MMT*, in which repeatedly it is said that *MMT* is a document emanating from a group "either identical with, or ancestor of, the Qumran group,"¹¹ or "*MMT* is a group composition originating in the Qumran group, or in one of its antecedents."¹² Strugnell states it even more forcefully in his review (with Daniel Harrington) of the book *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* by Robert Eisenman and Michael Wise:

The whole exhortation is important in that is contemporary with and reflects the thought of the slightly pre-Hasmonean and pre-Qumranic material found also in other texts (see "Words of the Luminaries," Daniel 9, Ezra 9).¹³

On the other hand, even a cursory reading of the chapters written by Qimron on the language and the halakhah shows that he places *MMT* not in a pre-qumran group but right inside Qumran. As he rather bluntly says: "The 'we' group is clearly the Dead Sea Sect."¹⁴

This is the issue I want to address in this paper, although the limitations of the available time preclude its exhaustive treatment in a systematic way. I will therefore limit myself to the analysis in a Qumranic context of two terms which appear in the disputed fragment and which provide additional evidence for determining which of the two positions is more likely. These two topics are represented by the expressions *מַעֲשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה* and *אֲהָרִית הַיָּמִים*.

¹¹ DJD X, 117.

¹² DJD X, 121.

¹³ D. Harrington and J. Strugnell, "Qumran Cave 4 Texts: A New Publication," *JBL* 112 (1993): 495. See now also Strugnell, "MMT: Second Thoughts on a Forthcoming Edition," 70–73.

¹⁴ DJD X, 175.

1. TEXT OF 4QMMT C 18–24

Before we begin with this exercise we must examine the text of the fragment (4QMMT C 18–24),¹⁵ since there are a few places where I do not agree with either the translation or the reconstruction found in the *editio princeps*. Some of these differences are very minor ones and do not modify the meaning, such as the rendering “from the days” in C 19, following apparently the uncertain variant of ms D (מִיָּמֵינוּ), rather than translating the phrase בִּיָּמֵינוּ (“in the days of”), found in the composite text based on ms E). Other differences are of greater consequence.

a) In C 21 Qimron recognizes that אַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים is not preceded (as is usual in the OT and often in Qumran) by the preposition ב. He himself notes: “The phrase וְאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים (rather than וְאַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים or the like) is, however awkward.”¹⁶ But he nevertheless translates “And this is at the end of days,” (emphasis added) implying the presence of the letter *bet*, of which there is no trace in the manuscript. We will see later that the phrase as it is found in the text is an important clue to the Qumranic or pre-Qumranic context of the composition.

b) Also in C 21 we find the verb שׁוּב with two prepositions, ב and ל. While Qimron provides the translation “when they will return to Isra[e]l [forever . . .],” the manuscript reads . . . שִׁשׁוּבוֹ בִּישְׂרָאֵל לְחַן, where the last word is broken. It is true that in the Hebrew of Qumran some of the prepositions seem to be interchanged,¹⁷ but in this case the interchange of *bet* with *lamed* or of עַל and אֶל implied in Qimron’s translation “return to Israel,” seems to be unjustified due to the use of the *lamed* again in the same sentence. Hence the locative meaning of שׁוּב in the *editio princeps* is retained by the *lamed* (cf. C 15 “return to Him”). The expression is paralleled in 1QS V 22: לְשׁוּב בִּיהַד לְבְרִיתוֹ (“to return within the Community to his covenant”), and should be translated in the same way. In view of the uses of שׁוּב לְתוֹרָה in 4Q171 1–2 ii 2–3 or שׁוּב אֶל תּוֹרַת מוֹשֶׁה in 1QS and CD,¹⁸ the reconstruction of לְתוֹרָה at the beginning of C 22 does not seem to be too far-fetched.¹⁹ The whole sen-

¹⁵ Also identified as 4QMMT^b (4Q398), frags. 11–13 above.

¹⁶ DJD X, 61.

¹⁷ See, e.g., L.H. Schiffman, “The Interchange of the Prepositions *bet* and *mem* in the Texts from Qumran,” *Textus* 10 (1982): 37–43.

¹⁸ CD XV 9,12; XVI 1–2, 4–5; 1QS V 8.

¹⁹ A reconstruction already proposed by M. Wise in R. Eisenman and M. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered. The First Complete Translation and Interpretation of 50 Key Documents Withheld for Over 35 Years* (Shaftesbury: Element, 1992), 199–200, whose translation

tence should thus be translated: “when they return *in* Israel to the law.” This meaning fits the context perfectly, making it unnecessary to employ the special meaning of “and not be cancelled” for **וְלֹא יִשְׁבוּ אֲהוּרָה** in C 22 (if *vera lectio*). The well-attested meaning of this phrase in the Bible and in Qumran, “to withdraw, to depart from,”²⁰ offers a perfect antithesis to “return to the law.”

c) I also view the reconstruction of the beginning of C 24 as problematic, “feared [the To]rah,” not because of the lack of exact parallels to the expression, but simply because it seems to me materially impossible to fill the lacuna of almost 3 centimetres with only five letters, even in the irregular hand of this manuscript. Biblical use and Qumran parallels would rather recommend a reconstruction “feared [God and practised the l]aw,” or the like.

d) The presence of a *vacat* after 4QMMT C 24 cannot be resolved, of course, because it depends on the material ordering of the fragments. For Qimron it is the base line of the bottom of the column; for Strugnell it would be a *vacat* line. Greater coherence of thought appears evident if we assume (with Strugnell) a full stop in C 24 after “and these were seekers of the Torah” than if we (with Qimron) continue the sentence with “whose transgressions were forgiven.” After all the kings of Israel in C 23 are not portrayed as an impious lot whose transgressions need to be forgiven, but rather are presented as pious models who feared God, observed the Law (see previous paragraph on this reconstruction) and were delivered from troubles. Therefore they are honoured with the title “seekers of the Law,” a clear allusion to the priestly title of Mal 2:7.

2. אַחֲרֵי־הַיָּמִים

With the text and translation of the fragment established we can explore the first of the two selected topics: אַחֲרֵי־הַיָּמִים. This expression deserves investigation because there is a growing consensus that most of the biblical uses of the expression אַחֲרֵי־הַיָּמִים are devoid of eschatological connotations, but that in the Qumran writings the expression has a clear eschatological meaning. In the latter texts it is still disputed as to whether the period of time so designated covers only the last days before the final

seems to be closer to the original: “When (those) in Isra[e]l are to return to the La[w] of God].”

²⁰ See, e.g., 1QH^a V 24, 25.

bliss or refers also to the time after the judgment. The presence of the eschatological character of the expression, or its absence, can help us to establish whether the composition is Qumranic or pre-Qumranic. A recent article by A. Steudel surveys all of the uses of the expression in the Qumran corpus, thereby facilitating our task of comparing its usage in *MMT* and other Qumran literature.²¹

In the hortatory section we find the expression **אחרית הימים** in C 14, the word **באחרית** in C 16, and the already mentioned expression **וזה הוא אחרית הימים** in C 21. The fragmentary nature of C 16 precludes its value to us for this analysis.²² The expression in C 14 is introduced by a quotation formula, **וכתוב** (“And it is written”). It occurs as an insertion in the middle of a quotation or paraphrase of Deut 30:1, which, in the words of Qimron, “represents the biblical source in an idiosyncratic form that is at the same time both abbreviated and supplied with explanatory additions that date the promise of Deuteronomy to the end of days.”²³

All occurrences of the phrase in the Qumran writings, with the exception of 1QSa I 1, are found in the context of scriptural interpretation. When the scriptural quotation is introduced by a quotation formula, as in our text, the usual way to express the temporal relation to the passage quoted is indicated not by the preposition **ב** but by the preposition **ל**, as in 4Q174 (Florilegium) 1–2 i 15 **ישעיה הנביא לאחרית 15 ל[ה]ימים** (“as it is written in the book of Isaiah, the prophet, for the last days”). Even more important seems to me the fact that this quotation of Deut 30:1 is preceded in C 12 by another quotation (**ויאף כתוב**) from Deut 31:29, a biblical text in which the expression **באחרית הימים** appears with the usual meaning “in the latter days,” or “in the future.” While it is true that the text of the quotation is abbreviated and in the singular, rather than plural, and that our phrase is one of the expressions which is omitted, the quotation is clearly recognizable, as attested by the commentary in the *editio princeps*.²⁴ The proximity of the two quotations leads one to suspect that the expression is used in C 14 in its biblical

²¹ A. Steudel, “אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran,” *RevQ* 16/62 (1993): 225–46.

²² DJD X, 60. Qimron’s translation is here misleading in so far as it does not respect the sizable lacuna of the manuscript and connects the word with the previous sentence: “you will return unto Him with all your heart and with all your soul, at the end [of time, so that you may live. . .].”

²³ DJD X, 59.

²⁴ DJD X, 59.

sense and not in the typical eschatological sense it acquires in other Qumran writings.

This suspicion is strengthened by the fact that at the beginning of C 12 we find the word וְקִדְמוֹנוֹת, translated by Qimron as “and former days,” the exact opposite of אֶהְרִית הַיָּמִים in the biblical sense. The closest parallel to this section of *MMT* is to be found in 4Q504 1–2 iii 12–14 (4QDibHam^a), a pre-Qumranic text which not only mentions Moses and the Prophets but also uses Deut 31:19: “which Moses wrote and your servants the prophets whom you sent, so that evil would overtake us in the last days.”²⁵ In conclusion: a pre-Qumranic meaning for the expression in 4QMMT C 14 seems more likely.

What about the use of the phrase in C 21? It is difficult to get a precise grasp of the meaning of the sentence because in its present context it could be related either to the preceding sentence in the past tense, שֶׁבָּאוּ (“which have come”), or to the next sentence in the future tense, שִׁישׁוּבוּ (“which will come”). The word הוּא or הִיא in this phrase is also ambiguous since it can be read either as the verb הָיָה (“to be”) or as a pronoun. Relating the phrase to the preceding sentence the resulting translation could read: “We know that some of the blessings and the curses as written in the book of Moses have come, and this *is* the אֶהְרִית הַיָּמִים.” This would mean that the writers of the document have understood that the some of the blessings and the curses announced for the future by Moses in Deut 31:29 had already happened in the history of Israel. The time of Solomon and of the exile as well as their present time could be identified with this future. The writers will have concluded, by a pesher-like interpretation, that they were living in the אֶהְרִית הַיָּמִים. In this interpretation the expression will not have the eschatological connotations current in the Qumran writings, but could be considered as an incipient form of the thought that would further develop in the exegetical writings of the Qumran group. As Steudel notes, in the Qumran writings אֶהְרִית הַיָּמִים also refers on some occasions to events of the past, at least from the point of view of the writer. The Qumran community certainly thinks that אֶהְרִית הַיָּמִים includes its own present, since its members thought they were living in the last days.²⁶

In the second possible interpretation, the phrase would be linked to the following sentence, which could then be translated: “And the אֶהְרִית

²⁵ DJD VII, 141–42.

²⁶ Steudel, “בְּאֶהְרִית הַיָּמִים,” 229–30.

הַיָּמִים is when in Israel they will return to the Law,” or, if the reconstruction and interpretation of Qimron is to be preferred “when they will return to Israel forever.” The expression in this case is disconnected from the blessings and curses that have already occurred. The אֲזַרְיָה הַיָּמִים refers to the future, as in many of the Qumranic uses of the expression (either with the verb in the future tense or as a participle with future meaning), but the eschatological character of the period so designated depends on the nature of the anticipated events.

It could be argued that the final return to Israel, in Qimron’s reading, could permit such an eschatological meaning, but that is far from certain. The immediate context with the mention of גְּלוּת (“exile”) would rather point to a return from the exile than to the eschatological return to Zion.²⁷ The return to the law in my own interpretation could also arguably be constructed in a similar way; after all we know that a necessary condition for becoming a member of the Qumran group בְּאֲזַרְיָה הַיָּמִים was precisely to “undertake a binding oath to return to the Law of Moses.”²⁸ But since we do not know exactly from this text who it is in Israel that will return to the law, we cannot be sure of the eschatological content of the phrase.

Although the expression could represent in both interpretations the first stage of an idea which in its more developed form is characteristic of the ideology of the Qumran group, much as the incipient dualism of C 29 could be viewed as a predecessor to the radical dualism we know from other Qumranic writings, the concrete meaning of the expression in *MMT* favours a pre-Qumranic setting for this composition over the more fully-developed sectarian context.

3. מעשי התורה

In the section entitled “Specifically Qumranic Juridical Expressions,” Qimron lists the term מְעָשִׂים; he apparently considers it a synonym of דְּבָרִים, as meaning “laws” or “precepts.”

In *MMT* laws are not called halakhot, מִצְוֹת, and the like, but rather מְעָשִׂים (B 2) and מְעָשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה (C 27)... It is only from the Second Temple period and onwards, however, that we find widespread use of the plural מְעָשִׂים as a term specially designating the laws or commandments of the Bible.

²⁷ I do not think Qimron is assuming that the subject of the verb are the blessing and the curses, as he seems to suggest for the next phrase “and not be cancelled,” DJD X, 61.

²⁸ 1QS V 8; CD XV 9, 12; XVI 1, 5.

The term מעשים in this sense is also found in some other Qumranic works (4Q174, 1–2 i 7 and 1QS 6:18...²⁹

For Qimron this meaning of the word is significant because it belongs to the “expressions which are confined to the Qumran sect.”³⁰ The implication is clear: If this meaning of the expression is typical of the writings of the Qumran group, then the composition in which it appears originates from the same source. I have some difficulties with this argument.

Qimron’s explanation of the meaning of the word, in my opinion, not only disagrees with its usage in other Qumran writings, but is not even defensible on the basis of the manner in which it is employed in *MMT*. In the *Graphic Concordance of the Dead Sea Scrolls* more than 130 texts are listed in which the word is used.³¹ Of all these occurrences Qimron has been able to detect only two in which this particular meaning of the word would be attested, because in all the other occurrences the word clearly carries the traditional meaning of “works,” “deeds” or the like. If therefore, this peculiar meaning of the word as “laws” or “precepts” were really characteristic of a Qumranic setting, we should expect a more frequent use of it in those writings. Furthermore, when we look carefully to the two texts Qimron adduces as proof for this meaning, neither one qualifies.

4QFlorilegium 1–2 i 7 is simply the result of a wrong reading of the manuscript by Allegro,³² already queried by Strugnell in 1970,³³ corrected by George Brooke in 1985,³⁴ and definitively discarded by the palaeographic analysis of Puech in 1993³⁵ and by Kuhn in 1994.³⁶ Allegro read תודה in his text, but the correct reading is, without doubt, מעשי תודה (“works of thanksgiving”).

²⁹ DJD X, 139.

³⁰ DJD X, 138.

³¹ J.H. Charlesworth, *Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck/Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991), 407–408.

³² J.M. Allegro, DJD V, 53.

³³ J. Strugnell, “Notes en marge du Volume V des «Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan»,” *RevQ* 7/26 (1970): 221.

³⁴ G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran. 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 108.

³⁵ É. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien* (2 vols.; Études Bibliques Nouvelle série 21–22; Paris: Gabalda, 1993), 578.

³⁶ H.-W. Kuhn, “Die Bedeutung der Qumrantexte für das Verständnis des Galaterbriefes aus dem Münchener Projekt: Qumran und das Neue Testament,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies. Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. G.J. Brooke and F. García Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994), 205–206 and Plate 9.

The second text Qimron quotes is 1QS VI 18. Here the reading *לתורה ומעשיו* is clear, but the meaning of laws or precepts in this case is impossible. The text is describing the procedure for joining the community. The candidate to whom all the third person pronouns refer, in VI 14 is first examined *לשכלו ולמעשיו* (“with regard to his insight and his deeds”); in VI 17 after one year he is examined again *לרוחו ומעשיו* (“concerning his spirit and his work”); and then, after he has completed a year within the community,³⁷ comes the final examination *לפי שכלו ומעשיו בתורה* (“with regard to his insight and his works according to the law”). The strict parallel with the preceding lines requires that the usage in VI 18 have the same meaning. As in the other cases, it is the insight and the deeds of the aspirant member which are examined to see if they are according to the law and not the precepts or commandments of the law itself.

Qimron has apparently sensed the problem which poses to his interpretation the presence of the preposition *ב*, and has tried to resolve it by pointing out, rightly, that in some cases *מעשים בתורה* and *מעשים* are equivalent within a manuscript (as in 1QS V 21 and 23) and interchangeable in different manuscripts of the same work (1QS and 4QS^d).³⁸ But the logical conclusion of this observation is not that *מעשים* means laws or commandments of the Bible, but that the “works” or “deeds” in question are indeed works according to the law. Anyway, the real problem for the interpretation of Qimron in all these cases, as in 1QS VI 18, is that the personal pronoun attached to the word excludes the possibility of connecting it with the term “Torah” so that it means “commandments” or “precepts” of the Law. It rather refers to “his” or “their” works. In no other Qumranic text, therefore, is to be found the peculiar meaning given by Qimron to its use in *MMT*. Is this new meaning required by the context of this document?

The term appears three times in *MMT*, once in the halakhic section at B 2 and twice in the hortatory section at C 23 and 27, the latter the place from which the current title of the composition has been taken. The best way to understand it is to begin with the second occurrence

³⁷ Or “a year perfectly” as reads 4QS^b. See *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck/Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 64–65.

³⁸ DJD X, 139, n. 43.

which appears in the fragment whose position is disputed. The text of *MMT* C 23 exhorts the addressee, whoever it may be, to remember the kings of Israel and to understand their מעשיהם (“their deeds”). The personal pronominal suffix makes it clear that the meaning of the word here must be precisely the same as in the Qumran texts just mentioned, a conclusion confirmed by the continuation of the text, which in the best Old Testament tradition asserts that the retribution follows the works which are done: “Whoever among them feared [God and observed the] law was delivered from troubles.” This conclusion has already been drawn by Qimron who translates in this case: “Think of the kings of Israel and contemplate their deeds.”³⁹

In *MMT* C 27, however, Qimron translates מעשי התורה as “(some of the) precepts of the Torah,” but nothing in the text itself demands that we give the word this new meaning. The theme of retribution is repeated in the preceding line, this time applied to David who is also delivered from his troubles because he has been a pious man. Then, in a new sentence which introduces the conclusion of the document, the phrase under discussion summarizes the contents of the entire document with the purpose of exhorting the addressee to follow the examples that have been mentioned. If he follows the practices expounded in the legal section, he (and his people) will also be rewarded. “We have written to you some of the works of the law” then becomes a perfect summary of *MMT*: a collection of some of the practices, of the works, which according to the prescriptions of the law should be done in order to be rewarded. In this way, as indicated in the last line, “you will be doing what is upright and good before Him.”

In spite of the fragmentary context the same meaning applies, in my opinion, to the first occurrence of the word in the introduction to the legal section at *MMT* B 2. Qimron again considers it a synonym of דברינו and translates: “These are some of our rulings [...] which are [some of the rulings according to the] precepts (of the Torah) in accordance with...”⁴⁰ But here also, the normal meaning of “works,” “deeds,” or “practices” would suffice. The following rulings represent the works prescribed in the Law. The remainder of the legal section shows the manner in which the author(s) of the document intend that they be put into practice and followed.

³⁹ DJD X, 61.

⁴⁰ DJD X, 47.

The first interpreter, as far as I am aware, to understand מעשי התורה in this way and to react to its translation as “precepts of the law” was Robert Eisenman, who wrote in 1991:

They translate it as “Some precepts of the Torah,” but, as should be clear from the underlying Hebrew, it deals with “acts” or “works of the Law,” a not unknown theme in this period, and where my approach is concerned, a highly significant one.⁴¹

His reasons for qualifying מעשי התורה as “unclean acts of the Torah” or “unclean works of the Torah” eludes me. But he was certainly right opposing the translation “precepts of the Torah.”

We can conclude that the Qumranic setting postulated by Qimron for this phrase do not seems well-founded. The phrase is completely neutral and therefore perfectly compatible with either a pre-Qumranic, Qumranic or post-Qumranic setting for the composition. Its relationship with the well-known New Testament phrase is a subject outside the scope of this paper.⁴²

4. CONCLUSION

Of the two phrases discussed in this paper, one points to a pre-Qumranic setting for the composition and the other does not demand a Qumranic setting at all. It is my hope that this rather modest conclusion can be of some help to determine the proper placement of the disputed fragment from 4Q398. In its limited way, it shows that there are no compelling reasons to maintain Qimron’s ordering of the fragments if the material indications noted by Strugnell prove after further analysis to be true. The immediate context definitely favours the ordering of the fragments as presented by Qimron in the Composite Text, but the location favoured by Strugnell also provides a perfectly reasonable text within a pre-Qumranic context, closely related to the later Qumran group.

My argument with Strugnell is that I do not think the order in which we read the fragments in question matters that much. At least I was not able to discover any shocking difference, perhaps because I am con-

⁴¹ R. Eisenman, “A Response to Schiffman on MMT,” in *Qumran Cave 4 and MMT. Special Report* (ed. Z.J. Kapera; Kraków, Enigma, 1991), 96.

⁴² See J. Kampen, “4QMMT and New Testament Studies,” in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (ed. J. Kampen and M.J. Bernstein; SBLSymS 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 129–44.

vinced that *MMT* as a whole is better understood as coming from the parent group of the Qumran community. This pre-Qumranic group had already adopted the calendar, followed the halakhah we know from other Qumran compositions and started to develop some of the characteristic theological ideas we know in a much more developed form from the same Qumranic compositions. I already espoused this view in the context of my development of the Groningen Hypothesis.⁴³

Qimron and Strugnell, in spite of their quarrels, have jointly given birth to a very healthy child. For that we will always be thankful. The child is not a letter, is not Qumranic and talks about the works that should be done according to the Law. But this child remains one of the most fascinating documents of the Second Temple period, and now that it has escaped the custody of both caring fathers, will keep us very busy for a long, long time.

⁴³ Which considers *MMT* (and *11QTemple*) as “works of the formative period, presenting a vision still not so clearly differentiated from the Essenism which is its ultimate source but containing indications of future developments and offering an already characteristic halakhah,” see F. García Martínez and A.S. van der Woude, “A “Groningen” Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History,” *RevQ* 14/56 (1990): 525. See also F. García Martínez, “Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis,” *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1988): 122.

CHAPTER SIX

OLD TEXTS AND MODERN MIRAGES: THE “I” OF TWO QUMRAN HYMNS

Few Qumran texts have been more hotly discussed in recent times than the hymns Maurice Baillet published 20 years ago as part of one of the copies of the *War Scroll* from Cave 4.¹ These hymns have been preserved in the first column of fragment 11 of 4Q491, which Baillet entitled the “Canticle of Michael and the canticle of the Righteous.”² Apparently, one of the reasons for the interest in these badly fragmented hymns has been the possible importance of the first one for an understanding of some ideas present in the New Testament. The titles given to some of the studies of the text by scholars of the Dead Sea scrolls clearly reveal this focus,³ and this of course is why some New Testament scholars have

¹ M. Baillet, *Qumrân grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, VII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 26–29, pl. VI (= DJD VII).

² A basic bibliography on this text should include at least the following studies: M. Smith, “Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM^a,” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman; JSPSup 8; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 181–88 (a modified version of this article can be found in M. Smith, “Two Ascended to Heaven—Jesus and the Author of 4Q491,” in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* [ed. J.H. Charlesworth; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1992], 290–301); J.J. Collins, “A Throne in Heavens. Apotheosis in pre-Christian Judaism,” in *Death, Ecstasy and Otherworldly Journeys* (ed. J.J. Collins and M. Fishbane; Albany, NY: State University of New York, 1995), 41–58; J.J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star. The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 136–53; M. Abegg, “Who Ascended to Heaven? 4Q491, 4Q427 and the Teacher of Righteousness,” in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. Evans and P. Flint; SDDSSL 1; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 61–73; E. Eshel, “The Identification of the “Speaker” of the Self-Glorification Hymn,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Technological Innovations, New Texts, and New and Reformulated Issues* (ed. D.W. Parry and E.C. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 619–36; M.O. Wise, *The First Messiah. Investigating the Savior Before Christ* (San Francisco: Harper, 1999); M.O. Wise, “גַּי כְּמוֹנֵי בְּאֵלֵי־יָם,” A Study of 4Q491c, 4Q471b, 4Q427 7 and 1QH^a 25:35–26:10,” *DSD* 7 (2000): 173–219; I. Knohl, *The Messiah before Jesus. The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2000); C.H.T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam. Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 42; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 199–216.

³ Smith, “Two Ascended to Heaven—Jesus and the Author of 4Q491”; Collins, “A Throne in Heavens. Apotheosis in pre-Christian Judaism”; Wise, *The First Messiah. Investigating the Savior Before Christ*; Knohl, *The Messiah before Jesus. The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls*.

intensively studied this manuscript within the framework of so-called “Angelomorphic Christology.”⁴ This research has produced very valuable results, but has reached no agreement on the identity of the protagonist of the hymn which Baillet attributed to Michael, the person who speaks in it using first person singular forms.

Baillet, as the title he used shows, considered that the fragment contained two different hymns, the “Canticle of Michael,” extending from line 1 to line 18, and the “Canticle of the Righteous,” extending from line 20 onwards. For him the protagonist of the first was an angel, the Archangel Michael, who in 1QM conducts the sons of light to victory.⁵ Morton Smith, in a famous article, objected to Baillet’s interpretation, arguing, among other things, that Michael is never mentioned in the poem, that in the *War Scroll* Michael never speaks, and that the “I” of the hymn compares himself with other earthly kings. And he concluded: “Baillet’s attribution of the speech to Michael is useful only as a demonstration of his failure to understand the text.”⁶ For Smith the protagonist of the hymn is clearly human and could be related to the author of the *Hodayot*. The hymn would contain pre-Christian evidence of “speculation on deification by ascent towards or into the heavens, speculation which may have gone along with some practices that produced extraordinary experiences understood as encounters with gods or angels.”⁷ Smith connected the contents of the hymn with some Jewish traditions on the enthronement of Moses, and, of course, with his own interpretation of Jesus’ words in his *Clement of Alexandria*. The human protagonist of the hymn speaks of himself, according to Smith, as being enthroned in heaven and “deified.”

⁴ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*. The chapter dedicated to our text bears the title: “A throne in the heavens for the divine human mediator.”

⁵ Baillet never explained in detail the reasons that lead him to consider Michael as the protagonist of this hymn, not in DJD VII, nor in the general summary of the volume he presented at the Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense, M. Baillet, “Le volume VII de ‘Discoveries in the Judaean Desert.’ Présentation,” in *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Paris-Gembloux: Duculot / Leuven: University Press, 1978), 75–78. The only indication I have been able to find is a short reference in Baillet’s first presentation of the material of the *War Scroll* from Cave 4, where he adds to the mention of the Hymn of Michael: “commentaire de son nom” apparently implying a wordplay on the name of the Archangel, M. Baillet, “Les manuscrits de la Règle de la Guerre de grotte 4 de Qumrân,” *RB* 79 (1972): 217–26.

⁶ Smith, “Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM^a,” 187.

⁷ Smith, “Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM^a,” 188.

Smith's interpretation marked the opening of a close examination of this text. This was further accelerated by the preliminary publication in 1993 of a substantial fragment of a *Hodayot* manuscript from Cave 4 (4Q427 fragment 7) that was assumed to contain a copy of the same composition,⁸ and by the publication in 1996 of yet another copy coming from a Cave 4 manuscript related to the *War Scroll* (4Q471b).⁹ The official edition of both texts has now appeared,¹⁰ and of 4Q471b we even have two different editions in the same DJD volume, by Eshel as 4Q471b and by Schuller as fragment 1 of 4Q431.¹¹ The publication of 4Q427 and of 4Q431 has also allowed us to recognise yet another copy of the hymns in question in some isolated fragments of the *Hodayot* scroll from Cave 1 published by Sukenik.¹² An analysis of overlapping among these three texts confirms the editor's conclusion that, in spite of the small differences present, these three manuscripts have preserved three copies of the same composition.¹³ It is thus perfectly correct to use the elements preserved in each copy to fill the *lacunae* of the others in order to produce a composite text of the hymn that was included in the *Hodayot* manuscripts. However, comparison of this composite text with the two hymns preserved in 4Q491 shows, on the contrary, that, although somehow related, the hymns are clearly different.¹⁴ In spite

⁸ E. Schuller, "A Hymn from a Cave Four *Hodayot* Manuscript: 4Q427 7 i + ii," *JBL* 112 (1993): 605–28.

⁹ E. Eshel, "4Q471b: A Self-Glorification Hymn," *RevQ* 17/65–68 (1996): 176–203.

¹⁰ E. Schuller, "424. 4QHodayot," in DJD XXIX, 77–123, pls. IV–VI, foldout I, and E. Eshel, "4Q471b (=4QH^a frag. 1?)," in DJD XXIX, 421–32, pl. XXVIII (= DJD XXIX).

¹¹ E. Schuller, "431. 4QHodayot," in DJD XXIX, 199–208, pl. XII, foldout III.

¹² E.L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press and The Hebrew University, 1955). The fragments in question are 7, 46, 55 and 56. The second column of frag. 7 overlaps with lines 7–19 of 4Q427 ii and with lines 6–9 of the second fragment of 4Q431, and the second columns of the fragments 56, 46 and 55 (in this order) overlap with lines 9–21 of 4Q427 i. In the reconstructions of both Stegemann and Puech, the columns formed by those fragments are numbered cols. XXV and XXVI, cf. H. Stegemann, "The Reconstruction of the Cave 1 *Hodayot* Scroll," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years After Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J.C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, The Shrine of the Book, 2000), 272–84; figure 7 presents the reconstruction of the fragments that form columns XXV and XXVI. E. Puech, "Quelques aspects de la restauration du Rouleau des Hymnes (1QH)," *JJS* 39 (1988): 38–55, esp. 51–52.

¹³ Schuller, DJD XXIX, 101: "One recension is found in three *Hodayot* manuscripts (with such minor differences as are commonly found among different copies of the *Hodayot*).

¹⁴ I have presented a composite text of the three *Hodayot* manuscripts and compared

of this, the publication of the *Hodayot* texts has increased the number and variety of the interpretations offered concerning the identity of the protagonist who speaks in the first person and who is assumed to be the same in all four textual witnesses.¹⁵

John Collins, in his first study of 4Q491, accepted part of Smith's reasoning and considered the speaker as a human being, related to, and modelled on, the Teacher of Righteousness.¹⁶ For a while, Collins thought that the protagonist could possibly be identified with "the Teacher at the end of days" or the eschatological high priest,¹⁷ but in his later publications he concludes that the protagonist cannot be identified with any certainty.¹⁸

Esther Eshel, developing the proposal by Collins, identifies clearly the speaker with the eschatological High Priest, a figure modelled after the historical Teacher of Righteousness. She bases her argument on the parallels with the blessing of this eschatological high priest contained in 1QSb. Eshel explains the incorporation of this hymn in the *Hodayot*

it with the text preserved in 4Q491 fragment 11 in F. García Martínez, "¿Ángel, Hombre, Mesías, Maestro de Justicia? El problemático "yo" de un poema qumránico," in *Plenitudo Temporis. Miscelánea Homenaje al Prof. Dr. Ramón Trevijano Etcheverría* (Salamanca: Universidad Pontificia, 2002), 103–31.

¹⁵ In addition to the works quoted in note 2, the following studies are worthy of note: J.J. Collins and D. Dimant, "A Thrice-Told Hymn," *JQR* 85 (1994): 151–55; D. Dimant, "A Synoptic Comparison of Parallel Sections in 4Q427 7 and 4Q471B," *JQR* 85 (1994): 157–61; M. Abegg, "4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity?," 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), 137–47; C. Martone, "Hodayot e Regola della Guerra alla luce di un testo Qumranico recentemente pubblicato," *Henoch* 18 (1996): 111–20; J.J. Collins, "Powers in Heavens: God, Gods, and Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Religion in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J.J. Collins and R.A. Kugler; SDSSRL 5; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 9–28.

¹⁶ Collins, "A Throne in Heavens. Apotheosis in pre-Christian Judaism," 53–55.

¹⁷ Collins, *The Scepter and the Star. The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*, 136–53.

¹⁸ As he formulated in J.J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls; London, Routledge, 1997), 147: "The implied authorship remains enigmatic." His latest statement on the matter is even stronger: "It must be acknowledged, however, that the speaker is never identified in the Scrolls, and uncertainty as to his identification is inevitable." Cf. Collins, "Powers in Heavens: God, Gods, and Angels in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 26. This position is similar to the one taken by Émile Puech, who simply listed a string of possible identifications (Teacher, Instructor, Sage, King-Messiah, Priest-Messiah) followed by a big question mark, cf. E. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien* (2 vols.; Études Bibliques Nouvelle série 21–22; Paris: Gabalda, 1993), 494.

context as follows: “The resemblance between the Teacher of Righteousness and the eschatological high priest may have led some scribes to incorporate the Self-Glorification Hymn, which was composed in the name of the eschatological high priest, into the *Hodayot* scroll.”¹⁹

Israel Knohl criticises this interpretation by Eshel on two basic grounds:²⁰ first, by pointing to the fact that in the Blessing of 1QSB there are definite priestly elements—elements which are lacking in the hymn—and second, by noting that the similarity in the community with the angels exists only at a superficial level between the two texts. The priest who served God in the royal temple of 1QSB does indeed resemble the angels, but the real meaning of the expression of our hymn, מִי כְמוֹנֵי בְּאֱלִים, is “I am higher than all the angels.” For Knohl the protagonist is none other than the King-Messiah, to whom in the Bible divine attributes are already given (Isa 9:5 and Jer 23:6).²¹ In Knohl’s interpretation this protagonist is also presented in the hymn as the “suffering servant” of Isa 53, and he is none other than the leader of the messianic movement that arose within the Qumran community—*The Messiah before Jesus*, who appears in the title of his book.

Also, Martin Abegg has proposed that we see in the protagonist of our hymn the Teacher of Righteousness, the author of the *Hodayot*, and the founder of the Qumran Community, although without attributing to this protagonist a messianic character. This interpretation would not require that the Teacher of Righteousness had himself made the assertion that he ascended to heaven and was enthroned among the gods. “The Teacher of Righteousness might have made such a claim, but it is also possible that such a claim was made *on behalf* of the Teacher of Righteousness by the author(s) of the texts we have examined.”²²

¹⁹ Eshel, “The Identification of the ‘Speaker’ of the Self-Glorification Hymn,” 635. In DJD XXIX, 426, Eshel uses a similar expression: “One may assume that a scribe, coping with the death of the Teacher of Righteousness, composed the Self-Glorification Hymns thinking of the Teacher of Righteousness while describing the eschatological high priest.”

²⁰ Knohl, *The Messiah before Jesus. The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 75–86.

²¹ The identification with the Messiah was previously suggested by Hengel, cf. M. Hengel, “‘Setze dich zu meiner Rechten’ Die Inthronisation Christi zur Rechten Gottes und Psalm 110,1,” in *Le Trône de Dieu* (ed. M. Philonenko; WUZN 69; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1993), 108–94, 176: “So liegt doch wohl eine ‘messianische’ Gestalt am nächsten.”

²² Abegg, “Who Ascended to Heaven?,” 72.

Michael Wise proposes a collective interpretation of the protagonist.²³ At least in the form of the hymn transmitted in the *Hodayot* manuscripts, the “I” who is speaking could be identified with each member of the community. Independent of who may have been the protagonist of the hymn preserved in 4Q491, once the hymn was inserted in the collection of the *Hodayot*, the “I” was automatically identified with the Teacher of Righteousness, and through the collective recitation of his words each member of the Community could identify with him.²⁴

Crispin Fletcher-Louis²⁵ understands the protagonist as human and divine at the same time.²⁶ For him the hymn has a mystical context as well as a liturgical one and expresses a genuine mystical experience of ascending into heaven during the liturgy of the community.²⁷

In short, the protagonist of the hymn has been seen as an angel and as a man, and as both at the same time (a “divinized” man). It has also been seen as the priestly Messiah, the King Messiah, the historical Teacher of Righteousness, and as the expected eschatological Teacher.

²³ A collective interpretation was previously suggested by Anette Steudel in a postscript to her article: A. Steudel, “The Eternal Reign of the People of God—Collective Expectations in Qumran Texts (4Q246 and 1QM),” *RevQ* 17/65–68 (1996): 507–25, at 525: “The text 4QM^a 11 i (+12) might indeed be interpreted collectively.” And even before her, by Hartmut Stegemann, who identified the protagonist with the people of Israel, cf. H. Stegemann, “Some Remarks to 1QSa to 1Qsb, and to Qumran Messianism,” *RevQ* 17/65–68 (1996): 479–505, at 502. “A third example of this kind is another passage of *Serek ha-Milhamah*, which has survived only in the manuscript 4Q491. Here a being praises its own existence as a heavenly one, reckoning itself to the angels, but not being created as an angel. In spite of the singular formulation, the collective of the people of Israel, being raised to a quasi ‘heavenly status’ speak here.”

²⁴ Wise, “מי כמוני באלים,” 218: “On one level, by inserting the Canticle of Michael in the 1QH^a form of the *Hodayot*, the redactor meant for the reader, listener, user to think of the Teacher. The Canticle’s assertions were literally true of the Teacher in a way they could not be for anyone else. But on another level, each individual believer could make them true for himself or herself by partaking in the charisma of the Teacher. That happened partially through recitation. In a sense, the group became what their charismatic founder had been.”

²⁵ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 199–216.

²⁶ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 201: “Though there are an irritating number of lacunae and some obscure phrases, the autobiography of one who is both human and yet divine is clear.”

²⁷ Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 215–16: “A decision regarding the identity of the speaker eludes absolute certainty. Yet the most plausible identity for the speaker of both *Glorification Hymn A* and *Glorification Hymn B* is a priest who describes his experience of apotheosis during the liturgy of the community’s worship. There may be some connection with the Teacher of Righteousness, but this is less straightforward inference than the hymn is simply used on a regular basis by those priest who do actually enter the realm of heaven in the cultic setting.”

And the “voice” that speaks in the hymn has been interpreted both as an individual and a collective one, or as an individual voice appropriated by each single member of the community.

In spite of their diversity, all these interpretations share, in my opinion, the same two basic assumptions: (1) that the first column of fragment 11 of 4Q491 is an independent composition without a concrete literary context, and (2) that the two hymns there preserved²⁸ are more or less identical to the single hymn contained in the three *Hodayot* manuscripts.²⁹

The result of these two assumptions is, if I am not mistaken, that all these interpreters concentrate their efforts on elucidating the meaning of the hymn in the context of the *Hodayot*, but attribute to the protagonist the characteristics they have discovered in the hymns of 4Q491. But, in my opinion, neither of these two assumptions has been proved convincingly, and both should be abandoned and replaced by an independent analysis of the two texts within the literary context in which they have been transmitted.

1

The first assumption, that fragment 11 has no connection with the materials related to the eschatological war contained in 4Q491, is due to the

²⁸ That fragment 11 of 4Q491 contains two distinct hymns is obvious from line 19, which has been left blank in order to indicate a major division, and it is independent of the interpretation one would give to the oversized *lamed* partially preserved at the bottom. Morton Smith asserted that the fragment contained three hymns, and isolated lines 12–18 as a hymn autonomous and complete, cf. Smith, “Two Ascended to Heaven—Jesus and the Author of 4Q491,” 295: “From the corrected and completed text it appears that the preserved remains of col. 1 contain fragments of three poems. The first, which ends with *’olamim* in Baillet’s line 11 (p. 26), is the end of a hymn in praise of God; it does not concern us. The third, beginning with Baillet’s line 20, is plausibly described by him as a “cantic of the righteous”; neither does it concern us. The nine lines intervening are a brief paean of self-praise, which will be clearer if translated as verse.” But the photograph PAM 41.486 shows that the word עֹלָמִים is followed by another word of which the first letter has been preserved, which does not leave space for the *vacat* which would have marked the beginning of the new hymn.

²⁹ DJD XXIX, 103: “In the recension in 4Q491 11 i, the section with the pl. imperative verbs seems to be treated as a separate unit, separated by a *vacat* line. The evidence of 4QH^c 1 is ambiguous since the small fragment with]וּמְרִי[is physically separated; see the discussion *ad loc.* Here the text is continuous, with no additional space at all before וּמְרִי.” In fact there are no *vacats* at all in fragment 7, and Schuller, DJD XXIX, 100, considers that in the restored scroll of 4Q427 the single hymn would have extended “from col. II 18 (see the discussion of frag. 3 4) to col. V, probably at line 3.”

influence of the assertion of Martin Abegg³⁰ that the fragments which contain the hymns in 4Q491 are the only remains of an independent manuscript unrelated to the two other manuscripts edited by Baillet as 4Q491.³¹ If this assertion were true, this single copy of these two hymns would lack any literary context which could illuminate its meaning and allow us to know the precise nature of the protagonist because all that would have been preserved from this manuscript would be precisely the “Canticle of Michael” and the beginning of the “Canticle of the Righteous.” I was unduly influenced by Abegg in the presentation of the evidence in the *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*.³² But a new examination of all the photographs of 4Q491³³ persuades me not to accept totally Abegg’s analysis and conclusion, and thus to correct the presentation in the *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*.

In my view, Abegg has made a very good case for the division of 4Q491 into two manuscripts. According to him, one of the manuscripts (which he designates as 4Q491a) would have been formed by fragments 8–10, 11 ii, 12–15, 18, 24–28, 31–33 and 35 of Baillet’s edition. This manuscript would have preserved a copy, with few variants, of the *War Scroll* known from Cave 1. The second manuscript, which he designated 4Q491b, would have been formed by fragments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 16, 19, 20, 21 and 23 of Baillet’s edition. This manuscript would have preserved a composition dealing with the eschatological war but which

³⁰ In his doctoral dissertation on the *War Scroll*. This dissertation has not yet been published but Abegg has made known his results in the two articles quoted, Abegg, “Who Ascended to Heaven?” and “4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity?”

³¹ His examination of the physical, palaeographical, orthographical and literary evidence does not seem to leave room for doubt: “In my comparison of 4Q491 with 1QM, I have shown that manuscript I of 4Q491 contains material that is paralleled in 1QM as well as an expanded description of the final skirmishes in the war against the Kitians recounted in 1QM 15–18. In contrast, manuscript II of 4Q491 shares no common text with 1QM but instead echoes material that is scattered through 1QM. Manuscript III of 4Q491, the misnamed ‘Song of Michael’ shows no contextual connection at all with 1QM. It is best understood as an independent hymnic work containing the bold declarations of one who claims to sit in the council of heavenly beings.” Abegg, “Who Ascended to Heaven?” 70.

³² In which the manuscript was presented as “4Q491c 4QSelf-Glorification Hymn^b,” see F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 2:978–81.

³³ Accessible both in a microfiche edition: E. Tov with the collaboration of S. Pfann (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche. A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 1993), and in an electronic edition: *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Electronic Reference Library. Volume I* (ed. T.H. Lim in consultation with P.S. Alexander; Leiden: Brill/Oxford: OUP, 1995).

would be different from the *War Scroll* from Cave 1.³⁴ The elements he notes—differences in the form of the letters and in the general appearance of the manuscript, the use in one but not in the other of the *alef* in final position, and the different spelling of the word “Levites” (הלויים in 4Q491 1–3 9 and 17, and הלויים in 4Q491 11 ii 6 and 13 6)—are convincing and allow us to distinguish these two series of fragments.³⁵ In fact, it seems that, originally, Milik³⁶ has distinguished two groups of fragments with materials related to the *War Scroll*,³⁷ and that it was Hunzinger who later grouped both sets of fragments in one manuscript (4Q491).³⁸

This division of the materials of 4Q491 into two different manuscripts (4Q491a and 4Q491b), both related to the eschatological war, gives a satisfactory explanation of the differences noted by Abegg, and is, in my opinion, correct. But, as far as I can see, there is no reason to split the manuscript further, as Abegg does, and to create in this way a third manuscript (4Q491c) formed only by fragments 11 i and 12. Abegg himself recognises that what he calls 4Q491c (fragments 11 i and 12) was written by the same scribe who wrote 4Q491b,³⁹ and that both 4Q491b and 4Q491c follow consistently the same orthographic conventions (long forms), as against 4Q491a which is more irregular in its use. The only argument Abegg adduces for his proposal is a minimal difference (of 0.2 millimetres) in the separation of the lines of column i of fragment 11 (and of fragment 12) from the other fragments of 4Q491b. This difference (between 4.1 and 4.3 millimetres in the estimation of Abegg) is not of an order to demand such radical surgery, especially in

³⁴ Abegg, “4Q471: A Case of Mistaken Identity?,” 137 and n. 6.

³⁵ Abegg, “Who Ascended to Heaven?,” 64–69.

³⁶ To whom is due the first identification of the fragments, according to C.-H. Hunzinger, “Fragmente einer älteren Fassung des Buches Milhamah aus Höhle 4 von Qumran,” *ZAW* 69 (1957): 131–51, at 131: “Der Grundstock der Milhama-Fragmente aus 4Q war bereits von Abbé J.T. Milik gesammelt worden, bevor ich im Oktober 1954 in die Arbeit im Palestine Archaeological Museum in Jerusalem eintrat und mir u.a. die genannten Handschriften übergeben wurden.”

³⁷ One of them, formed by frags. 8–10, is reproduced on PAM 42.144.

³⁸ This can be deduced from the old designation of 4Q491 as H 1–2, from the fact that Hunzinger speaks always in his article from 1957 of four manuscripts of de *Milhamah* which were entrusted to Baillet in 1971, and from the dates provided by Baillet for the identification of the other *Milhamah* manuscripts: 4Q496 in 1960 and 4Q495 in 1969, cf. DJD VII, xi.

³⁹ Abegg, “Who Ascended to Heaven?,” 65: “Manuscript II, which is not represented, was in my estimation written by the same scribe as manuscript III.”

a manuscript which was as faintly ruled as this one.⁴⁰ His division of 4Q491b into two different manuscripts (the fragments of the “Self-Glorification Hymn” belonging to one and the rest to another) remains in my view very problematic and cannot be considered proved.

My point here is that if this division has not been proved, it will be wiser to consider the fragments as coming from the same manuscript which contains a composition with materials related to the *War Rule* and is similar to other manuscripts from Cave 4 that contain similar compositions. By this I do not mean that the materials of manuscript 4Q491b are a copy of the 1QM; but they certainly belong to a related composition dealing also with the eschatological war.⁴¹

2

The second assumption, that the two hymns preserved there are more or less identical to the hymn contained in the three *Hodayot* manuscripts, is so deeply embedded that the hymns of 4Q491 and the hymn of 4Q427, 4Q431 and 1QH are designated by the same title: “Self-Glorification Hymn,” “Thrice-Told Hymn” etc. This assumption started with the first announcement by Baillet that another manuscript from Cave 4 contained a copy of the “Canticle of Michael,” and with his use of this manuscript to complete the text of 4Q491.⁴² It has survived, in one form or another, the publication of all the witnesses. Some scholars, like Abegg, see such a close relationship among the hymns that they even speculate that 4Q491 11 i could belong to a *Hodayot* manuscript.⁴³ Collins and

⁴⁰ Abegg is not able to see the traces on the photographs: “in none of the photographs does there remain a trace of scribal ruling.” Abegg, “Who Ascended to Heaven?,” 64. According to Baillet the manuscript was ruled “Lignes et marges sont finement tracés à la point sèche, mais souvent peu apparents.” DJD VII, 12.

⁴¹ See further F. García Martínez, “Estudios Qumránicos 1975–1995. Panorama Crítico III,” *EstBib* 46 (1988): 343–55 and G. Aranda Pérez, F. García Martínez, and M. Pérez Fernández, *Literatura judía intertestamentaria* (Introducción al Estudio de la Biblia 9; Estella: Verbo Divino, 1996), 72–74.

⁴² In Baillet, “Le volume VII de ‘Discoveries in the Judaean Desert.’ Présentation,” 79: “Il y a des éléments du même cantique dans un autre manuscrit de la grotte 4 (sigle provisoire 4QSL 86).” According to Schuller, “A Hymn from a Cave Four *Hodayot* Manuscript: 4Q427 7 i + ii,” 606, n. 5, the reference corresponds to the fragment edited by Eshel as 4Q471b, that is fragment 1 of 4Q431. Baillet used this manuscript to fill in lacunae in lines 17 and 18, cf. DJD VII, 29.

⁴³ Abegg, “Who Ascended to Heaven?,” 72: “Given the repetitive, almost cyclical nature of the *Thanksgiving Hymns*, it is also quite possible that manuscript III of 4Q491 comes from a psalm that followed the current broken end of the *Thanksgiving Hymns*.”

Dimant recognise that the “Canticle of the Righteous” is a completely different text, but they defend the substantial identity of the “Canticle of Michael” with the text preserved in the *Hodayot* manuscripts.⁴⁴ But the great majority attempt to define the relationship between the two texts in terms of two recensions of the same composition: recension A preserved in the three *Hodayot* manuscripts and recension B contained in 4Q491. This terminology was introduced by Eshel in her first edition of 4Q431 (which she calls 4Q471b), and has been generally accepted,⁴⁵ although it was presented without any solid justification.⁴⁶ Eshel, while recognising that it is possible that both recensions could have originated from a common source, considers that recension B derives from recension A.⁴⁷ Wise, on the other hand, considers recension B as the oldest and original; the recension found in the *Hodayot* manuscripts depends on, modifies, and enlarges the recension found in 4Q491.⁴⁸

In my opinion, an analysis of the common elements—the shared phraseology and related expressions in both compositions—but also of their obvious differences, does not allow us to conclude that we are dealing with two genetically related compositions. Neither can be explained by the other. Nor can either be explained by an assumed common ancestor. The “recension” idea cannot be applied in this case, at least not if

⁴⁴ Collins and Dimant, “A Thrice-Told Hymn,” 153: “4Q491 11 has more substantial variants, but still represents the same text in so far as the correspondences between 4Q491 11 and 4Q471b are too close for these to be merely variations on a common theme.”

⁴⁵ Thus Collins in his latest publications on the topic, Knohl, Wise, etc. Even Schuller, who is more careful and uses the terms “versions” and “recensions” with reserve, states in DJD XXIX, 101: “A second version appears in 4Q491 11 i 8–24. This is obviously a closely related text, but it is not simply a copy of what is found in the *Hodayot* manuscripts. The relationship between the two versions is complex and still requires much further study; for the present, it seems helpful to consider them as two distinct recensions.”

⁴⁶ Eshel, “4Q471b: A Self-Glorification Hymn,” 190 simply asserts: “4Q491 shares a common theme and verbal correspondences with Recension A. Nevertheless, there are substantial variants in 4Q491. Therefore, we designate this text Recension B.” In DJD XXIX, 422 she simply refers to this article.

⁴⁷ E. Eshel, “4Q471b: A Self-Glorification Hymn,” 201: “The absence of these phrases in Recension B might indicate that the scribe of Recension B felt they were inappropriate for describing a human being, and chose to omit them... Recension B seems to have undergone editing, with the editor duplicating some phrases... This editor also added two important themes.”

⁴⁸ Wise, “מי כמותי באליהם,” 214: “To my mind the more probable direction of influence is from 4Q491c to the *Hodayot*. Not only is expansion more common than contraction in liturgical writings, such as these manifestly were, but the psychology that produced these specific contents would not seem amenable to the suggestion that less is more.”

we give it the meaning the word carries in the disciplines of textual and literary criticism where it originated.

A comparison of the composite text of the three *Hodayot* manuscripts with the text of 4Q491 which is actually preserved proves my point.⁴⁹

It is obvious that the contents of the composite text and of the two hymns of 4Q491 are somehow related. In both, a protagonist, speaking in the first person, exalts himself over everybody else, asserts that nobody can compare with him and that he is related to the “gods” (angels). But the metaphors used to express his incomparability and his relationship to the angels are different in the two cases—“beloved of the King,” “companion of the holy ones,” “my position is with the gods,” in the *Hodayot* texts, as against “being reckoned among the gods,” “dwelling in the holy congregation,” and having “my glory with the sons of God” in 4Q491.

In 4Q491 there is a rather abrupt shift from the plural protagonist of lines 8 to 12 to the speaker in lines 13–18. In the *Hodayot* texts this shift is not attested, although this could be the result of the fragmentary way the evidence has been preserved. In any case, the “Canticle of Michael” has as its protagonist not only the “I” who speaks in the first person but also “the council of the poor ones,” “the eternal congregation,” “the perfect ones,” “the holy ones,” and possibly (although the reading is uncertain) “the righteous ones,” who are the protagonists of the “Canticle of the Righteous.”

The “Canticle of the Righteous,” being an exhortation to praise and thanksgiving, shares with the *Hodayot* texts the use of imperative verbal forms; but the verbs employed (with the exception of זָמַר and perhaps שָׁמַע) are different, and, what is more important, so are the words employed to designate the addressees (דִּירִים in 4Q427 and צְדִיקִים in 4Q491); and the “Canticle of the Righteous” does not show the extended series of plural imperative verbs which characterize the hymn in the *Hodayot* texts.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ The synopsis published by D. Dimant, “A Synoptic Comparison of Parallel Sections in 4Q427 7 and 4Q471B,” 157–61, needs to be completed and modified in the light of the DJD editions. The list of “common” expressions published by Eshel, “4Q471b: A Self-Glorification Hymn,” 190, is of no real use, since many of the “common” elements are reconstructed and imported from one “recension” into the other. More useful is the list of parallels between 4Q491 and 4Q427 published by Schuller, “A Hymn from a Cave Four *Hodayot* Manuscript: 4Q427 7 i + ii,” 626.

⁵⁰ DJD XXIX, 100–101. Collins and Dimant, “A Thrice-Told Hymn,” 153 duly recognise the differences: “While there are verbal parallels between 4Q491 11 and

It is also obvious that there are some shared expressions: אֱנִי (א) עִם אֱלֹהִים of 4Q491 11 i 14, 18 with 4Q427 7 i 12 (though the verb which follows is different in each case);⁵¹ שְׂמֵחָה עוֹלָמִים of 4Q491 11 i 21 with 4Q427 7 i 17. We can add כָּהֵם אֲפִירִים in line 18 of 4Q491, if בִּירִים in line 13 of 4Q427 is considered a copyist's error, and הַשְׂמִיעוּ בְּהִנֵּי רִנָּה in line 21 of 4Q491 if הַנִּידָנָה, the reading of 4Q427 7 i 17 is also considered a copyist's error. But in any of these cases it is possible to make the text of the hymns overlap. There are also other similar expressions, such as לֹא יִדְמָה, וְלֹא יִבּוֹא and the use of the verb נִמְדָּר, but on all these occasions the sentence is formulated diversely. The use of כְּמוֹנִי in 4Q431 1 1, 2, 4 and in 4Q491 11 i 16 could have been more important, because the use of כְּמֹה + suffix is rare in the manuscripts and these are the only occurrences with the first person suffix; but here also the sentence is diversely formulated.

It also seems obvious that the relationship of the “Canticle of Michael” and the “Canticle of the Righteous” to the hymns preserved in the *Hodayot* texts is of the same kind. The number and kind of agreements and discrepancies are similar in both cases.⁵²

Under these circumstances, I do not think we can assert more than that the “Canticle of Michael” and the “Canticle of the Righteous” have a *generic relationship* to the hymn preserved in the *Hodayot* manuscripts, a relationship similar to that which the “Canticle of the Righteous” has with several other hymns in the *Hodayot* collection, and especially with the so-called “Hymns of the Community,” and similar also to the relationship the “Canticle of Michael” has with other poems in the *Canticles of the Sabbath Sacrifice* or even in 1QM. The term “two recensions” is unhelpful for describing a relationship consisting only of

4Q471b in these imperatival sections, the correspondences are not so close as to suggest that we are dealing with variants of the same text.”

⁵¹ The expression אֱנִי עִם אֱלֹהִים is not very common, but “being with the gods” (using other names for the angels) occurs often in the *Hodayot*, for example; 1QH^a XI 21–22 “The corrupt spirit you have purified from the great sin so that he can take his place with the host of the holy ones, and can enter in communion with the congregation of the sons of heaven.” 1QH^a XIX 13 “...so that he can take his place in your presence with the perpetual host and the [everlasting] spirits.” (translations from F. García Martínez, *DSS*, 332, 353.)

⁵² Collins and Dimant, “A Thrice-Told Hymn,” 153 think otherwise, but they fail to adduce any proof for their assertion: “4Q491 11 has more substantial variants, but still represents the same text in so far as the correspondences with the other two texts outweigh the differences. The verbal correspondences between 4Q491 11 and 4Q471b are too close for these to be merely variations on a common theme.”

some lexicographical affinity, a few common expressions, and a common theme of self-exaltation by the protagonist. And it runs the risk of inducing scholars to produce a portrait of the protagonist of 4Q491 and introduce it within the community context of the *Hodayot*.⁵³

If these two assumptions have not been substantiated, it would be methodologically unsound to complete the hymns of 4Q491 with elements which have only been preserved in the hymn attested in the *Hodayot* manuscripts and vice versa. Each poem should be read within the literary context in which it has been transmitted.

4Q491 in the context of the War Scroll

Now, if we examine the form of the Hymn as preserved in the first column of fragment 11 of 4Q491 against a background of the other materials in manuscript 4Q491b to which it belongs, and without paying attention to the elements attested only in the hymn included in the *Hodayot* manuscripts, what can be concluded as to who the protagonist was in whose mouth the redactor of these materials put the words of the Hymn? Reading the text with the victory hymns after the final battle in mind, the following elements come to the fore.

We can assert that the presence of hymns in this context is unsurprising. Both in 1QM and in the other materials related to the *War Scroll*, hymns of victory follow the final victory, and the compilers assert expressly that some of them are taken from the sources at their disposal.⁵⁴

As indicated before, and contrary to the opinion of Smith,⁵⁵ the first hymn of 4Q491 does not start after a *vacat* in line 11; lines 8–11 are a substantial part of the first hymn. The point of this observation is that, although we have neither the end nor the beginning of the first hymn, it is clear that it deals not only with the exalted person who will speak in lines 12–18, but also with “the poor,” “the eternal congregation,” “the perfect ones,” even with the “just ones,” if Baillet’s reading can be

⁵³ A look at Eshel’s edition of 4Q431 in DJD XXIX as 4Q471b or at Abegg’s assertions is enough to prove that the danger is anything but imaginary.

⁵⁴ Not only is 1QM full of all sort of hymns, but 1QM XV 5 expressly asserts that the High Priest will “say in their hearing the prayer for the time of war, as it is written in the ‘book of the rule of his time’, with all the words of their thanksgivings.” And in 4Q491 17 4 is mentioned a ספר התהלהים, which may be, as Baillet indicates, the oldest mention of the Psalter, but it could equally mean a collection of hymns that the author is using.

⁵⁵ See note 28.

accepted, who are speaking in lines 8–11. All the expressions used in these lines are commonly employed to designate members of the present and the eschatological community—the “sons of light” who fight against the “sons of darkness.” In other words, in the context of the manuscript of a composition related to the eschatological war, as it is in 4Q491b, there can be no doubt that the plural subject of the first part of the hymn comprises members of the community of the “sons of light,” victorious Israel in the eschatological battle. Of the human nature of the members of this eschatological community there can be no doubt. The key question, it seems to me, is the nature, human or otherwise, of the single protagonist of lines 12–18 in the context of the eschatological victory.

Since Morton Smith’s article, the protagonist’s human nature has been universally accepted, but with little attention to the arguments provided. Indeed Smith used more sarcasm than argument.⁵⁶ Eshel, in her articles and in the DJD edition, gives, as the only argument for the human character of this figure, the use of the expression *לוא כבשר האוהתי*, which she translates as “my desire is not of the flesh” and interprets as meaning “he cannot be tempted like ordinary mortals.”⁵⁷ But this phrase would be better translated giving the full weight to the *-כ*: hence “my desire is not according to the flesh,” which would rather imply that the protagonist does not follow human paths. Besides, *האוה* is used here without any further precision (*גפש*, *לב*, *אדם* etc.) and, because this is the only time it is used in the preserved scrolls, we are not even sure if we should read it with the meaning it has in the book of Proverbs or in Isa 26:8, or if we should understand it as in Gen 49:29 *עולם נבעת עולם*, and translate it as “my limit is not as (the limit) of flesh,” which would strongly accentuate the non-human character of the protagonist.

