STUDIES ON THE TEXTS OF THE DESERT OF JUDAH [103]

The Scrolls and Biblical Traditions

Proceedings of the Seventh Meeting of the IOQS in Helsinki

Edited by

GEORGE J. BROOKE, DANIEL K. FALK,

EIBERT J.C. TIGCHELAAR

AND MOLLY M. ZAHN

BRILL

The Scrolls and Biblical Traditions

Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

Edited by

Florentino García Martínez

Associate Editors

Peter W. Flint
Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar

VOLUME 103

The titles published in this series are listed at brill.nl/stdj

The Scrolls and Biblical Traditions

Proceedings of the Seventh Meeting of the IOQS in Helsinki

Edited by

George J. Brooke, Daniel K. Falk,
Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar and Molly M. Zahn

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2012

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

International Organization for Qumran Studies. Meeting (7th : 2010 : Helsinki, Finland)
The Scrolls and biblical traditions : proceedings of the seventh meeting of the IOQS in Helsinki / edited by George J. Brooke . . . [et al.].
p. cm. — (Studies on the texts of the desert of Judah, ISSN 0169-9962 ; v. 103)
Includes index.
"Seventh meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies (IOQS) was held at Helsinki, August 2–4, 2010, in association with the 20th Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament (IOSOT)"—Preface.
ISBN 978-90-04-23104-7 (hardback : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-90-04-23166-5 (e-book) 1. Dead Sea scrolls—Congresses. I. Brooke, George J. II. Title.

BM487.I56 2012
296.1'55—dc23

2012017177

This publication has been typeset in the multilingual "Brill" typeface. With over 5,100 characters covering Latin, IPA, Greek, and Cyrillic, this typeface is especially suitable for use in the humanities. For more information, please see www.brill.nl/brill-typeface.

ISSN 0169-9962
ISBN 978 90 04 23104 7 (hardback)
ISBN 978 90 04 23166 5 (e-book)

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

CONTENTS

PREFACE

The Seventh Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies (IOQS) was held at Helsinki, August 2–4, 2010, in association with the 20th Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament (IOSOT). In this preface we express our thanks to our hosts, the president of the IOSOT Congress, Prof. Raija Sollamo, and the congress secretary, Dr. Jutta Jokiranta, both of the University of Helsinki, for the hospitality and the perfect organization.

The special topic of the Helsinki meeting was "The Scrolls and Biblical Traditions." For the meeting, which, as usual, was open to papers on all aspects related to the Dead Sea Scrolls, we especially invited papers that discussed any aspect of the transmission, use, or interpretation of biblical traditions in the Scrolls from the Judean Desert. Those could include studies of the biblical scrolls proper, on the relationship between scrolls and the versions, or on light shed by the scrolls on issues of scripture, authoritativeness, or canon, up to the use or interpretation, explicitly or implicitly, of biblical traditions in the so-called non-biblical scrolls.

At the seventh IOQS meeting, fifty-six papers were presented. The plenary IOSOT session *Qumran, the Septuagint, and Textual History*, a joint IOSOT–IOQS session, included two more Qumran papers, by Sidnie White Crawford and Charlotte Hempel. The IOQS meeting also comprised a discussion of Aharon Shemesh's book *Halakhah in the Making: The Development of Jewish law from Qumran to the Rabbis*, and a panel discussion of the books of John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* and Alison Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yaḥad: A New Paradigm of the Textual Decelopment for the Community Rule*. At the meeting, there were presentations of the following research and projects in progress: the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten*; *La Bibliothèque de Qumrân*; and the Göttingen Project Qumran Lexicon. Florentino García Martínez announced that after having been secretary of the *Revue de Qumrân* for a quarter of a century, he would step down, and welcomed Corrado Martone as the new secretary.

Of the fifty-six papers presented at the meeting, some were published elsewhere, and twenty-seven were submitted for inclusion in the proceedings of the meeting. The four editors of this volume have reviewed all those papers. Each submission was read by at least two of the editors,

and the editors reported on every paper they read. On the basis of those reports, fifteen authors were invited to submit a final version of their paper. Some splendid submissions could not be accepted, because they were not directly related to the special topic of the meeting. In other cases the editors suggested changes to the authors. In the end, we received twelve final versions of papers. In other words, all papers in this volume have been peer-reviewed and most of them have been revised for this volume.

The papers in this volume have been arranged more or less according to focus or topic. Thus, the volume begins with the opening lecture of the meeting by George Brooke, who surveys the most important issues relating to transmission and interpretation of scripture in the scrolls. After two more general papers (Campbell and Martone) on canon and textual criticism, the volume continues with more specific studies on texts (Elwolde, Debel, Lesley, Pajunen, and Nitzan), and on topics and traditions (Harrington, Holtz, Hogeterp, and Kampen).

Eibert Tigchelaar
Secretary IOQS

SCRIPTURE AND SCRIPTURAL TRADITION IN TRANSMISSION: LIGHT FROM THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

George J. Brooke

Introduction

In this brief introduction to the principal theme of this conference volume I set out some key issues on several topics that most of the other studies address from one angle or another. This volume is concerned with scripture and scriptural tradition in its widest framework, so whilst some essays deal with the textual development of the various parts of the Hebrew Bible itself, others concern all kinds of ways in which scriptural traditions have been adapted, interpreted and received both in sectarian and non-sectarian contexts.

At the outset, of course, the terminological problems have to be acknowledged, namely, for example and as is widely recognized, that the labels "Bible" and "biblical," inasmuch as they imply an accepted or fixed number of books and an accepted or fixed form of the text of each book, are anachronistic for the evidence of our period.[1] They are anachronistic because really the period of the movement that collected together the scrolls that come from the eleven caves at and near Qumran is a period of transition in several ways. It is the period that spans the gap between the literary formation and the attaining of authoritative, even canonical, status of many of the scriptural books, it is the period when one Hebrew text form eventually comes to dominate the scene at least for many elite Jews, and it is the period in which interpretation moves from being predominantly implicit to being more often quite explicit. In addition in many cases other terms used by scholars influence their perception of the evidence. Since the scrolls provide us with so much new data, determining the appropriate way of talking about it all is not a straightforward

[1] Noted, e.g., by Florentino García Martínez, "Rethinking the Bible: Sixty Years of Dead Sea Scrolls Research and Beyond," in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (ed. Mladen Popović; JSJSup 141; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 19–36, esp. 19–21; and see the further comments on this matter by Jonathan Campbell in the next chapter of this book.

task.[2] Should scholars use terms from the early second temple period and read them forwards or terms from later rabbinic times and read them backwards; what might be the appropriate terms, perhaps to be found in some of the sectarian compositions themselves, contemporary with the data being described and analysed?[3]

1. Sorting the Texts of Scripture[4]

The first generation of scholars of the Dead Sea Scrolls, not least some of those who were responsible for producing editions of some of them, were exercised mostly with trying to describe and explain the huge range of variant readings in those scrolls that were more or less readily identified as copies of scriptural books.[5] As is well known, two theories came to dominate a debate which was engaged amicably and creatively, even producing a classic collection of confrontational essays, *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*.[6] On the one hand, there were those scholars, heavily influenced by W. F. Albright and led by F. M. Cross, who espoused a categorizing of the data according to a system that promoted a mixture of historical and regional assumptions that has always seemed to me to reflect the practices and outlook of New Testament textual critics. That temporal and geographical mixture attempted to understand the variety in terms of the activities of scribes in Babylon, Alexandria and Judah in the centuries well before the occupation of the Qumran site; texts could be grouped according to families and seen to have a relationship that could

---

[2] John Kampen's essay in this volume seeks to clarify what might have been meant by "Torah" in the community's rule books; he offers an important challenge to scholarly assumptions about the term's referent.

[3] See George J. Brooke, "From Bible to Midrash: Approaches to Biblical Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls by Modern Interpreters," in *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006* (ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen et al.; STDJ 80; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 1–19.

[4] A key reference work for the scriptural texts is now available: Armin Lange, *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer. Band 1: Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).

[5] García Martínez, "Rethinking the Bible," 28, has suggested that "in the historical circumstances of Qumran, textual plurality was the norm," but that many of the approaches taken to this challenging problem have been anachronistic in their formulation.

[6] Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon, eds., *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975); Talmon's contribution, "The Textual Study of the Bible: A New Outlook" (321–400) has been revised and updated considerably as the first chapter in Shemaryahu Talmon, *Text and Canon of the Hebrew Bible: Collected Studies* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 19–84.

aid towards the construction of what an author might have originally written. On the other hand, there was a group of scholars led principally by S. Talmon who were very reticent about attempting to discern the historical or regional background of the materials; instead they focussed on the variety of text-types as a reflection of the social groups actively engaged in the transmission of texts for whom evidence happened to have survived.

To these two schools of thought have been added two others associated principally with E. Tov and E. Ulrich. The former has argued that the internal complexity or mixed pedigree of some manuscripts seems to undermine somewhat the Albright–Cross classification system; other manuscripts, notably 11QpaleoLev, through the range of independent readings that they seem to present also seem to defy neat categorization.[7] The latter has considered that it is most important to reflect on the transmission history of each individual scriptural book; in some cases the textual tradition seems remarkably consistent, with little variety, but in other cases it seems as if two or more literary editions of the book can be discerned.[8] Tov and Ulrich have agreed on the need for the literary development of texts by scribes to be taken into account, though Tov has tended to argue that in most cases it is possible to discern when major literary interventions ceased and copying became the norm, whereas Ulrich has tended to argue that literary interventions are discernible even at much later stages in the transmission process for some books.[9]

The question that now faces scholars concerning the full appreciation of the variant evidence from the pre-canonical period can be put quite bluntly: what is to be done with all this information? Intriguingly, two schools of thought seem to have emerged—let us call them the eclectic and the diplomatic; some scholars belong to one rather than the other, but others belong somewhat surprisingly to both. First, there are those

---

[7] See, e.g., Emanuel Tov, *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008); idem, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3d ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012).

[8] See especially Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Hebrew Bible* (SDSSRL; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999). Ulrich has tried to present the processes of composition and transmission as a continuous literary development; see Eugene Ulrich, "The Evolutionary Production and Transmission of the Scriptural Books," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts* (ed. Sarianna Metso et al.; STDJ 92; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 209–25.

[9] The study by Hans Debel in this volume raises the worthwhile question of whether a text like the *Genesis Apocryphon* might be considered as a variant literary edition of Genesis, rather than as a rewriting of Genesis or as a new composition distinct from Genesis itself.

who seem primarily concerned with using all the evidence from the Qumran caves and elsewhere to suggest that it might now indeed be possible to put together an eclectic edition of the various biblical books, an edition whose purpose would be to propose what might be the earliest discernible reading in any particular case, even the original reading.[10] This approach, largely coming out of North America and in some ways the heir of the Albright–Cross family affair, represents the enlightenment predilection for the search for origins, the earlier the better. The edition of the text that results is nowhere attested in any manuscript but is an historicist construct with a modern agenda of its own.[11] Second, the scholarly diplomats, mostly in Europe, would rather engage with actual textual witnesses, giving pre-eminence to one rather than another for some explicit reason and then making available as much of the variety of variant readings and versional evidence as the discerning reader might be able to stomach.[12] Third, those who find themselves belonging to both approaches include somewhat surprisingly both E. Ulrich and his former pupil P. Flint. Ulrich espouses attention to literary variety as already mentioned and yet in his recent collected presentation of the scriptural manuscripts from Qumran has them all arranged according to the norm of the Masoretic Text.[13] Flint

---

[10] This approach is best represented by the Oxford Hebrew Bible project under the general editorship of Ronald Hendel: see Ronald S. Hendel, "Qumran and a New Edition of the Hebrew Bible," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Vol. 1, Scripture and the Scrolls* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 149–65; see also idem, "Assessing the Text-Critical Theories of the Hebrew Bible after Qumran," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 281–302.

[11] To some extent it tends to favour or prioritise the MT over other editions and so to support the view that there was a long-standing dominance of such a tradition; see the comments by García Martínez, "Rethinking the Bible," 24–26, on a possible role for uniformity even early in the processes described here.

[12] This has been the approach of the long-running Hebrew University Bible Project; see Moshe Goshen-Gottstein, "Editions of the Hebrew Bible—Past and Future," in *"Sha'arei Talmon:" Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (ed. Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 221–42, esp. 236–37; Emanuel Tov, *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays*, 247–70, esp. 255–56. and is also apparent in the diplomatic edition of the Hebrew Bible being produced as Biblia Hebraica Quinta. The edition of Deuteronomy, for example, refers to many readings of Deuteronomy as found in the *Temple Scroll*: Carmel McCarthy, ed., *Deuteronomy* (BHQ 5; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007).

[13] The contrasting approaches of Eugene C. Ulrich can be seen on the one hand in his collection of essays, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, and on the other in his collection of edited scriptural manuscripts, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants* (VTSup 134; Leiden: Brill, 2010). On the problematic character of the

has been widely commended for much of his work on the plurality of editions of the books of Psalms in the late Second Temple period and yet is also a prime mover behind the production of the *Dead Sea Scrolls Bible*.[14] As is well known, it is also the case that these two broad approaches have left their marks on modern Bible translations with some including what might be deemed to be earlier or better readings based on the Qumran manuscripts whilst others have resisted such emendations. In a generation's time we will come to know better which of those three options is preferable.

2. The Transmission of Scriptures and Scriptural Tradition

The concern with describing and classifying textual variants has tended to overshadow three other matters that it has become increasingly necessary to factor into the discussion, namely, the manuscripts as artefacts, the nature of textual criticism, and the wider significance of the versions.

The first of these matters, then, concerns the information that is to be learnt from consideration of the manuscripts as artefacts. The landmark work of E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert*, remains largely undigested by scholars interested in the scriptural scrolls.[15] I draw attention to three obvious matters briefly here in three subpoints.

To begin with, size matters. It is clear from Tov's magnum opus that the vast majority of his so-called "de luxe" manuscript editions contain copies of scriptural works;[16] is it obvious why that should be so? What

---

latter see George J. Brooke, "Review of E. Ulrich, *The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants*," *JTS* 60 (2010): 724–28.

[14] Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997); Martin G. Abegg et al., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999)—the subtitle indicates the volume's aspiration and agenda.

[15] Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004). One attempt at a detailed evaluation of one aspect of Tov's work is Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, "Assessing Emanuel Tov's 'Qumran Scribal Practice,'" in Metso et al., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*, 173–207.

[16] By scriptural works I refer not just to compositions now found in Jewish and Christian Bibles, but works like the *Temple Scroll* and *Jubilees* which were either concerned to project itself as scripture or was possibly received by some readers as such. 11QT[a] is surely to be counted amongst the de luxe manuscripts.

use might such editions have served? Or again, it is intriguing to note how the surviving manuscripts of most of the Meghillot, the festival scrolls, are smaller than average: why might that be the case? Were there already pocket editions for festival use? And material might matter too: why are some scrolls papyrus and some parchment?

Second, in relation to the manuscripts as artefacts, some features of the physical evidence have not yet been much discussed. For example, there is a need for each set of fragments assigned to a particular scriptural book to be questioned as to whether the manuscript concerned actually contained the whole scriptural book. On the basis of how its damage patterns might be best understood, it seems highly probable to me, for example, that 4QGen[d] only contained the first five or six chapters of Genesis; as such it might have been produced to form the basis for exegesis that would act as the counterpart or complement to what can be found in an anthological commentary like *Commentary on Genesis A* which covers matters variously from Genesis 6 to 49.[17] Or again, the large and distinctive gap of three lines at the end of column XXVII of the great Isaiah Scroll, marking the division between Isaiah chs. 33 and 34 and dividing the book of Isaiah in half needs to be correlated with the information, largely from Cave 4, that the majority of manuscripts of Isaiah survive with remnants either from Isa 1–33 or Isa 34–66; was there a scribal tradition of copying and preserving Isaiah in two halves? And what might have been the force of such a copying tradition on the interpretation of Isaiah by those who referred to the book frequently?[18]

Third, as artefacts, there needs to be considerable further reflection on how the various scribal characteristics of the manuscripts containing scriptural compositions reflect both how the texts were copied and how they were intended to be used. I refer here to such features as the use of paleo-Hebrew, the representation of the divine name, the use of vacats and systems of paragraphing, the appearance of marginal marks of various kinds, and so on. Also of importance here, inasmuch as the evidence for it might be discernible in scribal practices, is the place of orality, both in

---

[17] See George J. Brooke, "4QGenesis [d] Reconsidered," in *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Trebolle Barrera: Florilegium Complutense* (ed. Andrés Piquer Otero and Pablo Torijano Morales; JSJSup 157; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 51–70.

[18] See George J. Brooke, "The Bisection of Isaiah in the Scrolls from Qumran," in *Studia Semitica: The Journal of Semitic Studies Jubilee Volume* (ed. Philip S. Alexander et al.; JSSSup 16; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 73–94.

the production and transmission of scriptural texts, and also in the performance of such material in didactic, liturgical or other settings.[19]

The second large area that relates to the transmission of scriptural traditions can be described in terms of the influence of the scriptural scrolls on the breaking down of the modern distinctions between lower and higher criticism. There is indeed still a place for the application of all the erudition that the classic text critic can muster.[20] It is often the case that there are copyist's errors in the evidence that survives and it is not unusual to be able to discern on text-critical grounds which reading is earlier than another. Nevertheless, to my mind, it is also the case that many variant readings are other than the creation or preservation of errors and their corrections. There are both smaller and larger interventions in many texts as they are copied and transmitted from one generation to another. Whereas generations of critics before the discoveries of the scriptural scrolls seemed able to distinguish clearly between what belonged to the compositional stage of a text (its literary creation) and what belonged to subsequent stages of its transmission (its textual corruption), in relation to the books of the Hebrew Bible the evidence of the scrolls has called various certainties into question and it is no longer so easy to discern when literary creativity should be assigned to a compositional stage and when to the process of transmission.[21]

A classic example of this problem was very much part of the discussion at the first meeting of the IOQS in Paris in 1992 when the significance of the order of sections of Joshua in 4QJosh^{a} was fiercely debated.[22] Did the different order in 4QJosh^{a} reflect an early literary edition or a later scribal

---

[19] The discussion of the place of orality in Judaism in the Second Temple period has been gathering pace; see most recently the essays by Susan Niditch, "Hebrew Bible and Oral Literature: Misconceptions and New Directions," and Werner Kelber, "The History of the Closure of Biblical Texts," in *The Interface of Orality and Writing: Hearing, Seeing, Writing in New Genres* (ed. Annette Weissenrieder and Robert B. Coote; WUNT I/260; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010).

[20] As is argued in the essay by Corrado Martone in this volume who speaks of "the need to establish, if not the original text of the Scriptures, at least the text to be translated."

[21] It is interesting to note how in the 2001 second edition of his detailed Introduction to the discipline Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, the major expansion is to be found in Chapter 7 on "Textual Criticism and Literary Criticism;" in the 2012 third edition that chapter is expanded yet further.

[22] See Alexander Rofé, "The Editing of the Book of Joshua in the Light of 4QJosh^{a}," and Eugene 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. George J. Brooke with Florentino García Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 73–80 and 89–104.

intervention? Another example of the same matter has also involved a book from the former prophets. Since its first extensive analysis,[23] 4QJudg[a] has provoked fresh analysis of the textual history of Judges.[24] The single fragment assigned to this manuscript, dated approximately to the third quarter of the first century B.C.E., contains remnants of Judg 6:2–6 followed immediately by 6:11–13. Judges 6:7–10, with their Deuteronomistic mention of a prophet, are not present. J. Trebolle Barrera has noted how biblical scholarship, even before the evidence from Qumran came to light, had thought of 6:7–10 as a literary insertion and he concludes that "4QJudg[a] can confidently be seen as an earlier literary form of the book than our traditional texts."[25] Some scholars have urged caution before using such small pieces as evidence for constructing theories of the textual history of Judges;[26] N. Fernández Marcos has argued that "the omission of 6:7–10 in 4QJudg[a] does not belong to an original stage of the book but it constitutes an accidental or intentional abbreviation."[27] Others have argued that the convergence of earlier literary-critical insights and the textual data from the Qumran caves "strongly argues that 4QJudg[a] displays, if not an earlier edition of the *entire* book of Judges, at least an 'earlier literary form' for this

---

[23] Julio Trebolle Barrera, "Textual Variants in 4QJudg[a] and the Textual and Editorial History of the Book of Judges," *RevQ* 14/54 (1989): 229–45.

[24] See, e.g., Julio Trebolle Barrera, "The Text-Critical Value of the Old Latin and Antiochean Greek Texts in the Books of Judges and Joshua," in *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in Honour of Johan Lust* (ed. Florentino García Martínez and Marc Vervenne; BETL 192; Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 401–13 at 401: "4QJudg[a] shows clear contacts with Greek proto-Lucianic and *Old Latin* (OL) readings that preserve the oldest Greek textual tradition."

[25] Julio Trebolle Barrera, "49. 4QJudg[a]," in DJD 14:162.

[26] See, e.g., Richard S. Hess, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Higher Criticism of the Hebrew Bible: The Case of 4QJudg[a]," in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans; JSPSup 26; Roehampton Institute London Papers 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 122–28, who thinks of the variant as a later abbreviation; Natalio Fernándos Marcos, "The Hebrew and Greek Text of Judges," in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (ed. Adrian Schenker; SBLSCS 52; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 1–16, prefers to view the variant as an accidental or intentional omission.

[27] Natalio Fernández Marcos, "The Genuine Text of Judges," in Sôfer Mahîr*: Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker Offered by the Editors of* Biblia Hebraica Quinta (ed. Yohanan A. P. Goldman et al.; VTSup 110; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 33–45 at 42. Cf. the similar reasoning of Alexander Rofé, "The Biblical Text in Light of Historico-Literary Criticism: The Reproach of the Prophet-Man in Judg 6:7–10 and 4QJudg[a]," in *On the Border Line: Textual Meets Literary Criticism* (ed. Zippora Talshir and Dalia Amara; Beer-Sheva 18; Beersheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press, 2005), 33–44 [Heb.], x [Eng. summary]: "It is not plausible that 4QJudg[a] preserved a text that preceded that old edition [of the 8th century B.C.E.]."

passage,"[28] or that "it is reasonable to assume that the shorter text without this theological pattern represents an earlier edition of the book."[29]

The third important area of the study of the transmission of scriptural texts that the availability of the copies of scriptural books from Qumran has brought to the fore concerns the versions. The point does not need to be laboured in a context such as this. Whereas in earlier generations the early translators of the Hebrew scriptures could be excoriated for being far too free in what they produced, the lesson learnt from books such as Samuel or Jeremiah is that the picture is far more complex than previously thought. Those who translated into Greek have now been brought to centre stage and the scrolls have promoted a veritable renaissance in the study of the Septuagint and other Greek witnesses. But the way in which versions other than the Greek may also preserve significant readings has been widely recognized too, as the following examples illustrate very briefly: the universal attestation in the Aramaic targumim for the reading of *ywmm* in Gen 1:5 as in 4QGen^{g}, the place of the Old Latin for understanding the textual history of the book of Tobit, and the role of the Peshitta in the appreciation of Pss 154 and 155 in 11QPs^{a}. The role of the Ethiopic versions of *Enoch* and *Jubilees*, scriptural for some, almost goes without stating.

3. Issues in Moving from Authority to Canon

When we move to consider, with hindsight of course, what is taking place with regards to authoritative scriptural texts in the four centuries before the fall of the temple in 70 C.E., we can attempt to discern how it was that the early rabbinic "Bibles" came to be the way they are by tracing some threads from the second century B.C.E. evidence to the time of Jamnia and beyond. Such descriptions have been widely undertaken and generally fall into two groups, those who wish to date the determination of authoritative scriptures early in the period and those who want to leave

---

[28] Eugene C. Ulrich, "Deuteronomistically Inspired Scribal Insertions into the Developing Biblical Texts: 4QJudg^{a} and 4QJer^{a}," in *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola* (ed. Juha Pakkala and Martti Nissinen; Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 95; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2008), 489–506 at 492. Ulrich's approach to 4QJudg^{a} is supported by the wider contextual study of long additions by Molly M. Zahn, "The Problem of Characterizing the Reworked Pentateuch Manuscripts: Bible, Rewritten Bible, or None of the Above?" *DSD* 15 (2008): 315–39 at 323.

[29] Raija Sollamo, "Panegyric on Redaction Criticism," in Pakkala and Nissinen, *Houses Full of All Good Things*, 684–96 at 694.

room for developments of several kinds right up to the end of the second temple period or even beyond.[30]

In some instances scholars of the Dead Sea Scrolls have joined in this task of describing the move from authority to canon, either because a particular item of evidence, such as the so-called "canon note" in MMT, seems to contribute something valuable to the debate, or because the broader interest in matters scriptural in the Qumran community and the wider movement of which it was a part suggests that textual authority was a matter of self-definition and identity. I think that the role of the Hasmoneans in promoting the authority of certain traditions as scriptural is slowly beginning to emerge and there is indeed much work yet to be done in this area as there is ongoing scholarly discussion of how particular books are selected for pre-eminence and the text-type of each book is determined. But, as F. García Martínez has reminded us, "What we do not find at Qumran is any indication of a closed list of authoritative books."[31]

Two matters strike me as particularly worth pursuing in this discussion of how texts and traditions become increasingly authoritative and eventually canonically normative. First, I have been concerned in a number of studies to argue that in the transmission of scriptural tradition authority is both given and received in the transmission process.[32] To my mind it is important to consider the very wide range of compositions that seem to come under the practical procedural (rather than generic) heading of "Rewritten Bible" as part of the process by which some texts during this period receive authority of a particular kind.[33] If a composition is not rewritten, reworked and represented anew in each generation, it becomes a mere reference point or can even fall into disuse.[34] This is to claim that

---

[30] These two positions are neatly portrayed in the essay by Campbell in this volume who sets his own views against those of Steve Mason and his understanding of Josephus' "twenty-two book canon."

[31] García Martínez, "Rethinking the Bible," 21.

[32] George J. Brooke, "The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov; London: British Library, 2002), 31–40; cited approvingly by García Martínez, "Rethinking the Bible," 29.

[33] See, e.g., George J. Brooke, "Between Authority and Canon: The Significance of Reworking the Bible for Understanding the Canonical Process," in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran: Proceedings of a Joint Symposium by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature and the Hebrew University Institute for Advanced Studies Research Group on Qumran, 15–17 January, 2002* (ed. Esther G. Chazon et al.; STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 85–104.

[34] I like the way that the range of evidence is set out for Genesis in the first instance in Katell Berthelot, Thierry Legrand and André Paul, eds., *La Bibliothèque de Qumrân: 1.*

rewritten texts should not be considered as merely secondary to the texts they rewrite; rather, in re-presenting what they depend on they confer authority on their hypotexts, the texts that lie underneath them, not least by continuing to articulate in adjusted forms the concerns of the underlying compositions.[35] Several of these rewritings, such as Deuteronomy and Chronicles, were eventually included in the Hebrew canon. In the time before exegesis becomes explicit, because the authorized scripture is no longer open to interventions, minor or major, the rewriting processes provide a window into how textual authority was constructed, construed and conveyed.[36] These rewritings show that certain communities, such as those responsible for *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll*, invested heavily in the continuity of certain scriptural traditions, paying close attention to how they should be brought into the present, not least as they are written up as if from much earlier times, like the compositions that they rewrite.[37] To my mind all this is a very healthy process which shows living communities taking responsibility for what they thought important and which prevents the idolisation of the text in which the fixing of the text leads to it being revered inappropriately.[38]

Second, I consider that the library or libraries that survive from the eleven caves at and near Qumran need a much more precise set of profiles, both cave by cave and also in terms of how what survives suggests

---

Torah: Genèse (Paris: Cerf, 2008), though it is a pity that the manuscripts understood to be actual copies of Genesis, such as 4Q1–4Q12, are not also included so that the complete data could be to hand for the reader to assess all at once.

[35] This point, which should now be regarded as beyond dispute, has been made very clearly and developed richly by Hindy Najman, "Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and Its Authority Conferring Strategies," *JSJ* 30 (1999): 379–410; eadem, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003). See my comments on the latter in George J. Brooke, "Hypertextuality and the 'Parabiblical' Dead Sea Scrolls," in *In the Second Degree: Paratextual Literature in Ancient Near Eastern and Ancient Mediterranean Culture and Its Reflections in Medieval Literature* (ed. Philip S. Alexander et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 43–64, esp. 50–54.

[36] The existence of the *Apocryphon of Joshua* makes the point well, especially as it is cited in some kind of authoritative fashion in 4Q175 (*Testimonia*); see the very pertinent comments of García Martínez, "Rethinking the Bible," 23.

[37] Some scholars have famously tried to describe the process of being brought into the present as one of homogenisation; Gudrun Holtz considers that and other exegetical processes in relation to purification rituals in his study in this volume.

[38] On the topics of this paragraph see especially Molly M. Zahn, "Rewritten Scripture," in Lim and Collins, *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 323–36; the studies in section 2 in Hanne von Weissenberg et al., eds., *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpretating Authoritative Traditions in the Second Tempe Period* (BZAW 419; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011); and Molly M. Zahn, *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts* (STDJ 95; Leiden: Brill, 2011).

what might have been of importance at particular times and in particular circumstances.[39] Although it might be very difficult to say much with any great precision, not least because something of everything appears to be in Cave 4, nevertheless the distinctive aspects of some of the caves might be significant, such as, to my mind, the generally earlier profile of what is found in Cave 1, or that only Ezekiel of all the literary prophets is found in Cave 11, or that Ben Sira is found in some caves and not others, or that the festal pocket scrolls are absent from Caves 1 and 11, and so on. We need to be much more precise about provenance and dating, scribal style and other matters when we discuss each scriptural tradition and its co-texts.

4. Types of Scriptural Interpretation

In the light of what I have described above, I now move on to say a little more very briefly about interpretation.

To begin with I have hinted above and commented in more detail elsewhere that a rigid distinction between text and interpretation needs to be reconsidered.[40] At one level this is obvious in the way that texts, perhaps especially those with developing authority for one group or another, are glossed and edited in various ways. Several scholars have made explicit this kind of inner-textual interpretation, especially since the influential work of M. Fishbane.[41] But at another level it is easy to assume that earlier forms of text are more likely to be authoritative while later rewritings are secondary productions and probably only of local significance. Such assumptions need to be resisted. Not only is it clearly the case that what

---

[39] See the attempts at something like this by Gregory L. Doudna, "The Legacy of an Error in Archaeological Interpretation: The Dating of the Qumran Cave Scroll Deposits," in *Qumran—the Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates* (ed. Katharina Galor et al.; STDJ 57; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 147–57; Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra, "Old Caves and Young Caves: A Statistical Reevaluation of a Qumran Consensus," *DSD* 14 (2007): 313–33; Stephen J. Pfann, "Reassessing the Judean Desert Caves: Libraries, Archives, Genizas and Hiding Places," *Bulletin of the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society* 25 (2007): 147–70.

[40] George J. Brooke, "New Perspectives on the Bible and its Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran* (ed. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz; FAT 2/35; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 19–37.

[41] Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985). In his essay in this volume John Elwolde wonders whether the community behind the *Hodayot* perceived itself as somehow within scripture, and so did not think that they were quoting a Bible but rather were living in the biblical period, extending it into the present; if so, then community use of texts is akin to a kind of inner-textual interpretation.

was later given canonical status included several compositions that could clearly be understood as rewritings of earlier tradition, whether Deuteronomy from an earlier generation or the books of Chronicles from a later one, but also we may now suppose that often it was the later form of some scriptural works that became authoritative not an earlier one, whether one thinks of individual readings such as the MT's censored form of Deut 32:43 (cf. LXX and 4QDeut^{q}) or the complete forms of books such as Jeremiah.

Second, beyond matters of inner-scriptural interpretation, the scrolls from the Qumran caves seem to attest to a general transition within interpretative processes from the implicit to the explicit. In the volume of *Revue de Qumrân* that was compiled in honour of J. T. Milik, I suggested that *Commentary on Genesis A* was such a very intriguing text because in its anthology of interpretation it contained examples of both implicit interpretation, largely in the retelling of the flood narrative, and explicit interpretation exemplified most obviously in the pesher commentary provided for the blessings of Jacob.[42] It is not surprising that in two recent works on various types of interpretation in the scrolls, by D. Falk and S. White Crawford, *Commentary on Genesis A* has indeed played a pivotal role in their diachronic descriptions of some of the developing processes of interpretation as attested in the scrolls.[43]

Third, to my mind this general shift from the implicit to the explicit is contemporary with a process of scripturalization in some compositions. In some texts this process is implicit and in others it is explicit. An example of this process has been subtly observed for the developing *Rule of the Community* (S) traditions by S. Metso.[44] Without going into the details of the case, it seems to me that at least part of what can be observed here is the increasing use of scriptural tradition for some Jews in late Second Temple times, perhaps as other Jewish institutions, such

---

[42] George J. Brooke, "*4Q252* as Early Jewish Commentary," *RevQ* 17/65–68 (1996): 385–401 (*Hommages à Józef T. Milik*, ed. Florentino García Martínez and Emile Puech).

[43] Daniel Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls* (CQS 8; LSTS 63; London: T & T Clark International, 2007), esp. chapter 4; Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), esp. chapter 7. 4Q252 is compiled from a set of sources.

[44] Sarianna Metso, "The Use of Old Testament Quotations in the Qumran Community Rule," in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments* (ed. Frederick H. Cryer and Thomas L. Thompson; Copenhagen International Seminar 6; JSOTSup 290; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 217–31. John Kampen's essay in this volume raises the further important question concerning the precise meaning of "Torah" in the sectarian Rules.

as the temple or political leadership, perhaps became less significant for them. This process of appealing to scripture has been noticed before,[45] but possibly in contexts where withdrawal from or antagonism towards certain aspects of Judean life was a part of one's everyday existence, matters scriptural assumed an importance that otherwise they might not. In some way, at least part of what can be observed in the role of scripture in the self-understanding of the movement, part of which took up residence at Qumran, is a compensatory mechanism which anticipates in intriguing ways what was to be the case for Judaism more generally after 70 C.E. No doubt particular interpretations of scripture influenced sectarians from the moment they expressed an interest in joining the group right the way through their learning of elaborate theological systems that bolstered group identity.[46]

Fourth, within the library or libraries at Qumran it has been common for scholars to present some of the preferences of the sectarian movement within their reading of scripture. Most crudely this is often expressed in terms of the numbers of copies (and/or quotations) of any particular scriptural book that have been found.[47] Here it is clearly Psalms, Deuteronomy and Isaiah that take the lead, but I have argued that at least Genesis should also be included. To such raw data should be added at least the number of rewritten compositions associated with a particular scriptural book, the number of clear allusions, the number of explicit citations, the number of explicit commentaries, and so on. But the favourites do indeed seem to include the four books mentioned, to which might be added the Twelve. However, having made these quasi-statistical observations, few scholars proceed to ask why it might be those books that particularly attracted the attention of those who put the library together. Perhaps it was something like the following. Genesis provides for the patriarchal blessings to which

---

[45] See, e.g., Judith H. Newman, *Praying by the Book: The Scripturalization of Prayer in Second Temple Judaism* (SBLEJL 14; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999).

[46] See, e.g., George J. Brooke, "Justifying Deviance: The Place of Scripture in Converting to a Qumran Self-Understanding," in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretation* (ed. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange; SBLSymS 30; Atlanta: SBL, 2005), 73–87; idem, "The Place of Prophecy in Coming out of Exile: The Case of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta; JSJSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 535–50.

[47] See, e.g., James C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 48–50. Various recent purchases of fragments of scriptural books, particularly by institutions in the USA, may yet show that the numbers as given in the standard introductions are not quite as they should be.

the movement considered itself heir; Deuteronomy explained what life in the land involved; Isaiah created a sense of election; and the Psalms facilitated the recognition that God's mercy rested in this community which believed itself to be a proleptic substitute for where eventually heaven and earth would be conjoined.[48]

Fifth, because of the vast amount of material to which we are now privileged to have access, there has arisen a need to construct a system for categorising all the kinds of interpretation that are now before us. The need for fresh categories was felt early on in the history of Qumran scholarship as an earlier generation struggled with identifying the interpretative techniques of *Pesher Habakkuk*[49] or the distinctiveness of the *Genesis Apocryphon*.[50] In several places I have tried to suggest that we might be able to discern at least five types of scriptural interpretation.[51] The typology I have offered is largely etic and so seems not to have been widely accepted—though neither has it been refuted.

I have identified legal interpretation (the juxtaposition of two or more texts, often through catchword, in order to create new rules),[52] narrative interpretation (the retelling of narrative materials often with explanatory additions and identifications), poetic interpretation (the use of scriptural phraseology in allusory anthologisation, not least in prayers, liturgical

---

[48] See George J. Brooke, "'The Canon within the Canon' at Qumran and in the New Testament," in Porter and Evans, *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After*, 242–66, esp. 251–58.

[49] See, e.g., William H. Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BA* 14 (1951): 54–76.

[50] E.g., Geza Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (SPB 4; Leiden: Brill, 1961, 2d ed., 1973), esp. chapter 5.

[51] See, e.g., George J. Brooke, "Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman et al.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 60–73; idem, "Biblical Interpretation in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran," in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. Charlotte Hempel et al.; BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters/University Press, 2002), 201–20; idem, "Biblical Interpretation at Qumran," in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Vol. 1, Scripture and the Scrolls* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 287–319.

[52] This kind of interpretation lies at the heart of the studies by Hannah Harrington, Gudrun Holtz and Albert Hogeterp in this volume. Harrington shows how the halakic issue of intermarriage can also be reflected in other genres of texts too. Holtz discusses two purification rituals and also offers some comments on intermarriage in relation to them that complement the observations made by Harrington. Hogeterp considers the halakah associated with relations to Gentiles and shows additionally how non-Pentateuchal texts are used to relate the halakah to contemporary issues.

compositions and wisdom texts),[53] exhortatory interpretation (didactic or homiletic appeals that commonly refer to scriptural tradition as a resource of good and bad examples),[54] and prophetic interpretation (the fulfilment of unfulfilled scriptural oracles, blessings and oaths in the circumstances of the audience). All five forms can be found in the sectarian compositions, but it is only the last of these in the form of pesher that is peculiarly sectarian, though it has commonly come to dominate discussion of sectarian exegesis as if other ways of handling scriptural tradition were outside the concerns of the sectarian movement. Over the years several other typological frameworks have indeed been offered, some perhaps of a more etic kind, such as a concern to differentiate between pure and applied exegesis,[55] and some of a more emic sort, sometimes based around a reiteration of the broad categories of halakah and haggadah.[56]

Sixth, there is a need for ongoing attempts at understanding when and where scriptural reading and interpretation took place and what influence those contextual matters had on the transmission and interpretation of scriptural traditions. Was it usually a matter of instruction in a didactic setting or an auditory experience within some kind of group gathering for scriptural reading, exposition and prayer? Was it a night-time pursuit as is implied in 1QS 6:6–8 or did the encounter with scripture happen at other times as well? What use was made of scripture in community meetings when members gathered to make judgments on all manner of topics? And what about the authority of the interpreter, especially for the tradition of prophetic interpretation, the authority of the "voice of the Teacher"?[57]

---

[53] This kind of interpretation is discussed in the studies of John Elwolde, Michael Lesley, and Mika Pajunen in this volume. Elwolde highlights how difficult it is to use poetic allusions to the Psalter in the *Hodayot* for text-critical purposes. Lesley discloses the complex relationship between 4Q184 and Proverbs as well as other intertexts such as parts of Isaiah. Pajunen discusses how scriptural traditions are being transmitted in 4Q381.

[54] This kind of interpretation is exemplified in the study of 4Q470 by Bilhah Nitzan in this volume: Zedekiah seems to be part of a Second Temple period homiletic tradition concerning the eschatological covenant. In addition it is intriguing to note that Mika Pajunen in his study here of 4Q381 observes that there are didactic elements in the prayer's appeal to and supplementation of tradition.

[55] Geza Vermes, "Interpretation, History of: B. At Qumran and in the Targums," *IDBSup* (1976): 438–41.

[56] Philip R. Davies, "Biblical Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *A History of Biblical Interpretation, Vol. 1, The Ancient Period* (ed. Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 144–66.

[57] García Martínez, "Rethinking the Bible: Sixty Years of Dead Sea Scrolls Research and Beyond," 28–36; idem, "Beyond the Sectarian Divide: The 'Voice of the Teacher' as an Authority-Conferring Strategy in Some Qumran Texts," in Metso et al., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Transmission of Traditions and Production of Texts*, 227–44.

All these contextual matters that were internal to the life of the sectarian movement have no doubt influenced its handling of scriptural traditions, just as much as its consideration of external events and circumstances will have done; and if non-sectarian interpretations are preserved, then a similar set of contextual questions have to be applied to them.

Conclusion

This brief exposition has raised some of the key issues around the theme of the seventh meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies. Those of us involved in working on the scrolls come to think of them as the centre of the universe, but there is also a much more important task for most of us. That task concerns the need to convince the guild of biblical scholars more widely that unless they take all this material from the caves into account, both in terms of individual textual matters but also in terms of the wider issues that the body of texts raises about the transmission of scriptural traditions in the late Second Temple period, they will never do an adequate job on whatever task they set themselves. For example, it is still remarkable just how few modern commentaries on the books of the Hebrew Bible really engage with issues put forward by the evidence from the Qumran caves and elsewhere.[58] Those of us who have prioritised our loyalty in matters academic to the concerns of this Organization need to engage constantly with those in fields beyond the scrolls to avoid our own marginalisation, but more importantly the marginalisation of all that we now know from these texts and which enables us to reconfigure the discipline in ways that are far more realistic and complicated than many have yet recognized.

Within the framework that I have outlined in this essay, this volume of studies contributes in a limited but significant way to the better understanding of a range of topics from considerations of canon and text, to matters of legal, poetic, liturgical and homiletic interpretation. All those interested in scripture and its transmission in the late Second Temple period will surely find something here to enjoy and take into consideration.

[58] A notable exception is the three-volume commentary on Isaiah by Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1–39, 40–55, 56–66* (AB 19, 19A, 19B; New York: Doubleday, 2000, 2002, 2003).

JOSEPHUS' TWENTY-TWO BOOK CANON AND THE QUMRAN SCROLLS[1]

Jonathan G. Campbell

1. Scripture and Canon

The old consensus about the Jewish canon's formation, first put forward by Ryle and others in the late nineteenth century, saw in the Hebrew Bible's tripartite shape as Torah, Nevi'im, and Ketuvim the three-stage emergence of a Palestinian canon during Second Temple times.[2] Among supportive evidence, threefold references to Scripture, such as "the Law and the Prophets and the other books"[3] in the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus, appear to reflect such a three-stage development that culminated in the Rabbinic council of Yavneh in circa 90 C.E., where the contents of the Ketuvim and, with it, the whole Hebrew Bible were finalized.[4] However, this consensus has broken down in recent decades due largely to difficulties with the theory itself, as is widely acknowledged.[5] Lewis demonstrated almost fifty years ago that there was no Yavneh council, for example, while Sundberg dismantled the Alexandrian Hypothesis, a corollary of Ryle's thesis positing that Diaspora Jews possessed the Septuagint canon.[6] And as Barton has noted more recently, since Scripture was normally referred to through twofold formulae like "the Law and the Prophets," we should not assume that "the Law," "the Prophets," "the other books," or similar labels necessarily denote the later Hebrew Bible's canonical divisions.[7]

---

[1] I am most grateful to John Barton, Tessa Rajak, and two anonymous reviewers for feedback on earlier drafts of this chapter. Any shortcomings that remain are, of course, my responsibility alone.

[2] Herbert C. Ryle, *The Canon of the Old Testament* (London: Macmillan, 1892).

[3] Translations of primary sources are taken from NRSV, LCL, and DSSR, unless otherwise stated.

[4] See Ryle, *Canon*, 10, 89, 118, 122, and 153.

[5] For instance, Lee M. McDonald, *The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority* (3d ed.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2007), 11; and Andrew E. Steinmann, *The Oracles of God: the Old Testament Canon* (St Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1999), 21.

[6] Jack P. Lewis, "What Do We Mean by Yabneh?" *Journal of Bible and Religion* 32 (1964): 125–32; and Albert C. Sundberg, *The Old Testament of the Early Church* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1964).

[7] John Barton, *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile* (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1986), 44–55.

Indeed, over the past thirty years, long-known primary data have been subject to re-evaluation due to the consensus' shortcomings, while new Qumran evidence has been taken into account, especially given the scrolls' full publication since 1991. Consequently, scholars now adopt various positions on late Second Temple Scripture, some close to the old consensus but others departing substantially from it.[8]

1.1. *Refining the Consensus*

Among the former, it is often believed that Ryle's position requires only modest changes. Accepting there was no Yavneh council, for instance, Beckwith holds that a threefold canon was in any case complete by Maccabean times.[9] Evans maintains that a tripartite late Second Temple canon akin to the Hebrew Bible obtained in both Palestine and the Diaspora.[10] And Dempster posits that the common twofold way of referring to Scripture was merely an abbreviation for a less frequent but more significant tripartite division.[11]

Such suggestions remain within the bounds of reasoned debate, but they tend to entail a certain unnaturalness in handling primary data.[12] Limitations of space mean that one instance must suffice by way of illustration. Thus, in arguing for the emergence of a threefold canon in the mid-second century B.C.E., Beckwith appeals to the following passage:

> [Nehemiah] founded a library and collected the books about the kings and prophets, and the writings of David, and letters of kings about votive offerings. In the same way Judas also collected all the books that had been lost on

---

[8] See, for example, essays in Arie van der Kooij and Karel van der Toorn, eds., *Canonization and Decanonization* (SHR 82; Leiden: Brill, 1998); Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov, eds., *The Bible as Book: the Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (London: British Library, 2002); Lee M. McDonald and James A. Sanders, eds., *The Canon Debate* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002); J.-M. Auwers and H. J. de Jonge, eds., *The Biblical Canons* (BETL 163; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003); and James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls: the Princeton Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (3 vols.; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006).

[9] Roger T. Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church* (London: SPCK, 1985), 152.

[10] Craig A. Evans, "The Scriptures of Jesus and his earliest Followers," in McDonald and Sanders, *Canon Debate*, 185–95 at 188–89.

[11] Stephen G. Dempster, "Torah, Torah, Torah: The Emergence of the Tripartite Canon," in *Exploring the Origins of the Bible: Canon Formation in Historical, Literary, and Theological Perspective* (ed. Craig A. Evans and Emanuel Tov; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 2008), 87–127 at 107–25.

[12] Barton, *Oracles*, 58, makes a similar point.

> account of the war that had come upon us, and they are in our possession. (2 Macc 2:13b–14)

Assuming a canonical Torah already existed, Beckwith takes these verses to imply that a national literature collected in Persian times was canonized under Judas Maccabeus as the Hebrew Bible's Nevi'im ("books about the kings and prophets") and Ketuvim ("writings of David . . . letters of kings . . ."). [13] This reading is possible, of course. Yet, a more natural one is to see the alleged archival salvage of diverse materials—some scriptural, others not—on return from exile and again in Maccabean times. [14] If so, this example highlights the danger of over-interpreting late Second Temple evidence through the prism of the canonical language and ideas of a subsequent era.

1.2. *The Scriptural Alternative*

Indeed, an alternative approach departing more substantially from the consensus has gained support of late by proposing that late Second Temple Jews had no *canon* but *Scripture*. Barr and Barton were among those first arguing along such lines, [15] and it is now commonly asserted that anachronistic terms like *Bible* and *canon* should be abandoned in favour of *Scripture* or *Scriptures*. [16] In other words, it is helpful in academic discussion to distinguish terminologically between Scripture, used for compositions purportedly from the antique past that have not yet been precisely delimited, and canon (or Bible), employed for such texts once they have. [17] The former, not the latter, seems to apply to late Second Temple Judaism.

---

[13] Beckwith, *Old Testament Canon*, 152.

[14] See Armin Lange, "2 Maccabees 2:13–15: Library or Canon?" in *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology* (ed. Géza G. Xeravits and Jósef Zsengellér; JSJSup 118; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 155–67 at 166, noting that Judas' activity evokes a literary comprehensiveness "typical for Hellenistic libraries like the . . . one in Alexandria."

[15] James Barr, *Holy Scripture: Canon, Authority, Criticism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983); and Barton, *Oracles*, 1–95.

[16] For example, John J. Collins, "The Literature of the Second Temple Period," in *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Studies* (ed. Martin Goodman; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 53–78 at 55; and Julio Trebolle, "Canon of the Old Testament," in *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (ed. Katherine Doob Sakenfeld; 5 vols.; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2006–2009), 3:548–63 at 549.

[17] Eugene Ulrich, "The Notion and Definition of Canon," in McDonald and Sanders, *Canon Debate*, 21–35, further justifies the distinction. In this usage, canonical works are by definition scriptural but scriptural books are canonical only when belonging to a fixed collection. Such nomenclature is adopted in what follows, although Steve Mason, "Josephus and His Twenty-two Book Canon," in *Canon Debate*, 110–27, a study featuring prominently below, refers to *open* and *closed* canons, respectively, rather than *Scripture* and *canon*.

As Ulrich puts it in a study focused on Qumran: "there were recognized books of authoritative Scripture, but there is no clear evidence for a canon of Scripture."[18] Other Qumran specialists make a similar case for Scripture.[19] And as Ulrich has repeatedly observed, Qumran evidence demonstrates that the compositional-redactional process, long recognized vis-à-vis early post-exilic times, continued into the first century C.E.[20] We shall see that some aspects of that process, as broadly understood, seem incompatible with a canon.

1.3. *Mason's Challenge*

Yet, Mason has recently challenged those maintaining that late Second Temple Jews had Scripture through an analysis of *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43.[21] Because Josephus there appears to insist that Jews had long possessed a twenty-two book canon, Mason holds that the case for Scripture based on other sources, including the scrolls, is fatally undermined.[22] In what follows, therefore, we shall ask whether that one text really does destroy the argument for Scripture. To that end, firstly, we shall make the case for late Second Temple Scripture. Secondly, Mason's argument to the contrary will be summarized. Thirdly, several possible weaknesses in Mason's position will be examined. Fourthly, alternative readings of *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 will be considered. Finally, a short conclusion will close our discussion.

---

[18] Ulrich, "Qumran and the Canon of the Old Testament," in Auwers and de Jonge, *Biblical Canons*, 57–80 at 66. Since other types of authoritative literature existed—partisan community teachings (e.g., *Habakkuk Commentary*, Romans), for instance, and books with broader appeal (e.g., Ecclesiasticus and 1 Maccabees)—speaking of *authoritative works* undifferentiatedly or as equivalent to Scripture is unhelpful; cf. Daniel J. Harrington, "The Old Testament Apocrypha in the Early Church and Today," in McDonald and Sanders, *Canon Debate*, 196–210 at 197; and James C. VanderKam, "Questions of Canon viewed through the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Canon Debate*, 91–109 at 92.

[19] Thus, Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Crystallization of the 'Canon of the Hebrew Scriptures' in the Light of Biblical Scrolls from Qumran," in Herbert and Tov, *Bible as Book*, 5–20; and VanderKam, "Questions of Canon," 91–109.

[20] See recently "The Absence of 'Sectarian Variants' in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran," in Herbert and Tov, *Bible as Book*, 179–95; "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hebrew Scriptural Texts," in Charlesworth, *Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:77–99; and "Qumran Witness to the Developmental Growth of the Prophetic Books," in *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich* (ed. K. D. Dobos and M. Koszeghy; Sheffield: Sheffield-Phoenix, 2009), 263–74.

[21] Mason, "Twenty-two."

[22] For Mason's terminology, see note 17.

2. The Case for Scripture

Issues of Scripture and canon in late Second Temple Judaism are disputed, as just seen, and so certainty is impossible. Still, several factors render it likely that Jews, including early Christians, possessed Scripture in late Second Temple times and beyond; the scriptural text, moreover, remained fluid. Five such factors are worth mentioning.[23]

2.1. *Lack of Evidence*

Late Second Temple Jews undoubtedly possessed divinely inspired scriptural works whose authority lay in their supposed connection to the heroes of ancient Israel and Judah.[24] Their existence and importance are confirmed by the fact that non-scriptural writings refer to them using nomenclature like "the holy books" (e.g. *ta biblia ta hagia* in 1 Macc 12:9)[25] or, more commonly, "Moses and your servants the prophets" (e.g. *moshe we-ʿavadekhah ha-nevi'im* in 4Q504 [4QDibHam^{a}] 16:13–14),[26] where Moses is the prophet *par excellence* in a line of prophetic figures.[27] Furthermore, individual passages are often introduced into exegesis with formulae like "as God said through the prophet Isaiah" (CD 4:13) and "[God] through the mouth of our ancestor David . . . said" (Acts 4:25). A basic chronological awareness is also evident,[28] and different genres are sometimes acknowledged.[29] A proportion of Qumran manuscripts clearly falls into this category, including multiple copies of Genesis,

---

[23] For greater detail, see Barton, *Oracles*, 1–95; Jonathan G. Campbell, "4QMMT^{d} and the Tripartite Canon," *JJS* 51 (2000): 181–90; and Ulrich, "The Non-attestation of a Tripartite Canon in 4QMMT," *CBQ* 65 (2003): 202–14, among others.

[24] This purported antiquity often goes unmentioned; see Peter W. Flint, "Scripture in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Emanuel Tov* (ed. Shalom M. Paul et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 269–304; and Trebolle, "Canon of the Old Testament."

[25] Note also Mark 12:24; Rom 1:2; 1 Cor 15:3; Philo, *Worse* 139; and *Ag. Ap.* 1.10.

[26] Similarly, 1QS 1:3; CD 7:15–7; 2 Macc 15:9; 4 Macc 18:10; Matt 5:17; Acts 24:14; and Rom 3:21.

[27] On the late Second Temple understanding of such antique prophecy, see Barton, *Oracles*, 44–55.

[28] See, for instance, Sir 44:1–49:16; and Acts 7:2–53.

[29] Thus, 11QPs^{a} 27:2–11 ascribes to David 3,600 psalms; 364 songs for the daily service; fifty-two Sabbath songs; thirty festival songs; and four songs for the demon-possessed, while *Contempl. Life* 3.25 describes the Therapeutae's several types of scriptural (and probably other) literature.

Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Psalms, and, if we may pre-empt arguments below, *Jubilees*, and Enochic material.[30]

Yet, the evidence we would expect if these Scriptures already constituted a canon is absent: there is no sign of the controversy accompanying its formation (of the sort *4QMMT* reflects on legal issues); late Second Temple authors show no knowledge of it (with two alleged late exceptions, *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 and *4 Ezra* 14:44–48, to be considered shortly); no lists of canonical works have survived (with *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 a possible exception);[31] and the codex, repeated use of which for the same writings might imply canonicity, was not widespread until later. This is admittedly an argument from silence, and a canon could nonetheless have existed. But the lack of unambiguous pointers in that direction renders it improbable, and this improbability is compounded by three other factors.[32]

2.2. *The Compositional-Redactional Process*

First, as hinted, is the continuation of the compositional-redactional process into the late Second Temple period which, as Ulrich has shown, is something upon which Qumran data have recently shed much light.[33] Signs of ongoing redactional activity, for example, show that, while some books were relatively stable textually (e.g., Genesis), in other cases scribes were producing minor adaptations (e.g., pre-Samaritan Exodus) and variant editions (e.g. proto-Masoretic Jeremiah). The literary and textual form of individual works, in other words, was not yet fixed, though that itself is not incompatible with a canon on the assumption that it was the book, not its form, which was canonical.[34] However, though they are not prominent in Ulrich's analyses, two other types of scribal activity, which are arguably part of the same broad compositional-redactional spectrum, are

---

[30] See relevant DJD volumes.

[31] For Jewish and Christian lists from the late second century C.E. onwards, however, see McDonald, *Biblical Canons*, 163–65, 200–206.

[32] Those insisting that a canon like the Hebrew Bible existed necessarily make much of several supposed threefold canonical references similar to the Prologue's mentioned earlier: 4QMMT C 9–11; Sir 38:4–39:3; 2 Macc 2:13–14; *Contempl. Life* 3.25; Luke 24:44; and *Ag. Ap.* 1.39–40. Leaving aside the latter, however, these passages are more ambiguous than is normally recognized; see Campbell, "4QMMT^{d}." As for the Prologue, the three pertinent phrases *could* reflect a tripartite canon; but as Ulrich, "Non-attestation," 211–13, observes, lack of corroboration elsewhere means they *probably* denote Scripture ("the Law and the Prophets") and non-scriptural writings ("the other books"), especially since the latter category is required for Ecclesiasticus itself.

[33] See again note 20.

[34] Thus, Ulrich, "Canon," 59.

harder to reconcile with a canon. One entailed such extensive reworking of pre-existing materials that new compositions distinct from their *Vorlagen*, though often with similar claims to authority, were created (e.g., *Jubilees*, *Temple Scroll*, *Apocryphon of Joshua*).[35] Another involved the composition *de novo* of writings taking scriptural events or characters as the springboard for fresh works, also often projecting Scripture-like authority through purported links to past figures (e.g., Enochic materials, Daniel, *Visions of Amram*). Among the latter, 4Q543 (4QVisions of Amram[a] ar) 1 i 1–4 contains this opening statement:

> A copy of the book 'The Words of the Vision of 'Amram [son of Kohath, son of Levi.' It contains everything that] he told his sons and that he commanded them on [the day he died . . .]

The fragmentary nature of *Visions of Amram* manuscripts renders it hard to evaluate this assertion and, of course, making such a claim does not guarantee acceptance.[36]

Nevertheless, since no evidence suggests that such Qumran materials, whether those familiar before the finds (e.g., Enochic literature) or those known only afterwards (e.g., *Apocryphon of Joshua*), were sectarian,[37] scholars are increasingly open to the likelihood that at least some constituted Scripture at Qumran and/or elsewhere (e.g., Enochic literature, *Jubilees*, *Temple Scroll*, and *Apocryphon of Joshua*).[38] Writings of a similar nature outside Qumran include 1 Esdras, Wisdom of Solomon, and *4 Ezra* and, unless the explicit or implicit links to the past figures concerned conferred scriptural status, at least potentially, they would have been pointless. Hence, insofar as late Second Temple scribes were composing new works purporting to be additional books of Moses and additional books of the Prophets, both through the substantial rewriting of existing traditions and the production of fresh compositions *de novo*, it is necessary to conclude that precisely which compositions counted as Moses or the Prophets had not yet been canonically determined.

---

[35] See especially Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008) for rewritten Qumran pentateuchal traditions. As noted by Molly Zahn, "Rewritten Scripture," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 323–36 at 331, such rewritings did not normally replace their antecedents, though they often imply a superior understanding of their subject matter.

[36] See Michael. E. Stone, "Amram," in *EDSS* 1:23–24.

[37] Devorah Dimant, "Old Testament Pseudepigrapha at Qumran," in Charlesworth, *Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:447–67 at 460–61.

[38] For example, Flint, "Scripture;" and VanderKam, "Questions of Canon."

2.3. *Exegesis*

A related factor is that writings composed in late Second Temple times of the sort just described sometimes feature in exegesis from the period through quotation and allusion.[39] This happens in a way that seems indistinguishable from the employment of works whose scriptural status in indisputable (e.g., Deuteronomy and Psalms). Among clearer examples, 4Q247 (4QPesher on the Apocalypse of Weeks) is an exegetical work based on part of *1 En.* 91, 93; Jude 14–15 appeals to *1 En.* 1:9; and *Barn.* 4:3; 16:5–6 refer to Enochic literature as Scripture. The second-century B.C.E. Daniel quickly gained acceptance as an exilic work, as quotations in 11Q13 (11QMelch) 2:18, 1 Macc 2:60, and Mark 13:16 demonstrate; and *Jubilees* was employed in several sectarian Qumran writings only decades after its composition.[40] *Aramaic Levi Document* is quoted in CD 4:15–17; and 4Q379 (4QApocryphon of Joshua^b) 22 ii 7–14, unknown before the Qumran discoveries, is cited in 4Q175 (4QTestimonia) after Ex 20:21b, Num 24:15–17, and Deut 33:8–11.[41] Josephus, as is well know, draws on 1 Esdras in *Ant.* 11. Cumulatively, these and other examples demonstrate that some works produced in late Second Temple times that were attributed to long-past prophets took on scriptural status for those accepting them at face value.

2.4. *Acceptance and Rejection*

However, there is evidence that compositions to which some credited scriptural status were rejected by others. For instance, while the Qumran caves contained multiple copies of *Jubilees* which, in turn, features in the group's exegetical literature, the book's absence from contemporary scriptural interpretation is noteworthy.[42] On the one hand, therefore, it seems likely that those at Qumran viewed *Jubilees* as an additional book of Moses, not just because its theological and legal outlook largely

---

[39] For overviews, see Jonathan G. Campbell, "Scriptural Interpretation at Qumran," in *From the Beginnings to 600 C.E.* (ed. James Carlton Paget and Joachim Schaper; vol. 1 of *The New Cambridge History of the Bible*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming); and relevant essays in Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson, eds., *The Ancient Period* (vol. 1 of *A History of Biblical Interpretation*; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003), 283–303.

[40] See Jonathan G. Campbell, *The Exegetical Texts* (London: Continuum, 2004), 103.

[41] Ibid., 88–99.

[42] See Charlotte Hempel, "The Place of the *Book of Jubilees* at Qumran and Beyond," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context* (ed. Timothy H. Lim; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 187–96.

comported with their own but also because it placed the origin of practices and beliefs derived from that outlook firmly in the scriptural past; on the other, it is equally likely that other communities either did not know *Jubilees* or, given its promulgation of a solar calendar at variance with the dominant lunisolar one, rejected it as "obviously wrong."[43] Another example is Esther, for its presence at or absence from Qumran, as well as the nature of *4QTales of the Persian Court*, has been much debated.[44] On balance, Esther was almost certainly not preserved at Qumran and, because the Feast of Purim that it commends conflicted with the community's solar-lunar calendar, this was probably deliberate.[45] But since we know that Esther circulated in at least two editions in late Second Temple times and that Purim was observed no later than the first century B.C.E., there were obviously those for whom the work constituted Scripture.

In other cases, a scriptural book may have been accepted in theory by a community, constrained by the esteem in which it was generally held, but in practice marginalized because of its political or theological uses by opponents. For example, given its likely Hasmonean promulgation for ideological reasons, 1–2 Chronicles was probably sidelined by the anti-Hasmonean Qumran community.[46] When a tradition linked to 1–2 Chronicles was unavoidable, as with 1 Chr 24:7–18's priestly courses, it is altered in an anti-Hasmonean direction in *4QMishmarot* which lists Gamul, not Jehoiarib, first. Only with the Hasmonean dynasty's demise do we find evidence for 1–2 Chronicles at Qumran in the late first-century B.C.E. 4Q118 (4QChronicles).[47]

These cases suggest that, not only was community recognition essential for a text's acceptance as Scripture, but that communities differed as to certain works' scriptural status. Like the last two factors, this provides corroboration that the lack of unambiguous evidence for a canon almost certainly means that a canon did not exist.

---

[43] Eugene Ulrich, "From Literature to Scripture: Reflections on the Growth of a Text's Authoritativeness," *DSD* 10 (2003): 3–25 at 22.

[44] Sidnie White Crawford, "Has Esther been found at Qumran? 4QProto-Esther and the Esther Corpus," *Bible Review* 12 (1996): 307–25, provides a summary.

[45] So James C. VanderKam and Peter W. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (San Francisco: Harper, 2002), 119–20; cf. Shemaryahu Talmon, "Was the Book of Esther Known at Qumran?" *DSD* 2 (1995): 249–67.

[46] Thus, George J. Brooke "The Books of Chronicles and the Scrolls from Qumran," in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld* (ed. Robert Rezetko et al.; VTSup 113; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 35–48.

[47] Nevertheless, as Brooke, "Chronicles," 38–40, notes, the fragmentary 4QChronicles' identity remains uncertain.

2.5. *The Hardening of Boundaries*

But a final factor is different, for Lange has recently offered a potentially fruitful way of explaining the eventual emergence of a fixed text and canon by taking account of Alexandrian scholarship which "compiled canonical lists of Greek authors and prepared critical editions of these works for at least some of these authors."[48] More precisely, though historical events doubtless strengthened processes already under way, they were not the primary cause of such developments within Judaism, for Jews evolved their own fixed text and canon under the influence of Alexandrian scholarship, first in the Greek-speaking Diaspora and then the Judaean homeland.[49] Textually, for instance, *Let. Aris.* 31's depiction of the Septuagint as "accurate" (*diēkribōmena*) suggests that second-century B.C.E. Egyptian Jews were beginning to think in Alexandrian terms. Similar concerns are manifest in first-century B.C.E. corrections to Fouad papyrus 266b and 5Q1 (5QDeuteronomy), while Masada manuscripts, all dating palaeographically before the First Revolt, show proto-Masoretic dominance by the mid-first century C.E. At the canonical level, Lange holds that 4 Macc 18:10–19 (using only a few books to summarize ancient Israel's history) and Acts 13:15 (portraying a public reading of the Law and the Prophets) demonstrate that some pre-70 C.E. Jewish and Christian communities already possessed canonical collections, while *Ag. Ap.* 1.38 shows that a single canon had become universal by the century's end.[50]

Now, Lange's interesting proposal clearly requires further research and, meanwhile, caution is in order regarding details of his argument. Masada manuscripts may be too small a sample on which to base pre-70 C.E. proto-Masoretic pre-eminence so confidently, for example, especially since the New Testament and *Ant.* 1–11 demonstrate that other text forms persisted for some time.[51] Similarly, that 4 Macc 18:10–19 reflects a canon, rather than a mere selection of Scriptures, is not at all obvious; neither is the

---

[48] Lange, "Library or Canon?" 167.

[49] See Armin Lange, "'Nobody Dared to Add to Them, to Take from Them, or to Make Changes' (Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 1.42): The Textual Standardization of Jewish Scriptures in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. Anthony Hilhorst et al.; JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 105–26; and Armin Lange, "'The Law, the Prophets, and the Other Books of the Fathers' (Sir, Prologue): Canonical Lists in Ben Sira and Elsewhere?" in *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira* (ed. Géza G. Xeravits and Jósef Zsengellér; JSJSup 127; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 55–80.

[50] Lange, "The Law," 74–79.

[51] Lange, "'Nobody Dared,'" 126, acknowledges this point.

proposal that Acts 13:15's "the Law and the Prophets," unlike the phrase's other occurrences, is a canonical designation. Even in *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43, as we shall see presently, a universal canon is uncertain. Despite these reservations, however, two aspects of the primary data do suggest that, in the absence of other obvious causes, Alexandrian scholarship encouraged a certain hardening of textual and scriptural boundaries towards the end of the Second Temple period. Firstly, as Lange shows, there is evidence for at least localized attempts at textual standardization in the first centuries B.C.E. and C.E. Secondly, if surviving evidence from Qumran and elsewhere is an accurate guide, the number of new works directly or indirectly claiming antique status produced in the first centuries B.C.E. and C.E. was considerably smaller than that in the third and second centuries B.C.E.[52] We might tentatively conclude, therefore, that by the first century B.C.E. or C.E. it was more difficult, though not impossible, for such books to gain acceptance as Scripture.

2.6. *Summary*

If the above overview is accurate, late Second Temple Jews *both* looked to a long-past scriptural era from which they believed they had inherited writings by divinely inspired prophets *and* accepted that previously unknown works from that era might sometimes newly enter the public domain. Further, while a common core of Scriptures probably circulated widely, the reception history of certain books suggests that what precisely counted as Scripture varied between communities. At the same time, it is likely that, under influence from Alexandrian scholarship, textual and scriptural boundaries hardened to a degree during the first centuries B.C.E. and C.E. These factors, though compatible with Scripture, are incompatible with a canon in late Second Temple times.

3. Mason on *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43

Notwithstanding the strong case for Scripture, Mason argues for a late Second Temple canon, not by engaging directly with the above factors, but through a close reading of *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 against the background of

[52] On dating relevant compositions, see Dimant, "Pseudepigrapha," and George W. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*: *a Historical and Literary Introduction* (2d ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 2005).

Josephus' other writings.[53] Since *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43, written only decades after 70 C.E.,[54] constitutes crucial evidence by any standard, we shall consider Mason's position more fully.

3.1. Ag. Ap. *1.37–43 and Its Limitations*

Mason opens his discussion by explaining that *Against Apion*'s main aim is to show that the Jews constitute an ancient people, contrary to the accusations of their "literary adversaries,"[55] while *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 is part of a section (1.6–59) contrasting Greek and Jewish historiography. On that subject, Josephus highlights Greek culture's recent origins (1.6–14), Greek record-keeping's unsatisfactory nature (1.15–27), and the superiority of Oriental records (1.28–59), especially the Jewish Scriptures. *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 portrays those Scriptures as follows:[56]

> 1.37 Accordingly . . . then, seeing that the writing (of the records) is not the personal prerogative of everyone, nor is there actual disagreement among any of the things written, but the prophets alone learned the highest and oldest matters by the inspiration of the God, and by themselves plainly recorded events as they occurred, 38 so among us there are not myriads of discordant and competing volumes, but only twenty-two volumes containing the record of all time, which are rightly trusted.
>
> 39 Now of these, five are those of Moses, which comprise both the laws and the tradition from human origins until his passing; this period falls little short of 3000 years. 40 From Moses' passing until the Artaxerxes who was king of the Persians after Xerxes, the prophets after Moses wrote up what happened in their times [or, as they saw things] in thirteen volumes. The remaining four (volumes) comprise hymns toward God and advice for living among humanity. 41 From Artaxerxes until our own time all sorts of things have been written, but they have not been considered of the same trustworthiness as those before them, because the exact succession of the prophets failed.
>
> 42 Now it is clear in practice how we approach our special texts: for although such an age has already passed (sc. since Artaxerxes), no one has dared either to add anything or to take away from them or to alter them. But

---

[53] Tessa Rajak, *Josephus* (2d ed.; London: Duckworth, 2002); and Steve Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament* (2d ed.; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2003), 55–145, provide overviews of Josephus' life and work. John M. G. Barclay, *Against Apion* (vol. 10 of *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*; Leiden Brill, 2004), xvii–lxxi, introduces *Against Apion* in detail.

[54] According to Barclay, *Against Apion*, xxxvi, the work was penned "between 94 and ca. 105 CE."

[55] Mason, "Twenty-two," 112.

[56] The translation is from Mason, "Twenty-two," 113.

> it is innate among all Judeans from their very first moments of existence to consider them decrees of God, to stand by them, and for their sake, if necessary, cheerfully to die. 43 Thus already many of (our) prisoners of war have on many occasions been seen patiently enduring tortures and the ways of all sorts of deaths in theatres, without letting slip a single word against the laws and the related official records. (*Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43)

Mason's analysis starts by warning that this excerpt does not say as much as is commonly assumed. For example, though Josephus mentions two "authorial entities" (Moses and other prophets) (1.37, 39–40) and presents Scripture chronologically in "three strokes"[57] (five Mosaic books, thirteen prophetic books, and four others) (1.39–40), he says nothing in reality about the bipartite or tripartite canonical divisions others see in the passage.[58] That this twofold authorship and hint of a threefold chronology are mentioned in passing without being "consistently pursued"[59] shows he is not thinking in such terms. Likewise, when Josephus writes of "the laws and the related official records" (*tous nomous kai tas meta toutōn anagraphas*) (1.43), he is not describing a bipartite Law and Prophets, for, having distinguished between Mosaic law and Mosaic history (1.39), "laws" here can only denote legal parts of Moses' oeuvre.

3.2. *The Heart of the Matter*

Nonetheless, it is clear that *Ag. Ap.* 1.39–41 is intended to highlight four genres—Mosaic law, Mosaic and other historical material, hymns, and advice—to aid a largely Gentile readership unfamiliar with Jewish Scripture.[60] Clear also is the message of *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 in the context of the whole work: whereas Greek records are recent, contradictory, and legion, the Jews' are ancient, harmonious, and number just "twenty-two volumes [*biblia*]." They have remained unchanged since penned by divinely inspired prophets who finished their work in a long-past era ending with Artaxerxes' rule (464–424 B.C.E.) when "the exact succession of the prophets failed" (1.41); post-Artaxerxian compositions (e.g., 1 Maccabees) are naturally of inferior status.

---

[57] Ibid., 114.

[58] Ibid., 111, mentioning Barton, *Oracles*, 49, on the former possibility and Beckwith, *Old Testament Canon*, 125, among others on the latter.

[59] Mason, "Twenty-two," 114. Thus, Josephus names Moses but identifies no other prophetic figures and, having explained that Mosaic writings preceded other historical traditions, he fails to specify how "hymns" and "advice" fit in chronologically.

[60] On *Against Apion*'s likely audience, see Mason, *New Testament*, 31–40.

According to Mason, moreover, Josephus' employment of three terms, "records" (*anagraphai*), "prophets" (*prophētai*), and "succession" (*diadochē*), not just in *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 but also in *Jewish Antiquities* and *Jewish War*, shows that his thinking on such matters had long been part of his "basic outlook and training."[61] For example, *J.W.* 6.109 refers to "the official records [*anagraphai*] of the ancient prophets," while *Ant.* 1.12 and 20.261 designate Scripture with *anagraphē*; analysis of *prophētai* and related words in *J.W.* 6.109 and elsewhere shows that Josephus normally reserves such vocabulary for ancient prophets; and *Ag. Ap.* 1.41, combined with the likes of *Ant.* 4.165, 329, establishes that integral to Josephus' thought was a succession (*diadochē*) of prophets who, like kings but unlike priests, ceased long ago.[62]

When combined with the observations on genre, authorship, and chronology already noted, the terminological-ideological background of *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 and other passages allows Mason to ascribe to Josephus what are effectively four Scripture-related beliefs: (i) Jews possess divinely inspired Scriptures from prophets in a bygone age ending with Artaxerxes; (ii) these Scriptures can be described generically, in rough chronological terms, and as the product of "Moses and not-Moses;"[63] (iii) they comprise just twenty-two works; and (iv) their text remains unaltered since originally penned.

3.3. *Apparent Contradictions*

At the same time, Mason notes that Josephus' statements about Scripture in *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 and elsewhere are contradicted at first sight by his actual use of the *anagraphai*, especially in his account of ancient Israel in *Ant.* 1–11. There, he does three unexpected things given his assertions about a twenty-two book canon with a fixed text. Firstly, he alters that text by presenting an ideological paraphrase conflicting with known scriptural versions. According to *Ant.* 4–5, for example, Moses recommended aristocratic government, comprising the High Priesthood and senate; Joshua consulted that senate, but its subsequent abandonment led to exile. Secondly, Josephus knows of and, in some cases, draws on traditions outside the Hebrew Bible, making it hard to see how Scripture could be restricted to twenty-two compositions. For instance, he uses 1 Esdras and Esther

[61] Mason, "Twenty-two," 117.
[62] See Ibid., 115–19.
[63] Ibid., 114.

Additions (*Ant.* 11); he ascribes to Solomon 1,005 "books [*biblia*] of odes and songs" and 3,000 "books [*bibloi*] of parables and similitudes" (*Ant.* 8.44); and he mentions Daniel's "books" (*bibloi*) (*Ant.* 10.267).[64] Thirdly, Josephus extends Jewish history beyond Artaxerxes' (*Ant.* 11) up to the eve of the First Revolt (*Ant.* 20).

Mason believes these contradictions are not what they seem, however, for the fact that *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 and *Ant.* 1–20 are juxtaposed in Josephus' writings renders it unlikely that he was either knowingly altering the scriptural text in the latter or inventing a twenty-two book canon in the former. Otherwise, with both in the public domain in short succession, Josephus would be liable to contradiction; his claims about scriptural antiquity and universal acceptance would, if untrue, likewise be open to refutation.[65] As for the extension of the account beyond Artaxerxes, Mason insists that this does not signify that Josephus in reality had Scripture, the open-endedness of which allowed post-Artaxerxian materials to be included. *Ag. Ap.* 1.41 is so adamant in asserting the opposite, after all, and there is a break at *Ant.* 11.297, from which point Josephus' narrative is patchy, as though Scripture really had ended with Esther's story (*Ant.* 11).

