

EXEGESIS AT QUMRAN

4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context

GEORGE J. BROOKE





**JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT
SUPPLEMENT SERIES**

29

Editors

David J A Clines

Philip R Davies

Department of Biblical Studies

The University of Sheffield

Sheffield S10 2TN

England

Published by JSOT Press as
Volume 2 in the Dead Sea Scrolls Project of
the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity,
†William H. Brownlee, Director.

EXEGESIS AT QUMRAN

4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context

GEORGE J. BROOKE

Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
Supplement Series 29



To the memory of
WILLIAM HUGH BROWNLEE
(1917-1983)

Christian, scholar, friend

Copyright © 1985 JSOT Press

Published by
JSOT Press
Department of Biblical Studies
The University of Sheffield
Sheffield S10 2TN
England

Printed in Great Britain
by Redwood Burn Ltd.,
Trowbridge, Wiltshire.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Brooke, George J.

Exegesis at Qumran.—(Journal for the study
of the Old Testament supplement Series.

ISSN 0309-0787; 29)

1. Dead Sea scrolls—Criticism, interpretation,
etc.—History 2. Essenes

I. Title II. Series

296.1'55

BM487

ISBN 0-905774-76-0

ISBN 0-905774-77-9 Pbk

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Abbreviations	ix
Chapter I The Jewish Exegetical Context	1
A. Introductory Remarks	1
B. Early Jewish Use of the Bible	6
1. Judaism and Hellenism in the late Second Temple Period	6
2. The Age and Origin of the <i>Middôt</i>	8
3. Exegetical Method in Philo and the Targums	17
a. Philo	17
1) Introduction	17
2) Examples	19
3) Conclusion	25
b. The Targums	25
1) Introduction	25
2) Examples	29
3) Conclusion	36
4. Exegesis at Qumran: Some General Remarks	36
Notes	45
Chapter II 4Q Florilegium	80
A. Description	80
B. Text and Translation	84
1. Introductory Remarks	84
2. The Text	86
3. Translation	91
4. Textual Notes	97
C. Form-Critical Study	129
1. The Parts of the Text	129
a. 4QFlor 1:1-13	129
b. 4QFlor 1:14-2:6	144
c. 4QFlor Fragments 6-11	159
d. 4QFlor Fragments 4, 5, 12, 15-26	160

2.	The Composition of the Whole Midrash	161
a.	As a whole	161
b.	The unity and consistency of the Midrash	166
c.	The liturgical setting of the biblical texts	169
D.	4QFlor and Qumran Theology	175
1.	The Latter Days	175
2.	Place, Sanctuary, House and Congregation	178
3.	The Sons of Belial	194
4.	The Shoot of David and the Interpreter of the Law	197
E.	Traditio-Historical Study	205
1.	CD 3:12b-8:20	205
2.	Acts 13:33-37; Heb 1:5	209
3.	Acts 15:16	210
4.	2 Cor 6:14-7:1	211
F.	Conclusion	217
	Notes	220
Chapter III Qumran Exegetical Method		279
A.	11QtgJob	280
1.	אָוִר or אָוִר	280
2.	11QtgJob 37:8	281
3.	11QtgJob 21:4-5	281
4.	11QtgJob 29:1	282
B.	1QpHab	283
C.	1QM 10:1-8	292
D.	1QS 2:2-4	295
E.	CD 7:13b-8:1a	302
F.	4QTest	309
G.	11QMelch	319
	Notes	324
Chapter IV Conclusions		353
Indexes		
	Biblical Passages	357
	Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha	366
	Dead Sea Scrolls	368
	Ancient Authors and Works	379
	Author Index	385

Preface

This book is an extensive revision of a dissertation submitted in 1978 to the Department of Religion of Claremont Graduate School, California. Much in this book is the result of the careful guiding interest and attention to detail of Professor William H. Brownlee; it is to his memory that it is dedicated in gratitude. As Director of the Dead Sea Scrolls Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity at Claremont he generously welcomed this study as Volume Two in that project's series of publications, his own *The Midrash Peshet of Habakkuk* (SBLMS 24; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979) being Volume One. I am also grateful to the Editors of the JSOT Press for accepting this book into the JSOT Supplement Series.

Among many other scholars to whom I am grateful I would mention Professor R. P. Knierim whose methodological insights are evident in many places, Professor J. A. Sanders who offered much helpful criticism as the dissertation was in the final stages of production, Professor J. A. Emerton whose discerning eye has prevented many minor errors and immeasurably improved the consistency of the book's presentation, and Professor J.P.M. van der Ploeg, O.P., for encouraging the book's publication. To all these scholars I am especially indebted,

though naturally the responsibility for the content of this book remains mine.

I am also very grateful to all who have helped me meet the cost of publication: the trustees of the Sarum St. Michael Educational Trust and their chairman, the Very Rev. Dr. Sydney Evans; the trustees of Salisbury and Wells Theological College and the College Principal, Canon Reginald Askew; the trustees of the Kennicott and Pusey and Ellerton Hebrew Funds of Oxford University and their chairman, Professor James Barr; the trustees of the Bethune-Baker Fund for Theological Studies and their successive chairmen, Professors Henry Chadwick and Morna Hooker.

I also thank those who have helped produce this book: Sue Langford for many hours of painstaking typing, Geoffrey Annas for proof-reading, Michael Morris for proof-reading and the preparation of the indexes, and the staff of the JSOT Press for their care in publishing. To many other people, scholars, friends and members of my family, I am grateful for encouragement over the years it has taken for this work to come to fruition; not least among them is my wife, Jane.

Abbreviations

AJSL	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures</i>
ALGHJ	Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums
ALUOS	<i>Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society</i>
AnBib	Analecta biblica
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
APOT	R. H. Charles (ed.), <i>Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament</i>
ASTI	<i>Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute</i>
BA	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BDB	F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, <i>Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i>
BETL	<i>Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium</i>
BHS	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>
BibOr	<i>Biblica et orientalia</i>
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BO	<i>Bibliotheca orientalis</i>
BTB	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BZAW	Beihefte zur ZAW
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series</i>

ConBib	<i>Coniectanea biblica</i>
ConNT	<i>Coniectanea neotestamentica</i>
DBSup	<i>Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément</i>
DJD	<i>Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan</i>
EncJud	<i>Encyclopaedia Judaica (1971)</i>
ETL	<i>Ephemerides theologicae lovaniensis</i>
EvQ	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
HSM	<i>Harvard Semitic Monographs</i>
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
IDBSup	<i>Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible Supplementary Volume</i>
IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
Int	<i>Interpretation</i>
JANESCU	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University</i>
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JBLMS	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series</i>
JBR	<i>Journal of Bible and Religion</i>
JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
JNWSL	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JR	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
JSOTSup	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series</i>
JSS	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
JTC	<i>Journal for Theology and the Church</i>

JTS N.S.	<i>Journal of Theological Studies (New Series)</i>
KB	L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, <i>Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros</i>
LD	Lectio divina
LQR	<i>Law Quarterly Review</i>
MHUC	Monographs of the Hebrew Union College
NFT	New Frontiers in Theology
NovT	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum Supplements
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OJRS	<i>Ohio Journal of Religious Studies</i>
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTS	<i>Oudtestamentische Studiën</i>
PAPS	<i>Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society</i>
PEQ	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
PTMS	Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
RechBib	<i>Recherches bibliques</i>
REG	<i>Revue des études grecs</i>
RGG	<i>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i>
RHPR	<i>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
RQ	<i>Revue de Qumrân</i>
RSR	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
RSV	<i>Revised Standard Version</i>
SELDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SP	<i>Studia Philonica</i>
SPB	<i>Studia postbiblica</i>

STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
TBl	<i>Theologische Blätter</i>
THAT	<i>Theologische Handbuch zum Alten Testament</i>
TLZ	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
TS	<i>Theological Studies</i>
TZ	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
VC	Vigiliae christianae
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZTK	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>

Chapter I

THE JEWISH EXEGETICAL CONTEXT

A. Introductory Remarks

The purpose of this study is to provide a comprehensive analysis of one text from Qumran, 4Q Florilegium.¹ 4QFlor is a fragmentary text containing several quotations from the Hebrew scriptures: 2 Samuel, Exodus, Amos, Psalms, Isaiah, Ezekiel, Daniel and Deuteronomy. These quotations are variously interlaced with commentary that attempts to show the interrelationship of the various texts and their significance. It appears as if the quotations from 2 Samuel, Psalms and Deuteronomy determine the general argument of the text; their relative positions and the formulaic phrases that either precede or follow them or both suggest as much.² Yet it must be acknowledged from the outset that we do not know how the scroll began or how it finished and that the text that remains is in a poor state of repair.

Indeed the fragmentary nature of the text forces one to conclude that the methods of higher criticism which presuppose that the scholar is working with complete units of text are in need of supplementation when a partial text is under consideration. If it is the concern of historical criticism to describe and explain the intention of an author as it can be

discerned from the one predominant organizing principle behind the entity of the literary form,³ then it must be the case that a text with no clear beginning or end will only yield imperfect results to the critic. This realization has had two interrelated consequences for this study.

The first and more obvious is that it has become necessary to consider much background material from the inter-testamental period. The general conclusions of these theological, traditio-historical and other investigations are given in the appropriate sections of the next chapter. However, and perhaps more significantly, since 4QFlor contains scriptural texts and interpretation such general appreciation of 4QFlor is supplemented or rather is necessarily preceded in this chapter with very particular investigations of the ways in which scripture was treated in Judaism in the first centuries B.C. and A.D. This first chapter, then, argues that exegetical techniques akin to those set out in various lists of rabbinic *middôt* were used widely, if not universally, in Jewish exegesis of the late Second Temple period, and that their use was more, rather than less, precise. The results of the acknowledgement of this exegetical methodology for our understanding of 4QFlor are discussed in the proper sections of the next chapter. Chapter three contains further examples from Qumran texts of a variety of genres in support of the contention that an understanding of the exegetical methodology being used considerably aids our understanding of the text at hand. The approach is thus clear from the outset: without appreciation of exegetical devices and techniques at use in early Judaism, any analysis of 4QFlor is as fragmentary as the text itself.

Indeed in one or two cases knowledge of the technique in use enables the text to be more probably restored.

Some few remarks need to be interposed at this point concerning the terms "hermeneutic" and "exegesis." In a book that shares many concerns with this study D. Patte has attempted to show, particularly in relation to the targumim, that the Jews of the first century A.D. accepted scripture as "canonical," reckoned that everything in scripture was meaningful, and that scripture could be interpreted by scripture.⁴ Patte prefaces his study, therefore, with some remarks as to the necessity that the modern critic understand that for the early Jew there was no difference between exegesis and hermeneutic,⁵ that is, no difference between his encounter with the text as object *per se*, and as it related to himself as subject. Such is to say that the text presented itself to the early Jew as immediately relevant. So Patte's understanding of the early Jewish encounter with scripture leads not unnaturally to a traditional account of the place of revelation within the early Jewish use of scripture; through continual revelation all Jews, but the apocalyptists (including the Qumran covenanters) in particular, are brought to understand scripture.⁶

Admittedly we must accept Patte's contention that the Jew was concerned not with objective exegesis in the modern sense but with prolonging "in a new discourse the discourse of the biblical text,"⁷ but initially in whatever vague fashion it must remain that he encountered the text as object. Even if it is a slightly artificial distinction for the first century Jew, the hermeneutic, the result of the individual's making

contemporary a particular text, depends upon the exegesis, the application of a method to achieve a result that enables any canonical text to remain authoritative in some way. So a correct understanding of the hermeneutic depends upon a correct understanding of early Jewish exegesis and especially that exegesis' technical methodology.⁸ The missing ingredient from the modern scholar's point of view for understanding any commentary, including the fragmentary 4QFlor, is the exegetical methodology that was applied by its author.

The second consequence of supplementing the traditional methods of higher criticism by reference to early Jewish exegetical methodology concerns the validity of any interpretation. It seems that the use of any particular exegetical technique was not arbitrary. Any interpreter of scripture who wished his interpretation to be accepted is likely to have used particular interpretative techniques because they were reckoned to be valid ways of producing a meaningful interpretation. Though we may be unable to discover in every case what technique was used, nevertheless we can better gauge the acceptability and the possible impact of any interpretation if we appreciate how an interpreter has reached his conclusion.

The history of scholarship illuminates how it is important to consider the part played by the exegetical skill of the author in any assessment of the authority and meaning of any interpretation. Thus the traditional clash between the understanding of a text as inspired, over against it being solely a human production has long been seen to be a false dichotomy.⁹ For example, in relation to Qumran exegesis, W. H. Brownlee early proposed¹⁰ treating 1QpHab as a midrash employing some

of the exegetical techniques of the later rabbinic midrashim. K. Elliger opposed this view,¹¹ though adopting some of its conclusions, and proposed rather that the Habakkuk pesher be seen in the light of the inspired dream interpretations of Daniel. Several scholars have since pointed out that these views are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Writes L. H. Silberman: "It may be wondered whether these distinctions as they stand are not irrelevant to an understanding of the texts; indeed, whether they may not impede and frustrate any attempt fully to understand the materials at hand;"¹² and M. P. Miller adds: "If pesher is the revelation of prophetic mysteries, these mysteries are exegetically discerned. They are the product of a meditative study on biblical texts."¹³ So the determination of the way in which the commentary on a biblical quotation is written and connected is the means whereby a text can be seen to be valid, to have authority in itself apart from but also in conjunction with the biblical quotation; valid commentary is linked to scriptural citation through the use of certain principles applied in particular describable exegetical techniques.¹⁴

In light of what has been said in these introductory remarks, a proper understanding of 4QFlor depends upon the identification of the exegetical techniques used in the construction of the argument of the text. Since not all scholars recognize the use of these techniques in Judaism of the late Second Temple period and so as to demonstrate that the Qumran scribes were not acting independently of contemporary Judaism the rest of this chapter is a brief consideration of early Jewish exegetical method, the necessary

preliminary to any analysis of 4QFlor itself. The following discussion includes a description of some of the influences upon Jewish education in the period to which 4QFlor is dated, a consideration of the age and origin of the *middôt*, the provision of some examples from Philo and the Targums of various exegetical devices used by Jewish commentators at this time, and some few remarks about Qumran exegetical method based largely on the history of scholarship.

B. Early Jewish Use of the Bible

1. Judaism and Hellenism in the late Second Temple Period

In relation to the general cultural background in Palestine in 100 BC - AD 70, a Palestine which contained forever changing varieties of Judaism together with non-Jewish elements, the work of W. D. Davies has been most influential in stressing the interpenetration of Hellenism and Judaism both in Palestine and in the Diaspora. He writes: "Palestinian Judaism is not to be viewed as a watertight compartment closed against all Hellenistic influences: there was a Graeco-Jewish 'atmosphere' even at Jerusalem itself There is thus no justification for making too rigid a separation between the Judaism of the Diaspora and that of Palestine."¹⁵

More recently M. Hengel has completed a closer analysis of Judaism and Hellenism in pre-Christian times.¹⁶ He examines early Hellenism as a political and economic force, noting, for example, the Hellenistic war tactics used in 1QM;¹⁷ he

points to the apparent similarity of Jewish and Spartan governmental structures in early Hellenistic times¹⁸ and he discusses the LXX translation of Isa 58:6, "undo the thongs of compulsory treaties, release the broken ones by letting them go free, and *shatter every unjust treaty*,"¹⁹ as indicative of a change in the 'social climate' ascribable to Hellenistic influences, the rational and technical order of the Greeks.²⁰

The pervasiveness of the Greek language, occurring even among Essene documents at Qumran²¹ was enhanced among educated Jews by the fact known in Alexandria and elsewhere that many Jews participated to the full in Greek gymnasium education.²² Indeed the establishment of Greek institutions in Jerusalem in the second century B.C. could only have taken place, Hengel maintains, if there had already been a portion of the more influential Jews who were prepared for such innovation.²³ Even the Maccabean revolt was just a temporary break in the increasing hellenization of Palestine, though at no time, except perhaps under Antiochus IV, was there any major attempt to assimilate Judaism to Greek ways; rather, all that was learnt was put to serve the Jewish cause.

In education Hengel traces to a Greek background the tradition of naming of teachers, the master-pupil relationship, the dialectical form of instruction, the *middôt* and the purpose of haggadic exegesis.²⁴ The education of the professional class was thus permeated with Hellenistic elements.²⁵ Indeed in relation to Qumran, Hengel states that "der Ausgangspunkt der bei den Essenern geübten Gelehrsamkeit waren die palästinisch-chasidischen Weisheitsschulen in der 1. Hälfte des 2. Jh. s v. Chr., in denen - wie auch bei Ben-Sira - schon eine gewisse Kenntnis »griechischer Weisheit«

im Sinne popularphilosophischer, volkstümlicher Anschauungen vorausgesetzt werden darf."²⁶ That this was so is perhaps most clearly exemplified from the descriptions of the Essenes in Hellenistic terms by such contemporary observers as Josephus, Philo, Pliny, Solinus and Porphyry.²⁷

It is not possible, nor is it necessary, to list further the findings and the viewpoints of M. Hengel here. Rather, in sum, it can be said that his detailed analysis of source materials of a greater variety than those normally considered demonstrates that Hellenistic influence was in many ways as widespread in Palestine as it was in Alexandria and Diaspora Judaism. Though there is still some considerable debate concerning the extent of this Hellenistic influence, Hengel's views have been widely supported, explicitly by J. A. Fitzmyer,²⁸ G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Black,²⁹ and implicitly by D. E. Gowan³⁰ and M. E. Stone³¹ amongst others. It is, therefore, no longer proper to assert that Hellenistic Judaism can be set over against Palestinian Judaism in, say, the first century B.C., though of course there were different emphases in different areas.³²

2. *The Age and Origin of the Middôt*

Once the interdependence of Hellenistic and Jewish thought is recognized in Palestinian Judaism of the late Second Temple period then a fresh perspective can be given to the debate concerning the age and provenance of the *middôt*, the so-called "rules of exegesis." Undoubtedly our understanding of the Jewish use of scripture of this period will be enhanced, if light is shed on early Jewish exegetical method. Two schools

of thought persist concerning the *middôt*.

On the one hand Hengel, following D. Daube and others, supposes the use of the *middôt* to be dependent upon Hellenistic influence; more narrowly that they are largely derivable from the methods of Alexandrian philology as applied to demonstrate the absolute authority and sufficiency of Scripture, the Torah.³³ D. Daube himself, in an oft-quoted article,³⁴ has long insisted on the Hellenistic rhetorical basis of the *middôt* as ascribed to Hillel. Rather than there simply being a coincidence of method in Hillel's principles and those of Hellenistic rhetoric, Daube shows that the Hebrew lists of principles follow the order of those found in the earlier sources of Aristotle (*Rhetoric* 2:23:4f.), Cicero (*Topica* 4:23) and Auctor ad Herennium (2:13:18) amongst others:³⁵ first the inference *a minori ad maius* (*qal waḥōmer*), then the inference from analogy (*gēzērâ šāwâ*). The list of seven *middôt* is attributable to Hillel himself, according to Daube.³⁶ Although Daube's work is recognizably noteworthy in its insistence on the Hellenistic basis of Hillel's principles, even though they became judaized, he pays little attention to a detailed analysis of the sources in which the lists occur attributed to Hillel.³⁷

On the other hand the second school of thought is most forcefully represented by the work of J. Neusner. He bases his work on two suppositions: firstly, that the Mishnah-Tosefta as embodying the oral law in no way tries to show its dependence on scripture exegetically, that being the task undertaken by the early midrashim;³⁸ secondly, that the rabbinic sources are to be treated with all the available methods of higher criticism: a tradition attributed to a generation older than

the source in which it is written down must not be taken at literal face value, but, rather, its tradition-history must be revealed as best as possible to determine the way in which the form and content of the particular tradition developed over the years.³⁹

In relation to the list of *middôt* in *t. Sanh.* 7:11⁴⁰ which are there attributed to Hillel, Neusner supposes firstly that the pericope is making reference to the exegetical traditions of Hillel's encounter concerning what should be done when the Passover falls on a Sabbath;⁴¹ then, following Lieberman, in that the passage does not necessarily ascribe authorship of the seven *middôt* to Hillel, stating simply that he used them, Neusner points out that on the one hand the story of Hillel's encounter with the Bene Bathyra hardly bears out that Hillel used all seven principles,⁴² and on the other hand a pattern can be discerned in the formation of tannaitic materials in which as many well-known sayings and stories as possible were attributed to Hillel. When one considers the extremely composite, even self-contradictory, content of the description of Hillel's encounter with his opponents in the temple courtyard⁴³ and the fact that it seems incredible that no one can remember what to do should the Passover occur on a Sabbath, an event which must have occurred several times in the lives of Hillel's opponents, it is most unreasonable to attribute any of the story of the encounter as we now have it to a time when the temple was still in existence.⁴⁴

Thus for Neusner the *list* of seven *middôt* finds its best setting in the Hellenistic Jewish world of the second century A.D. The story of Hillel's encounter in the temple is designed

to demonstrate the superiority of tradition (oral) over deliberate exegesis, but at the same time it also shows the correct application of certain exegeses. It could be suggested that in a world where many varieties of Judaism existed, the rabbinic kind allowed only a limited number of exegetical methods. And, because of the rabbinic understanding of the nature of oral law, these exegetical methods were applied predominantly in other writings more clearly of tannaitic and amoraic origin wherein a certain attempt was made to demonstrate the exegetical relationship of oral law to scripture. The adoption and use of the seven *middôt* thus appears as a delimitation of exegesis by the rabbis rather than a broad acceptance of Hellenistic methodology.⁴⁵

A point of view midway between these two schools of thought is represented in the work of S. Lieberman.⁴⁶ Although his chapter on the rabbinic interpretation of scripture was written without reference to Daube's work, he reaches conclusions similar to those of Daube concerning the use of exegetical techniques in the Second Temple period and their Hellenistic provenance. He gives examples of what he argues are the Greek terminological equivalents of the rabbinic terms which antedate the Tosefta,⁴⁷ and he sees the technical use of some parts of the terms as clearly antedating Hillel.⁴⁸ The same can be said for the haggadic terminology of the rabbis: there are pre-rabbinic Greek parallels as far as content is concerned but little or no evidence that there was a current precise terminology available to the interpreters of Homer or whomever.⁴⁹

Lieberman's study provides the rabbinic examples that Daube does not fully cite, alongside those of classical authors.

Yet in investigating whether or not Hillel himself was responsible for the terminology that the later sources attribute to him in the list of *middôt*, Lieberman concludes that it is "very possible that . . . it is the editor of the *Tosefta* who designated Hillel's arguments by the later terminology."⁵⁰ With such a conclusion we have seen Neusner agree. Put another way this suggests that Pharisaic Judaism, once stripped of the Temple, was forced by that very event to see the justification of scriptural interpretation, and in varying degrees allowed the application of certain Hellenistic methods. Thus, while the content and methodology of the rabbinic interpretations may in some cases date from well before 70, the formation of the actual body of rabbinic literature as we now have it, including the lists of *middôt*, depends primarily upon the Pharisaic struggle for domination of Judaism after the temple's destruction.⁵¹

It is not surprising, therefore, to discover a list, very similar to that attributed to Hillel, in the introduction to *Sifra*.⁵² That list of thirteen principles expounded by R. Ishmael follows the order of the seven; it contains five exegetical principles that are variations on the twofold principle of "the general and particular" and "the particular and the general." This longer list, therefore, makes no pretence of having been adopted in rabbinic Judaism before the second century. If anything is surprising, it is that the thirteen principles are attributed to Ishmael and not to R. Akiba, for *Sifra* is most frequently associated with the school of Akiba.⁵³

Along with these halakic exegetical *middôt* are to be found

the thirty-two principles of R. Eliezer ben R. Yose Ha-Gelili which are largely concerned with haggadic exegesis.

H. G. Enelow, the editor of *The Mishna of Rabbi Eliezer*,⁵⁴ maintains that these thirty-two rules, possibly without the examples and the complete work that follows them, may in fact have originated with the second century Eliezer to whom they are attributed, and he supposes that where talmudic passages agree with materials in the main body of Eliezer's midrash, it is the talmudic literature that is dependent and not the other way around.

Whatever the case may be concerning the actual list of thirty-two⁵⁵ *middôt*, it is clear that there are many examples of the use of particular principles in the early rabbinic literature, such that if the list was only adopted later, it would have been adopted under pressure from already existing exegeses, rather than as a demonstration of acceptance of a new dimension in the rabbinic use of scripture: thus, once again, the delimiting nature of lists of exegetical principles can be observed, especially since the three lists of rules mentioned are far from representative of all the principles at work even in early rabbinic literature.⁵⁶

If the conclusion is right that although the clearly formulated lists of *middôt* are all tannaitic the methods they enshrine were being actively used in Judaism of the late Second Temple period, then it is necessary to give some particular examples of these exegetical principles at work.

Three sources seem inappropriate as quarries for such examples. The first is the corpus of rabbinic literature. Lieberman gives examples from rabbinic literature of *māšāl*

(parable), *gēmatrěyā* (computation of the numerical value of letters), *'atbaš* (letter substitution) and *nōtārîqôn* (abbreviation), but although he mentions materials that in content could antedate the destruction of the temple,⁵⁷ their form cannot be demonstrated as earlier than A.D. 70. Since the actual form in which an exegetical result is stated is important in determining which exegetical method was used, then if the form is datable with certainty only to tannaitic times it cannot be used to argue the use of exegetical principles in an earlier age.

The second body of material which cannot be dated with certainty is the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha. These texts can usually only be found in a later translation and often only in a translation of a translation. Again, since the actual wording of the text is important in identifying a pun or word-play, *gēmatrěyā* or *nōtārîqôn*, it is not justifiable to use texts that are largely versions or which are available only in forms which are very likely to be later than the fall of the Second Temple.

A third source that is not to be used here is the New Testament. Although the New Testament contains explicit and implicit use of the Jewish scriptures, the hermeneutical presupposition of all the writers and usually of their readers as well is clearly the centrality of the figure of Jesus recognized through faith as the Christ.⁵⁸ The authority of the Jewish scriptures rests in their finding their correct fulfilment in Jesus. The various literary forms of the NT do not for the most part set out to justify the faith in the Christ, crucified and risen (matters only poorly demonstrable from scripture),

but rather they work to proclaim that faith. The aim of the NT books is dependent on the twofold presupposition of faith in the Christ and the authority of scripture.⁵⁹

Undoubtedly, however, the scriptures do receive treatment in the NT similar in method to the Jewish use of scripture. It is noteworthy that those authors (and sometimes their audiences) most closely associated with demonstrating (or hearing), consciously or unconsciously, some continuity with the Jewish tradition more clearly use exegetical methods acceptable to Jewish ears. Thus there has been considerable scholarly work done on Matthew's use of scripture⁶⁰ and Paul's epistles have also been studied for their exegetical forms,⁶¹ especially in relation to rabbinic texts. Matthew is often considered the most Jewish of the Gospels, while Paul appears to have been among the best educated of the NT writers. Other scholars have variously attempted to assess both the form and content of much of the NT in terms of rabbinic traditions; most notably, in English, D. Daube⁶² has amassed and analyzed considerable parallel material, and in German the work of H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck remains unsurpassed.⁶³

Yet although these three sources are inappropriate for providing particular examples, they all suggest that during Judaism of the late Second Temple period there was widespread use of exegetical principles. Lieberman concludes that the rabbis, in attempting to expound and preserve the viewpoint of just one part of Judaism of the time, undoubtedly utilized exegetical principles accepted all over the critical world of the time; this they did in order to be understood and appreciated by their contemporaries,⁶⁴ that their interpretations should

be seen to be valid.⁶⁵ It is this conception of the prior existence and use of these principles of exegesis, especially in the Hellenistic literature before A.D. 70, that has led to use of the terminology of the lists of *middôt* and other exegeses in this study. This is not necessarily to suggest that the technical terms for the principles used in our examples were current in Judaism of the first centuries B.C. and A.D., but from convenience the examples cited are categorized according to the later Hellenistic Jewish (rabbinic) terms to save us from having to invent our own anachronistic terminology. The strength of the examples cited here lies in their demonstrating clearly the use of principles of interpretation that are the immediate progenitors of the later rabbinic principles as embodied in the various lists of *middôt*; these were used more widely and earlier than rabbinic sources would lead us to believe.

It is the works of Philo and the interpretations of scripture suggested in the Targums as well as the various materials from Qumran that support the conclusion that just as the fall of the Second Temple forced Pharisaic Judaism to delimit the canon so it forced it to delimit how the canon was to be interpreted. This was no simple step forward in an obvious process but rather it was the recognition by early tannaitic Judaism of what was already largely the case. So in Philo and in the targumic texts that more certainly predate the fall of the Temple are to be found various exegetical techniques some of which were later named and officially recognized in tannaitic Judaism and some of which were not. Of the precise age and origin of the *middôt* we cannot be sure,

but of their use, though without technical categorization, in the late Second Temple period, there seems to be increasing evidence; the following examples from Philo and the targums are adduced in support of such a conclusion.

3. *Exegetical Method in Philo and the Targums*

a. Philo

1) Introduction

Given what has been said about the interpenetration of Judaism and Hellenism, discussion of Philo's exegetical methodology is not out of place. Indeed such discussion may be part of a necessary corrective to much that has been written about the methods of Palestinian Jewish exegesis contemporary with Philo. This is supported by three factors.

Firstly, it is no longer possible to dismiss Philo simply as an allegorist.⁶⁶ On the one hand at least in relation to the laws of the Pentateuch, Philo was not an allegorist alone; he did not set aside the literal practice of the Law while attempting to unravel its inner truths.⁶⁷ On the other hand Philo attacks those who restrict their method of exegesis to allegory and likewise he rebukes those who hold to a literal meaning without asking further questions.⁶⁸ This "two-level view"⁶⁹ of scripture needs to be put alongside Philo's own statements concerning the allegorical style of scripture⁷⁰ for although he might have agreed with Heracleitus who defined allegory as "a style speaking certain things and meaning something other than what it says"⁷¹ nevertheless he had regard for scripture's plain meaning. Even if Philo considered scripture as pure allegory that does not answer

the question as to what methods of exegesis he used in order to describe its meaning.

Secondly, it is no longer possible to describe Philo's exegetical method either as essentially Greek⁷² or as most closely paralleled in the works of the rabbis⁷³ or as a mixture of both.⁷⁴ In a historical perspective these categories are too narrow, since it is quite possible to trace the allegorical method to the Near Eastern milieu of the early Stoics,⁷⁵ and to assert that, except for the presence of traditional Judaism in a variety of forms, the general Hellenistic culture prevalent at the time of Philo would not produce very different trends of exegesis in "Greek" Alexandria and "Jewish" Palestine, the whole geographical area being Hellenistic.⁷⁶

Thirdly in light of these two points it is not surprising that much recent Philonic scholarship has emphasized the centrality of scriptural exposition *per se* in Philo's works. J. Cazeaux⁷⁷ and V. Nikiprowetzky,⁷⁸ amongst others, both stress the dependence of Philo's exegesis on particular phrases. B. L. Mack has proposed a thorough examination of the Philonic corpus with the supposition that "Philo used traditional exegetical methods and materials. These materials are diverse and may reflect stages of exegetical history or 'schools' of exegesis which are in debate with one another. Philo employed these traditions with degrees of acceptance and he reworked them with varying degrees of consistency."⁷⁹ R. D. Hecht and H. Moehring are amongst those who have tried to work out the implications of Mack's program. Hecht has attempted to analyse Philo's use of scripture in *De Specialibus Legibus*;⁸⁰ Moehring

has considered arithmology as an exegetical tool.⁸¹

2) Examples

Philo's use of etymology is perhaps his most frequently discussed exegetical method. Of the two examples of philonic etymologies to be considered here, the first occurs in *Fug* 213⁸² where Philo writes that βαρεδ means ἐν κακοῖς. In *Quaest Gen* 3:36 Philo is clearly aware that the Hebrew word means "hail" and so to brush aside his interpretation in *Fug* 213 as "very faulty etymology"⁸³ is hardly sufficient.⁸⁴ A. Hanson notices that Philo is deriving his meaning from a combination of the preposition β and the adjective γ but he fails to see that Philo is in complete control of his derivation: not ἐν κακῶ but ἐν κακοῖς. Philo therefore wishes to understand βαρεδ at this point as representing β + γων whose pronunciations approximate one another. Furthermore the context of *Fug* 213 demonstrates that Philo was concerned not with a "faulty etymology" but with finding an antithesis to his exegesis of Kadesh as ἀγία; as Colson translates: "'Bered' means 'in evils', and Kadesh 'holy', for he that is in gradual progress is on the borderland between the holy and the profane, fleeing from bad things, but not yet competent to share the life of perfect goodness."⁸⁵

A second example of Philo's careful and exact use of Hebrew or a Hebrew tradition for his own purposes is to be found in his understanding of Abram and Abraham.⁸⁶ In both *Cher* 7 and *Mut* 60-76 Philo treats Αβραμ as meaning ἀρτὸ μετέωρος, "uplifted father," dividing the word, the two parts of which he then translates. When, however, Αβραμ is changed to Αβραάμ, Philo has to undertake some elaborate exegesis.

Once again Hanson⁸⁷ identifies the Hebrew that Philo is using without seeing that in translating the meaning of Abraham's name as he wishes it, Philo is understanding actual forms of Hebrew words and not simply their roots. So for Philo Abraham means πατήρ ἐλεκτός ἡκούς, "elect father of sound,"⁸⁸ a translation of אב ברור המון. By taking the first letter or two of each word, the name Abraham (אברהם) can be reconstructed.

In Genesis itself (17:5) when Abram's name is lengthened, the reason is given that היית לאב המון גויים, as if the last syllable of the name is taken to be the first of המון. In fact, the rabbis took Abraham's name-change as the biblical rationale for the use of *nōṭārīqōn* in exegesis, a method whereby words are broken up and each letter or syllable is treated as an abbreviation: "How is *noṭarikon* deduced from Scripture? We know it from this: And THOU SHALT BE AB HAMON the father of a multitude of nations, the *resh* being lacking."⁸⁹ This section of Genesis Rabbah makes it clear that אב המון was itself considered to be an example of *nōṭārīqōn* and this resulted in the application of *nōṭārīqōn* to the phrase itself (*b. Šabb.* 105a). The reasoning of the rabbis is that since scripture itself provides the interpretation of the lengthened name Abraham through *nōṭārīqōn*, it must be the case that *rēs* be ignored.

R. Aḥa solved the difficulty of interpreting the name in another ingenious way. By expounding the name-change of Sarai to Sarah and by alluding to Prov 12:4 and Gen 21:12, which, taken together, detail the crowning of Abraham by his wife, R. Aḥa holds to the tradition that the *hē'* in Abraham's name comes from the fact that the *yōd* of Sarai requires two *hē'*'s

to make up its numerical value: Sarah has one, Abraham the other.⁹⁰ Or again the Talmud offers another interpretation perhaps closer to the Bible's own: Abraham's position is changed with his name from that of father "to Aram" to father "to the whole world."⁹¹

In considering Philo's etymology of Abraham, therefore, several factors need to be kept in mind: 1) there is no consensus in Jewish (or Christian) tradition that the name be interpreted in any one way;⁹² 2) there is evidence, albeit late, that Abraham's name was used as the rationale for the use of *νόταριζόν* as an exegetical method; 3) *b. Šabb. 105a* witnesses to the fact that "chosen" or "elect" (root: בחר) was to be applied to the *bêt* in interpreting the phrase אב המון; 4) Philo is familiar with a tradition based upon the Hebrew since he scoffs at the godless man who expounds the addition of *alpha* to Abram's name and in a self-satisfying way notes that the same man ended up dead not long afterwards - surely Philo is concerned not just that the man scoffed at the name change but that also he misunderstood the nature of that change by basing his remarks on the Greek text.⁹³

This is not the place to attempt to settle the question whether or not Philo knew Hebrew and, if he did, how much;⁹⁴ rather the aim of the use of this example is to suggest that Philo considered himself to be using valid exegetical method; yet, it is worth including some remarks on Philo and the Septuagint. The evidence of the Septuagint seems to support the thesis that Philo was well acquainted with both Hebrew and Greek texts at this point, and in general. The Septuagint renders the phrase under discussion in Gen 17:5 as *κατέρα πολλῶν ἐθνῶν* (ἰνθη → πολλῶν). Elsewhere the Septuagint translates

ἰμνη by ἴχος seven times.⁹⁵ Nowhere is ἰμνη rendered by φωνή or any of its synonyms that could have served Philo as suitably for his purposes; rather, ἰμνη is restricted by its Hebrew meaning to ἰσχύς, πλήθος, πλοῦτος, δύναμις, μέγας, φόβος and πολυάνδρον - once it is homoeophonically translated as ἀρμονία.⁹⁶

Philo's choice of ἴχος to represent ἰμνη is, therefore, not based solely on a good acquaintance with the Septuagint but on knowledge of how the translators had rendered ἰμνη elsewhere in the scriptures. Unless Philo obtained his tradition of the meaning of Abraham from another source, his interpretation would suggest that he was competent in handling both Greek and Hebrew texts, but that he normally chose the former, since that was the medium in which he himself normally worked. Whatever the case may be, the presence of the two etymologies discussed above in the writings of Philo helps make the point that not only might he have known Hebrew, but also Philo used the exegetical methods of wordplay and abbreviation.⁹⁷

In other places than in his etymologies did Philo use exegetical methods akin to those associated with the rabbis. Although I. Christiansen has demonstrated clearly that in *De Agricultura* Philo's method most closely approximates that of the Greek *diairesis*, in which a basic idea is divided into its opposite secondary ideas and these ideas are in their turn divided,⁹⁸ that alone does not necessarily substantiate her claim that the diairetic technique is the basis of the whole of Philo's allegorical method. Indeed, as Hammerton-Kelly has pointed out,⁹⁹ *De Agricultura* itself is in part constructed around the use of *gēzērā šāwā* in its rabbinic mode, whereby

biblical verses can be juxtaposed in commentary or interpretation simply because they share a common word or two.

Thus in *De Agricultura* the section beginning with talk of the combination of horse and rider (72) contains a quotation of Deut 20:1: "If thou shalt go out to war against thine enemies and see horse and rider (ἵππον καὶ ἀναβάτην) and much people, thou shalt not be afraid, because the Lord thy God is with thee" (78). Taken with *Agr* 72-77, which is presupposed in the discussion following the quotation,¹⁰⁰ Philo continues to develop his commentary by discussing another biblical verse before he cites it with its common words: "Let us sing to the Lord, for gloriously hath he been glorified; horse and rider (ἵππον καὶ ἀναβάτην) He threw into the sea" (Exod 15:1, 21; *Agr* 82). In *Agr* 84, as Hammerton-Kelly points out,¹⁰¹ ἵππος alone enables Philo to introduce Deut 17:16: "because he shall not multiply horses to himself, nor turn the people back to Egypt." While what follows in the commentary elucidates Egypt, it also presupposes the diairetic distinction between rider (ἀναβάτης) and horseman (ἵππεὺς) which is one reason for Philo's citing of Gen 49:17 at *Agr* 94, again with the use of *gēzērā šāwā*, ἵππος, and that biblical quotation is the basis of the discussion until the end of the unit at *Agr* 123.

A similar construction, the use of *gēzērā šāwā* within a diairetic framework, can be seen in *Sac* 1-10. This section is a commentary upon Gen 4:2: "And He added (προσέθηκε) to this that she brought forth Abel his brother."¹⁰² After an explanation of the terms that Philo says he is about to use, in which the distinction is made between addition and subtraction and their necessary separation in philosophical discussion,

Philo talks of Abraham, citing Gen 25:8, "his is added (προστίθεται) ¹⁰³ to the people of God," of Jacob who "is added (προστίθεται) to something better, when he left the worse,"¹⁰⁴ an allusion to Gen 49:33, and of Isaac who "is added (προστίθεται) and allotted to another company."¹⁰⁵

All these are then diaretically contrasted with Moses about whom προστίθεται is never used (*Sac* 8-10) and Philo concludes the unit: "such is the meaning of the words that God added (προσθέναι) to the mind the birth of the perfect good. The good is holiness and the name of holiness is Abel."¹⁰⁶

These examples from *De Agricultura* and *De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini* illustrate how Philo composes his exposition of biblical texts along chains of analogous biblical phrases, the analogy often being maintained through only one word. In that way the reader is guided away from a solely literal understanding of the text to the allegorical meaning.

Other exegetical techniques are in evidence in Philo's work. Although more interested in content than form, S. Belkin has pointed to other ways in which Philo uses exegetical methods that are more frequently associated with the rabbis. He cites examples of Philo's use of *qal wāḥōmer*, inference from the less to the more important and vice versa,¹⁰⁷ and of *binyan 'ab*, the generalization of a special law.¹⁰⁸ In respect to tautology Philo seems to have held a similar view to that of R. Ishmael who denied that tautology was possible in scripture - each repetition must have a new significance.¹⁰⁹ Belkin also cites a list of passages from Philo that in his view depend upon his having used a Hebrew text, such that Belkin can only conclude that if Philo knew no Hebrew, "he must have been informed of

the Hebrew text by Alexandrian adepts of Hebrew Scripture."¹¹⁰

3) Conclusion

From these brief comments that include some considerable elements of detail on specific points, it no longer seems possible to confine Philo solely to the role of an exponent of Greek philosophy in the Alexandrian Jewish community. At the least some interaction with contemporary Judaism has been demonstrated and it seems as if Philo was an author "equally at home in the Hellenistic and the Jewish conventions of exposition"¹¹¹ - if indeed they are different and distinguishable. For the purposes of this study it is sufficient that such "conventions of exposition" have been seen to have existed in Philo's time and that the methods used included but also went beyond those attributed in formulation to his near contemporary, R. Hillel the Elder, to whom rabbinic literature assigns the seven *middôt* of interpretation.¹¹²

b. The Targums

1) Introduction

The recent growth of interest in the study of the targums¹¹³ has come about largely because of the publication of fragments of the so-called Palestinian Targum by P. Kahle,¹¹⁴ because of the discovery of a nearly complete copy of a targum to the Pentateuch by A. Díez Macho¹¹⁵ and because of the presence of written targums among the finds from Qumran.¹¹⁶ The interrelationship of the various targum recensions, the dates of their composition and redaction, and the establishment of the trajectories into which fit the various traditions reflected in those recensions are complex questions indeed and

beyond the scope of the present study. A few introductory remarks are appropriate, however, as justification for including a section on the targums in this book.

Firstly, although *Tg. Onqelos* is often considered apart because of its Babylonian provenance and its apparent word for word translation, recent studies¹¹⁷ have demonstrated that it contains considerable haggadic material and that sometimes it overlaps considerably, even in the use of whole phrases, with the targum tradition represented in the various Palestinian recensions. Evidence from *Tg. Onqelos* is thus included in the examples that follow.¹¹⁸

Secondly, arguments concerning the date of the targums are based on the linguistic evidence for which Qumran Aramaic is taken as the fixed starting point. But there seems little agreement amongst scholars. In relation to *Neofiti I* Díez Macho has refined his original proposal that it is to be dated early¹¹⁹ by arguing that its Aramaic is in many places similar to that of Qumran; where it differs, the difference is not necessarily one of time but rather is that of a spoken popular Aramaic (*Tg. Neofiti*) over against a literary Aramaic (Qumran). On the other hand J. A. Fitzmyer supports a more rigid evolutionary approach to Aramaic;¹²⁰ he insists that the language of the Palestinian targum in all of its recensions is later than Qumran Aramaic and must be recognized as such.¹²¹ Thus whilst the dictum that whatever disagrees with the Mishnah is pre-mishnaic cannot be applied across the board, it can be argued that in actual phraseology and morphology the targums may have preserved *forms* dating back to the late Second Temple period. At the least from the point of view of *content* the

targums definitely have a place in discussion of first century B.C. and first century A.D. exegesis; ever since the pioneering work of A. Geiger¹²² evidence has been accumulating for pre-tannaitic traditions of interpretation.¹²³

Consideration of the date of the targums makes some remarks about the place of the LXX in all this pertinent as a third point. Although there appears to be on occasion a certain correlation between the LXX and the targumic interpretations of scripture,¹²⁴ there seems to be little evidence whereby septuagintal material can be used directly to date targumic traditions or *vice versa*. For example, the LXX renders what is written as *לב קמי* in the MT (Jer 51:1) as *χαλδαίους*. It is impossible to determine whether the LXX translates and interprets by *'atbaš*¹²⁵ from a text similar to that of the MT or whether in a Babylonian recension the MT represents a deliberate concealment of *כשדים*; the targum in all recensions follows the LXX tradition and speaks of the land of *כשדיא*. It is not necessary, therefore, to conclude from this that the LXX and the targums have "les mêmes méthodes targumiques,"¹²⁶ except coincidentally, if indeed there is any interpretation taking place.

Lastly, bearing in mind that absolute contemporaneity with Qumran materials is not at the moment provable, it is worth venturing to investigate the method of exegesis that the targumists use, for clearly all scholars now agree that there exists such a method. R. Le Déaut has attempted to outline the targumic methodology which, he mentions, overlaps that found in the "genre midrashique."¹²⁷ He lists six

tendencies:

1. The Bible is treated as a whole which is complete in itself and which can be clarified from the juxtaposition of biblical texts one with another.
2. The targum has a synthetic view of the whole of the unrolling of the history of salvation.
3. Everything in the text is of value and has significance.
4. The popular nature of the targum means that it employs correspondingly popular methods: "étiologies; histoires drôlatiques, voire salaces; souci de préciser et déterminer d'ajouter des détails, de trouver un nom aux lieux, aux personnages pour mieux concrétiser un récit."¹²⁸
5. Occasionally texts are isolated from their contexts and treated more freely.
6. The overall aim of the targumist is to render the Hebrew text intelligible.

Le Déaut's list is an important pointer to what might be expected to happen in a targumist's treatment of his Hebrew but it fails to distinguish clearly between the presuppositions that the targumist may have had, the aims which he hoped to achieve and the methods by which he hoped to achieve those aims.

In making more precise the exegetical methodology of the targumist especially as concerns Le Déaut's fourth point, it is worth considering certain verses as they are treated in the targums. Of necessity the expositions in the examples

given depend on minutiae but that should not invalidate their use in the discussion since the targums intentionally stay closer to the text of the Hebrew scriptures, as they translate-interpret, than do those texts solely interested in interpretation.¹²⁹ It will become clear that the most evident technique of interpretation used by the targumists is that of 'al liqrā' whereby the Hebrew text is understood in a slightly different way from the tradition represented in the consonantal MT.

What is proposed in the following examples is put forward with extreme caution, since one cannot be exactly sure from what form of Hebrew text the targumist was translating. Because of this, all the examples are taken from the Pentateuch, for scholars are fairly certain that for the Pentateuch at least Qumran (and therefore Palestine?) possessed, among others, copies of a text often closest to that represented by MT; also the variety of recensions of the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch provide more comparative material from which the history of the tradition of certain targumic interpretations can be better reconstructed.

2) Examples

The first example concerns וַיִּכַּל in *Genesis* 2:2. The MT implies that God in creating worked on the Sabbath. The LXX altered the text so that God completed his work on the sixth day; the Peshitta and Samaritan versions agree with the LXX. *Genesis Rabbah* 10:9 unfolds the manifold ways in which the rabbis tried to skirt the issue: God had finished his work just as the Sabbath commenced; it only *appears* as if God completed his work on the seventh day; the sabbath itself

was created to complete creation (but it was not created, of course, on the sabbath); the sabbath is the perfection of the world.¹³⁰

Of the targumic versions of Gen 2:2, *Tg. Onqelos* renders ויכל by ושיצי. B. Grossfeld takes the use of this particular word to demonstrate that *Tg. Onqelos* is understanding it in the sense of cessation (from creation) rather than completion (of creation).¹³¹ Although it is difficult to date the tradition of interpretation as represented by *Tg. Onqelos*, it is noteworthy that a similar interpretation does not occur elsewhere in rabbinic literature.

Among the Palestinian recensions both *Tg. Pseudo-Jonathan* and *Tg. Neofiti* render ויכל of Gen 2:2 as וואשלם, thus remaining close to the MT, though attempting to create in their choice of words an ambiguity of completion/perfection, the latter of which is akin to rabbinic understanding. The *Fragmentary Targum*, however, reads וחמיר at this point: "and on the seventh day the word of the Lord was *filled with desire* for his work which he had made."¹³² The targum has thus understood that ויכל comes from כלה, "to desire, long for, pine," as in 2 Sam 13:39 but always with a *lāmed* since this verb only occurs with that particular meaning in the idiom ל כלה.¹³³ What is of especial importance is that one manuscript of *Tg. Onqelos*¹³⁴ also at this place reads וחמיר, suggesting that an ancient Palestinian interpretation has at some point influenced *Tg. Onqelos* as they encountered one another. The absence of this interpretation from any rabbinic understanding of Gen 2:2 and its distinctiveness over against the other recensions of the targum at this point suggest that the deliberate use of 'al

tiqrē' in the *Fragmentary Targum* and the interpretation that results from its use are pre-tannaitic.

A second example of '*al tiqrē*' concerns the understanding of בני אלהים and נפילים in *Genesis 6:1* and *4* respectively. Until the middle of the second century A.D., it can be reasonably ascertained that the בני אלהים were identified as angels; indeed, 1 Enoch 6-11, a midrash on Gen 6:1-4, is dependent on this identification.¹³⁵ After R. Simeon b. Johai¹³⁶ every effort is made to exclude the connection between בני אלהים and angels from Jewish literature; where angels are mentioned they appear to be merely parts of old interpretation that have not been removed and none of them has any link with Gen 6:1-4.¹³⁷

The targum recensions reflect such a development in the tradition. *Tg. Onqelos* renders בני אלהים by בני רברביא and הנפילים by גיבוריא; *Onqelos* is followed in the former by *Tg. Ps.-Jonathan* and in the latter by *Tg. Neofiti*.¹³⁸ But the Palestinian Targum represents the older understanding which R. Simeon rules against, in that *Tg. Neofiti Margin* reads מלאכיא, "angels," instead of *Tg. Neofiti's* בני רייניא, and more interestingly, at least as far as exegetical method is concerned, *Tg. Ps.-Jonathan* renders הנפילים by the phrase שמחזאי ועזאל הינון נפלו מן שמיא. By the application of '*al tiqrē*' the targumist reads נפילים for נפילים. This is not to suggest that that understanding of the text is necessarily original to the targumist,¹³⁹ but merely to assert that here seems to be a clear indication that the targum represents an early, even pre-Christian, interpretation through the application of a particular exegetical method to the Hebrew text; P. Alexander concludes, indeed, that of the three traditions of fallen angels

which he discusses¹⁴⁰ *Tg. Ps.-Jonathan* represents the oldest form of the story.

Another example involving angels suggests the use of *hilluf* (anagram)¹⁴¹ in the interpretation of *Genesis 32:25* as represented in *Tg. Neofiti*. There the angel who wrestles with Jacob is named specifically as Sariel;¹⁴² he describes himself in v27 as "chief of those who praise."¹⁴³ This secondary description is common to the whole Palestinian Targum and also occurs in Pseudo-Philo (1st C. A.D.).¹⁴⁴ G. Vermes has pointed out that Sariel is the angel named at 1QM 9:12-15¹⁴⁵ who has not appeared among lists of the four archangels prior to Qumran literature.¹⁴⁶ As well as providing a parallel to 1QM 9:12-15, which with Pseudo-Philo helps date the tradition represented in *Tg. Neofiti*, *Neofiti* also helps toward an understanding of the name of Israel in intertestamental tradition.

Over against the MT etymology "for you have striven (שרית) with God and with men and have prevailed," which is variously explained as from the root שרה,¹⁴⁷ or the understanding of the versions,¹⁴⁸ the targumists render the Hebrew with the Aramaic רב (*Tg. Onqelos*) or אחרנב (Palestinian recensions), "to rule, dominate, act as a prince." "In other words," concludes Vermes, "they attribute to the root שרה the sense of שרר, 'to be a prince, rule,' a denominative verb from *sar*, 'prince'."¹⁴⁹ Aquila and Symmachus support this in their use of ἄρχεσθαι, "to rule." So Vermes justifiably translates the etymology of *Tg. Neof.* Gen 32:29 as "for you have conducted yourself as a prince with angels before the Lord, and with men, and have prevailed against them."¹⁵⁰

1. *The Jewish Exegetical Context*

The targumist, therefore, is understanding part of the etymology of Israel as dependent upon associating it with the root שרר, but that derivation and his complete understanding rests upon his association of Israel and Sariel. Sariel interprets Israel, firstly through the exegetical method of *hilluf* (anagram) which justifies the juxtaposition of the two names, and secondly through *nôṭārîqôn*¹⁵¹ whereby the name is seen to be an abbreviation for its explanation. This use of anagram may go a long way in explaining why in 1 Enoch 10:1 the archangel's name appears as Οὐραήλ in one Greek manuscript (G^S), as 'Ισραήλ in the other Greek manuscript (G^E) and as *ǎ-sǎ-rě-yǎ-lě-yē-r(e)* with many variations in the Ethiopic manuscripts.¹⁵²

In the targumic treatment of *Exodus 15:8* there seems to be another example of a pre-tannaitic use of '*al tiqrē*'. The phrase of interest is וַצְבּוּ כַּמּוֹ נַד נְזִלִים. *Tg. Neofiti* renders this phrase by קָמוּ צְרִירִין הֵיךְ זִיקִיא דְּמִיא נְזִלִיא, "they stood bound like water bags of flowing water;" this is also the phraseology of *Tg. Ps.-Jonathan* and the *Fragmentary Targum*. A fragment from the Cairo Geniza published by W. Baars reads קָמוּן לְהוֹן צְרִירִין בְּזִיקִיא מִיא נְזִלִיא,¹⁵³ "They stood for them bound by bags of flowing water," which detracts somewhat from the miraculous nature of the event even though Yahweh provides the water-skins.¹⁵⁴ All the recensions of the Palestinian Targum, therefore, agree on reading זִיקִיא for the Hebrew נָךְ, which is thus being consistently understood by means of '*al tiqrē*' as Hebrew נֶאֱרַךְ.¹⁵⁵

That this is an ancient traditional interpretation not necessarily primarily dependent on the originality of the

targumist appears from its occurrence in the LXX,¹⁵⁶ the Peshitta and elsewhere.¹⁵⁷

Further attestation that this tradition in the Palestinian Targum is pre-tannaitic comes from *Tg. Neofiti's* reading of the very next verse, Exod 15:9. E. Levine has pointed out that the unspecified hand of the MT is specified in *Tg. Neofiti* as the right hand against normative rabbinic tradition.¹⁵⁸ *B. Menah.* 36b-37a rules, through the application of Isa 48:13, Judg 5:26 and Ps 74:11, that all unspecified hands in the text are left hands: "Our Rabbis taught: *thy hand*, that is the left hand."¹⁵⁹ The indefinite "our Rabbis" suggests that here is an ancient tradition that did not require any particular name for its validation.

Exod 22:4 provides a final example of pre-tannaitic interpretative method. This *locus classicus* for the study of targumic interpretation serves as a good illustration of the dictum that a text that contains a tradition which goes against standard mishnaic codified law, most probably antedates the Mishnah. Not surprisingly *Tg. Onqelos* agrees with the mishnaic position on this text and renders the disputed word, בְּעִירָה, by נְעִירִיה, "cattle."

P. Kahle was the first to notice, however, that the Geniza Fragment for this verse understood בְּעִירָה as יְקִירָה, "fire,"¹⁶⁰ whereas the understanding of the Mishnah (*B. Qam.* 6:4) is that the words from the root נָעַר in Exod 22:4 are to be taken as "cause to be eaten," "beast" and "feed" whereas in v5 they are taken as "kindled" and "fire."¹⁶¹

J. L. Teicher voiced the loudest objection to Kahle's interpretation of the text.¹⁶² He made three points: that

יקירתה is feminine but the verb depending on it is masculine; that the targum fragment renders only the noun (בעירה MT) as "fire"; that ינקר cannot mean "to visit" as Kahle suggested, but rather is an alternative spelling of ינקר, "to abandon one's rights," "to disregard." In the second edition of his book¹⁶³ Kahle ignored Teicher's criticisms¹⁶⁴ whilst commending the work of G. Schelbert.¹⁶⁵

Schelbert answers Teicher's first objection by arguing convincingly that the verb יוכל can only be an 'aph^σēl and that, therefore, יקירתה is no longer its subject: there is thus no conflict in gender. For the second objection Schelbert proposes from the photographs that in fact יוכל should be better read as יוקר, 'aph^σēl, meaning "brennen machen, anzunden, verbrennen."¹⁶⁶ This then means that Cairo Geniza Fragment A agrees with *Tg. Neofiti* at this point. For the initial occurrence of בער in Exod 22:4, which Fragment A translates as ינקר, Schelbert offers for the Aramaic the meaning "säubern," that is, to purify or cleanse the field by means of fire.¹⁶⁷ *Tg. Neofiti* again supports this conjecture by understanding all three occurrences of the root בער in Exod 22:4 as to be translated by יקר.

Thus Fragment A and *Tg. Neofiti* have the same understanding of Exod 22:4 throughout. Since the LXX represents the understanding of בעירה as "beast" rather than "fire,"¹⁶⁸ it can only be supposed that in encountering the ambiguous unpointed Hebrew text the targumist deliberately decided not to read ('al tiqrē') בְּעִינָה but rather chose to interpret the whole verse as being about fire, בְּעִנָּה; it is possible that he was influenced by the only other use of this word in the Hebrew text, at the end of Exod 22:5.

Not only the anti-mishnaic interpretation of the targum recensions but also the occurrence of that interpretation indirectly in *m. B. Qam.* 6:4 and overtly in *Mekilta*,¹⁶⁹ shows that this exegesis of Exod 22:4 is indeed old.

J. Heinemann concludes that here the "*Targumim* have undoubtedly preserved an ancient pre-tannaitic halakhic *midrash*,"¹⁷⁰ "un derecho pretannaitico."¹⁷¹

3) Conclusion

Thus it seems evident that throughout the targumic material available for study there can be located very specific uses of particular exegetical methods for rendering the Hebrew text more intelligible according to a particular tradition of that text's interpretation, and that these exegeses belong in many instances to pretannaitic times. Furthermore, the targumic use of such exegetical principles shows that they belong not only in Alexandria, as Philo's work has shown, but also in Palestine. The use of the Bible at Qumran confirms the pervasiveness of these principles in Judaism of the Hellenistic era.

4. Exegesis at Qumran: Some General Remarks

It would be rash to suppose that all that has been written on the use of the Bible at Qumran, and on Qumran biblical exegesis in particular, could be summarized and presented here in a few short pages: some terse remarks must suffice.

It is clear that the scriptures were used in a variety of ways at Qumran:¹⁷² "with the exception of the Copper Scroll and a few fragments, all the texts discovered in the eleven

caves are either biblical manuscripts or works based on Scripture: exegetical therefore, in the broader sense of the word."¹⁷³ In many of the non-biblical manuscripts there are direct citations of scripture which are interpreted or used as support for the content of the particular document, and the part played by implicit citation of scripture, allusion to biblical texts and the use of biblical imagery is no less important (e.g. in 1QS, 1QSa, 1QM, CD). For the rest, alongside the pesharim, commentaries on biblical books in the form of text citation followed by interpretation, there are works which expand and retell biblical narrative (1QapGen), pieces of targums (4QtgLev, 11QtgJob), texts fashioned after biblical books (1QH) or perhaps containing traditions for some reason excluded from the normally accepted ("canonized") scripture (4QPrNab, 4QPssJosh), texts with midrashic features (1QSB, 4QPB, 4QFlor, 11QMelch) as well as other non-biblical texts (4QTestim, 4QOrd). Any consideration of the use of the Bible in the Qumran texts must, therefore, be based on this broad spectrum of texts with their multiple use of the biblical books.

In seeking to identify in some small way wherein lies the unity of approach to the Bible of the Qumran covenanters, if there is unity as such, it can be ascertained that, lacking a fixed canon, certain books were held as more or less authoritative by the sect. These included the Pentateuch,¹⁷⁴ the Prophets,¹⁷⁵ almost certainly the other books that were later included in the authorized canon, as well as certain of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (Ben Sira, Tobit, *Jubilees*, *Enoch*, *T. Levi* and *Naphtali*). It is these texts that are used as the basis of the ordering of the community, and it is these

texts, especially the Pentateuch and the Prophets, that are interpreted in detail and appealed to or alluded to in support of that ordering.

Although a case can be made for the existence of a specialized vocabulary used by the sectarians in their discussion of both halakic¹⁷⁶ and prophetic materials (e.g. formulae of introduction), such a word-study approach to the materials already limits the number of texts that can be considered and possibly imposes an unwarranted classification upon the texts themselves. In fact, the largest part of the literature devoted to the use of the Bible at Qumran has concerned itself with attempting to define the term פטר in the hope that that would be the key to any understanding of what the commentaries in particular may contain.

It is in the definition of פטר that some have seen the best answer to the question of how the text of the commentary relates to that of the biblical citation. Yet since 4QFlor contains both the word מדרש and the word פטר in relation one to the other, the only Qumran document so to do, a detailed discussion of these terms and the way in which they function in Qumran literature, and also their possible use for designating generic categories, will be postponed until treatment of 4QFlor. Of note at this point is that the discussion of the pesharim has, in general, followed either one of two approaches. Summarily these are on the one hand the stress that the pesharim are to be considered within the development of intentional scriptural interpretation on the basis of the use of certain exegetical techniques,¹⁷⁷ a type of interpretation that is evident in the Bible itself and

which culminates in the medieval Jewish commentaries; on the other hand there is a more general understanding of the pesharim as reflecting literary compositions based on a revelation given to the interpreter: rationalistic explanations are then false, irrelevant or incomplete.

The first approach has been supported by W. H. Brownlee in various forms for many years¹⁷⁸ and has been further enhanced by the work of L. H. Silberman and A. Finkel. L. H. Silberman¹⁷⁹ proposed many more or less precise ways in which the commentary (peshar proper) of 1QpHab was related to the biblical citation through certain deliberate exegeses involving various interpretative techniques. Silberman reckons that the closest analogy to the pesharim is to be found in the structure of the rabbinic midrash in which occurs the formula פתר קריא followed by the "interpretation of individual words or phrases within the verse in terms of the specification of the meaning of the whole verse."¹⁸⁰ The interpretations themselves are not revealed but they are interpretations of revealed material (dreams or visions) and the correspondence between commentary and citation is worked out systematically. It is the belief of the interpreter that it is valid to make the revealed vision contemporary that is the starting point of the Qumran pesharim.

A. Finkel¹⁸¹ adopted a similar line in understanding the interrelation of scripture and commentary but he relies for the most part on dream interpretations for his extra-Qumran examples since he maintains that the pesharim are closely linked to the dream interpretations of the OT, though also to the interpretations of the visions of Daniel. He too allows

that beyond the allegorical method of dream/vision interpretation,¹⁸² the interpreter deliberately employs interpretative techniques: dual-reading ('*al tiqrē'*), dual meaning and word-splitting (*nōṭārîqôn*) to reveal the hidden meaning of the text.¹⁸³

More recently E. Slomovic has tentatively discussed the use of rabbinic exegetical techniques in the Qumran writings.¹⁸⁴ Although he warns that no techniques of exegesis are explicitly named in Qumran literature, he amasses sufficient evidence to make the use of *gēsērâ šāwâ*, *zēker lēdābār* and *'asmaktā* seem very probable at Qumran.

Alongside these scholars, and the list could be augmented, several have concentrated more on an analysis of the content of the Qumran biblical interpretation than on precise discussion of methods whereby that content was reached. Among those seeing Qumran exegesis as lying close to the mainstream of midrashic development in the intertestamental period is, above all, G. Vermes.¹⁸⁵ R. Bloch also understood the pesharim within the context of the early midrashim,¹⁸⁶ but she noted that where they come close to apocalyptic literature ("revelation") then they diverge generically from the more reflective rabbinic midrashim. It is in fact this apocalyptic or revelatory characteristic of the pesharim in particular, but also of some of the other Qumran scrolls (e.g. 1QM), that has been the cause of considerable difficulty in the second approach to the use of scripture in the Qumran literature, for, of its very nature, revelation eludes those who desire a complete systematic explanation of scriptural usage at Qumran.

Shortly after Brownlee's initial treatment of the exegetical

methods used in 1QpHab, K. Elliger published an extensive commentary on the scroll¹⁸⁷ with some lengthy remarks about the "Methode der Auslegung"¹⁸⁸ of which the last section is a critique of Brownlee's thirteen Hermeneutic Principles. Elliger's own understanding of the exegetical method used in 1QpHab is based on the order of priorities that he saw the interpreter to have: primarily the interpreter wished to use the text of Habakkuk word for word or slightly paraphrased, secondarily he would resort to atomization of the text to convey the desired interpretation, and only if there was no other way would he use other modes of exegesis (allegory, wordplay, rearrangement of the text, use of corruptions in the text, etc.).¹⁸⁹ With the understanding that the prophets were preaching about the endtime and that he was living in that time, the interpreter, according to Elliger, revealed the mysteries of the prophetic words in the same way as dreams and visions are interpreted in the book of Daniel. Yet therein lies the ambivalence of Elliger's presentation, for even in the book of Daniel the interpretations are somewhat midrashic;¹⁹⁰ also Elliger does not totally exclude midrashic exegetical techniques from his explanations of the connection between citation and commentary,¹⁹¹ though he does minimize their role.