The only argument that Collins offers as an indication of the human character of the protagonist is the reference to “grief” in line 16. But he candidly recognises that the phrase is fragmentary and can be differently

⁵⁶ “Would an archangel have stooped to say that?... Michael would scarcely have compared himself to such small-fry... Who would think of getting a summons for an archangel?” for example, cf. Smith, “Ascent to the Heavens and Deification in 4QM^a,” 186–87.

⁵⁷ “The most distinctive phrases of Recension B are *לוא כבשר האוהתי*, “my desire is not of the flesh,” where the speaker emphasizes that he cannot be tempted like ordinary mortals.” Eshel, “The Identification of the “Speaker” of the Self-Glorification Hymn,” 626 and DJD XXIX, 422.

reconstructed and interpreted.⁵⁸ And indeed, while Knohl uses the same expressions as an indication of the presence in the Hymn of the (human) figure of the “suffering servant” of Isaiah, and reconstructs the text accordingly as “Who has borne all afflictions like me?,”⁵⁹ Puech reads the fragmentary verb as [צ]הק], and translates it as “Qui se rit des peines comme moi”?⁶⁰ The next sentence is also fragmentary in 4Q491; so no יסבול needs to be assumed (even if this verb were to be inserted in the *Hodayot* manuscripts, where it not has been preserved either, and where it has been introduced, both by Eshel and Knohl, in a reconstruction intended to reflect the influence of Isaiah, a notion which is very unlikely on material grounds).⁶¹

Thus, I do not consider it proved that the individual protagonist of the “Canticle of Michael” of 4Q491 is a human figure. The language employed in the preserved parts does not favour this interpretation, and neither do the exclusive parallels of a couple of the expressions used in the *Canticles of the Sabbath Sacrifice* noted by Dimant.⁶² This protagonist does not appear to be an angel either. He is “reckoned” among the angels (line 14 and, maybe, 18), but the phrase used clearly implies that his status is higher. His glory is “incomparable” (this word has been dotted out by the scribe in line 13, but in line 15 we can read “who can compare with my glory”). Little wonder, then, that the only literary par-

⁵⁸ “The reference to griefs may also point to a human speaker, but much depends on how the context is restored. (If the line is read ‘who ta[kes away all] grief like me’ the speaker is not necessarily human.)” Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 144–45.

⁵⁹ Knohl, *The Messiah before Jesus. The Suffering Servant of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 77.

⁶⁰ Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 494, n. 156 proposes as a possible reading and reconstruction: מִי־אֵי צִהֵק בְּצַעֲרֵי־ם.

⁶¹ It is impossible to compress 13 letters into a lacuna (on 4Q471b 1 3) as Eshel does in DJD XXIX, 428) when in the following line (1 4) the same space is occupied by only two or three letters (כִּי in her reconstruction). The reconstruction of Schuller in DJD XXIX, 203 is much more sensible; she only reconstructs the article in line 3, with no space for יסבול ומי יסבול, of course.

⁶² “On the one hand, Dimant is sympathetic to Baillet’s identification of the figure as an angel. She points to the presence of a number of terms found only in the Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice, e.g., the use of בְּנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ (sons of the Kings) and the locution כְּהֵם אוֹפִירִים (gold of Ophir).” Collins and Dimant, “A Thrice-Told Hymn,” 154. In Dimant, “A Synoptic Comparison of Parallel Sections in 4Q427 7 and 4Q471B,” 161 she retracts this view: “Having worked on the synopsis, I now tend to agree with Collins (see the preceding article) that the hymn is pronounced by a human rather than angelic being.” But the reasons adduced are not really convincing: “This is indicated by a number of details: in line 5 the speaker apparently describes himself as sitting on a throne ‘amid a congregation of *’elim*’ (4Q491 11 5), *’elim* being the regular Qumran term for angels. Such a statement implies that the speaker is not one of these angels.”

allel to his “boasting,” as Collins has noticed,⁶³ is that put in the mouth of personified Wisdom, also a most exalted non-angelic character and clearly not non-human.

What this protagonist tells us of himself, of his functions or qualities, is very little, at least in the parts of the poem preserved in 4Q491. The poem does not attribute to him either priestly or military functions. Nor do I consider proved the view that our hymn attributes to him a teaching function. This teaching element is generally found in lines 16–17, where it was introduced by Baillet, importing it from the *Hodayot* copy; but the reading of וְהוֹרִיָּה in 4Q491 is most uncertain.⁶⁴ A judicial function may be implied in the three rhetorical questions in line 17; but, of course, the meaning of בְּמִשְׁפָּטִי in line 17 is ambiguous. The fact that this word climaxes the three rhetorical questions could point in this direction, an indication strengthened by the close verbal parallels with Job 9:19 (וְאֵם לְמִשְׁפָּט מִי וְעִדְנִי) and with 1QSb III 27 (וּמִמְזוֹל שְׁפָחִיכָה): “May he judge all the nobles by your works and by the outpouring of your lips.” But other victory contexts cannot be excluded, and the use of the verb נָגַד may be relevant here.⁶⁵ Even the “enthronement in heaven,” which is one of the elements which has strongly stimulated the study of this text, is not really present in 4Q491. The preserved text does mention “a throne in heaven” in line 12: “a mighty throne in the congregation of the gods above which none of the kings of old shall sit,” but the preceding lacuna does not allow us to specify who sits on this throne or to which action it relates.⁶⁶

That the speaker in the first person of the “Canticle of Michael” presents himself as dwelling in heaven can be inferred from some of the details, but also here the lacuna which follows אֲנִי יֹשְׁבֵי בַּיְהוּדִים, and the distance of this expression from the word “heavens,” does not allow us to construct the phrase as a direct affirmation of his heavenly residence.⁶⁷

⁶³ Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 147.

⁶⁴ The drawing by Wise, “מִי כְמוֹנֵי בְּאֵלִים,” 181 is not accurate on this point. He shows the word as preserved in a single fragment, as reproduced in PAM 42.474, but PAM 41.846 shows that we are dealing with two separate fragments.

⁶⁵ Gen 49:19 uses this verb in an historical context, and Psalm 84:21 in a context where divine action is expected in order to liberate the righteous.

⁶⁶ Wise, “מִי כְמוֹנֵי בְּאֵלִים,” 183, for example, reconstructs the line in question: “Blessed be God who has seated me among] the [et]ernally blameless—(given me) a mighty throne in the angelic council. No king of yore will sit therein, neith[er] will their noble [(take seat) therein to judge.” This is an imaginative and sensible interpretation, but, as the brackets indicate, goes far beyond the preserved evidence.

⁶⁷ As does Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 147: “The verb יֹשְׁבֵי (I have sat, or I have

The only element asserted strongly and clearly is the exalted status of the protagonist, among and above all the angels, and his being endowed with a “glory” to which no one compares. The heavenly residence, and even his being enthroned in heaven, can be deduced from his having been exalted and endowed with an incomparable glory, from his being among and above the angels.

From this minimalist reading of 4Q491 it may be concluded, in my opinion, that the protagonist speaking in the first person in the “Canticle of Michael,” as inserted in the context of materials related to the eschatological war, is neither the priestly Messiah of Aaron nor the eschatological Teacher (whether the same or a different figure) nor the Messiah of Israel, nor the Prince of the Congregation (whether the same or a different figure). These figures have a definite place and function in the eschatological war. The first, who is identical with the eschatological High Priest, exhorts the troops in several circumstances in 1QM, and the second, who is identical with the Prince of the Congregation, destroys the enemies in the same battle, according to 4Q285. But neither is described as being endowed with a glory to which nobody compares, nor exalted among and above the angels. And these messianic figures are, of course, human, while the protagonist speaking in the first person in the “Canticle of Michael” appears to be heavenly.

In the context of the known materials related to the eschatological war, the only heavenly figure to which the characteristics of the protagonist of the hymn apply is the head of the heavenly army who opposes the army of darkness at the decisive moment of the battle. In the *War Scroll* from Cave 1, on the blessing of the eschatological High Priest that precedes the final victory, this function is expressly attributed to the archangel Michael:

This is the day appointed to humiliate and abase the prince of the dominion of evil.

—6 He has sent everlasting aid
to the lot redeemed
by the power of the majestic angel
for the dominion of Michael
in everlasting light.

dwelt) is most naturally taken to mean that the speaker has sat on the ‘mighty throne’,” although in his footnote 13 he recognises that “It is possible to take ‘שבתי’ in a more general sense as ‘dwelt’, and not to associate it with the Throne.”

—7 He will make the covenant of Israel shine with joy, peace and blessing to God's lot.
 He will exalt the authority of Michael above all the gods
 —8 and the dominion of Israel over all flesh.
 Justice will rejoice in the heights
 and all the sons of his truth
 will have enjoyment in everlasting knowledge.
 And you, sons of his covenant,
 —9 be strong in God's crucible
 until he shakes his hand
 and fills up his crucibles,
 his mysteries concerning your being. (1QM XVII 5–9)⁶⁸

Some expressions used, such as מלאך האדיר in line 6, recall the expressions of the “Canticle of Michael.” In particular להרים באלים in line 7 reflects the two basic elements emphasised in it: the incomparable exaltation of the protagonist and his being with and above the “gods” (angels).

The “Canticle of Michael,” in the preserved text, leaves unnamed the protagonist who speaks in the first person, which makes uncertain any attempt at identification. But in view of the parallels with the description of Michael in 1QM XVII, the original attribution by Baillet of the hymn to the Archangel makes more sense than all other attributions proposed because it is the only one that respects the elements preserved in 4Q491.

A similar case could be argued for attributing the hymn to the “Prince of Light,”⁶⁹ because, according to 1QM XIII 10, he also has the same two characteristics: he is a heavenly being under whose dominion are “all the spirits of truth” and who is appointed to assist “the lot of light.” But in all probability these two figures should be identified, as is generally acknowledged. Both are similarly described, both are given the same characteristics, and both have the same adversaries within the dualistic and deterministic framework of the writings of the community. In 1QM XVII the figure of Michael opposes “the Prince of the dominion of evil” in a dualistic and deterministic context (כול הויה ונהיה... בכול גהי עולמים), line 5); the “Prince of Light” opposes “Belial” in column XIII of 1QM and in CD V 18, and in 1QS III the “Angel of Darkness” is his opponent within a clear dualistic context. The “polynomy” of this heavenly

⁶⁸ Translation from *DSSS*, 112.

⁶⁹ Cf. 1QS III 20 and CD V 18.

character should be of no surprise, since the two heavenly beings twisting over the soul of 'Amram in *4QVisions of 'Amram* each bear three names.⁷⁰ Although only one of the three names of the one who rules over the darkness has been preserved in the manuscript (Melchiresha),⁷¹ Milik's proposal, which identifies the two series of three names with Michael, Mechizedek, and the Prince of Light, on the one hand, and with Belial, Melkiresha, and the Angel of Darkness, on the other,⁷² has been generally accepted.⁷³ If this "polynomy" is accepted, the protagonist of the "Canticle of Michael" would be none other than the heavenly figure which I have labelled "heavenly messiah," which appears as the eschatological saviour Melchizedek in 11Q13,⁷⁴ and as the "son of God" who in 4Q242 restores peace after the final battle.⁷⁵

This context of the "Canticle of Michael" within the texts dealing with the eschatological battle, helps us also to understand why a non-human voice can be mingled with human voices in a single hymn, since it is there that the presence of the angels within the eschatological community is more forcefully asserted. The reason given in 1QM VII 9 for the non-participation in the battle of anyone affected by any sort of impurity is the presence of the angels among the troops of the sons of light.⁷⁶

⁷⁰ That there were two is specifically asserted in 4Q544 1 10; that they bear three names is attested in 4Q544 3 2. Cf. É. Puech, *Qumrân grotte 4. XXII: Textes Araméens. Première partie* (DJD XXXI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 322 and 328.

⁷¹ 4Q544 2 2–3: "This one is ca[lled . . .] and Melkiresha."

⁷² J.T. Milik, "4Q Visions de 'Amram et une citation d'Origène," *RB* 79 (1972): 77–97, 85–86.

⁷³ Cf., for example, Paul J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchiresha* (CBQMS 10; Washington, D.C., The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981), 27–28, 33, 36, and Puech, DJD XXXI, 329.

⁷⁴ F. García Martínez, "Las tradiciones sobre Melquisedec en los manuscritos de Qumrân," *Biblica* 81 (2000): 70–80.

⁷⁵ F. García Martínez, "4Q246: ¿Tipo del Anticristo o Libertador escatológico?," in *El Misterio de la Palabra. Homenaje de sus alumnos al profesor D. Luis Alonso Schökel al cumplir veinticinco años de magisterio en el Instituto Bíblico Pontificio* (ed. V. Collado and E. Zurro; Madrid: Cristiandad, 1983), 229–44; *idem*, "Two Messianic Figures in the Qumran Texts," in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995* (ed. D.W. Parry and S.D. Ricks; STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 14–40.

⁷⁶ "And no young boy or any woman at all shall enter the camps when they leave 4 Jerusalem to go to war, until they return. And no lame, blind, paralysed person nor any man who has an indelible blemish on his flesh, nor any man suffering from uncleanness 5 in his flesh, none of these will go out to war with them. All these shall be volunteers for war, perfect in spirit and in body, and ready for the day of vengeance. And every 6 man who has not cleansed himself of his 'spring' on the day of battle will not go down with them, for the holy angels are together with their armies." Cf. *DSST*, 100.

1QH^a, 4Q427 and 4Q431 [4Q471b]

If we apply now the same minimalist reading to the part of the composite text resulting from the integration of the materials preserved in the three *Hodayot* manuscripts, in which a single protagonist appears speaking in the first person, and without importing the elements which are only attested in 4Q491, the characteristic elements which emerge there are the following: a teaching function,⁷⁷ the fact of being “despised,” if the reading of the editor is to be trusted,⁷⁸ being “beloved of the King,”⁷⁹ having a place among the angels, and even being considered superior to them.⁸⁰ All these elements are familiar to the reader of the *Hodayot* and are found there frequently, as shown by the references given by the two editors.

Thus, reading this hymn in the context of the *Hodayot* to which it belongs, there is no doubt that the “I” who speaks here is the same “I” who speaks in the other hymns of these collections. In the words of Schuller:

Whoever the referent may be in 4Q491 11 i, in the recension of this psalm that is found in the *Hodayot* manuscripts, the ‘I’ is to be understood in relationship to the ‘I’ voice we hear speaking in the other psalms, particularly the other Hymns of the Community.⁸¹

Investigating the problem of the “I” of the *Hodayot* in the “hymns of the Teacher,” in the “hymns of the community,” and in the successive appropriations of these voices as represented in the different collections of *Hodayot* materials, would take us too far from our present objective. It is enough to say that, in my opinion, the “I” of the hymn preserved in these three copies is neither a messiah (be it the Messiah of Aaron, the Messiah of Israel, or the “heavenly Messiah) nor any other eschatological figure. It can only be the voice of the Teacher of Righteousness which continues to resound in the community through this hymn.

⁷⁷ תרומה בהריתי, “will be like my teaching” in 4Q431 1 3.

⁷⁸ Both Eshel (DJD XXIX, 427) and Schuller (DJD XXIX, 201) read גבזה, but both mark the two first letters as very uncertain. The photographs show that the reading of the letters *he* and *zayin* is certain, *bet* is possible, although other letters are equally possible, and of the assumed *nun* there is no trace at all.

⁷⁹ זמרו יידיים שירו למלך in 4Q427 7 i 13: “Sing praise, O beloved ones, sing to the King.” It is interesting to note that the protagonist uses the same word to express his relationship with God (ידיד) and with all the others to whom he exhorts to praise (יידיים).

⁸⁰ כי כמוני באלים in 4Q431 1 4.

⁸¹ DJD XXIX, 102.

B. APOCALYPTICISM

CHAPTER SEVEN

IS JEWISH APOCALYPTIC THE MOTHER OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY?

“Beginnings are for the most part hidden. This also applies to the beginnings of Christianity after Easter.” So began the article that Ernst Käsemann published in 1960, which unleashed the polemic reflected in the question used here as a title.¹ In that article, which had the title “The beginnings of Christian theology” and in the articles which Käsemann felt obliged to write in order to clarify his thought in view of the reactions it caused,² he tried to unravel the mystery of the origins of Christian theology, to discover the roots of the tree with fruits of many kinds that the New Testament exhibits and to find the fertile ground whose vitality feeds the roots of this tree and allows it to give such a variety of fruits. Käsemann’s reply was clear and straight to the point: the generative womb of all Christian theology was apocalyptic: “Apocalyptic was the mother of all Christian theology—since we cannot really class the preaching of Jesus as theology.”³

The *purpose* of this conference, almost thirty years after the publication of the original article,⁴ is to re-examine the problem once again in

¹ E. Käsemann, “Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie,” *ZThK* 57 (1960): 162–85 (hereafter quoted as “Anfänge”). All English quotations from Käsemann are from *New Testament Questions of Today* (cf. note 4).

² E. Käsemann, “Zum Thema der urchristlichen Apokalypitik,” *ZThK* 59 (1962): 257–84 (hereafter quoted as “Thema”); *idem*, “Paulus und der Frühkatholizismus,” *ZThK* 60 (1963): 75–89.

³ Käsemann, “Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie,” 180; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 102.

⁴ The article was republished in 1964, together with other writings by Käsemann on the topic, in his work *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen II* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), 83–104; it was translated into English with the title “The Beginnings of Christian Theology,” in *New Testament Questions of Today* (New Testament Library; London: SCM Press, 1969), 82–107, and included in a special number of the *Journal of Theology and Church*, edited by R.W. Funk, with the title “Apocalyptic,” *JTC* 6 (1969), together with the more important contributions to the dossier, such as the articles by G. Ebeling and E. Fuchs to which we will refer below. Unfortunately, this special number of the *JTC*, which besides the articles mentioned also contains important studies on the topic by O. Betz and the editor, Funk, is not available to me. I was able to use the study by W.G. Rollins, “The New Testament and Apocalyptic,” *NTS* 17 (1970–71):

the light of the knowledge acquired in recent years on Jewish Apocalyptic. I am not a theologian; nor am I a specialist in the New Testament. My field of research comprises Jewish literature after the Tanakh (the Bible) and before the Mishnah, Jewish literature that, chronologically, lies between the Old and New Testament, part of which can be defined as apocalyptic literature. This implies that my way of focusing on the problem does not start from the final result: the theologies of the New Testament, but from the supposed starting point: Jewish Apocalyptic.

My working *method* will be very simple: I will begin by presenting Käsemann's hypothesis as briefly and objectively as possible; then I will discuss this hypothesis just as briefly and I will devote the third part of my paper to an outline of a new way understanding the problem which may allow us to reply to the question that forms the starting point in a way that differs from Käsemann's and also from the answers of his critics.

1. KÄSEMANN'S HYPOTHESIS

The central thesis "Apocalyptic was the mother of all Christian theology" is stated more clearly by Käsemann as follows: "apocalyptic of the time after Easter designates the earliest variant and interpretation of the kerygma."⁵ This tells us exactly the meaning that Käsemann gives to his thesis. The apocalyptic in question is fundamentally early Christian apocalyptic; this apocalyptic arrived on the scene after the Easter experience; it is basically a reaction, a modification, and eventually a replacement of the preaching of the historical Jesus: "Easter and the reception of the Spirit caused primitive Christianity to respond to the

454–76, which analyses the work, as well as the work by I.H. Marshall, "Is Apocalyptic the Mother of Christian Theology?," in *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament* (ed. G.F. Hawthorne and O. Betz; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans/Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 33–42, and the reply by R. Bultmann: "Ist die Apokalypik die Mutter der christlichen Theologie?," originally published in *Apophoreta. Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 10. Dezember 1964* (ed. K. Aland; BZNW 30; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964), 64–69, and reprinted in *Exegetica. Aufsätze zur Erforschung des Neuen Testaments* (R. Bultmann; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1967): 476–82, and in *Apokalypik* (ed. K. Koch and J.M. Schmidt; WdF 365; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982) 370–76. References are to the original publication in *ZThK*, and to the translation in *New Testament Questions of Today*.

⁵ "Thema," 263 n. 1; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 115 n. 8.

preaching about the God at hand and, in a certain sense, to replace it with a new apocalyptic.”⁶

For Käsemann, Jesus remains outside this apocalyptic; furthermore, Jesus cannot be considered in any way as an apocalyptic nor can his teachings be considered as the source or the inspiration of Christian apocalyptic. Käsemann acknowledges that Jesus had relationships with John the Baptist and that the Baptist’s preaching is clearly apocalyptic, but he emphasises that the preaching of Jesus has no connection at all with apocalyptic: “The situation was this: Jesus admittedly made the apocalyptically determined message of John his point of departure; his own preaching, however, did not bear a fundamentally apocalyptic stamp but proclaimed the immediacy of the God who was near at hand.”⁷

a) *Apocalyptic after Easter*

Basing himself chiefly on the Gospel of Matthew,⁸ Käsemann attempts to reconstruct a broad outline of the history of apocalyptic after Easter.⁹ According to Käsemann, Matt 7:22–23 preserves for us the polemic against a group of prophets belonging to a movement of enthusiasts of Palestinian origin; Matt 23:8–10 provides an attack against a sort of Christian rabbinate developed within the community; Matt 5:17–20 preserves the core of an exhortation to follow the Torah minutely, changed considerably by the evangelist; Matt 10:5–6 reflects the Jewish-Christian opposition to the mission to Samaritans and Gentiles. These four texts, and the undoubted polemics they contain, allow him to conclude that in the early Christian Church there were two opposing groups: a strict

⁶ “Anfänge,” 180; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 102.

⁷ “Anfänge,” 179; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 101. See also “Thema” 269–71 (*New Testament Questions of Today*, 122–23) where Käsemann indicates the differences between the Baptist and Jesus.

⁸ This choice is not random, but based on critical grounds and because “Matthew, located somewhere on the borders of Palestine and Syria, writing apparently for Gentile-Christians yet out of a wide knowledge of Jewish-Christian tradition, might well be nearer, in the material peculiar to him, to primitive tradition than others” (“Anfänge,” 163; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 83).

⁹ The following reconstruction summarises the broad outline of “Anfänge,” 163–71; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 83–92. It is worth noting that Käsemann himself is aware of its hypothetical nature: “I must say with all the emphasis I can command that what is being attempted here is a reconstruction.” (163, resp. 83).

Jewish-Christian group, faithful to the precepts of the Torah and only interested in a mission to the Jews, in the recovery of the lost sheep of Israel to complete the messianic unity of the twelve tribes and so make the parousia possible, and another antinomian group, formed around Stephen and the seven and committed to a mission to the gentiles, as documented by the Acts of the Apostles. This group was to move to Antioch and prepare the way for Paul. The Jewish-Christian group, heir to Jewish apocalyptic, was to establish itself in small communities on the border between Palestine and Syria. In Matt 10:41 and 13:16–17, Käsemann even discovers a form of organisation of these communities in which there is a prophet in the service of the group and a presbyter who administered its affairs.

He also uses Matthew to specify the theology of this apocalyptic after Easter. He would have been the first to introduce into Christianity a theology of history, with its vision of the history of salvation and of the history of condemnation, which run in parallel and divide time into two different epochs, a theology of history that ultimately made a “gospel history”¹⁰ possible. Texts such as Matt 19:28–29; 10:13–14; 7:2 and others allow him to ascribe to this apocalyptic after Easter the introduction of the concept of an eschatological *jus talionis* which transforms gnomic utterances into an eschatological threat;¹¹ Matt 10:16 leads him to attribute to it the first formulation of “the apocalyptic law of the transvaluation of all values in the time of the End,”¹² and Matt 10:23 the re-introduction of the topic of the restoration of the twelve tribes in the last days.¹³ Above all, Käsemann finds in Matthew the key elements of this apocalyptic after Easter: the fervent hope in the parousia of the Lord, the heated defence of the Mosaic law and the definite opposition to the mission to the gentiles.

Käsemann strives to pinpoint the origins of this post-paschal apocalyptic, although he acknowledges that this is one the main problems of his hypothesis.¹⁴ As a faithful follower of Bultmann, he defends all theology as being post-paschal and tries to disassociate this apocalyptic com-

¹⁰ “Anfänge,” 175; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 96: “Conversely, it is true that it was apocalyptic which first made historical thinking possible within Christendom.”

¹¹ “Anfänge,” 172–74, 176–78; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 93–99.

¹² “Anfänge,” 178; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 99.

¹³ “Anfänge,” 184; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 106.

¹⁴ “Thema,” 260; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 111: “What is probably the most difficult problem of all presents itself at the very outset. When did Christian apocalyptic in the strict sense really begin?”

pletely from the preaching of Jesus on the immediate nearness of God. For him, this idea is incompatible with the hope in the coming of the Son of Man, the restoration of the twelve tribes in the messianic kingdom and the hope in the parousia,¹⁵ which are typical of post-paschal apocalyptic. Although his milieu was apocalyptic, Jesus clearly breaks with it through preaching a merciful and non-vindicative God and his announcement of brotherly love. It is not surprising that, for Käsemann, this Jesus does not baptise or build a community as a “remnant” and nucleus of the messianic people of God, or retain other precepts of Law except for brotherly love.¹⁶ The disciples, instead, after the Easter experience, interpret and conceptualise this experience with the categories of Jewish apocalyptic and its milieu. The hope in the immediate return of the Lord comprises the central element of this “post-paschal enthusiasm,” as Käsemann calls it: given that the Messiah of the Jewish apocalyptic should manifest himself in Jerusalem, it is there where the first community goes; given that this Messiah was expected as heavenly Son of Man, the hope in his return comprises the central theme of its hope; the very resurrection of Jesus is seen not as an isolated miracle but as the start of the resurrection of the dead expected in apocalyptic and as sign announcing the arrival of the Kingdom; the community, united in its hope, considers itself as the sacred remnant of the ancient covenant that must reunite the twelve tribes and already anticipates the new eschatological covenant; since apocalyptic interprets the “signs” (ecstasy or the cures, for example) as signs of the Spirit at the end of the world, the Easter experience of the Spirit makes them consider themselves as living already in the last times; the Old Testament idea of the people of God, interpreted apocalyptically, forms the basis of its first Christology, etc.¹⁷ To summarise, the origins of this apocalyptic after Easter are no other than the interpretation by the disciples of the profound Easter experience through the inherited categories of Jewish apocalyptic.

¹⁵ “Anfänge,” 180; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 101–102: “To combine the two would be, for me, to cease to make any kind of sense.”

¹⁶ “Thema,” 262; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 114: “On the basis of this remarkable ‘eschatology’, which views all life as lived ‘before God’, it is easy to understand how Jesus, so far as we can see, did not baptize, built up no community as a holy remnant and as the nucleus of the messianic people of God and recognized no sharpening of the Torah other than the demand for obedience and love.”

¹⁷ “Thema,” 262–65; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 114–17.

b) *The enthusiasts of Corinth*

The later development of this apocalyptic after Easter is described by Käsemann using as an antithesis the Hellenistic enthusiasm typified by the Church of Corinth, and as a synthesis, in what starts from the elements recovered again, Paul's thought.

In view of the characteristics of post-paschal apocalyptic, its growth was perforce limited to the scope of influence of messianic beliefs of Palestinian origin; ultimately, it was a flower that could not be transplanted. Once the Church was open to the gentiles, its position was condemned to be increasingly in the minority. Outside of Palestine, Christianity was understood as a mystery religion and the theology of apocalyptic after Easter was either denied or interpreted in a different way. Among the elements that were considerably re-interpreted, Käsemann notes the following examples:¹⁸

- The theme of the two eras, following each other in time, is understood as an atemporal opposition of the two worlds, and the theme of passing from one to the other is re-interpreted in anthropological terms, focused on the differences between the new man and the old man rather than on the differences between the present and the future.
- This loss of temporality also affects the saved being; like a mystery drama with different phases, the Incarnation is seen as a humiliation, and Pre-existence is considered as the start of the process of salvation in which the believer is associated and takes part in its different phases.
- The concept of Christ lifted to heaven and hidden at the right hand of God is transformed into the concept of Christ exalted, enthroned as Lord of the world, who has subjected all powers to himself; the community, as the Body of Christ, must spread throughout the whole world, like a new creation, to express this lordship.
- In a context of mystery religions, baptism is seen as a central saving act and the all earthly existence is understood as a temporal representation of heavenly existence. Baptism is interpreted radically: the saved have died with Christ and with him they have been enthroned, The resurrection of the dead is something that is considered to have

¹⁸ "Thema," 272–78; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 124–31.

happened already; as sharing in the crucifixion of Christ believers share also in his resurrection and enthronement and so find themselves already freed from the power of death and as having entered the Kingdom of Christ.

- The dualism of apocalyptic is transformed into a metaphysical dualism of anthropological mode which allows the saved to be separated from those who have not been saved and to understand the reception of the Spirit as a new creation, and since this new creation is of heavenly origin, it eliminates all differences: there is no longer Greek or Jew, slave or freeman, man or woman!
- However, the most profound change (as Käsemann stresses replying to the criticism of E. Fuchs)¹⁹ has taken place at the level of eschatology; the future eschatology of apocalyptic has been transformed into a present eschatology in the strict sense.²⁰ For the Corinthians, the end of history has already arrived.²¹ The community of Corinth has interpreted the baptismal experience of death and resurrection with Christ so radically that it considers itself as already taking part in heavenly life in the present time. Hope in the parousia, the central theme of post-Easter apocalyptic, no longer has any meaning.²²

c) *The Pauline synthesis*

This denial of the essence of post-Easter apocalyptic, however, was not to be the definitive answer within the early Church. Käsemann believes he has discovered a new phase of synthesis, in which certain elements of post-paschal apocalyptic are recovered in the theology of Paul.

¹⁹ E. Fuchs, "Über die Aufgabe einer christlichen Theologie," *ZThK* 58 (1961): 245–67.

²⁰ "Thema," 274; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 127: "This is done in opposition to apocalyptic with the one all-important which necessitates "present eschatology" in the strict sense."

²¹ "Anfänge," 183; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 105–106 "Here lies the point of deepest difference between the enthusiasm of the community after Easter and that of the Corinthians who say that they have overcome the ultimate trial, boast of having attained a condition the angelic state and express this in many forms in their practice. For the Corinthians the end of history has already arrived."

²² "Thema," 278; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 130–31: "This is Hellenistic enthusiasm's radical interpretation of the baptismal statement that the redeemed are risen with Christ and enthroned with him in the heavenly state. Expectation of an imminent Parousia thus ceases to be meaningful, because everything which apocalyptic still hopes for has already been realized."

In a form that we can call Hegelian, Käsemann emphasises the elements in which Paul's theology provides a synthesis of both tendencies,²³ beginning with his eschatology of "already, but not yet," his vision of the present not as the end of history but as the start of the period of the end, that is, with its combination of future eschatology of apocalyptic with present eschatology typified by the community of Corinth. For Käsemann, Paul's apostolic self-awareness can only be understood in the light of apocalyptic. Against the interpretation that has been predominant since the Reformation (and in disagreement with Ebeling and Fuchs) which sees in Paul's doctrine on the Law and Justification especially as an anti-Jewish polemic, Käsemann stresses the elements of anti-enthusiastic polemic, conducted under the banner of apocalyptic, present in his writings and evident especially in his anthropology. In this connection is characteristic the precision that Paul contributes to the concept of participation through baptism in Christ's crucifixion and resurrection when speaking of sharing in the resurrection in the future and not in the perfect mode: baptism anticipates, gives hope, but does not yet give future life. Similarly characteristic is the interpretation that 1 Cor 15:20–28 gives of the resurrection not in an anthropological but in a Christological perspective, and where Paul makes the present eschatology of the enthusiasts the basis of the future eschatology of apocalyptic. Other elements in which Paul synthesises apocalyptic thought would be his use of *Basileia Christi* ("Christ's kingdom") to denote the eschatological future, his description of the Lord not as *Kultherrn* ("lord invoked in the cult") but as *erhöhten Kosmokrator* ("cosmocrator exalted to the heavens"), his technical use of the terms "spirit" and "flesh" to refer to the cosmic powers that rule over man and make him submit to their spheres of rule and that reflect apocalyptic dualism. The same Pauline concept of justification, the tension between the already *Erlöstsein und dem noch nicht Gesichertsein* ("being already redeemed but not yet secure"), the dialectic between the Pauline indicative and imperative, would be a reflex of this synthesis of the enthusiastic and apocalyptic elements.

d) *Conclusion*

In Käsemann's hypothesis, the Pauline synthesis would have ensured that the post-Easter apocalyptic survived within the theological system

²³ "Thema," 278–83; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 130–35.

that would ultimately dominate within Christianity. The mother would have given birth to Christian theology. But what happened to the mother itself? What happened to the communities on the Syria-Palestine border in which post-paschal apocalyptic was forged and developed? For Käsemann the end of the story is as obscure as its beginning. The fact is that these communities disappeared from history and with them this apocalyptic. Käsemann finds the reason for this disappearance in the delay of the parousia. Due to the extended wait for the return of the Son of Man, the enthusiasm that occasioned this apocalyptic lost its force. This hope that was not realised caused the decline of the apocalyptic. Post-paschal apocalyptic, which had begun as a Jewish-Christian minority within the Church, saw itself reduced later to a sect and it ended by vanishing from the scene, but not without first having deeply influenced all the development of later Christian theology.

Käsemann's conclusion is worth quoting in its entirety:

We have to state clearly and without evasion that this hope proved to be a delusion and that with it there collapsed at the same time the whole theological framework of apocalyptic of the time after Easter, at the heart of which was the restoration of the Twelve Tribes but which also fought for the Mosaic Torah and against the practice the Gentile mission. There is also that way, which leads from Easter to the theology first of a Jewish Christian minority and later to that of a sect within the Great Church and finally, leaving only literary traces behind it, disappears for good.²⁴

2. A CRITIQUE OF KÄSEMANN

With the foregoing summary I think that I have given a respectful and objective summary of Käsemann's hypothesis. Next I will set out the main points that prevent me accepting this hypothesis. Of course it is impossible to discuss here the great presuppositions that form the basis of Käsemann's hypothesis, both at the level of form criticism and of literary criticism of the New Testament as well as at the level of the theology underlying his whole hypothesis. My critique tries to set itself at the same level of research as Käsemann's and therefore starts, not from implicit theoretical presuppositions but from specific statements. My critique will focus on the following points:

²⁴ "Anfänge," 184; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 106.

- The definition of apocalyptic
- The importance of the expectation of the Parousia
- Non-apocalyptic Jesus
- Historical reconstruction

a) *The definition of apocalyptic*

The first comment that has to be made to this hypothesis of Käsemann (and this was one of the first objections to be made) is that it starts from a peculiar concept of “apocalyptic.” It is enormously revealing that, in his first article, Käsemann did not feel it necessary to define what he meant by apocalyptic. A whole series of expressions indicate that for him, as for his readers, the concept of apocalyptic is quite evident. Moreover, his frequent use of “apocalyptic” without further specification suggests that it is a uniform phenomenon in which elements from Old Testament apocalyptic are blended: the apocalyptic of late Judaism, the apocalyptic represented by the Qumran Community, etc., as well as what he calls Christian post-paschal apocalyptic. However, as Ebeling remarks, parodying one of Käsemann’s expressions, “it is necessary to distinguish between apocalyptic and apocalyptic.”²⁵

Only in his second article, and motivated by Ebeling’s critique on the problem of terminology, did Käsemann feel obliged to specify that for him “apocalyptic” is “the imminent hope in the parousia,” that is, “the special form of eschatology that deals with the end of history.”²⁶ This attempt at definition clearly specifies for us that Käsemann uses the word “apocalyptic” in a very peculiar meaning: “apocalyptic” has no connection at all with the literary genre of “apocalypse,” or with the social context in which apocalyptic developed with the literary expressions in which apocalyptic is translated. Instead, “apocalyptic” is used only as a label for a certain theological motif present in the early

²⁵ G. Ebeling, “Der Grund christlicher theologie,” *ZThK* 58 (1961): 227–44: “Aber wie Käsemann mit Recht betont, daß “zwischen Enthusiasmus und Enthusiasmus . . . genau so wie zwischen Geist und Geist zu unterscheiden” sei, so wäre nun doch mit gleichem Recht zu betonen, daß zwischen Apokalypitk und Apokalypitk zu unterscheiden sei.” (235).

²⁶ “Thema,” 258 n. 2; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 109 n. 1. “. . . we have been embarrassed by no longer having any specific term for the particular kind of eschatology which attempts to talk about ultimate history. It is not in dispute that ‘apocalyptic’ is ambiguous. But of what term is that not true? It emerges from the context that almost throughout I speak of primitive Christian apocalyptic to denote the expectation of an imminent Parousia.”

Christian community, one of the forms of its eschatology, namely: the imminent expectation of the parousia. Accordingly, it is very significant that in Käsemann's long articles we do not find (except for one single reference to the acclamations of the Apocalypse of John) any allusion to works considered as apocalypses, or any reference that would justify considering certain ideas or expressions as "apocalyptic." For Käsemann, "apocalyptic" is simply the form of early Christianity characterised by the expectation of the imminent return of Jesus. Clearly, this early Christian apocalyptic is considered by Käsemann as a prolongation of Jewish apocalyptic; or, as he says in his own words: "theologically it is nourished by the Jewish apocalyptic tradition." However, the real Jewish apocalyptic remains beyond the horizon of his considerations, and the problems whether there existed a Christian apocalyptic as a phenomenon different from the Jewish apocalyptic, and, what then would be the elements that allow to differentiate one form the other, or whether the early Christian apocalyptic texts are only an expression of Jewish apocalyptic, are questions never posed. Posing the problem crudely, we could ask ourselves: is it legitimate to reduce apocalyptic to this single theological element? The answer is obvious: the use of "apocalyptic" with this meaning only helps to feed confusion.

In the Protestant context in which Käsemann writes and in the period in which his articles appear, the word "apocalyptic," exactly like the other key term that he uses, "enthusiasm," had certain obvious provocative connotations which could explain to us his use of them and the commotion provoked by his thesis. However, this does not imply that his use was justified. It is significant that, in his reaction, Bultmann, after noting certain differences of detail and a different interpretation of Pauline anthropology, limits himself to rewording the exposition, replacing "apocalyptic" with "eschatology": "...in my opinion, it can be said that eschatology is the mother of early Christian theology, but not apocalyptic."²⁷

b) *The central position of the parousia*

We must, then, separate the problem posed by Käsemann from the terminology he used and ask ourselves whether the expectation of the imminent parousia in the early community had the central position that Käsemann ascribes to it.

²⁷ Bultmann, "Ist die Apokalyptik die Mutter der christlichen Theologie?," 69.

My reply is twofold: on the one hand it must be stated that the expectation of the parousia is certainly present in the New Testament and not only at the level of early Christian community to which Käsemann assigns the Gospel of Matthew or at the level of the Acts of the Apostles, but also in Paul's theology, the sayings of the "Q" Source and of the Gospel of Mark and in the very preaching of Jesus of Nazareth, but at the same time it must be acknowledged that this expectation does not have the central position that Käsemann grants it.

It is easy to prove the first part of my reply: for that it is enough to add to the references given by Käsemann and to the cry "Maran atha," at the end of Peter's discourse in Acts 3:19–21, Paul's teaching in 1 Thessalonians, the sayings about the Son of Man preserved in the Q Source or texts such as Mark 9:1: "I tell you truly: there are some who are here who will not taste death without first seeing the kingdom of God, come with power," or the conclusion of the parable of the fig-tree (Mark 13:30): "I tell you truly: this generation will not disappear without all this happening." Now: if the expectation of the parousia is not a post-paschal event but instead goes back to the oldest levels, is scattered throughout the New Testament and links with the preaching of the historical Jesus, it is difficult to make it a breaking-off point and the key to the apocalyptic interpretation of the message of Jesus.

The second part of my reply (that the expectation of the parousia does not have the central position that Käsemann assigns it) is more complex and in some way more subjective precisely because I start from the fact that the expectation of the parousia is present at all levels of the New Testament and because the evaluation of its importance is a matter of appraisal. And yet there is a couple of objective facts that I think make it clear that this expectation is not central but rather lies towards the edges of early Christian thought.

The first fact is that in the oldest expressions of Christian kerygma which have been transmitted to us (such as 1 Cor 15:3–5 or Rom 10:9–10) the topic of the expectation of the parousia does not appear; in these old confessions of faith the central element is the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus, not the future coming of the Son of Man. As E. Lohse²⁸ says: "It is clear that the origin of Christian theology is not to be found in apocalyptic—nor in Jewish expectation nor in the enthusiasm of early Christianity—but lies in the kerygma that the crucified

²⁸ E. Lohse, "Apokalypitk und Christologie," *ZNW* 61 (1971): 48–67 (58).

Christ preaches as the risen Lord. Käsemann's thesis . . . does not receive confirmation in the oldest expressions of Christian preaching or in the confession of the early Church. The origin and centre of Christian theology lies, from the beginning, in the world of the cross."

The second fact, also objective, is that the many references to the expectation of the parousia scattered throughout the New Testament are often offhand remarks; when Paul, or the author of 2 Thessalonians, discusses the topic of the parousia specifically (in 2 Thess 2:1–12) it is to correct the idea that is something imminent, whereas other discussions of eschatology in which the expectation of the parousia appears (as in 1 Thessalonians, or in 1 Corinthians) the central problem discussed there is the resurrection. References within the synoptic tradition contain two elements: exhortation to being prepared for the coming of the day of the Lord on the one hand and on the other, avoiding the impression that this day has already arrived; it is difficult to consider this as a way of pronouncing a really central topic.²⁹

As a result, if the hope in the parousia does not have the central position that Käsemann ascribes to it in the thought of the early Christian community, and if it is also already present since the beginning in the actual preaching of Jesus, it is not possible to attribute to this hope the function of a keystone that Käsemann assigns it, as an element that transforms and modifies apocalyptically the message of Jesus and converts it into the first Christian theology.

c) *A non-apocalyptic Jesus*

Another of the basic mistakes of Käsemann's hypothesis, briefly anticipated in what has already been said and which will appear in a much clear form in the third part of my account, is the break that he supposes between the preaching of Jesus, which would in no way be apocalyptic, and the post-paschal apocalyptic interpretation of his message. Without attempting to enter here the problem of the relations between the Easter faith and the historical Jesus, between Jesus the preacher and Christ the preached, and with the sole objective of noting the weakness of this fundamental point in Käsemann's hypothesis, it is enough to note that

²⁹ If I had to choose a central element within the eschatological thought of the New Testament (which is very different from suggesting that this element is the origin of Christian theology), I would perhaps say that it is the awareness of living in the last days motivated by the experience of the resurrection of Jesus and the reception of the Spirit; however, fortunately, this is not the task that I have been assigned here.

Käsemann himself is forced to acknowledge that “Through the designation of Jesus as Lord and as the Son of Man who must return and through this knowing themselves sent ‘in his name,’ the early community ascribes to itself a historical and real continuity. This can only mean that post-paschal eschatology, Christology and ecclesiology are linked to the message and activity of Jesus”.³⁰ This confession undermines all the terrain on which Käsemann builds and voids the foundations of his antithesis. However, as a historian, Käsemann is forced to acknowledge the existence of this continuity and to accept implicitly a Jesus as apocalyptic as the post-paschal eschatology, Christology and ecclesiology that depend on his message and his activity. After all, I think it is impossible to deny that Jesus foretold the imminent coming of the Kingdom of God, the effects of which already appear in his own works, with the same force as the Baptist, whose apocalyptic Käsemann affirms forcefully; just as I think it seems impossible to deny that he anticipated the end of time even indicating the troubled period that must precede it and which is known in apocalyptic tradition as “the period of the birth pangs of the Messiah.”

d) *Historical reconstruction*

The final point of my critique will focus on some elements of the historical reconstruction of the development of this post-paschal apocalyptic that do not seem to match the texts.

Käsemann is correct to emphasise the split within the early Christian community, but the question is whether this split took shape along the lines that he indicates: a strict Jewish-Christian community, representing post-paschal apocalyptic on the one hand and Stephen’s group and the seven, supporting the mission to the gentles and representing the enthusiasts on the other. Käsemann appeals to the information in the Acts of the Apostles to specify the next stage in the struggle,³¹ but a close examination of the texts does not seem to support his conclusions. Käsemann connects post-Easter apocalyptic, which he describes as “strict Jewish-Christianity” and “Christian rabbinate” with the Twelve

³⁰ “Thema,” 269–70; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 121: “By designating Jesus as its Lord and as the Son of Man who was to come and by its consciousness of itself as sent ‘in his name’, the primitive community was laying claim to a continuity of history and of content. But this can only mean that after Easter eschatology, christology and ecclesiology were and are bound up with the message and activity of Jesus.”

³¹ “Anfänge,” 168–69; *New Testament Questions of Today*, 88–89.

(whose theological positions as a groups are practically unknown), with Peter (to whom it cannot be applied, in spite of his contemporising with the Jewish-Christians, to the extent that he accepts and joins the mission to the gentiles) and with James (the only person to whom in some way the description can apply as acknowledged chief of the “Church of circumcision”). Nor does his assimilation to the group of the “enthusiasts” with Stephen and the seven seem more successful, at least for what concerns the fundamental point of the mission to the gentiles, since, as Rollins³² notes, Acts 11:19 tells us that when Stephen’s group dispersed after his martyrdom, its members “went towards Phoenicia, Cyprus and Antioch, *without explaining the word to anyone, except only to the Jews*”; it is true that the next verse says: “Some of them were Cypriots and from Cyrene, and these, when they arrived at Antioch, spoke to the Greek as well, preaching the gospel of the Lord Jesus,” but in any case the combination of both statements assures us that the element of the mission to the gentiles could not have been the point of conflict between the group that formed around Stephen and post-paschal apocalyptic.

Another element of his historical reconstruction that is problematic is the central position he ascribes to Jerusalem in the process which leaves no room for the Galilean dimension of post-paschal Christianity, a dimension that in Matthew, Mark and John is as important as the Jerusalemite dimension of Luke-Acts.

Nor do his localisation of these communities on the Syria-Palestine border, after the martyrdom of Stephen, the separation of Peter from Jerusalem or the war against Rome, although historically likely, seem to be documented in the texts.

Nor do I find documented in the texts the disappearance of this Jewish-Christian apocalyptic when the parousia was delayed. In any case, Jewish-Christianity, with its focus on the Torah, its requirements of purity and its opposition to the Church of the gentiles, remained alive on Palestinian soil during several centuries, a long time after the supposed disappearance of post-paschal apocalyptic. In sum, the type of Christianity that Käsemann describes as the place of origin of the first Christian theology and the mother of all later theology, if it ever did exist as a historical reality, far from being the centre of early Christianity does not seem to be, at most, more than one of the many facets in which

³² W.G. Rollins, “The New Testament and Apocalyptic,” *NTS* 17 (1970–71): 454–76 (468).

the message of Jesus and the Easter experience were transformed and the traces of which can be found within the New Testament.

3. JEWISH APOCALYPTIC AS THE MOTHER OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY

The foregoing considerations prove, in my opinion, that the thesis, exactly as formulated by Käsemann, is unacceptable. Christian post-paschal apocalyptic is not the womb in which all Christian theology developed. Käsemann's hypothesis is the result of his time and from the viewpoint of our own time it is easy to realise its failings. However, the question to which Käsemann points: his wish to find this fertile womb from which Christian theology derives continues to be valid and pressing. This is why the third part of my paper is intended to specify in what sense we can speak today of Jewish apocalyptic as a mother of Christian theology.

My answer to this question, ultimately, is positive. And to some extent even more radical than Käsemann's answer, although at the same time more nuanced and less exclusive and polemical. More radical, since it does not suppose a first non-apocalyptic message, re-interpreted apocalyptically later, but accepts fully that Jesus was the son of his time and that his message is, from the beginning, impregnated with the ideas of Jewish apocalyptic tradition of his age. More nuanced, since it does not see in the ideas from the apocalyptic tradition the explanation of all later Christian theology, but only one of its essential components.

My reply can be set out as follows: the Jewish apocalyptic tradition (like the prophetic tradition and the wisdom tradition) is one of the essential components of the thought of the historical Jesus, of Pauline theology and of all Christian theology. In my opinion, the influence of Jewish apocalyptic tradition does not enter Christian thought as a post-paschal reaction to the gospel message but is present from the beginning of the preaching of Jesus and so conditions all later theological developments. In this sense one can speak of the apocalyptic tradition as the womb of Christian theology in the same way that one can speak of the apocalyptic tradition as the womb of Qumran theology, to use a parallel from my field of study. Christianity, like the Qumran sect, began as an apocalyptic sect within Judaism, and since the question about the womb is in fact a question about origins, we can state that the Jewish apocalyptic tradition was the womb of Christian theology.

In order to be able to make my answers precise and to understand the differences from Käsemann's thesis that I have summarised and criticised, I will next specify what I understand by Jewish apocalyptic and then I shall try to show how different elements from this apocalyptic tradition appear in the preaching of the historical Jesus and so become part of all Christian theology.

a) *The apocalyptic tradition*

We will begin, then, by explaining what is understood today (thirty years after Käsemann's article) by Jewish apocalyptic. Fortunately, there are good presentations of this phenomenon, such as the general survey by Professor A. Piñero, which also includes an excellent bibliography, which will allow me to be relatively brief.³³

The vague and inexact concept of apocalyptic that Käsemann's article reflects is typical of his time and of an understanding of apocalyptic in which were predominant the combination of different elements of content that can be selected from the different types of apocalypse (among which eschatology was predominant) with the addition of some formal elements of apocalyptic language that point to possible sociological elements, such as "conventicles" or marginal groups in which apocalyptic would have developed, etc., and allow practically every scholar (depending on the element he considered as predominant) to conceal under the name of "apocalyptic" any reality or any theology. This vague and inexact way of defining apocalyptic culminated in 1970 with K. Koch's book, the title of which suitably expresses the position of helplessness of research faced with apocalyptic: *Ratlos vor der Apokalyp-tik*.³⁴ With this work a period of reaction begins in which attempts are made to leave this vague and inexact understanding to reach a more

³³ A. Piñero, "La apocalíptica dentro de la literatura intertestamentaria. panorámica general," in *Il Simposio Bíblico Español* (ed. V. Collado Bertomeu and V. Vilar Hueso; Valencia-Córdoba: Fundación Bíblica Española, 1987), 591-602. For a survey of the problem see A. Díez-Macho in *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento* (directed by A. Díez-Macho; 5 vols.; Madrid: Cristiandad, 1982-1987), 1:45-48. Cf. also F. García Martínez, "Encore l'Apocalyptique," *JSJ* 17 (1986): 224-32, *idem*, "Les Traditions Apocalyptiques à Qumran," in *Apocalypses et Voyages dans l'au-delà* (ed. C. Kappler; Paris: Cerf 1987), 201-35; *idem*, "La Apocalíptica y Qumrán," in *Il Simposio Bíblico Español*, 603-13.

³⁴ K. Koch, *Ratlos vor der Apokalyp-tik. Eine Streitschrift über ein vernachlässigtes Gebiet der Bibelwissenschaft, und die schädlichen Auswirkungen auf Theologie und Philosophie* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1970).

specific definition of what apocalyptic is. This reaction lasted until 1979, the year in which appeared simultaneously an article by J. Carmignac³⁵ and issue 14 of *Semeia*, edited by J.J. Collins, with the results of the research of the Apocalypse Group of the SBL Genres Project³⁶ and in which a great international congress was held in Uppsala.³⁷ The result of this reaction is clear: from this moment form is separated from content and a definition of apocalyptic is offered that reduces the phenomenon to a pure literary genre. Formulating this reaction crudely, we can say: apocalyptic does not exist, there are apocalypses which are literary works with certain common formal characteristics which allows us to define them as belonging to the apocalyptic literary genre; strictly speaking the systematisation of these characteristics could be defined as apocalyptic, but the use of “apocalyptic” to denote a specific eschatology, or messianism, or any other “idea” would be out of place. From the pan-apocalyptic of the sixties there is a shift to the elimination of apocalyptic in the seventies.

Fortunately, already during the same congress in Uppsala and in later publications of the eighties the way has been opened to a new understanding of apocalyptic, which is the predominant one today and which we use here. This concept accepts a large part of the purifying and clarifying results that the attempt to define apocalyptic and the literary genre “apocalypse” have produced and adopts the terminological rigour that previous work has imposed. However, at the same time we cannot reign ourselves to the reduction of apocalyptic to a simple literary genre, convinced that without apocalyptic it is impossible to understand apocalypse. In short, if the *Book of Watchers* the *Book of Dreams* and the *Epistle of Enoch*, three real apocalypses of different origin and date, could already in the 1st c. B.C.E. be included in and form part of the larger unit that is the *Book of Enoch*, which we know and which in turn is a true apocalypse, this was possible because these three works reflect, in spite of their differences, the same current of thought, because they were heirs of a single tradition and not because the three belong to the same literary genre that as such was completely unknown.

³⁵ J. Carmignac, “Qu’est-ce que l’Apocalyptique? Son emploi à Qumran,” *RevQ* 10/37 (1979): 3–33.

³⁶ J.J. Collins (ed.), *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (Semeia 14; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979).

³⁷ D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East. Proceedings of the International Conference on Apocalypticism. Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983).

This conception of apocalyptic has been developed along two lines of research: one, typified by P. Sacchi,³⁸ interprets apocalyptic in a historical perspective and traces the evolution of its main ideas and its development through interaction with other currents of thought of the Judaism of the period; the other, represented by L. Hartman and D. Hellholm,³⁹ develops a syntagmatic approach and tries to specify the sociolinguistic function of the texts and to throw light on in what sense the very form is a transmitter of content.

In this conception, which is the one I am using here, apocalyptic is a current of thought that is born in the religious context and specific culture of post-exilic Judaism, that develops over a long period, reacting interactively with other currents of thought of the Jewish environment, such a prophetic tradition to the wisdom tradition, and is shaped in the various works that we call "apocalypses." This current of thought must have been complex enough to be able to give rise to such different works as the various apocalypses are and sufficiently powerful to bring about that one of the representative products, a large part of the book of *Daniel* would ultimately be accepted in the canon of Scripture.

Within this Jewish apocalyptic tradition, the principal developmental phases of which we can now follow from its first preserved literary product (the *Book of Watchers*) up to its final representatives in the 1st c. C.E.

³⁸ From his long list of works on apocalyptic we can note as most characteristic: P. Sacchi, "Il 'Libro dei Vigilanti' e l'apocalittica," *Henoch* 1 (1979): 42–92; *idem*, "L'apocalittica e il problema del male," *Parola di vita* 25 (1980): 325–34; *idem*, "Ordine cosmico e prospettiva ultraterrena nel postesilio. Il problema del male e l'origine dell'apocalittica," *RivB* 30 (1982): 6–25; *idem*, "Riflessioni sull'essenza dell'apocalittica: Peccato d'origine e liberta' dell'uomo," *Henoch* 5 (1983): 31–58; *idem*, "Per una storia dell'apocalittica," *Atti del terzo convegno dell'AISG—Idice, Bologna, 9–11 novembre 1982* (Rome, 1985), 9–34; *idem*, "Enoc Etiopico 91,15 e il problema della mediazione," *Henoch* 7 (1985): 257–67; *idem*, "Jewish apocalyptic," *SIDIC* 18 (1985): 4–9; *idem*, "Testi palestinesi anteriori al 200 a.C.," *RivB* 32 (1986): 183–204; *idem*, "L'apocalittica del I secolo: Peccato e Giudizio," in *Correnti culturali e movimenti religiosi del giudaismo. Atti del V Congresso internazionale dell'AISG (S. Miniato, 12–15 novembre 1984)* (ed. B. Chiesa; AISG Testi e studi 5; Roma: Carucci, 1987), 59–77; *idem*, "L'eredità giudaica nel cristianesimo," *Augustinianum* 28 (1988): 23–50.

³⁹ L. Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning. A Study of 1 Enoch 1–5* (ConBNT 7; Lund: Gleerup, 1979); *idem*, "Form and Message. A Preliminary Discussion of 'Partial Texts'" in Rev 1–3 and 22, 6ff.," in *L'Apocalypse Johannique et l'Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament* (ed. J. Lambrecht; BETL 53; Gembloux: Duculot / Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1980), 129–49; D. Hellholm, *Das Visionenbuch des Hermas als Apokalypse: formgeschichtliche und text-theoretische Studien zu einer literarischen Gattung: I Methodologische Vorüberlegungen und makrostrukturelle Textanalyse* (ConBNT 13.1; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1980); *idem*, "The Problem of Apocalyptic Genre and the Apocalypse of John," in *SBLSP 1982* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1982), 157–98.

(such as *4 Ezra* or *2 Baruch*) certain characteristic ideas are developed, such as the explanation of the origin of evil in the world as a result of the intervention of an angelic agent, determinism, the dominion over the world of the powers of evil and the final destruction of these forces by the divine judgment, the transition from a meta-historical structure to a historical structure and the division of history into period, communion with the world of angels, the theme of mediation between man and God and the development of messianic figures, the resolution of the problem of retribution by means of the resurrection, to cite no more than a few of the long list that could be drawn up. These ideas, of course, do not always appear in the same form nor are each and every one to be found in every apocalypse. Above all, they appear formulated not with our theoretical and abstract language but in a mythopoetic language, imaginative rather than descriptive, a language that instead of explaining the revelation it transmits tries to make one share in the visionary experience that it reflects, a language that must, therefore, be respected, since it is the essential vehicle of this communication.

b) *Apocalyptic elements in the preaching of Jesus*

Leaving aside central concepts of the preaching of Jesus whose roots in Jewish apocalyptic are not disputed, such as the concepts “Kingdom of God,” “Son of Man,” “Day of Judgment,” etc., I have chosen three concepts to which generally not too much attention is paid, as *examples* that show us to what extent the preaching of Jesus is influenced by apocalyptic thought and its “theology” by the “theology” of the apocalyptic tradition. These concepts are:

1) *Evil in the world*

One of the oldest ideas of the apocalyptic tradition is the ascription of the existence of evil in the world to the action of an agent outside of history and of man;⁴⁰ only in the fourth phase of apocalyptic and no doubt as a reaction to the danger of dualism that this explanation entails, the origin of evil will be located in the *cor malignum*, the *yēser raʿ* of *4 Ezra*. From the union of the fallen angels with the daughters of men in the *Book of Watchers* to Prince Mastema of *Jubilees* or the “angels of darkness” and Melki-resha of Qumran, Belial or the Satan of the gospels,

⁴⁰ See note 38 and especially “L’eredità giudaica nel cristianesimo,” 38–46.

the origin of the existence of evil and its presence and dominion over man is linked to these superhuman figures. Within the apocalyptic tradition, this topic is closely linked with the topic of the future destruction of evil, with the final triumph of God and final punishment of those causing evil.

The same pattern occurs in the preaching of Jesus. As for the apocalyptic tradition, for Jesus the evil in the world is above all a personification of demonic forces; as for the apocalyptic tradition, for Jesus also the final result of the battle against evil is assured beforehand and will end with God's victory. The most noteworthy difference is that for Jesus, this destruction has already begun in some way with what he has done, hence his cures and expulsions of demons are seen as a beginning of this victory of good over evil. As Jesus says: "I was watching the adversary, who fell from the sky like lightning" (Luke 10:18) or "Now is the judgment of this world; now the prince of this world will be driven out" (John 12:31), he tells us that God has destroyed the force of evil and has begun his victorious walk in this world. Even though, as the last petition in the Lord's Prayer tells us "but deliver us from evil" (Matt 6:13), the final victory is still seen in distant perspective and the life of the disciples is regarded as a harsh fight against this evil.