3.4. *Three Deductions*

On the basis of these observations, Mason draws three main conclusions of interest to us.[66] First, given his statements about Scripture in *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43, *Jewish Antiquities*, and *Jewish War*, it must be accepted that Josephus believed Jews had a canon, though "too many variables and insufficient evidence"[67] leave its precise contents unclear. We cannot say that the canon was a recent Jewish development or idiosyncratic to Josephus, for he is unambiguous: Jews had an antique canon that had long been universally accepted. Were these claims wrong, Josephus would be liable to ridicule.

Second, the discrepancy between Josephus' theoretical claims about a canon with a fixed text in *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 and elsewhere, on the one

---

[64] As noted by Christopher T. Begg and Paul Spilsbury, *Judaean Antiquities Books 8–10* (vol. 5 of *Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary*; Leiden Brill, 2005), 14, Josephus takes these figures from 1 Kgs 4:32 ("[h]e composed three thousand proverbs, and his songs numbered a thousand and five") but turns Solomon into the author of the equivalent number of books.

[65] Mason, "Twenty-two," 120–21, 122, 125–26.

[66] Ibid., 125–27, also lists several less pertinent concluding points.

[67] Ibid., 124.

hand, and his practical use of Scripture in *Ant.* 1–11, on the other, is superficial. Josephus genuinely believed the claims that he makes, and so the mismatch between these beliefs and his own handling of the Scriptures was either something that he and his readers did not notice or something by which they were not troubled. That modern scholars are so sensitive to the discrepancy tells us more about their contemporary preference for academic precision than about Josephus as an unreliable witness or "incurable liar"[68] in the first century C.E.

Third, other late Second Temple literature which, like *Ant.* 1–11, seems to imply Scripture rather than canon does not really do so either. Mason explains:[69]

> if we lacked the *Against Apion*, Josephus himself would offer a clear case for an open canon. But we *do* have the *Against Apion*, in which this same Josephus emphatically . . . insists that the Judean records have long since been completed in twenty-two volumes.

Put differently, those responsible for other writings taken by scholars to show that late Second Temple Jews had Scripture would probably have asserted the opposite if, like Josephus in *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43, they had the opportunity. We cannot appeal to the "Scrolls' authors or Philo or Ben Sira"[70] to argue against a canon, therefore, any more than we can base such a conclusion on *Ant.* 1–11.

3.5. *Summary*

For Mason, then, the case for late Second Temple Scripture dissolves through a critical reading of *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 against the background of *Ant.* 1–11. The former's claim that Jews had long possessed a textually unaltered, twenty-two book canon must be given priority, he insists, over "circumstantial evidence"[71] for Scripture with a fluid text in the latter and in other sources, including the scrolls.

4. A Critique of Mason

Mason undoubtedly presents a distinct argument for a canon by concentrating on *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43's linguistic and ideological background and by

---

[68] Ibid., 120.
[69] Ibid., 126, though see note 17 regarding terminology.
[70] Ibid., 127.
[71] Ibid., 126.

largely bypassing the so-called circumstantial evidence we considered earlier. But whether that circumstantial evidence can be so easily discounted, and whether *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 can be so readily elided with other Josephan statements, is debatable. Several comments on aspects of Mason's argument are apposite, therefore, before we evaluate his overall thesis.

4.1. *The Law and the Prophets*

Mason convincingly explains that, in referring to two "authorial entities" and "three strokes," as he puts it,[72] *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 describes neither two nor three canonical divisions, for Josephus is not thinking that way. Yet, when Scripture's prophetic authors (1.37) are further defined as Moses and other prophets (1.39–40), it is difficult not to see an echo of the widespread tendency to employ phrases like "Moses and the Prophets." Such nomenclature denotes, not a canon's literary divisions, but an authorial bifurcation of all Scripture into Moses, the prophet *par excellence*, and other prophets. *Pace* Mason, that is the twofold scriptural scenario envisaged by Barton among others.[73] And if it is accurate, insisting that "the laws and the related official records" (1.43) is not a reflection of something similar, because the distinction between Mosaic law and Mosaic history (1.39) means that "the laws" (1.43) must designate the former only, overinterprets the material. Josephus is not operating at this level of precision, after all, as Mason himself demonstrates.[74]

4.2. Ag. Ap. *1.37–43 and Other Evidence*

By combining *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 with parts of *Jewish Antiquities* and *Jewish War*, Mason attributes to Josephus the convictions (i)–(iv) described above. Although (ii), (iii), and (iv) are unambiguously present only in *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43, with other passages referring more obliquely to antique prophetic Scripture, it is possible to elide all the material concerned, as though (ii)–(iv) are implicit throughout because explicit in *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43. This is what Mason does and, regarding (ii) at least, doing so makes sense insofar as its elements, like (i), are taken for granted in other late Second Temple sources, as we saw earlier in this study.

Yet, it is equally possible that, unlike (i)–(ii), the appearance of (iii)–(iv) in *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 is anomalous. That possibility arguably becomes a

---

[72] See above note 57.
[73] See above note 58.
[74] See again note 59.

probability when we consider more thoroughly that (i)–(ii) and (iii)–(iv) relate differently to evidence elsewhere. In other words, Scripture's antique origin, (i), is unequivocally expressed in *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43, echoed in *Jewish War* and *Jewish Antiquities*, and widely assumed in other sources, just as its twofold authorship, generic variety, and implicit chronology, (ii), appear in *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43, feature in other literature, and are most likely assumed in *Jewish War* and *Jewish Antiquities*; in contrast, that Scripture comprises a textually fixed, twenty-two book canon, (iii–iv), is attested only in *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43.[75] Instead of harmonizing Josephus' statements and bypassing the circumstantial evidence to which the elements of the resultant harmonization relate divergently, therefore, it is preferable to highlight those divergences on the assumption they are significant. We can then see that the evidence of *Jewish War* and *Jewish Antiquities* is compatible with what is found in a range of sources: Moses and the Prophets wrote Scripture long ago, though exactly which books were scriptural and their precise textual form remained undetermined. In that case, the presence of (iii)–(iv) in *Ag. Ap*. 1.37–43 requires an explanation other than Mason's, and to that question we shall return. Meanwhile, several additional points lending weight to this line of argument seem pertinent.

4.3. *Hyperbole and Inaccuracy*

Mason states several times that Josephus could not have asserted that Jews had long possessed a canon if it were untrue.[76] Insofar as tension exists between *Ag. Ap.* 1.38's twenty-two *biblia* and *Ant*. 1–11's awareness of Scriptures beyond that number, he believes it must result solely from the difference between ancient and modern perceptions. Now, that would be persuasive if the evidence suggested that all late Second Temple Jews had scriptural collections of *approximately* twenty-two books—twenty here, twenty-three there, and, say, twenty-six elsewhere. Though modern scholars would not speak of a canon in such circumstances, Josephus might well allow himself to describe the situation in canonical terms, appealing to twenty-two because of its symbolic value as the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet.[77] If necessary, small differences—many

---

[75] For *4 Ezra* 14:44–48's twenty-four *libri*, see below.

[76] See above note 65.

[77] David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 177–239, unpacks the alphabet's undoubted importance in scribal circles vis-à-vis abecedaries, alphabetized lists, and memorization schemes.

groups rejecting *Jubilees*, for instance, or others accepting Esther—could be smoothed over by combining or separating compositions (e.g., Judges/Ruth, Jeremiah/Lamentations) to arrive at twenty-two.[78]

Yet, Josephus exceeds this scenario's limits by claiming that Solomon penned 4,005 books, a figure so distant from twenty-two that no appeal to ancient-versus-modern sensibilities suffices: a canon of twenty-two items cannot simultaneously incorporate 4,005. Of course, the number of Solomonic works in *Ant.* 8.44 may be hyperbolic.[79] But it must then be asked why twenty-two in *Ag. Ap.* 1.38 cannot be seen as symbolic, for, as noted, it reflects the Hebrew alphabet.[80] Given the disparity, in any case, at least one of these numbers must be incorrect, undermining the supposition that Josephus could not place inaccuracies in the public domain. Undermined with it also is Mason's belief that *Ag. Ap.* 1.38's twenty-two book claim must outweigh all contrary evidence.

4.4. *A Fluid Text*

Mason initially seems to accept the above argument's force vis-à-vis *Ag. Ap.* 1.42's assertion regarding an unchanged scriptural text: this must be one of several "rhetorical flourishes"[81] in *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 because Josephus so boldly alters the scriptural text in *Ant.* 1–11. But Mason maintains that too much should not be made of the underlying discrepancy, for the fact that Josephus put both *Jewish Antiquities* and *Against Apion* into the public domain shows that he and his readers were essentially unaware of it; otherwise, Josephus would be open to criticism. Yet, this approach to *Ag. Ap.* 1.42 is problematic in three respects.

Firstly, we have already seen that the irrefutability argument—the notion that Josephus could not say anything inaccurate or hyperbolic because it could be contradicted by others—is not strong. Secondly, *Ag. Ap.* 1.42 pertains to actual copies of Scripture and, though Josephus "insinuates himself into the company of the ancient prophets"[82] by using

---

[78] Scholars sometimes employ a similar strategy to equate *Ag. Ap.* 1.38's twenty-two *biblia* with *4 Ezra* 14:44–48's twenty-four *libri*; see note 90 below.

[79] See again note 64, as well as note 29.

[80] Carr, *Writing*, 249–51, overstates the case in maintaining that the Scriptures by Josephus' day had long been numbered, quite literally, according to the alphabetic principle, not least since, unlike other numerical traditions (e.g., twelve tribes; twelve disciples), a canon of twenty-two compositions is otherwise unattested for the late Second Temple period.

[81] Mason, "Twenty-two," 119.

[82] Ibid., 117.

anagraphai for his own work (*Ant.* 1.17), he nowhere claims that *Ant*. 1–11 has scriptural status.[83] Strictly speaking, therefore, *Ant*. 1–11 does not alter the records. Thirdly, nonetheless, it is important to ask how *Ag. Ap.* 1.42's claim relates to real scriptural manuscripts from Qumran and scriptural citations within late Second Temple exegesis, though Mason does not do so. As seen earlier, neither suggests the sort of moderate fluidity which, though unlikely to convince modern scholars of a fixed text, would have been near enough to that ideal to render *Ag. Ap.* 1.42 a harmless exaggeration. The extent of textual fluidity that persisted into the first century C.E. is, on the contrary, greater than such a scenario would allow.

4.5. *New* Antique *Scriptures*

Mason's argument is convincing, however, regarding the discrepancy between *Ag. Ap.* 1.40's Artaxerxian cut-off point for Scripture and *Jewish Antiquities*' continuation beyond Artaxerxes: the contradiction is more apparent than real, for presumably Josephus simply wanted to demonstrate in *Ant*. 12–20 how themes prominent in *Ant*. 1–11—"divine providence, reward and punishment"[84]—played out in the post-prophetic era. Convincing also is Mason's argument, so far as it goes, that the continuation into *Ant*. 12–20 does not imply that Jews had Scripture in the sense that post-Artaxerxian compositions could be added to the collection.

Yet, in insisting on the latter point, Mason reveals two related but unstated assumptions that are difficult to justify. Thus, in acknowledging that Josephus and others believed that Scripture heralded from a bygone age, he takes it for granted that they must have believed that all Scriptures were necessarily already known in canonical form and that the only way scholars might argue for Scripture, rather than canon, would be by showing that scriptural status was also granted to post-Artaxerxian works like *1 Enoch, Letter of Aristeas*, Tobit, and 1 Maccabees.[85] But the evidence considered in our second section suggests that, while late Second Temple Jews looked to a long-past scriptural era, previously unknown Scriptures purportedly from that era were occasionally added to the scriptural corpus. Such a scenario is what is envisaged by scholars arguing recently

---

[83] Ibid., 119; this is unsurprising, given the presumption of scriptural antiquity.

[84] Ibid., 21 (note 40).

[85] Ibid., 126, summarizing the position of Rudolph Meyer, "Bemerkungen zum literargeschichtlichen Hintergrund der Kanontheorie des Josephus," in *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet* (ed. Otto Betz, Klaus Haacker, and Martin Hengel; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 285–99.

for Scripture and, with it, the presumption that late Second Temple Jews distinguished between those newly available works that were obviously post-Artaxerxian (e.g., *Letter of Aristeas*, 1 Maccabees) and others that were seemingly ancient (e.g., *1 Enoch*, Tobit). Mason, unfortunately, considers neither possibility.

4.6. *Summary*

If these observations are valid, Mason's three deductions listed in the last section are not as persuasive as they initially appear. More precisely, first, it is unnecessary to conflate all Josephan statements about Scripture on the assumption they constitute a coherent whole devoid of hyperbole or inaccuracy for fear of contradiction. It can then be seen that what is found in *Jewish War* and *Jewish Antiquities* is broadly compatible with the use of Scripture in *Ant.* 1–11 and other late Second Temple exegesis, as well as with Qumran scriptural manuscripts, whereas *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43's claims about a twenty-two book canon and fixed text are unusual and accordingly require their own explanation. Second, if so, the need to appeal to excessive contrasts between ancient and modern sensibilities to reconcile the irreconcilable within the primary data is removed. We are not constrained to maintain that Josephus believed in a twenty-two book canon that somehow contained thousands of works or in a long-fixed text that he or others nevertheless felt free substantially to alter. Consequently, third, the proposal that the "Scrolls' authors or Philo or Ben Sira"[86] did not have Scripture because, like Josephus in *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43, they would have affirmed the opposite can be turned on its head. They make no such affirmations and so, as with Josephus in *Jewish War* and *Jewish Antiquities*, it is just as likely they were not thinking in canonical terms. Overall, therefore, it seems that *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 does not, after all, destroy the case for late Second Temple Scripture in the manner envisaged by Mason.

5. *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43: Alternative Possibilities

How, then, should we understand *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43? Given the above discussion, two options rejected by Mason re-emerge as potential alternatives: either belief in a canon with a fixed text, though universal by the late first century C.E., was a recent innovation; or Josephus' distinctive claims in that one passage are idiosyncratic.

---

[86] Mason, "Twenty-two," 127.

5.1. *A Recent Development*

The proposal that *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 reflects recent developments that Josephus hyperbolically projects onto earlier times enjoys considerable support, for it allows that a canon with a more-or-less fixed text became the norm towards the close of the first century C.E. after a long period of Scripture with a fluid text.[87] It has its difficulties, however. Thus, if Jews up to the First Revolt had a textually fluid Scripture, albeit perhaps with some hardening of boundaries by that time, a canon with a fixed text is unlikely to have emerged only two or three decades later when *Against Apion* was composed. Although Rabbinic Judaism probably possessed a canon with a more-or-less stable proto-Masoretic Text by the third century C.E.,[88] the nascent movement could not have effected such a universal change so early.[89] This is confirmed by use of other texts forms in late first- and early second-century C.E. exegesis (e.g., in *Ant.* 1–11 and New Testament writings). It is further confirmed by *4 Ezra* 14:44–48 which reads:

> So during the forty days, ninety-four books were written. And when the forty days were ended, the Most High spoke to me, saying, 'Make public the twenty-four books that your wrote first, and let the worthy and unworthy read them; but keep the seventy that were written last, in order to give them to the wise among your people. For in them is the spring of understanding, the fountain of wisdom, and the river of knowledge. And I did so. (*4 Ezra* 14:44–48)

Since this excerpt is roughly contemporary with *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43, and since the former's twenty-four is so close to the latter's twenty-two, it is often taken to denote the same canon, with the slight discrepancy reflecting different ways of counting identical texts.[90] Yet, *4 Ezra* 14:44–48 cannot easily be read as pointing to a canon of twenty-two or twenty-four books, for it envisages ninety-four divinely inspired compositions, of which seventy esoteric ones are more highly esteemed than twenty-four exoteric

---

[87] Thus, Lange, "The Law, the Prophets," 74–75, and Karel van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005), 234.

[88] See further McDonald, *Biblical Canon*, 170–89; and Russell Fuller, "The Text of the Tanak," in *The Medieval through the Reformation Periods* (ed. Alan J. Hauser and Duane F. Watson; vol. 2 of *A History of Biblical Interpretation*; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 201–26.

[89] See Lester L. Grabbe, *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Practice and Belief from the Exile to Yavneh* (London: Routledge, 2000), 116–26.

[90] Thus, Philip R. Davies, *Scribes and Schools: The Canonization of the Hebrew Scripture* (London: SPCK, 1998), 178–89; and Steinmann, *Oracles*, 42.

ones.[91] Because both twenty-four (understood as 2 x 12 or as matching the Greek alphabet) and seventy (echoing Septuagintal origins or the numerical value of the Hebrew *sod*, "secret") are probably symbolic, it is unlikely that either should be "understood as a literal signifier of the accumulated texts"[92] of a canon. Indeed, their force within *4 Ezra* 14 is not to set canonical limits but to allow *4 Ezra* itself to take its place within Scripture because such limits presumably do not yet exist.[93] *4 Ezra* 14:44–48 presents a different scriptural picture to *Ag. Ap*. 1.37–43, thereby undermining the theory that there was a single canon by the late first century C.E.[94]

5.2. *Josephan Idiosyncrasy*

The main alternative is that, because evidence for Scripture is so strong, *Ag. Ap*. 1.37–43 expresses atypical ideas.[95] Mason rejects this because, as seen, he believes that Josephus' oeuvre should be read as a whole and that *Ant*. 1–11 (like all sources superficially pointing to Scripture) can be subsumed within *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43's canonical outlook to which Josephus had subscribed for decades.[96] Were that correct, it would, of course, be hard to see how Josephus could have emerged from his priestly-aristocratic training in the mid-first century C.E. with unconventional beliefs about a canon and fixed text which he alone, unlike his contemporaries, held for fifty years, explaining them properly only in his last composition. Yet, even if Josephus' views were shared by all Jews, as Mason maintains, it would still be odd that neither he nor any other late Second Temple author mentions a twenty-two book canon with fixed text before *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43.[97] Consequently, as mooted in the last section, it is arguably best to see

---

[91] Michael E. Stone, *4 Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1990), 437–42, considers *4 Ezra* 14:44–48's textual uncertainties.

[92] Bruce W. Longenecker, *2 Esdras* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 91, though he notes only seventy's symbolism without considering that of twenty-four; see further Barton, *Oracles*, 64–66.

[93] On some communities' reception of *4 Ezra* and other late writings as Scripture, see William Adler, "The Pseudepigrapha in the Early Church," in McDonald and Sanders, *Canon Debate*, 211–28.

[94] See above note 31.

[95] For example, McDonald, *Biblical Canons*, 151–58. Mason, "Twenty-two," 126, mentions in this regard Meyer, "Bemerkungen," although, strictly speaking, as Mason acknowledges, Meyer believes that Josephus reflects a minority Pharisaic view that became dominant post-70 C.E.

[96] Mason, "Twenty-two," 126.

[97] Although a fourth-century C.E. variant of *Jub.* 2:23–4 in Epiphanius refers to twenty-two books, no extent copies of *Jubilees* do so; see McDonald, *Biblical Canons*, 158–60.

Ag. Ap. 1.37–43's distinct ideas as peculiar to that work. The question, then, is whether some feature or features of *Against Apion* can account for such idiosyncrasy.

5.3. Ag. Ap. *1.37–43 and Alexandrian Scholarship*

To formulate a tentative answer to that question, we may return to Alexandrian scholarship which, as suggested earlier, possibly encouraged a certain hardening of textual and scriptural boundaries towards the end of the late Second Temple period. Given the Hebrew-Greek education of his youth,[98] Josephus may have been aware of such developments and would, in any case, certainly have learned about the Alexandrian scholars.[99] Indeed, as part of *Against Apion*'s overarching goal of demonstrating Jewish antiquity, Josephus counters anti-Jewish allegations from several Alexandrian scholars (Chaeremon, Lysimachus, Molon, and Apion)[100] in *Ag. Ap*. 1.210–2.144. That fact, as well as oblique references to them in *Ag. Ap.* 1.1–5, suggests that Alexandrian scholarship might also have influenced *Ag. Ap*. 1.6–59 where, as Mason explains so well,[101] Josephus argues that Jewish historiography is superior to its Greek equivalent and that the Jewish Scriptures are more ancient (*Ag. Ap.* 1.40–41), more circumscribed numerically (1.38–40), and more accurate (1.37–38, 42) than their unreliable (1.19–27, 37), innumerable (1.16–18, 38), and relatively recent (1.13) Greek counterparts.

More specifically, Josephus must have known, given his training, that the Greek reality was rather different: Alexandrian scholarship had brought a measure of textual stability to Greek writings[102] and was responsible for relatively short lists of the most important authors.[103] In failing explicitly

---

[98] Thus, generally, Carr, *Writing*, 201–51.

[99] Lange "'Nobody Dared,'" 122–24, points to archaeological evidence showing the intense Graeco-Roman enculturation of Jerusalem's elite post-63 B.C.E.

[100] On these and other opponents' identities, which are not always certain, see relevant parts of Barclay, *Against Apion*.

[101] Mason, "Twenty-two," 115–19. For Josephus' numerous logical sleights of hand in *Ag. Ap.* 1.6–59, see Barclay, *Against Apion*, 3–42.

[102] This was driven by the need for textual standardization in public performance and competition; see Hubert Cancik, "Standardization and Ranking of Texts in Greek and Roman Institutions," in *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World* (ed. Margalit Finkelberg and Guy G. Stroumsa; JSRC 2; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 117–30.

[103] See Amiel D. Varda, "Canons of Literary Texts at Rome," in Finkelberg and Stroumsa, *Homer, the Bible*, 131–52, who notes that, in a Roman context, certain Latin works and genres had been added by Josephus' day.

to mention these factors and instead caricaturing Greek literary culture as he does in *Ag. Ap.* 1.6–27, Josephus obviously exaggerates.[104] But it is also unlikely to be coincidental that the two Greek developments he passes over are then mirrored in those two traits of Jewish Scripture unique to *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43. In other words, the preceding exaggeration provides the rhetorical foil against which Josephus' assertions about a canon with a fixed text portray the Jewish *anagraphai* as superior to Greek literature, notwithstanding the unmentioned efforts of Alexandrian scholars. Josephus thereby emphasizes that "his own culture fulfils a cultural value of the opponent culture better," as Lange puts it.[105] But whereas Lange holds that this Jewish canon really existed by the late first century C.E., our analysis above suggests that Josephus' positive assertions in this regard can no more be justified on empirical grounds than his negative characterization of Greek texts. Josephus' rhetoric has run ahead of reality on both counts and, again, it is unlikely he was unaware of this.[106]

5.4. *Compositions or Scrolls?*

The above may have implications for the precise nuance of the word *biblia* throughout *Ag. Ap*. 1.37–43. Commentators unanimously take it to denote "books" in the sense of discrete literary compositions, but that would be obvious only if the existence of a canon of discrete literary works was so taken for granted that Josephus' twenty-two *biblia* would automatically connote it. There is no evidence for such a widespread tradition, as we have seen. Hence, since the less specific "scroll" is an alternative meaning of the noun *biblion*,[107] "scrolls" may be the better option: the image conveyed is then one in which the Jewish *anagraphai* fill twenty-two scrolls, with use of that number deriving from the alphabetic tradition mentioned earlier, compared to the "myriads" (*Ag. Ap.* 1.38) of Greek scrolls. To be sure, this still constitutes a canonical claim of sorts and, as Qumran manuscripts show, most, though not all, scrolls contained a single item. Yet, a

---

[104] Mason, *New Testament*, 135, notes that Josephus' well-disposed Roman audience may have appreciated this dig at the Greeks.

[105] Lange, "'Nobody Dared,'" 126.

[106] Sid Z. Leiman, "Josephus and the Canon of the Bible," in *Josephus, the Bible, and History* (ed. Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata; Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989), 50–58, agrees that "[i]t is inconceivable that Josephus was unaware of the wide range of textual diversity" in Jewish Scripture, but he fails seriously to consider that something similar might apply to the canonical claim.

[107] It should be noted that *biblion* can additionally refer to a "volume" in a multi-volume work, as with *Against Apion*'s two parts (see *Ag. Ap.* 1.320; 2.296).

list of such items is hardly Josephus' point in *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43; otherwise, he would have had to specify them to be properly understood.[108] As it is, the impression of canonical fixity is given without that amounting to much in terms of particular works because of the inherent flexibility of scrolls regarding length and content. Moreover, it may well be that, at least as far as the Scriptures were concerned, a weak sense of genre and closure meant that a clear distinction between *biblia* as compositions and *biblia* as scrolls would in any case have been unavailable to Josephus.[109]

5.5. *Summary*

Insofar as there are obstacles to seeing *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43's distinct assertions as reflecting either recent developments in Judaism or long-standing idiosyncratic elements in Josephus' thought, the notion that these claims are peculiar to Josephus' last work is preferable. It is tempting, furthermore, to conclude that in the background of the presentation of Greek and Jewish literature in *Ag. Ap*. 1.6–59 lies Alexandrian scholarship. Josephus depicts Jewish Scripture as though its canonical nature and fixed text exceed the comparatively modest results of the Alexandrian scholars' textual standardization and listing of Greek writers, while simultaneously ignoring those latter developments in favour of a more negative caricature. Since the primary data support neither portrayal, however, both are arguably best understood in terms of the rhetorical, rather than factual, context of *Against Apion*. If so, it may be best to understand *biblia* in *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 as scrolls, the detailed contents of which are not of particular concern, rather than as a clearly delineated set of discrete literary compositions.

---

[108] *Ag. Ap*. 1.39 specifies five Mosaic *biblia* but it is unclear whether these are five scrolls (possibly containing more than five works) or five compositions (presumably the Pentateuch). Even if the latter is probable, Josephus' failure to pursue the matter (as with the "authorial entities" and "three strokes" mentioned above, page 31) by identifying the other seventeen *biblia* suggests specific compositions were not in mind; cf. Arie van der Kooij, "The Canonization of Ancient Books Kept in the Temple of Jerusalem," in van der Kooij and van der Toorn, *Canonization and Decanonization*, 17–40.

[109] Thus, John Barton, "What is a Book? Modern Exegesis and the Literary Conventions of Ancient Israel," in *Intertextuality in Ugarit and Israel* (ed. J. C. de Moor; OtSt 40; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1–14 regarding the Hebrew noun *sefer* in Second Temple and Rabbinic literature.

6. Conclusion

This chapter has sought to engage with the ongoing scholarly debate about Scripture and canon in late Second Temple Judaism in the wake of the old consensus' demise. Thus, we saw earlier that not a few scholars have concluded of late that late Second Temple Jews and early Christians had Scripture, not canon, given a range of factors pointing in that direction, including, of course, the Qumran scrolls. Mason, on the other hand, has recently challenged that perception through a linguistic-ideological analysis of *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 which, he believes, when understood appropriately alongside *Ant*. 1–11, demonstrates that Josephus and other Jews had long believed in a textually fixed canon. Yet, though replete with important observations about *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 in its wider context, Mason's position is arguably unconvincing in view of certain weaknesses in the case he makes. In particular, he underestimates the significance of the different ways in which the various elements of Scripture's portrayal in *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 relate to what is found in other sources: the notion that Scripture heralded from an antique prophetic age and that it could be described in terms of genre, chronology, and twofold authorship appear to have been commonplace; but Scripture as both textually and canonically fixed is otherwise unattested outside *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43 so early. Since it is difficult to maintain that the latter convictions were a widespread late first-century C.E. development or had been idiosyncratic to Josephus for a long time, the most straightforward approach is probably to view them as peculiar to *Ag. Ap*. 1.37–43. Indeed, we tentatively proposed that Alexandrian scholarship's textual stabilization and listing of key Greek writers provide a credible rhetorical background for understanding Josephus' two anomalous claims in *Ag. Ap.* 1.37–43. That suggestion, like the influence of Alexandrian scholarship on Jewish Scripture more generally, requires further research. But whether it ultimately proves persuasive or not, *Ag. Ap*. 1.37–43 should not be allowed single-handedly to outweigh the critical mass of evidence for Scripture rather than canon among Jews, including early Christians, in late Second Temple times.

ALL THE BIBLES WE NEED: THE IMPACT OF THE QUMRAN EVIDENCE ON BIBLICAL LOWER CRITICISM

Corrado Martone

Multa non quia difficilia sunt non audemus,
sed quia non audemus sunt difficilia
Seneca, *Moral letters to Lucilius*, 104, 26

Experimental thought seeks not to persuade but to inspire;
to inspire another thought, to set thought moving.
Milan Kundera, *Testaments Betrayed*

1. By way of an Introduction: The Classical Literatures

In the late nineties the German publisher Teubner produced a huge volume (nearly 800 pages) entitled *Einleitung in die griechische Philologie*,[1] which was the companion piece to the massive *Einleitung in die lateinische Philologie*, appeared a few months earlier in 1997.

It is interesting to note that the title of both volumes translate to *An Introduction to the Greek* (*and Latin*) *Textual Criticism*, and it is even more compelling, though, to note that these volumes, far from being a mere introduction to classical textual criticism, are a proper introduction to each and all aspects of the Greek and Latin culture.

So what does this title mean? This title is based on the assumption that "a student of philology must be a student of *Altertumswissenschaft*, 'the science of antiquity', a term invented by German scholars of the nineteenth century to describe the study, conceived as a unity, of everything connected with the ancient world".[2] Or, to use the words of the German classical scholar and teacher Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1848–1931), "The nature of classical scholarship [...] is defined by its

[1] Heinz-Günther Nesselrath, ed., *Einleitung in die griechische Philologie* (Stuttgart, Leipzig: Teubner, 1997).

[2] Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *History of Classical Scholarship. Edited with introduction and notes by Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (trans. Alan Harris; Stuttgart: Teubner, 1921; repr., London: Duckworth, 1982) (H. Lloyd-Jones' introduction, vii–viii).

subject-matter: Graeco-Roman civilisation in its essence and in every facet of its existence [. . .] Because the life we strive to fathom is a single whole, our science too is a single whole."[3]

2. Higher and Lower in Biblical Studies

In Biblical studies, a diametrically opposed situation occurs. In fact, we are often faced with a number of statements, some of them influential and authoritative, against the need of a sound and clear-cut philological approach to the text of the Bible. It is not by chance that, only in this field, a distinction between a "lower" and a "higher" criticism is found.

A cursory check of the treatment devoted to textual criticism in three recent major introductions to the Literature of the Old Testament produces the following results: The German *Grundinformation Altes Testament*[4] (about 600 pages) does not spend one single word on textual criticism; one page out of about 700 is devoted to textual criticism in the French *Introduction à l'Ancien Testament*, edited by Thomas Römer;[5] a better situation (two pages!) is found in the massive *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*,[6] whose chapter devoted to textual criticism opens up with a lapidary preventive attack against what should be the main aim of the subject matter: "In the third millennium the aim of textual criticism neither need nor can be the establishing of the original text of the Scriptures." Which is, simply put, to give up without a fight. In fact, such a statement skips over a longstanding discussion, that is by no means closed,[7] sometimes even in the case of one single scholar's views.[8]

---

[3] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, History of classical scholarship, 1.

[4] Jan Christian Gertz, ed., *Grundinformation Altes Testament. Eine Einführung in Literatur, Religion und Geschichte des Alten Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006).

[5] Thomas Römer, ed., *Introduction à l'Ancien Testament* (Genève: Labor et fides, 2004), 45.

[6] James D. G. Dunn and John Rogerson, eds., *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003).

[7] See, for example, Eibert Tigchelaar, "Editing the Hebrew Bible: An Overview of Some Problems," in *Editing the Bible: Assessing the Task Past and Present* (ed. John S. Kloppenborg and Judith H. Newman; SBLRBS 69; Atlanta: SBL, 2012 forthcoming), that discusses, among other things, Ronald Hendel, "The Oxford Hebrew Bible: Prologue to a New Critical Edition," *VT* 58 (2008): 324–351; Sidnie White Crawford, Jan Joosten, and Eugene Ulrich, "Sample Editions of the Oxford Hebrew Bible: Deuteronomy 32:1–9, 1 Kings 11:1–8, and Jeremiah 27:1–10 (34 G)," *VT* 58 (2008): 352–66; for a thorough *status quaestionis* see the classic work by Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2d ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 2001), 165–180 at 180: "textual criticism attempts to reconstruct details from both the preserved evidence and suggested emendations . . . in a textual entity (a tradition or single witness), which stood at the beginning of the textual transmission stage."

[8] A case in point is Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999). In this major collection of articles, the author

As an aside, it may be added that the distinction itself between a "lower" and "higher" criticism indicates a clear-cut scale of values, and not by chance it was first made explicitly by a biblical scholar, J. Eichhorn, who, as early as 1795, defined lower criticism as the "little sister" of higher criticism since it "simply deals with words".[9] As mentioned above, that distinction is unknown, as far as I know, to the textual criticism of any other literature, and it is to be hoped that George Brooke is right when he maintains that, thanks to the new canvas created by Qumran discoveries, "textual criticism is not seen as a complex preliminary to the literary analysis of texts but an indispensable part of such analysis when undertaken so that there is a holistic account of the evidence."[10]

3. The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls

This turns us to the Dead Sea discoveries that have been a turning point in our comprehension of the making of the text of the Hebrew Bible. As Eugene Ulrich pointed out: "[t]he more than two hundred biblical manuscripts discovered in the Judaean Desert fifty years ago have revolutionized our understanding of the Bible and the text of the Scriptures in antiquity".[11]

I would like to analyze a few cases taken from the Qumran evidence, from the point of view of the so-called "lower" criticism of the biblical text, to demonstrate how the Dead Sea manuscripts call our attention to a reappraisal of philology as an inescapable means of determining the text of the Bible. In fact, in spite of any theoretical and programmatic stands against "eclectic" editions, those editions stand behind most modern translations.

In this quick survey, the problem of determinig the "best" option will not be addressed. Leaving aside the fact that, from a text critical point

---

declares his approval of the possibility of getting the "original text" on p. 279 (a 1985 article) and refuses it in a more recent article (1997, pp. 14–16).

[9] Johan Eichhorn, "Über Mosis Nachrichten von der Noachischen Fluth," *Repertorium für biblische und morgenländische Litteratur* 5 (1779): 185–217 at 187.

[10] George J. Brooke, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Demise of the Distinction Between Higher and Lower Criticism," in *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8–10 September 2003* (ed. Jonathan G. Campbell et al.; London: T&T Clark, 2005), 26–42 at 41. In light of the examples given above, Brooke's statement sounds rather optimistic.

[11] Eugene Ulrich, "The Scrolls and the Study of the Hebrew Bible," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty. Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings* (ed. Robert A. Kugler and Eileen Schuller; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 31–41 at 31.

of view, "best" reading is a rather naive concept,[12] the focus of the argument will concentrate on the inner contradiction of a widespread distrust toward the possibility of getting an "original" text and the many "original" texts implicitly created by different translations. In this regard, we should praise the consistency of Emanuel Tov's recent proposal of exactly translating the text handed down by the St. Petersburg manuscript B19a.[13]

4. Some Examples of Lower Criticism

(1) To begin with, a simple case of metathesis (transposition of sounds). Deut 31:1 reads in MT:

וַיֵּלֶךְ מֹשֶׁה וַיְדַבֵּר אֶת־הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה אֶל־כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל

The NIV translates as follows:

> And Moses went [וַיֵּלֶךְ] and spoke these words

The same verse is a bit different in the LXX:

> καὶ συνετέλεσεν Μωυσῆς λαλῶν πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτους πρὸς πάντας υἱοὺς Ισραηλ
>
> And Moses finished speaking these words . . .

The Vorlage of the LXX readings is to be found in 1Q5 (1QDeut^{b}) 13 ii 4:[14]

ויכל משה לדבר את כל הד[ברים האלה אל כל ישראל]

---

[12] It is worth noting that from a text critical point of view only errors may help reconstructing the history of a given text. "Best" readings are of no help: "errors arising in the course of transcription are of decisive significance in the study of the interrelationships of manuscripts" (Paul Maas, *Textual Criticism* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1958], 42). This concept has entered biblical studies thanks to Paolo Sacchi, "Il Rotolo A di Isaia. Problemi di storia del testo," *Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere 'La Colombaria'* 30 (1965), 31–111; see also Bruno Chiesa, "Textual History and Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Old Testament," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March, 1991* (ed. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 257–72. Following Chiesa's conclusions, F. M. Cross has recognized the importance of "bad genes" to detect manuscripts' filiation, see Frank M. Cross, "Some Notes on a Generation of Qumran Studies," ibid., 1–14 at 7.

[13] Emanuel Tov, "Textual Basis of Modern Translations," *Text* 20 (2000): 193–211.

[14] Dominique Barthélemy and Józef T. Milik, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I* (DSD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), 57–62.

Here we find ויכל, that is equivalent to LXX's συνετέλεσεν. But what is more interesting for the present paper is that this variant is to be found in the NRSV translation too:

> When Moses had finished speaking all these words to all Israel

It is clear that we are faced with different translations based on different *Vorlagen*.

(2) Quite different is the case of a pre-Qumran scholar's conjectural emendation which is confirmed by a Qumran reading. Let's read 1 Sam 1:23 in the MT:

> וַיֹּאמֶר לָהּ אֶלְקָנָה אִישָׁהּ עֲשִׂי הַטּוֹב בְּעֵינַיִךְ שְׁבִי עַד־גָּמְלֵךְ אֹתוֹ אַךְ יָקֵם יְהוָה אֶת־דְּבָרוֹ וַתֵּשֶׁב הָאִשָּׁה וַתֵּינֶק אֶת־בְּנָהּ עַד־גָמְלָהּ אֹתוֹ

> Her husband Elkanah said to her, "Do what seems best to you, wait until you have weaned him; only—may the LORD establish his word." So the woman remained and nursed her son, until she weaned him. (NRSV)

In the LXX, a variant reading is found:

> καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Ελκανα ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς ποίει τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου κάθου ἕως ἂν ἀπογαλακτίσῃς αὐτό ἀλλὰ στῆσαι κύριος τὸ ἐξελθὸν ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἐθήλασεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς ἕως ἂν ἀπογαλακτίσῃ αὐτόν

> And her husband Elkana said to her: "Do what is good in your sight; stay until you have weaned him; only may the Lord establish that which goes out of your mouth." And the woman remained and nursed her son until she weaned him. (NETS)

Owing to the problematic masculine suffix pronoun in אַךְ יָקֵם יְהוָה אֶת־דְּבָרוֹ, as early as 1842, Otto Thenius in the first edition of his *Die Bücher Samuelis*[15] proposed the emendation היוצא מפיך that is equivalent to the LXX's τὸ ἐξελθὸν ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου ("that which goes out of your mouth").[16]

---

[15] Cfr. Otto Thenius, *Die Bücher Samuels* (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1842), ad loc.

[16] On this and other passages from 4QSam^a see Alessandro Catastini, "Su alcune varianti qumraniche nel testo di Samuele," *Hen* 2 (1980): 267–83; idem, "4QSam^a: I. Samuele il 'Nazireo'," *Hen* 9 (1987): 161–95; idem, "4QSam^a: II. Nahash il 'Serpente,'" *Hen* 10 (1988): 17–49; idem, "Ancora sul nazireato di Samuele: 4QSam^a," *Egitto e Vicino Oriente* 14–15 (1991–1992): 155–58; see now Frank Moore Cross et al., *Qumran Cave 4 XII: 1–2 Samuel* (DJD 17; Oxford: Clarendon, 2005).

Thenius' emendation has been confirmed by 4QSam[a], that reads as follows (4Q51 2a–d 4–6):

4 [ויאמר לה אלקנה אישה] עשי הטוב בעיניך שבי עד 5 [גמלך אותו אך
יקם יהו]ה היוצא מפיך ותשב האשה 6 [ותינק את בנה עד גמלה א]ותו

4 [Elkanah her husband said to her,] "Do what seems good to you. Wait until 5 [you have weaned him. May the LOR]D [establish] the words of your mouth." So the woman waited 6 [and nursed her son until she weaned] him.[17]

It is worth noting that, more recently, Ralph Klein has accepted this reading in his commentary on 1 Samuel where the passage is translated "[m]ay Yahweh bring to pass what you have said". In fact it is clear from the context that Elkanah wants Yahweh to fulfill Hannah's vow.[18]

Excursus: Who's Afraid of Conjectural Emendation? With Some Observations on the Codex Optimus

As for conjectural emendations we must admit that our predecessors were much braver than we are[19] if the recent *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* explicitly affirms to print the text of the Leningrad manuscript "even when this shows obvious errors."[20]

In the case analyzed above, Qumran evidence has confirmed Thenius' conjecture, and fortune favors the brave. But my question is, would we have the right to dismiss this conjecture *only* for want of such evidence? To put it in other words, have we the right to dismiss conjectural emendation in principle?[21]

---

[17] Trans. Martin G. Abegg et al., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999).

[18] Ralph W. Klein, *1 Samuel* (WBC 10; Nashville: Nelson, 1983).

[19] See for example Felix Perles, *Analekten zur Textkritik des Alten Testaments* (München: Ackermann, 1895), 1: "machte sich . . . das Bedürfnis geltend, einen möghlichst authentischen Text herzustellen, auf dessen Grundlage die neuen Thesen teils erfolgreicher verteidigt, teils sicherer widerlegt werden sollten".

[20] *Biblia Hebraica Quinta: First Fascicle, General Introduction and Megilloth* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004), x; on this topic see Pier Giorgio Borbone, "Prospettive recenti di ecdotica biblica: l'edizione 'Quinta' dell'Antico Testamento ebraico e il progetto 'Oxford Hebrew Bible,'" *Materia giudaica* 6 (2001): 28–35.

[21] On this topic in New Testament studies see the brilliant article by John Strugnell, "A Plea for Conjectural Emendation in the New Testament, with a Coda on 1 Cor 4:6," *CBQ* 36 (1974): 543–58; see also Günther Zuntz, "The Critic Correcting the Author," *Phil* 99 (1955): 295–303, on the critic's right to emend an error to be found in the archetype (on 1 Cor 6:5); on rabbinic literature, see Piero Capelli, "Sullo status quaestionis nella ricerca sulla 'letteratura' rabbinica," *Hen* 13 (1991): 349–63; more recently on the same subject, see Chaim Milikowsky, "Reflections on the Practice of Textual Criticism in the Study of

As the passage from the Introduction to the *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* mentioned above attests, conjectural emendation is not well-thought-of these days. This negative attitude has a long history[22] and has been well theorized in the first volume of D. Barthélemy's *Critique textuelle de l'Ancient Testament*,[23] where we read that the so-called *Textus Receptus* is to be preferred to "un texte conjectural qui a des chances d'être littérairement exact, mais dont nous ne possédons aucun indice qu'il ait fonctionné comme Écriture Sainte."[24] From a theological point of view, this is a perfectly legitimate assumption, but theology is not the only possible point of view: textual criticism (and text critics) could be (should be?) interested, also, in texts that have never "functioned as sacred scripture", or in texts that *could* have done so.

Over the past centuries, the wildest conjectural emendations have been put forward and have peacefully coexisted with the Ben-Hayyim text,[25] and a number of them have been confirmed by Qumran discoveries.[26] To be sure, conjectural emendation, like any human activity, entails risks and Barthélemy's assertion that a number of Houbigant's emendations have been uncritically handed down until today, though devoid of theoretical weight, is an opportune admonishment for text critics to be more careful.[27]

Midrash Aggada: the Legitimacy, the Indispensability and the Feasibility of Recovering and Presenting the (Most) Original Text," in *Current Trends in the Study of Midrash* (ed. Carol Bakhos; JSJSup 106; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 79–110.

[22] Cardinal Thomas Cajetan (1469–1534), as one might say, icastically expressed such an attitude toward the *Textus Receptus*: "si ego non intellexero, alius intelliget", *Liber Psalmorum ad verbum ex Hebreo versorum, per Thomam de Vio Caietanum, Sancti Christi Cardinalem ad literam accúratissime enarratus* (Apud Guillelmum de Bossozel: Parisiis 1539), I. See Paolo Sacchi, "Rassegna di studi di storia del testo del Vecchio Testamento ebraico," *Rivista di storia e letteratura religiosa* 2 (1966): 257–324.

[23] Dominique Barthélemy, ed., *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament: Josué, Juges, Ruth, Samuel, Rois, Chroniques, Esdras, Néhémie, Esther* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).

[24] Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle*, 77.

[25] E.g., the monumental work by Charles François Houbigant, *Biblia hebraica cum notis criticis et versione latinâ ad notas criticas factâ; accedunt libri græci qui deutero-canonici vocantur in tres classes distributi* (4 vols., folio, Paris, 1753–54), see also Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 356.

[26] An updating of the striking list given by Godfrey Rolles Driver, "Hebrew Scrolls," *JThS* 2 (1951): 17–30, esp. 25–27, might be interesting.

[27] See Pier Giorgio Borbone, "La critica del testo e l'Antico Testamento ebraico. A proposito di un libro recente," *RSLR* 20 (1984): 251–74; See also Strugnell's caveat against "those who exhort us to use care in our conjecturing, without ever, for all their renowned care, making one conjectural suggestion themselves", Strugnell, "A Plea for Conjectural Emendation," 554.

The fact that in relatively recent years one single manuscript has been chosen as the best should not necessarily force biblical scholars to clutch at straws to defend its many untenable readings, and it is worth noting Harry M. Orlinsky's judgment on the Aleppo, Leningrad and Or 2626–27–28 biblical manuscripts:

> It cannot be emphasized too strongly that none of these manuscripts or of the printed editions based on them has any greater merit or "masoretic" authority than most of the many editions of the Bible, than, say, the van der Hooght, Hahn, Letteris, Baer, Rabbinic and Ginsburg bibles.[28]

On the other hand it is undeniable that, if the result of a critical edition of a given text is (or can be) arbitrary, the choice of the best manuscript is no less arbitrary[29] and, it goes without saying, entails "an inevitable subjective element".[30]

In a recent article[31] published in a volume honoring Adrian Schenker, Natalio Fernández Marcos maintains that if it is undeniable that B19a is a medieval manuscript, then it would have, in principle, little or no right to be put at the beginning of text-critical inquiry. On the other hand "Qumran discoveries . . . have reinforced the value of M[asoretic Text]."[32] To substantiate his assumption, Fernández quotes a study by Emanuel Tov[33] where we read that "fifty-two per cent of the Qumran biblical texts in the Torah, and forty-four per cent in the other books are Proto-Masoretic, while four and a half per cent in the Torah and three per cent in the other books are close to the presumed Vorlage of G".[34] It may be interesting to take a closer look at Tov's statistics summarized by Fernández. Among

---

[28] See Harry M. Orlinsky, "The Septuagint and its Hebrew Text," in *The Hellenistic Age* (ed. William D. Davies and Louis Finkelstein; vol. 2 of The Cambridge History of Judaism; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 534–62 at 557. The mistake of treating the *codex optimus* as if it were the *codex unicus* (cmp. Paul Maas, *Textual Criticism* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1958], 19) is not so rare in Biblical studies.

[29] Michele Barbi, La nuova filologia e l'edizione dei nostri scrittori da Dante al Manzoni (Firenze: Sansoni, 1938), xxiii; see also Paola Pugliatti, "Textual Perspectives in Italy: From Pasquali's Historicism to the Challenge of 'Variantistica' (And Beyond)," *Text* 11 (1998): 155–88.

[30] Hugh G. M. Williamson, "Do We Need A New Bible? Reflections on the Proposed Oxford Hebrew Bible," *Bib* 90 (2009): 153–75 at 171.

[31] Natalio Fernández Marcos, "The Genuine Text of Judges," in *Sôfer Mahîr: Essays in Honour of Adrian Schenker Offered by Editors of Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (ed. Yohanan A. P. Goldman et al.; VTSup 110; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 33–45 at 42.

[32] Ibid.

[33] Emanuel Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert: An Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov; London: British Library, 2002), 128–54.

[34] Fernández Marcos, "The Genuine Text of Judges," 42 n. 22.

the biblical manuscripts labelled as proto-masoretic (or proto-rabbinic) by Tov, we find 4QProv^{b} (4Q103), a text published by Patrick W. Skehan and Eugene Ulrich in DJD 16,[35] in which at least two variants are found, one in agreement with the LXX, one unique, namely:

4Q103 5–7 i+8 4
[צדקה]תרומם גוי [[ ]] וחסר לאמים[חטאת]

and

4Q103 7 ii+11 10
[לב] צדיק לענות [[ ]] ופי רשעים יבֻ[יע רעות]

In line 4 of 4Q103 5–7 i+8 (Prov 14:34) the reading וחסר is in agreement with LXX's ἐλασσονοῦσι δε as against MT's וְחֶסֶד, a reading conjectured by Johann Gottlob Jäger as early as 1788.[36]

In 4Q103 7 ii+11 10 (Prov 15:28) the scroll implies MT's יהגה, an interesting possible case of *lectio difficilior* unattested elsewhere.

A further interesting example is found in 1QIsa^{b}, often labelled as the protomasoretic biblical manuscript from Qumran *par excellence*.[37] Ironically, this manuscript presents one of the most intriguing and debated variant readings of the whole Qumran corpus in Is 53:11,[38] where we find (1QIsa^{b} XXIII 22): [מעמל נפשו יראה אור ישׂ]בע בדעתו against MT's מֵעֲמַל נַפְשׁוֹ יִרְאֶה יִשְׂבָּע בְּדַעְתּוֹ and in agreement with LXX as well as with 1QIsa^{a} and 4QIsa^{d}. As a working hypothesis we may assume that such a reading should suffice to create an exclusive relationship among its witnesses, in virtue of which 1QIsa^{b} should no longer be counted as a protomasoretic text. Moreover, it would seem that a careful analysis and measurement of the manuscript's lacunae allow the foreseeing of a text much shorter than the MT.[39]

---

[35] E. Ulrich et al., DJD 16:183–86.

[36] Johann Gottlob Jäger, *Observationes in Proverbiorum Salomonis versionem Alexandrinam* (Meldorf und Leipzig: Boie, 1788).

[37] See, e.g., Peter W. Flint and Eugene Ulrich, *Qumran Cave 1.II: The Isaiah Scrolls* (DJD 32; Oxford: Clarendon, 2009), 211: "[i]n general, 1QIsa^{b} has from its first publication been correctly assessed as textually close to the Masoretic tradition"; Flint and Ulrich go on to say "even if now the differences between them also require more precise appreciation" (ibid.). Besides Eugene Ulrich, "Isaiah, Book of," *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1:385 some ten years ago warned us that the text of 1QIsa^{b} "is closely allied with the tradition transmitted in the Masoretic Text, but not quite as closely as is commonly described".

[38] See the classic study by Isac Leo Seeligmann, "ΔΕΙΞΑΙ ΑΥΤΩΙ ΦΩΣ," *Tarbiz* 27 (1958): 127–41 [Hebrew].

[39] See Giovanni Garbini, "1Q Isa^{b} et le texte d'Ésaïe," *Hen* 6 (1984): 17–21. See *contra* Dominique Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament, Volume 3, Ezechiel, Daniel et les 12 Prophètes* (Fribourg: Academic Press, 1992) 24–36. Neither studies are discussed in

Thus, a random checking of "premasoretic" biblical manuscripts may offer some interesting matters of discussion. As a matter of fact, Tov[40] affirms that "textual identity [with M] is spotted only for the texts from the other sites in the Judaean Desert". Moreover, Tov fairly warns us that "this calculation is based on the *probability* that most of the texts that are equally close to both SP and MT and equally close to MT and LXX should be counted as MT texts",[41] and implicitly assumes that such texts could also be counted as LXX or, for that matter, SP texts. In this case statistics would be different and, most probably, conclusions on the value of Masoretic text drawn from such statistics would also be different. Thus, even though R. Hanhart maintains that

> [d]ie masoretisch überlieferte hebräische Textform ist als Kriterium der Textform der griechischen Übersetzung die konstante, eine vor der masoretischen abweichende Textform die variabile Grösse

Hanhart knows well that there are a number of exceptions to the above assertion and he goes on to say that "Ausnahmen . . . bestätigen nur die Regel":[42] we should remember, though, that any exception just *disproves* the rule.[43]

Besides, it is worth noting that the highly fortuitous circumstances of the Qumran discoveries makes statistics relatively unreliable. One single example of virtual textual criticism[44] may help clarify the point. If we would find in one of the caves from Qumran the following couple of fragments, penned by the same hand:

---

the recent study by Peter W. Flint, "Variant Readings and Textual Affiliation in the Hebrew University Isaiah Scroll from Qumran (1QIsa^b)," in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Sixth Meeting of the IOQS in Ljubljana* (ed. Daniel K. Falk et al.; STDJ 91; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 33–53, where, at 51, we read nonetheless "the evidence and sharper focus in this essay suggests that 1QIsa^b may not be as close to the medieval MT as has been assumed."

[40] Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert," 155.

[41] Ibid., 163, n. 68, italics mine.

[42] Robert Hanhart, "Zum gegenwärtigen Stand der Septuagintaforschung," in *De Septuaginta. Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. Albert Pietersma and Claude Cox; Mississauga, Ont.: Benben, 1984), 3–18 at 10.

[43] See Carl Cohen and Irving M. Copi, *Introduction to Logic* (New York: Macmillan, 1990), 434.

[44] See J. Cheryl Exum, ed., *Virtual History and the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 3: "[o]ne of the real benefits of considering counterfactuals is that it teaches us about reasoning historically. Virtual History . . . is not just about what might have happened; it is about how biblical historians work to synthesize and evaluate evidence, posit theories, and test historical reconstructions."

Frg. 1

1 לכן אשוב ולקחתי דגני בעתו ותירושי[במועדו]
2 והצלתי צמרי ופישתי מלכסות את[ערותה]
3 ועתה אגלה את נבלותה לעיני מאה[ביה ואיש]
4 לוא יצילנה מידי *vacat* [ ]

Frg. 2

1 [...]והשבתי כול משושה
2 ח[גה חד]שה ושבתה וכול מועדיה

we would have no doubt to label these two fragments as a "protomasoretic" biblical manuscript of Hosea, with just one single variant reading in frg. 1 2 (מלכסות || לְכַסּוֹת). In this case, though, fate has been generous enough to let us know that this text is not a "biblical" manuscript, but is part of a "nonbiblical" manuscript, namely the *pesher* to Hosea (4Q166 II 8–11).

Thus, the concept itself of "biblical" manuscript on which this kinds of statistics are based would require widening. As it has been justly pointed out: "if we try to achieve a historical perspective on the text of the Bible, the first step is not talk about a Bible. The word Bible evokes the image of a unified book, a codex, a unit, a collected anthology; but this was not the case in the late Second Temple period".[45] In this regard, the distinction between "biblical" and "nonbiblical" manuscripts is likely to create more problems than it would solve. How can "biblical" manuscripts exist without a Bible?[46]

---

[45] Eugene Ulrich, "Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups and the Question of Canon," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (ed. Eugene Ulrich; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999), 79–98 at 89; see also George J. Brooke, "'E Pluribus Unum'; Textual Variety and Definitive Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. Timothy H. Lim et al.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 107–19 at 107 n. 1: "the term biblical is commonly understood to refer to a definitive collection of authoritative works in a single text type. As such the term 'biblical' is somewhat anachronistic when applied to the Scrolls found at Qumran, since . . . the precise form and content of the community's canon is not known"; see also Johann Maier, "Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Literature," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation* (ed. Magnes Saebø; 3 vols.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 1:108–29.

[46] See Adam S. van der Woude, *Pluriformiteit en uniformiteit. Overwegingen betreffende de tekstoverlevering van het Oude Testament* (Kampen: Kok, 1992), 18: "Een uniforme tekstoverlevering wordt echter noodzakelijk als het beroep op actuele goddelijke inspiratie vervalt en men in de Schrift vroegere profetische inspiratie wil vasthouden, met andere woorden wanneer het gezag buiten de Schrift naar de Schrift zelf verlegd wordt"; see also Corrado Martone, "Biblical or Not Biblical? Some Doubts and Questions," *RevQ* 21/83 (2004): 387–94; John C. Reeves, "Problematizing the Bible . . . Then and Now," *JQR* 100 (2010): 139–52.

Bertil Albrektson has written a seminal, though rather neglected, study[47] that calls for a sane and sensible use of conjectural emendation. In this study, Albrektson focuses on the reuse of a well known text-critical rule called *difficilior lectio probabilior* from the field of classical scholarship to the field of biblical studies. Albrektson has demonstrated that, in biblical studies, this rule is intended as a passe-partout to always legitimate the Masoretic Text, and to avoid conjectural emendation even when the text is clearly and desperately corrupt. In this regard, Albrektson's call for an approach to the biblical text "as free as possible from all ideological bonds"[48] is topical now more than ever.

The necessity of conjectural emendation is also the main point of a recent study by Alexander Rofé, who justly remarked that since sources at our disposal are late or tendentious or fragmentary or indirect "[c]onjecture . . . is permissible and even necessary in every branch of historical science."[49] Conjectural emendations, we may add, are of vital importance to historians. In fact, if the text of a historical source is corrupt, it is self-evident that the resulting historical information will be corrupt[50] and on this matter it is not necessary to point out that, to a very great extent, the Bible is our only source for the history of ancient Israel.[51]

In this regard it is interesting to remember Paul Maas' wise words, which by no cogent reason have been restricted to classical philology only:[52]

---

[47] Bertil Albrektson, "Difficilior Lectio Probabilior: A Rule of Textual Criticism and Its Use in Old Testament Studies," *OtSt* 21 (1981): 3–18, now in Bertil Albrektson, *Text, Translation, Theology: Selected Essays on the Hebrew Bible* (Burlington: Ashgate, 2010), 73–86.

[48] Albrektson, "Difficilior lectio probabilior," 85.

[49] Alexander Rofé, "The History of Israelite Religion and the Biblical Text: Corrections Due to the Unification of Worship," in *Emanuel, Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. Shalom M. Paul et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 759–793 at 760. It might be added that oddly enough even the sharper adversaries of conjectural emendation have no problem to fill the lacunae of Qumran biblical manuscripts on the basis of conjecture, see Martone, "Biblical or Not Biblical," 388.

[50] Hermann Bengtson, *Introduction to Ancient History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), 162: "[t]he historian must have learned not only to read the ancient sources, but also to interpret them, and to do that he must have a thorough training in the methods of classical philology."

[51] See James Barr, *History and Ideology in the Old Testament. Biblical Studies at the End of a Millennium. The Hensley Henson Lectures for 1997 delivered to the University of Oxford* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 18: "[h]istory of Israel, as thus written, whether in the more conservative style of John Bright or in the somewhat more critical one of Martin Noth, was still very much tied to the Bible and its picture of historical reality"; see also John J. Collins, *The Bible After Babel: Historical Criticism in a Postmodern Age* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), 27–51.

[52] Maas, *Textual Criticism*, 17.

> We may just mention the passing aberration of the school which opposed all conjectural criticism on principle. Of course it is far more dangerous for a corruption to pass unrecognized than for a sound text to be unjustifiably attacked. For as every conjecture provokes refutation, this at all events advances our understanding of the passage, and only the best conjectures will win acceptance; on the other hand, the unnoticed corruption damages our total impression of the style, and anyone who fails to recognize a right conjecture lays himself open to the reproach of ingratitude, if not of envy. Anyone who is afraid of giving an uncertain text had best confine himself to dealing with autograph manuscripts.

(3) Another example from 4QSam[a] is very interesting. 1 Samuel 10:27 is attested in MT as follows:[53]

וּבְנֵי בְלִיַּעַל אָמְרוּ מַה־יֹּשִׁעֵנוּ זֶה וַיִּבְזֻהוּ וְלֹא־הֵבִיאוּ לוֹ מִנְחָה וַיְהִי כְּמַחֲרִישׁ

this verse is translated in the New International Version (1978) as follows:

> But some troublemakers said, "How can this fellow save us?" They despised him and brought him no gifts. But Saul kept silent.

and in the Revised Standard Version (1952) as follows:

> But some worthless fellows said, "How can this man save us?" And they despised him, and brought him no present. But he held his peace.

In the 1989 New Revised Standard Version, however, the same verse is different:

> But some worthless fellows said, "How can this man save us?" They despised him and brought him no present. But he held his peace. Now Nahash, king of the Ammonites, had been grievously oppressing the Gadites and the Reubenites. He would gouge out the right eye of each of them and would not grant Israel a deliverer. No one was left of the Israelites across the Jordan whose right eye Nahash, king of the Ammonites, had not gouged out. But there were seven thousand men who had escaped from the Ammonites and had entered Jabesh-Gilead.

It is clear that this latter translation is based on the text of 4QSam[a], first published by F. M. Cross in the 1950s (4Q51 10a 4–8):[54]

---

[53] On this passage see the pioneering study Catastini, "4QSam[a]: II".

[54] Frank Moore Cross, "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," *BASOR* 132 (1953): 15–26; idem, "The Ammonite Oppression of the Tribes of Gad and Reuben: Missing Verses from 1 Samuel 11 Found in 4QSamuel[a]," in *History, Historiography and Interpretation: Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Literature* (ed. Haim Tadmor and Moshe Weinfeld; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1983), 148–58.

4 ובני הבליעל א[מרו]מ[ה יושיענו] 5 [זה וי]בזוהו ולוא הביאו לו מנחה [[ ]]
[ ] 6 [ונ]חש מלך בני עמון הוא לחץ את בני גד ואת בני ראובן בחזקה
ונקר להם כ[ול] 7 [ע]ין ימין ונתן אין [מושי]ע ל[י]שראל ולוא נשאר איש
בבני ישראל אשר בע[בר הירדן] 8 [אש]ר ל[וא נ]קר לו נח[ש מלך] בני
[ע]מון כול עין ימין ו[ה]ז שבעת אלפים איש

But certain worthless men s[aid, "How will this man save us? And] they despise[d] him and brought him no gift. 6 [. . .] [Na]hash king of the [A]mmonites oppressed the Gadites and the Reubenites viciously. He put out the right [ey]e of a[ll] of them 7 and brought fe[ar and trembling] on [Is]rael. Not one of the Israelites in the region be[yond the Jordan] remained 8 [whose] right eye Naha[sh king of] the Ammonites did n[ot pu]t out, except seven thousand men [who escaped from] the Ammonites. (trans. Abegg et al.)

As is well known, in this case the situation is complicated by the fact that this passage is missing from any other biblical source passed down to us, but it is known to Josephus. So we may infer that it was found in the biblical text used by the historian.[55] Moreover, it is interesting to note that line 9 of this fragment begins with the words ויהי כמו חדש, that is in agreement with the LXX's ὡς μετὰ μῆνα as against MT's כְּמַחֲרִישׁ, and that confirms H. P. Smith's conjectural emendation in his commentary on Samuel appeared in 1904.[56] A further proof that conjectural emendation is not only legitimate but also necessary to Biblical studies.

(4) Another interesting case is found in 1QIsa[a]. Isaiah 37:28 is attested in the MT as follows:

וְשִׁבְתְּךָ֙ וְצֵאתְךָ֔ וּבוֹאֲךָ֖ יָדָ֑עְתִּי וְאֶ֥ת הִתְרַגִּזְךָ֖ אֵלָֽי

And here are a couple of English translations:

I know your rising up and your sitting down, your going out and coming in, and your raging against me. (NRSV)

But whether you stand up or sit down, whether you go out or come in, I know it (and how you rave against me). (NJB)

---

55 Suffice it to mention here the classic work by Eugene Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (Harvard: Harvard Semitic Museum, 1978).

56 Henry P. Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904), 87; see also Catastini, "4QSam[a]: II," 24–30.

As a matter of fact, these two translations do not translate the MT but the 1QIsa[a] variant reading (1QIsa[a] XXXI 6–7):

6 קומכה ושבתכה וצאתכה ובואכה 7 ידעתיא ואת הרגזכה אלי

Even more interesting is the fact that both translations translate 1QIsa[a] even in the parallel passage 2 Kgs 19:27:

> But I know your rising and your sitting, your going out and coming in, and your raging against me. (NRSV)
>
> But whether you stand up or you sit down, whether you go out or you come in, I know it. (NJB)

Even if the MT of 2 Kings passage is in accordance with the MT of Isaiah:

וְשִׁבְתְּךָ וְצֵאתְךָ וּבֹאֲךָ יָדָֽעְתִּי וְאֶת הִתְרַגֶּזְךָ אֵלָֽי

(5) The great Isaiah scroll was defined as protomasoretic as early as 1948, when M. Burrows wrote that it "agrees with the Masoretic text to a remarkable degree . . . in wording. Herein lies its chief importance, supporting the fidelity of the Masoretic tradition."[57]

Even so, a number of this scroll's variant readings have entered a number of Bible translations, and I am going to quote just another one here:

Isaiah 49:17 runs as follows according to the MT:

מָֽהֲרוּ בָנָֽיִךְ מְהָרְסַיִךְ וּמַחֲרֵבַיִךְ מִמֵּךְ יֵצֵֽאוּ׃

This passage is translated by the JPS as follows:

> Thy children make haste; thy destroyers and they that made thee waste shall go forth from thee.

But it is different in the NRS' translation:

> Your builders outdo your destroyers, and those who laid you waste go away from you.

which, again, is translating the reading found in 1QIsa[a] (XLI 16):

מהרו בוניך מהורסיך ומחריביך ממך יצאו

> Your builders are working faster than your destroyers, and those who devastated you will depart from you. (trans. Abegg et al.)

---

[57] Millar Burrows, "Variant Readings in the Isaiah Manuscript," *BASOR* 111 (1948): 16–24; see the comments of Sacchi, "Il Rotolo A di Isaia".

(6) As a last example, I would like to quote Hab 1:17 in the MT:

הַעַל כֵּן יָרִיק חֶרְמּוֹ וְתָמֵיד לַהֲרֹג גּוֹיִם לְאׇ יַחְמֹוֹל

And this is the NAB translation of the verse:

> Shall he, then, keep on brandishing his sword to slay peoples without mercy?

The innocent reader might legitimately ask: Why does the NAB translate as "sword" the term חרם, which means "net"? In this case, the NAB is not based on any "biblical" manuscript from Qumran, but on the Habakkuk verse as quoted in 1QpHab 6:8–9;

על כן יריק חרבו תמיד להרוג גוים ולוא יחמל...

where the word חרב ("sword") is attested instead of חרם and the *pesher* comments on the verse on the basis of this reading, 1QpHab 6:10:

> This refers to the Kittim who destroy many people with the *sword*...

5. Some Provisional Conclusions

The examples could be multiplied further,[58] but some provisional conclusions are in order.

A recent study dealing with these problems poses the question of whether we need a new Bible.[59] From these few examples, we have seen that some modern versions of the Bible translate some passages of the Hebrew Bible on the basis of the MT. Other versions translate the same passages on the basis of the Qumran evidence. From a certain point of view this is surely a widely known fact[60] but what is less patent is that so many translations are based on a text that is not available anywhere or,

---

[58] Bertil Albrektson, "Masoretic or Mixed: On Choosing a Textual Basis for a Translation of the Hebrew Bible," *Text* 23 (2007): 33–49.

[59] Williamson, "Do We Need A New Bible?" For a thorough confutation of Williamson's arguments see Ronald Hendel, "Reflections on a New Edition of the Hebrew Bible: A Reply to H. G. M. Williamson" (forthcoming, although already available on the internet, see e.g. http://ohb.berkeley.edu/Hendel, Reflections on a New Edition.pdf, last cited February 4, 2011). For a well-balanced evaluation of the main current editions of the Bible see Emanuel Tov, "Hebrew Scripture Editions: Philosophy and Praxis," in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* (ed. Florentino García Martínez et al.; STDJ 61; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 281–312.

[60] See, e.g., Harold Scanlin, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Modern Translations of the Old Testament* (Wheaton: Tyndale House, 1993).

one would dare say, on a text which does not exist as such. All the more so if we bear in mind that

> it is only the Hebrew books (not even their order beyond the Torah, i.e., the order of the books that came to constitute the Prophets and the Writings) that were canonized, not the Hebrew text of these books. The Hebrew text of the Bible was never canonized or fixed.[61]

This very fact legitimates the need to establish, if not the original text of the Scriptures, at least the text to be translated. And, simply put, the text to be translated is a critical, or as some improperly (and perhaps rather derogatorily) say, an "eclectic" edition of the Hebrew Bible.[62]

George Brooke[63] has written an interesting and well-argued essay against the need and possibility of getting an "original" text of the Bible, and discusses the necessity to "resist" eclectic editions. Nevertheless eclectic editions are already among us, though "disguised",[64] thus perhaps it is time they dig their way out to sunlight[65] since "[t]here can never be too many editions of any work because each one is part of the unending process of responding to the work".[66]

Obviously, that does not mean that it is in fact necessary, let alone beneficial, that every translation of the Hebrew Bible use the same text. This really means that each translation of the Bible should be able to

---

[61] Orlinsky, "The Septuagint and its Hebrew Text," 552, n. 1; see also Emanuel Tov, "The History and Significance of a Standard Text of the Hebrew Bible," in Saebø, *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament*, 1:49–66 at 64: "although there indeed existed the express wish not to insert any changes in the Masoretic texts, the reality was in fact paradoxically different, since the texts of the MT group themselves already differed one from the other. There thus existed a strong desire for textual unity and standardization, but this desire could not erase the differences already existing between the texts. The wish to preserve a unified textual tradition thus remained an abstract ideal which could not be accomplished in reality."

[62] On this topic see Bruno Chiesa, "La filologia della Bibbia ebraica: passato, presente, futuro," in *Convegno internazionale: I nuovi orizzonti della filologia. Ecdotica, critica testuale, editoria scientifica e mezzi informatici elettronici* (*Roma, 27–29 maggio 1998*) (ed. AA. VV. Roma: Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, 1999), 59–84.

[63] Brooke, "Qumran Scrolls and Demise," 38.

[64] The verb is used, *pour cause*, by Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 373.

[65] See the critical editions published by Pier Giorgio Borbone, *Il libro del profeta Osea. Edizione critica del testo ebraico* (Torino: Zamorani, 1990); Anthony Gelston, "Isaiah 52:13–53:12: An Eclectic Text and a Supplementary Note on the Hebrew Manuscript Kennicott 96," *JSS* 35 (1990): 187–211; Giovanni Garbini, *Cantico dei Cantici. Testo, traduzione e commento* (Brescia: Paideia, 1992); Alessandro Catastini, *Storia di Giuseppe: Genesi 37–50* (Venezia: Marsilio, 1994); Ronald Hendel, *The Text of Genesis 1–11. Textual Studies and Critical Edition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

[66] Thomas G. Tanselle, "Textual Criticism at the Millennium," *Studies in Bibliography* 54 (2001): 2–81 at 78.

mention which text has *really* been translated. In fact "[t]he reconstruction of elements in the assumed Ur-text . . . remains one of the aims of the textual critic, even if it is virtually impossible to determine what stage in the development of a given biblical book should be called the Ur-text."[67]

Finally, it is worth recalling the colophon of the famous Codex Cairensis (ca. 897 C.E.), warning us that

> whoever alters a word of this Mahzor or this writing or erases one letter or tears off one leaf . . . may we have neither pardon nor forgiveness, neither "let him behold the beauty of the Lord"

the same colophon, though, makes it clear that this should occur

> unless he understands and knows that there is a word in it in which we have erred in the writing or in the punctuation or in the Masora or in defective or in plene.[68]

---

[67] Emanuel Tov, "Textual Criticism," *ABD* 6:394; see also Emanuel Tov, "Criteria for Evaluating Textual Readings: The Limitations of Textual Rules," *HTR* 75 (1982): 429–48 at 432: "The search for the original reading, subjective as it may be, remains a legitimate and necessary constituent of the textual comparison." On the same line also Arie van der Kooij, "Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible: Its Aim and Method," in Paul et al., *Emanuel*, 729–39; it is interesting to note that even the editors of the HUBP leave room for hope in their introduction to Ezekiel: "שחזור נוסח המקור אינו המטרה העליונה של מהדורה מדעית של המקרא", see Moshe H. Goshen Gottstein and Shemaryahu Talmon, eds., *The Book of Ezekiel* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2004), 11 (underlining mine).

[68] Trans. Paul Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (New York: Praager, 1959), 97–99.

THE HODAYOT'S USE OF THE PSALTER: TEXT-CRITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS (BOOK 4: PSS 90–106)

John Elwolde

This is the fourth in a series of studies, previous ones having covered Books 1–3 of the Psalms.[1] Some fifty short sequences from Book 1, twenty from Book 2, and eighteen from Book 3, which appear in a more or less identical form in the *Hodayot* manuscripts from Qumran caves 1 and 4, have so far been analysed for any light they might cast on the textual development of the Psalter. The texts discussed in this article, on Book 4, are the fourteen listed by Jean Carmignac[2] (Pss 90:8; 92:11; 94:19; 97:6; 98:2; 99:2; 102:6, 10, 29; 103:20; 104:4, 35; 106:7, 8), as well as two others discussed only by Preben Wernberg-Møller (Ps 94:21 and Ps 96:3).[3]

Ps 90:8 = 1QH^{a} 13:33–34 [5:31–32][4] + 4QH^{c} 3:4–5[5]

Ps 90:8(*Qere*):	שַׁתָּה עֲוֹנֹתֵינוּ לְנֶגְדֶּךָ עֲלֻמֵנוּ לִמְאוֹר פָּנֶיךָ׃
1QH^{a} 13:33–34 [5:31–32]:	כ̊י̊ ס̊בׄב̊ו̊נ̊י̊ בהוות לבם ויצרם הופיע לי למרורים ויחשך מאור פני לאפלה והודי נהפך למשחי̊ת̊[6]

[1] "The Hodayot's Use of the Psalter: Text-Critical Contributions (Book 1)," in *Psalms and Prayers: Papers Read at the Joint Meeting of the Society of Old Testament Study and Het Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap in Nederland en België, Apeldoorn August 2006* (ed. Bob Becking and Eric Peels; OtSt 55; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 79–108; "The *Hodayot*'s Use of the Psalter: Text-Critical Contributions (Book 2: Pss 42–72)," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures* (ed. Armin Lange et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 79–99; "The *Hodayot*'s Use of the Psalter: Text-critical Contributions (Book 3: Pss 73–89)," *DSD* 17 (2010): 159–79.

[2] Jean Carmignac, "Les citations de l'Ancien Testament, et spécialement des Poèmes du Serviteur dans les Hymnes de Qumran," *RevQ* 2/7 (1960): 357–94 at 376–77.

[3] Preben Wernberg-Møller, "The Contribution of the *Hodayot* to Biblical Textual Criticism," *Text* 4 (1964): 133–75 at 159, 168.

[4] Bracketed *Hodayot* references are to the edition of E. Sukenik, unbracketed ones follow the edition of H. Stegemann and E. Schuller in DJD 40. DSS (Dead Sea Scrolls) sequences have been extracted from M. Abegg's Accordance electronic edition and *Hodayot* texts adjusted where necessary to DJD 40. Targum texts have been taken from the Accordance module "based upon the electronic text of The Complete Aramaic Lexicon Project (CAL) of Hebrew Union College." Hebrew and Greek biblical texts have been extracted from the United Bible Societies' Paratext electronic editions, as have Syriac texts (based on the Leiden Peshitta Institute version).

[5] DJD 29:187–89.

[6] For the first three words "Sukenik mistakenly read] ○○נבׄ̊○○" (DJD 40:177). For the last word, Abegg's Accordance edition has למשחור; DJD 40:177: "[משחית is] most likely

Because this is the only occurrence of the expression מְאוֹר פָּנִים in MT,[7] emendation to לְמוֹ אוֹר (enclitic mem) was suggested by Dahood,[8] לְמוֹ[9] being parallel to לְ in the preceding bicolon.[10] Similar collocations with the noun אוֹר are well attested,[11] as are instances of פָּנִים as subject of the verb אוֹר "be light, shine"[12] or as object of הֵאִיר.[13] The Targum and, less clearly, LXX may be argued to treat מְאוֹר פָּנִים differently from אוֹר פָּנִים,[14] which might suggest that מְאוֹר is indeed original,[15] despite the absence of other direct textual witnesses.