Both F. F. Bruce and O. Betz have developed understandings of the use of scripture at Qumran that allow for the supposed dichotomy between revealed interpretation and the deliberate use of exegetical techniques, a dichotomy to which Elliger's work bears witness. Bruce maintains assuredly that as "principles" in the Qumran use of the prophets must be seen the attitude that God's revelation to the prophets could only

be comprehended with the interpretation that He gave to the Teacher of Righteousness through revelation, and the notion that all the words of the prophets had reference to the time of the end which was the present.¹⁹² These principles were put into operation through the atomization of the text, the selection of variant readings, allegorization and the making contemporary of the prophets' words.¹⁹³

O. Betz also recognizes the primary position that revelation occupies as the correct perspective from which to view both the prophetic oracle and the Qumran interpretation;¹⁹⁴ for Betz the exegetical technique employed in the interpretation is allegorical, and the authority of the interpretation depends not upon any particular exegetical method but on the correct reading of scripture itself from which can be calculated the very imminence of the endtime.¹⁹⁵ That of itself vindicates and justifies the claims of the interpreter, be he the Righteous Teacher or anybody else.¹⁹⁶ Other scriptures too are to be applied in various ways to the ordering of the sect because of the belief of the members of the sect in the correctness of their understanding of their own situation.

Beyond the suggestions of these scholars M. P. Miller has noted that several factors need to be taken into account in considering peshar: its use of midrashic methods and techniques, its paraphrastic structure akin to the targums and its function within an eschatological context - also the unique position of the interpreter as one favoured by God to unlock the mysteries of the prophets.¹⁹⁷ D. Patte has also pointed to the importance of the techniques used in the interpretation of the prophets' visions,¹⁹⁸ yet he also stresses that the pesharim

are the fruit of "an inspired search of Scripture."¹⁹⁹

M. P. Horgan offers a similar picture: whilst the pesharim contain divine revelations, yet the various biblical texts are interpreted in a variety of modes involving a number of exegetical techniques.²⁰⁰

There would appear, therefore, to be an impasse in the understanding of the use of the Bible at Qumran, particularly as regards the pesharim. It seems as if all the ingredients of the Qumran use of scripture have been described more than adequately but that the description is not entirely satisfying as an explanation of the whole. From the next two chapters it should become clear that in all of the Qumran documents that cite or allude to biblical texts one should expect the use of certain and various exegetical techniques that are more or less close to those used and accepted later by the rabbis; at the least there is an exegetical tradition represented which in some instances goes back to scripture itself and which rests upon certain valid inherited interpretations of scripture. Furthermore, it is also noteworthy that no one technique is the prerogative of any particular kind of literature, peshar, targum, sectarian halakah or whatever. Thus the use of exegetical techniques is not solely constitutive of the genre, if that it be, of peshar;²⁰¹ neither for that matter is its eschatological outlook.

These observations will receive their complete significance when the genre of material in 4QFlor is discussed. Suffice it to say for the moment that the use of exegetical techniques abounds in all the scrolls that in any way refer to scripture. Inspiration, if any, does not lie in the result of the exegesis

as such, in its content, but rather in the ability of any member of the community and especially the Teacher of Righteousness to interpret scripture through the correct application of exegetical techniques. If the techniques had not been used, then there would have been no objective means whereby the Qumran audience could have judged the validity or otherwise of the "inspired" interpretation.

NOTES

¹For the purposes of this study the sectarian Qumran writings are taken as from the centuries immediately preceding the destruction of the second temple. For a summary statement to this effect and bibliographical support, see, e.g., R. N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1975), 26 and n.19.

²It is to be regretted that the method of comparative midrash is of little use for the study of 2 Samuel 7 and Psalms 1 and 2 in intertestamental literature. Philo, Josephus and the various works of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha hardly allude to either text. Similarly there is no messianism present in the targum of 2 Samuel 7; see S. H. Levey, *The Messiah: An Aramaic Interpretation, The Messianic Exegesis of the Targum* (MHUC 2; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College), 37.

³E.g., that is the very assumption of the essay by O. Eissfeldt expressed in its title, "Die kleinste literarische Einheit in den Erzählungsbüchern des Alten Testaments" (*TBl* 6 1927, 333-37). More recently, the first aspect of the methodology outlined by W. Richter (*Exegese als Literaturwissenschaft*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971, 49-69) is entitled "Einheit oder Zusammengesetztheit des Textes." Also, R. Knierim ("Old Testament Form Criticism Reconsidered," *Int* 27 1973, 459) in describing "a programmatic unfolding of the method of structural interpretation" writes: "Assuming that texts are entities, we are concerned with the factors which constitute such entities."

⁴*Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine*, SELDS 22; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975, 63-81.

⁵*Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 6.

⁶*Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 7; this is to overemphasize the contrariness between the language and the speaker. Cf. J. M. Robinson's assessment of Bultmann: "Thus Bultmann's program of demythologizing is embedded in a specific view of language as the objectification of understanding, an objectification that is itself contrary to the understanding seeking expression in it" ("Hermeneutic Since Barth," *The New Hermeneutic*, NFT 2, eds. J. M. Robinson & John B. Cobb Jr.; New York: Harper & Row, 1964, 37).

⁷*Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 7.

⁸In fact, as Patte (*Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 4) concludes from M. Noth's essay, "The 'Re-presentation' of the Old Testament in Proclamation" (*Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics*, ed. C. Westermann: Richmond: J. Knox, 1963, 80), there is no choice between different kinds of hermeneutic once a specific exegesis of the text has been accepted.

⁹Hence Patte's discussion of certain texts as revelation alone is incorrect.

¹⁰"Biblical Interpretation among the Sectararies of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BA* 14 (1951), 54-76.

¹¹*Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Totem Meer*, BHT 15; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1953.

¹²"Unriddling the Riddle. A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Peshet (1QpHab)," *HQ* 3 (1961-62), 323.

¹³"Targum, Midrash and the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," *JSJ* 2 (1971), 53.

¹⁴Later these were derived from scripture itself; e.g., for the use of *nōṭārîqōn* as derivable from Gen 17:5, see *Gen. Rab.* 46:7. Study of wherein lies the authority of these principles or techniques is the subject of a dissertation in itself; see the preliminary remarks of I. L. Seeligmann in his paper "Voraussetzungen der Midrashexegeese" (*Congress Volume, Copenhagen 1953*, VTSup 1; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953, 150-81). Recognition of the use of these principles is sufficient for our present purpose.

¹⁵*Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, (London: SPCK, 1948, 1955²), 8. For a recent exposition of Jewish education, particularly that of the scribe, in the first century, see M. Goulder, *Midrash and Lction in Matthew*, 10-13; he portrays a traditional rabbinic picture and omits mention of Hellenistic influences: see below n. 60.

¹⁶*Judentum und Hellenismus*, WUNT 10; Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1969, 1973²; ET, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 2 Vols., London: SCM, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.

¹⁷*Judentum und Hellenismus*, 31.

¹⁸*Judentum und Hellenismus*, 49-50.

¹⁹MT reads: "Is not this the fast that I choose . . . to undo the thongs of the yoke and to let the oppressed go free and for you (s.) to break every yoke."

²⁰*Judentum und Hellenismus*, 99 - a bit of an overstatement.

²¹*Judentum und Hellenismus*, 112-114; though admittedly some

Jewish writings of the period appear deliberately purified of Greek loanwords: yet, that in itself, shows the pervasiveness of Greek.

²²*Judentum und Hellenismus*, 125-52.

²³*Judentum und Hellenismus*, 138-39. The polemics of Ben Sira and the predilection for Greek names in the upper class of Jerusalem from the end of the third century B.C. point in this direction.

²⁴*Judentum und Hellenismus*, 148-49.

²⁵For those less privileged the local *bēt hamidrāš* and the family were the sources of education.

²⁶*Judentum und Hellenismus*, 451.

²⁷*Judentum und Hellenismus*, 452, n. 809.

²⁸*A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays*, SBLMS 25; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979, 49, n. 23. Fitzmyer also cites other evidence of the Hellenization of Palestine at the time of Jesus.

²⁹E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (175 B.C. - A.D. 135), revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black, Vol. 2, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1979, especially 417-22. This section on education in the late Second Temple period acknowledges (422, n. 41) that "although Jewish education founded on the Torah was intended to be exclusive, it had to compete with the influence of Hellenistic civilization." "The Cultural Setting," Section 22 in the same volume, similarly testifies to the extent of the influence of Graeco-Roman culture though it argues also that

Judaism defended itself successfully against pagan religions; it may be that the distinction is not altogether tenable.

³⁰*Bridge Between the Testaments: A Reappraisal of Judaism from the Exile to the Birth of Christianity*, PTMS 14; Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1976, 69-72, 91-95, and generally throughout Part One.

³¹*Scriptures, Sects and Visions: A Profile of Judaism from Ezra to the Jewish Revolts*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980, especially chapters 4 and 9.

³²E.g., Hengel (*Judentum und Hellenismus*, 183) points out that from the sources that survive, it appears that whereas the interest in Alexandrian Judaism was in philosophy, that in Palestine seems to have been in history-writing. Indeed, Hengel understands (356-57) that it is in the apocalyptic understanding of history that there is "eine Frucht des jüdischen Kampfes um die geistig-religiöse Selbstbehauptung gegenüber dem Einbruch des hellenistischen Geistes in Jerusalem."

³³*Judentum und Hellenismus*, 314-15.

³⁴"Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric," *HUCA* 22 (1949), 239-64. Cf. Daube's article "Alexandrian Methods of Interpretation and the Rabbis" (*Festschrift Hans Lewald*, Basel: Helbing und Lichtenhahn, 1953, 27-44) for a discussion of the Hellenistic basis of certain exegetical methods used by the rabbis but not included in any list of *middôt*.

³⁵"Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation," 252.

³⁶"On the Third Chapter of the Lex Aquila," *LQR* 52 (1936),

265. In this Daube follows among others W. Bacher ("Hillel," *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, 6; New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1904, 400). *The Encyclopedia Judaica* ("Hillel," *EncJud*, 8, col. 482) presents the predominant current opinion (shared e.g. by J. Goldin, "Hillel the Elder," *JR* 26 1946, 268): "It is not to be assumed that Hillel was the first to formulate these seven hermeneutical rules, but it does seem that he was one of the first to apply them for the determination of practical *halakha*." This hardly advances the treatment of the rabbinic sources beyond that of Bacher. Vermes, Millar and Black (Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People*, Vol. 2, 333-34) understandably do not attempt to analyze the history of the traditions concerning Hillel and the *middot*; presumably such analysis does not fall within the scope of their work.

³⁷The same criticism can be made of Chapter II of Bonsirven's work *Exégèse rabbinique*, 77-115). However, Bonsirven provides many useful examples of the various rabbinic exegetical principles from rabbinic literature. Bonsirven's conclusion of the great difference between Pauline and rabbinic exegesis lies not in his critical treatment of his rabbinic sources as much as in his conception of the nature of the Gospel that Paul was preaching. It is that aspect of the kerygma that has led to the exclusion of the NT from consideration in this study.

³⁸Most clearly stated in "The Meaning of Oral Torah," *Early Rabbinic Judaism*, (SJLA 13; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), 3-33. A typical statement that the Mishnah is the heir of oral halakic midrashim since the time of Ezra is made by B. M. Casper (*An Introduction to Jewish Bible Commentary*, New

York: T. Yoseloff, 1960, 30-31). One very important corollary of Neusner's view of "oral" law is the suggestion that the reliability of the oral preservation of the law is a rabbinic device to ensure the supremacy of pharisaic-rabbinic halakic traditions. There is no firm evidence that material was not written down before the second century - in fact, the opposite is most likely the case; e.g. Gamaliel and the written Targum of Job (*Šabb.* 115a). D. Patte (*Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 13-15) is among the most recent to accept somewhat uncritically the rabbinic assertions.

³⁹E.g., Neusner would justifiably deny the usefulness for critical study of the *middōt* of work such as that done by S. Zeitlin ("Hillel and the Hermeneutic Rules," *JQR* 54 1963-64, 161-73). It is an approach to rabbinic materials similar to that of Neusner that has negated the usefulness of most of the rabbinic writings for this study - hence their omission from this section on comparative material.

⁴⁰שבעה דברים דרש הילל הזקן לפני זקני פתירא קל וחומר וגזירה שיה וביניין אב וכתוב אחד ושני כתובין וכלל ופרט ופרט וכלל וכיוצא בו ממקום אחר ודבר הלמד מעניינו אליו שבע מידות דרש הילל הזקן (Tosefta, ed. M. S. Zuckerman, Paserwalk, Trier: Lintz, 1880-82, Jerusalem: Wahrman Books, 1963, 427; ET for this passage: H. Danby, Tractate Sanhedrin, London: SPCK 1919, 76-77; J. Neusner, *The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70* Part 1; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971, 240). These principles are commented upon by H. L. Strack, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch* (München: C. H. Beck, 1976⁶), 96-99. The list in 'Abot R. Nat. A 37 is almost certainly dependent upon that preserved earlier in this Tosefta passage ('Abot R. Nat.

A 37: Hebrew text: S. Schechter, אבות דרבי נתן, Vienna: Lippe, 1887, 110; ET: J. Goldin, *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan*, New Haven: Yale University, 1955, 154).

⁴¹*Rabbinic Traditions*, Part 1, 241.

⁴²In fact, Hillel is credited with use of *gězērā šāwā*, *qal wāḥōmēr*, and *hiqqiś*, this last not even being one of the seven *middōt* (*y. Pesah.* 6:1; French tr., M. Schwab, *Le Talmud de Jerusalem*, Vol. 3, *Pesahim*, Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1874, 81-82; ET, Neusner, *Rabbinic Traditions*, Part 1, 246-48). The earlier version of the encounter in *t. Pesah.* 4:13 (text ed. S. Lieberman, *The Tosefta*, New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962, *Mo^eed*, 165-66, 11. 80-94; ET, Neusner, *Rabbinic Traditions*, Part 1, 231-32) does not cite the exegetical principle by name, though it contains the same exegeses as *y. Pesah.* 6:1.

⁴³*y. Pesah.* 6:1 is composite too, but more clearly emphasizes in its parts the subordination of Hillel to his' masters.

⁴⁴Neusner's sound conclusion based on form analysis on *t. Pesah.* 4:13 (*Rabbinic Traditions*, Part 1, 235) runs: "That a shred of historically usable information is before us seems to be unlikely."

⁴⁵See F. Maass, "Von den Ursprüngen der rabbinischen Schriftauslegung," *ZTK* 52 (1955), 156 for further literature on this aspect of the use of exegetical *middōt*; also R. Loewe, "The 'Plain' Meaning of Scripture in Early Jewish Exegesis,"

Papers of the Institute of Jewish Studies London (Vol. 1, ed. J. G. Weiss; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1964), 152-53. Loewe stresses the legal and therefore conservative setting mentioned by Daube in relation to the origin of the list of *middōt*.

⁴⁶*Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*, New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962².

⁴⁷E.g., for Lieberman, *gēzērā šāwā* = σύγκρισις προς ἴσον, which term he sees used technically by Hermogenes (*Progymnasmata*, 8) amongst other 2nd century A.D. authors (*Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*, 59); Daube ("Rabbinic Interpretation," 259) discusses the Greek equivalents of some of the Hebrew terms, citing Aristotle (*Rhetoric* 1:2:19).

⁴⁸Citing material quoted in Liddell and Scott (*A Greek-English Lexicon*, revised ed. Jones-McKenzie; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968⁹, 1667) under σύγκρισις II.

⁴⁹*Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*, 68-82. Lieberman relies heavily upon Artemidorus' *Onirocriticon* for comparative material (2nd century A.D.).

⁵⁰*Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*, 62.

⁵¹Thus some such presentation as that of F. Maass ("Von den Ursprüngen der rabbinischen Schriftauslegung") can arguably be seen to describe the origin of much of the content of rabbinic literature adequately in relation to certain determinative events in the times after Ezra, but its form and terminology remain that of the tannaitic rabbis.

⁵²Hebrew text: תורה כהנים (ed. J. H. Weiss, Vienna, 1862; reprinted, New York: Om, 1946) 1-3; *Sifra or Torat Kohanim*

according to *Codex Assemani LXVI* (ed. L. Finkelstein; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1956), 1-3: German Tr., J. Winter, *Sifra*, Breslau: S. Münz, 1938, 1-2. See Strack, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*, 99-100.

⁵³Strack (*Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*, 199) describes the rivalries of the rabbis of the 2nd century A.D. Further straightforward description of R. Ishmael and the thirteen *middōt* can be found in Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People*, Vol. 2, revised and edited by Vermes, Millar and Black, 376-77.

⁵⁴Or *The Midrash of Thirty-Two Hermeneutic Rules*, New York: Bloch, 1933. Formerly the text was known only from the introduction to *Midrash Ha-Gadol* and in *Midrash Ha-Ḥefes*: German tr., Strack, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*, 100-108.

⁵⁵On the actual number, see Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*, 68, n. 168.

⁵⁶E.g., none of them mentions the principle of 'al tiqrē'. The most complete list of exegetical terms in rabbinic literature is that of W. Bacher, *Die exegetische Terminologie der Jüdischen Traditionsliteratur* (I, *Die bibelexegetische Terminologie der Tannaiten*, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1899; II *Die Bibel- und traditionsexegetische Terminologie der Amoräer*, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1905). Furthermore, we must deny that the *middōt* developed from 7 to 13 to 32 in an evolutionary way (e.g., as understood by R. N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 33); rather, the increase in *middōt* represents a relaxation of an earlier rigidity in Pharisaic interpretation.

⁵⁷*Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*, 68-82.

⁵⁸Except perhaps portions of James and Jude. For an exposition of James as a midrash on Psalm 12 see M. Gertner, "Midrashim in the New Testament," *JSS* 7 (1962), 283-91.

⁵⁹H. M. Shires (*Finding the Old Testament in the New*, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974, 29) expresses this well: "Scripture was only one authority for early Christianity. Another was Jesus Christ, and he alone is the key to the Christian understanding of all scripture."

⁶⁰E.g., K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew* (Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1954); and more recently, R. H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* (NovTSup 18; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967; with a full bibliography, pp. 235-40), W. Rothfuchs, *Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums* (BWANT 88; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1969), M. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (London: SPCK, 1974) and B. Gerhardsson, "The Hermeneutic Program in Matthew 22:37-40," *Jews, Greeks and Christians* (eds. R. Hamerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs, *SJLA* 21; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), 129-50.

⁶¹E.g., J. Bonsirven, *Exégèse rabbinique et exégèse paulinienne* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1939), W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: SPCK, 1948, 1955²), E. E. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1957) and A. T. Hanson, *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology* (London: SPCK, 1974).

⁶²*The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, London: Athlone, 1956.

⁶³*Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München: C. H. Beck, 1924-28. As often pointed out, its major weakness is its naive methodological appreciation of the rabbinic sources such that it is really a 'Commentary on the Talmud and Midrash from the NT'. Noteworthy for the present observations is that the volume on Matthew contains 1055 pages whereas that on the rest of the Gospels and Acts has only just over 800. Cf. a similar predominance of Matthew in M. Smith's *Tannaitic Parallels to the Gospels* (SELMS 6; Philadelphia: SBL, 1951).

⁶⁴*Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*, 78.

⁶⁵Even if the form of an exegetical tradition appears peculiarly rabbinic, the content of the exegesis is more often than not expressed in an Hellenistic way. E.g., S. Towner (*The Rabbinic 'Enumeration of Scriptural Examples'*, SPB 22; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973, 95-117) has identified a peculiarly rabbinic form, but he fails to see beyond the overall pattern that the parts are related in a very Hellenistic fashion (118-213). For an opposing presentation, see the study of H. A. Fischel, *Rabbinic Literature and Greco-Roman Philosophy* (SPB 21; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973), in which are shown, from tannaitic literature, many parallels to Graeco-Roman orations basically intact as to structure and stylistic interpretative devices.

⁶⁶E.g., R. Williamson, *Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews* (ALGHJ 4, ed. K. H. Rengstorff, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1970), 520: "The method of interpretation which Philo used to get beneath the superficial, literal level of meaning to the under-

lying truth of the OT was the allegorical method."

⁶⁷*Praem* 61, *Som* i, 120. This point is made strongly by R. Longenecker (*Biblical Exegesis*, 29); cf. *b. Yebam.* 11b. All references to Philo's works are to the Loeb Classical Library edition (tr. F. H. Colson & G. H. Witaker, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 10 vols., 1929-62) and the titles of Philo's works are abbreviated according to the Loeb system provided on pp. xxiii-xxiv of volume 1.

⁶⁸*Mig* 89-94, as discussed by S. Belkin, *Philo and the Oral Law* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1940), 11-13.

⁶⁹The phrase is that of S. G. Sowers, *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews* (Richmond: John Knox, 1965), 28-34. For a clear exposition of the way one level may fairly compromise but not deny the other see S. Sandmel, "Philo's Environment," 249-50.

⁷⁰E.g., "Broadly speaking, all or most of the law-book is an allegory," *Jos* 28; "Let us not, then, be misled by the actual words, but look at the allegorical meaning that lies beneath them," *Cong* 172.

⁷¹Homeric Allegories 5:2. ὁ γὰρ ἄλλα μὲν ἀγορεύων τρόπος, ἕτερα δὲ ἄν λέγει σημαίνων, ἐπωνύμως ἀλληγορικά καλεῖται (Text: *Héraclite: Allégories d'Homère*, ed. F. Buffière, Paris: Société d'Édition Les Belles Lettres, 1962, 4).

⁷²E.g., I. Christiansen, *Die Technik der allegorischen Auslegungswissenschaft bei Philon von Alexandria* (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1969), 132-33 and 150-51.

⁷³As most often proposed by S. Belkin (see n.68, n.87).

⁷⁴C. Siegfried (*Philo von Alexandria als Ausleger des Alten Testaments*, Jena: H. Dufft, 1875) long ago suggested that Philo's allegorical exegesis was something *sui generis* as a whole but sharing in certain elements with other interpretations of scripture; he outlined 24 rules which he discerned Philo followed, albeit unconsciously at times, in his exegetical method (pp. 168-97) - at least one of these is not really a rule (No. 24: "Gattungen der Allegorie"), but for several Siegfried enumerates rabbinic parallels (Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6) without, however, any mention of technical rabbinic terminology for the particular items. Something akin to Siegfried's opinion is now becoming the general majority approach: even Belkin might not hesitate to adopt it. It is the view most recently of R. G. Hammerton-Kelly, "Some Techniques of Composition in Philo's Allegorical Commentary with Special Reference to *De Agricultura* - A Study in the Hellenistic Midrash," (*Jews, Greeks and Christians*, ed. R. G. Hammerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs, SJLA 21, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976, 45-56).

⁷⁵As does Sowers, *The Hermeneutics of Philo*, 11ff.

⁷⁶B. J. Bamberger, "Philo and the Aggadah," *HUCA* 48 (1977), 153-85, argues that Philo had a modest knowledge of Palestinian haggadic tradition.

⁷⁷"Aspects de l'exégèse philonienne," *Exégèse biblique et Judaïsme*, ed. J. E. Ménard, Strasbourg: Université des Sciences Humaines, 1973, 108-15.

⁷⁸"L'exégèse de Philon d'Alexandrie," *RHRP* 53 (1973), 309-29; e.g., p. 309: "Les idées philosophiques sont entièrement mises au service de l'interprétation du passage étudié."

⁷⁹"Exegetical Traditions in Alexandrian Judaism: A Program for the Analysis of the Philonic Corpus," *SP* 3 (1974-75), 75. In all this Mack argues for the appropriateness of comparing Philo's exegesis with other exegetical traditions of the Hellenistic period: Midrash, Halachah, Homer Exegesis, etc., ("Exegetical Traditions in Alexandrian Judaism," 103-6). Indeed, through his succinct description of Philo's individuality within its setting S. Sandmel ("Philo's Environment and Philo's Exegesis," *JBR* 22 1954, 251) implied nearly 30 years ago that study of Philo might take this approach.

In relation to Philo's scriptural exegesis and its importance for the Jewishness of Philo, see H. A. Wolfson, *Philo* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University, 1947) 1, 95-96.

⁸⁰"Preliminary Issues in the Analysis of Philo's *De Specialibus Legibus*," *SP* 5 (1978), 1-55.

⁸¹"Moses and Pythagoras: Arithmology as an Exegetical Tool in Philo," *Studia Biblica 1978: Papers on Old Testament and Related Themes*, ed. E. A. Livingstone, *JSOTSup* 11; Sheffield: JSOT, 1979, 205-8; "Arithmology as an Exegetical Tool in the Writings of Philo of Alexandria," *SBL Seminar Papers 1*, Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978, 191-227. On the work of the Philo Project at Claremont, California with which Mack, Hecht and Moehring are all connected see "The Philo Project," *The Institute for Antiquity and Christianity Report 1972-80*, ed. M. W. Meyer, Claremont: The Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, 1981, 15-18.

⁸²Loeb Vol. 5, 125.

⁸³A. Hanson, "Philo's Etymologies," *JTS N.S.* 18 (1967), 130.

⁸⁴ Notwithstanding the evidence inferred by J. -G. Kahn ("Did Philo Know Hebrew? The Testimony of the Etymologies," *Tarbiz* 34 1964-65, 337-45, Eng. Summ. iv-v) that Philo copied his etymologies from a Greek model in which Hebrew names were already transliterated and explained.

⁸⁵ Loeb Vol. 5, 125.

⁸⁶ Nowhere in his long treatment of Abraham in Philo's writings does S. Sandmel discuss the etymology of the name; rather, for Sandmel, the change in name is solely significant for the change in character that God gives Abraham (*Philo's Place in Judaism*, Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1956, 168-69, 172, 184-85).

⁸⁷ "Philo's Etymologies," 136. E. Stein (*Die allegorische Exegese des Philo aus Alexandria*, BZAW 51; Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1929, 58) had selected the first two of these, אב and בר, but for the third suggested that רהם was understood by Philo as a variation of רעם "to thunder." S. Belkin ("Some Obscure Traditions Mutually Clarified in Philo and Rabbinic Literature," *Studies in Judaica*, ed. L. D. Stitskin, New York: Ktav, 1974, 22) adequately dismissed Stein's proposal: "According to Philo, sound here stands for "the uttered word, for in living creatures the instrument of sound is the vocal power." It would be unwarranted, therefore, to convert this vocal power into a power of the elements, a metamorphosis which Philo did not intend."

⁸⁸ One reason for this somewhat forced though possible etymology is that in discussing the character of Abraham, Philo appears interested to stress the faculty of speech, whereas with Jacob/Israel he stresses sight (ראה). In relation to

Abr 61-84 this is the observation of J. Cazeaux ("Interpréteur Philon d'Alexandrie," *REG* 84 1972 , 352).

⁸⁹*Gen. Rab.* 46:7 (Text: *Midrash Rabbah*, ed. H. Freedman; London: Soncino, Vol. 1, 1939, 393). The phrase is associated with third century Babylonian Amoraim. On the other hand *b. Šabb.* 105a claims that the use of *nōṭārîqôn* belongs to the interpretation of **אב המון**: "If one writes a letter as an abbreviation, R. Joshua b. Bathyra holds him liable, whilst the sages exempt him. R. Johanan said in R. Jose b. Zimra's name; How do we know (that) abbreviated forms (are recognized) by the Torah? Because it is written, for *AB* (the father of) *HaMWN* (a multitude of) nations have I made thee: a father (*Ab*) of nations have I made thee; a chosen one (*Baḥur*) among nations have I made thee. *HaMWN*: beloved (*Ḥabib*) have I made thee among nations; a king (*Melek*) have I appointed thee for the nations; distinguished (*Wathik*) have I made thee among the nations; faithful (*Ne'eman*) have I made thee to the nations" (Edition: *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. H. Freedman, London: Soncino, Vol. 8, 1938, 505).

S. Belkin maintains because of *Šabb.* 105a that **בחר** and not **בר** served Philo as a pattern and that the rest of the exposition of **המון** was dropped because of the possible political misunderstandings that might have arisen from the use of "king" ("Obscure Traditions," 23-24). Yet Belkin's treatment is inadequate: he fails to suggest an alternative way in which Philo came to use *ἄγοῦς* and he fails to remember that Philo is not expounding **אב המון** but the name Abraham.

⁹⁰*Gen. Rab.* 47:1. R. Aḥa was a 4th century Palestinian Amora.

⁹¹ *B. Ber.* 13a. The targums do not help towards an understanding of the interpretation of the name Abraham, though, interestingly, Neofiti renders כִּי אֵב הַמּוֹן גּוֹיִם by the elaborate phrase קַהֵל כְּנַשָּׁה אֹמִיּוֹן זֹדִיקִין which is exactly repeated at Gen 28:3, 35:11 and 48:4. Against the tradition represented in *Ber.* 13a Neofiti thus clearly limits the blessing of Abraham to the tribes of Israel and relates it to Abraham's acquisition of life in the world to come (*Neof.* Gen 15:1).

⁹² A further example of a possible interpretation of the name can be seen in the extracts of an anonymous historiographer wrongly named Eupolemus among the Jewish fragments of the collective work of Alexander Polyhistor preserved in Eusebius' *Praeparatio Evangelica* 9, 17. There Abraham is the universal bringer of culture, not so much the father of many nations as their teacher. This text is most recently discussed by M. Hengel (*Judentum und Hellenismus*, 162-69). Sir 44:19a and Jubilees both remain very close to the LXX.

⁹³ *Mut* 61-63.

⁹⁴ There is much literature on this subject. Among those for Philo knowing Hebrew are C. Siegfried (*Philo von Alexandria als Ausleger*, 144: "Er verstand hebräisch - nicht im modernen Sinne, aber nach den Ueberlieferungen über Gesetze und Wortschatz der heiligen Sprache, die nach Alexandria von den Palästinern überbracht und daselbst seit lange einheimisch waren"), S. Belkin (*Philo and the Oral Law*, 35) and H. Wolfson (*Philo*, 1, 88-90). Ascribing Philo some elementary knowledge of Hebrew are S. Sandmel (*Philo's Place in Judaism*, 12-13; "Philo's

Knowledge of Hebrew," *Studia Philonica* 5 1978 , 107-111) and A. Hanson ("Philo's Etymologies," 138-39). Denying Philo any knowledge of Hebrew are E. Stein (*Die allegorische Exegese*, 20-21), E. R. Goodenough (*An Introduction to Philo Judaeus*, Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1962², 9, 11) and J. -G. Kahn ("Did Philo Know Hebrew?" iv-v). Stein's argument is most comprehensive, but his denial is largely on the basis that the etymologies are often far from literal translations; yet the list Stein gives (53-61) demonstrates the necessity of an initial explanation of a majority of the etymologies in terms of Hebrew not Greek - though whether this was Philo's or somebody else's is still open to debate; Stein, of course, proposes that Philo had a Greek source for these and other haggadic materials (*Philo und der Midrasch*, *BZAW* 57; Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1931, 15).

In fact both those for and against Philo's knowing Hebrew agree in varying degrees that he was most likely acquainted with Palestinian rabbinic traditions: e.g., Siegfried lists instances of traditions which Philo may have used (145-56) as well as those he may have influenced (281-88); and, on the other hand, Stein (*Philo und der Midrasch*, 50-51) concludes that the Palestinian haggadah may have played some part in the history of the traditions which Philo uses. D. Rokeah ("A New Onomasticon Fragment from Oxyrynchus and Philo's Etymologies," *JTS* N.S.19 1968 , 70-82) denies Philo knowledge of Hebrew and proposes the existence of a first redaction of a list of etymologies in Greek in the second century B.C.; Rokeah's treatment of an onomasticon fragment thus supports one proposal for a Hellenistic dating for such etymologies as occur in Philo's writings. More recently J. T. Milik (*The Books of Enoch*.

Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4, Oxford: Clarendon, 1976, 213-16) in discussing 4QEn^c 5 ii 22-24 (1 *Enoch* 106:18) has supported Rokeah by noting that the etymologies in 4QEn more often play on the Hebrew than the Aramaic meaning, suggesting that the author of 1 *Enoch* used a secondary Hebrew source for his etymologies.

⁹⁵1 Kgs 14:9, Ps 41(2):4, Amos 5:23, Joel 3(4): 14, Jer 28:16, 42, 29:3.

⁹⁶As noted by G. B. Caird ("Homoeophony in the Septuagint," *Jews, Greeks and Christians*, ed. R. G. Hammerton-Kelly and R. Scroggs, SJLA 21, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976, 84) who classifies it simply as a mistranslation.

⁹⁷Cf. Philo's treatment of Israel as based on the Hebrew אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל; the same etymology may be the basis of the wordplay in John 1:46-51.

⁹⁸*Die Technik*, 99-131.

⁹⁹"Philo's Allegorical Commentary," 55-56.

¹⁰⁰Hammerton-Kelly ignores the opening section of the unit and so his structural interpretation is slightly out of balance.

¹⁰¹"Philo's Allegorical Commentary," 55.

¹⁰²Loeb Vol. 2, 95.

¹⁰³LXX has προσετέθη.

¹⁰⁴*Sac* 5; Loeb Vol. 2, 99.

¹⁰⁵*Sac* 6; Loeb Vol. 2, 99. Gen 35:29 (LXX) reads: καὶ κατέπαυσεν Ἰακώβ ... καὶ προσετέθη πρὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ.

¹⁰⁶*Sac* 10; Loeb Vol. 2, 101.

¹⁰⁷*Philo and the Oral Law*, 32. Philo exegetes Num 27:7-11 by means of *qal wāḥōmer* in *Spec* 2, 132; this is the same as the method employed in *Sifre* Num 134.

¹⁰⁸*Philo and the Oral Law*, 33-34. The rabbis have a similar exegesis of Deut 22:23-27 in *Sifre* Deut 243. Clearly the reservations of R. D. Hecht, "Preliminary Issue in the Analysis of Philo's *De Specialibus Legibus*," 2, must be taken into account in any use of Belkin's conclusions.

¹⁰⁹*Cong* 73 reads: "Now it is worth considering carefully why in this place Moses again calls Sarah the wife of Abraham, when he has already stated the fact several times; for Moses did not practise the worst form of prolixity, namely tautology." Siegfried (*Philo von Alexandria als Ausleger*, 168) names this as the first rule of Philo's method of allegorization.

¹¹⁰*Philo and the Oral Law*, 35; a list criticized justifiably for its very brevity by D. Daube (*EO* 5 1948, 65).

¹¹¹Hammerton-Kelly, "Philo's Allegorical Commentary," 56.

¹¹²For exegetical techniques other than those discussed here (*gēzērā šāwā, nōṭārīqōn, 'al tiqrē'*) see the work of scholars involved in the Claremont Philo Project (above, n.81).

¹¹³For bibliographies of recent and important works see: J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1969), 327-48; M. P. Miller, "Targum, Midrash and the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," *JSS* 2 (1971), 29-82; and the works of B. Grossfeld: *Bibliography of Targum Literature* (New York: Ktav, 1972) and his continuing bibliographies in the *Newsletter for Targumic and Cognate*

Studies (ed. W. E. Aufrecht; Toronto: Victoria College).

¹¹⁴*Masoreten des Westens II*, BWANT 14; Stuttgart:

W. Kohlhammer, 1930.

¹¹⁵Ms. Neofiti 1 of the Vatican Library. The volumes used in this section are editions by A. Díez Macho: *Neophyti 1*, Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Tomo 1: Génesis, 1968; Tomo II: Exodo, 1970.

¹¹⁶4QtgLev, 4QtgJob, 11QtgJob.

¹¹⁷E.g., G. Vermes, "Haggadah in the Onqelos Targum," *JSS* 8 (1963), 154-69 and J. Bowker, "Haggadah in the Targum Onqelos," *JSS* 12 (1967), 51-65.

¹¹⁸For a brief outline of the interrelationship of the targum recensions see R. Le Déaut, "Les études targumiques. État de la recherche et perspectives pour l'exégèse de l'ancien testament," *De Mari à Qumran* (ed. H. Cazelles; BETL 24; Gembloux: J. Duculot, 1969), 302-31 - especially the diagram and its explication, 314-19.

¹¹⁹"The Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum: Its Antiquity and Relationship with the Other Targums," *Congress Volume: Oxford* (VTSup 7; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960), 222-45. This was countered (on the basis of lack of evidence) by P. Wernberg-Møller, "An Inquiry into the Validity of the Text-critical Argument for an Early Dating of the Recently Discovered Palestinian Targum," *VT* 12 (1962), 312-31.

¹²⁰*The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1* (BibOr 18A; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1971²), 193-227. This is more completely worked out, with consideration of Díez Macho's work, in

A Wandering Aramean, Chapter 3.

¹²¹Thus, in reviewing M. Black's *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967³), Fitzmyer remarks that "any discussion of the Aramaic substratum of the NT must begin with local and contemporary Aramaic." The Aramaic of Qumran and of first century inscriptions "must be the latest Aramaic that should be used for *philological* comparisons of the Aramaic substratum of the Gospels and Acts" (*CBQ* 30 1968 , 420); see also, *A Wandering Aramean*, Chapter 1.

¹²²*Urschrift und Übersetzungen der Bibel*, Frankfurt, 1928². In his second excursus he studied more than 100 passages which appear to him to contain an interpretation of the Hebrew text. He fails, however, to outline the exegetical technique of the targumist.

¹²³See especially the work of R. Le Déaut ("Targumic Literature and New Testament Interpretation," *BTB* 4 1974 , 243-89), of M. McNamara (*Targum and Testament*, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1968) and of G. Vermes (*Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*, SPB 4; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973²; *Post-Biblical Jewish Studies*, SJLA 8; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975) for studies of particular exegetical traditions that appear in the targums and for reference to other works; also see the bibliographical sources listed on p. 65, n.113, especially *Bibliography of Targum Literature*, 79-84.

¹²⁴E.g., L. H. Brockington ("Septuagint and Targum," *ZAW* 66 1954 , 80-85) has concluded that there are numerous parallels, especially in the stress on salvation in Isaiah, between the LXX and the Targum, but that there is no evidence

for outright borrowing either way. Cf. P. Churgin's proposition ("The Targum and the Septuagint," *AJSL* 50 1933-34, 41-65) that particular word-use in the LXX reveals that its text has been emended shortly after composition to bring it into line with targumic interpretations: Churgin views the LXX as a Greek targum. For further bibliography see S. P. Brock, C. T. Fritsch, S. Jellicoe, *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint* (ALGHJ 6; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973), 52.

¹²⁵The substitution of each letter by its counterpart in sequence counting either from the beginning or from the end of the alphabet as required, e.g. א(<=>)ן, ב(<=>)ש, etc.

¹²⁶A. Díez Macho, "Le Targum palestinien," 47.

¹²⁷*La Nuit pascale*, AnBib 22; Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical, 1963, 58-62.

¹²⁸*La Nuit pascale*, 59.

¹²⁹Although all translation is interpretative, the targumim deserve their categorization as interpretative translation because they fulfilled more than just a translational role in their setting in the synagogue; see D. Patte. *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 49-86. Patte does not, however, give a single example of a targumic text the form and content of which could almost certainly go back to the period which he discusses (first centuries B.C. and A.D.); all his remarks are, therefore, somewhat inconclusive for his thesis, though there may be some value in them. Indeed, A. Paul (*RSR* 64 1976 543) criticizes Patte's work in that it "lacks historical perspective."

¹³⁰For a summary of these various rabbinic interpretations see B. Grossfeld, "Targum Onkelos and Rabbinic Interpretation to Genesis 2:1, 2," *JJS* 24 (1973), 176.

¹³¹As also at Gen 17:22, Gen 49:33, Exod 34:33 and Deut 32:45 ("Targum Onkelos and Rabbinic Interpretation to Genesis 2:1, 2," 177).

¹³²Trans. of J. W. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature*, 112.

¹³³E.g., 2 Sam 13:39, Ps 84:3, 119:81, 82, 123, 143:7, Isa 38:14. It may be that the targumist knew that to achieve his interpretation he would be implying כלה + ל in the Hebrew text but that he justified that to himself by considering the preposition ל simply as designating a direct object as Aramaic grammar allows.

¹³⁴Complutensis 1516/17.

¹³⁵As are allusions in *Sub.* 4:15, 22, 5:1; *T. Reub.* 5:6, 7; 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 56:11-14; Philo, *Gig.* 2:6ff. For other references see Charles, *APOT* 2, 191, J. Morgenstern, "The Mythological Background of Psalm 82," *HUCA* 14 (1939), 86-95, and P. Alexander, "The Targumim and Early Exegesis of 'Sons of God' in Genesis 6," *JJS* 23 (1972), 61, n.5. 11QtgJob 30:5 renders בני אלהים (MT) as מלאכי אלה.

¹³⁶According to *Gen. Rab.* 26:5; trans. in J. W. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature*, 153.

¹³⁷E.g., *b. Yoma* 67b, *Nid.* 61a. In the non-authoritative *Pirqe R. El.* 22 angels are mentioned once more. Alexander attributes the change in the Jewish understanding of בני אלהים

to the reassertion of Torah Judaism against Gnosticism and its like after the second Jewish war ("The Targumim and Early Exegesis," 68-71).

¹³⁸Rendering אלהים as earthly judges or nobles, the same phrase as that used by R. Simeon b. Johai: בְּנֵי דִינִינָה.

¹³⁹¹ Enoch presupposes this 'al tiqré'. On the fall of the Angels see especially A. Lods, "La chute des anges," (*RHPR* 7 1927, 295-315) who wishes to see a predominantly Babylonian influence behind the creation of the myth; also J. Morgenstern "The Mythological Background of Psalm 82," 40-70.

¹⁴⁰Namely: 1) Angels descend on a good errand but fall victim to the charms of the daughters of men (*Jub.* 4:15, 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 56:11-14); 2) Angels disparage man and so are sent to earth to be tested - and fail (*Ps.-Clem. Homilies* 8:11-15); 3) Angels are simply seduced from heaven by the daughters of men (1 *Enoch* 6-11, *Pirqe R. El.* 22). This third tradition is the one to which *Ps.-Jonathan* comes closest ("The Targumim and Early Exegesis," 70-71).

¹⁴¹On this term see J. Bowker, *The Targums and Rabbinic Literature*, 318, and W. Bacher, *Die exegetische Terminologie der jüdischen Traditionsliteratur* II, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1905, 65-66.

¹⁴²*Tg. Ps.-Jonathan* and Cairo Genizah Fragment C give no proper name but refer to "an angel" and to "the angel in the likeness of a man" מלאך עמיה ברמיה גבר respectively. *Midr. Rabbah* has the guardian angel of Esau wrestle with Jacob.

¹⁴³*Tg. Onqelos* has only "let me go for the dawn has risen;"

Tg. Ps.-Jonathan Gen 32:27 adds, "I am one of the praising angels. Since the day that the world was created, my time to praise has never arrived until this moment." The *Fragmentary Targum* and *Fragment C* of the Cairo Genizah are nearly identical with *Tg. Neofiti*.

¹⁴⁴"Jacob . . . cum luctaretur in pulvere cum angelo qui stabat super (h)ymnos . . ." (Text: G. Kisch, *Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*, Indiana: Notre Dame University, 1949, 159); cf. M. R. James' translation, *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo* (New York: Ktav, 1971), 124: "Jacob also, when he wrestled in the dust with the angel that was over the praises,..."

¹⁴⁵Sariel also appears at 4QEn^a 1 iv 6 but the angels are in a different order there from that of 1QM 9:12-15. Unfortunately not enough of the text of Gen 32:25 is preserved in 4QBibParaph (4Q158) to determine whether Sariel is mentioned.

¹⁴⁶"The Archangel Sariel. A Targumic Parallel to the Dead Sea Scrolls," *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults* (SJLA 12:3; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975) 159f. Vermes notes that Sariel (Σαριελ) of 1 *Enoch* 20:6, who is rendered as *sā-rā-qā-ē-l(ē)* in the Ethiopic text, belongs to a group of seven in which the four archangels already occur, Uriel supplanting Sariel in 1QM 9:15. A third Sariel features at 1 *Enoch* 6:8, 8:3; he does indeed derive his name from the Aramaic שרהר, "moon," as proposed by R. H. Charles (*APOT* 2, 191) as his name in 4QEn^a 1 iii 11 is שריאל (J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 154).

This short study on Gen 32:29 is largely dependent on Vermes' work. Some additional comments by Vermes are available

in his article "The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Jewish Studies during the last Twenty-Five Years," *JJS* 26 (1975), 1-14, reprinted in *Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice*, ed. W. S. Green, BJS 1; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978, 201-14, especially 211-13.

¹⁴⁷Gen 32:29, Hos 12:4-5; BDB, KB: "to struggle, persist, exert oneself, persevere." Cf. R. Coote's conclusion ("The Meaning of the Name *Israel*," *HTR* 65 (1972), 137-40): "The meaning of the name *Israel* is probably 'El judges', from the verb *šry* or *yśr* meaning 'to govern by rendering judgment or decree'."

¹⁴⁸LXX ἐνσχυθεῖν, "to be strong," implies an understanding of the root שרר and this is reflected in the Peshitta's אשתרר.

¹⁴⁹"The Archangel Sariel," 165. Vermes supports this understanding with reference to the various treatments of שרר in Num 16:13. *Tg. Onqelos*, *Tg. Ps.-Jonathan* and *Tg. Neofiti* translate it by אחררר and this time the LXX agrees with them (αυτάρχεις and δοχων) as does the Peshitta: אחררר.

¹⁵⁰"The Archangel Sariel," 162.

¹⁵¹As Vermes ("The Archangel Sariel," 165) suggests.

¹⁵²R. H. Charles, *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1906), lists the variants of the name on p. 24: B-f have *ǎ-rě-sě-yǎ-lǎ-lě-yē-r(ě)*, m has *ǎ-sū-rě-yē-ū-lě-yē-r(ě)*, q has *ǎ-sǎ-rē-yē-lǎ-lě-yē-r(ě)*, t has *ǎ-sě-rě-ē-lě-yē-r(ě)*, and u has *ǎ-sě-rě-yē-lě-yē-l(ě)* (For the Ms sigla see Charles, *Ethiopic Enoch*, xvii-xxi). According to A. Lods (*Le Livre d'Hénoch*, Paris: E. Leroux,

1892, 112) the combination of "Arsial = Sariel et de Aliour = Ourial."

¹⁵³"A Targum on Exod. xv 7-21 from the Cairo Geniza," *VT* 11 (1961), 340.

¹⁵⁴This is, however, the targum recension that comes closest to the Peshitta (איך זינזקא רדיא) according to the comparison of all the recensions at this point by A. Vööbus (*Peschitta und Targumim des Pentateuchs*, Stockholm: Etse, 1958, 41). M. Black (*A Christian Palestinian Syriac Horologion*, Texts and Studies, N.S. 1; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1954, 24) translates the phrase of the Syriac as "like gravel the streams."

¹⁵⁵As pointed out most recently by E. Levine, "Neofiti 1: A Study of Exodus 15," *Bib* 54 (1973), 311. BDB translates נד as "dam, barrier;" KB as "dam or wall" citing Arabic *nadd*. Cross and Freedman, ("The Song of Miriam," *JNES* 14 1955, 246, n. 21), comment: "This is a rare word apparently meaning 'hill' or 'heap'. The other occurrences of the word are related to this passage and are probably dependent on it. Cf. Josh. 3:13, 16; Ps. 78:13. The other references are obscure and perhaps corrupt." Cross continues to support this in his *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1973, 128, n. 58; presumably there is nothing in 4QExod^C to call into question the antiquity of the MT at this point. The susceptibility of *ʿāleph* to the method of 'al tiqrē' may be further represented in 1QIsa^a 40:15 which reads מְזַנִּים over against מְזַנִּים of the MT; this variant is not mentioned by J. R. Rosenbloom, *The Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll: A Literary Analysis*, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1970, 49, but it is recognized in *BHS*.

¹⁵⁶LXX reads: ἐπάγη ὡσεὶ τεῖχος τὰ ὕδατα

¹⁵⁷E.g., *Mek. Exod 15:8*, 'Abot R. Nat. 33; the ten miracles at the sea are not extrapolated in 'Abot R. Nat. B 36 or *Pirqe 'Abot 5:5*.

¹⁵⁸"*Neofiti 1: A Study of Exodus 15*," 312.

¹⁵⁹Trans. of E. Cashdan in *The Babylonian Talmud* (translated under the editorship of I. Epstein, London: Soncino, 1935-52); *b. Menah. 36b-37a* is in the Vol. published in 1948, p. 227.

¹⁶⁰*The Cairo Geniza*, (London: Oxford University, 1959²), 123. The complete text of Exod 22:4 in Cairo Geniza Fragment A (Cambridge: T.-S. 20.155) reads: כי יבער איש/ארום יבקר גבר (Ed. P. Kahle, *Masoreten des Westens II*, 3).

¹⁶¹As RSV. In 4Q 158, frgs. 10-12, בעה is substituted for the initial בער of v 4 and appears to be a deliberate alteration of the sense, by the Qumran scribe or in his Vorlage, to avoid the difficulty of understanding the verse in the sense of the targum whilst not denying something akin to the mishnaic ruling.

¹⁶²"A Sixth Century Fragment of the Palestinian Targum?" *VT* 1 (1951), 125-29.

¹⁶³Oxford: B. Blackwell/New York: Praeger and Sons, 1959, 205-8.

¹⁶⁴Probably largely because of the vindication of his thesis which *Tg. Neofiti* now provides.

¹⁶⁵"Exodus xxii 4 im *Palästinischen Targum*," *VT* 8 (1958), 253-63.

¹⁶⁶"Exodus xxii 4 im *Palästinischen Targum*," 255.

¹⁶⁷"Exodus xxii im *Palästinischen Targum*," 258.

¹⁶⁸As does the Samaritan text. 4QBibParaph 10-12 lacks the phrase at issue though other parts of Exod 22 that are present suggest an understanding similar to that of the LXX and Samaritan versions.

¹⁶⁹As pointed out by Schelbert, 262. *Mekilta Nez.* 6, 11. 15-16 reads **השולח את הנערה** (ed. J. Z. Lauterbach, 52) "The one that kindled the fire shall make restitution" (Exod 22:4 5). But *Mekilta Nez.* 14 carries the standard mishnaic interpretation of the text (ed. J. Z. Lauterbach, 108-13).

¹⁷⁰"The *Targum* of Ex. xxii, 4 and the Ancient *Halakha*," *Tarbiṣ* 38 (1969), V; Heinemann writes largely against D. Reider ("On the *Targum Yerushalmi MS Neofiti 1*," *Tarbiṣ* 38 1968, 81-86) who maintains that the Geniza *Targum* Fragment A contains a simple scribal error in reading **יקירתה** for **נעירה** in Exod 22:4 and that the rendering of *Tg. Neofiti* is a case of mis-translation. In a later article ("Early *Halakhah* in the Palestinian *Targumim*," *JJS* 25 1974, 114-22) Heinemann maintains his position on Exod 22:4; he cites a wealth of bibliographical material on the subject.

¹⁷¹As phrased by A. Díez Macho, *Neophyti 1*, Tomo II: *Éxodo*, Introducción, 43*.

¹⁷²See the summary of M. P. Miller, "Targum, Midrash and the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," *JJS* 2 (1971), 49-55. Not to be excluded, though more elusive, are interpretative variants within biblical manuscripts at Qumran; see, among others, J. V. Chamberlain, *An Ancient Sectarian*

Interpretation of the Old Testament Prophets, Dissertation: Duke University, 1955, 138-202; S. Talmon, "DSIa as a Witness to Ancient Exegesis of the Book of Isaiah," *ASTI* 1 (1962), 62-72; W. H. Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible*, New York: Oxford University, 1964, 155-259.

¹⁷³G. Vermes, "The Qumran Interpretation of Scripture in its Historical Setting" (*Dead Sea Scroll Studies 1969*, ALUOS 6; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969), 86.

¹⁷⁴CD 16:2 speaks of the Torah as that wherein "all things are strictly defined," and 1QS 1:1-3 outlines that it is the aim of the members of the community "to seek God with a whole heart and soul, and to do what is good and right before him, as he commanded by the hand of Moses and all his servants the Prophets."

¹⁷⁵Broadly defined as including all the prophetic books and any other visionary material in scripture; maybe better defined as the former and latter prophets of Tanak. 1QpHab 7:4-5 tells how the Teacher of Righteousness can interpret all the words of the prophets.

¹⁷⁶As has been done by L. H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (SJLA 16; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), 22-76.

¹⁷⁷That these techniques are more than literary devices is clear from study of 4Q 186 which is devised cryptically being written backwards in square Hebrew, proto-Hebrew, Greek and other secret alphabets (DJD V, 88-91).

¹⁷⁸See especially, "Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BA* 14 (1951), 54-76 (this

is discussed and adjusted in the comments on 1QpHab in Chapter 3) and more recently, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk*, SBLMS 24; Missoula, Scholars Press, 1979. I have already acknowledged Brownlee's influence on this study in the Preface.

¹⁷⁹"Unriddling the Riddle. A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Pesher (1QpHab)," *RQ* 3 (1961-62), 323-64.

¹⁸⁰"Unriddling the Riddle," 327.

¹⁸¹"The Pesher of Dreams and Scriptures," *RQ* 4 (1963-64), 357-70.

¹⁸²Which itself is dependent on the use of scripture: e.g., Finkel notes that in interpreting the dream in 1QapGen 19:14-21 the symbolic elements are a cedar and a palm, taken most certainly from Ps 92:13: "The righteous (=Abraham; Gen 15:6) shall flourish like a palm tree, He shall grow like a cedar (=Sarah; ארז could be an anagram and pun on שרה in Lebanon."

¹⁸³Assignment of technical terms mine.

¹⁸⁴"Toward an Understanding of the Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *RQ* 7 (1969-71), 3-15.

¹⁸⁵See especially his collected essays in *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*, SPB 4; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961, 1973² and in *Post-Biblical Jewish Studies*, SJLA 8; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975, and his article "Interpretation (History of) at Qumran and in the Targums," *IDBSup* (1976), 438-43.

¹⁸⁶"Le *Commentaire d'Habacuc*, qui est une paraphrase actualisante des deux premiers chapitres d'Habacuc, met en

oeuvre tous les procédés midrashiques connus" (DBSup 5, 1277).

¹⁸⁷ *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Totem Meer*, BHT 15; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1953.

¹⁸⁸ Title of chapter six, pp. 118-164.

¹⁸⁹ These three categories are outlined on pp. 127-39, 139-42 and 142-49 respectively.

¹⁹⁰ E.g., the interpretation of the writing on the wall: Dan 5:24-8.

¹⁹¹ As pointed out by J. V. Chamberlain, *An Ancient Sectarian Interpretation*, 109 n. 57.

¹⁹² *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1959, 9.

¹⁹³ *Biblical Exegesis*, 16.

¹⁹⁴ *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte*, WUNT 6, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1960, 75-77.

¹⁹⁵ *Offenbarung*, 78; CD 1:5-10, 20:14.

¹⁹⁶ Bruce shares this understanding that the new situation understood from a scriptural perspective is the basis for the authority of the Qumran interpretation (*Biblical Exegesis*, 18-27, 59-65).

¹⁹⁷ "The Use of the OT in the NT," 51-52.

¹⁹⁸ *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 303-8. Patte cites uncritically the conclusions of Brownlee and Silberman; see, however, below, pp. 283-288, 291-292.

¹⁹⁹ *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 299.

²⁰⁰ *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*,
CBQMS 8; Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of
America, 1979, 244-59.

²⁰¹ See my article "Qumran Pesharim: Towards the Redefinition
of a Genre," *RQ* 10 (1979-81), 483-503.

Chapter II

4Q FLORILEGIUM

A. Description

The material of Chapter I has enabled us to establish the boundaries within which a first century Jew used scripture and to suggest that, between the scriptural text cited and the hermeneutical result achieved, there was the use of certain principles of exegesis: correctly carried out, such principles went some way to demonstrating the validity of the hermeneutical result. 4QFlor can be placed within these same boundaries.

Because 4QFlor is a genuine fragment, a work known only in this one instance, it is worth beginning its detailed study with a complete description. The Florilegium is part of the large group of scroll fragments which were found by the Ta^camireh Bedouin in the summer of 1952, and which were eventually purchased by the Palestine Archaeology Museum.¹ In 1967 the scroll pieces passed into Israeli hands and came under the authority of the Shrine of the Book, Jerusalem.²

M. Burrows has described the find as the climax of the whole extraordinary series of discoveries . . . at an out-of-the-way spot in the plateau on which Khirbet Qumran stands. This plateau is cut by a ravine, and at the point where the ravine

joins the Wady Qumran the Bedouins found a chamber, hollowed out of the soft marl, containing many fragments of manuscripts. This is the cave now known as 4Q.³

J. Allegro, then of Manchester University, was the scholar assigned the task of editing and sorting some of the 4Q material including the text that is the subject of this study. He has also described the events surrounding the discovery of the 4Q cave with its entrance "in the precipitous edge of the plateau,"⁴ very near to the site of Khirbet Qumran.

In his first publication solely concerned with 4QFlor, Allegro gives it the following description:

The skin of the fragments is fairly coarse, in colour a rather striking reddish-brown. It is clear from the nature of the edges that at some time in antiquity the scroll was brutally torn apart. One result has been that the fragments have suffered differently from the ravages of time, so that pieces which should fit together often differ in coloring and warping, or in the state of preservation of the writing. Margins: bottom 2.5cm., top 2cm., right-hand side 1.4cm., left-hand side 1.8cm. The ruling is regular at .8cm.⁵

Earlier Allegro had mentioned that column 1 is made up of some 21 fragments and he published a photograph of some of them.⁶ On the basis of study of that photograph J. L. Teicher challenged Allegro and argued that column 1 was not a continuous text.⁷ If he had kept solely to description of the

photograph, he might have been forgiven, for the cut-off nature of the reproduction is indeed deceptive, and Allegro provided no explanation of it. Teicher continued his argument, however, by saying that the contents of the text made no sense, and that all the evidence, including the context, pointed to the fact that the text was "spurious." Allegro was allowed to reply to Teicher and did so as politely as he could.⁸ The best refutation came with publication of the whole passage in "Fragments".⁹

All twenty-one fragments of column 1 were again reproduced in Allegro's *Qumran Cave 4, I (4Q 158-4Q 186)*,¹⁰ classified as No. 174, 1 and 2, along with 24 other fragments which he had identified as part of the scroll. The description of the scroll may be completed by noting that, if all the fragment pieces are accepted, it contains at least five columns: column 1, in fact, starts in the middle of a passage and is thus a second or later column, column 2 is evidenced in the same fragment as column 1, and furthermore fragments 9 and 13 both contain the top right hand corner of a column.

Allegro provisionally named the scroll *Florilegium* in 1956¹¹ and this was confirmed in his later publications of the text: in his article "Fragments" and in the volume *DJD V*. Other titles have been suggested. A. M. Habermann entitles it מדרש על אחרית הימים,¹² which G. Vermes parallels in his "A Midrash on the Last Days."¹³ Y. Yadin is more precise: "A Midrash on 2 Sam. vii and Ps. i-ii (4QFlorilegium)."¹⁴ W. H. Brownlee notes that to be in keeping with the general preference of finding an appropriate Semitic name for each book the title of Allegro's article "Fragments" might seem to

suggest the name 4Q Midrashim.¹⁵ T. H. Gaster, qualifying Allegro's title, proposes "A 'Messianic' Florilegium."¹⁶

The title Florilegium, the latinized form of the Greek-rooted 'anthology', will be retained throughout this study because it has become the convenient label that the great majority of scholars use, and because, even though it suggests a certain randomness in the selection of passages and that all the biblical passages are equally important, it is less restrictive as a title than any other.

Allegro describes the script as a "neat bookhand,"¹⁷ and comments about 4QOrdinances that "the writing is in a beautifully shaped and proportioned bookhand, bearing a marked resemblance, if not identical with that of 4 Q Florilegium."¹⁸ J. Strugnell also notes the resemblance of the script of the two scrolls but adds that "cette main hérodienne ancienne formelle (avec des elements du semiformal rustique, voir le *shin* et l'*aleph*) est assez largement représentée dans la quatrième grotte."¹⁹

A suggested date for this "Herodian" script can be deduced from palaeographical studies. N. Avigad classes 1QIsa^b, 1QM, 1QPHab and 1QH as Herodian, distinguished by its "strict formal hand" and proposes that the date for this class of scrolls is roughly 50 B.C. to A.D. 70.²⁰ Further detailed comparative material can be found in S. A. Birnbaum's work on the Hebrew scripts.²¹ This expands other evidence he has provided in relation to the Dead Sea Scrolls²² and from the arguments and diagrams presented concerning the evolution of the Hebrew script, it is clear that for him 4QFlor would belong at the very end of the first century B.C. or in the first century A.D.²³ F. M. Cross also offers a table of scripts in relation to which

4QFlor most nearly belongs to line 6 which he describes as "a late hand belonging to a Deuteronomy manuscript (4QDeutj). The script is to be dated ca. A.D. 50; it is the immediate typological forbear of the standard hand of the second century A.D. and later."²⁴

Palaeography provides a rough date; yet a sufficient terminus ante quem for 4QFlor is given by the archaeological date of the discovery itself. R. de Vaux has concluded thus: "Aucun des manuscrits de la communauté n'est plus récent que la ruine de Khirbet Qumran en 68 ap. J.-C."²⁵ Remarks will be made throughout this study concerning the relation of 4QFlor to the various manuscripts at Qumran with the hope that it can be put in the context of its own tradition. Thereby its date will be made more precise; yet this can only be done after a detailed discussion and analysis of the text of 4QFlor.

B. Text and Translation

1. *Introductory Remarks*

In establishing as certainly as possible the textual content (not necessarily the same thing as the meaning content) of the fragments the following steps have been taken:

1. An accurate reading of the fragments was carried out. This is not always as easy as it sounds; for example, ךַּ in 4QFlor 1:4 is situated on a crease in the manuscript and may yet prove to have defied a precise reading. Also, for instance, there is an often confusing similarity in Herodian script between a *wāw* and a *yōd*. W. H. Brownlee has provided additional evidence at several points from unpublished photographs in the Palestine Archaeology (Rockefeller) Museum.

2. Where partially extant letters and words have to be read, it is hoped that all the possibilities have been admitted. For example, in 4QFlor 1:17 every scholar has read $\chi\gamma$ as the initial letters of $\chi\gamma\eta\omega$, a good Qumran word, to be sure, but not necessarily what is required by the context. Thus arises the question as to what are valid criteria for the textual restoration of words and letters. For word restoration, the letters that are wholly extant or are beyond doubt must be recognized as such. For example, Y. Yadin reads a $t\dot{a}w$ in 1:17 for his phrase $\text{בְּאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים}$ ²⁶ but the letter is clearly a $h\bar{e}'$, as all other scholars have correctly recognized. For word and letter restoration where there is a multiple choice, other considerations must be taken into account: grammar, syntax, context, the presupposition of known vocabulary (in this case Hebrew with possible Aramaisms), and comparative literature. No restoration that might affect the apparent structure of the passage has been made, unless it is demonstrably the best option,²⁷ all known alternative possibilities being clearly excluded.

3.—Measurement of the length of the proposed restoration has been done when necessary. The discussion concerning 1:19 provides an example of the use of this simple method.

4. Special treatment has been given to the restoration of quotations from the Hebrew Bible. This has taken account of the style of the author and of his general intention; for example, in 1:10-11 the author only cites those parts of the scriptural verses that suit his purposes, and the possibility has been recognized that that may be the case elsewhere. In 4QFlor the writer is consistently accurate in citing Biblical

texts when he announces his intention to do so with some introductory formula, or when he is quoting the text of the midrash, even though it is abbreviated. Restorations have been made, therefore, according to our best understanding of the version(s) the author had available or knew, even if his subsequent comments and expositions seem to require some different reading of the text. For example, Yadin's reading of מִשְׁחִיו in 1:19 (Ps 2:2) is unacceptable as it is only required because of his restoration of the pesher.

5. More often than not one has to admit that the restoration can never be known - unless a second copy of the fragments is found.

2. *The Text*

ñ = partial letter; if a letter is included, it is the surest reading.

[] = restoration.

[...] = restoration impossible, text probably continues.