2) *The eschatologisation of the words of the prophets*

One of the essential elements of apocalyptic tradition is the re-interpretation of Scripture which is attained through revelation. From the re-interpretation of Jeremiah that Gabriel gives Daniel to the re-interpretation of Daniel that Uriel offers to Ezra, passing through the re-interpretation of the Torah of Ezekiel that we find in the *New Jerusalem*, we can state that this re-interpretation is one of the constants of the apocalyptic tradition. We find the best example of this type of re-interpretation within the Qumran Community, where the complete text of the Prophets is re-interpreted eschatologically in virtue of the revelation received and applied directly to the present reality of the Community, which is seen as the reality of "the last days".⁴¹ It is what the Qumran *pesharim* ("interpretations") teach and all the other quotations from the prophets that appear interpreted in the sectarian writings. This re-interpretation even goes as far as stating that the true meaning of the text

⁴¹ See F. García Martínez, "Escatologización de los Escritos profeticos en Qumran," *EstBib* 44 (1986): 101-16.

has not been really understood by the original prophet and that its deep meaning can only be understood in the light of the revelation received within the Community:

And God told Habakkuk to write what was going to happen to the last generation, but he did not let him know the end of the age. And as for what he says: "So that the one who reads it may run." Its interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God has disclosed all the mysteries of the words of his servants, the prophets. (1QpHab VII 1–5)

This same eschatologisation of the prophetic text is present in the re-interpretation that Jesus provides. Thus, in his first speech in Nazareth, he ends the reading of Isa 61 with the statement: "Today this scripture has been fulfilled before this audience" (Luke 4:18–21). This amounts to saying: the true meaning of the text of Isaiah does not refer to the historical circumstances that the prophet deals with but refers to the present that I represent. The same interpretation is found in the reply that Jesus gives to the envoy from the Baptist: "The blind recover their sight, the lame walk..." (Matt 11:2–6; Luke 7:18–23), with which he shows that the prediction of the prophets is considered as already realised. These and other examples that could be multiplied show us that Jesus, like the apocalyptic tradition, applies to itself and its present, understood as "the end of time," the words of the biblical prophets.

3) *The present as "the end of time"*

This is the third of the elements that I wish to note. In the preaching of Jesus, as in apocalyptic tradition, the present is seen as "the end of time," as the beginning of the fulfilment of all the promises. The topic is more than well known to require insisting on it, and a large part of the texts that Käsemann cites can be used to prove it. My basic idea is that this conviction is not simply a post-paschal conviction, resulting from the experience of the resurrection of Jesus as the first-fruits of the resurrection the just, or from the reception of the Spirit as an introduction to messianic times, but that this vision of the present as the place in which the final battle against the forces of evil has already begun, of the present as the place in which the promises of the prophets are fulfilled, of the present as the beginning of the "kingdom of God," etc., is one of the characteristic elements of the preaching of Jesus, and that this concept comes from the Jewish apocalyptic tradition and from the vision of history that it brought into Judaism.

I do not think more examples are needed to establish the statement that the influence of the Jewish apocalyptic tradition is one of the constitutive elements of the preaching of Jesus of Nazareth. And if this Jewish apocalyptic tradition has deeply influenced the formation and formulation of this message, with reason it can be considered as the womb of Christian theology, in a different meaning from the one that Käsemann gave to his thesis, but no less real for that. However, before ending this rapid journey, allow me to note a methodological detail in order to avoid misunderstandings.

From what I have said I think that it clearly emerges that the figure of Jesus was anchored, and well anchored in the fertile humus of the Judaism of his time and that his message takes up and incorporates a large number of elements from apocalyptic tradition. My presentation of the origins of early Christianity like those of a Jewish apocalyptic sect among the different groups that we know from the same period is historically correct. However, this does not mean to say that Christianity, as an historical phenomenon and in spite of this historical continuity with the apocalyptic tradition, is reduced to apocalyptic, nor that Christian theology is identical to the theology of apocalyptic. The divinisation of Jesus is such an unthinkable event within apocalyptic tradition as within the rest of Judaism and clearly shows us the existence of a deep split between Christian theology and the Jewish theologies.

Käsemann's insistence on the differences between the preaching of Jesus and post-paschal Christianity and the central nature of the Easter experience is one of the ways possible of localising the moment of this split between Judaism and Christianity as a new religion. Others have set this split at the point that separates the teaching of Jesus from the theology of Paul; for others, finally, the split would have happened already at the level of the self-awareness of the historical Jesus. The fascinating historical and theologically fundamental problem of locating this split, from which Christianity understands itself to be a new religion, evidently remains outside the perspective of this paper.

CHAPTER EIGHT

TRADITIONS COMMON TO 4 EZRA AND THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

While preparing a new edition of *4 Ezra*, with a commentary, for the series *Sources Chrétiennes*¹ we have been induced to revise as a whole the relationships between this apocalypse and the texts from Qumran.

Here we are not considering the many references to words or expressions from *4 Ezra* which have an equivalent in the texts from Qumran or in respect of which the texts from Qumran allow us to rediscover the Hebrew expressions underlying the Latin translation (fully indicated in the notes of the commentary by Myers),² and no doubt deserve a detailed discussion in our own commentary. Instead, we wish to concentrate on certain formal elements and above all indicate some ideas that are characteristic of *4 Ezra* which we think the texts from Qumran can clarify considerably.³

However, before we begin, we have to explain why we feel obliged to turn specifically to the texts from Qumran in order to understand some aspects of the theology of *4 Ezra* better. After all, according to current opinion, neither its date of composition, nor its original setting, nor its theological concerns, nor the milieu of its transmission allow us to suppose in advance that our inquiry could produce results. M. Stone, a great specialist in *4 Ezra*, recently stated: "No impression of Essene or associated sectarian ideas can be found in *4 Ezra* and the book often conforms to traditional rabbinic exegesis and views."⁴ And in the recent annotated translation of *4 Ezra*, in the Pléiade edition, which has

¹ In collaboration with A.F.J. Klijn. This lecture was given at the *Fourth Congress of the European Association for Jewish Studies* which took place in Troyes in July 1990. We have retained its character as a lecture.

² J.M. Myers, *I and II Ezra. Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible; Garden City: Doubleday, 1974).

³ The discussion of other ideas typical of *4 Ezra*, such as the divine birth of the Messiah or the length of his intervention, in the light of texts such *4Q246*, goes beyond the limits of this paper and must be left for another occasion.

⁴ M. Stone, "Apocalyptic Literature," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. M. Stone; CRINT II/2; Assen: van Gorcum/Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 414.

been accused, frequently and with reason, of pan-Essenism and pan-Qumranism, we find only 18 references to the texts from Qumran in the notes.⁵

Our decision not to forget the texts from Qumran when attempting to understand certain aspects of the theology of *4 Ezra* is motivated by two factors: our theory on the apocalyptic roots of the Qumran community and the publication of a fragment from Qumran which has an astonishing affinity with *4 Ezra*.

4 Ezra is universally acknowledged to be an apocalypse and therefore the literary genre of book is apocalyptic. However, we are convinced that an apocalypse cannot be reduced to the literary genre of apocalypse,⁶ and therefore we consider *4 Ezra* to be one of the witnesses of thought in the Jewish apocalyptic tradition at the end of the 1st century. We are equally convinced that the theological ideas of the Qumran Community have their roots in an apocalyptic tradition that was flourishing in Palestine at the close of the 3rd c. B.C.E.⁷ Now, if this apocalyptic tradition was the matrix in which the ideological characteristics of Qumran Essenism were born,⁸ and if the Qumran Community was one of the channels carrying this apocalyptic tradition to the interior from which new apocalypses were produced, both historical and cosmic

⁵ P. Geoltrain, "Quatrième Livre d'Ezra," in *La Bible. Écrits Intertestamentaires* (ed. A. Dupont-Sommer and M. Philonenko; Paris: Gallimard, 1987), 1395–1470. The verses of *4 Ezra* in respect of which reference is made to the Qumran texts are as follows: 3:22; 4:36; 6:18; 7:28, 36, 75, 80, 97, 132; 8:21–24, 29, 52; 10:45; 12:32; 13:42, 53; 14:11–12:39.

⁶ F. García Martínez, "Encore l'Apocalyptique," *JSS* 17 (1986): 224–32. Our opinion seems to be in the minority in current research. The tendency to reduce apocalyptic to the literary genre of apocalypse appeared in 1979 in the famous article by J. Carmignac, "Qu'est-ce que l'Apocalyptique? Son emploi à Qumran," *RevQ* 10/37 (1979): 3–33, and in the even more influential issue of *Semeia*: J.J. Collins (ed.), *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (*Semeia* 14; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979); it was established by the publication in 1983 of the proceedings of the Colloquium on Apocalyptic held in Uppsala, D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), and strongly affects current debate; see most recently R.L. Webb, "Apocalyptic: Observations on a Slippery Term," *JNES* 49 (1990): 115–26, an article which is included in M.O. Wise, "Qumran and Apocalyptic: The 'End of Days' in Ancient Judaism and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Symposium Chicago University 18 Nov. 1988," *JNES* 49 (1990): 101–94.

⁷ F. García Martínez, "Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis," *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1989): 113–36.

⁸ F. García Martínez, "Essénisme Qumrânien: Origines, caractéristiques, héritage," in *Correnti culturali e movimenti religiosi del giudaismo. Atti del V Congresso internazionale dell'AIISG (S. Miniato, 12–15 novembre 1984)* (ed. B. Chiesa; AIISG Testi e studi 5; Roma: Carucci 1987), 37–57.

in type⁹ it is completely logical, when tackling one of the latest products of this apocalyptic tradition, to look for traces of the ideas that appear within this secular apocalyptic tradition. Of course, as P. Sacchi has shown correctly,¹⁰ in a current of thought that was alive and functional over several centuries, one should not expect an unchanged repetition of the same ideas, but an evolution and modification of them, a development in contrast with other ideas or historical circumstances, indeed even the denial of some characteristic elements.

The second factor which prompted our inquiry was the publication of the first fragments of a previously unknown Qumran composition: *Second Ezekiel*.¹¹ As the editors of the text have noted, the similarities of this apocalypse with *4 Ezra* are surprising,¹² and a recent article¹³ has shown that in fact one of the sentences of *The Epistle of Barnabas*, usually considered to have originated in *4 Ezra*, comes from the Second Ezekiel recovered from Qumran. Therefore, a new examination of the relationships between *4 Ezra* and the Qumran texts does not seem completely useless.

⁹ F. García Martínez, "Les traditions apocalyptiques à Qumran," in *Apocalypses et voyages dans l'au-delà* (ed. C. Kappler; Paris: Cerf, 1987), 201–35. For the opposite view, see H. Stegemann, "Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyphtik," in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*, 495–530, who tries to "de-apocalypticize" the Qumran Community completely.

¹⁰ P. Sacchi, "Il 'Libro dei Vigilanti' e l'apocalittica," *Henoch* 1 (1979): 42–92; *idem*, "L'apocalittica e il problema del male," *Parola di vita* 25 (1980): 325–34; *idem*, "Ordine cosmico e prospettiva ultraterrena nel postesilio. Il problema del male e l'origine dell'apocalittica," *RivB* 30 (1982): 6–25; *idem*, "Riflessioni sull'essenza dell'apocalittica: Peccato d'origine e libertà dell'uomo," *Henoch* 5 (1983): 31–58; *idem*, "Per una storia dell'apocalittica," *Atti del terzo convegno dell'AIISG—Idice, Bologna, 9–11 novembre 1982* (Rome, 1985), 9–34; *idem*, "Enoc Etiopico 91,15 e il problema della mediazione," *Henoch* 7 (1985): 257–67; *idem*, "Riflessioni e proposte per una possibile storia dell'apocalittica," in *Tempo e apocalisse. Atti dell'incontro 19–20 settembre 1981 al monastero di Montebello, a cura di Sergio Quinzio* (Milazzo: SPES, 1985), 9–34; *idem*, "L'apocalittica del I secolo: Peccato e giudizio," in *Correnti culturali e movimenti religiosi del giudaismo. Atti del V Congresso internazionale dell'AIISG (S. Miniato, 12–15 novembre 1984)*, 59–78.

¹¹ J. Strugnell and D. Dimant, "4QSecond Ezekiel (4Q385)," *RevQ* 13/49–52 (1988): 45–58 and D. Dimant and J. Strugnell, "The Merkabah Vision in Second Ezekiel (4Q385 4)," *RevQ* 14/55 (1990): 331–48.

¹² Strugnell and Dimant, "4QSecond Ezekiel (4Q385)," 57: "Indeed, it now appears that *Second Ezekiel* is a very close forerunner of *Fourth Ezra*, and *Second Baruch*, for fragments 2–3 reveal very similar preoccupations, and are formulated in a similar way." And in a note, they add: "The affinity between the present fragments and *4 Ezra* 4:33–52 is striking. Compare, for instance, 4Q385 3 3–5 with *4 Ezra* 4:33–37. Both works contain the question of the seer concerning the flow of time in relation to the reward of the Righteous, and the answer concerning the "measure of time." In both works the problem of the afterlife underlies the overt content."

¹³ M. Kister, "Barnabas 12:1, 4:3 and 4QSecond Ezekiel," *RB* 97 (1990): 63–67.

1. FORMAL ELEMENTS

In terms of form, the seven episodes of *4 Ezra*, often called seven visions, can be grouped into two clearly differentiated parts: the first, in which the dialogues comprise the most important element (the dialogues: 3:1–5:19; 5:20–6:34; 6:35–9:25), and the second, the nucleus of which is formed by the visions and their explanation (the visions: 9:26–10:59; 10:60–12:51; 13:1–58; 14:1–48).¹⁴ The two parts seem to be modelled on biblical precedents: the dialogues of the book of Job and visions of the prophets supplied with an explanation, as in Ezekiel or Daniel or the dreams of Pharaoh. However, these biblical precedents do not give us an exact literary model either for the dialogues or for the visions. Instead, the Qumran texts do provide a specific literary model for each of the two parts that make up *4 Ezra*, a model that enables us to shorten the distance between the biblical precedents and the literary reality of *4 Ezra*. And this applies both at the level of general structure and at the level of the expressions used to introduce the dialogues and to interpret the visions.

4QSecond Ezekiel is essentially “a dialogue between God and the prophet on the destiny of Israel and of the righteous, with one difference: here God himself speaks to Ezekiel, while in the other apocalypses the seer usually discourses with an angel.”¹⁵ From this aspect, *4QSecond Ezekiel* lies halfway between the biblical model and *4 Ezra*. It provides us with a literary form that is identical with the dialogues of *4 Ezra* in the series of questions and answers, but still without the fiction of the *angelus interpres* (interpreting angel). In *4 Ezra*, instead, this fiction is presented almost continuously, as is right and proper in a text from a later period, even though sometimes the author seems to forget it and it is not very clear whether God or Uriel is conducting a dialogue with Ezra,¹⁶ and in

¹⁴ This division of the work is imposed by the actual text and is adopted by all commentators. For the Latin text of *4 Ezra* we use the edition by A.F.J. Klijn, *Der Lateinische Text der Apokalypse des Esra* (TU 131; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1983). For the relationships to other versions, cf. A.F.J. Klijn, *Die Esra-Apokalypse (IV Esra) Nach dem lateinischen Text unter Benutzung der anderen Versionen übersetzt und herausgegeben* (GCS; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1992). Our translations of the texts are based on the translations by H. Cousin, *Quatrième Livre d'Esra. Traduction française, présentation et index* (Lyon: Profac, 1987), and P. Geoltrain, “Quatrième Livre d'Esra.”

¹⁵ Strugnell and Dimant, “4QSecond Ezekiel (4Q385),” 48.

¹⁶ For details cf. A.L. Thompson, *Responsibility for Evil in the Theodicy of IV Ezra: A Study Illustrating the Significance of Form and Structure for the Meaning of the Book* (SBLDS 29; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 141–43.

ch. 14, the *angelus interpres* disappears completely and Ezra carries on the dialogue directly with God. In addition to the general literary structure of the dialogues, as indicated by the editors, *4QSecond Ezekiel* provides us with the Hebrew equivalent of Ezra's questions on when and how: *Quo et quando haec?*¹⁷

In the same way, the visions exhibit a literary form that is very close to the *pescharim* of Qumran.¹⁸ In Qumran, the biblical text is carved up in sections and the author gives us the interpretation of each of them; in *4 Ezra* we find the same splitting up of the vision, and each section is followed by an interpretation. Even the introductory formulae are parallel if one takes into account the differences between vision and written text: *Et quoniam vidisti...haec est interpretatio* // ואשר אמר...פשוו // *Quia vidisti...ipse est/quoniam vidisti...haec sunt* // ואשר אמר...פשוו הוא.¹⁹

This formal similarity between the *pescharim* and Qumran leads us directly to another much more important similarity with these *pescharim*: a similar conception of the biblical text, perceived as a mystery for which the key to interpretation is only given by divine revelation.

2. THE APPROACH TO THE WORDS OF THE PROPHETS

Formerly, we defined the most outstanding characteristic of Qumran biblical interpretation as an "eschatologisation" of the text of the prophets.²⁰ In the Qumran texts, especially the *pescharim*, the meaning of the text of the prophets is directly related to the eschatological future which at the same time is the present of the community, as shown by the

¹⁷ *4 Ezra* 4:33, 35; 6:59; 4Q385 2 3 יהו מתי יהו ואלה מתי יהו 2 9 אלה מתי יהו יהוה יהוה מתי יהו יהו אלה 2 9. This manuscript, initially referred to as *4QSecond Ezekiel*, has now been published by D. Dimant in DJD XXX as 4QPseudo-Ezekiel^a.

¹⁸ As already noted by M. Knibb in his study: "Apocalyptic and Wisdom in 4 Ezra," *JStJ* 13 (1982): 71: "There is a further characteristic of the fifth and sixth sections of 4 Ezra to which I should like to draw attention, and that is that they to some extent share the literary form of the Qumran Pesharim."

¹⁹ See the references in Knibb, "Apocalyptic and Wisdom in 4 Ezra," 72. Equally similar are the formulae in which the pronoun is used to introduce the interpretation directly. For a complete list of introductory formulae to the *pescharim* see F. García Martínez, "El Peshar: interpretación profética de la Escritura," *Salm* 26 (1979): 135–36 and the table on 138–39.

²⁰ F. García Martínez, "Profeet en profetie in de geschriften van Qumran," in *Profeten en profetische geschriften* (ed. F. García Martínez, C.H.J. de Geus, and A.F.J. Klijn; Kampen: Kok, 1986), 119–32; *idem*, "Escatologización de los Escritos profeticos en Qumran," *EstBib* 44 (1986): 101–16.

introductory formulae: פִּשְׁרוֹ לְאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים²¹ or פִּשְׁרֵי הַיָּמִים לְאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים.²² The text of the prophets is in some way emptied of its original meaning and no longer refers to the period of the Prophet; for the community, the content of the prophet's revelation speaks about what will happen to the last generation, לְדוֹר אַחֲרָיו. But the contents remain hidden, even for the prophet, and are not unveiled until revealed by the Teacher of Righteousness:

And God told Habakkuk to write what was going to happen to the last generation, but did not let him know the end of the age. And as for what he says: so that *the one who reads it may read swiftly*, the prediction of this concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God has made known all the secrets of the words of His servants the Prophets. (1QpHab VII 1–5)

The Qumran Community has arrived at this special understanding of the words of the Prophets thanks to the intervention of the Teacher of Righteousness, raised up “to make known to the last generations what he will do to the final generation” (CD I 11–12), as well as the acceptance by the Community of seeing the Teacher of Righteousness as a prophet, and identifying him with the “Prophet-like-Moses,” the eschatological prophet of 1QS IX 11.²³

In *4 Ezra* we find the same elements. Like the Teacher of Righteousness, Ezra has been chosen to be the witness of what will happen לְאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים:

And the Most High will show you in the visions of dreams what the Most High will do to the inhabitants of the earth in the last days. (10:59)

Like the Teacher of Righteousness, Ezra is portrayed as a prophet, Daniel's brother (12:12) and the sole survivor of the prophets:

For, of all the prophets, you (alone) remain to us, like a cluster after the grape harvest, like a lamp in a dark place, like a port for the ship saved from the storm. (12:42)

Like the Teacher of Righteousness, Ezra is acknowledged as the new Moses, and ch. 14 portrays him in this way: the repetition of the episode

²¹ 4Q163 4–7 ii 8, 9.

²² 4Q162 II 1; 4Q163 4–7 ii 14; 4Q163 23 ii 10; 4Q177 10–11 9.

²³ A.S. van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân* (SSN 3; Assen: van Gorcum, 1957), 75–89; see also his article: “Le Maître de Justice et les deux Messies de la Communauté de Qumrân,” in *La Secte de Qumrân et les Origines du Christianisme* (ed. J. van der Ploeg; RechBib 4; Paris-Bruges: Desclée De Brouwer, 1959), 121–34, as well as the articles cited in note 19.

of the burning bush (Exod 3:2–6) in vv. 1–2, the reference to Moses at the beginning of the divine speech, the parallel of forty days (vv. 23, 42 and 44) during which Ezra is going to rewrite the law with the forty days Moses spent on Sinai (Exod 24:18), are so many signs that leave no room for ambiguity.

It is no surprise, then that in *4 Ezra* we also find an approach to the words of the Prophets that we think is typical of the Qumran Community. The clearest text is to be found within the explanation given by the angel to Ezra, of the famous vision of the eagle, a vision which has its origins in the text of Dan 7.²⁴

He said to me: "Here is the interpretation of this vision that you have seen. The eagle that you saw going up from the sea is the fourth kingdom that appeared in the vision to your brother Daniel; but it was not interpreted as I now interpret it to you or as I did interpret it to you (*quod visum est in visu Danielo fratri tuo, sed non est illi interpretatum quomodo ego nunc tibi interpreto vel interpretavi*)."²⁴ (12:10–12)

For the author of *4 Ezra*, as for the Qumran Community, the text of Daniel speaks of the final days, even if Daniel had not understood this deeper meaning. Only the meaning of his vision in relation to the historical reality of his own time had been revealed to Daniel, but this understanding does not exhaust the meaning of the vision. The interpretation that Ezra receives shows that, in fact, the original vision was speaking of the final days, in spite of the fact that this is not how it was revealed to Daniel, and this meaning remained secret until the moment when God, through the angel, revealed it to Ezra: *Dignum enim me habuisti ostendere mihi temporum finem et temporum novissima* [12:9].

No doubt there are many differences between the interpretation of scripture in Qumran and the use of the biblical text that we find in *4 Ezra*, both in the dialogues and in the visions. However, this approach to the words of the prophets as a secret, as a mystery of which the interpretation is given by divine revelation, seems important and worth emphasising as one of the common elements in which the fruits of the conception of prophecy that is characteristic of apocalyptic tradition appear.

²⁴ A. Lacocque, "The Vision of the Eagle in 4 Ezra, a Rereading of Daniel 7 in the first century C.E.," in *SBL 1981 Seminar Papers* (ed. K.H. Richards; Chico: Scholars Press, 1981), 237–58.

3. REVEALED LAW AND HIDDEN LAW

The splitting of the Torah into a revealed part and a hidden part reserved for the initiates that we find in *4 Ezra*, depends strictly on this approach to the words of the prophets and of the concept of Ezra as the new Moses. This concept, characteristic of apocalyptic tradition, is also found in the Qumran writings.

For the author of *4 Ezra*, the original revelation of Moses on Sinai comprised a public part and a secret part. In speaking to Moses, God says:

I told him many wonders, I showed him the secrets of time and the end of time. I gave him an order, saying: Some words, you will make public and others you will hide. (14:5–6)

Ezra, the new Moses, also receives the revelation of the complete Torah, of its public part and of its secret part. Like Moses, he also must make public one part of this revelation and keep secret and reserved for initiates another part. God agrees to Ezra's request to allow him to rewrite *quae erant in lege tua scripta* (14:22) because the law has been burnt (*incensa est* 14:21, cf. 4:23) and so that men can find life again at the end of time (14:24); but on condition that, as on Sinai, one part of the law remains secret:

When you have finished, you will make some things public and some things you will transmit secretly to the wise. (14:26)

And when Ezra had completed his task and written this complete Torah in ninety-four books, he received the order to publish only one part of it and to keep the rest for the initiated:

And it happened, when, the forty days had passed, that the Most High spoke to me saying: The first things that you have written, make them public and may the worthy and unworthy read them. As for the seventy last things, you will keep them to transmit them to the wise ones of your people. (14:45–46)

In Qumran, we find a similar concept of the Torah; in Qumran also the Torah has a public component and a secret component, reserved for the members of the sect. Rather than looking for this idea in the references to the more or less mysterious books that we find mentioned in the manuscripts, or in the allusion to a ספר התורה שנית in 4Q177 1 14,

we think that we can find it in the distinction between the נגלות and the נסתרות of the Torah in the Qumran writings.²⁵

A fundamental text of the sect specifies that anyone wishing to enter the Community must:

swear with a binding oath to revert to the Law of Moses, according to all that it decrees, with all his heart and all his soul, following all that has been revealed of it to the sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant and interpret his will... He should swear by the covenant to be segregated from all perverse men who walk in the path of wickedness. For these are not included in his covenant, since they have neither sought nor examined what concerns his decrees in order to know the hidden things (נסתרות) in which they strayed in a blameworthy manner, and the revealed things (נגלות), which they treated with disrespect. (1QS V 7–12)

This text shows us that in Qumran, the complete Torah comprises the law revealed through the mediation of Moses, but also the elements of this law revealed “from age to age” (1QS VIII 15–16), or which have been found by the “Seeker of the Law,” the new Moses of the sect. These secret elements must not be made public, but must be reserved for the members of the Community. One of the functions of the *maskil* is precisely this:

He should keep secret the maxims of the law from the men of perversion and he should keep true knowledge and just judgment for those who have chosen the path. (1QS IX 17)

However, nothing should be hidden from the members of the Community, once they have been initiated:

And everything that has been hidden from Israel, but which has been found by the man who seeks, should not be hidden from them for fear of a spirit of apostasy. (1QS VIII 11–12)

In the same way that in *4 Ezra* the public books and the secret books form the complete Torah revealed to the prophet, in Qumran also the נסתרות and the נגלות oppose and complete each other: the two together form the complete Torah of the sect. According to Schiffman, the characteristic of Qumran נסתר is that it is derived from the biblical text “through divinely-inspired biblical exegesis.”²⁶ And we also think that

²⁵ On this terminology, see L.H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (SJLA 16; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 22–32.

²⁶ Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran*, 32.

this is the characteristic of the secret law of *4 Ezra*. The author considers the vision of the eagle and its interpretation as part of this revelation which must remain secret and can only be communicated to the initiated; now, this vision and this interpretation are simply a prophetic exegesis of the vision of Daniel:

Such is the vision that you have seen and such is its interpretation. But you alone have been worthy of knowing the secret of the Most High. So write all that you have seen in a book and deposit it in a hidden place. You will teach it to the wise of your people, whose heart you know is able to understand these secrets and to keep them. (12:35–38)

4. EVIL IN HISTORY

The central problem of *4 Ezra* is the problem of evil in the world, a problem represented by the destruction of Zion and by the evil committed by each man. One of the characteristics of *4 Ezra* is the way in which the author combines two facets of the problem of evil in his questions about the fate of Israel and his questions about the fate of each individual,²⁷ as well as the poignant force (which has no parallel in Jewish literature) with which he presents both problems.

The problem posed by the destruction of Zion and by the scattering of the people is strongly present in the prophetic literature of the exilic period, often in the form of a lament over Zion. In this biblical tradition the reason for this collective evil is sought in the history of the chosen people, in unfaithfulness to the covenant. The solution to the problem is also foreseen within history, in the restoration guaranteed by divine promise. In *4 Ezra*, as in biblical tradition, the way the problem is posed is conditioned by the search for a reason and for how long it would last:

Why has Israel been delivered in disgrace to the gentiles, the people that you loved to wicked tribes? (4:23)

And now, Lord, behold the nations which are accounted for nothing, control us and devour us. And we, your people, whom you called first-born, only son, object of jealousy, beloved, have been delivered into their hands. If the world was created for us, why do we not possess as inheritance this century which is ours? How long is this for? (6:57–59)

²⁷ The arguments “one/many” and “many/few” in the terminology of Thompson, cf. *Responsibility for Evil in the Theodicy of IV Ezra*, 157–256.

But the author does not consider the solutions given in prophetic tradition to be sufficient. If Israel has not obeyed the commandments of God, the other countries have been even more unfaithful:

Now then, weigh our sins in the balance and those of the inhabitants of the world, and see on which side the beam tilts. (3:34)

For him, Israel, even if it so wished, was unable to be faithful to the covenant because evil is present in every man. For *4 Ezra*, then, the reason for Zion's misfortune has its roots outside history and is found in the *cor malignum* implanted in every man since the beginning of creation:²⁸

Indeed, this is because he was carrying the bad heart that the first Adam transgressed and was overcome, but also all his descendants. The illness became permanent: the Law was in the people's heart with the bad root. (3:21–22)

This search for the origin of evil outside history is a constant in the apocalyptic tradition that we also find in Qumran. In the Qumran writings, as in *4 Ezra*, evil is in every man, a “building of sin,” from the maternal womb; but, in spite of some occasional allusions to *יצר אשמה* in 1QH^a and even the mention of *יצר רע* in 11QP^s^a XIX 15 (“may the evil purpose not take possession of my bones”), in Qumran the origin of evil is not placed in the *cor malignum* but in the action of Belial, of Satan, of the angel of darkness, etc.

And due to the Angel of Darkness, all the sons of justice stray; all their sins, their iniquities, their guilt, the faults of their works are the result of his hold, according to the mysteries of God, until his moment. (1QS III 21–23)

I think that *4 Ezra* has consciously dismissed this element in its explanation of the origins of evil in order to avoid any risk of dualism.²⁹ But even so, the fact of placing this origin outside history shows us that he continues, in modified form, the research of the apocalyptic tradition to which he belongs.³⁰

²⁸ For a detailed study of the relationships between the *cor malignum* and the rabbinic concept of *יצר הרע* see Thompson, *Responsibility for Evil in the Theodicy of IV Ezra*, 332–39.

²⁹ For the same reason, the author, in spite of his insistence on *יצר רע*, does not use a *יצר טוב*, as in rabbinic tradition.

³⁰ *4QSecond Ezekiel* (4Q385) also provides us with an unexpected parallel to one of the ideas of *4 Ezra*: *festinans festinant saeculum pertransire* (4:26). 4Q385 4 2–5 says: “And the days will hurry very quickly, until [all the sons] of man say: Do the days not hurry

Nor is the solution of *4 Ezra* to the problem of the destruction of Zion to be found in history. It is placed at the eschatological level,³¹ in the visionary experience of the *New Jerusalem*:

For behold, a time will come: it will happen, when the signs that I foretold you come, that the city that is now invisible will appear,³² and the land that is at present hidden will be shown. (7:26)

As in the Qumran writings, in *4 Ezra* this new Jerusalem is not portrayed as a promise of restoration as in Ezekiel.³³ Unlike the prophets, *4 Ezra* does not promise a return to Zion, the rebuilding of the Jerusalem and the temple; it limits itself (in the vision of the woman in labour, 9:1–10:60) to showing the transformation effected on it by the vision of the plan (תבניתה) of the new Jerusalem that God himself will build at the end of days.³⁴ This vision, which forms the centre and turning point of the book, provides an answer to the problem of the destruction of Zion, as in Qumran, with a solution that is outside of history.

5. INDIVIDUAL RETRIBUTION AND RESURRECTION

The solution that *4 Ezra* gives to the problem of evil at the individual level, if one can speak of a solution,³⁵ is also clearly set outside history in an eschatological perspective.³⁶ The solution to the present evil is given

so that the children of Israel may possess [their land] as inheritance? and YHWH said to me: I will not reject you, Ezekiel. Behold, I measure [time, and I shorten] the days and the years.” See Mark 13:20, where we find the same idea of the shortening of time because of the elect.

³¹ It is only in the eschatological period that the *cor malignum* will disappear; only at that moment “will the heart of the inhabitants be transformed and changed into another spirit (*sensum*)” (6:26).

³² Translated according to the Armenian version. The Latin version may perhaps be translated: “may the spouse appear under the appearance of a city.”

³³ See F. García Martínez, “La ‘nueva Jerusalén’ y el Templo futuro en los MSS de Qumrán,” in *Salvación en la Palabra: Targum—Derash—Berith: en memoria del profesor Alejandro Díez Macho* (ed. D. Muñoz León; Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1986), 563–90, and “L’interprétation de la torah d’Ézéchiél dans les MSS de Qumran,” *RevQ* 13/49–52 (1988): 441–52.

³⁴ M. Stone, “Reaction to Destruction of the Second Temple. Theology, Perception and Conversion,” *JSS* 12 (1981): 195–204.

³⁵ Sometimes the author seems to doubt this solution: “And if we do not pass through judgment after death, perhaps that would be better for us” (7:69).

³⁶ T.W. Willet, *Eschatology in the Theodicies of 2 Baruch and 4 Ezra* (JSPSup 4; Sheffield JSOT Press, 1989).

in the future world. The recompense of the just will happen in the after-life, where they will be rewarded after their resurrection:³⁷

After seeing death you will obtain mercy, for judgment will come after death, when we live once again; then the names of the just will appear and the works of the wicked will be shown. (14:34–35)

The influence of Dan 12, a key text for the development of the idea of resurrection,³⁸ is obvious and shows that on this point *4 Ezra* is a faithful representative of apocalyptic tradition.

In the Qumran writings we find another perspective, the final triumph of good over evil is an accepted and obvious fact. The result of the final war is known beforehand, and divine intervention ensures the victory of good over evil. But this victory, even if it has a certain eschatological dimension, is undoubtedly set in this world. One example, taken from the *Book of Mysteries*, is enough:

They did not know the future mystery and they did not understand ancient matters. They did not know what is going to happen to them and they did not save their soul from the future mystery. Here for you is the sign that this is going to happen: when the firstborn of sin are locked up, evil will disappear in front of justice as darkness disappears in front of light. And as smoke disappears and no longer exists, so will evil disappear for ever and justice will open out like the sun, ruler of the world. And all those who curb the wonderful mysteries will no longer exist. And knowledge will pervade the world and there will be no more folly. (1Q27 1 i 3–7)

This position seems to be opposed to the statements of *4 Ezra*. If the victory over evil and the recompense of the just happen in this world “at the end of days,” individual resurrection does not seem necessary. As a result, in the texts from Qumran, and despite the statements of Hippolytus about the beliefs of the Essenes, it is almost impossible to find positive statements about resurrection.³⁹ The only undisputed references

³⁷ A resurrection that affects the whole of mankind: “the earth will return those who sleep in it, the dust, those who dwell in silence, and the dwellings (*prumtuaria*) will return the souls that have been entrusted to them” [7:32].

³⁸ See G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (HTS 26; Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press, 1972), and H.C. Cavallin, *Life After Death. Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in I Cor 15. I: An Enquiry into the Jewish Background* (ConBNT 7; Lund: Gleerup, 1974).

³⁹ A good survey of the various opinions and an analysis of the texts is available in J. Duhaime, “La doctrine des Esséniens de Qumran sur l’après-mort,” in *Essais sur la mort* (ed. G. Couturier, A. Charron, and G. Durand; Héritage et Projet 29; Montreal:

are the allusion in *4QPsDaniel^c*, unfortunately incomplete⁴⁰ and the text of Starcky's lot translated by É. Puech:⁴¹

And they (= those who curse) shall be for death [when] the Vivifier [resur]rects the dead of his people. (4Q521 7+5 ii 6)

But now in *Second Ezekiel* we have the proof that in Qumran the triumph of good in this world "at the end of days" did not necessarily exclude the idea of the resurrection of the just as a solution to the problem of retribution:

[And I said: YHWH], I have seen many men of Israel who have loved your name and have walked on the paths of [justice. And these] things, when will they happen? And how will they be rewarded for their faithfulness? And YHWH said to me: I will show the children of Israel and they will know that I am YHWH.

[And he said to me:] Son of man, prophesy over the bones and say: May a bone [connect] with its bone and a joint with its joint. And so it happened. And he said a second time: Prophesy, and sinews will grow on them and they will be covered with skin. [And so it happened.] And again he said: Prophesy over the four winds of the sky, and they will blow [on them and they will live. And so it happened.] And a large crowd of men will stand and bless YHWH Sebaoth who [gave him life again]. And I said: Oh YHWH, when will these things happen? (4Q385 2 2–9)

The resurrection of the just is presented here as a reward for their faithfulness. To the question: "How will they be rewarded?," the author answers with the vision of dry bones: Ezek 37:1–12. The re-use of the prophet's text is obvious, but the author of *4QSecond Ezekiel* has changed the structure of the vision, reducing it to three consecutive actions: rejoining the bones, covering them with sinews and skin, and infusing the spirit of life. What is even more important, he has omitted vv. 11–13 of Ezek 37, which in the prophet's original vision gave us the explanation of the vision and its original meaning (God will give the exiles a new spirit which will permit their return to their land). These changes and the fact of making the vision the answer to the question about the

Fides, 1985), 99–119. See also L. Rosso Ubigli, "La concezione della vita futura a Qumran," *RivB* 30 (1982): 35–49.

⁴⁰ J.T. Milik, "Prière de Nabonide' et autres écrits d'un cycle de Daniel. Fragments araméens de Qumran," *RB* 63 (1956): 407–15; see F. García Martínez, "Notas al Margen de 4QpsDaniel Arameo," *Aula Orientalis* 1 (1983): 193–208.

⁴¹ É. Puech, "Les Esséniens et la vie future," *Le Monde de la Bible* 4 (1978): 38–40.

reward of the just have transformed the old vision of national restoration into a promise of personal resurrection.

Here we are still a long way from the universal resurrection of *4 Ezra*, just as we are still a long way from its statements about the small number of the saved.⁴² For the author of *4QSecond Ezekiel* only those who are faithful to the covenant will have a right to resurrection, but these “faithful” are still numerous: רבים מישראל. For the author of *4 Ezra* these “many” will become an insignificant minority. However, we are in the same line of development, and *4QSecond Ezekiel* shows us that the solution to the problem of reward in the afterlife and through resurrection was also known in the Qumran Community.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions of our study are no doubt modest but by no means insignificant. The observation that some of the key ideas of *4 Ezra* are to be found in one way or another in the MSS from Qumran, allows to fit this apocalypse within a secular tradition more easily. We can see its roots, the development of certain themes, the rejection of others, etc. In short, we have a more historical vision of this fascinating work. In the same way that the publication of the Qumran fragments of *1 Enoch* had proved that one should not look for the origins of apocalyptic tradition in the Antioch crisis, the discovery of certain basic ideas of *4 Ezra* in *4QSecond Ezekiel* forces us to separate the origin of these ideas from the great crisis that was the destruction of Jerusalem and of the Temple. We also have to acknowledge that these ideas had already been present within the apocalyptic tradition for some two centuries. While recognising the importance of this fundamental event in the radical way in which the author of *4 Ezra* poses his problems, the Qumran parallels noted here force us to acknowledge that these ideas are not exclusively the product of reactions to the author’s present desperate situation, but had existed and matured over a long period within the apocalyptic tradition to which the author of *4 Ezra* belongs.

⁴² The assertion of the small number of the saved recurs continually in *4 Ezra*. See, for example, 7:47: “Now I see that it is for a small number that the future century will have to provide pleasure, but torments for many,” or 8:1: “This century, the Most High has made it for the many, but the future century, for a few.”

CHAPTER NINE

THE END OF THE WORLD OR THE TRANSFORMATION OF HISTORY? INTERTESTAMENTAL APOCALYPTIC*

The Christian response to the central question of this III Course can only be given, obviously, by the New Testament. That response, as we shall see tomorrow,¹ is quite different from the reply provided by the eschatology of the prophets that was presented yesterday.² To understand how Paul, or the discourse of Mark 13, or the Apocalypse, came to formulate the replies to this question, we need to know the intermediate links, the ancient Jewish texts in which the eschatology of the prophets evolves and grows, seeking new answers to old questions. It is this set of very different texts grouped, under the general label “Intertestamental Apocalyptic,”³ which obviously also includes the texts from Qumran,⁴ that we are going to survey this morning, in an attempt to understand what reply, or which replies, they provide to the question that unites us together here. Evidently, it is not possible to analyse all the texts that in one way or another are connected with the topics. The limited time at our disposal forces us to make a selection. For this reason I will only mention texts that, for one reason or another, seem to me more important to understand how, from the eschatology of the prophets, the New Testament reached the Christian answer to the question: The end of the world or the transformation of history?

* Lecture given on March 15th, 1994 in the Centro de Estudios Teológicos of Sevilla as part of the *III Jornadas Teológicas* on “Aspectos de la escatología bíblica.” My very sincere thanks to the CET for the invitation to take part in this course, to P. Miguel de Burgos for the magnificent welcome he gave me and to those attending the course for the stimulating discussion after my lecture. I have kept the text of the conference as read unchanged, in spite of its oral character, adding only indispensable bibliographical references.

¹ In the lecture by Juan Mateos “La llegada del Hijo del Hombre.”

² In the lecture by José María Abrego: “La escatología de los profetas.”

³ Most of these texts are easily available in English in the collection *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; 2 vols.; Garden City: Doubleday: 1986), and in Spanish in the collection *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento* (directed by A. Diez Macho; 5 vols.; Madrid: Cristiandad, 1982–1987).

⁴ Available in F. García Martínez, *DSS*.

But before beginning the analysis of these texts and to avoid disappointment at the end of the survey, a couple of methodological details are necessary.

The first is that we have to respect the character and language of these texts. They speak to the imagination rather than to the intellect. Through a symbolic language, they attempt to make us perceive and feel the mystery, to make us penetrate the unfathomable mystery of the hereafter. Therefore, we should not expect them to answer unequivocally our Cartesian and rational questions. I would almost say that they make us intuit, rather than understand, the answers they provide.

The second is that these texts are very different from each other. Each one of them is the child of its time and its circumstances. Each one of them has a starting point and has served for a particular function in the circle it addressed. Its presuppositions, like its objectives, are often unknown to us. Only the texts or fragments of texts have reached us. So we should not be surprised that the answers they give us often have many forms, different from each other and sometimes almost contradictory. Above all, we should not try to make these answers uniform, adapting them to each other, imposing on them a linear development that allows our desire for synthesis to be satisfied. Instead, we must listen attentively to what the texts say in order to understand how they are feeling their way, their starting points, the new intuitions that they include, without fitting them into a set pattern.

The third detail is that we cannot impose our own questions on the texts but instead must try to understand what their questions were, since it is to these questions and not to ours, that they give answers.

I can assure you that if we approach the texts in this way, humbly and respectfully, we will not have wasted our time. "Intertestamental Apocalyptic" will not give us the "Christian" answer to the question concerning "The end of time or the transformation of history," but perhaps it will enable us to understand how the first generation of Christians could formulate their answer to this question (or to be frank, and in parentheses, their answers; I am not a specialist in the New Testament, nor can I say what they will tell us tomorrow, but I think it is impossible to reduce the various New Testament statements on the subject to one single answer). It is precisely these apocalyptic texts that show us the evolution that the eschatological seeds of the Old Testament underwent in the beginning of that era that we call "Christian," they reveal to us the growth of the Old Testament seeds and allow us to appreciate the rich and varied flowering that we find in the New Testament.

In order to put some order into what otherwise could seem more a cacophony of contradictory voices than a collection of helpful elements in respect of the New Testament answers, I have opted for a systematic presentation⁵ rather than a historical presentation,⁶ and I have grouped one part of the different elements found in the texts into five sections, which I shall present in sequence: The division of history into periods, the kingdom of God, the final conflagration, life beyond the end and future salvation as a present reality. And now, without further preamble, we can begin to read the texts.

1. THE DIVISION OF HISTORY INTO PERIODS

As you know, the apocalyptic writings can be divided into two large groups: cosmic apocalyptic and historical apocalyptic.⁷ For our case, evidently, apocalypses of the historical type are more interesting as they contain wide vistas of sacred history with the inevitable projection into the future in which the final time is included.

A characteristic element of all these visions of history is the introduction of one system or another of the division of history into periods, allowing the past, the present in which the apocalypse arises and the future that it claims to reveal to form a single whole. Thus, the book of Daniel, which belongs completely to this category of apocalypse, uses the pattern of four successive reigns (the four beasts) in ch. 7 to arrange the historical events, and resorts to the pattern of 70 weeks in ch. 9 to plot the course of history from the decree of Cyrus until the coming of the end.⁸ In essence, this is the “division of history into periods,” a way of fitting metahistory into a pattern together with known history and comprises one of the important contributions of apocalyptic writings in order to incorporate the coming of the end.

⁵ Similar to what “the new Schürer” makes of the messianic ideas of these writings, ideas that include some eschatological elements, see E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)* (rev. and ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Black; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: Clark, 1973–1987), 2:514–47.

⁶ As A. Díez Macho does in his study of the “Reino de Dios” in the “Introducción General,” in *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento*, 1:356–98.

⁷ On this typology, the definition of apocalyptic and the characterization of the various writings see J.J. Collins (ed.), *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (Semeia 14; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979), and the collection of studies in D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983).

⁸ See the commentary by J.J. Collins, *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).

In the first apocalypse,⁹ which is much earlier than Daniel, we already find a brief reference to this division of history into periods using the pattern of 70 weeks. In the *Book of the Watchers*, the punishment of the fallen angels is announced as follows:

And the Lord said to Michael: Go, inform Semyaza and the others with him who have associated with the women to corrupt themselves with them in all their uncleanness. When all their sons kill each other, and when they see the destruction of their beloved ones, bind them *for seventy generations* under the hills of the earth until the day of their judgement, and of their consummation, until the judgement which is for all eternity is accomplished. And in those days they will lead them to the abyss of fire; in torment and in prison they will be shut up for all eternity. (*1 En.* 10:11–13)¹⁰

While the author of this first apocalypse limits himself to a simple allusion, using seventy generations for the period from the time before the flood until the moment of final destruction (in this case, of the fallen angels), another apocalypse, more or less contemporary with Daniel, provides us with a fully fledged example of this pattern for incorporating history. In the third of the compositions that comprise the Enochic pentateuch, the *Book of Dreams*, we find a great panorama of the history of Israel from creation to the end of time, in which the protagonists are symbolised by two different types of animal (hence the name by which it is known: *Animal Apocalypse*). After summarising the main stages of this history, at a certain moment the author introduces seventy shepherds charged with guiding Israel, each of them during one era. The author groups the dominion of these shepherds into four great epochs, corresponding to the four epochs covered by the four reigns in Daniel, and at the end of the seventy periods of rule by these seventy shepherds, he introduces a final period, in which the Messiah emerges, judgment takes place, God himself replaces the old “house” with a “new house, larger and higher than the first,” all the animals of the earth and the birds of the sky prostrate themselves in front of the sheep, and these same sheep end up being transformed into white bulls.¹¹

⁹ Included in the collection of writings we know as the *1 Enoch*. On the date of the various compositions it comprises see F. García Martínez, “Estudios Qumránicos 1975–1985: Panorama Crítico I,” *EstBib* 45 (1988): 127–92 and “Contribution of the Aramaic Enoch Fragments to our understanding of the Books of Enoch,” in *Qumran and Apocalyptic* (F. García Martínez; STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 45–96.

¹⁰ Translation by M.A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch. A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), 2:89–90.

¹¹ *1. En.* 85–90.

In the Qumran writings we find various systems to express this division of history into periods. Both the pattern based on the number 70 and the pattern of the four empires in Daniel had some success in Qumran. The first is used in 4Q180–181 (70 weeks), in the Aramaic *Pseudo-Daniel* (70 years),¹² and in an as yet unpublished Aramaic papyrus that also speaks of 70 periods. The pattern of four empires is found in *Pseudo-Daniel* in which the first 70 years of the diaspora form the “first kingdom” and a very fragmentary Aramaic apocalypse in which four speaking trees appear, the first of them is Babylonia and the second is Persia.¹³

However, together with these patterns, known already, we find other patterns for dividing history into periods. 4Q390 (*Pseudo-Moses Apocalypse*)¹⁴ uses a system of Jubilees, each of them divided into weeks of years, to incorporate the various periods of sacred history, although unfortunately and due to the little that is preserved, we cannot determine which periods they are in each case. On the seventh jubilee, for example, it says:

And when this generation passes, in the seventh jubilee of the devastation of the land, they will forget the law, the festival, the sabbath and the covenant; and they will disobey everything and will do what is evil in my eyes. And I will hide my face from them and deliver them to the hands of their enemies and abandon them to the sword. But from among them I will make survivors remain so that they will not be exterminated by my anger and by the concealment of my face from them. And over them will rule the angels of destruction. (4Q390 1 7–11)

A similar system, of ten Jubilees, is used by 11QMelchizedek,¹⁵ to announce the final liberation:

¹² Hebrew text of 4Q180–181 in Allegro, DJD V, and of 4QpsDan in J.T. Milik, “‘Prière de Nabonide’ et autres écrits d’un cycle de Daniel. Fragments araméens de Qumran,” *RB* 63 (1956): 407–15; translation in *DSST*, 211–12 and 212–13 [now published in DJD XXII, 97–164].

¹³ See F. García Martínez, “Notas al Margen de 4QpsDaniel Arameo,” *Aula Orientalis* 1 (1983): 193–208.

¹⁴ Hebrew text in D. Dimant, “New Light From Qumran in the 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; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 405–48; translation in *DSST*, 280–81.

¹⁵ Hebrew text in A.S. van der Woude, “Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI,” *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 14 (1965): 354–73; translation: *DSST*, 139–41.

He (Melchizedek) will proclaim liberty for them, to free them from the debt of all their iniquities. And this will happen in the first week of the jubilee which follows the nine jubilees. And the day of atonement is the end of the tenth jubilee in which atonement will be made for all the sons of God and for the men of the lot of Melchizedek. (11QMelch II 6–8)

This system of ten jubilees is transformed into a system of ten weeks in an apocalypse from a period slightly after Daniel, the “Apocalypse of weeks,” included in the fourth of the compositions that comprise the Enochic pentateuch. In spite of its length I think that it is worth quoting the text in its entirety:

I was born the seventh, in the first week, while justice and righteousness still lasted. And after me in the second week great wickedness will arise and deceit will have sprung up; and in it there will be the first end, and in it a man will be saved. And after it has ended, iniquity will grow, and he will make a law for the sinners. And after this in the third week, at its end, a man will be chosen as a the plant of righteous judgement; and after him will come the plant of righteousness for ever. And after this in the fourth week, at its end, visions of the holy and righteous will be seen, and a law for all generations and an enclosure will be made for them. And after this in the fifth week, at its end, a house for glory and for sovereignty will be built for ever. And after this in the sixth week all those who live in it (will be) blinded, and the hearts of all, lacking wisdom, will sick into impiety. And in it a man will ascend; and at its end the house of sovereignty will be burnt with fire, and in it the whole race of the chosen root will be scattered. And after this in the seventh week an apostate generation will arise, and many (will be) its deeds, but all its deeds (will be) apostasy. At at its end the chosen righteous from the eternal plant of righteousness will be chosen, to whom will be given sevenfold wisdom concerning his whole creation. And after this the roots of iniquity will be cut off, and the sinners will be destroyed by the sword; from the blasphemers they will be cut off in every place, and those who plan wrongdoing and those who commit blasphemy will be destroyed by the sword. And after this there will be another week, the eighth, that of righteousness, and a sword will be given to it that the righteous judgment may be executed on those who do wrong, and the sinners will be handed over into the hands of the righteous. And at its end they will acquire houses because of their righteousness, and a house will be built for the great king in glory for ever. And after this in the ninth week the righteous judgment will be revealed to the whole world, and all the deeds of the impious will vanish from the whole earth; and the world will be written down for destruction, and all men will look to the path of uprightness. And after this in the tenth week, in the seventh part, there will be the eternal judgment which will be executed on the watchers, and the great eternal heaven which will spring from the midst of the angels. And the first heaven will vanish and pass away, and a new heaven will

appear, and all the powers of heaven will shine for ever (with) sevenfold (light). And after this there will be many weeks without number for ever in goodness and in righteousness, and from then on sin will never again be mentioned. (*I En.* 93:3–10, 91:12–17)¹⁶

To me this text seems particularly important because it is the first to introduce a division into periods not only of history but of time that transcends history, in the metahistory that begins in the time of the end. The author compresses the history of Israel, from the birth of Enoch, into only seven weeks, or what amounts to the same, a complete jubilee. The author is situated, evidently, at the end of the seventh week, on the threshold of metahistory, a week governed by a wicked generation, but in which a faithful group arises, a chosen plant, to which he belongs and which represents the seed of salvation to which the apocalypse is directed. In this, our author is not substantially different from Daniel and his group of *maskilim*, or from the author of the *Animal Apocalypse* and his group of “pious ones.” His great innovation consists in not limiting the division of history into periods to the past or to the present but in bringing it into the future, into metahistory, dividing the eschatological era into three weeks and even each one of these weeks into seven parts. This allows him to present a development of the end that is progressive and in separate phases. The eighth week is marked by the victory of the just and the rebuilding of the Temple; the ninth by the destruction of evil, and the tenth by the final judgment and the appearance of the new heaven.

2. THE REIGN OF GOD WITH AND WITHOUT A MESSIAH

In the perspective of the Old Testament, the fulfilment of the divine promises to Israel generally remains in an inner-worldly horizon. What apocalyptic will call the reign or kingdom of God is conceived, above all, as the salvation of the people of this world, as the triumph of Israel over the enemy, under the rule of a legitimate sovereign from David’s stock, with the elimination of all evil and the perfect observance of the Law, a contented life, a perfect cult. The fact is that already the post-exilic prophets hear a voice proclaiming the end as the appearance of something completely new: “Behold, I am going to create a new heaven

¹⁶ Translation taken from Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2:223–25, 218–21.

and a new earth: of the past there will no memory nor will thought come,” as Trito-Isaiah had already said (Isa 65:17). But even the book of Daniel, in which belief in resurrection for the just already appears (Dan 12:2–3), the eschatological kingdom seems to be seen, above all, as a continuation of human history, a transformed history, but within the horizon of this world, with the dominion of Israel over the nations and with the rebuilding of the temple.

Of course, the images we find in apocalyptic literature derive from this Old Testament vision.¹⁷ Thus, for example, in *Jub.* 23, the end is described in the following terms:

There will be a great punishment from the Lord for the actions of that generation. He will deliver them to the sword, judgment, captivity, plundering, and devouring. He will arouse against them the sinful nations who will have no mercy or kindness for them and who will show partiality to no one, whether old, young, or anyone at all, because they are evil and strong so that they are more evil than all mankind. They will cause chaos in Israel and sin against Jacob. Much blood will be shed on the earth, and there will be no one who gathers up (corpses) or who buries (them). At that time they will cry out and call and pray to be rescued from the power of the sinful nations, but there will be no one who rescues (them). The children’s heads will turn white with grey hair. A child who is three week of age will look like one whose years are 100, and their condition will be destroyed through distress and pain.

In those days the children will begin to study the laws, to seek out the commands, and to return to the right way. The days will begin to become numerous and to increase, and mankind as well—generation by generation and day by day until their lifetimes approach 1000 years and to more years than the number of days (had been). There will be no old man, nor anyone who has lived out his lifetime, because all of them will be infants and children. They will complete and live their entire lifetimes peacefully and joyfully. There will be neither a satan nor any evil one who will destroy. For their entire lifetimes will be times of blessing and healing. Then the Lord will heal his servants. They will rise and see great peace. he will expel his enemies. The righteous will see (this), offer praise, and be very happy forever and ever. They will see all their punishments and curses on their enemies. Their bones will rest in the earth and their spirits will be very happy. They will know that the Lord is one who executes judgment but shows kindness to hundreds and thousands and to all who love him. (*Jub.* 23:22–31)¹⁸

¹⁷ For an overall view of this topic see O. Camponovo, *Königtum, Königsherrschaft und Reich Gottes in den frühjüdischen Schriften* (OBO 58; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984).

¹⁸ Ethiopic text in J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (2 vols.; CSCO 510–11,

This image of the end is purely of this world and is modelled on the image of a life in paradise. With large brush strokes the progressive decline due to sin is described, and the final restoration that God himself will cause, a restoration that does not seem to be anything more than a return to the beginning, before sin. Curiously, and unlike most apocalypses, this transformation is foreseen as something gradual and progressive, not as something sudden and violent. As in the Old Testament, God acts completely alone here, with no intermediary or agent of salvation.

Jubilees is not, of course, the only apocalypse from which the Messiah is missing. But in other texts, the Messiah is made to intervene as an instrument of the arrival of the kingdom of God. The images of the Messiah that we find in these texts are very varied and different, and go from a purely human Messiah to a pre-existent Messiah of a heavenly nature. But, independently of his nature, what interests us here is that to this character is ascribed a function in the arrival and installation of the kingdom of God in this world.

A Qumran commentary on the blessings of Judah (Gen 49:8–12), 4Q252, tells us that the fulfilment of these blessings is projected to the age of the Messiah. Then, God will restore the Davidic monarchy, and the Messiah, heir to the throne of David, will exercise kingship over the people, evidently a kingship that is military in character, as indicated by the equation of “the feet” with the thousands.

A sovereign shall not be removed from the tribe of Judah. While Israel has the dominion, there will not lack someone who sits on the throne of David. For the “staff” is the covenant of royalty, the thousands of Israel are “the feet.” Until the messiah of justice comes, the branch of David. For to him and to his descendants has been given the covenant of royalty over his people for all everlasting generations, who have observed the law with the men of the community. (4Q252 V 1–5)¹⁹

Another Qumran text, this time in Aramaic, 4Q246, clearly influenced by Daniel, describes the intervention of a mysterious person whom the editor, É. Puech, has called messianic.

Scriptores Aethiopici 87–88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989). Translation from VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2:146–49.

¹⁹ Hebrew text in J.M. Allegro, “Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature,” *JBL* 75 (1956): 174–76; translation: *DSSS*, 215. [Now edited in DJD XXII, 185–207]

He will be called son of God, and they will call him son of the Most High. Like the sparks of a vision, so will their kingdom be; they will rule several years over the earth and crush everything; one people will crush another people, and one city another city, *Blank* until the people of God arises and makes everyone rest from the sword. His kingdom will be an eternal kingdom, and all his paths in justice; he [will] judge the earth with justice, and all will make peace. The sword will cease in the earth and all the cities will pay him homage. The great God with his power will make war for him; he will place the peoples in his hand and cast away everyone before him. His kingdom will be an eternal kingdom, and all the abysses. (4Q246 II 1–9)²⁰

The preserved text tells us that someone (a seer?) falls in front of the throne of a king and addresses him. He describes the evils to come, among which the reference to Assyria and Egypt plays an important role. Even more important will be the apparition of a mysterious person to whom will be given the titles of “son of God” and “son of the Most High,” and whom “all will serve.” His apparition will be followed by troubles, but these will be transient like a spark and will only last “until he raised the people of God and makes all rest from the sword.” He will conquer all kings with the strength of God, will end war, and establish an eternal kingdom in which all will make peace, and in which justice will rule eternally.

This person is described with the features of Daniel’s “Son of Man,” from whom come the expressions “his kingdom will be an eternal kingdom” and “his rule will an eternal rule,” which our author applies to the mysterious protagonist of his tale, whom he considers without any doubt to be an individual. This person is presented as judge of the whole world and his rule extends to the whole globe. His action will end the period of previous crisis and he will bring in the situation of eschatological peace, which will allow the exalted titles applied to him of “son of God” and “son of the Most High” to be understood.²¹

I cannot resist the temptation to quote another Qumran text, even though it is incomplete, since on the one hand, it provides the proof that the victory of the “Messiah, son of David” will include the destruction of his eschatological enemy in the war at the end of time, and on

²⁰ Hebrew text in É. Puech, “Fragment d’une apocalypse en araméen (4Q246 = pseudo-Dan^d) et le ‘Royaume de Dieu,’” *RB* 99 (1992): 98–131; translation: *DSSS*, 138.