---

the correct reading on the basis of Dan 10:8 והודי נהפך עלי למשחית ["my vigor was destroyed" (NJPS)] . . . The left foot of the *taw* is still visible and a noun משחור is otherwise unattested." The reading בהפך in DJD 40.168 is apparently a mistake (cf. DJD 40.343a, where נהפך is correctly found).

[7] Even though מְאוֹר occurs as often in MT as in the DSS (19 times in each).

[8] Mitchell J. Dahood, *Ugaritic-Hebrew Philology: Marginal Notes on Recent Publications* (2d repr. with minor corrections; BibOr 17; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1989; originally published 1965), 27; see *DCH* (David J. A. Clines, ed., *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* [Sheffield: 1992–]), 5:116b–117b.

[9] See also Job 27:14; 29:21; 38:40; 40:4 (*DCH* 4:552b).

[10] Limited support for such an emendation might come from fifth- and seventh-century Sahidic Psalters, which reflect instead of εἰς φωτισμόν, ἐνώπιον (used in the preceding bicolon) or ἐναντίον "before (your face)" (see Rahlfs's Göttingen edition).

[11] Pss 4:7; 44:4; 89:16; Job 29:24; Prov 16:15.

[12] Sir 13:26.

[13] *DCH* 1:161a includes the following references: Num 6:25; Pss 31:17; 67:2; 80:4, 8, 20; 119:135; Qoh 8:1; Dan 9:17; Sir 7:24; 32:11; 1QH^{a} 11:4 [3:3]; 12:6, 28 [4:5, 27]; 1QSb 4:27; 4Q375 (4QapocrMoses^{a}) 2 ii 8; 11Q14 (11QSefer ha-Milhamah) 1 ii 7.

[14] At Pss 4:7; 44:4; 89:16; Job 29:24; Prov 16:15, LXX renders consistently as φῶς, except at Ps 44:4, where it has φωτισμός, the noun used for מָאוֹר at Ps 90:8. In the three Psalms passages other than Ps 90:8, the Targum renders as נְהוֹר "light" followed by an additional construct noun—סְבַר "look, countenance" (see Jastrow, 2:952b; D. M. Stec, *The Targum of Psalms: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes* [ArBib 16; London: T&T Clark, 2004], 32 n. 12); or זִיו, in more or less the same sense (see Jastrow, 1:392b)—followed by the nomen rectum; at Ps 90:8, in contrast, נְהוֹר is followed directly by the nomen rectum: נהור אפייך. Stec, *Targum of Psalms*, 32 n. 12, on Ps 4:7, affirms that the additional noun "softens an anthropomorphic reference to the face of God." Thus, Ps 90:8 is aligned, whether consciously or not, with references to the *human* face, for which no such "softening" is required: Prov 16:15, נהורא דפרצופא דמלכא; Job 29:24, קלסתור אפיי "the brightness of my face" (see Jastrow, 2:1379b–1380a). Peshitta has ܓ ܐܝܩܪ followed by a noun for "face" in all six passages. Psalterium iuxta hebraeos has *lux* at Pss 4:7; 44:3; 90:8 (also at Job 29:24) and *lumen* at Ps 89:16; note also *hilaritas* at Prov 16:15.

[15] C. A. Briggs and E. G. Briggs, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1909), 2.277, comment that מְאוֹר פָּנֶיךָ is a phrasal hapax "in this sense; but cf. Pr. 15^{30} [מְאוֹר־עֵינַיִם יְשַׂמַּח־לֵב]; well suited to context in the sense of *luminary*, the face of God being cf. to the sun with its scorching heat; cf. Ps 74^{16} [אַתָּה הֵכַנְתָּ מָאוֹר וְשָׁמֶשׁ]"; A. A. Anderson, *The Book of Psalms* (NCB Commentary; 2 vols.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1972), 2:652: "the secret sins [עֲלֻמֵנוּ, for which Anderson reports the interpretations: 'our youth' (Briggs & Briggs, *Psalms*, 2:274, 277) and 'the sins of our youth' (Dahood)] are not concealed from God but they are, so to speak, before his very eyes. Cf. F. Nötscher, *Zur Theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte*

The immediate context of the *Hodayot* text is the suffering caused to the "servant" by the words of his opponents—(13:30 [5:28]) ותהי לכאוב אנוש ונגע נמאר בתכמי עבדכה—whereas that of the biblical text is of the mortality and sinfulness of humankind. In view of the sentence that follows in line 36 (l. 34)—כי עששו מכעס עיני ונפשי במרורי יום—and the repeated reference to מרורים (l. 34: הופיע לי למרורים), one wonders whether מאור פני here actually means "the luminary of my face," in reference to the eye(s). The fact that מאור פני is also immediately parallel to הודי[16] "my radiance"[17] suggests that the eyes here are understood not primarily as organs of vision but rather as elements that display or allow access to the character of their possessor. In the general biblical background to the text are numerous passages in which light and darkness are contrasted or in which light is made dark.[18]

Although מְאוֹר פָּנִים only occurs in these two passages, the suffix (and therefore the referent) differs, there are no other signs within the *Hodayot* text of dependency on the Psalms passage (only Delcor and Mansoor[19] follow Carmignac in noting it), and the context of the Psalms passage has little in common with that of the *Hodayot* one. Had we been able to argue for a relationship between the two passages, our *Hodayot* text could have been used in support of MT despite the versional evidence indicating that the biblical expression gave some difficulty to its early examiners. In this case, the evidence of the *Hodayot* would have been especially interesting as the Psalm in question is one of the few not otherwise attested in the various DSS Psalms scrolls.[20]

(1956), 100 f."; W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Psalms: Translated with Text-Critical and Exegetical Notes* (London: SPCK, 1959), 406: "We may seek to gloss over or to conceal the wrong that lies within us, but the very *face* of God is a *light*, a piercing sun, which reveals the blackest and most secret depths of the soul (v. 8)."

[16] See G. Roye Williams, "Parallelism in the Hodayot from Qumran" (Ph.D. diss., 2 vols., Annenberg Research Institute, 1991), 1:373.

[17] Thus Carol Newsom, in DJD 40:180, and Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Penguin, 1997), 270.

[18] E.g. Isa 5:30; Job 18:6; cf. Przemysław Dec, "Zwoje Hymnów Dziękczynnych znad Morza Martwego [*Megillôt hāHôdajôt*] 1QH^{a} [1QH^{b}/4Q427–4Q440]" (Ph.D. diss., Papal Theological Academy Krakow, 2004), 243 n. 692.

[19] Mathias Delcor, *Les Hymnes de Qumrân* (*Hodayot*)*: Texte hébreu—Introduction—Traduction—Commentaire* (Autour de la Bible; Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1962), 169; Menahem Mansoor, *The Thanksgiving Hymns Translated and Annotated with an Introduction* (STDJ 3; Leiden: Brill, 1961), 139 n. 13.

[20] See, e.g., Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 48 n. 140, 142 n. 21, and DJD 16:25.

Ps 92:11 = 1QH^{a} 15:25, 26–27 (7:22, 23–24)

Ps 92:11: וַתָּרֶם כִּרְאֵים קַרְנִי בַּלֹּתִי בְּשֶׁמֶן רַעֲנָן
1QH^{a} 15:25 (7:22): ותרם קרני על כול מנאצי
1QH^{a} 15:26–27 (7:23–24): עזרתה נפשי ותרם קרני למעלה והופעתי באוֹר שבעתים

Kittel argues that the repetition of ותרם קרני represents an inclusio[21] that marks out the closing stanza of a poem.[22] קֶרֶן occurs some 35 times in the DSS[23] in a variety of usages including as an emblem of power.[24] Not just the word but a similar expression is also found once elsewhere in the DSS, at 4Q437 (4QBarkhi Nafshi^{d}) 2 i 15 (DJD 29:311)—ויעלוץ לבבי בכה תרום ק[רני—which M. Weinfeld and D. Seely (DJD 29:318) derive from 1 Sam 2:1—עָלַץ לִבִּי בַּי׳ רָמָה קַרְנִי בַּי׳—with no mention of Ps 92:11. In fact 1 Sam 2:1 continues with the words רָחַב פִּי עַל־אוֹיְבָי "my mouth has been wide over my enemies," and the use of the preposition עַל suggests that at least the first *Hodayot* sequence might depend on 1 Sam 2:1 rather than on Ps 92:11. On the other hand, Ps 75:6—אַל־תָּרִימוּ לַמָּרוֹם קַרְנְכֶם—contains a clear parallel to the למעלה of the second *Hodayot* passage and, like that passage, follows closely on a previous use of the "horn-raising" idiom—וְרִשְׁעֵים אַל־תָּרִימוּ קָרֶן (Ps 75:5b)—which actually occurs a third time in the Psalm, at v. 11.

For different reasons, then, 1 Sam 2:1 and Ps 75:5–6 would each seem to be a more obvious inspiration for our *Hodayot* text than Ps 92:11, despite

---

[21] Also Dec, "Zwoje Hymnów Dziękczynnych," 253 n. 893.

[22] Bonnie Pedrotti Kittel, *The Hymns of Qumran: Translation and Commentary* (SBLDS 50; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1981), 133; cf. ibid., 124.

[23] Thus Accordance.

[24] Cf. Dec, "Zwoje Hymnów Dziękczynnych," 253 n. 887, who draws attention to 1QM 1:4–5, להכרית את קרן י[שראל] "eliminate the strength of I[srael]" (trans. Edward Cook, in Michael Wise et al., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation, Translated and With Commentary* [NewYork: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996], 151). Delcor, *Hymnes*, 194, seems to suggest a difference in meaning between the Psalms and the *Hodayot* with regard to רוּם, הָרִים, or רוֹמַם with קֶרֶן: "expression que l'on rencontre dans les Psaumes canoniques où elle est employée pour signifier la glorification des justes: ps. LXXV, 11; XCII, 11. Ici, 'lever la corne', c'est donner de la puissance." Cf. André Dupont-Sommer, *"Le Livre des Hymnes découvert près de la mer Morte (1QH): Traduction intégrale avec introduction et notes*," *Semitica* 7 (1957): 5–120 at 60 n. 4: "C'est-à-dire ma puissance. Cf. *Ps* XCII 11." However, A. M. Gazov-Ginsberg (and M. M. Elizarova, and K. B. Starkova), *Teksti Kumrana* (Pamyatniki Kulturi Vostoka 7; St. Petersburg: Tsentr 'Peterburgskoe Vostokobedenie', 1996), 181–258 at 248 n. 269, who, like Dupont-Sommer, cites Ps 92:11, interprets as an idiom of victory. In the twelve biblical passages that employ the idiom of the raised horn, the possessors of the horn are distributed as follows: Hannah's horn (over enemies) (1 Sam 2:1), king's horn (1 Sam 2:10; Ps 89:25; perhaps 1 Chr 25:5); horn of the wicked (Ps 75:5, 6), horn of enemies (Lam 2:17), horn of the righteous (Pss 75:11; 112:9); Israelite worshippers' horn (Pss 89:18; 92:11; 148:14).

the identity of the consonantal forms of the verb at Ps 92:11 and in the two *Hodayot* usages (וַתָּרֶם קַרְנִי). Moreover, of the twelve biblical passages in which the combination is found,[25] ones that would seem to fit the *Hodayot* usage at least as well as Ps 92:11 include Ps 89:18 *(Ketiv)*—כִּי־ תִּפְאֶרֶת עֻזָּמוֹ אָתָּה וּבִרְצֹנְךָ תָּרִים קַרְנֵנוּ—and Ps 148:14: וַיָּרֶם קֶרֶן לְעַמּוֹ תְּהִלָּה לְכָל־חֲסִידָיו.

In view of the frequency of the combination in the Bible and the fact that כִּרְאֵים is lacking in the *Hodayot* text there seems little to justify Carmignac's parallel here, and Holm-Nielsen[26] compares several of the passages we have cited (including Ps 92:11). It is probably safest to say here that the *Hodayot* usage derives from the relatively common biblical concept of the raising of the horn as a symbol of strength or victory, with no clear link to any specific passage.[27]

Were one, nonetheless, to accept Carmignac's claim of a relationship between the two texts, the only text-critical value would be to support the consonantal text of MT for the verb, but it would not help to decide whether the final syllable should be vocalized as a *hip'il* (thus MT) or as a *qal* (thus, apparently, LXX, καὶ ὑψωθήσεται, and Vulgata, *et exaltabitur*; see BHS). The relevant portion of the Psalm is missing from 4QPs^{b} 4.[28]

Ps 94:19 = 1QH^{a} 18:32–33 (10:30–31) (17[9]:7–8 / 19:9–10 [11:6–7])

Ps 94:19:	בְּרֹב שַׂרְעַפַּי בְּקִרְבִּי תַּנְחוּמֶיךָ יְשַׁעַשְׁעוּ נַפְשִׁי
1QH^{a} 18:32–33 (10:30–31):	כִּי֯ שש לבי בבריתכה ואמתכה תשעשע נפשי
1QH^{a} 17[9]:7–8:	מ֯קץ לקץ תשת שע נפשי בהמון רחמיכה
1QH^{a} 19:9–10 [11:6–7]:	ואספרה כבודכה בתוך בני אדם וברוב טובכה תשתעשע נפשי

A search of Accordance indicates that שַׁעְשַׁע occurs seven times in 1QH^{a} and twice in other DSS. In MT the same verb is found six times, only one of them being with נֶפֶשׁ. As neither of the other striking lexical items in the Psalms verse, תַּנְחוּם and שַׂרְעָף, is found in the context of the *Hodayot* texts that Carmignac cites, and לֵב, בְּרִית, אֱמֶת, and שׂוּשׂ, are not found in the immediate context of Ps 94:19, it is difficult to sustain any claim of specific dependency of the first *Hodayot* text cited above on the Psalms

[25] For the *hip'il*, see also 1 Sam 2:10; Lam 2:17; 1 Chr 25:5; Ps 75:5, 6; see also Pss 75:11 (*polal*); 89:18 (*qere*); 89:25; 112:9 (*qal*).

[26] Svend Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran* (ATDan 2; Aarhus, Universitetsforlaget, 1960), 135 n. 39.

[27] Kittel, *Hymns*, 135: "The reference is drawn from several canonical psalms with military imagery, employing this expression to indicate victory over enemies (Pss 18:3, 75:11, 89:18, 92:11)."

[28] See DJD 16:25.

passage. Thus, for example, Holm-Nielsen[29] simply notes the four Psalms verses in which the verb occurs, but does not comment on the combination with נֶפֶשׁ. BHS indicates no textual variation for the sequence in question, and the verse is not attested in DSS Psalms manuscripts.[30] Kittel[31] notes the various links between lines 6–13 [3–10] and Ps 145.

With regard to the second of the passages noted by Carmignac (1QH^a 17[9]:8), Hughes comments that תשתשע נפשי בהמון רחמיכה "combines markers to Ps 94:19 . . . and Isa 63:15 [הֲמוֹן מֵעֶיךָ וְרַחֲמֶיךָ]." Hughes sees "echoes [of the same] allusion to Ps 94:19" in 1QH^a 17[9]:13, where the form אשתעשע is found.[32]

Ps 94:21 = 1QH^a 10:25–26 [2:23–24]

Ps 94:21:	יָגֹודּוּ עַל־נֶפֶשׁ צַדִּיק וְדָם נָקִי יַרְשִׁיעוּ
1QH^a 10:25–26 [2:23–24]:	והמה מאתכה גרו על נפשי

According to Wernberg-Møller,[33] the *Hodayot* sequence "reflects a conflation" of the Psalms text and Isa 54:15, הֵן גּוֹר יָגוּר אֶפֶס מֵאוֹתִי מִי־גָר אִתָּךְ עָלַיִךְ יִפּוֹל, with possible influence from Ps 59:4a as well, כִּי הִנֵּה אָרְבוּ לְנַפְשִׁי יָגוּרוּ עָלַי עַזִּים (יָגוּרוּ). BHS (at 94:21) also compares Ps 56:7 (יָגוּרוּ).

The practical semantic differences among the different verbs attested—גָּדַד and its byform גּוּד, "band together, come in bands" or "cut,"[34] and גּוּר, "attack"—are slight, and if there is any more than a merely fortuitous relationship between the *Hodayot* passage and Isa 54:15[35] and/or Ps 94:21, the *Hodayot* passage might at the very most be viewed as lending support

---

[29] *Hodayot*, 16 n. 95.

[30] See Martin Abegg et al., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1999), 543 note; DJD 16:25; Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls*, 95.

[31] *Hymns*, 117–18.

[32] Julie A. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot* (STDJ 59; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 163, 164; see also ibid., 172, 173, 232.

[33] Wernberg-Møller, "Contribution," 159.

[34] This verb appears to be represented in the *Hodayot* (as well as at 4Q471b 1:5 and 4Q491 (4QM^a) 1 i 17), at 1QH^a 15:15 [7:12]—כי כול גדי למשפט תרשיע—although it has generally been assumed that גדי is an error for גרי; see the discussion in DJD 40:203.

[35] Although one can hardly sustain Wernberg-Møller's apparent claim of identity between the pronoun המה in the *Hodayot* passage and the interjective הנה (for MT הֵן); see E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll* (*ו Q Isa^a*) (STDJ 6; Leiden: Brill, 1974), 214–15. Note, moreover, that the *Hodayot*'s מאתכה results from the work of two scribes and may well arise from influence of the preceding מאתכה in line 25 (line 23) rather than from מֵאוֹתִי in the Isaiah verse; see Kittel, *Hymns*, 39; DJD 40:139; contrast Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 42 n. 10: "there is no reason to doubt the originality of the word."

to BHS's proposal to read יָגוּרוּ "they attack" (as at Pss 59:4 and 56.7)[36] as against MT יָגֹודוּ.[37] It should be noted, however, that the verb found in the *Hodayot* passage could equally well be from גָּרָה,[38] not גּוּר, although the meaning is similar: "contend." All these factors indicate that it is safest to assume, as Kittel, that there is no conscious (or unconscious) citation of Ps 94:21 here, but rather merely a "free use of biblical language."[39]

The *Hodayot* sequence noted by Wernberg-Møller is in fact quoted in a form similar to that of MT at CD 1:20, ויגודו על נפש צדיק, where the verb has been pointed more or less in keeping with MT (וְיָגֹודוּ).[40] Unfortunately, the Qumran parallel has not preserved the *dalet* or *resh*, so throws no further light on the status of the different variants.[41]

---

[36] The proposal is much earlier; see F. Delitzsch's commentary, ad loc. Delitzsch also notes, as Dominique Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, vol. 4: *Psaumes* (OBO 50.4; Fribourg: Academic Press, 2005), 351, that Abraham Ibn Ezra proposed the opposite emendation at 56:7.

[37] The expected form, יְגֻדוּ, is found in many manuscripts (see BHS); according to Briggs & Briggs, *Psalms, 2*:292, יָגֹודוּ is a *forma mixta* combining a "*Ketib*" from גּוּד and a "*Qere*" from גָּדַד. Other proposals are יָגוּדוּ "they attack," or, more speculatively, יְגִידוּ, as NEB: "they put the righteous on trial"; see Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle*, 349, 352. Both Wernberg-Møller, "Contribution," 159, and Oesterley, *Psalms*, 417, draw attention to the *targumim*, which use the same verb (כְּנַשׁ) in all four passages. LXX has the same verb (θηρεύω) at Ps 94:21 and Ps 59:4. (F. W. Mozley, *The Psalter of the Church: the Septuagint Psalms Compared with the Hebrew, with Various Notes* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905], 150, points out that the Greek verb here could equally well reflect יָצוּדוּ "they hunt"; cf. Gen 27:3; Ps 140:12.) Peshitta and both versions of the Vulgata Psalter have a different term in each of the three passages, all of which differ from the rendering at Isa 54:15.

[38] As pointed out most clearly by Dec, "Zwoje Hymnów Dziękczynnych," 225 n. 410, who refers to Prov 15:18; 29:22; Deut 2:19, 24 (but not, naturally, to Ps 94:21!). Contrast J. Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea, Text, Introduction, Commentary and Glossary* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1957), 70 n. 24, who, assuming the verb גּוּר, compares Isa 54:15; Ps 94:21 (noting the possibility of a variant reading), as well as Deut 2:24 (וְהִתְגָּר בּוֹ מִלְחָמָה), 1QH^a 21:35 [fr. 3:15], כ[ו]ל עולה ורמיה יגורו יחד לזדון (DJD 40:262), and 1QH^a 15:15 [7:12] (reading גרי, but see note 34, above). Mansoor, *Thanksgiving Hymns*, 108 n. 6, adds Ps 59:4 to the three biblical passages cited by Licht.

[39] Kittel, *Hymns*, 54. Delcor, *Hymnes*, 104, claims that the *Hodayot* sequence "est inspirée du ps. xciv, 21," but does not comment on the difference in verb (similarly, Dupont-Sommer, *Livre*, 33 n. 6), in contrast to Mansoor, *Thanksgiving Hymns*, 108 n. 6, who goes further than Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 70 n. 24, and claims that the *Hodayot* reading "may justify the reading יגורו" in Ps 94:21; stronger still is the statement of Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 42 n. 10: "[in] Ps 4:21 . . . יגורו should probably be read as in Ps 59:4." Curiously, Holm-Nielsen is more restrained elsewhere (ibid., 45): "גרו על נפשי may be based on Ps 94:21."

[40] The parallel at 4Q266 (4QD^a) 2 i 23–24 (DJD 18:35) has [נפש צדיק] על [ו]יגו[ד]ו.

[41] Williams, "Parallelism," 1:131, notes that "some read [*grw*] as *gdw*," but there is no comment relevant to this in the discussion in DJD 40:139. In 4Q84 only the first two letters of the verb [יג] have been preserved (DJD 16:32), as noted by Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle*, 351.

Ps 96:3 = 1QH^{a} 9:31–32 [1:29–30]

Ps 96:3: סַפְּרוּ בַגּוֹיִם כְּבוֹדוֹ בְּכָל־הָעַמִּים נִפְלְאוֹתָיו

1QH^{a} 9:31–32 [1:29–30]: להודיע כבודכה ולספר נפלאותיכה

Wernberg-Møller[42] claims that the *Hodayot* passage "represents a conflation of Ps 96:3 and 145:12"—לְהוֹדִיעַ לִבְנֵי הָאָדָם גְּבוּרֹתָיו וּכְבוֹד הֲדַר מַלְכוּתוֹ—apparently giving preference to the latter passage as the source of inspiration.[43] However the only item clearly deriving in from Ps 145:12 (rather than from Ps 96:3) would be the introductory להודיע.

Returning, then, to Ps 96:3, although the similarities between the two texts are striking, the absence in the *Hodayot* text of anything corresponding to בַּגּוֹיִם or בְּכָל־הָעַמִּים, casts doubt on the relationship being more than fortuitous, and the addition of להודיע as well as the fact that the various elements of the sequence individually and in combination occur relatively frequently in the *Hodayot*[44] suggest that our *Hodayot* sequence simply reflects the dictional preferences of the *Hodayot* author(s) rather than the creative reworking of a biblical text, which is, moreover, not cited in any study consulted other than that of Wernberg-Møller.

The fact that Ps 96 is repeated in almost its entirety at 1 Chr 16:23–33 might suggest that the Psalm was well known and, therefore, that quotation, if intended, should have been relatively easy. As indicated, however, the *Hodayot* text probably does not represent quotation in this case, and so it is unlikely that it has any bearing either on the one minor variation in MT between Ps 96:3 and 1 Chr 16:24 (which includes the object marker: אֶת־כְּבוֹדוֹ) or on the absence of Ps 96:3a and 1 Chr 16:24 as a whole in some parts of the Greek tradition.[45]

---

[42] Wernberg-Møller, "Contribution," 168.

[43] Ibid.: "Our author is . . . clearly dependent on the general phraseology of Ps 145:9–13." Cf. Delcor, *Hymnes*, 90, who draws attention to the parallelism of the *Hodayot* passage and Ps 145:12, but does not mention Ps 96:3. However, Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 63 n. 30, who cites no passage in particular, points out that the concept of making known the glory of God is widespread in the *Hodayot*.

[44] The only element for which this statement does not hold is the (non-biblical) collocation of סַפֵּר and הוֹדִיעַ, which, other than in our *Hodayot* passage, occurs elsewhere only at 11QPs^{a} 18:3 (DCH 4:110a). Thus, an Accordance search of *Hodayot* manuscripts reveals 27 instances of סַפֵּר (with one instance of סִפֵּר), 19 of הוֹדִיעַ, 86 of כָּבוד, and 21 of נִפְלָאוֹת; in 1QH^{a} סַפֵּר נִפְלָאוֹת and סַפֵּר כְּבוֹדְכָה are found or reconstructed six times each (cf. Mansoor, *Thanksgiving Hymns*, 103 n. 3, who cites 1QH^{a} 11[3]:23); להודיע כבודך is also attested at 1QH^{a} 5:30 [13:13], as well as at 11QPs^{a} 18:3 (DCH 4:109b)—להודיע כבוד י—and a combination similar to the one found at 9:31–32 [1:29–30] also occurs at 7:14 [fr. 10:3 + 42:2]: לדעת בכבוד[כה ולס]פֹּר נפלאֹ[ותיכה (the prepositional bet is marked for deletion); cf. Dec, "Zwoje Hymnów Dziękczynnych," 220 n. 334, on the use of the two nouns, expressing theophany, as a characteristic feature of the *Hodayot*.

[45] Only fragments from verses 1 and 2 of the Psalm are attested in 1Q10 (1QPs^{a}) (DJD 1:69) and 4Q84 (DJD 16:33).

Ps 97:6 = 1QHa 14:15 [6:12]

Ps 97:6: הִגִּידוּ הַשָּׁמַיִם צִדְקוֹ וְרָאוּ כָל־הָעַמִּים כְּבוֹדוֹ

1QHa 14:15 [6:12]: וידעו כול גוים אמתכה וכול לא֯ומים כבודכה

Even though a very similar idea is expressed in each passage, it is difficult to see any detailed linguistic or textual relationship between these two texts, and no source consulted other than Carmignac mentions such a relationship.[46]

Ps 98:2 = 1QHa 6:27 [14:16]

Ps 98:2: הוֹדִיעַ י׳ יְשׁוּעָתוֹ לְעֵינֵי הַגּוֹיִם גִּלָּה צִדְקָתוֹ

1QHa 6:27 [14:16]: ו֯ר֯שע תשמיד לעד ונגלתה צדקתך לעיני כול מע֯שיך

Similar remarks to those made on the immediately preceding parallel apply. For the revealing of God's righteousness, Holm-Nielsen compares other *Hodayot* texts[47] and Isa 56:1, which he thinks might be the source of the sequence presented here.[48] The *Hodayot* text can have little bearing on the suggestion made in BHS to delete לְעֵינֵי הַגּוֹיִם as a gloss from Isa 52:10.

Ps 99:2 = 1QHa 6:34–35 [14:23–24]

Ps 99:2: י׳ בְּצִיּוֹן גָּדוֹל וְרָם הוּא עַל־כָּל־הָעַמִּים

1QHa 6:34–35 [14:23–24] מעולם ועד ע֯ו֯ל֯[ם רב הרחמי]ם וגדול [החס]ד֯ים

Carmignac restores [אתה ר]ם וגדול here,[49] but the restoration is far too insecure to derive any text-critical conclusions about Ps 99 (which the immediate context of the *Hodayot* sequence does not reflect in any other way) or, indeed, any other biblical passage. Even were the restoration justified, the sequence גָּדוֹל וְרָם is also found at Deut. 1:28 and 9:2 (preceded on each occasion by עַם "people").

46 Dupont-Sommer, *Livre*, 53 n. 2, compares Isa 42:4, 6; 49:6, as does Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 114 n. 108, who also refers to the Psalms in general as expressing this "universalist thought"; Dec, "Zwoje Hymnów Dziękczynnych," 245 n. 736, mentions Isa 37:20 and 49:26.

47 Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 221 n. 17, Delcor, *Hymnes*, 264, and Gazov-Ginsberg, *Teksti*, 257 n. 412, compare 1QS 4:17–20.

48 Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 223. Of other commentators consulted, apart from Carmignac only Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 190, refers to Ps 98:2 (along with Isa 56:1 and *4 Ezra* 6:28).

49 See the discussion of restorations prior to the text of DJD 40, cited here, in DJD 40:94. Note also Dupont-Sommer, *Livre*, 90 n. 8: [אתה רחו]ם וגדול [מישר]ים "[Tu es miséricor]dieux et riche [en droiture]"; Mansoor, *Thanksgiving Hymns*, 182: "And [Thou who art] great [in merc]y"]; Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 192: מעולם ועד כול [קצי עול]ם וגדול [החס]דים.

Ps 102:6 = 1QH^{a} 17[9]:4

Ps 102:6: מִקּוֹל אַנְחָתִי דָּבְקָה עַצְמִי לִבְשָׂרִי

1QH^{a} 17[9]:4:[50] משברי מות ושאול על יצועי ערשי בקינה תשא וֹמְ[טתי] בְּקול אנחהְ

The noun אֲנָחָה is found some 17 times in the DSS and the related verb, four times. The combination with קוֹל is found only in the two texts cited. In the Bible, this combination is immediately preceded and followed by references to the worshipper's turning aside from food and drink: הוּפָה־כָעֵשֶׂב וַיִּבַשׁ לִבִּי כִּי־שָׁכַחְתִּי מֵאֲכֹל לַחְמִי (v. 5) and דָּבְקָה עַצְמִי לִבְשָׂרִי (v. 6).[51] The imagery of hunger and thirst is interrupted in vv. 7–8 by that of the worshipper as an unclean bird that has to live in isolation from human company. The Psalmist's situation is sufficiently wretched not only to encourage the taunts of his enemies (v. 9) but also to be used by them as an example in their curses (v. 9: בִּי נִשְׁבָּעוּ). The worshipper's situation, is seen, in turn, as deriving from divine anger with him (v. 11; cf. v. 3: אַל־תַּסְתֵּר פָּנֶיךָ מִמֶּנִּי).

As can be seen, the *Hodayot* sequence is preceded by references to the breakers of death (also mentioned in lines 6–7) and to the author's bed, neither of which are mentioned in the Psalm. However, in the line that follows (5)—עיני כעש בכבשן ודמעתי כנחלי מים כלו למנוח עיני—it is tempting to see echoes of כִּי־כָלוּ בָעָשָׁן יָמָי "for my days have ended in smoke" (v. 4a) on the one hand and of הוּפָה־כָעֵשֶׂב וַיִּבַשׁ לִבִּי "my heart has been struck like grass and is dried up" (v. 5a) on the other.

Of all the sources consulted with regard to this passage, Mansoor[52] is the only scholar who exclusively cites Ps 102:6 as the source of the *Hodayot* expression here. Hughes does not refer to קול אנחהְ in her discussion of this passage (including the other parallels mentioned above), but merely lists Ps 102:6 along with various other texts, concluding that "there is insufficient evidence of specific allusion."[53]

---

[50] Eileen Schuller indicates, in DJD 40:229, that E. Puech's reading וֹתְ[שמע] בְּקול אנחהְ "and makes heard the sound of my groaning" is also possible.

[51] Cf. v. 10, כִּי־אֵפֶר כַּלֶּחֶם אָכָלְתִּי וְשִׁקֻּוַי בִּבְכִי מָסָכְתִּי, discussed below in its own right.

[52] *Thanksgiving Hymns*, 158 n. 8.

[53] Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 162.

Holm-Nielsen[54] does not mention Ps 102:6 but derives the wording of lines 4–5 from Ps 6:7–8:[55]

יָגַעְתִּי בְּאַנְחָתִי אַשְׂחֶה בְכָל־לַיְלָה מִטָּתִי בְּדִמְעָתִי עַרְשִׂי אַמְסֶה׃
עָשְׁשָׁה מִכַּעַס עֵינִי עָתְקָה בְּכָל־צוֹרְרָי׃

However, it is perhaps more judicious to say that whereas some wording of our *Hodayot* passage seems to draw on the sequence מִטָּתִי בְּדִמְעָתִי עַרְשִׂי in Ps 6, other elements, including קול אנחה, rather clearly derive from Ps 102.[56] The possible corruption of כעשב בעשן "(my eye is) as grass in smoke"[57] (or כעשב כבשן "as the grass of a furnace") to כעש בכבשן "as a moth in a furnace"[58] might derive from interference of the

---

[54] *Hodayot*, 160 nn. 88–89.

[55] Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 143, derives על יצועי from Ps 6:7 and ערשי בקינה תשא from Job 7:13: תְּנַחֲמֵנִי עַרְשִׂי יִשָּׂא בְשִׂיחִי מִשְׁכָּבִי; Delcor, *Hymnes*, 213, prefers Ps 132:3b, אִם־אֶעֱלֶה עַל־עֶרֶשׂ יְצוּעָי, as the source of על יצועי ערשי.

[56] However, Dec, "Zwoje Hymnów Dziękczynnych," 264 n. 1129, regards קול אנחה as a formula of lament equivalent to יָגוֹן וַאֲנָחָה at Isa 35:10=51:11 and 1QH[a] 19:24 [11:26].

[57] Cf. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 160 n. 89, who cites Th. Gaster's emendation to עיני כעשן בכבשן (see also Mansoor, *Thanksgiving Hymns*, 158 n. 9), on the basis of Exod 19:18: וַיַּעַל עֲשָׁנוֹ כְּעֶשֶׁן הַכִּבְשָׁן.

[58] As Eduard Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran: Hebräisch und Deutsch, mit masoretischer Punktuation, Übersetzung, Einführung und Anmerkungen* (2d ed.; München: Kösel, 1971), 147, and Martin Abegg, in Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 104. Despite the oddity of the image, which is based, presumably, on the incessant rapid movement of a moth attempting to approach the light of a fire mirrored by the eye's movements in generating tears, this seems to be the best interpretation of עיני כעש בכבשן (although Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 143, claims that the sequence is "lacking in sense and is obviously corrupt").

Interpretations of the second word as representing כָּאֵשׁ "like fire" (Talia Thorion-Vardi, "Noch zu K'S in 1QH IX, 5," *RevQ* 12/46 [1986], 279–81, as Vermes, *Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*, 282) or כֶּעָשָׁן "like smoke" (cf. Exod 19:18; Prov 10:26, "Like vinegar to the teeth, like smoke to the eyes" [NJPS], as Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 143; Mansoor, *Thanksgiving Hymns*, 158; Karl Georg Kuhn, *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960], 172b, followed by Florentino García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: the Qumran Texts in English* [transl. Wilfred G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1994], 348), while phonetically possible, are implausible in the context of the linguistic characteristics of the *Hodayot* and, in any case, do not yield an image that is significantly easier to understand. Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 143, also suggests emendation to כָּעֻשָּׂה (כָּעֻסָּה =) "is irritated" (by [the smoke of] the kiln), although Williams, "Parallelism," 2:487, obtains much the same sense without change ("Literally, 'my eyes are grief [כַּעַס] in the furnace,' . . . 'my eyes cry with grief, just as eyes cry when irritated by the smoke at the furnace' "). Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, thinks that the original reading might have been עיני עששה מכעס, as Ps 6:8, "My eyes are wasted by vexation" (NJPS), with בכבשן later mistakenly replacing מכעס. It is of note that this Psalms text is indeed cited almost verbatim at 1QH[a] 13:36 [5:34] (כי עששו מכעס עיני ונפשי במרורי יום), as signalled in Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 107. G. W. Nebe, "Zu עש in 1QH IX, 5," *RevQ* 12/45 (1985), 115–18, concentrating on 13:36

wording of Ps 6 (עָשְׁשָׁה מִכַּעַס עֵינִי) with that of Ps 102. Another text that might have been at the back, but not the front, of the *Hodayot* author's mind at this point is Ps 31:11.[59]

No obvious variants of מִקּוֹל אַנְחָתִי are extant, although BHS takes up the proposal[60] to insert a verb, יָגַעְתִּי being a favoured candidate because of the supposed parallel with Ps 6:7 (יָגַעְתִּי בְּאַנְחָתִי). The missing letters before the *Hodayot* sequence do not lend support to any proposal in this regard[61] and the difference in the ending of the nomen rectum (אנחה rather than אַנְחָתִי) means that the difference in preposition (ב- for מן) cannot safely be argued to represent a textual variant (even though both prepositions can equally well express causality: "on account of"). Indeed it is probably safer to assume that here we are in the presence of a text that was composed in recollection of Ps 102:6 but without any clear intention to reproduce it word for word. For various reasons, then, the *Hodayot* text is of limited or no text-critical value with regard to מִקּוֹל אַנְחָתִי at Ps 102:6. Likewise, the difficult sequence כעש בכבשן in the following line is of little help in deciding whether at Ps 102:4 we should read with MT (and Peshitta) בְּעָשָׁן or with LXX, Vulgata, and the Targum, כְּעָשָׁן.[62]

Ps 102:10 = 1QH^a 13:35–36 [5:33–34]

Ps 102:10:	כִּי־אֵפֶר כַּלֶּחֶם אָכָלְתִּי וְשִׁקֻּוַי בִּבְכִי מָסָכְתִּי
1QH^a 13:35–36 [5:33–34]:[63]	ויוסיפוה לצוקה וישובו בעדי בצלמות ואוכלה בלחמ֯ אנחת֯ ושקוי בדמעות אין כלה

[5:34] and Ps 6:8 (=31:10: בְּכַעַס), argues that עש means "darkness": "mein Auge ist wie Dunkelheit in einem (oder: durch einen) Schmelzofen."

[59] Ps 31:10–12:

חָנֵּנִי ׀ כִּי צַר־לִי עָשְׁשָׁה בְכַעַס עֵינִי נַפְשִׁי וּבִטְנִי׃
כִּי כָלוּ בְיָגוֹן חַיַּי וּשְׁנוֹתַי בַּאֲנָחָה כָּשַׁל בַּעֲוֹנִי כֹחִי וַעֲצָמַי עָשֵׁשׁוּ׃
מִכָּל־צוֹרְרַי הָיִיתִי חֶרְפָּה וְלִשְׁכֵנַי מְאֹד וּפַחַד לִמְיַדָּעָי רֹאַי בַּחוּץ נָדְדוּ מִמֶּנִּי׃

See my discussion of this text in connection with 1QH^a 13:36 [5:34] in "Hodayot's Use of the Psalter (Book 1)," 97–98. Dec, "Zwoje Hymnów Dziękczynnych," 264 n. 1129, sees Ps 31:11 as a primary parallel here.

[60] Found in, e.g., Oesterley, *Psalms*, 435. See also Anderson, *Psalms*, 2:706, where attention is drawn to NEB's emendation.

[61] Neither does the preceding context in the *Hodayot* lend support to the argument of Briggs & Briggs, *Psalms*, 2:318, that מִקּוֹל אַנְחָתִי "belongs to the previous [verse]; for it gives a good reason for the absence of appetite; the mouth is engaged in the constant utterance of groans."

[62] See also Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle*, 216–18. Verses 4 and 6 and most of v. 5 are missing from the two DSS Psalms manuscripts that preserve Ps 102 (11QPs^a and 4Q84; see DJD 16:25, 36).

[63] For אנחת֯ (Sukenik: אנחה), see DJD 40:177, where it is argued that אנחה is probably original but has undergone "secondary assimilation to Job 3:24 [כִּי־לִפְנֵי לַחְמִי אַנְחָתִי וְתָבֹא]."

It is evident (1) that the *Hodayot* sequence ואוכלה בלחמ אנחתי ושקוי בדמעות quite closely echoes v. 10 and (2) that the following lines (36–38 [34–36]) also recall elements from Ps 102, already discussed under the preceding item:

> כי עששו מכעס עיני ונפשי במרורי יום אנחה ויגון יסובבוני ובושת על פנים ויהפך לי לחמי לריב ושקוי לבעל מדנים ויבוא בעצמי להכשיל רוח ולכלות כוח

If, therefore, we may reasonably safely assume a background in Ps 102, the two words that are closest in form to their Masoretic counterparts may be examined for any potential text-critical value they might hold. In the case of ושקוי the *Hodayot* form (in lines 36, 37 [34, 35]) appears to support the standard MT form in שִׁקֻּוַי as against a Geniza fragment in שִׁקּוּיַי (the form found in the MT of Hos 2:7);[64] more significantly, *Hodayot* בלחם lends support to Hebrew manuscripts that have this form instead of כַּלֶּחֶם (see BHS; LXX, Targum, Peshitta, and Vulgata all have "as") and also to some variation in the preposition between the first phrase and the second.[65] Note however, that in 4Q84 (4QPs^{b}),[66] which preserves all of v. 10, the text is identical to that found in MT.

Apart from these specific text-critical speculations, one might also regard the *Hodayot* material here as reflecting alternative wordings of the biblical text—ואוכלה instead of אָכַלְתִּי, בדמעות instead of בִּבְכִי, etc.—which in turn might be taken as demonstrating not so much fluidity in the wording of the biblical text, as, more importantly, a focus on the representation of the biblical *message* rather than on any specific *text* in which that message was encapsulated.

The closeness of the *Hodayot* and biblical passages here is generally accepted and has even made its way into the popular scholarly commentary of Anderson;[67] however, up to this point, no-one has claimed the level of dependency that we have suggested. Indeed, Holm-Nielsen contends that "[t]he . . . two parallel expressions of food and drink come from a combination of Ps 80:6 [הֶאֱכַלְתָּם לֶחֶם דִּמְעָה וַתַּשְׁקֵמוֹ בִּדְמָעוֹת שָׁלִישׁ] and Job 3:24 [כִּי־לִפְנֵי לַחְמִי אַנְחָתִי תָּבֹא]; a reference may also be made to Ps 102:10, even though the method of expression is dissimilar."[68]

---

[64] See BHS; HALOT; Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 107.

[65] Thus, Rahlfs's Göttingen edition notes *sicut* for μετά in the Syro-Hexapla.

[66] DJD 16:36.

[67] *Psalms*, 2:707.

[68] Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 125. All three texts are also cited by Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 107. Mansoor, *Thanksgiving Hymns*, 140 n. 4, mentions Ps 102:10 and Job 3:24. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 110 nn. 63–64, also mentions Isa 30:20 and Hos 9:4. Williams, "Parallelism,"

Ps 102:29 = 1QH^{a} 4:26 [17:14]

Ps 102:29: בְּנֵי־עֲבָדֶיךָ יִשְׁכֹּונוּ וְזִרְעָם לְפָנֶיךָ יִכּוֹן

1QH^{a} 4:26 [17:14]: לעובדיך באמונה [ל]ה֯יות זרעם לפניך כול הימים

Although there are no other clear signs in the immediate context of the *Hodayot* passage of dependency on this Psalm, the coincidence of three shared words in close proximity is certainly striking and has caught the attention of the commentators,[69] even though, as Licht indicates,[70] there could also have been some influence from 2 Sam 7:29a: וְעַתָּה הוֹאֵל וּבָרֵךְ אֶת־בֵּית עַבְדְּךָ לִהְיוֹת לְעוֹלָם לְפָנֶיךָ.

From a text-critical perspective, the closing words of the *Hodayot* sequence, כול הימים, tend to support the addition of "forever" (BHS), as found in LXX and 11QPs^{a} (לדור),[71] although it should be noted that in principle כול הימים could equally well be a paraphrase of לְעוֹלָם in the 2 Samuel passage, if this is regarded as the primary source here.

If the source is indeed Ps 102, then the *Hodayot* passage might exemplify yet again a tendency to "quote" the *message* rather than an exact *text*: עובדיך for בְּנֵי־עֲבָדֶיךָ, [ל]ה֯יות for יִשְׁכֹּונוּ or יִכּוֹן, etc.

Ps 103:20 = 1QH^{a} 16:12–13 [8:11–12] = 18:36–37 [10:34–35]

Ps 103:20: בָּרֲכוּ יְ מַלְאָכָיו גִּבֹּרֵי כֹחַ עֹשֵׂי דְבָרוֹ לִשְׁמֹעַ בְּקוֹל דְּבָרוֹ

1QH^{a} 16:12–13 [8:11–12]: ואתה[א]ל שכתה בעד פריו ברז גבורי כוח
ורוחות קודש ולהט אש מתהפכת

1QH^{a} 18:36–37 [10:34–35]: ואפחדה בשומעי משפטיכה עם גבורי כוח ורי֯בכה
עם צבא קדושיכה

The expression גִּבֹּרֵי כֹחַ is also found at 4Q510 (4QShir^{a}) 1 i 2–3: אדון לכול קדושים וממש[לתו] על כול גבורי כוח.[72] Although at a lexical level one can draw parallels with גִּבֹּרֵי חַיִל,[73] the fact that גִּבֹּרֵי כֹחַ is collocated with a term or terms referring to angels in the Psalm and in all

---

1:377, refers to Ps 80:6 alone, and Dupont-Sommer, *Livre*, 51 n. 1, and Delcor, *Hymnes*, 169, to Ps 102:10 alone. Dec, "Zwoje Hymnów Dziękczynnych," 243 n. 697, simply notes בלחם אנחה as a symbol of adversity.

[69] Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 245; Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 208; Delcor, *Hymnes*, 281 (following Dupont-Sommer, *Livre*, 97 n. 14); Dec, "Zwoje Hymnów Dziękczynnych," 203 n. 43. Mansoor, 189 n. 15, prefers the reading זרעם [לח]יות (see DJD 40:69), and, accordingly, sees a quite different background to the text.

[70] Licht, *Thanksgiving* Scroll, 208.

[71] 4Q84 (DJD 16:39) lacks the end of the verse. Iuxta hebraeos, Targum and Peshitta, all agree with MT.

[72] See also 4Q286 (4QBer^{a}) 2:2 (גבורי אלים בכוֹחָ); 4Q393 (4QCommunal Confession) 3:8 (גבורי{ם} החיל ועֹצומֹ כח) (DJD 29:53).

[73] Note also גבורי עוז at 4Q402 (4QShirShab^{c}) 1:4 and גבורי פלא משר{י}תיכה at 1QH^{a} 13:23 [5:21].

three DSS passages, indicates that the DSS use of this expression is indeed derived directly or indirectly from that of the Psalm,[74] and is not simply a phraseological innovation of the DSS.[75] However, because the sequence is identical in all four places and also very short, it has no obvious bearing on the minor variants relating to the verse,[76] beyond that of supporting the authenticity of the expression as such against proposals to emend to גְּבוּרָיו *metri causa*.[77]

Ps 104:4 = 1QH^a 9:12–13 [1:10–11]

Ps 104:4: עֹשֶׂה מַלְאָכָיו רוּחוֹת מְשָׁרְתָיו אֵשׁ לֹהֵט

1QH^a 9:12–13 [1:10–11]:[78] [ה]כִּינֹותה לרצונכה ורוחות עוז לחוקיהם בטרם היותם למלאכי ק[ודש ו]ם לרוחות עולם בממשלותם מאורות לרזיהם

Psalm 104:4a, עֹשֶׂה מַלְאָכָיו רוּחוֹת, is generally regarded[79] as the most immediate source of the *Hodayot*'s possible reference to the transformation of winds or spirits into angels, although as only one of these three words in the biblical text is present in the *Hodayot* one, the text-critical value of the *Hodayot* sequence is limited; from an exegetical perspective, however, the *Hodayot* text clearly supports the interpretation "you make the winds your messengers" (NRSV), "You use the winds as your

---

[74] Thus, Helmer Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (transl. Emilie T. Sander; Christian Origins Library; introduction by James H. Charlesworth; New York: Crossroad, 1995 [transl. originally published 1963]), 84; Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 156; Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 135, 159; Mansoor, *Thanksgiving Hymns*, 154 n. 7; 166 n. 18; Gazov-Ginsberg, *Teksti*, 250 n. 295; Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 152 n. 21; 166. See also M. Baillet, on 4Q510 1 i 3 (DJD 7:217). In his discussion of the two *Hodayot* passages, Delcor, *Hymnes*, 204, 232, does not mention the Psalm, but does cite (ibid., 204) 1QM 15:14: [ו] . . . [ג]בורי אלים סדר[י קד]ושים. Similar remarks apply to Dec, "Zwoje Hymnów Dziękczynnych," 258 n. 1003; 273 n. 1364, who only cites (ibid., 258) 1QH^a 13:23 [5:21] (see the following note).

[75] Cf. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 166: "the mighty warriors . . . [is a term] borrowed from Ps 103:20, even if the concept may well have come into being independent of this place," comparing 1QH^a 13:23 [5:21]: גבורי פלא משר{י}תיכה. Anderson, *Psalms*, 2:717, notes גבורי שמים as "a similar term" at 1QH^a 11:36–37 [3:23–24].

[76] See BHS, 4Q84 (DJD 16:42). The repeated כול in 4Q510 might be seen as lending support to LXX's apparent reading of this word before מַלְאָכָיו (as against MT, 4Q84, Iuxta hebraeos, Targum, Peshitta), as at Ps 148:2 (הַלְלוּהוּ כָּל־מַלְאָכָיו); see Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle*, 140.

[77] See, e.g., Briggs & Briggs, *Psalms*, 2:328.

[78] For כִּינֹותה[ ] and ק[ודש ו]ם see DJD 40:123.

[79] See Dupont-Sommer, *Livre*, 27 n. 3; Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 58; Mansoor, *Thanksgiving Hymns*, 98 n. 7; Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 21 n. 14; Gazov-Ginsberg, *Teksti*, 231 n. 14 (where "Enoch 17:34" is also noted, perhaps in reference to *1 En.* 18:5: "I saw the winds on the earth carrying the clouds: I saw the paths of the angels" [R. H. Charles]); Michael A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 163.

messengers" (TEV),[80] rather than vice-versa, as KJV, "Who maketh his angels spirits," the Targum, "who makes his messengers as quick as the wind, his attendants as mighty as a blazing fire,"[81] and, as often interpreted, Heb 1:7, "He makes his angels winds" (NRSV).[82] The plural construct למלאכי supports MT, if needed, against the obscure form מלאכו (for MT מַלְאָכָיו) in 4Q93 (4QPs^{l})[83] and the second person possessive pronouns in the different traditions of Vulgata.

Ps 104:35 = 1QH^{a} 4:33 [17:21]

Ps 104:35: יִתַּמּוּ חַטָּאִים מִן־הָאָרֶץ וּרְשָׁעִים עוֹד אֵינָם

1QH^{a} 4:33 [17:21]:[84]]תמו רשעים ואני הֹובינותי כי את אשר בחרתה
ה[כינותה] דרכו

Ps 104:35 is the only place in the Bible in which the verb תֹּם[85] is combined with חַטָּא or רָשָׁע,[86] but it is difficult to defend the relationship between this biblical text and the *Hodayot* one,[87] in view of the uncertain nature

---

[80] Cf. Delcor, *Hymnes*, 81: "Il est clair que le Psalmiste fait ici allusion à la croyance exprimée dans Ps, civ, 4, où les vents sont considérés comme les messagers divins"; Briggs & Briggs, *Psalms*, 2:332: "As God Himself is conceived as really present in nature, wrapping Himself in light, setting up His tent in the heavens, using the clouds as his chariot; so His angels, the ministrant spirits about Him, are made to assume the form of winds and lightnings." Similar to NRSV and TEV are NEB, REB, NJPS, and CEV; note also the Russian Synodal Bible, Ты творишь ангелами Твоими духов (in both Psalms and Hebrews), which leaves no room for ambiguity; LXX's ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πῦρ φλέγον may be taken, as Anderson, *Psalms*, 2:719, comments, "[to] imply that God makes his angelic messengers assume the form of various natural phenomena," although LXX's rendering is in principle as ambivalent as the Hebrew (contrast L. Brenton, "Who makes his angels spirits," and NETS [A. Pietersma], "He who makes spirits his messengers"), and the same is true of Iuxta hebraeos and Peshitta.

[81] Stec, *Targum of Psalms*, 188 (דעבד אזגדוי סרהובין היך רוחא שמשוי תקיפין היך אשא מצלהבא).

[82] Similarly, REB; TEV; CEV ("I change my angels into wind . . ."); contrast NJB: "appointing the winds his messengers." For an overview of grammatically possible interpretations, see Briggs & Briggs, *Psalms*, 2:338. On the relationship of LXX and Hebrews 1:7, see Mozley, *Psalter of the Church*, 156.

[83] DJD 16:128–29, but 4Q86 (4QPs^{d}) (DJD 16:67) reads as MT here; 11QPs^{a} has a variant reading at the end of the verse:]תיו אש לוהטת; see J. A. Sanders, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1967) 160.

[84] For the readings]תמו, הֹובינותי (a second *Hip'il* form . . . previously only known from rabbinic Hebrew"), and ה[כינותה, see DJD 40:71.

[85] In the *qal* found four times in other texts within the *Hodayot* manuscripts (according to an Accordance search).

[86] The sequence cited is "an imprecation" added by "a Maccabean editor," according to Briggs & Briggs, *Psalms*, 2:337. The statement by Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 250, that: "תמו רשעים is [also] found in Ps 9:7, 73:19" is difficult to sustain, as in each case the noun is found at some distance from the verb (9:6; 73:12).

[87] Licht, *Thanksgiving Scroll*, 210, is the only study consulted that draws a direct connection between the two texts.

of the verb, the different noun employed, and the lack of anything corresponding to מִן־הָאָרֶץ[88] or to other elements in the immediate context of the Psalm passage.[89] With regard to the choice of noun, the participle in 11QPs^{a}, חוטאים, supports MT as does the following [ם]ורשעי in 4QPs^{a}, and there is no evidence for reversal of חָטָא and רָשָׁע in the Psalm.[90] The *Hodayot* text here is too fragmentary to help us with the variation among MT and the two DSS biblical manuscripts regarding the particle, if any, that precedes the verb.[91]

Ps 106:7 = 1QH^{a} 18:6–7 [10:4–5]

Ps 106:7: אֲבוֹתֵינוּ בְמִצְרַיִם | לֹא־הִשְׂכִּילוּ נִפְלְאוֹתֶיךָ לֹא זָכְרוּ
אֶת־רֹב חֲסָדֶיךָ וַיַּמְרוּ עַל־יָם בְּיַם־סוּף

1QH^{a} 18:6–7 [10:4–5]: כי תשכילנו בנפלאות כאלה ובסוד אמ[תכה] תודיענו

Apart from the use of the construction הַשְׂכִּיל נִפְלָאוֹת there is no further obvious coincidence of linguistic or conceptual elements in the two passages. The frequency of the verb[92] and of the *nipʿal* participle plural,[93] and of related constructions in the *Hodayot*[94] and other DSS[95] makes it difficult to claim any direct dependence of the *Hodayot* text on the biblical one, and in fact not a single commentator consulted follows Carmignac in drawing this parallel. Moreover, BHS signals no textual variation, and there is no indication in the versions of the object being introduced by -ב.[96]

---

[88] As 4Q86 (DJD 16:71); 11QPs^{a}: מארץ; see (for this and the other forms cited) DJD 16:71 and Sanders, *Dead Sea Psalms Scroll*, 162.

[89] Cf. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 250: "none of [the three references cited (see above, n. 86)] seem to form a basis for the text here."

[90] This order of the words is found only here; they occur in the opposite order at Ps 1:1 and 1:5 and in the only place they occur in relatively close proximity in the DSS, at 4Q266 2 ii 2–3 (DJD 18:36, 38).

[91] כי in 4Q86, כאשר in 11QPs^{a}.

[92] Based on a search of Accordance, 19 times in *Hodayot* mss and 73 times elsewhere.

[93] 21 times in *Hodayot* mss and 51 times elsewhere.

[94] 1QH^{a} 15:29–30 [7:26–27]: כי השכלתני באמתכה וברזי פלאכה הודעתני; 19:7 [11:4]: כי הודעתם בסוד [ה]בינותני בסוד אמתכה ותשכילני במעשי פלאכה; 19:12–13 [11:9–10]: אמתכה וברזי פלאכה השכלתם. Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 172 n. 8, cites additionally 1QH^{a} 7:34 [15:21]: ומה אף הוא בשר כי ישכיל [באלה]. Williams, "Parallelism," 2.520 cites 19:7, 12 [11:4, 9] only, and Dec, "Zwoje Hymnów Dziękczynnych," 269 n. 1268, 19:7 only.

[95] 1QS 9:18 = 4Q258 (4QS^{d}) 8:3: להשכילם ברזי פלא ואמת; 4Q417 (4QInstruction^{c}) 1 i 2 + 4Q418 (4QInstruction^{d}) 43 i 1: [ו]ברזי פלאי אל הנוראים תשכיל; 4Q417 20:2: [נ]פלאות אל תסכילו.

[96] 4Q86 possibly contains the end of the doxology in Ps 106:48, immediately before Ps 147; see DJD 16:64, 66.

Ps 106:8 = 1QHᵃ 26:31a–31 [fr. 7:6] + 4QHᵃ [4Q427] 7 ii 12

Ps 106:8:	וַיּוֹשִׁיעֵם לְמַעַן שְׁמוֹ לְהוֹדִיעַ אֶת־גְּבוּרָתוֹ
1QHᵃ 26:31a-31 [fr. 7:6][97] + 4QHᵃ (4Q427) 7 ii 12:	[[יומרו ברוך אל המפלי פלאות גאות ומגדיל {להודיע גבורה} ומצ̊ד̊י̊[ק בדעת]
4QHᵃ [4Q427] 7 ii 12–13:[98]	יומרו ברוכ אל ה̊[מפ]ל̊י̊ [פ]ל̊א̊ו̊ת̊ ג̊א̊ות ומגדיל להופיע גבורה̊[ומצדיק] בדעת̊

The discussions of this text in DJD[99] make no reference to the Psalms passage cited[100] and neither does any other study consulted. God's גְּבוּרָה as object of לָדַעַת or הוֹדִיעַ occurs in three other places in the Bible[101] as well as in the *Hodayot*[102] and other DSS.[103]

However, the variation within the *Hodayot* tradition here matches, whether or not fortuitously, a similar variation in the traditions of Ps 106:8, a fact that would tend to support dependency of the *Hodayot* passage on the Psalm at this point. The expression הוֹפִיעַ גְּבוּרָה is not otherwise attested in the Bible or DSS[104] and E. Schuller[105] suggests that "the more poetic לְהוֹפִיעַ may be original." However, Schuller does not note that the 4QHᵃ reading might reflect a text-tradition at Ps 106:8 that can also be perceived behind ܕܢܚܘܐ ܓܢܒܪܘܬܗ of Peshitta and *ut ostenderet fortitudinem suam* of the Psalterium iuxta hebraeos. In this case, then, the 1QHᵃ reading, in להודיע would reflect the tradition found in MT and LXX, and the 4QHᵃ reading, in להופיע, would reflect the tradition found in Peshitta and Vulgata.

---

[97] In the DJD edition, each letter in the sequence הודיע גבורה has an erasure dot above and below it (as also in Sukenik's edition); the opening *lamed* only has a supralinear dot.

[98] DJD 29:97.

[99] DJD 29:107; 40.306.

[100] Although Schuller, DJD 29:107, notes Ps 145:12 as an example of הוֹדִיעַ גְּבוּרָה.

[101] Isa 33:13 (וּדְעוּ קְרוֹבִים גְּבֻרָתִי); Jer 16:21 (אוֹדִיעֵם אֶת־יָדִי וְאֶת־גְּבוּרָתִי); Ps 145:12 (לְהוֹדִיעַ לִבְנֵי הָאָדָם גְּבוּרֹתָיו).

[102] 1QHᵃ 12:29–30 [4:28–29]: ולהודיע לכול החיים̊ גבורותיכה (also noted by Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 267); 12:33 [4:32]: למען ידעו כול מעשיו בכוח גבורתו.

[103] 4Q417 1 i 13: ואז תדע בכבוד ע̊[וזו ע]ם רזי פלאו וגבורות מעשיו. Cf. 4Q266 1a:5–6 (DJD 18:31).

[104] Dec, "Zwoje Hymnów Dziękczynnych," 299 n. 1911, regards the construction as synonymous with להודיע כבודכה at 1QHᵃ 5:30 [13:13] and 9:31–32 [1:29–30].

[105] DJD 29:107.

Summary and Conclusions

In the case of ten of the sixteen Psalms texts discussed—Pss 90:8; 92:11; 94:19, 21; 96:3; 97:6; 98:2; 99:2; 104:35, 106:7—there is no clear dependency of the *Hodayot* text (or texts) on the Psalms one and where there is a known textual issue in relation to the Psalms passage in question the claimed *Hodayot* parallel tends to be either irrelevant (e.g. Pss 94:19; 96:3) or to support MT (e.g. Pss 90:8; 92:11). In the case of a possible parallel to Ps 94:21, the *Hodayot* text would appear to support a reading proposed by BHS, but the claim of relationship is hardly sustainable.

Of the remaining six possible parallels, those relating to Pss 102:6, 103:20, and 104:4, although reasonably clear, are of no obvious text-critical relevance.

In connection with Ps 106:8, two parallel *Hodayot* texts might be argued to reflect a variation in verbs that matches a variation between MT and LXX on the one hand and Vulgata and Peshitta on the other. The text-critical status of the apparent parallel between the Psalm and the *Hodayot* is, however, called into question because there is no further evidence for the dependency of the two *Hodayot* texts on Ps 106:8.

In the case of Ps 102:29, the *Hodayot* evidence seems to support the addition of "forever" as found in LXX. However, the expression used in the *Hodayot* (כול הימים) is not the same as that attested in 11QPs^{a} (לדור) and doubt remains as to whether Ps 102:29 is the real source here, or 2 Sam 7:29. Effectively, then, this parallel falls into our first category of parallels for which it is difficult to justify claimed dependency on a specific Psalms passage.

In fact, of the claimed parallels from Book 4, only in connection with Ps 102:10 do we have a parallel for which a reasonably clear relationship between the *Hodayot* sequence and the Psalms one may be maintained and for which there is also some evidence from the *Hodayot* sequence for known textual variation in the Psalm. The *Hodayot* parallel appears to support on the one hand the standard MT form in שִׁקָּוִי (rather than שִׁקּוּיַ) and, on the other hand, a manuscript variant in בלחם (for כַּלֶּחֶם of MT and the versions).

However, in connection with Ps 102:10 and 102:29 (as well as 102:6), the simultaneous closeness to and distance from the text of the Psalm might suggest that the *Hodayot* author focused more on conveying the message of a recollected text than on its exact wording. Against that background, of course, any attempt to use the *Hodayot* data for text-critical ends is hazardous.

From this study of Book 4 and the three preceding ones, overall two negative conclusions clearly observe. The first is the paucity of sequences that parallel variants already known from the versions. This might be argued to reflect the dominance in the DSS community of scriptures that were closer to what would become consolidated in MT. Whatever the value of this deduction, of greater significance is the second negative conclusion, namely the relatively small number of sequences that can in any case convincingly be argued to reflect the biblical text (regardless of tradition) in a verbatim way.

Of course this lack of verbatim reproduction could be argued to be completely normal: suffering, yearning, the idea of an utterly holy God and an utterly impure humanity and of a divinely-facilitated transformation of humankind—all of these thoughts and passions were expressed in a biblicizing type of language that almost never employed the actual wording of the numerous biblical passages that were drawn upon to convey these ideas.[106] This type of argument is similar to the one I deployed when I first wrote about this issue: "Like the great hymnists of more recent times, the composers of the *Hodayot* consciously or unconsciously tended to *recast* biblical language in order to express the meaning of a passage in a way that fitted the linguistic and literary structure of the composition and contributed to its aesthetic and emotive impact."[107]

However, I have grown ever less satisfied with this approach, in part because it perpetuates the lazy anachronism of the existence of a Bible that people consulted, memorized, etc., and in part because the absence of verbatim references seems to run counter to the apparent importance of "Bible study" in everyday sectarian life, as indicated by the well-known passage from the *Community Rule* (1QS 8:12–15): "When these join the community, in Israel, in accordance with these rules, they are to separate themselves from among the dwelling place of the people of iniquity by going to the desert to prepare there the way of Him, just as it is written, In the desert prepare a way; make straight in the wilderness a highway for our God. This is the study of the law, which he commanded through Moses." In this text, Isa 40:3 is interpreted in reference to the study, or teaching, of the law (מדרש התורה). That such study (or teaching) seems to have been

---

[106] Broadly speaking, this is in line with a comment made by Florentino García Martínez at the IOQS VII session in which this paper was first delivered, to the effect that the *Hodayot* corpus is poetry and cannot be expected to yield usable data for the textual criticism of biblical texts.

[107] "Hodayot's Use of the Psalter (Book 1)," 81.

one of the primary raisons d'être of the Community is evidenced not only by the numerous copies of biblical texts found in the caves of Qumran, by the explicit commentaries (*pesharim*) on biblical texts found there, and by "rewritten" or "para-biblical" texts, but also by another explicit reference to Bible (specifically Torah) study in the *Community Rule* (1QS 6:6–8): "And there is not to depart, in any place where there are ten, a person studying the law by day and by night continuously, by turns, each person being replaced by another. And the many are to stay awake together for a third of all the nights of the year to read the (Holy) Book and to study/teach judgment, and to pronounce blessings together."[108]

How, then, do we square the sectaries' regular intensive exposure to Scripture with the lack of verbatim reproduction in the *Hodayot*,[109] which at least may be argued to have had a quasi-liturgical status? The way out of this conundrum might perhaps be presented in the following terms. At least in the type of composition represented by the *Hodayot*, the community did not perceive itself as using, or referring to, scripture but rather saw itself as somehow *within* scripture. Thus, "the author or authors of the *Hodayot* did not so much think about '*the* Bible' and quote it (or misquote it) as feel themselves to be *living in the same world* that the figures of the Bible lived in, to be, as it were, still living in the biblical period, and, therefore, open to divine revelation and inspired interpretation . . . [;] the sectaries' lives and conceptual worlds were completely infused by the Bible; they did not so much 'know' the Bible as 'live' it. The divine plan of salvation, together with the Scriptures that would announce and record this, was taking shape through the life and work of the sectaries; through them, the biblical period and the Bible itself, was being extended into the present and future."[110]

Of course, our thinking here is hampered by such terms as Bible/biblical and even Scripture(s)/scriptural. If the sectaries understood themselves as being somehow implanted into the mainstream of Israel's relationship with an actively directive God, then the notions of Bible, scripture, and

---

[108] This paragraph is largely drawn from my "The Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls and Some Issues of Canon," in *Canon and Modern Bible Translation in Interconfessional Perspective* (ed. Lénart J. de Regt, Istanbul: Bible Society in Turkey/United Bible Societies, 2006), 1–41 at 8–9.

[109] At the IOQS VII session at which this paper was first delivered, Armin Lange drew a parallel between the type of dependency (or lack of it) of the *Hodayot* on the literal wording of the Psalter and the relationship between early classical Greek writers and the Homeric corpus.

[110] "Hodayot's Use of the Psalter (Book 1)," 80–81.

even sacred (at least in connection with these two categories) are intrinsically inappropriate. Instead of thinking in terms of "Bible study," which in the context of Qumran studies can lead us subconsciously either to the yeshivah or to the practices of evangelical Protestantism, we might think instead (as perhaps the sectaries thought) more in terms of *history* study, that is to say the development of an ever greater familiarity with documents—the "biblical" documents—that presented the history of Israel (and the DSS community *qua* Israel) and her God.

Once this perceptual shift is made, then it is easier to see how the texts of the Bible are studied more for their content—their ideas—than for their wording, and how the community is able to write new texts, including the *Hodayot*, which add to the existing store of texts already known from what would later be called the Bible and which implicitly or explicitly reflect upon them. Thinking of Qumran *Bible* study—the activity arguably referred to in the two 1QS passages quoted above—as *history* study helps explain the absence of verbatim reproduction of biblical texts in the *Hodayot* because in fact the engagement with these texts was an encounter with their historical content much more than with their linguistic form.[111] Moreover, if one already lives, breathes, thinks, and feels *within* the world of the Bible, the notion that the texts referring to one's earlier history are sacred, while true is only trivially so. The sacred gains meaning through contrast with the profane and if there is *no* contrast because one's whole existence is a continuation of the life of a community brought into being and sustained by continual interaction with the numinous, then the texts that recount that existence and experience—whether texts from the past (the biblical texts as we know them from various canonical traditions) or (sectarian) texts from the present—are no more special in essence than the call that brought the sectaries to the desert "to prepare the way" in the

[111] George Brooke, "Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls and in the New Testament," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery*, 60–73 at 64, has argued that the focus of sectarian Bible study was specifically on the Torah: "[The] availability of the complete corpus [of the Dead Sea Scrolls] has . . . allowed scholars to see that the dominant element in its attention to scripture was . . . the correct interpretation of the Law. . . . The Damascus Document makes [it] plain [that] it is not for the wrong view of prophecy that the community member can be expelled but for not following the right interpretation of the Law." However, the overall purpose of the community's interpretation of specific texts, be they legal or prophetic, was, it seems to me, the prolongation in the DSS community's life and persons of the Israel that appears in the biblical texts, and for that reason any community study of scripture represents in the first instance a look at the community's own early history with a view to avoiding the mistakes of the past.

first place and the literary creations that constitute the intellectual and spiritual fruits of that relocation.

Although the foregoing argument is by no means a full explanation for the paucity of verbatim reproductions in a composition as apparently "biblicizing" as the *Hodayot*, it might at least serve as an initial attempt to reflect on the underlying issues that arise rather sharply when we approach a Qumran text from the assumption that it employs, albeit indirectly, "Scripture" as its source.

EDITIONS, REWORKINGS, AND THE CONTINUITY OF TRADITION: SOME EXPERIMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS ON THE *GENESIS APOCRYPHON*

Hans Debel

In the past few years, discussions about the relationship between the "biblical" texts and the phenomenon of "rewriting/rewritten Scripture" have been in the front rank of biblical studies in general and Dead Sea Scrolls research in particular.[1] As noted in the oft-cited essay by Michael Segal, "rewriting" was the rule rather than the exception, and so-called "rewritings" simply continue the patterns and processes that gave rise to the biblical texts themselves.[2] These insights raise the important question whether certain texts may not have been too hastily classified as "rewritten Scripture" in the past, without considering the possibility that they represent a "variant literary edition" of the scriptural text—scholarly reflection on the "Reworked Pentateuch" texts presents an excellent example in this regard.[3] The present article intends to explore the case of another text, the *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen), the most badly preserved manuscript among the seven "original" scrolls from Cave 1, of which an article

---

[1] See, e.g., my paper "Rewritten Bible, Variant Literary Editions and Original Text(s): Exploring the Implications of a Pluriform Outlook on the Scriptural Tradition," in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period* (ed. Hanne Von Weissenberg et al.; BZAW 419; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 65–91; and, in the same volume, Molly M. Zahn, "Talking about Rewritten Texts: Some Reflections on Terminology," 93–119.

[2] See Michael Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), 10–28 at 28.

[3] See, e.g., the excellent state of the question by Molly M. Zahn, "The Problem of Characterizing the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts: Bible, Rewritten Bible, or None of the Above?" *DSD* 15 (2008): 315–39; and more extensively her recently published book *Rethinking Rewritten Scripture: Composition and Exegesis in the 4QReworked Pentateuch Manuscripts* (STDJ 95; Leiden: Brill, 2011); as well as Emanuel Tov's lengthy explanation of his second thoughts on the issue in "From 4QReworked Pentateuch to 4QPentateuch (?)," in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism* (ed. Mladen Popović; JSJSup 141; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 73–91. On the concept of "variant literary editions" of scriptural texts, reference should be made to the work of Eugene Ulrich; see, e.g., his most recent papers "The Jewish Scriptures: Texts, Versions, Canons," in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (ed. John J. Collins and Daniel C. Harlow; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010), 97–119; and "Methodological Reflections on Determining Scriptural Status in First Century Judaism," in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods* (ed. Maxine L. Grossman; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010), 145–61.

in *Time Magazine* once aptly described the outward appearance as a "dried cigar."[4]

As is well-known, this Aramaic retelling of the patriarchal accounts that, in its extant parts, roughly parallels Gen 5–15,[5] has been included under the heading of "rewritten Bible" ever since the term was coined by Geza Vermes in 1961.[6] Although subsequent research has significantly modified Vermes's understanding of the concept and attempted to formulate a set of criteria that enable a more precise classification of texts, the *Genesis Apocryphon* has always kept its intuitively determined position as one of the key texts that helps to proliferate the genre.[7] Besides its divergence from the known scriptural texts of Genesis (particularly in the Noah section),[8]

---

[4] On the scroll's wanderings around the globe, see particularly the relevant portions of the masterful survey by Weston W. Fields, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Full History. Volume One: 1947–1960* (Leiden: Brill, 2009); and on the subsequent stages in its decipherment, Daniel A. Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon: A New Text and Translation with Introduction and Special Treatment of Columns 13–17* (STDJ 79; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 21–26.

[5] Although it seems reasonable that the narrative continued at least through the birth of Isaac, as maintained by Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008), 126, ultimately it is impossible to determine the composition's original length, despite the conjectures by Matthew Morgenstern, "A New Clue to the Original Length of the Genesis Apocryphon," *JJS* 47 (1996): 345–47, that some 70–105 columns from the scroll's beginning are missing, and by Klaus Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 186–88, that the Aramaic fragments of 4Q537, 4Q538 and 4Q539 represent another copy of 1QapGen that continues the series of first-person accounts with Jacob looking back on his dream in Bethel, Benjamin recounting his encounter with Joseph in Egypt, and Joseph instructing his sons. In this regard, Philip S. Alexander, "Retelling the Old Testament," in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF* (ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 99–121 at 104, rightly notes that "[t]he title *Genesis Apocryphon* may be misleading [. . .] since there is no proof that the original work covered the whole of Genesis, or, for that matter, confined itself to Genesis."

[6] See Geza Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies* (StPB 4; Leiden: Brill, 1961), 124–25, discussing the *Genesis Apocryphon* in terms of "the lost link between the biblical and Rabbinic midrash," the author of which "does indeed try, by every means at his disposal, to make the biblical story more attractive, more real, more edifying, and above all more intelligible."

[7] For an overview of the issues involved, see, e.g., Molly M. Zahn, "Rewritten Scripture," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 323–36.

[8] Although the composition may originally have been structured around the stories of several patriarchs, the extant form of 1QapGen is commonly divided into a Noah and an Abram cycle; see, e.g., Daniel K. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (LSTS 63; CQS, 8; London: T&T Clark, 2007), 29–30, who notes the possibility of a Lamech cycle but prefers to consider the extant Lamech materials as part of the Noah cycle, linking Noah's birth to the Enochic myth of the Watchers. Nevertheless, Esther Eshel, "The Noah Cycle in the Genesis Apocryphon," in *Noah and His Book(s)* (ed. Michael E. Stone et al.; SBLEJL 28; Atlanta: SBL, 2010), 77–95 at 77–80,

the language of the composition is often referred to as the obvious reason why it cannot be classified as a "scriptural" text.[9]

However, as I have argued elsewhere,[10] the language argument can hardly be considered persuasive in the multilingual context of late Second Temple Judaism.[11] Many scholars now accept that the earlier parts of *1 Enoch* were accepted as authoritative Scripture by certain Second Temple Jews,[12] and the four fragmentary copies of Tobit from Cave 4 may hint at the fact that this book was originally written in Aramaic and only at a later stage translated into Hebrew.[13] At the very least, one needs to be aware that a *petitio principii* is lurking around the corner: if one assumes from the outset that no Aramaic text was ever considered scriptural, then one is inclined to relegate all Aramaic texts that could serve as a counter-example to an inferior status, so that, in the end, no evidence for the

---

believes that the surviving text can be divided into an Enoch cycle, a Noah cycle and an Abram cycle.