Fragments 1 and 2 (1:1-19)

1 [ע... זך אויב] יור ולרא יוסי] הַ בן עולה [לענות] ז כאשר

בראישונה ולמן היום אשר

צויתי שופטים] על עמי ישראל הואה הבית אשר [יבנה] ל[ורא]

בְּאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים כִּאֲשֶׁר כָּחוּב בַּסֵּפֶר

מוֹשֶׁה מִקְדָּשׁ אֲדוֹנָי כִּי] וְנָנוּ יִדְיָכָה יִהְיֶה יִמְלֹךְ עוֹלָם וְעַד הוּאֵה

הַבַּיִת אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִבּוֹא שָׁמָּה

גַּם דּוֹר עֲשִׂירֵי וְעַד עַל] וְלִמְרֹנֵי וּמִרְמִזֵּר וּבֶן נָכַר וְגַר

עַד עוֹלָם כִּיֹּא קְדוֹשׁוֹ שֵׁם

- 5 יגְלוּהָ [ככרדו ל] עוֹלָם תמיד עליו יראה ולוא ישמרהו עוד
 זרים כאשר השמו בראִישונה
 אח מקד[ש י] שראל בחטאתמה ויראמר לכנות לוא מקדש אדם להירות
 מקטירים בוא לוא
 לפניו מַעֲשֵׂי תודה ואשר אמר לדריד ו[הניחו] תִּי לכה מכול
 אויביכה אשר יניה להמה מְכֻל
 בני בליעל הַמְכַשִּׁילִים אותמה לכלוחמ[ה במשנת]מה כאשר באו
 במחשבת [ב] לְוִי עַל להכשיל בְּנֵי
 אֲוֹר[ר] וְלַחֲשׂוֹב עליהמה מחשבות און לְמַעַן [ית] פשו לבליעל
 במשגת אֲוֹר[מ]מה
- 10 והגִּיד לכה יהוה כיא בית יבנה לכה והקימותי את זרעכה
 אחריכה והכינותי את כסא ממלכתו
 לעו[ל]ם אני אֶהְיֶה לוא לאב והוא יהיה לי לבן הואה צמח דריד
 העומד עם דורש התורה אשר
 ימשול[ב] צִיּוֹן [ב] אַחֲרֵית הימים כאשר כתוב והקימותי את סוכת
 דריד הנופלת הואה סוכת
 דריד הנופל[ת] אֶשֶׁר יעמוד להושיע את ישראל
- מִרְשָׁ מַאֲשְׂרֵי [ה] איש אשר לוא הת[ה] לְךָ בעצח רשעים פשר הדב[ר]
 על[על] סרי מדרך[חטאים על
 15 אשר כתוב בספר ישעיה הנביא לאחרית הַיָּמִים ויהי כחזקת [יד
 יסירני מלכת בדרך
 הַעֵלָם הזה והמה אשר כתוב עליהמָה בספֵר יחזקאל הנביא אשר לו[א
 יטמאו עוד ככול
 גְּלוּר[ר] לִיְהִימה המה בני צדוק וְאֲנֹר[שי ע]צ[ת]מ[ה] הִי רוח[ק]ים מרע
 ר[אַחֲרֵיתֶמָּה]....] יחד
 למה רנשו גויים ולאומים יהג[ו] ריק [ת] יצבו [מלכי ארץ
 ר[רוזנים נוסדו ביחד על יהוה ועל
 משיהו פ]שר הדבר [אשר הגויים המה הכת]יים וְחָ[ו]סִי בוא המה]
 בחירי ישראל באחרית הימים

Fragments 1 and 3 (2:1-6)

- 1 היאה עת המצרף הב[אה על בית יה]ודה להחם [...]
- 2 בליעל ונשאר שאָר [הע]ס [ישר]אֵל ועשו את כול התורה [...] .
- 3 מושה היאה הָ[עת כאש]ד כתוב בספר דניאל הנביא להרשִׁיעַ
[רשעים ולוא יבינו]
- 4a וצדיקים יִ[תבררו יתלב]נו ויצטרפו ועם יודעי אלה יהזיקו
המֵלה
- 4 הָ[משכילים יבינו] [...] אחרי הָ[...]. אשר אליהמה יו[...]
- 5 [...] ברדתו מ[...]
- 6 [...] אֵ [...] .

Fragment 4

- 1 [...] הַמבלעים את צאצאֵי
- 2 [...] בִּ[טרים להמה בקנאתמה]
- 3 [...] היאה העת אשר יפתח בליעל
- 4 [...] לכית יהודה קשות לשוטמם
- 5 [...] וְכַקש בכול כוחו לבזרמה
- 6 [...] הָ[ביאמה להיורה]
- 7 [...] יה]ודה ואל ישִׁרָאֵל י[...]

Fragment 5

- 1 [...] ° [...] .
- 2 [...] ה[כאשר ה] [...]
- 3 [...] י[שִׁרָאֵל ואהרוֹן] [...]
- 4 [...] י[ָע כיא הוואה מ] [...]
- 5 [...] הָ[בכול החוזים] [...]
- 6 [...] ל[...]

Fragments 6 and 7 (Deut 33:8-11 and interpretation)

- 2
]ל להאביד את קרן]....
- 3 וללוי אמר חומיכה ואוריכה לאיש חסידכה אשר נסיתו במס]ה
 וחר]וי]בהו על מי מריבה הא]ומר
- 4 לאביו ולאמו לוא ידעתיכה ואת אחיו לוא הכיר ואת בניו לוא
 י]דע כיא [שמרו אמר]ת]כה] וברי]ת]כה
- 5 ינצורו ויאירו משפטיכה ליעקוב ותורתכה לישראל ישימו קטורה]
 באפכה וכליל על מזבחכה]
- 6 ברך יהוה חילו ופועל ידיו תרצה מחץ מתנים קמיו ומשנאיו מן
 י]קומרן
- 7
- 8
]הא]ר]ים והתומים לאיש]....
- 8
]ל]....

Fragment 8 (Deut 33:12)

- 1]אשר]....
- 2]א]ר]ץ כיא ה]....
- 3לבנימן אמ]ר] י]ד]וד י]הוה]....

Fragments 9 and 10 (Deut 33:19-21 + pesher)

- 1 וההיד]ד]....]ה זבח הצ]ו]ק]....
- 2 טוב הא]ר]ץ....
- 3 ולגד א]מ]ר]....
- 4 מחק]ק]....]
- 5 על שב]י]....]
- 6 להצ]ו]ל]....]

Fragment 11 (Deut 33:19?)

....]הספון ע'....
 [כֹּל אשר צונו עשו את כול]....

Fragment 12

....] [.... 1
] כול [.... 2
]אמט'.... 3
]לוא [.... 4
]בספ'ר.... 5

Fragment 13

Fragment 14

....]ר'°°	1]בָּה לַק[....	1
....]הקש[ח....	2]לְאַחֲרֵית ה[....	2
....]הדבר[....	3]זָיָא הַמָּה[....	3

Fragments 15 and 19

1 כחוב בספר יש[ע'יה הנ[ביא....

2כימי עץ [ימי עמ'וא ומעשה ידיהמה יבלו בחי]ר'י ל[וא יגעז לריק

3 ולוא ילדו לבהל]ה' כ'א זרע [ברך יהוה המה....]חמה[....

Fragment 16

Fragment 17

....]....	1]ג'ורל'....	1
....]יקים [....	2]מָה את פ'....	2
....]בְּרָקִי[....	3]בָּחַו עליה'....	3
....]א'....	4]ל'....	4

Fragment 18

....]° [.... 1
]א [.... 2
]בטן [.... 3

Fragment 20

....]אח כל [.... 1

Fragment 21

....]ז יהוה ז [.... 1
] [.... 2

Fragment 22

....]א [.... 1

....]ה יחד [.... 2

Fragment 23

....]דרש [.... 1

Fragment 24

....]° [.... 1

....]מִצְרַף [.... 2

....]° [.... 3

Fragment 25

....]ש [.... 1
]לשמך [.... 2
]° [.... 3

Fragment 26

....]° [.... 1

....]° צ [.... 2

Unpublished Fragment

....]ישראל הוא [.... 1

....]פדיוכה [.... 2

3. Translation²⁸

Fragments 1, 2 and 3

(1:1) . . . "and his enemies [will not disturb him] any more; neither will a son of wickedness afflict him anymore as formerly and as from the day that (2) I commanded judges to be over my people Israel." That is the house which [he will build] for him in the latter days, as it is written in the book of

(3) [Moses], "The sanctuary of the Lord which thy hands have established; The Lord will reign for ever and ever:" that is the house to which shall not come (4) [even to the tenth generation and for] ever, Ammonite nor Moabite nor bastard nor stranger nor proselyte for ever, for his holy ones are there. (5) [His glory shall] be revealed for ever; continually it shall be seen over it. And foreigners shall not make it desolate again, as they desolated formerly (6) the sanctuary of Israel because of their sin. And he promised to build for himself a sanctuary of men, for there to be in it for him smoking offerings (7) before him, works of thanksgiving. And that he said to David, "And I will give you rest from all your enemies," that means that he will give rest to them for all (8) the sons of Belial who cause them to stumble in order to destroy them [through their errors], just as they came with the plots of Belial to cause to stumble the sons of (9) light, and in order to devise against them plots of wickedness so that they [might be caught] by Belial through their [wicked] error.

(10) "And the Lord declares to you that he will build you a house. And I will raise up your seed after you, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom (11) for ever. I will be to him as a father, and he will be to me as a son:" he is the shoot of David who will stand with the Interpreter of the Law, who (12) [will rule] in Zion in the latter days as it is written, "And I will raise up the booth of David which is fallen:" he is the booth (or, branch) of (13) David which was fallen, who will take office to save Israel.

(14) Midrash of "Happy is the man who does not walk in the counsel of the wicked;" the real interpretation of the

matter concerns those who turn aside from the way of [sinners concerning] (15) whom it is written in the book of Isaiah the prophet for the latter days, "And it will be that as with a strong [hand he will cause us to turn away from walking in the way] (16) of this people;" and they are those concerning whom it is written in the book of Ezekiel the prophet that "they shall not [defile themselves any more] (17) with their idols." They are the Sons of Zadok and the m[e]n of their cou[nc]il who keep fa[r from evil....] and after them [...] a community (or, together).

(18) "Why do the nations rage and the peoples meditate on a vain thing, the kings of the earth set themselves and the rulers take counsel together (or, against the community) against the Lord and against (19) his anointed;" the real interpretation of the matter [is that "the nations" are the Kitt]im and those who take [refuge in Him" are] the chosen ones of Israel in the latter days; (2:1) that is the time of refining which is coming [upon the house of] Judah to complete [...] (2) of Belial and a remnant of [the people] Israel will be left, and they will do all the Law [...] (3) Moses; that is [the time as] it is written in the book of Daniel the prophet, "For the wicked to act wickedly but they do not understand" - (4a) "but the righteous [shall purify themselves] and make themselves white and refine themselves, and a people knowing God will be strong," - they are - (4) the wise will understand" [...] after the [...] to whom [...] (5) [...] in his descent [...].

Fragment 4

- (1)] those who consume the offspring of
- (2)an]gry towards them in their zeal
- (3)] that is the time when Belial shall open

- (4)] to the house of Judah severe things to cherish
 enmity against them
- (5)] and shall seek with all his strength to scatter
 them
- (6)] brought them to be
- (7)Ju]dah and to Israel [...

Fragment 5

- (1)] when [...
- (2)I]srael and Aaron [...
- (3)k]now that he [...
- (4)] among all the seers [...

Fragments 6-7 (Deut 33:8-11 and pesher)

(3) "And to Levi, he said, your Tummim, and your Urim
 to your pious one whom you tested at Massah] and with whom you
 quarreled at the waters of Meribah; who said (4) [to his father
 and to his mother, I do not know you, and who did not acknowledge
 his brother, and his sons he did not] know, for [they observed
 your word and your] covenant (5) [they will keep. They shall
 cause your laws to shine before Jacob and your Law before Israel.
 They shall cause incense to rise] into your nostrils and a burnt
 offering on your altar. (6) [Bless his power, O Lord, and
 accept the work of his hands. Smite his adversaries on the loins
 and his enemies so that they will not] rise." (7)] Urim
 and Tummim to a man [...

Fragment 8 (Deut 33:12[?] and pesher)

- (1)] which [...
- (2)] land, for [...
- (3) of Benjamin he sa]id "The beloved of the [LORD....

Fragments 9-10 (Deut 33:19-21 and pesher)

- (1) "And the shou[t....] "right sacrif[ice"....
- (2) good of the la[nd
- (3) "and to God he sa[id....
- (4) a commander [...."
- (5) concerns the penitents of [....
- (6) to deliver [....

Fragment 11 (Deut 33:19, 21?)

- (1)] hidden [....
- (2)] all that he commanded us, they have done all [....

Fragment 12

- (1)] all [....
- (2)] [....
- (3)] to him [....

Fragment 13

- (1) ? [....
- (2) the bo[w....
- (3) the matter [....

Fragment 14

- (1)] ? [....
- (2)] for the latter d[ays
- (3)] for they are [....

Fragments 15 and 19 (Isa 65:22-3)

- (1) ...in the book of] Isaiah the prophet [....(2)
 "like the days of a tree shall] the days of my people
 be [and the works of their hands] my chosen [will enjoy; they

shall not weary themselves in vain, (3) or bear children in] terror, for the seed [of the blessed of the Lord are they....]" they are [....

Fragment 16

- (1)] ? [....
- (2)] he will raise up [....
- (3)] and lightnin[gs
- (4)] ? [....

Fragment 17

- (1)] lot [....
- (2)] with [....
- (3)] ? upon her [....

Fragment 21

- (1)] the Lord [....

Fragment 22

- (1)]
- (2)] together

Fragment 23

- (1)] Interpreter of [....

Fragment 24

- (1)] [....
- (2)] refining [....

Fragments 18, 20, 25 and 26 contain only a few letters and are not translatable.

Unpublished Fragment 27

(1)] Israel, he [....

(2)] [....

4. Textual Notes

Fragments 1, 2 and 3

Column 1

Line 1

The reading] ור אויב[comes from an examination of the original manuscript and of photograph 41.807 in the Rockefeller Museum which confirms beyond doubt the *bêt* of אויב. Also, at least part of the *šwā* of ור[ע appears probable under magnification.²⁹ These readings show that Yadin's proposal of עו[ר או]ח is incorrect.³⁰

Yet the problem remains as to how the text is to be construed. Are these two words near the beginning of 4QFlor 1:1 part of a previous interpretation or part of a text of 2 Samuel 7? No known text-type of 2 Samuel 7:10 includes אויב or its translation at this point. This has led several scholars to suggest that אויב in 4QFlor 1:1 is part of an earlier interpretation. Habermann's presentation suggests that nothing was written after אוי]ב save the quotation from 2 Sam 7:10b.³¹ That requires there to be a considerable gap after אוי]ב. Though there is a large space at the end of line 9 before the biblical quotation in line 10, it is unusual to find such a space in the middle of a line. A. Dupont-Sommer³² and E. Lohse³³ in their translations have argued explicitly that the words at the start of line 1 belong to a previous interpretation.

Two considerations, however, argue against their proposal.

The first consideration is that textually in quoting 2 Samuel 7 4QFlor follows no single known text-type slavishly. The text of 2 Samuel 7 represented in 4QFlor is neither that of the MT, LXX nor Syr, yet it is not far from any of them. For example, 4QFlor and the LXX read the singular *בְּנוֹ עוֹלָה*, the MT and Syr have the plural; again, at the end of line 1 4QFlor has the singular *הַיּוֹם* in agreement with the MT and Syr whereas the LXX (and 1 Chr 17:10) has the plural.³⁴ Furthermore *אויב* occurs several times in 2 Samuel 7³⁵ and it would not be unlikely from the contextual influence, if not from Psalm 89:23,³⁶ that it would be included as the subject of *יגז* at this point.

The second consideration is that two structural points argue for construing *עיר אויב* as part of the text of 2 Sam 7:10a. In the first place the commentary for the text of 2 Sam 7:11a^b is cited in a structurally subordinate position that requires that it is linked somehow with the main quotation: the joint occurrence of *אויב* in both would provide a sufficient link. Secondly from such an understanding that the commentary, and particularly the biblical texts within the commentary, are related intricately to this quotation of 2 Samuel by means of an exegetical technique, one can argue that because of the later use of Exod 15:17-18, the author of 4QFlor presupposes 2 Sam 7:10a in his interpretation.³⁷ *מקום* of 2 Sam 7:10a is the most apt referent for "the house" in 4QFlor 1:2.

On these grounds it is preferable to combine the reading of *עיר אויב* with the text of 2 Samuel 7. Vermes has proposed "[I will appoint a place for my people Israel that they may dwell there and be troubled no more by their] enemies."³⁸ Yet since

no *hoph^cal* is attested for רגז, Vermes' passive may be seen as a translation from a *hiph^cil* that might be reconstructed as ולוא ירגיז עוד אויביו. This is better translated actively: "and their (Israel's) enemies will not disturb them any more."

In sum, more precise readings in connection with a structural understanding that takes account of the method of the Qumran interpreter lead us to say that at the beginning of 4QFlor 1:1 we are dealing with a direct or indirect quotation of 2 Samuel 7:10 (possibly as reflected in the textual tradition of Psalm 89). Thus הוואה הניה of line 2 refers back to מקום of 2 Sam 7:10 and אויב can be restored with a suffix to make the correct length for the lacuna: ע[וד אויבִּי] נו ולוא יוסי[ן] הָ בֹ עוֹלָהּ [לענוות] הָ

Line 2

All scholars agree upon restoring צויתי שופטים at the beginning of the line; plene spelling is used throughout the manuscript.³⁹ As to the second lacuna in the line neither Allegro in "Fragments" nor Habermann has identified the top of the *lāmed*; while Allegro made no attempt at a restoration, Habermann restored as יבנה יהוה.⁴⁰ That correctly derived the sense from the following supportive Biblical quotation, yet Yadin managed to include the *lāmed* too: [יעשת] ל [ך בא] חרית. This he did with reference to the end of 2 Sam 7:10.⁴¹ Strugnell corrects Yadin's לך to לכה but would rather read לו or preserve the *lāmed* by using some form of the verb as if from Exod 15:17.

W. H. Brownlee has suggested⁴² reading יתנו or יתנונו which is used of God's "putting" the future sanctuary in the midst of Israel (Ezek 37:26); נתן would thus be a synonym for שים of 2 Sam 7:10. But the prepositional phrase is to be construed

differently in Ezekiel from the most likely idiom in 4QFlor, and due to the frequency of בנה in the rest of 4QFlor and particularly its occurrence in line 10 where the corresponding section of the MT has יעשה, it seems best to use that root with Habermann⁴³ and to render the *lāmed* with the preposition. There is also room enough for the third person singular suffix to have a final *'āleph* as in lines 6 and 11.⁴⁴

The more complete reading of בְּאַחֲרֵיהֶן (over against אַחֲרֵיהֶן [ב of DJD V) is made possible by close examination of photograph 41.308 of the Rockefeller Museum; there are faint dots of the first two letters.

Line 3

All scholars agree upon restoring the quotation of Exod 15:17 back as far as מקדש,⁴⁵ but there is some dissension as to what, if anything, was the first word of the line. By reconstructing the Exodus quotation from letters in the fragment one can certainly say, against Habermann, that there was a space before מקדש. It is, however, barely large enough for מושה and it therefore seems unlikely that הוורה of five letters be restored (as Gaster).

For the version of Exod 15:18 it is worth comparing the LXX αὐτός βασιλεύων τον αἰῶνα καὶ ἐπ'αἰῶνα καὶ εἶτα with the MT: יהוה ימלך לעלם ועד. As with the quotation of Amos 9:11 in line 12, 4QFlor diverges from both LXX and MT.⁴⁶

Allegro's reading of בְּוַנְנוּ [ב is borne out by photograph 41.308.

Lines 4 and 5

Allegro in DJD V compares the words at the end of line 3

with Deut 23:3-4 and Ezek 44:9. Strugnell takes up the latter to suggest a restoration consisting of **ערל לב וערל בשר ער** . Vermes proposes "[the unclean shall] never [enter, nor the uncircumcised,] nor . . .", which seems to be a free allusion to the Ezekiel verse. Dupont-Sommer's "(ni l'impie ni l'impur à) jamais," is yet another step further away.⁴⁷ Yadin, supported by Slomovic and the translations of Maier and Tocci, refers to 1QM 7:4-5 as the basis for his restoration: "**איש אשר בשרו מום**), Anyone in whose flesh there is a permanent blemish." Maybe the permanent blemish is a euphemism for the phrases in Deut 23:2.

Because of the occurrence of three of the excluded classes of people in Deut 23:3-4, it certainly is preferable to make proposals for restorations from study of those verses.⁴⁸ It is noteworthy in this respect that the **ממור** and the **עמוני ומאני** share the same qualification in the phraseology of Deuteronomy; none of them shall enter even to "the tenth generation." Thus the restoration could read **גם דור עשירי וער עולם** and this then stresses neatly the analogical phrase, **עולם וער**, of the Exodus quotation.⁴⁹ No restoration at this place can be made definitively, but one that contains a direct verbal link to Exod 15:17-18 is perhaps to be preferred on the basis of our understanding of the exegetical principles involved; at least, the text is most likely concerned somehow with those that are to be excluded.

Three views exist in relation to the correct reading of the middle of line 4. Firstly there is the proposal by Allegro, "Fragments" and DJD V (supported by Strugnell, Lohse and the translations of Tocci, Carmignac, Dupont-Sommer, Moraldi and Vermes) to read **ויגר** in the middle of the line. Secondly there

is the suggestion by Yadin to read *וּעַד*, based on *וּעַר עַד עוֹלָם* in Isa 30:8 (suggested also by Habermann and supported by Maier and Slomovic). Thirdly, Strugnell has hinted that instead of *וּגַר* it is possible to read *לִגַּד*, "être séparé." While photograph 42.605 shows that what Yadin takes to be the left arm of an *ʿayin* is in fact a crack, photographs 41.308 and 41.807 show that *וּגַר* and *לִגַּד* are equally possible.

The recent work of J. M. Baumgarten has helped decide the issue.⁵⁰ In support of the reading *גַּר*, which seems most likely from the context, he has offered evidence from rabbinic tradition. This is derived especially from *b. Qidd.* 4:1 where *גַּר* is associated with *ממזר* and the *נְהִינִים* (= *בֶּן נֹכַר* according to the arguments of Baumgarten). Thereby Baumgarten considerably reduces the contextual objections raised by Yadin and others based on a comparison of this section of 4QFlor with CD 14:4 where the *גַּר* is given a definite rank in the congregation (*עֵרָה*) for public meetings.

Baumgarten suggests, however, that the barrier of significance for the author of 4QFlor was entry to the assembly of the Lord (*קַהֲל יְהוָה*), which is the context of Deuteronomy 23, and not simply participation in some of the activities of the congregation (*עֵרָה*). He also lists a similar distinction in 1QSa where "those with bodily afflictions were included in the general congregation and were granted the right to present inquiries (2:9-10); they were, however, ineligible to enter the exclusive *qahal* (2:4) of those 'called to the council of the *yahad*'."⁵¹

Thus, if Yadin's emendation for the beginning of the line is correct (see above), then there is even less reason for him

to describe וגר as "impossible," a direct association being made between the blemished and the גר in 1QSa. A problem with Baumgarten's proposals is that neither קהל nor ערה is specifically used in 4QFlor, so the exact referent must remain obscure.

The problem with the final phrase of line 4, כִּיָּא קְדוּשִׁי שֵׁם, is threefold. Firstly, as Strugnell has pointed out, the last letter of קְדוּשִׁי could equally well be a *wāw*; secondly, the question needs to be answered whether or not the end of line 4 is the end of the sentence, and, if not, then what might the restoration be at the beginning of line 5; and thirdly, שֵׁם can be read as either "there" or "name" and that may have some influence on any proposal for the start of the next line.

To start with the beginning of line 5, we can see that a *yōd* and part of what is almost certainly a *gimel*⁵² are the first two letters of the line; after a lacuna the length of one or, at the most, two letters, two cut-off vertical strokes most probably represent a *hē*'. A further lacuna is followed by the words עוֹלָם תְּמִיד עָלָיו יֵרָאֵה. Since it is unlikely that תְּמִיד and עוֹלָם belong to the same phrase, we may conclude that the words after עוֹלָם are a unit in themselves. It can be taken in one of three ways: "always he (it) will be seen above it,"⁵³ or, "always he (it) will appear upon it,"⁵⁴ or, "always he (it) will protect it."⁵⁵

For the phrase at the start of the line several alternatives have been suggested but none has taken into account the *gimel* in the second letter position. Because of the considerable length of the lacunae most scholars do not restore anything at the opening of the line. Yet, if the first word of the line

should be *יגלה*, as proposed by W. H. Brownlee,⁵⁶ then it can be taken either as *qal* or as *pi^ael* or as *niph^aal*. Whichever the case, the subject or object of the verb, the most probable content of the second and major lacuna of the line, needs to be one that might also be used as the subject of *ראה* in the phrase already treated.

The restoration that seems most probable⁵⁷ derives from the use of *כבוד* with *גלה* in Isa 40:5, "and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed," a phrase that is contextually close to the verse concerned with the preparation of a way in the wilderness (Isa 40:3) which was so important for the self-understanding of the Qumran community.⁵⁸ Of those scholars who have not recognized the verb *גלה* at the start of line 5 Vermes has come the closest to perceiving such an understanding in the lacuna. His translation reads: "[Its glory shall endure] forever; it shall appear above it perpetually."⁵⁹ Our restoration may be translated either as, "He will reveal his glory for ever, always it will appear upon it," or as, "His glory will be revealed for ever, continually it will be seen over it." It is the second of these that comes closer to Isa 40:5, "And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together." Ezek 43:2-5 describes how the glory of God filled the temple and some such image is surely the referent here, since 4QFlor is discussing who may enter the sanctuary.⁶⁰ Further support for restoring *כבוד* in 4QFlor comes from a similar sentence in 11QTemple 29:8-10 which reads *ואקדשה* [קדשי] *בכבודי אשר אשכן / עליו את כבודי עד יום הברכה אשר אברא אני את מקושי / להכינו לי כול הלימים*.⁶¹ D. R. Schwartz has offered an acceptable translation of these lines, "I will sanctify My temple

with My glory which I will cause to dwell upon it, until the day of blessing when I will create My temple to establish it for Me forever."⁶²

Having determined how line 5 most likely began, we can treat the final phrase of line 4. Here there is no lacuna but ambiguity in the suffix of קדוש and in how שם is best understood. Before dealing with the various understandings of קדוש שם, the suggestions of scholars which use line 5 can be dismissed. Habermann proposes יהוה ימלוך / קדושי שם and Gaster translates, "but where (only) those shall be that are God's saints." These two suggestions are only produced after straining the Hebrew grammatically, the former with an unusual appositional construction, the latter with a complex compound sentence. Neither can Yadin's rendering be correct: "for His holy ones there will be for ever."⁶³

Most scholars read a *γδδ* on קדוש and conclude the sentence at the end of line 4, taking שם as "there." Thus Allegro (DJD V) translates, "for my holy ones are there," commenting that this refers to angels as in the MT of Deut 33:3 and elsewhere. Similarly Vermes renders the phrase, "for there shall My Holy Ones be." Unless this phrase is an actual scriptural citation, it is difficult to justify the occurrence of the 1st person suffix.

Dupont-Sommer and Lohse take קדושי as a participle, read "name" and conclude line 4 respectively: "mais ceux qui portent le nom de saints"⁶⁴ and "sondern diejenigen, die den Namen Heilige tragen." But this is an exceptional construction that it is difficult for the Hebrew to carry without some recourse to the following line.

It is also possible to end the sentence at the end of the line but to read a *wāw*, considering that these cannot be the words of God and that therefore they require the third person suffix: "for His holy ones are there," or, as Carmignac suggests, the somewhat awkward phrase: "Son Saint (est) là." Carmignac explains: "c'est à dire: Dieu, le Saint d'Israel, y réside." It has already been noted that several scholars read the suffix as a *wāw* while continuing into line 5. The only difficulty with such a reading is that the orthography of 4QFlor is consistently *plene*, and although there are no third singular suffixes for plural nouns present in the manuscript with which comparison could be made, the reading of such a defective form can only be justified on the basis of comparison with 1QpHab where such a form occurs in both scriptural citation (1QpHab 3:6-7; Hab 1:8) and in the commentary (e.g., 1QpHab 5:13).

If the third singular suffix is for a singular noun, then וְיָיָהוָה must refer either to God himself, as Carmignac suggests, or to God's Holy One, the Messiah. Since the eschatological figures are described later in 4QFlor, we take the suffix as a plural written defectively and read the phrase: "for his holy ones are there."⁶⁵ Such is to exclude the possibility of reading וְיָיָהוָה as "name,"⁶⁶ even though in 4QFlor 1:3 the adverb is spelled with a *hā'*. וְיָיָהוָה is the normal Qumran spelling of the adverb and may simply be spelled differently in 4QFlor 1:3 because of the verb of motion.⁶⁷

From all this it is not surprising that many scholars refrain from filling the lacuna at the start of line 5; yet, some matters can be settled. Structurally line 5 is a continuation of the reasons for the exclusion of certain groups from

the house; in providing further reasons, there is also further description of the house. It thus seems more advisable to read this section as three phrases than to try to link line 4 with line 5 in some closer way.

For the first phrase at the end of line 4, קדושו שם is preferable, as proposed by Yadin; to read a *yōd* would make the phrase into some direct speech of God. The phrase "My holy ones" never occurs in Qumran literature or in the MT. "His holy ones are there" is further supported by 1QM 7:6: כִּיָּא מלאכי קדוש עם צבאותם "For the holy angels shall be with their hosts." שם is the most frequently used form of the adverb at Qumran and the use of שמה in line 3 is to be considered in relation to נוֹא as the directional "thither."

For the second phrase it thus remains only to decide upon something that could be revealed for ever and that might fit the context. The use of כבודו in that capacity reflects the thought of Ezekiel⁶⁸ which the whole of Qumran literature echoes; its suffix refers to the Lord. Then, for the third phrase, by reading a *niph^cal* with Allegro and Gaster, one avoids any awkward break in the flow of the sense of the three phrases.⁶⁹

In sum, therefore, a workable text is:

כִּיָּא קדושו שם / יג [ל] ה [כבודו ל] עֹלָם תמיד עליו יואה

For his holy ones are there. His glory will be revealed for ever, continually it will be seen over it.

Line 6

All scholars rightly agree upon restoring מִקְדֵּשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא in this line could be either the negative particle or the preposition with the third masculine singular suffix - the appearance of לוֹ and נוֹ with 'āleph is frequent at Qumran.⁷⁰

Line 7

All scholars restore מעשי. Strugnell correctly mentions the reading of תורה for the second word which is indeed confirmed from the original manuscript and earliest photographs. This is surprising in view of the excellent sense that מעשי תורה would make in the context of the Qumran stress on obedience to the Law.⁷¹ Yet, the "deeds of thanksgiving" as appositional to מקטירים shows that the author's intention is more inclusive than the traditional thankoffering alone. In the middle of the line והניחותי is restored *plene* from the MT. Interestingly the certain restoration at the end of the line produces a phrase that is unique in extant Qumran literature.⁷² Yadin suggests that 2 Sam 7:11 may also be alluded to in 11QT 3:3 which passage shares certain similar concerns with 4QFlor 1:4-7.⁷³

Line 8

In the centre of the line, which Allegro does not restore beyond the suggestion that it may contain another infinitive, Yadin proposes מה [בעוונותי] לכלותם and he makes reference to 1QM 13:11 and CD 8:2 for this restoration.⁷⁴ The relevant section of 1QM reads, "and his (Belial's) purpose is to bring about wickedness and perversity," (Vermes), ובעצו להרשיע ולהאשים, that of CD, "they shall be visited for destruction by the hand of Satan," לפוקדם לכלה בער בליעל. Both these texts suggest that Belial is to cause destruction through his scheming. Habermann on the other hand follows Allegro's idea and provides a parallel infinitive: מה [ולהשחית]. It is impossible to declare which is correct, but because of the large number of infinitives in this part of the sentence, it seems preferable to restore with an instrument of the destruction, as Yadin, which then parallels

the instrumental *bêt* at the end of line 9. Yet, Yadin's choice of word may be too long for the lacuna. It is preferable to restore, therefore, the shorter *במשגתמה*, which is then explained in the following phrases.

In the middle of the line Yadin proposes to read *כאשר תעו* in place of Allegro's *כאשר באו*, but Strugnell disagrees with him in favour of Allegro's original reading which certainly appears more likely from the photograph and is confirmed by an examination of the original manuscript. It also makes better contextual sense in relation to the subsequent infinitival phrase.⁷⁵ Near the end of the line the phrase *מחשבה בליעל* can be restored with certainty; it also occurs at 1QH 4:12-13 which is, therefore, a guarantee to a restoration that all scholars agree in making.

Line 9

Most scholars follow Allegro in restoring *בני אור* as the necessary object of the infinitive of line 8. Certainly the suggestion of Yadin, followed by Maier and Slomovic, of *להכשיל* [] [ח] *ולחשוב* can be excluded as this provides only an indirect object for the *hiph²il* of *כשל*; nowhere in the MT or Qumran literature is this attested as either a grammatical or idiomatic possibility. Furthermore Yadin's suggestion does not fully account for the space at the start of line 9 where an *'āleph* can be restored with reasonable certainty. In fact the phrase *אור להכשיל בני אור* actually occurs at 1QS 3:24 and seems preferable to anything else.

Concerning the lacuna at the centre of the line, if *פשו* is taken as the end of a verbal form, then the most satisfactory root to restore is *תפש*. In CD 4:16ff. the discussion similarly concerns how men are ensnared by Belial and there the root *תפש*

is used three times. Thus למען יתפשו of Yadin and Habermann is accepted here;⁷⁶ this phrase also occurs at 1QH 4:19. Mention should also be made of the reading נפשו , the noun with the third masculine singular suffix. Because the subject and object of this explanation are clearly in the plural this reading is unlikely unless one sees that נפשו is being used collectively, as suggested by Allegro, with reference either to the sons of light or, cryptically, to the Teacher of Righteousness, with Belial as the wicked Priest or Man of Lies.⁷⁷

For the end of the line it is worth noting that the one use of מטגה in the MT occurs at Gen 43:12 in the Joseph story.⁷⁸ Jacob reluctantly tells his sons to return to Egypt with Benjamin and that, as they are going, they must also take back the first payment that Joseph had ordered to be put in the top of their sacks, since, in Jacob's mind, perhaps there was an "error." Nowhere is it described as a sin to return money to people or to give them grain when in need. When used in 4QFlor., therefore, the term would require some qualification, as it is there implied that the mistake is wrong. That fact together with a close study of the photograph (DJD V, Plate 19) excludes Yadin's restoration, for from the shape of the edges of the fragment it is not at all certain that it could be joined so closely as to enable the reading במטגהימה ; also much of the $y\delta d$ would have had to have faded. Rather it is more certain, because the last preserved letter before the text breaks off preserves most of the head of what is most probably an 'aleph.⁷⁹

Those who make a restoration all supply or understand אונמה except Strugnell who proposes אשמה and translates "guilty error". However, although Strugnell's proposal gives a stronger

sense and a more clarificatory reading, the מ of the word to be restored is better read as the suffix from a syntactical point of view, and that is the reading followed here. The scroll is very damaged at this point and it is impossible to measure the resulting lacuna accurately: it could possibly hold some such reconstruction as $\text{מ}[שמת]א$, "through their guilty error".⁸⁰

Lines 10-13

These four lines were first published by Allegro in 1956.⁸¹

Line 10

The restoration at the beginning of the line is agreed upon by all scholars on the basis of the MT of 2 Sam 7:11b, though one should not forget that the text tradition of the Samuel quotations in 4QFlor is in many respects closer to the LXX.⁸² The text of 2 Samuel 7 cited at this point omits three phrases found in the MT: $\text{יהוה כי ימלאו ימיו ושכנת את אבתיך}$, $\text{אח ממלכתו הוא יבנה בית לשמי וכננתי}$ and אשר יצא ממעיו . As Carmignac observes, all three omissions are explicable in relation to the MT on the basis of homoeoteleuton.

Yet, if the text of 2 Samuel 7 that the author of 4QFlor had was approximately the same as that of the MT (or LXX for that matter), then it would seem to be a more remarkable coincidence that three times in two verses, he should make the same mistake and leave it uncorrected. Certainly the scribe was not beyond making corrections in his manuscript; see, for example, his insertion at 4QFlor 2:4a. We are thus pushed to the conclusion that the text of 2 Samuel 7 has received some deliberate editing at this juncture; and this is tantamount to saying that omission through homoeoteleuton may be correctly considered as a correct exegetical principle used here by the author deliberately!

From the context of the interpretation, certain reasons can be advanced for the omissions. To begin with the third, "he will build a house for my name": this goes against the main intent of the passage which is trying to suggest that the future house (sanctuary) is not to be made with human hands but to have its origin from God. Secondly, "who will come forth from your body" introduces the delicate subject of the origin of the messianic kingly figure. That this person is coming is repeated often in the Qumran texts but nowhere is his origin described - it was either not an issue or, as this second omission perhaps suggests, it was a matter to be avoided.⁸³ The first phrase, "when your days are fulfilled and you lie down with your father," may simply have been excluded because of its temporal content.

Further support for the deliberate use of homoeoteleuton comes from the fact that, if the second and third phrases were to be omitted for some such reasons as those given above, then the only way in which both phrases could be left out by means of this technique is that used by the author of 4QFlor: he could not jump directly from *ואחריכה* to *ויכוננתי*, but through the use of *והכינת* which is "conveniently" preceded by *ממעיר* (*ממעיקה*) he could proceed directly to the last half of verse 13. What was formerly in scholarship described as a scribal error is now to be seen as the correct use of a valid exegetical technique.

Line 11

In his first publication of this line Allegro tentatively proposed at its start *עַר עוֹלִים*, referring to 2 Sam 7:13; in his later article, "Fragments," he restored *לִיעוֹלִים*, and in DJD V he became more definite: *לִיעוֹלִים*. This last reading is endorsed

by Strugnell⁸⁴ against Yadin's לַעַד, proposed on the basis of lack of space for לַעֲלוּם. The MT reads עַד עֲלוּם but the LXX text type, that seems to be followed here, has εως εως τον αλωνα which would corroborate the MT, or even suggest a Hebrew of עַד לַעֲלוּם.⁸⁵ The author then abbreviated that to the much more common לַעֲלוּם that is the most likely reading here.

Line 12

Again the beginning of the line is missing in part from the manuscript. Allegro has omitted a first word restoration from all his publications but has proposed בַּצִּי; וְוּ בְּאֵי חַרְיָה for the lacuna that follows, with which all scholars agree; yet, traces of the 'āleph occur in photograph 41.807, hence that letter may be partially restored. Van der Woude, Dupont-Sommer and Vermes all render the whole lacuna alike; Vermes translates: "with the Interpreter of the Law [to rule] in Zion [at the end] of time." These three scholars have correctly understood the grammatical structure of the passage. It is similar to that in line 13 where both the participle with the article and the relative clause⁸⁶ clearly refer back to סוּכַת דָּוִד.

The restoration of Yadin and Habermann, יְקוּם, seems to be an attempt to make the action of the יְרוּשׁ הַחֹרֶה parallel to the הַעוֹמֵד of the דָּוִד; צִמַח דָּוִד; Strugnell, who also adopts יְקוּם, certainly interprets it so. In fact, he makes the whole of lines 12 and 13 refer to the יְרוּשׁ הַחֹרֶה, reading the penultimate word of line 12 as הוּאָה, of common gender, and translating that phrase, "He (i.e. the יְרוּשׁ הַחֹרֶה) is the tent of David which is fallen, who will arise etc." But this not only misunderstands the earlier use of the extended dependent relative clause in Hebrew, expressed with the article prefixed to the participle, but also

misinterprets the long citation of 2 Sam 7:11b-14, especially edited by the author of 4QFlor, of which lines 11-12 are all explanatory. What at first appears to be an ambiguous construction at the end of line 11 and the beginning of line 12,⁸⁷ is clear. Furthermore the sequence עמך + משל occurs also at Dan 11:3 and 1QpHab 8:9.⁸⁸ Thus the restorations of van der Woude, Dupont-Sommer and Vermes are followed here - grammar and context being used to decipher the structure and proper content of the passage.

As for the text of Amos 9:11 that is quoted in 4QFlor, J. de Waard has pointed out that its text is identical in Acts 15:16 and 4QFlor 1:12.⁸⁹ Both differ from the LXX and from the MT. Even the introductory formula in Acts, ἀλλὰ ἡμεῖς γεγόναμεν, has its Hebrew equivalent in 4QFlor, כאשר כחוב, over against the כאשר אמר introducing the same verse in CD 7:16. De Waard, therefore, postulates a common text tradition for 4QFlor and Acts, which to him is much preferable to other theories of the text tradition of Amos 9:11 in the Book of Acts.⁹⁰

At the end of the line הוא is read rather than היא because of the gender of the verb. The author appears to be playing on the varied meanings of טוכה.

Line 13

All scholars correctly agree upon restoring הנופל [ח א] שר near the beginning of this line.

Line 14

The middle of the line is warped and it is clear from the original manuscript that ה[ח] לך should be read instead of הליך. No adjustment in the sense is required.

The difficulty at the end of this line is chiefly derived

from the crumpled state of the fragment which allows neither precise readings nor the exact measurement of the lacuna.

With that, it is clear that any decision must be tentative.

Of the three alternatives פשר הדבר אשר, פשר הדבר and פשר על הדבר, the first is very infrequent in Qumran literature, occurring with certainty only at 4QpIsa^b 2:1, and although that should not necessarily exclude it as a restoration, it does make the other two more likely. It also seems that any attempt to restore the letter preceding סרי as a *hē*' or a *rēš*' is asking too much of the fragment, for, although there are traces of ink there, they occur partly at a much greater height than the letters that follow, so that the only letter, if any, that could be restored is a *lāmed*.⁹¹ Concerning סרי, the head of the third letter, the distinguishing feature of the *yōd* is even larger than that of the normal *yōd*; thus the *yōd* of Allegro, Habermann and Lohse is to be preferred to the *wāw* suggested by Yadin.

Strugnell, in the light of the subsequent quotation of Isa 8:11, restores the whole of the end of the line either as פשר דב[ר אשר] סרו מדרר or as דב[ר המ] סרי מדרר [העם (הרשעים)?] but apart from what has been said about reading ר[אש] and ה[מ] it is rare for a pesher preceding a supportive biblical quotation to contain a large amount of that quotation;⁹² rather, it is more likely that it would contain words from the text of which it is the pesher, in this case רשעים.⁹³ Or, if the first lines of the psalms are quoted with the intention that the rest of them is to be understood, then the restoration would be better as חטאים from Ps 1:2,⁹⁴ used there in a phrase with דרר, the linkword, by *gšzērd šāwš* to the Isaiah quotation. Once again an understanding of the exegetical principle involved

enables a particular restoration to appear much more likely than any other. על is added at the end of the line to complete the formula אשר כתוב of line 15; for such a restoration it is worth comparing line 16: אשר כתוב עליהמה.⁹⁵

Line 15

The restoration of the phrase לאחריה ה'ימים⁹⁶ is agreed upon by all scholars, and is confirmed in its present more definite reading from photograph 41.807.

Since the reading כחזקה agrees with 1QIsa^a and many Mss., the rest of the cited verse is restored from 1QIsa^a and not from the MT. Thus, whereas most scholars restore the MT ה'י but translate it indefinitely, 1QIsa^a has י'ד. Similarly יסירונו of 1QIsa^a is to be preferred to the MT's ויסירוני.⁹⁷

F. du T. Laubscher has proposed reading ויסירוני here⁹⁸ but it seems unnecessary to preserve the initial *wāw* as if the MT text-type was normative. Indeed to omit that *wāw* because it is not in 1QIsa^a renders Laubscher's proposed future translation of the whole phrase more likely. With Laubscher the initial ויהי is taken as an imperfect with *wāw* copulative⁹⁹ and the second verb is read as a *hiph*^{על} form of סורר,¹⁰⁰ not יסר as in the MT,¹⁰¹ but with a first person plural suffix which gives greater sense to the plural identification in the pesher that follows.

Line 16

When Allegro first published the text of this line in 1958, he provided no restoration for the end of the line but suggested that it might contain a paraphrase of Ezek 44:10;¹⁰² but by the time of the publication of DJD V he had come to give preference to the reading of Yadin and Habermann who restored the quotation as if from Ezek 37:23.¹⁰³ Although it is impossible to fit both

a *bêt* and a *gimel* before the *lāmed* at the beginning of line 17,¹⁰⁴ there are several good reasons for following Yadin here, but in the version of Strugnell.

1. Of all the thirty-nine occurrences of לוי in Ezekiel, 11 of which are in the plural with the third plural masculine suffix, only Ezek 37:23 can account clearly for the לו at the end of line 16 as it stands in the fragment.¹⁰⁵

2. To restore the text as if from Ezek 37:23 requires that there be only very slight editing of the biblical quotation. The author has announced his intention to quote from Ezekiel as support for his pesher and such an introductory formula is usually followed by an exact quotation - or else it is no support - even if later that quotation receives some radical treatment in exegesis.

3. Ezek 44:10 is clearly concerned with the Levites, whereas almost the only thing of which we can be certain in the ensuing clarification in 4QFlor is that the concern in the quotation from Ezekiel should fit the Sons of Zadok. Vermes, for one, has wondered if the Levites are included under the title "Sons of Zadok."¹⁰⁶ However, 1QSa 1:2 and 9 describe the Sons of Zadok as the "Priests who keep the Covenant," and again in 1QSa 1:2 and 24 the Sons of Zadok are the "priests;" also it is clear in 1QSa 2:3 that the Levites are summoned prior to the "Sons of Zadok the priests." While there remains some confusion as to who exactly the Sons of Zadok in 4QFlor are, even if they are the whole community, the context of the pesher fits more precisely with Ezek 37:23,¹⁰⁷ as will be discussed below in the remarks on line 17.

4. When the phrase from Ezek 37:23 is recalled in full,

there is a linkword with Psalm 1 to enable the *gēzērâ šāwâ*.¹⁰⁸

5. In the last case, Ezek 37:23 fits very well with certain passages from CD with which 4QFlor seems to be closely associated.¹⁰⁹

Line 17

The context of the quotation from Ezekiel 37 concerns the future unity of Judah and Israel (Ezek 37:15-28), that God will gather the divided and scattered people under one king,¹¹⁰ and that "they shall not defile themselves any more with their idols." The matter concerns two groups of people.¹¹¹ That the sect called itself the "House of Judah" on occasion is well known;¹¹² it would not be unlikely, therefore, that one of the groups mentioned should be the Sons of Zadok. At the end of the line there appears with reasonable certainty the sometime designation of the whole community, יחד.

Between the בני צדוק and the phrase leading up to the final יחד, there was probably mention of a second group. Indeed it is possible to see that the word following צדוק begins with a *wāw*, introducing the second subject of the commentary on Ezek 37:23. Study of the passages in which בני צדוק הכוהנים¹¹³ is used shows that more often than not the group is mentioned alone; but in 1QSa 1:2 they are associated with the אנושי בריתם, "the men of their covenant," who are further defined as אנושי עצתו, "the men of his council."¹¹⁴ So, rather than giving this second group some negative role such as ודורשי עצתמה,¹¹⁵ the suggestion of several scholars¹¹⁶ is adopted here, but in plene spelling which none has proposed: וּאִ [נר] שִׁי עֵצ [תמ] הִּי.

Any restoration at the centre of the line is highly

tentative. After ה[חנ]ע occur the two letters *rēš* and *wāw* at the beginning of a word; they are followed by a stroke that could be either a *dālet* or a *bêt*. Using a *dālet*, some scholars have suggested phrases beginning with a word from the root פרר, "to pursue."¹¹⁷ But פרר is primarily a military term in the Qumran writings, only occurring once in a non-military sense (1QS 18; poetry) and from the nonmilitary context of 4QFlor it is perhaps advisable to read a participle from a verb of which the first two root letters are *rēš* and *ḥēt*: רחק appears most suitable.¹¹⁸ In partial fulfilment of 1QS 1:4 the Sons of Zadok and the men of their counsel have kept far from all evil.

As for the end of the line, there is complete agreement among scholars that יחר should be read as the last word. In the lacuna before that, the remaining letters require the reading of אַחַרְיָהֶמָּה.¹¹⁹ Habermann's אַחַרְיָהֶמָּה is difficult to fit into the context unless one follows his other less certain readings for the line,¹²⁰ and anyway, photograph 41.802 shows most of the word's initial 'āleph.

Remembering the context of the Ezekiel passage in which two parties will be united (אחד) and expecting the comment to describe those two parties as they are part of the eschatological community (יחר) it is best to restrict any restoration to the following:¹²¹ [מה בני ציון וא[נו] שי עץ [חמ] ה רוח [קי מרע. [...]] יחר [אחריהמה] [...]]

They are the Sons of Zadok and the men of their counsel who keep far from evil . . . after them . . . community (or, together).

Line 18

All agree in restoring Psalm 2:1 in full from the beginning of the line, and make recourse to the MT to do so. However, traces of ink appear at the edge of a small hole in the manuscript and it would seem that these belong to a *bêt* prefixed to יחד. Although נוטרו is clearly written in 4QFlor, this would bring the text of Ps 2:2 closer to the LXX (συστήχθησαν ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ); that does not negate the common scholarly opinion that the LXX verb represents a Hebrew *Vorlage* of נוטרו. The phrase is thus ambiguous and can be rendered either "take counsel together (lit. in a gathering)" or "take counsel against the community."

Line 19

Referring to CD 4:3-4, "the Sons of Zadok are the Chosen of Israel," Yadin wishes to read the content of the peshar as concerning the "chosen of Israel" whom he relates to the quotation of Psalm 2 by reading משיחו as the plural משיחיו. But nowhere in QL are the Qumran Covenanters as a body called "anointed" nor is the title בְּחִירֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל restricted solely to the expected messianic figures.¹²² Indeed, to take משיחו as a plural in the interpretation based on a collective understanding of the word in the Psalm or to restore a plural in the text of the Psalm itself is to risk too much.

Furthermore, if attention is paid to the positioning of Fragment 2 with regard to line 18 (where restoration is certain), it can be seen that it should be further to the right than either of Allegro's photographic reproductions depict. Thus Yadin's restoration for line 19¹²³ (על בני צדוק הכוהן) [ניט] (על בני צדוק הכוהן) [ניט], apart from having debatable content, is

too long before the portion of Fragment 2, and too short after it.

On the other hand, Habermann's פ[שר הדבר [על הגר] יים is too short before Fragment 2,¹²⁴ though he suggests the interesting restoration of יה[גו ריק על] for the centre of the line, staying close to the vocabulary of the Psalm citation. Strugnell adopts a similar policy and suggests the following alternative restorations: פ[שר הדבר [אשר ירגשי מלכי הגר] יים or, for the space after וה[גויים וה] גו, בחירי ישראל [תיצברו על] or, for the space after ריק על]. Although it is most uncharacteristic of Qumran pesharim to start with such a long adapted requotation of the original biblical citation, Strugnell's work does point to the way in which restoration can be made in both lacunae.

The suggestion that the lacunae contain close references to Psalm 2 is to be considered seriously since there needs to be some logical connection between the interpretation and the biblical text; and yet the uneasiness that identification of the "chosen ones of Israel" with the "anointed" makes must imply that the chosen ones are to be seen in relation to some other characters in the Psalm. The remarks made on the restoration for line 14 show that, to provide the best text for the lacuna at the end of that line, reference must be made to a later section of Psalm 1.

Similarly it is Psalm 2:12 that provides the best vocabulary and most sensible reading for the last lacuna of 4QFlor 1:19. Extant in the text are a *wāw* and what must be either a *hē'* or a *hēt*. With regard to Psalm 2:12 either is possible. If the text of the Psalm is adhered to then a *hēt* is to be read with the result of ווח [ומי בו המה] בחירי ישראל if a *hē'*, perhaps

less preferable, then the Psalm text can be adjusted accordingly: $\text{וְהָ[חֹסִים בּוֹ הַמָּה] בְּיַרְדֵּי יִשְׂרָאֵל}$ ¹²⁵ Once again, an understanding of the methodological presuppositions of the writer has enabled us to decide upon a particular restoration.

For the second lacuna of the line, there is preserved on Fragment 2 the end of a word, most likely correctly read as gentilic. At least Yadin's נִים [הַכּוֹהֵ] is most unlikely for his מִנֵּה (though blurred) would then be touching the following $\text{y}d\delta$; in 4QFlor the מִנֵּה is consistently written upright. In taking account of the gentilic ending several scholars have suggested restorations using גִּיִּים from Psalm 2:1;¹²⁶ yet all require some forced readjustment of the text of the Psalm to result in reading גִּיִּים [גִּי] in that place. If none of them is right, then it could be that as there is an identification from Psalm 2:12 in the second half of the line, so also in the first half some party from the psalm is being identified in a gentilic way:¹²⁷ the options are several, but it is כְּתִיִּים , suggested by W. H. Brownlee,¹²⁸ that would best suit an identification of the גִּיִּים of Psalm 2:1.

Concerning this restoration 1QpHab 2:11-12 identifies the Chaldeans, "that bitter and hasty nation" (גִּיִּי ; Hab 1:6), as the Kittim and 1QpHab 3:4-5 has the Kittim inspire with fear all the nations (גִּוֹאִים ; i.e. other nations). Indeed, just as the Kittim laugh at the kings and people (Hab 1:10a, 1QpHab 4:1-3) so in turn the Lord laughs at the kings of the earth and the rulers in Psalm 2:4. Furthermore 4QpIsa^a clearly describes the Kittim in terms of the eschatological foe,¹²⁹ whose demise occurs at the same time as the appearance of the shoot of David (צֶמַח דָּוִד ; 4QpIsa^a frgs. 8-10, 4QFlor 1:11, 4QP Bless 3-4).

So a substantially justified restoration of the whole line might read:

משיחו פ] שר הדבר ¹³⁰ [אשר הגויים המה הכת] יים וה[וסי בו המה]
 בחירי ישראל באחרית הימים

Column 2

Apart from quoting the beginning of lines 1-4a as published by Allegro, "Fragments," few scholars have made much attempt at making sense out of what remains of Column 2 - indeed, largely because Allegro did not publish the whole of 4QFlor until the appearance of DJD V. Just as for Psalm 1 there are supportive biblical texts for the pesher, so these few lines in Column 2 contain at least one introduced quotation, as well as what appears to be an indirect quotation from a nearby passage. Assuming that the lines of Column 2 are of similar length to those of Column 1,¹³¹ then the most important question becomes that of ascertaining how far or near Fragment 3 should be placed to Fragment 1. It is quite possible that they are not so very far from each other, as the restoration here intends to demonstrate.

Line 1

The restoration of פתאי בית יהודה is to be preferred to פתאי יהודה considering the concern of 4QFlor with houses and because the phrase actually occurs in Fragment 4, line 4.¹³² בליעל of line 2 might be preceded in line 1 by a phrase such as כול מחשבת¹³³

Line 2

The original manuscript is the basis of the reading רונשאר ש] רונשאר over against Allegro's שאר. It is worth

comparing this line with CD 1:14: **הַשְׂאִיר שְׂאִירֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל**, "he left a remnant to Israel."¹³⁴ The line is to be completed with something that might fit between **הַתּוֹרָה** and **מוֹשֶׁה** of line 3. For the phrase **כּוֹל הַתּוֹרָה** cf. 1QS 5:16, 8:2.

Lines 3 and 4

From the repetition of **הִיאָה** and from the fact that the context of the Daniel quotation is very concerned with the "time," it seems that, as in line 1, there is to be an explanation of **עַתָּה**.¹³⁵ The proximity of Fragment 3 to Fragment 1, according to the above restoration of lines 1 and 2, enables a short restoration to be made utilizing the clearly visible *rêš* at the start of line 3 in Fragment 3. Because of the very likely reading of **הַמַּשְׂכִּילִים** in line 4, it is possible to identify the quotation as from Dan 12:10; but it is also necessary to admit that, according to the MT, this requires alteration of the *hiph²l* perfect to the infinitive to fit the evidence of the Fragment. The existence of a different text tradition cannot be ruled out. Dan 12:10 and 11:35 are both connected to Psalm 2 through their common use of the root **שָׂכַל**: again understanding of exegetical presuppositions enables a more certain restoration to be proposed. At the end of line 3 magnification of the original manuscript reveals vestiges of an *ayin* Allegro (DJD V) reads **לְהַרְשִׁי ע**].

Line 4a

This insertion is clearly by the same hand as the rest of 4QFlor. It seems to contain a quotation of Dan 11:32b,¹³⁶ **וְעַתָּה יִרְעִי אֱלֹהֵי יִחְזְקוּ וְעַשׂוּ** and the phrase before that seems to be drawn from verbs used in Dan 11:35 concerning the action of the **מַשְׂכִּילִים** which is the link back to Dan 12:10 in lines 4 and 5.

The restoration proposed used the three roots צרר, נרר and לבו from Dan 11:35, one of which is definitely in Fragment 3, and one of which is partially represented.¹³⁷

Lines 5 and 6

Strugnell wonders whether these lines may contain a quotation of Psalm 3:1-2. However, none of the remaining words are the same.¹³⁸ If נררתו is part of a biblical verse it can only be from Exod 34:29 where the context discusses Moses after his descent from Mount Sinai where he had talked with God. Psalm 2 does indeed contain an actual speech of the Lord to the king - which may be the connection between the passages, if indeed Exod 34:29 is being cited.¹³⁹

If נררתו is not part of a direct quotation of scripture then the descent mentioned could be that of Yahweh in a theophany. Isa 63:19 (Eng. 64:1) calls on God to come down (ירד) and intervene. Ps 18:10 (Eng. 18:9) uses ירד with Yahweh as subject; indeed in verse 12 the thick clouds dark with water are described as his *sukkāh* (סכתו) which might suggest how 4QFlor 2:5 is to be linked with the earlier interpretation (4QFlor 1:12). Zechariah 14 associates Yahweh's theophany with the feast of Tabernacles (14:16); the defeat of the nations (Zech 14:2) echoes the language of Ps 2. Similarly Joel 4 proclaims a theophany in battle; the description of Yahweh as the refuge (מחסה) of his people (Joel 4:16; Eng. 3:16) echoes Ps 2:11, used above to restore 4QFlor 1:19.¹⁴⁰

Fragment 4

The content of this fits well with that of Fragments 1-3. There is mention of the "time," (Col. 2:1, 3?), of Belial (Col. 1:8), and, most likely, of Judah and Israel which is the context

of the Ezekiel quotation in the pesher of Psalm 1, (Col. 1:16-17). Also מאמץ appears frequently in 1QM and 1QH. Careful reading of photograph 41.810 shows יִשְׁרָאֵל more fully preserved than Allegro allows (DJD V; יִשְׁרָאֵל).

It is impossible to say where this fragment might have been within the context of the whole scroll.

Fragment 5

This fragment is interesting primarily because it may contain a reference to the Messiah(s) in its having the same phrase as occurs in 1QS 9:11, CD 12:23, 14:19, 19:10 and 20:1 but in the reverse order: $\text{אֲהַרְוֶן וְיִשְׂרָאֵל}$. That the Messiah of Israel should come before the one of Aaron may reflect a change in attitude toward the messianic figures. This will be discussed further below. A close reading of the original manuscript shows the dot of an earlier line on this fragment's upper edge.

Fragment 6-11

These are all text and pesher of the blessings of Deuteronomy 33. Because Fragments 9 and 10 are clearly at the top of a column, one can presume that 6, 7 and 8 were in a previous column. Strugnell has improved on Allegro's suggestion for Fragments 6 and 7 by more carefully aligning the fragments in relation to the text of Deuteronomy. Strugnell also proposes using the text of 4QPest to restore the lacunae. Allegro's text is cited here but it is emended according to the suggestions of Strugnell.

For Fragment 10 Strugnell identifies an *ʾaleph* at the beginning of the fragment, from which he tentatively suggests reading הוֹאֵה .

Fragment 12

This is a piece of the right hand edge of a column.

For line 4 Strugnell reads נִבֵּ and proposes בִּטְסָר. This would fit well with the frequent use of supportive biblical quotations introduced by formulae containing such words in 4QFlor. In fact, from photograph 42.608 the more complete כַּבִּטְסָר[can be determined.

Fragments 13 and 14

These fragments can almost certainly be aligned to form the third verse of Psalm 5, as Strugnell has pointed out. It is also likely that these two fragments belong with those Allegro lists under 4QCatena^a,¹⁴¹ where there is material concerned with psalm interpretation - Catena^a is not to be joined to 4QFlor: the hand is different and the column size is smaller with only 16 lines.

The *bêt* in line 1 of Fragment 14 could equally well be a *kaph*.

Fragment 15

Strugnell identifies this as being a quotation from Isa 65:22-23, though, of course, the position of the text in the column cannot be determined. The context of that section of Isaiah speaks of the "chosen ones" which is certainly relevant to 4QFlor. Strugnell mentions that it may also just be possible to include Fragment 19 as part of this quotation, though he admits of the difficulty in aligning the two texts. Even if one follows the text of 1QIsa^a, the lines cannot be fitted; in fact, the positioning is even less likely as there is, as usual at Qumran, a *hê'* on יְדִיחָמָה and yet בְּרוּכֵי of the MT

is shortened to נרן . Perhaps, however, the המה of Fragment 19 is part of the exposition, and not of the Isaiah quotation, unless the Isaiah text has been edited at this point, as that of 2 Samuel 7 was in Column 1:10-11.

Fragments 16-18 and 20-26

Little can be said concerning these fragments.

For Fragment 16 photograph 42.608 shows more of the letter of the first line than is reconcilable with the vestiges of a *'āleph* (Allegro, DJD V). Photograph 41.810 shows that the letter preserved in line 1 of Fragment 18 is most probably a *bêt*; for line 3 a final *nūn* is quite ascertainable.

For Fragment 21 Strugnell suggests that it could be joined to Column 1 at line 3 to read there מקדש] יהוה כ[ון . The *kaph* fits well and יהוה for ארוני is attested in 86 Mss. and the Samaritan text.

Fragment 23 may contain once again the title of the figure who is to accompany the צמח דויד ; Fragment 24 contains מצרף which is found in 4QFlor 2:1.

Unpublished Fragment 27

W. H. Brownlee has observed that this fragment is preserved in the Rockefeller Museum along with those depicted in Plate XX of DJD V, although it was not published with the other fragments of that plate. For the partial word of line 2 the *wāw* could equally well be a *yōd*.

11QMelch

J. Carmignac suggests that 4QFlor and 11QMelch, because of their similar "thematic" style and content, especially as both contain a quotation of Isa 8:11, may originally have been two

pieces of the same work.¹⁴² Yet, the column length, the location of discovery and slight stylistic variations all tell against this proposal.

C. Form-Critical Study

1. *The Parts of the Text*

a. 4QFlor 1:1-13

Extent of the Unit

Any definition of the extent of a unit in this fragmentary text is complicated through the lack of a clear beginning and a clear end. The main body of the text (frgs. 1-3), however, can be divided precisely at the end of 4QFlor 1:13: form and content both show that 1:1-13 requires treatment apart from 1:14-2:6. In the former it is the text of 2 Samuel 7 that the interpreter explains, in the latter it is Psalms 1 and 2 that are expanded in a midrash. Formally, the explanation of 2 Samuel 7 is attached to the scriptural text in a different way from the *pēšer* interpretations of Psalms 1 and 2 and their scriptural citations. Since textual problems have already been dealt with, consideration of the structure of the passage follows immediately.

Structure of the Text

The main feature of the unit is the way in which the pun on *בית*, "house," in 2 Samuel 7 is preserved in the two major subdivisions: in the first place *בית* is aptly taken to refer to the sanctuary and secondly it is discussed in its metaphorical significance in relation to the royal house of David. But within

the treatment of 2 Samuel 7:10-11a*, the interpretation of בית as מקדש is developed into an explanation of מקדש in terms of קהל, "congregation" such that by the time 2 Sam 7:11a* is introduced the discussion of the sanctuary has evolved solely into a consideration of the community itself - that in itself then forms the thematic link whereby discussion of the shoot of David is seen in the perspective of saviour of the community as well as in terms of ruler of Zion, the holy city.

Nathan's Oracle Interpreted

4QFlor 1:1-13

I. Concerning the Eschatological Sanctuary/Community 1:1-9

A. Quotation of 2 Sam 7:10-11a*

B. Interpretations

1. Concerning the House

2-7

- a. Statement of identification (with explanation:
relative cl. including temporal phrase)

(הואה...הימים)

- b. Statement of explanation around Exod 15:17b-18

- 1) Quotation of Exod 15:17b-18 with
introduction (cKs)

(כאשר...ועד)

- 2) Interpretation of מקדש (הואה...תורה)

- a) Statement of identification

(הואה הבית)

- b) Statement of explanation (relative cl.)