²¹ On this text and the following see F. García Martínez, “Nuevos textos mesiánicos de Qumrán y el Mesías del Nuevo Testamento,” *Communio* 26 (1993): 3–31.

the other confirms that in the Qumran texts the messianic figure of the “Prince of the community” is identical with the “shoot of David,” that is, with the traditional “Messiah-king.”

¹ [...as] the Prophet Isaiah [said]: “[The most massive of the] ² [forest] shall be cut [with iron and Lebanon, with its magnificence,] will fall. A shoot will emerge from the stump of Jesse [...] ³ [...] the bud of David will go into battle with [...] ⁴ [...] and the Prince of the Congregation will kill him, the bu[d of David...] ⁵ [...] and with wounds. And a priest will command [...] ⁶ [...] the destruction of the Kittim [...] (4Q285 7)²²

Royalty, dominion, destruction of the enemies, including a specific personalised adversary, all this in the perspective of a kingdom of God in this world. We could go on quoting texts and multiplying the functions attributed in them to the Messiah, always in this perspective. But perhaps it would be more interesting to move on to other texts from apocalyptic literature in which the distinction between the world of history and the world of metahistory begins to make way for the present and future worlds, or to use rabbinic terminology in which this idea is firmly established, between “this world” (העולם הזה) and “the world to come” (העולם הבא).

4 Ezra provides an excellent means of showing the difference between these two worlds:

For behold, the time will come, when the signs which I have foretold to you will come, that the city which now is not seen shall appear, and the land which now is hidden shall be disclosed. And everyone who has been delivered from the evils that I have foretold shall see my wonders. For my Messiah shall be revealed with those who are with him, and he shall make rejoice those who remain for four hundred years. And after these years my son (or: servant) the Messiah shall die, and all who draw human breath. And the world shall be turned back to primeval silence for seven days, as it was at the first beginnings; so that no one shall be left. And after seven days the world, which is not yet awake, shall be roused, and that what is corruptible shall perish. (*4 Ezra* 7:26–31)²³

Here the difference and the break between this world and the world to come is complete and is accentuated by this stretch of silence. The world

²² Translation: *DSST*, 124. [Now edited in *DJD XXXVI*, 228–46]

²³ Latin text in A.F.J. Klijn, *Der Lateinische Text der Apokalypse des Esra* (TU 131; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1983); translation by M.E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra. A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 202.

to come emerges from this silence just as the present world emerged from the primeval silence that preceded creation. Just as the division of metahistory into periods allowed the various components of the vision to be distributed among different periods, the clear separation of the present world from the world to come allows the author to separate different components of the kingdom of God and set some in this world and others in the world to come. The kingdom of God, so to speak, has a messianic phase, the era of the kingdom of the Messiah. This is limited and temporal; it will be preceded by the signs that in other texts foretell the coming of the kingdom to the extent that in rabbinic tradition the phrase “the birth-pangs of the Messiah” will be coined to denote the disturbances that precede the arrival of God’s kingdom; in it will be carried out the destruction of enemies and even judgment; the fulfilment of the promises; the coming of the new Jerusalem, etc. But this Messianic phase of the kingdom is limited in *4 Ezra* to four hundred years, like the slavery in Egypt. In *2 Baruch* the length of the kingdom of the Messiah is also presented as limited, although its duration is not specified:

And it will happen that when all that which should come to pass in these parts has been accomplished, the Anointed One will begin to be revealed. And Behemoth will reveal itself from its place, and Leviathan will come from the sea, the two giant monsters which I created on the fifth day of creation and which I shall have kept until that time. And they will be nourishment for all who are left. The earth will also yield fruits ten thousandfold. And on one vine will bear a thousand branches, and one branch will produce a thousand clusters, and one cluster will produce a thousand grapes, and one grape will produce a cor of wine. And those who are hungry will enjoy themselves and they will, moreover, see marvels every day. For winds will go out in front of me every morning to bring the fragrance of aromatic fruits and clouds at the end of the day to distil the dew of health. And it will happen at that time that the treasury of manna will come down again from on high, and they will eat of it in those years because they are those who have arrived at the consummation of time. And it will happen after these things when the time of the appearance of the Anointed One has been fulfilled and he returns with glory, that then all who sleep in hope of him will rise. And it will happen at that time that those treasures will be opened in which the number of the souls of the righteous were kept; and they will go out and the multitude of the souls will appear together, in one assemblage, of one mind. And the first ones will enjoy themselves and the last ones will not be sad. For they know that the time has come of which it is said that it is the end of times. But the souls of the wicked will the more waste away when they see all these

things. For they know that their torment has come, and that their perditions have arrived. (2 *Bar.* 29:3–30:5)²⁴

These two texts clearly show us that the inner-worldly dimension of the kingdom of God has been compressed and reduced in certain apocalypses to the kingdom of the Messiah. The kingdom of God, definitive and eternal, is no longer expected in this world but in the world to come, once the age of the Messiah has ended, when he returns to glory.

There is even more. Within apocalyptic literature we even find descriptions of the end in which the inner-worldly aspect of this kingdom of God has completely disappeared and hope is concentrated on belonging to a kingdom of God that is only the world to come. There has been a shift from a purely inner-worldly kingdom of God to hoping in a kingdom of God the manifestation of which will result in raising Israel to the heavens. The best example of this vision of the end is provided by ch. 10 of the *Testament of Moses*:

And then his kingdom will appear in his entire creation.
 And then the devil will come to an end,
 and sadness will be carried away together with him.
 Then, the hands of the messenger, when he will be in heaven, will be
 filled,
 and he will then avenged them against their enemies.
 For the Heavenly One will rise from his royal throne,
 and he will go out from his holy habitation
 with anger and wrath on account of his sons.
 And the earth will tremble until its extremes it will be shaken,
 and the high mountains will be made low,
 and they will be shaken, and the valleys will sink.
 The sun will not give its light,
 and the horns of the moon will turn into darkness,
 and they will be broken and (*sc.* the moon) will entirely be turned into
 blood,
 and the orbit of the stars will be upset.
 And the sea will fall back into the abyss,
 and the fountains of the waters will defect
 and the rivers will recoil.

²⁴ Syriac text in S. Dederling, *Apocalypse of Baruch* (The Old Testament in Syriac according to the Peshitta version IV/3; Leiden: Brill, 1973); commentary P. Bogaert, *Apocalypse de Baruch* (SC 144–145; Paris: Cerf, 1969). Translation from A.F.J. Klijn, “2 (Syrian Apocalypse of) Baruch,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 1:630–31.

For the Highest God, the sole Eternal One, will rise,
 he will manifest himself in order to punish the nations,
 and to destroy all their idols.
 Then you will be happy, Israel,
 you will mount on the neck and the wings of an eagle,
 and they will be filled,
 and God will exalt you,
 and make you live in the heaven of the stars,
 the place of his habitation.
 And you will look down from above,
 and you will see your enemies on the earth;
 and you will recognize them.
 And you will rejoice,
 and you will thank and praise your Creator.
 But you, Joshua son of Nun, keep these words and this book.
 For from my death, my being taken away, until his (*sc.* God's) advent, there
 will be 250 times that will happen. And this is the course of events that will
 come to pass, until they will be completed. (*T. Mos.* 10:1–13)²⁵

The distance travelled between this text and the Old Testament visions of the end is extraordinary, in spite of the extremely traditional nature of the images used. The result of the divine action after vengeance and the destruction of the enemies is not a happy kingdom on earth, nor a new Jerusalem, nor a new earth. The present world no longer matters, and Israel, lifted to heaven on an eagle's wings, is established in God's dwelling. We could almost say that here there has been a shift from the announcement of the "kingdom of God" or of the "messianic kingdom" to the announcement of the "kingdom of heaven."

3. THE FINAL CONFLAGRATION AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE WORLD

The reply of the *Testament of Moses* is virtually unique in its radical nature. Most of the apocalyptic texts do not leave the earthly horizon completely out of sight. A recurrent pattern of the messianic age, which we have already glimpsed in some of the texts quoted, is as follows: premonitory signs final conflagration divine judgment transformation of the world. In rabbinic tradition there is a characteristic expression to denote the premonitory signs: "the birth pangs of the messianic age"

²⁵ Latin text and translation: J. Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses. A Critical Edition with Commentary* (SVTP 10; Leiden: Brill, 1993), 18–21.

or simply “the birth pangs of the Messiah.” In the description of these signs great imagination is shown, as if utter chaos had to be experienced to be able to attain salvation. Here I quote an example from *4 Ezra* 5–6:

the days are coming when those who dwell on earth shall be seized with great terror...and unrighteousness shall be increased beyond what you yourself see, and beyond what you heard of formerly...and the sun shall suddenly shine forth at night, and the moon during the day. Blood shall drip from wood and the stone shall utter its voice...the birds shall fly away...the sea of Sodom shall cast up fish; and one whom the many do not know shall make his voice heard by night, and all shall hear his voice...infants a year old shall speak with their voices, women with child shall give birth to premature children at three and four months, and these shall live and dance. Unsown places shall suddenly appear sown, and full storehouses shall suddenly be found to be empty...(*4 Ezra* 5:1–7; 6:21–23)²⁶

Some scholars attempt to put some order into this chaos of ominous signs of the end. *2 Bar.* 27–29 describes this preparation of the end as divided into twelve parts, each with its own characteristic, as if these evil ones were pigeonholed. But at the same time it anticipates the contents of the various boxes of this wheel of fortune moving out of place and getting mixed up with others in this mad whirl, so that to see them as signs of the end is very limited:

This time will be divided into twelve parts, and each part has been preserved for that for which it was appointed. In the first part: the beginning of commotion. In the second part: the slaughtering of the great. In the third part: the fall of many into death. In the fourth part: the drawing of the sword. In the fifth part: famine and the withholding of rain. In the sixth part: earthquakes and terrors;...In the eighth part: a multitude of ghosts and the appearances of demons. In the ninth part: the fall of fire. In the tenth part: rape and much violence. In the eleventh part: injustice and unchastity. In the twelfth part: disorder and a mixture of all that has been before. These parts of that time will be preserved and will be mixed, one with another, and they will minister to each other. For some of these parts will withhold a part of themselves and take from others and will accomplish that which belongs to them and to others; hence, those who live on earth in those days will not understand that it is the end of times. (*2 Bar.* 27)²⁷

²⁶ Translation by Stone, *Fourth Ezra. A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra*, 106, 163.

²⁷ Translation from Klijn, “2 (Syrian Apocalypse of) Baruch,” 630.

After these portents there will be a final conflagration, the ultimate conflict with the forces of evil. According to the emphasis of each apocalypse, in some these forces of evil that are completely destroyed are the various pagan gentile kingdoms, in others the wicked in general, in yet others the sinful Jews themselves, or the demons, or a long series of enemies in which all these categories follow each other or are mixed together. Sometimes this final conflagration is only the direct execution of divine vengeance on his adversaries, at other times using his angels, in other texts it is presented as an act by the Messiah who destroys all his enemies, either alone or with the help of the people of Israel, and in others still, as in the *War Scroll* from Qumran, as a long struggle in which all the forces of good, angelic and human, are associated. These descriptions are more than well known, so that I limit myself to citing one fragment from the beginning of this *War Scroll*:

And on the day on which the Kittim fall, there will be a battle, and savage destruction before the God of Israel, for this will be the day determined by him since ancient times for the war of extermination against the sons of darkness. On this (day), the assembly of the gods and the congregation of men shall confront each other for great destruction. The sons of light and the lot of darkness shall battle together for God's might, between the roar of a huge multitude and the shout of gods and men, on the day of the calamity. It will be a time of suffering for all the people redeemed by God. Of all their sufferings, none will be like this, from its celerity until eternal redemption is fulfilled. (1QM I 9–12)²⁸

Clearly, the result of this conflagration could only be the complete victory of God or of his angels, or of the Messiah, or of Israel, or of the coalition of the forces of good. Victory is followed by divine judgment, a judgment that precedes the beginning of the kingdom of God (as in *1 En.* 83–89), or ends it (as in *1 En.* 91–94). I will quote only one fragment from the *Book of Parables* 51 (the second composition in the Enochic pentateuch), because in it, the Messiah, called the Chosen or the Son of Man, performs this judgment seated on the divine throne:

In those days the earth will return that which has been entrusted to it, and Sheol will return that which has been entrusted to it, that which it has received, and destruction will return what it owes. And he will choose the righteous and holy from among them, for the day has come near that they

²⁸ Hebrew text in E.L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press and The Hebrew University, 1955); translation: *DSS*, 95.

must be saved. And in those days the Chosen will sit on my throne, and all the secrets of wisdom will flow out from the counsel of his mouth, for the Lord of Spirits has appointed him and glorified him. And in those days the mountains will leap like rams, and the hills will skip like lambs satisfied with milk, and all will become angels in heaven. Their faces will shine with joy, for in those days the Chosen One will have risen; and the earth will rejoice, and the righteous will dwell upon it, and the chosen will go and walk upon it. (*I En.* 51)²⁹

In this very text we already see that the final phase of the pattern is the transformation of the world, a world in which “the mountains will dance like kid goats and the hills will frolic like lambs full of milk,” a world in which the earth will overflow with fruit, in which the animals will not be wild, in which prosperity, peace and happiness will rule. Of course, this transformation begins at the centre, at this “navel of the world” which the holy city of Jerusalem is. The *Animal Apocalypse* of *I Enoch* describes this transformation:

And I stood up to look until he folded up that old house, and they removed all the pillars, and all the beams and ornaments of that house were folded up with it; and they removed it and put it in a place in the south of the land. And I looked until the Lord of the sheep brought a new house, larger and higher than that first one, and he set it up on the site of the first one which had been folded up, and all its pillars (were) new, and its ornaments (were) new and larger than (those of) the first one, the old one which he had removed. And the Lord of the sheep (was) in the middle of it. And I saw all the sheep which were left, and all the animals on the earth and all the birds of heaven falling down and worshipping those sheep, and entreating them and obeying them in every command. (*I En.* 90:28–30)³⁰

This Jerusalem is the subject of a beautiful vision in *4 Ezra*, and a complete composition, of which several copies have been found in the various caves of Qumran, was completely devoted to describing his marvellous appearance and his superhuman size. However, I think that the pattern of conflagration, judgment, transformation remains clear enough and we can move on to another aspect of the end that is important in this apocalyptic literature: the resurrection of the dead.

²⁹ Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2:135–36. For “my throne,” cf. note in *ibid.*, 135.

³⁰ Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, 2:215.

4. LIFE BEYOND THE END

It is undoubtedly not by chance that the clearest statement of belief in the resurrection of the just in the whole of the Old Testament (and for some scholars, the only reference) is found in such a clearly apocalyptic writing as Dan 12, nor that this statement is expressed in the context of the last days. What Daniel affirms, in effect, is that the just, both the dead and those who at this moment are still alive, will enter together the kingdom that God will establish on that day.

To provide a survey here, even the most summary, of the whole range of opinions on the resurrection, its kinds, the moment, the situation of the dead during the interval between death and resurrection, etc. in intertestamental apocalyptic, would clearly be impossible. The summary of the beliefs in the resurrection in ancient Judaism, published a few months ago by E. Puech covers 950 closely-printed pages, and there all the necessary information can be found.³¹ Here I will limit myself to citing three examples that illustrate the three different aspects of this belief in the resurrection, all of them in the perspective of this end of times: resurrection in order to take part in the messianic era, resurrection as individual punishment and resurrection in order to appear before the divine tribunal.

The first example is a Hebrew fragment, part of an apocalypse, known by the siglum 4Q521:

[for the heav]ens and the earth will listen to his messiah, [and all] that is in them will not turn away from the precepts of the holy ones. Be encouraged, you who are seeking the Lord in his service! *Blank*. Will you not, perhaps, encounter the Lord in it, all those who hope in their heart? For the Lord will observe the devout, and call the just by name, and over the poor his spirit will hover, and the faithful he will renew with his strength. For he will honour the devout upon the throne of eternal royalty, freeing prisoners, giving sight to the blind, straightening out the twisted. Ever shall I cling to those who hope. In his mercy he will judge, and from no-one shall the fruit [of] good [deeds] be delayed. And the Lord will perform marvellous acts such as have not existed, just as he sa[id], for he will heal the badly wounded, and will make the dead live, he will proclaim good

³¹ É. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien* (2 vols.; Études Bibliques Nouvelle série 21–22; Paris: Gabalda, 1993).

news to the meek, give lavishly [to the need]y, lead the exiled, and enrich the hungry. [...] and all [...] (4Q521 2 ii 1–13)³²

This text portrays the resurrection as one of the glorious acts that the Lord will perform during the messianic age. Apparently restricted to the just, and connected with the announcement of good news to the poor, resurrection here is one of various elements that characterize the kingdom of God at the end of time. The perspective is purely inner-worldly and is interwoven with references from Isaiah. This text is full of interesting elements that we cannot comment on here (from the spirit that *hovers* over the poor, a close parallel to Matt 11:3–5 which, due to the connection between the resurrection and the announcement of good news to the poor, seems to require literary dependence), but serves perfectly to illustrate the use of the resurrection as one of the essential elements of the Messianic age. The resurrection is not effected by the Messiah but by God himself, and its function is to allow the just to share in the Messianic age. In this sense, this text still remains in line with Old Testament, which regards people rather than the individual.

In the next example, from a composition called *Pseudo-Ezekiel* and known as 4Q385, the perspective is different, and resurrection is presented as a response to individual faithfulness:

[And I said: “YHWH,] I have seen many in Israel who have loved your name and have walked on the paths of [justice.] When will these things happen? And how will they be rewarded for their loyalty?” And YHWH said to me: “I will make the children of Israel see and they will know that I am YHWH.” *Blank.* [And he said:] “Son of man, prophesy over the bones and say: May a bone [connect] with its bone and a joint [with its joints.]” And so it happened. And he said a second time: “Prophesy, and sinews will grow on them and they will be covered with skin [all over.]” And so it happened. And again he said: “Prophesy over the four winds of the sky and the winds [of the sky] will blow [upon them and they will live.]” (4Q385 2 1–8)³³

Evidently, the author is using the vision of dry bones from Ezek 37:1–12 to answer the question that he poses in the first lines: How and when will those who have remained faithful to the divine covenant be rewarded?

³² Hebrew text in É. Puech, “Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521),” *RevQ* 15/60 (1992): 475–522; translation: *DSSST*, 394.

³³ Hebrew text in J. Strugnell and D. Dimant, “4QSecond Ezekiel (4Q385),” *RevQ* 13/49–52 (1988): 45–58; translation: *DSSST*, 286.

A comparison with the biblical text shows a series of slight modifications, and above all, the omission of the explanation that made sense of the original vision: God will breathe a new spirit into the exiles that will allow them to return to Israel. Not only has the author suppressed this element, but he uses the text of Ezekiel to give a direct answer to the problem of retribution. And the reply is clear: God will reward those who have been faithful to the covenant, by giving them a new life, resurrecting them. What in Ezekiel was a vision of national restoration is now used to affirm individual resurrection as a response to faithfulness to the covenant. In this case too the resurrection is situated at the end of time, as is clear in another fragment of the same manuscript, in which it states that, out of love for the chosen ones, the Lord “will shorten the days and the years” to allow the children of Israel to “inherit the land.” As in the previous example, resurrection is limited to the just, and the perspective is inner-worldly.³⁴

In the examples of the third category, resurrection in order to appear before divine judgment, we already find a universal resurrection, of the just and of sinners, and a resurrection that takes place as a preliminary to the final judgment that inaugurates meta-history.

And it will happen after these things when the time of the appearance of the Anointed One has been fulfilled and he returns with glory, that then all who sleep in hope of him will rise. And it will happen at that time that those treasures will be opened in which the number of the souls of the righteous were kept; and they will go out and the multitude of the souls will appear together, in one assemblage, of one mind. And the first ones will enjoy themselves and the last ones will not be sad. For they know that the time has come of which it is said that it is the end of times. But the souls of the wicked will the more waste away when they see all these things. For they know that their torment has come, and that their perditions have arrived. (*2 Bar*: 30)

—And after seven days the world, which is not yet awake, shall be roused, and that which is corruptible shall perish. And the earth shall give back those who are asleep in it, and the dust those who rest in it; and the treasures shall give up the souls which have been committed to them. And the Most High shall be revealed upon the seat of judgment, and compassion shall pass away, mercy shall be made distant, and patience shall be withdrawn; but only judgment shall remain, truth shall stand, and faithfulness shall grow strong. And recompense shall follow, and the reward shall be

³⁴ On this text see my “Tradiciones apocalípticas en Qumrán: 4QSecond Ezekiel,” in *Bibliche und Judaistische Studien. Festschrift für Paolo Sacchi* (ed. A. Vivian; *Judentum und Umwelt* 29; Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1990), 303–21.

manifested, righteous deeds shall awake and unrighteous deeds shall not sleep. Then the pit of torment shall appear, and opposite it shall be the place of rest; and the furnace of Gehenna shall be disclosed, and opposite it the paradise of delight. Then the Most High shall say to the nations that have been raised, Look and understand whom you have denied, whom you have not served, whose commands you have despised! Look opposite you: here are delight and rest, and there are fire and torments! Thus he will speak to them on the day of judgment. (*4 Ezra* 7:31–38)³⁵

It is evident that for the authors of the apocalypses, the final period of history, the period that precedes the end, the present in which they find themselves and to which they address their writings in their attempt to lift the veil of mystery over the future, takes on special importance. Their historical panoramas, as in Daniel or in the *Animal Apocalypse*, become more detailed the closer they are to the author's present. But within pre-Christian Judaism, only in the writings from Qumran do we find a special clarification of this last period of history that precedes the end. And it is important to spend a little time on it since it can help us understand later Christian developments.

5. FUTURE SALVATION AS PRESENT REALITY

In Qumran, the final period of history is called *אֲדָרִית הַיָּמִים*, an expression that occurs over thirty times in the non-biblical texts and the exact meaning of which it is not always easy to determine, although it can be translated as “the final days” or “the last days.” It is a period of indeterminate length, co-extensive with the existence of the community, which throughout its history considers itself as living in this period, in “the final times.”³⁶

In some texts, the “last days” are portrayed as the actual present in which the texts are composed, the author's today. Thus, the end of the famous “Halakhic Letter,” a document from the earliest period of the community, says:

And it is written in the book of Moses and in the words of the prophets that blessings and curses will come upon you [...] like the blessings and curses which came upon him in the days of Solomon the son of David

³⁵ Translation by Stone, *Fourth Ezra. A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra*, 106, 163.

³⁶ The most recent study on this topic is A. Steudel, “אֲדָרִית הַיָּמִים in the Texts from Qumran,” *RevQ* 16/62 (1993): 225–46.

and also the curses which came upon him from the days of Jeroboam son of Nebat right up to the capture of Jerusalem and of Zedekiah, king of Judah [...] and we are aware that part of the blessings and curses have occurred that are written in the book of Moses. And this is the end of days. (*4QMMT C 17–21*)³⁷

However, other texts speak of “the final days” of the present time of the community as referring to events that have happened in which it is already the past from the author’s viewpoint but also as belonging to this final period of history, since these events are connected with the history of the community. Thus the references to the events of the earliest history of the community, such as the persecution of the Teacher of Righteousness by the Wicked Priest, or all the allusions in the *pesharim* that were already history when these biblical interpretations were being drawn up, are presented to us as predicted and realised in the same “last days.”

Finally, other texts set events that have not yet happened in these same “last days,” the coming of which continues to be expected, even though they form part of these same last days, such as the coming of the Messiah within the community “in the last days” or the eschatological war that will bring in final salvation in the same “last days.”

Thus it is clearly a limited time, a final period of history that has already begun, that is elapsing and whose end will give way to the time of salvation. Evidently, this present time is not a neutral time but a period of purification, like the moment when metals are smelted in a crucible. To use the expression of the texts, it is “the period of testing”: “The end of time is the period of testing,” as the exegetical *Catena 4Q177* tells us literally.

However, since it is a limited time, it would be very strange that the members of the community would not have tried to calculate its duration, to foresee the moment of its end, preparing themselves for the transition from the test to the salvation hoped for so much. And in fact, in these texts we find traces of these calculations. No text tells us clearly at what precise moment this final period of history has begun, nor the exact moment when it would give way to lasting salvation. But the traces of these calculations of the end are clearly discernible in the following text, *Pesher Habakkuk VII*:

³⁷ Translation: *DSSS*, 79.

And God told Habakkuk to write what was going to happen to the last generation, but he did not let him know the end of the age. And as for what he says: "So that the one who reads it may run." Its interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God has disclosed all the mysteries of the words of his servants, the prophets. "For the vision has an appointed time, it will have an end and will not fail." Its interpretation: the final age will be extended and go beyond all that the prophets say, because the mysteries of God are wonderful. "Though it may delay, wait for it; it definitely has to come and will not delay." Its interpretation concerns the men of truth, those who observe the Law, whose hands will not desert the service of truth when the final age is extended beyond them, because all the ages of God will come at the right time, as he established for them in the mysteries of his prudence. (1QpHab VII 1–14)³⁸

In spite of being concise, this text tells us many things. That the true meaning of the words of the prophet Habakkuk refers to this final period of history, the "last days" which are the present time for the community, although this meaning had not been perceived by the prophet himself. That this deeper meaning, which for the prophet was cloaked in mystery, is known by the community thanks to the revelation that the Teacher of Righteousness received and to whom this mystery has been revealed. That this revelation to the Teacher of Righteousness includes the fact that community is living in the "last times," but does not include the moment when this period will give way to final salvation. That this end forms part of the divine mystery, a mystery that includes the prolongation of hope as part of a marvellous plan. That the end, in any case, will arrive and it will arrive at the moment that God has decreed. That what matters for the members of the community is not to forsake the service of truth during this prolongation, to keep hope alive and take part actively through faithfulness to the Law in this arrival of the end.

What the text does not tell us, although it does clearly suggest it, is that the community had calculated the duration of this final period of history, and that these calculations had not been completed at the time this commentary was written. The text shows us that the community has found a way of explaining the delay and of continuing to live in the hope of an end that does not arrive, that is delayed beyond what is expected, without this end disappearing from the horizon that conditions the life of the community. The text reaffirms hope beyond disappointment.

³⁸ Hebrew text in M. Burrows (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery I* (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950); translation: *DSS*, 200.

It is not possible to know whether the calculation of the end comes from the Teacher of Righteousness himself, from whom certainly came the intuition that the present of the community is the “end of time.” One of the few texts that may allude to these calculations places the moment of the end precisely in connection with the death of the Teacher of Righteousness. The second copy from the Genizah of the *Damascus Document* tells us that those members who have not remained faithful

shall not be counted in the assembly of the people and shall not be inscribed in their lists from the day of the session (of the death) of the unique Teacher until there arises the Messiah of Aaron and Israel. (CD XIX 35–XX 1)

and a little further on adds:

And from the day of the gathering in of the unique Teacher until the destruction of all the men of war who turned back with the man of lies, there shall be about forty years. (CD XX 13–15)

This could indicate to us that this end was expected about forty years after the death of the Teacher of Righteousness, a period that had already passed when the *Peshar Habakkuk* was being written, which provides a stable solution to the delay of the end. The acute awareness by the community of living in the time of the end, in these final times that have already begun but whose consummation is still awaited, is what allowed the community to effect the most surprising theological innovations that we find in their writings. It is what allowed them to substitute the sacrificial cult of the profaned temple, in the hope of a final restoration, with “the offering of lips,” replacing bloody sacrifices with prayer. It is what allowed them to consider their liturgy as a communion with the angelic liturgy. It is what made them see that the angels are present in their midst, and therefore to demand from all their members a level of angelic purity. It is what allowed them to describe the eschatological banquet, in which the Messiah would take part, as a mirror of the daily community meal. In short, it is what explains the severity of their practices and their zeal in not admitting any compromise at all.

However, it is now time to end this account, no doubt too long. By way of summary I would say that to the question “The end of the world or the transformation of history?,” intertestamental apocalyptic literature does not give us an unequivocal answer, but it does provide a large variety of partial answers, as diverse as the writings that comprise this

literary corpus. However, the elements noted—the division of history into periods, the kingdom of God with or without a messiah, the final conflagration and transformation of the world, life beyond the end and future salvation as a present reality—help us to understand the type of answer that the New Testament will give to this question.

CHAPTER TEN

APOCALYPTICISM IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

If “apocalypticism” is broadly defined (as it is in this Encyclopedia) as “the belief that God has revealed the imminent conclusion of the ongoing struggle between good and evil throughout history,” there can be no doubt that the Qumran community was an “apocalyptic” community. The writings that most probably can be considered a product of the Qumran community and which better represent its thought show clear indications that the authors believe that their own lives and the life of the community were part of the ongoing struggle between good and evil, that God had revealed to them the approaching end of the struggle, that they were preparing themselves for an active participation in the final climax, and even that they were already living somehow in the final phase.

Since some of the elements that show the apocalypticism of the Scrolls, such as the participation in the final struggle of several messianic figures have been dealt with in other articles in this volume, I will present a summary of the other most relevant topics: the origin of evil; the periods of history and expectation of the end; the communion with the heavenly world; and the eschatological war.

At the outset, it seems necessary to offer a short *status quaestionis* with reference to the literature on the topic listed at the end of this article.

The hard questions posed by Klaus Koch¹ definitively ended the optimism of the previous decade of research, which saw in the Dead Sea Scrolls the solution to all the problems that had vexed scholarship in the field of apocalypticism. The announcement that the most characteristic apocalypses, such as *Enoch* or *Daniel*, were abundantly represented in the new finds, the discovery that other compositions

¹ K. Koch, *The Rediscovery of Apocalyptic: a polemical work on a neglected area of biblical studies and its damaging effects on theology and philosophy* (transl. M. Kohl; Naperville: Allenson/London: S.C.M., 1972). German original: *Ratlos vor der Apokalyptik. Eine Streitschrift über ein vernachlässigtes Gebiet der Bibelwissenschaft, und die schädlichen Auswirkungen auf Theologie und Philosophie* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1970). The book gives a critical analysis of the problems posed by the indiscriminate use of the term “apocalyptic.”

previously unknown had characteristics similar to these apocalypses and could therefore be legitimately considered new apocalypses, the awareness that the most typical sectarian writings had a remarkable eschatological dimension and showed a very radical dualistic thinking, and above all the fact that the group from which the manuscripts were supposed to have come was a secluded community, providing for the first time a model for the sociological background of the apocalypses all helped to create a *pan-Qumranism* in the investigation of apocalypticism. But after many years of intensive research, this optimism proved to be illgrounded, and the contribution of Hartmut Stegemann to the Uppsala Colloquium in 1979 concluded that the expected master key to unlock the secrets of apocalypticism had not been found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The Qumran manuscripts had not provided the solutions hoped for; the apocalyptic elements to be found within the Scrolls were scanty, and they could be foreign bodies, to which it is impossible to assign any central position in the life or organization of the Qumran group.² At the same time, there was a growing awareness of the inadequacy of the traditional way of defining apocalypticism by a melange of literary and thematic elements, or by a mixing of form and content. On the one hand, a large number of elements used to characterize apocalyptic were to be found in many compositions that no one would dream of defining as apocalypses, and, on the other hand, many compositions recognized as apocalypses were lacking elements that were thought to be characteristic of apocalypticism. The intensive efforts of the Society of Biblical Literature group on the genre apocalypse, which culminated with the publication of *Semeia* 14, brought the necessary refinement of the terminology used to chart the problem and provided a definition of apocalypse commonly accepted today.³ The definition of *Semeia* 14 and its distinction of two basic types of apocalypses—the *historical* and the *heavenly ascent* types—proved very fruitful and paved the way for the developments of the next decade. In these years we saw the development of the *syntagmatic* or *text-linguistic* analysis of several apocalypses as well as the *sociological approach* to apocalypticism (in which the insights gained by the study of millenarian movements through history

² H. Stegemann, "Die Bedeutung der Qumranfunde für die Erforschung der Apokalyphtik," in *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East* (ed. D. Hellholm; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 495–530.

³ J.J. Collins (ed.), *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (*Semeia* 14; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979).

[mediaeval millenarianism, Puritan groups in England in the sixteenth century, etc.], or by means of anthropological study of contemporary sectarian apocalyptic movements or groups [fringe groups in the United States, for example] were applied to the study of apocalypticism, but also the detailed study of single apocalypses)⁴ and a systematic mapping of the developments of apocalypticism in a historical perspective, both in a synchronic⁵ and in a diachronic way.⁶ As a result, we can observe a decline in the importance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for understanding the phenomenon of apocalypticism, and a more differentiated way of understanding the individual apocalypses and the phenomenon of apocalypticism. Nonetheless, the contribution of the Scrolls to this field of study remains considerable.

As I formulated the issue in the introduction to my book *Qumran and Apocalyptic*:

The study of the Qumran manuscripts has completely transformed the way in which we nowadays understand the most ancient apocalypses, those composed within the Enochic tradition, has had a profound effect on the study of the origins and the development of the apocalypse of Daniel and has indicated a number of new factors demonstrating the variety and the ideological richness of the apocalypses written within, or transmitted by, the Qumran community itself.⁷

I think this is still a fair, and rather non-polemical, representation of the situation. Everybody agrees now on the characteristics of the literary genre apocalypse and its basic division of “cosmic” and “historical” apocalypses. Everybody agrees also that in the definition of the literary genre apocalypse the function of the genre (absent in the definition of *Semeia* 14) should be included in one way or another. And most tend to agree that this function could be defined as was done in *Semeia* 36: an apocalypse is “intended to interpret present earthly circumstances in the light of the supernatural world and of the future, and to influence both the understanding and the behaviour of the audience by means of divine authority.” This has resulted in a better understanding of the best

⁴ Such as J.C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1984) and M.E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990).

⁵ J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination* (New York: Crossroad, 1984; 2nd ed; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

⁶ P. Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996). Italian original, *L'Apocalittica Giudaica e la sua Storia* (Brescia: Paideia, 1990).

⁷ F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic* (STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992), xi.

representatives of both basic types: the books of Enoch and the book of Daniel. This would also, in my opinion, allow some of the compositions from Qumran lately published to be categorized as apocalypses despite their fragmentary condition.

Everybody also agrees that apocalypticism cannot be reduced to the literary genre apocalypse. The number, certainly limited, of apocalypses found at Qumran (or the even smaller number of apocalypses that can be attributed to the activity of the group)⁸ do not need to limit us in the study of the apocalypticism of the Scrolls. The major sectarian scrolls, which are certainly not apocalypses, provide us in spite of their generic differences with a worldview similar to the worldview we find in the apocalypses, a worldview that can be considered representative of the group's way of thinking. Since this worldview has been clearly influenced by ideas characteristic of well-known apocalypses, mainly *Enoch* and Daniel, it can be described as "apocalyptic." In the words of John J. Collins:

A movement or community might also be apocalyptic if it were shaped to a significant degree by a specific apocalyptic tradition, or if its worldview could be shown to be similar to that of the apocalypses in a distinctive way. The Essene movement and Qumran Community would seem to qualify on both counts.⁹

Everybody also agrees that the worldview we find in the Scrolls presents also obvious differences from the ideas of these apocalypses. But there are several ways to interpret these differences, and so scholars are divided.

The basic question seems to be: Are the different solutions given to the same problem in Qumran and in some apocalyptic writings disagreement within a common framework in the interpretation of the same original myth (as seems to be the case between the *Book of Watchers* and the *Epistle of Enoch*, for example, or between *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*), or are they due to the use of different premises, referring to different myths? Should we see the relationship as one of continuity within a certain tradition or rather of discontinuity and derivation from different traditions?

⁸ D. Dimant, "Apocalyptic Texts at Qumran," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 175–91.

⁹ J.J. Collins, *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (JSJSup 54; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 37.

For Paolo Sacchi, the differences remain within the same basic framework and we can speak thus of a continuity within the tradition (Sacchi 1996). For Collins, they indicate derivation from a different tradition. In the words of Collins: "I agree with Sacchi, against Carmignac and Stegemann, that apocalypticism can not be reduced to a literary genre... I do not agree, however, that apocalypticism can be reduced to a single stream of tradition, or to a single socially continuous movement."¹⁰

It is usually assumed that the circles responsible for the different Enochic compositions formed a single movement or belonged to a single tradition in spite of the differences, implying something more than a common worldview. After all, we usually speak of a "prophetic tradition" and of "a wisdom tradition," and we imply by this something more than a common worldview, in spite of our ignorance of the concrete sociological basis for these "prophetic" and "sapiential" traditions. In this way it does indeed seem appropriate to speak of an "Enochic tradition" even if the sociological basis remains rather vague. And because the Enoch books are apocalypses, it seems also appropriate to speak of an "(Enochic) apocalyptic tradition."¹¹ By the same token it would be equally legitimate to speak of a "(Qumranic) apocalyptic tradition," and it would be equally legitimate to investigate the relationships (generic or other) between the several apocalyptic traditions.

In my opinion, the *status quaestionis* boils down to the following: Is apocalypticism simply a worldview (an umbrella term for different apocalyptic traditions), or it is something more? Can the cluster of ideas we find in the Qumran writings be attributed to an apocalyptic tradition? As we shall see in the following summaries, the cluster of ideas appearing in the sectarian scrolls is something more than an umbrella term; it represents a genuine apocalyptic tradition, connected with, but different from, other apocalyptic traditions.

1. THE ORIGIN OF EVIL AND THE DUALISTIC THOUGHT OF THE SECT

The core of the oldest part (the *Book of the Watchers*) of the oldest apocalypse (*I Enoch*) is dedicated to giving an explanation of the origin of evil in the world. And the explanation given to this topic, using the old myth of the "rebellion in heaven," is that evil was not introduced into

¹⁰ Collins, *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*, 298.

¹¹ VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*.

the world by men, but is the result of the sin of the Watchers, the fallen angels led by Asael and Shemihazah, who consorted with women and taught them heavenly secrets. The fallen angels introduce a disruption in the harmonic order of nature: “The whole earth has been devastated by the works of the teaching of Asael; record against him all sins” (*1 En.* 10:7). Sin originates in heaven not in earth, and it is introduced on earth by the action of angelic beings. Within the Enoch tradition itself, we will find a direct refutation of the conclusion of the *Book of the Watchers* about the heavenly origin of evil. In the last composition incorporated into the Enochic collection, the *Epistle of Enoch*, we can read (in Ethiopic, the Greek version is somewhat different): “I swear to you, sinners, that as a mountain has not, and will not, become a slave, nor a hill a woman’s maid, so sin was not sent to the earth, but man of himself created it” (98:4). It is impossible not to conclude that the author of the *Epistle* is completely turning around the conclusion of the *Book of the Watchers* in order to arrive at the opposite conclusion. In spite of this direct rebuttal, both compositions, the *Book of the Watchers* and the *Epistle of Enoch*, seem to have originated within the same ideological tradition (which some people call the Enoch school, much in the same way others talk about a Johannine school); they were in any case considered compatible enough not only to fraternize in the same shelves of a library but to be included as part of the same book, our *1 Enoch*.

I thus conclude that it was perfectly possible within one and the same tradition to hold divergent (and even opposite) views on some central theological problem; and that we cannot expect dependence to be expressed only as agreement.

We do not know precise antecedents for the idea put forth by the author of the *Book of the Watchers*. In the short form in which we find the myth in Gen 6 it is not put to use to explain the origin of evil. Nor is it used in this way by the book of *Jubilees*, which is dependent on the *Book of the Watchers* in many respects, but does not accept the idea that evil comes into the earth through angelic mediation and gives a different explanation of the origin of evil. For *Jubilees*, sin begins in the earth with the fall of Adam, long before the fall of the angels. *Jubilees*, on the other hand, presents the fallen angels as an army, led by Mastema, who is described as a prince, and who obtains from God that a tenth of the fallen spirits will not be directly destroyed but will be left under his command in order to harass, mislead, and destroy humanity. The idea that evil originates in heaven is also dismissed in the wisdom tradition as represented by Sir 15:11: “Do not say, ‘It was the Lord’s

doing that I fell away.’” But Sirach does not attribute evil either to the sin of Adam, which he never mentions (some manuscripts even change the famous reference to the sin of Eve in Sir 25:24, attributing it to the “enemy”). Sirach introduces the idea of the “inclination” (the *yēšer*): “God created man in the beginning and placed him in the hand of his inclination” (15:14). But he also insists that everything is in the hands of God: “In the fullness of his knowledge the Lord distinguished them and appointed their different ways. Some he blessed and exalted, and some he made holy and brought near to himself; but some he cursed and brought low, and turned out of their places” (33:11–12). Most of the interpreters rightly insist that the *yēšer* in Sirach is very different from the *yēšer* as it will be understood in *4 Ezra* (the *cor malignum*) and especially in the rabbinic tradition, where it is even identified with Satan. Sirach does not exploit the potentiality of the *yēšer*, and at the end, he is unable to resolve the tension created by his adherence to the traditional biblical conception, which preserves free will and the equally biblical conception that underlines God’s omnipotence. As Collins says: “Sirach’s overall position remains ambiguous,”¹² and he limited himself to observing the duality of evil and good: “As evil contrasts with good, and death with life, so are sinners in contrast with the just” (33:14).

It is my contention that all these strands of thought are interwoven in the thought on the origin of evil that we find in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and that all of them contribute in some way to shape the new solution they gave to the problem. It is clear that the Scrolls know the myth as it is presented in the *Book of the Watchers*. Not only have several copies of the composition appeared in Cave 4, but also the story itself is used in some other Qumran compositions such as 4Q180, a *pesher* on the periods, in which Asael plays a leading role. Even more significantly, the *Damascus Document* (CD) uses the story of the Watchers as the first example in a review of human unfaithfulness to the will of God (CD II 15–16). Similarly, *Jubilees* has had a deep influence in the thought of the community, which sees the angelic forces as organized armies under an angelic leader, and which even knows Mastema as one of the names used for this leader. Copies of *Jubilees*, of course, are among the compositions best represented in their library, as are (to a lesser extent) copies of Ben Sira. No wonder then that the *yēšer* of the wisdom tradition has also left its traces within the Dead Sea Scrolls. As expected, its presence

¹² Collins, *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*, 370.

is more notorious in the wisdom texts, such as *4QInstruction*, where we find expressions such as: “Do not be deluded with the thought of an evil inclination” (4Q417 2 ii 12), but it is also used in more clearly sectarian compositions such as CD II 15–16: “so that you can walk perfectly on all his paths and not follow after the thoughts of a guilty inclination.”

However, the most characteristic explanation of the origin of evil, the one we find in the *Treatise of the Two Spirits*, does not limit itself to incorporating and blending together these influences but offers us an original solution to the problem. This treatise, embodied in the *Community Rule* (1QS III 13–IV 26),¹³ is at the same time the most systematic exposition of the dualistic thinking of the community.

The treatise begins with a solemn introduction (III 13–15), followed by the basic principle:

From the God of knowledge stems all there is and all there shall be. Before they existed he made all their plans, and when they come into being they will execute all their works in compliance with his instructions, according to his glorious design without altering anything (III 15–16)

From this deterministic formulation the author deduces the basic dualistic structure of humankind, expressed with the traditional symbols of light and darkness: “He created man to rule the world and placed within him two spirits so that he would walk with them until the moment of his visitation: they are the spirits of truth and of deceit” (III 17–19). The author develops in detail his dualistic conception, applying it not only to each individual but to all humanity, which he describes as divided into two camps (two dominions), led respectively by the Prince of Light and the Angel of Darkness: “And in the hand of the Prince of Light is dominion over all the sons of justice; they walk in the paths of light. And in the hand of the Angel of Darkness is total dominion over the sons of deceit; they walk in the path of darkness” (III 20–21). He even extends this dualistic division explicitly to the angelic world, which is divided, as are humanity and each individual, in two camps: “He created the spirits of light and of darkness and on them established all his deeds, and on their paths all his labours. God loved one of them for all eternal ages and in all his deeds he takes pleasure for ever; of the other one he detests his advice and hates all his paths forever” (III 25–IV 1). The treatise goes further, describing the characteristic deeds that result

¹³ All translations from the Dead Sea Scrolls are taken from F. García Martínez, *DSSS*.

from the dominion of each one of the two angelic hosts, the conflicting human conduct that results from the influence of the opposing spirits, and the contrasting retribution of each person according to their share of light and darkness.

Not only the origin of sin is explained by the treatise in this way. The sin of each individual also finds an explanation in this dualistic context. Human life is seen as a battle between the forces of light and darkness, a violent conflict in which there is little left to human initiative:

Until now the spirits of truth and of injustice feud in the heart of man and they walk in wisdom or in folly. In agreement with man's birthright in justice and in truth, so he abhors injustice; and according to his share in the lot of injustice he acts irreverently in it and so abhors the truth. For God has sorted them into equal parts until the appointed end and the new creation. (IV 24–25)

A person can, of course, sin; even the righteous do. But these sins are explained as caused by the influence of spirits of darkness:

Due to the Angel of Darkness all the sons of justice stray, and all their sins, their iniquities, their failings and their mutinous deeds are under his dominion in compliance with the mysteries of God, until his moment, and all their punishments and their period of grief are caused by the dominion of his enmity; and all the spirits of their lot cause the sons of light to fall. (III 21–24)

At the end, at the time of God's visitation, however, sin will disappear and justice will triumph:

God, in the mysteries of his knowledge and in the wisdom of his glory, has determined an end to the existence of deceit and on the occasion of his visitation he will obliterate it forever. Then truth shall rise up forever in the world which has been denied in paths of wickedness during the dominion of deceit until the time appointed for judgment. Then God will refine, with his truth, all man's deeds, and will purify for himself the configuration of man, ripping out all spirit of deceit from the innermost part of his flesh, and cleansing him with the spirit of holiness from every irreverent deed. He will sprinkle over him the spirit of truth like lustral water (in order to cleanse him) from all the abhorrences of deceit and from the defilement of the unclean spirit. In this way the upright will understand knowledge of the Most High, and the wisdom of the sons of heaven will teach those of perfect behaviour. For these are those selected by God for an everlasting covenant and to them shall belong the glory of Adam. (IV 18–23)

This eschatological perspective is an essential part of the treatise and puts in perspective the solution to the problem of evil given by its author.

For him, as for the *Book of the Watchers*, evil clearly has its origins not on earth but in heaven. But the author the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* is apparently not satisfied with the solution given in the *Book of the Watchers*; after all, if the Watchers are the origin of evil on earth, their own capability of doing evil also needs to be explained. The solution given to the problem by the author of the *Treatise* is much more radical than the one given in the *Book of the Watchers*. For him there is no rebellion in heaven. The Watchers are part and stock of the evil spirits, the army of the Prince of Darkness; they are created as evil spirits directly by God. Evil comes thus from heaven, and directly from God. The author also has used the conception of the angelical army as represented in *Jubilees*, and has fully developed the deterministic and dualistic implications of the *yēšer* of the wisdom tradition. But its thought has a radicality that cannot be explained only by these influences. It was recognized almost as soon as the scroll was published that the thought of the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* is most akin to the myth of Persian dualism with its twin spirits, the twin sons of the supreme God, one identified as good and the other as evil from the beginning, and one associated with light and the other with darkness. This myth is already present in the oldest part of the Avesta, the *Gathas*, generally considered to be the work of Zoroaster. The dualism of the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* does not imply the initial option of humans for one or the other spirit in the manner of the Persian myth, and, even more importantly, the *Treatise* emphatically views the two spirits as created by God and completely subordinate to him. It is thus far removed from the later Persian thought that considers evil to be primordial. Yet it seems clear that the thought of the author of the Qumran text is deeply indebted to some form of Zoroastrian thought and has used it in order to radicalize the ideas he has received from the apocalyptic and sapiential traditions.

It is true that the Avesta is known to us in a collection from the Sasanian period, but the centrality of dualism in Zoroastrian thought is already attested by Plutarch (*On Isis and Osiris*), and, although we do not know the exact channels of transmission, the possibility of its influence in a Jewish context poses no special problem during the Hellenistic period.

Although the explanation of the origin of evil and the expression of dualistic thought in the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* is perhaps not the most widespread idea in the Dead Sea Scrolls, we find it attested in enough different writings that we may consider it one of the trademarks

of the thought of the Qumran community. I have already quoted a sentence of the *Damascus Document* in which the human *yēser* is qualified as “guilty.” One of the paraenetic sections of the same document, CD II 2–13, shows not only a very close verbal parallel to the *Treatise of the Two Spirits*, but the same emphatic deterministic outlook. Another section, CD IV 11–18, describes Israel under the dominion of Belial and the people falling in his three nets, and CD V 18–19 offers a perfect example of dualistic thinking presenting Moses and Aaron raised up by the Prince of Light and Jannes and his brother Jambres by the hand of Belial. The end of the original composition (as shown by 4Q266 11) contains a ceremony of expulsion from the assembly which exactly parallels the ceremony of entry into the covenant of 1QS I–II and has the same general dualistic overtone.

Another composition closely related to the worldview of the *Treatise* is 4QAmram, an Aramaic composition recovered in five copies, all very poorly preserved. In it, Amram tells his sons about a vision he has had in which two angelic figures who “control all *the sons* of Adam” quarrel over him. One of them “rules over darkness”; the other “rules over all what is bright.” Each figure has apparently three names, although the only name preserved is Melchireša^ϕ. The assumed counterpart, Melchizedek, is the central figure of another composition from Cave 11, where he is the agent of the eschatological judgment and saves “the men of his lot,” freeing them from the hand of Belial and the spirits of his lot. Although visions and revelations are involved, the literary genre of the composition is more that of testament than apocalypse. The Qumranic origins of 4QAmram have been disputed because it is in Aramaic, but the fact that the same cluster of ideas and expressions is to be found in a series of liturgical texts (4Q280–4Q287) which explicitly mention the Council of the *yahad* and abound in curses against Melchireša^ϕ, Belial, and other angelic figures seems to me to place the composition within the corpus of sectarian writings.

The deterministic view of the *Treatise* appears also in a good part of the *Hodayot*, especially in the so-called *Hymns of the Teacher*, to the point that some people have speculated that both compositions were penned by the same author, the Teacher of Righteousness. The dualistic understanding of the world is equally obvious in the *War Scroll*. There it is not related to a description of human nature but concerns the development of human history and its final denouement in the eschatological war.

Summary

Summarizing the evidence on this point, I think we can conclude that the Dead Sea sect inherited from the Enochic tradition a view of the origin of evil that it further developed using elements coming from other traditions (like the Sapiential tradition and Zoroastrianism) so as to arrive at a full dualistic and deterministic view of the world.

2. THE PERIODS OF HISTORY AND THE EXPECTATION OF THE END

One of the most characteristic features of the “historical” apocalypses is the division of history into periods and the expectation that God will intervene in the last of these periods in order to bring an end to evil in the world. Introducing these periods into history allows the apocalypses the possibility to integrate the past and the present reality with the future that the author intends to “reveal” and with the expected intervention of God, which will bring the end of history. The systems used to divide history into periods, bringing in this way some order into the chaos, are based on the numbers 4, 7, 10, 49 (7×7), 70, and even 490 (70×7 or 10×49). We find different ways of indicating this division of history into periods in different apocalypses, or even within the same composition. Daniel, for example, uses the schema of four successive kingdoms but also, and most characteristically, the schema of seventy weeks (of years), transforming the seventy years of Jeremiah into 490 years, which equals ten jubilees and can be correlated with the use of the number 10 in other apocalyptic compositions.

Within the different components of *1 Enoch*, we find different ways to express the division of history into periods. In the *Book of the Watchers* there is an allusion to a division of seventy periods before the end: “Bind them (the Watchers) for seventy generations under the hills of the earth until the day of their judgment and of their consummation, until the judgment which is for all eternity is accomplished” (10:12). The so-called *Apocalypse of Weeks*, which presents the protagonists in the history of Israel as various animals, also introduces periods into history; seventy shepherds pasture the sheep, each at his own time (89:59), and these seventy shepherds are divided into four unequal groups which pasture the sheep during four periods of different length (corresponding to the four kingdoms of Daniel). At the end of these periods the judgment takes place, the Messiah comes, and all the sheep become white bulls. But the most interesting view of the division of history is the one found in the

so-called *Apocalypse of Weeks*, embedded in the *Epistle of Enoch* and now restored to its original order (disturbed in the Ethiopic translation) with the help of the Aramaic fragments from Qumran. As in Daniel, history is here divided into “weeks,” presumably weeks of years, but the schema is based on the number 10, or, better said, on a combination of 7 and 10. The author compresses history from the birth of Enoch to his own days in seven weeks, and places himself obviously at the end of the seventh week, a week in which an apostate generation has arisen and at the end of which “the chosen righteous from the eternal plant of righteousness will be chosen [or “rewarded” according to other Ethiopic manuscripts], to whom will be given sevenfold teaching concerning his whole creation” (93:10). He obviously belonged to the chosen group to which he addresses his composition. Similarly, the author of Daniel belonged to the *maskilim*, and the author of the *Apocalypse of Weeks* to the *hasidim*. The great originality of the *Apocalypse of Weeks* lies in the fact that history does not end with this week. The Apocalypse goes on to reveal what will happen in the following weeks, introducing the organizing principle also in the future, and unfolding the progressive development of meta-history: in the eighth week a sword will be given to the righteous, who execute judgment on the sinners, and at its end “a house will be built for the great king in glory forever” (91:12–13); in the ninth week “the judgment of the righteous will be revealed to the whole world, all the deeds from the impious will vanish from the whole earth, and the world will be written down for destruction” (91:14); in the tenth week (in its seventh part) there will be apparently the judgment of the Watchers (the Ethiopic text is rather confused) and “the first heaven will vanish and pass away, and a new heaven will appear” (91:15–16). Then: “And after this there will be many weeks without number forever in goodness and in righteousness, and from then on sin will never again be mentioned” (91:17). The author of the *Apocalypse of Weeks* periodises not only history but also meta-history; the “end” is for him not one event, but rather the unfolding of a process in which several moments can be discerned.

In the Dead Sea Scrolls we find attested almost all the models used in the apocalyptic writings to periodise history, and also a conception of the “end” of history as an unfolding process in which several moments can be discerned.

A composition in Aramaic, preserved in two copies, 4Q552 and 4Q553, contained apparently a division of history following the model of the four kingdoms of Daniel; but the text is so badly preserved that we can say almost nothing. There is at least one vision and there is question

of an interpretation. There is a king and there are trees that are able to talk and answer questions; one of the trees gives his own name as Babel, and of him it is said that he rules over Persia. This is almost all that can be gathered from the surviving fragments, but because it is also said that these trees are four, we can assume the author was following the well-known model of the four kingdoms.

Another very fragmentary text contained a commentary expressly dedicated to the division of history into periods that comprise the diverse phases of human history, which have been preordained by God and engraved in the heavenly tablets (4Q180–181). It begins: “Interpretation concerning the ages which God has made.” This composition, certainly authored within the Qumran community and marked by the strongly deterministic outlook of the *Treatise of the Two Spirits*, could have provided us with a complete view of the problem within the community, but unfortunately it has also been badly preserved. Even combining the material of the two manuscripts (which are not necessarily part of the same composition) only part of the assertions concerning the first period (the ten generations from Noah to Abraham) can be recovered: the first is characterized by the sin of the fallen angels; the last by the sin of Sodom and Gomorrah. It is not clear how many periods were reckoned, but one of the fragments used the expression “in the seventieth week,” apparently implying that a system of subdivisions was worked out inside the main divisions.

Another composition (4Q390) uses a system of jubilees to offer a review of the history of Israel, similar to the historical reviews of the apocalypses and of the beginning of the *Damascus Document*, but put into the mouth of God: “And when this generation passes, in the seventh jubilee of the devastation of the land, they will forget the law, the festival, the sabbath and the covenant, and they will disobey everything and do what is evil in my eyes” (4Q390 1 6–9). The author also uses other units to mark the divisions: a week of years (“and there will come the dominion of Belial upon them to deliver them up to the sword for a week of years” (4Q390 2 i 3–4), and a period of seventy years: “and they will begin to argue with one another for seventy years, from the day on which they break this vow and the covenant. And I shall deliver them to the hands of the angels of destruction and they will rule over them” (4Q390 2 i 6–7). Curiously enough, all the periods preserved in this document are characterized by a negative connotation: infidelity to the covenant and all sorts of transgressions, and especially the dominion of

Belial and the “angels of destruction,” a clear allusion to the Mastema of the book of *Jubilees*.

More clear, although also fragmentary, is the system we find in 11QMelchizedek, a thematic *peshet* that interprets Lev 25 (the jubilee year), Deut 15 (the year of release), and Isa 52 and 61 (which proclaim the liberation of the prisoners), applying these (and other biblical texts) to the eschatological period, the “last days.” In this text, which knows Daniel and refers explicitly to it, history is divided into ten jubilees. The preserved part of the composition concentrates on the last of these ten jubilees: “This will happen in the first week of the jubilee which follows the nine jubilees. And the Day of Atonement is the end of the tenth jubilee in which atonement will be made for all the sons of God and for the men of the lot of Melchizedek” (11Q13 II 6–8). The protagonist of the text is Melchizedek, who is presented as a heavenly figure. The remission of debts of the biblical text is interpreted as referring to the final liberation, which will occur during the Day of the Expiation. Melchizedek, the agent of this liberation, is presented as the eschatological judge mentioned in Ps 7:8–9 and Ps 82:1–2. He is also presented as the chief of the heavenly armies, the leader of the “sons of God,” who will destroy the armies of Belial, identifying his figure in terms of practical functions with the “Prince of Light” (a figure we find in 1QS III 20, CD V 8, and 1QM XIII 10) and with the angel Michael (a figure appearing in 1QM XVII 6–7). The victory of Melchizedek against Belial and the spirits of his lot will usher in an era of salvation, which is described in the words of Isa 9.

In this text we have encountered the most usual expression within the Dead Sea Scrolls to indicate the period of the end, the phrase $\text{אֲהַרְיָהּ הַיָּמִים}$. The expression is well attested (in Hebrew and once in Aramaic) within the Hebrew Bible. The phrase occurs more than thirty times in the non-biblical scrolls and is especially frequent in exegetical compositions. The phrase originally meant “in the course of time, in future days,” and this (non-eschatological) meaning seems to be best suited to many of the biblical occurrences of the expression, although its use in Isa 2, Mic 4, Ezek 38, and Dan 2 and 10 may have a more specifically eschatological meaning.

In Qumran this is certainly the case, as the expression seems to be used to designate the final period of history. Nowhere are the precise limits of this period defined, but it is the last of the divinely preordained periods and the period in which the community exists. According to the latest

study published on אֶהְרִית הַיָּמִים in the Scrolls,¹⁴ the phrase may refer, depending of the context, to the past, to the present, or to the future from the point of view of the writer. The last days are thus a period already started but not yet completed, somehow coextensive with the present of the community. As CD IV 4 put it: “the sons of Zadok are the chosen of Israel, ‘those called by name’ who stood up at the end of days.”

The text most often quoted as asserting that the last days have already begun is 4QMMT, where the complete expression occurs twice in the hortatory section. But in the first occurrence (C 13–15) the expression may have a meaning more akin to the biblical usage, and the second—”And this is the end of days” (C 21)—can be linked both to the preceding sentence in the past tense (“We know that some of the blessings and the curses as written in the book of Moses have come, and this is the end of days,” and to the following sentence in the future tense: “And this is the end of days, when in Israel they will return to the Law.” In neither case will the phrase have the fully developed eschatological connotation characteristic of other Qumran usages; it will rather represent a first stage in the development of Qumranic thought.

The most characteristic usage is the one we find in the exegetical compositions, where the meaning of the biblical text, “for the last days,” is directly applied to the life of the community, which is seen as fulfillment of the prophetic text. The phrase has two different aspects in the Scrolls. The last days are a period of testing and refining, a period of trial, but the expression also designates the time beyond the trial, the period in which salvation will start.

The first element is explicit in 4Q174, which interprets Ps 2:1 as referring to the elect of Israel in the last days and continues: “That is the time of refining which comes . . .” The participle used can be translated with a past or with a future meaning, but there is no doubt that the time involved is a time of trial: Belial is mentioned, and also a remnant, and the text explicitly refers to Dan 12:10, where the just “shall be whitened and refined.” Other texts use the same expression, “time of refining,” referring to the persecution of the Teacher of Righteousness or of the men of the community (4QpPs^a II 17–19) or to locate during the last days the hostile actions of the “violators of the covenant,” as well as the suffering and tribulations of its members and its leaders (1QpHab, 4QpNah, etc.).