[9] As has been asserted most strongly by Moshe J. Bernstein, "Re-Arrangement, Anticipation and Harmonization as Exegetical Features in the Genesis Apocryphon," *DSD* 3 (1996): 37–57 at 39: "In the case of the Genesis Apocryphon, we are in no danger of erring and defining it as a biblical text, if for no other reason than that is was composed in Aramaic rather than Hebrew," cf. also Bernstein's "Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls: Categories and Functions," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Esther G. Chazon et al.; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 1–26 at 17: "the author of the Genesis Apocryphon avoided the appearance of forgery by writing in Aramaic"; and Alexander, "Retelling the Old Testament," 104, stating that the *Genesis Apocryphon*'s language "gives it a greater distinctness from the biblical text, and avoids the risk of confusing it with Scripture." Finally, according to Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," 17–18, both in the case of the *Genesis Apocryphon* and of Josephus's covering of the biblical period in his *Antiquitates*, the difference in language presents a clear demarcation line.

[10] See Hans Debel, "Greek 'Variant Literary Editions' to the Hebrew Bible?" *JSJ* 41 (2010): 161–91, where I could only briefly refer to the *Genesis Apocryphon* as a too quickly discarded text in Aramaic (185–87).

[11] Cf. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, "Rewritten Bible as a Borderline Phenomenon: Genre, Textual Strategy, or Canonical Anachronism?" in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. Anthony Hilhorst et al.; JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 285–306 at 288, n. 5, noting that the criterion of language "does not pay satisfactory heed to the fact that many Jews were fluent in more than one language."

[12] See particularly James C. VanderKam, "Revealed Literature in the Second Temple Period," in *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* (JSJSup 62; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 23–28; and most recently, Michael A. Knibb, "Reflections on the Status of the Early Enochic Writings," in Popović, *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*, 143–54, esp. 143–49.

[13] See, e.g., Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Significance of the Hebrew and Aramaic Texts of Tobit from Qumran for the Study of Tobit," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman et al.; Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 418–25.

use of Aramaic scriptural texts will be found and the unfounded assumption appears as proven by a circular reasoning. Therefore, this contribution will approach the issue from a literary perspective without using the external criterion of language. In the end, this inquiry will necessitate a more nuanced approach to the text and status of the *Genesis Apocryphon* itself, and will side with those scholars who reject making a rigid dichotomy between "variant literary editions" and "rewritten Bible/Scripture."

1. The Textual Strategies Applied in the *Genesis Apocryphon*: Some Parallels

1.1. *Which Text to Compare With?*

In dealing with the relationship between the *Genesis Apocryphon* and other texts containing the patriarchal traditions, one first of all needs to determine which text(s) should serve as a point of comparison. At first thought, it may seem perfectly logical to compare the *Genesis Apocryphon* to the single "edition" of Genesis found in MT-LXX-SP Genesis,[14] but this would disregard discussions about the dependence of 1QapGen on *Jubilees* and parts of *1 Enoch*. In their *editio princeps* of the scroll, Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin stated that "the scroll may have served as a source for a number of stories told more concisely in 1 Enoch and the Book of Jubilees," a conclusion endorsed, inter alia, by Geza Vermes.[15] Joseph A. Fitzmyer, however, believes the opposite to be more likely, viz. that 1QapGen depends on *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*,[16] and Daniel K. Falk likewise noted that "the strongest arguments seem to favor the view that the *Genesis Apocryphon* draws on both *Jubilees* and parts of *1 Enoch*."[17] In a similar vein,

---

[14] As is well-known, many scholars think in terms of a single "edition" for the scriptural Genesis, with the possible exception of the chronological sections in Gen 5:18–32 and 11:10–32; see, e.g., Eugene Ulrich, "Two Perspectives on Two Pentateuchal Manuscripts from Masada," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. Shalom M. Paul et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 453–64, esp. 460, 462; and James C. VanderKam and Peter W. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 2002), 104–5.

[15] See, respectively, Nahman Avigad and Yigael Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1956), 38; and Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*, 124.

[16] Thus, e.g., Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (1Q20): A Commentary* (BibOr 18B; Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2004), 20.

[17] Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts*, 29.

Sidnie White Crawford suggests that the composer of 1QapGen wished to incorporate the narratives of the (in his view equally authoritative) books of Genesis, *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, and possibly also the hypothetical *Book of Noah*,[18] into a single whole.[19] Nevertheless, most recently Esther Eshel saw the position of Avigad and Yadin confirmed through the geographical traditions evidenced in 1QapGen,[20] whereas Dan A. Machiela argued that the geographical similarities and discrepancies between 1QapGen and *Jubilees* point in the direction of a common source, presumably of a cartographic rather than a textual nature.[21]

The dependence of 1QapGen on *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch* thus being a disputed matter, for the sake of the argument the foregoing study will compare 1QapGen with the text of Genesis found in MT-LXX-SP. Doing so, this by no means implies any judgment on the overall stability of the text of the Genesis traditions in Second Temple times, nor on the authoritativeness of this textual tradition in particular. In fact, a dependence of 1QapGen on *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch* would only strengthen the argument that will be raised in this paper: if, indeed, both *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch* were intended as authoritative representations of the patriarchal traditions, and 1QapGen depends on them, then neither the distance from 1QapGen vis-à-vis the authoritative form(s) of these traditions nor the fact that it was written in Aramaic can be used any longer to relegate this composition to the position of "rewritten Scripture."

1.2. *Rearrangement, Harmonisation, Additions and Omissions*

Likewise comparing 1QapGen with MT-LXX-SP Genesis, Moshe Bernstein has described three closely related techniques by which the author attempted to create a smoother and more seamless narrative, viz. (1) rearrangement of information supplied elsewhere in the narrative on what is deemed a more appropriate place; (2) anticipation to such information

---

[18] On the heavily disputed existence of such a *Book of Noah*, see, e.g., Michael E. Stone, "The Book(s) Attributed to Noah," *DSD* 13 (2006): 4–23.

[19] See White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 116, 126–27.

[20] See Esther Eshel, "The *Imago Mundi* of the *Genesis Apocryphon*," in *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism* (ed. Lynn R. LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber; JSJSup 119; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 111–31.

[21] Thus Dan A. Machiela, "'Each to His Own Inheritance': Geography as an Evaluative Tool in the Genesis Apocryphon," *DSD* 15 (2008): 50–66. For a summary of research into the relationship between 1QapGen and both *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch*, see Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*, 9–17, where he rightly notes that statements about one or the other's alleged priority often rely on vague intuition.

without removing it from its original location; and (3) constructive harmonisation or the filling-in of information that is lacking in the text but is referred to elsewhere.[22] In his conclusions, he readily admits that these three strategies are ultimately "variations on a single theme," and that particularly "anticipation" and "constructive harmonisation" could easily be brought together under the same heading of "harmonisation" in a broadly defined sense. Elsewhere, Bernstein has pointed to the insertion of new textual material without overt reason as one of the outstanding characteristics of this composition, particularly in the Noah section.[23] Finally, White Crawford lists five techniques applied by the composer of 1QapGen: addition, omission, harmonisation, re-arrangement, and anticipation.[24]

The most obvious parallel to the application of these techniques is the extensive reworking of Samuel-Kings in Chronicles, which reorganises the accounts on the kings and incorporates new material in order to put a distinct emphasis on the person and house of David and on the centrality of the Temple in Jerusalem. However, Chronicles is usually classified as an example of "rewritten Bible/Scripture," and not as "variant literary edition" of Samuel-Kings,[25] although the term may apply to certain chapters in Chronicles.[26] For 1 Kings, however, such an alternate edition is evidenced in the Old Greek, which a number of scholars regard as representing an older textual form ("Old Hebrew") than is found in MT.[27] In a recent article, Emanuel Tov, who considers the *Vorlage* of 3 Kingdoms as a later rewriting of the text reflected in MT, summarised the differences between the two "editions" as addition of new material, omission, duplication of sections found elsewhere, and transposition of verses.[28] This description

---

[22] For definitions of the terms, see Bernstein, "Re-Arrangement, Anticipation and Harmonization," 38–39.

[23] See Moshe J. Bernstein, "Pentateuchal Interpretation at Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1:128–59, esp. 145.

[24] See the techniques referred to by White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*, 107, 126.

[25] See, e.g., Segal, "Between Bible and Rewritten Bible," 20–21.

[26] See, e.g., Eugene Ulrich, "David, the Plague, and the Angel: 2 Samuel 24 Revisited," in *After Qumran: Old and Modern Editions of Biblical Texts—The Historical Books* (ed. Hans Ausloos et al.; Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 63–79; as well as numerous studies by Adrian Schenker, such as his analysis of 1 Kings 3 // 2 Chron 1 in "Salomo, Gibeon und Jerusalem: Das gegenseitige Verhältnis der vier Berichte von Salomo in Gibeon (1 Königreiche 3; 3 Königreiche 3; 2 Chronik 1; 2 Paralipomena 1)," *Annali di Scienze Religiose N.S.* 1 (2008): 19–43.

[27] For a summary of the divergent opinions on the relationship between LXX 3 Kingdoms and MT 1 Kings, see Percy S. F. van Keulen, *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative* (VTSup 104; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 4–20.

[28] See Emanuel Tov, "3 Kingdoms Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions," in Hilhorst et al., *Flores Florentino*, 345–66, esp. 353–55.

of the techniques applied by the (supposed) reviser of 1 Kings displays strong similarities with Bernstein's characterisation of the *Genesis Apocryphon*, but this, however, does not prevent Tov from putting 3 Kingdoms on a par with similar rewritten texts that are commonly labelled "editions" of the scriptural text.[29] Moreover, it is worthwhile to note Zipora Talshir's presentation of 3 Kingdoms as an "edition" that was largely created on the basis of "midrashic" exegesis,[30] which recalls Vermes's description of the *Genesis Apocryphon* as "the most ancient midrash of all."[31]

Another literary strategy that links up the "variant literary editions" of 1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms to the *Genesis Apocryphon* is that of harmonisation,[32] which likewise appears in MT's revised edition of Joshua when compared to the older edition preserved in the Old Greek.[33] In fact, small harmonising additions and alterations pervade the scriptural texts,[34] but they appear most pronouncedly in the so-called "pre-Samaritan" group of texts,[35] which Esther Eshel proposed to designate a "harmonistic" group.[36]

---

[29] See, e.g., Emanuel Tov, "Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere," in *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten* (ed. Martin Karrer et al.; WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 369–93.

[30] See particularly Z. Talshir, "1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms: Origin and Revision. Case Study: The Sins of Solomon (1 Kgs 11)," *Textus* 21 (2002): 71–105, esp. 71–77; cf. also her monograph *The Alternative Story: 3 Kingdoms 12:24a-z* (JBS 6; Jerusalem: Simor, 1993), 281, attributing the book to "a reviser who elaborates upon given material, using methods well-established in the Midrash."

[31] Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*, 124.

[32] Examples have been discussed by Philippe Hugo, see, e.g., *Les deux visages d'Elie: Texte massorétique et Septante dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 17–18* (OBO 217; Fribourg: Academic Press, 2006), 301–22; and "Text and Literary History: The Case of 1 Kings 19 (MT and LXX)," in *Soundings in Kings: Perspectives and Methods in Contemporary Scholarship* (ed. Mark Leuchter and Klaus-Peter Adam; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2010), 15–34, at 21–24.

[33] As has been argued particularly by Kristin De Troyer, "'And They Did So': Following Orders Given by Old Joshua," in *Her Master's Tools? Feminist and Postcolonial Engagements of Historical-Critical Discourse* (ed. Caroline Vander Stichele and Todd Penner; SBLGPBS 9; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2005), 145–57.

[34] Thus Emanuel Tov, "Textual Harmonizations in the Ancient Texts of Deuteronomy," in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible and Qumran: Collected Essays* (TSAJ 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 271–82 at 272. On the phenomenon of harmonisation, see also his still valuable study "The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts," *JSOT* 31 (1985): 3–29.

[35] See especially Emanuel Tov, "Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch," *DSD* 5 (1998): 334–54, esp. 339–43.

[36] See her suggestion in Esther Eshel, "4QDeut^{n}: A Text that Has Undergone Harmonistic Editing," *HUCA* 62 (1991): 117–54 at 120–21, taken up by Emanuel Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert: An Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov; The Bible as Book 4; London: British Library, 2002), 139–66 at 155.

A case in point of such a harmonising approach, bearing strong resemblances to the harmonisation of command and execution in MT Joshua, can be found in the so-called "Plagues Narrative," where the execution of God's commands by Moses and Aaron is systematically added to the text where it seemingly lacked, and vice versa, both in SP and in two "pre-Samaritan" manuscripts from Qumran.[37]

With respect to the rearrangement of textual material, one could point to the two "editions" of the tabernacle section in MT and LXX Exodus, or to the reordering of wisdom sayings that appears in LXX Proverbs. An even more significant example is provided by the two "editions" of Jeremiah in MT and LXX, of which the former is acknowledged to constitute a later revision marked by a number of plusses and by a reorganisation of pericopes, particularly but not exclusively with respect to the "Oracles against the Nations." Remarkably, the rearrangements that appear in 1QapGen are of a more limited nature, and yet the composition is usually lumped into a "parascriptural/-biblical" group of texts, while the status of MT Jeremiah as a "scriptural" text is hardly ever questioned.

Finally, insertions of new material and omissions of certain parts of the text were well-established scribal techniques to produce a more coherent text. This can readily be seen in the *4Q*[*Reworked*]*Pentateuch* texts, which contain, next to some instances of harmonistic editing shared with the "pre-Samaritan" group, a number of substantial additions of which the otherwise unattested "Song of Miriam" represents the most salient example.[38] Additions and omissions are also evident in the two "editions" of the restoration narratives attested in LXX 1 Esdras and MT Ezra-Nehemiah (LXX 2 Esdras),[39] unless one considers both as independent developments

---

[37] For a discussion of these "larger plusses," see Bénédicte Lemmelijn, "The So-Called 'Major Expansions' in SamP, 4QpaleoExod^{m} and 4QExod^{j} of Exod 7:14–11:10: On the Edge between Textual Criticism and Literary Criticism," in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Oslo, 1998* (ed. B. A. Taylor; SBLSCS 51; Atlanta: SBL, 2001), 429–39; as well as her monograph *A Plague of Texts: A Text-Critical Study of the So-Called 'Plagues Narrative' in Exod. 7:14–11:10* (OtSt 56; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 197–207.

[38] A concise overview of additions and of a few omissions in *4Q*[*Reworked*]*Pentateuch* is provided by Emanuel Tov, "Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts with Special Attention to 4QRP and 4QPara Gen-Exod," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Eugene Ulrich and James C. VanderKam; CJAn 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 111–34, esp. 130–33; see also White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*, 40–52, which includes a useful discussion on harmonisations in 4Q364–365.

[39] To be precise, if the edition of 1 Esdras preceded that of Ezra-Nehemiah, then the latter's composer left out an entire episode from the narrative, usually referred to as the "Story of the Three Youths," while simultaneously inserting a large chunk of text presumably

of a common ancestor. In fact, Talshir's outlook on (the Hebrew *Vorlage* of) 1 Esdras as having been created for the sole purpose of inserting the "Story of the Three Youths" could easily be transferred to 1QapGen,[40] because one of the latter's principal aims may have been to integrate certain traditions about Noah into a more seamless narrative. The most telling parallel, in this regard, comes from the two "editions" of David's battle with Goliath in 1 Sam 17–18, as LXX's "heroic tale" is about 50 percent shorter than its conflation with a "romantic tale" in MT.[41] Apparently, MT's interweaving of supplementary traditions about David poses no problems for the "scriptural" character of this pericope, while many scholars insist that the insertion of additional traditions about Noah urges us to consider the *Genesis Apocryphon* as an example of "rewritten Bible/Scripture." Given the inconsistency of this reasoning, one is tempted to conclude that the principal—and perhaps only—reason for not relegating MT's heavily reworked David-Goliath episode to the category of "rewritten Bible/Scripture" lies in its presence among the Masoretic collection of texts. True enough, this could be considered a valuable argument from a certain point of view, but it can hardly be called an investigation of "the situation as it existed at the time," and rather anachronistically judges the evidence by "the present outcome of history."[42]

2. The Added Layers in the *Genesis Apocryphon*: Some Suggestions

As is well known, this latter approach to the scriptural texts has been jettisoned by Eugene Ulrich, who relentlessly insisted that "theories and conclusions must rest upon data," rather than being governed by modern

borrowed from another literary source commonly called the "Nehemiah Memoir." If, on the other hand, the edition of Ezra-Nehemiah preceded that of 1 Esdras, then a scribe omitted the entire account about Nehemiah and incorporated the story about Zerubbabel and his two fellows at the royal court into the rewritten narrative he produced.

[40] See Zipora Talshir, *1 Esdras: From Origin to Translation* (SBLSCS 47; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 270.

[41] With respect to the two editions of this pericope, see particularly the joint research venture by Dominique Barthélemy et al., *The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism* (OBO 73: Fribourg, Editions Universitaires, 1986).

[42] See particularly Ulrich, "Two Perspectives on Two Pentateuchal Manuscripts from Masada," 455–58 (quotes taken resp. from 456 and 457). See also his "The Text of the Hebrew Scriptures at the Time of Hillel and Jesus," in *Congress Volume Basel 2001* (ed. André Lemaire; VTSup 92; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 85–108, esp. 92–94.

notions of how the "biblical" text must have looked like.[43] Operating from an inductive perspective, he proposed to clearly separate three (and later four)[44] fundamentally different types of variation, of which the qualitatively highest level is that of "variant literary editions."[45] As he defined such editions as an intentional reworking of a textual unit by a creative scribe who consciously added a new layer in order to meet the needs and opportunities of his contemporary community,[46] it seems a worthwhile pursuit to investigate whether certain patterns of variation emerge from a comparison of 1QapGen with MT-LXX-SP Genesis.

2.1. *An Apocalyptic Frame with the Patriarchs as Paragons of Virtue*

For as far as one can tell from its extant parts, the composer of 1QapGen did not merely aim to create a seamless and more coherent narrative by applying the techniques discussed in the previous paragraph, but also recasted the Flood narrative in particular into the apocalyptic frame that is now often called "Enochic,"[47] perhaps because he considered the ancient Flood as the prototype of the end-time which he expected in the very near future.[48] This interest in the antediluvian era may well explain the incorporation of the material associated with the figure of Noah that is

---

[43] See already his essay "Characteristics and Limitations of the Old Latin Translation of the Septuagint," in *La Septuaginta en la Investigación Contemporánea* (*V Congreso de la IOSCS*) (ed. N. Fernández Marcos; TECC 34; Madrid: Arias Montano, 1985), 67–80, esp. 68, as well as, e.g., "Multiple Literary Editions: Reflections 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. Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks; STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 78–105, esp. 81–82.

[44] See, e.g., Ulrich, "The Jewish Scriptures," 110–12.

[45] See especially his seminal essay "Pluriformity in the Biblical Text, Text Groups, and Questions of Canon," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress* (ed. Julio Trebolle Barrera and Luis Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 23–41.

[46] See, for instance, his description in "The Canonical Process, Textual Criticism, and Latter Stages in the Composition of the Bible," in *Sha'arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (ed. Michael Fishbane and Emanuel Tov; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 267–91 at 278; comp. the definition in his forthcoming article *The Old Testament Text and Its Transmission* (to be published in the *New Cambridge History of the Bible*), of which he graciously shared an advanced copy with me: "A variant edition is a new reproduction of a book or passage which faithfully attempts to transmit the text being copied but at the same time revises it substantially according to a discernible set of principles."

[47] See particularly Dan A. Machiela, "Genesis Revealed: The Apocalyptic Apocryphon from Qumran Cave 1," in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery* (ed. Daniel K. Falk et al.; STDJ 91; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 205–21.

[48] Thus George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (2d ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 174.

lacking in MT-LXX-SP Genesis, and probably also accounts for the relocation of the story of the Watchers before the birth of Noah.[49] As a result, Noah appears as a much more developed character, the model of a righteous man living amidst "a hopelessly wicked generation."[50]

Through its enhancement of Noah's character, 1QapGen stands in stark contrast to the bittersweet interpretation of Noah in the rabbinic tradition. The rabbis tend to view Noah as a kind of one-eyed king in the country of the blind, who pales before the righteousness of Abram and Moses,[51] despite the fact that Gen 6:9 calls him a "man of perfect righteousness," which is echoed in Ben Sira's "Praise of the Fathers" (Sir 44:17).[52] By the removal of questionable elements in his character, 1QapGen portrays Noah as a paragon of virtue, "a new Adam and a proto-Abraham."[53] At the same time, however, Abram is also presented in a more positive way, particularly through attributing him additional acts of piety, smoothing

---

[49] See Moshe J. Bernstein, "From the Watchers to the Flood: Story and Exegesis in the Early Columns of the *Genesis Apocryphon*," in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (ed. Esther G. Chazon et al.; STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 47, 63.

[50] Thus Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*, 101, who furthermore notes that the admirers of Noah and Enoch, the latter of whom would eventually surpass the former as the supreme paradigm of righteousness, "were attracted to the idea of super-human heroes—peerless benchmarks against which the corruption of their own generation could be measured"; comp. Dorothy M. Peters, *Noah Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conversations and Controversies of Antiquity* (SBLEJL 26; Atlanta: SBL, 2008), 180: "the representation of an archetype for a known righteous figure or as the hoped-for ideal of a contemporary group or movement who lived in a time of 'violence, evil, and deceit' (1Q20 XI,13–14)"; and Devorah Dimant, "Noah in Early Jewish Literature," in *Biblical Figures outside the Bible* (ed. Michael E. Stone and Theodore A. Bergren; Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press, 1998), 123–50 at 135: "Noah, the righteous survivor, becomes the prototype of the small group of righteous that is active amidst wickedness at the dawn of the eschatological era, a group that will survive and build the new and just world to come."

[51] Cf. Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts*, 68, summarising the rabbinic interpretation of Noah as "only the best of a degenerate lot." According to Dimant, "Noah in Early Jewish Literature," 143, the rabbis may have deliberately downplayed Noah's righteousness as a reaction against his prominent place in certain circles.

[52] In this respect, Moshe J. Bernstein, "Noah and the Flood at Qumran," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 199–231 at 203, points out that "Ben Sira gives us no hint of any extrabiblical information and seems to imply no more than a passing interest in Noah." On the evolvement of the theme of Noah's righteousness in Second Temple literature, particularly *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, see James C. VanderKam, "The Righteousness of Noah," in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (ed. John J. Collins and George W. E. Nickelsburg; SBLSCS 12; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1980), 13–32.

[53] Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts*, 67. Comp. Michael E. Stone, "The Axis of History at Qumran," in Chazon et al., *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives*, 133–49 at 141: "a second Adam for the new, postdiluvian world order."

out his quarrel with his nephew Lot, and concealing his deception for his own profit.[54] As such, the question may be raised whether the *Genesis Apocryphon* intended to present all the patriarchs as models of virtue in the light of the "Urzeit-Endzeit typology" of its composer.[55]

2.2. *An Interaction of Purity, Righteousness and Geography*

In addition, a seminal essay by George Nickelsburg drew attention to the fact that letting the patriarchs tell their own account not only enhances the story's vividness, but also allows the author to develop the psychological dynamics of the main characters, particularly Lamech and Abram, who share a remarkable concern for their wife's sexual purity.[56] In both cases, the questioning of the female character's purity eventually comes to the benefit of the male protagonist, whose descendants will receive the land.[57] In order to assure his readers that the land of Israel has of old been designated by God as the rightful inheritance of Abram, the composer of 1QapGen emphatically presents him as the heir of Noah's grandson Arpachshad.[58] Furthermore, the purity of the divinely favoured genealogical line from which the people of Israel descends is explicitly safeguarded by attributing to Noah's son Shem, the father of Arpachshad, five sons and five daughters who are to marry each other in the exceptional post-diluvian situation, thus avoiding intermarriages with the children of Ham and Japhet, who would father the nations.[59] As such, so Ida Fröhlich has

---

[54] See, e.g., Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts*, 84–85. On the more positive depiction of Abram in the story of his sojourn in Egypt as a case in point, see most recently Beate Ego, "The Figure of Abraham in the *Genesis Apocryphon*'s Re-Narration of Gen 12:10–20," in *Qumran Cave 1 Revisited: Texts from Cave 1 Sixty Years after Their Discovery* (ed. Daniel K. Falk et al.; STDJ 91; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 233–43; and Jacques T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, "The Book of Jubilees and the Genesis Apocryphon as Examples of the Rewriting of Authoritative Texts in Early Judaism: The Case of Abram and Sarai's Stay in Egypt (Gen 12:9–13:4)," in *Beyond Biblical Theologies* (ed. H. Assel et al.; WUMNT; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, forthcoming).

[55] Thus Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*, 132.

[56] See George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Patriarchs Who Worry about Their Wives: A Haggadic Tendency in the Genesis Apocryphon," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon; STDJ 28; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 137–58.

[57] Thus I. Fröhlich, "'Narrative Exegesis' in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Stone and Chazon, *Biblical Perspectives*, 81–99, esp. 96.

[58] Thus Machiela, "'Each to His Own Inheritance,'" 65.

[59] See the short but important essay by James C. VanderKam, "The Granddaughters and Grandsons of Noah," *RevQ* 16/63 (1994): 457–61, who points out that the *Genesis Apocryphon* thus differs from *Jubilees*, which seems to suggest intermarriage between the children of Shem and Japhet.

pointed out, purity, righteousness and geography are closely intertwined in 1QapGen, which may well echo the specific interests of its composer's community.[60]

2.3. *Repetition and Resignification in the Genesis Apocryphon*

In line with the first part of this paper, it may briefly be noted that neither the tendency to present the people's ancestors in a more favourable light nor the interest in the main character's thoughts and feelings are unique to 1QapGen as they are likewise attested in variant "editions" of scriptural text. Thus, for example, the longer edition of Esther in LXX improves on the emotions of Esther and Mordecai when compared to the "matter-of-fact narrative" of the Hebrew text,[61] and one of the *4Q[Reworked]Pentateuch* manuscripts contains a "plus" that elaborates on Rebecca's grief at Jacob's departure,[62] while scholars of Samuel-Kings have expressed divergent opinions on which of the textual witnesses portrays David and Solomon in a more positive way.[63] Again, the nature of the textual differences between 1QapGen and MT-LXX-SP Genesis is not fundamentally different from what can be found in commonly accepted examples of genuine "editions" of the scriptural texts.

The upshot of these observations is that, if "stability" and "adaptability" constitute the principal dynamics that led to the creation of "variant

---

[60] See Fröhlich, "'Narrative Exegesis' in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 95–96.

[61] Thus White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*, 121–22.

[62] See Tov, "Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts," 132.

[63] Long ago, in a study devoted to the principles underlying the γγ-section, the tendency towards a more positive portrayal of the kings, particularly Solomon, was highlighted by John W. Wevers, "Exegetical Principles Underlying the Septuagint Text of 1 Kings ii 12–xxi 43," in *OTS* 8 (ed. P. A. H. De Boer; Leiden: Brill, 1950), 300–22, and it has recently been revived by Andrzej S. Turkanik, *Of Kings and Reigns: A Study of Translation Technique in the Gamma/Gamma Section of 3 Reigns* (*1 Kings*) (FAT II 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), who maintains that LXX 3 Kingdoms takes great pains to whitewash David and Salomon. However, other scholars believe that the attempt to present the kings of the united monarchy in a more favourable light should be located on the part of MT 1 Kings, which they believe contains a revision of (the *Vorlage* of) LXX 3 Kingdoms; thus, e.g., Adrian Schenker, *Septante et Texte Massorétique dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 2–14* (CRB 48; Paris: Gabalda, 2000), 151–52; Jörg Hutzli, "Mögliche Retuschen am Davidbild in der masoretischen Fassung der Samuelbucher," in *David und Saul im Widerstreit—Diachronie und Synchronie im Wettstreit: Beiträge zur Auslegung des ersten Samuelbuches* (ed. Walter Dietrich; OBO 206: Fribourg, Academic Press, 2004), 102–15; and Philippe Hugo, "Abner der Königsmacher *versus* David den gesalbten König (2 Sam 3,21.39): Die Charakterisierung Abners und Davids als Merkmale der literarischen Abweichung zwischen dem Massoretischen Text und der Septuaginta," in *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse* (ed. Wolfgang Kraus et al.; WUNT 252; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 489–505.

literary editions" of scriptural texts,[64] then 1QapGen certainly qualifies for that designation. In essence, it repeats the overall narrative as it stands in other textual witnesses of the patriarchal accounts, maintaining the general order of events and leaving out little of its content.[65] At the same time, however, it recasts—or one could say *resignifies*—the story into a new framework and enriches it with additional layers. In other words, the composer of 1QapGen contemporises the tradition and makes it relevant for his audience, which corresponds exactly to Ulrich's definition of a "variant literary edition."[66] Or to use Ulrich's inventive comparison to baklava: a creative scribe added new layers on top of the tradition which he was faithfully handing down, and the heated honey of his community's actual experience formed them into a unity.[67]

3. The *Genesis Apocryphon* and the Continuity of Tradition

As such, a careful consideration of the remains of the narrative found in 1QapGen reveals that the literary strategies occurring in this peculiar composition do not qualitatively differ from similar rewritings of other narratives that are commonly accepted as "variant literary editions" of the scriptural text. At the very least, we therefore need to take into account the *possibility* that 1QapGen presents us with a "variant literary edition" of the patriarchal accounts. Whether or not it was also accepted by a community as an authoritative text that had the status of "scripture," cannot be ascertained in the absence of solid evidence, as arguments from silence are, by their very nature, built on shifting sands, and the vicissitudes of history may simply have erased any trace of a text's importance for certain people. This, however, ought not to concern us here, because the authoritative reception of a composition should be treated separately from its coming into being as a rewriting of an existing text.

---

[64] As maintained by Ulrich in his assessment of the seminal work by James A. Sanders; see esp. Ulrich, "The Canonical Process, Textual Criticism, and Latter Stages in the Composition of the Bible," 288–89.

[65] As noted by Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts*, 94; see also Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1*, 16–17.

[66] Comp. Ulrich, "The Canonical Process, Textual Criticism, and Latter Stages in the Composition of the Bible," 289.

[67] For this comparison, see his essay "The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures at Qumran," in Ulrich and VanderKam, *The Community of the Renewed Covenant*, 77–94, esp. 83–84.

Nevertheless, 1QapGen's rewriting of the patriarchal accounts seems to indicate that certain *traditions* carried an authoritative status,[68] and it definitely enhanced peoples' interest in these stories, which paved the way for the later concept of a single, canonical text.[69] As such a standard text did not yet exist during Second Temple times, speculations about 1QapGen being intended to replace or to function alongside an authoritative text, or about its "parabiblical/-scriptural" nature introduce a false and entirely anachronistic dichotomy.[70] If anything was considered authoritative at the time, it was the tradition rather than a specific textual form in which this tradition has been "frozen." Following the important reflections of Hindy Najman,[71] one could therefore say that 1QapGen presents us with one particular crystallisation of that tradition, functioning alongside others to which it is genealogically related, but still differing from them in that it attempts to provide a particular interpretative context for the tradition. As one of the forms by which the tradition was shaped and transmitted, 1QapGen re-presented the scriptural tradition, perhaps in a way that suited popular imagination.[72] The composer's choice for Aramaic as the vehicle of his retelling may reflect an attempt to "resignify" the tradition on the linguistic level, too, as he rendered the patriarchal narratives into a language better understood by the common people,[73] or perhaps into the language preferred by the "apocalyptic" circles to which its composer seemingly belonged.

Be that as it may, whether or not to call 1QapGen an example of "rewritten Bible/Scripture" or a "variant literary edition" was presumably of little avail for a modal Second Temple Jew, who could easily recognise the story line of the patriarchal tradition and may have been eager to learn more about his ancient forefathers who had played an important role in

---

[68] See, e.g., Machiela, *The Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon*, 131.

[69] Thus George J. Brooke, "Between Authority and Canon: The Significance of Reworking the Bible for Understanding the Canonical Process," in Chazon et al., *Reworking the Bible*, 85–104 at 94, who furthermore points out that, paradoxically, the very creation of the *Genesis Apocryphon* may be indicative of the fact that MT-LXX-SP Genesis was well on its way to become the sole authoritative representative of the tradition from which the *Genesis Apocryphon* took form (p. 96–97).

[70] Comp., nevertheless, the well-balanced reflections of Zahn, "Rewritten Scripture," 329–31.

[71] See Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 44–46.

[72] Thus Falk, *The Parabiblical Texts*, 141, who points to the "imaginative and emotional elements" in the text.

[73] An idea borrowed from Alison Salvesen, "Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation," in *The Biblical World* (ed. John Barton; London: Routledge, 2004), 323–32 at 324.

the foundation of the world as he knew it. Seen from this perspective, 1QapGen leads us into the shadowy zone where an authoritative tradition had already taken a generally stable shape, but had not yet become enshrined in one specific textual form. As such, this peculiar composition helps reveal the dynamic process from which both the texts commonly described as "variant literary editions," as well as the compositions usually labelled "rewritten Bible/Scripture" took form. Both concepts are rooted in the continuous retelling of tradition, and the principal difference between them is all too often sought in their respective distance from the text that later became canonical. If we are to free ourselves from letting the actual canonical text govern our reconstructions of the development of the text in antiquity, then the case in point of the *Genesis Apocryphon* urges us to allow the distinction between "variant literary editions" and "rewritten Bible/Scripture" to become blurred and to dissolve into a "sliding scale" or a "spectrum" for the period prior to the fixation of the text.[74] Admittedly, this may seem like opening the proverbial can of worms, but, as Ulrich has repeatedly emphasised, we should investigate every source of evidence at our disposal, and if the picture we form in accordance to it clashes with our modern picture, we should honestly consider whether it is not our categories that ought to be revised.[75]

4. Conclusion

In sum, it should be clear that any statements on the *Genesis Apocryphon* must remain tentative on account of the deteriorated nature of the preserved parts, even if what has remained allows one to discern some of the major tenets of its retelling.[76] Leaving aside the fact that the composition was written in Aramaic, the present study has attempted to locate some

---

[74] See, respectively, George J. Brooke, "The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible," in Herbert and Tov, *The Bible as Book*, 31–40, esp. 36; and White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times*, 13–14. See also my article "Rewritten Bible, Variant Literary Editions and Original Text(s)." Furthermore, for another case in point, see my essay "A Quest for Appropriate Terminology: The Joshua Texts as a Case in Point," in *The Book of Joshua and the Land of Israel* (ed. Ed Noort; Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming).

[75] See, e.g., Eugene Ulrich, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text," in Flint and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, 1:79–100 at 85; and Ulrich, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Biblical Text," in Schiffman et al., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery*, 51–59 at 54.

[76] Cf. George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Response to Eileen Schuller," in *George W. E. Nickelsburg in Perspective: An Ongoing Dialogue of Learning* (ed. Jacob Neusner and Alan J. Avery-Peck;

blind spots in its straightforward classification as an example of "rewritten Bible/Scripture." By pointing to a number of parallels for the literary strategies used to create a more seamless narrative, and to the distinctive layers that were imposed upon the inherited tradition, this investigation has drawn attention to the fact that 1QapGen could also be classified, with an equal degree of plausibility, as a "variant literary edition" of the scriptural Genesis. Ultimately, 1QapGen presents us with one particular crystallisation of the same scriptural tradition that gave rise to the texts that later received the label "biblical," and stands in continuity with the composition process of these texts themselves. As such, rather than constituting a classic example of the genre "rewritten Bible/Scripture," the case of the *Genesis Apocryphon* demonstrates how our scholarly categories still fall short of adequately depicting the development of the scriptural tradition and its texts during Second Temple times.[77]

JSJSup 80; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 213–15 at 213: "One sees the many lacunae that remain, and one is (or should be) forced to qualify any general statements about this text."

[77] The author is a postdoctoral Research Fellow of the Research Foundation—Flanders (FWO-Vlaanderen), working at the *Centre for Septuagint Studies and Textual Criticism* (CCSTC), Faculty of Theology and postdoctoral Religious Studies, KU Leuven (http://www.theo.kuleuven.be/lxxtc/en/), directed by prof. dr. Bénédicte Lemmelijn (KU Leuven). Thanks go out to the participants in the seventh meeting of the IOQS for their comments on the oral presentation of this paper, and particularly to the editors of the present volume for their constructive criticisms that helped improve a previous version of it.

EXEGETICAL *WILES*: 4Q184 AS SCRIPTURAL INTERPRETATION

Michael J. Lesley[1]

I have taught you the way of wisdom;
I have led you in the paths of uprightness.
When you walk, your step will not be hampered;
and if you run, you will not stumble.
Prov 4:11–12

She raises her eyes wantonly
to seek out a righteous man and lead him astray,
and a perfect man to make him stumble . . .
so they do not walk in the way of uprightness.
4Q184 1 13–14, 16–17

1. Introduction

4Q184 (4QWiles of the Wicked Woman) has one of the most varied histories of interpretation among the Qumran scrolls.[2] First published in 1961, it was available to scholars nearly thirty years before most of the remaining scrolls from Cave 4, including the majority of the Qumran wisdom texts. With so long between its publication and that of some of the most relevant comparative material, there was time for much speculation about the meaning of the character in the central fragment of the text. This character—the dark female who causes men to sin—has been understood variously as one of the historical enemies of the Qumran sect, evidence of sectarian misogyny, a demon, a pedagogical vehicle, and, in the current consensus view, a general symbol for evil.[3]

---

[1] I would like to thank a number of people who offered help and suggestions on this work at various stages: George Brooke, Matthew Goff, Joanna Greenlee Kline, Jon Levenson, Cameron Moran, Suzanne Smith, and Andrew Teeter. Most of all I would like to thank my teacher, Maxine Grossman, for her immeasurable kindness and encouragement.

[2] The title derives from the first publication by John Allegro, "The Wiles of the Wicked Woman: A Sapiential Work from Qumran's Fourth Cave," *PEQ* 96 (1964): 53–55. However, no title was given by Allegro in the official edition in *Qumran Cave 4 I* (DJDJ 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 82–85.

[3] Historical interpretations were proposed by Jean Carmignac, "Poème allégorique sur la secte rivale," *RevQ* 5/19 (1965): 361–74; Hans Burgmann, "The Wicked Woman: Der

Despite these differences in interpretation, there are two consistent points of agreement in all scholarship on the text. The first, often stated explicitly, is that the character described in the main fragment of the scroll is based on the evil female characters from the book of Proverbs, the Strange Woman (אשה זרה) and Dame Folly (אשת כסילות). But there are significant differences between the characters from Proverbs and the one found in 4Q184 1, some of which explicitly contradict the philosophy of Proverbs. These have lead to the second point of agreement, this one usually implicit: since the differences from the character in Proverbs are inexplicable in light of Proverbs itself, the interpreter of 4Q184 1 must simply have taken the scriptural text and reused it to fit his own ideological purposes.

In a recent volume on biblical interpretation, Phillip Davies gives an especially lucid summary of the problems of interpreting the scriptural language and allusion in 4Q184 and in Qumran literature in general. 4Q184 in particular "illustrates a typical dilemma facing Qumran scholars":

> It describes a woman who is generally understood to be the evil woman of Proverbs 7 (from which a good deal of the language and imagery is clearly borrowed). Is this merely a reprise of the scriptural warning against folly, or is it a sectarian warning against defection? Or is it directed against women in general, in a possibly celibate community, since, among other things, this woman "makes the simple rebel against God" . . . [D]espite stretches of "non-sectarian" traditional wisdom language, there is a very different worldview lying behind these compositions . . . the importance of this insight is not only that these texts are, after all, possibly "sectarian," but also that they show how the scriptural texts were being *understood* as they were read. For if it is true, as it undoubtedly is, that the writers of the Qumran literature, and the

---

Makkabäer Simon," *RevQ* 8/31 (1974): 323–59; the study of gender in 4Q184 has been treated a number of times, especially by Melissa Aubin, " 'She is the beginning of all the ways of perversity': Femininity and Metaphor in 4Q184," *Women In Judaism: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 2 (2001): 1–23; and William Loader, *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Sectarian and Related Literature at Qumran* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009). Joseph M. Baumgarten, "On the Nature of the Seductress in 4Q184" *RevQ* 15/57–58 (1991): 133–43; and Sidnie White Crawford, "Lady Wisdom and Dame Folly at Qumran," *DSD* 5 (1998): 355–66, argued for identifying the character as a demon. Scott C. Jones, "Wisdom's Pedagogy: A Comparison of Proverbs VII and 4Q184," *VT* 53 (2003): 65–80, considers how 4Q184 differs from Proverbs pedagogically on how to best teach good and evil. Current consensus holds the work to be a personification of evil more balanced with Wisdom found in Proverbs, e.g., Matthew J. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (VTSup 116; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 104–21; and John Kampen, *Wisdom Literature* (Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2011), 233–49. An extensive bibliography can be found in Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 105.

> readers as well, were students of the Scriptures, it follows that they found in these Scriptures the confirmation of their own way of life, of their history, beliefs, and of their expectations for the future.[4]

More generally he says that,

> We can say with some justification that among those addressed by the Qumran scrolls, including one or more sects, the Scriptures themselves were "sectarianized" in the very act of reading. There was *no fundamental conceptual distinction* in the minds of these writers between a scriptural text and a sectarian interpretation.[5]

In what way does this sort of interpretation difffer from the interpretation of *Gemarah* or Augustine? Both of these read their own movement's interpretation directly into individual scriptural texts where they are not obviously present. If there is a difference, it is above all that these other interpretations begin with a canonical understanding of Scripture. The existence of a larger canon allowed these readers to interpret the various books in light of one another, and, perhaps most importantly, find a unified meaning in the whole not found in any individual book. This unified meaning of the whole could act as a hermeneutical key to understanding problematic particulars of an individual text. It is unclear what, if any, canon existed at Qumran, and there is no text that offers a clear hermeneutical key to unlocking Scripture as a whole. As such, the interpretations found at Qumran that contradict the plain sense of an individual book appear arbitrary and eisegetical.

4Q184 1, though, does not appear so. Far from being an arbitrary work of eisegesis formed out of language borrowed from Proverbs, 4Q184 1 is an extremely careful scriptural interpretation formed out of connections between two texts: the characters of folly found in Prov 1–9 and Isaiah, especially chapter 59. The interpreter harmonized these texts, both the connections and the differences, to form a single character. This interpretation answers a question that looms large in many central sectarian texts—why the righteous sin—in the form of a character found in many sectarian texts, a demon. What makes this text so important and so fascinating is not the answer, but that it was arrived at entirely through the reading of two scriptural texts in light of one another.

---

[4] Philip Davies, "Biblical Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *A History of Biblical Interpretation* (ed. A. Hauser et al.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2003), 144–66 at 163–164. Italics original.

[5] Ibid., 164. Italics original.

Due to its length, I begin with an overview of the argument:

In the book of Proverbs, Folly and Wisdom are personified female characters representing the forces of good and evil. These two characters are not equal opposites: in Proverbs Wisdom is a supernatural, almost divine being, whom "God created at the beginning of his ways" (Prov 8:22). In contrast, the characters of Folly are very human and sexual, often adulterous women, whose aim is to convince unwitting men to sin. This difference between the characters also reflects a core belief in Proverbs, that Wisdom is stronger than Folly and protects people from wickedness.

In 4Q184, the various characters found in Proverbs who are opposed to Wisdom are unified into one wicked female opposite of Wisdom. These wicked characters include not only wicked females (the Strange Woman and Dame Folly), but also an unnamed group of evil people who are contrasted with the character of Wisdom in Prov 1.

Beyond these characters, however, phrases from Proverbs referring to their opposite, Lady Wisdom, are also alluded to, but these phrases are reversed: the basic phrase is preserved, but is modified to describe an evil character rather than a good one. This makes the character in 4Q184 a more perfect evil opposite to righteous Wisdom. But then the text goes further: at the end of 4Q184 1, the character is shown to have power over the good and righteous, making her more powerful than Wisdom. This also contradicts the belief found in Proverbs in the power of good against evil. If this is an exegetical text there must be a scriptural explanation for this change, otherwise it may be nothing more than a work of eisegetical fiat.

That explanation comes from a chapter of different book, Isa 59, which describes a group of wicked characters resembling those in Proverbs.[6] In

---

[6] The allusions to Proverbs have been readily recognized by modern scholars, but not those to Isaiah, readers contemporary with the text might have recognized the allusions to Isaiah as easily. Isaiah was undoubtedly one of the most important scriptural books at Qumran, both in terms of numbers of copies found and use in interpretation. Nearly all the texts from Isaiah alluded to in 4Q184 are alluded to in other scrolls, and it appears the issues in those parts of Isaiah were cited more generally in the period, not just among sectarians, e.g. Isa 59:10 in CD 1:9 and 4Q306 2 5, Isa 59:4 in CD 5:13. According to Julie Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot* (STDJ 59; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 203, references to Isa 59 are also found in the *Hodayot*, e.g. Isa 59:4–5 in 1QH^{a} 11:9, 13.

I am grateful to George Brooke for bringing to my attention to the use of verses from Isa 59 cited in 4Q184 1 1–4 in Rom 3:9–18, where Paul addresses the issue of universal sinfulness. The verses from Isa 59 cited by Paul in Rom 3 are verses describing people in third person plural, and not inclusive statements in the first person plural that speak to his point more explicitly, such as v. 12: "For our transgressions before you are many, and our sins testify against us. Our transgressions indeed are with us, and we know our iniquities." It is reasonable to assume that the context and implications of those verses would have been recognized by a contemporary audience.

Isa 59, the prophet is chiding the people, telling them that the long-expected salvation has not yet arrived because of their sins. It is not only the wicked who sin, but nearly everyone. Those few who are innocent, meanwhile, become prey to a group of unnamed wicked sinners, whose "feet run to evil, and they hurry to shed innocent blood" (רַגְלֵיהֶם לָרַע יָרֻצוּ וימַהֲרוּ לִשְׁפֹּךְ דָּם נָקִי). A similar group of unnamed wicked sinners is found in Prov 1, and the description of them is quite similar to that of Isa 59:

> 11 . . . they say, "Come with us, let us lie in wait for blood; let us wantonly ambush the innocent; 12 like Sheol let us swallow them alive and whole, like those who go down to the Pit . . . 16 their feet run to evil, and they hurry to shed blood (כִּי רַגְלֵיהֶם לָרַע יָרוּצוּ וימַהֲרוּ לִשְׁפָךְ־דָּם׃)

In Proverbs this group is contrasted with the character of Wisdom, which connects it with all the other wicked female characters in Proverbs. This similarity between the texts, among others, appears to have suggested a connection to the interpreter of 4Q184, who seems to have read Isa 59 either as a related text or as part of the same text; either way, they could be read together.[7]

---

[7] A great deal has been written on inner-biblical exegesis or allusion, less so on allusion at Qumran. In certain ways the relationship between this Qumran text and Scripture is closer to interpretation in Rabbinic works and the New Testament than to inner-biblical allusion and exegesis, both in the breadth of the corpus of authoritative material alluded to and the interpretative techniques employed in it.

In his study of inner-biblical allusion and exegesis, Benjamin Sommer, *A Prophet Reads Scripture: Allusion in Isaiah 40–66* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 11–13 identifies four stages of allusion, a schema originally laid out by Ziva Ben-Porat: first, a marker in an alluding text points to another text; second, the evoked text is recognized; third, something about the evoked text modifies the interpretation of the alluding text; fourth and finally, the context of that evoked text as a whole is brought to bear on the interpretation of the alluding text. Inner-biblical allusion generally refers to one alluding text referring to one evoked text, which is not always the case in 4Q184. In later periods, when more texts were considered scriptural and the canon began to settle, several texts might be "read together" in a midrashic manner. In a recent article on the interpretative technique of reading together texts in the Qumran scrolls and New Testament, Friedrich Avemarie, "Interpreting Scripture through Scripture: Exegesis Based on Lexematic Association in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pauline Epistles," in *Echoes from the Caves* (ed. F. García Martínez; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 83–102, at 101–2 writes that, in these texts, "combinations of scriptural evidence involving lexematic overlaps are not incidental; in general they can be regarded as a conscious selection." Such interweavings of scriptural texts can be used for a variety of purposes including "enhancement of scriptural evidence," "support for a particular hermeneutical approach," "contrasting of divergent biblical messages," "illustration of two complementary sides of a given topic," and "exploration of implicit meaning by inference from a related biblical verse." Assumed in this use is that "the interpreters understood the books of Moses and the Prophets to be a unified whole" (ibid., 87). Similarly see Aharon Shemesh, "Scriptural Interpretations in the Damascus Document and their Parallels in Rabbinic Midrash" in *The Damascus Document: a Centennial of Discovery* (ed. Joseph M. Baumgarten et al.; STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 161–75. On this see also Avemarie, "Interpreting Scripture." Indeed,

There is a striking difference between the two texts, though. In stark contrast with Proverbs, in Isa 59 goodness offers no protections from evil. Rather, sin is inescapable and goodness is simply prey to wickedness. While such a difference might make reading these texts as related difficult for modern readers, for the ancient reader who understood both texts as related (and as equally true or authoritative) the discrepancy was something that could be reconciled, and indeed was to be. In doing so, the interpreter appears to have formed a character central to sectarian eschatology: an evil spirit or demon who has power over the righteous. While the identification of the character as a demon has been suggested before, it has not been widely accepted. The overlap between the most striking features of this character and features ascribed in the scrolls to demons are numerous and clear. While the evidence is still circumstantial, it seems the most plausible interpretation in that it not only takes all the features of this character into consideration, it also explains how this character being a demon is a necessary part of the biblical interpretation. By creating a demon out of these texts the author manages to resolve the differences in perspectives on sin between Proverbs and Isaiah by separating them temporally: thus while wickedness might have power over righteousness in the current age (as in Isa 59), in the eschatological end time the power of these creatures will cease. This effectively returns the situation to that of Proverbs where wisdom, not wickedness reigns.

Like all interpretations, it is impossible to say precisely how much of the scriptural interpretation in 4Q184 was guided by some goal in the mind of the interpreter and how much the scriptural text itself was the guide. What can be said is that the author of 4Q184 made a great effort to keep the interpretation entirely within the bounds of the texts he used, and that any contradiction of one text seems to be balanced by the use of another text to explain that change. This would appear to weigh in favor of the scriptural text having been if not the primary guide for this interpretation, then at least as the boundaries of what could and could not be said in the creation of this character.

Since this is the first study dedicated to the biblical interpretation of 4Q184, I have undoubtedly missed some allusions, while some of the allusions I propose may not figure as importantly as I imagine. My hope above all for this paper is to give a general outline of the complex and sophisticated

---

some sort of canon would have demanded interpretation of multiple texts to reconcile apparently differing perspectives. This more aptly describes the sort of interpretation at work in 4Q184.

scriptural interpretation in 4Q184 and show how that interpretation helps us understand the text as part of the Qumran corpus.

The paper is divided into three parts: the first part reads through the text of 4Q184 to find the allusions in the text and show how the characters from Proverbs and Isaiah are transformed. The second part shows that this transformation has turned the character of Proverbs into the image of a spirit of demon, and how this image fits into the theology of other scrolls found at Qumran. Following the interpretation of the text I consider an additional fragment of the text, fragment 3. Read in light of the interpretation found in the first two parts, this fragment may offer some tentative clues toward the meaning of 4Q184 as a whole document.

2. The Text of 4Q184 and Scriptural Parallels

Section 1: 4Q184 1 1–3: Body and Speech ‖ Prov 5:3–5

4Q184 1 1–4

1 [...] comes absurdity (הבל) and and [...] errors she seeks; Continually she whets/oils (תשמן/תשנן)	1 [...]ה תוציא הבל וב[...]א תועות תשחר תמיד[ת]שנן דבריו[לשוניה]
2 the word[s of her tongue] and imparts (תחל[י]ק) insult and utters scorn and to trip up together [or: *yahad*] with l[ips] of iniquity. Her heart prepares traps, and her kidneys ne[ts her palms]	2 וקלס תחל[י]ק ולהליץ יחד בש[פתי]עול לבה יכין פחין וכליותיה מק[שות כפיה]
3 Have been defiled with iniquity, her hands grasp the pit, her feet descend to act wickedly (רגליה להרשיע ירדו) and to walk in guilt [...]	3 בעול נגעלו ידיה[8] תמכו שוח רגליה להרשיע ירדו וללכת באשמות[...]
4 are the foundations of darkness, and there are many sins in her wings.[9]	4 מוסדי חושך ורוב פשעים בכנפיה

[8] Reading with John Strugnell, "Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,'" *RevQ* 7/26 (1970): 163–276, at 264. In the original reconstruction this part of the fragment was set off-center, as can be seen with the *shin* of פשעיה and the first *lamed* of ולהליץ. Proper placement leaves a space requiring an extra letter, including the *dalet* in ידיה and an extra *waw* in ורוב.

[9] Translations here and elsewhere are my own, based heavily on the translations by Allegro, DJD 5, and Rick D. Moore, "Personification of the Seduction of Evil: 'The Wiles of the Wicked Woman,'" *RevQ* 10/40 (1981): 505–21.

The fragmentary first section of the text describes the character's body parts, focusing more on their actions than their physical properties.

Proverbs 5:3 and 5:5 are the only verses in Proverbs to describe the body of the Strange Woman in any detail:[10]

> Drops of honey drip from the lips of a strange woman (שִׂפְתֵי זָרָה), and smoother than oil is her speech (חָלָק מִשֶּׁמֶן, cf. 4Q184 1 2); 5 Her feet descend to death (רַגְלֶיהָ יֹרְדוֹת מָוֶת, cf. 4Q184 1 3); her steps take the path (יִתְמֹכוּ, cf. 4Q184 1 3) to Sheol.

In Isa 59 there are a number of terms that correlate with this section of 4Q184, more even than are found in Proverbs. In Isa 59 the connection between iniquity and deceit with body parts is more explicit than in Proverbs:

> 3 For your palms (כפיכם) are defiled (נגאלו, cf. 4Q184 1 3) with blood, and your fingers (אצבעותכם) with iniquity; your lips (שפתותיכם) have spoken lies, your tongue (לשונכם) mutters wickedness (עולה, cf. 4Q184 1 3).
> 7 Their feet run to evil, and they make haste to shed innocent blood (רגליהם לרע ירצו וימהרו לשפך דם נקי, cf. 4Q184 1 3); their thoughts are thoughts of iniquity

The term נגעל, "defiled" (נגאל in Isa 59:3) is found three times in the biblical text, and only refers to body parts in Isa 59, where the palms (כף) of an unnamed group of sinners are defiled.[11]

The second of the lines from Isa 59:7 has a few similarities to 4Q184 1: the first is the phrase רגליהם לרע ירצו, similar to 4Q184 1 3, רגליה להרשיע ירדו, and continues with the description of the legs in a second part, that "they make haste to shed innocent blood." It appears that the same parallelistic phrase is found in 4Q184: "her feet descend to act wickedly and to walk in guilt [...]." The second similarity is stylistic, as the composition of certain phrases (for instance מחשבותיהם מחשבות און, v. 6) is found in 4Q184 (e.g. שעריה שערי מות in 4Q184 1 10). Finally, the phrase רוב פשעים, "many sins" from 4Q184 1 4, is found Isa 59:12, as רבים פשעינו, "many are our sins."

---

[10] With the exception of Prov 6:22, which refers to her eyelids. This phrase appears further on in 4Q184 1 13.

[11] This word would seem to fit the context of 4Q184, which moves from top to bottom: mouth, heart, kidneys, hands, and finally feet: the lacuna before נגעל precedes a description of her hands (ידיה), and might be filled in כפיה (her palms).

While the terms in 4Q184 undoubtedly allude to the slippery-tongued character in Proverbs, the body parts also appear to reflect Isa 59, adding to the character deceit, defilement, and legs moving to commit evil.

Section 2: 4Q184 1 4–8 Clothing and Dwelling ‖ Prov 7:6–27

4Q184 1 4–8

4 Her […] are the peaks of the night, and her clothes […]	4 […]ה תועפות לילה ומלבשיה[…]
5 Her garments are the darkness of twilight, and her adornments are plagues (or: afflictions) of the pit. Her beds are couches of the pit, […]	5 מכסיה אפלות נשף ועדיה נגועי שחת ערשיה יצועי שחת […]
6 depths of the Pit. Her lodgings are beds of darkness, and in the depths of the nigh[t] are her [do]minions. From the foundation of darkness	6 מעמקי בור מלונותיה משכבי חושך ובאישני ליל[ה ממ]שלותיה ממוסדי אפלות
7 she takes her dwelling, and she resides in the tents of the underworld, in the midst of everlasting fire, and she has no inheritance (in the midst of) among all	7 תאהל שבת ותשכון באהלי דומה בתוך מוקדי עולם ואין נחלתה בתוך בכול
8 who shine brightly	8 מאירי נוגה

This section is parallel to the only description of the Strange Woman's clothing and dwelling, the famous seduction scene of Prov 7:6–27. In this section of Proverbs a father instructs his son to keep away from a Strange Woman (אשה זרה), a woman whose house leads to Sheol and the chambers of death. He describes an event he witnessed: a young man walking near the Strange Woman's house "in the twilight" (נשף), "in the evening, in the depth of night" (אישון לילה) "and darkness" (אפלה; Prov 7:7–9). Dressed like a harlot (שִׁית זוֹנָה, Prov 7:10), the woman approaches the young man to seduce him, telling him her husband is away, and describing in sensuous detail her "divan" (עַרְשִׂי) and her "bed" (מִשְׁכָּבִי), which are covered with the best cloths and scents (7:16–17).

4Q184 5–6 takes this image and twists it to create a dark picture of the character's dress and abode:

> 5 Her clothes are shadows (אפלות) of the twilight (נשף) and her ornament diseases of the pit. Her divans (ערשיה) are couches of the pit, […] 6 (are)

> deep ditches. Her lodgings are beds of darkness (משכבי חושך) and in the depths of the nigh[t (אישני לי]ל[ה) are her tents

No longer the adulteress of Proverbs, this character now lives in the darkness of Prov 7; even her clothing and furnishings are made of darkness and shadow.[12]

In Isa 59:9–10, two verses after the previous allusion, the same terms for darkness are found. Here, however, they do not describe the atmosphere of the scene, but use the terms referring to light and darkness to signify good and evil, as in 4Q184:

> 9 Therefore justice is far from us, and righteousness does not reach us; we wait for light (אור, cf. 4Q184 1 8), and lo! there is darkness (חשך, cf. 4Q184 1 6); and for brightness (נגהות, cf. 4Q184 1 8), but we walk in gloom (אפלות, cf. 4Q184 1 5). 10 We grope like the blind along a wall, groping like those who have no eyes; we stumble at noon as in the twilight (נשף, cf. 4Q184 1 5) among the vigorous as though we were dead.

The image of the character's dark, insubstantial clothing is a striking poetic image, with no parallel in other Qumran texts. There is, however, a parallel in Isa 59:5–6: in these verses, the prophet refers to the evil intentions of sinners as "spider webs" the sinners weave. These webs, it says, cannot serve them as clothing (בגד) and cover their deeds.

It is possible that "spider webs" (קורי עכביש) was in the text of 4Q184 in the large lacuna at the end of line 4, following the word ומלבשיה, "and her clothing [is . . .]." The verse is cited elsewhere in the scrolls (CD 5:11–14), as mentioned above, where it describes those who scoff at the statute (חוק). In 4Q184 1 14 the character causes "those who walk uprightly to change the statute" (להשנות ח[ו]ק). It therefore seems plausible that the character in 4Q184 who causes others to change the statute might have worn, among her other insubstantial garments, the webs of those who revile that same statute.

Section 3: 4Q184:8–11: Reversals of Wisdom and the Paths of the Wicked Character

In this section of 4Q184 the character is radically transformed. Until now the character has been based primarily on references to the characters

---

[12] While in Proverbs the character's house is "the way to sheol, descending to the chambers of death" (Prov 7:27), in 4Q184 1 10 she actually dwells there: "her gates are the gates of death, and at the entrance of her house steps sheol."

from Proverbs of the Strange Woman and Dame Folly. The allusions here are still to Proverbs; however, the verses alluded to all refer to the female character Lady Wisdom, who is often contrasted with Folly. Whatever is said about Wisdom in Proverbs is reversed in 4Q184 to make verses about the goodness of Wisdom statements about evil, sin, and darkness. In doing so, the interpreter changes the characters in Proverbs into a more perfect opposite of the supernatural character of Wisdom—her evil twin.[13]

The section begins by subverting one of the central phrases in Wisdom's speech about herself, from Prov 8:22: "The Lord created me at the beginning of his ways" (יְהוָה קָנָנִי רֵאשִׁית דַּרְכּוֹ). In 4Q184 1 8 the beginning that is referred to is not her own origin, but what she originates: "And she is the beginning of all the ways of iniquity" (והיאה ראשׁית כול דרכי עול).[14] This brief introduction to the reversal of wisdom leads immediately to this obvious and striking reversal of Prov 3:17–18:

Prov 3:18, 17

18 She is a tree of life to those who possess her and all who hold her are happy.	18 עֵץ־חַיִּים הִיא לַמַּחֲזִיקִים בָּהּ וְתֹמְכֶיהָ מְאֻשָּׁר׃
17 Her paths are paths of goodness, and all her ways are peace.	17 דְּרָכֶיהָ דַרְכֵי־נֹעַם וְכָל־נְתִיבוֹתֶיהָ שָׁלוֹם׃

4Q184 8–10

Alas! ruin shall be to all who inherit her, and desolation to a[ll]9 who hold her.	8 הוי הוה לכול נוחליה ושדדה לכ[ול] 9 תומכי בה
For her paths are paths of death and her byways[s] are the roads to sin; her tracks lead astray 10 to iniquity, and her ways are the guilt of transgression.	9 כיא דרכיה דרכי מות ואורחותיה שבילי חטאת מעגלותיה משגות 10 עול ונתיבו[תי]ה אשמות פשע

[13] The change is also marked formally, and this first allusion to a verse from Proverbs about Wisdom is the central and dividing phrase of fragment one. See Moore, "Personification," 509.

[14] There is also a similarity to Job 40:19, referring to behemoth: הוּא רֵאשִׁית דַּרְכֵי־אֵל, "he is the beginning of God's ways," though there seems to be no connection to this text other than a formal one.

Out of a possible thirty-four words in Proverbs, the excerpt from 4Q184 shares just three lexemes—תמך, דרך and נתיבה; yet the formal parallels and thematic similarities (albeit inverted) make the allusion to Prov 3:17–18 hard to miss.[15]

The use of these quotes only accounts for the form of this section of the text. What it does not explain is the formal and ideological differences, including the dark, negative imagery of the text and the four paths, instead of two. There are two possible sources for these. This first is Prov 2. Speaking to his child, the parent speaks of the protection offered by Wisdom: "12 It will save you from the way of evil, from those who speak perversely, 13 who forsake the paths of uprightness to walk in the ways of darkness, 14 who rejoice in doing evil and delight in the perverseness of evil; 15 those whose paths are crooked, and who are devious in their ways." A few verses later it also speaks of the paths of the Strange Woman herself: "18 for her way leads down to death, and her paths to the shades."

Isa 59 also contains a list of four paths of evil sinners. This list includes the two terms for Wisdom's paths quoted from Prov 3 in 4Q184, and these paths are described with negative attributes identifiable with folly and wickedness.[16] Isa 59 also speaks of the iniquity (עולה, 59:3, cf. 4Q184 1 10) and transgression (פשע 59:12, 13, cf. 4Q184 1 10) of this group.

Section 4: Her stations and her victims: 4Q184 1 11–17

In the previous section, the character was shown to be a perfect opposite and equal to Wisdom. In this final section, in which the poet describes the character's victims and what she does to them, the character is shown to be even more powerful than wisdom:

---

[15] The reversal of verses in an allusion is a technique often referred to as Seidel's law, whereby a recognizable sequence is alluded to in inverted order to catch the attention of the audience. See Shermaryahu Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible—A New Outlook," in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical text* (ed. F. M. Cross and S. Talmon; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975), 321–400, esp. 362–63. These verses are repeated at least three times a week in Jewish liturgy in the reversed order found in 4Q184. I undoubtedly would have missed this allusion had the key terms and the form not been so familiar.

[16] The list of path terms is nearly identical to the list in 4Q184.

11 She lies in wait in secret places, [...]	11 והֿ[י]אֹ במסתרים תארוב[...]
12 all [...]. In the city's public squares she covers herself, and in the town gates she sets herself, and there is none to cause her to res[t...]	12 כוֹלֹ[...] בֿרחובות עיר תתעלף ובשעריֿ קריות תתיצב ואין להרג[יעה ...]
13 from [fornica]tion. Her eyes glance keenly hither and thither, and she wantonly raises her eyelids to seek out	13 מה[זנו]תֿ תֿמיד עיניה הנה והנה ישכילו ועֿפעפיה בפחז תרים לראו[ת לא]יֿשֿ
14 a righteous man and lead him astray, and a perfect man to make him stumble; upright men to divert (their) path, and those chosen for righteousness	14 צדיק ותשיגהו ואישֿ[ע]צום ותכשילהו ישרים להטות דרך ולבחירי צדקֿ
15 from keeping the commandments; the steadfast of h[eart] to make fools of them with wantonness, and those who walk uprightly to change the st[atute]; to make	15 מנצור מצוה סמוכי ה[לב] להביל בפחז והולכי ישר להשנות ח[וק] להפשיע
16 the humble rebel from God, and to turn their steps from the ways of righteousness; to bring presumptuousness into their [hearts], so they do not walk[	16 ענוים מאל ולהטות פעמיהם מדרכי צדק להביא זדֿ[ו]ן ב[לב]ֿמה בל עֿרוכי[ם]
17 in the tracks of uprightness; to lead mankind astray in the ways of the Pit, and to seduce by flatteries the sons of men.	17 במעגלי יושרֿ להשגות אנוש בדרכי שוחה ולפתות בחלקות בני איש

In Proverbs, the Strange Woman and Dame Folly seek out "the simple ones" (מִי־פֶתִי/פְּתָאיִם 7:7; 9:16), "the youths" (בָּנִים 7:7), "a young man without sense" (נַעַר חֲסַר־לֵב 7:7; 9:16), and, more rarely, "those who pass by" (עֹבְרֵי־דָרֶךְ 9:15), "those who are going straight on their way" (מְיַשְּׁרִים אׇרְחוֹתָם 9:15).

In contrast, the character in 4Q184 looks for—and conquers—"a righteous man" (איש צדיק); "a perfect man" (איש עצום); "upright men" (ישרים);[17] "those chosen for righteousness" (בחירי צדק); "the steadfast of h[eart]" (סמוכי ה[לב]); "those who walk uprightly" (הולכי ישר); "the humble" (ענוים); "man" (אנוש); "the sons of men" (בני איש) (4Q184 1 13–17).

[17] Perhaps a play on the character in 9:15, who is walking straight (ישר) on his way.

Whereas in Proverbs the characters are all foolish or neutral, in 4Q184 they are almost all explicitly good.[18] In Proverbs, good, wise, and righteous characters are the sort that are successful in wisdom; according to Proverbs success in Wisdom is all the protection from evil the student needs (e.g., 1:33, 2:21, etc.).[19]

In 4Q184 the good are no longer protected from that evil. This appears to be a direct challenge the ideology of Proverbs, and 4Q184 says so by alluding and reversing various parts of Proverbs: in Prov 4:11–12, the father says "I have taught you the way of wisdom; I have led you in the paths of uprightness (בְּמַעְגְּלֵי־יֹשֶׁר). When you walk, your step will not be hampered; and if you run, you will not stumble (לֹא תִכָּשֵׁל)"; in Prov 6:20–25, a father tells his son to "keep your father's commands (נְצֹר בְּנִי מִצְוַת אָבִיךָ) and mother's torah, . . . for they will lead you . . . watch over you, . . . and will protect you from an evil woman (אֵשֶׁת רָע), and from the smooth tongue (חֶלְקַת לָשׁוֹן) of the adulteress.[20] Do not," he warns, "desire her beauty in your heart, and do not be taken by her eyelashes (בְּעַפְעַפֶּיהָ)."

In 4Q184 1 the Wicked Woman "raises her eyelashes (13 עפעפיה, cf. Prov 6:25) wantonly to look at the 14 righteous man and overtake him and a perfect man to make him stumble (ותכשילהו, contra Prov 4:12) . . . and the righteous elect, from keeping the command (מנצור מצוה, contra Prov 6:20); to make 16 the humble rebel from God, and to turn their steps from the ways of righteousness; to bring presumptuousness into their [hearts], so they do not walk [. . .] 17 in the tracks of uprightness (במעגלי יושר, contra Prov 4:11); to lead mankind astray in the ways of the Pit, and to seduce by flatteries (חלקות, Prov 6:24) the sons of men."

4Q184 takes phrases out of Proverbs that assure protection against the evil woman through righteousness and contradicts them. If you "walk in paths of righteousness . . . you will not stumble"; she overtakes him to "make him stumble," so he does "not walk . . . in the tracks of uprightness." Also, if you "keep your father's commands," you will be protected from an

---

[18] An interesting term in the list of her victims is the בחירי צדק, "the chosen of righteousness." The original transcription in 4Q184 reads בחורי צדק, "righteous young men." Since the idiom בחירי צדק is found in 1QH[a] 10:15, and numerous constructs of the form בחירי are found among the scrolls, this would seem preferable. See already Strugnell, "Notes," 265. This term has been given little attention in studies of this text, but is likely not insignificant.

[19] With the exception of "the sons of man" and "man" (בני איש, אנוש), two terms paralleled to those sought out by Wisdom in Prov 8:4.

[20] In Prov 6:4 the terms תורה and מצוה appear to refer to human wisdom, though in 4Q184 they are more likely references to scriptural מצוה and תורה.

evil woman, from a "smooth tongue"; here she stops him "from keeping the command" with her "smooth words" and her "eyelashes."

Again, the important difference is the identity of the victims. If they were all unwitting boys, there would be nothing amiss about this description. But the characters here are all exactly those who, by the standards of Proverbs, have succeeded, and should be inviolable. But they are not.

There is nothing in Proverbs that explains such a change. To take up Proverbs so clearly and then blatantly contradict it, to show that wisdom is not as powerful as wickedness is a bold move that requires explanation, if it is not simply an authorial invention.

Isa 59 might offer the key to this change, in a speech on the omnipresence of sin:

9 Therefore justice is far from us, and righteousness does not reach us; we wait for light, and lo! there is darkness; and for brightness, but we walk in gloom.	9 עַל־כֵּן רָחַק מִשְׁפָּט מִמֶּנּוּ וְלֹא תַשִּׂיגֵנוּ צְדָקָה נְקַוֶּה לָאוֹר וְהִנֵּה־חֹשֶׁךְ לִנְגֹהוֹת בָּאֲפֵלוֹת נְהַלֵּךְ׃
10 We grope like the blind along a wall, groping like those who have no eyes; we stumble at noon as in the twilight, among the vigorous as though we were dead.	10 נְגַשְּׁשָׁה כַעִוְרִים קִיר וּכְאֵין עֵינַיִם נְגַשֵּׁשָׁה כָּשַׁלְנוּ בַצָּהֳרַיִם כַּנֶּשֶׁף בְּאַשְׁמַנִּים כַּמֵּתִים׃
11 We all growl like bears; like doves we moan mournfully. We wait for justice, but there is none; for salvation, but it is far from us.	11 נֶהֱמֶה כַדֻּבִּים כֻּלָּנוּ וְכַיּוֹנִים הָגֹה נֶהְגֶּה נְקַוֶּה לַמִּשְׁפָּט וָאַיִן לִישׁוּעָה רָחֲקָה מִמֶּנּוּ׃
12 For our transgressions before you are many, and our sins testify against us. Our transgressions indeed are with us, and we know our iniquities:	12 כִּי־רַבּוּ פְשָׁעֵינוּ נֶגְדֶּךָ וְחַטֹּאותֵינוּ עָנְתָה בָּנוּ כִּי־פְשָׁעֵינוּ אִתָּנוּ וַעֲוֹנֹתֵינוּ יְדַעֲנוּם׃
13 transgressing, and denying the Lord, and turning away from following our God, talking oppression and revolt, conceiving lying words and uttering them from the heart.	13 פָּשֹׁעַ וְכַחֵשׁ בַּיהוָה וְנָסוֹג מֵאַחַר אֱלֹהֵינוּ דַּבֶּר־עֹשֶׁק וְסָרָה הָרוֹ וְהֹגוּ מִלֵּב דִּבְרֵי־שָׁקֶר׃
14 Justice is turned back, and righteousness stands at a distance; for truth stumbles in the public square, and uprightness cannot enter.	14 וְהֻסַּג אָחוֹר מִשְׁפָּט וּצְדָקָה מֵרָחוֹק תַּעֲמֹד כִּי־כָשְׁלָה בָרְחוֹב אֱמֶת וּנְכֹחָה לֹא־תוּכַל לָבוֹא׃

15 Truth is lacking, and whoever turns from evil is despoiled.	15 וַתְּהִי הָאֱמֶת נֶעְדֶּרֶת וְסָר מֵרָע מִשְׁתּוֹלֵל

The author of Isa 59:9 laments that, especially because of the actions of unnamed wicked people who despoil the good, righteousness does not reach the speaker and his audience (וְלֹא תַשִּׂיגֵנוּ צְדָקָה); in 4Q184 1 14–15, the character overtakes the righteous (לאיש צדיק ותשיגהו). In Isa 59:14 truth is tripped up in the public square (כָּשְׁלָה בָרְחוֹב); in 4Q184 1 12–14 she stands in the public squares of the city (ברחובות עיר) and trips up the perfect (ותכשילהו). In Isa 59:15, in contrast to Proverbs, those who avoid sin—the righteous, presumably—become prey to evil.

It appears that the belief in Isa 59 that sin is more powerful than righteousness has been incorporated into the description of this character's actions in 4Q184. This reversal of the basic ideology of Proverbs is brought about by connecting the characters from Proverbs with the wicked unnamed group in Isa 59. While this connection contradicts Proverbs, it explains the problem of the sin of the righteous through Scripture: it is caused by outside forces, despite their best efforts. This striking final section completes the transformation of the characters from the human characters in Proverbs to the far more powerful supernatural character in 4Q184.

Before continuing, it would be helpful to summarize how this transformation was effected through the combination of biblical sources:

The book of Proverbs refers to a few female characters who are contrasted with the female character of Lady Wisdom. In Proverbs these evil characters are associated with adultery and sin, and can only exert influence over those who are naïve and uneducated. Wisdom, in contrast, is a powerful supernatural force who can protect the educated from the evil of folly.

Isaiah 59 sees things quite differently: sin is everywhere and unavoidable, and goodness is no protection against evil. The source of this evil is a nameless and faceless group: the chapter speaks only of *you* and *them*, both groups of sinners; even the good cannot turn from evil (סור מרע).

These two scriptural texts appear to contradict one another. Yet the two texts overlap in a number of ways, including shared terminology—and, perhaps most importantly, the nameless group found in both Isa 59 and Proverbs—which implies a relationship between them such that they could be read in light of one another.

In the first two sections of 4Q184 (1 1–8) the various wicked (female) characters opposed to Wisdom are alluded to and their attributes combined, to form one archetypal wicked female character. In the third

section (1 8–11) verses referring to the character of Wisdom are alluded to and then reversed, making the character a more perfect opposite of Wisdom. In the final and longest section (11–17), the character becomes more powerful than Wisdom, and is now able to exert power over those whom, according to Proverbs, Wisdom was supposed to protect.

The changes to the character from Proverbs take place through very deliberate reversals of key statements from Proverbs about Wisdom and her power. The aforementioned connections between the wicked sinners in Prov 1 and Isa 59, the contradictions between these characters and, as we will see, the resolution of these contradictions in the form of the character in 4Q184, all seem to point to Isa 59 as the scriptural key to the transformation of the characters from Proverbs into this character.

3. The Spirit of 4Q184 and Qumran Eschatology

While the interpretation shown above resolved certain scriptural disagreements, the interpretation also created a new character out of the scriptural sources. It is reasonable to assume that the final form of the character had significance as well, and is more than just the sum of her scriptural parts. If this character does represent something more, and if there is any possibility of reconstructing what that something is, one must look for parallels in literature contemporary with the scroll, especially the scrolls themselves.