(אשר...תורה)

- (1) Conc. limited admission

(a) Allusion to Deut 23:3-4

(אשר...עולם)

- (b) 5 groups denied admission
(ועמוני...עולם)
- (c) Threefold reason for exclusion
(כיא...יראה)
- (2) Conc. non-desolation
 - (a) Introductory statement
(ולוא...זרים)
 - (b) Comparative statement
(כאשר...בחטאתמה)
- (3) Conc. promise and purpose of the Lord
 - (a) Promise: to build
(ויואמר...אדם)
 - (b) Purpose: to offer
(להיות...תורה)
- 2. Concerning the lack of enemies 7-9
 - a. Quotation of 2 Sam 7:11a^f with introduction
 - 1) Introductory formula (cA)
 - 2) 2 Sam 7:11a^f
 - b. Interpretation (relative cl.) (אשר...אונמה)
 - 1) Basic statement
(אשר...במשגתימה)
 - 2) Comparative description of sons of Belial
(כאשר...אונמה)
 - a) Conc. their coming w. plots of Belial
(כאשר...בליעל)
 - b) Twofold purpose for coming with overall intention
 - (1) To cause sons of light to stumble
(להכשיל...אור)

(2) To devise against them plots of
wickedness

(ולאשׁוּב...אוֹן)

(1) + (2) To catch them for Belial

(למען...אוֹנֵמָה)

II. Concerning the Eschatological Figures

10-13

A. Quotations from 2 Samuel 7

1. 2 Sam 7:11b

2. 2 Sam 7:12a^f

3. 2 Sam 7:13b with verb from 12b^a

4. 2 Sam 7:14a

B. Interpretation

1. Statement of identification (expanded)

(הוא...התורה)

a. Demonstrative pronoun

(הוא)

b. Subject of reference

(צמח...התורה)

1) Name

(צמח דויד)

2) Relative participial description

(העומד...התורה)

2. Statement of explanation (relative cl.)

(אשר...ישראל)

a. Basic statement with temporal phrase

(אשר...הימים)

b. Comparative quotation w. interpretation

(כאשר...ישראל)

- 1) Quotation of Amos 9:11 w. introductory formula (cK)
(כאשר...הנופלת)
- 2) Interpretation
(הואה...ישראל)
 - a) Statement of identification
(הואה...הנופלת)
 - b) Statement of explanation (relative cl.)
(אשר...ישראל)

A detailed analysis of this kind is only justifiable in as much as it arises from the text. In the case of the unit under consideration one can see that the very layout of the text on the scroll is itself informative. The second major subsection of biblical text to which commentary is attached starts with its first word at the margin and it may be presupposed on the basis of this same feature in the second unit of the text (when Psalm 1 and 2 are cited) that the material from 2 Sam 7:10-11a^α also began at the margin, possibly on the bottom line of the previous column.

But apart from this physical clue certain formal characteristics support the analysis as outlined above. From the whole of 4QFlor it appears that the major texts, which form the basis for the various subsections of the two units so far identified, are not themselves introduced with any formula. That alone could lead to an understanding that the quotation of 2 Sam 7:11a^β in line 7 is in some way subordinate; indeed the relative significance of this quotation is central to a correct analysis of the first subsection of the unit 4QFlor 1:1-13. The discovery of two subsections within our first unit is further supported

on the basis of style: it is to be noted that each subsection of 4QFlor contains the temporal phrase *אחריה הימים* (lines 2, 12, 15, 19) indicating for the first unit (4QFlor 1:1-13) that there are two subsections which the author is insisting must be seen in relation to the latter days - this already points to one aspect of the purpose that the author had in his interpretation.

Taking the first subsection (1:1-9) of this first unit and remembering that certain exegetical principles were the tools of the commentator of the first centuries B.C. and A.D., we can trace the treatment of one half of Nathan's pun, that "house" is used of the temple. *בית* does not occur in 2 Sam 7:10-11a^a but is presupposed as the basis of the oracle of Nathan from 2 Sam 7:5-6. In 2 Sam 7:10 it is *מקום*, "place," that is used: only in this verse is a place described concerning which God takes the initiative, He is to appoint it for his people Israel. It is the initiative of Yahweh that is the salient characteristic of the first expanded demonstrative introductory formula; coupled with such initiative is the thematic temporal phrase *באחריה הימים*.

Then, immediately, the identification of *מקום* in this introductory way is established through a comparative quotation of Exod 15:17b-18 that is itself interpreted. Through the use of the exegetical principle of *g'ezērâ šawâ* in the association of Exod 15:17b-18 and 2 Sam 7:10 through their analogical use of the root *נטע*, the interpreter demonstrates that it is not the Solomonic temple that is the referent of Nathan's oracle but the eschatological sanctuary (*מקדש*). The circumstances of that sanctuary are then expounded in lines 3-7 but not without

a second use of the demonstrative introductory formula, הוּא הַבַּיִת, which highlights the tension of the interpretation: while the sanctuary is to be expounded in terms of the congregation the original reference is to the בַּיִת, "house."

4QFlor 1:3-7 is to be taken as interpretative of Exodus 15, rather than of the "place" of 2 Sam 7:10. This can be seen from the fact that this section of exegesis is not introduced with the conjunction *wāw* as parallel pieces of exposition are in lines 15 and 16; also, in line 12 the exposition that follows Amos 9:11 without a *wāw* clearly directly corresponds to and expounds the Amos quotation, and only indirectly the Samuel verses. The structure reveals that for the content of lines 3-7 the tension within the ambiguity of understanding the sanctuary is played out to the full. On the one hand it is a heavenly building and on the other the eschatological community. J. A. Fitzmyer has commented that the text of Exodus 15 is modernized so as to refer to the Qumran community "which is the new Israel, the new 'house'."¹⁴³ But a preferable way of describing the development of the exposition on Exod 15:17b-18 would be in terms of the proleptic function of the Qumran community in the age that is to be characterized by God's initiative in establishing his sanctuary, from which he will rule.

The interpretation of מְקוֹם of Exodus 15 is carried out in the consistent manner of our interpreter. Similar structures of a statement of identification followed by a statement of explanation occur overall for lines 2-7, 10-13, etc. Not only is there a degree of formal consistency, but also, once again, there is use of an exegetical principle in the statement of

explanation (relative clause). The first section of the explanation concerns limited admission to the eschatological sanctuary. It is introduced by an allusion to Deut 23:3-4 whereby it is made more clear that the author intends us to understand one meaning of מקדש as referring most probably to a group of people, הקהל. Since neither Deut 23:3-4 nor adjacent texts refer to the "sanctuary" or the "house," it is reasonable to suppose that the allusion is made through a parent text; an example of the use of the principle of *binyan 'ab*. For such purposes either Lev 16:33 or Num 19:20 would serve suitably;¹⁴⁴ the latter reads ונכרתה הנפש ההוא מתוך הקהל כי את מקדש יהוה טמא The two words מקדש and קהל are used in the one verse and the author of 4QFlor could have treated them as synonymous.¹⁴⁵

Only in the third part of the explanation is the tension fully played out in the description of the promise of the Lord that he will build for himself a sanctuary of men. It is such a statement that enables the interpreter to return to the text of 2 Samuel 7. This he does not according to the consistent pattern of starting fresh quotations of the main text at the margin without introduction; rather, as the structure shows, the quotation of 2 Sam 7:11a^b is subordinate to the longer quotation that is already partly expounded in lines 3-7.

The relation of 2 Sam 7:11a^b to the earlier Samuel citation is problematical. The introductory phrase (line 7) ואשר אמר must be considered in its entirety for the conjunction plays a decisive role in enabling the correct identification of the relative position of the two elements of the unit of 4QFlor 1:1-13. In 1QpHab, where the same phrase occurs at least five times,¹⁴⁶ it always introduces a requotation. The requoted text and its

interpretation are clearly in a subordinate position to the main textual citation. In CD the same formula occurs three times: CD 8:14, 9:2, 16:6. In each of these cases it introduces a fresh quotation in a position subordinate to the overall theme but of a different content from that which immediately precedes.

Since 2 Sam 7:11a^b is not a re quotation, although it is a new and separate section of text awaiting interpretation, the author has introduced it in a manner suggestive of its subordination to the overarching quotation of 2 Sam 7:10-11a". That subordination does not come in terms of the eschatological sanctuary of which the quotation has nothing to say, and so lines 7-9 cannot be subsumed in some way under the explanation of the "house." The last and most reasonable option is to consider it of equal weight structurally to the explanation of the "house" as an explanation in its own right. Its following after the interpretation of מקום (2 Sam 7:10) around Exodus 15:17b-18 consecutively links its content to that part of the preceding interpretation which is speaking of the "sanctuary of men."

Furthermore justification for the structural analysis above is provided in the form of the most probable restoration of the interpreter's citation of 2 Samuel 7:10: וְיָרַח... אֲרִיבִי. The quotation of 2 Samuel 7:11a^b is thus linked to the earlier citation through their analogous use of אֲרִיבִי. The interpretation of Nathan's oracle is thus continued by means of a quotation from it and the discussion of the eschatological sanctuary and community is superceded by an interpretation concerning the removal of the enemies during the eschatological age.

The structure of this second element in the interpretation of 2 Sam 7:10-11a^a reveals clearly a lengthy description of the enemy, the sons of Belial. The description mentions firstly their coming and secondly outlines the reasons for their coming. From this one can suppose that the prophecy of Nathan as interpreted has evidently not yet happened: the enemy is still present, the eschatological rest has not yet come.

The second subsection of the first unit of 4QFlor is of four lines: 10-13. It contains quotations with interpretation. Of great interest is that just as it is likely that 2 Samuel 7:10 has been adjusted through a particular exegetical technique so that 2 Sam 7:11a^b could be used as subordinate interpretation, so also the quotation of 2 Samuel 7:11b-14a has been considerably edited to provide the just text for the interpretation. And such editing is done in a way that is far from random; rather, as noted already, there is the deliberate use of an exegetical principle whereby a text itself can be treated before it is quoted, and in this way made suitable for purposes of commentary upon those selected parts.

The structure of this subsection concerning the eschatological figures is very similar to that of the preceding subsection. The quotation is followed by an interpretation that has a statement of identification which leads into a statement of explanation that contains a basic statement and then a comparison. Of note is the recurrence within the basic statement of the temporal phrase that is one of the unifying factors between the two units of Fragments 1-3: אחרית הימים.

Within the comparison is a scriptural citation that is again linked to the main quotation through use of an exegetical

principle. The analogous use of הקימותי in both biblical verses is an example of *gēsērā šāwā*. Furthermore the treatment of Amos 9:11 witnesses a possible example of paronomasia: סוכה could be taken to mean both "booth" and "branch" whereby the identification of the צמח דוד is confirmed. Thus the quotation of Amos 9:11 and its explanation are to be understood from their place within 4QFlor; any imposition of the interpretation of the same quotation in CD is inappropriate.¹⁴⁷ הקימותי refers directly to 2 Sam 7:11a^b; the seed of David and the booth of David are parallel phrases, and it is only the booth that requires explanation. The requotation of part of Amos 9:11 in its explanation is stylistic precision. The הוומר of line 11 is balanced by הנופלה of line 12, and in inverted order the הנופלה of line 13 is in turn balanced by יעמור. The care with which this is done is the best support for taking them as expressing opposites of meaning, noting that עמר usually means "take office" in Qumran Literature.¹⁴⁸

So, in sum, 4QFlor 1:10-13 describes the royal family aspect of בית as punned in 2 Samuel 7, and reflects the Qumran expectation of the Davidic King-Messiah, accompanied by the eschatological Interpreter of the Law, through whom God's proper rule will be restored and who will save Israel.

Genre

In an article in *Revue de Qumrân*¹⁴⁹ I have argued that three matters determine the classification of any genre: "primary factors" (e.g., form, content, author, setting, function, etc.), "secondary factors"¹⁵⁰ (largely a matter of method and style), and the history of literary traditions. No one factor alone is sufficient for the determination of a genre. For the

primary factors of this unit of 4QFlor the structural analysis provides us with a generic clue: explicit scriptural quotations are combined with interpretations which are a combination of statements of identification and statements of explanation. For the secondary factors of this text it would seem that the use of certain exegetical techniques, especially *gězērâ šāvâ*, has enabled the author to argue a particular theme within his formal structural restraints. These two factors alone would suggest that this unit is akin to rabbinic midrash, but such an association has been complicated by scholars hastily labelling the Qumran commentaries as pesharim and as a result it has often been argued that these Qumran writings stand outside the literary tradition of midrash.¹⁵¹

Detailed consideration of the literary tradition within which the pesharim may stand will follow in the discussion of the next unit of 4QFlor. In relation to 4QFlor 1:1-13, however, it is necessary to say that an explicit association with pesharim is difficult, for nowhere in this unit of 4QFlor is the interpretation introduced formally by a phrase including the word פשר as is familiar from other Qumran commentaries.¹⁵² Given the precision of the commentator in stylistic matters, this would seem not to be accidental. Several explanations are possible. Firstly, if Samuel was conceived *in toto* as being an historical book, then it may be that such conception has made impossible the use of the term פשר which in all other Qumran uses, including its one occurrence in CD at 4:14, is reserved for prophetic texts.¹⁵³ However, if the text of 2 Samuel 7 is considered by itself then it is an oracle of the prophet Nathan, a prophetic text of the first order.¹⁵⁴ Or, secondly, since the part played

by a particular speaker may be partly constitutive of genre, it could be that this first unit of 4QFlor is not pesher because it was not originally spoken by the Teacher of Righteousness. From 1QpHab 7:3-5 we know that it was to him that God had "made known all the mysteries of the words of His servants the Prophets." Yet thirdly, 1QpHab 7:3-5 also implies that pesher was a genre reserved for the *secrets* of the prophets as the Teacher interprets them (correctly and once for all) for the Qumran community. So, if the Teacher was believed to have or actually did pronounce the interpretation upon the verses of Nathan's prophecy, then one must suppose that Nathan's prophecy did *not* contain any mystery (רִי) that the Teacher had to unravel; rather, it was clearly an eschatological prophecy and so only needed elucidation and explanation as to its particulars.

In fact, the way in which the scriptural text has been edited in both subsections suggests that the interpretation may be precisely slanted towards their eschatological significance. In other words the task of the פֶּשֶׁר is carried out within the editorial work done through valid exegetical principles upon the scriptural text itself; pesher becomes, therefore, redundant as a form of interpretation upon that text. Only in a somewhat tenuous sense can 4QFlor 1:1-13 be classified generically as פֶּשֶׁר; otherwise it must be labelled solely as *Qumran midrash*.

Setting

If the lack of the פֶּשֶׁר formula is attributable to the fact that the Righteous Teacher was not considered to be the author of this unit, then 4QFlor 1:1-13 may find its setting in any one of the different communities that had their parenthood in Qumran. The commentary, possibly in an oral form no longer

preserved, could thus have arisen out of some such group meeting as described in 1QS 6:3-8 in which ten men and a priest form a body sufficient for a community meal and uninterrupted study of the Law.

On the other hand if we limit the unit under discussion to Qumran itself then it can be seen against a background of what we know to have been the place of study of the scriptures within the community. Study of all the scriptures, but of the Law especially, was an important part of the sectarian's life and it was also assigned to certain people at certain times. As mentioned, 1QS 6:3-8 contains information on scriptural study that would have applied equally at Qumran itself: "and where the ten are, there shall never lack a man among them who shall study the Law continually, day and night" (1QS 6:6). And 1QS 8:11-12 states that the "Interpreter" was not "to conceal from them . . . any of those things hidden from Israel which have been discovered by him."¹⁵⁵

It may be possible, by using material from Philo concerning the Essenes, to identify the time in the daily life of the sectarians when such exposition took place. In *De Vita Contemplativa*, Philo describes how after the meal the head of the community "discusses some question arising in the Holy Scriptures or solves one that has been propounded by someone else."¹⁵⁶ He does this in an allegorical fashion which enables the audience "to discern the inward and hidden through the outward and visible."¹⁵⁷ And so Bo Reicke concludes:

Quoique le supérieur, selon tout apparence, fasse seulement un exposé oral, on peut facilement admettre que des commentaires bibliques écrits

aient été composés dans ces milieux à partir de tels exposés oraux. De cette façon on peut comprendre un écrit tel que le commentaire d'Habakkuk de Qumran comme le fixation par écrit de recitations exégétiques.¹⁵⁸

F. M. Cross similarly allows that such biblical exposition may stem from the founder of the sect and that this was transmitted and supplemented "in the regular study of scholars of the community, and particularly in the regular sessions of the sect mentioned in the sources, where Scripture was read and systematically expounded by those who had become the experts of the community."¹⁵⁹ However, Cross also points out that the pesharim are autograph copies, as no duplicate copies have come to light, and so they may not necessarily have had a large or any oral tradition before being put into writing.¹⁶⁰

Yet, as will be pointed out in relation to 4QFlor, it is almost certain that a liturgical setting lies behind the combination of scriptural texts in 4QFlor. Apart from such a setting 1:1-13 remains primarily a written work and its not being pesharim may be a signal that the preaching of the Teacher of Righteousness lies nowhere in its background.

Intention

Though it may be somewhat rash to suggest what may be the intention of the unit, since it could be that the unit should have been longer, preceding into the previous column, it seems safe to suggest certain features that may come under this heading. In 4QFlor 1:1-13 the author intends to provide a midrash on Nathan's oracle from 2 Samuel 7, in which commentary is developed the original oracle's pun on בית, "house," in terms of the

eschatological expectations of the Qumran sect. But the midrash is far from arbitrary and throughout attempts to demonstrate the correctness of its interpretation by using generally accepted principles of exegesis.

The eschatological concern is emphasized through the repeated use of the phrase *אחרית הימים* and is played upon in the way in which the community is depicted as proleptically representing the eschatological sanctuary. With such use of Nathan's pun the commentator can discuss the Qumran community and its expected messianic leaders while never negating the idea of the eschatological sanctuary and of God's ultimate rule. It is God's rule, indeed, that provides a secondary theme to the commentary; it is expressed in Exod 15:17-18, in the expected defeat of the enemies (a sign of kingly rule), and in the representative rule of the shoot of David in Zion in the last age. It is such motifs that provide links with the second unit of 4QFlor, to be considered next.

b. 4QFlor 1:14-2:6

Extent of the Unit

The start of the unit is defined by the paragraphing of the manuscript, by the formulary introduction and by the change in content of the scriptural citations from 2 Samuel 7 to Psalm 1. The introductory formula helps determine the extent of the unit. It is not repeated before the quotation from Psalm 2 and so we must suppose that it introduces the quotations and interpretations of both Psalms 1 and 2. It could introduce more than that but the text breaks off in column 2 so that we are left with a unit that has no end. Enough is discernible from the subsections of

the unit that it is certainly valid to proceed with a form-critical analysis, even though the unit remains incomplete.

Structure of the Text

The main feature of the unit is the very formal way in which Psalms 1 and 2 are treated midrashically. The structure of the unit is a long succession of two-part elements. The strict consistency within the unit is suggestive of a uniform literary composition.

<i>Midrash on Psalms 1 & 2</i>	4QFlor 1:14-2:6(?)
I. Introductory formula	1:14
II. Midrash proper	1:14-2:6(?)
A. Quotation of Ps 1:1a ^α with pesher	1:14-17
1. Ps 1:1a ^α	
2. Pesher (פֶּשֶׁר... יַחַד)	
a. Introductory formula (פֶּשֶׁר... עַל)	
b. Pesher proper (סֵרִי... יַחַד)	
1) Statement of identification (abbreviated)	
(סֵרִי... חֲטָאִים)	
2) Two statements of explanation	
a) First explanation (relative cl.)	
(עַל... הָעֵם)	
(1) Introductory formula w. temporal phrase (cKsL) (עַל... הַיָּמִים)	
(2) Quotation of Isa 8:11 (=1QIsa ^a)	
(וַיְהִי... הָעֵם)	
b) Second explanation (וְהַמָּה... יַחַד)	
(1) Reiteration of subject (demonstrative pronoun) (וְהַמָּה)	

(2) Explanation proper (relative cl.)

(אשר... יחד)

(a) Quotation w. introductory

formula (אשר... גלוליהמה)

α. Introductory formula

(cKsL+A abbreviated)

β. Quotation of Ezek 37:23

(b) Interpretation (יחד... המה)

α. Statement of identification

β. Statement of explanation

(mostly in lacunae)

B. Quotation of Ps 2:1-2 with pesher 1:18-2:6(?)

1. Ps 2:1-2

2. Pesher

a. Introductory formula

b. Pesher proper

1) First statement of identification

(הגויים... הכתים)

2) Second statement of identification with

interpreted qualification (... וחוס)

a) Identification proper (ישראל... וחוס)

b) Adverbial qualification w. interpretation

(... באחרית)

(1) Adverbial qualification (temporal

phrase) (באחרית הימים)

(2) Interpretation

(a) Statement of identification

(היא... המצרף)

- (b) Statement of explanation
 - (relative cl.) (...הבאה)
 - α. Description (הבאה...מושה)
 - β. Further interpretation
 - aa. Statement of identification
 - (היאה העה)
 - bb. Statement of explanation
 - (relative cl.) (...כאשר)
 - α. Introductory formula (cKs)
 - β. Quotation of Dan 12:10
 - w. insertion alluding to Dan 11:35 + quotation of Dan 11:32b

The material in 4QFlor 1:14ff is based upon citations of the first verses of Psalms 1 and 2. The pesher following Psalm 1:1a^α contains two supportive biblical quotations which can be linked to the psalm by *gšāwā šāwā* provided that it is understood that in giving just part of the first verse of the psalm the author assumes of his reader knowledge of the rest. Such incipit verses appear in the MT, for example, at Exod 15:21 which implies that Miriam then sang the whole song of Moses in Exod 15:1-18; Jer 33:11 also contains an incipit for either Psalm 116 or 136.¹⁶¹ This suggests also that, although Psalms 1 and 2 were known as belonging together, possibly in a certain situation only, and although they require only one overall introductory formula, they were considered at Qumran as two distinct parts of a whole.¹⁶²

For the first explanation Isa 8:11 is linked to Psalm 1 through their analogical use of *לל*. This linkword does not

occur in the Psalm quotation but is implied from Ps 1:1a⁶ by its occurrence in the author's own words in the pesher. The introductory formula to the quotation of Isa 8:11 is noteworthy in that it is expanded with the temporal phrase that has already featured twice in 4QFlor 1:1-13. The second explanation is structured exactly like the first except that the quotation has its own explanation. The citation of Ezek 37:23 is linked to Psalm 1 through their analogical use of מוֹשֵׁב. The secondary explanation of Ezek 37:23 which follows after the quotation has been discussed in detail under the textual notes.

The total effect of the structure of the passage is to demonstrate how the Qumran community under its various designations, the converts, the Sons of Zadok and the men of their Council, is illustrative of the type of Psalm 1 who "has not walked in the counsel of the wicked." In fact because Isaiah 8 was talking of the last days, it is clear that, since valid exegetical principles have been used, so also Psalm 1 must refer to the Qumran community.

In line 18 the quotation from Psalm 2 begins at the margin in the same way that the edited text of 2 Sam 7:11-14 had done in line 10. The content of the pesher is formulated in two statements of identification (according to the textual reconstruction that appears most likely). The first such statement identifies one of the parties mentioned in the Psalm quotation, כְּיָגִי, with the Kittim (?); this first statement is then dropped and is only significant in the background role that the Kittim are bound to play in the guise of the sons of Belial.

The second identification is of those who take refuge in the Lord as the chosen ones of Israel. Yet the chief concern

of the interpreter is with their situation in the latter days. The key temporal phrase *אחרית הימים* is then explained in length in a manner similar to that of the house in 1:2-6. The latter days are to be a time of trial for the community, the "House of Judah." The result is that just as 2 Sam 7:10-11a is treated in terms of the ideal (Qumran) congregation proleptically representing the heavenly sanctuary, and there is then discussion of the enemies who no longer disturb God's rest, so the *pesher* of Psalm 1 is a description of the present Qumran community and it is followed by the *pesher* on Psalm 2 in which the time of refining, of the domination of the sons of Belial, is described. But the remnant of Israel will survive as they come to understand the eschatological situation; Dan 12:10 and 11:35, both connected with Psalm 2 through their analogical use of the root *שכל*, allude to such understanding.

It is also just possible, if *נורתו* represents a quotation from Exodus 34:29, that it is connected with Psalm 2 through their common use of *הר*, "mountain." In that way the interpreter describes the eschatological age in terms of the identification of the mountain on which the Law was given and the mountain, Zion, on which the Lord will set his eternal king.¹⁶³ Thus, once again the secondary theme of the kingship of God vicariously carried out through the messianic king is represented as it was in the treatment of the texts of 2 Samuel 7.

Genre

Like 4QFlor 1:1-13 4QFlor 1:14-2:6 must be considered generically from three angles, those of "primary factors" (structure, content, setting, author, purpose), of "secondary factors" (style and method), and of the history of literary

traditions.¹⁶⁴ Since the basic structure of the unit is clear, we may begin with consideration of primary factors. *Structurally* this unit with its scriptural citations and interpretations made up of statements of identification and explanation resembles the other Qumran commentaries and the earlier unit of 4QFlor as well as many sections of the other Qumran writings where there is scriptural citation and interpretation.¹⁶⁵ This makes this unit of 4QFlor akin to the rabbinic midrashim as defined in part by such authors as H. L. Strack,¹⁶⁶ R. Bloch¹⁶⁷ and A. G. Wright.¹⁶⁸ Indeed to the modern observer the structure of this unit is its most obvious characteristic.

If midrash is the appropriate generic term for 4QFlor 1:14-2:6, then the *content* of this unit would naturally be classified as haggadah, given that all rabbinic midrash is categorized either as halakah or haggadah.¹⁶⁹ The unit includes interpretation of Psalms 1 and 2 treated as prophecy;¹⁷⁰ each interpretation is introduced with a formula including the word פֶּשֶׁר. Whilst all that could be an aid to enable us to be clearer as to what kind of haggadic midrash this unit is, several scholars would deny this. For some careful study of the etymological associations of פֶּשֶׁר is sufficient for such a denial. For example, I. Rabinowitz categorizes the pesharim firstly according to their form and secondly according to how the content of the interpretation relates as presage to the text receiving the peshar, yet he states categorically: "neither in method nor in form is a Peshar any kind of *midrash* as familiar to us from Rabbinic literature."¹⁷¹ M. P. Horgan in a careful treatment of the word פֶּשֶׁר concludes that it and the literature in which it occurs is to be considered alongside the dream interpretations of Daniel;¹⁷² from the

perspective of their respective historical contexts "the term 'midrash' is neither a useful nor an informative term by which to characterize the pesharim."¹⁷³ For some the historical concerns of the content of the pesharim speak decisively for their being *sui generis*. For example, C. Roth argues that "we are to assume therefore that a *pēšer* existed or at any rate was communicated verbally, on all or most of the passages of the Bible - about fifteen in all - in which the End of Days was specifically mentioned."¹⁷⁴ Yet "the End of Days" cannot be the exclusive criterion for defining peshar since *אחרית הימים* occurs in 4QFlor 1:2, 12, CD 6:11 and 1QSa 1:1 but there is no mention of peshar.

For other scholars neither particular eschatological content nor the presence of formulae containing the word *פֶּשֶׁר* are sufficient barriers against associating the pesharim with rabbinic midrashic literature, especially when the most explicit criterion of structure is remembered too. Pre-eminently L. H. Silberman has noted that the structure of the rabbinic *Petirah* is the same as that of 1QpHab: "It is immediately apparent that in structure this midrash¹⁷⁵ is parallel to *Hab. Peshar*, with the Aramaic root *פֶּתַר* standing in place of the Hebrew *פֶּשֶׁר*. The term introduces the specific point of reference from which the entire verse is to be understood. This specification seems to be entirely arbitrary, or rather it is not necessarily connected with any word in the text."¹⁷⁶ Silberman continued by noting that the actual word *פֶּשֶׁר* is not structurally necessary since personal or demonstrative pronouns can serve the same purpose; there can be nothing that structurally distinguishes peshar from midrash. Furthermore, in relation to content Silberman criticizes part

of W. R. Lane's conclusion¹⁷⁷ by saying "Peshar refers to structure and not content. While Lane is correct in defining 4QFlor as a midrash, his suggestion that it be distinguished from Rabbinic midrash because of its messianic, eschatological orientation is irrelevant for the same intent is to be found in some if not in all Rabbinic midrash."¹⁷⁸ Similarly W. H. Brownlee describes the purpose of peshar as for the benefit of the whole community by demonstrating from scripture the vindication of the Righteous Teacher and his followers against their various enemies and opponents and by instructing the community from an eschatological perspective to endure persecution, to avoid apostasy, to prepare the way of Yahweh and to be ready for the future.¹⁷⁹ Yet none of this summary purpose deflects Brownlee from stating that "one should not view midrashic exegesis and eschatological interpretation as mutually exclusive categories,"¹⁸⁰ nor from describing 1QpHab as *Midrash Peshar*.

One last but very important comment on the content of 4QFlor 1:14-2:6 is necessary. The whole unit is introduced with the word מַרְשָׁה.¹⁸¹ Because of its positioning one must assume that this is some kind of technical designation; its presence cannot simply be sidestepped as an exception to the rule. Furthermore the use of such a technical term is bound to influence how the subordinate term פֶּשֶׁר is to be translated. After a careful analysis of the use of פֶּשֶׁר and פִּתְרוֹ in the Bible, I. Rabinowitz has concluded that "the term peshar, in fine, never denotes just an explanation or exposition, but always a presaged reality, either envisaged as emergent or else observed as already actualized."¹⁸² Yet, as W. H. Brownlee has argued,¹⁸³ it is not necessarily the case that this meaning was carried over unmodified at Qumran. For example,

while for 1QpHab 12:2-3 Brownlee concurs with Rabinowitz's insight into the meaning of פֶּשֶׁר by translating the relevant formula as "the prophetic fulfillment,"¹⁸⁴ he points out that in many cases "prophetic meaning" is more suitable especially in equational statements.¹⁸⁵ The suggested translation of פֶּשֶׁר in 4QFlor 1:14 and 19 as "the real interpretation" is an attempt to allow for the full range of meaning of phrases including פֶּשֶׁר: on the one hand the meaning of the text being interpreted will be "realized" in the present or future (thus the dream actually contains its interpretation [Gen 40], and Nebuchadnezzar expects that whoever can tell him the interpretation of the dream must also be able to tell him the dream) and on the other hand in the explicit content of midrash the peshar provides a verifiable, real, interpretation.¹⁸⁶ All in all while the content of peshar may have certain distinct characteristics they are not sufficient to prevent the association of peshar with midrash.

Further support for such an association comes from a consideration of *setting*. Though it is far from clear precisely in what setting the pesharim were created it is the suggestion of this examination of 4QFlor that this kind of interpretation was applied to texts that had some liturgical setting, within the life of the community. R. Bloch included in her definition of midrash that it is homiletical and largely originates from the liturgical reading of the Torah.¹⁸⁷ Such once only interpretation would go some way towards explaining why all the pesharim are autographs; a sermon can only truly be delivered once.

The last primary factor to be considered is that of *authorship*. Here there is a distinctive claim, arising from the pesharim themselves, that the Teacher of Righteousness alone was

capable of making known the mysteries of the prophets.¹⁸⁸ Because of the likely date of 4QFlor (and the continuous pesharim) it is unlikely that it was composed by the Teacher of Righteousness himself though it may well contain features of interpretation that do go back to him.¹⁸⁹ The scroll's authorship cannot determine for us in itself the nature of the genre but it is a positive aid to our identifying the scroll and the other pesharim with Qumran alone. Consideration of authorship thus aids an understanding of this genre's setting. In light of what has been said in chapter one and of what has already emerged in this chapter in relation to 4QFlor any modern claim for the divine inspiration of the interpreter, and hence the distinctiveness of the genre, must be balanced by the careful statement of how we can see the interpreter going about his work and of how his audience could see that his interpretation was valid: even for the interpreter the pesharim do not reflect the direct intervention of God in any exclusive way.¹⁹⁰

The secondary factors for determining the genre concern style and method.¹⁹¹ Nearly all the scholars who have investigated these have associated the methodology of the author with that of the rabbinic midrashim. Most notable amongst them are W. H. Brownlee, who for many years has advocated identifying the pesharim as *midrash pesher* because of what he early identified as hermeneutic principles,¹⁹² L. H. Silberman¹⁹³ and E. Slomovic.¹⁹⁴ M. P. Horgan is an example of a scholar who cites extensive examples of "modes of interpretation"¹⁹⁵ and yet scrupulously avoids the word midrash in her discussion - that, by implication, because she associates the pesharim with a literary tradition that does not include rabbinic texts.

Indeed the third point to be considered in discussing the genre of 4QFlor 1:14-2:6 is the history of literary traditions. It might seem clear from what has been said that battle lines are clearly drawn up. On one side there are those who associate the pesharim with dream visions and their interpretations, especially those of the book of Daniel.¹⁹⁶ For example, Horgan has argued on the basis of the well-established observation that פשר and זך are used in similar contexts in Qumran biblical interpretations and in Daniel that it is the nearly contemporary material in Daniel that provides the most suitable comparison with the pesharim in formulae (Dan 5:26), method (e.g., Dan 5:24-28) and interest in matters historical. Yet with all this she merely hints at the end of her work that the apocalyptic world of thought may provide a likely literary setting for the pesharim.¹⁹⁷ On the other side there are those who argue with determination that the pesharim are closer to the rabbinic midrashim.¹⁹⁸ The work of Silberman needs restating as a position that allows for these two schools of thought not to be mutually exclusive. He concludes that the pesharim belong somewhere between the contemporary dream interpretations and the later rabbinic *Petirah* with all its midrashic features.¹⁹⁹

In sum these three factors point to our labelling 4QFlor 1:14-2:6 as midrash but clearly not rabbinic midrash *simpliciter*. The unit's structure, content, setting and method are all akin to what is found in many definitions of midrash. Because the term midrash may seem anachronistic to some it is best to define the text as *Qumran midrash*;²⁰⁰ and 4QFlor 1:14-2:6 is Qumran midrash of a particular *haggadic* kind, that of *peshar*.²⁰¹ As such some of its features echo those of contemporary dream visions

and their interpretations.

Setting

Little can be said as to the setting of this unit that has not already been discussed in relation to the first unit or in the debate over the generic definition of pesher. The strict two-part structure, especially of the pesher on Ps 2:1-2, might support an original oral form for the piece, and, since the pesher form is used, that orality may have been considered as going back to the Teacher of Righteousness himself. Yet, in the final analysis, 4QFlor remains a written composition and nothing certain can be said of the oral background of its two parts or of the whole. The lack of first and second person pronouns suggests that there is certainly no direct recording of speech and that the passage was not composed to be read aloud.

Some further discussion on the setting will result from the consideration of 4QFlor as a whole, from which certain liturgical aspects of the setting of the scriptural texts in combination may become apparent.

Intention

The unit provides the pesher to Psalms 1 and 2. The psalms are treated together in the same unit under the same introductory heading. Surprisingly the pesher does not develop the figure of the king in Psalm 2 in terms of the messianic prince but, rather, it is absorbed in seeing how the psalms presage the condition of the community in the eschatological age. Because of the fragmentary state of the text, its intention is not fully discernible at this point.

The most probable understanding of the pesher that follows

Psalm 1:1a^a is that it is concerned with the members of the community. Those who have walked in the counsel of the wicked, in joining the community, have turned from the way of "this people;"²⁰² and, in terms of the Ezekiel quotation, two groups do not defile themselves any more with their idols, the Sons of Zadok and the men of their council (if the restoration is correct²⁰³). The Sons of Zadok are part of the house of Judah (Ezek 37:16, 1QpHab 8:1).

This would then bear out the research done upon the title "Sons of Zadok" to determine that it is not a synonym for the community. J. Liver has shown that, because of their particular didactic function in 1QS, 1QSa and 1QSB, "'the sons of Zadok' is not to be considered as a general sectarian appellation. Rather it is to be regarded as the distinctive connotation of a priestly hierarchy determining the sect's spiritual image . . . These very priests were the indubitable nucleus around which the sect clustered."²⁰⁴ In relation to 4QFlor, Liver notes that the situation is far less clear, but, by following Yadin's reading, based on 1QS 11:2-3, "they are the sons of Zadok and the men of their counsel," he is able to explain the use of the title in 4QFlor as correctly reflecting its use in the earlier manuscripts, "the men of their counsel" being the community itself.

In relation to the title in CD, Liver concludes that at 3:20-4:4 the sons of Zadok stand for the members of the sect who are to serve as the latter-day Israel.²⁰⁵ In other words, the phrase has become a name for a particular part of the sect, over against the priests and the Levites, the other groups mentioned in the CD passage. But the title appears to have undergone some change in its use; B. Gärtner has even suggested

that at this place in CD the whole community is referred to.²⁰⁶ It is noteworthy that the phrase has lost its qualificatory "the priests;" also the sons of Zadok are identified as "the chosen ones of Israel, the ones called by name who shall stand in the latter days." The fact that 4QFlor also omits "the priests" from the title of the sons of Zadok, connects them with the latter days, and uses the phrase "the chosen ones of Israel" as the sole reference to the community in the pesher to Psalm 2, suggests that at the time of 4QFlor the phrase had become a general appellation for the latter-days community, that community which has been precisely delimited in the midrash on 2 Sam 7:10,²⁰⁷ and of which a particular part is "the men of their counsel."

The plural title "chosen ones" occurs three times in Mss. contemporary with 4QFlor, at 1QpHab 10:13, 1QM 12:1 and 4, and in all three cases refers to the whole community. If the tradition history of the title "sons of Zadok" as suggested above is correct, then there seem to be good grounds for maintaining that the sons of Zadok in 4QFlor refers to the whole community; and it is thus the whole community that is the concern of the pesher.

The pesher of Psalm 2 most likely continues in this vein with a description of the testing of the chosen ones of Israel in the latter days at the hands of the nations (the Kittim[?]). It is in fact the latter days that receive the particular exposition of the pesher. The latter days are a time of refining, but a remnant, which we may suppose to be the community, will survive, purified and refined - to use the terms of the quotations from Daniel. It is just possible that "his anointed" (Ps 2:2)

is taken up in reference to a messianic figure who will reign on the Lord's holy hill and that this is done in terms of Exod 34:29, but nothing conclusive can be said on this score.

Thus the intention of the midrash on Psalms 1 and 2 is to identify the good parties in those psalms with the community and to suggest that it is the community who is the remnant that is to survive the trial of the latter days, the period that also looks beyond that testing to a time when the understanding of the wise will be vindicated.

c. 4QFlor Fragments 6-11

These six fragments are text and commentary of the blessings of Deuteronomy 33. Detailed structural treatment of the text is impossible. Three things can be said. Firstly, as to genre, none of these fragments contains the word פֶּשֶׁר. Yet since there is a small amount of non-scriptural material and since Frg. 9 line 5 begins with על, lines 1-4 having biblical text, Allegro (DJD V) is probably correct in suggesting that the previous line contained some such formula as פֶּשֶׁר הַדָּבָר or פֶּשֶׁרוֹ. All these fragments that deal with Deuteronomy might, therefore, be considered as *Qumran midrash pesher*.

As to setting, it is noteworthy that a blessing should be expounded. One wonders whether or not this chapter of Deuteronomy might belong with 2 Samuel 7 and Psalms 1 and 2 in a particular liturgical setting. More will be said of this when the text is treated as a whole.

As to intention, it could be that one of the functions for provision of a pesher to Deuteronomy 33 is to expand upon the figure of the messianic priest. In 4QTest 14-20 Deut 33:8-11

is used in such a way as to suggest its application to the messiah of Aaron. Such discussion in 4QFlor would be very apt, for in the exposition of 2 Sam 7:11b-14 the priestly messiah is only mentioned in a secondary position, the emphasis there being on the messianic king.

d. 4QFlor Fragments 4, 5, 12, 15-26

Once again detailed form critical treatment is impossible for these fragments.

Fragment 4 concerns the struggle of the House of Judah in the time (עת) when Belial will be the archenemy. The fragment's vocabulary fits closely that of other Qumran literature. Of interest, though very speculative, is on the one hand the possible allusion to Gen 49:23-24 in line 4, the blessing of Jacob, which in certain respects parallels Deuteronomy 33 and may have had a liturgical use (cf. 4QPBless); on the other hand, line 5 contains what may be some allusions to Daniel 11 (נזר in Dan 11:24; כוה in Dan 11:15), which chapter has already provided material to interpret Psalm 2 eschatologically.

Fragment 5 contains the phrase לְשֵׁרָאֵל וְאֶחָרֹן the literary order of which has already been discussed. That the reference is to the two messiahs is most likely and the reversal of order from that in all other of its Qumran occurrences except CD 1:7 might imply a predominant interest at the time of 4QFlor in the kingly messiah, whereas at an earlier time the community with its priestly background had primarily hoped for the leadership of a priestly messiah. Also of note is the use of the root מָה (line 4), perhaps an allusion to Num 24:16-17, part of Balaam's oracle, which in 4Q Testimonia refers by implication to the two

messiahs (cf. CD 6:19-20). Could there be in Fragment 5 part of a commentary on this messianic proof-text?

The significance, or rather, insignificance, of the remaining fragments has already been pointed out under the textual notes.

2. *The Composition of the Whole Midrash*

a. *As a whole*

From a form-critical standpoint the taking of 4QFlor as a whole, inasmuch as we have it, must be justified. Such justification comes partly from palaeographical study which reveals that the whole (extant) scroll was written in the same hand and, therefore, almost certainly by the same person. The scribe must have had some reason for writing the material in the order he did, even if only because it was the order of the manuscript from which he may have been copying. Unless such a manuscript was a random composition by many scribes working independently (an unlikely construction), then to isolate, say, two separate literary units is to deny any and every possible connection between them, and that is clearly untenable. Yet it is far from certain how at least the first two units, 1:1-13 and 1:14-2:6(?), are related to one another.

1. In the first place it could be suggested that the lack of the word *נשר* in 1:1-13 implies that the section of 2 Samuel 7 that is treated there is not in fact the main text. Rather, by analogy to 1:14ff., it is part of a pesher on some other text. This argument is supported by the occurrence of statements of identification in 1:2, 3 and 11 which therefore resembles the

subordinate parts of the pesharim in 1:14ff. Because the midrash of 1:14ff. begins with the first verse of Psalm 1, three possibilities are open. Firstly, if one wishes to see 4QFlor as a fragment of a complete commentary on a book of Psalms,²⁰⁸ then either the psalms are in a different order from that in the MT, as in the case of 11QPss^a, or, secondly, the material in 1:1-13 and presumably in the previous column is all part of the pesher on an introductory title; and from the content of 1:1-13 it might be safely guessed that that title contained the name of David, to whom the composition of many of the psalms is attributed.²⁰⁹ Or thirdly, 1:1-13 is part of a pesher on some other biblical book, the content of which suggested to the scribe that he subsequently record the midrash on the psalms.

However, these three possibilities depend on the initial premise that 1:1-13 is only part of a pesher and not the whole basis of the concern of the author. Nowhere in published Qumran material is there a subsection or part of a pesher that is this long and involved. On the contrary, the usual style of pesher is very short and sometimes cryptic, and when it becomes more involved, then the relevant section of the text upon which the pesher is being made is quoted again.²¹⁰ The longest section of pesher in 1QpHab, whose lines, however, are considerably shorter than those in 4QFlor, is that of 10 lines at 2:1b-10a. 4QpNah and 4QpPs^a both have lines of similar length to 4QFlor, but in them the pesher is never longer than three lines.²¹¹ Also, nowhere is there any evidence, unless it is in the various fragments of Deuteronomy in 4QFlor, that a supportive biblical quotation of such length is used to expound a section of scriptur

such that it in turn is broken down and commented upon - rather it is true that supporting quotations are short and clearly relevant or easily made so by the addition of an explanatory phrase.²¹²

2. When it is acknowledged that 1:1-13 is connected to but different from 1:14ff., then some further observations can be made from the structure. 2 Samuel 7 differs from Psalms 1 and 2 in that it has no pesher but rather is treated like the supporting biblical quotations in 1:14ff. That suggests that the difference between 1:1-13 and 1:14ff. lies in the nature of the texts which are being expounded and not only in their expositions. Thus 2 Samuel 7 and Psalms 1 and 2 need to be generically defined, not from how they currently appear in the MT, but as to how the author at Qumran saw them.

When the text of 2 Samuel 7 as the author of 4QFlor cites it is set beside that in the MT, then it becomes clear that the portions excluded from 4QFlor are the very ones that apply only to the time immediately following David. The stress in 4QFlor, however, is on the latter days as visible in the oracle of Nathan, and no mention is made that David's immediate son will build a house for the Lord - rather, the Lord builds a house that is both the shoot of David and the sanctuary (of men) that David himself wished to build for the Lord.²¹³ The parts of the oracle of Nathan selected and quoted in 4QFlor require no pesher as they already refer directly to the messianic age. Psalms 1 and 2, however, though containing the very word משיח, were normally used in relation to the actual king of the moment (and perhaps at a post-exilic enthronement festival²¹⁴), and can only be shown to talk of (presage, or have reality of) the messianic

age through the use of the form of pesher. Thus with the diversity of form there is an overall unity of purpose that can be seen as expressed in the consistent use of certain exegetical principles.

3. The decisive factor for considering 4QFlor as a whole comes from a consideration of the setting as the Qumran author knew it of the main biblical texts which the body of 4QFlor comments upon: 2 Samuel 7 and Psalms 1 and 2 (and possibly Deuteronomy 33 and Numbers 24). There is the thematic link of messianism between the texts, particularly apparent in the royal messiah being in a special sense Yahweh's son in both 2 Samuel 7 and Psalm 2. But, over and above such a theme, it is highly probable that the scriptural texts used in 4QFlor were all known from one particular liturgical setting. They were then adapted through commentary for the intentions outlined above in relation to the various units of text. Maybe the original orality of the units of 4QFlor is best described in terms of their being homilies on liturgical texts.

Such thoughts on the unity of 4QFlor as being a "latter days" midrash upon liturgical texts can be outlined structurally according to the analysis that follows. Further discussion of 4QFlor as a whole will follow in terms of the genre of the whole and in terms of the liturgical setting of the biblical texts used in 4QFlor.

4QFlorilegium A Midrash on Festival Texts; for the Latter Days

I. The Coronation Oracle explained 1:1-13

A. Concerning the eschatological sanctuary/community 1-9

1. Quotation of 2 Sam 7:10-11a^c

- 2. Interpretations
 - a. Concerning the house
 - b. Concerning the lack of enemies
- B. Concerning the eschatological figures 10-13
 - 1. Quotations from 2 Sam 7:11b-14a
 - 2. Interpretation
 - a. Statement of identification
 - b. Statement of explanation (relative cl.)
- II. Midrash on the Coronation Psalm(s) 1:14-2:6(?)
 - A. Introductory Formula
 - B. Content of Midrash
 - 1. Ps 1:1a^o with pesher
 - 2. Ps 2:1-2 with pesher
- III (?). Blessing of Moses explained

The overall fragmentariness of the text enables only a restricted description of 4QFlor as a whole. It has at least 3 major sections and probably many more. From the elements within these three major sections, it can be seen that the intention of the author or editor has been to provide midrash on certain scriptural texts. The proposal below as to the liturgical background of the combination of these texts provides the reason for these particular scriptural texts being together (and, most likely, for the order in which they are treated). In providing the midrash the major concern has been to relate the texts to the latter days. In Section I this is done partly through treating the scriptural texts through certain principles for midrashic purposes, and partly through accepting parts of

2 Samuel 7 as being eschatological prophecy. In Section II the midrash is attained through *peshet*.

b. *The unity and consistency of the Midrash*

The difference in format between 4QFlor 1:1-13 and 1:14ff. has already been pointed to and need not detain us further. The unity of the various sections has also been alluded to, in that midrash, as defined, accounts primarily for scriptural citation followed by exposition; this is present throughout 4QFlor. Also present throughout are certain principles of exegesis that are commonly associated with midrash²¹⁵ but which, it has been shown, are not determinative of the genre midrash.

A minimal list of these principles for 4QFlor is as follows:

1. *Gēzērâ šāwâ*²¹⁶ is used several times. Exod 15:17b-18 is linked to 2 Sam 7:10-11a^a through the common occurrence of the root נטע; Amos 9:11 is linked to 2 Sam 7:12 through והקימותי; Isa 8:11 is attached to Ps 1:1 through ורר; Ezek 37:23 is linked to Ps 1:1 through מושב; Dan 12:10 and 11:35 are linked to Psalm 2 through the root שכל; the possible quotation of Exod 34:29 would be linked to Psalm 2 through הר.

2. Deliberate editing through homoeoteleuton is carried out on the text of 2 Sam 7:11b-14a.

3. Through paronomasia, סוכה in 1:12 can be read in an alternative way.²¹⁷

4. Through a possible use of *binyan 'ab*, the parent text being either Lev 16:33 or Num 19:20, מקדש in Exod 15:17 is interpreted as קהל.

5. The principle of *šmûkîn* may be present in 1:5, if it is seen to come from Gen 22:14. In many other places there are

supportive scriptural allusions.

6. The double meaning intended in the biblical text is kept and played upon as מִצִּיב of 2 Samuel 7 is understood as the sanctuary/community on the one hand, as the royal house on the other.²¹⁸

4QFlor thus evidences the use of various exegetical principles that enhance its midrashic character and enforce the overall generic designation for the extant parts of the scroll as *Qumran Midrash*.

Furthermore, a consistent element within 4QFlor, and indeed in all the pesharim, is that it only treats prophetic texts. 2 Samuel 7 not only contains the words of a prophet, but the books of Samuel are part of the canon of the former prophets. For Psalms 1 and 2, the books of Chronicles, in their description of the Levitical guilds, reflect the attitude that psalmody was considered prophecy. That tradition is almost certainly reflected in the books of Samuel and Kings: indeed, one of David's compositions is explicitly defined as an oracle (2 Sam 23:1-7) and is to be found alongside the Psalms in 11QPss^a.²¹⁹

Together with 2 Samuel 7 and Psalms 1 and 2, the fragmentary parts of Deuteronomy 33 may form a third major unit of texts. It is likely that it too was considered as prophecy, for 4QTest includes a quotation of Deut 18:18-19 in which the Lord promises Moses he will raise up a prophet like him. Whoever the new prophet may be, that Moses was identified as a prophet, or even as *the* prophet par excellence, is the assumption of the quotation. Its occurrence at Qumran shows that the covenanters there shared that assumption. Balaam's oracle (Numbers 24; 4QFlor frg. 5?) also falls within the category of prophecy, as may the words of

Jacob in Genesis 49 (frg. 4?).

Apart from these two elements of consistency there is also a consistency of style in two respects. The first, at least in so far as 4QFlor was written by one scribe, concerns the divine name. This is written in Aramaic script throughout 1QIsa^a and other biblical manuscripts at Qumran, but in Palaeo-Hebrew in the biblical quotations of the non-biblical "sectarian" manuscripts: 1QpHab, 1QH, 4QpPs^a and other scrolls contemporary with or earlier than 4QFlor. According to M. H. Segal this was done

so that the sacred name in square script should not make the scroll sacred, since the palaeo-Hebrew script was at that time considered to be a profane script as is said in the Mishna (Yadayin 4:5): "Palaeo-Hebrew script does not make the hands levitically impure," i.e. it has no sacredness whatsoever.²²⁰

4QFlor, however, uses the square Aramaic script for the divine name in biblical quotations (1:3, 10, 18). This may be an indication that the particular Ms. discovered is of a later date than all the other Qumran literature from a time when the use of palaeo-Hebrew had died out; or it may be that the scribe is simply breaking a general rule.²²¹

The second consistency of style is to be observed in the introductory formulae to the biblical quotations. F. L. Horton had described and classified the components of certain introductory formulae as follows:²²² A = אשר אמר, K = כתוב, c = connective word (conjunction, pronoun or both), s = citation of source, L = presence of some object to which the quotation is applied. He proposes that there are two main types of formula,

K and A. Various combinations are found in the Qumran literature, A formulae being the most extensive.²²³ K formulae are also represented²²⁴ - they are the ones most consistently found throughout 4QFlor - and, indeed, are to be seen in the Bible itself.²²⁵

This leads Horton to suggest a tradition history for introductory formulae such that K has developed into KA which in turn has evolved into A. Yet, comments Horton,²²⁶ 4QFlor evidences a further and still later development: in 1:16 there is an example of an abbreviated A formula, as part of a defective KA formula, where אמן is omitted allowing אשר alone to introduce the quotation as though an object clause. Thus 4QFlor not only shows some consistency in its use of introductory formulae, but also evidences a particular formula that may be further support for a late date for the manuscript - at least the broad palaeographical date is confirmed.

c. *The liturgical setting of the biblical texts*

Although D. Goldsmith incorrectly describes 4QFlor 1:1-13 as a pesher, he does provide evidence in his discussion of Acts 13:33-37 that 2 Samuel 7 and Psalm 2 were known to be compatible in combination, in that case to show how Jesus is the Christ, not through random selection of biblical quotations, but through a carefully conceived linguistic and theological scheme.²²⁷ The question remains to be asked, however, whether or not the combination of such biblical texts has a setting, beyond the literary one, which may have been part of the covenanters' experience. Such a setting could have provided the texts already in combination before they were ever commented

upon, and such a combination may partially describe the stimulus from which 4QFlor derives its final form.²²⁸

Most scholars now hold that the oracle of Nathan in 2 Samuel 7 has undergone major editing during the process of its inclusion in the Samuel narrative and during the revision of the Deuteronomistic period.²²⁹ There is also a large amount of agreement that Psalm 89 is prior to the inclusion of the oracle within the Samuel narrative, and is probably even datable to the tenth century B.C. The underlying oracle of Nathan, whatever its precise dimensions, comes, therefore, from a period close to the time described in Samuel. Several settings for the oracle have been proposed.

H.-J. Kraus has suggested that
 in Jerusalem existierte das 'königliche Zionfest' am
 15 Tage des 7. Monats, also am ersten Tage des Laub-
 hüttenfestes. Jahr für Jahr wurde die Erwählung des
 Zion den Wallfahrern Israels zusammen mit der Erwählung
 der Davidsdynastie in Jerusalem durch einen kultischen
 Akt verkündigt.²³⁰

He further argues that this "Zionfest" is the festival that continues the tradition of the ancient amphictyonic covenant festival. The oracle of Nathan belongs directly to this tradition as it is a major aspect of the festival in pre-exilic times that David and his seed should be seen as rulers over Jerusalem and the kingdom according to the will of God. At no point before the exile is there an enthronement of Yahweh; however, in a changed form in post-exilic times the "Zionfest" became assimilated to the procession cult act of the Jewish New Year feast, but it still remained primarily a festival of "Offenbarung, Gesetzgebung

und Bundeserneuerung,"²³¹ even though Yahweh was then spoken of as the king of his people.

R. A. Carlson has supported but slightly adapted this theory to show the importance of the oracle in relation to the Ark narrative and the fact that the Deuteronomic legal tradition is to be clearly seen in the editing of the oracle within its own particular covenant tradition as expressed in the Jerusalemite tabernacles festival during monarchic times.²³²

The major alternative to the above, beyond a purely literary approach, is that the oracle in 2 Samuel 7 is a historical transposition of a coronation liturgy. S. Mowinckel concludes that "from the literary and traditio-historical point of view, 2 Sam vii is a faithful culthistorical reflection of a common cultic situation,"²³³ that is, the installation of a king at Jerusalem. I. Engnell had earlier stated that 2 Samuel 7 is an "historicised coronation-liturgy: a dialogue between the god and the king . . . selection, victory, enthronement . . . followed by the king's psalm of thanksgiving culminating in a prayer of fulfillment."²³⁴ However, Mowinckel also mentions in the same place that Nathan's oracle as a whole "in form and content corresponds to that which was addressed in the ritual to a new king at his anointing," and it may be that rather than 2 Samuel 7 containing a historicized coronation liturgy, it is simply only a part of such a liturgy.

From the enthronements described in 1 Kgs 1:32-48 and 2 Kgs 11:12-20 de Vaux has deduced that the coronation rites located at the sanctuary consisted of investiture with the insignia, anointing, acclamation, enthronement and homage, and he mentions some psalms that may have been used as accompanying

liturgy.²³⁵ Others have hinted at a fuller form of coronation rite: R. Patai²³⁶ notes that according to Widengren the ascension of the throne only occurs after an oracle of promise. Such an oracle is the mark of selection in many places in the OT,²³⁷ an oracle which is later ritually ratified by the people either through recognition of the oracle or through acceptance of its truth as exemplified by some mighty deed performed by the chosen, in both cases shown by acclamation.

Both of the above theories claim Psalm 2 as part of their particular rite. For example, Kraus says that "ps 2 ist ein Gedicht zum königlichen Zionfest, das von der Erwählung und Einsetzung eines Nachkommens Davids handelt."²³⁸ Engnell, on the other hand, picks on Psalm 2 as clearly reflecting the dialogue between the god and the king which is apparent in 2 Sam 7:16-18.²³⁹

Three comments need to be made at this point. Firstly, there has been much debate among commentators as to the actual date of Psalm 2 and few have supported a date for it in its complete form prior to the reigns of the last few pre-exilic kings of Judah, and most assign it an exilic or post-exilic date largely because of its future orientation and messianism. Secondly, both the above theories of "Zionfest" and coronation ritual tend to merge in post-exilic times and it becomes difficult to distinguish them clearly, especially as both are held to be aspects of the New Year enthronement festivities, or rather part of the Feast of Tabernacles (celebrated after an autumnal New Year?).²⁴⁰ Thirdly, Psalm 1 is identified with Psalm 2 in rabbinic literature and in the Western text of Acts 13:33; the similarity of content and the overarching form

of the two psalms has led W. H. Brownlee to suggest that "Ps 1, though originally only didactic, was aptly joined to and knitted together with Ps 2 for the coronation of one of the last kings of Judah, who thereby pledged himself to fulfil the Deuteronomic Law."²⁴¹ Whatever the case may be in pre- or early post-exilic times, certainly by late post-exilic times the psalms could have been traditionally used together with 2 Samuel 7 at the Feast of Tabernacles.²⁴²

To relate this to the Qumran community it is necessary to see that for the covenanters the most important festival was that of the renewal of the covenant, when new converts were admitted to the community, described at the beginning of 1QS. According to 1QS 2:19, this was to be performed annually. It is commonly held to have taken place at the Feast of Weeks, an important festival at Qumran, as is reflected in the popularity there of the book of Jubilees. If covenant is seen to be the sole importance of the tradition of 2 Samuel 7 - Psalms 1 and 2, then these texts may belong to the liturgy of the Qumran Feast of Weeks.²⁴³

However, if the basic biblical texts in 4QFlor assert the kingship of Yahweh and the community as properly reflecting and allowing that kingship, then it is most likely that some other festival should be considered. Though a particular enthronement aspect of the Feast of Tabernacles may have ceased in late post-exilic times,²⁴⁴ the Feast of Tabernacles may still have maintained some processional element.²⁴⁵ In Judaism contemporary with Qumran, the Feast was probably celebrated from the 15th to the 22nd Tishri, five days after the Day of Atonement, a feast which is mentioned several times at Qumran,²⁴⁶ and to whose

liturgy several of the Qumran texts have been ascribed.²⁴⁷

Although the dates of the festivals celebrated at Qumran and in contemporary Judaism did not coincide,²⁴⁸ the fragment of the Book of Priestly Courses shows that the sect observed the Day of Atonement on the sixth of the course in Joiarib, and the Feast of Tabernacles from the fourth in Jedaiah, that is, the 10th and 15th respectively of their seventh month.²⁴⁹ This dating of the Feast of Tabernacles should not exclude that the observance of the festival was carried out with the use of traditional materials formerly associated with the feast when celebrated with a different emphasis and possible at a different time.²⁵⁰

Thus, from all these various traditions and comparative festivals as practised at Qumran, might it not be suggested that 4QFlor is a midrash on texts that have their setting at Qumran as part of the liturgy of the Feast of Tabernacles? If that were the case and that that liturgy maintained some of the post-exilic traditions, then it accounts for the existence together of 2 Samuel 7 and Psalms 1 and 2 in both a post-exilic and a Qumran setting, for the presence of sections of Deuteronomy 33,²⁵¹ for the interest in the midrash in the community as sanctuary over against the physical temple building and for the stress on the rule of Yahweh. It also gives powerful significance to the use of Amos 9:11 as an explanatory text: "I will raise up the booth (tabernacle) of David that is fallen." At very least one can conclude that the midrash of 4QFlor is on texts that may have formed part of a testimonia which was based on the traditional liturgy of the festivals of post-exilic Judaism.²⁵²

D. 4QFlor and Qumran Theology

1. *The Latter Days*

Of the theological aspects of 4QFlor, this first to be considered may well be also first in importance since the phrase *אחרית הימים* occurs at 1:2, 12, 15 and 19 (and in Fragment 14?) in all the major subsections of 4QFlor. To that extent its discussion will also influence and expand the earlier effort of this study to describe the intention of 4QFlor. The term is in fact explained in the second column.

J. Carmignac has observed one point of this explanation: Par bonheur, le Florilège 1:19-2:1 prend soin de définir la formule *אחרית הימים* en ajoutant à titre d'explication "c'est le temps de la fournaiſſe à venir " et nous savons que la "fournaiſſe" désigne à Qumran la domination de Bélial et la guerre de libération (1QM xvi:15, xvii:1, 9) donc que le "temps de la fournaiſſe" est l'époque qui précédera l'installation de la paix inaltérable.²⁵³

This is also the case for the other occurrences of *מצרף* in the Qumran literature.²⁵⁴ Yet *מצרף* and *אחרית הימים* are not always associated with one another. Indeed, whilst Carmignac argues persuasively that the primary and usual meaning of *אחרית הימים* is "la suite des jours," he acknowledges that at least in CD 4:3-4 and 6:8-11 the phrase refers to the time after the period of present refining.²⁵⁵ Such may also be the case in 4QFlor. In 2:3-4 the time (*עת*) when the righteous will understand (Dan 12:10) is described, though that understanding is clearly inaugurated by the process of refining; similarly in 4QFlor 1:12

the coming of the shoot of David may occur in that time which sees the restoration of the kingdom after the final victory when the fallen booth stands again. Yet generally in 4QFlor the period referred to is the time before the end.

If it is accepted that the primary meaning of אחרית הימים is not "end of days" but something like "la suite des jours," "l'avenir,"²⁵⁶ then the translation "the latter days" allows for this sense of futurity whilst embracing something of the eschatological and historical self-understanding of the community. This future time, this time before the end, is already being experienced. The latter days herald and anticipate, even inaugurate the end but they are not the end except proleptically in the exceptional texts of CD 4 and 6. So Carmignac's understanding seems preferable to that of H. Kosmala who would translate the phrase as "the end of the days" largely because of his observations that in Daniel קץ and אחרית הימים tend to coalesce and because the passages in CD mentioned above can carry this meaning.²⁵⁷ But against Kosmala's translation can be cited the use of אחרית הימים elsewhere in the OT; for example, G. W. Buchanan has argued that "end of days" is an inappropriate translation for most of the MT occurrences of the phrase.²⁵⁸ In addition J. Licht has made two important observations with regard to Qumran eschatology: firstly "that the sect distinguished at least four periods, viz. the past which preceded its own establishment, its historical present, the coming period of active struggle against the forces of evil, and the ultimate future of full eschatological peace;"²⁵⁹ secondly, that the thought of the Qumran writings is "pre-occupied by the things to be done in this time . . . not on

the fundamental or abstract aspects of the whole question of the sequence of times."²⁶⁰

Although one should not impose a rigid time structure on the Qumran evidence, one might conclude that the phrase אחרית הימים is certainly distinct from קץ in Qumran usage though there may also be some overlap,²⁶¹ not resulting from confusion of terminology but from the different period within the history of the sect at which the various documents were composed. Licht's view could perhaps be modified from the perspective of the scribe: the later he was writing, the more he saw of the past history of the sect as being in the latter days, and therefore the more he thought of his own time as being nearer the end. 4QFlor must be seen, therefore, in a tradition history the later stages of which are reflected in CD and 4QFlor where אחרית הימים has the two aspects of the time of trial and the time beyond the trial. Thus in the use of the phrase in 4QFlor there is further evidence for the late date of the manuscript, especially as the author's intention throughout the midrash is to stress the referent of the biblical texts as being in the latter days.

This understanding of אחרית הימים influences the way in which מקדש אדם is to be understood. This will be considered in detail in the next section. Suffice it to say that if אחרית הימים is thought to refer only to the end, then it is easy to see that scholars can conclude that the references to the eschatological sanctuary must refer to a building in the future.²⁶² On the other hand, if אחרית הימים refers to the time before the end, the time before the heavenly temple is established on earth, then it is possible to argue that the primary meaning of מקדש אדם

is "sanctuary *consisting* of men." This human sanctuary is not conceived apart from the awaited heavenly building; rather it is that building in anticipation.

2. *Place, Sanctuary, House and Congregation*

The major section of the midrash on 2 Samuel 7 is concerned with the identification of the house that is punned in the Nathan oracle. In lines 1-7 the primary identification is made between the sanctuary and the house (place, in 2 Sam 7:10) through Exod 15:17b-18 by means of *gēzērā šāwā*.²⁶³ The root used to link the two quotations, *גזר*, is commonly applied as a metaphor for the establishment of the Qumran community as the true Israel.²⁶⁴

It is this particular part of Nathan's oracle that is used for midrash on the house as sanctuary because later the pun in the oracle reveals that Solomon will build a house.²⁶⁵ The intention of 4QFlor, however, is to say that God has established both houses, the sanctuary and the shoot of David. D. Flusser has pointed to the belief that was common in Jewish thought at the time, that God would establish the eschatological sanctuary, and not man, as being the factor that counted towards the linking of Exod 15:17-18 with 2 Sam 7:10-11.²⁶⁶

But in 4QFlor much more is at play than just a general contemporary Jewish belief, though that is undoubtedly present too. In the Exodus quotation another idea is stressed: the kingship of Yahweh. Interestingly this is also the case in the text of the oracle of Nathan in 1 Chronicles. For example, 1 Chron 17:14 reads, "I will maintain him in my house and in my kingdom for ever," over against, "and your house and your kingdom shall be made sure for ever before you; your throne shall be established for ever," in 2 Sam 7:16. The sense of the

version in Chronicles is that the king of David's house occupies his throne as the representative of God, who is the supreme king. A difficulty remains, however, concerning the house: is it the royal house or the temple? S. Aalen has pointed to the difficulty but prefers to emphasize rather that the kingdom in later texts, including the Targum, was understood as being a synonym for the people of God.²⁶⁷ Certainly 4QFlor supports his contention that at least part of contemporary Judaism could conceive the house primarily as the proper religious community and secondarily as the royal line or the temple building.