¹⁴ A. Steudel, “אֶהְרִית הַיָּמִים in the Texts from Qumran,” *RevQ* 16/62 (1993): 225–46.

The second element is equally explicit. The last days comprise the beginning of the messianic age. The same 4Q174 locates in the last days the rising up of the “shoot of David” and the construction of the new temple. A *peshet* on Isaiah (4Q161), commenting on Isa 11:1–5, presents the same “shoot of David” (also called the Prince of the Congregation in the same document, and the Messiah of Israel in other writings) waging the eschatological war against the Kittim in the last days, destroying its enemies and judging and ruling over all the peoples. CD VI 11 extends the duration of age of wickedness “until there arises he who teaches justice at the end of days.” 11QMelchizedek announces the ushering in of the age of salvation in the last days. The *Rule of the Congregation of Israel in the Last Days* (1QS_a), which legislates for the eschatological community, assumes as a matter of fact that the Messiahs are present in these last days and take an active part in the life of the community. One of the most famous and disputed passages of the Scrolls announces God’s begetting the Messiah “with them.” For the rest, as L. Schiffman¹⁵ put it: the document describes the eschatological future as a mirror of the present. 1QS_a reflects the everyday life of the community as we know it from the *Community Rule*—its purity concerns, its hierarchical structure, and its meals—but addresses at the same time particular concerns of the communities of the *Damascus Document*, as if indicating that in the last days the *yahad* community and the communities of the camps will be reunited in a single eschatological congregation.

The precise limits of the end of days are nowhere clearly stated, but it is said that this period of time will be closed by God’s “visitation.” In the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* we read: “God, in the mysteries of his knowledge and in the wisdom of his glory, has determined an end to the existence of deceit and on the occasion of his visitation he will obliterate it forever” (1QS IV 18–19). It is thus a period of time of limited duration, and it would be surprising if the members of the community had not attempted to calculate exactly the moment when the evil would be obliterated forever. Indeed, in some texts indirect traces of these calculations can be found. I do not think (as Steudel does) that the Day of Atonement of the tenth jubilee of 11QMelchizedek could give us this date, nor that it can be provided by the 390 years of the beginning of the *Damascus Document* (the year 172 B.C.E.). But I do think that other

¹⁵ L.H. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).

texts, the peshet Habakkuk and the *Damascus Document* preserve traces of these calculations.

This last text tells us that the traitors to the covenant “shall not be counted in the assembly of the people and shall not be inscribed in their list, from the day of the gathering in of the unique Teacher until there arises the Messiah of Aaron and Israel” (XIX 35–XX 1). A little further on it adds: “And from the day of the gathering in of the unique teacher, until the destruction of the men of war who turned back with the man of lies, there shall be about forty years” (XX 13–15). If we identify the “men of war who turned back with the man of lies” with the traitors “who turned and betrayed and departed from the well of living waters,” and if we understand both the coming of the Messiahs and the destruction of the men of war as an indication of the beginning of the divine visitation, we can see here a trace of these calculations: the end will come *about* forty years after the death of the Teacher. I do not think we can calculate an exact date on the basis of this “about forty years,” but its presence in the *Damascus Document* is a sure indication that such calculations were made.

The other text, 1QpHab VII 1–14 does not offer any more precision, but it is a precious witness to the way the community coped when the calculations proved to be wrong and the expected end did not materialize. The text concerns Hab 2:1–3, which is quoted, section by section, and interpreted:

And God told Habakkuk to write what was going to happen to the last generation, but he did not let him know the end of the age. And as for what he says: “So that the one who reads it may run”: Its interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God has disclosed all the mysteries of the words of his servants, the prophets. “For the vision has an appointed time, it will have an end and will not fail.” Its interpretation: the final age will be extended and go beyond all that the prophets say, because the mysteries of God are wonderful. “Though it might delay, wait for it; it definitely has to come and will not delay.” Its interpretation concerns the men of truth, those who observe the Law, whose hands will not desert the service of truth when the final age is extended beyond them, because all the ages of God will come at the right time, as he established for them in the mysteries of his prudence.

In its extreme conciseness, this text teaches us many things: that the true meaning of the word of the prophet concerns the last period of history, the last days in which the community lives, although this meaning is not known by the prophet; that this deep meaning is known to

the community thanks to the revelation the Teacher of Righteousness has received; that the core of this revelation is that the community lives in the last days, but this revelation does not include the exact time of arrival of the final salvation; that this arrival is part of the divine mystery, which includes prolongation as part of the divine plan; that the moment of salvation will come anyway, at the precise moment God has decreed; and that what really matters for the members of the community is not to abandon the service of truth during this prolongation.

The text clearly implies that the community has calculated the arrival of the end but that their prediction has not been fulfilled at the moment of the writing of the *peshet*: “the final age has extended beyond them.” The text also shows that the community has already found a way to explain this delay without losing either the certainty of living already in the last days or the hope of the approaching final salvation.

This calculation of the end is nothing new. Daniel had already attempted to make even more specific calculations of the same end, and the biblical text shows traces of new calculations when the end did not come (Dan 12).

Summary

The historical apocalypses were characterized by the division of history into periods and the expectation that God would intervene in order to bring an end to the evil in the world. These ideas are abundantly represented in compositions we can attribute to the Qumran community that are of very different literary genres. They also seem to have profoundly shaped the worldview of the sect, which considered itself to be living in the last period of history.

3. THE COMMUNION WITH THE HEAVENLY WORLD

One of the elements that distinguishes apocalyptic literature from the traditional biblical worldview is an increased interest in the heavenly world. This is shown by the number, and the concrete names, of the heavenly beings, be they angels or demons, that we encounter in this literature.¹⁶

¹⁶ M. Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit* (TSAJ 34; Tübingen: Mohr, 1992).

These heavenly beings appear named for the first time in such books as *1 Enoch* and Daniel, where their numbers “cannot be counted,” but they are no fewer than “a thousand thousands and ten thousand times ten thousand.” The angelology of *1 Enoch* is particularly developed, where a multitude of angelic beings exercise multiple functions. They are servants of the deity who stand before the throne of glory or outside the heavenly residence; they are intercessors before God, ministers of the heavenly liturgy but also executioners of the divine will. They are intimately related to the seer; they interpret dreams for him and disclose to him heavenly secrets. They guide the visionary in his heavenly tours and communicate to him divine decisions. They are also deeply involved in the affairs of this world. They rule over the stars, the winds, the rains, the seasons, and over all celestial elements which form part of their own names. They record the deeds of human beings and execute the punishment of the Watchers and of the sinners, but also they help the righteous and watch over Israel.

Already in the classical description of the Essenes it is said that they cherished “the knowledge of the names of the angels.” So it comes as no surprise that the angelology of the scrolls is rather developed, more in line with the angelology of *1 Enoch* than with the sober angelology of the biblical texts. We have already mentioned the dualistic division of the angelic world with the Prince of Light and the Angel of Darkness at the head of two angelic hosts, and we have also alluded to Belial, the most common name for the demonic leader in the Scrolls, to the “angels of destruction” (a designation that echoes the proper name of Mastema, their angelic leader in the book of *Jubilees*), and to Michael, the opponent of Belial in the eschatological war. But in the Scrolls we find also explicitly stated that another of the names of this angelic prince is Melchireša^c (4Q544), in parallel to Melchizedek (11Q13), who in the Scrolls is apparently identified with Michael and with the Prince of Light.

In the Scrolls we find also a strongly hierarchical structure of the heavenly world, similar to the one that appears in the apocalypses, with different roles and different degrees of proximity to the deity. The Scrolls also attribute to angels many of the functions assigned to angelic beings in *1 Enoch* and other apocalyptic writings: angels interpret dreams and visions to the seer (such as to Amram); they guide the visionary on a tour to the future city and the future temple (as in the *New Jerusalem*), or read for him from a heavenly book or inscription in the temple (as in 11Q18 19 5–6). A fragmentary Aramaic composition (4Q529) even records “The Words of the book which Michael spoke to the angels of God.”

But the most characteristic view of the heavenly world we find in the sectarian scrolls is the idea, expressed several times, that the angels are present in middle of the community, and consequently that its members somehow share already the life of the angels. This communion with the heavenly world and fellowship with the angels is explicitly stated as the reason for the high degree of purity required of those who take part in the eschatological battle: "And every man who has not cleansed himself of his 'spring' on the day of battle will not go down with them, for the holy angels are together with their armies" (1QM VII 5–6). But it is also invoked as an absolute reason to refuse entry into the eschatological community to anyone with an imperfection:

No man defiled by any of the impurities of a man shall enter the assembly of these; and everyone who is defiled by them should not be established in his office amongst the congregation. And everyone who is defiled in his flesh, paralyzed in his feet or in his hands, lame, blind, deaf, dumb or defiled in his flesh with a blemish visible to the eyes, or the tottering old man who cannot keep upright in the midst of the assembly, these shall not enter to take their place among the congregation of famous men, for the angels of holiness are among their congregation. (1QSa II 3–9)

That this fellowship with the angels is not something reserved for the eschatological time, for the "last days" to which these two documents are addressed, is proved by one of the copies of the *Damascus Document* from Cave 4, which legislates who can become members of the present community:

And no-one stupid or deranged should enter; and anyone feeble-minded and insane, those with sightless eyes, and the lame or one who stumbles, or a deaf person, or an under-age boy, none of these shall enter the congregation, for the holy angels are in its midst. (4Q267 17 i 6–9)

It is also shown by the repeated use of this idea both in *Rule of the Community* and in the *Hymns*, perhaps the most characteristic documents of the Qumran community, as indicated by the following two samples:

To those whom God has selected he has given them as everlasting possession; until they inherit them in the lot of the holy ones. He unites their assembly to the sons of the heavens in order (to form) the council of the Community and a foundation of the building of holiness to be an everlasting plantation throughout all future ages. (1QS XI 7–9)

And I know that there is hope for someone you fashioned out of clay to be an everlasting community. The corrupt spirit you have purified from the great sin so that he can take his place with the host of the holy ones,

and can enter into communion with the congregation of the sons of heaven. (1QH^a XI 20–22)

The idea of communion with the heavenly world gives us the key to understanding the document in which the angelology of the Qumran group is most explicitly stated: the *Songs for the Sabbath Sacrifice*. This composition, the title of which has been taken from the sentence that begins each one of its thirteen songs, has been found in ten fragmentary copies: eight from Cave 4, one from Cave 1, and another one found in the excavations of Masada. All of them were made between the second half of the first c. B.C.E. and the first half of the first c. C.E.¹⁷ The peculiarities of the language, dominated by nominal and participial sentences with elaborate construct chains, the omnipresence of constructions with the preposition *l-*, many lexical novelties, and peculiar syntax, indicate that the original composition should not be dated very much earlier than the oldest copy.

The composition comprises thirteen songs intended for consecutive sabbaths, apparently designed to be repeated in each quarter of the year. Each song starts with a fixed formula but has no fixed end, and each one consists of a call to different sorts of angelic beings to praise the deity. Although the angels are insistently exhorted to praise, nowhere in the composition is their praise recorded, except as “the serene sound of silence” (4Q405 19 7), or “the voice of a divine silence” (4Q405 20–22 7) of the blessing.

The first four songs deal with the establishment of the angelic priesthood, its responsibilities and functions in the heavenly sanctuary (“[Because he has established] the holy of holies among the eternal holy ones, so that for him they can be priests [who approach the temple of his kingship,] the servants of the Presence in the sanctuary of his glory” [4Q400 1 i 3–4]), as well as with the relationship of the angelic priesthood to the human priesthood: “And how will our priesthood (be regarded) in their residences? What is the offering of our tongue of dust (compared) with the knowledge of the divinities?” (4Q400 2 6–7). The fifth song deals with the eschatological battle: “the war of the gods in the per[iod...] for to the God of the divinities belong the weapons of war [...] the gods run to their positions, and a powerful noise [...] the gods in the war of the heavens” (4Q402 4 7–10), placing this eschato-

¹⁷ C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 19.

logical battle in the same deterministic perspective we have seen in the *Treatise of the Two Spirits*: “Because from the God of knowledge comes all that existed for ever. And through his knowledge and through his decision all that is predestined exists for ever. He does the first things in their ages and the final (things) in their appointed periods” (4Q402 4, completed with the copy from Masada). The sixth and eighth songs detail respectively the seven praises uttered by the seven sovereign angelic princes who are the seven high priests of the seven heavenly sanctuaries, and the praises by their seven deputies, “those second among the priests who approach him, the second council in the wonderful dwelling among the seven... among all those having knowledge of eternal things.” The seventh song, the centre of the whole cycle, contains a very elaborate exhortation to praise, followed by the praise uttered by the different elements of the heavenly temple: “the foundations of the holy of holies, the supporting columns of the highest vault, and all the corners of his building,” but also “all its beams and walls, all its shape, the work of his construction.” This praise is continued in more detail in songs 9–11, which proceed with the description of the praise of the elements of the heavenly temple, described as animate beings, from the outside in the ninth song (“the lobbies of their entrances, spirits who approach the holy of holies”), to the inside in the tenth song, as far as the veil of the sanctuary with all that is engraved there, to reach finally in the eleventh song the inside of the *debir*, which describes the praise uttered by all its elements “living gods are all their works and holy angels the images of their forms.” The twelfth song describes the appearance of the chariot-throne, the movement of the heavenly beings which surround it and the praises they utter:

They bless the image of the throne-chariot (which is) above the vault of the cherubim, and they sing the splendour of the shining vault (which is) beneath the seat of his glory. And when the *ofanim* move forward, the holy angels go back; they emerge among the glorious wheels with the likeness of fire, the spirits of the holy of holies. Around them, the likeness of a stream of fire like electrum, and a luminous substance with glorious colours, wonderfully intermingled, brightly combined. The spirits of the living gods move constantly with the glory of the wonderful chariots. And (there is) a silent voice of blessing in the uproar of their motion, and they praise the holy one on returning to their paths. (4Q405 20–22 8–13)

The climax of the whole composition is reached in the thirteenth song, in which the sacrifices that appear on the heading of each song are finally mentioned: “agreeable offerings,” “the sacrifices of the holy ones,”

“the odour of their offerings,” “the odour of their libations.” The angels are described as officiating priests wearing the ephod and the breastplate, and the praise of the whole heavenly temple is summarized (11Q17 cols. 10–11).

Although the *Songs* do not preserve personal names of the angels (except perhaps the name of Melchizedek in two broken instances) and it is difficult, nor to say impossible, from the generic names used (gods, holy ones, glorious ones, spirits, angels, princes, priests, deputies, angels of the face, angels who approach, angels who serve, and so on) to extract the assigned or intended functions of the different classes of angels, there is no doubt that the number of beings and the differentiation of the heavenly world in the *Songs* is as great and variegated as it is in other apocalypses. In the *Songs* even all the material elements of the heavenly abode—the structures of the heavenly temple and the components of the chariot-throne—are presented as animated heavenly beings of angelic nature who utter praise and participate in the heavenly liturgy. And, though the hierarchical structure of the angelic realm is somewhat blurred in the *Songs*, at least there is explicit mention of the seven princes and their seven deputies in the sixth and eighth songs. These are clearly two categories of angelic beings superior to the others, the first corresponding perhaps to the seven archangels of the Greek text of *1 Enoch* or to the four archangels of the Ethiopic text, who are also named in other Qumran scrolls.

In spite of the non-polemical and neutral character of the *Songs* and of the absence of clearly sectarian terminology in the composition, the abundant parallels with other clearly sectarian scrolls, such as 1QH^a or 1QS, suggest that the *Songs* are a product of the Qumran community. Other considerations supporting this view include the use of לַמַּשְׁכִּיל in the headings (which is common to many sectarian compositions); the close parallels between the description of the angelic praise and the heavenly temple in the *Songs* and in compositions such as 4QBerkhot (4Q286–290) and the *Songs of the Maskil* (4Q510–511), whose sectarian character cannot be doubted; the great number of copies found; the late date of all of them and the equally late date assumed for the original. The idea of communion with the angels, which we find to be characteristic of the Qumran community, provides the most illuminating setting for the composition.

The function of the *Songs* within the community has been diversely explained. For those who value most the detailed descriptions of the components of the heavenly temple, the text would function as revelation of the heavenly realities. For those who underline the numinous charac-

ter of the language used and the importance of the description of the chariot-throne, the *Songs* would function as an instrument of mystical meditation or even mystical ascent to the divine throne, similar to the mystics of the *Merkavah*. For those who emphasize the priestly character of the *Songs*, its function would be to validate and justify the priestly character of a community that has no control over the earthly temple by its association with the heavenly cult. In my view the most likely function of the *Songs* within the Qumran community was to substitute for the participation in the sacrifices of the earthly Temple the association with the heavenly liturgy and the sabbath offerings. "We know that the community, in the expectation of the new situation "at the end of the days" had developed an interim theology of the community as spiritual temple, in which praise substituted for the sacrifices (see 1QS VIII 4–10; IX 3–6). We have also seen (in the texts from 1QSa and 1QM quoted above) that the community had developed the idea of fellowship with the angels, and other texts show that the priests of the community considered themselves to be associated with the angelic priesthood. The blessing over the priests, the sons of Zadok, says: "May the Lord bless you from his holy residence. May he set you as a glorious ornament in the midst of the holy ones. For you may he renew the covenant of eternal priesthood. May he grant you a place in the holy residence" (1QSb III 25–26), and even more clearly in the next column: "You shall be around, serving in the temple of the kingdom, sharing the lot with the angels of the face and the council of the community... for eternal time and for all the perpetual periods" (1QSb IV 25–26). The recitation of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* on the successive sabbaths of the four quarters of the year gave the members of the community the possibility of participating in the sabbath sacrifice of the heavenly temple, compensating for their absence from the sabbath sacrifice of the Jerusalem Temple and giving a concrete expression to the life shared with the angels already in the present.

Summary

The complexity and structured organization of the heavenly world that we find in the apocalypses are represented also in the Scrolls, which add a most notable element: the idea that the angels are already living among the members of the community. This fellowship with the angels is not restricted to the future but is a reality also of the present and allows participation in the liturgy of the heavenly temple.

4. THE ESCHATOLOGICAL WAR

One of the basic themes of the prophets is the announcement of the final triumph of God and of the people of Israel against the evil forces and against the enemies who oppress the people in the present. Very often this triumph takes the form of a future military victory in which the Israelites will destroy the hostile powers who actually oppress them. This expectation is rooted in the realities of the political history of the people of Israel with its repeated experience of invasions and defeats by foreign powers and in the confidence that the God of Israel, who has overpowered the forces of chaos, will deliver his people from oppression. Although in some cases this liberation takes the form of a victory against a very concrete enemy (such as in the various oracles of Jeremiah against different nations), very often it is generalized in the form of a victory against all the nations (Ps 2) or against a mythical enemy, such as Gog, king of Magog, who represents all the hostile powers (Ezek 38–39); a famous oracle of the prophet Joel links this victory with the day of the Lord, when the nations will be judged (Joel 3:9–16).

The apocalypses develop further this idea of the victory over all the nations, placing it in a clear eschatological perspective (as in the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, which ends with the destruction of all the hostile nations [1 En. 90]), and introduce in this eschatological war, as participants or as protagonists, the angelic forces with a celestial leader (as in Daniel, where Michael is the leader who overpowers the angels of the nations).

In the Scrolls the biblical elements of the final victory against all the nations are clearly present, and they are placed in an eschatological perspective. 4QFlorilegium (4Q174) interprets Ps 2 in the context of the “end of days” and “the time of the trial”; 4QpIsa^a (4Q161) refers to Magog and “the war of the Kittim” together with the Branch of David, the Davidic Messiah who participates in the eschatological victory; the same figure, called there “the Prince of the Congregation,” appears in the *Damascus Document* as “the sceptre” of the oracle of Balaam “who will smite the children of Seth” (CD VII 20–21). The angelic participation in the final battle is also well attested in the Scrolls, which refer to “the war of the heavenly warriors” (1QH^a XI 35), and which (as we have already seen) anticipate the final victory of the forces of light against the forces of darkness “at the time of his visitation” in the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* (1QS III–IV).

But in the Scrolls the eschatological battle does not simply coincide with the biblical and apocalyptic vision of the final victory against the

foreign nations, because it comprises the victory against all evil forces. The dividing line is not between Israel and the foreign nations but between the Sons of Light (which are the elected ones of Israel) and the Sons of Darkness (a term that covers not only pagans but also unfaithful Israelites). In the thought of the Qumran community, the eschatological battle will not be restricted to a battle against the foreign nations; it will also be a battle against all the evildoers, including the part of Israel that has not joined the community.

The document in which the thought of the group on the eschatological battle and final victory is best reflected is the *Rule of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (1QM), which has been best preserved in a copy from Cave 1, but which is also attested in several fragmentary copies from Cave 4 (4Q492, 4Q494–496). Other manuscripts, such as 4Q491 and 4Q493, have preserved materials related to this composition or even different recensions of the same composition, while two other manuscripts (4Q285 and 11Q14) that also deal with the eschatological war may represent part of the lost end of 1QM or may come from another composition dealing with the same topic.¹⁸

The contents of 1QM may be summarized as follows:

Col. I and part of col. II contain a summary of the development of the war, which ends with the victory of the Sons of Light and the restoration of the cult in Jerusalem.

Cols. III–IX record the organization and the military tactics that should be employed in this war: rules of the trumpets to conduct each one of the phases of the war (II 15–III 11); rules of the banners with their inscriptions (III 13–V 2); rules of the formation of the battle arrays, the weapons, and the tactical movements (V 3–VII 7); and the rules to conduct the war with the different trumpets (VII 9 until the end of col. IX).

Cols. X–XIV contain the prayers that are to be said during the different phases of the war: in the camps (cols. X–XII), during the battle (col. XIII), and after the victory (col. XIV).

Col. XV to the end of the manuscript preserves another version of the war against the Kittim, with the exhortation of the high priest before the battle, the first engagement, the use of the reserve troops

¹⁸ J. Duhaime, "War Scroll (1QM; 1Q33; 4Q491–496; 4Q497)," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 2. Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; PTS DSSP 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck / Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 80–203.

when the Belial army seems to have the upper hand, the final battle and the celebration after the victory.

The unity and coherence of the document in its present form have led some scholars to defend the unity of composition of 1QM. But, because of certain repetitions, inconsistencies, and especially because there are two basically different conceptions of the eschatological war, most scholars recognize that 1QM is the result of the fusion of at least two documents.

One of them, inspired by Dan 11–12 and Ezek 38–39, developed the idea of an eschatological conflagration on seven lots in which each one of the sides has the upper part during three lots and which ends with the victory of God. As stated in col. I: “In the war, the sons of light will be the strongest during three lots, in order to strike down wickedness; and in three (others), the army of Belial will gird themselves in order to force the lot of [...] to retreat... And in the seventh lot, God’s great hand will subdue [Belial, and a]ll the angels of his dominion and all the men of [his lot]” (1QM I 13–15). The same idea is found in cols. XIV–XIX, in which, in spite of the bad state of preservation, we can discern that these seven lots alternate, a victory following a defeat, until the final victory of the Sons of Light in the seventh lot, when “the Kittim shall be crushed without a [remnant...] when the hand of the God of Israel is raised against the whole horde of Belial” (1QM XVIII 2–3). This war is envisaged in two levels, the human and the angelic: “On this (day), the assembly of the gods and the congregation of men shall confront each other for great destruction” (1QM I 10), but the angelic hosts appear to have no leader apart from God himself, who at the end decides the victory. These two ideas characterize cols. I and XIV–XIX.

These two elements allow us to distinguish this original document from the second one, reflected in cols. II–XIII, in which the war of seven lots is transformed in a progressive battle of forty years against each one of the nations enumerated in Gen 10, and in which the angelic army is guided by an angelic leader, the Prince of Light: “From of old you appointed the Prince of Light to assist us, and in [...] and all the spirits of truth are under his dominion” (1QM XIII 10). This progressive battle, which evidently is based on the forty-year schema of Exodus, does not know any interruption other than the obliged rest of the sabbatical years, five in a forty-year period. This leaves thirty-five years for the conduct of the war. For the author of this document (or for the redactor who has united it with the previous one), the war of seven lots of the first document seems to be understood as the first seven of the

forty years, of which the seventh year is not the final victory but the first sabbatical year, and the other six either a general preparation for the war or a general battle of the whole congregation against the main enemies, according to the interpretation one gives to the problematic expression of II 9. The remaining twenty-nine years are dedicated to eradicating all the enemies of Israel: nine years of war against the sons of Shem, ten years against the sons of Ham, and the last ten years against the sons of Japheth:

During the remaining thirty-three years of the war, the famous men called to the assembly, and all the chiefs of the fathers of the congregation shall choose for themselves men of war for all the countries of the nations; from all the tribes of Israel they shall equip for them intrepid men, in order to go out on campaign according to the directives of war, year after year. However, during the years of release they shall not equip themselves in order to go out on campaign, for it is a sabbath of rest for Israel. During the thirty-five years of service, the war will be prepared (or waged) during six years; and all the congregation together will prepare it (or wage it). And the war of the divisions (will take place) during the remaining twenty-nine years. (1QM II 6–10)

If the idea of the forty-year war is clearly based on the biblical tradition and reminds us of the wandering in the wilderness, it is difficult to find a biblical precedent for the idea of the war of seven alternate lots, although there is an obvious similarity between the seven lots and the sabbatical structures that inform so much of Jewish thought. The closest parallel to this idea is provided by a passage in Plutarch that attributes a similar idea to the Persians: “Theopompus says that, according to the Magians, for three thousand years alternately the one god will dominate the other and be dominated, and that for another three thousand years they will fight and make war, until one smashes up the domain of the other. In the end Hades shall perish and men shall be happy” (*On Isis and Osiris* 47).

Although there are many uncertainties in this text, it provides some basic elements, like two supernatural forces that battle each other and alternately hold sway until the victory of the supreme God, which may have helped to give shape to the thought of the author of the *War Scroll*. This possible Persian influence comes at no surprise since we have already noted the most plausible Persian influence on the *Treatise of the Two Spirits*, and the first document of the *War Scroll* shares the characteristic dualistic framework of this tractate.

The redactor who has combined both documents to form the *War Scroll* that we have in 1QM has also used other elements. Most prominent

is a collection of prayers for the time of the war, which could have had an autonomous existence. This is suggested by the text itself:

The High Priest will take up position, and his brothers the priests and the Levites and all the men of the rule shall be with him. And he will say in their hearing the prayer for the time of war, [as it is written in the “Bo]ok of the Rule for this time,” with all the words of thanksgiving. (1QM XV 4–5)

This clearly echoes the biblical order: “before you engage in battle, the priest shall come forward and speak to the troops” (Deut 20:2), but the specific reference to a “book” seems to indicate that these prayers were already at the disposal of the redactor of the composition, an assumption that is corroborated by the use of the same prayers in other closely related but different compositions on the same topic such as 4Q491. These prayers are mostly grouped in cols. IX–XIV, but we can find them also in other places of the scroll. The prayers are very closely based on biblical material; many of them recall incidents from biblical history that show examples of divine intervention in favour of Israel, and their language is mostly a mosaic of biblical expressions. They are put in the mouths of Levites, of priests, or of the high priest (who are also the ones who exhort the people by means of speeches and enforce the purity regulations), and they help to accentuate the priestly preeminence in guiding the people and the ritualistic character of the whole war.

The redactor has also sought inspiration from Greco-Roman tactical military manuals to specify the regulations for warfare that he applies to the development of the war in cols. II–IX. These regulations for warfare show some general similarity to Maccabean battles, but they are more akin to the Roman military tactics (such as the use of the “gates of war,” the Roman *intervalla*).¹⁹ The knowledge of these tactics and the descriptions of the weaponry (such as the square shield, the Roman *scutum*) indicate a certain familiarity with the Roman army but do not imply that the redaction of 1QM is posterior to the intervention of Pompey, because this knowledge could be obtained well before the Roman conquest of Palestine. The author has been influenced by the biblical tradition more than by Greco-Roman military manuals or Maccabean warfare. The organization of the army in thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens is patterned after the Israelite army as described in Exod 18; the overall use of the banners to distinguish each unit and their

¹⁹ See Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962).

elaborate inscriptions are dependent on Num 2 and 17; and the use of the trumpets has its basis in Num 10, although in the *War Scroll* the use of trumpets is much more complex and elaborate than in the biblical tradition, and its function in conducting each phase of the war goes far beyond the biblical text. This use of trumpets and horns accentuates the ritualistic character of the whole composition and recalls the ritual character of the conquest of Jericho in Josh 7.

Because we do not have the end of the 1QM manuscript, we do not know in detail what expectations its author had for the time after the eschatological war or how he imagined the life of the community after the final divine intervention. But if he accepted, as it seems, the summary of the first document of the war of seven lots, one of the first results of the final victory (col. II) would be the reconstruction of the temple service according to the proper order and the right calendar of 364 days. This implies return to Jerusalem after the necessary purification of the earth from the corpses of those slain in battle, and the reorganization of the whole of life according to the regulations of the community, which would be no more in exile but would control the whole country. Because all the Sons of Darkness, the "army of Belial," would be completely destroyed, the Sons of Light would no longer be a remnant but would be the whole of Israel. Hence, the *War Scroll* shares the perspective of other sectarian documents, such as the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa), in which membership of the community seems to be coextensive with the Israel "of the last days." Characteristically, the same people who are excluded from the community "of the end days" are also excluded from participating in the final battle (compare 1QM VII 4–5 with the already quoted text of 1QSa II 5–8).

The function of the *War Scroll* has been defined in very different terms by various scholars: as the apocalyptic revelation of the several phases, enemies, and general development of the eschatological war; as a composition designed to instruct the perfect soldier, a manual to be used on the battlefield to oppose the enemy; as a propaganda pamphlet to oppose the way rival Jewish leaders were conducting the war indicating the right way to proceed; as a composition written more for liturgical than for practical purposes, more to celebrate the future victory than to prepare for or to conduct the war. But in fact these readings of the function of the text do not need to be mutually exclusive, and perhaps the best way to understand this complex document is by combining these apparently contradictory functions. The *War Scroll*, by representing the dramatic final conflict of the forces of good and evil as a liturgy in

which the trumpets are as effective as the weapons, the priestly prayers as necessary as the movements of the troops, and the purity regulations as essential as the presence of the heavenly warriors, stimulates the hope for the future intervention of God, helps to organize the present as a preparation for this intervention, justifies the present opposition to other forces, and conveys the certitude that the actual dreams and hopes will be fulfilled in the final victory.

Summary

The apocalypses developed the traditional idea of a final victory against the enemies of Israel and placed it in an eschatological context, with participation of angelic forces. In the Dead Sea Scrolls this idea is further developed and transformed into an eschatological war of seven lots or of forty years which will end with the final victory against all forces of evil.

5. CONCLUSION

In the four topics examined we have seen that characteristic ideas of the apocalyptic tradition have not only contributed to the thought of the Qumran community but have undergone there equally characteristic developments. The idea of the origin of evil has been developed to a fully dualistic and deterministic view of the world; the apocalyptic division of history into periods and the expectation that God will intervene to bring an end to the evil in the world have profoundly marked the worldview of the community, which considers itself living in the last of these periods; the Scrolls add to the complexity and structured organization of the heavenly world of the apocalypses the idea that the angels are already living among the community, allowing its members to participate in the liturgy of the heavenly temple; the Scrolls also develop the apocalyptic idea of an eschatological war in which the heavenly forces help Israel to defeat the nations in a final war in which all evil will be destroyed.

We can thus conclude that the apocalypticism indicated by this cluster of ideas in the sectarian scrolls is something more than an umbrella term. It represents genuine continuity with the worldview of Daniel and 1 *Enoch* even while it adapted the tradition inherited from these earlier apocalypses in its own distinctive ways.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

IRANIAN INFLUENCES IN QUMRAN?

The influence of Iranian religious ideas on the development of some key concepts in the Hebrew Bible was one of the most hotly debated issues among the adherents and adversaries of the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule* in the first part of the twentieth century.¹ The discovery of the Qumran texts gave a new impetus to this controversy, and provided both partisans and adversaries with new arguments.² However, in spite of the many studies,³ a consensus cannot be said to have emerged and the discussion continues today. In the article on “Zoroastrianism” in the *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Klaus Koch asks himself:

Were the later layers of the Hebrew scriptures, especially the apocalyptic writings, dependent on Iranian models or was the influence the other way around? In scholarly literature, this question is highly disputed.⁴

At this conference, dedicated to exploring the influence of Oriental ideas on Celtic thought within a Millennial perspective, it seems fitting

¹ A good summary of the problem can be found in A. Hultgård, “Das Judentum in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit und die iranische Religion—ein religionsgeschichtliches Problem,” in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. II. 19.1 (ed. W. Haase; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1979), 512–90. See also S. Shaked, “Qumran and Iran,” *Israel Oriental Studies* 2 (1972): 433–46; *idem*, “Iranian Influence on Judaism: First Century B.C.E. to Second Century C.E.,” in *Cambridge History of Judaism*. Vol. I (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1984), 308–25. The latest attempt to cast doubt on the influence is J. Barr, “The question of religious influence: the case of Zoroastrianism, Judaism and Christianity,” *JAAAR* 52 (1985): 201–35.

² See, among the first contributions, K.G. Kuhn, “Die Sektenschrift und die iranische Religion,” *ZTK* 49 (1952): 296–316; A. Dupont-Sommer, *Nouveaux aperçus sur les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (L’Orient ancien illustré 5; Paris: Maisonneuve, 1953), 157–72; H. Michaud, “Un mythe zervanite dans un des manuscrits de Qumrân,” *VT* 5 (1955): 137–47; J. Duchesne-Guillemin, “Le Zervanisme et les manuscrits de la mer Morte,” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 1 (1957): 96–99.

³ The latest studies I am aware are: S. Shaked, “Qumran: Some Iranian Connections,” in *Solving Riddles and Untying Knots: Biblical, Epigraphic, and Semitic Studies in Honor of Jonas C. Greenfield* (ed. Z. Zevit, S. Gittin, and M. Sokoloff; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 277–81, and G. Widengren, A. Hultgård, and M. Philonenko, *Apocalyphtique iranienne et dualisme qoumrânien* (Recherches intertestamentaires 2; Paris: Maisonneuve, 1995).

⁴ K. Koch, “Zoroastrianism,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 2:1011.

to look again at this issue from the specific perspective of the texts of Qumran, and to ask whether the influence of Iranian religion on some of the key apocalyptic ideas of the Qumran community is the most reasonable explanation for the appearance of these ideas in this typically Jewish context. If this were the case, and if it is reasonable to accept that these millennial ideas have travelled from the Persian Empire to the shores of the Dead Sea, their travel farther West to distant Ireland would be less of a surprise.

I am convinced that with the elements at our disposal, certainty on this matter, as with so many other aspects of historical research, is unattainable. Consequently, I do not intend to *prove* that this cross-fertilization took place. In a scale of possible, probable, and certain, my conclusion will remain at the level of probability.⁵ But the two prime examples adduced show not only that this influence may reasonably be assumed, but also that it is the most likely explanation.

1. METHODOLOGICAL PREMISES

In order to show that certain ideas from one religion could have influenced another, two basic presuppositions are crucial:⁶ an earlier attestation of these ideas in one of the two religious systems (“the temporal priority”), and the possibility of cultural contacts through which these ideas could have been canalized (“the channels of transmission”). Without these two presuppositions there can be no possibility of influence.

There can be no doubt about the cultural contacts in our case: Palestine was dominated by the Achaemenian empire from 538 B.C.E. until the Macedonian conquest, a sizeable Jewish population was exiled to Mesopotamia, and many of the exiles remained there during the Parthian and Sassanian empires; in addition, some knowledge of Iranian religion was disseminated in the West during the Hellenistic period by Greek writers.⁷ And within the Qumran writings we do have certain

⁵ I follow the methodology established by R.N. Frye, “Qumran and Iran. The State of Studies,” in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty. Part Three: Judaism Before 70* (ed. J. Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 167–73.

⁶ See A. Hultgård, “Persian Apocalypticism,” in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. Volume 1: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. J.J. Collins; New York: Continuum, 1998), 39–83, p. 79.

⁷ J. Bidez and F. Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés. I–II* (Paris: Société d’éditions ‘Les Belles Lettres,’ 1938); M. Boyce and F. Grenet, *A History of Zoroastrianism. III: Zoroastrianism under Macedonian and Roman Rule* (Handbook of Oriental Studies 1/3; Leiden: Brill, 1991);

stories located precisely in the Persian court.⁸ There is no doubt, therefore, about the existence of enough channels of transmission through which religious ideas could have been conveyed.

The temporal priority of Iranian religious ideas should not be a problem either. Even if the *floruit* of Zoroaster in the tenth c. B.C.E. is not accepted and a more conservative dating in the sixth c. B.C.E. is preferred, we are long before the foundation of the Qumran Community.⁹ It is true that the attestation of the key ideas of Iranian religion in written form is of a much later and uncertain date—the main collection of religious writings, the *Avesta*, was written during the Sassanian period and has been only partially preserved in Pahlavi translations of the Islamic epoch, the same epoch in which major compositions such as the *Bahman Yāšt*, the *Bundahišn* and the *Dēnkart*, should be dated;¹⁰ but everybody acknowledges that the oldest part of the *Avesta*, the *Gāthās*, the sacred hymns attributed to Zoroaster, were in circulation long before they were put in writing.

Therefore, the *possibility* of the influence of Iranian ideas on the apocalyptic thought of Qumran can be accepted without reserve: the two basic presuppositions, temporal priority and channels of transmission, are certainly present. But realizing that such influence is possible does not really advance our knowledge if we cannot exclude other, equally valid possibilities.

For this reason we can assert, for example, that it is *possible* that the more developed angelology or demonology of Iranian religion could have influenced qumranic angelology and demonology.¹¹ But since the

A. de Jong, *Traditions of the Magi: Zoroastrianism in Greek and Latin Literature* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 133; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

⁸ 4Q550, the so-called “Proto Esther” text, is clearly located in the Court of Darius and the protagonists of the stories have Persian names, see Shaked, “Qumran: Some Iranian Connections.”

⁹ M. Boyce, “On the antiquity of Zoroastrian apocalyptic,” *BSOAS* 47 (1985): 57–75, and *idem*, “Zoroaster, Zoroastrianism,” in *ABD* 6:1168–74.

¹⁰ See J. de Menasce, “Zoroastrian Pahlavi Writings,” in *The Seleucid, Parthian, and Sasanian Periods* (ed. E. Yarshater; The Cambridge History of Iran 3; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 1166–91; *idem*, “Zoroastrian Literature after the Muslim Conquest,” in *The Period from the Arab Invasion to the Seljuks* (ed. R.N. Frye; The Cambridge History of Iran 4; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 543–65. See also Philippe Gignoux, “L’apocalyphtique iranienne est-elle vraiment ancienne?,” *RHR* 216 (1999): 213–27.

¹¹ One of the classic points of the influence of the Iranian religion in the Jewish Bible according to the partisans of the *religionsgeschichtliche Schule*; see, for example W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (3d rev. ed. H. Gressmann; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1926), 320–42.

presence of this general religious idea at Qumran (i.e. that between God and humanity there are a series of mediators) could also be due to the influence of other religions in which it appears, or to other factors, including an inner Jewish development on the basis of data already present in the Old Testament, asserting the possibility of Iranian influence does not advance our knowledge.

To raise the possibility to a higher, more convincing level, that is, to increase it to *probability*, other conditions are needed: not only should the general idea be common, but also some concrete, specific detail in this general idea, what Frye calls “motif similarity.”¹² Take, for example, the belief that both just men and the unrighteous should be rewarded or punished after their lives according to their conduct. This general idea is found both in Iranian religion and in Qumran; but without further concrete details, assessing the possible influence of one upon the other is meaningless because this is a general idea also and attested in many other religions. But if we should have in two different religions a common concrete detail connected with this general idea, the question of the influence and the order of this influence can be legitimately asked.

In order to illustrate this “motif similarity,” Frye quotes the imagery of the bridge. In Iranian religion (and as early as in the *Gāthās*, which assures us of the antiquity of the idea) the soul of each deceased man must cross the Chinvat bridge, a bridge over the abyss that widens itself to allow the righteous to reach Paradise and narrows to a knife-edge from which the unrighteous fall into hell. This imagery of the bridge is not found in the Hebrew Bible¹³ but it has recently showed up in a fragment from Cave 4.

In lines 11–15 of 4Q521 frag. 7 + 5 ii, its editor¹⁴ reads:

- 11 Et la vallée de la mort *dans* [...]
- 12 et le pont de l'Abî[me (/des Abî[mes) ...]
- 13 se sont figés des maudit[s...]
- 14 et les cieus sont allés au devant de(s) [justes/ont accueilli[les justes
(?)...]
- 15 et to]us les anges [...]

¹² Frye, “Qumran and Iran. The State of Studies,” 168: “Many scholars, however, would accept my second category of borrowings as sufficient to demonstrate direct influence. This category I call that of “motif similarity”, which means that not only are general beliefs similar but details of those beliefs coincide.”

¹³ This image of a broad or narrow bridge appears later on in the Jewish world (in the Talmud of Babylon) as well as in Islamic theology (the famous *al-sirat*).

¹⁴ É. Puech, DJD XXV, 23–28, pl. III.

In spite of the fragmentary state of the manuscript and of the problems with some readings—instead of the “valley of death,” וְנִי מוֹת, read by the editor in line 11, a reading in which all the letters are uncertain, we have previously read “he reveals them” וְיִגְלֶם, in our DSSSE¹⁵—it is clear that in a context of the resurrection of the dead and of the righteous who receive the reward for their fidelity while the unrighteous receive the punishment they deserve,¹⁶ our text speaks of a bridge over the abyss, a נִשְׂרַת הַיָּם].

In this case it is clearly not only the general idea and the general eschatological context that is in common with known Iranian beliefs, but also the concrete specific detail, “the bridge over the abyss.” The question of influence here is not only possible but clearly something more, and the editor speaks of “renvoi” to the Iranian ideas. His French text¹⁷ could be translated as follows: “Here we do not have a direct reference to the abyss you cannot cross of Luke 16:29 nor to the great sea and the passage narrow as a river of 4 *Ezra* 7:4–5. Within the context of the remains of this column, the image of the bridge over the Abyss refers to the Chinvat bridge in the similar conception of the end days of Zoroastrianism.”

The term Puech uses is ambiguous enough to be irreproachable. If what he really means by “renvoi” (which I have translated by “refers to”) is that the influence of the Iranian concept of the Chinvat bridge is possible, I would certainly agree. I would say this influence is even probable,¹⁸ since we have here not only a general idea, but also part of

¹⁵ F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 2:1046–47.

¹⁶ The fragmentary lines 4–8 are translated in *DSSSE*, 2:1047: “4 [...] those who do the good before the Lor[d] 5 [...] like these, the accursed. And [they] shall b[e] for death, [...] 6 [...] he who gives life to the dead of his people. 7 And we shall [g]ive thanks and announce to you [...] of the Lord, wh[o...] 8 [...] ... and opens [...]” Puech, *DJD* XXV, 24, fills in some more of the missing text and translates: “4 [Réjouissez-vous (/vous vous réjouirez) vous to]us qui faites le bien devant le Seigneur; 5 les bénis et no]n comme ceux-ci, les maudit[s], car [ils] seront pour la Mort [lorsque] 6 le Vivificateur [ressus]citera les morts de son peuple. (*vac*) 7 Alors nous ren[d]rons grâce et nous vous annoncerons les actes de justice du Seigneur qui [a délivré ?].”

¹⁷ Puech, *DJD* XXV, 28 “Il n’y a sans doute pas ici de rapport direct avec ‘l’abîme infranchissable’ de Lc 16:26 ou l’immense mer et le passage étroit comme un fleuve de 4 *Esd* 7:4–5 et 96. Dans le contexte des restes de cette colonne l’image du ‘pont de l’Abîme’ renvoie au ‘Pont du trieur—Pont de Çinvat’ dans une conception comparable des fins dernières du Zoroastrisme.”

¹⁸ This seems to be the opinion of Puech in his more detailed treatment of the topic, É. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d’une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien* (2 vols.; Études Bibliques Nouvelle série 21–22; Paris: Gabalda, 1993), 687–92: “le rapprochement suggéré ci-dessus semble devoir au moins être signalé comme source (indirecte?) vraisemblable.” (691)

a specific point in common. But in order to obtain certainty, to consider the dependence *proved*, it is necessary to have the whole specific detail in common, including what I would call “the linguistic link.”

Bridges are of many types. To be certain that the presence of the “bridge over the abyss” in the Qumran text is dependent on the Iranian concept, we need to have not only “a bridge” but the concrete Chinvat bridge, either as a loan word or as a translation, that is, the characteristic element in Iranian religion. *Chinuuatō peretus*¹⁹ means “the bridge of the divider.” *Chinvat* in Middle Persian means precisely “the one who divides, who separates” (the good and the bad people); the word used in Qumran Hebrew נִשְׂרָ²⁰ means precisely the opposite, “to bridge” (from the root *gašar*, to unite, to make a bridge, derived from the Akkadian *gišru*). The specific common element is only the idea of a bridge (*peretu/gešer*) not the idea of Chinvat, that this concrete bridge will recognize people who have been good during their lives and separate them from the damned.

Thus, in order to consider the influence of one religion upon another as *proved*, we need something more than a common idea and a specific motif, we also need a lexical connection, be it a loan word or a translation. That finding this connection is not impossible is proved by the very well known example of the devil Asmodaeus from the book of Tobit.²¹ In the Greek text (Tob 3:8,17), we twice come across this demon, called in the manuscripts of the second Greek recension Ασμοδαῖος, Ασμοδεος or Ασμοδευς, and in the manuscripts of the first recension Ασμοόδαυς, Ασμοδαῖος or Ασμοδαῖον, and in both cases he is qualified as τὸ δαιμόνιον τὸ πονηρὸν or τὸ πονηρὸν δαιμόνιον respectively.²²

¹⁹ The phrase appears in the *Gāthās* (*Yāsna* 46:10), where it is translated by Humbach as “the account-keeper’s bridge.” See H. Humbach, in collab. with J. Elfenbein and P.O. Skjærvø, *The Gāthās of Zoroaster and the Other Old Avestan Texts. Part I: Introduction, Text and Translation* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1991), 170.

²⁰ The word is not attested in Biblical Hebrew and is only known from later rabbinical sources. It is attested in Egyptian Aramaic with a different meaning. See the references given by Puech, DJD XXV, 28.

²¹ The Greek versions of Tobit are available in a critical edition by R. Hanhart, *Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis editum. Vol. VIII, 5. Tobit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983). Five fragmentary copies have been found in Cave 4 from Qumran, four in Aramaic (4Q196–199) and one in Hebrew (4Q200). They have been edited by J.A. Fitzmyer, DJD XIX, 1–76, pls. I–X. For a recent commentary, see C.A. Moore, *Tobit* (The Anchor Bible 40A; New York: Doubleday, 1996).

²² The Latin versions use *Asmodaeus malus daemon* or *Asmodaeus daemonium nequissimum*. Unfortunately, the corresponding texts (Tob 3:8, 17) have not been preserved in the Qumran copies, neither in Hebrew nor in Aramaic.

In this famous example, we find both the common general religious idea (demons have a bad influence in the lives of men) and a concrete specific detail (among these demons there is one, the demon of wrath who causes sickness to men); and we also find that both religious traditions use the same word to designate this figure. In this case, we can be *certain* that its presence in the Book of Tobit is due to the influence of the Persian religion.²³ It is well known that as early as in the *Gāthās* we encounter the figure of the “demon of wrath” *aēšma-daēva*, which in the Pahlavi writings will develop into one of the main demonic powers, *xēšm-dēv*, personified Wrath.²⁴ Since it is also equally well known that the name Asmodaeus does not appear in other places in the Hebrew Bible, and that the Greek text unnecessarily repeats the qualification of the figure as δαϊμόνιον, an element already included in the name Asmodaeus (*daēva* in Old Persian, *dēv* in Pahlavi), it is clear that in this case the influence comes from Iranian religion. The biblical book has imported the general idea, the specific detail and the name of the demon.

With these methodological caveats in mind, we can now look at the two best cases by which the influence of Iranian ideas in the apocalyptic thought of Qumran has been asserted. These two examples are the dualism of the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* in the *Rule of the Community*, and the scheme of the final war in seven alternate phases in which each of the two opposing forces has the upper hand in turn before the final victory of the forces of light.

2. THE DUALISM OF THE “TREATISE OF THE TWO SPIRITS”

The *Treatise of the Two Spirits* is a unified whole, embodied in columns three and four of the copy of the *Rule* found in Cave 1 (1QS III 13–IV 26), in which the basic deterministic and dualistic conceptions of the Qumran group are expounded.²⁵

²³ Which is also responsible for its later appearance in the Babylonian Talmud, *b. Git.* 58, in the story of Solomon and his ring.

²⁴ See S. Pines, “Wrath and Creatures of Wrath in Pahlavi, Jewish and New Testament Sources,” in *Irano-Judaica. Studies Relating to Jewish Contacts with Persian Culture Throughout the Ages* (ed. S. Shaked; Jerusalem: Ben Zvi, 1982), 76–82.

²⁵ M. Burrows with the assistance of J.C. Trever and W.H. Brownlee (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery. Vol. II. Fasc. 2: Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline* (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951). The following classic studies of the “Treatise” still remain influential: A. Dupont-Sommer, “L'instruction sur les deux Esprits dans le ‘Manuel de Discipline’,” *RHR* 142 (1952): 5–35; J. Licht,

The treatise begins with a solemn introduction (III 13–15), followed by the basic theological principle: “From the God of knowledge stems all there is and all there shall be. Before they existed he made all their plans and when they come into being they will execute all their works in compliance with his instructions, according to his glorious design without altering anything” (III 15–16).²⁶

From this deterministic formulation, the author deduces the basic dualistic structure of mankind expressed by the traditional symbols of light and darkness: “He created man to rule the world and placed within him two spirits so that he would walk with them until the moment of his visitation: they are the spirit of truth and of deceit” (III 17–19). The author develops his dualistic concept in detail, applying it not only to each individual but to the whole of humanity, which he describes as divided into two camps (two dominions), led respectively by the Prince of Light and by the Angel of Darkness: “And in the hand of the Prince of Light is dominion over all the sons of justice; they walk in the paths of light. And in the hand of the Angel of Darkness is total dominion over the sons of deceit; they walk in the path of darkness” (III 20–21). The Tractate explicitly extends this dualistic division to the angelic world, split in the same way as humanity and each individual into two camps: “He created the spirits of light and of darkness and on them established all his deeds, and on their paths all his labours. God loved one of them for all eternal ages and in all his deeds he takes pleasure for ever; of the other one he detests his advice and hates all his paths forever” (III 25–IV 1). The treatise goes further and describes the characteristic

“An Analysis of the Treatise of the Two Spirits in DSD,” *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4 (1958): 88–100; P. Wernberg-Møller, “A Reconsideration of the Two Spirits in the Rule of the Community (1QSerek III, 13–IV, 26),” *RevQ* 3/11 (1961): 413–41; P. von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran* (SUNT 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 17–27 and 116–89; G. Maier, *Mensch und freier Wille*. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1971), 222–61. Among more recent studies, the following are worthy of note: J. Duhaime, “L’instruction sur les deux esprits et les interpolations dualistes à Qumrân,” *RB* 84 (1987): 566–94; H. Stegemann, “Zur Textbestand und Grundgedanken von 1QS III,13–IV,26,” *RevQ* 13/49–52 (1988): 95–131; A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination. Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 121–70; J. Frey, “Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library: Reflections on Their Background and History,” 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. M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 275–335, and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding One* (STDJ 44; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 194–207.

²⁶ Translations of 1QS are taken from F. García Martínez, *DSSD*, 3–22.

deeds which result from the dominion of each of the two angelic hosts, the contrasting human conducts which result from the influence of the opposing spirits, and the equally contrasting retribution for each man according to his share of light or darkness.

This type of dualism is defined by Ugo Bianchi²⁷ as “moderate” as opposed to “radical dualism,” in which there are two absolute principles of good and bad. In our Tractate, both Spirits are clearly subordinated to the unique God, the source of everything, thus uneasily staying within the limits of orthodoxy. This type of dualism, of course, has neither precedent in the Bible nor any precise known parallel in Jewish literature.

It was recognized almost as soon as the scroll was published that the thought in the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* is most akin to the myth of Iranian dualism with its twin spirits.²⁸ In the form of this myth transmitted in the later Pahlavi writings, Iranian dualism is of the kind Bianchi defines as “radical,” with a complete opposition between a good and an evil God, because Ahura Mazda (the supreme God) is fully identified with the Spenta Mainyu (the good Spirit) to which Ahura Mainyu (the evil Spirit) is opposed. But in the oldest form of this dualism, as it can be recognized in the *Gāthās* of the *Avesta*, Zoroastrian dualism is of the same sort as the dualism in our tractate, in which the supreme God, Ahura Mazda, although associated with the good Spirit, is clearly above the two conflicting entities. Ahura Mazda is the father of the good spirit, and although the texts do not say explicitly that he is also the father of the evil spirit, they do call the two spirits twins, sons of the supreme God. We can read in *Yāsna* 30:3

These (are) the two spirits (present) in the primal (stage of one’s existence), twins who have become famed (manifesting themselves as) the two (kinds of) dreams, the two (kinds of) thoughts and words, (and) the two (kinds of) actions, the better and the evil. And between the two, the munificent discriminate rightly (but) not the miserly.²⁹

Although the dualism of the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* does not imply the initial option of men for one or other spirit, characteristic of the Persian myth, and although in the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* the two spirits are

²⁷ U. Bianchi, “Dualism,” in *ER* 4:509–12.

²⁸ Simultaneously (1952) in Kuhn, “Die Sektenschrift und die iranische Religion,” and Dupont-Sommer, “L’instruction sur les deux Esprits dans le ‘Manuel de Discipline’.”

²⁹ Translation by Humbach, *The Gāthās of Zāraushtra*, 1:123.

emphatically created by God and completely subordinate to him, the opposition between the two Spirits is the same in both works. We can read in *Yasna* 45:2

I shall (now) proclaim the two spirits (present) in the primal (stage) of one's existence of whom the more prosperous one shall address the harmful one: "Neither our thoughts, nor our pronouncements, nor our intellects, nor our choices, nor our statements, nor our actions, nor our religious views, nor our souls, agree."³⁰

It seems obvious that the general idea in both texts is the same, as they are the same in many of the specific details. Perhaps the most telling of these is that in both traditions the spirit of good and the spirit of evil each have an army of assistants, a host of good or evil spirits respectively, which help them in their opposite tasks, and that in both literary corpora these opposing elements are disposed in parallel lists. We may compare, for example, the lists of actions (the "Two ways") which result from the influence of the angels of Light and of Darkness with the similar and even more systematic lists of the *Dankart*.

But, according to the methodology proposed, in order to close the case and consider the dependence of Qumran dualism on Iranian proved, we need to have not only the same general idea and the same specific elements in common but also a linguistic link. The opposition of good and evil is too general to be considered of any use. The basic metaphor of light and darkness (אור and חושך in Hebrew, *roshnih* and *tarikin* in Pahlavi) and its association with good and evil appears more promising. But this metaphor is too general and widespread (as in the beginning of Genesis "and God saw that the light was good, and divided the light from darkness") and, besides, it does not appear in the oldest layers of the *Avesta*. It is frequently used in later writings and even appears in *De Iside et Osiride*:

They (the Persians) also relate many mythical details about the gods, and the following are instances. Horomazes is born from the purest light and Areimanius from darkness, and they are at war with one another.³¹

But we are already in the second half of the first century, and in this case Plutarch does not quote any older authority.

³⁰ Humbach, *The Gāthās of Zarthushtra*, 1:164.

³¹ Translation by J. Gwyn Griffiths, *Plutarch's De Iside et Osiride. With an introduction, translation and commentary* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1970), 46.

One of the major specialists in Iranian religion, Shaul Shaked,³² has tried to relate the term *mēnōg* to the Hebrew term רַחַם as used in our tractate, and has attributed to our רַחַם the three meanings of the *mēnōg*:³³ the two spiritual entities of the ethic dualism, the two human qualities which correspond to this cosmic dualism, and the diverse human qualities conceived of as psychological and cosmological at the same time. But although רַחַם is certainly polyvalent in our Tractate, I do not think the texts support this triple meaning when talking of the human רַחַם . Besides, although this pair of concepts has its origins in the *Avesta*, in its fully developed form it is only found in the writings of the Sassanian period. So, in the end we lack the linguistic link. Therefore, although the influence of Iranian dualism on the development of the Dualism of the Dead Sea Scrolls provides the best available explanation, and due to the presence of the same general theme and several concrete details can be considered probable, it cannot be considered proved. This first prime example leaves us short of having obtained certainty.

We shall now examine the second example generally adduced: the scheme of the final war in seven alternative phases in the *Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (1QM).

3. THE FINAL BATTLE IN THE WAR SCROLL

This composition, known from a manuscript from Cave 1³⁴ and from several others from Cave 4,³⁵ is in all probability a compilation of at least two different documents.³⁶ One of them develops the idea of an

³² S. Shaked, "The notions *mēnōg* and *gētīg* in the Pahlavi texts and their Relation to Eschatology," *Acta Orientalia* 33 (1971): 59–107 (repr. in S. Shaked, *From Zoroastrian Iran to Islam* (Collected Studies Series 505; Aldershot: Variorum, 1995).

³³ The immaterial element, as opposed to the *gētīg*, the material element.

³⁴ Edited by E.L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press-The Hebrew University, 1955), 1–19, pls. 16–34, 47.

³⁵ 4Q491–496, edited by M. Baillet, DJD VII, 12–68, pls. V–VIII. It is disputed whether all these materials are copies of the same composition represented by 1QM, or whether some of them are the remains of other compositions on the same topic. The same holds true for two other Qumran manuscripts, 4Q285 (DJD XXXVI, 228–48, pls. XII–XIII) and 11Q14 (DJD XXIII, 243–51, pl. XXVII), which have preserved materials related to the eschatological battle and are now entitled *Sefer ha-Milhamah*.

³⁶ For this basic division of 1QM into two documents see J. van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre* (STDJ 2; Leiden: Brill 1959). This position is excellently summarized by J.J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), 91–109. A more complex redaction is proposed by P.R. Davies, *1QM, the War Scroll from Qumran*.

eschatological conflagration in seven lots in which each of the sides has the upper hand during three lots and which ends with the victory of God. As stated in col. I:

In the war, the sons of light will be the strongest during three lots, in order to strike down wickedness; and in three (others), the army of Belial will gird themselves in order to force the lot of . . . to retreat . . . And in the seventh lot, God's great hand will subdue Belial and all the angels of his dominion and all the men of his lot. (1QM I 13–15)³⁷

The same idea is found in cols. XIV–XIX, in which, in spite of the bad state of preservation, we can discern that these seven lots alternate, a victory following a defeat, until the final victory of the Sons of Light in the seventh lot, when “the Kittim shall be crushed without a remnant . . . when the hand of the God of Israel is raised against the whole horde of Belial” (1QM XVIII 2–3). This war is envisaged on two levels, the human and the angelic: “On this (day), the assembly of the gods and the congregation of men shall confront each other for great destruction” (1QM I 10), but the angelic hosts appear to have no leader apart from God himself, who at the end decides the victory.

These two elements characterize the first document and allow us to distinguish it from the second one, presented in cols. II–XIII, in which the war of seven lots is transformed into a progressive battle of forty years against each of the nations mentioned in Gen 10, and in which the angelic army is guided by an angelic leader, the Prince of Light: “From of old you appointed the Prince of Light to assist us, and in . . . and all the spirits of truth are under his dominion” (1QM XIII 10). This progressive battle, which is evidently based on the forty-year schema of Exodus, does not have any interruption other than the compulsory rest of the sabbatical years, five in a forty-year period. This leaves thirty-five years for the conduct of the war.