And one does not have to look far to find a match. As we have seen, the most striking changes from the characters in Proverbs are her dwelling in darkness and fire, her dark, shadowy clothing and, most importantly her victims, who are the good and righteous.[21] In the scrolls all of these characteristics are found in one character only: the demonic spirit. According to the *Treatise on the Two Spirits*, for instance:

[21] There is also a significant difference between Proverbs and 4Q184 in what the victims suffer. In Proverbs those who stray from the path of wisdom lose money, inheritance, honor, labor and other material things. In 4Q184 they lose a connection from God, the law, and righteousness. A similar situation is found in CD 5:11–19, which cites Isa 59:5 in reference to those who reject the law. In this section, an evil spirit has power over others, and those who change the law or are involved with them are guilty of sin, though with a cryptic caveat, "unless they are forced" (כי אם נלחץ), which may reflect compulsion by spirits.

> 20 The authority of the Prince of Light extends to the governance of all righteous people; therefore, they walk in the paths of light. Correspondingly, the authority of the Angel 21 of Darkness (מלאך חושכ, cf. 4Q184 1 4) embraces the governance of all wicked people, so they walk in the paths of darkness. The authority of the Angel of Darkness further extends to the corruption 22 of all the righteous (בני צדק, cf. 4Q184 14, בחירי צדק). All their sins, iniquities, shameful and rebellious deeds are at his prompting (or: in his dominion בממשלתו; cf. 4Q184 1 6), 23 a situation God in His mysteries allows to continue until His era dawns. Moreover, all the afflictions of the righteous, and every trial in its season, occur because of (or: during) this Angel's diabolic rule (or: the rule of his Mastemah). 24 All the spirits allied with him share but a single resolve: to cause the Sons of Light to stumble (להכשיל, cf. 4Q184 1 14). (1QS 3:20–24; 4:11–13)

As in 4Q184 and Isa 59:15—and against Proverbs—even the righteous are under the power of the wicked. But what causes them to stumble, both here and other Qumran texts, are demons, spirits allied with the angel of darkness.[22]

It has been suggested before that this character is a demon, based on her connection with the netherworld, with scrolls theology, and with later rabbinic thought, but this proposal has not met with general acceptance.[23] In what follows I will consider the parallels between the most notable changes to Proverbs and demonic spirits in the Qumran texts, and explain why the most plausible and illuminating interpretation of this character is as one of these spirits.

3.1. *Her Dwelling*

The Enochic books were apparently important texts at Qumran, with 11 copies found at the site (more than the majority of "biblical" texts including Daniel, Jeremiah, Samuel, etc.), and they may even have had scriptural significance. The Enochic *Book of Watchers* describes Enoch's journey to the northwest, where he sees the Watchers for the first time:

> I came and saw a place that was burning night and day . . . and I saw a great chasm among pillars of heavenly fire. And I saw in it pillars of fire descending; and they were immeasurable toward the depth and toward the height. And Uriel said to me, "There stand the angels who mingled with the women.

---

[22] It is noteworthy that the spirits allied with this angel are a group, like the characters in Prov 1 and Isa 59.

[23] Baumgarten, "Nature of the Seductress"; White Crawford, "Lady Wisdom."

> And their spirits—having assumed many forms—bring destruction on men and lead them astray."[24] (*1 En.* 18:6, 11–19:1)

The watchers, fathers of the spirits who cause men to stray, live in eternal fire. The image of demons living in eternal fire is also found in 1QS 4:11–13, where sinners dwell eternally with demons (מלאכי חבל) in dark fire:

> . . . the judgement 12 of all who walk in such ways will be multiple afflictions at the hand of all the angels of perdition, everlasting damnation (or: the eternal pit, שחת, cf. 4Q184 1 5 [twice] and 1 11) in the wrath of God's furious vengeance, never-ending terror and reproach 13 for all eternity, with a shameful extinction in the fire of Hell's outer darkness (or: dark fire, באש מחשכים).[25]

As we have seen, the house of the character in 4Q184 is described as having *beds of darkness* (משכבי חושך), located in "the foundations of darkness (מוסדי אפלות) in the midst of everlasting fire (מוקדי עולם)."

While in Proverbs the character's house only leads to sheol and the underworld, in 4Q184 she dwells there, in eternal darkness and fire, like the eternal fire of Enoch, and like the place where sinners are punished in 1QS, among other texts.[26] The expression for this fire, "everlasting flames" (מוקדי עולם), is found only once in scripture, in Isa 33:14: "The sinners is Zion are afraid; trembling has seized the godless: 'Who among us can live with the devouring fire? Who among us can live with everlasting flames (מוֹקְדֵי עוֹלָם)?'"

It does not seem coincidental that 4Q184 takes an image of sinners dwelling in everlasting flames and gives it to this character as its residence. A reader familiar with the scrolls would most likely have read this description as signaling that the character in 4Q184 is either a punished sinner or a the punishing demon. But while the sinners dwell eternally in dark fire (for having committed sins on earth), this character dwells in darkness but then leaves it, for the city streets, to trip up the good. This character is clearly the punisher, not the punished.

---

[24] Trans. G. W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001).

[25] What happens to sinners who are judged in this text is similar to the part of the dress in 4Q184: in 1QS the sinners suffer "multiple afflictions (נגועים) at the hand of all the angels of perdition, everlasting damnation (or: the pit שחת)." In 4Q184 her adornments are נגועי שחת, "afflictions of the pit (or: damnation)."

[26] The belief that the sinners' lot is "fiery judgment" is found also in 1QpHab 10:5, 13; CD 2:5, among others. See Kampen, *Wisdom Literature*, 243.

Proverbs might also have offered some scriptural support for her dwelling. In 9:18, describing Dame Folly's unsuspecting victims it says: "But they do not know that the dead (*rephaim*) are there/that her guests are in the depths of Sheol (וְלֹא־יָדַע כִּי־רְפָאִים שָׁם בְּעִמְקֵי שְׁאוֹל קְרֻאֶיהָ)."[27] The *rephaim* are understood as the spirits of the dead, found especially in Isa 14:9, where they live in the netherworld and the pit. If this scripture stands behind the interpretation, it offers another scriptural basis for this character being set apart from the spirits of the dead she has lead to her world.

3.2. *Her Clothing*

In Proverbs the only description of the Strange Woman's clothing is found in Prov 7, where she is said to be dressed like a prostitute (שית זונה, 7:10). Her bedding, though, is given in purposely sensual detail: "I have decked my couch with coverings, colored spreads of Egyptian linen; I have perfumed my bed with myrrh, aloes, and cinnamon" (7:16–17). The materiality of the character is central in the description of the seduction.

The ghostly immateriality of the clothing worn by the character in 4Q184 is in sharp contrast: she is garbed in shadows, darkness and filth (1 5), with more lost in the lacunae. The only evidence in the scrolls for a character with similar immateriality is found in the apotropaic text 11Q11 (11QapocPs). The text describes an encounter with a demon:[28]

> [When] he comes to you in the nig[ht,] you will say to him: 6 "Who are you, [oh offspring of] man and of the seed of the ho[ly one]s? Your face is a face of 7 [delu]sion and your horns are horns of ill[us]ion, you are darkness and not light, 8 [injust]ice and not justice." (11Q11 5:4–8)

This demon is the same creature found in *1 Enoch*, the offspring of man and divine being who lead humans astray. The demon is described as dark and immaterial: his face and horns are illusory, and he *is* darkness (אתה חושך). The description of the face and the horns is identical to the descriptive form in 4Q184 1 9–10, Prov 3:17, and Isa 59:7: its "x" is an "x of y":

---

[27] See also Prov 2:18. On Rephaim, see Hedwige Rouillard, "Rephaim," in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (*DDD*) (ed. Karel van der Toorn et al.; 2d ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 692–700.

[28] On the demonology of the Dead Sea Scrolls, see especially Esther Eshel, "Genres of Magical Texts in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Die Dämonen: Die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt* (ed. A. Lange et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 395–415.

פניך פני [שו]ו וקרניך קרני חל[ו]ם, "Your face is a face of 7 [delu]sion and your horns are horns of ill[us]ion."

Another description, found in 4Q544 (4QVisions of Amram^{b} ar), may be even more apt to this character. In the vision, Amram sees two characters having a dispute over him: "And behold, I lifted my eyes and saw[. . . one] of them, whose appearance [was moulting (?) [like a ser]pent [and all] his clothing was multicoloured and very dark; [his face . . . " (1 12–13).[29] The character who wears clothing of darkness is apparently Melki-Resha, ruler of wickedness, about whom the text says: "his deeds are darkness, and he l[eads] into darkness . . . and he rules over all darkness" (2 14–15).

The changes to the character from Proverbs—a home in eternal flame and darkness, clothing of darkness and the power to cause the righteous to sin—striking as they would be in Proverbs, are standard in images of spirits in the scrolls.

3.3. *Causing the Righteous to Sin*

This aspect of the character is perhaps the most important evidence for identifying her as demon, as it seems to be one of the defining characteristics of demons in the scrolls. It was encountered above in 4Q510 1 6, *1 En.* 1:18, and 1QS 3:20–24, but is also to be found in 4Q174 1–3 i 7–9 and elsewhere. Alexander also points out that "stumbling" (כשל) is often used to describe what demons bring about, the same term used in 4Q184 1 14 to describe what she does to the righteous.[30]

3.4. *Three Counterarguments*

The three major arguments against identifying this character as a demon have been: (1) there are no explicit features of a demon in the text; (2) it would be strange to find a gendered demon; and (3) there is no evidence from this period of a belief in demons who could seduce men.[31]

The first—that there is no explicit description of a demon in 4Q184—is difficult to argue, since only one physical feature of a demon is referred

---

[29] On this text see Liora Goldman, "Dualism in the Visions of Amram," *RevQ* 24/95 (2010): 421–32.

[30] Philip S. Alexander, "The Demonology of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:331–53, esp. 345.

[31] Ibid., 346.

to in the scrolls, namely horns (11Q11 5:7).[32] The scrolls refer to a variety of demons, however, and there is no reason to assume all of them had horns.[33] 11Q11 also says of the demon that it is "darkness not light, iniquity and not righteousness," both of which are found in 4Q184 1. The character is covered in darkness (e.g. תועפות לילה, line 4, and אפלות נשף, line 5) and one of her body parts might be too (מוסדי חושך). 4Q184 also states that she has "no inheritance with those who shine brightly" (1 8). One of her body parts is defiled with iniquity (עול), and the word itself is found in the description four times (lines 2, 3, 8, 10).

Beyond 11Q11, the only depictions of demons describe what they do and where they dwell, and these match the character entirely: she dwells in darkness and fire, and she causes men to trip up, including the righteous.

Second, on the question of the character's gender, Alexander has argued that the femininity of the character would prevent her from being a demon: demons do not procreate, so they could have no gendered offspring. Beyond the lilith mentioned above, in 4Q510, the scrolls offer an even more explicit reference to a female demon, in 4Q560 (4QExorcism ar):

> . . . the midwife, the punishment of childbearers, an evil madness, a de[mon . . .
> I adjure all you who en]ter into the body, the male (דכרא) Wasting-demon

---

[32] It is possible this character has wings (כנפים), though this is an issue of contention. Outside Qumran there is a long tradition of winged demons from ancient Mesopotamian literature through the rabbinic period, and even into the *Zohar*. Describing the demon Lilith, the Babylonian Talmud says that she "is a child but has wings" (*b. Nid.* 24b). Goff objects to the translation in 4Q184 1 4 of כנפיה as "*wings*," arguing that the term comes in the context of phrases describing her clothing, and should be translated "hem" (of her skirt). It is not clear whether the term falls at the beginning of the description of clothing or at end of the description of body parts. The answer hinges on the missing noun that begins the parallelistic phrase preceding it, at the end of line 3:

רגליה להורשיע ירדו	וללכת באשמות[
[ ] 4 מוסדי חושך	ורוב פשעים בכנפיה
[ ]ה תועפות לילה	ומלבשיה]

The lacuna makes it difficult to tell, though the structure of the phrase, with the noun at the beginning of the first half of the parallelism and the noun at the end of the second half gives the phrase a sense of completeness and might therefore be the end of the list of body parts. Baumgarten, "Nature of the Seductress," points out that "כנף is elsewhere used with reference to the garments of men, not those of women. It may be used euphemistically for a woman's lap, but not in the plural." The question remains unsettled.

[33] As Baumgarten, "Nature of the Seductress," has argued, it is possible that horns are referred to in line 4 (תועפות לילה), though this is doubtful, as the term falls clearly in the list of clothing. The lacuna in the phrase before her wings could have contained the word קרניה, "her horns." If it were so, it is possible that they were put at the end of the top-to-bottom list of body parts for effect, because of their being uniquely demonic features.

> and the female (נקבתא) Wasting-demon [. . . I adjure you by the name of the YHWH, "He Who re]moves iniquity and transgression" (Exod 34:7), O Fever-demon and Chills-demon and Chest Pain-demon [. . . You are forbidden to disturb by night in dreams or by da]y during sleep, O male (דכרא) Shrine-spirit and female (נקבתא) Shrine-spirit, O you demons who breach [. . . w]icked. (4Q560 1 i 2–6)

The explicitly gendered "male Wasting-demon and female Wasting-demon" and "male Shrine-spirit and female Shrine-spirit" (or: "male crumbler-demon and female crumbler-demon"), are names similar to names of demons found in later Jewish amulet texts.[34] While it is unclear what these spirits of illness actually are, it is clear that gendered spirits were not foreign to Qumran.

The final counterargument is that there is no evidence contemporary to 4Q184 of seductive demons. Since there is so little evidence for demonology in this period of Judaism, and since the evidence from Qumran is often vague and disconnected, it is unclear whether attractiveness should disqualify a character from being a demon.

With no clear evidence in either direction, it becomes a methodological issue of positive versus negative evidence. It is surely a problem that there are no images of seductive female demons when there is no evidence in that period. If this means she is to be assumed to be human, the opposite problem arises, how her dwelling, clothing and victims are to be interpreted. What human woman lives in eternal fire, wears darkness and causes righteous men to trip up? These details, which are so central to the description in 4Q184, conform perfectly with the various descriptions of demons from Qumran. Moreover, there are descriptions of a seductive female demon found both before the scrolls, in ancient Near Eastern, *and* in later Judaism.[35] It is difficult to find alternative explanations for these obviously striking differences to the character of Folly. Yet, assuming Folly to be the basis for the character in 4Q184—as all scholarship on this text has—explains why she is alluring. As the earlier analysis of the scriptural allusions shows, Scripture seems to have been not only the source of the language in 4Q184, but the source of the ideas themselves. The reversals of Wisdom in 4Q184 1 8–9 seem to show that the character of Folly was

---

[34] On this see, Eshel, "Genres of Magical Texts," 397. The second column also refers to רוחות, "spirits." It is interesting to note that the exorcism prayer refers to God not as a healer of illness, but as one who removes iniquity and transgression (עון ופשע), a point we will return to further on.

[35] See esp. Manfred Hutter, "Lilith לילית," *DDD*$_2$, 520–21.

adopted at least partly because in Proverbs she is the dualistic antithesis of the near-divine character of Wisdom, not simply—if at all—for her own characteristics. Folly might have been adopted because she was seductive; or, the author might have included the seduction because it was part of the character he received. It is even possible that, if the author believed himself to be uncovering a demon hidden in the scriptural text, he might have assumed allure was a characteristic of this demon, even if he had never heard of such a demon before. Yet, as mentioned above, there is a strong possibility he had heard of such a demon. The seductive demon found in ancient Near Eastern sources and in the Talmud both have the same name, a name found in Isaiah as well, and in the scrolls: Lilith.

Lilith is referred to in the apotropaic text 4Q510 (4QShir^{a}), as part of a list of demons:

> And I, the Instructor, proclaim His glorious splendor so as to frighten and to te[rrify] all the spirits of the destroying angels, spirits of the bastards, demons, Lilith, howlers and [...] and those which fall upon men without warning to lead them astray from a spirit of understanding and to make their heart and their [...] desolate during the present dominion of wickedness and predetermined time of humiliations for the sons of light, by the guilt of the ages of those smitten by iniquity—not for eternal destruction, but for an era of humiliation for transgression. (4Q510 1 4–8)

This text includes a number of details pertaining to demonology in the scrolls: during the time of Belial demons lead men astray including the good (referred to here as the sons of light). The demoness Lilith is explicitly named as one of these characters who does so. Part of the list of demons in 4Q510 is from Isa 34:14: "Wildcats shall meet with hyenas, goat-demons shall call to each other; there too Lilith shall repose (שָׁם הִרְגִּיעָה לִילִית), and find a place to rest."[36]

In Isa 34 the resting of Lilith is one mark of a significant event that is to occur in the future: she reposes because of the arrival of "the day of vengeance for the Lord, a year of vindication by Zion's cause" (34:8) The "day of vengeance" is found repeatedly in the scroll's eschatology (in 1QS and 1QM), where it refers to an eschatological end time when men will be freed from the power of Belial and his minions, who cause the righteous

[36] NRSV. The translations of most of these terms are disputed, and biblical scholars still debate whether or not the scriptural text was a list of demons or animals. The other terms—רוחי מלאכי חבל ורוחות ממזרים ("the spirits of the destroying angels, spirits of the bastards")—may have been added to 4Q510 to gloss the meaning of the terms from Isaiah.

to sin.[37] Assuming 4Q510 is relevant here, Lilith would presumably counted among those minions.

The issue of righteous sin is one of the central features of Qumran demonology and eschatology.[38] As we have seen, this is also the central issue in 4Q184 1: the character is constructed out of the combination of the female character who seduces naïve men to sin with the more powerful characters of Isaiah who cause righteousness itself to stumble. But there may be a further defining scriptural allusion in 4Q184, one which connects directly to the character of the lilith and, quite possibly, the eschatological message she represents: "In the city's public squares she covers herself, and in the town gates she sets herself, and there is none/nothing to cause her to re[st] from [fornica]tion" (1 12–13).

The phrase "there is no one (or: nothing) to cause her to rest" (ואין להרג[יעה), which may be an allusion to Isa 34, is a quite striking change from Proverbs, yet it has received little scholarly attention. It is surely notable that, for some reason, this character cannot be caused to desist from her wickedness. The answer of course should already be clear: the only character in the scrolls that nothing and no one can stop from wickedness is a demon. At the same time, the only individual character in the Bible that rests using the term רגע is the lilith in Isa 34:14. The statement in 4Q184 appears to be another reversal of Scripture: while the lilith in Isa 34 rests at "the day of the vengeance of the Lord," that day has not come. Therefore she will not rest; indeed, there is nothing that can make her rest. Given the evidence in ancient Near Eastern and later Jewish texts for Lilith, and given the noteworthy phrase in 4Q184 1 12, it is quite possible that this character is to be understood as a lilith.[39]

If this is so, it may have implications on the nature of the interpretation of Proverbs and Isaiah in 4Q184. The possible introduction of an eschatological element could mean that the interpretation is bounded temporally: 4Q184 1 would be the description of a character who is active now, but will not be in the future. The author would thus have brought Isaiah to bear to explain the problem the world itself posed to the ideology of Proverbs. Wisdom is more powerful than Folly, the author says, and this period is an exception, one foreseen by Isaiah.

---

[37] E.g. 1QS 10:19; 11Q13 II 13.

[38] E.g. 1QS 1:17–18, 23–24; 2:5; CD 4:13, 12:2, 1QM 1:1–2 etc.

[39] In 1QIsa[a], Isa 34:14 has plural forms: אך שמה ירגיעו ליליות ומצאו להמה מנוח, "there liliths will repose and find for rest for themselves." Apparently in 1QIsa[a], and perhaps in Qumran in general, Lilith referred to a type of demon and not an individual character.

In light of the scroll's evidence, the most plausible explanation seems to be that this character is intended to be a demon: demons are understood to be the opposite of light and goodness (1QS, *Visions of Amram*), dark and shadowy figures (11Q11 and 4Q544) who live in eternal fire (*1 Enoch*, 4Q510, 1QS and Isa 33), and who, most notably, cause righteous men to stumble (1QS 3, 4Q444, 4Q510). In 4Q184 the character is the opposite of light (1 7), dark and shadowy (1 4–5); lives in eternal fire (1 7) and, centrally, causes righteous men to stumble and sin (1 13–17). Finally, just as demons have power over the righteous, but only until "the day of the vengeance of the Lord" (as in 1QS and other texts), in 4Q184 "there is no one (or: nothing) to cause her to rest" (1 12–13) because that eschatological end time has not yet arrived. This character thus not only resolves the differences between Proverbs and Isa 59, it does so without contradicting either text, by separating them temporally. Presumably when the end time came this character would rest, fulfilling Isa 34, and wisdom would be strongest, as in Proverbs.

4. Conclusion

One of the main reasons there has been little agreement on the identification of this character is that studies on 4Q184 have focused entirely on the final form of the character. The aim of this paper was to demonstrate that the 4Q184 1 is fundamentally a work of scriptural interpretation, and that the character can be understood only when viewed as the outcome of that interpretation. Put another way, the only way to understand the significance of this character is to understand what was at stake for the author. This is to be found not in the final form of the character; she is the *resolution* of the issue. What was at stake for the author is to be found in the scriptural sources he skillfully wove together into that final form.

Seen this way, 4Q184 1 is not about a female character, but about the existence of sin in the world, particularly righteous sin. This issue was a significant one for the authors of the scrolls, who believed strongly in a fundamental order to the world under God's control and supervision. Their response to this issue was eschatological: righteous sin was the result of the rule of evil spirits in the world, a divinely-sanctioned situation that God would eventually bring to an end.

The two key scriptural sources alluded to in 4Q184—Prov 1–9 and Isa 59—both speak to the question of righteous sin: in Proverbs such a thing is impossible; in Isa 59 it is not only possible, it is the norm. Yet the author saw not only contradictions in these sources but also connections, and it

was these connections that allowed the author to bring these texts to bear on one another. They, along with Isa 33 and 34, were brought together to resolve the divergent views on the nature of sin in a form that accorded with eschatological thought in the scrolls. The wicked female character in Proverbs is shown to be connected to the Lilith in Isa 34, a demon who will not rest until the eschatological end-time. This identification of the character in Proverbs with the character of the lilith is the explanation of why the situation in Isa 59 persists, why sin is still universal.

But why the wicked female characters from Proverbs at all? The key to this seems to be the reversal of the statements referring to Wisdom in Proverbs in 4Q184 1 8–10, which bring into 4Q184 another element of scrolls thought, a belief in the dualistic order of the universe.[40] By reversing these key verses in the description of the semi-divine character of Wisdom in Proverbs, the author shows the character in 4Q184 to be exactly the opposite of Wisdom. This character was quite probably not chosen for any characteristics of her own, but only for her dualistic opposition to Wisdom.

This point is of importance in light of the focus on the gender of the character. The question of her femininity has figured centrally in the study of this text, something the original title of the text, *The Wiles of the Wicked Woman* did little to dissuade. The choice by the author of a female character to represent evil is generally assumed to offer important evidence on the attitude toward women in the scrolls community. However, in 4Q184 the femininity and the allure of the women have been greatly muted in comparison with Prov 7, even as it clearly alludes to that section. What this study does show clearly, however, is their attitude toward Scripture. The character appears to have been predetermined primarily because of her dualistic relationship to Wisdom, and possibly also because of her relationship with the lilith. The choice of this character appears in the main not to have been a choice at all. If so, it is possible her gender may be entirely incidental, and speak more of earlier traditions and their attitudes toward them than of their personal attitudes. If so, the character's femininity might offer no particular insight into attitudes towards women in the scrolls community and may also have no bearing on the interpretation of 4Q184.

---

[40] As Hultgren shows, the characters of Wisdom and Folly in Proverbs were an important precedent for the dualism that became prominent in central sectarian texts. See Stephen Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 66; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 330–32.

Having taken the character who was representative of the force of evil against the forces of good and shown how she is related to all these other pieces of Scripture, the author manages to demonstrate how a central belief in scrolls thought—that demons have power over even the righteous in this time—is found directly in Scripture. To do so meant not just bringing multiple texts together in the same place, but giving them bearing on one another.

This brings us back to the beginning again, to Davies's argument that scriptural interpretation was built into the reading of the text in the Qumran scrolls. It is possible that a text like 4Q184 offers a way to understand how such interpretation as Davies describes might have come to be: the author, having brought together apparently unconnected scriptural texts and shown their interconnectedness, uncovers the meaning of this larger text. This meaning becomes part of both texts, even though it is not to be found in either text individually. In this case, it is that the evil female character in Proverbs is the same character as the evil characters in Isa 59 and the demon in Isa 34. It is also that the statements about Wisdom in Proverbs are tempered by those about wickedness in Isa 59, which can be explained by the relationship of these characters to the lilith in Isa 34. After such a scripturally-based interpretation shows that at least this aspect of the eschatological beliefs attested to elsewhere in the scrolls was to be found in certain scriptural texts, it might have been assumed that such an interpretation was to be found generally, now even in individual verses or even words—without any further need for larger scriptural corroboration.

It may be that there are other scrolls that offer hermeneutical bases for the more piecemeal interpretations found elsewhere, but that these have been lost or destroyed. Or perhaps they are not lost at all and there are more such interpretations hidden in already familiar texts like 4Q184, ready to be uncovered.

Appendix: A Further Fragment

Beyond 4Q184 1, there are between one and four further fragments of the text. Although these fragments were published in the editio princeps in DJD 5 they have gone almost entirely unexamined since most of them are quite small and contain fewer than a dozen words without context. Eibert Tigchelaar has recently brought these fragments back to scholarly attention, arguing that the largest of the fragments, frg. 3, unquestionably

belongs to the same document, perhaps the same sheet, and therefore has implications on the meaning of frg. 1.[41] Despite its small size (6 lines of no more than 3 words per line), this fragment is the best available evidence for understanding the larger document 4Q184 and how frg. 1 fits into it.

Little can be said conclusively about such a small fragment. Therefore, this appendix is far more exploratory than the rest of this paper; all conclusions about its meaning and relationship to frg. 1 are only tentative. Nevertheless, the preceding interpretation of frg. 1 opens the text up for some preliminary thoughts that might suggest a direction for further study of the composition as a whole. In what follows, I will consider each of the lines and their connections with other Qumran texts, referring to 4Q184 only occasionally; at the end I will propose an interpretation based on the fragment as a whole.

4Q184 frg. 3[42]

1]you shall be delivered [	1]תִּחָּלֵץ ○[
2]always purify for him y[our hands	2]תמיד הבר אליו כֻּ[פיכה
3]stretch out to him your hands in pra[yer	3 פ]רוש אליו כפיכה בתְּפֻ[לה
4]remove wickedness from you[	4]סיר ממכה עול צי○[
5]with impetuous pupils [	5]עם עישוני פחז ו○[

Fragment 3 brings together the subjects of deliverance, purification, prayer to God, the removal of iniquity (עול, cf. 4Q184 1 2,8,10), and perhaps a cause of sin (עישוני פחז "impetuous pupils," cf. 4Q184 1 13, ועפעפיה בפחז תרים, "she raises her eyelids impetuously"). The verbs in this fragment are generally in the second person, and appear to be directions, either to the reader or for someone to read to an audience.

Line 1. תִּחָּלֵץ[,[43] "you shall be delivered"

This verb חלץ is found in a number of Qumran texts, though many of these texts are themselves too fragmentary to be of use. Four less fragmentary texts also use this term: 1QS, 1QM, 4Q177 (4QCatena) and 4Q525 (4QBeatitudes). Of these, the term is used in 1QM to refer to equipping

[41] Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, "Constructing, Deconstructing and Reconstructing Fragmentary Manuscripts: Illustrated by a study of 4Q184 (4QWiles of the Wicked Woman)," in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods* (ed. M. Grossman; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010), 26–47.

[42] According to Tigchelaar's transcription, which he was kind enough to send me.

[43] The word is reasonably legible on PAM 43.432.

for battle, which seems an unlikely use in the context. This leaves 1QS, 4Q177 and 4Q525.

In 1QS 11 the verb is used to describe salvation by God from the pit, שחת, a term attested to especially in the sectarian texts—and three times across the seventeen lines of 4Q184 1.[44] The text from 1QS, part of the *Hymn of the Maskil*, speaks of God's power and his relation to man, his purification of man, and forgiveness from sin lest he trip up (בשל). These themes appear to encapsulate what remains in this small fragment of 4Q184, so I will quote it at some length:

> As for me, to evil humanity and the counsel of perverse (עול) flesh do I belong. My transgressions, evils, sins and corrupt heart 10 belong to the counsel of wormy rot and them who walk in darkness. Surely a man's way is not his own; neither can any person firm his own step. Surely justification is of God; by His power 11 is the way made perfect. All that shall be, He foreknows, all that is, His plans establish; apart from Him is nothing done. As for me, if 12 I stumble, God's lovingkindness forever shall save me. If through sin of the flesh I fall, my justification will be by the righteousness of God which endures for all time. 13 Though my affliction break out, He shall draw my soul back from the Pit (or: will save my soul from the pit; ומשחת יחלץ נפשי), and firm my steps on the way. Through His love He has brought me near; by His lovingkindness shall He provide 14 my justification. By His righteous truth has He justified me; and through His exceeding goodness shall He atone for all my sins. By His righteousness shall He cleanse me of human 15 defilement And the sin of humankind—to the end that I praise God for His righteousness, the Most High for His glory. Blessed are You, O my God, who has opened to knowledge 16 the mind of Your servant. Establish all of his works in righteousness; raise up the son of Your handmaiden—if it please You—to be among those chosen of humankind, to stand 17 before You forever. Surely apart from You the way cannot be perfected, nor can anything be done unless it please You. (1QS 11:9–17)

In this text sin is human and, like Isa 59 perhaps, the human condition. Justification can occur only through God, who also provides strength, atones for sins, and cleanses from the defilement of sin. The text ends with gratitude to God for granting knowledge, and a plea to God to raise him up to be among the chosen (לבחירי, as in 4Q184 1 14, בחירי צדק.) While there are no references to spirits here, the text is nevertheless part of 1QS, which includes some of the clearest demonological statements in the scrolls.

---

[44] Especially 1QS, 1QH, as well as CD. The term is found in 4Q184 line 5 (twice), and line 11.

The term in 4QCatena (4Q177 12–13 i 3) is found in an allusion to Ps 6:4–5: "And now, O Yahweh, how long? Be gracious unto me, save [my] li[fe" (חלצה נפשי). The allusion is in the context of statements about the end of days and the destruction of Belial: God's "angel of truth will help the Children of Light from the power of Belial" (line 7).

In the sapiential text 4QBeatitudes (4Q525), the deliverance is also from God, who protects "from all evil and no fear will come upon you if you [love God with all your heart and all] your soul."[45] Here too, the importance of dependence on God for protection is stressed, in the context of wisdom.

These three texts, one hymnic, one sapiential, and one eschatological, refer to the same theme: the help of God in fending off evil. In one of these the evil is a spirit innate to the person (1QS 11); in another the sin comes in the form of the spirit Belial and his lot (4Q177), and in the third from evil enemies generally (4Q525).

Line 2. תמיד הבר אליו כ֯[פיכה, "always purify to him your hands"
The verb ברר, "purify," is also found primarily in sectarian texts, including 1QS, 1QM, 1QH, 4Q177. More particularly, the phrase הבר כף, to purify the hands, is found twice, in the *Hodayot* (1QH^a 8:28), and in 11QPs^a 21:17, a version of Sir 51:13–30 in Hebrew.[46]

The latter text (11QPs^a) is a sapiential text referring to a female character of Wisdom, at times almost erotically. The phrase in 11QPs^a is הברותי כפי אל, followed by a lacuna, could be translated either "I purified my hands to" or "I have purified my hands, God". While it is unclear to whom the speaker purifies his hands, it appears to be done in preparation for approaching Wisdom.

In the *Hodayot* the image of purifying hands is in a hymn that bears many resemblances to the earlier text from 1QS: the speaker thanks God for counting him among the righteousness. He further says that there is no righteousness apart from God (1QH^a 8:27, 29), and asks God to purify him. In response, the speaker chooses to purify his hands as is God's will because, like God, he hates every work of injustice, עולה (28–29). He then

[45] 4Q525 14 ii 12–13. This manuscript includes a description of a dwelling that resembles the character in 4Q184. Eibert Tigchelaar, "Lady Folly and Her House in Three Qumran Manuscripts: On the Relation between 4Q525 15, 5Q16, and 4Q184 1," *RevQ* 23/91 (2008): 371–81 has argued that 4Q418 and 4Q525 may be copies of one composition. Whatever the case, there is undoubtedly a strong relationship between these two texts that calls for much further study.

[46] On this see Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 247–57.

prays, that "there not come before him any affliction that causes stumbling from the precepts of your [sc. God's] covenant" (1QH[a] 8:33; trans. Newsom, DJD 40:117).

Line 3. פ֯]רוש אליו כפיכה בת֯פ֯[לה, "stretch forth your hands to him in prayer"
In this line, the speaker instructs the reader to pray to him, i.e., to God.[47] What sort of prayer would this have been? The phrase עישוני פחז, "impetuous pupils" from line 5 suggests a connection to the character of frg. 1. It might be assumed that the prayer called for here would be exorcistic, to dispel the demons. However, the prayer is to be directed "to him" אליו (toward God, presumably), not against anyone or anything. The prayer would therefore more likely be a prayer for protection by God. As we have seen, nearly all the expressions found in the rest of this fragment have been found in the context of prayers to God requesting salvation or purification, including the prayer from *Hodayot*, which asks for God to protect him from afflictions that cause stumbling (מכשול) from the statutes of the covenant (like the character in 4Q184 1, who causes the righteous to stumble, כשל, and change the statute).

Line 4. סור (/סיר) ממכה עול[, "remove from you iniquity"
Because of the lack of context the actor in this phrase is not entirely clear. It could be something/someone removing a person's iniquity (God, presumably), or someone removing their own iniquity. The verb for "turn" or "remove" (סור) is most often used in the context of turning one's path from or turning from evil, not removing anything.[48] The only use of the verb in the sense of removing wickedness *from* a person is found in 4Q436 (4QBarkhi Nafshi[c]) 1 ii 1–2: "Adulterousness of the eyes you have removed from me (זנות עינים הסירותה ממני) and wrathful anger you have removed [from me" (ותשמו ענוה זעף אף הסירותה [ממני). Like many of the texts encountered above, this text is a prayer of thanksgiving to God for purifying him from sin and making him holy (4Q436 1 i–ii 1). It is possible that it does refer to God removing the supplicant's iniquity.

[47] The phrase פרש כף, to stretch out the hands or palms, is found in 11QPs[a] 24:3 (Syriac Psalm 155). It is a plea for deliverance and forgiveness of sins, since none are justified before the Lord, as in Isa 59. The phrase appears to refer to the act of prayer, strengthening the identification of the remainder of the word תפלה in the lacuna. The collocation is also found in 4Q512 (4QpapRitual of Pur B) 42–44 ii 6.

[48] E.g., CD 8 :4, 1QS 1 15, etc.

The other possibility is also interesting, though. The term עול/עולה ("iniquity," "injustice," "sin") is a key term in 4Q184, found more often than any other term referring to iniquity or sin. The term is also found prominently in the dualistic worldview of a number of sectarian texts, usually in opposition with the term אמת, "truth."[49] In an article on the connections between the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* in 1QS and the other parts of the *Rule of the Community*, Charlotte Hempel points out the importance of the two opposing terms, עול, "iniquity," and אמת, "truth," in the ethical dualism of 1QS, calling it the most prominent connection between the two parts, and "a central defining feature of the community in 1QS v–ix//4QS".[50] In a "particularly instructive example"[51] of the use of these terms, 1QS 6:14–15 speaks of admission to the community: "If he has the potential for instruction, he is to begin initiation into the Covenant, returning to the truth and repenting of all iniquity (ולסור מכול עול)."

The same phrase is found again in 1QS 9, again in a section on teaching those who enter the community. The maskil is instructed not to teach iniquitous men (אנשי העול) the revealed law of the sect, only to those who choose to enter the community (1QS 9:17–18). He is to teach these entrants all the "wondrous mysteries and to separate from every man who fails to keep himself from perversity (ולוא הסר דרכו מכול עול)" (9:20–21). Meanwhile, he is to be humble before the men of the pit (אנשי שחת), but "a zealot for God's law whose time will come: even the Day of Vengeance (יום נקם)" (9:23). He is also to praise God for all the present goodness, and "recount His lovingkindness in all that is to be" (9:26). Earlier in the same column new entrants are instructed to "atone for the guilt of transgression (אשמות פשע) and the rebellion of sin, becoming an acceptable sacrifice for the land through the flesh of burnt offerings, the fat of sacrificial portions and prayer" (1QS 9:3–5).[52]

Looking at the connections between 4Q184 3 and texts from other scrolls that include these words, as well as combinations of the concepts

---

[49] On this, see, e.g., Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant*, 344.

[50] Charlotte Hempel, "The Treatise on the Two Spirits and the Literary History of the Rule of the Community," in *Dualism in Qumran* (ed. Geza Xeravits; Library of Second Temple Studies 76; London: T & T Clark, 2010), 102–120 at 116.

[51] Ibid., 117.

[52] The expression אשמות פשע, "guilt of transgression," is found in 4Q184 1, possibly twice. It may also be found in 3Q9 (3QSectarian text) 3 2, though the context is unclear. Whatever the case, this unique expression might point to a possible connection between these texts.

behind them suggests one interpretation of this fragment. 4Q184 3 refers to salvation (from evil, presumably, line 1) and purification (line 2), both of which are in God's power according to a number of sectarian scrolls (1QS, 1QH, 4Q177, 4Q436, etc.). In all these texts the sectarian prays for salvation and purification from God, as well as protection from the forces of iniquity.

In her work on Qumran prayer, Bilhah Nitzan points to a sharp contrast between prayers against demons in ancient Judaism generally and those found at Qumran. In other forms of ancient Judaism demons acted out only at various times and could be entirely dispelled. In Qumran apocalyptic theology, as mentioned above, evil spirits were permitted temporary power on earth, but would eventually be put to rest at the day of judgment (like the demons in Isa 34, perhaps). Demons could not destroy the children of light, though they could cause them to stumble. In the community complete destruction of the spirit was not possible. Protection from demons existed, though, and came through membership in the community, since being in the community meant being one of the chosen who could not be entirely destroyed.[53] Prayers against demons at Qumran were therefore above all hymns to God thanking him for his goodness (for giving him knowledge, setting him on the right path), as well as requesting protection, as in the Hodayot, 1QS, 4Q510 and 4Q511, and elsewhere. As Nitzan puts it,

> In the Yaḥad community, in particular, there took shape the view that the battle against the spirits of iniquity in the present is part of the overall struggle against the evil regnant in the universe. However, the present struggle is only concerned with protecting the Children of Light from being misled toward the ways of iniquity and from 'afflictions of transgression.[54]

---

[53] Bilhah Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 259. As she points out, the *Damascus Document* (CD 16 4–5) states that "on the day that a man imposes upon himself by oath to return to the Law of Moses, the angel Mastema will depart from behind him, if he carries out his words." "Thus," she writes, "the member of the Yaḥad sect is protected against being misled towards the way of darkness and destructive forces through repentance and fulfillment of the commandments" (ibid., 252).

[54] Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer*, 272. In her forthcoming work on sin in Qumran prayer, Miryam Brand shows that there were two different paradigms of sin at Qumran. In the conclusion to her 2009 SBL paper on the topic she writes that "In brief, the general paradigm of sin found in Second Temple prayer is that sin is innate, human and inevitable. This idea is found in sectarian Qumran prayer with the addition of belief in predestination and a connection of sinfulness to human physicality. In apotropaic prayer, a different paradigm is central. Sin comes from the demonic realm, and is not an inevitable part of the human condition. In the example before us [4Q444], when sectarian prayer meets the apotropaic genre, the two paradigms are merged: sin is both innate and human, and external

Protection came through membership in the community, which was also a sign of salvation, and which demanded purity and turning from evil—which could only be accomplished by one who is chosen.

If the statements in 4Q184 3 are related to these particularly sectarian beliefs at Qumran, the fragment might be instructions for the new or potential entrant to the community. This fragment might be referring to the necessity of salvation—assuming one has the right spirit—the importance of prayer and purification in response to that chosenness, and the need to turn from evil, an important theme in wisdom texts. The rarity of the expressions, and their appearance in combination with one another in these particular sectarian texts would seem to suggest this, though this is by no means assured.

Assuming the foregoing for the sake of argument, this interpretation of frg. 3 might therefore suggest the reason for the composition of frg. 1. As we have seen, the character in 4Q184 1 is created out of a meticulous interpretation of various parts of scripture, the interpreter having been very careful not to contradict any scripture except with another piece of scripture. The interpreter blended various sources to show their unity—a unity that forms an image found in Qumran eschatology: a spirit of iniquity that has power over the good, but only for a limited time.

While this belief is found in texts like *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch*, which Qumranites may have considered to have scriptural authority, it is unclear how many other Jewish groups did. The connection of two scriptural texts, Proverbs and Isaiah, which were most likely accepted in all Jewish groups, might have constituted scriptural proof of their eschatological belief.

If this is so, the character in 4Q184 1 might have been created as a scriptural "proof," to show potential members of the group the truth of the Qumran eschatological worldview without recourse to any sources beyond generally accepted scriptural text.[55] Fragment 3, which might be

---

and demonic." This description fits the character in 4Q184, who seems to be created out of a blend of these two paradigms, of sin originating internally (Isa 59), and externally (Prov 1–9).

[55] George Brooke, "Justifying Deviance: The Place of Scripture in Converting to the Qumran Self-Understanding," in *Reading the Present: Scriptural Interpretation and the Contemporary in the Texts of the Judean Desert* (ed. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange; SBLSymS 30; Atlanta: SBL, 2005), 73–87, has written a very interesting article on the possible use of scripture in the conversion process. He identifies various stages of the conversion process in light of modern conversion theory, and points out how scripture, and scriptural interpretation in particular might have been instrumental in convincing potential members to join. He draws special attention to the importance of acculturation to their dualistic interpretation: "it is perhaps no accident that in the form of the *Rule of the*

directions to a potential member, would have come after this text and described membership in the community and its ability to protect from this evil and her seductive eyes (4Q184 3 5).

This interpretation is obviously a very speculative and imaginative response to the evidence. I offer it above all in the spirit of exploration, as an invitation to further thought on this important but extremely opaque fragment, in hopes that future studies can bring more light to it as part of 4Q184 as a whole, and in that whole as part of the wider scrolls corpus.

Community found in the exemplar from Cave 1 (1QS), the ritual of admission is followed in cols. 3 and 4 by the so-called treatise on the two spirits. In light of theories of conversion, it seems as if the editors of 1QS recognized that new members would need thorough cultural transformation within the cosmic dualism of the spiritual outlook of the community" (Brooke, "Justifying Deviance," 86–87). An interpretation such as that one in 4Q184 1 might well have acted as such a text.

THE PRAYER OF MANASSEH IN 4Q381 AND THE ACCOUNT OF MANASSEH IN 2 CHRONICLES 33

Mika S. Pajunen

There is a penitential prayer in the psalm collection 4QNon-Canonical Psalms B (4Q381) that the superscription ascribes to: "Manasseh king of Judah, when the King of Assyria imprisoned him" (frg. 33 8). This prayer plausibly has some connection with the tradition of Manasseh's prayer mentioned in 2 Chr 33 (vv. 12–13, 18–19), but the extent of the connection with the narrative about Manasseh's reign and the direction of the influence have thus far been evaluated in various ways. William Schniedewind has claimed that the prayer in 4Q381 is a pre-exilic composition that the Chronicler(s) may have used as a source,[1] and Eileen Schuller, the editor of 4Q381, has stated that it is difficult to suggest that the psalm in 4Q381 is directly dependant on the account of Chronicles, but equally difficult to suggest the influence going the other way around.[2] Schuller's further proposal that the superscription ascribing the prayer to King Manasseh might have been secondarily attached to a general psalm of a repentant individual makes this question even more complex.[3] These issues have larger ramifications because if the 4Q381 prayer had been used as a source by the Chronicler(s), it would have consequences for understanding the textual

---

[1] William M. Schniedewind, "A Qumran Fragment of the Ancient 'Prayer of Manasseh'?" *ZAW* 108 (1996): 105–7.

[2] Eileen M. Schuller, "4QNon-Canonical Psalms B," in *Qumran Cave Four IV Poetical and Liturgical Texts, part 1* (ed. Carol Newsom and Eileen Schuller; DJD 11; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 87–173 at 123. For a fuller discussion on the topic see, eadem, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: A Pseudepigraphic Collection* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 31–32.

[3] Schuller, *Non-Canonical*, 32, 162. Moshe J. Bernstein, "Pseudepigraphy in the Qumran Scrolls: Categories and Functions," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997* (ed. Esther G. Chazon and Michael E. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 1–26, designates the secondary attribution of compositions to biblical figures as decorative pseudepigraphy. This kind of pseudepigraphy is only external, and is in contrast to works that are wholly pseudepigraphic both externally and internally. Whether the 4Q381 prayer of Manasseh is to be placed in the category of decorative pseudepigraphy as Schuller's argument would indicate or is a "genuine" pseudepigraphic prayer depends on whether firm links between the text of the prayer and traditions of Manasseh found elsewhere can be established.

history of the Chronicles account of Manasseh, and if the influence goes the other way, it gives a glimpse into the use and interpretation of the older tradition(s) at a relatively early stage. Therefore, in order to situate the 4Q381 prayer in the correct discussion the relative chronology of these two texts has to be established. Through analysis of the connecting details between the texts and taking their particular characteristics into account, it will be argued that the passage in Chronicles represents the earlier text and was used as a source by the author(s) of the prayer in 4Q381.[4]

1. Traditions about King Manasseh

In order to fully appreciate the nuances of the textual connection between 2 Chr 33 and the 4Q381 prayer of Manasseh, it is imperative to have a general knowledge about the different traditions relating to King Manasseh. The traditions of Manasseh now found in the Hebrew Bible and the problems they present are well known to scholars and need not be fully discussed here, and consequently they are only briefly outlined in the following presentation. There are two distinctly different strands of tradition about King Manasseh in the Hebrew Bible. One is represented by 2 Kgs 21 (and Jer 15:4) and the other by 2 Chr 33. According to the tradition represented by 2 Kgs 21:1–18, Manasseh is perhaps the most heinous king in the history of Judah. His list of sins (vv. 2–9, 16) is worse than the sins of most of the other kings put together. These sins are deemed terrible enough that even King Josiah's later reform is not enough to absolve them (23:26). Instead they are given as the main reason for God's final judgment of his chosen nation and its subsequent exile (24:3–4). Surprisingly enough Manasseh himself does not suffer any consequences for his sins,[5] but rather enjoys the longest reign in the history of Judah and dies peacefully in the end (21:1, 18).

The account of Manasseh's reign in 2 Chr 33:1–20 is significantly different. It starts in the same way (vv. 1–10) following the account of 2 Kings

[4] A similar view of the chronology between these texts has been expressed by Florentino García Martínez in his review of Eileen Schuller's preliminary edition of 4Q381. See Florentino García Martínez, "Estudios Qumranicos 1975–1985: Panorama Critico (V)," *EstBíb* 47 (1989): 93–118 at 99.

[5] Although, note the suggestion by Francesca Stavrakopoulou, *King Manasseh and Child Sacrifice: Biblical Distortions of Historical Realities* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004), 44–45, that the writer of Kings might have meted out a measure of narrative justice to Manasseh by placing his burial place in the Garden of Uzza instead of the ancestral tombs in the City of David.

almost to the letter, but then a complete reversal of the situation happens in vv. 11–13. First, Manasseh is captured by some chiefs of the Assyrian king and taken to Babylon. He then repents his evil deeds, prays to God for forgiveness, and God answers by letting him return to his throne. After this brief episode of captivity Manasseh in effect reverses his former deeds by making religious reforms and completing building projects (vv. 14–16). Because he subsequently remains loyal to God, the rest of his reign is prosperous and his sins are not recounted again in the rest of the Chronicles.

As has been observed by Schuller,[6] both of these ideologically charged lines of tradition also find expression in later literature. The influence of 2 Kings is testified to, e.g., by *2 Bar.* 64–65, the *Mart. Isa.* 2:1–6, perhaps implicitly by Ben Sira (Manasseh not mentioned in the praise of the ancestors) and many rabbinic traditions, and the influence of 2 Chronicles by the Greek apocryphal Prayer of Manasseh,[7] Josephus (*Ant.* 10.37–46),[8] and many rabbinic sources.[9]

2. The Origin of the Tradition of Manasseh's Prayer

But which of the traditions in the Hebrew Bible is the more original?[10] The question hinges on the prayer of Manasseh (2 Chr 33:11–13, 18–19), which, as commentators hasten to point out, occupies a central place in the narrative.[11] Where does this idea about Manasseh repenting come from:

---

[6] Schuller, *Non-Canonical*, 161–62.

[7] For the Greek text of the prayer, see Alfred Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975). For a general introduction to the prayer, see James H. Charlesworth, "Prayer of Manasseh," in *OTP*, 2:630–38, at 630. As noted already by Schuller, *Non-Canonical*, 160–61, with the exception of the same setting given in the superscript of the Greek prayer and the 4Q381 prayer, there seems to be no direct textual connection between these two prayers. For a recent study of the structure, form and social setting of the Greek prayer, see Judith H. Newman, "The Form and Settings of the Prayer of Manasseh," in *Seeking the Favor of God, Volume 2, The Development of Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism* (ed. Mark J. Boda et al.; SBLEJL 22; Atlanta: SBL, 2007), 105–25.

[8] For Josephus' portrayal of Manasseh, see Louis H. Feldman, *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible* (JSJSup 58; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 416–23.

[9] For the rabbinic traditions on Manasseh, see, e.g., Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1909–38), 6:375–76; Pierre Bogaert, "La Legende de Manasse," in *Apocalypse de Baruch* (SC 144–45; Paris: Cerf, 1969), 296–319; Feldman, *Studies*, 416–18.

[10] It has to be emphasized that "more original" is not meant here in the historical sense as both accounts are strongly influenced by theological motifs. Cf. Stavrakopoulou, *King Manasseh*, 46–47, 58–60.

[11] For a study of the structure of the Chronicler's account of Manasseh, see, e.g., Klaas A. D. Smelik, *Converting the Past: Studies in Ancient Israelite and Moabite Historiography* (OtSt 28; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 129–89.

Is it the pen of the Chronicler(s), an unknown source not possessed by the writers of Kings, the account of Dtr1(H) or perhaps the prayer found in 4Q381 (frgs. 33a+b+35, 45a+b, 47)?[12]

The solution that seems to be the most plausible is that the Chronicler(s) is behind the idea of Manasseh's repentance. Others have discussed this question at length,[13] and therefore only a brief sketch of argumentation along these lines is presented here. Apparently the account of Manasseh in 2 Kings has created substantial ideological problems for the Chronicler(s). One of these issues is that, although Manasseh is depicted as a king without an equal in sinfulness, he still reigns longer than any other king including David, Solomon, etc. A king who commits such dreadful sins should have received punishment for them during his lifetime instead of dying peacefully.[14] Another problem seems to have been the reform of King Josiah, which in the 2 Kings account is in practice made null and void by Manasseh's sins. The notion of repentance, which is one of the motifs frequently highlighted in Chronicles,[15] cannot function with the idea that true repentance has already been made impossible by previous events. This would actually directly contradict the promise of God to accept true repentance given in 2 Chr 7:14 (a passage that exemplifies the Chronicler's notion of repentance). A still further problem is that 2 Kings emphasizes the sins of Manasseh to such a degree as to make him a scapegoat for the whole punishment of the exile, namely, the sin of the people is diminished.[16]

---

[12] All of these alternatives have previously been suggested by scholars. Compare, e.g., Steven L. Mckenzie, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1984), 191–93; Schuller, *Non-Canonical*, 161; Sara Japhet, *I & II Chronicles: A Commentary*, (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993), 1009; Schniedewind, "A Qumran Fragment," 105–7; Philippe Abadie, "From the Impious Manasseh (2 Kings 21) to the Convert Manasseh (2 Chronicles 33): Theological Rewriting by the Chronicler," in *The Chronicler as Theologian. Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein* (ed. M. Patrick Graham et al.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2003), 89–104; Stavrakopoulou, *King Manasseh*, 55–57.

[13] See, e.g., Abadie, "From the Impious," 89–104; Stavrakopoulou, *King Manasseh*, 46–59.

[14] For immediate retribution theology in Chronicles, see, e.g., Hugh G. M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1982), 391–93; Raymond B. Dillard, *2 Chronicles* (Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1987), 76–81; Brian E. Kelly, *Retribution and Eschatology in Chronicles* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 29–45; Sara Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1997), 165–76.

[15] Cf. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 389–93.

[16] Cf. Stavrakopoulou, *King Manasseh*, 38–43, 59–68.

The Chronicler(s) deals with these problems by making up an account of Manasseh being punished by imprisonment in Babylon (thus he is in practice exiled from the land) that causes him to repent which in turn enables the forgiving of his sins. These modifications to the account reconcile the length of Manasseh's reign with the theological concept of just rewards for actions, satisfy the need for punishment, and allow for Manasseh's sins to be forgotten from that point on in the story. This in turn results in true repentance being possible until the very end of Judah's national existence and the blame for the exile being shared equally between king and people. Thus, in the account about Josiah's reform it is said that the whole nation turned to God and the reform was a success (34:33). No mention of the sins of Manasseh is made. The same absence of Manasseh's sins in the narrative is found when the final reason for the exile is given. Instead of Manasseh, the blame falls on Zedekiah (36:12–16) who did *not* repent, which of course implies that according to the Chronicles even at that late stage judgment could have been averted by turning back to God. But unlike Manasseh in 2 Kings, Zedekiah is not alone to blame for the catastrophe. The people and their leaders also commit transgressions and refuse to heed the warnings sent by God (36:14, 16) and consequently the immediate divine retribution follows (36:17–20).

All in all, the account of Manasseh's captivity, repentance and subsequent prosperous reign is best seen as an example of complete theological rewriting of source material by the Chronicler because it yields a motivation for a number of differences between the accounts.[17] With differences in details, an explanation of this kind has been very common among scholars and if one accepts this type of explanation then the superscription in 4Q381 (frg. 33 8) is in itself enough to decide the question about which text is earlier as it would need to come from the Chronicles or a source dependant on it. However, even though it is hard to find a scholar who would refute that the account of Manasseh's captivity and repentance is thoroughly enmeshed in a theological framework created by the Chronicler, there are nevertheless a number of scholars who hold that the account is based on another source and could even describe a historical event.[18] There is no evidence for such an incident outside 2 Chronicles

[17] Similarly, e.g., Abadie, "From the Impious," 104; Stavrakopoulou, *King Manasseh*, 46–59.

[18] Cf. Jacob M. Myers, *II Chronicles* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965); Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 1009. The Chronicler's source would in this case be either an unknown account or 2 Kings prior to Dtr2. For this notion of textual development, see, e.g., Mckenzie,

and the sources that are available instead describe Manasseh as a faithful vassal of Assyria.[19] Sara Japhet claims that the event must be historical because the punishment is in no way proportional to Manasseh's sins and according to the theological scheme of Chronicles the people should also have been punished.[20] But Philippe Abadie has shown that the story has been modified so that it is actually the sin and consequent repentance of an individual that are highlighted.[21] One can add to this that it could hardly be expected that the Chronicler(s) would create an awful punishment worthy of the sins of Manasseh (although exile from the land can be argued to represent one of the worst available punishments) or to drag all of the people into exile etc. These changes would have been too drastic, and calamities of this scale should have been noted in earlier accounts. It is exactly the way the event is portrayed that reinforces the notion that the Chronicler(s) has created the whole incident. The account of Manasseh's captivity in 2 Chr 33:11–13 is very vague. It speaks about some commanders of the Assyrian king who somehow whisk Manasseh away without anyone objecting, and just as suddenly Manasseh is back on his throne. It is displayed as a minor incident not even worthy of notice, nothing like a large scale invasion or something similar that should have been known by all educated people. Another curiosity is that Manasseh is taken to Babylon, not to Nineveh as might have been expected if a real historical setting were behind the story.[22] As such the account gives a model for the exile of the people and the acts of repentance that will be needed to ensure restoration to the land.[23]

But if one prefers another type of hypothesis over the solution presented above, then a more thorough analysis of Chronicles and 4Q381 is needed to decide the issue of which text is earlier, and the results would have direct consequences for the above discussion in the sense that if the prayer in 4Q381 was the source of the Chronicler then the tradition did not originate in Chronicles. This would lend credence to the idea of

---

The Chronicler's, 191–93. For a short survey of the discussion about the historicity of the account see, Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 391–93, and for more comprehensive assessments, see Kai Peltonen, *History Debated: The Historical Reliability of Chronicles in Pre-Critical and Critical Research* (Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 1996); Stavrakopoulou, *King Manasseh*, esp. 15–140.

[19] For the historical King Manasseh, see Stavrakopoulou, *King Manasseh*, 73–120.

[20] Sara Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, 1009.

[21] Philippe Abadie, "From the Impious," 97–98.

[22] Cf. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 389–90; Stavrakopoulou, *King Manasseh*, 56.

[23] Cf. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 388–89; Kelly, *Retribution*, 223; Stavrakopoulou, *King Manasseh*, 56–57.

another line of tradition that the Chronicler happened to know. On the other hand, if the influence goes the other way, it does not help in resolving this question. It only means that the author of the 4Q381 prayer used the tradition in Chronicles, regardless of its origin, and testifies only to the development of that tradition. With this background in mind it is time to turn to the prayer of Manasseh found in 4Q381.

3. The 4Q381 Penitential Prayer of Manasseh King of Judah

Column—(frgs. 33a+b, 35)[24]

17 תפלה למנשה מלך יהודה בכלו אתו מלך אשור [א]לה[י]ק֯רו֯ב ישעי לנגד עיניך מה◦[ ]ל[ ][25]

18 לישע פניך אקוה ואני אכחש לפניך על ח֯[ט]י כי הגדל[ת רחמיך]ואני הרביתי אשמה וכן א[כרת]

19 משמחת עוד ולא ת֯ר֯אה בטוב נפשי כי [ ]י גלו וא[ ]וא֯ ה֯רימני למעלה על גוי [ ]

20 ואני לאזכ֯רתיך [במקו]ם ק[ד]ש֯ ולא֯ ע֯בדת[יך]לי [ ][26]

Column—(frgs. 45a+b, 47)

1 ואבי֯נ֯א֯ ו֯א֯ין֯ מ֯ב֯ין אשכיל ו֯לו ◦[ ]◦ ה֯◦◦[ ]י ואפחד ממך ואטהר֯[27]

[24] The Hebrew text and its translation are my own, but there are no major differences from the DJD edition. For the readings, the photographs available on microfiche and electronic editions as well as the original fragments have been consulted.

[25] מה◦[. There is an ink trace after *he* at the very edge of the fragment that Schuller has not noted in her edition. Observations from the original fragment confirm that the trace is indeed ink, which means that the word continues with a third letter and thus cannot be read, along with Schuller, *Non-Canonical*, 146, 151, as מה "what." The ink trace is from the top of a vertical stroke, but is too small to allow for recognition of the letter.

[26]]ש֯ ולא֯. Schuller, *Non-Canonical*, 146, reads only לא֯ ק֯[דשך], but the original fragment allows for two more letters to be identified. There is a stroke beside *lamed* on the right that is virtually certain the head of *waw*. This letter is preceded by a noticeable word space, and on the right side of the word space there are several ink traces belonging to either one or two letters depending on how they are combined. They appear to be the upper ends of vertical/diagonal strokes with no marked enlargement at the top or any trace of a horizontal top stroke. Thus, the *kap* reconstructed as the last letter of this word by Schuller is not plausible, but the traces can easily be fitted as parts of the branches of *šin*.

[27]]◦ ה֯◦◦[. Schuller, *Non-Canonical*, 171, notes traces of two undecipherable letters in this section of the leather, but slightly more information can be gleaned. First, there is an ink trace well below the baseline. This is probably the lower end of a final letter going below the line such as final *nun*, *kap* or *mem*, although it cannot be decided which of these letters the trace belongs to. After this is a gap before the next letter that corresponds with the typical word space left by the scribe. The next letter is only partly visible, but the characteristic crossbar of *he* appears fairly certain. This is followed by traces belonging to one or two additional letters. They can be read together for example as *mem* or separately as *nun* or *kap* followed by an undecipherable letter.

2 מתעבות הכרתי ואתן נפשי להכנע מלפנ֯[יך] הרבו פשעה ועלי יזמו֯
3 להסגירני ואני בד בטחתי[ ]ל[ ]○[ ]ל[ ]
4 ואל תתנני במשפט עמך אלהי [ ]
5 מתיעצים עלי פתחו לשן שק֯[ר]
6 לי מעשי ○○○[ ]○○○○○[]○○[ ] ○ אלהי כי רחמון וחנון אתה [ ]
7 לה֯○○ ○○[ ]מו֯ ד֯○○○[ ]ואהלך באמתך ל[ ][28]
8]]ל֯מבֿיניך ואשכילה[ ][29]
9] סלה] *vacat*

Translation

—17 Prayer of Manasseh, King of Judah, when the King of Assyria had imprisoned him. [My G]o[d] near, my salvation is before your eyes, *mh.*[ ]*l*[ ]

18 I wait for your saving presence, and I submit myself before you because of my s[in]s. For [you] magnified [your mercy,]but I multiplied guilt. And so I [will be cut off]

19 from eternal joy, and my soul will not experience prosperity. For [ ]*y* they went into exile and *w'*[ ]*w'* exalted me on high, over a nation [ ]

20 But I did not remember you [in the] ho[l]y [plac]e and [I] did not serve [you]*ly*[ ]

—1 and I understand, and the one who does not understand I will instruct, and to him .[ ]. *h.*.[ ]*y* and I fear you, and I purify myself

2 from the abominations I was acquainted with, and I give my soul to be humbled before [you] they multiplied sin, and they plot against me

3 to lock me up. But I trust in you[ ]*l*[ ].[ ]*l*[ ]

4 and do not set me in judgement with you, my God [ ]

5 those who conspire against me loosed a deceit[ful] tongue[ ]

6 to me deeds of…[ ].….[ ]..[ ]. my God. For merciful and gracious are you [ ]

7 *lh.*…[ ]*mwr d*…[ ]and I will walk in your truth *l*[ ]

8 [ ]to those who understand you, and I will instruct [ ]

9 [selah] *vacat*

The prayer of Manasseh in 4Q381 is preserved on several separate fragments containing text from two consecutive columns (33a+b, 35, 45a+b and 47). Schuller and Schniedewind only use the fragments in the first column, 33a+b and 35, when they discuss the possible connections between the 4Q381 prayer and the Chronicles account of Manasseh, but both of them find it plausible that fragment 45a+b could come from the same

[28]]○○○ד֯ מו֯ [. Schuller, *Non-Canonical*, 184–85, reads the first letter of the second word as a possible *ḥet*, but the obvious downward slant of the horizontal stroke suggests *dalet* as a slightly more plausible alternative.

[29]]ל֯מבֿיניך[. PAM 41.409 shows the upper end of a vertical stroke visible between the lines, but the ink has since flaked off. The placement of the stroke and its alignment with the word visible on line 8 suggest that it is the upper part of a *lamed* that precedes the possible *mem* in מבֿיניך, but in theory the trace might also belong to a supralinear letter.

psalm.[30] More importantly, the preliminary material reconstruction of the manuscript done by Hartmut Stegemann in 1985 and my own recent still unpublished reconstruction both suggest that fragments 45a+b and 47 present the continuation of the prayer (Stegemann adds still another fragment, frg. 79, but this seems to be part of another psalm).[31] Without going into the physical details here, it will just be noted that there are no obstacles present in the material to this arrangement. Additionally, attention can be drawn to fragment 45a+b having language connectable with the accounts of several kings in the Chronicles. Schuller has listed these connections and hesitantly suggests the king might be Manasseh,[32] but to be precise Manasseh is the only one of the kings that all of these verbal links support. Thus, it is plausible on both material and contextual grounds that the fragments stem from the same psalm and the following analysis will treat them as such.

4. 2 Chronicles 33:1–20 and the Prayer of Manasseh in 4Q381

It is now time to turn to the actual text of the prayer and the details connecting it to Manasseh. Schuller has previously listed the following six instances in fragments 33a+b and 35 that might be connected with the story of Manasseh:[33]

(1) The superscript. The same verbal root (פלל) is used for the prayer in 4Q381 (line 17) and in 2 Chr 33:13, and the idea about Manasseh being captured by the king of Assyria is present in both texts. This in itself would be enough to show that a connection between the texts exists, but as Schuller has raised the question of whether the superscription is original or added later to a quite general penitential prayer,[34] the

[30] Schuller, *Non-Canonical*, 175–76; eadem, "4QNon-Canonical," 133; Schniedewind, "A Qumran Fragment," 105–6.

[31] Stegemann's material reconstruction of 4Q381 is found in Schuller, *Non-Canonical*, 267–83. The reconstruction has some problems relating to the material evidence and also the resulting text created problems (for some of these, see Schuller, *Non-Canonical*, 277–78). A new material reconstruction of the manuscript has successfully been made in accordance with the methodology set by Stegemann and will hopefully be published in the near future. The above arrangement of the text and the line numbering follow that reconstruction.

[32] Schuller, *Non-Canonical*, 175.

[33] Ibid., 31–32.

[34] Ibid., 30–31.

links with Manasseh in the rest of the text need to be investigated. However, it is important to remember that if the pseudepigraphic title is part of the original composition, it would have made further explicit links to Manasseh unnecessary because the setting for the whole prayer has already been established by it. In light of this, if one wanted to support Schuller's claim concerning the superscript, it would actually be more appropriate to search for ideas that do *not* fit with Manasseh. But fortunately positive evidence for a connection with Manasseh does exist even apart from the superscription.

(2) The expression ואני אכחש לפניך "I submit myself before you" in line 18 could be related to Manasseh humbling himself before God in 2 Chr 33:12, 19, but with a different verb.[35]

(3) ואני הרביתי אשמה "but I multiplied guilt" near the end of line 18, recalls the Chronicles accounts of Manasseh (הרבה לעשות הרע 2 Chr 33:6) and Amon (הרבה אשמה 2 Chr 33:23) especially because the *hipʿil* of רבה is otherwise rarely used in connection with sin in the Hebrew Bible (note also הרבו פשעה in line 2 of the next column).

(4)]וא֯ ה֯ר֯ימני למעלה על גוי "…exalted me on high, over a nation" (line 19). This is a difficult phrase to interpret because of the fragmentary context as it seems to refer to God in the 3d person singular whereas the 2nd person singular is used elsewhere.[36] If it is God then it is similar to the expression used of the elevation of David from the people in Ps 89:20, and would probably function as an allusion to the oracle given there.[37] Schuller suggests that another possibility would be to read the cola as referring to the removal of a person from a position of leadership.[38] This seems an unlikely alternative,[39] but cannot be entirely ruled out because of the broken context. Regardless of whether the phrase is seen to refer to the elevation of a person over

[35] The roots כנע (2 Chronicles) and כחש (4Q381) can be used to express quite synonymous ideas of humbling and submitting, cf. the usage of both in Ps 81:15–16.

[36] For the possible ways of reading these cola and the problems relating to each of them, see Schuller, *Non-Canonical*, 158–59.

[37] If there is a link with Ps 89 in these cola, the bicola might be restored by wording drawn from 89:20, 22 as "but m[e, from the people h]e exalted me, above a nation [he established me]". That the word גוי is applied to the nation in the extant text suggests that the noun עם, which is far more common in references to Israel, has already been used in the first colon. Especially if a link to Ps 89 exists, the verb of the second colon would most likely be from the root כון used in Ps 89:22.

[38] Schuller, *Non-Canonical*, 159.

[39] Note especially the use of על גוי instead of מעל גוי. I am grateful to the editor who pointed this out in the review reports of an earlier form of this article.

a nation or his removal from over the people, it best fits with a king. Thus, the prayer was probably written with a king in mind which in itself supports the originality of the superscript. If it speaks about the elevation of a person it fits with any king, but if it is about removal then Manasseh would be among the few possible candidates.

(5) ואני לאזכֹרתיך "But I did not remember you" (line 20). This could be seen as wordplay on the common etymology of Manasseh's name which means "to forget"; cf. Gen 41:51, *Mart. Isa.* 2:1–6, *t. Sanh*. 102b.[40]

(6) ולוֹא עֹבדת יד["and [I] did not serve [you". Could be connected with Manasseh serving foreign gods instead of YHWH (2 Chr 33:3).

Two other possible connections to Manasseh traditions in fragments 33a+b and 35 should be mentioned.

(7) First is the possibility that the expression לישע פניך אקוה "I wait for your saving presence" in line 18 might be somehow connected to the idea in 2 Chr 7:14 that a repentant person should "seek the face of God" (יבקשו פני). Waiting for salvation is a relatively common feature in the Hebrew Bible and other texts (e.g., Gen 49:18, Isa 25:9. 11QPs[a] 22:8), but connecting God's countenance with the notion, is not. Naturally, this is just a possibility and even if the thoughts are connected, it would most of all strengthen the link between the 4Q381 prayer and Chronicles, not prove anything about Manasseh. However, drawing attention to the fact that the Septuagint renders Manasseh's entreaty in front of God in 2 Chr 33:12 with: ἐζήτησεν τὸ πρόσωπον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ "he sought the face of God," a link to Manasseh too might not be as far fetched as it first seems.

(8) Nevertheless, the second case is far more intriguing as far as Manasseh is concerned. The idea in the first part of line 19 is about the praying person being cut off from salvation because of his sins, but the expressions used seem directed towards the afterlife (or to the eschatological future) rather than being about punishment in the present day, i.e., he is being denied a part in future salvation not threatened with imminent calamity or something similar.[41] If so, this would

[40] For more information on this etymology of the name, see Schuller, *Non-Canonical*, 32. For a theory about the significance of the name of Manasseh as a Northern name for the writer(s) of Kings, see Stavrakopoulou, *King Manasseh*, 61–72.

[41] Cf. 4Q380 1 i 10–11 and the parallel passage found in Ps 106:5, where experiencing prosperity and joy are also paralleled.

be indicative for establishing a date for the composition, but more importantly it seems to presuppose the idea that the bad deeds of this person are only fully punished after death. This is not a typical notion in the Hebrew Bible or Qumran texts. Rather the recompense of the wicked should happen during the person's lifetime, and usually the just punishments expected for evil deeds are vividly described in texts. Here the person is denied a share in the future salvation, which suggests that either the person was not punished in his lifetime at all, or his sins were grave enough to merit even further punishment after death. If the superscript is original then this passage would indicate that further punishment of Manasseh after death was envisioned by the author as a just recompense for Manasseh's sins. The repentance of Manasseh naturally alters this situation, but if he had not repented the author claims that in addition to the already narrated imprisonment in Babylon, he would have been cut off from eternal joy.[42]

What makes this line even more perplexing is the only other complete word from the next colon that starts with כי and plausibly gives the reason why this person's sins where terrible enough for him to be cut off from eternal joy. The lone word (גלו) speaks about people going into exile which is rather surprising in this context. It is tempting to connect the sequence of ideas in these cola with the story of Manasseh in 2 Kgs as the king not punished in his lifetime and as the reason for the exile (cf. 2 Kgs 24:3, Jer 15:4). Reconstructing the sins of the praying person as the reason for the exile in the lacuna preceding the verb is possible, but too uncertain to implement. Perhaps the author of the prayer in 4Q381 wished to present the view that if Manasseh had not repented, his sins would have caused the exile and because of this he would have been punished further by being cut off from eternal joy. Thus, he would have offered the portrayal of events in 2 Kings as essentially correct in the case that Manasseh had not repented, but as Manasseh does repent his fate is altered. Whether or not a deliberate connection to 2 Kings exists in these cola cannot be firmly demonstrated, because of the fragmentary context, but regardless of this, the ideas in these cola can readily be fitted in with the traditions of Manasseh, but are much more difficult to connect with any other figures.

---

[42] The claim that Manasseh will be punished in the afterlife is found in several rabbinic sources that state that because of his sins Manasseh has forfeited his share in the world to come; for these traditions, see Feldman, *Studies*, 416.

There are also several things connectable with specific kings in the next column (frgs. 45a+b, 47).[43]

(9) Purifying oneself from abominations, which is a conception found in lines 1–2, at least implicitly contains the notion that the person has been acquainted with the abominations and is in need of purification. This fits best with the account of Manasseh in Chronicles. But if the second verb of the clause is taken to come from the root כרת instead of נכר and thus refers to cutting down the abominations, then it fits Asa (1 Kgs 15:13), Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18:4), Josiah (2 Kgs 23:14) and possibly Manasseh (2 Chr 33:15–16).
(10) The humbling (כנע) of oneself before God in line 2 fits the Chronicles accounts of Rehoboam (2 Chr 12:6–7, 12), Hezekiah (2 Chr 32:26), Manasseh (2 Chr 33:12, 23), and Josiah (2 Chr 34:27), and the verb is the same as employed in the Chronicles.
(11) The imprisonment mentioned in line 3 fits with Manasseh (2 Chr 33:11), Jehoiakim (2 Chr 36:6) and Jehoiachin (2 Chr 36:10).
(12) Line 7 can be read as anticipating the rest of Manasseh's reign after he is released from captivity (2 Chr 33:14–20).[44]

While none of these clues by themselves is enough, taking all of them together does, even without the superscription, establish a connection with the Manasseh traditions and particularly the account in Chronicles. This means that the superscription is most likely part of the original composition and the prayer was purposefully written as Manasseh's penitential prayer. Thus, the prayer is both externally and internally pseudepigraphic, and is therefore meant as a far more profound engagement with the Manasseh traditions than a prayer with a mere secondary superscript attached to it could be. While this survey of possible textual links has established that there is a connection between the 4Q381 prayer of Manasseh and 2 Chr 33, it is yet to be decided which one is the earlier text.

The first clue is the use of the root כנע in line 2. This verb is used frequently in the Chronicles but is quite seldom found elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible.[45] The use of this particular word is more likely to have come from the account in Chronicles to the 4Q381 prayer than vice versa.

---

[43] Schuller, *Non-Canonical*, 175, has listed some of the possible connections to different kings used in the first three cases (9–11).

[44] For lines 6 and 7 of the second column, cf. Ps 86:11, 15.

[45] The verb כנע is most often used both in the Hebrew Bible and Qumran texts in a context of subduing enemies. Apart from altogether fourteen occurrences in 2 Chronicles

A second indicator for establishing the direction in which the influence between the texts goes is found in lines 2 and 5, which describe the enemies of Manasseh as being conspirators and deceitful. While not surprising in a plea of an individual for deliverance, it is certainly noteworthy that it is used twice in the extant text to describe the adversaries. The rare *hitpaʿel* form used in line 5 (מתיעצים) suggests that the author may have been thinking specifically about Ps 83:4, which is the only instance where the *hitpaʿel* form of this word is used in the Hebrew Bible. The inclusion of Assyria (Ps 83:9) as part of the coalition conspiring against the psalmist in Ps 83 further strengthens this possibility as it would give a plausible reason why the author of the 4Q381 prayer would allude to this particular Psalm.