As soon as the author of 4QFlor has validly established that the oracle of Nathan is concerned with the sanctuary of the latter days, he then proceeds to describe that sanctuary in detail. Firstly, it will be of limited access.²⁶⁸ The exclusion of Ammonite and Moabite is based on an ancient Israelite tradition taken here from the legislation as expressed in Deut 23:3-4.²⁶⁹ The bastard is similarly excluded by Deut 23:2; there is also rabbinic evidence for the idea of the exclusion of the bastard from the Jerusalem of the latter days.²⁷⁰ Although rabbinic tradition has for the most part taken Deut 23:2-4 to refer to marriage restrictions, Philo understood the exclusions to apply to assemblies: "knowing that in assemblies there are not a few worthless persons . . . it banishes not only harlots, but also the children of harlots."²⁷¹

Concerning the *בני נכר*, J. Baumgarten has demonstrated²⁷² the dependence of 4QFlor on the concept expressed in Ezek 44:6-9: "O house of Israel, let there be an end to all your abominations, in admitting foreigners (*בני נכר*), uncircumcised in heart and flesh, to be in my sanctuary, profaning it . . . No foreigner,

uncircumcised in heart and flesh, of all the foreigners who are among the people of Israel, shall enter my sanctuary" (RSV). In his description of the restored temple Ezekiel insists on the elimination of all foreign temple-servants.

Baumgarten notes the equation of the בני נכר with the devoted ones, נתינים, of Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles, concerning whose status there is some ambiguity.²⁷³ Isa 56:3-7 assumes a similar identification and offers encouragement to the בני הנכר, the servants of the Lord. From *m. Qidd.* 4:1, however, Baumgarten argues that the legal status of the נתינים at the time of Qumran was equivalent to that of the ממזר. That important text reads:

Ten classes of definite genealogy came up from Babylon: priests, Levites, Israelites, priests of impaired stock, proselytes (גירי), freedmen, bastards, netinim, children of unknown fatherhood and foundlings. The priestly, Levitic and Israelitish stocks may intermarry; the Levitic, Israelitish, impaired priestly stocks, proselyte and freedmen stocks may intermarry; the proselyte, freedman, bastard and Natin stocks, children of unknown fatherhood, and foundlings may all intermarry.

Essentially the halakah has put the *nâtîn* in the same category as the classes excluded in Deuteronomy 23.

M. Qidd. 4:1 also provides evidence concerning the proselyte. Although he could legitimately intermarry with any Jewish family (except priests), his position was still inferior to those who belonged to the community by birth. The proselyte and the בני נכר were indeed counted as members of the general congregation governed by the laws of the Torah, both in rabbinic and Qumran thought.²⁷⁴ Thus at Qumran CD 11:2 reflects the law that the

גַּר בֶּן נְכָר could not do errands for an Israelite on the Sabbath, and the proselyte was to be aided by the members of the community together with the poor and needy (CD 6:21). Yet, at Qumran, concludes Baumgarten,

a significant barrier remained; for neither the *ger* nor the *ben-nekar* could gain admittance into the "congregation of the Lord." The meaning which Qumran exegesis attached to the latter phrase in the communal law of Deuteronomy 23 was evidently at variance with rabbinic interpretation. While the rabbis understood to "come into the congregation of the Lord" as a restriction on intermarriage, the author of 4Q *Florilegium* applied it to the exclusion of the disqualified classes from the messianic sanctuary.²⁷⁵

11QT 40:6 describes the third court for the proselyte. If 11Q Temple can be used for providing information about the sectarians' hopes for the eschatological sanctuary, then 11QT 40:6 may cause us to qualify Baumgarten's statement. In any case the גַּר was excluded from the central court of the worshipping community (לְהַק).

The reason(s) offered for the exclusion of the five classes is surrounded by textual difficulties, but given the reading "His holy ones are there," one must ask who the holy ones are. Most scholars hold them to be angels and certainly the Qumran texts, especially 1QM, and possible contemporary external literature would support this.²⁷⁶ However, H.-W. Kuhn has shown that exactly the same arguments can be used to aid those who prefer to read "His holy ones" as saints. In relation to

1QH 11:1ff. he writes that "von den übrigen Qumrantexten her keine sichere Interpretation möglich ist - 'die Heiligen' beziehen sich zweifellos auf Menschen nur noch an folgenden Stellen in 1QM 3:5, 6:6, 10:10, 16:1; an anderen Stellen der Texte dagegen sicher auf Engel."²⁷⁷ Turning to external literature Kuhn sees the holy ones as Israelites in Daniel 7, Deuteronomy 33, *I Enoch* 65:12, 93:6, *Jub.* 2:24 and as particular pious people in Ps 34:10, 16:3, Tobit 12:15 and 1 Macc 1:46. He also claims that in late Judaism the expression took on an eschatological sense designating those who belonged to the eschatological people of God, and it is this particular meaning which he wishes to apply at Qumran. He thus concludes that "auf Grund des ausgebreiteten Stellenmaterials ist es also durchaus möglich, dass mit 'den Heiligen' . . . Menschen und nicht Engel gemeint sind."²⁷⁸

In relation to the context of 4QFlor, however, three important passages must be considered: 1QM 7:6, which reads "And no man shall go down with them on the day of battle who is impure because of his fount, for the holy angels (מלאכי קרוש) shall be with their hosts;" 4QD^b which states that "no fools, madmen, simpletons and imbeciles, the blind, maimed, lame and deaf may not enter into the community for the holy angels are in their midst;"²⁷⁹ and 1QS 11:7:

God has given them to His chosen ones
 as an everlasting possession,
 and has caused them to inherit
 the lot of the Holy Ones.
 He has joined their assembly
 to the Sons of Heaven

to be a Council of the Community,
 a foundation of the Building of Holiness,
 an eternal Plantation throughout all ages to come.²⁸⁰

This last quotation designates the community as the chosen ones (as in 4QFlor 1:19) in antithetic parallelism to the Holy ones - the heavenly council. Mention is also made of the building and of the plantation, both of which are present in 4QFlor 1:1-7. It can thus be maintained that the criterion for entry into the community is based on the purity of those already there and that when purity is being discussed, the Holy Ones refer to the angels²⁸¹ - not as intermediaries, but as those who are already in the heavenly council. These holy ones are also the guarantee that all will not be lost to the sons of Belial (4QFlor 1:8), for in the seventh battle God will intervene with his holy ones to defeat Belial and his hosts (1QM 18:1-2).²⁸²

All that is certain concerning the exact meaning of all three (?) reasons given for the exclusions is that this first description of the sanctuary is evidence for the general Qumran concern for purity. Barthélemy, in summarizing the motive for this concern, points not to a desire for asceticism *per se*, but rather to the idea, as expressed in 1QSa 2:8-9, that the community is only "une réalité sainte" because the angels are part of the congregation and "toute la sainteté humaine n'est que participation de celle des Saints par autonomasse, les anges."²⁸³

The second description of the sanctuary deals with the fact that it cannot be desolated. The גרים, foreigners, who live in other countries, will not desolate the sanctuary like they desolated the former one.²⁸⁴ If it is understood that the former sanctuary was desolated because of Israel's sin, then

this could be a reference, from the perspective of the Qumran author, to the Solomonic temple which is the concern of part of the original oracle of Nathan. The desolation, a technical term applied to that which results from sin or the breaking of the Law,²⁸⁵ would in this case be the destruction of the temple because of Israel's sin in disobeying the Law.

The desolation could also be that which stems from the זרים and is because of *their* sin. In other words, their presence is what caused the desolation of the former sanctuary and the former sanctuary in that case could be the present earthly temple which was desolated by the admission of זרים. C. Roth supports this second reading, taking זרים to refer to Gentiles in general.²⁸⁶ That may indeed be the case, but "foreigners" seems a safer translation;²⁸⁷ certainly this alternative understanding is preferable to any allusion to the temple of Solomon as it is, above all, the difference between Qumran, as proleptically representing the eschatological sanctuary, and the existing temple that is the author's concern in describing the various aspects of the purity of the "sanctuary."²⁸⁸

The third point of description concerns the ongoing practice of that proleptic "sanctuary". God has promised himself that a מקדש אדם be built. Various translations have been offered for this phrase. Yadin and D. Flusser translate it as "sanctuary amongst men" and Flusser comments that the apparent combination האדם ארוני in 2 Sam 7:19 seems to have enabled the author of the midrash to call the מקדש ארוני of Exodus 15 by the cryptic name מקדש אדם. This then would refer to the temple to be built for the coming Messiah.²⁸⁹ But that is to have missed the point of the identification in the demonstrative introductory formula

and to insist that מקדש can only be a physical building.

Nor does the phrase mean that the sanctuary will be "man-made,"²⁹⁰ for the building is to be done by God himself according to the Exodus verse under which this description is still subsumed. Rather it is a simple construct relation that literally can be taken as a "sanctuary of man"²⁹¹ or collectively as "sanctuary of men."²⁹² This does not deny that there will be an eschatological sanctuary but stresses the position of the Qumran community vis-à-vis the Jerusalem temple.

The purpose of the sanctuary of men is to make smoking sacrifices, appositionally described as deeds of thanksgiving. It is interesting that לוא of line 6 is expanded by לפניו in line 7. The latter expresses both the idea that God observes, that what is done is seen by him,²⁹³ and also as a technical term shows the place where the sacrifice was performed; לוא, on the other hand, shows the direction in which the sacrifice was offered.²⁹⁴

In relation to the discussion concerning whether or not the Qumran sect burnt sacrifices either in Jerusalem or at Qumran itself, this section of 4QFlor does not deny outright that no sacrifices are to be performed, for to do that would be to destroy the cleverly constructed metaphor that has already convinced some scholars to take מקדש all the time literally as the temple building! Are the works of thanksgiving simply a reference to correctly performed sacrifices or to a whole lifestyle? It should be remembered that the analogy in 4QFlor is to מקטירימ which are any sort of smoking sacrifice and not necessarily a bloody animal one.

Those against seeing any actual sacrifice at Qumran use Philo to support their view. He describes the Essenes as

"especially devout in the service of God, not by offering sacrifices of animals, but by resolving to sanctify their minds."²⁹⁵ O. Betz, for example, does not deny the possible sacrifices of some of the Essenes but he tries to show how Philo's observation and the practice at Qumran, deducible from the Qumran literature, points to his conclusion that at Qumran "s'est développée non seulement en théorie mais aussi en pratique, une nouvelle conception du ministère sacerdotal. Le culte sacrificiel n'y fut pas supprimé, mais il fut pour une large part remplacé et spiritualisé."²⁹⁶

On the other hand F. M. Cross observes that "Philo's comment would be appropriate if the Essenes either rejected the temple cultus on principle or insisted only that God's ethical and ritual laws be observed as a prerequisite of valid sacrifices,"²⁹⁷ and he proceeds to argue that the Qumran texts show that their authors' objections to the cultus at Jerusalem fall under the second alternative. Cross stresses the priestly nature of the Qumran sect, that they expected to perform legitimate sacrifices in the days of the last war (1QM 2:1-6) and that it is quite possible, as reported by Josephus (*Ant.* 18:19), that the Essenes at Qumran performed private sacrifices, for archaeological evidence at Qumran includes the meticulous burial of animal bones.

Yet Cross omits mention of the relative paucity of bones,²⁹⁸ and also he skips over 1QS 9:3-6 where prayer is described as an acceptable fragrance of sweetness in place of the flesh of holocausts and the fat of sacrifice.²⁹⁹ Partly on the basis of that text G. Klinzing concludes that the Qumran scrolls propose perfection of life and prayer as equivalents of sacrifice, and

that the perfect life is seen as having an expiatory function.³⁰⁰

It also seems unlikely that מעשי תורה refer explicitly to animal offerings; 1QS 6:18, for example, states how a novice in the community is examined as to his intelligence ומעשיו בתורה, and 1QS 8:1 explicitly describes the council as perfect in all the revealed Law ומשפט וצדקה ואמה לעשות such that they can atone for sin. Baumgarten, too, points out that "inasmuch as all of them know the covenant of the law they 'offer a pleasant savor' and 'atone for the earth' (1QS 8:9-10) The 'oblation of the lips through the (study of) law is like a pleasant savor of righteousness'."³⁰¹ Thus the מקטירים in 4QFlor are best understood as a continuation of the metaphoric language of the eschatological sanctuary and, in order that the use of the term remain valid, one must accept that the Qumran sect did not reject sacrifice as such; it may even be the case that they practised it in some way and did not just consider themselves as waiting until the properly ordered cult be restored in Jerusalem.³⁰²

Thus the threefold description of the sanctuary describes its exclusive nature, the fact that it will not be desolated and that, proleptically, God constitutes it of men whose works of thanksgiving are the smoke-sacrifices of the sanctuary. In light of this two major studies of this section of 4QFlor which antedate the publication of 11Q Temple may be considered; after them more recent studies will be discussed.

B. Gärtner³⁰³ understands that the OT texts quoted in 4QFlor are interpreted as referring to the "house" (i.e. temple) which Yahweh is to establish in the last days; this is none other than the community itself. The community as the "house

of God" bears the seal of eternity; the eternal temple, in process of realization, practises spiritualized sacrifices that are lives lived in perfect obedience to the Law. The impotency of Belial will be a further sign of the realization of the promises of God in the oracle of Nathan. Also, because the pesher after 1:14 is concerned with the community, Gärtner wishes to assume that it is the community that is at the centre of the interpretation of lines 11-13; by analogy with CD 1:4-11 (and notwithstanding 4QP Bless, where the only other occurrence at Qumran of מנח clearly refers to the Messiah of the house of David), the shoot of David is a symbol representing the community which grows up under the leadership of the Interpreter of the Law who is the teacher of Righteousness. Gärtner finds further support for this identification in 1:18-19 where he reads משיחו collectively with Yadin.³⁰⁴ For the quotation from Amos 9:11 Gärtner compares CD 7:14-21 in which the סוכה is to be identified with the Law and the king with the community such that the "tabernacle of the king" is the community and its correct interpretation of the Law; thus the tabernacle of David in 4QFlor is the community appearing under its teacher in fulfilment of the promise of a restored "house" of David.

This thesis, seeing the community throughout 4QFlor, appears to come from an understanding of the exposition which Gärtner has then read back into the citations of the OT, for the author of 4QFlor has been most careful to edit the text of 2 Sam 7:11b-14a for his purpose of referring the seed of David to the future Davidic figure rather than to Solomon. It is surely difficult to say as Gärtner does that seed, which he sees as the central relational word between 4QFlor and 4QP Bless, is

"an expression, which, according to 4QFlor, refers to the community."³⁰⁵ Nowhere else in Qumran literature is קָרָה to be taken as the whole community.³⁰⁶

Furthermore, Gärtner's use of Qumran texts to support his interpretation appears arbitrary. He largely ignores the clear identification of the shoot of David with the Messiah of Righteousness in 4QP Bless preferring to attempt to stress the "covenant of the kingdom over his people" which is given to David and his seed, the latter of which he has identified with the community in 4QFlor. Yet, in relation to the quotation from Amos 9:11, Gärtner uses every last comparative identification in CD 7:14-21 in an exposition that leads nowhere. In CD the king is the community and the tabernacle are the books of the Law such that the phrase סִיכַח הַמֶּלֶךְ is the community and its interpretation of the Law. This cannot be transferred, however, to 4QFlor, as Gärtner admits, and so is of little use for his argument beyond that the teacher and the community appear together, for which he could have cited any number of texts. It is also unfortunate that Gärtner uses the word "temple" to translate מִקְדָּשׁ , which is more properly rendered as "sanctuary." Nowhere in Qumran is the community identified as הַיְכָל .³⁰⁷ Although his overall exposition is faulty, Gärtner provides a very adequate summary and exposition for 4QFlor 1:1-7.

The second major study of this passage of 4QFlor is that of G. Klinzing.³⁰⁸ He begins by questioning the common view that 4QFlor contains the idea of the community as temple and asks whether it does not rather contain the notion of the eschatological sanctuary. That sanctuary is the subject of Exod 15:17-18 which is followed by comments on how its purity

and holiness are to be preserved by excluding certain groups, for man with the community of the angels will there partake of the glory of God. Also, the sanctuary will be built by God, not by man, and will be built among men for sacrifices to be offered in it.³⁰⁹ Late Jewish eschatology supports these ideas of the eschatological sanctuary,³¹⁰ and Klinzing concludes: "So eindeutig in 4QFl 1 das eschatologische *Heiligtum* gemeint ist."³¹¹ This idea was used in the other Qumran manuscripts to refer to the community³¹² but in 4QFlor there is no concept of community and the "house" has solely to do with the future sanctuary.

Several criticisms of Klinzing's view have already been made implicitly in the discussion of the text so far. His reading depends on certain highly debatable points; for example, the understanding of *מקדש אדם* as "sanctuary amongst men," or his reading *מעשי תורה* as actual sacrifices. It also depends upon establishing a dichotomy between the community as sanctuary and the eschatological sanctuary, when it is clear, as Klinzing himself points out, that the two are not mutually exclusive categories. Furthermore it depends on taking 4QFlor 1:1-7 out of its (small) context in which it has already been observed that the exposition of 2 Sam 7:11a^b in line 7 depends on the reader's prior understanding of the sanctuary as community in the preceding lines. However, Klinzing's overall thesis that the community as sanctuary is a relatively late development in Qumran literature supports the date for 4QFlor suggested by the other analyses above.

The first of three scholars who have considered 4QFlor in detail since the publication of 11QTemple is the editor of that scroll himself. Already in a paper given in 1976 and published

two years later³¹³ Y. Yadin described how the scroll distinguished between two temples, that built by the Israelites and that belonging to the end times. He cited 11QT 29:8-10 in support of his description and in his treatment of those lines in his edition of 11Q Temple³¹⁴ he has argued that they confirm his interpretation of the sanctuaries referred to in 4QFlor: there is an earthly temple and there is a heavenly temple built by God which it is hoped will become a sanctuary amongst men, a sanctuary like the previous earthly ones except that God will build it. Thus Yadin has argued against identifying the community with the sanctuary, even proleptically.

There are two major problems with Yadin's interpretation of 4QFlor. The first, which has already been discussed,³¹⁵ concerns his translation of מְקוֹשׁ אָרֶם; "sanctuary of men" seems a more appropriate translation than "sanctuary amongst men." The second problem concerns the identification of the eschatological temple with a heavenly temple. Even if 4QFlor does not speak of the community as sanctuary, neither it nor 11QTemple refers to a heavenly temple. Largely in response to Yadin's proposals D. R. Schwartz has written an article³¹⁶ pointing to these two problems, though his alternative interpretation is not without its difficulties. Schwartz argues that there is neither reference to a heavenly temple nor should מְקוֹשׁ אָרֶם be interpreted as "sanctuary amongst men." Rather the author of 4QFlor meant his readers to understand that in citing 2 Sam 7:10 he was discussing the Second Temple, which the sect held to be desecrated, and the Third Temple to be built by God in the future; then, even though the phrase מְקוֹשׁ אָרֶם occurs structurally within the treatment of 2 Sam 7:10, Schwartz proposes that it is a

paraphrase of 2 Sam 7:13a (הוא יבנה בית לשמי) and refers to the "man-made" Solomonic First Temple.

In his turn M. Ben-Yashar³¹⁷ has criticized Schwartz's interpretation. Rightly he points out that Schwartz's approach is somewhat too systematic; מקדש ישראל (line 6) refers to both temples that had been violated, the Solomonic Temple and the Second Temple. Yet Ben-Yashar's main argument against Schwartz concerns his interpretation of מקדש אדם. By suggesting that the phrase is dependent on the expression תורת האדם in 2 Sam 7:19 he gives support to Yadin's translation of מקדש אדם as "sanctuary amongst men." But this use of 2 Sam 7:19 depends upon reading תורה in 4QFlor 1:7 (the linkword with 2 Sam 7:19); by following Strugnell's reading of תורה, of which Ben-Yashar seems unaware, we have already rendered this proposal unlikely.

Several other criticisms of Schwartz must be stated here. Firstly he proposes that 2 Sam 7:13a lies behind the phrase לבנות לוא מקדש אדם (which precedes the citation of 2 Sam 7:11a^b) yet he also argues that "the order of texts and ideas discussed is governed by that of the biblical text;"³¹⁸ this is clearly having it both ways. Secondly he explains that, while 2 Sam 7:13a is used in this indirect way, 2 Sam 7:12a^a and 12a^v are omitted because they are duplications; this seems somewhat arbitrary given the suggestion under our discussion of line 10 of the text that all three omissions are deliberate editing through the use of homoeoteleuton as an exegetical device.³¹⁹ Thirdly Schwartz is far from clear himself what is the referent of each phrase: at one point he says that מקדש אדם refers to the man-made temple of the present,³²⁰ yet the main point of his argument seems to rest in seeing that phrase as referring to the Solomonic Temple.

Fourthly, like many other scholars he has taken אחרית הימים to mean the end of days; we have already argued against that above. Lastly he argues that the association of one sanctuary with another necessarily implies that they are essentially the same, that is, material; yet no such material identity need be the case, if one recalls how intricately the author of 4QFlor is interpreting the pun that is already before him in Nathan's oracle - not every ביה is made of bricks and mortar.

All in all there is nothing in 11QTemple which changes the way that 4QFlor is to be interpreted except that the "community as sanctuary" thesis must not be pursued to the exclusion of any aspiration amongst the sectarians that there would be an actual temple in the end: 11QTemple is the blue-print for such a temple because it is primarily the blue-print that should have been followed for all Israel's temples. In as much as 11QTemple is a description of what the present temple should have been like, it gives us insight into why the sectarians were dissatisfied with the temple in Jerusalem. In sum, therefore, the "place" (מקום) of the oracle of Nathan is identified with the "house" (בית) which in turn is identified with the "sanctuary" (מקדש). The eschatological sanctuary, part of the manifestation of the rule of Yahweh,³²¹ is then described in a threefold way in sanctuary-language. The whole description is concerned with identifying the sanctuary proleptically with the Qumran community³²² and its role in the latter days; and the identification of מקדש with קהל, which is implied in the indirect quotation of Deut 23:2-4, is clearly the scribe's primary understanding when he writes his next section on the children of Belial and their relation to the community members.

3. *The Sons of Belial*

The section of the midrash in which the expression נני בליעל chiefly occurs is concerned to relate the rest that is to be given to David, according to Nathan's oracle, to the rest that will come about when all the plottings of the children of Belial cease. The rest from the enemies in 2 Samuel 7 is part of that peace which is the mark of the establishment of מנוחה, the Deuteronomistic concept that is said to accompany the proper habitation in the land.³²³ Because the enemies in 4QFlor are the sons of Belial, the rest can only come about with their defeat by Yahweh himself. This is described in 1QM 19 as an aspect of the sovereignty of God, and similarly in 4QFlor, just as Exod 15:17-18 is quoted mentioning the rule of Yahweh, so in lines 7-9 there is another aspect of that reign: the rest from enemies promised to the king, David, is to be realized by Yahweh, "He will give them rest."

The phrase נני בליעל occurs only here in the whole of Qumran literature (and possibly in 4QFlor 2:1-2). It occurs in the MT several times, however, and appears to denote the enemy in the holy war.³²⁴ This has led P. von der Osten-Sacken to suggest that 4QFlor may come closer than any other of the pesharim to eschatological dualistic thought.³²⁵ He defines eschatological dualism as being present when Belial is thought of as the real leader of the forces opposed to God and the children of Light, and he proposes that that dualism is an aspect which is clearly visible in 1QM as a feature of Maccabean times that was dependent on Daniel, on the Yom Yahweh tradition and the theory of the holy war; it is lacking in 1QS and 1QH where dualism is ethically oriented and Belial is an abstract

entity - though perhaps no less real.³²⁶ He understands CD to be a later document that is in many ways close to the pesharim, sharing a number of concepts with them alone; the only eschatological dualism in CD is in the phrases שר האורים (5:18) and מלאך המשטמה (16:5) which both occur elsewhere in Qumran literature. The emphasis in CD is rather that Belial is *the* means whereby the pious in the new covenant are deceived. However, because he reads 4QFlor solely in terms of rest from enemies, Osten-Sacken does not draw the conclusions that his thesis suggests in connection with the understanding of these lines outlined structurally.

It is clear that lines 7-9 are not only concerned with rest from enemies but that also they are closely connected with the preceding discussion of the community as the anticipated sanctuary. The structure reveals that the important aspect of the defeat of the children of Belial is the cessation of their present activity in the community of the children of light. That activity is also described as having occurred in the past, "when they came with their plots." The children of Belial are seen as determined to destroy the community through their sin.

Because of the mention of the past, this section may actually contain an allusion to an event within the history of the community which threatened to destroy it. Lines 1-7 have shown how the sanctuary is to be pure from the outset and to be maintained as such, yet there is always the possibility until the latter days cease, because the sanctuary is of men, that it can be made desolate, impure, from within, through the activity of Belial. As lines 1-7 are in the language of the eschatological sanctuary, so 7-9 are in the language of the eschatological

battle, but the referent in both cases is the community. CD also uses eschatological battle language but its link with 4QFlor is closer than that, for CD 4:12-19, in expounding Isa 24:17, describes the three nets of Belial.

H. Kosmala has demonstrated how the Qumran concept of the profanation of the sanctuary, the third net (שׁוֹמֵר הַמִּקְדָּשׁ), is derivable from the Torah:

The defilement of the "sanctuary was in the end the defilement or profanation of (the name of) God (Ez 43:8; with hll, Lev 20:3) who had his miškan in the midst of the people; it was a defilement of the land (Lev 20:22-24, 18:24b-28); and it was a defilement of oneself and of the whole nation (Lev 18:24a, 29) which should be holy (Lev 19:2, 20:6)...The purity of the miqdaš was understood as the purity and holiness of the people, that is, of every individual member as well as of the community of the New Covenant as a whole.³²⁷

Defilement could be avoided by obeying the Law; this notion in the thought of the covenanters is shown, for example, in CD 5: 6-7, "also they profane the sanctuary because they do not distinguish (clean and unclean) according to the Law." This same concept recurs in 4QFlor: those who are refined or in the process of being refined will do all the Law (2:2).

Thus the purity of the sanctuary is depicted in eschatological dualistic language, in terms of the rest that Yahweh will give the children of Light from the plottings of the children of Belial; that rest is derived from Nathan's oracle and is an aspect of the sovereignty of God. The eschatological aspect of the work of Belial is stressed through such work being a major

characteristic of the latter days as described in 4QFlor 2:1ff.

4. *The Shoot of David and the Interpreter of the Law*

Before discussing these phrases and the section in which they are used, it is necessary to define terms.³²⁸ The frequency of the use of the phrase "the latter days" in 4QFlor, by which is meant both the time of trial leading up to a climax and the period immediately after that climax, as described in terms borrowed from Daniel, indicates an eschatological concern. That eschatology is also founded in history; the Qumran sect believed that their historical experiences were part of the events that constituted the latter days - at least, to be precise, the authors of those manuscripts that contain the phrase אחרית הימים regard their historical position as such. This in turn raises the question as to the development of eschatological expectations and beliefs during the existence of the community; to be able to date all the manuscripts accurately, and to read them without error, would enable a clear line of tradition to be established into which certain other manuscripts could be placed for their clearer understanding.

Alongside eschatology, the other term requiring careful definition is "Messiah." This must be restricted to a specific person or persons who, as anointed, will serve a particular function during the period of the latter days.

In 4QFlor two figures are mentioned: the shoot of David and the Interpreter of the Law, and both these are connected with the latter days (1:12).³²⁹ The only other occurrence of the noun צמח in Qumran literature is in 4QP Bless 3.³³⁰ That text expounds Gen 49:10 and clearly talks of the Messiah from the seed of David; the covenant of kingship was given to David

and is being kept, until the coming of the Davidic Messiah, by the thousands of Israel. At the Messiah's coming he will resume the responsibility of that covenant. The structure of 4QFlor 1:10-13 shows that the shoot of David, which is then identified with the *סוכה רוּיָר* has the slightly different function in the future of saving Israel.³³¹

The verb *ישע* is comparatively infrequent in Qumran literature, though it occurs in diverse manuscripts. In 1QS 6:27, CD 9:9 and 10 it is used idiomatically with *י* to denote that one is the master of his own immediate future; in 1QH 2:23 and 3:6 it is used of the deliverance of the individual from death; in 1QM 10:4, 8 (both biblical quotations) and CD 5:19 (=6QD 3:2) it is used in relation to the mighty deliverance of Israel by God; in 1QM 11:3 it is used specifically in relation to the function of the king, "and also you have delivered us by the hand of our kings;" and in 4QpHos^b 2:14 it is said that the nations (*גוֹאִים*) are unable to save those who break the covenant from their torments. Thus it could be maintained that there is not a single use of the verb *ישע*, apart from 4QFlor, that is specifically eschatological.³³² And yet, apart from the obvious personal uses in 1QS, 1QH and CD, it is used in connection with the activity of God, with that activity as performed by kings and in relation to the impotence of the nations. Equally, the noun clearly has eschatological significance.³³³ Nowhere does the community operate "to save Israel," but these other aspects of salvation can be observed in 4QFlor if *ממֵן* is seen to refer to a particular individual who will have the powers and function of a king. Thus, once again in 4QFlor, there is an aspect of the sovereignty of Yahweh, to be carried out through the seed of

David (2 Sam 7:12a), the shoot.

The shoot is described firstly as רומי with the Interpreter of the Law. J. D. Amussin has taken the verb to mean "to rise from the dead,"³³⁴ but he cites Dan 12:13, which is far from explicit, for his support, as well as some epitaphs from Beth She'arim, which it must be remembered are from the third century A.D. J. Carmignac, on the other hand, underlines that a correct understanding of the Interpreter of the Law leads to a correct understanding of the verb; that title refers to any Essene and not to the Teacher of Righteousness alone. There is, therefore, no need to translate the verb as "be resurrected."³³⁵

G. Klinzing prefers to see the term as used in CD 6:10, 4:4 and 4QFlor 1:11 in association with the latter days, as meaning "to appear," that is, of historical persons.²³⁶ And W. Grundmann has argued from NT parallels that at Qumran both "to stand" and "to fall" belong to the ethical-eschatological sphere and their significance is "eine Frage menschlicher Existenz, denn der Mensch kann in seinen Leben Stand haben oder ohne Stand sein, ein Fallender, ein Getriebener, ein seinen Standort Wechselnder."³³⁷ Although עמד can have particular cultic, legal or military connotations, and even though נפל is frequently used at Qumran to signify stumbling through sin, because of the occurrence of both עמד and נפל in balance together in 4QFlor, the clearest meaning comes when they are translated with their basic meaning and are understood in relation to the figures with which they are used as signifying their taking office or having fallen from it.

The Interpreter of the Law features as a specific figure in CD at 6:7 and 7:18.³³⁸ CD 6:7, in commenting on Num 21:18,

equates the Interpreter of the Law with the stave, but it also speaks of "staves," which would suggest that there was a succession of Interpreters, that one founding Interpreter was particularly important and that the Teacher of Righteousness of the latter days was an heir of the same function. Little can be said from this, other than that it would appear as though the Interpreter of the Law of 4QFlor was to have a similar function to the Teacher of Righteousness of the latter days, and could even be the same expected eschatological figure.³³⁹

The other passage, CD 7:18, reads: "and the star is the Interpreter of the Law who came (הָנִיחַ) to Damascus, as it is written, A star went forth from Jacob and a sceptre shall rise from Israel (Num 24:17). The sceptre is the Prince of the whole congregation and when he takes office (בְּעֹמְדוֹ) he shall smite all the children of Seth." Although there is much debate concerning whether הָנִיחַ should be taken as past, present or future, the quotation of Num 24:17 is clearly divided in the mind of the writer, one half referring to the Interpreter of the Law and the other half referring to the Prince of the whole congregation. If there was a succession of Interpreters with the first and the last (still to come) being considered the most important, then any tense is possible for הָנִיחַ, unless one insists that the future referent should be maintained from the original sense of Num 24:17 such that both the figures referred to are eschatological.

From both these CD quotations it is thus quite in line with Qumran thought to consider that there would be an eschatological figure entitled Interpreter of the Law and that he would not be alone. As to whether or not these figures are messianic, it is

important to turn to current scholarship which has tried to establish a line of tradition for Qumran thought on this subject into which it may be possible to fit 4QFlor.³⁴⁰

Until J. Starcky published his article on the four stages of Qumran messianism,³⁴¹ most scholars were concerned to pinpoint a consistent Qumran messianic doctrine, and although some were prepared to admit that difference in time of writing may have caused difference in expression, those differences were divergencies from an orthodox doctrine, and were not understood as a total shift on the part of the whole community.³⁴² So, for example, J. Liver attempted to show that the doctrine of the two Messiahs, which can be observed in the pseudepigrapha, must have its historical and social background in the Qumran sect and the Hasmonean period;³⁴³ although there were various stresses at different periods in the history of the sect, these are all accountable and the doctrine of the two Messiahs can be seen consistently throughout the sect's history.

As more manuscripts were published, the difficulties with maintaining this consistent approach became obvious. Starcky, especially, has proposed that the history of the Qumran sect be seen in two phases, subdivided into four periods.³⁴⁴ To each period he assigns certain manuscripts and works out a theory of the development of Qumran thought concerning messianism as it is discernible from those manuscripts, which to a great extent reflect the historical setting in their changing messianic ideology. Thus he sees an eclipse of messianism in the hellenistic period, a reawakening in Hasmonean times but with the expectation of both a royal and priestly Messiah, an absorption of the total messianic office in the one figure of the future

High Priest at the start of the Roman period, and the rebirth of the traditional concept of the Davidic Messiah at about the same time as Jesus.

Yet such a scheme also has many difficulties. It depends largely on the dating of the various scrolls and upon particular understandings and interpretations of their contents. For example, Starcky's dating, especially his third period in which he sees one Messiah and the eschatological prophet, has been questioned by R. E. Brown who argues in favour of a Hasmonean date for CD, that it quite possibly contains a two Messiah expectancy and, therefore, that Starcky's third period is simply a continuation of the second.³⁴⁵

Earlier J. A. Fitzmyer pointed out that a danger in any treatment of messianism is that the scholar, in relating documents one to another, may fail to treat distinctly titles which may represent different trends and beliefs. He also insists that titles be taken at face value, not watered down: two Messiahs must be recognized at some points because "the texts do use the word *māšīāh* as a substantive in the plural and not just as an adjective, and in an individual, not a collective sense."³⁴⁶

Taking Fitzmyer's warning seriously, the structure of the text and the Qumran understanding of the salvific function of the *nnx* allow the conclusion that this eschatological figure of David's seed is indeed to be understood as the kingly Messiah, the Messiah of Israel of other Qumran Mss. With this the vast majority of scholars agree.³⁴⁷ Yet there is not so much agreement concerning the Interpreter of the Law.³⁴⁸ 4QFlor gives no description of the Interpreter other than that he will stand with the Davidic shoot in the latter days:³⁴⁹ he is,

therefore, at least an eschatological figure.

If one examines the manuscripts that are possibly contemporary with 4QFlor, then for the figure of the Interpreter of the Law, whose title must be taken as the only description of his function, two options present themselves. Firstly, 4QP Bless stresses the Davidic Messiah alone; 1QM though mentioning the High Priest, stresses the role of the Prince (כִּנְיֹן). This might lead to the conclusion that the Aaronic Messiah was no longer important, nor perhaps even held to be a Messiah, such that the eschatological Interpreter of the Law is rather to be aligned with the eschatological prophet of 1QS 9:11 and 4QTest.

Or, secondly, 4QpIsa^a describes how one priest in particular, of the priests who will teach the Davidic Messiah how to judge, "shall go out and garments of . . . shall be in his hands" 4QpPs^a speaks of a future time of trial for the priest and the men of his council; if the time of trial is to be identified as part of the latter days, as 4QFlor 2:1 suggests, then this would allow that the figure beside David is priestly in the tradition of Zerubbabel and that therefore one may see the Interpreter as the Priestly Messiah.

4QFlor has enabled us to conclude that the Qumran covenanters expected two eschatological figures; one of these was to seek out, interpret, the Law. The normal usage of the expression in no way necessitates that the person in the particular office of "law-seeker," sometimes self-appointed, had to be a priest; in fact, from Ezra 7:10, Sir 32:15, 1 Macc 14:14 and *Jub.* 1:12 it might be deduced that the task of seeking the Law is everybody's though some take it up with special vigour.³⁵⁰ Alongside 4QFlor can be placed the priest of 1QM, 4QpIsa^a and 4QpPs^a. Is it

possible to join this priestly eschatological figure with that of the Interpreter of the Law?

The essential link between the functions of this eschatological figure as Interpreter of the Law and as priest is provided by the fortunate preservation among the fragments of 4QFlor (6-11) of a section of Deuteronomy 33.³⁵¹ It is in Deut 33:10 that the priestly descendants of Levi are described as teaching the law. This same passage in Deuteronomy is cited in 4QTestimonia and there clearly refers to the messianic priest. If Num 24:15-17 also receives exposition in 4QFlor (Frg. 5) then there is further support for the messianic function of the Interpreter of the Law as priest. At Qumran this biblical text was taken to refer to two eschatological figures (CD 7:18-20; also 4QTest?) as in *T. Levi* 18:3 and *T. Judah* 24:1-6, in both of which passages the "star" is specifically designated as the priest.

Just as the king and priest were anointed for office so the two figures that are expected will be Messiahs in the technical sense.³⁵² But also, because of their functioning in the latter days, they both can be described as Messiahs in the broader sense as well; they are the eschatological pair who will usher in the new and just age of God. In 4QFlor 1:10-13 it is the messianic prince around whom the exposition of the quotation of 2 Samuel 7 is developed. In Fragments 6-8 the messianic priest is probably the centre of attention. Furthermore the phrase *שְׂרָאֵל וְאַהֲרֹן* [י] in Fragment 4 in all probability either refers to the messianic priest alone or to both the messianic figures³⁵³ - not to the kingly messiah by himself.

In sum 4QFlor 1:10-13 describes the royal family aspect of *בֵּית* as punned in 2 Samuel 7 and reflects primarily the Qumran

expectation of the Davidic King-Messiah, through whom God's proper rule will be restored and by whom Israel will be saved. Alongside the Davidic Messiah is the Interpreter of the Law who, from other fragments of 4QFlor and from the consistent way in which certain biblical texts (Deuteronomy 33; Numbers 24) receive treatment in closely related literature, can be identified with the Aaronic Priest Messiah. From the perspective of the author of 4QFlor, both these eschatological figures are still awaited.

E. Traditio-Historical Study

1. CD 3:12b-8:20

Having investigated 4QFlor from a form-critical point of view and having discussed certain of its contents in relation to Qumran theology, we can now attempt to delimit the tradition in which 4QFlor may belong or the traditions to which it approximates. First to be considered, of course, is the Qumran literature itself, but within the Qumran writings there is much diverse material and just as certain texts have been grouped as contemporaneous according to content, so it may be possible to group texts as to their dependence, direct or indirect, on other Qumran manuscripts.

It has often been remarked that the pesharim are more closely related to CD than to any other Qumran text. 4QFlor not only shares this with the other pesharim, but witnesses to it more than any of them for one particular unit of CD, 3:12b-8:20. At CD 3:12b there is a clear break in the sense of the document and the new unit that begins there appears to run until 8:20

where again the sense also breaks; 8:20 is also the point at which the manuscript traditions for CD diverge - whichever is followed from that point there are no great parallels between 4QFlor and CD. As to the unit 3:12b-8:20, items 10 and 11 below might suggest that 4QFlor stands particularly within the tradition of CD A.

The following list of parallels between 4QFlor and CD concern overall content, specific phraseology peculiar to these two passages in Qumran literature, and also the mixed type of midrash common to both. The parallels are listed in order of their occurrence in CD

1. CD 4:3 has the only occurrence of the phrase "the sons of Zadok" in its unqualified form apart from 4QFlor 1:17; 1QS 9:10-11 is widely regarded as a later emendation of that text from a viewpoint representing a similar tradition to that of CD.

2. CD 4:3-4 contains the identification of the sons of Zadok with the chosen ones of Israel, as is most likely the case in 4QFlor 1:17-19.

3. CD 4:4 and 6:11 have the only use of the phrase "the latter days" in CD and its only use, apart from the title of 1QSa (later ?), in material other than the pesharim; the phrase is used in each of the major subsections of 4QFlor, at 1:2, 12, 15 and 19.³⁵⁴

4. Apart from the quotation of Isa 7:17 at CD 14:1, the only other clear references to the house of Judah in CD are at 4:11, 7:12 and 13, and that house is thus a specific concern of this section of CD. To be compared with this is the use of the quotation of Ezekiel 37 in 4QFlor 1:16-17 where the context is also concerned with Judah over against the house of Ephraim -

which also is only here in CD apart from the Isaiah quotation at 14:1. The house of Judah also occurs in 4QFlor Fragment 4 and possibly in 2:1.

5. CD 4:13-18 speaks of the three nets of Belial and specifically names the desolation of the sanctuary as the third net. The purity of the sanctuary is also the concern of 5:6-7 and in detail of 6:13-21. This concern is shared by 4QFlor 1:1-6 and Belial is also mentioned in 1:7-9. According to CD, by doing the Law, the nets of Belial can be avoided; the doing of the law in 4QFlor 2:2 is mentioned in a similar context.

6. At CD 4:14 occurs the only use of the word רשע in CD, the statement of identification being the usual formal method of exposition in CD. In 4QFlor there is both midrash with such statements and midrash with peshet occurs - perhaps a combination suggested by this passage in CD.

7. In his article on the use of OT quotations at Qumran,³⁵⁵ J. A. Fitzmyer identifies four classes of quotation. In the classes within which the quotation of 4QFlor fall, those of "modernized" texts (4QFlor 1:2-3, 14-16, 16-17) and of "eschatological" texts (4QFlor 1:11-13), are almost all of the passages in CD 3:12b-8:20 that use explicit OT quotations: CD 4:12-18, 6:11-14 and 7:15-16 are "modernized" texts; CD 7:10-12 is "eschatological." CD 7:8-9 is the only explicit OT quotation that does not share a common categorization with 4QFlor.

8. The only use of the verb ישׁו in CD occurs at 5:19 in relation to the saving of Israel. This idea also occurs at 4QFlor 1:13.

9. רָא occurs in CD at 6:21 (and 14:4 and 6) and at 4QFlor 1:4. Apart from 11QTemple 40:6 these are its only uses. At

6:21 he is clearly identified as a member of a particular category of people; γ is also used categorically in 4QFlor. CD 14:4 and 6 are connected with the position of the γ in the community and do not necessarily contradict the categorization of 4QFlor.

10. The Interpreter of the Law appears at CD 6:7 and 7:18 (A only) - the only other places in Qumran literature, apart from 4QFlor 1:11, that use exactly the same phrase formally as a title.

11. Amos 9:11 is used in both CD 7:16 (A) and 4QFlor 1:12, and Isa 8:11 at both CD 8:16 and 4QFlor 1:15. There are also several quotations of Deuteronomy 32 in this passage of CD with which one may possibly associate the quotations of Deuteronomy 33 in 4QFlor Fragments 6-11.

These many and detailed parallels between 4QFlor and CD 3:12b-8:20 are sufficient to suggest that one is dependent, to an extent of literary influence, upon the other. Certain remarks have already been made from archaeology, palaeography, style and content concerning the date of 4QFlor. From the early date normally assigned CD (circa 100 B.C.) and from the several copies of CD that have come to light, especially in the fourth cave,³⁵⁶ we cannot but conclude that the dependence is of 4QFlor upon these five and a half columns of CD. Such dependence could also reflect that within the Qumran community there were distinct traditions with their own particular emphases, and that 4QFlor is the heir of that represented by CD. That, however, may be an overstatement of the case since so many different genres of material are present at Qumran.³⁵⁷ Also in other literature, for example, in Paul's writings, that is

approximately contemporary with 4QFlor, the same concerns emerge.

2. Acts 13:33-37; Heb 1:5

2 Samuel 7 and Psalm 2, being messianic texts, are used frequently throughout the NT,³⁵⁸ but they are used in combination in only two places.

Firstly for Acts 13:33-37, D. Goldsmith has drawn attention to the use of 2 Samuel 7 in both 4QFlor and the Acts passage.³⁵⁹ In the latter he sees it as the base text which is used midrashically to frame other biblical quotations: ἀπαγγελεῖ, κουμηθήσῃ, ἀναστήσω, σπέρμα, μου εἰς υἱόν, ἐλεός μου, and πιστωθήσεται of 2 Sam 7:11-16 all recur in only a slightly modified form in Acts 13:33-37. Apart from the fact that 2 Samuel 7 is used in this way, the point of interest in relation to 4QFlor is that Psalm 2:7 occurs explicitly within this passage's use of the Nathan oracle.³⁶⁰ Although the use of other biblical texts in this portion of Acts can best be described from a literary standpoint, as certain exegetical principles are applied,³⁶¹ it is possible to suggest that, in light of what has been said concerning the combination of 2 Samuel 7 and Psalm 2 (1) in 4QFlor, the liturgy was the initial factor in these texts' combination for the author of Acts too.

The same can be proposed for Hebrews 1:5. There, there are side-by-side explicit quotations of Psalm 2 and 2 Sam 7:14a, used rhetorically in relation to the divine sonship of Christ, to demonstrate Christ's superiority over the angels. Might not this combination be based on a similar setting as was suggested for the 4QFlor texts? Though there may be several literary layers between the liturgy and the texts we have, we can at best

postulate a combination of biblical texts that is apparent in a few cases as going back originally to a common source.

3. Acts 15:16

If the combination of certain biblical texts in 4QFlor and the NT passages mentioned belongs to a common liturgical tradition, Acts 15:16 suggests that there may have been a common tradition of the biblical text. No literary dependence is proposed here; merely that one text tradition is maintained in two places.

The quotation of Amos 9:11 at Acts 15:16 has textual differences from both the MT and the LXX, yet it is exactly the same as that of 4QFlor and CD 7:16. J. de Waard has proposed a common text tradition for Amos 9:11 as used in 4QFlor and Acts 15:16 and lists their similarities in detail.³⁶² These can best be seen in a presentation of the texts:

MT	ביום ההוא אקים את סכת דויד הנפלה
CD	והקימותי את סוכת דויד הנופלה
4QFlor	והקימותי את סוכת דויד הנופלה
Acts	καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὴν σκαυτὴν Δαυὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν
LXX	ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐαυτῆς ἀναστήσω τὴν σκαυτὴν Δαυὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν

The texts of 4QFlor and Acts are identical and those of the LXX and the MT match. Fitzmyer also points out³⁶³ that the introductory formula to the quotation is parallel in both 4QFlor and Acts, כאשר כתוב and καθὼς γέγραπται, whereas the quotation in CD is introduced by כאשר אמר. W. H. Brownlee stresses the similarity of the text tradition³⁶⁴ by paying particular attention to the initial אָשׁ of 4QFlor and CD and the καὶ of

Acts 15:16. From all this de Waard's postulation seems very likely though it cannot be said that the author of Acts borrowed his text of Amos from a Qumran source.

4. 2 Cor 6:14-7:1

There have been four particularly detailed studies of this paragraph of 2 Corinthians in relation to Qumran literature, especially 4QFlor: by J. A. Fitzmyer,³⁶⁵ by J. Gnilka,³⁶⁶ by B. Gärtner,³⁶⁷ and by G. Klinzing.³⁶⁸ These need to be re-considered in light of the treatment of 4QFlor in this present work.³⁶⁹

Fitzmyer deals with the whole body of Qumran literature and having noted the obvious interruption that 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 makes in the epistle in its present place, he examines the NT text under five heads: the dualism of uprightness and iniquity, light and darkness, Christ and Belial; the opposition to idols; the concept of the temple of God; the separation from impurity; and the concatenation of OT texts.

Concerning dualism Fitzmyer points to the use of the word $\mu\epsilon\pi\tau\iota\varsigma$ in 2 Cor 6:15 in close relation to light as parallel to the Hebrew word used at Qumran for "lot."³⁷⁰ Noteworthy for 4QFlor is the occurrence of גורל in the first line of Fragment 17. All the aspects of dualism that Fitzmyer mentions 4QFlor has in common with the other Qumran documents and 2 Cor 6:14-7:1.

For the opposition to idols Fitzmyer cites 1QS 2:16-17³⁷¹ but the most important passage in this respect is 4QFlor 1:16-17 wherein Ezek 37:23 is cited concerning the revocation of idols. The Corinthians passage makes use of the nearby text Ezek 37:27 in the same verse as mention is made of the disagreement of the

temple of God and idols. Indeed the same phrase, "I will be their God, and they shall be my people," occurs in Ezek 37:23 but with the two phrases in reverse order from that of Ezek 37:27 and 2 Cor 6:16.

The third point, the concept of the community as the temple of God, is not totally foreign to Pauline thought,³⁷² but it is definitely not suitable to the context of 2 Corinthians 6. Yet the idea is fairly common at Qumran, where the group, deprived (in part at least) of the Jerusalem temple, spiritualized its significance for themselves. In this respect the present study's understanding of 4QFlor 1:4-9, particularly the phrase *מקדש אדם*, is highly significant.³⁷³ While not denying the belief in the existence of an eschatological sanctuary, 4QFlor points to the idea that the Qumran community anticipates in itself such a building.

As to the interest of separation from all impurity, this is evident in many places in Qumran literature.³⁷⁴ Fitzmyer comments that in light of the Qumran evidence "the counsel in 2 Cor, to 'cleanse ourselves from everything that can taint body and spirit' in an effort toward perfect holiness, takes on new meaning. It resembles strongly the general Qumran proscription of all contact with outsiders."³⁷⁵ This is exactly the concern of 4QFlor 1:3-4 in its delimiting who will be allowed into the eschatological sanctuary and thereby into the Qumran community itself. Fitzmyer does not mention this passage of 4QFlor.

Lastly Fitzmyer points to the concatenation of OT texts in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 as resembling in collection those of 4QTest but he fails to indicate the reason why such collections should be made or how they were made. Though we would not wish to suggest

a liturgical background for the combination of texts in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1, it is noteworthy that a close Ezekiel passage and a quotation of 2 Samuel 7:14 are to be found in 4QFlor.

Fitzmyer concludes that so many points of comparison with Qumran literature implies that "we are faced with a paragraph in which Qumran ideas and expressions have been reworked in a Christian cast of thought."³⁷⁶ For him 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 is a Christian reworking of an Essene paragraph which has been introduced into the Pauline letter.

J. Gnilka in his study of the same passage³⁷⁷ begins by outlining the thematic connection between the various OT quotations in the 2 Corinthians passage. He then attempts to decide the question Fitzmyer leaves open as to the exact source of the section. Although he notes the large number of NT hapax legomena in the section, Gnilka particularly stresses the occurrence of the name *βελιάς* as indicative of a certain dependence upon intertestamental Jewish literature.³⁷⁸ Yet, claims Gnilka, in such literature Belial's opponent, when mentioned, is always God, never the kingly messiah; the dualism of Christ against Belial is something peculiarly Christian and suggests that 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 was penned by a Christian author.

Further support for this position is deduced from the Christian meaning implied clearly in the dichotomy established between believer and unbeliever. Yet here Gnilka has not taken account of the concern that the Qumran covenanters show in respect of the limits of their community (4QFlor 1:2-4). Indeed Gnilka himself draws a very fine line between language used by the "Christian" author and theological concepts that he considers to be Essene in origin, namely, the community as God's temple,

separation from a godless environment and dualism.

The first of these is only found in Essene literature among material contemporary with the NT; the second is certainly not Pauline but permeates other literature especially that of the Essenes; the third certainly indicates Jewish circles and possibly those of the Essenes. In sum, Gnilka proposes that although the tradition has been subject to Christian revision, the basic Essene character of the fragment is still evident; the editor of 2 Corinthians was responsible for the passage's interpolation in its present place.

For all Gnilka's contributory suggestions he mentions 4QFlor but twice and only in a secondary fashion, such that his conclusions are not fully discretionary as to the various traditions present within Qumran literature itself, and certainly he does not attempt to limit his options upon slight evidence. His work points constructively in the right direction. The study of B. Gärtner, on the other hand, is based on the presupposition that Paul wrote 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 and so is somewhat restricted from the start.

As already noted, Gärtner sees 4QFlor as solely concerned with the community; even the "shoot of David" is understood as the community. Thus in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1, which Gärtner uses basically as an example of parallel thought to prove his point about 4QFlor, he sees a concern similar to that which he observes in 4QFlor: for the community as temple,³⁷⁹ for idols; also for connecting the community as temple with the oracle of Nathan at 2 Sam 7:14 (2 Cor 6:18),³⁸⁰ for purity and separation, and for Belial. He works solely upon the basis of literary and conceptual parallels and is in no way involved with attempting to show the

dependence, interdependence or independence of the traditions represented by 4QFlor and 2 Cor 6:14-7:1. Perhaps with all of Gärtner's careful literary analysis, Gnilka could have proposed a more definite line of tradition for the Corinthians passage.

G. Klinzing, lastly, is also steeped in his own conclusions when he approaches the question of the relationship of 4QFlor and 2 Cor 6:14-7:1. He works from the result of his analysis of 4QFlor 1:1-7 which he sees, somewhat artificially according to this study, as solely a literal portrayal of the eschatological sanctuary. He criticizes Gärtner, therefore, for insisting on an improbable temple = community identification.³⁸¹

Furthermore, Klinzing notes in detail that "idols" is not only a conjectural reading in 4QFlor 1:17, but that it also occurs in a quotation there, whereas in 2 Cor 6:16 it is not in a quotation. Again in reply to Gärtner in particular, he observes that to identify the shoot of David with the community, and thus to see the whole of the Nathan oracle in 4QFlor as concerning the community, is to misunderstand a clear messianic term. Moreover, since the sect is not the concern of the midrash until Psalm 1, according to Klinzing, it is wrong to see a general concept of purity and separation in relation to 4QFlor 1:1-13 for that depends upon reading those lines as a portrayal of the sect and not of the temple. All these factors lead Klinzing to conclude:

Zusammenfassend ist zu sagen, dass 4QFl 1 bei genauerer Untersuchung nicht als der Paralleltext zu 2 Kor 6, 16ff. angesehen werden kann, als der er bei Gärtner erscheint: als ein Stück mit der Vorstellung von der Gemeinde als

Tempel, das auch in der Einzelzügen weithin mit 2 Kor 6 übereinstimmt.³⁸²

Klinzing then continues to say that from a literary critical point of view 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 can only be seen to have similarities to 4QFlor if it is understood that in different ways both might be traced back to Ezek 37:26-28 which speaks of the eschatological sanctuary; indeed 2 Cor 6:16 even quotes part of Ezek 37:27. However, from a form-critical perspective, 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 has a clear setting in the baptismal rites of the early church and that explains the emphasis on purity, separation, sanctification, admission and the temple.³⁸³

In sum, Gärtner is certainly correct to have drawn together so many parallels: 4QFlor is indeed concerned with the community as is 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 with their common citations of Ezekiel 37 and 2 Samuel 7. On the other hand Klinzing is completely justified in pointing out Gärtner's inadequate explanation of the shoot of David. It is somewhat unfortunate that Klinzing was unable to see the link between the belief in the eschatological sanctuary and the Qumran self-understanding as being that sanctuary as a community in anticipation, for then his remarks on the Corinthians passage would have been more than hypothetical: both 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 and 4QFlor express theological concepts in connection with entry into the community. Thus 4QFlor may have in mind the entry ceremony associated with the Feast of Weeks, 2 Corinthians the rite of Christian baptism.

In support of this supposition is the quotation from Exodus 15 in 4QFlor (and from Isaiah 65) which is traditionally associated with either Passover or Weeks. And such remarks imply that any dependence between 4QFlor and 2 Corinthians is

of a literary kind, since it appears that more than one festival is involved in the selection of the various biblical texts. At least, and certainly, 4QFlor and 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 are heirs of a common tradition concerning the eschatological community. Our suggestion thus bears out some of the proposals of Fitzmyer and Gnilka, adopts the stance of Gärtner concerning the content of both passages, except for the overly strong emphasis on the temple understood solely as the community at Qumran, and while allowing that Klinzing is correct in part concerning the eschatological sanctuary, supports his theory as to the baptismal interest of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1.

F. Conclusion

The Florilegium from the fourth cave at Qumran is a midrash on festival texts concerning the latter days. The main texts which are expounded in it are from 2 Samuel 7 and Psalms 1 and 2, "coronation" texts which belonged together in some traditional liturgical setting with which the author of the manuscript was familiar, probably the Feast of Tabernacles.

Palaeography, archaeology and style show the date of the actual manuscript to be somewhere in the first century A.D.; study of the content enables that date to be fixed with a great degree of probability in the second or third quarter of the first century.

While the approach of this study has been to distinguish carefully between the interpreter's use of exegetical principles and the hermeneutical result attained, it cannot be denied that the two are very closely intertwined. The overall eschatological hermeneutic of the content of many of the scrolls may rest

ultimately on some exegesis by the Teacher of Righteousness, but in relation to 4QFlor the concern of the author writing with an eschatological hermeneutical purpose was to describe the eschatological content of two liturgical texts in terms of the latter days. In the latter days, a term explained in detail in column two, the community, described in terms of the eschatological sanctuary, will have restricted admission, the resultant purity of which will guarantee that the sanctuary be not desolated. The ongoing ritual in the sanctuary will be the performance of deeds of thanksgiving offered to God who, in turn, will give the members of the community rest from all the devices of their enemies, particularly those concerned with profanation of the sanctuary. In that way, one half of the play on the word "house" in 2 Samuel 7 is expounded. Belief in the eschatological sanctuary as such is not denied; rather the community is portrayed as seeing itself to be that sanctuary in anticipation.

In 1:10-13 the midrashist uses the other part of the pun to describe the Messiah of the Davidic "house" who is to come to save Israel in his divinely delegated role as king. The eschatological messianic priestly Interpreter of the Law will accompany him.

The section of the midrash in the form of peshar shows how joining the community is the initial step in the reunification of the houses of Israel and Judah, which Ezekiel 37 describes as yet another aspect of the reign of David who is prince for ever. In that reign God will also set his sanctuary in their midst for evermore that "all the nations will know that I, the Lord, sanctify Israel" (Ezek 37:28).

From Psalm 2 it is the nations who are identified as those who will be active against the community in the time of trial, which is itself a major aspect of the latter days. Those days are also characterized as the time when the wise will understand, and the rest given to the community at that time, along with that understanding, are sure signs of the sovereignty of God, as is the rule of the Davidic Messiah in Zion.

Thus, in relation to some larger whole, 4QFlor functions as a midrash on texts concerned with royalty that in its exposition of the latter days stresses the kingship of God. And such stress is achieved through the application according to generally accepted methods of particular exegetical principles, recognition of which has often been the first step not only in understanding the text but also, on occasion, in restoring it.

NOTES

¹See "Le Travail d'Édition des Fragments Manuscrits de Qumrân," *RB* 63 (1956), 50.

²In May 1978 W. H. Brownlee wrote to me from Jerusalem to inform me that both Ms. 286 (Fragments 1, 2 and 3; DJD V, Plate XIX) and Ms. 281 (Fragments 4-26; DJD V, Plate XX) were at the Shrine of the Book for restoration work for their better preservation. In May 1983 I studied Ms. 286 at the Rockefeller Museum; Ms. 281 was then still at the Shrine of the Book.

³*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, New York: Viking Press, 1955, 62. Further references to the site of 4Q and to the discovery of its contents may be found in H. Bardtke, *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer, Die Sekte von Qumran*, Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1958, 25-29; F. F. Bruce, *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Grand Rapids, Mich.: W. B. Eerdmans, 1956, 30-33; F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*, Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1958, 19-22; J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, London: SCM Press, 1959, 16-18; R. de Vaux, *L'Archéologie et Les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte*, London: Oxford University Press, 1961, 42-43; G. Vermes, *Les Manuscrits du Désert de Juda*, Paris: Desclée & Co., 1954², 22-23. Milik and de Vaux were the first two scholars on the scene after the initial Bedouin excavations.

⁴*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1964², 44.

⁵"Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological *Midrašim*," *JBL* 77 (1958), 350-51; hereafter cited as "Fragments."

⁶"Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," *JBL* 75 (1956), 176 (photograph facing page 174). An interesting photograph (Plate 13a in his book *The Dead Sea Scrolls*) shows two hands (Allegro's?) holding together what is described in the caption as "a Fourth Cave document;" it is clearly 4QFlor.

⁷"Spurious Texts from Qumran? I The Question," *PEQ* 90 (1958), 61.

⁸"Spurious Texts from Qumran? II A Reply," *PEQ* 90 (1958), 64.

⁹With a photograph facing page 350.

¹⁰DJD V; with the collaboration of A. A. Anderson, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968, with Plates (XIX-XX); hereafter cited as DJD V, ad loc. assumed.

¹¹In "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," *JBL* 75 (1956), 176. This is apparently capitalized from his description of the document ("Communication," in "Le Travail d'Édition des Fragments Manuscrits de Qumrân," *RB* 63 1956, 63), as "un florilège de passages bibliques avec commentaires tirés de l'Exode, II Samuel, Isaïe, Amos, les Psaumes et Daniel."

¹²*Scrolls from the Judean Desert*, Jerusalem: Machbaroth Lesifurth Publishing House, 1959, 173; hereafter cited as Habermann, adloc. assumed.

¹³*The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd., 1968³, 245; hereafter cited as Vermes, ad loc. assumed.

¹⁴Which is the title of his article in *IEJ* 9 (1959); Yadin is supported in this by M. Ben-Yashar ("Noch zum *miqdaš 'ādām* in 4QFlorilegium," *RQ* 10 1979-81, 587, n.2).

¹⁵*The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible*, New York: Oxford University, 1964, 88, n. 52; hereafter abbreviated to *Meaning*.

¹⁶*The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation*, Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1956, 337; hereafter cited as Gaster, ad loc. assumed. The title and translation remain the same in the 3rd revised and enlarged edition, 1976, 446-48.

¹⁷"Fragments," 351.

¹⁸"An Unpublished Fragment of Essene Halakhah (4Q Ordinances)," *JSS* 6 (1961), 71. Later (*PEQ* 96 1964, 53), Allegro also likened the script of "The Wiles of the Wicked Woman" to that of 4Q Ordinances.

¹⁹"Notes en marge du Volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan'," *RQ* 7 (1967-69), 177; hereafter cited as "Notes."

²⁰"The Palaeography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents," *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Scripta Hierosolymitana IV, Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1958, 56-87. Avigad acknowledges the work of J. C. Trever ("A Paleographic Study of the Jerusalem Scrolls," *BASOR* 113 1949, 6-23) who was the first to argue for the age of the scrolls from palaeographic evidence; Trever's later work ("Studies in the Problem of Dating the Dead Sea Scrolls," *PAPS* 97 1953, 184-93) confirmed his earlier proposals for variously dating the scrolls in the two centuries preceding the fall of the Second Temple.

²¹*The Hebrew Scripts*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971, Part I: the Text, see especially 138-62 on Palestinian square script; Part II: the Plates, see especially Plates 81-89.

²²"How old are the Cave Manuscripts? A Palaeographical Discussion," VT 1 (1951), 98-101; also, *The Qumran (Dead Sea) Scrolls and Palaeography*, BASOR Supplementary Studies 13-14, Yale: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1952. This latter was written largely in an attempt to refute certain scholars who persisted with sceptical attitudes towards the scrolls.

²³From his table illustrating the development of the final *mem* (*The Qumran Scrolls and Palaeography*, 42), it is possible to affiliate the scribe of 4QFlor with that style which Birnbaum dates between 37 B.C. and A.D. 70.

²⁴*The Ancient Library of Qumran*, 78. Elsewhere Cross develops his arguments fully ("The Development of the Jewish Scripts," *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. G. E. Wright; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1961, 133-202), though his conclusions in relation to the Qumran material remain the same.

²⁵*L'Archéologie et les Manuscrits de La Mer Morte*, 84.

²⁶"A Midrash on 2 Sam. vii and Ps. i-ii (4QFlorilegium)," 98; hereafter cited as Yadin, *ad loc.* assumed.

²⁷E.g., demonstrable because of the known way in which scripture was used as shown in Chapter I.

²⁸A translation in itself may alter the meaning of the text, e.g., by excluding puns that occur in the original (see the discussion on כֹּחַב in 1:12), but it is hoped that no translation is given here which radically alters the outline structure of the text.

²⁹I owe these readings of the original manuscript and the earliest photographs to Professor W. H. Brownlee who examined

them in the summer of 1976. Presumably the manuscript and earliest photographs go some way towards explaining Allegro's original suggestion in "Fragments" reading אַויַן]ב; Allegro is followed closely by Carmignac. Brownlee's conclusions have been previously supported by Strugnell ("Notes," 220) who proposes to restore וַיַּגִּיז וְיָבֵן [בְּוֹלֹא יוֹסִי] וְיָבֵן, mostly from Psalm 89:23.