During the thirty-five years of service, the war will be prepared during six years; and all the congregation together will prepare it. And the war of the divisions (will take place) during the remaining twenty-nine years.

Its structure and history (BibOr 32; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1977). For a presentation of the different interpretations of this document, see J. Duhaime, “War Scroll (1QM; 1Q33; 4Q491–496; 4Q497),” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 2. Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; PTS DSSP 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck / Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 80–203.

³⁷ Translations of 1QM are taken from *DSS*, 95–115.

During the first year they shall wage war against Aram-Naharaim; during the second, against the sons of Lud; during the third they shall wage war against the remnant of the sons of Aram, against Uz and Hul, Tugal and Mesha, who are beyond the Euphrates; during the fourth and fifth, they shall wage war against the sons of Arpachsad; during the sixth and seventh they shall wage war against all the sons of Assyria and Persia, and the eastern peoples up to the great desert; during the eighth year they shall wage war against the sons of Elam; during the ninth they shall wage war against the sons of Ishmael and Keturah; and during the following ten years the war will be divided against all the sons of Ham, according to their clans, in their dwellings; and during the following ten years the war will be divided up against all [the sons of Japheth, in their dwellings]. (1QM II 9–14)

For the author of this document (or for the redactor who has united it with the previous one), the war of seven lots of the first document seems to be understood as the first seven of the forty years, of which the seventh year is not the final victory but the first sabbatical year, and the other six either a general preparation for the war or a general battle of the whole congregation against the main enemies, depending on the interpretation given to the problematic expression in II 9.³⁸ The remaining twenty-nine years are dedicated to eradicating all the enemies of Israel: nine years of war against the sons of Shem, ten years against the sons of Ham, and the last ten years against the sons of Japheth.

Although the idea of the forty-year war is clearly based on the biblical tradition and reminds us of the wandering in the wilderness, it is difficult to find a biblical precedent for the idea of the war of seven alternating lots, although there is an obvious similarity between the seven lots and the sabbatical structure that informs so much of Jewish thought. The closest parallel to this idea is, again, provided by Iranian religion. The alternating dominion of good and evil is a basic element in

³⁸ The reading of the manuscript is *תַּעֲרֵךְ הַמִּלְחָמָה*, which may be understood as “prepare for the battle” or “set in array for the battle.” According to the preferred interpretation, the numbers of years that are mentioned in lines 6 (33), 9 (35) and 10 (29) need to be interpreted differently. In my interpretation, the redactor of 1QM harmonizes the two schemes (of 7 and of 40 years war) in the following way: the 40 years include 5 years of sabbatical rest, which leads him to mention the 35 years of *הַעֲבוּרָה* in line 9; “the remaining 33 years” in line 6 is obtained by subtracting the 7 years of the other document (6 years of “work” and 1 year of rest) from the total of 40 years; but these 33 years also include 4 sabbatical years, and that leaves only the 29 years in line 10 for effective fighting after the first 7 years.

the writings of the Sassanian period. In *Bahman Yāšt*, for example, we can read:

Le Mauvais Esprit crie à Mihr, maître des vastes campagnes: “lève-toi en justice, ô Mihr, maître des vastes campagnes.” Lors Mihr, maître des vastes campagnes, crie: “pour ce qui est du traité (*pašt*) des neuf mille ans qu’il (sc. Ohrmazd) conclut, Dahāk de mauvaise religion, Frāsyāp le Turanien, Alexandre le Romain et les démons aux ceintures de cuir et aux cheveux défaits ont régné pendant une période qui dépasse l’accord par mille ans.” Le Mauvais Esprit, le trompeur, est étourdi lorsqu’il a entendu cela. (*Bahman Yāšt* III.33)³⁹

Some texts speak of a period of 12,000 years, while others, such as the vision of Zoroaster of the tree whose seven branches symbolize the seven periods of history, refer to a shorter period of 7,000 years, which would be closer to the seven lots of the *War Scroll*. It is true that this myth is not present in the *Gāthās*, but in this case we can trust Plutarch, who quotes Theopompus (around 300 B.C.E.) as his source of information, to be sure of the antiquity of the idea of the battle among the gods with alternating periods of victory:

Theopompus says that, according to the Magians, for three thousand years alternately the one god will dominate the other and be dominated, and that for another three thousand years they will fight and make war, until one smashes up the domain of the other. (*De Iside et Osiride*, 47)⁴⁰

Although this text is not without problems—the Greek is ambiguous and the 3,000 alternate years could be interpreted as either giving a total of 12,000 or of only 6,000 years—it proves without doubt that in Iranian religion, not only the general idea (the final battle between the good and evil) but also the specific detail (the structure of the conflict, in which the protagonists are alternately victorious and in which the final result is fixed from the beginning) is already attested.

As with the former example, we may conclude that this qumranic apocalyptic idea has most probably been developed under the influence of Iranian religion. But in this case, too, we lack the linguistic link that could have sealed the matter. For a moment, I thought I had found it in the word נחשיר, which I have translated as “destruction” because it is in parallel with the well-known קרב נחשיר. נחשיר is a lexical loan word from

³⁹ Translation by A. Hultgård, “Mythe et histoire dans l’Iran ancien: Étude de quelques thèmes dans le *Bahman Yāšt*,” in *Apocalypique iranienne et dualisme goumrānien*, 63–162 (9).

⁴⁰ Gwyn Griffiths, *Plutarch’s De Iside et Osiride*, 47.

Persian, previously unknown in Hebrew, and in Qumran exclusively used in the first column of the *War Scroll* (where it appears three times 1QM I 9, 10, 13), which, as said above, is a summary of the concept of the battle of seven alternate lots.⁴¹ The word comes from the semantic field of hunting, at least in Syriac, which has also borrowed it from Persian. But as far as I have been able to ascertain, the Pahlavi texts that deal with the final battle do not use it, and the two verbs employed by Plutarch (πολεμεῖν καὶ ἀναλύειν) are too general to be considered as lexical equivalents.

But it is time to finish. As I stated at the beginning, we cannot attain certainty in the matter of the Iranian origins of some key apocalyptic ideas in Qumran. But I think that it is reasonable to assume that the growth of theological ideas that have no roots in the biblical tradition is the result of cross-fertilization. The seed planted by the elusive prophet Zoroaster has flourished unexpectedly in a secluded community on the shores of the Dead Sea. And if this travel was indeed possible, a further traveling of Oriental ideas to Irish shores and their taking root in Celtic thought is less of a mystery.

⁴¹ The word has been discussed by J.P. de Menasce, "Iranien *naxēv*," *VT* 6 (1956): 213–14.

C. HISTORY OF RESEARCH

CHAPTER TWELVE

FIFTY YEARS OF RESEARCH ON THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND ITS IMPACT ON JEWISH STUDIES

Contrary to married life, in which turning fifty is associated more with a “midlife crisis” than with joyous celebrations, the Fiftieth Anniversary of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls has been universally acclaimed.¹ Obviously, a part of the celebration was a (more or less self-indulgent) retrospective look at the achievements of these fifty years. This was done last year in many ways and from many different perspectives. I think that every practitioner in the field of Qumran studies has written and delivered his or her own “Fifty Years of Research on the Dead Sea Scrolls” lecture during the past year. In any case I did so: I indulged in this “trip down memory lane” in a lecture given last year.² I did it in Spanish, of course. But you need not worry. I am not going to deliver here an English translation of a lecture that I have already published and that you may read in Spanish, if you wish.

What I intend to do in the first part of this lecture is to offer you some thoughts on the topic, which reflect the impressions I formed after a whole year of celebrations of this fiftieth anniversary. These thoughts can be summarized easily in two propositions and in a consequence:

1. Qumran studies have reached maturity as an independent academic discipline within the general field of Jewish Studies.
2. Qumran studies continue to impassion a large segment of the public outside the academia.

¹ I have retained the style of the oral presentation of this paper, adding only the indispensable references. As a model of these joyous celebrations, I may refer to the main Congress organized by the Israel Antiquities Authority, the Hebrew University and the Shrine of the Book in Jerusalem on July 1997, on which I will comment later, and, within the publishing world, to the Jubilee volumes *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. Flint and J. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999).

² At the closing of the academic year of the “Centro de Estudios Judeo-Cristianos” de Madrid published in *El Olivo* 21 (1997): 23–44.

3. Therefore, Qumran studies are one of the main factors that have contributed to the flourishing of the general field of Jewish Studies in the second part of the twentieth century.

In the second part of this lecture I will list, as indicated in the title, some of the contributions of the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls to other areas of Jewish Studies.

After my lecture, you may, of course, question the first and the second proposition; and you may especially question the sort of causal relationship implied by the use of “therefore” in the third statement, a word which relates this third proposition as a consequence of the other two. But a basic objection needs to be dispelled from the start: does not the program of our own Congress completely disprove what I intend to show? At first sight, it does; but not upon reflection.

While, in our Congress held in Troyes in 1990, was a large section on the “Littérature de la Période Gréco-Romaine” which included several papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls,³ there is no similar section here. If there are any papers on topics related to the Dead Sea Scrolls, they are hidden under the heading “Miscellaneous.”⁴ At first sight, this could imply that the impact of research on the Dead Sea Scrolls has been not been felt very strongly by our guild, or that the members of the European Association for Jewish Studies are not interested in the study of the Scrolls. Among the fifteen sections of our Congress there is none specifically dedicated to the study of the Jewish Literature of the Greco-Roman Period, nor to the Pseudepigrapha, Qumran, Apocrypha or Second Temple Period (to list only the relevant areas as they appear in the “Index of Scholars by Subject Area” of the Directory of Jewish Studies in Europe of our European Association for Jewish Studies).⁵ But, upon reflection, we cannot conclude anything from this.

Obviously, we cannot conclude that the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls is not part and parcel of the general field of Jewish Studies (in which

³ See the proceedings of the Congress, edited by G. Sed-Rajna, *Rashi, 1040–1990. Hommage à Ephraïm E. Urbach. Congrès européen des études juives* (Patrimoine Judaïsme; Paris: Cerf, 1993).

⁴ This was written when only the preliminary program was known. In the final program, there was a session on “Qumran, Rome and Judaism” within the section “Ancient Jewish History,” with two papers on Qumran topics by M. Bockmuehl and P. Alexander. Another paper, on the Hebrew of the Copper Scroll from Cave 3, was placed in the section on Hebrew Linguistics.

⁵ A. Winkelmann (ed.), *Directory of Jewish Studies in Europe* (Oxford: European Association for Jewish Studies, 1998).

case we would also have to conclude that, for example, “Jewish Liturgy and Prayer,” another subject areas not covered by a Congress section, does not belong to the general field of Jewish Studies).

We also cannot conclude that the practitioners of Jewish Studies are no longer interested in the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls; the flood of publications on the Scrolls proves exactly the contrary.⁶ The latest Qumran Bibliography published in the *Revue de Qumrân*, which only covers 1996–97, lists almost a thousand items (only scholarly articles and books, many of them written by members of the EAJIS).⁷

Thus, we cannot measure the impact of Dead Sea Scrolls research on the general field of Jewish Studies by the number of sessions or papers presented to our Congress, just as we cannot measure the extent and the intensity of the work of the members of our guild through the already quoted (and very useful) *Directory of Jewish Studies in Europe*. If we were to believe this *Directory*, only one scholar in Europe is actually working on Josephus, and no one at all on Philo (on whom two full sessions are dedicated in our Program), for example. As editor of the *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* I can confidently assure you that this is not the case.

If the fact that there are no specific sections in our Congress on the Jewish literature of the Greco-Roman Period and very few papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls in its different sessions has a meaning at all, this could well be that the study of the scrolls has developed as an independent academic discipline to such an extent that its practitioners prefer more specialized fora for the presentation of the research done.⁸ And now that this preliminary objection has been dispelled, we can start with the first of the two impressions I formed after last year’s celebration.

I

A) The climax of the celebrations of fifty years of research on the Dead Sea Scrolls was, without a doubt, the international congress organized

⁶ The listing of the scholarly publications of the last 25 years covers 560 pages in F. García Martínez and D.W. Parry, *A Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah, 1970–95* (STDJ 19; Leiden: Brill, 1996).

⁷ F. García Martínez, and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, “Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *RevQ* 18/71 (1988): 459–90 and 18/72 (1988): 605–39.

⁸ Such as the Congress of the International Organization for Qumran Studies (Groningen 1989, Paris 1992, Cambridge 1995 and Oslo 1998).

by the Israel Museum, the Israel Antiquities Authority, the Hebrew University and the Israel Exploration Society, and held in Jerusalem exactly one year ago: July 20th to 25th, 1997. The organizers of the program of the congress managed to compress into the five days of the congress no less than 130 lectures.⁹ Attending all these lectures was, of course, impossible, if not for other reasons, then at least because there were several simultaneous sessions. But reading through the program and the abstracts book, the thing that struck me most was not the variety of approaches, nor the diversity of the issues dealt with by the lecturers, but the homogeneity of the whole. As a participant in the congress, I had the strong impression of witnessing to the unveiling of a new discipline in the academic world. The festive character of the Congress gave the impression of an old fashioned “first ball” in which the new discipline was displaying its charms. In any case, it was no a new discipline which was hesitantly venturing its first steps in the world, but an already grown up academic discipline, conscious of its attraction and very self-assured, with its own corpora, its own tools for research, its own channels of publication, etc.

I could have dismissed this impression as the result of the temporary euphoria of a very well organized congress, but it was so strong that I decided to look into the matter more carefully. The occasion for doing so was given to me through a request to write a survey of the contributions of European scholarship for a panel on the study of the scrolls during the last fifty years organized by the American Society of Biblical Literature (SBL). In this paper, written jointly with Professor Julio Trebolle and read by him at the meeting of the SBL in San Francisco,¹⁰ we analyzed the contribution of scholars of four European countries (Germany, France, Britain and Holland). This survey of the data allowed us to extract the following as the most characteristic elements of the “European” contribution to the study of the Scrolls:

⁹ The proceedings were published in 2000. Cf. L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years After Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, The Shrine of the Book, 2000).

¹⁰ F. García Martínez and J. Trebolle Barrera, “Qumran Scholarship: A European Perspective,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings* (ed. R.A. Kugler and E.M. Schuller; SBLEJL 15; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999), 129–41.

1. The publication of a whole series of bibliographies, concordances, dictionaries, translations, data-bases and monographs; in short, the production of the basic tools necessary for further research on the Scrolls.¹¹
2. The creation and establishment of specialized periodicals (such as *Revue de Qumrân*, *Dead Sea Discoveries*, *The Qumran Chronicle*) and book series dedicated exclusively to the study of the scrolls in all their aspects (such as *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*, *The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls*); in short, the creation of adequate vehicles for the dissemination and communication of research.
3. The creation of permanent structures within the University context (Research Institutes, Chairs of Qumran Studies, etc.) in which the research can take place without disturbing external influences and without being submitted to the grill of fashion, and the establishment of professional associations (such as the International Organization for Qumran Studies) which provide for regular opportunities for interchange among professionals dedicated to its study.
4. The incorporation of the study of the Scrolls into the university curriculum at undergraduate, graduate and post-graduate level, as an important sector of Jewish literature of the Hellenistic and Roman Period, parallel to the study of the Hebrew Bible and the Greek New Testament.

These elements prove, in my opinion, that the impression I had during the Jerusalem congress was well founded. If one thing can be said to characterize research as rich and as varied as that carried out in Europe during these fifty years of study of the scrolls, I think that it is precisely the emphasis on gradual and progressive production of the tools necessary for a truly scientific study of these old texts. It is certain that in Europe, as in America or Israel, there has been no lack of brilliant analysis of specific texts, of acute and enlightening philological study, of discussion of the theological problems contained in the texts, of brilliant (or misguided) synthesis, of study of the scrolls for purely Christian motifs or from exclusively Jewish concerns. But when the whole thing is examined and weighed, what emerges most clearly is not hidden agendas or particular biases, but a constant and humble concern for creating little by little the necessary equipment for arriving at a proper understanding

¹¹ All the bibliographical references are given in that article.

of certain texts perceived as really important for “European culture,” which is, by definition, a Judeo-Christian culture. Combined with this is the wish to establish the study of the scrolls in the academic world as the best guarantee of its independence.

Therefore, in the San Francisco panel presentations we were able to conclude that:

Independent of the value, permanent or temporary, of the contributions of each of the researchers in the four countries we have mentioned and of all those whose names we have had to omit, we believe there are two elements which stand out as characteristically “European”: the build up and institutionalization of this research on one hand, and on the other its implanting in the academic world in that they have given it a place of its own, thus guaranteeing its future development. The combined result of these two factors is the consolidation of Qumran research as a new academic discipline.¹²

What we concluded last year from the analysis of the data provided by our survey of the research done in Europe, can be stated, I think, as a conclusion on a more general level: Qumran studies have reached maturity. The first “proposition” of my lecture can thus be summarized for further discussion:

In the fifty years following the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, research into these collections of Jewish writings from the Second Temple Period has developed to the point of reaching the status of a new academic discipline within the general field of Jewish Studies, a discipline now solidly anchored both in the Departments of Biblical Studies of the Theological Faculties and in the Jewish Studies Departments of the Arts Faculties.

B) The second impression I had during the Jerusalem congress was that of taking part in a very “public affair,” and not just in Jerusalem or in the rest of Israel. That the congress should become a “public affair” in Israel was logical to a certain extent: after all, the congress was opened by the Prime Minister and it was closed with a sumptuous dinner in what is now the Qumran National Park, in the Plateau of Qumran itself, between the ruins of the Khirbeth and the mountains illuminated for the occasion, and with the interpretation of a specially commissioned musical composition “Sound of Light and Darkness.” But I had the strong impression that it was also a “public affair” all over the world. I

¹² García Martínez and Treballe Barrera, “Qumran Scholarship: A European Perspective,” 140.

missed several interesting lectures because I was being interviewed by newspapers and television crews from Spain, France and The Netherlands. And the same happened to many other colleagues who became speakers for many other countries. I even missed the hors d'oeuvres of the closing banquet because I was taken aside for an interview with the Spanish National Broadcasting system, which had followed us all the way down to Qumran to have it, in situ, during the closing ceremony. Due to disruptive effects of these non-academic activities in the development of the Jerusalem congress, we used to designate it (only half joking) as "the Qumran circus." But the fact was that the congress itself was a news item, an item interesting enough to catch (and hold) the attention of the media. And if the media were interested in the congress, this was only due to the continuous interest for the Dead Sea Scrolls by a large audience outside the academia.

The interest of the general public in all matters related to the Scrolls, and the many faces this interest can have, is apparent to whoever has "navigated" a little on the Internet, or has browsed in the huge number of web sites directly concerned with the topic.¹³ I am not concerned with the contents of most of these sites or home pages, or with their relationship (or the lack of) with the real contents of the manuscripts. I mention them, as I could mention a good number of works of fiction,¹⁴ some of them real bestsellers only as a sign of the public's interest in matters related to the Scrolls, and as proof that the Scrolls are nowadays "public domain."

This public's interest in the Scrolls is not new; on the contrary, it has been part and parcel of the Scrolls research since their discovery. I do not think it is an exaggeration to assert that the Dead Sea Scrolls have since their discovery attracted a continuous and pervasive public attention. Obviously, there have been peaks and downs in this public attention, but a surprisingly high degree of involvement of the general public in matters related to the Scrolls has always been present. Looking back to the fifty years of Scrolls research, it is easy to isolate two main peaks: one during the fifties, the other at the end of the eighties and beginning of the nineties.

¹³ I do not refer to the academic web sites dedicated to the study of the Scrolls, such as the ones established by the Orion Center of the Hebrew University, or the Universities of Oxford, Pennsylvania, St. Andrews, Uppsala and many others, but to the more "esoteric" or popular web sites one can reach through the general search engines of the web.

¹⁴ To which was dedicated a whole session of the Jerusalem congress.

The series of articles by Edmund Wilson in *The New Yorker* and his book, *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea*,¹⁵ can serve to characterize the public interest during the fifties; they reflect the excitement of the discoveries, the hopes raised by the new texts, the emerging general frame of interpretation of the context of the Scrolls and the first polemics among the scholars who served as informants for him.

The “six-year campaign of the Biblical Archaeology Review to free the Scrolls” (to quote the words of Hershel Shanks, the Editor of *BAR*)¹⁶ can serve as an indication of the renewed interest at the end of the eighties, as can the book by Neil Asher Silberman, *The Hidden Scrolls*.¹⁷ The subtitle of this book (“Christianity, Judaism, and the War for the Dead Sea Scrolls”) indicates the shift of focus of the public’s attention. More than for the contents of the scrolls themselves, interest was aroused by what was called “The Battle over the Scrolls.”

I will quote a rather lengthy passage by Chaim Potok¹⁸ because it illustrates perfectly the change in perspective:

My first encounter with the Dead Sea Scrolls came about through the reporting of Edmund Wilson. In the late 1950s I studied some of those scrolls with Professor Jonas Greenfield in Los Angeles. The vaguest of pictures was then beginning to appear: something about a marginal sect of Second Temple Jews and the beginnings of Christianity. (And “Qumran” was becoming a word resonant with awe and apprehension, bringing some concern to historians of embryonic Christianity and slowly taking the gravity of myth.)

Over the decades, the scrolls have produced a history of their own, some of it rather tawdry, as scholars took issue with one another over the translation and publishing rights, over the laggardly appearance of the scrolls before the public, over the self-aggrandizement of a small group of learned academics who appeared to be hoarding them, parcelling them out in tightfisted fashion to their own students, and seemingly deliberately holding back the unrestricted availability of that stunning treasure.

In place of the actual scrolls came wretched journalism, tacky gossip, and the tiresome conjuring of the media, filling the void of secrecy and expectation.

¹⁵ E. Wilson, *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955).

¹⁶ In H. Shanks (ed.), *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Random House, 1992), xxvii.

¹⁷ N.A. Silberman, *The Hidden Scrolls. Christianity, Judaism and the war for the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Heinemann, 1995).

¹⁸ From the “Foreword” he wrote to the book by L.H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia and Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 1994), xi.

The years in between these two peaks have been described by Geza Vermes as “the lean years in Qumran studies.” In Vermes’s opinion:

In the 1960s the editorial enthusiasm characteristic of the previous decade was steadily dying down. From the late 1960s to the 1980s it was replaced by a general slumber, only occasionally interrupted by the publication of an odd volume of the official series Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, lavishly and unhurriedly produced by Oxford University Press.¹⁹

Vermes refers, of course, to scholarly activity, not to the public perception of the Scrolls. And he may be right; although he seems to have overlooked some quite interesting developments that were taking place precisely in these “lean years in Qumran studies.” His concern with the publications in the “official” series DJD has led him to forget the many publications of new texts that appeared precisely in this period. And I am thinking not only of the many small fragments edited in preliminary publications during this period, but also of such basic works as the publication of the Aramaic Enoch fragments by Milik in 1976,²⁰ the publication of the *Temple Scroll* by Yadin in 1977,²¹ the complete edition of the *Shirot ‘Olat ha-Shabbat* from Cave 4²² and of the paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll from Cave 11²³ in 1985, or the edition of the *Non-Canonical Psalms* from Cave 4 by Schuller in 1986,²⁴ for example. But the public perception and interest in the scrolls seems not to have suffered during these “lean years.” I still remember the excitement in Jerusalem when Yadin published the *Temple Scroll*, or the polemic reactions in the press when Allegro published his *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Myth* in 1979.²⁵

¹⁹ G. Vermes, *Providential Accidents. An Autobiography* (London: SCM Press, 1998), 188.

²⁰ J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976).

²¹ Y. Yadin, *Megillat ham-Miqdash* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977) (Hebrew) and *idem*, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983).

²² C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press 1985).

²³ D.N. Freedman and K.A. Mathews, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev)* (with contributions by R.S. Hanson; [Philadelphia]: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1985).

²⁴ E. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran. A Pseudepigraphic Collection* (HSS 28; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).

²⁵ J.M. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Myth* (London: Westbridge Book, 1979).

If these years witnessed no peaks in the public interest for the Scrolls, neither were there “lean years.” In fact, most of the elements noted above as leading to the establishment of Qumran Studies as an academic discipline were taking place precisely during this period, and these developments would not have been possible without public support.

The reasons for this public interest are difficult to fathom, and I think many different factors may have played a role; the adventure and romance of the whole story of the discovery; the fascination with the “original” and the hope to achieve the ultimate truth; the attraction of materials which have not been altered by later orthodoxies, the quest for the “missing link” between biblical and rabbinical Judaism, between the Old and the New Testament, or between Judaism and Christianity etc.

Hershel Shanks worded these reasons in the following way:

The Dead Sea Scrolls are the greatest manuscript discovery of the twentieth century, certainly as concerns biblical studies. Amidst confusion and speculation, they have ignited the imagination of nonscholar and scholar alike. It is easy to understand why. A library of over eight hundred texts, they cast a direct light on the critical period more than two thousand years ago out of which both Christianity and rabbinic Judaism emerged.²⁶

In my own lecture on “Fifty years of Qumran Research” I concluded that both Jews and Christians have been interested in the Scrolls and are still interested, but for the wrong reasons. But here we do not need to worry about the reasons. For me it is enough to note that this interest, peculiar as it may be, has been present: all along and that the Scrolls research has always taken place under the spotlight. This fact has certainly produced its share of negative results, violent polemics, hidden agendas and all sort of by-products but it also has had very positive consequences: it has brought to the centre of public interest the object of its research, the Judaism of the Second Temple Period. It is my contention that this public interest in the Scrolls has been an important factor in the growth of other areas of Jewish Studies during the last fifty years. This is the point to which I turn now, before directly illustrating the impact of Scrolls research on several areas of Jewish Studies.

C) I confess I cannot offer hard proof for this third point. That Jewish Studies have seen an unprecedented growth during the last fifty years seems to me a plain fact, and your presence here in such a huge numbers

²⁶ Shanks, *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls*, xv.

offers the best proof. That this upward trend has been influenced by many factors also seems to me an indisputable fact, and I am sure other lectures during this congress will show some of the factors involved. That one of these factors has been the attention to the Judaism of the Second Temple Period brought about by the discovery and gradual publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls seems to me logic enough, but can hardly be proven when so many other factors are also involved. The contributions of Scrolls research to several areas of Jewish Studies that I will present in the second part of my lecture are indications of this positive impact, but fall short of being a proof. Therefore, I present this “conclusion” to the two precedent “premises” simply as my own personal conviction, or, if you wish, as an educated guess.

And because I consider it more a personal conviction than an unavoidable conclusion of the premises, I hope you will allow me to tell two personal anecdotes, which have shaped this personal conviction.

After graduating in Biblical Studies at the Pontifical Biblical Institute of Rome, I went to Jerusalem intending to write a dissertation at the Hebrew University on the Mekilta of Rabbi Johanan ben Zakai. I had the promise of a scholarship by a Spanish foundation, but, once in Jerusalem, I was notified that the review committee had found the topic of my dissertation too “esoteric” and that funding was not available for it. During the following summer vacation, I went back to New York to pursue the work at the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary, although I was very seriously considering abandoning the whole project because of lack of money. In New York, I accidentally met one of my teachers of Hebrew at the Biblical Institute, the late Professor Luis Alonso Schökel. In our conversation I told him of my problem and of my intention to abandon the work on the dissertation. His advice went right to the point. As I recall, he said to me something like the following: “We have nobody in Spain actually working on the Dead Sea Scrolls. You are already familiar with the languages of the period, and you will only need to advance a couple of centuries the historical context; the Scrolls cannot be more “esoteric” than your present topic and I am sure money will be available to work on the Scrolls.”

And so it was. Following his advice, I presented a research project on the Scrolls to another Spanish foundation and, indeed, the money came, and after the summer I moved from the Hebrew University to the *École Biblique* and started working on the Scrolls.

Of course, this anecdote does not “prove” the point, but it shows you that in my case, the public fascination with the Scrolls (this was the

reason why the March Foundation gave me the scholarship) has been a basic factor in my own dedication to Jewish Studies.

My second example is only a little less personal. It concerns the founding of the *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period*, the journal with which I have been directly involved during the last eighteen years and which is an important vehicle for publication of research in this area of Jewish Studies.

As you know, the *JStJ* was founded in 1970 by Professor A.S. van der Woude. He wrote his dissertation on *Die Messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân* in 1957,²⁷ and starting in 1962 he was charged with the publication of the Dutch share of the manuscripts of Cave 11;²⁸ he was thus one of the first generation of Qumran scholars. The founding of the Journal was a formal recognition of the renewed interest in Judaism of the Second Temple period, provoked “in part due to the discovery of new manuscripts,” as he himself put it in an editorial statement in the first issue.²⁹ It was also the result of the problems Van der Woude had been encountering in his study of the Scrolls. He recognized that the Scrolls could not be studied in isolation, and that they only could be understood within their own Jewish historical and literary context, the Judaism of the Greco-Roman Period. This crucial period was then only accidentally and very sporadically covered by other Periodicals, such as the *Jewish Quarterly Review* or the *Journal of Jewish Studies*. From the correspondence of Van der Woude, both with the publishing house and with Father Carmignac, the Editor of the *Revue de Qumrân* (with whom Van der Woude signed an agreement on the sort of materials that should be published in each one of the Periodicals), it appears clear that Van der Woude wanted to create an adequate forum for discussion of all aspects of the Judaism brought to the fore by the discovery of the Scrolls in order to provide the Scrolls with an adequate historical, and literary context.

It is not up to me to measure the results achieved by this initiative. But I see this example as a direct indication of the impact that research on the Scrolls has had on other areas of Jewish Studies.³⁰

²⁷ A.S. van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân* (SSN 3; Assen: van Gorcum, 1957).

²⁸ Published in the DJD series, after several preliminary editions, in F. García Martínez, E.J.C. Tigchelaar, and A.S. van der Woude (eds.), *Qumran Cave 11.II (11Q2–18, 11Q20–31)* (DJD XXIII, Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).

²⁹ [A.S. van der Woude], “Introduction,” *JStJ* 1 (1970): 1.

³⁰ That the force of this argument is not restricted to Spain or The Netherlands, the two countries which shaped my conviction and of which I can speak first hand,

As I have already said, these examples do not “prove” the point, but they illustrate my personal conviction that research on the Dead Sea Scrolls and public interest in the discoveries have been very important factors in the growth of other fields of Jewish Studies, at least of those dealing with different aspects of the Judaism of the Second Temple.

II

We can now move to the second part of this lecture, in which I intend to summarize some of the significant contributions of the Dead Sea Scrolls to other fields of Jewish Studies.

In order to avoid making this second part of my lecture a simple bibliographical listing of contributions,³¹ I have decided to limit myself to only the first four sections of our Congress and, within these sections, to be very selective, commenting only upon some of the key elements. Consequently I will say nothing on such fascinating topics as the use or misuse of the *Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbat* in the discussions of Jewish Mysticism or the influence of the cave four materials of the *Damascus Document* or of the *Aramaic Levi Document* on the study of the corresponding Genizah materials, to mention only two topics which will be dealt with in the general lectures.

The Hebrew Bible

Now that almost all the biblical scrolls from Qumran have been published in the DJD Series³² (with the exception of the manuscripts of the Writings from Cave 4, which are now sub press and will appear shortly in DJD XVI, and the Samuel manuscripts, also from Cave 4,

is demonstrated in the founding of the Martin Buber Institute of the University of Köln, an Institute in which all areas of Jewish Studies are practiced. As Prof. J. Maier, its founder and former director, told me when I was lecturing there, the starting of the Institute was greatly facilitated by the public interest in the Scrolls, his personal speciality.

³¹ Easily available in García Martínez and Parry (eds.), *A Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah*.

³² Besides the DJD volumes of Cave 1 (DJD I), Murabba'at (DJD II), the “Minor Caves” (DJD III) and Cave 11 (DJD IV and XXIII), which contain biblical and non-biblical texts together, the following volumes of DJD containing only biblical texts have been published: DJD VIII (XII Prophets from Nahal Hever), DJD IX (Paleo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical manuscripts), DJD XII (Genesis to Numbers), XIV (Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings) and XV (The Prophets).

expected in the year 2000) and the whole range of the so-called “parabiblical” texts³³ are also available, it is easy to assess the impact they have had upon the study of the Hebrew Bible. Although the majority of the manuscripts can be classified as proto-Masoretic in textual character, there are enough manuscripts of other sorts to raise many and interesting questions for students of the Hebrew Bible. I will signal only four main areas of study that are deeply indebted to the evidence provided by the Scrolls: textual criticism, the history and evolution of the biblical text, the problem of the canon and the standardization and uniformity of the biblical text.

That the practice of textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible has already been changed by the publication of the Scrolls hardly needs to be proved. A look at the editions of Isaiah and Jeremiah of the Hebrew University Project, or simply at the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, would suffice. In the Preface to his *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, Professor Emanuel Tov wrote:

The centrality of the texts from the Judean Desert for textual research necessitated a detailed investigation of all their aspects, and it was only after completing an investigation in this area that I was ready to embark on the writing of this book. The impact of these scrolls is felt in every chapter.³⁴

The change brought about by the availability of the new manuscript evidence is the understanding of the evolution of the biblical text seem equally clear to me. The classical theory of the three basic text types, which, through gradual development, were supposedly transformed into the Jewish, the Christian (the Septuagint) and the Samaritan Bible respectively, had to be abandoned as soon as 11QpaleoLeviticus^a, 4QpaleoExodus^m, and 4QNumbers^a were published. Everybody is now familiar with the theory of “local texts” put forth by Frank Cross,³⁵ with Shemaryahu Talmon’s theory of the sociological origins of the three basic textual types,³⁶ with Tov’s theories of the multiplicity of texts versus

³³ Published in DJD XIII, XIX and XXII.

³⁴ E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Assen: van Gorcum/Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), xxxix.

³⁵ F.M. Cross, 1975. “The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts,” in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Texts* (ed. F.M. Cross and S. Talmon; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975), 306–15.

³⁶ S. Talmon, “The Textual Study of the Bible—A New Outlook,” in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, 321–400.

a unique text and the conservative versus innovative approaches of the scribes,³⁷ and with Ulrich's theory of multiple literary editions of the biblical texts.³⁸ And everybody is aware of the advantages in some respects and of the inconveniences in others of each one of these new theories. If the new evidence has not yet led us to an encompassing new theory which could explain the totality of the data now at hand, it has at least made us aware of the real problems and of the importance of the period prior to the standardization of the biblical text.

In view of the Qumran evidence, it seems clear that we cannot speak of a canon, in the sense of a well-defined number of holy writings, in the Greco-Roman Period, at least not for Judaism as a whole.³⁹ The absence of Nehemiah (which could be purely accidental) and of Esther (which certainly is not) from the collection of sacred writings at Qumran, and the massive presence and authoritative use of books like Ben Sira, Tobit, Enoch or *Jubilees*, make it completely clear. This absence of a "canon" makes even more interesting the problem of the authority of sacred texts, and brings to the fore a whole series of manuscript—the so-called "paraphrases," "reworked Pentateuch" etc.—of which we are not able to identify precisely the "biblical" or "non-biblical" character, and which I have called "borderlines texts."⁴⁰ The problems debated since the publication in 1965 of the 11QPsalms Scroll (with its characteristic mix of biblical and non-biblical psalms)⁴¹ are reinforced with the publication of these "borderline" manuscripts in 1994 for the Pentateuch.

The last point that I wanted to note is the striking difference between the pluriformity of the biblical texts found at Qumran and the uniformity

³⁷ E. Tov, "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls," HUCA 53 (1982): 11–27.

³⁸ E. Ulrich, "Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of canon," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1:23–41, and *idem*, "Multiple Literary Editions: Toward a Theory of the History of the Biblical Text," in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995* (ed. D.W. Parry and S.D. Ricks; STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 78–105.

³⁹ See, for example, E. Ulrich, "The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures at Qumran," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 77–93.

⁴⁰ F. García Martínez, "Biblical Borderlines," in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices* (F. García Martínez and J. Trebolle Barrera; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 123–38.

⁴¹ For a convenient summary, see P.W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

of the biblical manuscripts discovered at Masada, Murabba'at and Nahal Hever. In the later collections only manuscripts of the proto-Masoretic text type have been found or, as in the case of the Greek text of the Twelve Prophets from Nahal Hever, of a revision of a Septuagint tradition on the basis of a Hebrew text similar to the proto-Masoretic tradition. The problem is not only to explain how it was possible to go from one situation to another, but also to understand the status of the biblical text in both situations. Some specialists have tried to solve this problem by postulating a gradual development from pluriformity to uniformity in the textual tradition, which only would have been reached after 70 C.E., when the Pharisaic gained dominance and imposed its textual tradition, progressively eliminating all others.⁴² Others have postulated a different development: from uniformity obtained around the Temple well before the second c. B.C.E., to a progressive diversification of the textual traditions excluded, such as the proto-Samaritan and proto-Septuagint.⁴³ Finally, others have postulated a co-existence of both tendencies. In this view, there was a uniform text tradition in the religious circles around the Temple of Jerusalem well before 70 C.E., motivated by the Pharisaic belief that the prophecy had ended, with a consequent shift from authority outside Scripture to Scripture alone and which would lead to the canonization of the Hebrew Scripture. At the same time, according to this theory, there was a pluriform tradition elsewhere, as exemplified by the biblical texts found at Qumran, in which recourse to the authority of the Scripture was less needed due to a belief in the direct inspiration of the Teacher of Righteousness.⁴⁴

The Greek Bible

I have just mentioned the scroll of the Twelve Prophets from Nahal Hever, a scroll made famous long before its official publication⁴⁵ by the monograph of Dominique Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila*, in which

⁴² B. Albrektson, "Reflections on the Emergence of a Standard Text of the Hebrew Bible," in *Congress Volume Göttingen 1977* (ed. J.A. Emerton; VTSup 29; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 49–65.

⁴³ M. Greenberg, "The Stabilization of the Text of the Hebrew Bible Reviewed in the Light of the Biblical Materials from the Judaean Desert," *JAOs* 76 (1956): 157–67.

⁴⁴ A.S. van der Woude, *Pluriformiteit en Uniformiteit. Overwegingen betreffende de tekstoverlevering van het Oude Testament* (Kampen: Kok, 1992).

⁴⁵ By E. Tov with the collaboration of R. Kraft, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)* (DJD VIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990).

he discovered the *kaige* recension of the Septuagint.⁴⁶ The importance for Septuagint studies of this manuscript is evident and has been widely recognized. Less interesting, because of their fragmentary character, are the Greek fragments of biblical books found in Cave 4 and published in 1992.⁴⁷ But the significance of some Hebrew biblical manuscripts for Septuagint research can hardly be exaggerated. The famous 4QSamuel^{a48} and the equally famous 4QJeremiah^{b49} and 4QJoshua^{a50} have provided us with fragments of a Hebrew text which corresponds to the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint translation, a Hebrew *Vorlage* clearly different from the MT. In this way, these along with many other manuscripts of the proto-Septuagint type found in the different caves, have not only helped to solve the old dispute on the character of the Septuagint (“Translation versus Targum”), but have brought strong support to the credibility of the procedure of retroversion used to reconstruct details of its *Vorlage*.⁵¹

The Aramaic Bible

The evidence for Targumic material at Qumran is limited to the main Targum of Job from cave 11,⁵² and the small fragment of a Leviticus Targum and a second Job Targum from cave 4.⁵³ But its influence on Targumic studies has been strongly felt, especially in the discussion on

⁴⁶ D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila. Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophète* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963).

⁴⁷ By E. Ulrich, DJD IX, 161–97.

⁴⁸ Partially known since Cross's publication of one fragment in 1955 (F.M. Cross, “The Oldest Manuscript from Qumran,” *BASOR* 140 [1955]: 27–33), and analyzed by E. Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Chico: Scholars Press, 1978).

⁴⁹ Originally published by E. Tov, “The Jeremiah Scrolls from Qumran,” *RevQ* 14/54 (1989): 189–206, and now included in DJD XV, 171–76.

⁵⁰ Originally published by E. Ulrich, “4QJoshua^a and Joshua's First Altar in the Promised Land,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies. Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. G.J. Brooke and F. García Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 89–104 and now included in DJD XIV, 143–52.

⁵¹ All these (and many other) issues were treated in detail in a Congress dedicated to exploring the contributions of the Dead Sea Scrolls to the study of the Septuagint, held at the University of Manchester in 1990, see G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars (eds.), *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings. Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings* (SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).

⁵² Preliminary editing by J.P.M. van der Ploeg and A.S. van der Woude, *Le Targum de Job de la Grotte XI de Qumrân* (with the collaboration of B. Jongeling; Leiden: Brill, 1971). It has been assigned the number 11Q10 in DJD XXIII, 79–180.

⁵³ Published by J.T. Milik, DJD VI, 86–89 (Targum Lévitique; 4Q156), 90 (Targum Job; 4Q157).

the Palestinian Targum. The antiquity of these Targumim and their Palestinian character have been used in discussions of the antiquity of the traditions contained in Neofiti and in the Genizah Fragments, and their language has been examined to better understand Palestinian Aramaic.

Also other Aramaic and Hebrew compositions found at Qumran have also been gladly used by Targumists' colleagues: Qumran halakhah has been used to prove the "pre-mishnaic" character of some halakhic traditions found in the Palestinian Targumim, the haggadah of the *Genesis Apocryphon* has been related to the haggadah of the Targumim, and theological ideas appearing in the Qumran manuscripts have been adduced to prove the pre-Christian character of some of the ideas of the Palestinian Targum.⁵⁴

Jewish Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic Literature

This is perhaps the field of Jewish Studies in which the influence of the Dead Sea Scrolls has been felt with the most intensity. That the study of the Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha has become a flourishing field in the last twenty years needs not be proven.⁵⁵ The signs of this flourishing are obvious enough: new critical editions of texts follow one another,⁵⁶ as do new commentaries on the main compositions;⁵⁷ new Periodicals have been created for publication of research⁵⁸ as well as several new Series;⁵⁹

⁵⁴ See the Bibliography published by W.E. Aufrecht, "A Bibliography of the Job Targumim," *Newsletter for Targumic and Cognate Studies*. Supplement 5, 1987.

⁵⁵ For bibliographical details, see A. Lehnardt, *Bibliographie zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit* (JSHRZ VI.2; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1999).

⁵⁶ For example, Greek *Enoch* (by M. Black, 1970), Ethiopic *Enoch* (by M. Knibb, 1978), *Jubilees* (by J.C. VanderKam, 1989), *Joseph and Aseneth* (by Ch. Burchard, 1979), *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* (by M. de Jonge, 1978), *Assumption of Moses* (by J. Tromp, 1993), *Apocalypse of Abraham* (by R. Rubinkiewicz, 1987), *4 Ezra* (by A.F.J. Klijn, 1992), *Ascensio Isaiae* (by E. Norelli, 1995).

⁵⁷ For example, M. Black, *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch. A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes* (SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985); H.W. Hollander and M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. A Commentary* (SVTP 8; Leiden: Brill, 1985); H. Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum with Latin text and English translation* (AGJU 31; Leiden: Brill, 1996); M.E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra. A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990).

⁵⁸ Such as the *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*, edited by J.H. Charlesworth and published by Sheffield Academic Press.

⁵⁹ The new Supplements to the *JSSJ* and the classic *Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha* by Brill, the Supplements to the *JSP* and the *Guides to the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* of the Sheffield Academic Press, the *SBL Early Judaism and Its Literature* of the Scholars Press, for example.

and new collections of translations of the whole corpus⁶⁰ into a number of different languages such as English, German, Spanish, Italian, Danish, Dutch, Polish, Hebrew and French have appeared.⁶¹

All this revival was stimulated, if not directly provoked, by the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In the words of Michael Knibb, one of the major protagonists of this revival: "The most important factor that has affected, and will continue to affect, study of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha has undoubtedly been the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls."⁶²

The reasons are easy to understand, and they are perfectly summarized by Knibb: the Scrolls have provided remains of several of these compositions in their original languages, they have given us evidence of their being read and copied in the period of the Second Temple, they have provided an increased volume of comparative material for their understanding and they have provided an enlarged context for the interpretation of these writings, not as self contained corpora, but as part of the Jewish writings of the period.⁶³ His conclusion, "It is impossible for

⁶⁰ Formerly only available in English, in R.H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. With introductions and critical and explanatory notes to the several books* (Ed. in conjunction with many scholars; 2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), and in German, in E. Kautzsch, *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (ed. and transl. in conjunction with colleagues; Tübingen: Mohr, 1900), and P. Riessler, *Altjüdisches Schrifttum außerhalb der Bibel. Übersetzt und erläutert* (Augsburg: Filser, 1928).

⁶¹ The French collection, edited by A. Dupont-Sommer and M. Philonenko, *La Bible: Ecrits intertestamentaires. Bibliothèque de la Pléiade* (Paris: Galimard, 1987), has adopted the most elegant and practical solution of printing in one single volume a very good selection of apocryphal writings together with a very good selection of Qumran writings, underlying in this way the elements common to all these Jewish writings from the Greco-Roman period.

⁶² M. Knibb, "Perspectives on the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: The Levi Traditions," in *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism. A Symposium in Honour of Adam S. van der Woude on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday* (ed. F. García Martínez and E. Noort; VTSup 73; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 198.

⁶³ Knibb, "Perspectives on the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: The Levi Traditions," 198–99: "At the most obvious level, the scrolls have provided us with fragments in the original languages, and from close to the time of their composition, of works—for example Ben Sira, or Enoch, or *Jubilees*—for which in the past we were forced to rely on translations into Greek, or on daughter versions of the Greek, or—exceptionally in the case of Ben Sira—on medieval copies of the text in the original language. The evidence from Qumran for the writings of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha is limited in extent, and we are still heavily dependent on the translations into Greek or on the secondary translations. But the Hebrew and Aramaic fragments have brought us much more closely into touch with the writings of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in the form in which they were originally composed, have enabled us to assess the quality and character of the translations, and in the cases of the book of Enoch have shed light on the formation of a work that is best known to us in the pentateuchal form represented by

the future to conceive a serious study of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in isolation from the study of the texts from Qumran, just as the converse ought to be the case," seems to me perfectly justified.

Time does not allow me to deal with the impact of the research on the Dead Sea Scrolls on the other areas of Jewish Studies, as originally planned. In the case of "Hebrew Language Studies" it is generally acknowledged that the Scrolls have provided us with the missing link needed to follow the evolution of Hebrew from the late biblical Hebrew to the Mishnaic Hebrew.⁶⁴ A look at the *Materials for the Dictionary. Series I 200 B.C.E.–300 C.E.*⁶⁵ shows that practically all the sources available for this crucial period come from the finds in the Judean Desert. A reference to the work of Kutscher and of E. Qimron should be enough.⁶⁶

The same happened, and even more clearly, with the "Aramaic language." We have recovered at Qumran more than 100 manuscripts, some of them of sizeable dimensions, which reveal a phase of the language previously unknown and have provided a great impetus to the study of the Aramaic dialects. A reference to the work of Kutscher, Fitzmyer, Greenfield and Muraoka on 1QapGen, or to that of Sokoloff on 11QtgJob, and above all to the magnum opus of Klaus Beyer,⁶⁷ make further comments unnecessary.

the Ethiopic version, that is in the form that represents the final stage in its evolution.

In addition to their significance from a purely textual point of view, however, the Qumran discoveries are of fundamental importance for the study of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha because they have provided a considerably enlarged context for the interpretation of these writings. This has occurred at two levels. Sometimes specific discoveries have been of relevance for particular writings of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, for example the texts associated with Levi in relation to the Greek *Testament of Levi*, or the *Genesis Apocryphon* in relation to traditions of *Jubilees*. But more commonly the Qumran discoveries are of importance because they provide a greatly increased volume of comparative material for the assessment of the literary genres or the interpretation of the beliefs and ideas that occur in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, for example the Qumran wisdom texts in relation to the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical wisdom texts, or the various texts from Qumran with messianic beliefs in relation to the messianic passages in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha."

⁶⁴ See A. Sáenz Badillos, *Historia de la Lingua Hebraea* (Estudios Orientales 2; Sabadell: AUSA, 1988), 136.

⁶⁵ Published in microfiches by the Academy of the Hebrew Language and the Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language, Jerusalem 1988.

⁶⁶ Especially Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a)* (STDJ 6; Leiden: Brill, 1974) [translation of the original Hebrew of 1959] and E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS 29; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

⁶⁷ K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), and *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Ergänzungsband* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), with the bibliographical references to the other studies.

As is well known, there are practically no historical works at Qumran, or documentary texts. But in other collections of documents from the Judean Desert we do find most interesting materials of this sort, and they have indeed attracted the attention of the colleagues of the section "Ancient Jewish History Studies." The history of the Second Revolt cannot be understood without the Bar Kochba letters from Murabba'at, Nahal Hever and Wadi Seiyal, nor can the economic and social history, the administration, law, family relations, etc. of this period can be grasped without the family archives recovered in the caves of all these wadis.⁶⁸

I would have loved to say something on the impact of Dead Sea Scrolls study in "Early Rabbinics," if only because I recently edited in the *Revue de Qumrân* an article on 4QMMT written by Miguel Pérez, who was attracted by the language of the document and by the analogies with the Midrash Sifra.⁶⁹ But it is already time to close. And besides, I am convinced that in this case the "impact" goes the other way around. It is not research on the Dead Sea Scrolls that has had an impact on the Study of Rabbinics, but expertise in Rabbinics that is making the research on the Dead Sea Scrolls flourish. It does not seem accidental that J. Strugnell requested the help of Ya'akov Sussmann to elucidate the *Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah*,⁷⁰ that J.T. Milik entrusted the edition of the Cave 4 *Damascus Document* manuscripts to J.M. Baumgarten,⁷¹ or that some of the most exciting work on the *Temple Scroll* is coming from L.H. Schiffman;⁷² these are three accomplished rabbinic scholars.

* * *

I started my lecture contrasting the "midlife crisis" associated with turning fifty with the joyous celebration of fifty years of Qumran research, and I have tried to present, very briefly, some of the achievements of

⁶⁸ Published in the DJD Series (Murabba'at, DJD II; Hever/Seiyal DJD XXVII) or elsewhere (Nahal Hever: N. Lewis, *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters. I: Greek Papyri* [Judean Desert Studies 2; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1989]; Nahal Se'elim: A. Yardeni, *Nahal Se'elim Documents* [Judean Desert Studies; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1995] [Hebr.]).

⁶⁹ M. Pérez Fernández, "4QMMT: Redactional Study," *RevQ* 18/70 (1997): 191–205.

⁷⁰ Y. Sussmann, "The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls," originally published in *Tarbiz* 59 (1989–90): 11–76 and included in English in a modified form as "Appendix 1" in DJD X, 179–200.

⁷¹ J.M. Baumgarten, DJD XVIII.

⁷² See his numerous publications on halakhic issues of the *Temple Scroll* listed in García Martínez and Parry (eds.), *A Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah*, 386–94.

this research and its influence in other areas of Jewish Studies. My last sentence on Rabbinics leads me again to the image of marriage and to the fruits of a happy union. I am sincerely convinced that the Scrolls research has had a very positive influence in various areas of Jewish Studies. But I am also equally convinced that it is only thanks to the effort and the involvement of colleagues working in other areas of Jewish Studies that the Scrolls research has progressed in the past and can further grow in the future. Qumran studies are a grown up academic discipline, but no academic discipline can flourish in isolation. Would it not be wise for our EAJIS to have a section dedicated to the Dead Sea Scrolls in each one of our congresses in order to enhance the interaction among the many grown up disciplines that form our field?

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

NEW PERSPECTIVES ON THE STUDY OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS*

At the closing ceremony of the Congress organized by the Israel Antiquities Authority, the Hebrew University and the Shrine of the Book to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the discovery of the Scrolls on July 1997 in Jerusalem, Professor Hartmut Stegemann delivered a memorable lecture. At the end of a banquet in what is now called “the Qumran National Park,” on the plateau of Qumran itself, between the ruins of the Khirbeth and the mountains illuminated for the occasion, and before the interpretation of a musical composition, “Sound of Light and Darkness” (commissioned by the Israel Museum for the occasion in which some of the old Qumran texts resounded for the first time in the desert in a rather modern musical version), the reminiscences of two of the protagonists of the discoveries, Professors Frank Cross and Joseph Aviram, were read. Both of them had written their souvenirs in the light tone of an after dinner speech, with an irony and tenderness perfectly fitting to the occasion. And then came the turn of Professor Hartmut Stegemann. His lecture was announced with the title “Qumran Challenges for the Next Century.” I think that everybody was expecting quite a tone and quite a duration something similar to the reminiscences of Cross and Aviram: a light dessert after a copious meal. But Stegemann would not be true to himself if he had not seized the occasion to surprise everybody, which means that he treated us to the delivery of a magisterial lecture in the best German tradition: a very copious and difficult to digest meal, at least for a public already satiated after some hundred and thirty lectures in the five days of the congress. Hartmut Stegemann presented a complete panorama of all the problems still not solved in Qumran research and indicated the ways in which these problems should be dealt with in the coming years in order to arrive at a satisfactory solution.

* I have retained the style of the oral presentation of the paper, adding only the indispensable references.

I do not intend to compare our small symposium with the big celebration in Jerusalem, nor do I intend to compare this last lecture to Hartmut Stegemann's magisterial summing up of the challenges the Dead Sea Scrolls pose for biblical research in general and for research in Early Judaism in particular. I only recall this anecdote to indicate clearly from the beginning what I will not do in this lecture: I do not intend to outline the ways in which Qumran research will develop in the future.

I must confess that before Stegemann's lecture in Jerusalem, I was tempted to do something of the sort, in a more restricted way, of course, and I had started to write down some notes for that purpose. But after hearing his lecture (which will be published in the Proceedings of the Jerusalem congress) I have put away these notes.

What I intend to do is something different and much more simple. I have reflected on the results achieved in the last five years of Qumran research on the Scrolls and (with the inevitable subjectivity of this sort of exercise) I have tried to isolate the single element that, in my view, makes all the difference and opens really new perspectives on the study of the Scrolls. Afterwards I have applied this single element to a single composition in order to see what difference it makes to our understanding of it.¹

In my opinion, the single element, which really opens new perspectives on the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls is the fact that now, and after fifty years, we have available for study, *all* the materials recovered in the eleven caves of Qumran.

Although there are still some volumes of the *Discoveries of the Judaean Desert Series* which have not yet been published, and even if almost nobody can keep abreast of the pace in which the DJD volumes are now appearing under the general editorship of E. Tov,² we do have the microfiche edition with all the PAM photographs³ and we also have the Oxford-Brill CD-ROM electronic version of these photographs.⁴ Of course, it remains true that we never can pretend to have a complete

¹ The underlying assumption is, of course, that the same single element will also make a difference and open new perspectives for the understanding of all other compositions.

² Four volumes in 1997 (DJD XV, XX, XXIV and XXVII) and four volumes so far in 1998 (DJD XI, XXIII, XXVI and XXV).

³ *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Microfiche. A Comprehensive Facsimile Edition of the Texts from the Judaean Desert* (ed. E. Tov with the collaboration of S. J. Pfann; Leiden: Brill-IDC, 1993).

⁴ *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Electronic Reference Library. Volume I* (ed. T.H. Lim in consultation with P.S. Alexander; Oxford: Oxford University Press / Leiden: Brill, 1997).

image of all of the collection of manuscripts that once were deposited in the caves, nor can we have a concrete idea of the relationship of the materials recovered with the materials completely lost. We should be well aware that all we have recovered is due to purely accidental factors and that from this gigantic puzzle there are more pieces missing than pieces in our possession. But even so, it is my contention that having all the recovered materials now available does make a difference and opens really new perspectives on the study of the Scrolls.

This is thus the single element I have selected. In choosing a composition to test the new perspectives this element opens for us I have hesitated a long time. The most obvious choice (leaving aside the biblical books which form the central focus of our symposium) would have been to test this single element using the best-known compositions from cave 1: the *Serek ha-Yahad* or the *Hodayot*. We have now several other copies of both compositions from cave 4 available (although not yet published in the *DJD* Series). Also an obvious choice would have been the *Damascus Document*, because the cave 4 copies were recently published in *DJD* XVIII⁵ and allow us to see what difference it makes to have at hand all the available evidence for understanding this fundamental composition. But because we are in Groningen and we are celebrating the 70th Birthday of Adam van der Woude, you will understand why I have finally settled on a composition well represented in the “Dutch share,” one of which the honoree himself has published a small fragment⁶ and which prominently figures in *DJD* XXIII, the “Groningen volume.”⁷ I refer to the *Temple Scroll*. I intend to explore which new perspectives can be opened for study given the fact that now we have available all the materials preserved which come from copies of this composition.

1. THE MATERIALS

Let us start by summarizing all the evidence we have recovered belonging to or related to this composition. From the *Temple Scroll* we have recovered two copies, a third possible copy and some further fragments related to this composition.

⁵ J.M. Baumgarten, *DJD* XVIII.

⁶ A.S. van der Woude, “Ein bisher unveröffentlichtes Fragment der Tempelrolle,” *RevQ* 13/49–52 (1988): 89–92.

⁷ F. García Martínez, E.J.C. Tigchelaar, and A.S. van der Woude, *DJD* XXIII.

The two copies, both found in Cave 11, have been known for a long time. Yadin published 11QT^a in 1977,⁸ and the existence of 11QT^b has been known since the “Journées bibliques de Louvain” of 1976, in which J. van der Ploeg presented some fragments that were immediately identified by Yadin as a second copy of the *Temple Scroll*.⁹ Many of these fragments were included in Yadin’s edition,¹⁰ I published some more,¹¹ and the complete edition is now available in DJD XXIII.¹²

There is no doubt that 11Q19 (11QT^a) and 11Q20 (11QT^b) are copies of the same composition and that both represent the same text copied more or less at the same time by two different scribes. Although in my preliminary edition I characterized 11QT^b more as a different *literary edition* of the *Temple Scroll* than as a *copy*, and indicated three cases in which 11QT^b may have had a somewhat longer text than 11QT^a,¹³ closer scrutiny of the text has convinced me that this is not the case¹⁴ and that 11QT^a and 11QT^b are indeed two scribal copies of the same original. The relationship between the manuscripts is expressed in this way in the *DJD* edition:

11Q19 and 11Q20 are clearly two copies of the same work. Although the evidence is restricted and the fragments tend to be clustered around certain columns, the preserved material of 11Q20 covers almost all the five parts of 11Q19 and has preserved elements of four of the five sources of 11Q19 identified by Wilson and Will and carefully studied by Wise. The only missing element is the Midrash to Deuteronomy, including the King’s Law, the absence of which may be due merely to the vagaries of preservation.¹⁵

⁸ Y. Yadin, *מגילת-המקדש* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977).

⁹ J.P.M. van der Ploeg, “Une halakha inédite de Qumrân,” in *Qumran. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Paris-Gembloux: Duculot/Leuven: University Press, 1978), 107–13.

¹⁰ The photographs are included in the Supplementary Plates volume, pls. 35*–40*.

¹¹ F. García Martínez, “11Q^bTemple^b: A Preliminary Publication,” 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; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 2:363–91, pls. 9–15.

¹² DJD XXIII, 357–409, pls. XLI–XLVII.

¹³ The then numbered frags. 8 ii, 13 ii and 17. From their analysis I concluded: “11Q20, to use the terminology of the discussion of the Biblical text, more than another *copy*, represents another *edition* of the same work,” F. García Martínez, “11Q^bTemple^b: A Preliminary Publication,” 390.

¹⁴ As it is explained in detail in my contribution to the Jerusalem Qumran congress, “Multiple Literary Editions of the Temple Scroll?,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years After Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J.C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, The Shrine of the Book, 2000), 364–71.

¹⁵ DJD XXIII, 365.

A similar conclusion can be reached concerning a third possible copy of the *Temple Scroll*, 4Q524,¹⁶ although here the conclusion is less assured.