But be that as it may, it is of relevance that the enemies of Manasseh are described in such a way because it is something that derives from the vagueness of the Chronicles account of the capture of Manasseh (2 Chr 33:11). The narrative states that some commanders come on orders of the king of Assyria and take Manasseh away. This leaves open how the Assyrians were actually able to capture Manasseh. There is no description of a battle, but somehow members of a foreign army are able to capture a nation's sovereign and put him in chains without anyone apparently trying to stop them. A later interpreter reflecting on this dilemma created by the gap in the information, might have come up with the solution that the deed had to have been accomplished by treachery, perhaps gaining further support for this idea by interpreting parts of Ps 83 in the light of this event, which is exactly how the deed is explained in 4Q381: "they conspire to lock me up." If such information had been in a source used by the Chronicler it is difficult to comprehend why he would not have used that knowledge to complete the story (he could even have tied the conspirators together with the ones who eventually kill Amon in 2 Chr 33:24). Fortunately, there is another source available that describes the deed in the same way. Josephus relates in his account of Manasseh (*Ant.* 10.40) that the king of Assyria captured Manasseh by treachery and he was taken to Babylon where he repented. Thus, both 4Q381 and Josephus are witness to the development of the tradition started by the Chronicler as they fill in the information gap left in the narrative in the same way. The 4Q381

---

the verb is used in the meaning of a spiritual sense of humility and repentance only three times in the Hebrew Bible, viz., Lev 26:41, 1 Kgs 21:29, 2 Kgs 22:19. The use of the verb in this sense is equally rare in the Qumran texts with only one certain (4Q504 [4QDibHam^{a}] 19 6), and one probable (1QS 10:26) occurrence in addition to the one found in 4Q381.

author and Josephus might have arrived at the same basic conclusion concerning the event independently of each other, but it seems more likely that Josephus was aware of the tradition of interpretation represented by the 4Q381 prayer, especially as there is another peculiarity concerning Manasseh that is shared by just these two sources.[46]

A third indicator for the direction of the influence is found in the way Chronicles and the 4Q381 prayer employ source texts in general. Chronicles utilizes many sources, at least some of which are available in the books of Samuel, Kings and Psalms. While the editorial work of the Chronicler(s) in these passages in terms of additions, changes and omissions is undeniable, the main vehicle for introducing source material in the Chronicles is a (nearly) verbatim quotation. Contrary to this, the links between Chronicles and the 4Q381 prayer are much more elusive allusions, depending on distinct verbal links and the background provided by the 4Q381 superscription, which makes it very unlikely that the Chronicles would be using the 4Q381 prayer as a source. On the other hand, the 4Q381 prayer uses sources as well, such as Ps 86, perhaps also 83 and 89, as well as 2 Kings,[47] but all these connections are allusions that rest mostly on distinct verbal links or shared impressions. The textual links between Chronicles and the 4Q381 prayer of Manasseh are similar to these other allusions found in the 4Q381 prayer, and this reinforces the claim that Chronicles was used as a source by the author of the 4Q381 prayer. All in all, at least these three factors suggest that the 4Q381 prayer is using the Chronicles as a source, and there do not appear to be any strong arguments for seeing the influence going the other way. Thus, it is concluded that the account of Manasseh in 2 Chr 33 is the earlier text and was used as a source by the compiler(s) of the 4Q381 prayer.

[46] For this element, see the brief discussion on the function of the 4Q381 prayer below.

[47] These links to different texts of the Hebrew Bible strongly contrast with the view of Schniedewind, "A Qumran Fragment," 105–6, that "there is no dependence on biblical literature in general or II Chr 33,1–19 in particular in the Qumran prayer." He uses this "absence of any quotation or allusion to biblical literature" as evidence of an early date of composition for the 4Q381 prayer, but in accordance with the number of textual links found such an assumption must be discarded.

5. Reflections on the Function(s) of the Prayer(s) of Manasseh

The function of the 4Q381 prayer has not yet been assessed by anyone, but it is an essential feature for understanding why someone saw it fitting to write a penitential prayer of Manasseh. This is a complex question that ties in with the function of the whole psalm collection in 4Q381, and will be thoroughly discussed in a later study. However, some issues concerning the authorial intention behind making a penitential prayer for Manasseh can be briefly noted at this point. What is peculiar in Manasseh's case is that there is not just one prayer, but two independent prayers meant for the exact same setting, i.e., the 4Q381 prayer and the Greek Prayer of Manasseh. Is it the function of such a prayer to act as a *Fortschreibung* of the Chronicles story by providing a wording for the actual prayer that is missing from the narrative, or is it mainly meant to have a function outside the narrative world in a liturgical or didactic setting?[48] One thing in common between the two prayers is that by their very existence they strive toward a common goal in rehabilitating Manasseh in accordance with the Chronicles account. The creation of these prayers sets their authors in deliberate confrontation with the other line of tradition emphasizing the villainous image of Manasseh found in 2 Kings.[49] That there apparently was a continuing debate concerning this question is demonstrated by the different sources siding either with Kings or with Chronicles concerning Manasseh.[50] Thus, one motivation for composing these prayers could have been to legitimate the Chronicles image of a repentant Manasseh by presenting to the people the actual "historical" prayer offered by Manasseh.

Judith Newman has shown that the Greek Prayer of Manasseh is in some ways structured after Ps 51,[51] which is described as David's penitential prayer in the Psalter. Thus, by imitating the structure of an earlier

---

[48] Neither prayer is found in any textual witness to the Chronicles account so the question is entirely theoretical. Both prayers would almost certainly have been perceived by later users as the actual penitential prayer offered by Manasseh, but what the primary authorial intention was in writing such a song is an entirely different matter.

[49] Cf. Newman, "The Form," 114–21, who argues that the Greek Prayer of Manasseh can be seen as part of a counter discourse over the dominant discourse represented by the Deuteronomistic view of Manasseh prominently displayed by the portrayal of Manasseh in Kings.

[50] Cf. *2 Bar.* 64–65; *Mart. Isa.* 2:1–6; Greek Prayer of Manasseh; Josephus (*Ant.* 10.37–46).

[51] Newman, "The Form," 106–9, 124.

penitential prayer,[52] the Greek Prayer of Manasseh is evidently meant to be the penitential prayer of Manasseh *per se*. In theory it could be placed at the appropriate place in the Chronicles narrative and would display a penitential prayer of an individual using a formal structure also found in other penitential prayers, but applied to the setting of Manasseh. Whether or not the prayer was originally intended to be perceived in such a way is a matter that cannot be decided, but the prayer's basic format as a penitential prayer helps to understand its later placement among a collection of odes found in several Greek manuscripts, and its probable later status as the historical penitential prayer of Manasseh accounts for its setting as exemplary instruction in *Didascalia Apostolarum*.[53]

The 4Q381 prayer of Manasseh is different from the Greek Prayer of Manasseh in one important respect. While it is written in a prayer form, it actually engages with a number of aspects relating to the Manasseh traditions, explaining and interpreting them. Where the Greek Prayer of Manasseh is tied to the actual setting and form of the prayer, and does not reveal any particular knowledge of Manasseh apart from his sins, the 4Q381 prayer engages more fully with different facets of the Manasseh traditions so as to be able to paint an image of the whole reign of Manasseh. It not only explains the sinfulness of Manasseh and the expected punishments for these sins, but it also tells about the king's enemies and in a form of a conditional vow it already reveals what Manasseh will do after he is released from Babylon. This constant engagement with the larger framework of Manasseh traditions and the need to explain them is characteristic of the 4Q381 prayer, and nowhere is it more pronounced than in the two wisdom sections hitherto unnoted in this article. They appear at important junctures of the text, after the description of Manasseh's sins and their consequences (line 1), and at the very end of the prayer, after Manasseh's deeds following his repentance and the acceptance of his repentance by God have been dealt with (line 8). These instructional sections do not fit very well into a penitential prayer as a liturgical piece, but into a composition instructing about the author's chosen interpretation of the Manasseh traditions they are more than appropriate. In effect, these passages, while broken, display Manasseh as teaching something to the intended audience. The placement of the first wisdom section suggests

[52] Ibid., 117, places the composition of the Greek Prayer of Manasseh to some point during the first century B.C.E. or C.E., which seems to be a plausible suggestion.

[53] For a discussion of the use of the Greek Prayer of Manasseh in these two settings, see Newman, "The Form," 121–24.

it might be about the sins of Manasseh and their consequences, and the second at the very end could plausibly be about God accepting true repentance. This didactic angle is a specific feature of the whole psalm collection in 4Q381,[54] and is to be judged as an aspect original to it, not taken up from elsewhere. However, there is one other text, besides the 4Q381 prayer, that specifically mentions that Manasseh taught people concerning his sins and their consequences after his release from Babylon, and this is Josephus (*Ant.* 10.43). Taken together with the common notion in these two texts about the capture of Manasseh by treachery, this peculiar detail suggests that Josephus was aware of the prayer found in 4Q381 or a later tradition making use of it. Thus, in contrast to the Greek Prayer of Manasseh, which displays concern over liturgical forms, the 4Q381 prayer presents a prayer constructed for a didactic setting that aims to present a uniform image of King Manasseh and his reign as the sinner who repented and was mercifully forgiven and who subsequently mended his ways.

6. Conclusions

While the clues about a textual connection between the Chronicles account of Manasseh and the 4Q381 prayer of Manasseh are scattered among the details of the texts, they are nevertheless there to be discovered, and it seems that with reasonable confidence the relative chronology of the texts discussed in this article can be established as 2 Kings—2 Chronicles—4Q381 prayer of Manasseh. The 4Q381 prayer gives a glimpse at how the earlier traditions related to Manasseh in 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles are received around the middle of the second century B.C.E. It looks probable that the author of the 4Q381 prayer knew both of the earlier accounts and added to them the views of his age (or his group). He takes the setting of the prayer from the Chronicles, but is quite liberal in how he uses the Chronicles as a source. The story is certainly in the background all the time, but except for a few expressions the author does not use the specific vocabulary of Chronicles (or Kings). It feels safe to assume that he is not using a literal source in front of him but is alluding to the earlier texts from memory. He apparently shares the view of the Chronicler(s) that Manasseh repented, God saved him and he mended his ways. But the author is not content to merely create a formal penitential prayer based on the account

[54] Cf. Schuller, *Non-Canonical*, 23–24.

of Manasseh in Chronicles as the Greek Prayer of Manasseh does. Instead, he fills in gaps in the information given in the Chronicles, and by his own compositional aims he actually creates a unique idea of Manasseh teaching people about his sins and repentance, thus emphasizing Manasseh's exemplary role as a repentant sinner forgiven by God. That these new advances made in the 4Q381 prayer turn up in Josephus' description of Manasseh, suggest that the tradition represented by the 4Q381 prayer was more widespread than what the isolated manuscript found at Qumran might suggest. That many of the specific issues concerning Manasseh that are taken up by the 4Q381 prayer's author find expression in still later literature, e.g., Josephus and rabbinic sources, demonstrates the important role of the 4Q381 prayer as a witness to these issues, because it is probably near the beginning of this interpretive trajectory.

4Q470 IN LIGHT OF THE TRADITION OF THE RENEWAL OF THE COVENANT BETWEEN GOD AND ISRAEL

Bilhah Nitzan

Introduction

4Q470, *Text Mentioning Zedekiah*, is preserved in three small fragments of unknown authorship, copied in early Herodian script.[1] The extant text deals with an eschatological message of the angel Michael to King Zedekiah upon making the eschatological covenant for performing and causing the performance of the Law (frg. 1). This will happen after Israel will call upon God for help from their troubles; then God, who delivered Israel during the Exodus, will save them and make the covenant with them (frg. 3).

Frg. 1

1.]○[
2.]○ מיכאל[
3. יב]וא צדקיה ביום [הה]וא בב[רי]ת
4.]○○ לעשות ולהעשות את כל התורה
5. ב]עת ההיא יאמר מ[יכ]אל אל צדקיה
6.]אכרתה עמד[בר]י[ת]לעיני הקהל[2]
7. לע]שות ו [ ]○ ל[

1.] [
2.] Michael[
3.] Zedekiah [shall en]ter, on [th]at day, into a/the co[ven]ant
4.] to perform and to cause the performance of all the Law
5. at]that time M[ich]ael shall say to Zedekiah:
6.]l will make with you [a cove]na[nt] before the congregation
7.] to [3]

[1] Erik Larson, Lawrence Schiffman and John Strugnell, eds., DJD 19:235–44, plate XXIX.

[2] For the phrase לעיני הקהל ("before the congregation") cf. 1 Chr 28:8; 29:10, concerning David's call to Israel and to his son Solomon to observe the Law, made during the ceremony at which he chose Solomon to be his successor who would build the Temple. The editors noted here a parallel phrase to 1QS 5:8; 4Q491 (4QM[a]) 1 i 2.

[3] The editors did not translate their Hebrew suggestion לע]שות, because the letter after the *sin*/*shin* could be either *waw* or *yod*. They noted (DJD 19:238) that "if the latter, the proposed restoration would obviously have to be changed."

Frg. 2

1.]○ התורה הז[את
2. א]שלחה נותן א[
3.]כאשר[

1. th[is] Law[
2. I]will send; giving (or: he who gives)[
3.]as[

Frg. 3

1. ו]קראו ו[
2.]○נות ופנ[4]
3. א]נקתם אל השמים [
4. ל]החלימם ולעזרם ברוח ג[בורתו
5.]ובעמוד האש פעמים[רבות
6.]ויכתב משה בדברו ככ[ל
7.]ה קמ○ [ ]ל קדש ב[רנע5
8.]○על נו○[

1. and]they called and[
2.] and [
3.]their [c]ry to heaven [
4. to]heal them and to help them with His mi[ghty] spirit
5.]and in the pillar of fire [many] times[
6.]and Moses wrote by His word (or: when He spoke) according to a[ll
7.] . . . [t]o Kadesh Ba[rnea
8.] . . . upon . . . [

As I shall explain below, the editors of 4Q470—Eric Larson, Lawrence Schiffman and John Strugnell—dealt correctly with the issue of why King Zedekiah, specifically, was chosen to make the eschatological covenant and the appointment of the angel Michael to apprise him of this message.[6] The covenantal relationship between God and Israel, alluded to in frg. 3, by mentioning the Exodus and the Sinai covenant became a generic motif in late biblical (e.g. Neh 9:9–31), apocryphal and Qumranic texts. The absence of continuation of such a survey in 4Q470 does not imply anything definite as to what was present in the original text of 4Q470 nor

[4] Strugnell has suggested the restoration ע]ונות ופנ[י מסתרים (DJD 19:242). On the phrase ופני מסתרים cf. 4Q387 2 ii 9 (see DJD 30:179).

[5] This uncertain restoration was suggested by the editors according to the sequence of the events narrated above, possibly referring to Moses' words according to Deut 1:2, 19. But they kept in mind that other vocalizations of קדש are also possible. DJD 19:243.

[6] For a comprehensive discussion of the appointment of Zedekiah and the angel Michael for the renewal of the covenant, see Erik Larson, "4Q470 and the Angelic Rehabilitation of King Zedekiah," *DSD* 1 (1994): 210–28.

of its genre.[7] Hence its editors, who dealt justifiably with the preserved text as such, left this issue open. Nevertheless, the motifs of this tradition, as preserved in 4Q470 in the context of the eschatological message of making a covenant, call for an examination of the possibility of integrating 4Q470 into the historical and literary development of this tradition. Jeremiah's eschatological message regarding the formulating of a new covenant between God and Israel (Jer 31:30–33) played a central role in the eschatological hopes of Judaism during the Second Temple period. This message was utopian, as it was unattainable by a human action, but required divine action, involving a psychological change of Israel's disobedient character (Jer 31:32; cf. Ezek 36:26–27).[8] Nevertheless, the covenants to fulfill the Law made during the Second Temple period, such as that made with the returnees of Zion (Neh 9–10) or the Qumranic covenant, were made within Jewish society, as were the renewals of the covenant during the First Temple period.

Although the extant fragmented text seems non-sectarian, as its last preserved fragment only relates to the Exodus events, its position between the biblical tradition and the Qumranic viewpoint concerning the making of a new covenant seems self-evident. Thus, in addition to the investigation of how 4Q470 may be integrated in the tradition of the covenantal relationship between God and Israel, we may ask whether there is any possibility that the aim of the covenant, "to perform and to cause the performance of all the Law" dealt with in 4Q470 (1 4) may also be appropriate to the "new covenant" dealt with in the sectarian Qumranic texts.

1.1. *The Choice of Zedekiah for Renewing the Covenant*

The choice of Zedekiah to make the eschatological covenant between God and Israel may relate to the following: (1) The symbolic name ה' צדקנו ("the Lord is our righteousness"), prophesied by Jeremiah for the eschatological king of the Davidic line, "who shall execute justice and righteousness in the land; in his days Judah will be saved and Israel will live in

[7] Larson, "4Q470," 213, suggests that "the Exodus account in frg. 3 is some sort of historical prologue or epilogue attached to the prediction of the giving of a new covenant."

[8] See David Noel Freedman and David Miano, "People of the New Covenant," in *The Concept of the Covenant in the Second Temple Period* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. De Roo; JSJSup 71; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 7–26 at 21–26; Bilhah Nitzan, "The Concept of the Covenant in Qumran Literature," in *Historical Perspectives: From the Hasmoneans to Bar Kokhba in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. David Goodblatt et al.; STDJ 37; Leiden: Brill 2001), 85–104 at 87–90.

safety" (Jer 23:5–6; 33:14–16), may allude to the name Zedekiah.[9] (2) Historically, although the Bible portrayed Zedekiah in a negative light—"he did evil in the sight of the Lord" (2 Kgs 24:19; Jer 52:2; 2 Chr 36:12)—he was also known as the king who made a covenant with the people of Jerusalem to set free their Hebrew male and female slaves in accordance with the Sinai covenant of Exod 21:1–11 and Deut 15:12–18,[10] a covenant that was later breached by the people (Jer 34:8–22).[11] On the basis of this biblical background, and Zedekiah's valor in saving Jeremiah from the prison where he had been imprisoned by his ministers (Jer 37:15–21; 38:7–13),[12] the Rabbinic sages evaluated Zedekiah as being more righteous than his generation, in striking contrast to Jehoiakim, whose generation was more righteous than he (see Jer 34:5, vis. Jer 22:18).[13] (3) A legal principle may be suggested: According to Deut 17:18–19, the chosen king is obligated to perform the Law as well as to cause it to be performed by Israel. The motif "th[is] Law," restored by the editors in frg. 2 1, and the mission of Zedekiah "to perform and to cause the performance all the Law" in frg. 1 4, may explain why the king is chosen to make the covenant.

Zedekiah king of Judah, who was exiled at the end of the First Temple period, is mentioned in Qumranic surveys of the periods. In the historical sequence in *MMT* C 18–20, the exile in the days of Zedekiah is included among the curses brought upon Israel for their evil deeds, in accordance with Moses' prophecy (Deut 31:29).[14] The following sentence expresses the

---

[9] Larson "4Q470," 221–22, explained the hope for a king of the branch of David who would execute justice, in opposite to the context of Jer 21:11–22:30, that criticized the misdeeds of the kings of the House of David, Shallum (= Jehoahaz) son of King Josiah, Jehoiakim, and Jehoiachin.

[10] Cf. Lev 25:39–43; and see Nahum M. Sarna, "Zedekiah's Emancipation of Slaves and the Sabbatical Year," in *Orient and Occident* (ed. H. A. Hoffner; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973), 143–49.

[11] The king's authority to free slaves was known in Mesopotamian legislation. See Moshe Weinfeld, *Justice and Righteousness in Ancient Israel and Among the Nations* (Jerusalem 1985), 92–106 [Hebrew]. According to Jer 34:8, 10, 18 this act was done by a covenantal agreement between Zedekiah and the people of Jerusalem. The historical explanation of the breach of this covenant by the people, in taking back their male and female slaves, is concerned with the situation of the Babylonian siege on Jerusalem, that was removed for a while when the Babylonian troops fought with the Egyptians at 587 B.C.E. (Jer 34:21; 37:5). See Yair Hoffman, *Jeremiah* (Jerusalem: Mikra Leyisrael, 2001), 2:648–53 [Hebrew].

[12] See Josephus, *Ant*. 10.120–23.

[13] *B. 'Arak*. 17a; *b. Sanh*. 103a; and cf. *Midrash Seder Olam* 28:8–10 (Ratner edition, Hebrew version New York: Tal Orot, 1966:63). See also Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1968}, 6:429.

[14] See DJD 10:60.

hope for the return of Israel to the Law (C 21–22).[15] In *Pesher on the Apocalypse of Weeks* (4Q247 4), Zedekiah's exile is mentioned in the context of the sixth appointed historical week, in keeping with the apocalypse of *1 En.* 93:8.[16] The following event in this text referred to the period of the return to Zion during the Persian rule, the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, who according to the Bible made efforts to renew the covenant between God and Israel (Neh 8–10). As the eschatological reenactment of the covenant between God and Israel is associated with Israel's return to the Law (4Q470 1 3–4, cf. Deut 30:1–10; *MMT* C 21–22), the message of the making of the covenant dealt with in 4Q470 is integrated with these surveys.

1.2. *The Appointment of the Angel Michael for the Making of the Covenant*

Once the direct connection between God and Israel via His chosen prophets ceased, as God had hidden his face from Israel, another religious phenomenon—that of angelic mediators between God and humanity—became dominant in the Second Temple literature.[17] Malachi 3:1 apprised the coming of "the angel of the covenant" of whom Israel is desired, possible for clearing the way for the messianic age, but this figure was not identified there with the angel Michael.[18] The angel Michael, one of the four "angels of the Presence," was responsible for saving the righteous from suffering, and protecting them from unjustified accusation (see *1 En.* 20:5; 40:7, 9).[19] According to 4Q470 1 5 and 3 3, his mission will take place

---

[15] For this reading see Menahem Kister, "Studies in 4QMiqṣat Maʿaśe HaTorah and Related Texts: Law, Theology, Language and Calendar," *Tarbiz* 68/3 (1999): 317–71, at 322–23, 349 [Hebrew].

[16] See the explanation in DJD 36:187–91 of Magen Broshi, the editor of 4Q247, of the events surveyed in this text.

[17] Alex P. Jassen noted that the revelation of God's message by other-worldly beings to a human recipient is one of the revelatory techniques used in Second Temple literature (see e.g., Zech 1:9–15; 4:1–7; Dan 8:16–25; 9:21–27; 4Q246). See his *Mediating the Divine: Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism* (STDJ 68; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 200, 218–21, 225. In the *Temple Scroll* the laws of Moses are presented by the voice of God himself (ibid., 236–37).

[18] Jewish commentators such as David Kimchi and David Altschuler (Metzudat David) identified this figure with Elijah, who was intended to judge the wicked who breached the commandments of the covenant.

[19] For the emissary of these angels see e.g., *1 En.* 9–10 (cf. 4QEn^{c} 1 v). In *1 En.* 40:9 the angel Michael is described as merciful and forbearing. In *3 Bar.* 11:4 the angel Michael "is descending to receive the prayers of men," cf. *3 Bar.* 11:9. The text of 4Q529 (4QWords of Michael; DJD 31, Pl. I) mentions the mercy that the Great One, Eternal Lord will show to someone. But the fragmented preservation of this text prevents any certain knowledge regarding the identity of this figure.

"at that time" in the future, which will be a time of anguish for Israel. This situation is alluded to in the message of Dan 12:1–2 that Michael, "the great prince, the protector of Israel,"[20] will arise "at that time" which "shall be a time of anguish" for delivering Israel.[21] According to the eschatological message of 1QM 17:6–7, God will send an everlasting help to the lot whom he has redeemed (namely, Israel) through the might of the majestic angel, Michael, for illuminating the covenant of Israel to shine in joy. This eschatological joy is not just for the victory over the dominion of wickedness, but also for the renewal of the covenant between God and Israel.

2.1. *4Q470 in Light of the Tradition of the Covenantal Relationship between God and Israel*

The extant contents of frg. 3 include the following ideas: that Israel cry out to God in Heaven to heal them from the distress of their punishment (lines 1–4); the remembrance of God's help to Israel during the Exodus (line 5); and the remembrance of the Sinai covenant (line 6). Lines 7–8 are too fragmented to reconstruct or even conjecture their content. These details are common ones in the tradition of historical surveys written in biblical, apocryphal and Qumran writings dealing with the covenantal relationship between God and Israel.[22] As Larson puts it: "Such historical reminiscences of the prototypical covenant given at Sinai are indeed common in biblical passages that describe the establishment of subsequent covenants between God and His people."[23] Hence, notwithstanding the fragmented nature of 4Q470, the clarification of this tradition in biblical and the Second Temple literature may shed light on the place of 4Q470 in the historical and literary development of this tradition, and the message of this text.

---

[20] Cf. Dan. 10:21; 1QM 17:6. In *2 En.* 22:6, the angel Michael is titled "the Lord's archistratig." For this definition see F. I. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch," in *The Old Testament Psuedepigrapha* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 1:138.

[21] Cf. Jer 30:4–11. Larson "4Q470," 222–23, relates the eschatological message of the redemption of Israel to the establishment of the eschatological kingdom of David and the renewal of the covenant according to Jer 23:5–8; 31:31–33 and 33:15–16.

[22] This tradition appears in Isa 63:7– 64; Ps 79: 13; Neh 9; *Jub.* 1:5–25; 1QM 14:8–9; 18:5–8; 4QDibHam (4Q504, 4Q506); 4Q381 69; CD 2:14–3:20.

[23] Larson, "4Q470," 213.

2.2. *Comparison of the Motifs of 4Q470 with the Tradition of the Covenantal Relationship between God and Israel*

The Hebrew words נאקה, or אנקה ("a cry," "a groan") do not appear in the Bible in the context of historical surveys, but only concerning specific events. The editors of 4Q470 compared the Hebrew word נאקתם used in 4Q470 3 3 with Exod 2:23–24; 6:5, where it refers to the cry of the Israelites from their oppression and bondage in Egypt. God's response to their cry, thanks to His covenant with their ancestors, is connected with the aforementioned tradition, but on this historical occasion, before the Sinai covenant, Israel had not yet transgressed, and hence there was no need for a covenant renewal. Notwithstanding, from the historical point of view this event is perceived as the beginning of the relationship between God and Israel as his nation.

Another use of the term אנקה is in asking help for Israel in its distress: "Let the groans of the prisoners come before you," appears in Ps 79:11[24] in a lamentation over the defilement and destruction of the Temple and of Jerusalem, probably referring to the destruction wreaked by the Babylonians in 586 B.C.E. The preserved reference to Ps 79:2–3 in *Tanḥumim* (4Q176 1–2 i 2–4) proves that this psalm was known during the Second Temple period.[25]

It seems that the painful distress expressed in the lamentation of Ps 79 did not allow for a historical survey of the covenantal relationship between God and Israel, but was only a supplication for the forgiveness of sins and to remember Moses' effort for the atonement of Israel's sin, hinted at in Exod 32:13, 30, for the sake of God's name and his people Israel, as stated in Ps 79:9, 13. Although the word *'anaqah* in 4Q470 alludes to two historical events that are not connected directly to the covenantal tradition, it reflects biblical situations for which the reaffirmation of the relationship between God and Israel was needed.

Post-biblical situations which may imply Israel crying out in distress for God's help may be implied here if we accept Strugnell's suggested

---

[24] A similar verse in Ps 102:21 is written in the context of God response to the cry of Israel.

[25] Some scholars ascribe this psalm to the defilement of the Temple by Antiochus IV in 167 B.C.E. Amos Hakham, based on the citation of Jer 10:25 in 79:6, and the similarity between Ps 79:4 and Ps 44:14 (cf. Ezek 35:12–13; Obad 11–12) and Ps 79:11 to Ps 102:21, ascribed it to the first destruction at 586. See his *Book of Psalms: 73–150* (5th ed.; Jerusalem: Mossad Ha-Rav Kook, 1990), 69 [Hebrew].

reconstruction of 4Q470 3:2—that is, ע]ונות ופנ[י מסתרים ("they perform iniquities and my face shall be hidden from them."[26] This phrase appears in 4Q387 2 ii 9 in the context of the exile of Israel, following the destruction of the kingdom, when "the children of Israel will be crying out [because of the heavy yoke in the lands of] their [captivity] and [there will be none to deliv]er them, etc." (4Q387 2 ii 10–12; cf. the 11QT[a] 59:5–6[27]). Devorah Dimant suggests that this distress is related to the Second Temple situation of Israel.[28] Cf. 4Q372 1 14–16 about the cry of the tribes of Joseph to help them from their suffering in the captivity lands.[29] Thus, we may suggest that this exilic punishment corresponds to the present distress that, according to Lev 26:41–42, Deut 30:2, and *MMT* C 20–22, will cause Israel to repent, and the reestablishment of the covenant with God.

2.3. *The Turn for Performance the Covenantal Commandments during the Second Temple Period*

The prayer of Neh 9, and the making of a firm agreement for performing the commandments of the Law (Neh 10:30),[30] signifies the dramatic change during Second Temple Judaism towards the renewal of the covenant.[31] In Neh 9:32–35 this change is accompanied by a confession of breaching the covenant and justification of the Divine punishment (cf. Dan 9, Ezra 9; 1 Bar 1:15–2:10; Pr Azar 5–12; 1QS 1:24–2:1; CD 20:27–30) as

---

[26] The hiding of God's face from Israel is alluded to in Moses' prophecy in Deut 31:17–18; 32:20; and is used by Ezek 39:23–24 for the definition of Israel's punishment of the first destruction. Cf. *Jub.* 1:13.

[27] The exilic distress of Israel in their captivity lands is integrated in 11QT[a] 59 within the laws of the king, regarding the curses brought upon him and Israel in the case of breaching the covenant, and the blessings that will come upon him and Israel when they return to the Law. See Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977), 1.265–66; 2.186–190 [Hebrew].

[28] Devorah Dimant, DJD 30:179, 184–85.

[29] See Eileen M. Schuller, "4Q372 1: A Text about Joseph," *RevQ* 14/55 (1990): 349–76.

[30] See also, Neh 13 about the ordinances made by him for preventing the breaching of the Sabbath commandments, for preventing marriage with Gentile women, for purifying the temple from non-Jewish persons, and arranging its worship.

[31] This ideological change may be reflected in the latter call by Mattathias to those who were zealous for the Law to fight against Antiochus IV's decrees against Jewish Law (1 Macc 2:27; cf. 2:49). The permission given by Mattathias and his cohorts to fight on the Sabbath day was based upon the saving of life and maintaining future Sabbaths (1 Macc 2:40). The sanctifying of God's name by martyrdom so as to prevent the breaching of the Law (2 Macc 6:18–7:22; 1 Macc 2:29–36; and perhaps *As. Moses* 9 may also be considered as a phenomenon relating to this change. See Jacob Licht, "Taxo or the Apocalyptic Document of Vengeance," *JJS* 12 (1961): 95–103; idem, "The Attitude to Past Events in the Bible and in Apocalyptic Literature," *Tarbiz* 60 (1990): 1–18 at 6–7 [Hebrew].

prescribed in Lev 26:40, expressing a sincere will for practical return to the Law and restoration of the covenant with God.

Nehemiah's prayer, introducing the making of a firm agreement with the generation of the returnees to Zion, ratified at the assembly of the people in Jerusalem on the 24th of the seventh month, was related to the law stated in Deut 31:10–13 (cf. Neh 8–9:3). The historical survey of the relationship between God and Israel articulated in this prayer follows the Deuteronomic tradition of renewal of the covenant. Compare Josh 24 and 1 Sam 12, in which there appear historical surveys of God's salvation of Israel from their distress during the Exodus, and in the latter case His help during the period of the judges. Also noteworthy are those assemblies at which warnings of punishments for breaching the covenant were written, such as Deut 29;[32] 2 Kgs 23 during the reign of Josiah, and 2 Chr 15:10–15 at the reign of Asa.[33] Assuming Strugnell's suggested reconstruction of 4Q470 3 2 is correct in its context (see above), it seems to be followed by a historical survey, opening with the help of God during the Exodus stated in frg. 3. In that case frg. 3 may be considered as a prologue of historical survey, referring to the tradition of renewal of the covenant.

The aim of the eschatological covenant with Zedekiah—"to perform and to cause the performance of all the Law"—as recorded in 4Q470 1 4, is appropriate to the dramatic turn toward performing the Law during the Second Temple period. This purpose was realized in different circles of Jewish society through intensive study of the Law and homiletic interpretation of its practical (i.e., halakic) performance.[34] The writings of

---

[32] It may be that the admonitory psalm of 4Q381 69, in which Israel is blamed for breaching the Sinai covenant, following the ways of the Gentiles, and thereby contaminating the purity of the holy land, refers to the guilt mentioned in Ezra 9:1–10:4 of the marriage with Gentile women. See Eileen M. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: A Pseudepigraphic Collection* (HSS 28; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 200–12.

[33] See Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972); idem, *From Joshua to Josiah* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1992), 134–55 [Hebrew].

[34] See Ya'akov Sussmann, "The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in DJD 10:179–200, and the bibliography written there. Some traces of early halakah in rabbinic sources are parallel to sectarian halakah as it was demonstrated by scholars. See e.g., Joseph M. Baumgarten, "Tannaitic Halakhah and Qumran—A Re-Evaluation," in *Rabbinic Perspectives: Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Steven D Fraade et al.; STDJ 62; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 1–12; Vered Noam, "Traces of Sectarian Halakhah in the Rabbinic World," ibid., 67–85; eadem, "Divorce in Early Halakhah," *JJS* 56/2 (2005): 206–63; Vered Noam and Elisha Qimron, "A Qumran Composition of Sabbath Laws and Its Contribution to the Study of Early Halakhah," *DSD* 16 (2009): 55–96; Hebrew version, *Tarbiz* 74/4 (2005): 511–43; Aharon Shemesh, "The Origins of the Laws of Separatism: Qumran Literature and Rabbinic Halacha," *RevQ* 18/70 (1997): 223–41; idem, "Common Halakhic and Exegetical Traditions Shared by DSS and Rabbinic Literature," in *Zaphenath-Paneah: Linguistic*

Josephus, the Qumran Scrolls, and later on the Rabbinic writings, all testify to the disagreement between the Pharisees and the priestly circles—the Essenes and the Sadducees—regarding legal issues.[35] The Qumran community, that in accordance with its apocalyptic world view assumed its epoch to be "the last historical generation,"[36] designated their interpretation of the Law as a revelation of a "New Covenant," after Jer 31:30–33,[37] and its members pledged to perform its commandments, as stated in 1QS 5:8–10:

> To return to the Torah of Moses according to all which he has commanded with all heart and with all soul, according to everything which has been revealed[38] from it to the sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant and seek his will, and according to the multitude of the men of their covenant.[39]

In addition to these sectarian apocalyptic terms, the Qumran scrolls, like other Jewish circles, used the Deuteronomic term עשות תורה to refer to halakic interpretation of the Law.[40] This term, used in the late biblical books to describe the performance of the Law (see Ezra 7:10, Neh 9:34; 10:30; 2 Chr 14:3), appears in the sectarian Qumran writings in the form עושי התורה ("those who perform the commandments of the Torah") to designate those who observed the sectarian interpretation of the Law (see 1QpHab 7: 10–12; 8:1; 12:4–5; 4QpPs^{a} 1–2 ii 12–14, 22), and its noun מעשי התורה, was used for the sectarian halakah. See 1QS 5:21, 23 (cf. 4QS^{d} 1 ii 3); 6: 18; 4Q174 1–2 i 7,[41] and note the title מקצת מעשי התורה ("some

---

Studies Presented to Elisha Qimron on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday (ed. Daniel Sivan et al.; Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University.of the Negev, 2009), 383–94 [Hebrew].

35 See Josephus, *Ant*. 18.11–22; *War* 2.119–66; *MMT*; 1QpHab 5:8–12; 7:10–8:3; 10:5–13; 12:2–10; 1QpMic 8–10 1–9; 4QpNah 2:1–2, 7–10; 3:1–8; 4QpPs^{a} 4:7–10; CD 1:11–21; 3:12–16; 6:2–7:6.

36 See e.g., 1QpHab 2:7; 7:7, 12; CD 1:12 (= 4Q266 2 i 16); 1QpMic 17–19 5; 1QpNah 4:3; See Bilhah Nitzan, *Pesher Habakkuk: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (*1QpHab*) (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1986), 22–23, 25–27, 154 [Hebrew].

37 See 1QpHab 2:3; CD 6:19, 8:21 (=19:34), 20:12.

38 For this and additional Qumranic terminology of their interpretation of the Law (cf. e.g., 1QS 8:15–16; 9:13; CD 3:12–16; etc.), see Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (SJLA 16; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 22–54.

39 The mentioning of the priests is absent in 4QS^{b} and 4QS^{d}. Cf. CD 15:6–10. See also the responsibility one takes upon himself by his pledge in CD 15:3–5, 11–12.

40 For the term עשות תורה in the Deuteronomic tradition see Deut 17:19; 27:26; 28:58; 29:28; 31:12; 32:46; cf. Josh 22:5.

41 See Jacob Licht, *The Rule Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1965), 135 [Hebrew]; Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Studies in Qumran Law* (SJLA 24; Leiden: Brill, 1977), 82–83.

precepts of the Torah"; in *MMT* C 27 and B 2) for the scroll that deals with the halakic controversies between the Qumran and the Pharisees.[42] This terminology is also used in Rabbinic literature (e.g., *ʾAbot R. Nat.* 1:13; *Sipre* to Deut 7:12; *b. B. Qam*. 38a),[43] and in the New Testament (Rom 2:13, 15; Gal 3:5, 10). The halakic–homiletic interpretation of the Sinai covenantal laws in Neh 10 and in the Qumran and rabbinic writings gives a new homiletic character to the Sinai laws. But only the Qumran community, who considered its own interpretation of the Law as a new revelation,[44] defined this as a "new covenant." However, the "new covenant" of the sectarian writings, whose laws only the members of the Qumran community were obligated to perform,[45] could not be the eschatological covenant, which the angel Michael will make with the eschatological Zedekiah "before the congregation" of all Israel (4Q470 1:6). This seems clear, even though the continuation of 4Q470 is truncated.

The idea of the clause "to perform and to cause the performance of all the Law" (לעשות ולהעשות את כול התורה) of 4Q470 1 4 is stated in the prayers of *Dibre Hamme'orot*, albeit mostly in other terms.

The weekly prayer of *Dibre Hamme'orot* ("Words of the Luminaries") surveys the covenantal relationship between God and Israel through six weekday supplications for forgiveness of breaching the covenant, while the prayer for the Sabbath is a hymn. According to the edition of Esther Chazon, that restored those prayers in the order of the weekdays,[46] the prayer for Sunday deals with the first created generations until the Exodus

---

[42] DJD 10:139. See also the verb לעשות in *MMT* B 54 referring to the prohibition against the blind and the deaf from having access to the sacred precincts of the Temple, because they do not know how to perform the laws.

[43] See Shraga Abramson, "מלשון חכמים," *Leš* 19 (1954): 61–66.

[44] The laws in the book of *Jubilees* are considered new revelation to Moses by the angel of the presence, and the laws in the *Temple Scroll* are considered new revelation of God to Israel. See Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1.298–303 [Hebrew]; 1.390–96 in the 1983 English edition; Ben Zion Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1983), 1–32.

[45] According to the sectarian annual covenantal ceremonies in the *Rule Scroll* (1QS 1:16–3:12) and the *Damascus Document* (4Q266 11 5–18; 4Q270 7 ii 11–12), those who enter into the covenant are blessed, whereas others are cursed (see 4QCurse = 4Q280 2 in DJD 29:1–8). See Bilhah Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 145–71; eadem, "Blessings and Curses," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 95–100.

[46] Esther Glickler Chazon, "A Liturgical Document from Qumran and its Implications, 'Words of the Luminaries' (4QDibHam)" (Ph.D diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1991) [Hebrew].

and the Sinai laws given to Moses;[47] the prayers for Monday and Tuesday are too fragmented to say anything significant about their contents; the prayer for Wednesday deals with the Sinai covenant made with the people of Israel;[48] the prayer for Thursday deals with the covenantal relationship between God and Israel until the kingdoms of David and Solomon,[49] and the prayer for Friday deals with the covenantal relationship between God and the post-exilic generations, their repentance and hope.[50] The central idea that reappears in almost all these prayers is the desire of the worshippers to renew the covenant with God by performing the Law. Thus, for example:

> Strengthen our heart to do[your Commandments[51] to] walk in Your ways. (Sunday's prayer, 4Q504 4 12–13)
>
> [These things were done] that we might [repe]nt with all our heart and all our soul to plant Your law in our hearts . . . Deliver us from sinning against You. (Thursday's prayer 4Q504 1 ii 13–14, 16)

These prayers, uttered by the post-exilic generation, express the aspiration for the eschatological renewal of the covenant. In Friday's prayer, the worshipers confess their and their fathers' iniquities, as demanded in Lev 26:40, and repent with all their heart and all their soul, as commanded in Deut 4:29–30; 30:1–2 and repeated in *Jub.* 1:15, 23–24, by desiring to perform the commandments of the Law. Thus, the generations of the Second Temple period made efforts to atone for their and their fathers' guilt in breaking the Sinai covenant.

These matters, stated in the prayers of *Dibre Hamme'orot*, represent the eschatological ideology of all Israel since the exilic period.[52] We may thus consider this composition as expressing the longing of the worshipers from the Second Temple period to reestablish the covenantal relationship with God, as implied by the tidings in 4Q470. The trouble spoken of in *Dibre Hamme'orot* and 4Q470 was the exilic situation, from which

---

[47] 4Q504 8 1–15; 9 1–7; 6 1–22; 4 1–15 + 4Q506 131+132 1–14. Chazon, ibid., 129–43.

[48] 4Q504 3 ii 5–19;+ 4Q506 125+127 1–4; 4Q504 7 1–20 + 18 1–6; 4Q504 1 i 7. Chazon, ibid., 195–204.

[49] 4Q504 1 i 8–10; 1 ii 6–19; 1–2 iii 1–21; 2 iv 1–15. Chazon, ibid., 218–29.

[50] 4Q504 2 v 1–21; 2 vi 2–19; 2 vii 1–2. Chazon, ibid., 261–70.

[51] This is Maurice Baillet's (DJD 7) and Chazon's suggested restoration, based upon 1 Chr 28:7.

[52] These matters are also expressed in the *'Amidah*'s fourth blessing. See Moshe Weinfeld, "The Prayers for Knowledge, Repentance and Forgiveness in the 'Eighteen Benedictions'—Qumran Parallels, Biblical Antecedents and Basic Characteristics," *Tarbiz* 48 (1979): 186–200 [Hebrew].

most of the Jewish people in many lands still suffered. There are no typical sectarian characteristics in the *Dibre Hamme'orot* prayers,[53] just as they are not found in the hope and good tiding preserved in 4Q470. Whereas, however, these weekly prayers are still supplications of the post-exilic worshipers to strength their heart to walk in God's ways, and to deliver them from sinning against Him, the text of 4Q470 seems to encourage the people of Israel during the Second Temple period by assuring them that the eschatological day when God will make a new covenant with them is on its way to being realized by the angel Michael with the eschatological King Zedekiah.

The implementation of the obligation "to perform and to cause the performance of all the Law," made throughout the eschatological covenant, will ensure Jeremiah's prophecy (31:31–32) that this covenant will not be breached, unlike the covenant with their ancestors.[54]

3. Conclusion

The good, eschatological tidings of 4Q470, in which the angel Michael is sent to make an eschatological covenant between God and Israel, is an apocryphal message. Despite the fragmented preservation of 4Q470, it contains clear data of the tradition concerning the Sinai covenant. The few clauses preserved in frg. 3 that suggest a survey of the historical relationship between God and Israel, the purpose of the eschatological covenant being "to perform and cause the performance of all the Law," as stated in frg. 1, are common motifs in the late biblical, apocryphal and Qumranic texts of this tradition. Unfortunately, the poor state of preservation of 4Q470 prevents us from knowing in which direction it was continued—whether into detailed survey of the covenantal history, or detailed suggestions as to the way Israel ought to be instructed to perform

[53] See Chazon, "A Liturgical Document," 87–89; eadem, "Words of the Luminaries," in Schiffman and VanderKam, *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 2:989–90 at 990; eadem, "Scripture and Prayer in 'the Words of the Luminaries," in *Prayers that Cite Scripture* (ed. James L. Kugel; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006), 25–41; eadem, "Words of the Luminaries and Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Times," in *Seeking the Favor of God, Volume 2, The Development of Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism* (ed. Mark J. Boda et al.; SBLEJL 22; Atlanta: SBL, 2007), 177–86; Bilhah Nitzan, "Traditional and Atypical Motifs in Penitential Prayers from Qumran," ibid., 187–208 at 187–98; eadem, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*, 80–87, 104–11; Daniel K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 68–78.

[54] See Larson, "4Q470," 222–23.

the Law. As for the latter possibility, Jeremiah's prophecy of the Lord's words: "I will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts" (31:32/33) is stylized from the literary viewpoint, and should have been implemented practically, as it was understood in the literature of the Second Temple period. The making of the covenant with the eschatological King Zedekiah (cf. Jer 23:5–6; 33:14–16), without mentioning a priest in the preserved text, prevents us from suggesting here the sectarian idea that the eschatological king of David branch shall judge according to what the priests will teach him (4QpIsa^{a} 8–10 23–24).[55] Thus, and according to the clauses stated to Zedekiah in 4Q470 "l will make with you[a cove]na[nt] before the congregation" (1 6) "to perform and to cause the performance of all the Law" (1 4) we may conclude that the eschatological covenant of 4Q470 to be established with the congregation of all Israel like the Sinai covenant will ensure Jeremiah's prophecy (31:31/32) that this covenant will not be breached as was the covenant with their ancestors. In light of these words, the apocryphal message of 4Q470 may be considered as a development of the biblical tradition of the eschatological establishment of God's covenant with Israel in the literature of the Second Temple period.

[55] This is a sectarian idea regarding the two messianic leaders, a king and a priest. See 1QS 9:11; 1QSa 2:11–22; CD 7: 18–21. The text of 4Q252 5:1–4 only mentions the messianic kingdom of David. The performance of the Law mentioned there in line 5 is too fragmented to suggest if it relates to the king or to the priest who will stand with him, as in 4QpIsa^{a}. In any case the word *yaḥad* stated there proves that it is a sectarian text.

HOW DOES INTERMARRIAGE DEFILE THE SANCTUARY?

Hannah Harrington

The notion that intermarriage defiles the sanctuary is promoted in certain Dead Sea Scrolls, although nowhere in Scripture is this statement explicitly made. What does this phrase mean and what are its biblical antecedents? This paper examines the intertwining of sexual defilement and the defilement of the sanctuary in several Second Temple texts found among the Dead Sea Scrolls, most notably, the *Aramaic Levi Document, Jubilees*, *MMT*, the *Damascus Document*, and several fragmentary texts from Cave 4. It becomes apparent from their use of cultic language that these authors are concerned not only about the possible defilement of the temple but for the desecration of the human sanctuary of Israel.

1. Sanctuary Pollution and Intermarriage

Defiling the sanctuary was one of the most severe violations in ancient Judaism and elsewhere in the ancient world.[1] According to the Torah, the sanctuary was instituted as a divine residence where unintentional violations could be rectified and the covenant relationship of Israel and her God continue. According to priestly doctrine, when the sins and impurities of Israel increase without confession, atonement, and purification, the sanctuary becomes polluted and the cult ineffectual (cf. Lev 20:1–3). The sacrifices of the Day of Atonement were made in order to purify the sanctuary of impurity (both moral and ritual, intentional and unintentional) which may not have been confessed and atoned for during the year (Lev 16:16). Several Second Temple texts evident among the Dead Sea Scrolls intertwine particularly the practice of intermarriage with pollution of the sanctuary, a connection nowhere explicitly made in Scripture: (1) *Test. Levi* 9:9 "Be on guard against the spirit of promiscuity, for it is constantly active and through your descendants it is about to defile the sanctuary

[1] Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16, A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 258–59, offers several examples from ancient Near Eastern texts of the seriousness of polluting the sanctuary. In Israel, even negligent temple gatekeepers were charged with a capital crime (Num 18:23; cf. 2 Chr 23:19).

(*ta hagia*)." The Qumran version of this document, the *Aramaic Levi Document* (*ALD*) contains Levi's exhortation to his son, "Marry a woman from my family and do not defile your seed with *zonot,* since you are holy seed, but sanctify your seed like the holy place (*hekh qodša*) since you are called a holy priest for all the seed of Abraham" (*ALD* 6:4).[2] (2) *Jub.* 30:13–15 "It is a disgraceful thing for the Israelites who give or take [in marriage] one of the foreign women because it is too impure and despicable for Israel. Israel will not become clean from this impurity while it has one of the foreign women or if anyone has given one of his daughters to any foreign man . . . If one does this or shuts his eyes to those who do impure things, pollute the Lord's sanctuary, and profane his holy name, then the entire nation will be condemned together because of all this impurity and this contamination." (3) *MMT* B 48–49 "beware of any impure sexual mixture, and be afraid of (defiling) the sanctuary.

The question at hand is: what is the connection between intermarriage, in particular, and the defilement of the sanctuary? Scholars have offered various suggestions. (1) Perhaps the point is that ritual purification must occur before anyone, especially priests, enters the sanctuary. Apparently there was some wrongful activity among the priests in this matter. The author of the *Psalms of Solomon* accuses priests of having relations with menstruants and then offering sacrifices at the sanctuary and causing pollution (*Ps. Sol.* 8:12–13). The *Temple Scroll* is similarly concerned about priests entering sacred areas while impure (*niddat ṭum'atemah*) (cf. 11QT[a] 45:10, 13; cf. also 3:6). But the texts listed above are concerned not just with ritual impurity stemming from sexual relations but with illicit sexual relations between Jews and non-Jews. (2) According to Yonder Gillihan, the illegitimate children of mixed marriages carry a ritual impurity: "Thus we recognize that the impure status of the *mamzer* precluded his or her access to that which was holy, namely, the temple, and that recognition of this principle motivated Jews to avoid illegal marriages."[3] While ritual

---

[2] Jonas C. Greenfield et al., *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary* (SVTP 19; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

[3] Yonder Moynihan Gillihan, "Jewish Laws On Illicit Marriage, The Defilement Of Offspring, And The Holiness Of The Temple: A New Halakic Interpretation Of 1 Corinthians 7:14," *JBL* 121 (2002): 711–44 notes that R. Tarfon recognizes the inherently impure status of a *mamzer* when he rules that it is possible to purify the *mamzer*'s offspring (*m. Qidd.* 3:13). Gillihan explains that the Rabbis considered the *mamzer* ritually impure without hope of purification but not inherently morally impure for "[if] a *mamzer* be a scholar, he ranks above the high priest that is an ignorant man" (*m. Hor.* 3:8), Cf. also Cana Werman, "Jubilees 30: Building a Paradigm for the Ban on Intermarriage" *HTR* 90 (1997): 1–22, esp. 16–17, who claims that, according to *Jubilees*, Jews incur ritual impurity through physical contact with Gentiles. For an opposing view, cf. Christine E. Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*

impurity may be involved, it was probably not at the heart of the matter, in which case one would expect contagion and purification laws for those who make contact with such people. (3) Perhaps the activity of illicit sexual relations triggers impurity at the sanctuary from a distance. The priestly idea that sin defiles the sanctuary has been explained by Jacob Milgrom that the accumulation of impurities among Israel (both moral and ritual) pollutes the sanctuary aerially even without physical entry, reaching an ultimate breaking point at which Israel is punished by God.[4] Remnants of this notion may be apparent in the *Temple Scroll*'s statement that bribery defiles the sanctuary (11QT[a] 51:14; cf. 2 Macc 3:12). But the question remains, why single out intermarriage as the trigger which pollutes the sanctuary? Finally, (4) Jonathan Klawans suggests that the idea that illicit sexual relations pollute the sanctuary may simply be an abstract way of saying that God will destroy the sanctuary if Israel engages in illicit sexual relations.[5] Indeed, the fate of the entire nation rests on its maintenance of sexual purity (*Jub.* 30:15; cf. Num 25:11; cf. also the extirpation of Eli's line on account of his sons' sexual and other offenses, 1 Sam 2:22, 34–35). Klawans surveys Second Temple Jewish texts and concludes that sexual sins are a larger concern to these authors than other sins, surpassing earlier concerns for idolatry and murder.[6] While this appears to be true, why is the concern of illicit sexuality expressed in terms of defilement of the sanctuary?

2. Biblical Antecedents

Trajectories have been speculated for how Second Temple writers conceived the notion that intermarriage defiles the sanctuary. Christine Hayes offers a simple equation: Leviticus teaches that the sanctuary is holy; Deuteronomy teaches that the people are holy. Thus, in some sense, the people of God are His sanctuary.[7] A fuller web of traditions can be

---

and Jewish Identities, Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud (Oxford: Oxford University, 2002), 76, who points out that the Jewish partner is never said to be defiled but only his seed and the sexual union itself, which she sees as a genealogical and moral, not a ritual, issue.

[4] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16,* 258–61; Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, *Miqṣat Maʿaśe ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 131.

[5] Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient* Judaism (Oxford: Oxford University, 2000), 58.

[6] Cf. *Ps. Sol.* 4:5; 8:9; Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 60.

[7] Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*, 46; for a similar version of the development, cf. Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 59.

separated out like threads on a loom as in the chart below (fig. 1). First of all, legitimate sexual relations produce ritual impurity, which pollutes the sanctuary and so must be purified (Lev 15:31). Another strand is that illicit sexual unions desecrate or defile Israel and expel them from the land of Canaan (e.g., Jacob accuses Reuben of desecrating [*ḥillalta*] Bilhah by incest, Gen 49:4; *Jub.* 33:7–18; Lev 18:24–25). Offering a child to Molech profanes God's name, defiles person and land, as well as the sanctuary (Lev 18:21; 24–25; 20:1–3). All Israel is holy and so may not marry the seven Canaanite nations, and other races are restricted (Deut 7:1–4; 23:2–8). In fact, Israel may not marry any idolaters (Exod 34:15–16). And finally, priests, because of their special holiness, may not marry certain women (prostitute, a raped woman, or divorcee, Lev 21:7). If a priest's daughter marries an outsider, she forfeits her right to sacred food (Lev 22:12).

As is clear from this list of traditions, the Deuteronomic label of Israel as "holy" is defined and protected by restrictions on sexuality. While in pre-exilic times, these restrictions contained some flexibility allowing for the *ger*, the resident alien, to join Israel if he has abandoned idolatry and the beautiful war captive to be taken as a bride (Deut 21:10–14), this picture changes in early Second Temple times. In fact, in many cases, priestly marriage laws are applied also to the laity. In the Second Temple period, there is a shift among many Jews in the understanding of Israel as the holy people to a more concrete and cultic interpretation. The author of Ezra-Nehemiah, near the end of the 4th century B.C.E., applies cultic terminology to Jewish bodies calling them "holy seed" in danger of desecration by intermarriage (Ezra 9:2). This sacrilege causes the illegitimatization and invalidation of Jews and their children.

Hayes notes that Second Temple sources which forbid intermarriage also forbid gentiles within the sanctuary and traces this back to Neh 13:1–9 where Nehemiah employs the Deuteronomic prohibition on various peoples entering the assembly to mean exclusion from the Temple as well as from marriage within Israel.[8] Although Deuteronomy allows for some infiltration through this boundary by giving rules for the absorption of a beautiful foreign captive woman, Ezra-Nehemiah does not and foreign spouses are expelled from the community. From the same era, Malachi too combats intermarriage from a cultic perspective intertwining sanctuary and people. He exhorts the community, "Do not profane what is holy

[8] Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*, 46.

Torah Antecedents	Texts
Licit sexuality defiles person/ sanctuary; requires purification	Lev 15:31
Illicit sexuality desecrates/defiles person and land	Gen 49:4; Lev 18:24–25
Child sacrifice profanes God's name, defiles person/land, desecrates sanctuary	Lev 18:21, 24–25; 20:1–3
No marriage with seven Canaanite nations; some nations restricted; no idolaters; *ger* and war captive allowed	Deut 7:1–4, 21; 23:2–8; Exod 34:15–16
Priestly marriage restrictions: no prostitute, no raped woman, no divorcee; no sacred food given to priest's daughter who marries outsider	Lev 21:7; 22:12

Figure 1

by marrying daughters of a foreign god" (Mal 2:11, JPS).[9] While this is not the only interpretation of Jewish identity in this period, it is a strong one and gains momentum in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Outside of the Pentateuch, the concern over intermarriage surfaces in late biblical texts in strongly cultic contexts. Sara Japhet claims that, according to 2 Chronicles, the holiness radiating outward from the ark affected who could live in its environ. The Egyptian wife of Solomon, for example, was forced to live in a separate house outside of the City of David, "for the places to which the ark of the LORD has come are holy" (2 Chr 8:11).[10] The emphasis on ethnic as well as religious correctness deepens during the exile and early Second Temple period. Ezekiel 44:6–9 states that a foreigner and *ger* will be excluded from the future sanctuary. Ezra 9:1–2 claims that mixed marriages cause sacrilege (*maʿal*). Malachi follows in the same vein when he claims that intermarriage desecrates the Holiness of the LORD (Mal 2:11). For these writers there is no possibility of

[9] Some translators render *qodeš* here as "sanctuary," e.g. NASB, NIV.

[10] Sara Japhet, "The Prohibition of the Habitation of Women: The Temple Scroll's Attitude Toward Sexual Impurity and Its Biblical Precedents," *JANES* 22 (1993): 69–87. Japhet makes the case that the temple city of the *Temple Scroll* is analogous to the City of David in 2 Chronicles.

Antecedent Exilic/Second Temple Traditions	Texts
No foreigner in temple	Ezek 44:6–9; Neh 13:1–9
No intermarriage	Ezra 9–10; Neh 12–13
Intermarriage = sacrilege	Ezra 9:2; 10:10; Mal 2:11
No foreign women in city of David	2 Chr 8:11
Israel = "holy seed"	Ezra 9:2
Gentiles carry impurity	Ezra 6:21; Neh 13:9

Figure 2

absorbing a non-Israelite into the community as in earlier texts. Intermarriage is viewed through a priestly lens where correct genealogy is critical for membership in the community.

The above charts reveal that it is fully within the parameters of biblical law to consider illicit sexuality as polluting the sanctuary. Sexuality and the sanctuary are simply poles apart; even licit sexuality defiles the holy. Moreover, in fig. 2 it becomes apparent that in several early Second Temple texts no allowance is made for the *ger* who might wish to join Israel and take on Israelite religious practice. In fact, the people of Israel are now viewed as cultic sancta which not only become impure by various ritual means, but can also be desecrated, and hence invalidated, just like other physical sancta, such as temple or altar.

3. Qumran Texts

With the biblical traditions in hand, I turn now to the evidence of the Qumran texts in regard to the pollution of intermarriage and the defilement of sancta.

3.1. *Intermarriage*

None of the Qumran texts that broach the subject of intermarriage endorse it. There is some debate about the position of the *Temple Scroll*.[11]

[11] William Loader, *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Sexuality: Attitudes towards sexuality in sectarian and related literature at Qumran* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 31, assumes

Two passages form the basis of discussion: (1) the allowance of the *ger* into the Temple court after the third generation (11QT[a] 39:4–5; 40:5–7) and (2) the acceptance of the war captive as a bride (63:10–15). However, neither of these inclusions is a welcome mat to foreigners to intermarry among Israel. In the first instance, the prohibition on Edomites and Egyptians admitted into Israel before the fourth generation is extended to all *gerim*. This means that no foreigner coming into Israel, or his children, or grandchildren, can join in the assembly of the nation at the Temple. In the second instance, the foreign wife is not allowed to touch or cook her husband's food for seven (or fourteen) years, in effect preventing the intermarriage.[12] Both of these rules extend Scripture's rigor against intermarriage beyond the scope of the biblical text to in fact neutralizing its elasticity altogether.

3.2. *Intermarriage Defiles the Sanctuary*

The texts listed at the outset (*ALD, Jubilees, MMT*) clearly view intermarriage as a threat to the sanctuary. The *Testament of Levi* castigates the priesthood for making illicit sexual unions, not only prostitution and adultery, but also "taking Gentile women as wives and purifying them with a form of purification contrary to the law" (14:5–6; 15:1). This attempted absorption of Gentile women into Israel was unacceptable and ineffectual. Not only must holy bodies not be united with illicit partners, but also holy food must not be shared with unholy women. The writer warns that the "spirit of promiscuity . . . is about to defile the sanctuary" resulting in the destruction of the temple entirely and the exile of the people.

The Qumran *ALD* makes a clear connection between the concept of sanctuary and the physical body of the Jew. Levi exhorts his son (6:4), "marry a woman from my family and do not defile your seed with harlots, since you are holy seed, and sanctify your seed like the holy place since you are called a holy priest for all the seed of Abraham." According to Lange, following Joseph Baumgarten, the concern is for the endogamy of all Israel, not just the priesthood, "For the time of the patriarchs, ancient

---

that for the *Temple Scroll* author, "foreign wives (like the captive wife) are a normal part of life."

[12] Ian Werrett, *Ritual Purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 72; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 287 lists all passages in the Qumran Scrolls on intermarriage and finds that only this one permits it. Also, note the *Temple Scroll*'s bans on intermarriage in 11QT[a] 2:1–15 and 57:15–17.

Judaism perceived the family of Levi and the peoples of Israel as identical."[13] Lange claims that *ALD*'s author is here requiring foreigners to convert to Judaism before they marry a Jew. However, that misses the point of the Dinah story. Shechem was willing to convert; however, he was still not only rebuffed, but also killed along with all the men of his town.

In *Jubilees* (30:15–16) too, the notion is explicit that anyone who sins sexually or allows sexual sin to persist unchallenged is guilty of defiling the sanctuary of Yahweh (cf. also 7:33; 16:5; 21:19; 23:18–23). In fact, the author states that curses come upon the entire land until the sin has been properly punished (cf. 41:26). *Jubilees* shows concern for both the defilement of the temple and the defilement of the people. For *Jubilees* Israel is holy seed, and offering one's child to a non-Jew in marriage is the same as offering a child sacrifice to Molekh. The child is holy and thus intermarriage invalidates and desecrates it and its offspring. Even the father who gives his daughter to a non-Jew becomes defiled, which must mean that he loses his holy status. Incest, too, will cause pollution. In *Jub.* 16:8–9 Yahweh vows to eradicate the seed of Lot from the face of the earth, because they came through incest with his daughters. In 16:9 this judgment is justified thus: "they were polluting themselves and they were fornicating in their flesh and they were causing pollution upon the earth" (16:5). Scholars disagree as to the nature of this impurity. Jonathan Klawans considers it a moral offense only, while Gillihan sees both a moral and a ritual contagion which can only be resolved by killing the illegitimate offspring.[14] While I agree that ritual impurity was not the primary reason for avoidance of Gentiles and that intermarriage was decried primarily on moral and ethnic grounds, I remain unconvinced that ritual impurity was not applied to Gentiles until the rabbinic period when the temple was only a memory. In any case, the point for this discussion is that the bodies of Israel are understood as sancta in the same terms as the temple. Both can be desecrated and their holy status invalidated.

---

[13] Armin Lange, "Your Daughters Do Not Give to Their Sons and Their Daughters Do Not Take for Your Sons (Ezra 9,12): Intermarriage in Ezra 9–10 and in the Pre-Maccabean Dead Sea Scrolls. *Teil 2*," *BN* 139 (2008): 79–98, esp. 80–81.

[14] Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 48, argues that this impurity is of a moral nature because Gentiles practice idolatry (22:17–22) and perform sexual transgression (20:3–7) and there are no suggestions of ritual contagion or purification. According to Gillihan, "Jewish Laws On Illicit Marriage," the divine vow to obliterate the *mamzerim* suggests that their impure status was a primary pollutant: the polluted and polluting *offspring mus*t be destroyed immediately—the parents' repentance from moral impurity was not enough. Concern for the holiness of Israel also warranted execution for Israelites who committed adultery (30:7–17) or incest (4:25–28).

MMT is the most vocal of the Qumran texts against intermarriage. *MMT* B 39–41 protests marriage with ineligible persons, and supports this with Deuteronomy's prohibition on foreigners entering the "assembly" (Deut 23:1).[15] Like Ezra-Nehemiah (Ezra 9:1; Neh 13:1), *MMT* excludes all foreigners and deletes generational time limits. The rationale given for prohibiting intermarriage in *MMT* is presented in two ways: (1) the author is concerned about a Jew "becoming one bone," i.e., sexual congress, with a non-Jew.[16] The other concern is (2) protecting the sanctuary, recalling the Deuteronomic injunction not to allow certain foreigners into the assembly (B 40–46). The author makes the intermarriage concern explicit in B 48–49, "beware of any impure sexual mixture, and be afraid of (defiling) the sanctuary."[17] It is curious that sexual union immediately raises concern to protect the holiness of the sanctuary. It seems that like *Jubilees* and *ALD*, the author's notion of sanctuary includes the people of Israel.[18] *MMT*'s author does not explain how intermarriage defiles the sanctuary. At first glance, it seems to be that the Gentile spouse is banned from physical entry into the Temple, and indeed, there was an inscription there forbidding Gentiles to enter beyond the rampart. But, who exactly is the author of *MMT* excluding—only the foreign spouse? or the Jewish partner as well? The writer does not discuss particular pollutions or exclusions from the temple, but focuses on the act of intermarriage itself. The reference to the sanctuary, coming in the middle of this passage against intermarriage, probably refers to protecting both the sanctity of the temple and the sanctity of Jewish bodies.

---

[15] See Shaye J. D. Cohen, *The Beginnings of Jewishness. Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 248–52, for the notion that many ancient interpreters of Deut 23:2–9 understood the prohibition on entering the assembly of the Lord as a ban against intermarriage.

[16] The author quotes the Edenic model of Eve as, "bone of my [Adam's] bones," and alluding to the "one flesh" that husband and wife are to become after marriage (Gen 2:23–24); Loader, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 61.

[17] "Be full of reverence for the sanctuary," Qimron and Strugnell, DJD 10:51, does not convey the sense of dread for defilement of the sanctuary that is implied.

[18] The term *mitʿārvim* is, according to the editor, also used in B 80 where the author claims that the people were intermingling sexually with outsiders and so defiling Israel's seed (Qimron and Strugnell, ibid., 56; cf. the intermarriage connotation of this verb in Ezek 9:2; Neh 13:3). The physical character of *MMT*'s prohibition is made explicit in the author's citation of the Torah's law against *kil'ayim*, improper intermingling of animal species, fabrics, and agricultural seeds, as an analogy for sexual relations between Jews and Gentiles (B 75–82). The point seems to be that intermarriage is wrong both biblically and biologically.

MMT continues to focus on the defilement of the holy seed of Israel. *MMT* B 75–76 reads, "And concerning the practice of illegal marriage that exists among the people: (this practice exists) despite their being so[ns] of holy [seed], as is written, Israel is holy" (reconstruction Qimron). Later, he seems to claim that some of the priests and, probably laity too, are engaging in sexual relations with outsiders, "and thus defiling the holy seed and also their own seed with forbidden women" (B 81–82). Like Ezra-Nehemiah, both writers are emphasizing the nation's cultic holiness by virtue of genealogy, not just the presence of the temple.

The identity of the "seeds" in this passage is unclear, but they most likely refer to intermarriage between Jews, both priests and laity, and Gentiles. Qimron regards the issue as intermarriage between priests and laity, but several scholars have argued that this was probably not the only issue.[19] According to the Torah, priests may marry women from non-priestly families; only the high priest must marry within the clan. As Christine Hayes explains, "For Ezra, Jubilees, and 4QMMT, the designation of Israel as holy prefaces and justifies the application of certain priestly marriage laws to lay Israelites."[20] The usage of Ezran language, "holy seed," recalling the issue of intermarriage between Jews and outsiders, adds significant weight to this argument that this is the case in *MMT* as well. It may even be the case that *MMT*'s intermarriage issue is, like Ezra's, not a case of completely different races, but simply of mixed heritage. While some may have considered themselves "Israel" and adopted some form of Judaism, the community of the author did not agree.[21]

---

[19] Loader, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 65–75, surveys the proponents of both sides of this issue including Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*, 85, who argues convincingly for the intermarriage concern affecting both priests and laity. She claims that priestly marriage laws (cf. Lev 21:7) have been extended to Israelite laity because they have been designated as "holy." Loader sees *qōdeš Yisrael* (B 75) as a quote from Jer 2:3: *qōdeš Yiśrā'ēl laYHWH*, 66–67. Martha Himmelfarb, "Levi, Phineas, and the Problem of Intermarriage at the Time of the Maccabean Revolt," *JSQ* 6 (1999): 1–24, esp. 8, opposes this view arguing that intermarriage with Gentiles was not an issue in this period because the Jewish sources, e.g., 1 and 2 Maccabees, do not complain of it. However, there is ample evidence of this practice and protest against it at least as early as Ezra-Nehemiah; cf. Ezek 44:33, *ALD* 6:3–4, 16–17, *Jub.* 30:15, and the Qumran texts discussed below.

[20] Hayes translates the passage: "They shall not marry a *zonah* . . . for they are holy to their God . . . Israelite marriages with outsiders (*zonot*) defile the holy seed of lay Israelites as much as priestly marriages with outsiders defile their seed (i.e., the most holy seed of the priests)." As holy seed and most holy seed, respectively, Israelite and priest alike are subject to the rule of Lev 21:7; Hayes, *Gentile Impurities*, 85–86. Cf. also Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22* (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 1805–6.

[21] So Gudrun Holtz, "Inclusivism at Qumran," *DSD* 16 (2009): 22–54, esp. 49.

Thus, while the details of the relationship between unlawful marriage and entrance into the temple in *MMT* are lost, lines B 48–49 stress that fear for the sanctuary should motivate observance of marriage restrictions. In addition to the temple, the bodies of Israel are a sanctum that is subject to desecration by intermarriage and other illicit sexual relations. Desecration is worse than ritual defilement, because defilement can usually be remedied. Moral impurity can be atoned for by repentance and sacrifices; ritual impurity can be washed off. But, desecration means invalidation. In the case of intermarriage, one's offspring are delegitimatized.

3.3. *The* Damascus Document

The *Damascus Document* does not emphasize the dangers of intermarriage, probably because the document reflects a closed group which is not threatened by the likelihood of mixed marriages. However, the author's concern with defilement of the sanctuary is important for this discussion. He lists the sanctuary's defilement among the top three sins, the "nets of Belial," that have ensnared Israel (CD 4:12–18). This defilement is not explained by ritual infractions but by illicit sexuality, *zenut*. The author (CD 4:20–5:2) elaborates on three species of *zenut:* polygamy, sleeping with menstruants, and incest.[22] The latter two are introduced with the phrase (CD 5:6–9), "And they also continuously polluted the sanctuary." Scholars have debated how sleeping with menstruants and incest pollutes the sanctuary. Davies considers it illogical. Ginzberg suggests that priests were having sexual relations with ritually impure women and then entering into the temple in a state of ritual impurity. Thus, ritual impurity could be at issue here, but, as Klawans points out, this does not account for the incest prohibition: CD 5:9 states that the sin of incest has polluted the persons involved as well as the sanctuary.[23] The same dynamic seems to be at work in the texts listed above which consider intermarriage as a pollutant to the sanctuary. According to these authors, Jews are considered containers for holiness in a cultic way and so subject to desecration by illicit sexual unions, whether intermarriage, incest or other sexual sins.

---

[22] See Joseph A. Fitzmyer's discussion in "The Matthean Divorce Texts and Some New Palestinian Evidence," in *To Advance the Gospel* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1998), 91–97.

[23] Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 54. Also, as Loader points out, there is no reason to limit the defilement to priests officiating in the sanctuary but any Israelite guilty of *zenut* defiles the sanctuary, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 120.

The *Damascus Document* supports this train of thought in its incest laws: "And a man shall not commit sacrilege with regard to his near kin" (CD 7:1). The author considers incest a violation of a sanctum. The author quotes the prohibition from Lev 18:6 but substitutes the Ezran term *māʿal*, "to commit sacrilege" for the Levitical term *qārab*, "approach" (cf. Ezra 9:2). On the positive side, according to Joseph Baumgarten's reconstruction, marriage between two Jews is considered sacred, "Let no man bring [a woman into the ho]ly [covenant?] (4Q271 [4QD^{f}] 3 10b–11a).[24] For these texts, marriage is the holy union of IsraeIite bodies; sexual union with a non-Jew violates the sanctity of Israel.

Although intermarriage is not discussed in the *Damascus Document*, there is a related matter of a priest who has returned from captivity in an area of Gentiles. The writer rejects such a priest from serving in the sanctuary because he has been "profaned by their impurity" (4Q266 [4QD^{a}] 5 ii 5–6; cf. also 4Q267 [4QD^{b}] 6 ii 5–9). Again the threat of desecration by non-Jews appears. In this case, the holy priest has been compromised simply by being in Gentile territory and is disbarred from the sanctuary. These terms recall the late biblical connection of Gentiles and impurity made by the author of Ezra-Nehemiah who decries, "the impurity of the peoples of the land" (Ezra 6:21).[25] Similar to Ezra-Nehemiah, D offers no purification means for these Gentiles nor for the priest who has been contaminated by living among them. The priest has not only been defiled, but also invalidated, and his contraction of Gentile impurity invalidates him for service in the temple.

The *Damascus Document* is known for its depiction of the community as a "holy house" along the lines of S. But this holy house, or "sanctuary," is comprised of individual Jews, each one a separate container for the spirit of holiness. The list of sins in CD 7 emphasizes sexual sins, especially in its final section (7:1–4). The writer concludes the list with the exhortation, "Let a man not defile (*yešaqqeṣ*) his holy spirit that God has set apart for him." Thus, the defilement of various sins, including illicit sexual relations,

---

[24] Joseph Baumgarten, DJD 18:177. Cf. also 4Q502 (4QpapRitMar) and 4Q415 2 ii 4 (4QInstruction^{a}) where קודש and cognates are employed in the context of marriage.

[25] Joseph Blenkinsopp notes several areas of correspondence: returned exiles in the pre-history (D) or current history (Ezra-Nehemiah) of the group; the commitment of the group to self-segregate themselves from other Jews; the reinstatement of law by the special Teacher (*doreš ha-torah*); "the prohibition of irregular sexual unions, including marriage with outsiders"; support of the cult and strict observance of Sabbath; and special concern to avoid impurity, *Judaism: The First Phase, The Place of Ezra and Nehemiah in the Origins of Judaism* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009), 225–26.

is said to have internal, spiritual ramifications. The spirit God has placed within a person can become polluted: "and they also defiled (*ṭimme'u*) their holy spirit" (CD 5:11).[26] On the other hand, the promise is given that the faithful will be able to count on the covenant and live for a thousand generations (CD-A 7:5b-6a; cf. "thousands of generations," CD-B 19:1–2). It is not an accident that this is a quotation from Deut 7:9 which appears in the biblical text immediately after the laws against illicit sexual relations and intermarriage (Deut 7:1–8).[27] Intermarriage can cancel a Jew's containment of the divine spirit. In fact, as the text continues, some members opt to live in "perfect holiness" as celibates, without having families at all. This sidesteps the whole issue of sexual relations and the impurity and restrictions involved.[28] The community of Israel is a "holy house," yet paradoxically the only way to get the next generation of holy Jews is through legitimate sexual relations.

3.4. *Cave 4 Texts*

Finally, several Cave 4 texts, mostly fragments, make the connection between intermarriage, and the desecration of Israel. I will examine them in four categories: law, wisdom, liturgy and eschatology.

3.4.1. *Law*

The notion of the Jewish body as a sanctuary is implicit in some legal Cave 4 texts. 4QOrdinances[b] refers to the food of the priests as the "food of angels." It cannot be shared with any profaned woman, "wives (or mistresses?) of foreigners" (4Q513 2 ii 2), even if they are members of the

---

[26] According to Loader, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 128, the defilement here "almost certainly includes reference to sexual wrongdoing." Cf. also the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* which includes *ruaḥ zenut*, "a spirit of sexual wrongdoing" in a list of sins deriving from Hos 4:12 (1QS 4:10).

[27] According to *Jub.* 23:28–29, sexual wrongdoing reduces the human lifespan.