³⁰Yadin preserves עוֹר from vs 10a and in providing an object for רָגַז, intransitive in the *qal*, is forced to suggest the *hiph^cil*, וְיָבֵן [עוֹר] וְיָבֵן [עוֹר] (?), "will move him no more." From where Yadin obtained his line's initial *yōd* remains a mystery. Yadin is followed here and for the most part by E. Slomovic ("Toward an Understanding of the Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *RQ* 7 1969-71, 7).

³¹וְיָבֵן [עוֹר] וְיָבֵן [עוֹר] וְיָבֵן [עוֹר] . . .

³²*Les écrits esséniens découverts près de la mer morte*, Paris: Payot, 1959, 325: "(. . . dans la main de (ses) enne(mis)." Hereafter cited as Dupont-Sommer, ad loc. assumed.

³³*Die Texte aus Qumran*, München: Kösel-Verlag, 1964, 256. Hereafter cited as Lohse, ad loc. assumed.

³⁴The text tradition of all the Samuel quotations in 4QFlor for the most part is closest to that of the LXX. This is confirmed also by comparison with 4QSam^{a,b,c}. Although none of the 4QSam texts preserves the section of 2 Samuel 7 quoted in 4QFlor, it is not insignificant that E. C. Ulrich has argued convincingly "that the Greek version was originally translated from a Hebrew text much closer to 4QSam^a than to M" (*The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*, HSM 19; Missoula: Scholars Press,

1978, 119; the conclusions of his thesis are stated more fully on pages 257-59).

³⁵2 Sam 7:1, 9, 11.

³⁶Psalm 89:23 reads: לא ישא אויב בו וכן עולה לא יעננו .

See note 29 for Strugnell's proposed restoration. It is not necessary to see a quotation from Psalm 89 at this point as Strugnell suggests. Rather it is possible that 2 Samuel 7 as reflected in 4QFlor and the text of Ps 89 represent a similar textual tradition, perhaps with direct liturgical associations.

³⁷E. Slomovic ("Toward an Understanding of the Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *RQ* 7 1969-71 , 7) includes the whole text of 2 Sam 7:10 here because he recognizes the use of the rule of *gēzērā šāwā* in relation to Exod 15:17-18. D. R. Schwartz ("The Three Temples of 4Q Florilegium," *RQ* 10 1979-81 , 87, n.14) also argues for the inclusion of the whole of verse 10.

³⁸F. M. Tocci (*I Manoscritti del Mar Morto*, Bari: Editori Laterza, 1967, 319; hereafter cited as Tocci) seems to follow Vermes. His translation reads "('Ho assegnato un posto ad Israele, mio popolo, e ve l'ho stabilito perché abiti in casa sua e non sia) I più (agitato dai suoi) nemi(ci, né seguiti) il figlio della perversione'."

³⁹In DJD V, Allegro restored שפטיס, changing an original plene restoration ("Fragments," 351), perhaps because he thought there was not really enough room for the plene reading at the beginning of the line. His earlier reading, however, is to be preferred.

⁴⁰Dupont-Sommer's restoration of a *niph^oal*, "sera batie," does not recognize the *lāmed* and is not long enough to fill the

lacuna. On the other hand, Gaster restores it as "the House (which God will cause to be built for his abiding) in the Last Days." That could offer a variety of *lāmeds* but is altogether too long - indeed Gaster's translation is of little use to the text critic although in many places he offers a very clear understanding.

⁴¹He is supported in this by J. Maier (*Die Texte vom Toten Meer*: München-Basel: Ernst Reinhardt, 1960, Bd. I Übersetzung, 185, Bd. II Anmerkungen, 165; hereafter cited as Maier, ad loc. assumed) and by Slomovic.

⁴²In a private communication.

⁴³Vermes and Tocci use "build" and "costruire" respectively in their translations, implying *בונה* in support of Habermann. Moraldi (*I Manoscritti di Qumrān*, Torino: Unione Tipografico-Editrice Torinese, 1971, 573; hereafter cited as Moraldi, ad loc. assumed) restores "*sarā edificata*." 11QT 4:8 implies that *בונה* was used of the earthly temple, while 11QT 29:9 suggests that *בוא* was used for the future temple.

⁴⁴Cf. 4QP Bless Fragment 2:1:2 where *בוא* = *בו*.

⁴⁵F. M. Cross ("The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth," *JTC* 5 1968, 16; *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 131, n.70) notes that *אדוני* of MT is "obviously secondary" and that the Samaritan text reads *יהוה*, "a rare instance of its preserving the older reading." Perhaps Sam. should be followed in the restoration here, especially because of 4QpaleoExod^m representing Exodus in a Samaritan recension. Strugnell suggests that Fragment 21, *יהוה ב* is to be placed at this point.

⁴⁶Exod 15:18 may lie behind the ועד לעולם ועד of 11QT 45:14:
אני יהוה שוכן בחורן בני ישראל לעולם ועד

⁴⁷Followed by Moraldi.

⁴⁸Yadin (*The Temple Scroll* Hebrew Edition, Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, The Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University, The Shrine of the Book, 1977, Vol 2, 136) mentions the phraseology of Deut 23:3-4 in association with 11QT 45:13 (לוא יבואו לה) which concerns the protection of the sanctuary (מקדש) from the blind.

⁴⁹Compare the similar stress in rabbinic tradition.

b. *Erub.* 54a reads: "It was taught at the school of R. Eliezer b. Jacob: wherever (in scripture) the expression . . . wa^ced occurs, the process to which it refers never ceases 'Wa^ced'. Since it is written, 'The Lord shall reign for ever and ever'."

⁵⁰"The Exclusion of 'Netinim' and Proselytes in 4QFlorilegium," *RQ* 8/29 (1972), 87-96, especially 92-96; reprinted in *Studies in Qumran Law*, SJLA 24; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977, 75-87, with an expanded postscript. He is supported in this by G. Blidstein ("4Q Florilegium and Rabbinic Sources on Bastard and Proselyte," *RQ* 8/31 1974, 431-35). Baumgarten endorses Blidstein's work in his expanded postscript (*Studies in Qumran Law*, 85).

⁵¹*Studies in Qumran Law*, 82, n.24.

⁵²In a letter to me of July 1978 W. H. Brownlee wrote concerning the *gimel*: "I had another look at it in Jerusalem this spring and noticed that the stance of the surviving left leg is affected by a tiny piece of scotch tape where someone had tried to raise it into a vertical position but was unable

to do so." This accounts for the stance of the stroke of ink which is not quite what one would expect for a *gimel*.

⁵³The *niph^aal* variously translated by Allegro, "Fragments" and DJD V, and Gaster.

⁵⁴The *qal* variously rendered by Dupont-Sommer, Lohse, Maier, Moraldi, Tocchi and Vermes.

⁵⁵The idiomatic understanding of Carmignac, followed by Strugnell.

⁵⁶In a private communication. In view of the presence of the *gimel* גל is the only likely root.

⁵⁷It may be possible to restore a form of מגן in the lacuna. It is used to symbolize protection and even as a divine epithet in Pss 18:3, 84:10, 12, 89:19 (a psalm already mentioned in relation to 4QFlor 1:1). See also 1QH 6:27-28: "For no enemy (רז) shall ever invade it, since its doors shall be doors of protection (גלתי מגן) through which no man shall pass." If שם in 4QFlor 1:4 is the noun "name," it is worth comparing 1QM 3:2-4:16, 6:2-3 and especially 5:1-2 in which the Prince of the congregation has his name written on his shield. Judges 5:18 (according to the textual restorations of C. F. Burney, *The Book of Judges*, 1918, reprinted: New York: Ktav, 1970, 117-20) may be the text upon which the whole phrase depends. Through *binyan 'ab* מגן of Psalms 18, 84 and 89 and יראה of Gen 22:14 (according to Yadin) are brought together. A restored text might read: "Our Shield will reveal himself for ever; continually he will protect it (the sanctuary)."

⁵⁸Cf. 1QS 8:14, 9:19.

⁵⁹This is also supported by J. D. Amusin ("Iz Kumranskoi Antologii Eskhatologicheskikh Tekstov," *Kratkie Sodbshcheniya Instityta Narodov Asii* Brèves communications de l'Institut des Peuples d'Asie 86 1965, 56-66; see the recension of Z. Kapera *RQ* 6 1967-69, 146-47) who uses Isa 60:2 as support for his restoration: [היו וכבודו] חמיר עליו יראה

⁶⁰The appearance of the Lord and talk of the eternal sanctuary occur together in *Jub.* 1:26-28.

⁶¹Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, Vol 1, 143-44; Vol 2, 238; Vol 3, plates 44 and 14*

⁶²"The Three Temples of 4Q Florilegium," 85.

⁶³Followed variously by B. Gärtner (*The Temple and the Community*, London: Cambridge University, 1965, 32) and G. Klinzing (*Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971, 80).

⁶⁴Followed by S. Lamberigts, "Le Sens de קדושים dans les Textes de Qumrân," *ETL* 46 (1970), 27.

⁶⁵In discussing 11QT 29:7-10, which is used above in support of restoring כבודו, H. Lichtenberger ("Atonement and Sacrifice in the Qumran Community," *Approaches to Ancient Judaism Volume II*, ed. W. S. Green, BJS 9; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980, 166-67) agrees with those scholars who suggest that the Qumran Community considered itself to be in the service of God with the angels; that would support understanding קדושו as referring to his holy (angels).

⁶⁶"His holy name" might appear as שם קדושו as in 1QpHab 2:4.

If there was word inversion it might have been written as קרושו שם but not as שם קרושו. 11QT 45:12 (המקדש אשר... אשכיו שמי בה. . . .) which occurs in a similar context and which might have been used in support of reading שם as "name" is qualified by a suffix rather than by any form of קרוש, as is שם in 11QT 3:4 (]ל שמי עליו כ[).

⁶⁷K.-G. Kuhn (*Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960, 223) lists שם many times, even with motion implied, especially in 1QM, whereas, apart from 4QFlor 1:3, שמה occurs only once: in 1QH 1:10 (with a possible second occurrence from a restoration in 1QH 1:2).

⁶⁸Cf. R. E. Clements (*God and Temple*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965, 104): "Whereas Deuteronomy had spoken of Yahweh's name as the means of his earthly presence, Ezekiel speaks of his glory." Cf. also Ps 104:31: "May the glory of the Lord endure for ever."

⁶⁹Alternatively, this expression could reflect the tradition of *Sifre Deut* 23:12: "And in the same way you find that Abraham saw it (the temple) being built, and saw it desolated and saw it rebuilt (Gen 22:14). 'And Abraham called the name of that place Yahweh-jireh (Yahweh will see);' behold, there it was desolated. 'Where the Lord will be seen;' behold, there it is rebuilt and perfect in the future."

⁷⁰In addition to 4QPB, Cf. 1QIsa^a 3:11, לוא for לו and 37:7, בוא for בו.

⁷¹See the further discussion below on whether the sanctuary in 4QFlor is actual and whether the sectarians practised sacrifices. G. Klinzing (*Das Umdeutung des Kultus*, 83-84) uses

Strugnell's reading at this point for his argument that the whole of 4QFlor reflects the hoped-for practice of the actual eschatological sanctuary. This argues against some of the points made by D. R. Schwartz ("The Three Temples of 4Q Florilegium," 85, especially n.9) and M. Ben-Yashar ("Noch zum *miqdaš 'ādām* in 4Q Florilegium," 588).

⁷²Similar phrases are לכול בליעל, 1QH 3:28; בני חשר כחיל, 1QM 1:1; כול חיל בליעל, 1QM 15:3; כול חמון בליעל, 1QM 18:3. None of these is identical to the phraseology of 4QFlor at this point.

⁷³*The Temple Scroll*, Vol 2, 4. A. Caquot ("Le Rouleau du Temple de Qoumrân," *ETR* 53 1978, 452) suggests that 11QT 3:3 is reminiscent of Deut 25:19 and 2 Sam 7:1.

⁷⁴In this he is followed by Maier, Vermes and Tocci. Slomovic refers to 1QH 2:16-17 where he reads with restoration למחשבותם ורשע בליעל ומזמתה; he then restores line 8 as לכלומתה במחשבותמה - but the lacuna is barely long enough to carry this and also the destruction is here conceived as only indirectly caused by the plots, directly, on the other hand, by "their" succumbing sinfully to those plots.

⁷⁵Habermann, Dupont-Sommer, Vermes, Lohse, Tocci and Slomovic all agree with Allegro on this point; Maier alone follows Yadin. Carmignac, in agreeing with Allegro, points to Mt 6:13: καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκης ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν.

⁷⁶With Maier, Vermes, Slomovic and possibly Strugnell.

⁷⁷"Fragments," 352 n.18.

⁷⁸For a recent discussion of the root שגג see R. Knierim, "šgg sich versehen," *THAT* II, 869-72.

⁷⁹If 'āleph is read, on the other hand, as a šādē, it is also just possible that the fragment is not put together exactly right (see the נא of line 8), and that very faint traces of the stem of a lāmed are visible as second (perhaps third) letter of the final word of line 9. That might then give a reading נמשגת עלמטת, "by their error of idolatry," as the error seems to concern the sanctuary.

⁸⁰Suggested by W. H. Brownlee: the meaning is not affected.

⁸¹"Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," *JBL* 75 (1956), 174-87. Apart from the editions already mentioned, lines 10-13 have also been published in translation by A. S. van der Woude, *Die Messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran* (Assen: van Gorcum, 1957), 173, and in Dutch, *Bijbelcommentaren en Bijbelse Verhalen* (Amsterdam: Proost en Brandt N. V., 1958), 85-86; by H. Bardtke, *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer* (Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1958, Bd. II), 298-99; by M. Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Viking Press, 1958), 401; and by W. H. Brownlee, *Meaning*, 88. The transliterated text of Slomovic contains at this point what must be two printing mistakes: כִּי for כִּי אֵל, and וְהִכְיִמוּתִי for וְהִכְיִנוּתִי.

⁸²Although here again the text quoted follows the type of the LXX, it is interesting to note, in connection with the restoration proposed above in line 2, that whereas MT here uses יָעִשׂ, the 4QFlor author uses יִבְנֶה. The LXX for 2 Sam 7:11 has καὶ ἀπαγγελεῖ σοι κύριος ὅτι οἶκον οἰκοδομήσεις αὐτῷ, with the variant in L alone of οἰκοδομήσει ἐαυτῷ the third person singular reading of the verb which is in accord with the MT's

use of יוננה, and is corroborated by all Mss. in the LXX of 1 Chr 17:10.

⁸³Notwithstanding the much debated lines of 1QH 3.

⁸⁴And confirmed from the original manuscript by W. H. Brownlee.

⁸⁵Attested in 1 Chr 23:25 and 28:7.

⁸⁶L. H. Silberman ("A Note on 4Q Florilegium," *JBL* 78 1959, 158-59) reads the final phrase of line 13 as "Afterwards he will stand up to save Israel." The *ḥēṭ* is possible, but the earlier parallel construction makes the *šēn* of אשר preferable.

⁸⁷And which may be left ambiguous according to the restorations of Yadin and Habermann. Slomovic reads the same restoration in his transliteration, but translates the whole sentence in an abbreviated form that shows a correct understanding of the grammar. The ambiguity can, of course, be retained in an English translation that does not restore the lacuna with a specifically Davidic action: e.g. that of W. H. Brownlee (*Meaning*, 88) "who (will reside) in Zi(on . . ."

⁸⁸Pointed out to me by W. H. Brownlee. The association of מלך with הר ציון in Isa 24:23 and Mic 4:7 might support the use of מלך at the beginning of the line; yet since there]בּוֹנֵי excludes the full phrase הר ציון, משל is to be preferred.

⁸⁹*A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament*, STDJ 4; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965, 24-26. De Waard gives a detailed description of how 4QFlor differs from the LXX, with an answer (26 note 1) to Fitzmyer's query ("4Q Testimonia and the New Testament," *TS* 18 1957, 536, n.74) concerning the minimal importance of the "waw-conversive

perfect in Amos 9:11 for argument about textual tradition." De Waard supports the *wāw* (וַ) in that syntactical function as part of the quotation in both 4QFlor and Acts 15:16; as does Brownlee (*Meaning*, 88-89).

⁹⁰A *Comparative Study*, 26, n.2. This will be discussed further below under Tradition History.

⁹¹This against Carmignac who denies the possibility of a *lāmed* in favour of the rare [למך] פשר הרב.

⁹²E. Slomovic, on the other hand, shows correctly that in Qumran and rabbinic sources it is common for the biblical quotation to be connected with what precedes by a linkword that is not necessarily even quoted. Thus the הַעַם of Yadin, followed by Maier, Vermes, Strugnell and Slomovic himself, becomes a less likely restoration. Although הַעַם דָּרָךְ occurs elsewhere in Qumran literature, as Yadin points out (CD 8:16, 19:29, 1QS*a* 1:2), it may be that here it is too like the Isaiah citation and too far from that of Psalm 1. From CD 8:9, 4 and 1QS, where דָּרָךְ is used most frequently, all that can be said definitely is that when used of the incorrect way, דָּרָךְ is always qualified; when used of the correct way, it may not be qualified. Thus a qualification is required here, and preferably one that is close to the Psalm text.

⁹³The restoration of Habermann, Carmignac, Dupont-Sommer, Tocci, and Moraldi.

⁹⁴This restoration depends form-critically not on the content, but rather on the intention of the scribe: did he intend a reference to the whole of Psalms 1 and 2, or just to their first verses?

⁹⁵Cf. Ps 119:49.

⁹⁶For the article in this common phrase compare its occurrence in lines 2 and 19.

⁹⁷As in the photographs of 1QIsa^a in *Scrolls from Qumran Cave 1* (from photographs by John C. Trever; Jerusalem: The Albright Institute of Archaeological Research and The Shrine of the Book, 1974), 15. Though many times there is *wāw/yōd* confusion in the scrolls, both the *yōds* in יסירנו are distinctly different in form from the final letter which is, therefore, most probably a *wāw*.

⁹⁸"A Suggested Reading for 4Q Florilegium 1:15," *JHWSL* 6 (1978), 25-31.

⁹⁹יהי with *wāw* copulative is also found in 1QH 8:8, 17, 18. Laubscher also remarks that ויהי (imperfect with *wāw* copulative) instead of והיה (perfect with *wāw* consecutive) is supported by 1QIsa^a 29:15 and 56:12 which have the imperfect with *wāw* copulative as against MT's perfect with *wāw* consecutive.

¹⁰⁰This then matches 1QS^a 1:2-3 which contains much terminology similar to this unit of 4QFlor.

¹⁰¹The LXX has ἀνελευθερωσεν which could represent either the text tradition of 1QIsa^a or that of the MT!

¹⁰²In this he has been variously followed by Dupont-Sommer and Vermes. Moraldi cites both Ezek 44:10 and 37:23.

¹⁰³Agreed upon by all other scholars who have published Hebrew texts, and by most in translation. Furthermore the phrasing of 11QTemple 29:7 resembles Ezek 37:23b; 11QTemple 29:8-10 have already been discussed in association with 4QFlor 1:4-5.

¹⁰⁴In order to remove at least one letter from line 17, Strugnell proposes a possible emendation to the Ezekiel text, reading נכול at the end of line 16; this nicely accommodates the *bêt*. Certainly no word apart from גלול can account for the double *lāmed*, unless it is שלל, "spoil," in Ezek 39:10: ולא יחטבו מן היערים כי בנשק יבערו אש ושללו את שלליהם. Although the quotation would have to be shortened somehow, נשק would provide a neat link with Psalm 2:12.

¹⁰⁵J. de Waard (*A Comparative Study*, 81, n.6) says the quotation is from Ezek 20:7 - partly because he wishes to see Ezek 20:34 quoted in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1. However, not only are both de Waard's identifications for the citation highly questionable, but also this clearly denies the author of 4QFlor any precision in his quoting of Ezekiel (at least in relation to MT).

¹⁰⁶*The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 206; in an introductory comment to his translation of 1QSB concerning the blessing of the priests.

¹⁰⁷F. du T. Laubscher ("A Suggested Reading for 4Q Florilegium 1:15," 27) also argues that Ezek 37:23 fits the context most suitably.

¹⁰⁸Slomovic describes this exegetical method in relation to 4QFlor in full in his article.

¹⁰⁹CD 4:3ff., 6:4ff. and 7:12ff. See the remarks below under Tradition History.

¹¹⁰Cf. Ps 2:6, "I have set my king on Zion, my holy hill." The general thought of this Ezekiel passage may also be present in Fragment 4, line 7 which speaks of Judah and Israel.

¹¹¹Allegro ("Fragments," 354) saw only one group, "the Sons of Zadok who sought (?) the(ir own) coun(sel) (?), . . ." He has been followed in this by Dupont-Sommer, Habermann, Vermes, Tocchi and Gaster. J. Le Moyne (*Les Sadducéens*, Paris: J. Gabalda, 1972, 87) reckons that the text is sufficiently poorly preserved that the בְּנֵי צְדוֹק in 4QFlor could be a designation for enemies of the community, possibly the Sadducees. His overall conclusion, however, is that the title is used in QL to stress the priestly background of the group and is not a sectarian designation of the kind like Sadducees.

¹¹²1QPHab 8:1 describes the righteous of Hab 2:4b as those who observe the Law in the house of Judah. Cf. CD 4:11, 7:12 and 13.

¹¹³בְּנֵי צְדוֹק occurs only twice in QL, at CD 4:1 in the quotation of Ezek 44:15 and at CD 4:3 in that quotation's explication.

¹¹⁴These people are described as those who have turned aside (סָרוּ) from the way of the people 1QSa 1:2-3. Cf. Isa 8:11, 4QFlor 1:15.

¹¹⁵As suggested by Vermes' translation, "the Sons of Zadok who (seek their own) counsel and follow (their own inclinations) apart from the Council of the community." Or alternatively וְהַחֲרָטֵי עֵצִים [בְּנֵי] וְהַחֲרָטֵי עֵצִים [בְּנֵי], "and the makers of idols," or, וְהַחֲרָטֵי עֵצִים [בְּנֵי] וְהַחֲרָטֵי עֵצִים [בְּנֵי], "and the engravers of wood," or again וְהַחֲרָטֵי עֵצִים [בְּנֵי] וְהַחֲרָטֵי עֵצִים [בְּנֵי], "and the engravers of idols;" any of these could fit the Ms. and be relevant to Ezek 37:23 but are less likely because of their still negative assessment of the second group.

¹¹⁶Allegro (DJD V), Yadin, Maier, Lohse, Strugnell and Slomovic.

¹¹⁷E.g. Vermes: "and follow (their own inclinations)," (= Gaster); Strugnell: רוּר[פי צ] דק; Dupont-Sommer: "qui sui(vent les oeuvres de) leurs mains." Moraldi follows Strugnell.

¹¹⁸Suggested by W. H. Brownlee in a private communication.

¹¹⁹Not [הימים] אחריה as Yadin suggests, for the *hē'* in אחריהמה is clear and so the only reading could be the suffix. אחריהמה is read by Allegro (DJD V), Lohse, Strugnell, and Moraldi.

¹²⁰Habermann's line reads: ד[ור] שי עצמהה רו[עיהמה וחב] ריהמה לעצה היחוד. לעצה היחוד has already been commented upon; the *ʿayin* in רועיהמה is impossible from the photograph and therefore the parallel הברייהמה is less likely.

¹²¹Most scholars do not give a restoration for the end of the line and those that do all admit that they are only attempting to make some sense by joining the few words that are restorable by meaningful phrases of the correct length. E.g. Yadin, with reference to 1QSa 1:1, restores [ב] אחריה [הימים בהאספם ל] יחוד. Allegro, Habermann, Dupont-Sommer, Vermes, Tocci, Lohse and Gaster variously restore יחוד לעצה, but לעצה is restored solely from their respective understandings of the context and not from Ms. evidence.

¹²²Cf. 1QM 10:9, 1QSB 1:2. In fact, based on 1 Sam 26:2, בחירי ישראל is a military designation. J. Coppens ("L'Élu et les élus dans les Écritures Saintes et les Écrits de Qumrân," *ETL* 57 1981, 120-24) argues that the OT term "elect" has passed from Israel in general to the members of the sect, and in some passages the title "elect one" is applied to the leader or founder of the sect.

¹²³Followed uncritically by Maier; and in his restoration of nnn at the start of the third lacuna by Lohse.

¹²⁴Followed by Lohse.

¹²⁵For the former cf. Nahum 1:7, Ps 5:12, for the latter cf. 2 Sam 22:31, Ps 18:31, 31:20, 34:23.

¹²⁶See the proposals of Habermann and Strugnell above.

Dupont-Sommer translates as "L'explication de cette parole (c'est que les rois des na)tions;" Vermes (followed by Moraldi) has, "concerns (the kings of the nations) who shall (rage against) the elect of Israel in the last days . . ." Both suggest a restoration similar to this second alternative. Gaster supports this too, as does Tocci: "riguarda i re dei Gent)ili."

¹²⁷For the phrases of dual identification see 1QpHab 1:13, 12:3-4.

¹²⁸In a private communication.

¹²⁹As does 1QM 1.

¹³⁰ אשר may possibly be omitted; cf. 4QCatena^a frgs. 10-11, 9 but the lacuna is sufficiently long that either way is admissible.

¹³¹Except, of course, for line 4a, which, as an insertion, does not necessarily fill a whole line; cf. 4QpPs^a 3:4a.

¹³²Cf. 1QpHab 8:1, CD 4:11.

¹³³See the discussion of 1:7 for other possibilities.

¹³⁴The participle הנשארים also occurs at CD 19:10, 13. The noun שאר occurs linked with עם in 1QS 6:8-9 and also at 1QM 2:11, 11:15.

¹³⁵In Daniel 12, עם occurs in vss. 1 (4 times), 4 and 9.

¹³⁶Cf. Psalm 1:6: כִּי יוֹדַע יְהוָה דַּרְךְ צַדִּיקִים .

¹³⁷יחלוננו was first proposed by Allegro (DJD V) but with no mention of a possible use of Dan 11:35.

¹³⁸"Notes," 237. The question whether 4QFlor 1:14ff. is the beginning of a commentary on the book of Psalms is discussed.

¹³⁹Or the use of ירא in Ps 2:11, Exod 34:30. It is just possible that this verse is cited in 11QT 7:3 which is in the section describing the fittings of the Holy of Holies; such subject matter fits well with the concern of 4QFlor 1:1-7a.

¹⁴⁰These possible associations will be mentioned again in the discussion of the possible liturgical setting for 4QFlor. I owe most of the observations in this paragraph to W. H. Brownlee.

¹⁴¹DJD V, 67-75. Strugnell ("Notes," 237) may be suggesting this by positioning his discussion of these two fragments under Catena^a.

¹⁴²"Le Document de Qumran sur Melkisēdeq," *RQ* 7 (1969-71), 361, n.33.

¹⁴³"The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," *NTS* 7 (1960), 314.

¹⁴⁴Cf. Psalm 89:6 - an important secondary text in relation to 2 Samuel 7.

¹⁴⁵It could be that a passage like Ps 114:2 influenced the interpretation through a syllogism such as 1) Judah = people of God = sanctuary; 2) People = קהל = sanctuary. Many texts could support the significance of קהל as "people."

¹⁴⁶1QP Hab 6:2, 7:3, 9:2, 10:1, 12:6.

¹⁴⁷A point made strongly by F. M. Cross (*The Ancient Library*, 172, n.74) in attacking Allegro's mathematical equating of eschatological figures; also by Fitzmyer ("The Use of Explicit OT Quotations," 331): "There is no evidence at Qumran for a systematic, uniform exegesis of the Old Testament. The same text was not always given the same interpretation (. . . compare the use of . . . Amos IX:11 in different contexts)." For example, even J. M. Baumgarten ("The Exclusion of 'Netinim'," 95) overstates the case for Amos 9:11 in CD and 4QFlor: "Through the arising of David with the Interpreter of the Law the tabernacle will again be erected, that is the Torah will be restored to its proper understanding."

¹⁴⁸Cf. 1QpHab 8:9. This goes against the theory of W. Grundmann ("Stehen und Fallen in qumranischen und neutestamentlichen Schrifttum," *Qumran-Probleme*, ed. H. Bardtke; Berlin: Akademie, 1963, 147-66) who insists on purely existential significance for the two verbs. H. Lichtenberger (*Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde*, SUNT 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1980, 151, n.9) notes the parallelism between נפל and כשל. Cf. ἀναστῆσαι in Acts 3:22.

¹⁴⁹"Qumran Peshar: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre," *RQ* 10 (1979-81), 483-503.

¹⁵⁰I owe these distinctions to the work of R. Wellek and A. Warren (*Theory of Literature*, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1956, 231).

¹⁵¹E.g., J. Carmignac, *Les Textes de Qumran*, Vol II, 46; I. Rabinowitz, "Pēsher/Pittārōn. Its Biblical Meaning and its Significance in the Qumran Literature," *RQ* 8 (1972-74), 225-26.

¹⁵²This simple observation speaks tellingly against the suggestion of D. R. Schwartz ("The Three Temples of 4Q Florilegium," 86), "Lines 1-13 are more aptly termed a *peshar* of a single passage, 2 Sam 7, 10-14."

¹⁵³On the Psalms as prophetic texts see the correct assessment of W. H. Brownlee, *Meaning*, 69-71. He is now supported by D. N. Freedman "Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy: An Essay on Biblical Poetry," *JBL* 96 (1977), 21-22.

¹⁵⁴The category of "oracle" recalls the so-called Demotic Chronicle, a fragmentary papyrus from the early Ptolemaic period which contains an oracle concerning the re-establishment of the native monarchy and an interpretation linked to each section of the oracle by a formula that can be translated as "this is;" see, M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, 258-59.

¹⁵⁵CD 10:6, and 13:2 also record that there is to be study of the book *Hagi*, and the fundamental elements of the covenant.

¹⁵⁶*Cont.* 10:75 (translated by F. H. Colson, *Philo*, IX, LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University, 1954, 159).

¹⁵⁷*Cont.* 10:78.

¹⁵⁸"Remarques sur l'Histoire de la Forme (Formgeschichte) des Textes de Qumran," *Les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1957, 43.

¹⁵⁹*The Ancient Library*, 84. The sources are presumably those mentioned above.

¹⁶⁰1QpHab is almost certainly not an autograph.

¹⁶¹Cf. Ezra 3:11. The scribe copying Ben Sira 51 considered verse 12 to be an allusion to Psalm 136 such that in the Cairo Hebrew Ms. a psalm is placed at that point beginning with Ps 136:1 but developing differently. The use of incipit verses is widely attested in the Near East, from Ugarit (Text 603) to Nag Hammadi (the first verses of the psalms being written on the entrance to the cave in which the Coptic library was discovered).

¹⁶²The Western text of Acts 13:33 (on Ps 2:7) reads ἐν τῷ πρωτῷ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται as observed by Lövestam (*Son and Saviour*, Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1961, 8, n.3) and as noted in relation to 4QFlor by W. H. Brownlee ("Psalms 1-2 as a Coronation Liturgy," *Bib* 52 1971, 321-22).

¹⁶³Cf. Isa 63:19; 1 Enoch 90:15, 18, 20, 37 (after God's descent in the pleasant land, Mt. Zion, the messianic king is born).

¹⁶⁴See above pp. 139-141.

¹⁶⁵In my article "Qumran Peshet: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre" (*RQ* 10 1979-81, 497-501) I drew attention to the structural similarity of several texts from among the scrolls whether or not they use a formula including וַיִּבְרַח: CD 7:14b-21a, 4QFlor 1:10-13, 1QpHab 6:2-5, 8-12, 12:1-10.

¹⁶⁶Midraš ist zunächst *a*, allgemein 'Forschung' u. zwar sowohl in dem Sinne von 'Studium, Theorie,' . . . als auch in der Bedeutung 'Auslegung' . . . *b*, Speziell wird dann M. auf die Beschäftigung mit der heil. Schrift bezogen . . . *c*, . . . Genaueres . . . ist sowohl das Auslegen der Schrift als auch dessen Ergebnis" (*Einleitung in Talmud und Midraš*, München: C. H. Beck, 1976⁶, 4). Strack sharpens this definition with further treatment of the form of midrash in

sections delineating the "schriftliche Fixierung des Midraš" and the "Struktur der Midrašim" (*Einleitung*, 196-98).

¹⁶⁷Bloch's five part definition of midrash is well known. Her first point states that "its point of departure is Scripture; it is a reflection or meditation on the Bible" ("Midrash," *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Vol 5, Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1957, 1265-67; as translated, paraphrased and largely supported by G. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism*, SPB 4; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961, 1973², 7).

¹⁶⁸"The midrashic unit must be so structured that the material contained therein is placed in the context of a Scripture text, and is presented for the sake of the biblical text. Midrash, then, is a literature about a literature" (*The Literary Genre Midrash*, New York: Alba House, 1967, 67.)

¹⁶⁹Bloch's fifth point ("Midrash," 1267); amongst many this distinction is shared by J. Theodor ("Midrash Haggadah," *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol 8, New York: Funk and Wagnells, 1904, 550), H. L. Strack (*Einleitung*, 5) and M. D. Herr ("Midrash," *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Vol 11, Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1971, 07) whose definition is perhaps less clear; for him midrash consists of "both biblical exegesis and sermons delivered in public as well as *aggadot* or *halakhot* and forming a running commentary on specific books of the Bible."

¹⁷⁰See above p. 242, n.153; also M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, 248, n.78.

¹⁷¹"*Pesher/Pittaron*. Its Biblical Meaning and its Significance in the Qumran Literature," *RQ* 8 (1972-74), 231.

172 *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, 230-37.

173 *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, 252.

174 "The Subject Matter of Qumran Exegesis," *VT* 10 (1960), 53.

175 In *Qohelet Rabbah* 12:1.

176 "Unriddling the Riddle. A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Peshar," *RQ* 3 (1961-62), 328.

177 "A New Commentary Structure in 4Q Florilegium," *JBL* 78 (1959), 346.

178 "Unriddling the Riddle," 328, n.10.

179 *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*, SELMS 24; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979, 35-36.

180 *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*, 31.

181 The word מדרש occurs in 1QS 6:24, 8:15, 26, CD 20:6, 4QFlor 1:14. Four further unpublished occurrences in Qumran literature are listed by A. G. Wright (*The Literary Genre Midrash*, 39-40). Only in 4QFlor 1:14 does מדרש seem to be a technical term introducing a literary type; in its four other occurrences it seems to mean "interpretation, exposition" and is used in relation to law or legal material, possibly alluding to a tradition of halakah. The presence of מדרש here must in some way have ended the impasse seen by G. Vermes when he asked "is peshar midrash or commentary?" ("A propos des Commentaires bibliques découverts à Qumran," *RHRP* 36 1955, 102).

182 "Pēsher/Pittārōn," 225-26.

183 "The Background of Biblical Interpretation at Qumran," *Qumrân: sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, BETL 46, ed.

M. Delcor; Paris: Duculot, 1978, 185, especially n.8.

¹⁸⁴*The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*, 27, 196.

¹⁸⁵"The Background of Biblical Interpretation at Qumran," 185; *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*, 27.

¹⁸⁶"Interpretation" is also the preferred translation of M. P. Horgan (*Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, 237).

¹⁸⁷Point 2 in her 5 part definition; see n.169. Both Vermes (*Scripture and Tradition*, 228-29) and Le Déaut ("Apropos a Definition of Midrash," *Int* 25 1971 , 272-75) expound on setting as constitutive of literary categories.

¹⁸⁸¹QpHab 7:4-5. Brownlee's understanding of ¹QpHab 2:7-10 (*The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*, 57) as referring to the Righteous Teacher is almost certainly to be preferred to Horgan's association of the "priest" mentioned there with "selected interpreters who followed him" (*Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, 229).

¹⁸⁹*The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*, 31.

¹⁹⁰Notwithstanding the arguments of F. García Martínez ("El peshar: interpretación profética de la Escritura," *Salmanticensis* 26 1979 , 125-39) who acknowledges the midrashic methods of the pesharim but claims that their claim to be revelation distinguishes them categorically from the midrashim which make no such claim.

¹⁹¹Bloch's third and fourth points; see p. 244, n.167.

¹⁹²"Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BA* 14 (1951), 54-76; *The Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash and the Targum of Jonathan*, Mimeographed paper issued by the

author, February 1953; *The Meaning of the Qumrân Scrolls for the Bible*, New York: Oxford, 1964; *The Midrash Peshet of Habakkuk*, SBLMS 24; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.

¹⁹³"Unriddling the Riddle. A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habbakkuk Peshet," *RQ* 3 (1961-62), 328-29.

¹⁹⁴"Toward an Understanding of the Exegesis of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *RQ* 7 (1969-71), 3-15.

¹⁹⁵*Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, 244-47.

¹⁹⁶E.g., K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Totem Meer*, BHT 15; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1953, 156-57; F. F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, Den Haag: van Keulen, 1959, 59-65; O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte*, WUNT 6; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1960, 77-78; F. García Martínez, "El peshet: interpretación profética de la Escritura," *Salmanticensis* 26 (1979), 125-39.

¹⁹⁷*Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, 249-59. Several scholars extend the association of the pesharim with Daniel to include visions and prophetic material whilst denying any connection with later midrash: e.g., J. Carmignac, "Le genre littéraire du 'Peshet' dans la Pistis-Sophia," *RQ* 4 (1963-64), 497-522; I. Rabinowitz, "Pēshet/Pittārōn," 220-26, 229-31; M. Delcor, "Les Pesharim ou les Commentaires qumrâniens," *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Vol 9, Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1979, 905.

¹⁹⁸E.g. R. Le Déaut: "by preserving two essential marks of midrash (scriptural context -- adaptation) many of the criteria can be considered . . . The sub-genres of midrash are many when

they are classed *according to content* (aggadic midrash, halakhic midrash, historical, narrative, didactic, 'ethical,' allegorical, mystic, apocalyptic) or *according to form* (pesher, liturgical midrash with homily...). Perhaps one could say that the 'midrashic' context remains as long as the scriptural stimulus continues" ("Apropos a Definition of Midrash," 282, n.85); J. van der Ploeg, *Bijbelverklaring te Qumrân*, Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Letterkunde Nieuwe Reeks Deel 23/8; Amsterdam: Noord-Holland, 1960, 209.

¹⁹⁹"Unriddling the Riddle," 328-29. A. Finkel ("The Pesher of Dreams and Scriptures," *RQ* 4 1963-64, 357-70) also finds parallels in both areas. For further bibliography see M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, 251, n.86.

²⁰⁰This enables a distinction to be made between Qumran and both rabbinic literature and 2 Chr 13:22 and 24:27 where the same term occurs.

²⁰¹Thus pesher is not to be set alongside haggadah and halakah as a third kind of midrash as W. H. Brownlee has argued (*The Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash and the Targum of Jonathan*, 12; *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk*, 25); in this he has been supported by K. Stendahl (*The School of St. Matthew*, Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1954, 184), P. Grelot (see Wright, *The Literary Genre Midrash*, 83-84) and Slomovic ("Toward an Understanding of the Exegesis of the Dead Sea Scrolls," 4). For further bibliography on the three positions, that the pesharim are midrash, that they are not, and that they are midrash pesher see A. G. Wright, *The Literary Genre Midrash*, 80; E. Slomovic, "Toward an Understanding

of the Exegesis of the Dead Sea Scrolls," 4-5; M. P. Miller, "Targum, Midrash and the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," *JSS* 2 (1971), 50-55; M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, 250-52.

²⁰²11QMelch 25 uses the same Isaiah quotation to refer most likely to the founders of the sect. R. Bergmeier ("Zum Ausdruck עצה רשעים in Ps 1, 1 Hi 10, 3, 21, 16 und 22, 18," *ZAW* 79 1967, 229-32) concludes that on the basis of understanding עצה as fellowship at Qumran one can translate the phrase עצה רשעים as "fellowship of the wicked" in the original MT context too, and obtain a clearer meaning. Certainly Ps 1:1 is to be understood that way in 4QFlor.

²⁰³Alternatively if some such restoration as proposed in the textual notes is followed, the pesher may be understood as referring to apostates of whom there is talk in 1QpHab 2 and CD 7-8. The two groups of people in Ezekiel are then to be taken as referring to the trusty members of the community, the sons of Zadok, and to the idolators, the unfaithful, the apostates.

²⁰⁴"The 'Sons of Zadok the Priests' in the Dead Sea Sect," *RQ* 6 (1967-69), 6-7.

²⁰⁵"The 'Sons of Zadok the Priests'," 10.

²⁰⁶*The Temple and the Community*, 4.

²⁰⁷In fact צדוק in 1QS 5:9 is not in the parallel passage in 4QS^e, which reads צרק; thus the 1QS passage appears as a later emendation. It is at best ambiguous and may reflect the starting point of the tradition which identifies the community as a whole with the Sons of Zadok.

²⁰⁸It is just possible that 4QpPs^a also belongs to this commentary though probably on a different scroll and certainly by a different scribe (the *šîn* and *mēm* are distinctly different in the two scrolls). However, 4QpPs^a is also arranged slightly differently with greater distance between the lines and the columns are, on average, 4 cms. narrower. It is also to be mentioned that 4QFlor has a pesher on the whole psalm through mention of the first verse, whereas 4QpPs^a contains a pesher on each verse of the Psalm. For a detailed description of 4QpPs^a, see Allegro, "A Newly Discovered Fragment of a Commentary on Psalm XXXVII from Qumran," *PEQ* 86 (1954), 69-75.

²⁰⁹P. W. Skehan ("A New Translation of Qumran Texts," *CBQ* 25 1963, 119-23) points to this unity of the scroll: "The section of 2 Sm represented consists of the promises to David, thought of as the composer of the Psalter, who arranged it for liturgical worship whether in an earthly or a spiritual "House" or Temple. Thus the material from 2 Sm is intended to introduce the running comments on the Pss."

²¹⁰1QpHab 9:14 is quoted in the pesher at 10:2; 1QpHab 12:1 is quoted in 12:6-7.

²¹¹The longest pesher in 4QpNah is at 3:3-5; in 4QpPs 37 at 2:17-19.

²¹²E.g. at 4QFlor 1:13-14, 17.

²¹³This is one argument amongst several against the proposals of D. R. Schwartz ("The Three Temples of 4QFlorilegium," 86-87).

²¹⁴See below pp. 170-173.

²¹⁵W. H. Brownlee ("Biblical Interpretation," 71) lists the

ancient authorities who devised set rules for midrashic exegesis. See also Chapter I, pp. 8-17.

²¹⁶This has been examined in detail in relation to 4QFlor by Slomovic who cites rabbinic texts where the rule is also used. He is misleading, however, in his treatment of Deut 23:1-4 and Neh 13:1, the latter of which he claims is necessary for the present understanding of 4QFlor; but קהל is used in both texts, מוקדש in neither so Neh 13:1 is not used for *gəzērâ šāwâ*.

²¹⁷Brownlee ("Biblical Interpretation," 75) quotes *Sifra* on Lev 23:40 as an example of this in rabbinic literature. L. H. Silberman ("A Note on 4Q Florilegium [Esch Midr]," *JBL* 78 1959, 158-59) first identified the alternative meaning for טוכח but he then excluded the original reading from the exposition. However, the importance of the interpretation is that it is an alternative which does not deny the original meaning. *B. Šabb* 63a clearly states that a scriptural verse never loses its plain meaning. In relation to Amos 9:11, from which טוכח comes, it is noteworthy that the Rabbis were able to derive the Messianic title בר נפלים from the verse (*B. Sanh.* 97a; cf. Dan 7:13).

²¹⁸There may well be an allusion in the interpretation of this word with the covenant made between Yahweh and Jacob at *Bethel*, "house of God" which is mentioned in 11QT 29:10 and associated with Tabernacles in *Jub.* 32:16-29.

²¹⁹See W. H. Brownlee (*Meaning*, 69-71) for a full account of the link between psalmody and prophecy at Qumran; also D. N. Freedman ("Pottery, Poetry, and Prophecy: An Essay on Biblical Poetry" *JBL* 96 1977, 22) summarizes part of his argument thus: "many of the poets of the Bible were considered to be prophets

or to have prophetic powers, and in some cases at least, the only tangible evidence for this identification is the poetry itself. On the other hand, most of the prophets for whom we have evidence in the form of speeches or oracles, were in fact poets." Cf. Acts 2:30.

²²⁰Cited by S. A. Birnbaum, *The Qumran Scrolls and Palaeography*, 26.

²²¹So far a search to locate even a single use of square script for the divine name in a biblical quotation in any published Qumran literature has been unsuccessful. Of course this does not hold, as would be expected for Mss. that contain biblical text only.

²²²"Formulas of Introduction in the Qumran Literature," *RQ* 7 (1969-71), 505-14. The introductory formulae to explicit quotations are also listed in relation to other Qumran Mss. by J. A. Fitzmyer ("The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," *NTS* 7 1960, 299-305). Horton's abbreviations have been provided in the relevant places in the structural analyses of the first two units of 4QFlor. Horton's work updates that of M. Burrows ("The Meaning of אשר אמר in DSH," *VT* 2 1952, 255-60) but he fails to take account of the structural significance of the conjunctive element in his schematisation of introductory formulae.

²²³₁QpHab 1:2, 7:3, 9:3, 10:2, 12:6, 4QpIsa^{a, b}, CD 9:2, 16:6, 11QMelch 1:2, 4QFlor 1:7.

²²⁴₁QS 5:17, 8:14, CD 7:9 - 4QFlor 1:2, 12, 15.

²²⁵₁ Kgs 21:11, Dan 9:13.

226 "Formulas of Introduction," 512.

227 "Acts 13:33-37: A *Pesher* on II Samuel 7," *JBL* 87 (1968), 321-24.

228 To venture here into a discussion of the influence of liturgy is indeed a hazardous task since so little is known of the Jewish liturgy at about the time of Jesus. For a brief summary of present knowledge of synagogue liturgy, see E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, Vol 2, ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979, 447-63.

229 The detailed studies of R. A. Carlson (*David, The Chosen King*, Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells Boktryckeri A. B., 1964, 97-128) and of J. Coppens (*Le Messianisme Royal*, LD 54, Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1968, 37-63) outline and criticize the main views of recent scholarship on this topic.

230 *Die Königsherrschaft Gottes im Alten Testament*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1951, 44.

231 *Die Königsherrschaft*, 115. Kraus cites Isa 52:7-10 as an exemplary passage that indicates the change in the tradition that the exile brought about.

232 *David, The Chosen King*, 121, 125-27. Deuteronomy 17 is especially important in this tradition.

233 *He That Cometh*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1956, 100 note 3.

234 *Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1967 (1943 Uppsala edition revised), 175, n.7.

235 *Les Institutions de l'Ancien Testament*, Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1958, Vol 1, 158-65. He speaks of Psalm 2

in relation to the enthronement.

²³⁶"Hebrew Installation Rites," *HUCA* 20 (1947), 145.

²³⁷For Saul, 1 Sam 9:17ff.; for David, 1 Sam 16:1ff.; for Jeroboam, 1 Kgs 11:29ff.; for Jehu, 1 Kgs 19:16ff. J. de Fraine (*L'Aspect Religieux de la Royauté Israélite*, Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1954, 201-2) notes that "l'oracle royal est très souvent suivie de l'accession au trône, et de l'investiture au moyen des insignes royaux." However, he would not wish to hold that the oracle was a necessary part of the coronation ritual - rather that it is a common feature which should not lead to "une thèse catégorique" (201, n.6).

²³⁸*Die Königsherrschaft*, 66 - that largely because of the occurrence of Zion in the psalm.

²³⁹*Studies in Divine Kingship*, 175 n.7.

²⁴⁰For example, Kraus (*Die Königsherrschaft*, 119) concludes that the Zion procession of the New Year Festival in post-exilic times becomes Yahweh's enthronement procession, and, on the other hand, Patai ("Hebrew Installation Rites," 209) emphasizes that the Feast of Tabernacles is a feast of the repetition of the coronation installation ritual.

²⁴¹"Psalms 1-2 as a Coronation Liturgy," *Bib* 52 (1971), 332. Psalm 1 was certainly written by the 3rd C. B.C.; see Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, 291.

²⁴²See Zech 14:16 and the tradition represented in Exod 23:16, Num 29:1, 7, 12, and Neh 8:14 for this combination of date and content.

²⁴³It is just possible that the exposition in 4QFlor reflects

admission rites in its stress on purity and works of thanksgiving (Cf. 2 Cor 6:14-7:1, discussed on pp. 211-217). However, 4QFlor talks about more than admission. Of course it remains true that all festivals and times of worship are times for renewing the covenant: Cf. 1QS 10. One further possible support for identifying the liturgical setting of the texts comes from the Cairo Geniza Ms. G: Exod 15 is therein set for either Passover or Weeks. See J. Mann, *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue* (I; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1940; reprinted New York: Ktav, 1971), 435, who questions the opening of the reading and M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967³), 306; F. M. Cross ("The Song of the Sea and Canaanite Myth," *JTC* 5 [1968], 11) also supports use of Exodus 15 at the spring festival from earliest times. Yet it is not necessary to insist that the supportive quotations in 4QFlor come from the same liturgy as the main ones, since 4QFlor is finally a written construction. On the possible covenanting ceremony associated with the Feast of Weeks see W. H. Brownlee, "The Ceremony of Crossing the Jordan in the Annual Covenanting at Qumran," *Von Kanaan bis Kerala*, AOAT 211, ed. W. C. Delsman et al; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag/Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1980, 300-301.

²⁴⁴Especially as the Feast of Booths, which may have contained liturgical traditions reflecting an enthronement, was fixed in the middle of the first month of the autumnal New Year. A similar suggestion in favour of the liturgical setting of certain texts has been made by J. Massingberd Ford who sees, in a general way, Tabernacles as the source for the biblical themes in the Shepherd of Hermas ("A Possible Liturgical Background to the

Shepherd of Hermas," *RQ* 6 1967-69 , 531-51).

²⁴⁵Perhaps this is the liturgical setting for 1QM.

²⁴⁶1QpHab 11:6-8, CD 6:19 and 1QS 3:4 (if taken substantively); also 11QT 25:10-27:10.

²⁴⁷M. R. Lehmann ("Yom Kippur' in Qumran," *RQ* 3 1961-62 , 121) so ascribes the Scroll of Three Tongues of Fire, Priestly Blessings, the Peshet on Jacob's Blessings, Yom Kippur Prayers and The Scroll of the Mysteries. He also sees several parallels between the Qumran and Samaritan rites and notes the frequency with which Deuteronomy 32, part of the Samaritan Yom Kippur liturgy, occurs at Qumran. 4QFlor probably contained midrash on Deuteronomy 33; can that have been part of an alternative blessing for the Feast of Booths?

²⁴⁸1QpHab 11:4-8, for example, talks implicitly of a difference in the date of the Day of Atonement.

²⁴⁹S. Talmon ("The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judaean Desert," *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Scripta Hierosolymitana IV, eds. C. Rabin and Y. Yadin; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1958, 170-73) works out in detail the priestly courses at Qumran from the texts discovered there and comments on the differences between the solar calendar of Qumran and other late post-exilic writings, and the contemporary lunar one of the Jerusalem temple. These dates are confirmed in 11QT 25:10 and 27:10.

²⁵⁰It is unfortunate that 11QT 28 restricts its treatment of the Feast of Tabernacles to description of the animals to be sacrificed. Perhaps the only clue as to the possible content of the liturgy comes from the summary conclusion in column 29 which

follows immediately the discussion of Tabernacles.

11QT 29:10 has already shown to have some remarkable parallels with 4QFlor.

²⁵¹It is just possible that Fragments 15 and 19 (Isa 65: 22-23) reflect the Synagogue liturgy if considered in combination with the Song of the Sea in Exodus 15; the readings for the 56th Seder from Exod 14:15ff. have as the haftara Isa 65: 24ff. (Mann, *The Bible as Read*, 430-34). At least according to the present discussion the 4QFlor Fragments 6-11 (Deut 33) find their place alongside 2 Samuel 7 and Psalms 1 and 2 in the festival liturgy; perhaps the combination of supportive quotations is dependent on a separate liturgical setting.

²⁵²As suggested by Fitzmyer ("4Q Testimonia and the New Testament," 531) on first seeing only 4QFlor 1:10-13.

²⁵³"Notes sur les Pesharim," *RQ* 3 (1961-62), 528.

²⁵⁴1QS 1:17, 8:4, 1QH 5:16, CD 20:27, 4QP^aPs^a 2:18, Catena A Fragments 5-6. Notwithstanding the remarks of H. Stegemann ("Der Pešer Psalm 37 aus Hohle 4 von Qumran," *RQ* 4 1963-64, 230, n.143): "מצרף ist in den Qumrantexten nicht nur terminus technicus für die endzeitliche Drangsal sondern häufig einfach Ausdruck zur Charakterisierung des Leidens der Gläubigen in der Welt, insofern sie es als läuternde Erprobung der Echtheit ihres Glaubens durch Gott annehmen." In Qumran the two cannot be separated: that has been particularly well demonstrated by J. Daniélou ("Eschatologie Sadocite et Eschatologie Chrétienne," *Les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1957, 118-20). He also makes a clear distinction between the latter days and the end but his presentation on

this point is such that for the covenanters there is no pre-eschatological time of trial. G. Klinzing (*Das Umdeutung des Kultus*, 104) understands מצרף as signifying that God purifies his community through their enforced exile.

²⁵⁵"La Notion d'Eschatologie dans la Bible et à Qumrân," *RQ* 7 (1969-71), 25-26. Carmignac has repeated his views on אחרית הימים more clearly and more forcefully in his article "La future intervention de Dieu selon la pensée de Qumrân," *Qumrân: sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, ed. M. Delcor, *BETL* 46; Paris-Gembloux: Editions Duculot, Leuven: University Press, 219-29.

²⁵⁶"La future intervention de Dieu selon la pensée de Qumrân," 229.

²⁵⁷"At the End of the Days," *ASTI* 2 (1963), 27-37. This translation of the phrase is supported by the earlier arguments of C. Roth ("The Subject Matter of Qumran Exegesis," 52-53) who claims that it is the primary characteristic of pesher.

²⁵⁸"Eschatology and the End of Days," *JNES* 20 (1961), 188-93.

²⁵⁹"Time and Eschatology in Apocalyptic Literature and in Qumran," *JJS* 16 (1965), 177.

²⁶⁰"Time and Eschatology," 182.

²⁶¹K. Schubert (*The Dead Sea Community*, New York: Harper & Row, 1959, 98-104) expresses the idea that אחרית הימים is both the latter days and a period beyond that by conceiving of it as being a phrase that might be rendered in terms of an "end period." That is, however, perhaps only applicable to 4QFlor and CD and not to the whole body of Qumran literature.

²⁶²It is this particular understanding of the eschatology of 4QFlor that leads R. J. McKelvey (*The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*, London: Oxford University, 1969, 51) and A. J. McNicol ("The Eschatological Temple in the Qumran Peshet 4QFlorilegium 1:1-7," *OJS* 5 1977, 136) amongst others to their understanding that מקדש אדם refers to a future building amongst men.

²⁶³A. Gelston ("A Note on II Sam 7:10," *ZAW* 84 1972, 93) has pointed out that מקום and מקדש are interchanged in the MT too; he cites Jer 7:12-14 and especially 1 Chr 16:27 quoting Ps 96:6, where מקדשו has become מקומו.

²⁶⁴1QS 8:4-6, 11:8, 1QH 6:15, 8:6-10. CD 1:1 also links the verb נטע and plantation in relation to the community. The secondary meaning of נטע, "to pitch a tent," may have some significance for the present passage when it is recalled that the tabernacle was originally a tent.

²⁶⁵This is expressed most clearly by Y. Congar (*Le Mystère du Temple*, LD 22, Paris: Editions de Cerf, 1963, 43): "Le mouvement et l'intention de la prophétie, dans Sam, sont polarisés par cette idée: Tu veux me bâtir une maison; ce n'est pas toi qui me bâtiras une maison, c'est moi qui t'en bâtirai une, à savoir une descendance perpétuelle. C'est bien ainsi que David comprend Nathan (v. 19)." If 2 Sam 7 is to be associated with the Feast of Tabernacles then Nathan's pun may be alluded to in *Jub.* 32:16-29 which describes that feast as a time of alliance with Jacob at *Bethel*.

²⁶⁶"Two Notes on the Midrash on 2 Sam vii," *IEJ* 9 (1959), 103. He cites Enoch 90:28-29 and Mark 14:58 as evidence for the idea

of the God-made eschatological sanctuary.

²⁶⁷"'Reign' and 'House' in the Kingdom of God in the Gospels," *NTS* 8 (1961-62), 234. He has a detailed discussion of background texts to the Gospel understanding of the Kingdom of God, and deals at length with the oracle of Nathan. However, in relation to Qumran he fails to cite 4QFlor which is clearly important for his argument that even in Judaism house was no longer understood in the sense of a royal family but "as the people of God, the true religious community" (240).

²⁶⁸It is somewhat surprising that G. Forkman makes no use at all of 4QFlor in his work, *The Limits of the Religious Community* (ConB *NTS* 5; Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1972).

²⁶⁹J. Baumgarten (*Studies in Qumran Law*, SJLA 24, ed. J. Neusner, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977, 85-87) also draws attention to *Jubilees* 16:25 which describes the exclusion of aliens from Abraham's celebration of Tabernacles, a remarkable parallel with 4QFlor if Tabernacles provided the liturgical setting for the midrash.

²⁷⁰G. Blidstein ("4Q Florilegium and Rabbinic Sources on Bastard and Proselyte," *RQ* 8/31 1974, 431-35) lists 'Abot R. Nat. 12 (3rd C. A.D.), which records that the bastard travelling to study at Jerusalem must go no further than Ashdod (applying Zech 9:6), and *t. Qidd.* 5:4, where R. Meir argues against R. Jose that bastards will not be purified in the future, as evidence for the exclusion of the bastard from the sacred geographic boundaries, and hence the temple, of the future Israel.

²⁷¹ *Spee* 1:326, translated by F. H. Colson, *Philo*, VII, LCL; Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University, 1958, 289.

²⁷² "The Exclusion of 'Netinim' and Proselytes in 4Q Florilegium," *RQ* 8/29 (1972), 87-96 = *Studies in Qumran Law*, 75-85.

²⁷³ Ezra 2:70, 77, Neh 10:29 rank them as the last of the menial servants and they are clearly servants in Ezra 2:58, Neh 7:60. However, Ezra 7:24 describes them as having tax exemption privileges, and Ezra 2:2-65 lists them among the לְנֶתִינִים; Neh 10:29 includes them among those who pledged that they would not intermarry with non-Israelites.

²⁷⁴ E.g., CD 14:4-6. G. Blidstein ("Rabbinic Sources," 433-34) points out that no rabbinic teachings prohibit the proselyte from entering Jerusalem and the temple, but that *m. Bik.* 1:4 says that the proselyte may bring the first fruits to the temple but may not recite the creed of Deut 26:1ff. as the Patriarchs were not his fathers. To this could be added *b. Yebam.* 24b which says that no proselytes will be accepted in the days of the Messiah because Israel will be prosperous and proselytes would be attracted for worldly reasons.

²⁷⁵ "The Exclusion of 'Netinim' and Proselytes," 93-94. Cf. 1QS 2:4-10. It is surprising that both Baumgarten and Blidstein have missed *b. 'Abod. Zar.* 3b which links the exclusion of proselytes in the messianic age with an interpretation of Psalm 2, both elements of which are present in 4QFlor: "Has it not been taught that in the days of the Messiah proselytes will not be received; . . . For when the battle of Gog-Magog will come about they will be asked, 'For what purpose have you come?' and they

will reply: 'Against God and His Messiah' as it is said, Why are the nations in an uproar, and why do the peoples mutter in vain, etc. Then each of the proselytes will throw aside his religious token and get away, as it is said, Let us break their bonds asunder, and the Holy One, blessed be He, will sit and laugh, as it is said, He that sitteth in heaven laugheth. R. Isaac remarked that there is no laughter for the Holy One, blessed be He, except on that day." That $\gamma\lambda$ is translated as proselyte (implying "convert") may be questioned on the grounds that it only acquires that meaning in late tannaitic times (so argues S. Zeitlin, "Proselytes and Proselytism during the Second Commonwealth and the Early Tannaitic Period," *Wolfson Jubilee Volume 2*, 874) but Philo uses "proselyte" (LXX rendering of $\gamma\lambda$) to refer to converts (H. A. Wolfson *Philo 2*, 364-73); furthermore it can be argued that the LXX translators understood $\gamma\lambda$ = προσήλυτος as referring to a convert and $\gamma\lambda$ = γεωργός OR κάρουκος as not doing so (P. Churgin "The Targum and the Septuagint," *AJSL* 50 1933-34, 47-51). Cf. *Mek. Nez.* 18:32-40.

²⁷⁶E.g. 1 *Enoch* 12:2, 14:23, 39:5 etc. Elsewhere in *Enoch* the more specific "holy angels" is used, but always in relation to the archangels.

²⁷⁷*Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil*, *SUNT* 4, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966, 90. Among the passages where Kuhn understands angels is 4QFlor 1:4. It may be that sometimes "holy ones" includes both men and angels; cf. 1QS 11:7.

²⁷⁸*Enderwartung*, 93.

²⁷⁹Translation of H. Ringgren (*The Faith of Qumran*,

Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1963, 85). This is a parallel to 1QSa 2:8-9 cited below. Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer "A feature of Qumran angelology and the angels of 1 Cor 11:10," *NTS* 4 (1957-58), 48-58.

²⁸⁰Translation of Vermes (*The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 93).

²⁸¹This is splendidly put by D. Barthélemy ("Le Sainteté selon la Communauté de Qumran et selon l'Évangile," *La Secte de Qumran et Les Origines du Christianisme*, RechBib 4, Paris-Brügge: Desclée de Brouwer, 1959, 205): ". . . l'unique réalité: Dieu et la cour des anges. Car le Très-Haut n'a pas placé l'homme au sommet de la création, comme celui-ci se plaît à le croire en des moments d'optimisme béat. Il y a d'abord les anges...qu'un juif de cette époque n'imaginait pas du tout comme des êtres fémininoïdes roses ou bleu-pâle, mais comme d'immenses êtres de feu, d'une pureté et d'une lucidité consumantes, seuls capables de faire face à Dieu . . . la part de la création qui seule sait connaître et louer Dieu."

²⁸²All this makes for a refutation of the pioneering work of S. Lamberigts ("Le sens de קוּשִׁים dans les textes de Qumrân," *ETL* 46 1970, 24-39). Of the three parallels mentioned above he considers only 1QS 11:7 in which he acknowledges that the holy ones are angels. Yet he does not use even that passage to inform the meaning of קוּשִׁים in 4QFlor 1:4 nor does he refer to the wider context of 4QFlor. Rather, taking 4QFlor by itself, he reckons that the phrase denotes the members of the sect over against the impure men who are excluded. This also ignores the structure of the text - those phrases are not parallel, that containing קוּשִׁים is a reason for the earlier statement of exclusion.

²⁸³"La Sainteté selon la Communauté," 210. If 4QFlor is an exposition of texts from the covenant service when new converts were admitted, then the stress on purity can be understood even more clearly. Barthélemy also summarizes the Essenes' conception of sanctity "en trois mots: se convertir, se séparer, s'unir" (204).

²⁸⁴נראי שונה seems to be borrowed from the quotation of 2 Samuel in line 1, and therefore would most likely carry the same meaning. Perhaps there is an allusion here to Jer 51:51.

²⁸⁵Thus Tamar is desolate because of the sin Ammon committed against her (2 Sam 13:20), an altar is desolate because of the idols associated with it (Ezek 6:4), the land is desolated by the wickedness of men (Jer 12:11), etc. One cannot translate directly "lay waste" (Vermes, Gaster, Dupont-Sommer) or "destroy" (Maier and, by implication O. Betz, "The Eschatological Interpretation of the Sinai Tradition in Qumran and in the New Testament," *RQ* 6 1967-69, 101; also G. Klinzing *Das Umdeutung des Kultus*, 82, who confuses the issue by claiming that "destroy is the original meaning of the root and that טמא would have been used for 'desolate'.")

²⁸⁶"The Cleansing of the Temple and Zechariah xiv 21," *NovT* 4 (1960), 178-79.

²⁸⁷McNicol's translation of נר as "enemy" ("The Eschatological Temple in the Qumran Peshar 4QFlorilegium 1:1-7," 138) is surely incorrect as is his identification of them with the priesthood in Jerusalem.

²⁸⁸This is also the understanding of Allegro, Yadin, Flusser ("Two Notes," 102) and Tocci - it certainly better accounts for

the plural suffix of מְבָרַחִים .

²⁸⁹"Two Notes," 102 n.11; followed by Maier. Yet, the simplest way of expressing the translation "among men" would be by the preposition ב which is indeed missing. G. Klinzing (*Das Umdeutung des Kultus*, 83) supports this reading too as it best reflects the thought of the passage which for him is concerned with the eschatological sanctuary, the building, alone.