Of this manuscript 39 fragments have been recovered, mostly of very limited size. Of these fragments the most useful are frags. 6–13 and frags. 15–22, grouped by the editor in two big combinations which correspond to 11QT^a LIX 17–LX 6 and 11QT^a LXVI 8–17, as well as frag. 14 corresponding to 11QT^a LXIV 6–11 and frag. 25, which has no correspondence in 11QT^a or 11QT^b. The rest are snippets, too small to be useful.¹⁷

In spite of the limited size of the preserved material, and of the presence of a couple of interesting variants, Puech is firm in his identification of 4Q524 as a copy of the *Temple Scroll*: “4Q524 est une copie très proche de, sinon identique à 11Q19.”¹⁸ Indeed, the overlapping is impressive enough. The first three lines reconstructed with the help of frags. 6–13 overlap with 11QT^a LIX 17–21, and the last three lines (lines 8 to 10) with 11QT^a LX 2–6, without any sensible difference in the preserved text. The lines in between allow enough space to fill the gap between the end of col. LIX and the preserved beginning of col. LX. Thus this group of fragments represent practically the same text known by 11QT^a.

Also the group of frags. 15–22 overlaps with 11QT^a LXVI 8–17, with only one major difference according to Puech’s placement of the fragments:¹⁹ the repetition of *כי תועבה היא* (“because it is an abomination”) in line 4 in the case of illicit intercourse with the daughter of one’s brother, as in the other cases of incest, instead of a change to the stricter *כי זמה היא* (“because it is a depravity”) as in 11QT^a LXVI 15.

¹⁶ Preliminarily published by É. Puech, “Fragments du plus ancien exemplaire du Rouleau du Temple (4Q524),” 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. M. Bernstein, F. Garcia Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 19–52, pls. 2–3, and now available in É. Puech, DJD XXV, 85–114, pls. VII–VIII.

¹⁷ Puech identifies frag. 1 with 11QT^a XXXV 7; frag. 2 with 11QT^a L 17–21; frag. 3 with 11QT^a LIV 5, frag. 4 with 11QT^a LV 11–13 and frag. 5 with 11QT^a LVIII 10–13, but a look at the photographs shows, in view of the number of letters really preserved in each fragment, that these identifications cannot be taken as very hard evidence. Frags. 23–39 have not been identified with any preserved part of the *Temple Scroll*.

¹⁸ Puech, “Fragments du plus ancien exemplaire du Rouleau du Temple (4Q524),” 57.

¹⁹ E. Qimron, *The Temple Scroll. A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions* (Judean Desert Studies; Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press/Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1996), who only reproduces 19 fragments of 4Q524, arranges them (p. 91) otherwise.

This difference in wording can be explained, as Puech does,²⁰ as a later intensification of the definition of this concrete sin as incest, bringing it into line with Lev 18:17 and 20:14 as well as with CD VIII 6–7.

Frag. 14 is more problematic. Its first four lines overlap without major problems with 11Q^T^a LXIV 6–10;²¹ but the resumptive quotation of Deut 21:23 “because they are cursed by God and by men, those hanged on a tree; thus you shall not defile the land which I give you for inheritance,” which concludes the passage on 11Q^T^a, is certainly absent from 4Q524. Instead, the overlapping passage is followed in line 5 by two complete words: תלבוש שטני (“[you shall not] wear a cloth made of different threads”),²² which Puech reasonably identifies as coming from a quotation of Deut 22:11,²³ and in line 6²⁴ by a new quotation of Deut 21:19–21, which Puech has already tentatively identified in line 1 of the fragment. Even if the tentative identification of lines 1 and 6 is not accepted,²⁵ this frag. 14 offers a shorter text, without the quotation of Deut 21:23 and, probably, with a different sequence of the deuteronomistic materials used, because Deut 21:22 is apparently followed by Deut 22:11, and not by Deut 22:1. In spite of this difference I think it reasonable to read this fragment as also part of a copy of the *Temple Scroll*, and I understand the insertion of Deut 21:23 in 11Q^T^a as a secondary development to underline the biblical basis of the capital punishment imposed.

Frag. 6–13, 14 and 15–22 strongly suggest that 4Q524 is indeed a copy of the *Temple Scroll*. But certainty is difficult to achieve for two reasons: the biggest fragment preserved (frag. 25) does not have a correspondence in the known text of the *Temple Scroll* and all the fragments that can be retained as significant correspond to the last part of the *Temple Scroll* and all of them belong to the source designated as “Midrash to Deuteronomy.” This observation immediately raises the question of whether this manuscript does represent the composition we know as

²⁰ DJD XXV, 106.

²¹ Significantly, without the *waw* inserted on 11Q^T^a LXIV 10 between “his people” in Yadin’s reading (“my people” in Qimron’s reading) and “the children of Israel.” On the significance of this variant see E. Puech, “Notes sur 11Q^T19 LXIV 3–13 et 4Q524 14 2–4. A propos de la crucifixion dans le Rouleau du Temple et dans le judaïsme ancien,” *RevQ* 18/69 (1997): 109–24.

²² In MT שעטני.

²³ Not attested on the preserved text of 11Q^T^a, but assumed by Yadin at the top of col. LXXV.

²⁴ If the identification of Puech, based on the only preserved word עיריו (“his city”) is to be accepted.

²⁵ And in my opinion the basis is too scanty to allow any firm conclusion.

Temple Scroll or if it represents one of the sources used by his author or redactor.

The editor is aware of this problem and offers two indications to solve it: all the fragments from 4Q524 recovered come from the most inner part of the scroll so that the correspondence with the last part of the *Temple Scroll* is what we should expect;²⁶ and the variance which we can observe between 4Q524 and 11QT^a witness changes due to scribal transmission of a known text rather than the use of a source.²⁷ I tend to concur and I consider for all purposes 4Q524 to be a third copy of the *Temple Scroll*.

All these three copies are easily accessible, although with some differences in the transcriptions and in the numbering of the fragments, in Qimron's handy edition of the *Temple Scroll*.²⁸

Two other manuscripts have also been tentatively edited as possible copies of the *Temple Scroll*: 4Q365a, published in DJD XIII as *Temple Scroll?*,²⁹ and 11Q21, first published by E. Qimron³⁰ and included in DJD XXIII as *Temple Scroll*^c (?).³¹ But, in my considered opinion, they do not represent copies of the same composition, and we should consider the "official" designations only as a rough indication that their contents are somehow related to the composition known as the *Temple Scroll*.

As its official Q-number indicates, 4Q365a was previously considered part of 4Q365 (one of the manuscripts assigned to Strugnell [SL 2], later labelled "Reworked Pentateuch"). Analysis of the data contained in the cards of the concordance of the Rockefeller Museum shows that three of the five fragments which now form 4Q365a were originally considered a separate manuscript, assigned to Jean Starcky for publication,

²⁶ Puech, "Fragments du plus ancien exemplaire du Rouleau du Temple (4Q524)," 22: "Mais ceux-ci portent essentiellement sur la partie finale du grand rouleau de 11Q19, col. L à LXVI, signifiant par là sans doute que la fin du rouleau se trouvait enroulée à l'intérieur, comme il arrive dans une majorité des cas."

²⁷ DJD XXV, 86: "Certaines variantes comme la correction en 11Q19 LXIV 10 (voir frag. 14:4) ou la sévérité accrue en LXVI 15 (voir frag. 15:4) témoignent en faveur d'une reprise du texte et de retouches et additions des scribes au cours de sa transmission... Il apparaît ainsi que 4Q524 n'est pas une source du *Rouleau du Temple* mais bien la plus ancienne copie retrouvée."

²⁸ Qimron, *The Temple Scroll: A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions*.

²⁹ Edited by S. White in DJD XIII, 319–33, pls. XXXIII–XXXIV. See also S. White, "Three Fragments from Qumran Cave 4 and Their Relationship to the Temple Scroll," *JQR* 85 (1994): 259–73.

³⁰ E. Qimron, "Chickens in the Temple Scroll (11QT^c)," *Tarbiz* 64 (1995): 473–76 [Hebrew].

³¹ DJD XXIII, 411–14, pl. XLVIII.

and were labelled “Nouvelle Jérusalem hébreu.” Its editor has decided, not without hesitation, to separate five fragments, formerly considered to be part of 4Q365, from the rest of this manuscript and to publish them as another possible exemplar of the *Temple Scroll* (4Q365a). She is perfectly aware of the problems posed by this identification, because only one of the five fragments overlaps (and not completely) with the known text of the *Temple Scroll*. In her own words:

However, as will be seen below, the identification of these fragments as part of 11QT^a is problematic. In one case where frag. 2 and 11QT^a have parallel content, the remains of the two columns of frag. 2 preclude incorporating all of the material from the parallel section of 11QT^a into its columns (see below). As for the other four fragments, they have no obvious location in 11QT^a. If these fragments do constitute another copy of the *Temple Scroll*, it must have been a copy different from 11QT^a and 11QT^b.³²

A comparison of the introductory matters of both 4Q365 and 4Q365a in the DJD edition shows clearly that the editor acknowledges that these five fragments attributed to 4Q365a were written by the same scribe who wrote 4Q365, that both manuscripts have margins in the same range, that the distance of the tops of the letters is the same in both manuscripts, that both manuscripts share the same feature of occasionally using “medial” forms in final position, that the orthography and the morphology of both manuscripts are the same, and that both have the same physical characteristics: colour of the leather, decay, use of guiding dots and ruling, etc. In short, nothing except the contents would suggest that the fragments attributed to 4Q365a do not come from the manuscript 4Q365, a position consequently adopted by J. Strugnell, who gave to the five fragments a logical position in his reconstruction of 4Q365.

For White, the fact that in the preserved text of these five fragments no known biblical quotations are preserved is enough to separate them from the rest of the manuscript. She explicitly states:

Unlike the fragments of 4Q365 however, which, like the other manuscript of 4QRP, contain a text of the Pentateuch that has been systematically reworked, these five fragments do not include any biblical material. Because of this, it is very unlikely that they belong to 4QRP.³³

³² DJD XIII, 320.

³³ DJD XIII, 319.

In general, the argument of content would be a very strong one, but in this particular case is rather problematic for several reasons. The five fragments attributed to 4Q365a are isolated fragments and the absence of “biblical” material in the parts recovered (all of them, except frag. 2, of very limited size) could be perfectly accidental. Frag. 14 of 4Q158³⁴ (another copy of the “Reworked Pentateuch”) proves my point because the fragment has no biblical material. Besides, the nature of the composition precludes the use of the argument of content with the categories of “biblical”/“non-biblical” as factors of attribution. In Tov’s general introduction to the manuscripts 4Q364–367, the category of “Reworked Pentateuch” is defined as “a running text of the Pentateuch interspersed with exegetical additions and omissions,” and Tov notes that:

The exegetical character of this composition is especially evident from several exegetical additions comprising half a line, one line, two lines, and even seven or eight lines.³⁵

This definition of the composition not only allows for additions consisting of non-biblical material, but also leads one to expect them as the most characteristic elements of this literary genre. Frag. 23 of 4Q365 proves that these “exegetical additions” could be done with materials not found in any “biblical” manuscript, but related to the *Temple Scroll*.

In short, I remain reasonably certain that these five fragments now labelled 4Q365a are part and parcel of 4Q365. They are thus not a possible copy of the *Temple Scroll* but a copy of the “Reworked Pentateuch,” a copy which incorporates materials known from and related to biblical manuscripts, materials known from and related to other compositions such as the *Temple Scroll* and the *New Jerusalem*, and materials previously unknown. The composition from which these fragments come is extremely interesting because it may represent one of the sources used by the author-redactor of the *Temple Scroll*, or may be witness to a common ancestor.

The problems of the other manuscript also tentatively published as possibly related to the *Temple Scroll* (11Q21) are similar to the problems of 4Q365a. Of its three fragments, only some letters of frag. 1 overlap with the known text of 11QT^a III 14–17 (and the key words of this fragment are not preserved on 11QT^a). The other two fragments have a content compatible with the *Temple Scroll* (with cols. IX and XLVII–XLVIII)

³⁴ Edited by J. Allegro, DJD V, 1–6, pl. I.

³⁵ DJD XIII, 191.

but with no overlapping. Besides, the physical appearance of the three fragments, the ruling and the writing, are very similar, not to say identical, to the fragments of 11Q12 (a copy of the Book of *Jubilees*). If DJD XXIII has retained Qimron's designation of these three fragments as 11QTemple^c (?) it is because of the impossibility of locating the text of the fragments in the known text of *Jubilees*, and in order to underscore that the shared vocabulary with the *Temple Scroll* may indicate that they preserve missing parts of this composition or of another composition dealing with similar or with related subjects.

If I am not mistaken, these five manuscripts represent all the evidence we have recovered pertaining to the *Temple Scroll*. What difference does it make to know now all the materials preserved of this composition? At first sight, not very much. After all, most of these five manuscripts are very or extremely fragmentary and they add very little, in terms of contents, to the more than eight meters long copy as published by Yadin since 1977 (11QT^a). But, upon reflection, they indeed make a very important difference.

But in order to understand the new perspectives opened by the new evidence, it is necessary to summarize briefly what we already did know about the *Temple Scroll* before the latest texts were available and what we did not know about this composition.

2. WHAT WE ALREADY KNEW

The *Temple Scroll* has been intensively studied since Yadin's magisterial publication³⁶ and we knew a lot about the composition contained in 11QT^a and about the two scribal hands, which copied it at the end of the first c. B.C.E. or at the beginning of the first c. C.E.

We knew that the redactor of the composition presented his work in a narrative frame similar to the one of *Jubilees*, the Sinaitic covenant reflected in Exod 34 and Deut 7. The author presented his work as a written version of the revelation God gave to Moses, to the point of changing to direct speech in the first person and putting into God's mouth what in Deuteronomy is presented as words of Moses to the people. In this way he presents his work as a new Torah coming directly from God (even if occasionally the author forgets this pseudepigraphic

³⁶ See F. García Martínez, "A Classified Bibliography," in Qimron, *The Temple Scroll: A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions*, 95–121.

fiction and keeps the third person of the biblical text). This new “Deuteronomy” systematically integrates the different laws of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers concerning the Temple and its sacrifices, sometimes literally, at other times in a modified way and with many additions which did not appear in any of the biblical texts we know. It completes the whole with a new version of Deut 12–23.

We knew that the author grouped the laws he wished to include into four main sections.³⁷ The first section contains the norms for the construction of the Temple (norms for the construction of the sanctuary and the altar, in cols. II–XIII, and norms for the construction of the Temple squares and other buildings placed there, cols. XXX–XLV). Between these norms for the construction of the Temple and its parts he inserted a second topic: the norms concerning the festivals of the whole year and their respective sacrifices, including some festivals not previously attested such as the festivals of the new wheat, the new wine, the new oil and the new wood. The third topic is the purity laws: the purity of the Temple and of the city of the Temple (cols. XLV–XLVII) and the purity of persons and things in a more general way (cols. XLVIII–LI). The fourth topic, which covers the rest of the manuscript (cols. LII–LXVI) is a new version of Deut 12–23 with the same variety of topics that characterize this section of Deuteronomy. It includes some notable expansions such as the section known as the “Torah of the King” (cols. LVI–LIX), which expands Deut 17:14–20, the amplification on the Levites (col. LX 1–11) and the section on the crucifixion as a form of capital punishment (col. XLIV 6–13).

We also knew that the author-redactor used written sources for these four topics.³⁸ Of course, he used first at all the Torah, which he knew intimately, and especially Deuteronomy; he did not hesitate to combine different biblical formulations, harmonizing, clarifying, completing or even modifying them if necessary for his purpose. But he also used other written sources which he incorporated into his work: a written source with instruction for the construction of the Temple; a “festal calendar” sensibly different from the usual lunar calendar; a “purity source” of

³⁷ For a detailed listing of the contents of the composition, see J. Maier, *Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer und das “Neue Jerusalem”* (3rd ed.; UTB 829; München: Reinhard, 1997), 8–20.

³⁸ See A.M. Wilson and L. Wills, “Literary Sources of the Temple Scroll,” *HTR* 75 (1982): 275–88, M.O. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (SAOC 49; Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1990) and F. García Martínez, “Sources et composition du Rouleau du Temple,” *Hénoch* 13 (1991): 219–32.

which he only gives a summary, but which clearly reflects the purity regulations considered normative within the group to which he addresses his composition; and a midrash to Deuteronomy from which he takes some of his expansion such as the “Torah of the King,” the privileges of the Levites and the crucifixion.

Even if there are some uncertainties in some of the details, such as the precise limits of some of the sources used, of the relative chronology of these sources, or of the redactional activity of the author, I think the foregoing is a fair reflection of the main points of the composition on which there has been a general consensus among scholars, and which we could consider we knew.³⁹

Together with these main lines in which there was a general consensus, there were also many very important aspects of the composition hotly disputed among scholars during the last twenty years, and of which we could not say that we knew for sure. In order to see if the new evidence we do have now makes a difference and opens new perspectives to the study of this composition, I list below some of these issues.

3. WHAT WE DO NOT KNOW

Among other things, there is a total lack of consensus regarding the date of composition, its origin and its relationship with other Qumran manuscripts, or its literary genre and relationship with the biblical text. Because it is impossible in this context to give a detailed account of all the divergent positions taken on each one of these issues and of the reasons for these different positions, I will limit myself to indicating the main divergent views and to delineate the one that Van der Woude and myself have expounded in more detail in the introduction to the Dutch translation of the *Temple Scroll*.⁴⁰

³⁹ There is also, of course, an enormous amount of detail we also knew because it is explicitly stated in the text, but here we are concerned only with the main lines of the composition.

⁴⁰ F. García Martínez and A.S. van der Woude, *De rollen van de Dode Zee: Ingeleid en in het Nederlands vertaald* (2 vols.; Kampen: Kok, 1994–1995), 1:133–39.

Date of composition

The dates proposed for the composition of the *Temple Scrolls* oscillate between the fifth-fourth c. B.C.E.⁴¹ and the first c. C.E.⁴² We tentatively dated the composition to the middle of the second c. B.C.E. We attempted to date each one of the sources used by the final redactor: we dated the festival calendar source to the third c. or the beginning of the second c. B.C.E., the “temple source” roughly to the Seleucid period, the “purity source” also roughly to the Antiochan crisis, and the “Midrash to Deuteronomy” to the Maccabean period. Because the final redaction of the *Temple Scroll* is necessarily posterior to its sources, but prior to *MMT* and the *Damascus Document*, we concluded that the most likely date of composition should be placed around the middle of the second c. B.C.E.⁴³

Origin of the composition

The origin of the composition has been as disputed as its date. Stegemann⁴⁴ postulates an origin completely independent of the Qumran group; many others, on the contrary,⁴⁵ have considered the *Temple Scroll* to be one of the characteristic products of the Qumran community. We prefer to consider it to be a composition which grew up in the same priestly circles from which, later on, the Qumran group would be formed, and that therefore it belongs to the formative period of the Qumran community, prior to its establishment and withdrawal to the desert. The overriding interest in the Temple and in its sacrificial system, the presentation of the blueprint of the Temple as normative and revealed to Moses, the division of powers and the presentation of the King as submitted to the High Priest, are some of the elements which

⁴¹ The date proposed by H. Stegemann, “The Origins of the Temple Scroll,” in *Congress Volume Jerusalem* (ed. J.A. Emerton; SVT 40; Leiden: Brill, 1988), 235–56, and most recently in *idem*, *The Library of Qumran. On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Leiden: Brill / Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 96.

⁴² The date assigned to it by B.E. Thiering, “The Date of Composition of the Temple Scroll,” in *Temple Scroll Studies* (ed. G.J. Brooke; JSPS 7; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 99–120.

⁴³ García Martínez and Van der Woude, *De rollen van de Dode Zee*, 137–38.

⁴⁴ But also others, starting with B.A. Levine, “The Temple Scroll: Aspects of Its Historical Provenance and Literary Character,” *BASOR* 232 (1978): 5–23.

⁴⁵ To begin with the editor Y. Yadin in the *editio princeps* and more explicitly in “Is the Temple Scroll a Sectarian Document?” in *Humanizing America's Iconic Book* (ed. G.M. Tucker and D.A. Knight; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980), 153–69.

point to these priestly circles as the matrix in which the *Temple Scroll* originated.

In our opinion, a detailed analysis of the relationship of the *Temple Scroll* to other clearly qumranic compositions leads to the same matrix. In the already quoted “Introduction”⁴⁶ we listed a long series of correspondences of the *Temple Scroll* to the *Damascus Document*, with the *Rule of the Congregation*, the *War Scroll*, the *Peshar Nahum* and the Calendar preserved in 4Q327. But we also listed an equally long series of elements that are not compatible with what is found in the clearly sectarian compositions. Keeping within the best tradition of the “Groningen Hypothesis,” we have proposed to explain both elements (the coincidences and the divergences) by postulating an origin within the priestly circles from which the Qumran community would later grow.

Literary genre and relationship with the biblical text

The literary genre of the *Temple Scroll* has also been hotly debated. For Stegemann the composition is a sixth book of the Torah, a new biblical book destined to complete the Pentateuch.⁴⁷ For Ben Zion Wacholder it is a biblical book destined not to complete, but to replace, the Mosaic Torah. According to Wacholder the *Temple Scroll* is the second Torah received by Moses on Mount Sinai, revealed when the Mosaic Torah proved ephemeral because of the transgression of the people and intended to replace the first Torah as the only Torah for the future.⁴⁸ For many others scholars the composition is above all a rewriting of the Torah to unify and solve the problems of the biblical text.⁴⁹ For us, the basic relation of the *Temple Scroll* (and as a consequence its literary genre) is in the realm of interpretation, an interpretation which is considered revealed and therefore normative and which allows the author to transform and modify the starting point, the biblical text. Like M. Wise,⁵⁰ we consider the *Temple Scroll* to be a new Deuteronomy, but unlike him we do not believe it is a new Deuteronomy to replace the Deuteronomy

⁴⁶ García Martínez and Van der Woude, *De rollen van de Dode Zee*, 136–37.

⁴⁷ H. Stegemann, “Is the Temple Scroll a Sixth Book of the Torah—Lost for 2500 Years?,” *BAR* 13/6 (1987): 28–35.

⁴⁸ B.Z. Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran: the Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Monographs of the Hebrew Union College 8; Cincinnati: HUCP, 1983), 31.

⁴⁹ See D.D. Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible. The Methodology of 11QT (STDJ 14; Leiden: Brill, 1995)*.

⁵⁰ Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11*, 200.

“in the last days,” but rather that it is a new Deuteronomy that represents the one and only way to interpret the biblical text.⁵¹

4. WHAT THE NEW EVIDENCE ADDS

We can now appreciate what the new evidence adds to our knowledge (to the things we did not know) and what perspectives it opens for the study of this composition. We can directly disregard 11Q21, the second of the two manuscripts related to the *Temple Scroll*, because it does not seem to add anything substantial to our knowledge of the document.

The other document related to the *Temple Scroll*, 4Q365a, is very important as an independent document and even more if it is considered (as I think it should be) as an integral part of 4Q365. In both cases it proves that the author of the *Temple Scroll* used other written sources than the known biblical texts (a thing we already knew), but it also renders problematic a thing we thought we knew (the commonly accepted division of these sources), and it opens new perspectives to the study of the sources used in the composition of the *Temple Scroll*.

Frag. 25 of 4Q365, after the text of Lev 23:42–44 (on the festival of Sukkot) contains an addition of non-biblical material concerning the festival of fresh oil, and most probably also concerning the festival of wood (which appears prominently in the *Temple Scroll*), in which the tribes which bring the wood into the sanctuary appear in the same order as in the *Temple Scroll*. Because these two festivals were unknown in the biblical text and in the *Temple Scroll* they appear within the section we have called “Festival calendar source” we thought we knew that the author had taken them from this non-biblical source. Their presence in 4Q365 frag. 23 does not disprove this assumption, but certainly relativizes it. 4Q365 has been published as one of the “Reworked Pentateuch” manuscripts, but its character of biblical or of non-biblical text (“a wildly aberrant biblical text” as described by J. Strugnell)⁵² has not been ascertained (and we need not forget that Nehemiah 10:35 explicitly says that the wood offering should be brought to the Temple “as it is written in the Torah”).

⁵¹ García Martínez and Van der Woude, *De rollen van de Dode Zee*, 135.

⁵² In a personal letter I published in F. García Martínez, “La ‘nueva Jerusalén’ y el Templo futuro en los MSS de Qumrán,” in *Salvación en la Palabra: Targum-Derash-Berith: en memoria del profesor Alejandro Díez Macho* (ed. D. Muñoz León; Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1986), 563–64; see also his letter to B.Z. Wacholder, published in Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran*, 205–206.

It is perfectly possible that this “reworked Pentateuch” took the reference to the oil and wood festivals from the same source the author of the *Temple Scroll* apparently used, but it is also equally possible that the author of the *Temple Scroll* was using all along a sort of mixed “biblical” text like 4Q365, and in this case we are deprived of one of the key elements used to distinguish the sources used in the composition of the *Temple Scroll*.

The problem is even more acute if 4Q365a is part of the same manuscript (as I think it is). Even if we leave aside frags. 3–5 with contents similar to some sections of the *Temple Scroll* but without correspondence in the known text of 11QT^a or 11QT^b, we should note that 4Q365a 1 deals with the Massot festival, which appears in 11QT^a XVI–XVII (although with no overlapping). Also frag. 2 i deals with the festival of First Fruits and with some measures of an undefined structure and seems to be somehow related to 11QT^a XXXVIII, although again there is no overlapping. On the other hand col. ii of the same fragment clearly runs parallel with 11QT^a XLI, and it represents, therefore, part of the source we have called “Temple Source.” Thus, even if 4Q365a is considered a manuscript different from 4Q365 we would have, united in a single document, the “Festival Source” and the “Temple Source.” And if 4Q365a were considered a part of 4Q365 (which, as already said, contains biblical text and the “Festival Source”), we would have both sources attested in a possible biblical (albeit “aberrant”) manuscript. We may conclude that the new evidence available on 4Q365a opens new perspectives to understanding the process of redaction of the *Temple Scroll*.

The perspectives which 4Q524 opens are far reaching and affect almost all the elements most hotly discussed that I have indicated: the date, qumranic origin and literary genre. In spite of the small amount of evidence that has been preserved, the manuscript contains certain really interesting features:

- The hand of 4Q524 is clearly a semi-cursive of the old Hasmonaean period, related to the hands of 4QQoh^a, 4Q504 and 4QXII^a, and has been reasonably dated by É. Puech to around 150–125 B.C.E.⁵³
- The divine name is substituted by four dots on frag. 6 4, a well-known practice of some Qumran non-biblical manuscripts.
- The orthography of the manuscript is clearly of the type recognized by E. Tov as characteristic of the “Qumran scribal system,” with its

⁵³ DJD XXV, 87.

long pronominal suffixes and the full writing of לוא and כול,⁵⁴ although it is not completely consistent, because it writes רשית for ראשית on frags. 6–13 6 and שטנו for שטנו on 14 5.⁵⁵

It is my contention that these features, and the already noted differences in wording in relation to the marriage with a niece as well as the absence of the biblical proof text Deut 21:23 in relation with the crucifixion as capital punishment did open new perspectives to solving the major problems still unresolved: the date of the composition, its origin, its relationship with other Qumran manuscripts, or its literary genre and relationship with the biblical text.

The palaeographical dating of the copy is of crucial importance for the problem of the date of the composition, since it gives a hard fixed point and provides physical evidence of the existence of the composition in the second half of the second c. B.C.E. It automatically excludes all theories that have dated the *Temple Scroll* to the time of John Hyrcanus or later periods. It does not exclude the theories that posit the composition of the original in the fifth-fourth c. B.C.E., of course, but these theories are disqualified by the other points that shed a new light on the origin of the composition and on its relationship with other Qumran manuscripts.

On this aspect, both the use of four dots to replace the Tetragrammaton and the orthographic features signalled are extremely interesting. They do not automatically make of the *Temple Scroll* a qumranic composition, but they certainly bring it closer to the corpus of writings connected with the early period of the group, and are more congruent with the opinion, which locates the origin of the composition within the circles from which the Qumran group finally emerged.

Until the publication of 4Q524 the use of the Tetragrammaton in 11QT^a and in 11QT^b was one of the strongest arguments of Stegemann in understanding the *Temple Scroll* as a sort of “biblical” scroll completely disconnected from the Qumran community. We now know that the oldest exemplar avoided the use of the sacred name, and we need to explain why the two other copies abandoned this practice a hundred years later. Had the composition in the meantime become normative within the group?

⁵⁴ E. Tov, “Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert—Their contribution to Textual Criticism,” *JJS* 39 (1988): 5–37.

⁵⁵ DJD XXV, 88.

The change in wording to qualify the marriage with a niece in 11QT^a is another pointer in the direction of an origin within the circles from which the Qumran group would eventually grow, because as is proved by CD V 7 the opposition to the marriage with a niece will eventually become one of the characteristic tenets of the group.

The addition in 11QT^a of the quotation from Deut 21:23 as a proof text, specifying the use of the crucifixion as a form of capital punishment, is, in my view, one of the most revealing elements to show that the composition was not understood as a new Torah intended to complete or to supersede the Mosaic Torah, and it clearly shows that the basic relationship of the *Temple Scroll* to the Bible is in the realm of interpretation, as composition intended to bring out the true meaning of the sacred text.

* * *

We can confidently conclude that, in the case of the *Temple Scroll*, having now at our disposal all the evidence preserved does make a difference and opens new perspectives for the interpretation of this composition. If from this very limited exercise we can extrapolate to other compositions, it seems reasonable to assume that research on the Dead Sea Scrolls in the future will increasingly take into account the whole of the collection, moving from the study of the isolated manuscripts to the analysis of complete documents and to the consideration of these documents in the context of the whole library in which they were once located.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

ANDRÉ DUPONT-SOMMER AND THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

I am, perhaps, one of those rare people in this illustrious assembly not to have had either the honour or the pleasure of having met Professor André Dupont-Sommer while he was still alive and whose memory we are celebrating today. The invitation to speak to you on this occasion is for me, certainly, a great honour. But I also ascribe a certain symbolic meaning to the fact that it is precisely me (a Spaniard, working in the Netherlands and in Belgium, and secretary of the International Organization of Qumran Studies) who has been entrusted with commemorating here the significance of the late lamented Master in research on the Dead Sea Scrolls. There is no lack of French scholars who could have done this with equal competence and with a great deal more facility in respect of the beautiful French language (so sparing you from suffering a pronunciation that even after twenty-five years still makes my wife suffer). If, in some way, I find my presence here significant, it is because the first characteristic of Dupont-Sommer's work on the Dead Sea Scrolls that I am keen to emphasise is the influence of his work outside the French-speaking world. The second element that I would like to mention is his fundamental contribution to the perception of the Qumran texts as Essene documents. I will end with a third aspect of his work: the importance of the manuscripts for understanding the origins of Christianity.

1. THE INTERNATIONAL INFLUENCE OF HIS RESEARCH

From the very beginning, the international influence of his research was tremendous and Dupont-Sommer was universally acknowledged to be the Master in Qumran studies beyond the walls of the Sorbonne and the Collège de France. In my opinion, three elements were determinative.

1. First of all, the direct influence outside France due to the very rapid translation of his major works. His *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits*

de la mer Morte,¹ which appeared in Paris in 1950, was translated into English in Oxford and New York in 1952.² His *Nouveaux aperçus sur les manuscrits de la mer Morte*³ of 1953 came out in English in London and New York as early as 1954.⁴ And his magnum opus, *Les Écrits esséniens découverts près de la mer Morte*⁵ of 1959, appeared in German in Tübingen in 1960⁶ and in English in Oxford in 1961⁷ and in New York in 1962.⁸ This book was very successful in bookshops in France (a second edition would already be necessary in 1960, a third in 1964, a fourth in 1980, which, like the other editions, was to be reprinted several times,⁹ and even a fifth edition in 1996, with a preface by Monsieur Philonenko).¹⁰ In France also, the translations of the principal sectarian texts from Qumran which comprised the heart of Dupont-Sommer's œuvre have found a second life in the third volume of *La Bible de la Pléiade*,¹¹ the collection of intertestamental writings edited by Monsieur Philonenko, which includes the translations by Dupont-Sommer supplemented by the translations of Monsieur Caquot of some important Qumran texts that had not been translated by Dupont-Sommer.¹²

The impact of the translations of the books by Dupont-Sommer can be explained first of all by the fact that, for the general public, these books were their first direct access to the recently discovered manuscripts.

¹ A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires sur les Manuscrits de la mer Morte* (L'Orient Ancien Illustré 4; Paris: Maisonneuve, 1950).

² A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. A Preliminary Survey* (trans. E.M. Rowley; Oxford: Blackwell/New York: Macmillan, 1952). Hereafter: *Preliminary Survey*.

³ A. Dupont-Sommer, *Nouveaux aperçus sur les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (L'Orient Ancien Illustré 5; Paris: Maisonneuve, 1953).

⁴ A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes* (trans. R.D. Barnett; London: Mitchell and Company/New York: Macmillan, 1954). Hereafter: *Jewish Sect*.

⁵ A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte* (Paris: Payot, 1959).

⁶ A. Dupont-Sommer, *Die essenischen Schriften vom Toten Meer* (trans. W.W. Müller; Tübingen: Mohr, 1960).

⁷ A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (trans. G. Vermes; Oxford: Blackwell, 1961). This is a translation of the second revised and enlarged edition of *Les écrits esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte* of 1960.

⁸ A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (trans. G. Vermes; Meridian Books 44; Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, 1962). All quotations are from this edition. Hereafter: *Essene Writings*.

⁹ The copy I am using dates to 1983.

¹⁰ A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte* (Preface by M. Philonenko; Histoire Payot; Paris: Payot, 1996).

¹¹ *La Bible. Écrits intertestamentaires* (Édition publiée sous la direction A. Dupont-Sommer et M. Philonenko; Bibliothèque de la Pléiade; Paris: Gallimard, 1987).

¹² I.e. the *Temple Scroll*, *11QMelchizedek* and *Mysteries*.

In 1955, in his famous series of articles in the *New Yorker* and in his mythical book, *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea*,¹³ Edmund Wilson stressed that the works of Dupont-Sommer were the only source providing access to the manuscripts outside academic circles:

Yet the fact, after all, remains that this independent French scholar has made so far the only attempt on any considerable scale to recover the lost chapter of history and to put it before the public. You can buy his two admirably written books—in the series *L'Orient Ancien Illustré*—at any first-rate bookstore in Paris. They have till now been the only source—aside from a few mostly perfunctory articles in newspapers and magazines—from which it was possible for the world at large to form any idea of the interest and scope of the writings contained in the scrolls.¹⁴

The fact that his books, whose rigour and academic accuracy were evident on every page, were written in a very clear, very direct and, I would say, very passionate manner, has certainly also contributed to his fame. “If I present my view clearly and without ambiguity, it is in order that everyone may be able to grasp it exactly and, where necessary, to criticise it to the best of his knowledge and ability,” he wrote in the preface to *Nouveaux aperçus*.¹⁵ This has allowed his books to retain their force in translation, even if, inevitably, a part of the beauty and elegance of expression of Dupont-Sommer has been lost in the process.

2. The international influence of Dupont-Sommer’s research was also undoubtedly due to the impact of the polemics provoked by his interpretation of certain difficult or obscure texts. The international polemics concerning his first interpretation of a famous passage from the *Pesher Habakkuk* (or rather of his reconstruction of a lacuna in the texts of the *Pesher*, presented right here, in a communication to the Académie) has remained famous in the annals of Qumran research. In 1955, Edmund Wilson had already said:

The moment of maximum strain in the discussion of the Dead Sea documents may, perhaps, be fixed on the day—May 26, 1950—when M. Dupont-Sommer, Professor of Semitic Languages and Civilisation at the Sorbonne and Director of Studies at the *École des Hautes Etudes*,

¹³ E. Wilson, *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea* (New York: W.H. Allen, 1955). I use the slightly enlarged and corrected edition of 1957 (Fontana Books 160; London: Collins, 1957).

¹⁴ Wilson, *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea*, 107.

¹⁵ Dupont-Sommer, *Nouveaux aperçus*, 12; *Jewish Sect*, ix.

read before the French Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres a paper on the Habakkuk Commentary.¹⁶

In his communication to the Académie,¹⁷ exactly as in his *Aperçus préliminaires*, Dupont-Sommer understood the passage from the pesher as an allusion to the conflict between the Wicked Priest and the Teacher of Righteousness, by inserting the latter in the lacuna. He took care to indicate the hypothetical nature of his interpretation by noting:

Space of two lines; towards the end of this space supply something like: . . . and he persecuted the Master of Justice, who was] struck by him

But in the commentary that follows, he stated in plain language:

From all the evidence this passage alludes to the Passion of the Master of Justice; he was judged, condemned, tortured. He suffered in 'his body of flesh': without doubt he was a divine being who 'became flesh' 'to live and die as a man'¹⁸

It was no surprise that a great many of his colleagues took part in the discussion that followed. Dupont-Sommer retained his reconstruction (of 1950) right up to the fourth edition of his *Écrits esséniens*, even though with a qualifying note:

Line 17 at the foot of the column has almost entirely disappeared: because of the extent of this lacuna, any reconstruction of the passage must remain uncertain. The one I suggest . . .¹⁹

He was to abandon it only in the edition of his translation that appeared after his death in the *Bible de la Pléiade*, where his note explains

La lacune importante de la fin de la colonne VIII rend l'interprétation de ce passage très difficile. La présente traduction met en scène Hyrcan II, le "Prêtre impie contre lequel les Esséniens ne cessent de polémiquer."²⁰

Had the Parisian scholar not already declared in all honesty since 1950 that "Here is only a question of 'a preliminary survey'; in the light of documents which will ultimately be published, certain views and perspectives will perhaps have to be modified or corrected or discarded.

¹⁶ Wilson, *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea*, 90.

¹⁷ A. Dupont-Sommer, *Observations sur le Commentaire d'Habacuc découvert près de la mer Morte* (Paris: Maissonneuve, 1950).

¹⁸ Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, 46; *Preliminary Survey*, 34.

¹⁹ Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens*, 276; *Essene Writings*, 264 n. 2.

²⁰ *La Bible. Écrits intertestamentaires*, 384.

Such is the law of research!"²¹ Between times, the deep conviction, the dialectic skill, the philological soundness, and the tiny hint of intentional provocation, with which the Master conducted his polemics about his interpretations of the manuscripts, also no doubt contributed to establish his international reputation and to make him an essential reference point in Qumran research.

3. The international influence of Dupont-Sommer's research was also, very probably, the result of the echo that his ideas found with Edmund Wilson. In this influential literary personality of the American press, Dupont-Sommer found the ideal populariser of his thought.²² First in his articles in the *New Yorker* and then in his best seller *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea*, Wilson became the spokesman of the Parisian Master. In 1955, Wilson gave us this portrait of Dupont-Sommer:

M. Dupont-Sommer, when one meets him, presents a remarkable example of a phenomenon encountered so often that it cannot be due wholly to coincidence. Just as biographers sometimes look alike their subjects and ornithologists are often birdlike, so M. Dupont-Sommer in person astonishingly resembles Renan. He is round-faced, short and rotund, bland and urbane and smiling."²³

This portrait appears in the chapter that presents the substance of the relationships between the manuscripts and Christianity and has the title "What would Renan have said?"²⁴ It is preceded by the remark that, among all the scholars who until then had been concerned with the manuscripts, Dupont-Sommer was the only one to have invoked the authority of Renan. Following Renan, Dupont-Sommer looked for traces of the Essenes in intertestamental literature and in the new manuscripts, and portrayed the origins of Christianity as firmly rooted in the Essene movement revealed in the new documents. And it was this perspective that Edmund Wilson disseminated with all his talent as a great writer and which finally established the international importance of Dupont-Sommer right from the beginning of Qumran research.

²¹ Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, 10; *Preliminary Survey*, 4.

²² This point has also been stressed by J. Briand, in his article "Dupont-Sommer, André," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 1:220–21.

²³ Wilson, *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea*, 105–106.

²⁴ Wilson, *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea*, 83.

2. THE ESSENE NATURE OF THE MANUSCRIPTS

Wilson had understood Dupont-Sommer very well. His account of the Essene character of the Dead Sea Scrolls is one of Dupont-Sommer's greatest contributions to Qumran studies. This is the second characteristic of his work that I wish to emphasise here.

Dupont-Sommer himself was very much aware of the value of this contribution. While acknowledging that the merit of having been the first to recognise the Essene character of the new manuscripts went back to Sukenik, he noted in the preface to *Les Ecrits esséniens découverts près de la mer Morte*:

Already in 1949 a study of the first published texts, though few in number, convinced me of the Essene character of all documents as a whole. When the complete Hebrew text of the *Commentary on Habakkuk* appeared in 1950 I immediately set out to place this little work, as exactly as possible, in its time and environment; in my book, *Aperçus préliminaires sur les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Eng. edn., *The Dead Sea Scrolls. A Preliminary Survey*), which appeared a few months afterwards, I devoted several pages to the demonstration of this Essene theory. The following year, as soon as the complete scroll of the *Rule* was, in its turn, published, I returned to the same argument, which the availability of this essential book in its entirety allowed me enrich with new argument.²⁵

And a little later, after having noted that this hypothesis had by now become an accepted idea, he concluded:

It is even due to this progress that I am not afraid to include the word 'Essene' in the title of the present work. Not that the Essene theory is considered as absolutely definitive; but I think it is sufficiently supported by many solid arguments to be quite clearly asserted.²⁶

Without fear of exaggerating, one could define the abundant bibliography by Dupont-Sommer on the Dead Sea Scrolls (by far the largest part of the six sections into which his publications have been classified in the bibliography compiled by Madame Héléne Lozachmer)²⁷ as a continual quest for the lost legacy of the Essenes, also as a way of giving a concrete

²⁵ Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens*, 21; *Essene Writings*, 11.

²⁶ Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens*, 29; *Essene Writings*, 19.

²⁷ H. Lozachmeur, "Publications de M. André Dupont-Sommer," in *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer* (ed. A. Caquot and M. Philonenko; Paris: Maisonneuve, 1971), 539–56 ("Manuscrits de la Mer Morte"; 547–53.) See also her bibliographical supplement on pp. 10–13 of M. Szyner, "André Dupont-Sommer, 1900–1983," in *Journal Asiatique* 272 (1984): 1–13.

face to the Essene sect condemned to oblivion by the Synagogue and the Church. And the summary that he gives us in the first two chapters of *Écrits esséniens* remains, even today, the clearest and fullest account of this passionate dossier.²⁸ It is also the most valuable, I am convinced, as the hermeneutical setting for the history of the manuscripts from Qumran; on condition, of course, of taking into account the limitations that the new documentation imposes.²⁹

I think that, with the benefit of hindsight that 50 years of research gives us and our knowledge of all the manuscripts which were not accessible to Dupont-Sommer, we are now forced, on the one hand to reduce the Essene character of the manuscripts to only a few of them, and on the other, to specify the type of Essenism that the manuscripts reveal to us.

1. In Dupont-Sommer's time, only the manuscripts from Cave 1 were known and a few fragments of the manuscripts from Cave 4. And these manuscripts, the first to be published, were, when all is said and done, quite homogeneous and largely belonged to the category that we call "sectarian manuscripts."³⁰ They came from a group which is more or less sectarian in character, which had retired to the desert to await the end of days, and which was very different from the rabbinical Judaism that was to become the norm after the defeat of Bar Kokhba, but which, instead, showed considerable similarities in thought and structure with the early Christian communities and with what we know of the Essenes thanks to the descriptions by classical writers. So it was normal to consider, at least until the contrary was proved, that every document from Qumran had a Qumran origin, was the product of a particular group, and gave us information about the doctrines, rites or life-style of the members of the sect. It was no surprise that Dupont-Sommer drew from them the conclusions that were in force at the time, and that he had extended to the whole collection what strictly speaking only applied to a certain number of manuscripts, and as the group

²⁸ Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens*, 31–81; *Essene Writings*, 21–67.

²⁹ On the new perspectives opened up by the publication of all the manuscripts, using the *Temple Scroll* as an example, see F. García Martínez, "New Perspectives on the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism*, (ed. F. García Martínez and E. Noort; VTSup 73; Brill, Leiden 1998), 231–48.

³⁰ The *Rule of the Community*, the *Hymns*, the *War Scroll*, and the *Pesher Habakkuk* form part of the first manuscripts from Cave 1 to be published, as well as the *Nahum Pesher*, the *Florilegium* and the *Testimonia* form part of the first fragments from Cave 4 made available to the public.

in question showed undeniable similarities to the Essenes, that he had considered all the documents found in Qumran to be Essene. "From now on, the Qumran documents take us into the heart of the Essene sect, lift the veil from its mysteries, rites and customs."³¹

We now know that most of the texts found in Qumran do not have a Qumran origin.³² In spite of the publication of numerous extremely interesting copies of key texts such as the *Rule of the Community*,³³ the *Damascus Document*,³⁴ or even of the *Hodayot*,³⁵ from Cave 4, the ratio of strictly sectarian texts to the total of manuscripts found has been drastically reduced. The compositions called "para-biblical," to distinguish them from biblical texts and from sectarian texts, now exceeded in number biblical texts and sectarian texts and even both sets together; in fact such compositions comprise most of the total. Now, the massive presence of the "para-biblical" compositions forces to consider differently the whole collection and its relationship to the group, certainly sectarian, that transmitted them to us. Most of the manuscripts from Qumran, then, are now seen not as witnesses of the thought and *praxis* of the small group faithful to the Teacher of Righteousness who retreated to the desert and await the end of time, but as the remnants of the literature, theology and practices of Judaism from before the destruction of the Temple, a Judaism that we knew so little about before the discovery of the manuscripts from Qumran.

2. The other aspect in which his conclusion needs to be modified I think, is the type of Essenism represented in the Qumran writings. The best way to specify what I wish to say is to use that phrase of the Master by which he refined Ernest Renan's "finely shaded definition":

Christianity is an Essenism which has largely succeeded.

"An Essenism, he says, but not *the* Essenism" stressed Dupont-Sommer.³⁶ If it is accepted, in the perspective of the Groningen Hypothesis,³⁷ that

³¹ Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens*, 25; *Essene Writings*, 15.

³² See the attempts, always provisional, at classification by D. Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness* (ed. D. Dimant and L.H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23–58, and by A. Lange, "Annotated List of the Texts from the Judaean Desert Classified by Content and Genre," in DJD XXXIX, 115–64.

³³ Edited by P.S. Alexander and G. Vermes, DJD XXVI.

³⁴ Edited by J.M. Baumgarten, DJD XVIII.

³⁵ Edited by E. Schuller, DJD XXIX, 69–254.

³⁶ Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens*, 23; *Essene Writings*, 13.

³⁷ F. García Martínez, "Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis," *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1988): 113–36; *idem*, "The Origins of the Essene Movement

the Qumran group was born as a result of a split within the Essene movement, and that the communities behind the *Damascus Document* and the *Rule of the Community* are different, even though having many elements in common, and that they have a long history of development reflected in the copies from Cave 4,³⁸ one is forced to conclude that the Essene sect had many facets, facets that were vastly different. Basically, Essenism was much more diversified and pluralistic than the descriptions of classical writers allow us to suspect and it was also much richer and more complex than we could ever have dared to believe.³⁹

These changes in the way of perceiving the Essene origin of the manuscripts from Qumran motivated by the publication of absolutely all the manuscripts, were, I think, inevitable. They were also in some way anticipated by Dupont-Sommer himself. Did he not write in the preface to *Nouveaux aperçus*:

It is obvious that we are only at the beginning of a tremendous task of research. The documents so far made available to us are only a portion of those obtained from the cave discovered in 1947. Furthermore, in the Judean desert there are other caves containing manuscripts. Some of them have been explored only recently, and we are assured that the treasure surpasses in importance anything found hitherto . . . But in view of all this unknown material, of which not even the catalogue is yet known, the scholar can only devote himself to studying the material available to him, and formulate his opinion with the reservation that they are subject to confirmation in due course.⁴⁰

3. THE ORIGINS OF CHRISTIANITY

As a historian of religions, Dupont-Sommer could not avoid being interested by the light that the new texts could provide to explain the

and of the Qumran Sect," in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. F. García Martínez and J. Trebelle Barrera; transl. W.G.E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 77–96.

³⁸ On the *Damascus Document* see C. Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Traditions and Redaction* (STDJ 29; Leiden: Brill, 1998), and on the *Rule*, *eadem*, "The Community and Its Rivals according to the Community Rule from Caves 1 and 4," *RevQ* 21/81 (2003): 47–81, as well as S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997), and *eadem*, "Qumran Community Structure and Terminology as Theological Statement," in *RevQ* 20/79 (2002): 429–44.

³⁹ See C. Hempel, "Qumran Communities: Beyond the Fringes of Second Temple Society," in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. S. Porter and C.A. Evans; JSPSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 43–53.

⁴⁰ Dupont-Sommer, *Nouveaux aperçus*, 12; *Jewish Sect*, xi–xii.

origins of Christianity. He himself described his work as “the efforts of an historian anxious to extract from the marvellous archives of Qumran everything that may throw new light on the ancient history of Judaism and the origins of Christianity”⁴¹ In all his writings about the texts from Qumran, the summit to which all his reasoning inescapably progresses is his conclusion concerning the Essene origins of Christianity. This is the central thesis of all his Qumran research, a thesis that he was to repeat tirelessly, and for which his detailed research on the texts would serve to contribute new arguments.

Dupont-Sommer, in Renan’s wake, turned his attention right from the beginning to what he considered to be “one of the loftiest problems that could haunt the spirit of a historian and a thinker, the problem of the origin of Christianity.” The first conclusions he reached in *Aperçus préliminaires* already went beyond Renan’s conclusions:

The scholar, at all events, hesitated to affirm a ‘direct connection’ between Essenism and Christianity despite their deep resemblances. It was a wise and prudent attitude, in the light of the sources available in his time; but to-day, thanks to the new texts, the problem present itself in an entirely new way. Everything in the Jewish New Covenant heralds and prepares the way for the Christian New Covenant.⁴²

In the conclusions of the *Nouveaux aperçus*, where he makes the comparison between the Teacher of Righteousness and Jesus more specific (“Whereas I expressed myself with deliberate caution, my critics suppressed certain essential words. I was made to say, ‘*is nothing but* an astonishing reincarnation of the Teacher of Righteousness.’ This is confuse *to be* and *to appear*, and to overlook a serious qualification. For surely when the words ‘in many respects’ are used, it is not to be understood that the resemblance is not complete?”),⁴³ he insists strongly on the differences between Christianity and Essenism, but the central thesis of the Essene origins of Christianity remains the same, this time expressed with the metaphor of the Christian tree which takes its sap from the Essene earth in which it has grown: “The Christian tree only grew so far and so vigorously because the soil in which it germinated had been so marvellously worked.”⁴⁴

⁴¹ Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens*, 30; *Essene Writings*, 20.

⁴² Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, 121; *Preliminary Survey*, 99.

⁴³ Dupont-Sommer, *Nouveaux aperçus*, 207; *Jewish Sect*, 161.

⁴⁴ Dupont-Sommer, *Nouveaux aperçus*, 212–13; *Jewish Sect*, 166.

In the conclusion to his *Écrits esséniens* he again emphasises in detail the profound differences between Essenism and Christianity:

So Christianity is not properly speaking Essenism, even though it depended on it. It is even necessary to point out that there are a number of features in primitive Christianity which seem to indicate deliberate opposition to certain characteristic aspects of classical Essenism as we know it from the Qumran documents... Even though the historian may, in a sense, be led by the importance of the resemblances and borrowings to consider the primitive Church as a 'para-Essene' sect, as sort of derivative or variety of Essenism, he feels in no way disposed to set aside or underestimate the differences, and even the contrasts, between the Church and classical Essenism.⁴⁵

But the fundamental thesis remains unchanged:

... the documents from Qumran make it plain that the primitive Christian Church was rooted in the Jewish sect of the New Covenant, the Essene sect, to a degree none would have suspected, and that it borrowed from it a large part of its organization, rites, doctrines, 'patterns of thought' and its mystical and ethical ideas.⁴⁶

I have allowed myself to quote at length from the illuminating and profound writings of Dupont-Sommer out of concern for faithfulness to his thought, before wondering what is left today of this model of understanding the relations between the texts from Qumran and early Christianity. As is the case in the way we perceive the Essene origin of the manuscripts from Qumran today, the publication of absolutely all the manuscripts and the hindsight given by 50 years of research have forced us to modify this thesis of deriving Christianity genetically from Essenism as revealed by the manuscripts from Qumran, while still preserving the essential results of Dupont-Sommer's work. The hermeneutical model used today is rather one of parallel development, starting from the common ground which is the Hebrew Bible.⁴⁷ Early Christianity is perceived as one more Jewish group in the pluralised and divided Judaism of the time; a group (a sect, if you wish) alongside the Qumran group and the group represented by the *Damascus Document*, but also alongside Essene

⁴⁵ Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens*, 388–89; *Essene Writings*, 375.

⁴⁶ Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens*, 386; *Essene Writings*, 373.

⁴⁷ See F. García Martínez, "Los Manuscritos del Mar Muerto: Qumrán entre el Antiguo y el Nuevo Testamento," in *Actas de las IX Jornadas Bíblicas 1996* (ed. J. Campos Santiago; Zamora: Asociación Bíblica Española, 1998), 33–52; *idem*, "De Dode-Zeerollen en het Nieuwe Testament," in *Fragmenten uit de woestijn. De Dode-Zeerollen opnieuw bekeken* (ed. F. García Martínez and E. Tigchelaar; Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2003), 111–31.

groups, apocalyptic groups of all kinds and groups that refer to Zadok or Enoch or Adam, whose existence and vitality have been revealed to us by the manuscripts from Qumran. If we were to take up the metaphor of the tree, used by Dupont-Sommer, we would speak rather of the earth which is the Hebrew Bible and of the tree which is Palestinian Judaism, a tree that has several branches all of which are nourished by the same sap. The manuscripts from Qumran have given us some of the missing links in the process of growth and the development of religious ideas in pre-Christian Palestine; and it also allows us to fix firmly in this earth and in the first century a Christian phenomenon that we know chiefly when it was flourishing in the Graeco-Roman world. Thanks to that, it makes easier for us the task of grasping the origins of this phenomenon, of its taking root in biblical tradition, its appropriation of the theological development that had already taken place in the Jewish world, of its sharing the regulations of life common to many groups of the period.

As a result, and as Dupont-Sommer stresses so precisely, the Christian phenomenon appears much less like a meteorite fallen from the sky with which something completely new begins. On the contrary, we are able to see better its deep-rootedness in history, its own developments, its attitudes towards other Jewish groups that share the same origins but made different choices. Renan's remark, which Dupont-Sommer used to close his *Nouveaux aperçus*: "Nothing developed in Christianity which had not its roots in Judaism of the first and second century B.C.,"⁴⁸ remains completely justified as long as Essenism is not equated with Judaism.

I still remember the admiration and respect with which my predecessor at the head of the Qumran Institute in Groningen, the late lamented Adam van der Woude, told me about his conversations with Dupont-Sommer in Paris, where he had come to consult him while preparing his study on messianism in Qumran. May my witness today, in the places and among the colleagues to whom the Scholar, who left us twenty years ago, lavished his teaching, serve to show my debt to him. And may it also serve to emphasise the recognition of all those who today continue his pioneer work on the Dead Sea Scrolls for the courage and productivity of his thought that even today stimulates reflection on these texts, which he loved so much and made known!

⁴⁸ Dupont-Sommer, *Nouveaux aperçus*, 213; *Jewish Sect*, 166.

CHAPTER FIFTEEN

THE STUDY OF THE TEXTS FROM QUMRAN: A GRONINGEN PERSPECTIVE*

As a member of the Faculty of Theology hosting your congress in Groningen, I would prefer to remain in the background, smoothing matters and facilitating things in order to make your stay in our beautiful city as enjoyable and fruitful as possible. But I could not refuse a direct request by your Executive Secretary, Professor Kent Richards, to present to you all (particularly those of you who won't be attending the Congress of the International Organization for Qumran Studies starting tomorrow) some aspects of Scrolls research that have been carried out by the Qumran Institute at the Faculty of Theology of the University of Groningen.

The story of Qumran research in Groningen starts before the discovery of Cave 11 in 1956 and the subsequent acquisition by the Rockefeller Museum and the State of Jordan with funds provided by the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences of what is known as the "Dutch share" of the Scrolls. This story revolves around the work of a particularly gifted and inspiring scholar, the late Adam Simon van der Woude, the founder of the Qumran Institute. As a young student of Semitic languages and theology, Van der Woude became fascinated by the first Scrolls to be published in the early 1950s and chose as the topic for his dissertation the study of the Messianic expectations of these Scrolls. In 1957 he completed and published *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân*,¹ a work partially written during his stays in Heidelberg with Kuhn, in Basel with Baumgartner, and in Paris with Dupont-Sommer. With this book, which remains a fundamental reference work on the topic, Van der Woude was at once acknowledged as one of the major Qumran scholars of the first generation. Soon after, in 1960, at the age of only 33, he was appointed to the chair of Old

* Main lecture SBL International Meeting 2004, Groningen, Monday 26 July 2004.

¹ A.S. van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân* (SSN 3; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1957).

Testament and Early Jewish Literature in the Theological Faculty of the University of Groningen, which remained Van der Woude's home base for his entire academic career until his retirement in 1992. When in 1961 and 1962 the Royal Netherlands Academy acquired the publication rights for the largest part of the manuscripts found in Cave 11, Van der Woude, together with his older colleague from Nijmegen, Van der Ploeg, was entrusted with the task of opening, studying and editing these manuscripts. This task would occupy him intensively in the following years; with exemplary speed, Van der Woude published preliminary editions of all the fragmentary texts entrusted to him² and in 1971 together with his collaborator at the Qumran Institute, Jongeling, and Van der Ploeg he edited the longest of the Scrolls in the "Dutch share," the Aramaic *Targum of Job*.³ This work sealed Van der Woude's reputation as a Scrolls scholar. Since 1980 I have had the privilege of being a close collaborator of his at the Qumran Institute. In 1985 he and Van der Ploeg entrusted to me the publication of the remaining texts in the "Dutch share." In 1987 John Strugnell, then editor-in-chief of *Discoveries in the Judean Desert* (DJD), charged me with the task of publishing the whole "Dutch share" of Cave 11 in the DJD series. After Van der Woude's retirement in 1992, I became his successor as the head of the Qumran Institute. This is why, after a long and tiring day of lectures, you are now enduring my "Spaninglish" and suffering from my heavy accent.

But don't worry, I will be brief. I have decided to skip the first part promised in the summary (I quote): "The lecture will highlight the major contributions of Dutch scholars to Dead Sea Scrolls research." At the

² A.S. van der Woude, "Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI," *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 14 (1965): 354–73; *idem*, "Ein neuer Segenspruch aus Qumrân (11QBer)," in *Bibel und Qumran: Beiträge zur Erforschung der Beziehungen zwischen Bibel- und Qumranwissenschaft*. Hans Bardtke zum 22.9.1966 (ed. S. Wagner; Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1968) 253–58; *idem*, "Fragmente des Buches Jubiläen aus Qumran Höhle XI (11QJub)," in *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt. Festgabe für Karl Georg Kuhn* (ed. G. Jeremias, H.-W. Kuhn, and H. Stegemann; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 140–46; *idem*, "Fragmente einer Rolle der Lieder für das Sabbatopfer aus Höhle XI von Qumran (11QShirShabb)," in *Von Kanaan bis Kerala: Festschrift für Prof. Mag. Dr. J.P.M. van der Ploeg O.P. zur Vollendung des siebenzigsten Lebensjahres am 4. Juli 1979. Überreicht von Kollegen, Freunden und Schülern* (ed. W.C. Delsman et al.; AOAT 211; Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker / Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1982), 311–37; *idem*, "Ein bisher unveröffentlichtes Fragment der Tempelrolle," *RevQ* 13/49–52 (1988): 89–92.