[28] Loader, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 374–75, the best evidence for celibacy is in CD 7 with the distinction of two camps, one which is celibate and the other which is not. Also the motif of living for a thousand generations taken up in Pliny where it is linked with celibacy. Loader explains the assumed celibacy as "probably best understood in relation to a choice for a life of more stringent purity." Cf. Annette Steudel, "Ehelosigkeit bei den Essenern," in *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer* (ed. Jörg Frey and Hartmut Stegemann; Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 115–24 at 124. The archaeological evidence reveals that a predominantly male settlement and no evidence of families; in over 150 years only one spindle whorl, five beads, and three or four women have been positively identified (not including the southern cemetery which represents Bedouin burials in the modern period). See Loader, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 375, and Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002).

priest's household.[29] It is unclear if 4Q513 refers to priests' daughters who have been given to foreigners or if priests have married foreign women. In any case it is wrong, according to the author, to feed them with the holy food set apart for the priests' families. Similar to *MMT*, the author compares foreigners eating sacred food with *zenut*, illicit sexual relations; both are illicit mixtures of holy and unholy within the body and both result in profanation (4Q513 2 ii 5–6). Marrying foreigners and feeding them holy food is a sacrilege not only against the holy offerings but also against Jewish bodies.

Similarly, *Halakha A* is concerned about who may eat *terumah,* sacred food contributed to the priests but not offered on the altar. Following Lev 22:10–13, which states that *terumah* may be eaten by the priest's whole household, the author clarifies that a woman whom a priest purchases (wife, slave) or a woman born in his house (daughter, slave's daughter) can eat of the *terumah*, but not a prostitute, a profaned woman, or a divorcee (4Q251 16 1–3).[30] These are all categories which Lev 21:7 forbids a priest to marry. *Halakha A* 3, concluding with *kol ha-maʿal ʾašer yimʿal*, has been interpreted to warn against any "unfaithfulness" in the context of the marital relationship.[31] But, this misses the point that forbidden sexual unions cause *maʿal*, "sacrilege," because they desecrate Jewish bodies.

These legal texts, although fragments, are primarily concerned to protect the sanctity of the priesthood and its holy food. However, in *Halakha A* there is a hint that the prohibition against intermarriage extends beyond priestly families, since "no man" should marry his daughter to a foreigner (4Q251 17 7). The use of both foreign (4Q513) and sacrilege (4Q251) in the intermarriage context is reminiscent of Ezra-Nehemiah (cf. Ezra 9:2; Neh 13:30).

3.4.2. *Wisdom*

Not only legal but wisdom texts take up the notion of Israel's seed as a sanctum which is susceptible to desecration by wrongful sexual relations. Similar to the author of D, 4Q418 (4QInstruction^{d}) exhorts, "He shall not

---

[29] One is reminded of Nehemiah's claim that he had purged all of the *nekhar*, "foreignness," out of the priesthood (Neh 13:30; cf. also the separation of the seed of Israel from all *bene nekhar* as well, Neh 9:2).

[30] Cf. E. Larson et al., DJD 35:44, point out that the Rabbis understood this category as offspring of a forbidden union although in the biblical text it is most likely that *ḥălālā* refers to a woman who has been raped. See Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22*, 1807.

[31] Loader, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 226.

commit sacrilege against his own kin" (4Q418 101 ii 5). The translation "He shall not do harm to (or act unfaithfully against) his own kin" (tr. J. Strugnell/D. Harrington) does not do justice to the term *yimʿal*, "to commit sacrilege, desecrate." The author of *Instruction* intentionally uses the term, *yimʿal*, absent in the Lev 18 intertext, to make the point that Jewish bodies are sancta. *Instruction* refers in Ezran style, to "your holy seed," which will not depart from its inheritance (4Q415 2 i + 1 ii 4–6). One wonders what is this inheritance? According to the *Testament of Qahat*, Levi and Qahat, his son, have not mingled, which is probably a sexual allusion to intermarriage (4Q542 1 i 9). Then comes the exhortation, as in *Instruction*, "Do not give your inheritance away to strangers/Gentiles (*nokrin*), nor your inheritance to half-breeds" (4Q542 1 i 5–6a; inappropriate animal, seed, or textile mixtures, Lev 19:19; Deut 22:9).[32] This inheritance must be one's children (cf. *ALD* 6:4 above: one's seed is "like the holy place," i.e., it is a sanctum).

3.4.3. *Liturgy*

Although not particularly concerned with intermarriage, the notion of the holy spirit within a person in D and S (*šiqqeṣ*) surfaces again in fragments of the poetic *Barkhi Nafshi*, the *yeṣer raʿ*, or "evil inclination" is contrasted with the *ruaḥ qodeš*, "spirit of holiness" (4Q435 2 i 1–3a): "The evil inclination you have driven with rebukes far from me and the spirit of holiness you have set in my heart." The writer goes on to explain, "Sexual immorality of the eyes (*zenut ʿenaim*) [you have removed from me]." The contrast with holiness as well as the parallel line regarding the removal of sexual immorality makes a striking antithetical association between wrongful sexual relations and holiness similar to the association of *yeṣer* and sexual urge found often in rabbinic literature.[33] This dichotomy recalls the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* in S. Just as holiness is a spirit within people, so there is another spirit contained in non-Israel (all who are outside the true community) who are associated with wickedness, including, sexual wrongdoing (cf. *ruaḥ zenut*, 1QS 4:10).

Texts reflecting the Enochic tradition of the Watchers who had intercourse with women apply a demonic character to illegitimate offspring.

---

[32] And, for further emphasis on seed, see 1QapGen 2:15–16, "this seed is from you; from you is this conception, and from you the planting of [this] fruit [. . .], and not from any stranger."

[33] Contra Loader, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 256.

Just as marriage between holy partners contains the spirit of holiness, so evil spirits were spawned by miscegenation. For example, in *Song of the Sage*, the allusion to bastards reflects the Enochic tradition that the giants were bastards and their corpses the source of evil spirits (*1 En.* 15:8–9). Similarly, 11Q11 (11QapocPs) 5:6 reads: "Who are you [offspring of] humankind and of the seed of the h[oly one]s?" Sexual miscegenation has produced not only illegitimate children, but also evil spirits.[34]

3.4.4. *Eschatology*

Florilegium envisions a future sanctuary which will be free of all illegitimate worshippers, but which probably also represents the holiness of the community itself by the phrase *miqdaš ʾadam* ("Human Temple," or "Temple of Adam"; 4Q174 1–2 i 6).[35] Like Ezra-Nehemiah, the writer presents the types of outcasts listed in Deut 23, but he also excludes the *ben nekhar,* "foreigner" as in Ezek 44:6–9 and the *ger*. The writer apparently excludes these people from temple entry as well as from marriage within Israel and gives the rationale "because My [i.e. God's] holy ones are there" (4Q174 1–2 i 4). In the same vein as other sectarian literature from Qumran, *Florilegium* carries the notion that the holy angels are present, and thus no impurity, moral or ritual, can be allowed to remain within the community (cf. CD 15:15–18; 1Q33 7 6; 1Q28a 2:3–9; *MMT* B 39–49; 11QT[a] 45:12–14).

The *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* couches its concern about intermarriage in eschatological terms as well. The author prophesies that Israel will defile the temple, profane the Sabbaths and neglect the festivals, "and with the sons of foreigners they will profane their seed" (4Q390 2 i 9–10).[36] Although *nekhar* has been reconstructed here, the reading is reasonable and is reminiscent of its usage in the context of intermarriage in Ezra-Nehemiah (Neh 9:2; 13:30) and elsewhere (Mal 2:11; cf. Ezek 44:7–9). The writer uses the term *ḥillel* instead of Ezra-Nehemiah's *māʿal* but the point

---

[34] Also, 4Q444 associates bastards and "the spirit of impurity" (4Q444 1–4 i+5 8).

[35] Joseph Baumgarten, "The Exclusion of Netinim and Proselytes in 4Q Florilegium," in *Studies in Qumran Law* (SJLA 24; Leiden: Brill, 1977), 75–87, claims that a future sanctuary is intended, but George Brooke argues for polyvalence in the phrase and suggests that it refers to: (1) the sanctuary made up of humans as a designation of the community; and (2) a proleptic reference to the sanctuary of Adam as a restoration of what was originally intended, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 193.

[36] 4Q183 is another eschatological text which accuses someone (Israel? priests?) of defiling their sanctuary but the data is so fragmentary that a clear context is impossible to determine. There is no intermarriage concern in the extant text.

that Israelite seed is holy and can be desecrated by foreigners is the same. Although eschatological in presentation, there is probably a current social problem underlying these texts, as elsewhere in the Qumran corpus, in giving Jewish offspring to outsiders in marriage.

In addition to the web of biblical traditions (figs. 1–2), it is possible to compose a similar chart for Dead Sea Scrolls traditions related to the desecration of wrongful sexual relations, especially intermarriage (fig. 3). With the two sets of ideas, it becomes clear that in the Dead Sea Scrolls there is a strong concretization of Israelite bodies as sancta, a notion that began in early Second Temple times. This trend makes it all the more critical to avoid intermarriage and its threat of desecration.

Conclusion

How does intermarriage defile the sanctuary? The Second Temple texts discussed above allow for a variety of answers: (1) like other sins, intermarriage will bring God's wrath on a disobedient Israel; (2) ritual impurity accompanies the non-Israelite, which then defiles persons, temple, and food by physical contact; (3) intermarriage will bring immorality and idolatry into Israel through the pagan partner, thus making the temple cult ineffectual. On the basis of the foregoing discussion, a fourth answer must be added. The sanctuary of the bodies of Jews is the first line of defense for the nation's survival. Intermarriage, for these authors, ritually desecrates that sanctity leaving no possible chance for remediation. The Jewish partner is compromised and the children become illegitimate. Intermarriage is in direct conflict with holiness, be it at the temple or in the bodies of Israel, and a forbidden sexual partner can destroy one's holiness altogether.

The concept presented in the Dead Sea Scrolls is based on traditions that reach back into Scripture. The authors follow the lead of late biblical authors such as Ezra-Nehemiah and Malachi and tend to be priestly and conservative in their applications of these laws. Intermarriage is considered a sacrilege of holy seed desecrating one's body and children. Some authors go so far as to argue that evil spirits result from illicit sexual unions; others emphasize that the holy spirit is resident in holy bodies. Some texts apply a ritual impurity to outsiders, and some insist that they be disbarred from the temple. A summary of their statements on the defilement of intermarriage and other wrongful sexual relations is charted in fig. 3 below.

Idea/Term in the Scrolls	Texts
Holy Seed	*ALD, Jubilees, MMT, Instruction* (4Q415), *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* (4Q390)
Intermarriage is illicit union	*MMT, Testament of Qahat* (4Q542), *Temple Scroll, Halakha A* (4Q251)
No holy food to foreigner	*Halakha A* (4Q251), *Ordinances* (4Q513), *Temple Scroll*
Illicit sex = sacrilege	*Damascus Document*, *Halakha A* (4Q251), *4QInstruction* (4Q418)
Illicit sex defiles the sanctuary	*ALD, Jubilees, MMT*, *Damascus Document*
Holy house = Israel	*Damascus Document, Rule of the Community, Florilegium*
Gentile/Outsider/Sin = Impure	*Damascus Document, Rule of the Community, Jubilees, MMT, Ordinances* (4Q512), 4Q414, *Temple Scroll*
Body = house for holy spirit	*Damascus Document, Rule of the Community, Barkhi Nafshi* (4Q435)
Miscegenation → evil spirits	*1 Enoch*, 4Q444
No foreigners in temple	*Florilegium, Temple Scroll*

Figure 3

Finally, some thoughts on the development of the notion of human sanctuary. In my view the destruction of the first temple and the ensuing hiatus in which there was no Jewish cult or sovereignty in the homeland for several decades created a shift in the understanding of holiness in Israel. Away from land and temple, Israel began to emphasize what she did retain, namely, her identity as the people of Israel. The holy people itself was the link to continued holiness in Israel. Since some Torah traditions also make the case that the people of Israel are holy, not just the temple and its priests, many Jews in Second Temple times begin to emphasize that the bodies of all Israel were physical sancta. After the rebuilding of

the Second Temple in 516 B.C.E., there was still no agreement as to proper cultic procedures among various groups and thus again the current management of holiness at the Jerusalem sanctuary was opposed or ignored by some. Later under Hellenistic rule, among the increased corruption and strife among the Jewish priesthood, the proliferation of sects, and, in some cases, even the abandonment of the sanctuary, the bodies of Israel as sancta took on greater importance. The nation's future depended not only on its temple but on the ethnicity and purity of its people.

TEMPLE AND PURIFICATION RITUALS: FROM TORAH TO THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Gudrun Holtz

According to the Torah complete purification of impurity due to scale disease and abnormal genital discharge consists of two phases. During the first phase, which lasts seven days, different rituals aimed at cleansing the human body are prescribed. The second phase of the purification process takes place on the eighth day. It is characterized by a twofold modification: the change of place and of purificatory means. For his or her final purification the impure person must "come before the Lord at the entrance of the Tent of Meeting" (Lev 15:14) and bring the offerings to the priest who will make expiation on his or her behalf. For corpse defilement, however, an equivalent to the second phase, described above, is missing.

As has been pointed out by Jacob Milgrom and Joseph Baumgarten, the DSS repeatedly furnish evidence of the homogenization of the diverging purificatory rites required by the Torah for scale disease, genital discharge, and corpse defilement. This seems to include the *temporary* abandonment of the second phase of the purification ritual for people living in the cities, namely the sacrifices at the Temple and waiting until sunset on the eighth day. In what follows, I first want to present the evidence of a two-partite purification ritual in the DSS, one for the temple city, which includes full access to the sacrificial cult, and another for the cities (1). This interpretation contrasts with what is generally assumed,[1] without—to my knowledge—having been investigated. Furthermore, I want to discuss its implications for the biblically required sacrifices for scale disease and abnormal discharge. This concerns the purgation or sin offering (2) and the expiatory offering (3). In the concluding section, the textual evidence of the DSS will be related to issues of wider interest (4).

---

[1] Cf. Hannah K. Harrington, *The Purity Texts* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 21–22, and Thomas Kazen, "4Q274 Fragment 1 Revisited—or Who Touched Whom? Further Evidence for Ideas of Graded Impurity and Graded Purifications," *DSD* 17 (2010): 53–87 esp. 68. I wish to thank the editors of this volume for their constructive suggestions and comments on an earlier version of this paper, which helped me strengthen the argument. I also wish to thank Luke Neubert for revising the English of this paper.

1. From Torah to the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Evolution of Two Purificatory Rituals

For this paper two texts in the *Temple Scroll* (11QT[a]) on the purification of the scale-diseased person are of utmost importance, 45:17–46:? and 48:17–49:4. The ritual described in 45:17–46:? is intended for persons healed of scale disease who wish to enter the temple city, the one decribed in 48:17–49:4 is aimed at those living in the other cities. Other passages in the DSS similarly differentiate between two rituals for bearers of other impurities. This stands in clear contrast to the biblical sources which know only one purificatory rite for the bearer of scale disease (Lev 14:3–20) and the person suffering from abnormal discharge (15:13–15, 28–30) each.

According to Lev 14, immediately after the priest declares the bearer of scale disease clean, the cleansing ritual begins. On the first day, the priest performs the bird rite for the healed impure person (14:4–7). It takes place outside the camp and consists of the slaughtering over fresh water of one of two birds presented to the priest, the dipping of the live bird, of cedar wood, crimson yarn, and hyssop in the blood of the slaughtered bird, and the sprinkling of the blood on the impure person; finally the live bird is set free in order "to carry away the evil of the disease."[2] Afterwards, the person being cleansed must wash his clothes, shave his hair and bathe in water (14:8). At the conclusion of the rites of the first day, the person is clean (*we-ṭāhēr*). After the removal of this first layer of impurity, he or she is allowed to re-enter the camp but still must remain outside his or her tent for seven days. This prescription is intended to hinder direct contact with other persons and objects through which the person could defile profane entities through direct contact and holy things, e.g. sacred food, through overhang.[3] On the seventh day, then, the impurity bearer is to shave and to wash his clothes and his body a second time, in order to remove a further layer of impurity and, thus, to become clean (*we-ṭāhēr*; 14:9). He now is able to enter his tent for he "no longer contaminates sancta by overhang, only by touch."[4] For the complete eradication of his impurity, he must approach the tent of meeting on the eighth day bearing sacrifices, which will be offered by the priest (14:10–20): a guilt offering (*ʾāšām*; 14:12–18)

---

[2] Cf. Baruch A. Levine, *The JPS Torah Commentary. Leviticus* ויקרא (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1989), 85.

[3] Cf. Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16* (AB 3A; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 842–43.

[4] Ibid., 844.

"ordained to expiate for the possibility of *maʿal*,"[5] a purificatory offering (*ḥaṭṭāʾt*; 14:19) because by his impurity he has polluted the sanctuary,[6] a burnt and a meal offering (14:19–20) for expiation. With these offerings, the priest makes expiation for the impure person. These offerings are the final precondition for purity (*we-ṭāhēr*; 14:20). Henceforth, he again is a "full-fledged participant in his community and its worship."[7]

Although not in detail, the purificatory ritual for the bearer of scale disease in the highly fragmentary passage of 11QT[a] 45:17–46:? seems to agree with the procedure described in Lev 14. The text as reconstructed by Elisha Qimron can be rendered as follows:

> And any leper and diseased person shall not enter it (sc. the temple city) until they cleanse themselves. And when he has cleansed himself he shall sacrifice [his purgation offering (*ḥaṭṭāʾt*). On the eighth day he shall have access to the purity (*ṭohŏrāh*) within the temple city. B]ut he shall not enter the sanctuary, [nor eat of the sacred food (*ha-qŏdāšim*). And when the sun sets on the eighth day, of the sacred food] he may eat and the sanctuary [he may enter].[8]

Corresponding to the requirement in Lev 14:8, that the bearer of scale disease must remain outside his tent for seven days, the impure person, according to 11QT[a] 45:17–18, is permitted to enter the temple city on the seventh day, that is after the second set of ablutions.[9] The remainder of the text agrees with Lev 14 in that the bearer of scale disease must offer his sacrifice—the reconstructed lines, however, only mention a purgation or sin offering (*ḥaṭṭāʾt*)—as precondition for gaining full access to the worship of the community of Israel. The last part of 11QT[a] 45:17–46? goes beyond Lev 14. It specifies the gradually increasing degrees of re-inclusion into the cult after the sacrifice which correspond to the additional degrees

---

[5] Ibid., 363, and similarly Levine, *Leviticus*, 18; but see ibid., 87.

[6] Cf. Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 849; but see Levine, *Leviticus*, 88: "The sin offering served to put the individual in good standing with God."

[7] Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 859.

[8] Cf. Elisha Qimron, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew Writings* (Vol. 1; Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi, 2010), 184–85 (11QT[a] 45:17–18; 46 [= 11QT[b] 12 9–10]). For the translation cf. Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983), 2:194, and Johann Maier, *Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer and das 'Neue Jerusalem'* (3d ed.; München: Reinhardt [UTB], 1997), 194. The purity within the temple city could refer to an equivalent of what the rabbis call heave-offering and tithe; cf. *m. Kelim* 1:5: "He whose atonement [sacrifice] is incomplete . . . is prohibited in regard to holy thing(s) but permitted in regard to Heave-offering and in regard to tithe" (מחוסר כיפורים אסור בקודש ומותר בתרומה ובמעשר; translation according to Jacob Neusner, *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Purities. Part One. Kelim 1–11* (Leiden: Brill, 1974, 31).

[9] Cf. Jacob Milgrom, "Studies in the Temple Scroll," *JBL* 97 (1978): 501–23, esp. 514.

of purity attained.[10] Immediately after the offering, the scale-diseased person is allowed to consume the pure food (*ṭohŏrah*) within the temple city but not yet to enter the sanctuary and to consume the sacred food (*ha-qŏdāšim*) therein.[11] To get access to the highest sphere of holiness, additional purificatory rites surpassing the biblical purity demands are required, prominent among them waiting until sunset on the eighth day.

Though differing in many details, a fundamental agreement between Lev 14 and 11QT[a] can be observed: in both texts, ablutions outside the area of the sanctuary *and* offerings inside it are deemed necessary for attaining purity. In the context of a less sophisticated ritual, this can also be seen in Lev 15 and 11QT[a] 45 / 4QD[a] regarding impurity due to abnormal discharge. According to Lev 15, the man (15:13–15) or woman (15:28–30) must count seven days after his or her healing from abnormal discharge. On the seventh day he or she must wash his or her clothes and body (15:13). By these very acts they become clean.[12] On the eighth day, they are required to approach the tent of meeting (15:14) and deliver two turtledoves or pigeons as an offering, the one as a purgation offering (*ḥaṭṭā't*), the other as a burnt offering (*ʿōlāh*) in order to attain expiation (15:15).

11QT[a] 45:15–17 basically agrees with Lev 15:13 on the cleansing requirements of the seventh day for the male with a discharge (*zāv*).[13] 11QT[a] 45:16–17 specifies the consequences for access to the temple city: "Afterwards he shall enter the city of the temple." The text 4QD[a] 6 ii 2–4, which discusses the case of the woman suffering from irregular discharge (*zāvāh*), roughly begins where 11QT[a] 45:15–17 breaks off. Concerning the *zāvāh* it is stated: "and if she (sc. the woman) sees ag[ain] (sc. the blood), and it is not [at the time of her impurity] of seven days, she shall not eat anything holy, nor co[me] into the sanctuary until sunset on the eighth day." These rulings

[10] Similar specifications are found in Rabbinic literature; cf. Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 849–50.

[11] Different from the terms *qodeš/qŏdāšim* and *ṭohŏrat ha-miqdaš* which refer "to the sacred food eaten in the Temple" requiring the highest degree of purity, the terms *ṭohŏrah* and *ṭohŏrat ha-qōdeš* refer "to ritually pure food eaten elsewhere" (Elisha Qimron and John Strugnell, DJD 10:138). In Qumran Hebrew the term *ṭohŏrah* mostly refers to the pure food of the *yaḥad* (ibid., 142). This seems to include pre-Qumranic DSS Hebrew as well; cf. 4Q274 2 i 3.

[12] Lev 15:13 and 28. For women, the washings of the seventh day are not mentioned because the prescriptions detailed for the man apply to the woman as well.

[13] In accordance with the provisions for nocturnal emissions (11QT[a] 45:7–10) it seems likely that here too laundering one's clothes and bathing on the first day were prescribed in contrast to the wording of the Torah. Cf. Milgrom, "Studies," 516: "In the temple-city all impurities cause their bearers to be banished, requiring a minimum of two ablutions for passage through the two stages of impurity (טומאה) to profaneness (חל) to holiness (קדש)."

agree with those regarding the bearer of scale disease in 11QT[a] 46 par 11QT[b] 12:9–10, although they do not explicitly mention the offering which, however, in line with the Torah and the passage on the scale-diseased person from the *Temple Scroll* can be presupposed. Similar to the Bible, these texts view the sequence of ablutions and offerings as a precondition for entering the temple city and fully participating in the temple cult, e.g. for the complete re-integration of the formerly impure person into the community of worship.

The issue of the bearer of scale disease is taken up a second time by the author in 11QT[a] 48:17–49:4, thereby, focusing on the procedure in the *cities* of Israel. The text reads:

> And as for the leper who is afflicted with leprosy or scabies, and the priest has declared him unclean . . . [You shall shut] them up for s[even days {and their purgation offering (*ḥaṭṭā't*) (which is) for them} consists of two bird]s and cedarwood and hyssop and scarlet thre[ad and they shall not contaminate] your cities with scale disease (so that) they will become unclean.[14]

The fragmentary passage 11QT[a] 48:17–49:1 apparently deals with the issues discussed in Lev 13 and 4QD[a] 6 i where the rules guiding the priest in determining scale disease are explicated. 11QT[a] 49:2–4, alluding to Lev 14:4–8, specifies some of the details of the purification procedure. Lev 14:8 rules that after the initial cleansings of the first day (14:8a), the person healed of scale disease "may enter the camp, but must remain outside his tent for seven days" (14:8b). In incorporating the period of seven days, 11QT[a] 49:2 relates it to putting the impure person under quarantine within the places allotted in each city to those afflicted with scale disease (48:14–15). Only after the bird rite on the seventh day is performed is he allowed to return to his city and to enter his house. The reason given for this procedure is to avoid polluting the cities. Whereas the birds and the other elements mentioned in Lev 14:4 serve the cleansing of the impure person on the first day, in 11QT[a] 49:2–3—according to the reconstruction of Qimron[15]—they serve as a purgation offering (*ḥaṭṭā't*) on the seventh day.

Provided Qimron's reconstruction is correct, in characterizing the birds as a *ḥaṭṭā't*, 11QT[a] 49:2–4 or an earlier tradition, to which the *Temple Scroll* might be indebted, seems to be influenced by the provisions for corpse

---

[14] Instead of "{and their . . . for them}," which is based on Qimron, *Hebrew Writings*, 188, Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 212 paraphrases: "and if the sore heals, you shall cleanse them with two birds . . ." Between 48:17 and 49:1 nine lines are missing; cf. Qimron, ibid.

[15] Also see Maier, *Tempelrolle*, 206: "und entsühnt."

impurity specified in Num 19. Neither text requires temple offerings. In Num 19:9, however, the ashes of the red heifer function as a purgation offering (*ḥaṭṭā't*) for corpse impurity. Interestingly, its ashes are not only the product of the burning of the animal itself, but also of the "life-enhancing ingredients"[16]—blood, cedar wood, crimson yarn and hyssop (Num 19:6)—which are also used in the bird rite of Lev 14. The fact that both Lev 14 and Num 19 prescribe the same ritual elements may well have served the author of 11QT[a] as an argument for interpreting the bird rite of Lev 14 in terms of a *ḥaṭṭā't*. Furthermore, according to Num 19:12 the water containing the *ḥaṭṭā't* ashes of the red heifer is sprinkled upon the corpse-impure person on the third and seventh days; only then is he clean. But just as in Lev 14, the third day is not mentioned in 11QT[a] in connection with the bearer of scale disease. Provided that the author of 11QT[a], in conceptualizing the purificatory ritual for scale disease, was influenced by the rites for corpse impurity prescribed in Num 19, this might well explain why in 11QT[a] 49:2–4 the bird rite figures at the end of the seven-days' confinement of the healed leper and not on the first as in Lev 14: in 11QT[a] 49 the bird rite prescribed in case of scale disease is a *ḥaṭṭā't*, and it is the ashes of the red heifer functioning as a *ḥaṭṭā't* that in form of the water of lustration according to Num 19:12 must be sprinkled upon the bearer of corpse impurity on the seventh (and third) day, not on the first.

In contrast to both Lev 14 and 11QT[a] 45 but in agreement with Num 19 the passage 11QT[a] 49:2–4 does not require the previously scale-diseased person to go to the temple and sacrifice. The *Temple Scroll*, as mentioned earlier, plainly distinguishes between purity requirements for the temple city and the sanctuary on the one hand (11QT[a] 45:7–48:?) and those for the ordinary cities on the other (11QT[a] 48:11–51:10). The purity requirements for both places correspond to the degrees of holiness attributed to them. The temple city and sanctuary represent the sacred realm whereas ordinary cities belong to the realm of the profane.[17] Sacrifices are part of the requirements of the eighth day to gain access to the sacred sphere while the preceding purificatory period of seven days prepares for the full re-integration of the cleansed person into the realm of the profane—the

[16] Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 835.

[17] Cf. Jacob Milgrom, "The Qumran Cult: Its Exegetical Principles," in *Temple Scroll Studies* (ed. George J. Brooke; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 165–180, esp. 170; idem, *Leviticus*, 974. Cf. esp. 11QT[a] 47:15–17: "If you slaughter it (sc. the sacrificial meat; 47:15]) in my temple, it (sc. the skin) will be clean for my temple; but if you slaughter in your cities, it will be clean for your cities." The differentiation mentioned is also implied in *MMT* B 29–33, 59–62; see DJD 10:143–46, and Harrington, *Purity Texts*, 13–18.

society, the house and the pure food therein. Whereas in Lev 14 and similarly in Lev 15 a single purificatory ritual is described culminating in the sacrifices of the eighth day in the Tabernacle camp, these very same rituals in 11QT[a] are split up into a similar, though expanded ritual culminating in the temple *and* a seven-day purification ritual without sacrifices in the ordinary cities.

This interpretation is confirmed by *MMT* B 64–72, which also differentiates between purity requirements for healed lepers in the cities and those valid for entering the temple. Healed lepers must be isolated inside the cities for seven days so that they do not enter any dwelling and pollute the holy purity (*ṭohŏrat ha-qōdeš*), that is the pure food (B 64–68). This ruling evidently applies to the cities.[18] Obviously, the second prescription demanding that "one should not let them (sc. the lepers) eat of the sacred food (*qŏdāšim*) until sunset on the eighth day" (B 71–72) applies to the temple.[19] It is reasonable to assume that in accordance with Lev 14 and 11QT[a] 45–46 the eating of the sacred food in *MMT* would also have required the offering of sacrifices.

Further evidence of two distinct purificatory rituals in the DSS, one for the cities and the other for the temple, is of indirect nature only. A number of purity texts deal with different aspects of purification without mentioning the temple, sacrifices, sunset on the eighth day or the eating of the holy food.[20] These texts, then, seem to be unrelated to the

---

[18] "And also concerning lepers: we s[ay that] they should [not e]nter (a place) with hol[y] purity (*ṭohŏrat ha-qōdeš*), but in isolation they [shall stay outside a house. And] also it is written that from the moment he shaves and washes he should stay outside [his tent for seven d]ays. But now, even when they are still unclean le[pers approach (a place) wi]th holy purity, the house"; for the translation cf. Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill 2000), 797. For "holy purity" see above n. 11. This seclusion is implied in 4Q274 1 i 1–2 as well. DJD 10:169, and Kazen, "Fragment," 68, relate the text to the scale-diseased person; but see Joseph M. Baumgarten, DJD 35:101–2, who takes this passage to refer to the *zāv*. For the polemical dimension of the text see DJD 10:168–69.

[19] Provided the reconstruction of the text by Qimron and Strugnell, DJD 10:54, comes close to the original, the fact that two different places are presupposed in B 64–68 on the one hand and in B 71–72 on the other is also supported by the intermediate passage B 68–70. In line with Lev 5:4–6 temple and sacrifice here come into view instead of the realm of every-day life referred to before. What must be compared, then, is *MMT* B 71–72 and 11QT[a] 45:17–46 (= 11QT[b] 12:9–10) on the one hand and *MMT* B 64–68 and 11QT[a] 48:17–49:4 on the other; but see Qimron and Strugnell, DJD 10:167–68, who compare 11QT[a] 45:17–18, the passage referring to the temple city, and *MMT* B 64–72 which as a whole they claim to refer to the other cities.

[20] Cf. 4Q278; 2Q284; 4Q414; 4Q512. The most extensive fragment of 4QToharot, namely 4Q274, seems to presuppose the situation outside Jerusalem. One exception, however, needs be mentioned. In 2 i 9 the term *qŏdāšim* is used which usually refers to the holy

sacrificial cult. In the *Purification Liturgies* (4Q414 and 512), however, the "cities of their dwellings" are expressly mentioned,[21] thus pointing to the place of application of these liturgies. Similarly, *4QToharot A* refers to "the camps of the holy (ones) of Israel."[22] But as indicated, this is an argument from silence. The rituals referred to in these texts not only apply to scale disease[23] but also to corpse impurity[24] and abnormal discharge.[25] They consist of washings, launderings and sprinklings and—as an additional aspect mentioned neither in the Bible nor in the halakic texts discussed thus far—of prayer.

The distinction between two purificatory rituals is discernable in Jewish literature from the Second Temple period as well. Philo of Alexandria suggests that basic sprinklings and ablutions suffice for the reintegration of the impure person into normal life while further sprinklings and ablutions are needed for those who wish to enter the temple and offer sacrifices.[26] Philo here not only has the bearer of corpse impurity in mind,[27] but, similar to the DSS, the impure person in general.[28]

2. The Sprinkling with Water of Lustration as a Temporary Substitute for the Purgation Offering for those Living in the Cities

Provided my argument thus far is correct, one problem must be considered: If those living in the cities are not required to offer a sacrifice as part of the purificatory ritual, the question arises how the aerial defilement of the temple, caused by human impurities, is addressed (2.2.). Before dealing with this matter, however, I first want to discuss the evidence for aerial defilement of the temple (2.1.).

---

food of the temple (see above n. 11). Since the text breaks off, however, it is hard to tell to what exactly it would have referred.

[21] Cf. 4Q414 7 8–9; 4Q512 7–9 3.

[22] Cf. 4Q274 1 i 6: מחני קד[שי] ישראל; for the rendering given cf. Kazen, "Fragment," 63.

[23] Apart from the texts discussed from 11QT[a] and MMT cf. 4Q512 24–25 5 and see Maurice Baillet, DJD 7:268. A further example seems to be 4Q274 1 i,1–3; but see n. 18.

[24] Cf. 4Q512 1–3; 4Q277 1 ii 7–8.

[25] Cf. 4Q274 1 i 4–9; 2 i; 4Q277 1 ii 11–13; 4Q278 7; 4Q284 1 8; 4Q414 7 11; 27–28 1; 4Q512 7–9 1–2; 10–11 1; 34 17; 4Q514 1 i, 4, 7.

[26] Cf. *Spec.* 1.257, 261; 3.205.

[27] Cf. *Spec.* 3.205.

[28] Cf. *Spec.* 1.257, 261; see n. 56.

(2.1.) Part of the DSS share the understanding of the priestly texts of the Torah that impurity is dynamic.[29] "Dynamic impurity is a substantive entity"[30] which "assaults the sacred realm from afar."[31] It has an "aerial quality," that is, impurity is transmitted to the temple through the air[32] without there being any direct contact between the impure person and the temple. In the Torah, the dynamic quality of "ritual" impurity is clearly implied in the case of impurity due to genital discharge (Lev 15:31) and corpse impurity (Num 19:13, 20)[33] and can be inferred for the leper as well.[34]

Lev 15:31, which is part of the conclusion of the prescriptions concerning the man and woman suffering from genital discharge, presumes that, if their uncleanness were left unattended, they would be "defiling my sanctuary which is in their midst." Similarly, Num 19:13 states that a person who touches a corpse without cleansing him- or herself "defiles the Lord's sanctuary." The reasoning given is that if "the water of lustration was not dashed on him, he remains unclean." Since neither text presupposes that the person who has not cleansed himself enters into the sanctuary in order to defile it by direct contact, its defilement must be caused from afar. This is also true of Num 5:2–3 which not only demands the removal of the person suffering from discharge and the bearer of corpse impurity from the camp but of the leper as well. The purpose given is: "that they do not defile the camp of those in whose midst I dwell." The impure person is required to leave the camp because outside the realm of the camp "is out of the contamination range of the sanctuary, so that impurities there

---

[29] Cf. Eyal Regev, "Reconstructing Qumranic and Rabbinic Worldviews: Dynamic Holiness vs. Static Holiness," in *Rabbinic Perspectives. Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Steven Fraade; STDJ 62; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 87–112 at 89: "The thesis proposed . . . is that the *Temple Scroll* and MMT view holiness as dynamic, sensitive and dangerous, and therefore maintain that access to the sacred should be restricted." In this 11QT[a] and *MMT* "embrace(d) the cultic *worldview* of the Priestly School" (100). Since holiness and impurity are closely related concepts, Regev describes impurity—both "ritual" and "moral"—in similar terms as holiness (cf. ibid., 108–9).

[30] Ibid., 108, and idem, "Priestly Dynamic Holiness and Deuteronomic Static Holiness," *VT* 51 (2001): 243–61, esp. 255–56.

[31] Jacob Milgrom, *The JPS Torah Commentary. Numbers* במדבר (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1990), 445; further cf. Regev, "Worldviews," 90.

[32] Milgrom, *Numbers*, 445. Further cf. ibid., 161: "severe impurity is dynamic, attacking the sanctuary through the air," and Hannah K. Harrington, "How Does Intermarriage Defile the Sanctuary?" (in this volume).

[33] But contrast with *Sipre Num* 125 (Num 19:12): Against the plain sense of the biblical text the punishment of being cut off (Num 19:20) in Sipre only refers to those who enter the temple in a state of impurity, thereby defiling the sanctuary and the sancta. This defilement, then, is thought to be caused by direct contact only, not by aerial transmission.

[34] Cf. Num 5:2–3 and see Milgrom, *Numbers*, 34, 445.

cannot pollute the sanctuary." Inside the camp the impure person would defile it even without direct contact, that is from afar.[35]

Although in the DSS the evidence of the sanctuary's defilement from afar is not as explicit as in the Torah, the concept is still present. A number of traditions attest to the understanding that impurity—"ritual"-physical, "moral," or "genealogical"—is apt to attack the sanctuary from afar. At least three passages deal with "ritual"-physical impurity.[36]

(1) My first example is from the *Temple Scroll*. The closing lines of the passage on purity laws to be followed by all Israelites regardless of their place of residence (11QT[a] 51:5–10) state that by defiling themselves the Israelites assault the holiness of God "who dwells among the children of Israel" (51:7–8). The dwelling place of God in 11QT[a] is the temple city and, more specifically, the sanctuary. For both places the author uses the expression quoted as well.[37] Therefore, if the Israelites living outside Jerusalem by their physical impurities endanger the holiness of God "who dwells among" them, the defilement of the sanctuary must necessarily be thought of as to occur from afar.

(2) In connection with other texts further evidence is found in *MMT* B 48–49: "[For all the sons of Israel should beware] of any forbidden unions and be full of reverence for the sanctuary." From the preceding context (B 39–47) it follows that the term "forbidden unions" refers to impurity due to intermarriage between Jews and Gentiles.[38] The question arises as to what type of impurity is in view, "ritual"-physical, "moral," or "genealogical" impurity. Based on *MMT* alone, the issue cannot be clarified. Two texts, Nehemiah and the *Damascus Document*, that on certain points agree with *MMT*,[39] however, point to the "ritual"-physical dimension of impurity, without necessarily implying defilement of the sanctuary from afar. As Saul Olyan has shown, in Neh 13:4–9 "other than Tobiah himself, it is difficult to identify a likely source of 'ritual impurity' motivating Nehemiah's purifying actions." Even though the "cause of pollution is alienage rather

---

[35] Cf. ibid., 33–34, 445, quotation at 33. The distinction between the camp and its outside in Num 5 is formulated with regard to the conditions in the wilderness. In the land of Israel, "the demand for purity is extended to all of God's land (35:34)" (ibid., 34).

[36] For examples of "moral" impurity defiling the sanctuary from afar cf. 11QT[a] 51:11–16; CD 5:7–11; 1QpHab 12:7–9. For genealogical defilement cf. MMT B 48–49 (forbidden marriages).

[37] As related to the temple city cf. 11QT[a] 45:13–14; 47:3–4, to the sanctuary 46:3–4, 9–12.

[38] Cf. Qimron and Strugnell, DJD 10:139.

[39] Nehemiah is adduced for the interpretation of MMT by several scholars, e.g. Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 43, Christine Hayes, "Intermarriage and Impurity in Ancient Jewish Sources," *HTR* 92 (1999), 3–34, esp. 9–13, and Harrington, "Intermarriage."

than contact with corpses, skin disease, or the experience of a defiling effusion, its effect is to pollute in the manner of 'ritual' impurity." Tobiah, an Ammonite YHWH-worshipper, here is depicted as "a perpetual polluter, a threat to the holiness of the sanctuary."[40]

"Ritual"-physical impurity due to alienage can also be discerned in 4QD[a] 5 ii 9–11. This text states that "[anyone of] the sons of Aaron who has been a captive among the Gentiles [should not approach their division for priestly duty] to defile it with their impurity."[41] This halakah implies that any priest who has lived among Gentiles has become a perpetual polluter merely through casual contact with them. The defiled priest, if included in the priestly duty, would pass on impurity to his priestly division and eventually defile the sanctuary.

Another example of "ritual"-physical impurity caused by alienage is found in *Jubilees*. Similar to *MMT* B 42–46, *Jub.* 30:14 prohibits intermarriage of both Jewish men and women with foreigners and the integration of the latter into the congregation of Israel.[42] The reason given is Israel's defilement. Additional instructive details are found in the context. *Jubilees* 30:10 describes a man marrying off his daughter to a non-Jew as "caus(ing) defilement of his daughter," as giving "some of his seed to Molech" and as "sin(ning) so as to defile it." The type of impurity in view is clearly not "moral," for the daughter is said to be defiled and not the father. By giving his daughter in marriage to a Gentile, he is the perpetrator of an unlawful act and therefore would have to be qualified as "morally" impure if the language of purity were applied to him. In any case, since "moral" impurity cannot be passed on,[43] it is impossible that the daughter should be affected by it. Genealogical impurity can be ruled out as well, since by intermarriage the "seed" itself, the daughter, cannot possibly be affected, only her future offspring. What remains, is "ritual" impurity, the cause of which, again, is alienage: The alien husband defiles the Israelite woman.[44]

---

[40] Saul M. Olyan, "Purity Ideology in Ezra-Nehemiah as a Tool to Reconstitute the Community," *JSJ* 35 (2004), 1–16 at 11–12. Olyan here argues against both Klawans, *Impurity*, 43–46, and Hayes, "Intermarriage," 5, who reject the notion that in late biblical and Early Judaism "ritual" impurity of Gentiles is found; cf. Olyan, ibid., 1.

[41] Numbering and translation according to Qimron, *Hebrew Writings*, 26. This text is given as 4QD[a] 5 ii 4–6 by Joseph M. Baumgarten, DJD 18:50, and García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 588–89.

[42] *Jub.* 30:14 corresponds to *MMT* B 42–46. For *MMT* cf. Qimron and Strugnell, DJD 10:159.

[43] Cf. Klawans, *Impurity*, 5, and Olyan, "Purity Ideology," 26.

[44] In *Jub.* 30 the prohibition of intermarriage is linked to the story of the rape of Dinah in Gen 34. Conversion to Judaism as a way to allow for intermarriage with the Shechemites,

Intermarriage, however, does not only cause the defilement of individual Israelites but of the sanctuary as well (*Jub.* 30:15–16). Similar to Neh 13 and 4QD[a] 5, the type of impurity concerned is alienage which causes the pollution of the temple in the manner of "ritual"-physical impurity. This emerges from 30:16 which talks about "the man or woman who defiled his sanctuary," with "man or woman" referring to those living in intermarriage. Whereas "man" in *Jub.* 30,1–17 can refer either to a man who gives his daughter in marriage to a Gentile[45] or to one married to a foreign woman, the case of "woman" is unambiguous. "Woman" and the other terms used in *Jub.* 30 for females exclusively refer to Israelite or Gentile women who have cross-ethnical sexual relations. In terms of purity such relations, as seen, must be interpreted as causing "ritual"-physical pollution. If related to the sanctuary, pollution through intermarriage must necessarily be understood as effecting defilement from afar.

In sum: The texts adduced to the interpretation of *MMT* B 48–49 demonstrate that alienage may defile buildings, including the temple (Nehemiah, *Jubilees*), and persons (4QD[a], *Jubilees*). In addition, *Jubilees* links defilement caused by intermarriage to the defilement of the temple. These observations substantiate Hannah Harrington's claim that *MMT* B 48–49 "considers the act of intermarriage as already defiling" the sanctuary.[46] Based on the materials discussed above, however, two more qualifications concerning *MMT* must be added. The defilement of the sanctuary through intermarriage in *MMT* must be interpreted in terms of "ritual"-physical impurity, with impurity attacking the temple from afar.

(3) Another example is CD 5:6–7: "And they also defiled the temple, for they did not keep apart in accordance with the law, but instead lay with her who sees the blood of her menstrual flow." Although this passage is explained by most interpreters in terms of "moral" impurity,[47] there is strong evidence for interpreting it primarily in terms of "ritual"-physical impurity: the Cave 4 *Damascus Document* materials point to the fact that the prohibition of cohabitation with a menstruant is not only formulated

---

which is considered in Gen 34, is not mentioned in the rewriting of the biblical story in Jub; cf. Hayes, "Intermarriage," 21–22.

45 These statements are based on the English translation of *Jubilees* by O. S. Wintermute, *OTP*, 2:112–13. If "those who cause defilement" by giving their children in marriage to Gentiles are to be counted among "those who defile the sanctuary" (30:15), moral defilement of the temple would be in view as well.

46 Harrington, "Intermarriage." Also see her rendering of *MMT* B 48–49: "beware of any impure sexual mixture . . . , and be afraid of (defiling) the sanctuary" (ibid.).

47 Cf. esp. Klawans, *Impurity*, 53–56.

with Lev 18:19 in view,[48] a text from the Holiness Code reflecting the idea of "moral" defilement,[49] but also with Lev 15:24 in view, a text clearly dealing with "physical" impurity.[50] Furthermore, CD 5:6–7 and Lev 15:24 have two elements in common. The texts share the verb "lie" as well as the idea that impurity is transmitted from the woman to the man which is a characteristic of "ritual" impurity. Finally, according to Lev 15:31, the 'physical' impurities mentioned earlier in the chapter, among them impurity due to cohabitation with a menstruant, are apt to pollute the temple from afar. This is exactly what is presupposed in CD 5:6–7.[51]

(2.2.) Having demonstrated that also according to the DSS "ritual"-physical impurity in all likelihood is thought to be transmitted to the temple from afar, the question arises of how the Scrolls deal with the defilement of the temple due to "physical" impurity. The DSS, unfortunately, are silent on this issue. The biblical texts, however, provide information which fits well with what can be learnt from the DSS. The means by which, according to priestly law, the defilement of the temple is removed is the *ḥaṭṭā't*, the purgation offering.[52] In the case of scale disease and irregular genital discharge it must be offered at the sanctuary as part of the sacrifices prescribed in the Torah.[53] By way of contrast, a purgation offering at the sanctuary for corpse defilement is not required. Still, corpse defilement is not left without a purgation offering. In Num 19:9 the ashes of the red heifer are defined as "purgation offering." According to Milgrom they

---

[48] Cf. 4Q273 5 4–5 אל יקח איש את האש[ה...]מימי ספרה את דם...עד אשר [...]י, and see Ian C. Werrett, *Ritual Purity and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 72; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 87.

[49] Cf. Klawans, *Impurity*, 54, but see Martha Himmelfarb, "Impurity and Sin in 4QD, 1QS, and 4Q512," *DSD* 8 (2001): 9–37, esp. 12–13.

[50] Cf. 4Q266 6 ii 1–2: [... אליה ע]ון נדה עלו ו[א]יש א[שר י]קרב, and see Werrett, *Purity*, 87.

[51] Although "ritual"-physical impurity is the main thrust of CD 5:6–7, interpreted in the wider context of CD/4QD, however, a moral dimension of the text cannot be completely dismissed. Cf. 4Q266 6 ii 1–2, which text interprets the impurity of the male caused by prohibited cohabitation with a menstruant as iniquity (עון נדה). Morally defiling, however, is not physical impurity caused by flux but the transgression of the law; see Himmelfarb, "Impurity," 21.

[52] Cf. Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 256, 857 etc., and Gary A. Anderson, Sacrifice and Sacrificial Offerings, *ABD* 5:879–80. Lawrence H. Schiffman, "'Ôlâ and *ḥaṭṭā't* in the *Temple Scroll*," in *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord. Studies in the Temple Scroll* (ed. Florentino García Martínez; STDJ 75; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 535–63, esp. 360, seems to assume this understanding for the *ḥaṭṭā't* in 11QT[a] as well.

[53] Cf. Lev 14:19, 22 (for scale disease) and Lev 15:15, 30 (for genital discharge).

"continue to operate as a *ḥattȧ̊t*":[54] As emerges from 19:13, the sprinkling of the water of lustration prepared from the ashes of the red heifer not only cleanses the bearer of corpse impurity from his impurity but also hinders the defilement of the sanctuary which would occur if purification was delayed because the water of lustration was not dashed on the bearer of corpse impurity.[55]

For the authors of the DSS, Num 19:13, as I propose, is the key to the problem of aerial defilement of the temple by those living in the cities. Given firstly that those living in the cities defile the temple by their impurities but for the time being are not required to offer sacrifices because they do not wish to participate in the temple cult and secondly that the "water of lustration," as pointed out by Baumgarten, is meant for general purification, that is, not only as prescribed in the Torah for corpse defilement but also for any other impurity, including scale disease and genital discharges,[56] it may well be argued that for people living in the cities the sprinkling of the water of lustration not only serves to prevent the defilement of the temple by corpse impurity but by scale disease and genital

---

[54] Milgrom, *Numbers*, 441; but see Baruch A. Levine, *Numbers 1–20* (AB 4A; New York: Doubleday, 1993), 464.

[55] This cleansing of the sanctuary is of utmost importance for it prevents the impure person to be cut off from Israel.

[56] Cf. esp. Baumgarten, DJD 35:83–87, and Harrington, *Purity Texts*, 22, 82. Kazen, "Fragment," 84–85, questions the use of the *mê niddah* for general purification. His main argument is that "(n)one of these texts (sc. the texts adduced by Baumgarten) are unambiguous enough to conclude with any degree of certainty that the *mê niddah* was used for dischargers." Kazen is certainly right in negating the unambiguousness of Baumgarten's individual texts but seems to underestimate the cumulative aspect of the evidence: (1) The texts adduced by Baumgarten not only stem from different writings but also seem to cover both pre-Qumranic (4Q274 2 i 1; 4Q277 1 ii 8–9) and Qumranic texts (4Q284 1 i 7–8 [cf. Harrington, ibid., 63]); 4Q512 1–6 2–3, 5–6). (2) In two texts not discussed by Kazen the mentioning of the water of sprinkling is followed by a prayer hinting at general purification; cf. 4Q284 3 3–5 and 4Q512 1–3 7–9. If Baumgarten's reconstruction of 4Q278 is correct, there is additional evidence for the parallelization of *zāv/zāvāh* and corpse defilement in the context of purification. Furthermore, in 4Q514 1 i 5, 8 identical cleansing rules for "all the temporarily impure" regarding eating are formulated. (3) Kazen, ibid., 80, neglects the evidence for general purification by sprinkling in Philo, *Spec.* 1.261. Philo here talks about the necessity of cleansing the body with ablutions (λουτροῖς) and sprinklings (περιρραντηρίοις). As unambiguously emerges from §257 Philo here not only thinks of corpse impurity but of general impurity: τὸ δὲ σῶμα ἀφ' ὧν ἔθος αὐτῷ μιαίνεσθαι ("the body [purged] of those [impurities] by which he is *commonly* defiled"). Further evidence from Early Judaism is adduced by Baumgarten who in DJD 35:84 refers to early Rabbinic evidence, namely to *Sipre Zuta*, where "the red cow is designated as the means by which Israel was sanctified." Baumgarten interprets the passage to mean that the sprinkling water was "intended for general cleansing from any possible source of impurity."

discharge as well.[57] With the ashes of the red heifer assuming the function of the *ḥaṭṭā't*, temple sacrifices would no longer be necessary for immediate cleansing, that is for the basic cleansing of the impure person and for the prevention of the defilement of the sanctuary through aerial transmission of human impurity.

As indicated above, the purification requirements in the DSS attest to the homogenization of the diverging purity rules of the Bible,[58] the basis of which is often found in the Bible itself. The extension of the *ḥaṭṭā't*-dimension of the water of lustration from its usage in removing corpse impurity to their usage in cleansing from other impurities is no exception. The following arguments are apt to substantiate this statement: The fundamental biblical text for the homogenization of the prescriptions for the bearer of corpse impurity and scale disease and the person having a discharge is Num 5:2–3. This text equally requires all three groups to leave the camp.[59] Furthermore, for each of these groups a *ḥaṭṭā't* is prescribed in the biblical texts.[60] Next, for two of these impurities, namely corpse defilement and scale disease, the Torah prescribes, as mentioned, identical "life-enhancing ingredients . . . in the purificatory rites," that is blood, cedar wood, crimson yarn and hyssop. From there Milgrom concludes that in the biblical text the "scale-diseased person is regarded as a corpse."[61] This understanding is also found in the DSS[62] where it is extended to the person having a discharge as well.[63] The extension of the water of lustration from its usage for corpse impurity to scale disease and irregular discharge may finally be grounded on the shared understanding of Lev 15:31

---

[57] This contrasts with normative halakah according to which sprinkling (in case of corpse defilement) and the blood of the *ḥaṭṭā't*-sacrifice (in case of scale disease and genital discharge) are mutually exclusive; cf. Baumgarten, DJD 35:86. Additionally, it may be noted, that to Rabbi, the author of Mishnah, the water of lustration prepared from the ashes of the red heifer and the blood of the *ḥaṭṭā't* serve as an exact functional equivalent; cf. *Sipre Num* 125 (Num 19:13).

[58] Cf., e.g., Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 1:74–77; Milgrom, "Qumran Cult," 170–76; Baumgarten, DJD 35:83–87; Kazen, "Fragment," 76.

[59] Although in its very own way, this rule is reflected in the DSS as well. The clearest piece of evidence is 11QT[a] 45:15–18 which bars persons having a discharge and bearers of corpse impurity and scale disease from entering the temple city before the end of the purification period of seven days. This rule albeit with different temporal specifications is extended to other groups too, namely to those who had a nocturnal emission or sexual intercourse and to the blind (45:7–14).

[60] Cf. Num 19:9 and above n. 54. This also emerges from *Sipre Num.* 125 (Num 19:13).

[61] Cf. Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 835.

[62] Cf. 4Q266 6 i 8–12 and see Joseph M. Baumgarten, "The 4Q Zadokite Fragments on Skin Disease," *JJS* 41 (1990): 153–65.

[63] Cf. 4Q274 1 i 7–9 and 4Q278 and see Baumgarten, DJD 35:86–87.

and Num 19:13, 20 that impurity due to scale disease and corpse defilement pollutes the sanctuary from afar which, in turn, requires a *ḥaṭṭā't*. As regards scale disease, this is not mentioned expressly but would be implied in the requirement of the purgation offering. Interestingly, in Tannaitic exegesis also, Num 19:13 is used for the purpose of homogenization extending a rule, biblically applying to the bearers of corpse impurity only, to the person having a discharge and the scale-diseased person.[64]

3. Prayer as a Temporary Substitute for the Expiating Function of the Sacrifices

Of the sacrifices prescribed in the Torah for the cleansing of impurity, so far only the purgation offering (*ḥaṭṭā't*) has been dealt with. Leviticus, however, prescribes further sacrifices for scale disease and abnormal genital discharge, that is the burnt offering (*ʿōlāh*) for both impurities and as an additional sacrifice for scale disease the reparation offering (*'āšām*).[65] Both offerings in Leviticus are attributed an expiatory role,[66] a role they also have in the *Temple Scroll*.[67]

Different from the Torah, which strictly separates physical impurity and sin, both entities are connected in the DSS. Therefore, it is hard to imagine that the purificatory process in the cities would be without expiating rites, with expiation being postponed to a future temple visit when the sacrifices necessary to get full access to the temple cult would be offered. This, in fact, is not the case. Rather, there is evidence in both pre-Qumranic

---

[64] Cf. the discussion between R. Josiah and R. Jonathan (T3) in *Sipre Num.* 125 (Num 19:13) on the expression טמא יהיה.

[65] Furthermore, Lev 14:20 mentions the *minḥāh*. As Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 858, has pointed out, this sacrifice does not have a function of its own but acquires the role of the sacrifice it is part of, that is in verse 20 the *ʿōlāh*.

[66] In Leviticus the *ʿōlāh* expressly is attributed this function in Lev 1:4; 9:7; 14:20; 16,24. In 9:7 and 16:24 it serves collective purposes, in 1:4 and 14:20 individual ones. Lev 14:20 is of special importance since the expiatory function here is mentioned in the context of impurity, namely of scale disease. Not quite as clear is Lev 15:15, 30; see Milgrom, *Leviticus*, 926, who negates the expiatory dimension of this sacrifice; but see Levine, *Leviticus*, 96. For the expiatory function of the *'āšām* cf. Lev 5:16, 18, 25–26, in the context of impurity cf. 14:18 and see above.

[67] For the *ʿōlāh* cf. 11QT[a] 27:4: נרצתה העולה לבני ישראל (and see Lev 1:4). For the *'āšām* cf. 11QT[a] 32:6: אשמם לכפר על העם (according to the reading of Qimron, *Hebrew Writings*, 171; Yadin, *Temple Scroll*, 2:138, reads אשמתם and see Maier, *Tempelrolle*, 142, n. 386) and 11QT[a] 35:11–12, 14–15 where the biblical usage of the sacrifice seems to be presupposed; cf. Milgrom, "Studies," 507.

and Qumranic texts that in the purification rituals applied in the cities expiation is achieved through prayer.

The first piece of evidence is a passage from 4Q274 1 i 1–4, a presumably pre-Qumranic text.[68] Although explicit expiatory language is missing, the terminology suggests this dimension. Of the leper or, as the case may be, the man having a discharge (*zāv*)[69] it is said that he shall lie in a bed of sorrow and sit in a seat of sighing; furthermore, his situation is described as one of "affliction." All this is related to the prayer of supplication which by its very nature would imply expiatory purposes.[70]

Much clearer is the evidence of the sectarian *Ritual of Purification* 4Q512 which, as mentioned earlier, explicitly refers to the cities as the dwelling place of the men and women addressed in the text. One of the fragments, 29–32, is characterized by an especially strong vocabulary of sin, forgiveness and atonement.[71] It can serve as an example of how aspects of the temple cult were transferred to purificatory prayers uttered in the process of purification.

After mentioning the burnt offering, the text proceeds with a benediction, which in its first part spells out the consequences of the forgiveness of sin and the purification of the body in terms of renewed access to the sphere of the sacred.[72] As mentioned earlier, in Lev 14 and 15 full access to the sacred is achieved through sacrifice. In the context of Qumran thinking, however, it seems to refer to non-sacrificial cultic access to the presence of God and/or the angels.[73] This interpretation is confirmed by the continuation of the prayer expressing the idea of access to God. The language used is sacrificial language which both reminds of the sacrificial

---

[68] Cf. Harrington, *Purity Texts*, 57.

[69] See above n. 18.

[70] Kazen, "Fragment," 60–61, seems to be correct in arguing that contrary to Baumgarten, DJD 35:100, אל must not be added to the text, for the prayer of supplication would be uttered after the initial cleansing. Kazen's situating of the prayer agrees with the situation presupposed in 4Q414 and 4Q512. The expiatory function of the prayer of supplication proposed is supported by 4Q512 34 15: תחנן על כול נסתר[ו]ת אשמ[תי; further cf. 4Q512 1–3 3; 5 2; 6 1; 15 i + 16 1, 10; 28 4.

[71] For further evidence of this language in the *Purification Liturgies* cf. 4Q512 39 1; 34 15; 23; 15 i + 16 1, 10; 6 1; 5 6; further cf. 4Q414 1 ii-2 i 3–4; 8 4; 13 3.

[72] Cf. 4Q512 29–32 9 which breaks off with לבוא; cf. similarly 39 ii 2: כיא טהרתני ותביאני ב.

[73] Cf. 1QS 9:15; 1QH^a 9 [1]:31–33; 1QH^a 19 [11]:10–14; 4Q284 7 2 (?) and see G. Holtz, "Purity Conceptions in the Dead Sea Scrolls: 'Ritual-Physical' and 'Moral' Purity in a Diachronic Perspective," in *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism* (ed. C. Frevel and C. Nihan; Dynamics in the History of Religion 3; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 519–36, esp. 525–26, 533.

cult and temporarily replaces it. Although the prayer is fragmentary, it is evident that its terminology is indebted to Lev 1, the chapter on the burnt offering (*ʿōlāh*). This offering in Lev 1:4 is attributed expiatory function; in both texts expiation is related to the idea of seeking God's pleasure.[74]

A further indication that 4Q512 29–32 is a non-cultic variant of biblical purification transferred to the cities can be seen in the sequential order of the purificatory elements. Similar to Lev 14 and 15 the fragment seems to presuppose that the water rites serve the initial "ritual"-physical cleansing which is followed by the prayer taking up central aspects of the biblical *ʿōlāh*. This prayer, then, may well be taken as functional equivalent to the *ʿōlāh*-sacrifice.[75]

It may be noted that in the sources discussed above there is no indication whatsoever that the expiatory prayers resulted from a rejection of the temple by the group(s) behind the texts adduced.[76] The prayers form part of the purificatory period of seven days which, in the DSS in accordance with the Torah, is located outside the temple and the temple city. As such they are hardly meant to replace the sacrifices that allow the renewal of cultic access to God. Rather, the expiatory prayers are to be understood as temporary adaption of the expiating dimension of the temple cult to the reality of the life in the cities with an intended purpose of renewing non-cultic access to the sacred.

[74] The terminology used in Lev 1 and the fragment of 4Q512 29–32 is not identical, but related. Concerning the *ʿōlāh* cf. the expression ונרצה לו (Lev 1:4) with 4Q512 29–32: דם עולת רצונכה (in the MT the expression דם עלה is a hapax legomenon; cf. 2 Kgs 16:15); further cf. 11QT[a] 27:4: ונרצתה ה[ע]ולה לבני ישראל. In Lev 1:4 the expiatory function of the *ʿōlāh* is expressly mentioned (לכפר עליו); in 4Q512 29–32 the idea of expiation is expressed in lines 9, 21. In Lev 1:9; Num 28:6 the *ʿōlāh* is called a ריח־ניחוח; cf. with 4Q512 29–32 10 (זכרון ניחוח); 11 (וניחוח רצונכה) and see 11QT[a] 14:6–7; 15:12–13; 16:10 etc. For a semantic field similar to 4Q512 29–32, cf. 11Q5 18:9–11; 1QS 9:4–5; 1QM 2:5.

[75] In 4Q270 7 i 16–17 a comparable substitution of an expiatory sacrifice can be observed: the acceptance of the judgment of the community by a person who transgressed its rules is understood as equivalent to the offering of the *ḥaṭṭāʾt* and the *ʾāšām* in the temple.

[76] For a pre-Qumranic text which implies the expiatory function of the *ʿōlōt* without rejecting the temple cf. 11Q5 18:9–11. Depending upon the reading of 1QS 9:3–6 this passage can be adduced as a Qumranic example. Although prayer and ethical perfection to which expiatory function is attributed here take the place of sacrifice, this need not imply the rejection of the temple; see Martin Goodman, "Religious Variety and the Temple in the Late Second Temple Period and its Aftermath," *JJS* 60 (2009): 202–13, esp. 208–9.

4. Conclusion

(1) If the proposed reading of the texts dealt with above is correct, we must reckon with two separate but complementary purificatory rituals, one in the realm of the profane, the cities, the other in the realm of the sacred, the temple city. Whereas the ritual in the cities prepares for the full reintegration into the realm of the profane, the additional rites of the eighth day are the final presupposition for access to the realm of the sacred.

(2) The purificatory ritual for the cities adapts the basic functions of the biblical rituals to the reality of the cities, namely the bodily cleansing through washings, launderings, shavings, and sprinklings; the purgation for the aerally polluted sanctuary through the sprinklings of the water of lustration prepared from the ashes of the red heifer; and expiation through prayer.

(3) Since the texts discussed presumably stem from both pre-Qumranic and Qumranic times, the purificatory rituals in the cities cannot be interpreted in terms of a possible withdrawal of the Qumranites from Jerusalem and the temple. The two-partite purificatory ritual in the DSS is rather to be understood as an equivalent to the graded holiness of temple, temple city and the cities.

(4) The evidence of two different purificatory rituals in both pre-Qumranic and Qumranic texts points to the existence of a coherent view of ritual purification underlying the texts from the Scrolls discussed in this paper. This coherence concerns the halakic issues adapted from the Torah as well as the connection of physical purification and prayer in the ritual of the cities.[77] It contrasts with many other issues in the DSS on which different perspectives due to either developments in the field of history of ideas or to divergent authorial views can be observed. One of its reasons might be seen in that this coherence is a reflection of similar tendencies emerging in Second Temple times in wider circles of Judaism.[78]

---

[77] See above on 4Q274 1 i 1–4 and 4Q512 29–32. The connection of physical purification and prayer in the DSS may have precedents in pre-Scroll ideas such as found in Ps 51; cf. Ernst Würthwein, "Bemerkungen zu Psalm 51," in *Neue Wege der Psalmenforschung* (ed. Klaus Seybold and Erich Zenger; Freiburg: Herder, 1994), 381–88, esp. 384–85, and Klaus Seybold, *Die Psalmen* (HAT I/15; Tübingen: Mohr, 1996), 212–13; their reading of Ps 51, however, is rejected by other scholars.

[78] For a differentiation between the two phases of purification see above (Philo) and the following; for the connection of purification and prayer cf. *L.A.E.* 6–7 and *Sib. Or.* 4:165–168 and Baumgarten, DJD 35:92–93; and see the following.

(5) The two-partite purificatory ritual resulting in the reduction of sacrifical requirements fits in with other evidence from the Second Temple period. In its very own way this can be observed in Tannaitic tradition. Although Mishnah and Tosefta as a matter of principle presuppose the biblical sacrifices as part of the purificatory process, the tendency, which can be observed, is to reduce the number of incidents of impurity due to male and female genital discharge or to births or—as the case may be—to bring together several occurrences of impurity that demand a sacrifice.[79] These observations are confirmed by the Tannaitic concept of the *měḥussar kippūrim*, the person lacking full expiation, because he or she has not offered yet the biblically required purity-related offerings at the Temple. This concept points to the possibility that these offerings were regarded as a biblical ideal which could allow for later realization.[80] This development seems to be due to both ideological and practical reasons both of which could also underlie the DSS-purification ritual of the cities.[81]

---

[79] According to *m. Ker.* 1:7 par *m. Ṭehar.* 4:13 a woman who has had five doubtful fluxes or five doubtful births (in the sense of abortions) is obliged to only one sacrifice (*ḥaṭṭā't*) in order to be allowed to eat from the sacrifices (זבחים [*Ker.*], קודשׁים [*Ṭehar.*]). After a caesarian the woman is not obliged to sacrifice (*m. Nid.* 5:1). A menstrual cycle encompasses a minimum of eighteen days only: After counting the regular number of seven days blood is regarded abnormal only during the 11 days which follow, with blood from the 19th day onward being regarded as the beginning of a new cycle (*m. Nid.* 10:8; further cf. *m. Nid.* 2:2; *t. Nid.* 3:7). Regarding the reduction of sacrifices in case of male flux cf. the discussion between Bet Shammai and Bet Hillel in *m. Zabim* 1:1, 5–6; for reducing the number of incidents of male flux identified as זיבה cf. *m. Zabim* 2:2.

[80] Cf. *m. Ker.* 2:1; *m. Kelim* 1:5.

[81] From *m. Zabim* 2:2 emerges that R. Aqiva wants to reduce the preoccupation with זב-impurity even more than others did. In the DSS, the ideological dimension is seen in their holiness conception.

RELATIONS TO GENTILES IN THE *DAMASCUS DOCUMENT* AND BIBLICAL TRADITION

Albert L. A. Hogeterp

1. Introduction

The *Damascus Document* counts among core legal texts represented in finds from various Qumran caves (4QD$^{a–h}$, 5QD, 6QD) and it plays an important role in the study of the history of the parent movement behind Qumran literature. A recent trend in Qumran scholarship has moved away from Qumran-centric presuppositions about the Scrolls as the library of "the Qumran community" in order to emphasize a view of the Scrolls as library of a broader sectarian movement not confined to the Qumran settlement. The argument for this paradigm shift has focused on the *Serekh ha-Yaḥad*.[1] The *Damascus Document* is long known for presenting a complex situation of community settings. CD-A 7:4–9 // CD-B 19:1–5[2] clearly differentiates two groups: those striving after holy perfection and those who combined a way of life according to the movement's interpretation of Torah with the rule of the land. Recent social-scientific studies labelled the outlook of Qumran sectarianism in introversionist terms of a "high tension with the world" and "self-segregation," thereby including the *Damascus Document* among evidence of Qumran sectarianism.[3]

---

[1] John J. Collins, "Forms of Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. Shalom M. Paul et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 97–111; Sarianna Metso, "Whom Does the Term Yahad Identify?" in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović; STDJ 70; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 63–84; Alison Schofield, *From Qumran to the Yahad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for the Community Rule* (STDJ 77; Leiden: Brill, 2009); John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: the Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010).

[2] The Cairo Genizah text of the *Damascus Document* is from two partially overlapping manuscripts, CD-A (pages 1–8, 15–16, 9–14) and CD-B (pages 19–20). Only where the two overlap, i.e. CD-A 7:5–8:19 // CD-B 19:1–33, this article will differentiate between CD-A and CD-B.

[3] Jutta Jokiranta, "Learning from Sectarian Responses: Windows on Qumran Sects and Emerging Christian Sects," and Eyal Regev, "Wealth and Sectarianism: Comparing Qumranic and Early Christian Social Approaches," in *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament* (ed. Florentino García Martínez; STDJ 85; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 177–209 at 191–92, 205, with reference to concern for the temple and to polemic in the *Damascus*

This essay presents a test case for the reconsideration of "tension with the world," the subject of outsiders to Judaism in the worldview of the *Damascus Document*, namely Gentiles. Our point of departure for reconsideration concerns the question how D's viewpoint about relations to Gentiles connects with biblical tradition and whether it develops biblical positions in new directions. This question has hitherto not received in-depth treatment with regard to the *Damascus Document*. The essay aims to evaluate whether and how the study of relations to Gentiles in the *Damascus Document* and biblical tradition adds to a new perspective on the Scrolls as the library of a sectarian movement with broader communal settings and social ramifications.[4]

The subject of Qumran viewpoints about Gentiles and relations to Gentiles hitherto formed part of broader surveys of literature.[5] In fact, a distinction between a "we" group and "others" within historical Israel has been deemed more characteristic of Qumran sectarian thought than a distinction between Israel and other peoples, i.e., Gentiles.[6] Nevertheless, the evaluation of a Qumran standpoint of "tension with the world" should also take into account the picture of attitudes to Gentiles.

The Cave 4 manuscripts of the *Damascus Document*, officially published in 1996, comprise more reference to Gentiles than previously known on the basis of the Cairo Genizah manuscripts. The *Admonition* comprises just one section with more extensive reference to Gentiles in the overlapping pages of CD-A 8 and CD-B 19. The *Laws* comprise more passages with reference to Gentiles (CD 9:1; 11:2, 14–15; 7:6b–11; 14:15). However, the

---

Document, and 211–29 at 213–19, 227–29, with reference to wealth and sectarian ideology in both the *Community Rule* and the *Damascus Document*.

[4] Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community*, devotes one chapter to the *Damascus Document* (12–51), cf. 21–22: "*the kinds of issues* that lead to sectarian separation in 4QMMT are quite similar to those cited in the *Damascus Rule*. They are primarily disputes about the correct interpretation of the Torah, especially in matters pertaining to purity, and about the cultic calendar."

[5] See e.g. Lawrence H. Schiffman, "Non-Jews in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Quest for Context and Meaning* (ed. Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon; BibInt 28; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 153–71; J. M. Baumgarten, "Gentiles," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 304–6; Menahem Mor et al., eds., *Jews and Gentiles in the Holy Land in the Days of the Second Temple, the Mishnah and the Talmud: A Collection of Articles* (Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi, 2003); Israel Shatzman, "Jews and Gentiles from Judas Maccabaeus to John Hyrcanus According to Contemporary Jewish Sources," in *Studies in Josephus and the Varieties of Ancient Judaism* (ed. Shaye J. D. Cohen and Joshua J. Schwartz; AJEC 67; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 237–70.

[6] Florentino García Martínez, "Invented Memory: The 'Other' in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Qumranica Minora II: Thematic Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar; STDJ 64; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 187–218 at 192–208 on the "other" in the *Damascus Document*.

Cave 4 manuscripts further attest to materials with reference to Gentiles hitherto unparalleled.

A composite edition of the *Damascus Document* based on all textual witnesses has only recently been published by Wacholder in 2007.[7] Previous work on Scripture in the *Damascus Document* has focused much on the Cairo Genizah manuscripts and to a lesser extent on the Cave 4 manuscripts.[8] The question of how D's viewpoint about Gentiles relates to biblical tradition thereby merits renewed consideration.

Terms for non-Jewish people vary in the *Damascus Document*. The terms העמים and הגוים consecutively occur in the *Admonition* (CD-A 8:10 and 15 // CD-B 19:23 and 27). The *Laws* in CD-A consistently refer to גוים as term for Gentiles, but MS A of the *Damascus Document* from Cave 4 employs the term עמים (4QD[a] 11 10). The *Damascus Document* further includes a number of usages to designate non-Jewish people in the singular: בן הנכר in CD 11:2 and גוי נכר in CD 14:15. The term גר, which occurs in CD 6:21, could further merit consideration. However, its interpretation differs, ranging from "foreigner religiously integrated in Israel," according to Berthelot, to "proselyte," according to other scholars, including Schiffman and Wacholder.[9]

In CD 5:17 // 4QD[a] 3 ii 4, גוי refers to the people in Israel who lack understanding according to the sectarian perspective, which here draws on biblical language from Deut 32:28. When further specified as גוי נכר, the concept denotes "foreign people" in CD 14:15. However, outside D, the designation גוי קדוש, denoting "a holy people," occurs in 4Q504 (4QDimHam[a]) 4 10.

I will now turn to discussion of separate passages on Gentiles in the *Admonition*, the *Laws*, and the additional materials of Cave 4 manuscripts.

---

[7] Ben Zion Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document: The Midrash on the Eschatological Torah of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Reconstruction, Translation and Commentary* (STDJ 56; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

[8] See Jonathan G. Campbell, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1–8, 19–20* (BZAW 228; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995); Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, "The Cave 4 Damascus Document Manuscripts and the Text of the Bible," in *The Bible as Book; The Hebrew Bible and the Dead Sea Discoveries* (ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov; London: the British Library, 2002), 93–111.

[9] Cf. Katell Berthelot, "La notion de גר dans les textes de Qumrân," *RevQ* 19/74 (1999): 171–216 at 194–95 and 215; Schiffman, "Non-Jews in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 169–70; Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 231 and n. 185. Cf. Stephen Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 66; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 163–206 (Coordinate #2. The Integration of the גר and the Covenant "for all Israel") at 196–97 on גר as part of the members of the camps in CD 14:3–6.

2. Reference to Gentiles in the *Admonition*

CD-A 8 and CD-B 19 comprise two different recensions of a text unit within the *Admonition* that concerns Gentiles with reference to biblical passages. Cave 4 evidence has not resolved the debate about an original text according to the survey by Hempel,[10] even though Wacholder has postulated a composite edition of CD-A 7:6–8:21 and CD-B 19:1–34a.[11] According to Campbell's study of Scripture in the *Admonition*, the difference between the recensions is not an absolute difference as regards a quotation of Hos 5:10 in CD-B 19:15–16, because an allusion to this biblical verse does occur in CD-A 8:3, which also refers to judgement of the princes of Judah.[12] It is beyond the scope of this essay to test theories about the origins of the two respective recensions. I will go into the respective pages, CD-A 8 and CD-B 19, consecutively.

2.1. *CD-A 8:8–12*

Within a pericope variously delimitated by Davies between lines 2b–19 on the subject of "a critique of the authorities"[13] and between lines 1b–21 on the subject of "the deserters" according to Wacholder,[14] CD-A 8:8–12 concerns the Gentiles. The passage envisages judgement and retribution against Judaean leadership that is faulted with various ways of betrayal of and rebellion against the covenant. The leaders of Judah, שרי יהודה, are faulted with a number of misdeeds from which those who adhere to the covenant have been said to keep apart in CD 6:14–7:4. These include sexual immorality, wicked wealth, and resentful deeds against one's brother.

CD-A 8:8–12 fills in a sectarian picture of what results from not keeping apart from the people in dedication (to good leadership) (ולא נזרו מעם) and deliberate neglect:

> walking on the path of the wicked ones, about whom God says: "Their wine is serpents' venom and cruel poison of asps." *Blank* The serpents are the

[10] Charlotte Hempel, *The Damascus Texts* (CQS 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 78 on the points of correspondence of 4QD[a] 3 iii–iv and 4QD[d] 5 with CD-A on the one hand and of 4QD[a] 3 iii 25 with CD-B 19:15 and of 4QD[d] 6 with CD-A 8:5–6 and CD-B 19:17–19 on the other.