²⁹⁰Allegro and Dupont-Sommer ("un sanctuaire [fait de main] d'homme") read it this way; yet this goes against the contemporary idea (*1 Enoch* 90:28, *Jub.* 1:28) that God himself builds the eschatological temple. On Plato, Xerxes, Zeno, Plutarch and Philo all being against the ideal sanctuary as being man-made, see S. G. Sowers, *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews* (Richmond: J. Knox, 1965), 55. Recently D. R. Schwartz ("The Three Temples of 4QFlorilegium," *RQ* 10 1979-81, 86) has supported this translation, as also M. Delcor ("Littérature essénienne," *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Vol 9, ed. H. Cazelles et A. Feuillet; Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1979, col. 912).

²⁹¹So Gärtner (*Temple and Community*, 351; see also n.2).

²⁹²So Vermes, Tocci. O. Betz ("Sinai Tradition," 101) identifies the sanctuary as the living temple of the eschatological community. This idea that the sanctuary consists of men is also supported by J. Massingberd Ford ("A Possible Liturgical Background to the Shepherd of Hermas," *RQ* 6 1967-69, 542 and n.43) and by J. Amusin ("Iz Kumranskoi Antologii," *RQ* 6 1967-69, 147) who says that the expression "a human temple" emphasizes the "spirituality" and "humanity" of this sanctuary.

²⁹³Cf. Gen 6:13, Isa 65:6, Jer 2:22, etc.

²⁹⁴Lev 1:11 makes the distinction reflected in other parts of the book that the slaughter or sacrificial action is done before (לפני) the Lord, whereas the sacrifice goes up to or makes a pleasing smell for (ל) the Lord. 4QFlor uses both prepositions and so recognizes both aspects of sacrifice - performance and direction. Cf. also the use of פנים and sacrifice in Ps 51:9-11.

²⁹⁵*Prob.* 75, 75; translation by F. H. Colson, *Philo*, IX, 55.

²⁹⁶"Le Ministère Cultuel dans la Secte de Qumran et dans le Christianisme Primitif," *La Secte de Qumran et les Origines du Christianisme*, RechBib 4, Paris-Brügge: Desclée de Brouwer, 1959, 202. The same idea is expressed by O. Cullmann ("L'Opposition contre le Temple de Jérusalem, Motif Commun de la Théologie Johannique et du Monde Ambiant," *NTS* 5 1958-59, 165). Perhaps the scholar who has most surely stressed the works of the Law and Qumran practice in general being legalistically rather than sacrificially oriented is C. Rabin (*Qumran Studies*, London: Oxford University, 1957) who wanted to identify the sectarians with the Pharisees rather than as the priestly-oriented sons of Zadok.

²⁹⁷*The Ancient Library*, 75.

²⁹⁸De Vaux (*Archaeology*, 12-14, 86, 120) supports the view that the animal bones are to be related to some kind of sacrificial meal and notes that bones were buried throughout the history of settlement at Qumran, but he makes no comment on the amount of bones unearthed. Perhaps the bones unearthed reflect a practice of the burning of the red heifer whose ashes

were needed for purificationary purposes: cf. J. Bowman, "Did the Qumran Sect Burn the Red Heifer?" *RQ* 1 (1958-59), 73-84; W. H. Brownlee, "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls," *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl; New York: Harper, 1957, 37-38.

²⁹⁹J. Carmignac ("L'Utilité ou l'Inutilité des Sacrifices Sanglants dans la 'Règle de la Communauté' de Qumrân," *RB* 63 1956, 524-32) comments in relation to 1QS 9:3-5 and 1QM 2:5-6 that this is just use of language, suitable to their situation, from a different part of the OT which was held in respect as a whole at Qumran. However, the sect believed that one day it would return to Jerusalem to re-establish a true liturgy conforming to the Law. Yet the very specific term, מקטירים, may indicate that at the time of 4QFlor actual non-animal sacrifices were burnt at Qumran. Cf. the discussion by S. H. Steckoll ("The Qumran Sect in relation to the Temple of Leontopolis," *RQ* 6 1967-69, 55-69) who identifies a small altar at Qumran (p.57) and suggests the area was associated with a temple.

³⁰⁰1QS 3:4-12, 8:2-4, 9:4-5, CD 11:21, 11QPss^a 18:17 are mentioned in his treatment. Thus for him the Qumran community did not offer sacrifices in the literal sense.

³⁰¹"The Exclusion of 'Netinim' and Proselytes," 94.

³⁰²A. J. McNicol's approach ("The Eschatological Temple in the Qumran Peshar 4QFlorilegium 1:1-7," 140) seems too straightforward: for him חודה can only refer to the actual sacrifices performed in the future temple; he does not consider the whole phrase מעשי חודה.

³⁰³*The Temple and the Community*, 30-42.

³⁰⁴See above, under Textual notes, for discussion of these lines. We do not take them as having any referent, either collective or individual, in משיחו of Ps 2:2.

³⁰⁵*The Temple and the Community*, 39.

³⁰⁶D. R. Schwartz ("The Messianic Departure from Judah [4Q Patriarchal Blessings]," *TZ* 37 1981, 258) also rejects Gärtner's suggestion that the sect saw itself as the sprout of David.

³⁰⁷H. Kosmala ("The Three Nets of Belial," *ASTI* 4 1965, 112, n.27) has stressed this in relation to Gärtner's treatment of CD: "Miqdaš itself could be applied to God (Ez 11:16, cf. Is 8:14) or the land (Ex 15:17); the defilement of the land, the profanation of the name of God always begins with the self-defilement of the 'holy nation' (Lev 19f. and often). It was, therefore, quite natural for the author(s) of the Damascus Document to apply the word miqdaš (not hekal) also to the new congregation of Israel."

³⁰⁸*Das Umdeutung des Kultus*, 80-87. He tries to determine to which group of texts 4QFlor belongs: for him 1QS, CD and 1QpHab all contain the concept of the community as temple, 1QH, 1QM and 4QpPs^a do not. This he attributes to differences of "Gattung," and of period of writing. J. Murphy-O'Connor (*RB* 79 1972, 435-40) largely agrees with this and approves Klinzing's analysis of 4QFlor.

³⁰⁹Here Klinzing correctly leans towards the reading of Strugnell, תודה, "Dankopfer," which is found with קטר in Amos 4:5.

Thus for Klinzing the sacrifices to be offered in the future will be actual, though he concludes that "in jedem Falle bleibt die Deutung der Stelle ungewiss" (84).

³¹⁰Klinzing cites *Jub.* 1:17, 27, *Sib. Or.* 5:433, *Midr. Pss* 90:19 (198a), *1 Enoch* 91:13, *2 Bar.* 32:4, *Sifre Deut* 33:12 (145b). He also points to a similar concern in intertestamental literature concerning the eschatological city.

³¹¹*Das Umdeutung des Kultus*, 84.

³¹²At 1QS 5:6, 8:5, 9, 9:6, CD 3:18. Also at 4QD^b, 1QSa 2:3ff. and 1QM 7:6 which are discussed above.

³¹³"Le Rouleau du Temple," *Qumrân: sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Paris: Duculot, Leuven: University Press, 1978, 115-119.

³¹⁴*The Temple Scroll, Volume One: Introduction*, Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, The Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University, The Shrine of the Book, 1977, 140-144. 11QT 8-10 read: "And I will sanctify my sanctuary with my glory which I will cause to dwell on it, my glory until the day of blessing when I myself will create my sanctuary to establish it forever" (my translation).

³¹⁵See pp. 184-185.

³¹⁶"The Three Temples of 4QFlorilegium," *RQ* 10 (1979-81), 83-91.

³¹⁷"Noch zum *miqdaš 'ādām* in 4QFlorilegium," *RQ* 10 (1979-81), 587-88.

³¹⁸"The Three Temples of 4QFlorilegium," 86.

³¹⁹See pp. 111-112.

³²⁰"The Three Temples of 4QFlorilegium," 86.

³²¹Perhaps this interest is a part of the reaction at Qumran to Herod's temple rebuilding.

³²²This identification is supported recently by P. R. Davies, *Qumran*, Guildford: Lutterworth, 1982, 87; and by P. Garnet, *Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls*, WUNT 2, Vol 3; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1977, 103.

³²³1 Sam 7:1, 12:11, Deut 12:10, 25:29, Jos 23:1, Judg 2:14, 8:34, etc.

³²⁴Deut 13:14, Judg 19:22, 2 Chr 13:7ff. On "Belial" and its possible meaning in the OT, see D. Winton Thomas, "בליעל in the Old Testament," (*Biblical and Patristic Studies*, eds. J. N. Birdsall and R. W. Thomson; Freiburg: Herder, 1963, 11-19) and the more thorough work of V. Maag, "Be^elija^cal im Alten Testament" (*TZ* 21 1965, 287-99). Cf. W. Foerster "Βελίαιος," *TDNT* 1, 607.

³²⁵*Gott und Belial*, SUNT 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1969, 191,n.4.

³²⁶The difficult passage, 1QS 3:13-4:14, he sees as a direct modification by the editors of 1QS of material drawn from 1QM and influenced by Iranian dualistic thought concerning the world.

³²⁷"The Three Nets of Belial," 103. He shows how CD speaks of the defilement at 1:20, 3:11, 5:6, 12, 6:11-14, 7:3 and 20:23f.

³²⁸L. Stefaniak ("Messianische oder eschatologische Erwartungen in der Qumransekte?" *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze*, J. Schmid Festschrift, Regensburg: Verlag F. Pustet, 1963, 294-95) attempts a precise definition but he limits eschatology specifically to

the end, namely the end of history; however, he rightly describes the Messiah as the figure who will appear and function at the "Endzeit," that is, "das endzeitlich Gottesreich."

³²⁹This is not to exclude outright that these figures possibly stand for collective ideas, such as proposed by Gärtner for the shoot, and by Brownlee (*Meaning*, 89) for the booth, which he sees as the renewed and purified temple and cult.

³³⁰It may possibly be restored in 4QpIsa^a frgs. 8-10:17 where the interpretation of Isa 11:5 concerns the rule of the "shoot" in the latter days.

³³¹"Israel" is applied variously at Qumran to the whole people or to the land or to both - but never to the community alone.

³³²Not the case for the noun; 1QH 5:12, CD 20:20 and the change in 1QIsa^a 42:18-19 require a future if not an eschatological understanding. W. H. Brownlee ("Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament," *NTS* 3 1956-57, 19) offers a messianic interpretation of these passages. The possible restoration of (הַיְשׁוּעָה) at 1QH 11:18 is one among a list of the attributes of God. J. A. Fitzmyer ("The Aramaic 'Elect of God' Text from Qumran Cave IV," *CBQ* 27 1965, 349-50) cites a useful bibliography on Qumran Messianism up to 1965.

³³³E.g. in 1QIsa^a 42 the alteration of the suffixes in Isa 51:4-5 creates an overall sense in which salvation becomes an alternative designation for the expected ruler (king-messiah); cf. 1QH 5:11-12. Also compare "salvation" as a messianic title in Lk 2:30, *T. Naph.* 8:2, *T. Gad* 8:1, *T. Dan* 5:10, *T. Jos.* 19:11, *Jub.* 31:19; this last clearly identifies salvation as an aspect

of the work of the kingly messiah rather than of the eschatological high priest. On all this see W. H. Brownlee, "Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament," *NTS* 3 (1956-57), 195-98.

³³⁴"Iz Kumranskoi Antologii," 146. A. S. van der Woude (*Die Messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran*, Assen: van Gorcum, 1957, 174) speaks out strongly against this idea, which he sees as alien to Qumran. Yet, since his work scholars have persisted in pursuing the concept of a resurrected teacher of righteousness, e.g. A. S. Kapelrud ("Die aktuellen und die eschatologischen Böhorden der Qumrangemeinde," *Qumran-Probleme*, ed. H. Bardtke, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 260-61), and in the same volume, K. Weiss ("Messianismus in Qumran und im Neuen Testament," 354-55) actually identifies the Interpreter of the Law of 4QFlor with the resurrected Teacher.

³³⁵"Le Retour du Docteur de Justice à la fin des Jours?" *RQ* 1 (1958-59), 246-48.

³³⁶*Das Umdeutung des Kultus*, 139.

³³⁷"Stehen und fallen im Qumranischen und Neutestamentlichen Schriften," *Qumran-Probleme*, ed. H. Bardtke, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1963, 160.

³³⁸The general appellative דורש בחורה is used at 1QS 6:6; 1QS 8:12 also speaks of an Interpreter who is not to conceal anything from the members of the Council of the community. It is just possible that the title is also used in 4QFlor Fragment 23] דורש [.

³³⁹P. R. Davies ("The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document," *JJS* 33 1982, 301) proposes that the Interpreter of the Law in CD 6:7-10 is a figure from the past and must be

distinguished from the future Teacher of Righteousness.

³⁴⁰The starting point of D. Flusser ("Two Notes," 104) is questionable. He opens by saying that "our problem is to explain why the anointed priest of the last days should be called the 'Interpreter of the Law'." Rather, it is a question of how the Interpreter of the Law is the anointed priest.

³⁴¹"Les Quatre Étapes du Messianisme à Qumrân," *RB* 70 (1963), 481-505.

³⁴²Thus, W. H. Brownlee ("Messianic Motifs," 199); among others M. Black ("Messianic Doctrine in the Qumran Scrolls," *Studia Patristica I*, Part 1, eds. K. Aland and F. L. Cross, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957, 441) begins with the caveat that material from different periods may contain different beliefs, but then tries to show how Qumran consistently only expected one Messiah, the Davidic prince.

³⁴³"The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs in Sectarian Literature in the Time of the Second Commonwealth," *HTR* 52 (1959), 149-85. Thus, for him, נשן in CD 12:22, 14:19 and 19:11 "is merely a scribal error or an emendation of ינשן " (152), and concerning 4QTest and 4QFlor he clearly sees two messianic figures.

³⁴⁴Ia Maccabean, from 152 B.C., QS (in earlier 4Q copies), 1QH.
 Ib¹ Hasmonean, from 103 B.C., 1QSa, 1QSB, 4QTest, 4QAHA, 1QS.
 Ib² Pompeian, 64-32 B.C. CD, 4QarP, 4QD^b.
 II Herodian, 10 B.C.-A.D. 68, 1QM, 4QFlor, 1QpHab, 4QPB,
 4QPs^a.

³⁴⁵"J. Starcky's Theory of Qumran Messianic Development," *CBQ* 28 (1966), 51-57.

³⁴⁶"The Aramaic 'Elect of God' Text," *CBQ* 27 (1965), 355-56.

³⁴⁷J. Massingberd Ford's statement ("Can we exclude Samaritan Influence from Qumran?" *RQ* 6 1967-69, 120) is incomprehensible: "the same is true (as in 4QPB) of the Florilegium, where the prophecy of Nathan to David is applied first to the community and secondly the branch of David is applied to the Teacher of Righteousness."

³⁴⁸There is no need to rehearse the views of the multitude of scholars who have written on this subject. Most of the scholars cited in Fitzmyer's bibliography (*The Dead Sea Scrolls, Major Publications and Tools for Study, Sources for Biblical Study* 8; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975, 114-118) have proposed that the Interpreter of the Law in 4QFlor is the priestly messiah of Aaron; most recently A. Caquot has made this association with explicit reference to 4QFlor ("Le messianisme qumrânien," *Qumrân: sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, *BETL* 46, 1978, 243-44). To Fitzmyer's list might also be added J. J. Smith ("A Study of the alleged 'Two Messiah' Expectation of the DSS against the background of Developing Eschatology," *Dissertation Abstracts International* 31A 1970, 3027) who suggests that the Interpreter of the Law is the risen Teacher of Righteousness following, amongst others, Dupont-Sommer (*The Essene Writings from Qumran*, 313, n.2) and J. Starcky ("Les Quatre Étapes du Messianisme à Qumrân," 481-505).

³⁴⁹D. Flusser ("Two Notes," 108-9) concludes from this that the Interpreter of the Law would not become the Messiah of Aaron until the Davidic Messiah came; the Interpreter is thus

a potential Messiah, a Messiah-to-be.

³⁵⁰In this regard M. Hengel (*Judentum und Hellenismus*, 404) argues convincingly that the primary function of the משכילים of Dan 11:33, 35, 12:10 is to teach the law: cf. 4QFlor 2:4a.

³⁵¹On the importance of the Urim and Tummim in post biblical Judaism as *high-priestly* symbols of the חורה, see E. L. Ehrlich, *Die Kultsymbolik im Alten Testament und im nachbiblischen Judentum* (Stuttgart: A. Hiersemann, 1959), 21-22.

³⁵²For possible OT sources of the doctrine of two Messiahs at Qumran see J. R. Villalón, "Sources Vétéro-testamentaires de la doctrine qumrânienne des deux Messies," *RQ* 8 (1972-75), 53-63. He particularly stresses Malachi.

³⁵³For the former support can be adduced from such a text as CD 19:10; for the latter 1QS 9:11. Perhaps the former would be better because of the other parallels that 4QFlor has with CD; yet, the word order in 4QFlor Frg. 5 is inverted from the usual אהרון וישראל and so the talk may be rather of both messiahs.

³⁵⁴The eschatology of CD is discussed generally by H. W. Huppenbauer ("Zur Eschatologie der Damaskusschrift," *RQ* 4 1963-64, 567-73). Interestingly he concludes that CD's eschatology is primarily ecclesiological rather than messianic - 4QFlor also appears to show that ordering of priorities.

³⁵⁵"The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations," 305-30.

³⁵⁶Fitzmyer says that 8 fragmentary copies of CD have turned up in Cave 4 ("Qumran and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1," *CBQ* 23 1961, 276, n.16) apart from those of the fifth and sixth caves.

³⁵⁷If P. R. Davies is correct in identifying a certain ambiguity in the attitude of CD to the temple, that it is no longer the seat of the law but that it should be used by those who possess the law ("The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document," 300), then CD may support the interpretations of 4QFlor given here: the community, the מקדש אדם, is the seat of the law and its interpreter.

³⁵⁸S. Aalen discusses the 2 Samuel 7 passages in the gospels ("'Reign' and 'House' in the Kingdom of God in the Gospels," *NTS* 8 1961-62, 215-40); cf. esp. Acts 4:25-28.

³⁵⁹"Acts 13 33-37: A *Pesher* on II Samuel 7," *JBL* 87 (1968), 321-24.

³⁶⁰E. Lövestam (*Son and Saviour*, Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1961, 39) saw the allusion to the Nathan oracle in Acts 13:33 but failed to describe the extent of its influence as Goldsmith has now done.

³⁶¹E.g., both Isa 55:3 and Ps 16:10 use the word ὄστος and these verses are thus analogically combined.

³⁶²*A Comparative Study*, 24-26.

³⁶³"The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations," 300.

³⁶⁴*Meaning*, 88-89.

³⁶⁵"Qumran and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1," *CBQ* 23 (1961), 271-80; reprinted in his *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London: G. Chapman, 1971), 205-17.

³⁶⁶"2 Kor. 6, 14-7, 1, in Lichte der Qumranschriften und der Zwölf-Patriarchen-Testamente," *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze* (Festschrift J. Schmid; ed. J. Blinzer et al.; Regensburg:

F. Pustet, 1963), 86-99; ET: "2 Cor 6:14-7:1 in the Light of the Qumran Texts and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *Paul and Qumran* (ed. J. Murphy-O'Connor; Chicago: Priory Press, 1968) 48-68.

³⁶⁷*Temple and Community*, 49-56.

³⁶⁸*Das Umdeutung des Kultus*, 175-82.

³⁶⁹The important article by H. D. Betz, "2 Cor 6:14-7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?" *JBL* 92 (1973), 88-108, aligns the theology of this interpolated paragraph with that of the judaizers of Galatia. Betz does not address the question whether or not such ideas or people or both might stem from Qumran or an Essene source, and so his work is not treated here.

The study of M. Thrall, "The Problem of II Cor. vi. 14-vii. 1 in some recent discussion," *NTS* 24 (1977-78), 132-48, is ruefully inadequate in its argument for the Pauline authorship of this Corinthians passage.

³⁷⁰Cf. 1QS 1:9-11, 1QM 13:9, 5-6, CD: 13:12, also the phrase אגורל אל: 1QS 2:2, 1QM 1:5, 15, 13:5, 15:1, 17:7.

³⁷¹And secondarily 1QS 2:11, 17, 4:5, 1QH 4:19, CD 20:9.

³⁷²Cf. 1 Cor 3:16-17, Eph 2:21-22.

³⁷³Fitzmyer also mentions 1QS 5:6, 8:4-6, 8-9, 9:5-7, 11:8.

³⁷⁴1QS 4:5, 5:13-14, 9:8-9, CD 6:17. Also see the many regulations for ritual purity: e.g., 1QS 4:10, CD 7:3, 9:21, etc.

³⁷⁵"Qumran and 2 Cor 6:14-7:1," 278.

³⁷⁶"Qumran and 2 Cor 6:14-7:1," 279.

³⁷⁷Bibliographical information in n.2, above.

³⁷⁸Qumran literature, to be sure; but also *T. 12 Patr.*,
Sib. Or. and *Jub.*

³⁷⁹*The Temple and the Community*, 50; even though $\nu\acute{\alpha}\omicron\varsigma$ in
the LXX normally translates היכל and not מקדש .

³⁸⁰*The Temple and the Community*, 54.

³⁸¹*Das Umdeutung des Kultus*, 175-78.

³⁸²*Das Umdeutung des Kultus*, 178.

³⁸³*Das Umdeutung des Kultus*, 179-82.

Chapter III

QUMRAN EXEGETICAL METHOD

The purpose of this chapter is to provide examples of midrashic techniques at work in the interpretation of scripture in a wide variety of Qumran literature. All these examples give support to the proposals presented in the previous chapter concerning the use of midrashic techniques in 4QFlor. Some passages from 11QtgJob are considered in order to show that even in translating or re-presenting the scriptural text the interpreter is at work; so he is in the amended citation of 2 Sam 7:11b-14a in 4QFlor 1:10-11. Several examples of these techniques are cited from 1QpHab so that their use can be seen in a text of similar genre to 4QFlor. 1QM 10:1-8 provides an explicit example of *gēsērā šāwâ*, the most obvious method for the juxtaposition of scriptural texts in 4QFlor, and the liturgical midrash in 1QS 2:2-4 demonstrates that the proposals for a liturgical setting for 4QFlor in no way conflict with the use of exegetical devices. Three more texts, CD 7:13b-8:1a, 4QTest and 11QMelch, all share a biblical passage in common with 4QFlor, though those passages are not necessarily treated in the same way as they are in 4QFlor. These three texts also show the compatibility of the use of midrashic techniques with

messianic reflection. Furthermore the association of some of the biblical texts in 11QMelch may well depend on their common use in a liturgical setting.

A. 11 QTgJob¹

In Chapter I several examples of the interpreter at work were cited from the targums. It is appropriate, therefore, to include a few examples from one of the Qumran targums.² To observe the interpreter at work in the act of translating is to support the conclusion that the scriptural text may sometimes be adjusted through the acceptable use of certain exegetical techniques.

Some work on the hermeneutic of the Job targum has already been completed by E. W. Tuinistra,³ but he deals with the interpretation that 11QtgJob contains and implies, rather than being concerned with the exegetical method whereby those interpretations were reached.

Since it is difficult to determine in what text-type the Qumran community possessed the book of Job in Hebrew,⁴ remarks at this time will be limited to a few places where it clearly appears that the targumist depended on a consonantal Hebrew text the same as that represented by MT.

1. אור or אור

The first example concerns the targum's reading of the Hebrew אור. Three times it is translated by נורא, "fire," in the targum (11QtgJob 8:3 [Job 24:13a], 29:2 [Job 37:11] and 36:4 [Job 41:10a]) and F. J. Morrow proposes⁵ a possible fourth reading at 9:6 (Job 25:3) where the change from a masculine verb

(MT: יקום) to a feminine (11QtgJob: תקום) would suggest that once again אור is rendered by נורה, thus making the verb feminine: unfortunately the subject of the verb is lacking. The LXX rendering diverges considerably from the MT at Job 24:13a, but at Job 37:11 it translates אור by φῶς and at 41:10a by φέγγος.⁶ When it is considered that at 11QtgJob 23:7 (Job 33:28) and 29:6 (Job 37:15) אור is rendered as נהור (LXX φῶς both times), then it seems likely too that at 11QtgJob 10:1 (Job 26:10) נהור should be restored just before the initial word of the line⁷ and that the end of 28:7 (Job 36:30) is correctly read as נה]ורה. All this points to the possibility that the targumist, or the tradition that he represents (on occasion possibly similar to that of the LXX), deliberately chose to read אור either as אור or as אור, over against the consistent understanding of אור of the MT text-type. These choices not always to read ('*al tiqrē'*) אור as "light" are the result of the application of the targumist's exegetical concern to make the text of Job as understandable as possible for his audience.⁸

2. 11QtgJob 37:8

At 11QtgJob 37:8 (Job 42:6) the targumist has not taken נחמתי of his Hebrew text as a *niph²al* from the root נחם as MT ("I will repent in dust and ashes") but rather as a *niph²al* from the root חמם, "to be heated,"⁹ with the result that he had to supply a verb for "dust and ashes" at the end of line 8. Thus 11QtgJob reads for the whole verse, "Therefore, I am poured out and boiled up, and I will become dust and ash."¹⁰ This is a further example of '*al tiqrē'*.

3. 11QtgJob 21:4-5

A. D. York discusses the targumist's treatment of וַיִּבְרַח (Job 32:13) at 21:4-5.¹¹ Although the meaning of the Hebrew is very uncertain, York reckons that the context of the targum's interpretation requires that God is no longer considered as the verb's subject (which, if that is the case, then has a 1st or 3rd pers. suffix) as has been the traditional understanding of the MT (e.g., Vulgate), but rather it is the friends of Job who "condemn" God by their silence. That silence acknowledges Job as righteous in *their* eyes (Job 32:1): the LXX ($\epsilon\lambda\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$), the Peshitta (בְּעֵינֵיהוֹן), Symmachus ($\epsilon\lambda\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$) and at least one Hebrew manuscript (Kennicott 248) all support this reading of Job 32:1, unfortunately not preserved in 11QtgJob, and the LXX also presupposes two plural verbs for Job 32:13: $\epsilon\upsilon\theta\omicron\rho\mu\epsilon\nu$ $\sigma\omicron\sigma\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ $\pi\rho\sigma\theta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\omega$.¹² Thus the targumist represents a tradition in which the Hebrew verb is understood as a 1st person plural perfect; he did not read ('*al tigrē*') a 3rd person singular verb with a suffix which would have been presented to him as an option if the Hebrew *Vorlage* was pronounced as MT is currently pointed.¹³

4. 11QtgJob 29:1

W. H. Brownlee has proposed that the plural pronominal suffixes at Job 37:11ff. were understood by the targumist as referring to "personal agents who listen to God's voice and go forth to their assigned tasks."¹⁴ These are not the clouds and water of Job 37:10-11 but angels, the targumist taking אֱלֹהִים of MT Job 37:10a in this sense. Unfortunately the first half of verse 10 is not preserved in the targum, but although the targumist consistently translates אֱלֹהִים by אלהא everywhere in his

targum, it could be that at this one place, possibly influenced by his understanding of בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים at Job 38:7 as the מַלְאֲכֵי אֱלֹהִים and by the general use of אֱל for angel(s) at Qumran,¹⁵ the targumist interpreted the whole passage deliberately to reflect, "the cosmic role of angels."

B. 1QpHab

Much scholarly work has been done to illuminate the biblical exegesis that is present in 1QpHab. W. H. Brownlee's initial work on the commentary's exegesis¹⁶ has been supplemented, adjusted and criticized by various scholars,¹⁷ not least by Brownlee himself.¹⁸ Doubtless there is still much work to be done.¹⁹

It is necessary, firstly, to distinguish clearly between hermeneutical principles or presuppositions and exegetical techniques. Brownlee initially confused the two by defining his first hermeneutical principle as "Everything the ancient prophet wrote has a *veiled eschatological meaning*;"²⁰ the rest of the principles he outlines more or less closely approximate exegetical techniques that the commentator may have used. He has, however, provided enough material to show that his first principle never really describes more than the content or, at most, the underlying assumption of the interpretation and cannot explain how that particular content was attained.²¹ For example, the Kittim are not seen to be the subject of Hab 1:8-9 (1QpHab 3:7-13) through the understanding that there is a "veiled eschatological meaning," as Brownlee proposes; rather "veiled" and "eschatological" describe the content of the prophecy in relation to an already and otherwise obtained interpretation -

obtained most probably through the application of Num 24:24, Dan 11:30 and Isa 23:12b-13 in traditional exegesis.²²

Of Brownlee's twelve remaining principles nearly all fit into the standard pattern of rabbinic exegesis, more or less contemporary, in approximately the following way. Principle number two, that the meaning is to be "ascertained through a *forced, or abnormal construction of the biblical text*,"²³ is really an overarching category under which can be grouped several of the other principles; it is unfortunate that the words "forced" and "abnormal" were used, for the exegesis was surely an attempt through normative and accepted techniques to understand the meaning of the text and many of the basic teachings of Habakkuk come through in the Qumran pesher.²⁴ That exegesis may appear "difficult" to obtain, in fact it was only done by experts, but it should not be considered "forced." All the examples Brownlee gives of the use of this second principle can in fact be described otherwise.²⁵

The principles, numbers three, the use of "*textual or orthographic peculiarities*" in the study of a text, four, the use of "*a textual variant*," and ten, the use of "*the substitution of similar letters for one or more of the letters in the word of the Biblical text*" which is being interpreted are all variations of the rabbinic technique of 'al tiqrē'.²⁶

Of the two examples which Brownlee gives for his fifth principle, interpretation through the application of "*analogous circumstance*," the first, the identification of the כשרים (Hab 1:6, 1QpHab 2:11-15), more properly is an interpretation derived from the eschatological use of Num 24:24 and Dan 11:30 in relation to an understanding of Isa 23:12b-13 which could be

read so as to imply the identification of כשדים and כחיים.²⁷ The second example, in the interpretation of Hab 2:5-6 (1QpHab 8:3-13), is better explained through the application of the technique of *'asmaktâ* as tentatively but precisely laid out by E. Slomovic.²⁸ Thus the fifth principle, like the second, is more a description of the final interpretation than it is of the method of exegesis whereby that interpretation was reached.

Similar remarks can be made about the sixth principle, that of "*allegorical propriety*." The two examples classified under this principle require further explanation to elucidate how the "allegorical" interpretation was obtained. Firstly Brownlee notes how the understanding of מגמת פניהם (Hab 1:9; 1QpHab 3:6-14: "The mutterings of their face are . . .") as "the heat of his nostril" and "the snorting of his nostrils" in the interpretation is most likely dependent upon taking מגמת as from the Aramaic root גמת, and that the association of heat with anger and of the wind with speech both depend upon common themes in the OT.²⁹ The identification of מגמת פנו with קרים is already made in the text of Habakkuk through the reading of Hab 1:9 in the form of קרים מגמת פנו הם קרים over against MT's מגמת פניהם קרים;³⁰ this was either traditional or a deliberate use of *nd̄ḡārīqḏn*, division of words, by the author of 1QpHab.

Secondly, in relation to Hab 1:16 (1QpHab 6:2-5) Brownlee understands the equation of חרם, "net," and ארזות, "standard," as depending solely upon allegorical propriety, whereas for the equation of מכמרתו, "his seine," and the phrase "weapons of war are the object of their religious reverence" he gives an elaborate clarification of the application of certain interpretative techniques. A. Finkel has however pointed to the means of

equation in the first pair: חרם is to be considered in both its meanings of "banned, sacred object" and "net."³¹ It may also be possible to understand Finkel's identification of the paronomasia in greater detail by allowing that any word with the root letters חרם could provide the basis for the identification of חרם and אורח: at Josh 2:10 occurs the phrase החרמתם אותם normally and properly understood as, "you utterly destroyed them," but perhaps the commentator took אורח as "their standard" and conceived the destruction otherwise.³² Thus in both cases the "allegorical propriety" is most likely to be dependent on the use of some exegetical technique.

Principles seven and eight, the attachment of "more than one meaning" to a word in the prophet's vision and the use of "synonyms" are to be derived from the employment of the technique of paronomasia.³³ For examples Brownlee shows that אף means both "anger" and "face, nostrils" in the exposition of Hab 1:9 (1QpHab 3:6-14), that משל in Hab 2:6 "proverb" is taken as משל, "to rule" (1QpHab 8:9)³⁴ and that בלע is used to interpret Hab 2:15 in both its senses of "to swallow" and therefrom "to destroy" (1QpHab 11:2-8).³⁵

Brownlee's principle number nine, "rearrangement of the letters in a word," is the rabbinic exegetical technique of *hillûf*.³⁶ its clearest use is in the interpretation of היכל (Hab 2:20) by means of יכלה (1QpHab 12:15;13:4). Because the interpretation of destruction can be seen as parallel to that of the Targum of Jonathan which takes חן as signifying just that, Brownlee has since denied the use of this anagram technique at this point.³⁷ However, the particular choice of words that the commentator makes in 1QpHab would still seem to depend on a

deliberate anagram, whether or not that entails the destruction of the temple as part of the thought of the commentary.³⁸

Principles eleven and twelve, interpretation through "*the division of one word into two or more parts*" and "*interpretation of words, or parts of words, as abbreviations*,"³⁹ are two forms of *nôṭārîqôn*, used actually within the text of Habakkuk itself (Hab 1:9: *פנייהם--פניו הם*)⁴⁰ by the commentator (1QpHab 3:8-14) and in the interpretation too. Among examples Brownlee cites the interpretation of *כולו* (Hab 1:9; 1QpHab 3:7-13) as "to devour all the peoples as a vulture, but without being satisfied;"⁴¹ the exegesis of *עבט* (Hab 2:6; 1QpHab 8:3-13) so that it is divided in the sense of "thickness of mud" and so understood as "the guilt of transgression" and as "all impurity of defilement;"⁴² the understanding of *עור לה* (1QpHab 11:13) as two words, the second being an abbreviation for *לב תועבה* (Cf. 1QpHab 8:13);⁴³ and the interpretation of *בהיכל* (Hab 2:20; 1QpHab 13:2-4) as an abbreviation of the phrase *ביום המשפט יכלה*.⁴⁴

The thirteenth and final principle, that "*other passages of scripture may illumine the meaning of the prophet*," applies to almost all the other techniques and descriptions mentioned. Brownlee himself admits of the elusive nature of the principle though he is correct in ascertaining that other scriptural passages do indeed form the basis for certain interpretations.⁴⁵

In sum, Brownlee presents 13 principles from which can be distilled certain techniques of exegesis that are clearly midrashic; given their rabbinic names, Brownlee gives examples from 1QpHab of the use of '*al tiqrē*', *ḥillūf*, *nôṭārîqôn*, paronomasia and there is possibly an implied use of *gēsērâ šāvâ* where there may be two or more biblical texts, linked by a common word

or phrase, behind an exegetical tradition that is represented in the commentary. Even allowing for adjustments by other scholars and by Brownlee himself, the use of all these techniques would still seem to be evident in 1QpHab.

Further evidence for the use of the technique *'al tiqrè'* in 1QpHab has been gathered by A. Finkel.⁴⁶ He cites seven examples in which he considers that there is more to a proper understanding of the text than the recognition of the existence of a textual variant.

1) 1QpHab 3:1: במישור יכלו לכות, "in the plain they came to smite," suggests the dual reading of Hab 1:6, למרחבי, "in the plain," and להחריב, "to smite, to destroy."⁴⁷

2) 1QpHab 4:9 reads וישם, "he will make waste," instead of the MT's ויאשם (Hab 1:11) but the interpretation understands both: ביה אשם[ת], "house of guilt," and לשחית, "to lay waste" (1QpHab 4:11, 13).⁴⁸

3) 1QpHab 6:8 reads חרכו instead of the MT's חרמו and thereby the dual meaning of חרם introduced in 1QpHab 6:2-5 is reinforced.

4) 1QpHab 7:14 reads עופלה, "is puffed up," as in the MT (Hab 2:4), yet the interpretation contains יכפלו, "they will double" (1QpHab 7:15) - an auditory pun.⁴⁹

5) 1QpHab 9:14 reads קצוות, "the ends of" (or, better, "confines"), but the judgment of 1QpHab 10:2-5 suggests rather an understanding or play on the verb קצה, "to cut off, finish."⁵⁰

6) 1QpHab 11:3 reads מועריהם over against the MT's מעוריהם, yet, claims Finkel, the interpreter betrays an understanding of the MT in his phrase "his house of exile" (1QpHab 11:6).⁵¹

7) 1QpHab 11:9 reads הרעל, "stagger," instead of the MT's

הערל, "be uncircumcised" (Hab 2:15), but the interpreter takes account of both since alongside the staggering there is mention of the uncircumcised heart of the (wicked) priest.⁵²

Another technique the use of which has been pointed out by E. Slomovic⁵³ is that of *'asmaktâ*, the support of an interpretation through the use of other biblical texts in which occur either the words of the text interpreted or those of the interpretation or both. Slomovic gives as his example the interpretation of Hab 2:5a-b (1Q₁Hab 8:3-13). The biblical text reads: ואף כיא הון יבגוד גבר יהיר ולוא ינוה אשר הרחיב כשאול נפשו והוא ישבוע כמות לוא ישבע "Moreover the arrogant man siezes wealth without halting. He widens his gullet like Hell and like Death he has never enough."⁵⁴ The *pesher* for this section of Habakkuk reads: פשרו על הכוהן הרשע אשר נקרא על שם האמת בתחילה עומרו וכאשר משל "Interpreted, this concerns the Wicked Priest who was called by the name of truth when he first arose. But when he ruled over Israel his heart became proud, and he forsook God and betrayed the precepts for the sake of riches."⁵⁵

Slomovic comments: "The general idea of the *pesher* is apparent. The Wicked Priest, after a period of enjoying a reputation for truth, grew arrogant and betrayed God and his precepts for the sake of wealth. The commentator derives this from the introductory phrase כי היין utilizing the *al tikrei* rule to change the masoretic היין to הון."⁵⁶ Slomovic then continues by outlining how each phrase of the biblical quotation finds its parallel in the history and activities of the Wicked Priest. In this way כי הון is interpreted by ה:כוהן הרשע through *hillûf*, anagram, כוה(י)ן of Hab 2:5

becomes in interpretation אשר נקרא על שם האמת בתחילה עומדו through the support of Isa 48:8: כי ידעתי בגיד תבגוד ופשע מבטו קרא לך "For I knew that you would deal very treacherously, and that from birth you were called a rebel" (RSV).

Furthermore Slomovic proposes that the use of גבר in Hab 2:5, as interpreted to signify that the Wicked Priest ruled in Israel, כאשר משל בישראל, is supported by 1 Chr 5:2:⁵⁷ כי יהודה גבר באחיו ולנגיד ממנו, "though Judah became strong among his brothers and a prince was from him" (RSV). Then, after יהיר has been paraphrased by רם לבו, the phrase ולו ינוה is interpreted by ויעזב את אל which Slomovic sees as supported by Exod 15:2:⁵⁸ זה אלי ואנוהו, "This is my God and I will praise him" (RSV). Next, אשר הרחיב כשאול נפשו is interpreted as ויבגר לכן הרחיבה שאול נפשה ופערה: Isa 5:14: פיה לבלי חק, "Therefore Sheol has enlarged its appetite and opened its mouth beyond measure" (RSV). Lastly the exegesis of והוא כמוה ולא ישבע as בעבור הון is supported by Prov 30:15-16: שלוש הנה לא תשבענה ארבע לא אמרו הון שאול satisfied, four never say, 'Enough': Sheol . . ." (RSV).

Slomovic concludes his study with a note of caution that since "the Exegete of the Scrolls does not specify the method he employs, any discussion of that method must of necessity contain an element of speculation."⁵⁹ Yet the overall presentation of material by Slomovic would seem to provide sufficient evidence in support of an understanding of 1QpHab 8:3-13 such as he outlines.

The value of Slomovic's caveat cannot be overestimated in a study such as this for without indication of the method that he uses the interpreter links commentary in many and various ways. Most of what has been said thus far would imply that the use of

certain exegetical techniques has been discerned in 1QpHab with a corresponding increase in likelihood as to the precise meaning of the interpretation. Yet, in actuality, that there is a particular technique of exegesis being used in any one place is almost the only thing that is reasonably certain.

The uncertainty of the complete content of the interpretation can be seen well from the following example. Much of the text of Hab 2:2 is missing in the lacuna of 1QpHab 6:15-17 but it is partly requoted in the interpretation in column seven, thus:⁶⁰

וידבר אל *אל* חבוקק לכתוב את הנאות על על הדור האחרון ואת גמר
 הקץ לוא הודעו ואשר אמר למען *ירוץ* הקורא בו פשרו על מורה הצדק
 "Then God told אשר הודיעו אל את כול רזי דברי עבדיו הנבאים
 Habakkuk to write the things that are coming upon upon (*sic*)
 the last generation; but the fulness of that time He did not
 make known to him. And as for that which He said, 'for the sake
 of him who reads it' (or, 'that he who reads it may run [may
 divulge]'), its interpretation concerns the Righteous Teacher
 to whom God has made known all the mysteries of the words of
 His servants the prophets."⁶¹

In his extensive commentary Elliger made no attempt to correlate the biblical text and the interpretation, but since then several connections have been identified between the two. L. H. Silberman⁶² asks if there is any possibility that ירוץ be understood in such a fashion as to point to the ability of the Teacher of Righteousness to discern the meaning of the text. He offers three suggestions: firstly, *b. Sanh.* 34a on Jer 23:29 reads, "'And like a hammer that breaketh (פצץ) the rock in pieces,' id est, just as the rock is split into many splinters, so also may one Biblical verse convey many teachings." Just as

in this passage פָּצַח is taken to mean "interpret a text," so יָרוּץ, if taken from the root רָצַח, "crush," could mean "interpret." Secondly, there may be a play on the Aramaic root תָּרַח, "make level," used in *b. Yebam.* 11b-12a of interpretation: "Did you not, however, have recourse (וּלְתַרוּצִי) to an interpretation (מִתְרַצָּח)? You might as well interpret (תְּרַיֵץ) . . ." Lastly, Silberman notes the medieval Hebrew תְּרוּץ, "an answer to a difficult question."

Brownlee adds to these suggestions of his own:⁶³ he compares the root רָצַח, which in the *hiph²il* may mean "to arrange subjects for debate, to discourse:" to make יָרוּץ an understandable pun on רָצַח the commentator would have had to have read יָרַיֵץ, possible through the ambiguity of *šāw* and *yōd* in the scroll. To that reading might have been added a pun on יָלַיֵץ, "he may interpret."⁶⁴ Furthermore a verbal play on the letters רָץ might also yield the suggestion for רָץ, for the Teacher's interpretations divulge the mysteries (רָזִי) unknown to Habakkuk.⁶⁵ Which one or more of all these possibilities approximates something that was in the mind of the interpreter at Qumran? The answer is most likely beyond our present understanding of the text, but surely there was some association of commentary with lemma akin to the proposals outlined above.

C. 1QM 10:1-8

J. Carmignac was the first to describe the allusions to and citations of scripture in 1QM.⁶⁶ He noted that there were five explicit quotations of the Bible; three of these occur close together in column 10 of the scroll and are worthy of study in relation to one another. All three quotations occur within the

discourse of the High Priest to be used before the eschatological battle.

1) 1QM 10:1-2 (Deut 7:21): "And as (Moses) declared to us that 'You are in our midst (בקרבונו) a great and terrible God, causing all our enemies (אויבינו) to flee before us'."

Only the first part of the quotation is represented in MT's Deut 7:21: כִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ בְּקִרְבְּךָ אֵל גָּדוֹל וְנֹרָא with the persons variously changed.⁶⁷ The latter half of the quotation has been otherwise described as an adaptation of Deut 7:22 (וּנְשַׁל),⁶⁸ Deut 23:15 (לְתַח אִיבֶיךָ לִפְנֵי),⁶⁹ or Deut 6:19 (לְהִדָּף אֶת כָּל אִיבֶיךָ) (מִפְּנֵיךָ).⁷⁰ The quotation could be an indirect summary of these several passages.⁷¹

2) 1QM 10:2-5 (Deut 20:2-5): "And he taught our generations from of old saying, 'When you draw near to battle (בְּקִרְבְּכֶם לְמַלְחָמָה), the priest shall stand and speak to the people saying, "Hear, O Israel, you are drawing near to battle today (קִרְבֵּיט הַיּוֹם) against your enemies (לְמַלְחָמָה) (אויביכם). Do not fear, do not let your heart waver, do not be terrified and do not be horror-struck before them, for your God walks with you to fight (לְהִלָּחֵם) for you against your enemies (אויביכם) to save you." And our officers shall speak to all those prepared for the battle'."⁷²

The citation of Deut 20:2-5 in 1QM 10:2-5 is very close to the text of the MT; there are a few minor differences of word order and vocabulary. In relation to Deut 7:21 it can be seen that קרב occurs in both: בקרבנו in Deut 7:21 (1QM 10:1), בקרבכם and קרבים in Deut 20:2, 3 (1QM 10:2, 3). Furthermore, the use of אויב in Deut 20:3, 4 (1QM 10:3, 4) may provide a link with the phrase in which that word occurs in 1QM 10:1 and which is attached to Deut 7:21 in the form of being part of the quotation.

3) 1QM 10:6-8 (Num 10:9): "And that which you spoke through Moses, 'When war (מלחמה) comes⁷³ in your land against the oppressor who oppresses you, you shall blow on the trumpets and you shall be remembered before your God and saved from your enemies (מאויביכם)'."

This quotation, different only in orthography from the MT, provides the interpretation of Deut 20:5 by describing what the captains of the eschatological army are to say. But the link between the two quotations is more than one of general content alone; rather, it is through the occurrence of the word מלחמה in Num 10:9 that this quotation is most suitably attached to that of Deut 20:2-5. The analogy of vocabulary enables the use of the particular text of Numbers.

From this it can be seen that the phrases בקרבכם למלחמה (Deut 20:2; 1QM 10:2) and קרבים היום למלחמה (Deut 20:3; 1QM 10:3) are the means whereby the citation of Deut 20:2-5 is attached to and used as an interpretation of Deut 7:21: the priest exhorts the army not to fear because of the presence of God with them. Also those phrases enable the development and interpretation of Deut 20:5 by means of Num 10:9, relating what the captains say.

The dependence on one another of the three biblical quotations of 1QM 10:1-8 and the method through which they are linked by their analogous terminology is an example of the use of the exegetical technique of *gəzērā šāwā*.⁷⁴ Thus both Deut 20:2-5 and Num 10:9 are interdependent interpretations of the first text, Deut 7:21, since, although Num 10:9 is closely linked to Deut 20:2-5 in the scroll, it can be connected with Deut 7:21 (in its version quoted in 1QM 10:1) by their common terminology, אויבינו (1QM 10:1) and מאויביכם (1QM 10:8). With

this understanding Deut 20:2-5 interprets Deut 7:21 concerning the lack of fear that the presence of God brings with it,⁷⁵ while Num 10:9 develops the second half of the quotation in 1QM 10:1-2 through the declaration that at the trumpet blow God will save the covenanters from their *enemies*.⁷⁶

D. 1QS 2.2-4⁷⁷

The expanded Aaronic benediction of Num 6:24-26 in 1QS has received considerable treatment from scholars, largely because of its position within the Manual of Discipline where it functions in a traditional manner as part of an overall section concerned with the community's covenant ceremony,⁷⁸ be it either the annual renewal of the covenant or the ceremony at which new members were initiated into the covenant or both.⁷⁹ With all the scholarly discussion of the passage, however, there has been no ascertainable elucidation of the use of the Bible as the means whereby the benediction receives its expansion.⁸⁰

To answer how the text of Numbers was enlarged requires a detailed analysis of the three lines under consideration.

They read:

יברככה בכול טוב וישמורכה מכול רע

ויאר לבכה בשכל חיים ויחונכה בדעה עולמים

וישא פני חסדיו לכה לשלום עולמים

"May He bless you with all good and keep you from all evil. May He enlighten your heart with life-giving wisdom and grant you eternal knowledge. May He raise his merciful face towards you for everlasting peace."⁸¹

Far from being simply an *ad hoc* treatment of the biblical benediction, each phrase has received interpretative additions

in the following way.

1) To *יברכו* of Num 6:24 is added the phrase *בכול טוב*. Surprisingly, *כל טוב* and its corollaries is very infrequent in the Hebrew Bible,⁸² and only once does it occur with the preposition *ב*, at Deut 26:11: *בכל הטוב*. Although the article on *טוב* is not represented in 1QS 2:2, neither is it represented in the use of the prepositional phrase in Ps 34:11 and could, therefore, be a minor textual variant in the book of Deuteronomy present at Qumran.⁸³ It seems highly probable that the person who expanded this whole phrase was citing Deut 26:11 in the version he knew. O. Betz prefers to see an allusion to Deut 30:15 at this point, and throughout 1QS 2:2-3, because of the occurrence of *החיים*, *הטוב* and *הרע* in that verse and in 1QS; yet the more direct citation of Deut 26:11 and the accountability of the other expansions through other biblical texts would seem to lessen the suitability of Deut 30:15 at this point.⁸⁴

2) Many scholars have pointed out that the second phrase of the expanded benediction is comparable to Ps 121:7.⁸⁵ In fact, with the expected orthographic variants it is a direct citation of that psalm as represented in the MT tradition.⁸⁶ Together with *יאר* of the following stich there is a play on words: while the Lord keeps (*שמר*) and enlightens (*אור*) the covenanter, he attends to (*שמר*) the destruction of and curses (*ארר*) those who follow Belial (1QS 2:6-7).⁸⁷

3) Num 6:25a reads, *יאר יהוה פניו אליך*; the phrase *לנכה חיים* has therefore been added and substituted in 1QS 2:3, at least for the text tradition of MT and LXX. The only passage in the Hebrew Bible where *שכל* and *חיים* occur together is Prov 16:22a⁸⁸ which phrase reads in MT: *מקור חיים שכל בעליו*.

Literally translated this becomes, "The good sense of those who possess it is a fountain of life."⁸⁹ Yet the phrase in the LXX, ἡ γὰρ ἡσυχία ἐννοία τοῖς ἀεταρημένοις, may suppose a Hebrew *Vorlage* of מקור חיים שכל לבעליו.⁹⁰ Herein lies the key to the expansion of Num 6:25a in 1QS 2:3, for, taken together with Prov 16:21 and 23 in both of which verses לב occurs, it seems probable that the author of the expanded benediction understood Prov 16:21 through the deliberate division of לבעליו, a use of *nōṭārîqōn*, into לב and עליו. He therefore read the verse either as "prudence of mind is a fountain of life upon him (i.e. the man of discernment of Prov 16:21)," or by seeing מקור as מקיר - possible since *wāw* and *yōd* are very alike in contemporary script - the phrase could be understood as "prudence of mind causes life to gush upon it (i.e. the mind)," or, "upon him (i.e. the man of 16:21 again)." With the suffix of the preposition אל translated to לב in 1QS 2:3, all three words of the expansion, לבנה לשכל חיים are derivable from Prov 16:22.⁹¹

4) To ויחנך of Num 6:25b is added בדיעה עולמים.⁹² This phrase does not occur in the Hebrew Bible but the aura of wisdom that the phrase has and which makes it a "complementary correlative"⁹³ to the use of Prov 16:22 in expanding Num 6:25a is the result of a combination of words and ideas that may ultimately derive from Jer 31:31-34.⁹⁴ In Jer 31:33 the law is to be written on the heart (לבנט) and "no longer shall each man teach his neighbour and each his brother, saying, 'Know (ידעו) the Lord,' for they shall all know (ידיעו) me, from the least of them to the greatest, says the Lord" (*RSV*). The correlation of Jer 31:31-34 with Prov 16:22 at this point comes through the occurrence of לב in both passages; the use of Jer 31:31-34 here to link the

phrases of the expanded benediction almost amounts to practice of *gēzērā šāwā*. The eternal aspect of the knowledge⁹⁵ is implied from the context of Jeremiah and may also have been introduced because of the use of עולמים in the expansion of Num 6:26 that follows in 1QS 2:4.

5) Num 6:26 is altered considerably: with the excision of וישט the two clauses of the MT are reduced to one; the subject, יהוה, is also not mentioned specifically.⁹⁶ To what is left are added חסדיו, the preposition ל, and עולמים: put together in the order in which they are used in 1QS 2:4, it is clear that the refrain לעולם ליעולם כי חסדו has been put in the plural in both its parts and split up. This refrain belongs most overtly to Psalms 105, 106, 118 and 136, but it is also echoed extensively elsewhere.⁹⁷ It is, therefore, not surprising that the expansion maintains the unity of this allusion in reducing the number of clauses of Num 6:26 from two to one.⁹⁸

These five alterations of the text produce a benediction that contains three lines with five clauses over against the three sets of parallel clauses in the MT.⁹⁹ Although the deliberate omissions and additions are suggestive of an adjustment of the text so that there would be 18 words in the blessing,¹⁰⁰ O. Lehmann forces the text of 1QS when he claims that the expanded benediction has six stanzas of three stresses each, for it cannot be avoided, unless one exclude a word, that the middle pair of clauses is either 3:2 or 4:3, not 3:3.¹⁰¹

Rather than being an adaptation to certain number symbolism, the use of these five biblical texts as expansions of the benediction of Num 6:24-26 is a clear example of the exegetical technique of *'asmaktā*, the use of biblical citations and allusions

to support a biblical quotation. But why should the Aaronic blessing require support at this point? A complete understanding of the use of *'asmaktâ* can only come from some further remarks on the context of 1QS in which the expanded blessing occurs.

Although scholars soon noticed the liturgical correspondence of 1QS 1:16-2:25a to a covenant ceremony,¹⁰² it was several years before the section received detailed treatment, and the benediction within that section. O. Betz brought to light the way in which the expansions to the blessing emphasized the nature of the blessing over against the curses that are for Belial and his own which follow; Betz also noted the way in which the additions pointed to the eschatological life in which the members of the Qumran community believed themselves to be, in part at least, already participating.¹⁰³ But although he observed "die midraschartige Veränderung der einzelnen Aussagen,"¹⁰⁴ Betz failed to describe the change exactly.

M. Wise¹⁰⁵ has similarly shown the setting of the blessing to be antithetical to the curse that follows. For Num 6:24 he notes the dualistic stress of the expansion as characteristic of Qumran,¹⁰⁶ and he clearly expounds with quotations from Qumran literature the use of *יאר* in 1QS 2:3, whereby it is no longer God who lightens his own face but rather He enlightens the heart (mind) of the blessed.¹⁰⁷ Furthermore Wise expounds *שכל חיים* without mention of Prov 16:22; he prefers to understand the phrase solely on the comparative basis of the Qumran texts from which he derives the notion that *שכל חיים* is the gift of God and his Torah,¹⁰⁸ as is *דעת*, and *דעה* is not only an expression of a wisdom theme but also forms part of the dualistic vocabulary of Qumran.¹⁰⁹ Wise's most important contribution, however, to the

understanding of the Aaronic benediction in its expanded form is his observation that not only is Torah a frequent illuminating agent in Jewish liturgical texts, but that those texts are themselves frequently expansions or adaptations of the Aaronic blessing.¹¹⁰ Wise thus establishes that at least during tannaitic times there was a *liturgical* tradition of the adaptation of Num 6:24-26, and 1QS 2:2-4 most probably belonged in the mainstream of that tradition; such liturgical formulation he considers traceable to texts like Ps 67:2 and Ps 119:29.¹¹¹

K. Baltzer has also outlined the covenant liturgy as it is represented in prose form in 1QS 1:18-2:18¹¹² and he sees it as the only testimony there is for the actual liturgical order of a covenant ceremony that might have taken place in post-exilic times - not that there was a regular covenant ceremony in normative post-exilic Judaism attached to the celebration of a particular festival (either Weeks or Booths)¹¹³ but that such a covenant ceremony was celebrated whenever the need for it was felt. At Qumran the covenant liturgy was to be used every year (1QS 3:19) while the dominion of Belial lasted.

From these remarks and from the identification of the expanding phrases in Num 6:24-26 proposed above the most probable conclusion is that 1QS 2:2-4 is no *ad hoc* interpretative passage, but that the additions themselves are dependent upon the covenant liturgy that may or may not be associated with a major feast day at Qumran. Thus Deut 26:11 is from the "creed" associated with the offering of first fruits¹¹⁴ (Feast of Weeks); it is then followed in Deuteronomy 27 by the command of Moses to those who have "become the people of the Lord your God" that they keep all God's commandments and statutes (Deut 27:9-10). This in turn is

followed by the set of twelve curses (Deut 27:15-26; cf. 1QS 2:5-9) to which all the people say, "Amen" (Deut 27:26; cf. 1QS 2:10).

Similarly Ps 121:7 is a quotation from one of the "songs of ascent,"¹¹⁵ and the Psalm is so classified at 11QPss^a 3:1. These songs were most likely used by those on their way to Jerusalem for one of the major feast days,¹¹⁶ or, as Mowinckel understands it, the psalm was part of the great festal procession of the early harvest festival.¹¹⁷ The use of Prov 16:22, too, not only shows up the antithesis between the foolish and the wise (the cursed and the blessed) but also, as Weise has shown, it reflects the liturgical application of the theological understanding of the Torah with which wisdom through various particular words was associated. Jer 31:31-34 shares such wisdom traits in its use of "knowledge" but it is primarily connected to the ceremony of covenant renewal through its talk of the "new covenant." And lastly the basis of the adaptation of *כי חסדו לעולם* is most likely to be found in either Psalm 105 or 106. Both these Psalms have been variously connected with the covenant ceremony.¹¹⁸

In conclusion, therefore, 1QS 2:2-4 is not simply the elucidation of Num 6:24-26 through cross-references. Rather it shows the midrashic validation of the use of the Aaronic blessing at the covenant ceremony through the support (*'asmaktâ*) given it by its expansion with texts or allusions to biblical texts that could certainly be reminiscent of the covenant ceremony of old if not in actual fact themselves texts used in the liturgy of that ceremony.

E. CD 7.13b-8.1a

It has already been noticed that Amos 9:11 is quoted at both 4QFlor 1:12 and CD 7:16. Its quotation in CD occurs in the so-called "Amos-Numbers Midrash" which is present only in Text A (CD 7:13b-8:1a).¹¹⁹ Much has been written on the literary construction of CD, especially columns 6-8,¹²⁰ but the most plausible theory yet proposed in relation to the literary history surrounding the Amos-Numbers Midrash is that of J. Murphy-O'Connor.¹²¹ His overall suggestions will be considered summarily before a detailed investigation of the Amos-Numbers Midrash itself.

In analyzing CD 6:2-8:3 Murphy-O'Connor concluded that it contained two distinct literary units, 6:2-11a (the Well Midrash) and 6:11b-8:3a.¹²² The second of these he suggested contained a list of precepts (6:11b-7:4a) and a hortatory epilogue (7:4b-8:3) which is designed to motivate obedience to the precepts and itself has two parts: a promise (7:4-6) and a warning (7:9-8:3).¹²³ Having extracted 7:6b-8 and 7:13b-8:1a, Murphy-O'Connor demonstrates that 6:11b-8:3a forms a complete literary unit. His decision to describe 7:13b-8:1a (the Amos-Numbers Midrash) as an interpolation rests primarily upon his comparative analysis of Texts A and B at this point.

In a separate article¹²⁴ Murphy-O'Connor compared Text A (7:9-8:3) with Text B (19:5-14) and, far from ending up in the same state of bewilderment as Carmignac,¹²⁵ he proposes to reconstruct an original text consisting of 7:9-13b followed by 19:7b-14 from which both A and B diverge in explicable ways.¹²⁶ Prior to the identification of such an original text, however, is Murphy-O'Connor's conclusion that 7:13b-8:1a is an interpolation

inserted into an already divergent A text. The interpolation is pointed to by the repetition of the phrase הַנְּסוּגִים הוֹסִיפוּ לַחֲרֹב in 7:13 and 8:1,¹²⁷ neatly bracketing the Amos-Numbers Midrash. Furthermore, the concluding phrase of the interpolation is a redactional summary statement whereby the sense of the passage is brought back in line with what is to follow in 8:1b-3 and later.¹²⁸

Having exercised the Amos-Numbers Midrash in the way described, Murphy-O'Connor outlines his original text of 7:9-13b + 19:7b-14. The Zechariah quotation and its complete explanation (19:7-13a) is lacking in A through haplography, the occurrence of the phrase הַנְּסוּגִים לַחֲרֹב at 7:13b and 19:13a resulting in an accidental omission. The Amos-Numbers Midrash was inserted after the Zechariah material had dropped out to provide for the theme of salvation needed to counterbalance 7:13b.¹²⁹ As for the text of B, that it does not contain the Amos-Numbers Midrash is no longer a problem; the absence of the Isaiah quotation preceding that from Zechariah is to be accounted for through the similarity of their respective introductory formulae.¹³⁰

All this appears as the best proposal to date for explaining the different texts of A and B at this point. Yet one wonders whether or not such a large number of scribal accidents is so very accidental. When it is considered that the very same phrase is both the redactional sign for an interpolation and also the cause of the omission of the Zechariah quotation from Text A, the coincidence seems too great. Furthermore, the reason that Murphy-O'Connor gives for the inclusion of the interpolated Amos-Numbers Midrash is somewhat weak: maintenance of "the theme of salvation."¹³¹

In the quotation of 2 Sam 7:11-14 in 4QFlor we have observed that what appears to be a scribal error is in fact the deliberate use of homoeoteleuton to edit a text; in like manner the original text of CD that Murphy-O'Connor sets up appears to have been deliberately adjusted. At the same time as the Zechariah material was omitted by the original scribe of Text A, the Amos-Numbers Midrash was included.

Moreover, the content provides the reason for the deliberate switch of material. In CD 19:10-11 what we may suppose was the original text talked of the "Messiah of Aaron and Israel."¹³² The later A text, on the other hand, was written by somebody with different messianic expectations. The analysis of the Amos-Numbers Midrash that follows below shows that two eschatological figures were expected and that it is very likely that these two were considered equally as Messiahs.

With the various redactional material isolated and with recognition that even in the redaction itself there has been the deliberate use of an exegetical principle, an analysis of the Amos-Numbers Midrash can be offered from which some further comments will be made. The redactional material is excluded from the unit that is here analyzed.

Qumran Midrash of Amos 5:27 with insertion of 5:26a^{a2-8} CD 7:14b-21a

I. Quotation of Amos 5:27 with insertion 14b-15a

II. Interpretation

A. Concerning טוכת מלככם 15b-21a

1. Statement of identification

טפרי התורה ← טוכת המלך

- 2. 2 appositional statements of explanation
 - a. Comparison
 - 1) Introductory formula
 - 2) Quotation (Amos 9:11a^δ)
 - b. Identification המלך ← הקהל
- B. Concerning כיון צלמיכט
 - 1. Statement of identification
 - כיון הצלמים ← ספרי הנביאים
 - 2. Statement of explanation (relative clause)
- C. Concerning הכוכב
 - 1. Statement of identification
 - הכוכב ← דורש התורה
 - 2. Statement of explanation (relative clause expanded)
 - a. Relative clause proper
 - b. Expansion
 - 1) Introductory formula
 - 2) Quotation with explanation
 - a) Quotation (Num 24:17b^α)
 - b) Explanation
 - (1) Statement of identification
 - השבת ← נשיא כל העדה
 - (2) Further description
 - (a) Protasis: temporal clause
 - (b) Apodosis: quotation (Num 24:17b^χ)

Exegetical principles can be observed at work at the very beginning of the unit in the quotation from Amos 5. The first word is from Amos 5:27; we can therefore suppose that it is that verse which is cited. Through *nōtārīqōn* אתכם is taken as an

inclusive abbreviation of phrases from the previous verse: two are included at this point, **אח כיון עלמיכם** and **אח סכות מלככם**. The phrase concerning the star is not included in the citation since it cannot fully subscribe to the exegetical device and, in any case, is appositional to the second phrase;¹³³ the interpreter wishes to understand it apart from the other two subjects, as the three-part interpretation makes clear.¹³⁴

Also, the MT's **ל מהלאה** is altered to **מהאלי**, a possible use of the technique of *'al tiqrē'* to produce an understanding such as that proposed by C. Rabin: "from My tent to Damascus."¹³⁵ For P. R. Davies this alteration was made to show that the tent of God, that is, the Sanctuary, is the Temple from which the law has been exiled.¹³⁶ In any case these various explanations of the Amos text as cited in CD seem far preferable to some such comment as R. H. Charles' to the effect that CD's differences from the MT were due to the accidents of copyists.¹³⁷

The three parts of the interpretation also give ample testimony to the use of exegetical principles. In the first subsection, concerning **סכות מלככם**, there is initially a statement in which the books of the Law are identified with the Tabernacle of the king; that is, the Tabernacle represents the books of the Law, since the king is later identified with the congregation. The exact basis for this first identification is not known, but because it is solely the **סוכה** which is interpreted as the **תורה**, one might suggest that it was the final letter of **סוכה** that is the clue to the equation.¹³⁸ Support for such a proposal comes from **כיון**, if it should prove to be a similar pointer towards the books of the prophets (**נביאים**).