³ J.P.M. van der Ploeg and A.S. van der Woude, *Le Targum de Job de la Grotte XI de Qumrân* (with the collaboration of B. Jongeling; Leiden: Brill, 1971).

end of the day I am not going to bore you with lists of publications or technical details, nor am I going risk the animosity of dear Dutch colleagues who might think that I won't properly highlight their own contributions to the study of the Scrolls, due to my admittedly parochial Groningen view. Nor will I look to the future to predict how the study of the Scrolls (as seen from Groningen) will develop, now that we have all the documents at our disposal. I've already done precisely that in a widely available article entitled "New Perspectives on the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls"⁴ which was written for a symposium our faculty organized in 1997 to honour Van der Woude's 70th birthday. Instead, my intention here is to present within an historical perspective what I think has been the "Groningen" approach to the Scrolls. The emphasis will be on "historical," that is, when compared to the approach then current in the field, because otherwise it seems impossible to distinguish what I call the "Groningen" approach from what we now consider rightly to be simple sound scholarship (if you will allow me this boastful generalization).

I have reflected on what could be considered characteristic of the approach to the Scrolls practised by Van der Woude and what we therefore can label as "Groningen" (that is, somehow different from studies of the scrolls practised then in other places or by other scholars) and I have ended up with the following elements on which I will comment *seriatim*.

1. THE STUDY OF THE SCROLLS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE JEWISH LITERATURE AND HISTORY OF THE SECOND TEMPLE PERIOD

The first (and perhaps most characteristic) element is the study of the Scrolls in the context of the Jewish literature and history of the Second Temple Period.

Today this seems a truism and, in retrospect, the only correct way to deal with the materials provided by the discovery of the Scrolls. But it was not self-evident in the first years of Scrolls research.

I only became conscious of this characteristic when I read the correspondence in 1970 between Van der Woude and the publishers Brill

⁴ F. García Martínez, "New Perspectives on the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism. A Symposium in Honour of Adam S. van der Woude on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday* (ed. F. García Martínez and E. Noort; VTSup 73; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 230–48.

(whom we call our house publishers) and Father Carmignac, the founder of the *Revue de Qumrân*, before the launch of *JSTJ*, the *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* (to quote at least once the full title of our journal, the flagship of the Qumran Institute). From this correspondence, it is clear that Van der Woude wanted to create an adequate forum for discussion of all aspects of Judaism brought to the fore by the discovery of the scrolls in order to provide the scrolls with an adequate historical and literary context. Founding *JSTJ* was one of the ways in which he tried to solve the problems he was encountering. He recognised that the scrolls could not be studied in isolation, and that they could only be understood within their own Jewish historical and literary context, the Judaism of the Graeco-Roman Period (he added the Persian period in order to assure continuity with later layers of the Hebrew Bible). This crucial period was then only accidentally and sporadically covered by other periodicals, such as the *Jewish Quarterly Review* or the *Journal of Jewish Studies*.

Nowadays, the study of this literature has become a flourishing field, as a simple perusal of your programme will prove. New critical editions of texts follow one another, as do commentaries on the main compositions. New periodicals and book series have been created specifically for publication of research in this field; there is now a plethora of introductions, and new collections of reliable translations have been published in all the major languages. But back in the 1960s, all this was unheard of. There was not only a lack of reliable scholarly editions of the Jewish writings of the Second Temple Period (only the good old Charles⁵ and the almost equally ancient Riessler⁶ offered translations of some of these writings), but there was also a complete lack of tools for scholarly work on these writings as part of the Jewish literature of the period.

Carol Newsom, in her response to George Nickelsburg's review of "Fifty years of Qumran scholarship," noted with her customary wit and accuracy the changes in the intellectual landscape. She wrote:

Another way of talking about this reorientation is to note the rise in the last twenty years or so of the category "Second Temple Period." There is more to this shift in nomenclature than simply the attempt to find a "politically correct" substitution for "Intertestamental Period." The new terminology

⁵ R.H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. With introductions and critical and explanatory notes to the several books* (ed. in conjunction with many scholars; 2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913).

⁶ P. Riessler, *Altjüdisches Schrifttum außerhalb der Bibel. Übersetzt und erläutert* (Augsburg: Filser, 1928).

itself confounds the attempt to organize the discipline around established canons. Significantly, by eschewing terminology that orients itself to established canons, this reconfiguration of the field draws attention precisely to the complex issues of the emergence of the canon. This reconceptualization of the field carries certain implications for Qumran studies. In the past Qumran studies was accustomed to finding itself at one end or the other of a field of study: at the far end of Hebrew Bible or at the rear end of New Testament. When the field is construed as Second Temple Studies, however, Qumran ends up in the middle.⁷

Adam van der Woude had already made this paradigm shift in the 1960s, and he made it the cornerstone of the “Groningen” approach to the Scrolls. His *JSJ* not only opened a field hitherto non-existent, it provided a channel for scholarly research and placed the study of the Scrolls in their proper perspective, not as a marginal sectarian phenomenon, but as part and parcel of the Jewish literature of the time in all its variety, including, of course, its most strictly sectarian versions.

2. THE PHILOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL-CRITICAL STUDY OF THE SCROLLS

A second element of Van der Woude’s approach could be described as an exclusively philological and historical-critical study of the Scrolls. More than a characteristic, this element was born of necessity because of the demands of the task he had at hand: editing and interpreting the fragments, and it was shared, I think, by all the scholars who did what I call “primary” work on the Scrolls and thus laid the foundations of Qumran studies. Van der Woude was not prone to big syntheses or to importing great theological ideas into the texts. He was more inclined to carefully map the data and put them in an historical context, including all the uncertainties that fragmentary data impose. It is interesting to compare Van der Woude’s work on the Hebrew Bible (particularly on the Twelve Prophets)⁸ with his work on the scrolls. As a biblical scholar

⁷ C.A. Newsom, “A Response to George Nickelsburg’s ‘Currents in Qumran Scholarship: The Interplay of Data, Agendas, and Methodology,’” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings* (ed. R.A. Kugler and E.M. Schuller; SBLEJL 15; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999), 115–21 (117–18).

⁸ Cf. his Dutch-language commentaries: *Micha* (POT; Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1976); *Jona*, *Nahum* (POT; Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1978); *Habakuk*, *Zefanja* (POT; Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1978); *Haggai*, *Maleachi* (POT; Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1982); *Zacharia* (POT; Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1984).

he was trained in the historical-critical method, of course, but he didn't hesitate to apply other methods such as criticism, redaction-criticism, or whatever other "-ism" was useful for his work (although, I must say, he was rather reluctant when it came to the results of most of the post-modern approaches). But his work on the scrolls remained within the bounds of technical philology and historical-critical study. The work of his first collaborator at the Qumran Institute, Dr Jongeling, also followed exactly the same line. This may be regarded as a very conservative approach, even outmoded nowadays. A perusal of Van der Woude's surveys of the scholarship on the Scrolls published in the *Theologische Rundschau*⁹ clearly proves that he was well aware of the increasing application of other methodologies (social-scientific and hermeneutical approaches) and the positive results achieved by some of them. But his fidelity to the philological and historical-critical study of the Scrolls was the logical conclusion of the first characteristic mentioned and of his focus on the main task of laying the groundwork for future study of the scrolls. Now, when publication of the DJD series is almost complete, there seems no room left for this approach. But when one considers the work presently being done at the Qumran Instituut by Eibert Tigchelaar, unveiling new overlaps between manuscripts, identifying new fragments or new copies of already known compositions, or even compositions not previously attested, I am not so sure that this primary task is completely fulfilled.¹⁰ This does not mean, of course, that this methodology is the only one adhered to in Groningen. Dr Tigchelaar's other main project on the "embodiment of Judaism" is the best evidence of that. But in the historical perspective, I think it is fair to say that rigorous application of philological enquiry and sober historical reconstruction were the hallmarks of Van der Woude's approach to the Scrolls.

⁹ A.S. van der Woude, "Fünfzehn Jahre Qumranforschung (1974–1988)," *Theologische Rundschau* 54 (1989): 221–61; 55 (1990): 274–307; 57 (1992): 225–53; 57 (1992) 1–57. Cf. also *idem*, "Fifty Years of Qumran Research," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. Flint and J. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999), 1:1–45.

¹⁰ E.g., E.J.C. Tigchelaar, "On the Unidentified Fragments of DJD XXXIII and PAM 43.680: A New Manuscript of 4QNarrative and Poetic Composition, and Fragments of 4Q13, 4Q269, 4Q525 and 4Q5b (?)," *RevQ* 21/83 (2004): 477–85; *idem*, "These are the names of the spirits of . . .: A Preliminary Edition of 4QCatalogue of Spirits (4Q230) and New Manuscript Evidence for the Two Spirits Treatise (4Q257 and 1Q29a)," *RevQ* 21/84 (2004): 529–47; *idem*, "A Cave 4 Fragment of Divre Mosheh (4QDM) and the Text of 1Q22 I 7–10 and Jubilees 1:9, 14," *DSD* 12 (2005): 303–12.

3. PRODUCTION OF BASIC RESEARCH TOOLS

A third characteristic of Van der Woude's work (and the work of the Qumran Institute) was his dedication to producing the basic tools necessary for research on the Scrolls and placing these at the service of the scholarly community at large (like translations into several languages,¹¹ publishing the first list of manuscripts,¹² bringing out the *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*,¹³ etc.) as well as creating adequate channels and vehicles for the dissemination and communication of research. I have mentioned the creation in 1970 of Van der Woude's *JSJ*, and later in 1996 my own *Supplemental Series of the JSJ*, and alluded to the surveys of scrolls research published by Van der Woude¹⁴ and by myself.¹⁵ Since the inception of the Qumran Institute a great deal of its work has consisted of the ungrateful and unglamorous task of creating and sustaining a platform for the dissemination of Scrolls research done around the world. The bibliography published by Jongeling in 1971¹⁶ or the one I published with Donald Parry in 1996¹⁷ are examples of this. The bibliographies of the *Revue de Qumrán* have been prepared at the Qumran Institute since 1981.¹⁸ After the death of Carmignac in 1986 the editing

¹¹ Spanish: F. García Martínez, *Textos de Qumrán* (Estructuras y Procesos. Serie Religión; Madrid: Trotta, 1992); English: *idem*, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated. The Qumran Texts in English* (trans. W.G.E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1994); Portuguese: *idem*, *Textos de Qumran. Edição fiel e completa dos Documentos do Mar Morto* (trans. V. da Silva; Petrópolis: Vozes, 1995); Italian: *idem*, *Testi di Qumran* (trans. C. Martone; Biblica Testi e Studi 4; Brescia: Paideia, 1996); Dutch: F. García Martínez and A.S. van der Woude, *De rollen van de Dode Zee: Ingeleid en in het Nederlands vertaald* (2 vols.; Kampen: Kok, 1994–1995).

¹² F. García Martínez, "Lista de MSS procedentes de Qumrán," *Henoch* 11 (1989): 149–232.

¹³ F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998); *idem*, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).

¹⁴ Cf. note 8.

¹⁵ F. García Martínez, "Estudios Qumránicos 1975–1985: Panorama Crítico," *EstBib* 45 (1987): 125–205; 45 (1987): 361–402; 46 (1988): 325–74; 46 (1988): 527–48; 47 (1989): 93–118; 47 (1989): 225–67; 49 (1991): 97–134.

¹⁶ B. Jongeling, *A Classified Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1958–1969* (STDJ 7; Leiden: Brill, 1971).

¹⁷ F. García Martínez and D.W. Parry, *A Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah, 1970–95* (STDJ 19; Leiden: Brill, 1996).

¹⁸ F. García Martínez, "Bibliographie," *RevQ* 11/41 (1982): 119–59; 11/42 (1983): 295–320; 11/43 (1983): 461–78; 12/45 (1985): 129–60; 12/46 (1986) 293–315; 12/47 (1986) 455–80.

of the *Revue de Qumrân* transferred to the Institute, thus ensuring its survival. The editing of what arguably is the best book series for publication of research on all aspects of the scrolls, the *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* series, has been done at the Institute since 1991. The Institute has been actively involved in all major initiatives in the field, directly or in an advisory role: microfiche editions, databases, etc. And the International Organization for Qumran Studies (the IOQS), which provides a platform for exchange of current research by its practitioners (and which is holding its fifth meeting tomorrow), was created by the Qumran Institute at the congress of 1989; ever since its work has been organized by the Institute.

I mention all of this not to boast about achievements we may be proud of in Groningen, but to emphasize that humble service to the academic community was one of the characteristics of Van der Woude's approach to the Scrolls.

4. THE SCROLLS IN ACADEMIA

Finally, the fourth and most salient characteristic of the "Groningen" approach to the study of the Scrolls is its embedment in the academic context of the university.

By this I mean two different things. The first is that Van der Woude's research on the Scrolls was statutorily free of all religious or confessional bias. The Qumran Institute is established in one of the *duplex-ordo* faculties of the Netherlands. Our charter obliges us to approach the object of our study (be it the Hebrew Bible, the New Testament or the Jewish writings of Second Temple period) in a purely scientific way. Of course, we know that every scholar is driven by his own special interests and prejudices, and is conditioned by his own background; but our charter obliges us to support our arguments not with beliefs or confessional interests but by objective arguments that can be tested. In a famous article published in 1991 entitled "Confessionalism and the Study of the Scrolls,"¹⁹ Larry Schiffman underscores two main tendencies in Christian scholarship of the first forty years of Scrolls research with its emphasis on its value for understanding Christian origins, thereby

¹⁹ L.H. Schiffman, "Confessionalism and the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Forum of the World Union of Jewish Studies* 31 (1991): 3-14.

revealing the Christian prejudices of their practitioners, be they liberal Christians (who sought in the scrolls a prototype for Christianity) or conservative Christians who emphasized the differences between this Jewish sect and the early Church. Without entering into a discussion of the extent to which Schiffman's analysis is or is not correct, my point is that Van der Woude's approach to the texts completely lacked this Christian bias, which has no place in a *duplex-ordo* Faculty of Theology. Even if the original motive for selecting *Die messianischen Vorstellungen* as the topic of his dissertation may have come from his religious interests (he was a minister of the *Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk*, the Dutch Reformed Church), his research on the topic centred exclusively on the Qumran texts then available²⁰ and on the book of the *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs*.²¹ His book has no chapter on further developments of the Messianic ideas, not even an index of quotations of New Testament texts, and his conclusions are limited to "*Die Ursprünge und historische Bedingtheit der messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân*."²²

The second thing that I mean by embedment of research in academia is that Van der Woude succeeded in establishing permanent structures in the university context so that research could take place without distracting external influences and without it being subjected to the vagaries of fashion, as the establishment of our Qumran Institut proves. In our faculty the Biblical Department is organized around three basic chairs: a professorship of Ancient Israelite Literature, Old Testament Interpretation, the History of Israelite Religion and Intertestamental Literature (now held by my colleague Noort whom you heard yesterday), a professorship of the Religion and Literature of Early Judaism (of which I have the honour of being the current holder), and a professorship for New Testament and early Christian Literature (held by my colleague Luttikhuisen). This tripartite structure not only enables study of the Scrolls at undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate levels, but also shows that in Groningen the study of the Jewish Literature of the Second Temple Period runs parallel and on the same footing as studies of the Hebrew Bible and the Greek New Testament.

²⁰ Van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân*, chapter I: "Die messianischen Texte von Qumrân" (7–189).

²¹ Chapter II: "Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Testamente der Zwölf Patriarchen" (190–216).

²² Chapter III: "Die Ursprünge und historische Bedingtheit der messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân" (217–49).

In a survey of fifty years of European scholarship on the scrolls, written for the meeting of the Qumran section of the SBL convened to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of their discovery, I concluded:

It is certain that in Europe, as in America or Israel, there has been no lack of brilliant analysis of specific texts, of acute and enlightening philological study, of discussion of theological problems contained in the texts, of brilliant (or misguided) synthesis, of study of the Scrolls for purely Christian motives or from exclusively Jewish concerns. But when the whole thing is examined, what emerges most clearly are not the hidden agendas or particular biases, but a constant and humble concern with creating, little by little, the necessary equipment for arriving at a proper understanding of the texts perceived as important for “European culture” which is by definition a Judeo-Christian culture. Combined with this was the effort to establish the study of the Scrolls in the university world as the best guarantee of its independence.²³

Of course, when I wrote this survey of European scholarship my view of the scene may have been coloured by the Groningen-tinted lenses I was looking through at the time. But I honestly think that it is still the best synthesis of the “Groningen” approach to the Scrolls introduced by Adam van der Woude in the 1960s and 1970s, an approach which, I hope, will in the future continue to bear the same fruits.

* * *

Since we are on the eve of the celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the discovery of Cave 11 (the archaeologists excavated it in 1956, but we do not know exactly when the Bedouins extracted most of its documents), it seems fitting to close this “Groningen perspective” with some reflections on the “Dutch share” of Cave 11 published in DJD XXIII, as mentioned in the summary.

I find myself preceded in these reflections by the editor-in-chief of the DJD series, Emanuel Tov. After completing his time-consuming editorial task, Tov apparently has time at his disposal for research, as is shown by his massive monograph in the series “Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah” entitled *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judaean Desert*. I had hoped this work would be available

²³ F. García Martínez and J. Trebolle Barrera, “Qumran Scholarship: A European Perspective,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings*, 129–41 (140).

at the congress, but it is still in production.²⁴ Tov has just published an insightful article entitled “The Special Character of the Texts Found in Qumran Cave 11.”²⁵ His work makes this part of my lecture somewhat redundant but since I have already skipped the first part promised in the summary it would be unfair to deprive you of the third as well (even if you’d rather I stopped now and let you enjoy the pleasures of Groningen by night). I will thus only present some brief thoughts on Tov’s article in the light of the “Groningen” hypothesis of Qumran origins and early history.

Tov’s article has as its starting point a well-founded analytical premise, very carefully drafted:

It seems that the great majority of the texts from this cave were either copied according to the Qumran scribal practice, or were of interest to the Qumran community; in most cases, both conditions are met.²⁶

From this qualified observation, the founding and proving of which takes up most of the article, Tov derives two consequences (also duly qualified):

The evidence presented in this paper suggests that the texts from this cave are more homogeneous with regard to their content than those found in the other caves.²⁷

and

We would like to suggest that the collection of items in Cave 11 reflects a common origin, being more sectarian, so to speak, than the contents of the other caves.²⁸

The general conclusion of the article is much more strongly worded. I quote it in full:

A strong sectarian connection of the fragments from Cave 11, stronger than that of the other caves, together with the preponderance of handle sheets among Cave 11 texts characterize the contents of this cave.

²⁴ E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

²⁵ E. Tov, “The Special Character of the Texts Found in Qumran Cave 11,” in *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone* (ed. E.G. Chazon, D. Satran, and R.A. Clements; JSJSup 89; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 187–96.

²⁶ Tov, “The Special Character,” 187.

²⁷ Tov, “The Special Character,” 187.

²⁸ Tov, “The Special Character,” 187.

These characteristics suggest that the collection of texts found in Cave 11 must have come as a whole from the Qumran community itself, possibly brought from a specific location.²⁹

This is of course a very important conclusion for the characterization of the “Dutch share” of Cave 11 . . . if it holds.

I take the tables and qualifications of the manuscripts given by Tov at face value, even though using more recent discussions than Dimant’s list of 1995³⁰ to ascertain which texts may or may not be considered “sectarian” might have changed the numbers a little. But this is not the problem I have with Tov’s statistics. What leaves me unsatisfied is that while most of the statistical comparisons have been made for all of the non-Cave 11 manuscripts (thus comparing Cave 11 with the rest of the finds), the conclusion opposes the sectarian connection of Cave 11 to the sectarian connection of the other caves. Only when statistical comparisons are made between caves will their probative value be compelling. For example, if we compare the two most similar caves among them (Cave 1 and Cave 11), I am not so sure that the conclusion that Cave 11 presents a more homogeneous and “sectarian character” than Cave 1 would hold.

Cave 1 and Cave 11 present many common characteristics as to favourable storage conditions; those of Cave 1 were better, if we look at the number of manuscripts wrapped in linen and preserved entirely, the number of storage jars recovered, etc. The criteria generally used for determining the sectarian or non-sectarian character of each composition (those defined by Tov in “Sectarian Content and Terminology”) are on the whole abstracted from the analysis of the main manuscripts from Cave 1: the *Serek*, *Hodayoth*, *Pesharim* and *Milhamah* Scrolls, none of which (with the possible exception of the tiny fragment 11Q29 which does not provide any data on scribal practice) are attested in Cave 11. According to the “Sectarian Content and Terminology” criteria, I think that only 11Q13 (Melchizedek), 11Q17 (*Shirot ‘Olat ha-Shabbat*) and the tiny 11Q29, can be classified as sectarian. (I still consider 11Q5 [11QPs^a] to be a different biblical scroll.) This number is not only lower than the number of manuscripts from Cave 1 which can receive the same label,

²⁹ Tov, “The Special Character,” 196.

³⁰ D. Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness* (ed. D. Dimant and L.H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23–58.

but is also statistically lower when related to the total number of manuscripts found in both caves.

The “Groningen” hypothesis of Qumran origins and early history tries to bring into a coherent interpretative cadre the multiplicity of data provided by the scroll finds and the not always concordant information provided by classical sources for the main groups of Second Temple Judaism. It defends the argument that the origins of the Qumran group are to be found in a split within the Essene movement which had its roots in the Apocalyptic Palestinian tradition. It interprets the finds of the 11 Caves as the remains of the scroll collection (the library if you wish) of the sectarian group settled at Qumran on which the treasures of the biblical tradition and other non-canonical Jewish religious writings (which we use to call para-biblical), the heritage of the Apocalyptic movement and the compositions written during the formative period of the group, and the compositions written by the group after the split (the ones who receive the label “sectarian”) were kept, copied, and studied. A rough estimate of the compositions that can be identified, once all the preserved manuscripts are available, indicates that the number of “sectarian” writings is a minority of the whole, and that the “para-biblical” category is the most numerous, totalling more than the biblical and “sectarian” documents put together.

According to the Groningen hypothesis of the distribution of the manuscripts by categories, of the 22 identifiable manuscripts from Cave 11, nine belong to the “biblical,” four to the “para-biblical,” two to “Apocalyptic writings,” three to the “formative period” and only three belong to the “sectarian” category. The statistical proportion according to which each category is represented within the remains found in each cave varies of course, but the pattern remains constant in all caves (with the exception of Cave 7, where only papyri inscribed in Greek were found). Certainly in Groningen we would have loved the texts published in DJD XXIII to have a “special” character. Of course this would have made “our cave” even more special. I am grateful to Emanuel Tov for having tried to prove that, but at the end of the day I am not convinced that Cave 11 is more sectarian than Cave 1.

Like Emanuel Tov, I am convinced that the collection of texts from Cave 11 does indeed come from the community of Qumran as a whole (as does the collection from Cave 1 in any case, and the collection from Cave 4), and I am convinced that the specific source is none other than the ruins of Khirbet Qumran. But I believe this for different reasons than the ones presented in Tov’s article. Material features and scribal

characteristics are very important evidence indeed. They are objectively verifiable data. But as with all data, they need to be interpreted and placed in context, always keeping in mind the random and accidental character of the finds and their preservation, and the limited knowledge of the whole deposit. And what better way of interpreting the data than by applying the first characteristic of the “Groningen” approach: To study the Scrolls in the context of the Jewish literature and history of the Second Temple Period?

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- Abegg, M.G. 72, 81, 83, 86, 105, 108,
 109, 112–114, 118
 Abel, F.-M. 57
 Albani, M. 73
 Albrektson, B. 260
 Alexander, P.S. 112, 246, 268, 292
 Allegro, J.M. 33, 99, 177, 253, 275
 Alonso Schökel, L. 255
 Aufrecht, W.E. 262
 Aviram, J. 267

 Baillet, M. 105, 106, 111–114, 118,
 120, 121, 123, 237
 Barr, J. 227
 Barthélemy, D. 260, 261
 Baumgarten, J.M. 21, 77, 83, 86, 265,
 269, 292
 Baumgartner, W. 297
 Beall, T.S. 47
 Beckwith, R. 13, 21
 Ben David, A. 7
 Betz, O. 129
 Beyer, K. 264
 Bianchi, U. 235
 Bidez, J. 228
 Black, M. 262
 Blenkinsopp, J. 14
 Boccaccini, G. ix
 Bockmuehl, M. 246
 Bogaert, P. 181
 Bonani, G. 68
 Bousset, W. 229
 Boyce, M. 228, 229
 Briand, J. 289
 Brooke, G.J. 99
 Broshi, M. 83
 Brown, R.E. 22
 Brownlee, W.H. 25, 26, 53, 54, 59, 60,
 62, 63, 233
 Bultmann, R. 130, 132, 139
 Burchard, Ch. 262
 Burgmann, H. 51
 Burrows, M. 191, 233

 Callaway, P.R. 5, 51
 Camponovo, O. 176
 Caquot, A. 286

 Carmignac, J. 26, 58, 63, 146, 199,
 256, 300, 303
 Cavallin, H.C. 165
 Charles, R.H. 263, 300
 Charlesworth, J.H. 99, 100, 169, 262
 Collins, J.J. 105, 108, 114–117,
 119–121, 146, 154, 171, 196–199,
 201, 237
 Cousin, H. 156
 Cross, F.M. 6, 26, 43, 58, 69, 82, 258,
 261, 267
 Cumont, F. 228

 Davies, P.R. 5, 10, 17, 21, 45, 47, 50,
 51, 80, 237
 Dederling, S. 181
 Delcor, M. 3, 17, 53, 58
 Díez-Macho, A. 145, 169, 171
 Dimant, D. 10, 13, 108, 114–117, 120,
 155–157, 173, 187, 198, 292, 308
 Duchesne-Guillemain, J. 227
 Duhaime, J. 17, 165, 221, 234, 238
 Dupont-Sommer, A. viii, 20, 26, 47,
 53, 58, 62, 68, 227, 233, 235, 263,
 285–297

 Ebeling, G. 129, 138
 Eisenman, R.H. 4, 68, 80, 93, 94, 102
 Elfenbein, J. 232
 Elliger, K. 54, 58, 63
 Eshel, E. 105, 107–109, 114–116,
 118–120, 125

 Feldman, L.H. 11, 12
 Fitzmyer, J.A. 32, 74, 232
 Fletcher-Louis, C.H.T. 105, 106, 110
 Flint, P.W. 245, 259
 Freedman, D.N. 253
 Frey, J. 234
 Frölich, I. 26
 Frye, R.N. 228, 230
 Fuchs, E. 129, 135
 Funk, R.W. 129

 García Martínez, F. vii, viii, ix, 3, 4, 14,
 15, 17, 18, 25–27, 31, 32, 42, 48, 52,
 67, 69, 72, 74, 82, 88, 103, 108, 112,

- 114, 117, 123, 145, 149, 154, 157,
 164, 166, 169, 172, 173, 178, 188,
 197, 202, 231, 234, 245, 247, 248,
 250, 256, 257, 259, 265, 269, 270,
 276–281, 291, 292, 295, 299, 303, 306
 Geoltrain, P. 20, 154, 156
 Gignoux, P. 229
 Golb, N. 4, 31, 34, 36–47, 67, 71, 75
 Goodman, M.D. 75
 Goudoever, J. van 20
 Greenberg, M. 260
 Grenet, F. 228
 Gwyn Griffiths, J. 236, 240

 Hamerton-Kelly, R.G. 15
 Hanhart, R. 232
 Harrington, D.J. 93
 Hartman, L. 147
 Hellholm, D. 146, 147, 154, 171
 Hempel, C. 293
 Hengel, M. 109
 Hollander, H.W. 262
 Horgan, M.P. 25, 58, 60
 Hultgård, A. 227, 228, 240
 Humbach, H. 232, 235, 236
 Hunzinger, C.-H. 113

 Jacobson, H. 262
 Jaubert, A. 20, 21
 Jeremias, G. 4, 25, 26, 47, 58, 65
 Jong, A. de 229
 Jonge, M. de 262
 Jongeling, B. 298, 302, 303

 Kampen, J. 102
 Kanael, B. 7
 Kapera, Z.J. 80
 Käsemann, E. x, 129–145, 150, 151
 Kautzsch, E. 263
 Kister, M. 91, 155
 Klijn, A.F.J. 153, 156, 179, 181, 183,
 262
 Knibb, M.A. 157, 172, 175, 185, 262,
 263
 Knohl, I. 73, 105, 109, 115, 120
 Kobelski, P.J. 124
 Koch, K. 145, 195, 227
 Kraft, R.A. 260
 Kuhn, H.-W. 99
 Kuhn, K.G. 227, 235, 297
 Kutscher, Y. 264
 Lacocque, A. 159

 Lange, A. 234, 292
 Laperrousaz, E.M. 7, 34
 Lehnardt, A. 262
 Licht, J. 233
 Lichtenberger, H. 14
 Lim, T.H. 71, 112, 268
 Lindars, B. 261
 Lohse, E. 140
 Lozachmeur, H. 290
 Luttkhuizen, G.P. 305

 Mach, M. 213
 Maier, G. 234
 Maier, J. 257, 277
 María Abrego, J. 169
 Marshall, I.H. 130
 Martone, C. 73, 108
 Mateos, J. 169
 Mathews, K.A. 253
 Menasce, J. de 229, 241
 Merrill, E. 14
 Meshorer, Y. 7
 Metso, S. 293
 Michaud, H. 227
 Michel, A. 26
 Milik, J.T. 4, 5, 6, 13, 18, 32, 33, 43,
 47, 62, 69, 113, 124, 166, 173, 253,
 261, 265
 Moore, C.A. 232
 Murphy-O'Connor, J. 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12,
 24, 25, 27, 45, 47, 59, 64
 Myers, J.M. 153

 Naveh, J. 33
 Newsom, C.A. 42, 43, 216, 253, 300,
 301
 Nickelsburg, G.W.E. 165, 300
 Nitzan, B. 25
 Noort, E. 305
 Norelli, E. 262
 Nötscher, F. 15, 59

 Osten-Sacken, P. von der 234

 Parry, D. vii, 247, 257, 265, 303
 Pérez Fernández, M. 265
 Pfann, S.J. 74, 112, 268
 Philonenko, M. 20, 227, 263, 286
 Piñero, A. 145
 Pines, S. 233
 Pixner, B. 43
 Ploeg, J.P.M. van der 35, 237, 261, 270,
 298

- Porten, B. 91
 Potok, C. 252
 Puech, É. 32, 33, 99, 107, 108, 120,
 124, 166, 177, 178, 186, 187,
 230–232, 271–273, 282
- Qimron, E. 18, 19, 77, 79, 80, 81–83,
 91–103, 264, 271, 273
- Reicke, B. 53
 Renan, E. 289, 292, 294, 296
 Rengstorf, K.H. 37, 39
 Richards, K. 297
 Riessler, P. 263, 300
 Rollins, W.G. 129, 143
 Rosso Ubigli, L. 166
 Rowland, C. 15
 Rubinkiewicz, R. 262
- Sacchi, P. 14, 147, 155, 197, 199
 Sáenz Badillos, A. 264
 Schechter, S. 20
 Schiffman, L.H. 12, 51, 70, 80, 94,
 161, 211, 248, 252, 265, 304, 305
 Schuller, E. 107, 111, 114–116, 125,
 253, 292
 Sed-Rajna, G. 246
 Shaked, S. 227, 229, 237
 Shanks, H. 252, 254
 Silberman, L.H. 63, 64
 Silberman, N.A. 252
 Skjærvø, P.O. 232
 Smith, M. 105–107, 111, 118, 119
 Starcky, J. 32, 33
 Stegemann, H. 4, 5, 25, 32, 47, 59, 62,
 69, 71, 75, 77, 88, 91, 107, 110, 155,
 196, 199, 234, 267, 268, 279, 280, 283
 Steudel, A. 96, 97, 110, 189, 210
 Stone, M.E. 153, 164, 179, 183, 189,
 197, 262
 Strugnell, J. 18, 19, 32, 77, 78, 81, 82,
 91–93, 95, 99, 102, 103, 155, 156,
 187, 265, 274, 281, 298
 Sukenik, E.L. 68, 107, 184, 237
- Sussmann, Y. 80, 265
 Swanson, D.D. 280
 Sznycer, M. 290
- Talmon, S. 20, 73, 258
 Thiering, B.E. 4, 68, 279
 Thompson, A.L. 156, 162, 163
 Thorion, Y. 44
 Tigchelaar, E.J.C. 112, 231, 234, 247,
 256, 269, 302, 303
 Tov, E. 112, 248, 258–261, 268, 275,
 282, 283, 306–309
 Trebolle Barrera, J. 248, 250, 306
 Trever, J.C. 233
 Tromp, J. 182, 262
- Ulrich, E. 35, 259, 261
- VanderKam, J.C. 13, 21, 80, 81, 176,
 177, 197, 199, 245, 248, 262
 Vaux, R. de 5, 6, 34, 38, 39, 51
 Vermes, G. 4, 5, 6, 21, 26, 34, 43, 46,
 47, 68, 69, 75, 253, 292
- Wacholder, B.Z. 18, 72, 81, 83, 86,
 280, 281
 Webb, R.L. 154
 Wernberg-Møller, P. 234
 White, S. 273, 274
 Widengren, G. 227
 Willet, T.W. 164
 Wills, L. 277
 Wilson, A.M. 277
 Wilson, E. 252, 287–290
 Winkelmann, A. 246
 Wise, M.O. 73, 93, 94, 105, 110, 115,
 121, 154, 277, 280
 Woude, A.S. van der vii, viii, 26, 31,
 48, 52, 54, 57, 59, 64, 67, 69, 73, 88,
 103, 158, 173, 256, 260, 261, 269,
 278–281, 296–306
- Yadin, Y. 54, 224, 253, 270, 276, 279

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

1. HEBREW BIBLE

<i>Genesis</i>		<i>Joshua</i>	
6	200	7	225
10	222, 238		
48:6	59	<i>2 Chronicles</i>	
49:8–12	177	20:23	61
49:19	121		
49:29	119	<i>Ezra</i>	
		2:61	59
<i>Exodus</i>	277	2:63	60
3:2–6	159	9	93
18	224		
24:18	159	<i>Nehemia</i>	259
34	276	7:63	59
		7:65	60
<i>Leviticus</i>	277	10:35	281
18:17	272		
20:14	272	<i>Esther</i>	259
22:16	64		
23:11	76	<i>Job</i>	156
23:15	76	9:19	121
23:42–44	281		
25	209	<i>Psalms</i>	33
		2	220
<i>Numbers</i>	277	2:1	210
2	225	7:8–9	209
10	225	82:1–2	209
17	225	84:21	121
24:17	16	106:30	61
25	61		
		<i>Proverbs</i>	119
<i>Deuteronomy</i>	33, 277		
7	276	<i>Isaiah</i>	33, 120, 187
8:1–14	63	2	209
8:14	63	9	209
12–23	277	9:5	109
15	209	11:1–5	211
17:14–20	277	26:8	119
20:2	224	52	209
21:19–21	272	53	109
21:22	272	61	150, 209
21:23	272, 283, 284	65:17	176
22:1	272		
22:11	272	<i>Jeremiah</i>	
30:1	96	23:6	109
31:19	97		
31:29	96, 97	<i>Lamentations</i>	33

<i>Ezekiel</i>	156, 164	11:14	61
37:1–12	166, 187	12	165, 186, 212
37:11–13	166	12:2–3	176
38	209	12:10	210
38–39	220, 222		
<i>Daniel</i>	92, 147, 149, 156, 174, 189, 195, 198, 206, 207, 214, 220, 226	<i>Joel</i> 3:9–16	220
2	209	<i>Micah</i> 4	209
7	159, 169	<i>Habakkuk</i>	
8:22, 23	60	1:13	23
8:25	61	2:1–3	212
9	93, 169	2:5–6	58
10	209		
11–12	222	<i>Malachi</i>	
11:2, 3, 4	60	2:7	95

2. APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

<i>Epistle of Jeremiah</i>	36	10:7	200
		10:11–13	172
<i>Sirach</i>	36, 201, 259	10:12	206
15:11	200–201	51	184–185
15:14	201	83–89	184
25:24	201	85–90	172
33:11–12	201	89:59	206
33:14	201	90	12, 49, 220
47:1	60	90:8–30	185
47:12	60	91–94	184
		91:12–13	207
<i>Tobit</i>	33, 36, 232, 259	91:12–17	174–175
3:8	232	91:14	207
3:17	232	91:15–16	207
		91:17	207
<i>2 Baruch</i>	148, 198	93:3–10	174
27	183	93:10	207
27–29	183	98:4	200
29:3–30:5	180–181		
30	188	<i>4 Ezra</i>	148, 149, 153–165, 167, 180, 185, 198, 201
<i>1 Enoch</i>	8, 16, 92, 146, 167, 172, 195, 198–200, 206, 214, 218, 226, 259	3:1–5:19	156
		3:21–22	163
		3:34	163
<i>Book of the Watchers</i>	14, 146–148, 198–201, 204	4:23	160, 162
		4:26	163
<i>Book of Parables</i>	184	4:33	157
<i>Astronomical Book</i>	14	4:35	157
<i>Book of Dreams</i>	13, 17, 146, 172	5–6	183
<i>Animal Apocalypse</i>	172, 175, 185, 189	5:1–7	183
<i>Epistle of Enoch</i>	146, 198, 200, 207	5:20–6:34	156

6:21–23	183		177, 200, 201, 204,
6:26	164		208, 214, 259, 276
6:35–9:25	156	23	176
6:57–59	162	23:26	13
6:59	157	23:22–31	176
7:4–5	231		
7:26	164	<i>1 Maccabees</i>	61
7:26–31	179	2:1	61
7:31–38	188–189	2:18	64
7:32	165	2:26	61
7:47	167	2:42	28, 60
8:1	167	2:54	61
9:1–10:60	164	3:1	61
9:26–10:59	156	4:42	55
10:60–12:51	156	4:49	55
12:9	159	5:3, 28, 35, 51, 68	65
12:10–12	159	6:21	64
12:12	158	6:22–25	64
12:35–38	162	7:14	28, 60
12:42	158	7:16	28, 60
13:1–58	156	7:47	65
14	157, 158	9:31	61
14:1–2	159	13:14	61
14:1–48	156	14:32	61
14:5–6	160		
14:21	160	<i>2 Maccabees</i>	56, 57
14:22	160	4:29	57
14:23	159	8:25, 30–31	65
14:24	160	10:1	55
14:26	160	14:6	60
14:34–35	165	14:26	57
14:42	159		
14:44	159	<i>Testaments of the</i>	
14:45–46	160	<i>XII Patriarchs</i>	8, 305
<i>Jubilees</i>	8, 13, 17, 17, 21, 33, 36, 76, 148,	<i>Testament of Moses</i>	182
		10:1–13	181–182

3. DEAD SEA SCROLLS

<i>Damascus Document</i> (<i>CD</i>)	7, 10, 12, 16, 17, 33, 45, 50, 61, 80, 84, 86, 92, 94, 205, 208, 211, 212, 215, 257, 265, 269, 279, 280, 292, 293, 295	II 15–16	201, 202
		III 14–15	20
		IV 4	61, 210
		IV 11–18	205
		IV 19	23
		V 5	22, 61
I 1–12	158	V 7	284
I 5–12	16	V 8	209
I 8–12	16	V 17–VI 1	61
I 13–17	23	V 18	123
I 14	61	V 18–19	205
I 15	23	VI 10	19, 61
II 2–13	205	VI 11	211

VI 11–VII 4	19	VII 4–5	22
VI 14–15	19	VII 10	59
VI 15–16	19	VIII 8–13	27, 53, 57
VI 17–18	19	VIII 9–10	24, 50
VI 18	20	VIII 16	64
VI 18–19	19, 20	VIII 16–IX 2	28
VI 20	19, 20	IX 16–X 1	27
VII 1–4	19	X 9–13	23
VII 20	61	XI 2–8	27
VII 20–21	220	XI 4–8	27
VIII 4	64		
VIII 6–7	272	1Q17–18 (<i>Jub^{a-b}</i>)	36
VIII 13	23	1Q20 (<i>apGen ar</i>)	262, 264
VIII 19	16		
IX	85	1Q27 (<i>Myst</i>)	
X	85	1 i 3–7	165
X–XI	85		
XI 5–6	86	<i>Rule of the Community</i>	10, 33, 35, 45, 85,
XI 16–17	86	(1QS)	87, 88, 94, 100,
XI 17–21	12		211, 215, 218, 233,
XII	85		234, 269, 291–293,
XII 1–2	12		308
XII 19	85	<i>Treatise of the</i>	202, 204, 205, 208,
XII 23	61	<i>Two Spirits</i>	211, 217, 220,
XII 23–XIII 7	85		223, 233, 235
XIII 7–XIV 2	85	I–II	205
XIV 3–12	85	II 24	59
XV	85	II 26	59
XV 9	94, 98	III	123
XV 12	94, 98	III 13–15	202, 234
XV 12–18	85	III 13–IV 26	202, 233
XV–XVI	85	III 15–16	202, 234
XVI	85	III 17–19	202, 234
XVI 1, 5	98	III 20	123, 209
XVI 1–2, 4–5	94	III 20–21	202, 234
XIX 35–XX 1	192, 212	III 21–23	163
XX 1	61	III 25–IV 1	202, 234
XX 10–13	23	IV 10	65
XX 11–12	23	IV 18–19	211
XX 13–15	192, 212	IV 18–23	203
XX 14–15	52	IV 21–24	203
XX 15	23	IV 24–25	203
		V 5	59
<i>1QPesher to Habakkuk</i>	28, 35, 48, 50, 52,	V 7–12	161
(<i>1QpHab</i>)	53, 54, 56, 57, 68,	V 8	94, 98
	192, 210, 212,	V 9	22
	287–288, 291	V 15	65
II 1–3	23	V 21	100
II 1–5	23	V 22	94
II 6–10	23	V 23	100
IV 11	65	VI	86
V 9–12	23	VI 14	100
VII 1–5	150, 158	VI 17	100
VII 1–14	191, 212		

VI 18	99, 100	VII 30	59
VI 25	87	IX–XIV	224
VIII 1	86	IX 35	59
VIII 4–10	219	X–XII	221
VIII 9	59	X–XIV	221
VIII 11–12	161	X 27	59
VIII 12–16	24	XI 11	59
VIII 15–16	161	XIII	221
IX 3–6	219	XIII 5	65
IX 11	158	XIII 10	123, 209, 222, 238
IX 17	161	XIV	221
XI 7–8	15	XIV–XIX	222, 238
XI 7–9	215	XV	221
1Q28a (<i>Sa</i>)	211, 219, 225, 280	XV 4–5	224
I 1	96	XV 5	118
II 5–8	225	XVII	123
II 5–9	19	XVII 5	123
1Q28b (<i>Sb</i>)	108, 109	XVII 5–9	122–123
III 25–26	219	XVII 6	123
III 27	121	XVII 6–7	209
IV 25–26	219	XVII 7	123
		XVII 8	59
		XVIII 2–3	222, 238
1Q33 (<i>M</i>)	38, 106, 114, 117, 118, 122, 184, 205, 219, 221–225, 237, 238, 240, 241, 291	1QHodayot ^[a,b] (1QH ^[a,b])	14, 106, 107, 114–116, 118, 125, 163, 205, 215, 218, 269, 291, 292, 308
I	221, 222, 280, 308	II 14	59
I 9	241	V 24, 25	95
I 9–12	184	X 13–14	22
I 10	222, 238, 241	XI 20–22	215–216
I 13	241	XI 21–22	117
I 13–15	222, 238	XI 35	220
II	221, 225	XII 27–28	22
II–IX	224	XIV 2	59
II–XIII	222, 238	XIX 13	117
II 1–6	15	XXV	107
II 6	239	XXVI	107
II 6–10	223	7 ii	107
II 9	223, 239	56 ii, 46 ii, 55 ii	107
II 9–14	238–239	2Q18 (<i>Sir</i>)	36
II 10	239	2Q19–20 (<i>Jub^{a-b}</i>)	36
II 15–III 11	221	2Q24 (<i>Nj ar</i>)	33, 149, 214, 275
III–X	221	3Q5 (<i>Jub</i>)	36
III 13–V 2	221	3Q15 (<i>Copper Scroll</i>)	33, 43–44
V 3–VII 7	221	4Q22 (<i>paleoExod^m</i>)	258
VI 29	59		
VII 3–6	19		
VII 4–5	225		
VII 5–6	215		
VII 6	15		
VII 9	124		
VII 9–X 18	221		

4Q23 (<i>Lev-Num^a</i>)	258	1-2 i 17	99
		1-2 i 15	96
4Q47 (<i>Josha</i>)	261		
4Q51-53 (<i>Sam^{a-c}</i>)	257	4Q175 (<i>Test</i>)	35, 291
4Q51 (<i>Sam^a</i>)	261	23-25	61
4Q53 (<i>Sam^c</i>)	35	4Q176 (<i>Tanhi</i>)	
		19, 20, 21	36
4Q71 (<i>Jer^b</i>)	261		
4Q76 (<i>XII^e</i>)	282	4Q177 (<i>Catena A</i>)	190
		1 14	160
4Q109 (<i>Qoh^a</i>)	282	10-11 9	158
4Q156 (<i>tgLev</i>)	261	4Q180 (<i>AgesCreat A</i>)	173, 201, 208
4Q157 (<i>tgJob</i>)	261	4Q181 (<i>AgesCreat B</i>)	173, 208
		2	64
4Q158 (<i>BibPar</i> [= <i>4QRP^a</i>])		4Q186	33
14	275		
4Q161 (<i>pIsa^a</i>)	211, 220	4Q196-200	36
8-10 17	61	(<i>Tob^{a-c}</i> [<i>ar</i>])	
4Q162 (<i>pIsa^b</i>)		4Q204 (<i>4QEn^c</i> <i>ar</i>)	13
II 1	158	4Q205 (<i>4QEn^d</i> <i>ar</i>)	13
II 6	23	4Q206 (<i>4QEn^e</i> <i>ar</i>)	13
II 10	23	4Q207 (<i>4QEn^f</i> <i>ar</i>)	13
		4Q208 (<i>4QEnast^a</i> <i>ar</i>)	33
4Q163 (<i>pap pIsac</i>)		4Q213-214b	257
4-7 ii 8	158	(<i>Levi^{a-f}</i> <i>ar</i>)	
4-7 ii 9	158	4Q216-224 (<i>Jub^{a-h}</i>)	36
4-7 ii 14	158		
23 ii 10	158	4Q232 (<i>NJ²</i>)	33
4Q168 (<i>pMic[?]</i>)		4Q242 (<i>PrNab</i> <i>ar</i>)	124
3-4 i 3	61	4Q243 (<i>psDan^a</i> <i>ar</i>)	173
4Q169 (<i>pNah</i>)	210, 280, 291	4Q245 (<i>psDan^c</i> <i>ar</i>)	166
3-4 ii 6	65	4Q246 (<i>apocrDan</i> <i>ar</i>)	153, 177
3-4 iv 3	62	II 1-9	178
4Q171 (<i>pPs^a</i>)	68	4Q252 (<i>CommGen A</i>)	177
1-2 i 18-19	24, 49	V 1-5	177
1-2 i 18-ii 1	23	4Q256 (<i>4QS^b</i>)	100
1-2 i 19	23	4Q258 (<i>4QS^d</i>)	68, 100
1-2 ii 2-3	94	4Q259 (<i>4QS^e</i>)	71, 78
1-2 ii 6-7	52		
1-2 ii 17-19	210	4Q265 (<i>Miscellaneous</i>	71, 86-88
1, 3-4 iii 15-17	16	<i>Rules</i>)	
3-10 iv 14-15	23	4 i-ii	86
4Q174 (<i>Flor</i>)	15, 210, 211, 220,		
	291		
1-2 i 13	61		

- 4Q266–273 (*4QD^{e-h}*) 71, 87, 88
 4Q266 (*4QD^e*) 68
 2 i 2 83
 5 ii 85
 6 i–ii 85
 6 iii 85
 10 ii 85
 11 85, 205
 4Q267 (*4QD^b*) 68
 17 i 6–9 215
 4Q270 (*4QD^d*)
 2 84
 2 ii 19–20 84
 4 85
 7 i 85
 7 ii 85
 4Q271 (*4QD^f*)
 2 85
 3 85

 4Q280 (*Curses*) 205

 4Q285 (*Sefer ha-Milhamah*)
 7 122, 221
 179

 4Q286–290 (*Ber^{a-e}*) 42, 205, 218

 4Q317 (*cryptA*
Lunisolar Calendar) 33
 4Q319 (*Otot*) 33
 4Q320–330 72
 (*Mishmarot, Cal. Doc.*)
 4Q320 (*Cal.Doc./*
Mishmarot A) 72, 73, 74
 4Q321 (*Cal.Doc./*
Mishmarot B) 73, 74
 4Q321–321a 72
 (*Cal.Doc./*
Mishmarot B–C)
 4Q322–324 72, 73–74
 (*Mishmarot A–E*)
 4Q324b (*papCal.*
Doc. A?) 74
 4Q324d–i 74
 4Q325 (*Cal.Doc./*
Mishmarot D) 72, 74
 4Q326 (*Cal.Doc. C*) 74
 4Q328–329 (*Cal.Doc./*
Mishmarot F–G) 72, 74, 75

 4Q329a 72, 75
 (*Cal.Doc./Mishmarot H*)
 4Q330 72, 75
 (*Cal.Doc./Mishmarot I*)
- 4Q320–337 33
 (*Mishmarot, Cal. Doc.*)

 4Q331 74

 4Q341 (*Exercitium*
Calami C) 33

 4Q364–367 (*RP^{b-e}*) 275
 4Q365 (*RP*) 273–275, 281, 282
 23 275, 281
 25 281

 4Q365a (*T^{a?}*) 273–275, 281, 282
 1 282
 2 i 282
 2 ii 282
 2 275
 3–5 282

 4Q380–381 (*Non-*
Canonical Psalms A–B) 253

 4Q385 (*psEzek^d*) 33, 155–157, 166,
 167, 187
 2 1–8 187
 2 2–9 166
 2 3 157
 4 2–5 163

 4Q390 (*apocrJer C^e*) 173, 208
 1 6–9 208
 1 7–11 173
 2 i 3–4 208
 2 i 6–7 208

 4Q394–399 17, 18, 19, 21, 23,
 33, 47, 70, 71, 74,
 77–83, 91–93,
 96–103, 210, 265,
 279
 B 1–2 78
 B 2 98, 100, 101
 C 9–16 91
 C 12 96, 97
 C 13–15 210
 C 14 96, 97
 C 15 94
 C 16 96
 C 17–21 189–190
 C 18–24 91, 94
 C 19 94
 C 21 94, 96, 97, 210
 C 22 94, 95
 C 23 92, 95, 100, 101

C 24	92, 95	1 3	120
C 25	92	1 4	120
C 25-32	91		
C 26	92	4Q491-496 (<i>M^{g-f}</i>)	237
C 27	98, 100, 101	4Q491 (<i>M^g</i>)	107, 108, 110-116,
C 30	78		120, 122, 123, 125,
			221, 224
4Q394	71, 74, 78	1	112
4Q395	78	1-3 6	19
4Q397	94	1-3 9	113
4Q398	91, 102	1-3 17	113
11-13	91, 92, 94	2	112
14-17	91	3	112
		4	112
4Q394 1-2	74	5	112
(<i>Cal. Doc. D</i>)		6	112
		7	112
4Q400-407	33, 42-43, 117,	8-10	112
(<i>ShirShabb^{a-h}</i>)	216, 218, 219, 253,	11 i	105, 108, 111, 113,
	257		114
4Q400 (<i>ShirShabb^e</i>)		11 i 1-18	106
1 i 3-4	216	11 i 8-12	116
2 6-7	216	11 i 8-11	118, 119
4Q402 (<i>ShirShabb^f</i>)		11 i 11	111, 118
4	217	11 i 12	121
4 7-10	216	11 i 12-18	118, 119
4Q405 (<i>ShirShabb^f</i>)		11 i 13	120
19 7	216	11 i 13-18	116
20-22 7	216	11 i 14	117, 120
20-22 8-13	217	11 i 15	120
		11 i 16	117, 119
4Q415-8	202	11 i 16-17	121
(<i>4QInstruction^{g-f}</i>)		11 i 17	121
		11 i 18	117, 120
4Q417 (<i>4QInstruction^g</i>)		11 i 19	111
2 ii 12	202	11 i 20	111
		11 i 20-24	106
4Q427 (<i>H^e</i>)	114, 116, 125	11 i 21	117
7	107	11 ii	112
7 i 9-21	107	11 ii 6	113
7 i 12	117	12	113
7 i 13	117, 125	12-15	112
7 i 17	117	13 6	113
7 ii 7-19	107	16	112
		17 4	118
4Q431 (<i>H^e</i>)	114, 115, 118, 125	18	112
1	107, 114	19	112
1 1	117	20	112
1 2	117	21	112
1 3	125	23	112
1 4	117, 125	24-28	112
1 6	125	31-33	112
2 6-9	107	35	112
		4Q492 (<i>M^h</i>)	221
4Q471b (<i>Self-</i>	107, 114, 115, 118,	4Q493 (<i>M^e</i>)	221
<i>Glorification Hymn</i>)	125	4Q494-496 (<i>M^{d-f}</i>)	221

4Q504–506 (<i>DibHam^{a-c}</i>)	17, 92, 93	4Q543–549 (<i>Visions of Amram^{a-g} ar</i>)	124, 205
4Q504 (<i>DibHam^a</i>)	282	4Q544 (<i>Visions of Amram^b ar</i>)	214
1–2 iii 12–14	97	1 10	124
4Q509 (<i>papPrFêtes^c</i>)		2 2–3	124
233 2	64	3 2	124
4Q510 (<i>Shir^a</i>)	218	4Q550 (<i>PrEsther^a ar</i>)	229
4Q511 (<i>Shir^b</i>)	218	4Q552–553 (<i>Four Kingdoms^{a-b} ar</i>)	207
18 ii 7	66	4Q554–555 (<i>ḤḤ ar</i>)	33, 149, 214, 275
4Q512 (<i>papRitPur B</i>)	65	5Q15 (<i>ḤḤ ar</i>)	33, 149, 214, 275
15 i 1	65	7Q2 (<i>papEp̄jer gr</i>)	36
4Q521	186	11Q1 (<i>paleoLev^a</i>)	253, 258
(<i>Messianic Apocalypse</i>)		11Q5 (<i>Ps^a</i>)	259, 308
2 ii 1–13	186–187	XIX 15	163
7+5 ii 4–8	231	XXI	36
7+5 ii 6	166	XXII 6–7	63
7+5 ii 11–15	230	11Q10 (<i>tgJob</i>)	261, 264, 298
7+5 ii 11	231	11Q11 (<i>apocrPs</i>)	221
4Q524 (<i>T^b</i>)	271–273, 282, 283	11Q12 (<i>Jub</i>)	36, 276
1	271	11Q13 (<i>Melch</i>)	124, 173, 205, 209, 211, 214, 308
2	271	II 6–8	174, 209
3	271	11Q14 (<i>Sefer ha-Milhamah</i>)	221, 237
4	271	11Q17 (<i>ShirShabb</i>)	216, 218, 219, 257, 308
5	271	10–11	218
6–13	271, 272	11Q18 (<i>ḤḤ ar</i>)	33, 149, 214, 275 214
6–13 1–3	271	19 5–6	
6–13 4–7	271	11Q19 (<i>11QT^a</i>)	12, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 28, 76, 80, 92, 103, 253, 265, 269–276, 278–284
6–13 6	283	II–XIII	277
6–13 8–10	271	III 14–17	275
14	271, 272	IX	275
14 1	272	XVI–XVII	282
14 1–4	272		
14 1–6	272		
14 5	272		
14 6	272		
15–22	271, 272		
15–22 4	271		
23–39	271		
25	271, 272		
4Q529 (<i>Words of Michael ar</i>)	214		
4Q534 (<i>Birth of Noah^a ar</i>)	33		
4Q535 (<i>Birth of Noah^b ar</i>)	33		
4Q536 (<i>Birth of Noah^c ar</i>)	33		

XXIX 9-10	15	LX 1-11	277
XXX-XLV	277	LX 2-6	271
XXXV 7	271	LXIII 1-8	19
XXXVIII	282	LXIV 6-10	272
XLI	282	LXIV 10	272
XLIV 6-13	277	LXV	272
XLV-XLVII	277	LXV-LXVI	19
XLV 11-12	12	LXVI 8-17	271
XLV 12-13	19	LXVI 15	271
XLV 17ff.	19		
XLVII-XLVIII	275	11Q20 (<i>11QT^b</i>)	35, 253, 265, 269-276, 278-284
XLVIII-LI	277	8 ii	270
L 5-9	19	13 ii	270
L 17-21	271	17	270
LI 4-6	19		
LII-LXVI	277	11Q21 (<i>T?</i>)	273, 275, 276, 281
LIII 5	19	1	275
LIV 5	271	2	275
LV 11-13	271	3	275
LVI-LIX	277		
LVIII 10-13	271	11Q29 (<i>Fig. Related to Serekh ha-Yahad</i>)	308
LIX	271		
LIX 17-21	271	8Hev 1 (<i>8HevXII gr</i>)	260
LX	271		
LX 1-5	19		

4. NEW TESTAMENT

<i>Matthew</i>	131, 132, 140, 143	7:18-23	150
5:17-20	131	10:18	149
6:13	149	16:29	231
7:2	132		
7:22-23	131	<i>John</i>	143
10:5-6	131	12:31	149
10:13-14	132		
10:16	132	<i>Acts</i>	132, 140, 143
10:23	132	3:19-21	140
10:41	132	11:19	143
11:2-6	150		
11:3-5	187	<i>Romans</i>	
13:16-17	132	10:9-10	140
19:28-29	132		
23:8-10	131	<i>1 Corinthians</i>	141
		15:3-5	140
<i>Mark</i>	140, 143	15:20-28	136
9:1	140		
13	169	<i>1 Thessalonians</i>	141
13:20	164		
13:30	140	<i>2 Thessalonians</i>	
		2:1-12	141
<i>Luke</i>	143		
4:18-21	150	<i>Revelation</i>	139, 169

5. PHILO AND JOSEPHUS

Philo of Alexandria		12.328, 353	65
<i>Apologia</i>	11	12.362–366	64
<i>Hypothetica</i>		12.384	56
18	28	12.414	56
<i>Good Person</i>		12.419	56
75	15	12.434	56
89–91	28	13.171–172	11, 12
		13.172	14
		15.371	11
Flavius Josephus		18.11	11, 12
<i>Jewish War</i>		18.18	14
2.142	15	18.1915	
2.159	15	20.237	56
2.176	15		
<i>Jewish Antiquities</i>		<i>Vita</i>	
12.309, 312	65	12	12
12.318	55		

6. RABBINIC LITERATURE

<i>m. Ma'aser Šeni</i>		<i>b. Giṭṭin</i>	
5.15	28	58	233
<i>m. Menaḥot</i>		<i>b. Megillah</i>	
10.3	76	11a	56
<i>m. Parah</i>		<i>Ta'anit</i>	74
3.5	28	<i>Sipra</i>	265
3.7	80		
<i>m. Yadayim</i>			
4.7	80		

7. CLASSICAL, EARLY CHRISTIAN, AND ZOROASTRIAN LITERATURE

<i>Avesta</i>	229, 235–237	Hippolytus of Rome	
<i>Gāthās</i>	204, 229, 230, 233, 235, 240	<i>Refutatio omnium haeresium</i>	12
<i>Yasna</i>		Pliny the Elder	
30:3	235	<i>Historia Naturalis</i>	
45:2	236	5.73	12
46:10	232		
<i>Bahman Yašt</i>	229	Plutarch	
III.33	240	<i>On Isis and Osiris</i>	204
<i>Bundahišn</i>	229	46	236
<i>Dēnkart</i>	229	47	223, 240
<i>Barnabas</i>	155		