[11] Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 40–45 and 234–44.

[12] Campbell, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1–8, 19–20*, 29.

[13] Philip R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"* (JSOTSup 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), 155–71.

[14] Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 240–46.

> kings of the peoples *Blank* and their wine is their paths, and the asps' poison is the head of the kings of Greece, who comes to carry out vengeance against them.[15]

This perception of Gentile execution of vengeance against traitors of the covenant coheres with that of other sectarian texts, such as the *Pesher to Habakkuk*. It should be noted, however, that the association of the path of the wicked ones with the paths followed by the kings of the peoples (מלכי העמים) does not stand isolated from early Jewish literature outside Qumran. For instance, 1 Macc 1:11–15 describe lawlessness and abandonment of the covenant in terms of observing statutes of the Gentiles, of joining with the Gentiles, and of "selling oneself to do evil" (1 Macc 1:15).

The reference to Gentile leadership and its execution of vengeance revolves around a sectarian interpretation of Deut 32:33, which corresponds with the Masoretic Text. Deut 32:28–33 refers to godless adversaries to which a people void of counsel is given up. Contrary to the flow of subsequent sections of Deut 32, CD-A 8:8–12 applies the theme of vengeance to Gentile ways over against perceived wickedness of Judaean leadership rather than to vengeance on adversaries in order to vindicate the people of the covenant (Deut 32:34–43). Nevertheless, a conceptualization that likens the asps' head to the head of the kings of Greece also implies a negative perception of such adversaries. This aspect appears consistent with the Deuteronomic text.

The other side of the sectarian reading of Deuteronomy with a view to Gentiles follows in CD-A 8:14–19. This passage refers to parts of Deut 9:5 and 7:8 consecutively, reading: "Not because of your justice, or for the uprightness of your heart are your going to *subdue* these nations (לרשת את הגוים האלה), but because he loved your fathers and keeps the oath" (CD-A 8:14–15).[16] CD-A 8:16–18 applies this to those who remain faithful to the ancestral covenant. The subdual of the nations in CD-A 8:14–15 differs from Deut 9:5 which rather refers to possession of their lands and to the wickedness of these nations. CD-A 8:14–15 does not focus on these aspects, but insists on loyalty to the ancestral covenant which keeps wicked ways that lead to Gentile vengeance out of Israel. Subdual of nations thereby appears primarily related to subdual of the threat of their acts of vengeance rather than denoting subdual in a material sense of possession of

---

[15] Translation from Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Study Edition: Volume 1* (*1Q1–4Q273*) (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 563.

[16] Translation from García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 563 with the exception of the cursive part.

lands.[17] The material sense would run counter to another passage in the *Damascus Document* that generally counsels against the violent taking of riches from Gentiles (CD-A 7:6–8). I will turn to this latter passage when discussing sections in the *Laws*.

2.2. *CD-B 19*

I now turn to the overlapping passage in the recension of CD-B 19:13–33. I will not go into all details, since many lines are identical to the recension of CD-A 8. One difference to which I wish to draw the attention is the citation of Hos 5:10 in CD-B 19:15–16, which introduces the theme of judgement of the "princes of Judah." The cited text by and large corresponds with the Masoretic text of Hos 5:10. The biblical verse comprises reference to the leaders' act of "shifting the boundary," which sets the stage for wrath and ultimately for vengeance carried out by the Gentiles. The fact that Judaean leadership is polemically typified in terms of Hos 5:10 as "shifters of the boundary" plays a more structural part in the *Damascus Document*.

The "shifting of the boundary," probably the boundary of the ancestral covenant, is an issue right at the beginning of the prologue preserved in 4QD^{a} 1a–b 3. It further plays a part in CD 1:16–17, where removal of the boundary that marks the inheritance of the ancestral covenant is concerned. CD 5:20 // 4QD^{a} 3 ii 7–8, 4QD^{b} 2 4, 6QD 3 2–3 further mentions shifters of the boundary in "the age of devastation of the land" who made Israel stray. The concept of the shifting of the boundary as infraction against ancestral covenant boundaries makes part of the *Admonition*, but not of the *Laws*.

In the passage under consideration, the act of shifting the boundary sets the stage for judgement and for vengeance carried out by Gentiles. Apart from the citation of Hos 5:10, the "shifting of the boundary" denotes removal of a landmark of one's neighbour in Deut 19:14 and 27:17, while it signifies the removal of an ancestral landmark in Prov 22:28. Both biblical overtones, that of material markers of possession and that of ancestral tradition, appear to play in the background when CD-B 19:17 refers to the path of traitors marked by licentiousness and wicked wealth.

---

[17] *Contra* the translation of CD-A 8:14–15 as "to inherit these Gentile lands" by Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 45. The biblical ארצם of Deut 9:5 does not make part of the citation in CD-A 8:14–15.

2.3. *Treason Listed in the Catalogue of Transgressions*

Before turning to the subject of Gentiles in the *Laws*, I briefly refer to the "Catalogue of transgressions" in 4QD^{e} 2 i 9–ii 18. This catalogue has been located in an intermediate position between the main part of the *Admonition* and the *Laws* by Hempel. The catalogue anticipates on issues in the *Laws* (CD 15–16, 9–14) and is followed by an introduction to an "admonitory passage" (4QD^{e} 2 ii 19–21).[18]

The catalogue includes the following transgression: "[whoever] divulges the secret of his people to the pagans, or curses [his people or preaches] rebellion against those anointed with the spirit of holiness and error" (4Q270 2 ii 12–14).[19] The parallelism of the perceived misdeeds appears to imply that the divulging of the secret of one's people to the Gentiles entails treason. This description of a transgression involving Gentiles partly runs parallel to a passage in the *Temple Scroll* (11QT^{a} 64:6–8). Differently from the passage in the *Temple Scroll*, where Deut 21:22–23 is generally in view, the fragmentary "Catalogue of transgressions" does not preserve punishments envisaged for each separate transgression. However, 4QD^{e} 2 ii 18–20 generally conceives of God's judgement and distinguishes "paths of life" from "ways to the pit."

The transgression involving treason of one's people to the Gentiles, as it is formulated in the "Catalogue of the transgressions," seems to have no clear parallel in biblical tradition.[20] Biblical laws against idolatry (Deut 12:32–13:18) comprise reference to rebellion against God (Deut 13:6), while Exod 22:28 and Lev 24:10–16, 23 comprise laws against cursing and blaspheming the Name. Proverbs 11:13 and 20:19 provide a negative context for the revelation of secrets, but do not refer to Gentiles. The specified sense of betrayal of one's people to the Gentiles and of rebellion against those anointed with the spirit of holiness in 4QD^{e} 2 ii 12–14 has no direct biblical parallel. Only 2 Macc 13:21 provides a phrase, προσήγγειλεν δὲ τὰ μυστήρια τοῖς πολεμίοις, whose purport parallels the Hebrew phrase אשר יגלה את רז עמו לגואים, in terms of orientation of the act of treason against one's people toward non-Jews, i.e. Gentiles. The formulation of a transgression with a view to treason to Gentiles as specified in 4QD^{e} 2 ii 12–14

---

[18] Hempel, *The Damascus Texts*, 33–34.

[19] García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 609.

[20] Cf. Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 288, who critiques previous comparison of the catalogue with Deut 27 by Baumgarten and Hempel, noting a retracting statement by Baumgarten and a divergent syntax.

thereby appears to constitute an extra-biblical development in the context of Early Judaism since the Maccabean era.

3. Relations to Gentiles in the Laws

3.1. *Proscriptions Entailing Gentile Statutes*

Turning from the *Admonition* to the *Laws*, the first passage in CD-A that has Gentiles in view is line 1 of page 9 (CD 9:1 // 4QD^{a} 8 ii 8–9, 4QD^{e} 6 iii 15–16). The Hebrew text, כל אדם אשר יחרים אדם מאדם בחוקי הגוים להמית הוא, has been variously translated by García Martínez and Tigchelaar and by Wacholder respectively. Thus, the *Study Edition* translates "Every man who vows anyone else to destruction shall be executed according to the laws of the gentiles."[21] Wacholder translates: "Any devotion in which a person proscribes another person by the statutes of the pagans, shall be put to death."[22] The wording of the first part of the Hebrew, כל אדם אשר יחרים אדם, partly echoes Lev 27:28–29, but also differs from it. The D passage three times refers to אדם, whereas the biblical text combines חרם with the verb יחרים. CD 9:1 appears to allude to Lev 27:28–29 as biblical point of reference, whereas the parallel fragments 4QD fragments introduce the sentence with the citation formula ואשר אמר, "and as he said." Even so, the phrase appears to introduce a paraphrase which makes a new point vis-à-vis the biblical text.

Leviticus 27:28–29 focuses on devoted things and those proscribed to capital punishment, but the D text focuses on an interhuman deed of proscribing one another by three times emphatically referring to the term אדם. Reference to laws of the Gentiles does not make part of Lev 27:28–29, but biblical texts generally include reference to Gentile statutes (Lev 20:23; 2 Kgs 17:8, 33; Ezek 5:7; 11:12). Leviticus 20:23 forbids walking in the statutes of the nation cast out before the people, while 2 Kgs 17:33 associates a way of life according to the statutes of the nations with idolatry.

CD 9:1 elaborates on a biblical position in Lev 27:29 by phrasing the vow to destruction as a curse that stands in line with subsequent references to self-righteous resentment, avengement, and accusation of others of capital offences in CD 9:2–8. In the sectarian perspective, such misdeeds put

[21] García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 565.
[22] Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 83.

the transgressor outside the bounds of the covenant and within the orbit of Gentile statutes.

3.2. *Distance from Gentiles in D's Sabbath Laws*

CD 11 includes some injunctions concerning Gentiles as part of Sabbath laws. Line 2 states the following: "He is not to send a foreigner to do what he wishes on the Sabbath day."[23] According to CD 11:2, the Sabbath rest should not be disturbed, not even indirectly by giving instructions to foreigners. The next passage with reference to Gentiles, CD 11:14–15 // 4Q271 (4QD^{f}) 5 i 9, comprises the following injunction: "No-one <should stay> in a place close to gentiles on the Sabbath."[24] Perhaps the expected distance from Gentiles in connection with Sabbath regulations is informed by expected rest from any work and commercial activity on the one hand, and by dedication to the Sabbath day on the other. In fact, this injunction is immediately followed by the injunction not to profane the Sabbath for riches or gain on the Sabbath (CD 11:15). Profanation of the Sabbath through contacts with Gentiles would perhaps entail commercial activity according to the divergent calendar of the nations (cf. 4Q166 [4QpHos^{a}] 2:16).

The injunction not to stay in a place close to Gentiles on the Sabbath implies a world view in which proximity to or contacts with Gentiles could be part of life according to the rule of the land (CD-A 7:6 // CD-B 19:2–3).

This injunction with further concern against commercial activity is not isolated from biblical and early Jewish tradition. General parallels are Neh 13:15–22 and *m. Šabb*. 1:7–9. Nehemiah 13:15–22 narrates a setting of admonition against commercial exchange between people of Jerusalem and Judah and people of Tyre on the Sabbath.[25] *m. Šabbat* 1:7–9 further stipulates refrainment from time schemes of commercial exchange with Gentiles that would infringe on the Sabbath rest. However, the sectarian position appears more stringent and seems to extrapolate the idea of

---

[23] García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 569.

[24] Ibid., 569.

[25] Cf. Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 337, who supposes literary dependence of CD-A 9:15b on Neh 13:15–22 and on *Jub.* 50:8. A form of traditio-historical dependence seems more defendable with regard to *Jub.* 50:8, in view of citation of *Jubilees* as a source of authority in CD 14:2–4, than with regard to Nehemiah, since there are no extant witnesses of this biblical book among Qumran biblical scrolls and Nehemiah is not cited in the *Damascus Document*.

distance from Gentiles on the Sabbath from biblical Sabbath laws (Exod 20:8–11, Deut 5:12–15) that do not mention Gentiles, but only members of one's family, household, and the sojourner who is within peoples' gates.

3.3. *Non-Violence against Gentiles for the Sake of Gain*

Our next passage is CD 12:6b–11a // 4QD^{a} 9 i 16–17, 4QD^{b} 9 iii 1–4, 4QD^{f} 5 i 21–ii 3, a section generally described by Hempel as comprising "a number of restrictions on dealings with gentiles, mainly in the area of trade."[26] The area of commercial activity is in view in the latter part of lines 8b–11a, where the section underlines the explicit concern against trade with Gentiles that could directly or indirectly contribute to idolatrous practices. However, the first part, namely lines 6b–8a, further posits a perspective of non-violence against Gentiles and Gentile riches, "lest they blaspheme, except by the counsel of the association of Israel."

Non-violence against Gentiles for the sake of riches and gain, except for specific injunctions by "the association of Israel," stands out as a matter of principle in the *Damascus Document* that further admonishes against wicked wealth. It should further be noted that bloodshed was a cause of abomination in the viewpoint of D, as CD 2:7–8 illustrates: "And before they were formed he knew their deeds and he abhorred generations because of blood(shed) and he hid his face from the land until they came to an end."[27]

D's position of non-violence against Gentiles for the sake of gain coheres with other Qumran sectarian literature. The injunction against plunder of riches of Gentiles which would give rise to blasphemy further is a topic in the 1QpHab 9:3–7, which refers to plunder of the nations by the "last priests of Jerusalem" in the course of its interpretation of Hab 2:8. This parallel with regard to scriptural interpretation of Hab 2:8 in 1QpHab 9:3–7 is not an isolated point.

A common line of interpretation of Habakkuk is discernible in 1QpHab and CD-A, in that both relate the unbelief in foretold divine workings in their days, as mentioned in Hab 1:5, to a juxtaposition between divine revelation from the Teacher of Righteousness and traitors in the last generation (1QpHab 1:16–2:10; CD 1:10–11). A reading בוגדים rather than ראו

[26] Hempel, *The Damascus Texts*, 39.

[27] Translation mine. Cf. Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 29 and 31 whose translation of CD 2:7–9 presents a parallelism between מעשיהם and דם.

בגוים (MT Hab 1:5) appears to underlie this common line of interpretation in 1QpHab and CD-A.[28]

As for the point of non-violence against Gentiles for the sake of gain, Hab 2:6–20 constitutes a larger scriptural background with woes against evil gain and bloodshed that gives rise to shame rather than to glory. D's position on non-violence against Gentiles for the sake of gain generally echoes this biblical tradition.

3.4. *Captives of Foreign People Considered among the Socially Destitute*

Before turning to legal materials unique to 4QD manuscripts, I briefly refer to CD 14:12–17 // 4QD[a] 10 i 5–10, which describes the concern for material organization of social support of marginalized people in society by the association (החבר). Among those considered in need of social sustenance, CD 14:15 // 4QD[a] 10 i 8 mentions "the prisoner of a foreign people." It has been noted by Wacholder that "nothing in the biblical text (i.e. of Lev 19:9–10 and 23:22) indicates an organized system of social care as described here in sectarian literature."[29] Biblical tradition provides notions of a lamentable situation of captivity in a foreign land, among Gentiles, such as in Jer 13:17, Ezek 6:9, and 2 Chr 6:36–38. Apart from Lev 19:9–10 and 23:22, Deut 14:28–29 refers to support for the Levite, the sojourner, the fatherless, and the widow at the end of every three years (cf. Deut 16:11, 14; 24:17, 19–22). The "prisoner of a foreign people" does not constitute a standard group among references to sojourner, fatherless, and widow in these biblical law texts. D provides a specified organizational plan of elaboration on a general biblical injunction for social welfare. CD 14:12–17 // 4QD[a] 10 i 5–10 is more inclusive in its social concern than a social-scientific label of sectarian "self-segregation" would seem to suggest.

4. Relations to Gentiles in Legal Passages Unique to 4QD Manuscripts

Finally, three passages with reference to Gentiles unique to 4QD manuscripts are under consideration here; one about infidelity under Gentiles that disqualifies priestly service, one about the impurity of materials used

---

[28] William H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk* (SBLMS 24; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979), 53–54.

[29] Wacholder, *The New Damascus Document*, 351.

for making Gentile images, and one about reference to the nations as part of an "expulsion ceremony."

4.1. *Infidelity under Gentiles Disqualifies Priestly Service*

4QD^{a} 5 ii 4–6 // 4QD^{b} 5 iii 8, as reconstructed by Wacholder, reads as follows in translation: "[And anyone] of the sons of Aaron who is taken captive by the pagans [and bows down to graven images and curses the Torah,] profaning it with their impurities, may not lead the [holy] service."[30] This maximal reconstruction could be in line with the larger section of injunctions about features that disqualify the sons of Aaron, including reference to betrayal, to letting his name fall from the truth, and to conduct in the stubbornness of one's heart (4QD^{a} 5 ii 8–11). This passage has no direct parallel in biblical tradition, but it appears to elaborate on Lev 21 regarding impurities and blemishes from which sons of Aaron were expected to remain untouched. Leviticus 21:6 stipulates that the sons of Aaron shall be holy and not profane the name of God and Lev 21 in general provides regulations against defilement and profanation of the priestly service, albeit without reference to impurities conveyed through misconduct in captivity.

4.2. *Impurity of Materials Used for Making Gentile Images*

4Q271 (4QD^{f}) 2 8–10 // 4Q269 (4QD^{d}) 8 ii 1–3 // 4Q270 (4QD^{e}) 3 iii 20–21 concerns the impurity of materials used by Gentiles for the making of images in a passage that provides regulations for what may and may not be brought in for offerings. These lines stipulate that such metals can only be purified when refined as new coming from the oven. The impurity of materials used in Gentile idol worship generally stands at the receiving end of the Decalogue in biblical tradition (Exod 20:3–4, Deut 5:8–9). Wacholder has pointed out that the purification of impure materials used for making Gentile images by fire echoes Num 31:20–23.[31] The D fragments generally refer to such a procedure of purification of Gentile images, without specific indications of a context of war as it occurs in Num 31.

[30] Ibid., 56–57.
[31] Ibid., 284.

4.3. *Ritual of Expulsion*

Finally, a passage in 4QD[a] 11 5b–14b is known as expulsion ceremony against any one who despised the sectarian presentation of precepts. This ritual comprises priestly speech including reference to the "nations," עמים, with their families and languages, whom God caused to err "in a wilderness where there is no way" (4QD[a] 11 9–11 ותתעם בתהו ולו דרך). Apart from priestly speech, the ritual further stipulates total exclusion of the one expelled upon the penalty of condemnation (4QD[a] 11 14–16); a stipulation which could remind of the stringent character of expulsion attributed to the Essenes by Josephus (*J.W.* 2.143–144). With regard to the expulsion ceremony at large, Shemesh compared the permanent character of expulsion of intentional transgressors with a biblical paradigm of excision in Num 15.[32] With regard to the phrase about the "nations" who are said to err in a wilderness where there is no way, D echoes biblical language as well. That is, Ps 107:40 comprises a similar phrase about wandering in a trackless wilderness (ויתעם בתהו לא דרך), in a setting of juxtaposition between contempt for nobles and elevation of the poor from affliction (Ps 107:39–41). This echo of biblical language from Ps 107:40 appears to take up a similar echo of scripture near the beginning of the *Damascus Document*, CD-A 1:15 (ויתעם בתוהו לא דרך).[33] The implication of this repeated echo of language from Ps 107:40 is that the path of the "nations" (4QD[a] 11 9–11) is deemed comparable to the path of those led astray in Israel (CD 1:13–15) in D's perspective.

5. Conclusion

The *Damascus Document*'s position about relations to Gentiles in various ways echoes, paraphrases, cites, and elaborates on biblical tradition. D's perspective appears the more stringent in its restrictions about contacts with and proximity to Gentiles in the Sabbath laws and it further elaborates stipulations with regard to that which blemishes priestly service by the sons of Aaron.

On the other hand, a principle of keeping apart from wicked wealth permeates the *Damascus Document* and also informs a perspective of

---

[32] Aharon Shemesh, "Expulsion and Exclusion in the Community Rule and the Damascus Document," *DSD* 9 (2002): 44–74.

[33] Note that Ps 107:26–27 is referred to in 4Q418b 1 3–4.

non-violence against Gentiles for the sake of riches and gain. Several injunctions with reference to Gentiles imply a worldview that responded to broader social settings, including those of settlements according to the rule of the land in an environment of Jews and Gentiles. D's worldview appears more complex than a dichotomy between mainstream society and self-segregated sectarian thought. Moreover, D's organizational concern with social welfare appears to run counter to this dichotomy.

The sectarian worldview of the *Damascus Document* does comprise "tension with the world" in terms of anti-establishment polemics coupled with separation from the way of the people. Critique of the Judaean leadership joins a perspective of judgement and vengeance carried out by Gentiles against wicked ways of this leadership. D's counter-discourse picks up features of biblical tradition that in several sections are also concerned with broader social settings. Much of the intertextuality with Scripture can be traced back to the Pentateuch, but in regard to critique of Judaean leadership, to non-violence against Gentiles for the sake of gain and to the expulsion ceremony, non-Pentateuchal biblical passages, namely Hos 5:10, Hab 2:6–20, and Ps 107:40, also play a part in the presentation of D's perspective on relations to Gentiles. D's restrictions on relations to Gentiles comprise a withdrawn point of view which at the same time appears aimed at upholding a position of moral integrity in a surrounding world that was a world of both Jews and Gentiles.

"TORAH" AND AUTHORITY IN THE MAJOR SECTARIAN RULES TEXTS FROM QUMRAN

John Kampen

The sectarian texts from the Qumran corpus are characterized in part by the authoritative demands imposed on those who chose to become affiliated with the *yaḥad* or to join the covenant in the land of Damascus. The justification for the particular claims made is not always as self-evident nor is the basis for the various specific injunctions. This question has achieved greater significance with the much more extensive debates about the nature of the canon of the Hebrew Scriptures in the last two centuries B.C.E. and the development of the scriptural texts during that same time period. Determining the nature of their authority and their specific content on a given issue in Second Temple Judaism remains elusive. We must attempt to ascertain the nature of the authoritative claims that undergirded the sectarian Jewish communities of the first and second centuries B.C.E. as expressed in the literature which they produced and understand the basis upon which they made them.

This investigation is to be distinguished from the recent attempts to understand the rhetorical nature of this same literature in studies such as those of Carol Newsom and Maxine Grossman. Newsom, for example, describes her work as an attempt to answer the question, "How to make a sectarian?"[1] While not unrelated, the purpose of this study is to determine the nature of authority for the communities in which this rhetoric was utilized.

Within Judaism of the Second Temple era, we know that "Torah" was important when talking about communal structure, identity, and ethics.[2]

---

[1] This is one of the chapter headings from Carol A. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004). On rhetoric in the Qumran sectarian materials, see also Maxine L. Grossman, *Reading For History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Study* (STDJ 45; Leiden: Brill, 2002); Carol A. Newsom, "Rhetorical Criticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Rediscovering the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods* (ed. Maxine L. Grossman; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010), 198–214.

[2] Marcus K. M. Tso, "The Giving of the Torah at Sinai and the Ethics of the Qumran Community," in *The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. George J. Brooke et al.; TBN 12; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 117–27;

Evidence of the manner in which this tone was set for Second Temple Judaism is present in Neh 8–10 and in the presentation of Ezra as an expert in the law of Moses.[3] Determining its precise content is a much more difficult task.[4] This trajectory through Second Temple literature is evident in the Qumran literature, as well as most other exemplars. Two significant attempts to describe and analyze the manner of this trajectory are found in the work of Sidnie White Crawford and Hindy Najman. In her attempt to advance a satisfactory definition of rewritten scripture, White Crawford in her introductory chapter deals with a spectrum of texts, some of which claim authoritative status for themselves and others do not, however all have their basis in an authoritative text.[5] This spectrum of rewritten texts is an important contribution to our understanding of their authoritative nature, however constitutes an attempt to describe the literary techniques and developments of this tradition rather than to identify the nature and history of their claims to authority.[6]

---

idem, *Ethics in the Qumran Community: An Interdisciplinary Investigation* (WUNT 2.292; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 76–87. For two different approaches to this development, see Bernard S. Jackson, *Studies in the Semiotics of Biblical Law* (JSNTSup 314; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000); Michael LeFebvre, *Collections, Codes, and Torah: The Re-characterization of Israel's Written Law* (New York: T & T Clark, 2006). For a summary, see Hindy J. Najman, "Torah and Tradition," in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (ed. John J. Collins and Daniel J. Harlow; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010), 1316–17.

[3] Ezra 7:6. Note also the plan of the altar in Ezra 3:2, the priestly courses in Ezra 6:18, and the reference to the foreign wives (Ezra 10:3). The significance of this account for Second Temple Judaism was recognized in the influential study by Morton Smith (*Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament* [London: SCM, 1987, orig., 1971]), with his identification of the victory of the "Yahweh-alone" party. Important portions of this hypothesis are already to be found in his article, "The Dead Sea Sect in Relation to Ancient Judaism," *NTS* 1 (1961): 347–60. The significance of his research is discussed by Alexei Sivertsev, "Sects and Households: Social Structure of the Proto-Sectarian Movement of Nehemiah 10 and the Dead Sea Sect," *CBQ* 67 (2005): 59–78, esp. 60–61.

[4] On Ezra and "Torah" see Hindy Najman, "Torah of Moses: Pseudonymous Attribution in Second Temple Writings," in *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity* (ed. Craig A. Evans; JSPSup 33; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 202–16, esp. 214; Eugene Ulrich, "From Literature to Scripture: Reflections on the Growth of a Text's Authoritativeness," *DSD* 10 (2003): 3–25, esp. 14–15.

[5] Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008), 1–18.

[6] See also Moshe J. Bernstein, "Pentateuchal Interpretation at Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Comprehensive Assessment after Fifty Years* (ed. Peter W. Flint and James C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1:128–59; George J. Brooke, "The Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (ed. Edward D. Herbert and Emanuel Tov; London: The British Library, 2002), 31–40.

In the work of Hindy Najman, we find a model of a conceptual basis for how authority is portrayed and understood in these texts. The concept of *Seconding Sinai* begins from an examination of Deuteronomy ("Second Law"). Rejecting any argument that understands Deuteronomy as a replacement for the Covenant Code and to be usurping its authority, Najman argues that this rather is an example of a continuing Mosaic discourse for which Deuteronomy provides the earliest model.[7] In that composition we find an expanded role for Moses and the reworking of an earlier text in such a manner that it is regarded as an authentic expression of a law already characterized as a Torah of Moses.[8] This concept is based in the examples of "discourses that are inextricably linked to their founders."[9] From this basis she identifies four features of Mosaic discourse: (1) through reworking and expansion of older traditions, the new text claims the authority attached to them; (2) the new text ascribes to itself the status of Torah; (3) the new text is said to be a re-presentation of the revelation at Sinai; and (4) the new text is associated with or produced by the founding figure Moses.[10] The uniqueness of Moses as lawgiver, prophet, and faithful scribe/spokesperson for God is elaborated in this text, giving it its authoritative status as Torah. In Deut 34:10–12 we find the epitaph in which Moses is dubbed the ultimate prophet, thereby ascribing definitive status to the composition.[11] Such a claim, to a great deal dependent upon the depiction of Moses in the composition, permits the reader to understand that the entire revelation attributed to him has authoritative status and does not require that this representation supersede the (apparently) earlier one. This and subsequent examples of Mosaic discourse place the reader in the hands of Moses back at Sinai, when Moses was the person who by divine designation made it possible for the people to have direct access to the divine presence, the recipients of revelation. Here on the plains of Moab we find the re-presentation of the revelation at Sinai with Moses as the sole authority able to disclose (and interpret?) the divine word. The re-presentation of Sinai motif is well-established by the time that we leave the Pentateuch.

---

[7] Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 1–40.

[8] This phrase is used here for conceptual clarity. The phrase *torat Moshe* is not found in the Pentateuch, and appears a limited number of times in the Hebrew Scriptures.

[9] Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 12, based on the observations of Michel Foucault.

[10] Ibid., 16–17.

[11] Ibid., 37–39.

These features are then employed in the analysis of *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll*, both compositions from the Qumran corpus that are considered pre-sectarian, or at least non-sectarian, composed at the latest in the second century B.C.E. Najman cites evidence that neither composition is intended to replace the Pentateuch; in the case of the *Temple Scroll* the corpus is far too incomplete in the subjects covered to be considered comprehensive, and with *Jubilees* we find reference to an earlier authoritative Torah. She notes the obvious, that within the Qumran corpus copies of the Pentateuch as well as of these compositions are preserved in substantial numbers.[12] The presence of all four features of the Mosaic discourse can be demonstrated as characteristic of these two compositions.[13] *Jubilees* claims to be a revelation directly from God to Moses at Sinai, albeit via angelic dictation, while the *Temple Scroll* refers to itself as "this Torah." While it may be possible to question whether Najman has been able adequately to reconstruct the concepts of scriptural authority of the authors of the *Temple Scroll* and *Jubilees*,[14] she has demonstrated that they meet her stated criterion as exemplars of Mosaic discourse.[15] Arguments by others have been advanced for the proposal that each composition was considered canonical at Qumran.[16] An important contribution of Najman to this discussion is to advance the manner in which it is possible to claim authoritative status for these texts without having to maintain that they replace the authoritative status of the law in the Pentateuch. That these works making authoritative claims for themselves are based on the figure of Moses and return their readers to Sinai is an important contribution to

---

[12] Ibid., 43–50.

[13] Ibid., 50–69.

[14] Note the review by Justin Dombrowski, *WTJ* 67 (2005): 179–82. I will not evaluate the arguments about Philo or Rabbinic literature.

[15] A similar case is argued utilizing the *Damascus Document* by Maxine L. Grossman in her review article, "Beyond the Hand of Moses: Discourse and Interpretive Authority," *Prooftexts* 26 (2006): 294–301. In contrast to our argument below, she is evaluating the text of the *Damascus Document*.

[16] For the *Temple Scroll*, see Ben Zion Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983), 1–140. He considered the two works one composition: "The Relationship Between 11QTorah (The Temple Scroll) and the Book of Jubilees: One Single or Two Independent Compositions?" *SBL Seminar Papers, 1985* (SBLSP 24; Chico: Scholars Press, 1985), 205–16. For *Jubilees*, see James C. VanderKam, "Jubilees, Book of," *EDSS*, 1:434–48, esp. 437; idem, *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Judaism* (JSJSup 62; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 23–29; idem, "Questions of Canon Viewed Through the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Canon Debate* (ed. Lee Martin McDonald and James A. Sanders; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 91–109, esp. 100–108; White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 60–61.

our understanding of them. It is also worth observing that Deuteronomy itself may have precedent in Exod 34, when Moses has to bring two tablets up to the Lord on Sinai to get a second copy of the tablets to replace those that were broken, thereby providing the occasion for a covenant renewal ceremony.[17] As has been noted, the introductory column of the *Temple Scroll* and *Jub.* 1 appear to follow Exod 34 and Deut 7.[18]

Less convincing in Najman's work is the argument that *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll* are comprised simply of additions and supplements to the earlier codes, and not considered as replacements for them.[19] These would appear not to be the only options, within the perspective of a Mosaic discourse. It seems possible within the model to permit these texts to co-exist without any claim for priority. The "law of Moses" is authoritative; a text which can convince its reader that it is of that nature is to be regarded as such. Grossman's observation that the significance of a text that "seconds Sinai" is the manner in which it reframes the reader's understanding of the original text is an astute attempt to develop this dimension of Najman's work.[20] *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll* are compositions independent of their pentateuchal exemplars and stand upon their own authority. An examination of the alterations and adaptations of those pentateuchal texts is instructive, but not determinative to establish their

---

[17] In *Exod. Rab.* 47:2 (on Exod 34:27) we read: "The Holy One, blessed be He, said to Moses: 'It was I who wrote the first Tables,' as it says, 'Written with the finger of God' (Exod 31:18), 'but do thou write the second Tables, and may I also assist therein.' " We note also the discussion in *y. Šeqal.* 6:1 (49c–d) concerning what happened to the original broken tablets, and what to make of the repetition in the second account that Moses again is commanded to build an ark to house them. See James L. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1998), 734–35. Note that Ibn Ezra suggests that the second set of tablets contained the Deuteronomic version (Deut 5:6–18); see Nahum M. Sarna, *Exodus* (שמות)*: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the new JPS Translation* (The JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia: JPS, 1991), 215.

On the extent to which the tabernacle of Exod 25–30 and 35–40 served as an inspiration for models of the temple in the Second Temple period, see Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, 712–17.

[18] Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1983), 1:40; 2:1–2; Wacholder, *Dawn of Qumran*, 13, 42–43. Wacholder, ibid., 44–47, also understands Exod 34 to be the basis of *Jub.* 1.

[19] White Crawford notes the appeal to the "First Law" in the text of *Jubilees*, which she interprets as evidence that it was not meant to supersede the "base text," but that in subsequent usage it was regarded as authoritative, as attested elsewhere in Qumran texts (*Rewriting Scripture*, 81–82). The claims made in the *Temple Scroll* were for authority equal to the received Torah, however White Crawford does not find evidence that it was ever accepted as scripture in other Qumran texts (*Rewriting Scripture*, 102).

[20] Grossman, "Beyond the Hand," 298–301.

meaning or the authority of their legislation. Thus they are not additions or supplements, but neither do they replace the Pentateuch. While we find an appeal in *Jubilees* to the "first law" and the "later law," presumably acknowledging the authority of the received Torah, rather than the references in the *Temple Scroll* to "this Torah," presumably referring to itself, both are "seconding Sinai" in a similar manner in the appeal to their own legislation as an authoritative statement. Adherents of the communities in which these texts were either developed and/or utilized as authoritative would have misunderstood the meaning and significance of pentateuchal texts for communal life without them.

Corroboration for placing more emphasis on Moses, the founding figure, as an important criterion for determining authoritative texts can be found in the interesting argument advanced by Daniel Schwartz, in which he poses the question, "Special people or special books?"[21] He points out that Qumran texts prefer to speak of the books of Moses, of the prophets, and of David rather than to refer to the texts themselves, e.g., "Torah" or "prophetical books."[22] He notes the preference for citing verses as having been spoken by Moses rather than having been written in his book.[23] This is in contrast to the treatment of Moses in rabbinic texts where any words of Torah that would be attributed directly to Moses would be regarded as heresy.[24] The same impulse lies behind Najman's work, to compile a group of texts that center on the figure of Moses.[25] The selective nature of the utilization of a limited number of figures by the authors of these texts is apparent when noting the statistics compiled by Martin Abegg. He notes that in the Hebrew Bible, 8.5% of the total vocabulary is comprised of personal names, whereas this is true for only 2% in the Qumran texts.[26]

---

[21] Daniel R. Schwartz, "Special People or Special Books? On Qumran and New Testament Notions of Canon," in *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity* (STDJ 84; ed. Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 49–60.

[22] Schwartz, ibid., 50–53, cites 4QMMT C 9–11.

[23] Ibid., 54. E.g., CD 5:8.

[24] Ibid., 55–56.

[25] Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 13–16; see also Grossman, "Beyond the Hand," 295, 297; James E. Bowley, "Moses in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Living in the Shadow of God's Anointed," in *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (ed. Peter W. Flint; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2001), 159–81; George J. Brooke, "Moses in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Looking at Mount Nebo from Qumran," in *La construction de la figure de Moïse—The Construction of the Figure of Moses* (ed. Thomas Römer; TranseuSup 13; Paris: Gabalda, 2007), 209–21; idem, "Moving Mountains: From Sinai to Jerusalem," in Brooke et al., *The Significance of Sinai*, 73–89, esp. 80–84.

[26] Martin G. Abegg, Jr., "Concordance of Proper Nouns in the Non-biblical Texts from Qumran: Introduction," in *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to*

The utilization of the figure of Moses calls for more investigation in this attempt to understand the bases for the claims of authority within these sectarian texts.

This brings us to the main purpose of this paper: to determine what understandings of authority, or at least the basis of the authoritative content, we can identify in the sectarian texts from Qumran. In this case we are testing whether the concept of Mosaic discourse as defined by Najman can be helpful in clarifying this issue. Support for such an investigation can be found in the presence of Deuteronomy as the most frequently attested book from the Pentateuch in the Qumran corpus and second only to Psalms from the entire Hebrew Scriptures.[27] Those texts containing "rules" are the most obvious places to evaluate with regard to issues of authority, so I will limit myself to an examination of selected portions of the S and D texts.[28] We are looking at what these texts say about what they regard as authoritative. In such an exploration, the phrase that immediately attracts the investigator's attention, in view of the material just covered, is *torat Moshe*, "law of Moses."

A pivotal usage of this appellation is to be found in Ezra-Nehemiah.[29] For Second Temple Judaism and the development of Rabbinic Judaism, the reading of *sefer torat Moshe*, "the book of the law of Moses," in the city-gate by Ezra as recorded in Neh 8:1–3 is of tremendous significance.[30] References to the designation "law of Moses" already appear in Ezra 3:2 and 6:18. While the first reference can be understood within the context of legislation known to us from the Pentateuch, the specifications for building

---

the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert *Series* (ed. Emanuel Tov; DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon, 2002), 229–36 at 231. This was noted in Brooke, "Moving Mountains," 79.

[27] James C. VanderKam and Peter W. Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002), 148–50.

[28] Grossman's observation is that when she tests CD as an example of Mosaic discourse, she also finds additional figures to consider ("Beyond the Hand," 297–98). This is significant, but does not affect this evaluation of how the figure of Moses is used in this text.

[29] Najman, "Torah of Moses"; eadem, *Seconding Sinai*, 111–17.

[30] The anachronistic nature of the claims for continuity between this account and *torah še-be-ʿal peh* ("oral torah") in Rabbinic discourse is pointed out by Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 108–11, 117. The relationship between the account of Neh 8–10 and Ezra 8–9 is a source of debate (Ralph Klein, "The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah," in *NIB* 3:663–67). On the unity of Ezra and Nehemiah, see Tamara Cohn Eskenazi, *In an Age of Prose: A Literary Approach to Ezra-Nehemiah* (SBLMS 36; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988); Sara Japhet, "Composition and Chronology in Ezra-Nehemiah," in *Temple Community in the Persian Period* (ed. Tamara C. Eskenazi and Kent Harold Richards; JSOTSup 175; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 189–216.

the altar and the offering of sacrifices, this is less clear with the second instance. In this case, the priestly courses and the divisions of the Levites are not specified in the Five Books of Moses but rather in 1 Chr 23–26, traditionally attributed to David, and then mentioned again in connection with their reinstatement by Josiah in 2 Chr 35:2–5. In the latter passage the designation of these divisions is specified בכתב דויד מלך ישראל ובמכתב שלמה בנו ("in the writing of David King of Israel and in the composition of Solomon his son") for service "in the house which Solomon, the son of David King of Israel, had built."[31] The choice to attribute this requirement to Moses demonstrates an intentionality on the part of the author.[32]

The use of the figure and the authority of Moses for the composition appears to be established with a high level of deliberateness in the first use, 3:12, when the author writes ככתוב בתורת משה איש האלהים ("as it is written in the law of Moses, man of God"). The additional warrant for the authoritative claim is placed upon the person of the lawgiver Moses rather than upon the law itself. Najman also draws attention to Ezra 10:3, in which Shechaniah takes the lead to establish a covenant to drive out all of the foreign women and their offspring, וכתורה יעשה ("and let it be done according to the law"). In this case Najman notes the frequently cited dependence upon Deut 7:3 as the basis of this prohibition, but then observes that the pentateuchal stipulation applies to surrounding nations rather than a general prohibition of intermarriage and that there is certainly no requirement that someone who has married a non-Israelite neighbor must divorce the spouse and expel the children.[33] The argument is not that there is no possible connection between these prescriptions, but rather that the specific law in Ezra-Nehemiah is justified upon the basis of the authority of the figure of Moses rather than upon an explicit statement already found in the Pentateuch.[34] The author also establishes the credentials of Nehemiah in his initial prayer of confession by referring first to "the commandments, the statutes and the laws which you commanded Moses, your servant," and then to "the word which you commanded Moses, your servant."[35] In the days of study following the initial

[31] Klein, "Books of Ezra and Nehemiah," 712–13.
[32] Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 112.
[33] Ibid., 112–15.
[34] Ezra is introduced as a scribe, expert in the law of Moses (Ezra 7:6).
[35] Neh 1:7–8.

reading of "book of the law of Moses" by Ezra,[36] they learn that which was "written in the law that the Lord had commanded by the hand of Moses,"[37] also again referring to "the hand of Moses, your servant."[38] These requirements for the exilic community do not contradict what we find written in the Pentateuch, however they also are not simply an interpretation.[39] The appeal for their authority rests on the figure of Moses, the recipient of the earlier revelation at Sinai who now was seen as the person in Israelite history able to discern the divine will with regard to the stipulations of the covenant. The appeal is to the authority of Moses rather than to a specific body of content.

A similar case could be advanced for much of the material in Neh 10:30–39.[40] The legislation here records details different from or in addition to those included in the Pentateuch for each of the areas covered. With the publication of the *Temple Scroll*, for example, the reference to the wood offering in 10:35 and 13:31 has appeared more significant. The inclusion of a six-day feast of the wood offering in 11QT[a] 23:02–25:01 in the sequence of proposed first-fruits festivals points to a religious practice not recorded in the Pentateuch,[41] but also receives notice in *Jub.* 21:12–14.[42] While this may not have been the practice advocated in Nehemiah, the evidence points to some history of religious observance in this area that was not noted in the Pentateuch. Similar differences with the stipulations of the Pentateuch can be noted in each of the areas included for "those who enter by curse and oath to walk according to the law of God that was given by the hand of Moses, servant of God."[43]

It is at this point where the spectrum and trajectory of texts developed by White Crawford becomes important. We essentially have found external evidence which attests to the idea of a reworked Pentateuch. While

---

[36] Neh 8:1; "book of Moses" in Neh 13:1. In Neh 9:3, they read בספר תורת יהוה אלהיהם ("from the book of the law of the LORD, their God"), apparently the same document as mentioned in these other citations, assuming that the words uttered by Moses on behalf of God are the same as those of God.

[37] Neh 8:14.

[38] Neh 9:14; or "servant of God" (10:30).

[39] The designation *torat Moshe* is not found in the Pentateuch.

[40] Note also Neh 13:4–29, which has references back to some of the legislation in the previous passage, however not as clearly stated for our purposes. On Neh 13, see Eskenazi, *In an Age of Prose*, 135, 151–52; Klein, "Books of Ezra and Nehemiah," 846–50.

[41] Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1:122–31; White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 49–51.

[42] Lawrence H. Schiffman, *The Courtyards of the House of the Lord: Studies on the Temple Scroll* (ed. Florentino García Martínez; STDJ 75; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 101, 114–15.

[43] For an analysis of these laws, see David J. A. Clines, "Nehemiah 10 as an Example of Early Jewish Exegesis," *JSOT* 21 (1981): 111–17.

we do not have a written text, we do find reference to a *sefer torat Moshe* ("book of the law of Moses") and the indication that they "read" from this text, the Levites translated and explained it, and the priests, Levites and heads of the clans studied it.[44] In terms of literary development, we find evidence of what White Crawford has identified as content-editing and hyper-expansion in Reworked Pentateuch.[45] We are unable to determine whether this text contained material that moved it further along the spectrum of addition, modification, and conflation that resulted in a clearly-identifiable new work, such as the *Temple Scroll* or *Jubilees*.[46] There is nothing in the text of Ezra-Nehemiah that would constitute conclusive evidence of the latter. Let us recall, however, that the authority of the text rests not upon the specific content but rather the claim made with regard to the figure of Moses and the revelation at Sinai. The evidence does attest to the authoritative nature of this reworked text.

When we turn our attention to the legislative material from Qumran, we immediately discover that the designation, "law of Moses," is used almost exclusively in those sections describing the oath "to return to the law of Moses" sworn upon admission to the "covenant" or the *yaḥad* ("community"). There are three major literary units within the S and D compositions that cover procedures for the admission of new members to the group. For the sake of convenience, I list them initially according to their placement in the most complete copies of these texts.[47]

While recent research on the history of the S and D materials has demonstrated a complex development within each collection, making it difficult to identify any single date of composition, many of the D manuscripts are considered to represent an earlier stage of development than that reflected in the S documents.[48] We note that on the basis of attitudes

---

[44] Neh 8:1–18.

[45] White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture*, 39–57.

[46] Ibid., 60–102.

[47] 1QS 5:7b-20; 6:13b-23; CD 15:1–16:16; James C. VanderKam, "The Oath and the Community," *DSD* 16 (2009): 416–32. I have followed his delineation of the passages in this article. He also includes 1QS 1:16–3:12 and *B.J.* 2.137–42. These two references receive further mention below.

[48] We note that for the most part the initial work of scholars such as Sarianna Metso (*The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* [STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997]) and Charlotte Hempel (*The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Tradition and Redaction* [STDJ 29; Leiden: Brill, 1998]) concentrated on the developments within the two sets of materials independent of one another. In opposition to this chronology, Eyal Regev understands the two sets of materials to represent rival groups: "The Yahad and the Damascus Covenant," *RevQ* 21/82 (2003): 233–62.

toward the temple reflected in the compositions, Kapfer regards the *Damascus Document* as earlier than the *Community Rule*.[49] Both Hultgren and Schofield advance a similar case, even if not on the same basis.[50] In her analysis of the *Damascus Document*, Hempel does regard most of the materials to reflect the non-polemical stance of a pre-sectarian composition, with some evidence of minor revisions reflecting influence from the S texts.[51] Her examination of the texts relating to a penal code produce similar results.[52] Her treatment of the passages concerning the admissions procedures follows the same pattern. She regards CD 15:5b–10a as forming the background for 1QS 5:7c–9a, with their related emphasis on the swearing of an oath.[53] These two passages contrast with 1QS 6:13b–23 with its more elaborate procedures and predate it. Both CD 15:9 and 1QS 5:8 have the inductee return to the "Torah of Moses" rather than to "the truth," thereby providing support for Hempel's argument for development in the description of the procedures.[54] Of significance is the presence of the term *torat Moshe* in 4Q256 (4QS^{b}) 9:7 and 4Q258 (4QS^{d}) 1:6 in lines

---

[49] Hilary Evans Kapfer, "The Relationship Between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule: Attitudes Toward the Temple as a Test Case," *DSD* 14 (2007): 152–77. She also has reviewed the major literature on the subject in her article. Her portrayal of the significance of the temple for the D materials coheres with my portrayal, "The Significance of the Temple in the Manuscripts of the Damascus Document," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings* (ed. Robert A. Kugler and Eileen M. Schuller; SBLEJL 15; Atlanta: Scholars, 1999), 185–97. Her treatment of the work of Philip Davies (esp. *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"* [JSOTSup 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982], 173–201) could be misunderstood (pp. 161–63), when she cites him as someone who argued for the priority of the *Damascus Document* to the *Community Rule*. What Davies argues in this section is that the *Damascus Document* was substantially composed before the foundation of the Qumran community. Kapfer connects that argument with the *Community Rule*, a logical deduction. However Davies does not compare the two literary compositions in his monograph.

[50] Stephen Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 66; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 233–318, 540–42; Alison Schofield, *From Qumran to the* Yaḥad*: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for* The Community Rule (STDJ 77; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 166–73, 274–81.

[51] Hempel, *Laws of the Damascus Document*, 15–23, 149–51.

[52] Charlotte Hempel, "The Penal Code Reconsidered," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the IOQS Cambridge 1995* (ed. Moshe J. Bernstein et al.; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 337–48.

[53] Hempel, *Laws in the Damascus Document*, 122–23; eadem, "Community Structures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Admission, Organization, Disciplinary Procedures," in VanderKam and Flint, *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years*, 2:67–92, esp. 70–72. Note that the delineation of the literary units in her study are somewhat different from those noted above in this article, which are based on the work of VanderKam.

[54] Note also John J. Collins, *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2010), 56.

similar to 1QS 5:8, utilizing the same phrase from Deut 30:10. Since these manuscripts, in whole or in part, have been considered to be earlier than 1QS, the repetition of these terms also points to their earlier provenance.[55] We now turn to an evaluation of the meaning of this phrase with regard to assumptions about authority.

Assuming this sequence of literary development, the earliest composition to be considered is CD 15:1–16:16, in which the appellation appears five times.[56] The central concept can be found in CD 15:8–9: יפקדוהו בשבועת הברית אשר כרת משה עם ישראל את דברו לשוב אל תורת משה בכל לב ובכל נפש ("they shall install him by the oath of the covenant that Moses made with Israel, his word[57] to return to the law of Moses with the entire heart and the entire soul"). Three lines later again, "when he shall impose it upon him to return to the law of Moses with the entire heart and entire soul."[58] Here the oath the member swears to return to the law of Moses appears to be connected with the covenant at Horeb, i.e. Sinai, however utilizing the vocabulary of Deuteronomy, hence Moab.[59] We also observe in lines 8–9 the interesting reference to "the covenant that Moses made with Israel." Only in Deut 28:69 (NRSV 29:1) do we find the injunction: "These are the words of the covenant that the Lord commanded Moses to make with the Israelites in the land of Moab, in addition to the covenant that he made with them in Horeb." Worthy of note, here Moses rather than the Lord directly makes the covenant with Israel in Moab and this covenant is "besides" or "in addition to" the one the Lord made with Israel in Horeb.[60] Not to be overlooked is the "oath of the covenant." Of significance for this sectarian description is the manner in which the event is described in Ezra 10:5 and Neh 10:30 with regard to the oath to return, as well as in Deut 29:11, 13, 18 (NRSV 29:12, 14, 19). In this

---

[55] Sarianna Metso, *Textual Development*, 147; eadem, *The Serekh Texts* (London: T & T Clark, 2007), 18; Schofield, *Qumran to the* Yaḥad," 280.

[56] CD 15:2, 9, 12; 16:2, 5. On this section of CD as earlier, see below.

[57] On the use of the term דבר with regard to covenant, see Hag 2:5; Ps 105:9; 1 Chr 16:15. The last reference is of particular interest since here it is used in conjunction with the verb צוה, "the word which he commanded for a thousand generations," more commonly rendered "the promise which he gave for a thousand generations" (NJPS). Note also Exod 24:8; 34:27.

[58] CD 15:12.

[59] See Deut 30:10; see also Deut 4:29; 10:12; 11:13, 18; 13:4; 26:16; 30:2, 6. A reference to the Shema would seem to be indicated, even though the third element, "might," is absent (Deut 6:5).

[60] Note the comments of Bernard Levinson, "Deuteronomy," in *The Jewish Study Bible* (ed. Adele Berlin and Marc Zvi Brettler; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 356–450, esp. 433.

latter section, it is the covenant that the Lord makes with those gathered in the plains of Moab, i.e, the Lord is the one who swears to the covenant. However the covenant in Moab is also presented in Deut 5:3 as the same covenant as that at Sinai: "Not with our fathers did the Lord make this covenant, but with us, we who are here today, all of us alive."[61] Thus Najman is correct in asserting that the gatherings of Deut 31:12–13 and 28–30 are presented as reenactments of the Sinai event.[62] This agreement on the plain of Moab is not then a new covenant, but a re-presentation of Sinai, doing it all over again, represented in the language of "return."[63] This context of "return" (שוב) is established in Deut 4:30, reasserted in Deut 30:2, 10. Using the language of Deuteronomy, this sectarian author suggests that the inductee is returning to Sinai in the same manner as the Israelites gathered on the plains of Moab.[64] However, the inductee swears in the same manner as those present in the assemblies of Israelites described in Ezra and Nehemiah.

In CD 16:1–2, it continues "therefore a man will take upon his soul to return to the law of Moses for in it all is specified," and in 16:5 we learn about the supernatural power of this oath, for the angel Mastema is turned away "on the day that a man will take it upon his soul to return to the law of Moses."[65] More difficult to understand is the reference in CD 15:2. The context for this discussion of the oath is missing in the text, one reading of which would be that one should not swear by the law of Moses.[66] However, the major argument at the beginning of this section appears to highlight the significance of the oath: if the initiate swears an oath

---

[61] While we identify different sections of this book, it presents itself as one continuous revelation; hence references in the introduction can be utilized in conjunction with similar statements in the conclusion.

[62] Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 32–33.

[63] See the explanation of the "new covenant" in Deuteronomy by Ronald E. Clements, "Deuteronomy," *The New Interpreters Bible* (12 vols.: Nashville: Abingdon, 1994–2004), 510–14.

[64] That the covenants of Horeb and Moab are virtually identical is argued by Jeffrey Tigay, *Deuteronomy* (JPS Torah Commentary; Philadelphia: JPS, 1996), 274.

[65] That the phrase יקים האיש על נפשו ("a man will take upon his soul") in 16:1, 4 refers to the oath related to the law of Moses can be seen in 16:7, כל שבועת אסר יקים האיש על נפשו ("every binding oath a man will take upon his soul").

[66] On the strictures related to swearing by the Torah or the law of Moses in Rabbinic and Gaonic literature, see Louis Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (trans. and rev. ed.; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1970), 91–94. Lines 1–5 are characterized as one of a number of "odd statements" by Charlotte Hempel, *Laws of the Damascus Document*, 190; or "miscellaneous statements" (eadem, *The Damascus Texts* [CQS 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000], 52).

mentioning the law of Moses and then transgresses, that person has not only violated the oath but also has defiled the name of God specified in that law.[67] A transgression then is a violation of the first commandment. Noteworthy in this section is the centrality of the "law of Moses" for those of the covenant. Of significance also is the mention of the covenant that Moses made with Israel. Both of these usages enhance the significance of Moses from that known in the text of the Pentateuch and parallel the usage identified in CD above.

The imagery central to the *Community Rule* is the *yaḥad*; i.e., the covenant has a name or at least a descriptor. As already mentioned above, the induction into this body, as described in 1QS 5:7b–20, is remarkably similar in its outline and depiction: "everyone who comes into the council of the *yaḥad* will enter into the covenant of God before the eyes of all who have volunteered and will take upon himself a binding oath to return to תורת משה, according to all that he has commanded,[68] with the entire heart and the entire soul."[69] The major difference between this passage and CD 15:12 is that in this case the involvement of the מבקר is not mentioned and here it is the "binding oath" rather than "the oath of the covenant that Moses made with Israel." These linguistic differences appear inconsequential, commitment to the "law of Moses" is central to both. The literary unit into which the section on the oath is incorporated begins at 5:1, which in some manuscripts constitutes the beginning of the composition:[70]

> This is the rule for all of the men of the *yaḥad* who volunteer to return from all evil and to hold fast to all which he has commanded for his good favor, to separate from the men of perversity and to be united (ליחד) with regard to Torah and possessions, to return according to the sons of Zadok, the priests and the keepers of the covenant, according to the membership of the men of the *yaḥad* who hold fast to the covenant.

The similarity in language between lines 1–2 and 7–8 indicates that the covenant of the *serek* is the same as the one into which the volunteers

---

[67] See Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code* (BJS 33; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983), 136–39.

[68] See n. 52 above with regard to the use of the term צוה, in 1 Chr 16:15, as well as in the significant passage, Deut 28:69.

[69] 1QS 5:7b–9a.

[70] 4Q258 (4QS^{d}) 1:1. The text reads considerably different from 1QS 5, however is very similar to 4Q256 (4QS^{b}) 9. All copies of S begin a new column at this point, indicating that this line began a new literary section of the composition in all versions of the text (Metso, *Serekh Texts*, 9).

are inducted based upon the law of Moses. In this case the conjunction בתורה ובהון ("with regard to Torah and possessions") indicates that this is a broader category than what we know from pentateuchal law.[71] VanderKam notes that 1QS 1:11–12 is closely related to the Shema, Deut 6:5: "All those who freely devote themselves to this truth shall bring all their knowledge, their strength, and their possessions (והונם) into the *yaḥad* of God." This is based on the recognition that later rabbinic references equate מאד ("strength") with ממון ("wealth").[72] In 1QS 5:16 we find the strictures on interaction with the perverse men since they cannot be clean without "returning."

Our understanding of the implications of authority attached to the *Torat Moshe* in this passage is remarkably similar to the section of CD just discussed, they enter into the covenant by taking on a binding oath to return to the law of Moses. That this is attached to the Sons of Zadok suggests some alteration in the structure of the *yaḥad* from the group that formed the covenant, also called the covenant in the land of Damascus.[73] However the evidence suggests that the same authoritative claim underlies the communal life envisioned in both compositions and their varied editions.

Having made these connections in CD 15:1–16:16 and 1QS 5:7b–20, it is now valuable to return to the four features identified by Najman that characterize the texts of Mosaic discourse.

(1) Through reworking and expansion of older traditions, the new text claims the authority attached to them.

The covenant to which the inductee returns as specified in the law of Moses contains more than what can be identified in the text we know as the Pentateuch. The inductee pledges to return to the law of Moses with the entire heart and the entire soul "to that which is found to be done during the en(tire) era of (wickedness)."[74] This text has been reconstructed

---

[71] This interesting conjunction is repeated in line 3, with the addition of משפט ("judgment").

[72] James C. VanderKam, "Sinai Revisited," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2005), 44–60, esp. 57.

[73] The phrase "new covenant" appears only twice in this composition (CD 6:19; 8:21) and nowhere in the 4Q fragments of D. This evidence indicates that the major emphasis in the document is on the covenant and that the term "new" is a descriptive adjective, not a portion of an appellation used to designate the corporate identity of its membership.

[74] CD 15:10. The older reading was [הרשע] קץ), which was consistent with line 7 and still makes more sense. The first and last letter of the term as presently reconstructed,

by Qimron to read "during the en(tire) period of his ap[pro]ach," presumably referring to a probationary period.[75] Since this is defined as the "era of wickedness for all who repent of their corrupt ways" in line 7 above, the meaning remains essentially the same. Then we find the interesting injunction that no one is to inform the inductee of the regulations until he stands before the *mebaqqer*, so that the members are innocent if he proves unfaithful.[76] It seems that we are here discussing an authoritative tradition of communal legislation, all of which is designated as the "law of Moses." The extent to which it may be an oral tradition of memorization remains a problematic area in Qumran studies, given the high degree of oral transmission in this period of antiquity.[77] If the inductee errs according to "everything that has been revealed[78] from the law for the general membership of the camp," the *mebaqqer* will explain it to him and command him to study for an entire year. In CD 16:2 the claim is made that everything is מדוקדק ("carefully explained") in the law of Moses. However, ופרוש קציהם לעורון ישראל מכל אלה הנה הוא מדוקדק על ספר מחלקות העתים ליובליהם ובשבועותיהם ("and the specification of the times of Israel's blindness from all these things, this is carefully explained in the book of the division of the times of jubilees and weeks"), is usually interpreted as a reference to *Jubilees*.[79] Then in the next line we read that, "on the day that the man takes it upon himself to return to the law of Moses, the angel Mastemah will leave him." Within *Jubilees*, Mastemah

---

קץ ק[ר]בו, seem likely on the basis of the photographs, however the term is more difficult to interpret.

[75] Elisha Qimron, "The Text of CDC," in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (ed. Magen Broshi; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992), 39. The reading קץ הרשע is found at CD 6:10, 14; 12:23; 15:7. The only other use of the verb קרב in CD is found at 5:9, the prohibition of marriage to the niece. It is used in 1QS 6:16, 19, 22, in the context of the process of admission into full membership in the sect.

[76] CD 15:10–11.

[77] David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 124–42, 215–39; Carol A. Newsom, "Rhetorical Criticism and the Reading of the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 683–708, esp. 698.

[78] This usage may contradict the thesis of Lawrence Schiffman that *nigleh* refers to the Torah and *nistar* to the teachings of the sect (*The Halakhah at Qumran* [SJLA 16; Leiden: Brill, 1975], 22–32. Since, however, his distinction is based on 1QS 5:7–12, a closely related text, this observation may have broader significance for his treatment of the definition of these terms.

[79] Objections to this identification have been raised by Devorah Dimant, "Two 'Scientific' Fictions: The So-Called *Book of Noah* and the Alleged Quotation of Jubilees in CD 16:3–4," in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (ed. Peter W. Flint et al.; VTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 230–49, esp. 242–48.

is the chief of the spirits who intercedes with God to leave a portion of the polluted demons who lead the offspring of Noah astray alive and not destroy all of them (*Jub*. 10:8; cf. 11:5). God permits a tenth of them to remain. The experience of pollution and defilement that characterizes humanity as described in *Jubilees* is resolved by entry to the covenant by returning to the law of Moses. With the significance attached to that composition among the Qumran finds, this is not surprising. It is reasonable to argue that the oath that is sworn to return to the law of Moses includes all of the legislation incumbent upon members of the covenant in the land of Damascus, including that found in *Jubilees*. A similar argument holds for the very particular legal requirements developed and justified in CD 3:12–7:9. Presumably at some point in communal development the same could be said for the legislation in CD 9:1–14:22 and the stipulations specified in other D texts, even though the latter need to be evaluated within the literary development of the overlapping S materials as well.

Entry into the *yaḥad* is also dependent upon swearing an oath to return to the law of Moses. This process shows a remarkable similarity to that of the *Damascus Document*, particularly with regard to the oath to return to the law of Moses. The literary nature of the composition is remarkably different from CD, as is the rhetoric supporting the lifestyle of the body into which the inductee enters. The legislation of the "covenant" of CD is also different from the *yaḥad* of 1QS, even though the complex relationship of the two as found in the various manuscripts of both compositions does not permit a simplistic distinction. Returning to the "law of Moses" is a description of agreeing to take up the requirements of the lifestyle demanded by the group at the time of induction. The history of the legislation of the S and D materials indicates that this will not have been consistent over time. What was consistent is that the inductee "returned to Sinai" at the point of entry into the group.

(2) The new text ascribes to itself the status of Torah.
This feature is apparent in the name, *torat Moshe*, used to designate the authoritative blueprint for the way of life adopted upon the administration of the oath.

(3) The new text is said to be a re-presentation of the revelation at Sinai.
This also is implied by the name utilized for the authoritative materials at the heart of the oath. Already demonstrated above is the manner in which the language used built upon Ezra-Nehemiah and Deuteronomy. We note

of course that within this same section it is also abbreviated simply to *Torah*, thereby invoking Sinai.[80]

(4) The new text is associated with or produced by the founding figure Moses.
This also is suggested by the attribution. The significance of the figure of Moses as authoritative is indicated in other ways throughout the various portions of CD. In the discussion of incest in CD 5:8 the text of Lev 18:13 is identified as that which Moses said, but the implication that this included the same treatment of both sexes would be assumed to be the teaching of the law of Moses.[81] In CD 5:18 Moses and Aaron are identified as having stood in the past "by the hand (i.e., authority) of" the prince of light, in contrast to Belial who had installed Jannes and his brother to lead Israel astray. We have already noted that in CD 16:5 the angel Mastemah leaves the inductee once he has sworn the oath to return to the law of Moses. Three lines later in CD 5:21 the boundary-shifters in the era of destruction "had spoken rebellion against the commandments of God by the hand of Moses and by his anointed for holiness." In both lines 18 and 21 Moses is paired with Aaron in a significant manner, presumably emphasizing the role of the priesthood in the Sinaitic revelation. This central section of the Admonition is where the narrative and the halakic intersect; it provides the ideological underpinnings for the particular legislation that is to characterize the lifestyle of those who choose "to divide between the unclean and the clean, to make known the difference between the holy and the common, to keep the day of the Sabbath according to its specification(s), the festivals and the fast day according to the commandments of those who enter into the new covenant in the land of Damascus." This ideological section rests authority in the figure of Moses at Sinai in the same manner as the "law of Moses" does.

A fascinating conjunction of God and Moses can be found at CD 8:1–18. In lines 8–9 we find the denunciation, "and they arrogantly threw off restraint walking in the way of the wicked, concerning which God said," followed by the quote from Deut 32:33. The next lines include an interpretation of the imagery of the text of Deut 32:33, followed by the mention of the "wall-builders" and the "daubers of white-wash" from Ezek 13:10–15 applied to the "spewer of lie(s)" whose entire assembly had aroused the

[80] CD 15:13; 16:8, 9.
[81] Brooke, "Moving Mountains," 83.

ire of God. Then in line 14 we read "which Moses said," followed by quotations from Deut 9:5 and 7:8. This switch between God and Moses identifies Moses as a medium of revelation, a spokesperson of authority. God and Moses speak in the same manner, they are equal in the proclamation of the law.

Other references to the law are scattered throughout CD, even though interestingly not in the three-section prologue. In 4:8 we find a reference to the law of the foreparents. However this is a law whose details were not always fully available to the predecessors since David had not had an opportunity to read the ספר התורה החתום ("the sealed book of the law") that was hidden from the time of the death of Eleazar, Joshua and the elders who had served the Ashtoret (CD 5:2). In other words references to the foreparents point to the time of the pure revelation to Moses at Sinai, or the camps in the wilderness, even though we do not know whether it was a reference to the first or second set of tablets.[82] The "well midrash" of CD 6:2–11 bases the law for living during the period of wickedness in the wilderness camp, but endorses its more recent interpreters. The law in CD 7 for those who live in camps, marry, and have children finds an interpretive explanation of a similar nature, however here it is based on Amos 5:26–27, presumably based upon the reference to Damascus, however a continuation of the theme of law for living during the period of wickedness. In the halakic section we find general references to the law, including notices emphasizing that the priest should know the laws relating to life in the camps.[83] The law here means the regulations of communal life that have a root in the wilderness camp at Sinai. This is evident from the details of the mustering in CD 12:22–13:2 and 14:3–6.

Within the narrative portion, the *Admonition*, we also find the use of the prophets whose writings are cited as authoritative and quoted. Included among those utilized as authoritative sources on haggadic questions are

[82] Note the discussion of the military camp configuration based on Sinai in 1QS by VanderKam, "Sinai Revisited," 55–56.

[83] CD 9:17; 13:5, 6 (here the מבקר is to instruct the priest in proper procedures regarding skin diseases). In CD 14:3–12, for those who live in camps the ראש הרבים is to be knowledgeable about the "book of meditation" and the regulations of the law. The מבקר in this case seems to preside over the issues of daily life.

Ezekiel,[84] Amos,[85] Isaiah,[86] Micah,[87] Malachi,[88] Hosea,[89] and Zechariah.[90] In this composition the identification of Moses is exclusively with the legal sections, i.e., Sinai-Horeb. The Mosaic discourse is fundamental for the life of the new covenant outlined in the Damascus materials, as exemplified in the description of the oath sworn at the point of induction. Other prophets provide a theological rationale for the role of this covenantal group, but are not authoritative for the determination of lifestyle and communal life. For that they are taken back to Moses, on Sinai. A similar viewpoint is fundamental for the *Community Rule*.

In the introduction to this composition, it is identified as the ספר סרך היחד ("the book of the rule of the *yaḥad*") whose purpose is "to seek God [with the entire heart and entire soul], to do what is right and good before Him, as was commanded by the hand of Moses and by the hand of his servants the prophets" (1QS 1:1–3). Similarly in 1QS 8:15 in an exegesis of Isa 40:3: "It is the study of the Torah that was commanded by the hand of Moses according to all that was revealed in each age and according to what the prophets revealed by his holy spirit." The "hand of Moses," also a phrase not found in the Pentateuch, is another manner in which this composition specifies the authoritative tradition attributed to its founder, binding upon the members of the *yaḥad*.

The second list of procedures for admission in 1QS 6:13b–23 does not contain a reference to either an oath or the "law of Moses," but rather outlines a process of examination concerning "his insight and his deeds"[91] over a two-year period,[92] initially by the man who is appointed as leader of the many. At the end of the first year, the inductee's "property" is placed into the hands of the *mevaqqer*, the same official as listed in the *Damascus Document*.[93] At the end of this process, he is reviewed by the "many" and "if the lot is extended to him to join the *yaḥad*, he will write him into the rule

---

[84] CD 3:21–4:2; 8:12–13; 19:12; 20:3.
[85] CD 7:14–16.
[86] CD 4:14; 5:13, 14, 16; 6:8, 16–17; 7:11–12.
[87] CD 5:12.
[88] CD 6:13; 20:19–21.
[89] CD 8:3; 19:15; 20:16.
[90] CD 19:7–8. Some would include Jeremiah in this list. The question is whether CD 6:19 is based upon Jer 31:31. I think that is probably not the case since the designation ברית חדשה is not repeated and not included in other references to the covenant in this composition. Furthermore, there is no reference that attributes the usage to Jeremiah.
[91] 1QS 6:14; note the repetition of this latter phrase in line 18.
[92] 1QS 6:13b–23.
[93] Hempel, "Community Structures in the Dead Sea Scrolls, 80–81.

in rank in the midst of his brothers for Torah, for judgment, for the pure [food] and the incorporation of his property." VanderKam has proposed that these passages describe the same procedure; the text of 1QS 6:14–15 also refers to the oath: "he will bring him into the covenant, to return to the truth and turn away from perversity, to give him understanding of all of the judgments of the *yaḥad*."[94] While the assertion that they refer to the same oath seems plausible, this argument needs to rest on the functional description of the procedures rather than similarities in vocabulary. This admission procedure is much more detailed and involved regarding the specific details of sectarian life. The actual concrete requirements of the sect have in this case taken on an authority not present in the other texts covered so far, even though Torah is still mentioned. The conclusion with regard to sectarian life is interesting: "his counsel and his judgment belong to the *yaḥad*." Once the person is fully incorporated, the *yaḥad* needs and desires his full participation.

The two-year period is significant elsewhere in this composition with regard to the law of Moses. We have already noted in 1QS 8:15 the exegesis of Isa 40:3 which understands it to refer to "the study of the Torah that was commanded by the hand of Moses." 1QS 8:20–27 is part of a penal code in which any member who has entered into the council of holiness "who transgress a matter (i.e., anything) from *torat Moshe* with arrogance or deception will be sent out of the council of the *yaḥad* never to return and none of the men of holiness are to interact with him regarding business matters or seek his advice on any matter" (8:21–24).

> But if he will do this inadvertently, he will be excluded from the pure food, from the council, and from judicial proceedings for two years. If his way is perfect, (he may be in) the assembly for study and for counsel of the general membership if he does not inadvertently sin again until he completes the two years . . . He will be tested over the two years for the perfection of his way and the counsel of the general membership and (then) his rank will be written in for the *yaḥad* of holiness. (1QS 8:24–9:2)

The implications of this procedure are that the sectarian author(s) viewed it in such a manner that they wanted a similar level and time of testing to proceed as was the case with inductees. While in 1QS they neglected to include the information about the oath for inductees and hence also mention of the law of Moses, the procedures outlined here imply its

[94] VanderKam, "The Oath," 431–32.

continuing importance for the life of the sect described in the various compositions of the S materials.

The absence of the term "Torah" from the covenant renewal ceremony at the beginning of the Community Rule, 1QS 1:16–3:12 requires comment. Earlier researchers who proposed that this section was a later addition to the traditions preserved in the latter section found confirmation in the absence of any material from cols. 1–5 in 4Q258 (4QS^{d}).[95] Since this liturgical material is primarily in the plural, it does not concern the process of the admission of new members. In its liturgical function it rather serves to reinforce the fundamental values and orientation of the ongoing life of the sect and its adherents for those who have been admitted into full membership. This leaves us with the phrase "torah of Moses" as a key indicator of authority within those earlier texts discussing admission into the sect. Metso's proposal suggesting that we view the S texts as records rather than "texts" may be worthwhile extending into this conception.[96]

While the "torah of Moses" is at the heart of the covenant, we have already indicated that it is not clear that this was at any one time simply an established written text. In his evaluation of the role of Sinai, VanderKam emphasizes the covenant itself as central, but it is the covenant at the foot of Sinai in Exod 19–20 and 24.[97] Of utmost significance was the commitment that God had revealed to Moses on Sinai. All of the authors of both the S and D materials indicated that the "way" of the covenant, as they understood it, had been revealed to Moses on Sinai and membership in the sect was premised upon that basis. It is in that manner that they were "seconding Sinai."[98] However, neither Najman nor VanderKam attempt to probe the purpose of the utilization of Sinai in the various versions of these two compositions. While not addressed, it appears that neither scholar understands the use of Sinai in these Qumran texts as merely a glorification or idealization of the past, as even perhaps the wilderness camp functioned for portions of the *Temple Scroll* or the *War Rule*.[99] It is at this point that the article on "Jerusalem Rather than Sinai," by George Brooke becomes significant.[100]

---

[95] Note the review of the literature in Metso, *Serekh Texts*, 15–20.

[96] Ibid., 68.

[97] James C. VanderKam, "Sinai Revisited," 49.

[98] The significance of Najman's work for understanding the composition of the S materials is noted by Metso, *Serekh Texts*, 67.

[99] For summaries of this view, see Wacholder, *Dawn of Qumran*, 71, 76, 147, 225–26.

[100] Brooke, "Moving Mountains," 73–89.

The orientation toward Jerusalem within Deuteronomy is evident throughout the composition. The significance of Jerusalem becomes clear in the section beginning with Deut 12:5: "You shall seek the place that the Lord your God will choose out of all your tribes as his habitation to put his name there." The *Temple Scroll* utilizes Deuteronomy in such a way in the ongoing process of rewriting that it can use the legislation from the wilderness tabernacle, combine it with other traditions, and create direct divine revelation to describe a Jerusalem sanctuary as it should have been,[101] or, I would propose, as it will be.[102] In agreement with Najman, he notes that there is more focus on Moses than Sinai,[103] while also pointing out that throughout literature we do not get a very multi-faceted or complex portrayal of this figure. There is the sense in Second Temple literature that Moses' mediation was incomplete, pointing to the *Damascus Document* in its treatment of the "hidden things" as evidence. Of course, the ongoing need for contemporary appropriation is noted.[104] He also cites from the oath text in CD 5:7–10: "the Law of Moses in accordance with all that has been revealed of it to the sons of Zadok." Priestly elucidation and interpretation which itself is part of the revelation is necessary. Then he develops the theme of participation in the priestly activities with the angels, with the heavenly world, as portrayed in *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* and some other texts. While he describes this orientation as locating the priestly communities of Qumran between Sinai and Jerusalem, one recognizes that Jerusalem in these texts has not yet happened. One could superimpose a temporal dimension on this spatial portrayal, a discourse about the relationship of past and future. I will not review the ample evidence already within the Pentateuch and then in Second Temple literature for the portrayal of Moses as the one who has the knowledge on the basis of revelation about the future. Note *Jub.* 1:27: "And he said to the angel of presence, 'Write for Moses from the first creation until my sanctuary is built in their midst forever and ever. And the Lord will appear in the sight of all.' "[105] The interpretive techniques utilized in these developments within Second Temple literature are wide-spread, however the

[101] Ibid., 79–80.

[102] John Kampen, "The Eschatological Temple(s) of 11QT," in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (ed. John C. Reeves and John Kampen; JSOTSup 184; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 85–97.

[103] Brooke, "Moving Mountains," 80–81. Here he cites the references to the "Torah of Moses" in the texts on the oath.

[104] Ibid., 83–84.

[105] This text forms the conclusion of Brooke's article, "Moving Mountains," 89.

utilization of the figure of Moses as the authoritative voice of the founder is of particular significance for matters related to sectarian legislation, practice, and lifestyle, i.e., halakah. The significance of Brook's addition to this discussion is to place the utilization of this figure in the perspective of the future orientation of this literature and its belief patterns. The extent to which this future is eschatological, to which it is oriented to lifestyle of a sect that believed future promises were being fulfilled through its own existence, to which its legislation was oriented to that period between the transgression of Israel and God's future redemption, is a complex subject that will not be addressed in this essay. The figure of Moses at Sinai keeps that event from being idealized or glorified. The Sinai event itself is then foundational rather than ideal. It is from Sinai that we look ahead to Jerusalem in the Second Temple period as it is represented in the Qumran texts discussed here; not that we glance backward from Jerusalem to Sinai. Moses as the recipient of God's revelation at Sinai has the answers for a group that is pointed toward Jerusalem, whatever that is and wherever it may be.

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

Hebrew Bible

New Testament

Apocrypha

Pseudepigrapha

Dead Sea Scrolls

Papyri

Josephus

Philo

Apostolic Fathers

Rabbinic Literature