The first of the two appositional statements of explanation

is a citation of Amos 9:11.¹³⁹ It is linked with the main quotation of Amos 5:27 through *gšzērā šāwā*, סכּוּת being taken as סוכּה. The identification of the king with the assembly (קהל) is difficult to trace to a biblical source;¹⁴⁰ it may simply have been a traditional exegesis derived from the Aramaic (also Akkadian) use of the root מלך to signify "taking council." The קהל (council? 1QSa) is the source of counsel in its correct interpretation of the Law. Rabin has suggested that here we have a midrash that has been abbreviated from "the king is the prince of all the congregation."¹⁴¹ Davies has made the attractive proposal that the קהל is best considered as the worshipping congregation: the Law has been exiled to the community's place of worship from the previous place of worship, the Temple.¹⁴²

In the second part of the three-part identification כּיון צלמיכּ is identified with the books of the prophets. Mention has already been made of a possible abbreviation at this point. The midrash may be based, however, on an anagram, צלמיכּ being read as מליציים, "interpreters" or "intermediaries."¹⁴³ This is attractive from the point of view of the explanation that follows, since לץ normally means "to scorn" or "to despise." The explanation of the books of the prophets is that Israel despised (נזּה) their words.¹⁴⁴ Or again, Dupont-Sommer suggests that as סכּוּת was read as סוכּה, so כּיון can be read as כּיּוּן, "fidélicité;" the books of the prophets are faithful images of the Law.¹⁴⁵

The third part of the interpretation is based on the identification of the star. Just as the pesher on Psalms 1 and 2 in 4QFlor presupposes more than the text of the psalms that is quoted, so here the interpretation can be concerned with elements

close to the quoted scriptural section that are not themselves actually cited. In support of the midrash cited here Num 24:17b^α is quoted through *gēzērā šāwā* (כונב) and from the explanation that follows it is clear that the Numbers passage is understood as referring to two figures.¹⁴⁶

From an understanding of the redactional use of certain principles of exegesis and from the analysis of the Amos-Numbers Midrash above it is possible to suggest that the messianic expectations of the community changed in the course of time,¹⁴⁷ and that such change can be observed in the literary development of a single document. Thus the Amos-Numbers Midrash (two Messiahs) is substituted in a later version (Text A) of the original text of CD for the Zechariah material (one Messiah) that is preserved in another version (Text B). If *ביר משיחו* in the phrases *רוח קדשו* (CD 2:12) and *וגם במשיחו הקודש* (CD 6:1) is taken to refer to the prophets, as is quite possible¹⁴⁸ and as Rabin¹⁴⁹ and others suggest,¹⁵⁰ then the expectation of the editor of Text A¹ may be considered as of two Messiahs, while the copyist of Text B expected only one.¹⁵¹

Although the messianic expectation of CD will never be known exactly, partly because the precise significance of the term *משיח* for the covenanters cannot be known, there may be a road toward the understanding of CD's messianism that lies between the insistence on the one hand that CD talks of only one Messiah¹⁵² and on the other that there is nothing against taking all the references in CD as referring to two Messiahs.¹⁵³ Furthermore, in a more restricted way, the recognition of the use of certain exegetical principles has pointed to a clearer understanding of the method of the composition of the Amos-Numbers Midrash. The

understanding of early Jewish exegesis that has been brought to this text, as to 4QFlor, helps with both redactional and interpretative problems, helps to give reasons why various materials were included and others excluded.

F. 4QTest

4QFlor Fragments 6-11 contain several verses from Deuteronomy 33, some of which appear to be accompanied by interpretation. Fragments 6 and 7 include Deut 33:8-11; these verses occur again in 4QTest 14-20. Apart from various textual problems¹⁵⁴ which are unfortunately increased by the damage to the right hand bottom corner of the text, study of 4QTest has been concerned with its literary genre, its messianism and its possible historical allusions.

Those concerned with the genre of the piece have been eager to discuss it as an exemplar of a pre-Christian testimonial document from which support can be given to earlier theories represented, above all, in the work of Rendel Harris.¹⁵⁵ The most comprehensive analysis of the several positions with which 4QTest must now be reckoned is still that of J. A. Fitzmyer.¹⁵⁶ Other scholars have added little to his work except in as much as they use 4QTest as exemplary for collections of texts in other documents.¹⁵⁷

Scholars interested in the messianism represented in the collection of texts in 4QTest fall into two groups. On the one hand there are those who follow Allegro's original proposal that Exod 20:21 (Sam),¹⁵⁸ Num 24:15-17 and Deut 33:8-11 refer to the prophetic, kingly and priestly functions of the Messiah(s).¹⁵⁹ On the other hand the three texts are often taken separately as

referring to three eschatological figures: the prophet, the Messiah of Israel and the Messiah of Aaron. This is the view of Dupont-Sommer,¹⁶⁰ van der Woude,¹⁶¹ Vermes,¹⁶² and others.¹⁶³ Fitzmyer notes and accedes to this latter majority opinion but he warns that care should be taken in relation to Num 24:15-17, since in CD 7:18-20 it is applied to two figures and not solely to the Messiah of Israel.¹⁶⁴

In relation to the historical allusions that may exist in 4QTest, scholarly attention has been focused mainly on the last part of the document which contains a citation from Josh 6:26 and commentary. The whole section (4QTest 21-30) is represented in the Psalms of Joshua whose partially preserved text (4QPssJosh) enables several restorations to be made in corresponding places in 4QTest. Yet at one important point in line 25 the text remains fragmentary. The phrase in question reads: ²⁴וַעֲמַד וְ²⁵חַמֵּס [....] מ [....] יוֹת שְׁנֵיהֶם כָּלִי חַמֵּס. Nearly all scholars restore some such phrase as Milik's: "And he stood forth / and (made his sons) rulers and both of them became vessels of violence."¹⁶⁵ Vermes prefers to understand שְׁנֵיהֶם as referring to a total of two people and so proposes reading, "And (his brother) arose (and ruled), both being instruments of violence."¹⁶⁶ It would appear, however, that the majority opinion is more likely to be correct since the quotation of Josh 6:26 mentions three people: the accursed, the first-born and the youngest son.

According to Allegro's original publication the three people are to be identified as Alexander Jannaeus (ruled 103-76 B.C.) and his two sons, Hyrcanus II (76-40 B.C.) and Aristobulus II (67-63 B.C.).¹⁶⁷ Milik attempts to show that the reference is to Mattathias, father of Simon and Jonathan.¹⁶⁸ Cross argues

strongly for equating the accursed man with Simon (ruled 143-135 B.C.) and the vessels of violence would then be Judas and Mattathias, two of Simon's sons who died with him at Doq near Jericho in 135 B.C.¹⁶⁹ Although Cross' theory accounts for many historical details, still a fourth and possible proposal has been made by O. Betz.¹⁷⁰ He is in favour of identifying the Wicked Priest, the man accursed, with John Hyrcanus I (135-105 B.C.), the other members of the trio being his two sons Aristobulus I (104 B.C.) and Alexander Jannaeus.¹⁷¹ To this Brownlee adds that since the Joshua material almost certainly refers to actual historical figures, so also the prophet described in Deut 18:18 may be the Righteous Teacher.¹⁷²

Whatever the answers may be to all these questions, this present study intends rather to look at the composition of 4QTest; from such an investigation others may draw support for their various conclusions. The significant aspect of 4QTest from the compositional point of view is that it appears as an independent document of one column; as a unit we can clearly see its beginning and its end, even though there is some damage to the bottom right hand corner of the text. The following structural outline is offered for the unit.

4QTestimonia The cast of the eschatological struggle and reckoning

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| I. Those favoured by God | 4QTest 1-20 |
| A. Exod 20:21 (Sam) | 1-8 |
| 1. Introductory formula | |
| 2. Yahweh speech proper | |
| a. Concerning Yahweh's attitude to the people (MT: Deut 5:28b-29) | |

- 1) Concerning the correctness (הטיב)
 - of their words
 - 2) Wish for their continual well-being (הטיב)
 - b. Concerning future action with the prophet
 - (MT: Deut 18:18-19)
 - 1) Raise him up
 - 2) Put words in his mouth
 - 3) Require account of those who do not
 - heed him
- B. Num 24:15-17 9-13
- 1. Introductory formula
 - 2. Oracle
 - a. Announcement
 - b. Oracle proper
 - 1) Concerning הגבר
 - 2) Concerning כוכב and שטט
- C. Deut 33:8-11 14-20
- 1. Introductory formula
 - 2. Content of blessing
 - a. Command
 - b. Statement of future work of priesthood
 - 1) To cause precepts to shine to Jacob,
Law to Israel
 - 2) To offer incense and burnt offerings
 - c. Blessing proper
 - 1) Blessing
 - 2) Request for smiting of haters
- II. Those cursed by God 21-30
- A. Introduction

B. Quotation and Commentary (4QPssJosh)

1. Josh 6:26b (less יריחו את = LXX)

2. Commentary

a. Concerning the accursed man

1) Announcement of existence of man
of Belial

2) Description of purpose of existence

a) To be a fowler's net to his people

b) To be a cause of destruction of
his neighbours

b. Concerning two sons (or) b. Concerning one

1) Identification as brother

vessels of a. + b. Actions of the
violence two as vessels

2) Their actions of violence

The text as a whole lists, and to an extent implies description of, those involved in the affairs of the latter days, the cast of the eschatological struggle. The document has two parts: in the first those favoured by God are mentioned, in the second are those cursed by him. Since the second part is shorter, we may more easily discuss its structure, especially as that may have bearing upon the first part which is composed solely of three biblical citations.

After an introduction part two is developed according to the Psalms of Joshua in commentary upon Josh 6:26b. Firstly there is a clear description of the existence and purposes of the accursed man, the "one of Belial." The second half of the commentary is fragmentary and depending upon the way in which restoration is made in line 25, alternative structures can be

given. If the text is understood of two sons, then the second half is simply notice of their existence as vessels of violence followed by description of their violent actions. If the text is seen to refer to one figure, then after mentioning him, the rest of the column deals with the joint actions of the accursed man and the second figure (represented as a. + b.). Because the Joshua quotation speaks of three people and because the reading of three figures makes better sense syntactically, the first alternative and simpler structure is to be preferred.

This most likely reference to three figures and the people with which they are involved should be kept in mind when treating the content of the first major part of 4QTest. It contains three scriptural quotations: Exod 20:21 according to the Samaritan version,¹⁷³ Num 24:15-17 and Deut 33:8-11. There is no commentary between these citations and so the questions of most importance concern why these three quotations in particular were chosen and why they are in the order that they are.

In relation to the section on those cursed by God it is noteworthy that the three quotations in the first section have in common a note of doom for those who do not listen to the words of the prophet, those who are the "temples of Moab" or the "children of Sheth," or who are the enemies of the blessed priest(hood). Yet, if this destruction is the major concern of the collection of texts, then since all three quotations mention it, one cannot but ask why it is that only one text was not quoted, and perhaps one that would have been more suited to the purpose of describing destruction than any of those mentioned.

Rather, the inclusion of three citations suggests that each serves a specific purpose. Unless it is that the three are

ordered according to their appearance in the Pentateuch, a possibility that it is difficult to deny outright, then it is the order of the quotations that points towards their various functions. Over against those cursed by God the author would have included in his first section on those favoured by God mention of the agent through whom the destruction of the cursed would be achieved, which destruction is indeed an element of commonality between the three biblical texts. Such antithesis would not necessarily reflect person-to-person combat, but could be merely one of the supporters of Yahweh against those of Belial.

The general Jewish expectation, certainly shared by the Qumran covenanters, was that such an eschatological struggle would be led by a princely Messiah, an anointed individual who would save Israel; neither prophet nor priest would have a direct part to play in the battle. One could suggest, therefore, that the quotation of Num 24:15-17 was sufficient in itself, as portraying the messianic prince, to balance the second section concerning the accursed of God and their followers.

That Num 24:15-17 should be preceded and followed by quotations implies that in some way it required elucidation or clarification. Comparative study shows that it is very likely that in two places the Numbers quotation would require further comment, achieved here through the citation of additional biblical material. The first of these is the term גבר. G. Vermes has pointed most clearly to the ambiguity of this term as encountered in the MT text-type by the versions.¹⁷⁴ For 1QH 3:7-10 and 1QS 4:20-22, in both of which passages גבר occurs, Vermes analyzes the other possible messianic terms used and concludes that the various usages point to "two different figures: 1) a

King Messiah (*Geber* and its synonyms) and 2) a messianic Teacher (crucible and its parallels)."¹⁷⁵ And yet Vermes also stresses that in Palestinian exegesis there is a noticeable inclination to attach a teaching mission to the גבר.¹⁷⁶

Such ambiguity in the term גבר within Qumran literature itself is highlighted by the oscillating opinion of W. H. Brownlee. In 1954¹⁷⁷ he hinted at the messianic significance of גבר in 1QS 4:20 in relation to his reading at that time of 1QH 3:7-10. In 1964,¹⁷⁸ having considered many alternative possibilities, he proposed that in 1QS 4:20 גבר refers to the Teacher of Righteousness and in 1QH 3:5-10 to the personified sectarian society; he concludes that there is a "thematic agreement between the emergence of the *geber* as a corporate figure and also as the eschatological prophet"¹⁷⁹ since both must pass through the refining furnace of affliction. More recently, in 1966,¹⁸⁰ Brownlee adjusted his opinion in light of the description of David in 11QPs^a 27:2-4 as a sage, full of insight, and so concludes that the גבר in 1QS 4:20-22 and 1QH 3:7-10 is to be understood from the aspect of his wisdom role as the individual Messiah of Israel. Lastly in 1972 Brownlee noted that at least for 4QTest גבר refers to the future prophet since in the text of Numbers 24 גבר is applied by Balaam to himself.¹⁸¹

In light of this one can only propose that it may be premature for any scholar to suppose that there is a uniform use of the term גבר in Qumran literature. It could be used either of the King or of the eschatological prophet in early Jewish literature and the Qumran scrolls seem to reflect such ambiguity. As it stands, גבר in Num 24:15-16 refers to the prophet Balaam, and the author of 4QTest, while not denying the ambiguity, wanted

to ensure that the term be understood as referring to the eschatological prophet.¹⁸²

To ensure that the prophet was included in his role as teacher the author placed Sam. Exod 20:21¹⁸³ in front of the Numbers quotation. He put it there either because of the order of the Pentateuch itself or because the prophet was temporarily to precede the Messiah of Israel or because of the analogous concern of the two passages that the word of God should be heard.¹⁸⁴ Likewise the terms analogous to one another in Num 24:15-17 and Deut 33:8-11, and in Deut 33:8-11 and the PssJosh material can be used to support the literary construction of the order of those texts.

The second ambiguous passage of Num 24:15-17 occurs in the second part of the oracle where the talk is of the star and the sceptre. Normally taken as referring to one figure,¹⁸⁵ the author of 4QTest was almost certainly aware of the tradition witnessed by CD A 7:18-20, that the star was the eschatological Interpreter of the Law (whose high priestly status now seems secure), while the sceptre and the activity of the destruction of the children of Seth were understood in relation to the kingly Messiah of David. In order to make certain that the priestly Messiah was not overlooked, the author included the section from Deuteronomy 33 in which, along with mention of the symbols of the priest's office, there is a statement of the future work of the priesthood. One of the tasks of the priest will be to make the precepts shine (the work of a star?)¹⁸⁶ for Jacob and the Law for Israel; this function of the messianic priest is also described specifically in 4QpIsa^a frgs. 8-10:24.¹⁸⁷

The final part of the quotation from Deuteronomy 33 concludes

with the request of Yahweh that those who hate the priest be smitten (חָח). Together with mention of Jacob and Israel it is the smiting which can be seen as a link-word between Num 24:15-17 and Deut 33:8-11 for it also occurs in Num 24:17. Also, whether one restores "brother" or "sons" in line 25, such terms could be the catchword links between Deut 33:8-11 and the 4QPssJosh material;¹⁸⁸ both "brother" and "sons" occur in Deut 33:9. It is also interesting to note that just as in 1QS 2:3, part of a blessing, there is the verb יאר followed in 1QS 2:5 by ארוור, so in 4QTest 17 יאירו occurs before ארוור of lines 22 and 23.¹⁸⁹ That may represent yet another reason for the present order of the texts in 4QTest.

Overall it can be said that the structure of the first part of 4QTest concerning those favoured by God shows that the three texts quoted therein are interdependent in as much as they represent a particular understanding of the participants in the eschatological struggle.¹⁹⁰ Such interdependence rests on the collector's desire to clarify the messianic text of Numbers 24. Taking the first three citations alone, it seems as if it is not necessary to suppose the existence of a testimonial document from which they are copied. If the fourth quotation of Joshua material is included, it is possible to understand the whole document in a testimonial role, for then reasons can be given for the exclusion of certain messianic texts (e.g., Genesis 49).

In sum, the two major parts of 4QTest form a unit of texts that lists the cast of the eschatological struggle. Those favoured by God are the people who listen to his prophet, the prophet himself, the kingly Messiah and the priest; those to be destroyed are the people who follow or are ensnared by the

accursed man of Belial and his sons or brother and these figures (antichrists) themselves. If three figures are cursed, then there is an attractive balance with the three eschatological figures of the first three quotations. If nothing else, the structural approach has shown that, while far from removing all ambiguity from Num 24:15-17, there appears to be a set of precise reasons for the present order of the texts. This is apparent from the analogous words and phrases that occur between the particular quotations as now ordered (*gězērâ šāwâ*) and in the way in which the content of each scriptural text relates peculiarly to that of its neighbours.

G. 11QMelch

11Q Melchizedek has been chosen as the concluding illustration because it contains in line 25¹⁹² an indirect quotation of Isa 8:11. This verse is quoted with an introductory formula in 4QFlor 1:15-16;¹⁹³ it is there connected to the main text of the unit, Psalm 1, through *gězērâ šāwâ*, the analogous term being 117. Isa 8:11 is also quoted indirectly at 1QSa 1:2-3 and CD 8:16 = 19:29; it was, therefore, an important text in the self-understanding of the Qumran covenanters and is worth closer study.

When the citation of Isa 8:11 in Qumran literature is indirect, it always occurs in the context of the covenant:

" . . . the establisher(s of) the covenant are those who turn away from walking (in the p)ath of the people" (11QMelch);¹⁹⁴

" . . . the men of their Covenant who have turned aside (from the) way of the people" (1QSa);¹⁹⁵ ". . . thus shall it be with the converts of Israel who depart from the way of the people. Because God loved the first who testified in his favour, so will

He love those who come after them, for the Covenant of the fathers is theirs" (CD).¹⁹⁶

Such a contextual repetition would suggest that wherever the covenant was mentioned it could be deemed suitable to allude to Isa 8:11. It mattered not whether it was the title of a tract (1QSa) or in the text of an interpretation of a biblical passage (11QMelch: on Isa 52:7; CD: on Deut 9:5 and 7:8). Indeed it is probably some such text as Deut 7:8 that is to be understood as the parent of the association, for its immediate context is a discussion of the Israelites as the people (עַם) holy to God, the faithful God who keeps covenant (כִּרְיִת).¹⁹⁷

In 4QFlor 1:15-16 there is no mention of covenant and Isa 8:11 is quoted explicitly to stress the distinction between the righteous and the wicked of Psalm 1. The difference in the use of the Isaiah quotation is apparent also in the length in which it occurs in 4QFlor on the one hand and in the remaining Qumran locations on the other. This is stressed by the fact that whereas 4QFlor 1:16 includes the demonstrative adjective after כִּי, 1QSa, CD and 11QMelch omit it. Thus there appears to be two close but distinct uses of Isa 8:11 in Qumran literature. Such a feature re-emphasizes the fact that there should be no attempt to understand the use or interpretation of a biblical passage as necessarily consistent throughout Qumran writings. This in turn supports the distinction that has already been made between the use of Amos 9:11 in CD 7:16 and in 4QFlor 1:12.

As in 4QFlor, 1QM 10:1-8, CD 7:13b-8:1a and 4QTest it seems as if the scriptural texts cited in 11QMelch are associated with one another through *gēzērâ šāwâ*. From a literary point of view de Jonge and van der Woude have noted¹⁹⁸ that Lev 25:13 (line 2)

can be connected with Deut 15:2 (lines 3-4) through an analogous word-use represented only in the LXX text type: ἐν τῷ ἔτει τῆς ἀφέσεως σημασία (Lev 25:13), ἀφεσις (Deut 15:2). Also they observed that "11QMelch connects Isa. lxi. 1 and lii. 7 probably because of the words לַנְשָׁר and מוֹשֵׁר occurring there."¹⁹⁹ Again, they see a connection between Isa 52:7 and Lev 25:8-17 as reflected in an apparently similar combination in *Pss. Sol.* 11:1, though they give no reason for the association.²⁰⁰

In a closer analysis of 11QMelch itself J. A. Fitzmyer has proposed that "the thread which runs through the whole text and ties together its various elements is Lev 25."²⁰¹ He also sees the jubilee year as involving atonement for iniquity, and the Day of Atonement as playing a special part in it (11QMelch 7). On the other hand, M. P. Miller has noted²⁰² that the interpretative comments upon the biblical citations in 11QMelch (Lev 25:13, Deut 15:2, Isa 52:7, Pss 7:8-9, 82:1-2) can all be related to Isa 61:1-2 which "passage stands behind our document and appears in the form of Stichwörter at crucial points."²⁰³

J. A. Sanders has accepted Miller's identification of the use of Isa 61:1-2 in 11QMelch and has added some further phrases which most likely are taken from Isaiah 61,²⁰⁴ at least one of which (Isa 61:2 in line 20) he had already included in an earlier description of the use of "The Old Testament in 11Q Melchizedek," entitled just that.²⁰⁵ In that study Sanders set out firstly the text of 11QMelch according to van der Woude with all the biblical citations and allusions italicized; secondly he did the same for the text as proposed by J. T. Milik,²⁰⁶ thus highlighting several further possible references.²⁰⁷ Sanders' work is descriptive of 11QMelch in its literary construction and although

he has provided good explanations for the present composition, describing the use of various exegetical principles,²⁰⁸ the scriptural combination and the midrashic intention of the author remains detached from any setting other than Qumran, even though Isa 61:1-2 is expounded by Jesus in the synagogue at Nazareth (Lk 4:16-30).²⁰⁹

The study of C. Perrot, "Luc 4, 16-30 et la lecture biblique de l'ancienne Synagogue,"²¹⁰ provides the most complete proposal for the setting of the combination of Leviticus 25 and Isaiah 61²¹¹ each of which, as we have seen, has been proposed as the key text behind 11QMelch's composition. That Isaiah was handed to Jesus in the synagogue service suggests that at that time there was "un cadre général déjà fixé"²¹² within which Jesus focused on the two verses Luke quotes or has Jesus read. Having given the standard warnings about reconstructing first century lectionaries, Perrot argues convincingly, on the basis of the work of J. Mann,²¹³ that the seder which accompanied Isa 61:1ff. was that of Gen 35:9ff. *Tg. Neof.* Gen 35:9 mentions the death of Deborah with that of Rachel; according to *Jub.* 32:30 Deborah died on the 23rd of Tishri. The targum of Gen 35:9ff. also speaks of the circumcision of Abraham which Perrot states happened according to Jewish tradition on the 10th of Tishri, the Day of Atonement. Perrot concludes, therefore, that the lection of Gen 35:9ff. and Isa 61:1ff. took place sometime in Tishri, close to the feast of Tabernacles or the Day of Atonement.

The association of Isa 61:1-3 with the Day of Atonement appears old from another aspect. The readings for that day included Isa 57:15-58:14 but, since the day also marked the beginning of the jubilee year, the passages from Leviticus 25

and Isaiah 61 were alike appropriate.²¹³ Perrot points out that among other things Isa 58:5 and 61:2 (LXX) are connected through their use of $\delta\epsilon\kappa\iota\delta\upsilon\nu$. In the later triennial cycle the seder Lev 25:14ff. is followed by the haphtara Isa 52:3ff. Such liturgical association of these texts may already be reflected in 1QH 8:14 and Acts 10:35-38. 11QMelch acts as the confirmation of Perrot's theory. One may at least suppose some fluidity of the choice of the Isaianic text that accompanied the Leviticus seder, yet any such haphtara was consistently read with Isa 61:1-3 in mind.

Apart from the quotation of Leviticus 25 and possibly also of Deuteronomy 15, the only biblical verses to receive introductory formulae in 11QMelch are Pss 82:1, 2 and 7:8-9,²¹⁵ Isa 52:7 and Dan 9:25. Such an observation leads to the proposal that, apart from Dan 9:25 which may have been introduced later for midrashic purposes,²¹⁶ the most prominent texts in 11QMelch are based on a liturgical combination of readings. These were put together with the use of certain exegetical principles and these can still be seen at work in the particular homily on the texts that may lie behind the midrashic composition of 11QMelch.

The significance of Isa 61:1-3 then rests in its being associated with the Day of Atonement readings, directly in terms of Isa 57:15-58:14 and indirectly as it performed the function of haphtara to the seder Gen 35:9ff. which almost certainly was read at a time in Tishri close to the Day of Atonement, if not on that day itself. Thus, as for the combination of 2 Samuel 7 and Psalms 1 and 2 in 4QFlor, so also for the group of texts in 11QMelch we may understand them to have had their setting within early Jewish liturgy.

NOTES

¹The principal text used is that of J.P.M. van der Ploeg and A. S. van der Woude, *Le Targum de Job de la grotte XI de Qumrân*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971.

²This is not necessarily to suggest Essene authorship for 11QtgJob which J. A. Fitzmyer (*A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays*, SBLMS 25; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979, 9 and n.47) argues strongly against.

³*Hermeneutische Aspecten van de Targum van Job uit Grot XI van Qumrân*, Groningen: Dissertation, 1971. Tuinistra attempts to show that 11QtgJob models its figure of Job after the Righteous Teacher and that the interpretation of 11QtgJob is overtly Essene. I owe these observations to J. A. Fitzmyer ("Some Observations on the Targum of Job from Qumran Cave 11," *CBQ* 36 1974, 507-8) and to M. Sokoloff (*The Targum to Job from Qumran Cave XI*, Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1974, 237-39).

⁴2Q 15 is a small fragment of Job 33:28-30 that M. Baillet describes as "un texte du type massorétique" (M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, R. de Vaux, *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân: Exploration de la falaise. Les grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q, Le rouleau de cuivre* [DJD 3; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962], 71). See Fitzmyer, "Targum of Job from Qumran Cave 11," 524, for information on the responsibilities of F. M. Cross for publishing 4QJob^{a, b} and of P. W. Skehan for publishing 4QpaleoJob^c.

⁵"11 Q Targum Job and the Massoretic Text," *RQ* 8 (1972-74), 254. φέγγος is ambiguous being used of both "light" and thereby of the light from flame, especially of "torch" (LSJ, 1920).

⁶At Job 25:3 LXX reads ἔνεδρα κατ'αὐτοῦ: a Hebrew *Vorlage* of אורנו? (MT: אורנו).

⁷As does Sokoloff (*The Targum of Job*, 117). For the textual difficulty at 11Q_tgJob 31:2 where there is a gap corresponding to MT אור and for which the context requires רוח (as BH³ and LXX: ἀέχμη) Sokoloff inserts "wind" in brackets (*The Targum of Job*, 89).

⁸In fact, for 11Q_tgJob 29:2 the reading of אור as אור must lead the targumist to understand ענו, construct in the MT, as an absolute (Sokoloff, *The Targum of Job*, 143). This desire for clarity has also been observed by B. Jongeling, "Détermination et indétermination dans 11Q_tgJob," *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, BETL 46, 131-36.

⁹The *niph'al* pt. of חמם occurs at lsa 57:5.

¹⁰Trans. Sokoloff, *The Targum of Job*, 101, 167.

¹¹"11Q_tgJob XXI, 4-5 (Job 32, 13)," *RQ* 9/33 (1977), 127-29. MT reads לֹא-אִישׁ יִדְפְּנוּ אֵל יְדִפְנוּ חַמָּה אֵל יְדִפְנוּ לֹא-אִישׁ; 11Q_tgJob reads: פֶּן-תֵּאמְרוּ מִצְאֵנוּ חַמָּה אֵל יְדִפְנוּ לֹא-אִישׁ which Sokoloff (*The Targum of Job*, 69) translates "but God has declared us guilty."

¹²York notes that when this is rendered into Ethiopic two first plural semitic verbs are used ("11Q_tgJob XXI, 4-5 [Job 32, 13]," 129, n.6).

¹³Of course, the unpointed text remains ambiguous, as does the Aramaic of the Targum (cf. Sokoloff's trans. in n.4, pp. 78-79).

¹⁴"The Cosmic Role of Angels in the 11Q Targum of Job," *JSS* 8 (1977), 84.

¹⁵"The Cosmic Role of Angels," 84, n.2. Brownlee also notes the function of angels in *1 Enoch*.

¹⁶"Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BA* 14 (1951), 54-76. Ever since this article Brownlee has insisted that 1QpHab deserves the title midrash.

¹⁷E.g., for criticism, K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakkuk-Kommentar*, 157-64; for supplementation, K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew*, Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1954, 190-94.

¹⁸*The Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash and the Targum of Jonathan*, mimeographed paper, 1953, 10-11; *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran*, JBLMS 11, Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1959, esp. 118-23 ("The Presence of Dual Readings"); *The Midrash Peshet of Habakkuk*, SBLMS 24; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.

¹⁹M. P. Horgan (*Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, CBQMS 8, Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979, 10-55) appeared before Brownlee's *The Midrash Peshet of Habakkuk*; she is concerned with establishing the best text and translation for 1QpHab but with little reference to exegetical techniques. The few examples she gives of "modes of interpretation" are listed in her book, pp. 244-247, where she discusses the exegetical method in 1QpHab 1:16-2:10 and in 1QpHab 11:2-8 in detail.

²⁰"Biblical Interpretation," 60.

²¹J. V. Chamberlain (*An Ancient Sectarian Interpretation*, 96) describes this fault in Brownlee's principles by noting that "the validity of Brownlee's first 'hermeneutical principle' is dependent on the other eleven" - eleven, because Brownlee retracted the need for his 12th principle, "interpretation of

words, or parts of words, as abbreviations," in relation to 1QpHab (*The Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash and the Targum of Jonathan*, 10). Brownlee has now expounded the eschatological hermeneutic of Qumran in detail (*Midrash Peshet*, 28-35).

²²1QpHab 2:11-12 identifies the כְּשִׁימִים as the Kittim; also the evidence of Peshitta, Vulgate and Targums points to a traditional identification of the two (cf. Num 24:24, BH³) with the Romans; this is supported above all through the work of A. Dupont-Sommer (*Les écrits esséniens*, 351-61). Cf. H. H. Rowley ("The Kittim and the Dead Sea Scrolls," *PEQ* 88 1956, 92-109) who was one of the stronger advocates for the identification of the Kittim as the Seleucids.

²³"Biblical Interpretation," 60.

²⁴See Brownlee, *Meaning*, 66-69.

²⁵I.e., the division of Hab 1:8 and 9 a word later than usual (1QpHab 3:7-12) is paralleled in the technique used by R. Gamaliel (*b. Sanh.* 90b) in his punctuation of Deut 31:16, arguing for resurrection. Elliger mentions this verse division (*Studien*, 160-61) but ignores it in his notes to the text (174-76). Secondly, the reading of וְצוּר of Hab 1:12 as יְצוּר is an example of 'al *tiqrē*'; or, as Brownlee now remarks (*Midrash Peshet*, 88-89), this may be an interpretation much older than Qumran since the LXX reads a verb here too (καὶ ἐπλασέν με): the Qumran commentator may thus never have understood צוּר as "rock" (against Elliger, who reads only "Rock" here [*Studien*, 181]). Thirdly, 'al *tiqrē*' is also the basis for the understanding of מְרוֹתוֹ of Hab 1:16 "as the construct of *mr'* rather than that of *mrh*" (1QpHab 6:2-5), if one accepts there is exegesis of לְמַכְמַרְתּוֹ by

nōtārīqōn; Brownlee has now dropped this proposal (*Midrash Peshar*, 101). Brownlee has also dropped his earlier understanding of מִשְׁקָה as having רַעֲיָהוּ as its object (Hab 2:15; 1QpHab 11:2-8; *Midrash Peshar*, 180). Lastly the interpretation of חֲסוּב in its rare meaning synonymous with בָּלַע (Hab 2:16; 1QpHab 11:8-14) is an example of the use of paronomasia; on בָּלַע in 1QpHab see Brownlee, *Midrash Peshar*, 181.

²⁶Brownlee in fact cites the same Rabbinic examples for principles 3 and 4: *Gen. Rab.* 20:12, 40:5 ("Biblical Interpretation," 73). He gives the use of Ps 45:5 in *b. Šabb.* 63a as an example of principle 10.

²⁷"Arise, pass over to Kittim; even there you will have no rest. Behold the land of the Chaldeans (כַּשְׂדִּים), this is the people; it was not Assyria. She (i.e., אֶרֶץ כַּשְׂדִּים) builds up ships (צִיִּים, cf. צִיִּים, Dan 11:30; צִים, Num 24:24)." Isa 23:12b-13 is notoriously obscure; W. H. Brownlee suggests that the Massoretic accentuation may show that לֹא הָזָה was a scribal comment incorporated into the text. Whatever the actual history of the text, it may have been the basis at Qumran for understanding that כַּשְׂדִּים refers to כַּתְיִים: the latter as referring to the present oppressor would be left to the audience familiar with Dan 11:30. 1QIsa^a 23:12b-13 contains nothing to contradict this understanding. Surprisingly, exactly how the Chaldeans are exegetically related to the Kittim has not been a scholarly concern: e.g., Elliger (*Studien*, 172-73) only mentions their traditional identification with the Cypriots and thence allegorically with the sea-faring Romans.

²⁸"Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 14-15. The resulting

exegesis may be that of "analogous circumstance" but that is not the technique whereby the relationship of interpretation to biblical text can be legitimately explained.

²⁹"Biblical Interpretation," 63-63. In *Midrash Pesher*, 71, Brownlee translates the interpretation, "With the hot breath of his nose and the fierce storm of their face."

³⁰L. H. Silberman ("Unriddling the Riddle," 339) reached the understanding of קדים as "East wind" and מגמת as being what it carries without accepting the division of פניהם; that would, therefore, vindicate Brownlee's more complete understanding of 1QpHab at this point (for which, see *Midrash Pesher*, 69-70).

³¹"The Pesher of Dreams and Scriptures," 363.

³²Cf. Deut 3:6: נחרס אותם; 7:2: החרס תחרים אתם, "You destroy the net, their sign?" The Targum renders חרם as זיניה, "implement of war." The theory of N. Wieder ("The Habakkuk Scroll and the Targum," *JJS* 4 1953, 14-18) that the equation of אותות and חרם depends upon an understanding similar to that of the Targum to Hab 1:17 where חרמו is rendered מטירייתה, "his troops," a secondary meaning of *signum*, does not explain why the targumist translated חרם in that way, and seems a more roundabout road to the exegesis of 1QpHab than the ideas suggested above. Cf. also Exod 22:19.

³³A. Finkel ("The Pesher of Dreams and Scriptures," 369) points to several other examples of this, e.g., 1QpHab 4:4-6: שחק has the dual meaning of "laugh" and "mock;" 1QpHab 10:2-5: חרטי (Hab 2:11) is taken in its two senses of "condemn" (רשע) and purify, i.e., "sentence to fire and brimstone" - this example is questionable: Silberman ("Unriddling the Riddle," 352-53)

supports this identification of the part of the interpretation that goes with חוטי, but he does not see any need of a double reading here; 1QpHab 2:11-14: המר והנמהר (Hab 1:6) can be rendered, "the courageous and the swift" (2:12) or "to be sharp as a razor and to carry headlong" (2:13). To this Silberman ("Unriddling the Riddle," 336-37) prefers to see המר as related to מר, identified by Jastrow as from מרא II, "to be fat, strong," hence directly rendered in the interpretation by גבורים. These understandings are complementary and both need to be taken into account. For a complete list of the understandings of the phrase and its restored pesher, see Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 60-61; Brownlee himself translates, "the Kittim, w(ho ar)e swift and mighty / in war to destroy the s(of)t (and dainty)" (ועינוים). Cf. Isa 47:1.

³⁴On משל in its various meanings, see Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, excursus, 143-44. This pun is also noticed by Horgan (*Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, 245, n.67).

³⁵Silberman ("Unriddling the Riddle," 356) proposes linking this interpretation to מספה in the biblical citation through 'al tiqrē'; reading מספ, "to smite," for מספה, the commentator was able to play on the double sense of בלע. For further elucidation of the use of בלע in 1QpHab, see Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 181-82: he still supports the wordplay here.

³⁶See above, p. 70, n.141.

³⁷*The Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash and the Targum of Jonathan*, 10.

³⁸As J. V. Chamberlain, *An Ancient Sectarian Interpretation*, 115-16.

³⁹"Biblical Interpretation," 62.

⁴⁰Both I. Rabinowitz ("The Second and Third Columns of the Habakkuk Interpretation Scroll," *JBL* 69 1950, 48) and A. Finkel ("The Peshier of Dreams and Scriptures," 370) read it as two words; Rabinowitz translates (36), "my wrath are they."

⁴¹Supported by Silberman ("Unriddling the Riddle," 338) and maintained by Brownlee (*Midrash Peshier*, 69).

⁴²Or, better, "cloud of mud," as Elliger ("Wolke von Kot;" *Studien*, 146), Finkel ("The Peshier of Dreams and Scriptures," 370), and now Brownlee (*Midrash Peshier*, 134) who suggests that *uwy* could be construed as either "pledges" or "cloud of mud."

⁴³Maintained hesitatingly by Brownlee (*Midrash Peshier*, 192).

⁴⁴This was dropped by Brownlee in his mimeographed paper, *The Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash* (10-11), to which he keeps (*Midrash Peshier*, 216); but the actual choice of words may still depend upon some such *nôtarîqôn*.

⁴⁵"DSH makes no direct appeals to other passages of Scripture, but their influence upon interpretation is nevertheless to be detected" ("Biblical Interpretation," 75); i.e., no quotation with an introductory formula, but Isa 13:18 (in reading of 1QIsa^a) may be cited at 1QpHab 6:11-12.

⁴⁶"The Peshier of Dreams and Scriptures," 367-68. In *Midrash Peshier*, Brownlee takes little account of this work, but see his *Text of Habakkuk*, 118-23 on dual readings.

⁴⁷This second part of the wordplay may derive rather from the interpreter's reading *uwy* of Hab 1:6 as from the root *uwy*, "to beat down, shatter" (Jer 5:17) (Silberman, "Unriddling the Riddle," 337). There is no attestation for *uwy* meaning

"smite", so there may be just a midrashic pun here rather than a dual reading (so Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 65).

⁴⁸Reading וישם as from שמט (as Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation," 64); Elliger ("gemacht zu seinem Gott," *Studien*, 178-79) understands, on the other hand, the root שיט . Brownlee (*Midrash Pesher*, 81) allows that וישם is understood as וישט , וישט (root: שמט) and וישם (root: שיט), and he shows that the interpretation requires this multiple understanding of Hab 1:11.

⁴⁹Proposed already by Silberman ("Unriddling the Riddle," 347).

⁵⁰Actually, MT can be read in this way too; there would then be no double meaning here. Alternatively, the suggestion of R. Weis to see here the Arabic *qdy*, "to judge," in connection with Silberman's note of the use of קצין in Dan 11:18 to denote a judge or commander ("Unriddling the Riddle," 352), may allow a wordplay whereby קצורו is interpreted by the use of שפט in the commentary.

⁵¹I.e., "the house of his uncovering," using the root גלה , as Brownlee (*Midrash Pesher*, 183). Horgan (*Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, 247) sees a play on words between מער , "to stumble," and לכשילם , "to make them stumble."

⁵²Silberman ("Unriddling the Riddle," 361) maintains that the commentator deliberately metathesized the biblical text for interpretative purposes, and that this is not a witness to a textual variant as Elliger (*Studien*, 219) claims.

⁵³"Toward an Understanding of the Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *RQ* 7 (1969-71), 3-15, here 14-15. Surprisingly, Brownlee does not mention this part of Slomovic's work in his

recent exhaustive study of 1QpHab, *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*,

⁵⁴Tr. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 239-40.

⁵⁵Tr. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 240.

⁵⁶"Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 15. There may indeed be a use of 'al tiqrē' here, but it could also be a simple textual variant belonging to the interpreter's text.

⁵⁷In order to maintain correspondence with exact word usage it would be better to see either 2 Sam 23:1-3 or Prov 29:2-5 as referred to here. Or, if one allows the use of paranomasia, then it is likely that Hab 2:5-6 (or possibly Mic 2:2-4) is the support for the interpretation here: e.g., Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation," 67.

⁵⁸Perhaps Isa 65:10-11 is a better support.

⁵⁹"Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 15.

⁶⁰Words between * * are supralinear in the Ms.

⁶¹Tr. Brownlee, *Midrash Peshar*, 107.

⁶²"Unriddling the Riddle," 344-45.

⁶³*Midrash Peshar*, 111.

⁶⁴Brownlee notes that in 4QpPss^a 1:27 the Teacher is called נַחַד וְיִלְחָם.

⁶⁵Suggested also by Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, 245, n.67.

⁶⁶"Les citations de l'Ancien Testament dans 'La Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres'," *RB* 63 (1956), 234-60, 375-90.

⁶⁷Jer 14:9 reads וַאֲתָהּ בְּקִרְבֵּנוּ יְהוָה, a similar adaptation of the phrase. J. van der Ploeg (*Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, STDJ 2; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959, 135) also notes similar phrases at Exod 17:7, 34:9, 1 Sam 4:3, Mic 3:11.

⁶⁸Implied by J. A. Fitzmyer ("The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," *NTS* 7 1960-61, 327) and favoured by van der Ploeg (*Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 135) and Carmignac (*Les Textes de Qumran*; Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1961, 107).

⁶⁹Favoured by Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (London: Oxford University, 1962), 303, and by A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens*, 199, n.2.

⁷⁰Mentioned by J. Carmignac, "Les citations de l'Ancien Testament."

⁷¹Cf. 1Q22 wherein have been created summary speeches of Moses (DJD 1, 91-97).

⁷²The text here has paraphrastic allusions to Deut 20:5-8 (MT).

⁷³1QM agrees with LXX, Peshitta; MT reads תְּבוֹאוּ.

⁷⁴The use of *gəzšērâ šāwâ* in 4QFlor has been outlined by E. Slomovic ("Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls," 7-10).

⁷⁵Thus these verses are exhortations that "doivent rendre les Fils de lumière plus courageux qu'ils ne le sont déjà" (J. van der Ploeg, *Le Rouleau de la Guerre*, 136).

⁷⁶This understanding of the use of Num 10:9 in 1QM is clearly preferable to the proposal of G. Morawe ("Vergleich des Aufbaus der Danklieder und hymnischer Bekenntnislieder (1QH) von Qumran

mit dem Aufbau der Psalmen im Alten Testament und im Spätjudentum," *RQ* 4 1963-64, 333-37) that Num 10:9 introduces a hymn that goes as far as 1QM 10:18 and is parallel in structure to material in 1QH. Rather the whole set of biblical interpretations should be seen as part of one of the battle prayers of 1QM, in this case 1QM 10:1-12:17.

⁷⁷For a detailed analysis of how 1QS 2:2-4 is related to its context, see E. F. Roop, *A Form-Critical Study of the Society Rule (1QS) at Qumran*, Dissertation: Claremont Graduate School, 1972, 47-118.

⁷⁸E.g., as outlined by J. Gnilka, "Die Essenische Tauchbäder und die Johannestaufe," *RQ* 3 (1961-62), 189-90.

⁷⁹F. J. Helfmeyer ("Gott Nachfolgen" in der Qumrantexten," *RQ* 7 1969-71, 101, n.123) outlines summarily how the various parts of the ceremony could be formulated into a service for those entering the community and as a festival of renewal of the covenant - not just covenant renewal alone.

⁸⁰Similar results could be obtained from a detailed analysis of the expansion of the Aaronic blessing in *Jub.* 12:29. M. Gertner ("Midrashim in the New Testament," *JSS* 7 1962, 273-82) has carefully worked out how Lk 1:67-75 is a midrash on the Aaronic Blessing.

⁸¹It is noticeable that whereas MT uses יהוה, 1QS 2:2-4 omits any designation of God. H. Stegemann ("Religionsgeschichtliche Erwägungen zu den Gottesbezeichnungen in den Qumrantexten," *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, BETL 46, 203) suggests this is deliberate: the supposed antiquity of the new prayer is put over by avoiding the use of אֱלֹהִים, while writing

יהוה is avoided for obvious reasons.

⁸²Ps 34:11: כּל טוֹב; Exod 18:9, 1 Kgs 8:66, Jer 33:9 (bis): על כל הטובה; 1 Sam 15:9: על כל הטוב; Judg 10:15, 1 Sam 11:10: כּכל הטוב; Jer 32:42: את כל הטובה; Deut 26:11: בכל הטוב. Cf. T. Jos. 18:1, "He will bless you with good things for ever and ever" (APOT 2, 352).

⁸³LXX (and the Peshitta) support a *Vorlage* of כּכל הטובים (ἐν παντὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς).

⁸⁴Against O. Betz, *Offenbarung*, 167, n.1.

⁸⁵E.g., P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline* (STDJ 1; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957), 52; he also cites *Jub.* 12:29, 31:24; O. Betz, *Offenbarung*, 167; W. H. Brownlee, *Meaning*, 82.

⁸⁶11QPss 3:5 reads, [] יש [] ישומרכה מכו, best explained as metathesis.

⁸⁷For this and other wordplays and for the use of certain *Stichworten*, see A. Finkel, "The Peshier of Dreams and Scriptures," 369-70.

⁸⁸As observed by Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline*, 52.

⁸⁹Tr. W. McKane, *Proverbs* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1970), 490.

⁹⁰As proposed in BH³.

⁹¹On enlightenment at Qumran cf. 1QH 3:3, 4:5, 27, 1QSb 4:27. Compare also 2 Cor 4:6 " . . . light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ" (RSV).

⁹²W. D. Davies ("Knowledge in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11:25-30," *HTR* 46 1953, 125) classifies דעה in 1QS 2:3

as knowledge "of a personal or intimate kind." J. Worrell (*Concepts of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Dissertation: Claremont Graduate School, 1968, 203) correctly assesses the general view of scholarship when he states that "da'at in the scrolls is more akin to its connotations in the wisdom literature than to the esoteric *gnosis* of developed Gnosticism."

⁹³The phrase is that of Worrell, *Concepts of Wisdom*, 240.

⁹⁴Cf. 1QS 10:12, 1QM 17:8: מקור דעת; מקור כולם at 1QS 8:9 is often emended to נודעת עולם e.g., Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline*, (BASOR Supstud 10-12; New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951), 33, Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (München: Kösel, 1971²) 30 n.b., Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline*, 127, n.26.

⁹⁵Whether the phrase be understood as "knowledge of things eternal" (T. H. Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation*, Garden City: Doubleday, 1964², 47) or as "eternal knowledge" (Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline*, 10; G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968³, 73).

⁹⁶See above, n.81.

⁹⁷E.g., Jer 33:11, Pss 89:2, 29, 138:8, Ezra 3:11, 1 Chr 16:34, 41, 2 Chr 5:13, 7:3, 6, 20:21.

⁹⁸On this clause cf. 1QSB 3:5: [שלו]ם [עו]לם יתן לכה; 1QSB 3:20: יסד שלומכה לעולמי עד. Brownlee (*The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline*, 11) also points to T. Dan 5:11: "eternal peace."

⁹⁹As pointed out by Betz, *Offenbarung*, 166. M. Weise (*Kultzeiten und kultischer Bundesschluss in der 'Ordensregel' vom Toten Meer*, SPB 3; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961, 84) notes

that *Num. Rab.* 11 (43d) retains the tradition that blessings are said in groups of three: both Num 6:24-26 and 1QS 2:2-4 can fit this pattern.

¹⁰⁰18 is the number of blessings in the ^o*amidah* because of the 18 times God is mentioned in Psalm 29 (*b. Ber.* 28b). The tetragrammaton occurs 18 times in the song of Miriam. For other uses of 18 in rabbinic tradition, see O. H. Lehmann, "Number-symbolism as a Vehicle of Religious Experience in the Gospels, Contemporary Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls" (*Studia Patristica* IV:2, ed. F. L. Cross; Berlin: Akademie, 1961), 129, n.2.

¹⁰¹Nor is it possible to claim, as Lehmann does ("Number-symbolism," 129, n.4) that the Hebrew original of the blessing of Terah at *Sub.* 12:29 had 18 stresses.

¹⁰²E.g., Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline*, 53, 56; D. F. Baumgärtel, "Zur Liturgie in der 'Sektenrolle' vom Toten Meer," *ZAW* 65 (1953), 263-65. Most recently, see W. H. Brownlee, "The Ceremony of Crossing the Jordan in the Annual Covenanting at Qumran," *Von Kanaan bis Kerala*, edd. W. C. Delsman et al., AOAT 211; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1982, 295-302, esp. 297-98.

¹⁰³*Offenbarung*, 166-69.

¹⁰⁴*Offenbarung*, 169.

¹⁰⁵*Kultzeiten*, 82-93.

¹⁰⁶*Kultzeiten*, 85. Weise also cites Deut 30:15 and Amos 5:14 as well as some later rabbinic literature in which a similar expansion of the Aaronic blessing may be apparent.

¹⁰⁷*Kultzeiten*, 87. He compares this interpretation with 1QS 4:2, 11:15 and 1QH 4:5, 27. On the possibility that this refers to inspiration, see Betz, *Offenbarung*, 113.

¹⁰⁸*Kultzeiten*, 88. He cites 1QS 4:3, 18, 5:21, 6:18.

¹⁰⁹*Kultzeiten*, 89. He compares 1QS 3:15, 4:4, 10:12, 11:11.

¹¹⁰Weise notes that both *Sifre Num* 6:25 and *Num. Rab.* 11:6 mention the Torah as the illuminating agent, and that Torah is part of the application of Num 6:25 in the 19th benediction of the Babylonian recension of the *Tefilla*; ם׳׳נ also occurs in the 19th benediction.

¹¹¹*Kultzeiten*, 92.

¹¹²*The Covenant Formulary*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971, 168-69, 189-91.

¹¹³G. von Rad ("The Form-critical Problem of the Hexateuch," *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays*, New York: McGraw-Hill, London: Oliver and Boyd, 1966, 35) is the most notable supporter of the Feast of Booths as that at which the covenant was renewed. Most other scholars support the Feast of Weeks because of the stress in *Jubilees* (esp 6:17) on the renewal of the covenant at Weeks: e.g. W. H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline*. Appendix G, 53; "Light on the Manual of Discipline (DSD) from the Book of Jubilees," *BASOR* 123 (1951), 31-32; E. Roop, *A Form-Critical Study of the Society Rule*, 101.

¹¹⁴E. Kutsch ("Feste und Feiern," "II In Israel," *RGG*³ 2:912) supports the association of the Qumran covenant ceremony with the Feast of Weeks, as does A.R.C. Leaney (*The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning*, Philadelphia: Westminster, London: A. & C.

Black, 1966, 95-107) who relies for the most part on evidence from *Jubilees* which was much used at Qumran. Traditionally (*m. Pesah* 10:4) Deut 26:3ff. belongs to the Passover Haggadah.

¹¹⁵Called "A Pilgrim Song" by A. Weiser, *The Psalms* (Philadelphia: Westminster, London: SCM, 1962), 744.

¹¹⁶Weiser, *The Psalms*, 744.

¹¹⁷*Psalmenstudien*, V, (Kristiania: Jacob Dybwad, 1925), 48. Mowinckel classifies Ps 121 as a *Segenpsalmen*, another pointer to the suitability of its use for expanding Num 6:24-26, since the psalm itself may have been used as a blessing.

¹¹⁸D.F. Baumgärtel, "Zur Liturgie," 263: A. Weiser, *The Psalms*, 673, 679; K. Baltzer, *The Covenant Formulary*, 133, 189, 190.

Weiser states definitely that this Qumran ceremony was part of the autumnal festival with its tradition of *Heiligesgeschichte* (cf. von Rad [see above, p. 339, n.113]). If the phrase is borrowed from Ps 118:1 then a connection with Booths is also supported by Mowinckel (*Psalmenstudien*, V, 34) for that psalm, especially through its link with a possible enthronement festival (*Psalmenstudien*, II, 4, 89).

¹¹⁹Hebrew text with translations: S. Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries, Volume 1, Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1910; reissued with a prolegomenon by J. A. Fitzmyer, New York: Ktav, 1970; C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents*, Oxford: Clarendon, 1954; E. Lohse, *Texte*, 63-107.

¹²⁰E.g., I. Rabinowitz, "A Reconsideration of 'Damascus' and '390 Years' in the 'Damascus' ('Zadokite') Fragments," *JBL* 73 (1954), 13, 25; J. Carmignac, "Comparison entre les manuscrits 'A' et 'B' du Document de Damas," *RQ* 2 (1959-60), 53-67;

A. M. Denis, *Les thèmes de connaissance dans le Document de Damas* (Studia hellenistica 15; Louvain: Publications universitaires, 1967), esp. pp. 124, 139, 144-46, 200. For a structural outline of the whole of CD see J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls, Major Publications and Tools for Study* (SBLSEBS 8; Missoula: SBL and Scholars Press, 1975), 90-91.

¹²¹I have supported Murphy-O'Connor in my article which draws out the implications of his understanding in relation to Qumran messianic expectation ("The Amos-Numbers Midrash [CD 7,13b-8,1a] and Messianic Expectation," *ZAW* 92 1980, 397-404); P. R. Davies offers similar support ("The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document," *JJS* 33 1982, 299, n.29).

¹²²"A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document VI, 2-VIII, 3," *RB* 78 (1971), 210-32.

¹²³Murphy-O'Connor points ("A Literary Analysis," 220) to the structural parallel to the blessings and maledictions that end the Holiness Code (Lev 26:3-16).

¹²⁴"The Original Text of CD 7:9-8:2=19:5-14," *HTR* 64 (1971), 379-86.

¹²⁵"Comparison entre les manuscrits 'A' et 'B'," 65-66; he categorizes the divergencies between CD 7:10-21 and 19:7-9 as a "cas inexplicé."

¹²⁶The resulting text is laid out clearly in "The Original Text of CD," 384.

¹²⁷8:1 actually reads הנסוגים הסגירו לחרב, the second word being a scribal error of a later scribe: Lohse, *Texte*, 80.

¹²⁸המחזיקים אלה מלטו בקץ הפקודה הראשון (7:21b) thus refers to

(7:13b; Dan 11:32) "those who held fast," and not to the sons of Seth, the phrase's immediate antecedent.

¹²⁹"The Original Text of CD," 385.

¹³⁰"The Original Text of CD," 386. Both quotations are now introduced by אשר כהוב, but Murphy-O'Connor ("The Original Text of CD," 380, n.4, following Rabin, *Zadokite Documents*, 30-31) claims that the quotation of Zechariah was introduced by אשר אמר, the regular formula that precedes ביד (Cf. 3:21, 4:13, 19:14).

¹³¹"The Original Text of CD," 385.

¹³²The same phrase occurs at CD 12:23, 14:19, 20:1.

¹³³At least according to MT. BH³ supposes that כוכב אלהיכם is an addendum. In the LXX (=Acts 7:43) the order is altered such that $\mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\chi$ and $\text{P}\alpha\lambda\epsilon\alpha\nu$ (the star god) are described as idols. Syr. has a different order again.

¹³⁴If the phrase כוכב אלהיכם אשר עשיתם לכם is taken as a whole, then it may have been omitted purposely because of its negative significance.

¹³⁵*Zadokite Documents*, 28; followed by Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*, 2nd ed., 45.

¹³⁶"The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document," 300.

¹³⁷APOT 2, 816. Charles concedes that the change of verbs at the beginning of the line is deliberate; but this is negated if we allow some such description of the matter as proposed here: it is 5:27 that is quoted, not 5:26.

¹³⁸Nowhere is the סוכה identified with the Temple or Tabernacle *par excellence*, yet the two may be linked because one was kept in the other.

¹³⁹In the same form as in 4QFlor 1:12 though with a different introductory formula.

¹⁴⁰The king and the assembly are equated somewhat in 2 Chr 29:23, 30:2, 4, but not sufficiently for these verses to provide the basis of the identification.

¹⁴¹*Zadokite Documents*, 29.

¹⁴²"The Ideology of the Temple in the Damascus Document," 300.

¹⁴³Gen 42:23, Job 33:23, Isa 43:27. Charles (*ApOT* 2, 309) noticed in *T. Levi* 8:14 that ἱερός translating כֹּהֵן may rather stand for צדיק. צדיק is used for the Righteous Teacher in 4QPss^a 1:19.

¹⁴⁴A possible allusion to Num 15:31, 2 Sam 12:9, 2 Chr 36:16 or even *1 Enoch* 99:2, 104:9.

¹⁴⁵*Les écrits esséniens*, 149 and n.1.

¹⁴⁶Cf. *T. Levi* 18:2-3, *T. Judah* 24:1-6, wherein the star is the priest to come. For מלך as the royal prince cf. 1QSb 5:20, CD 5:1, 1QM 3:3, 15, 4:1. It is also the most frequent title for the messianic prince in Ezek 44-48. In Ps 2:9 the sceptre is the symbol of the (messianic) king; cf. Gen 49:10, Isa 11:4. It is possible that the Interpreter of the Law in CD 6:7 refers to a past figure whereas in the revision of CD, represented by the Amos-Numbers midrash, the title refers to a future figure; in different recensions of CD the one title may have different referents.

¹⁴⁷Already observed from the comparative study of the Qumran texts; see, e.g., J. Starcky, "Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumran," *RB* 70 (1963), 481-505; R. E. Brown, "J. Starcky's

Theory of Qumran Messianic Development," *CBQ* 28 (1966), 51-57.

¹⁴⁸Cf. plural suffix written without *yōd*: CD 10:9, 1QS 1:26, 3:1, 1QH 5:4, 5.

¹⁴⁹*Zadokite Documents*, 8, 20.

¹⁵⁰E.g., Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 98, 102; Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens*, 139, n. 1; 145, n. 8. Yadin ("Three Notes on the Dead Sea Scrolls," *IEJ* 6 1956, 158-59) was the first to read this phrase correctly.

¹⁵¹משיח (מ) אהרן ו (מ) ישראל CD 19:10, 20:1, A² (CD 9-16) also looked for only one Messiah: CD 12:23, 14:19 (supported by 4QD^b). None of this is appreciated by A. Caquot in his treatment of the phrase ("Le messianisme qumrânien," *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, BETL 46, 240-41).

¹⁵²E.g., E. A. Wcela, "The Messiah(s) of Qumran," *CBQ* 26 (1964), 340-49.

¹⁵³Argued most cogently by A. S. van der Woude, *Die messianische Vorstellungen*, 38-66; more recently by R. Deichgräber, "Zur Messiaserwartung der Damaskusschrift," *ZAW* 78 (1966), 333-43; on CD 7:10-21, see esp. 338-39. For further exposition on the messianism of this passage see my article "The Amos-Numbers Midrash (CD 7,13b-8,1a) and Messianic Expectation," esp. 402-4.

¹⁵⁴Allegro first published the text in "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," *JBL* 75 (1956), 182-87, and later definitively in DJD V, 57-60, No. 175 and Plate XXI. See further the corrective work of J. Strugnell, "Notes," 225-29.

¹⁵⁵*Testimonies I-II*, Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1916-20.

¹⁵⁶"'4QTestimonia' and the New Testament," *TS* 18 (1957), 513-37;

reprinted in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*, 59-89; see 89 n.78 for more recent bibliographical information. Also see Fitzmyer's bibliographical article on 4QTest generally, *CBQ* 30 (1969), 68-70.

¹⁵⁷E.g., F. Prigent, *Les Testimonia dans le Christianisme primitif: L'épître de Barnabé I-XVI et ses sources* (EBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1961), 27-28.

¹⁵⁸The combination of MT Deut 5:28-29 and 18:18-19 was first pointed out by P. Skehan, "The Period of the Biblical Texts from Khirbet Qumrân," *CBQ* 19 (1957), 435.

¹⁵⁹"Further Messianic References," 187; followed by E. A. Wcela, "The Messiah(s) of Qumran," 346 among others.

¹⁶⁰*Les écrits esséniens*, 330-31.

¹⁶¹*Die messianische Vortellungen*, 184.

¹⁶²*Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 247.

¹⁶³F. M. Cross (*The Ancient Library of Qumran*, revised 1961, 147-49) sees Deut 33:8-11 as probably referring to the Righteous Teacher, though he does not totally exclude possible reference to the priestly Messiah.

¹⁶⁴*Essays on the Semitic Background*, 84. M. Treves ("On the Meaning of the Qumran Testimonia," *RQ* 2 1959-60, 569-71) denies any messianism in 4QTest and supposes the text to celebrate John Hyrcanus I as prophet, ruler, son of Levi and high priest: he offers no cogent support for his assessment.

¹⁶⁵*Ten Years of Discovery*, 61.

¹⁶⁶*Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 248. R. E. Brown ("The Teacher of Righteousness and the Messiah(s)," 39) also understands

a reference to only two people; for him the accursed man is Jonathan (arrested 143 B.C.) and the other vessel of violence is his brother Simon. This view was expressed earlier by P. Skehan, "Two Books on Qumran Studies," *CBQ* 21 (1959), 75; and by implication, P. Winter ("Two Non-Allegorical Expressions in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *PEQ* 91 1959, 40-42) who relates the building of 4QTest to that of CD 4:19, 8:12, 13, 18=19:24-26 and 1QpHab 10:9-10 and refers such activity to Jonathan and Simon (1 Macc. 10:10-11:45, 12:36-37, 13:10, 48).

¹⁶⁷"Further Messianic References," 187; supported by Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens*, 366-68, and perhaps by Gaster (*Dead Sea Scriptures in English Translation*, 350, n.18) who lets the reader decide between Allegro's "ingenious" proposal and a further suggestion of Phasaël and Herod as the two brothers and either Antipater or Mark Anthony as the accursed man.

¹⁶⁸*Ten Years of Discovery*, 61-64; criticized and refuted by Cross (*The Ancient Library of Qumran*, revised 1961, 149-52, n.84).

¹⁶⁹*The Ancient Library of Qumran*, revised 1961, 147-55; now supported by H. Burgmann, "Antichrist-Antimessias. Der Makkabäer Simon?" *Judaica* 36 (1980), 152-74.

¹⁷⁰"Donnersöhne, Menschenfischer und der Davidische Messias," *RQ* 3 (1961-62), 42, n.4; also, Brownlee, *Meaning*, 103-4.

¹⁷¹J. Starcky ("Les Maîtres de Justice et la chronologie de Qumrân," *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, BETL 46, 253) identifies the men of violence as Antigonus and his brother Aristobulus I.

¹⁷²Brownlee sees the same act of building in 1QpHab 10:9-10 from which he concludes that John Hyrcanus and his sons are the

persecuting wicked priests; this highlights the antithesis between Righteous Teacher=Prophet and cursed man=false prophet. The Qumran covenanters reached the conclusion for the former identification after the death of the Teacher, upon reading 1QH 3:7-10.

¹⁷³Cf., 4Q 158 frg. 6 for a similar combination of MT Deuteronomy 5 and 18 (DJD V, 3).

¹⁷⁴*Scripture and Tradition*, 2nd ed, 56-66. From a study of the MT alone H. Kosmala concludes ("The Term *Geber* in the Old Testament and in the Scrolls," *Congress Volume, Rome 1968*, SupVT 17; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969, 168) that גבר in 1QH 3 is not messianic but simply refers to the spiritual re-birth of the author of the hymns.

¹⁷⁵*Scripture and Tradition*, 2nd ed, 65. Brownlee ("The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls. II," *BASOR* 115 [1954], 35) points out that Bo Reicke and J.-P. Audet seem to have been the first to recognize the messianic significance of גבר in 1QS 4:20.

¹⁷⁶E.g., the Targum of Jer 31:21. The Targum of Mal 3:1-3 implies that the messenger is the one to be purified, i.e., Elijah is given the same mission of purification and teaching as גבר in 1QS. Among those denying גבר in 1QH 3:10 any messianic significance are P. W. Skehan ("A New Translation of Qumran Texts," *CBQ* 25 1963, 120) and L. H. Silberman ("Language and Structure in the Hodayot [1QH 3]"; *JBL* 75 1956, 106).

¹⁷⁷"The Servant of the Lord . . . II," 36, n.30.

¹⁷⁸*Meaning*, Appendix A, 261-70; Appendix C, 274-81.

¹⁷⁹Meaning, 270.

¹⁸⁰"The Significance of 'David's Compositions'," *RQ* 5 (1964-66), 569-74.

¹⁸¹"Whence the Gospel According to John?" *John and Qumran*, ed. J. H. Charlesworth; London: G. Chapman, 1972, 175-77.

¹⁸²For other possible biblical support that גבר is used of a prophet, cf. Jer 23:9.

¹⁸³Along with the word נביא in line 7 which is in neither Sam. nor MT but is in the LXX text-type.

¹⁸⁴4QTest 7: שומע אמרי אל; 4QTest 10: שומע אמרי אל דברי.

¹⁸⁵E.g., *Tg. Ps.-J.* and *Frg. Tg. to Num 24:17*; cf., *γ. Ta^can.* 68d, Rev 22:16 (Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition*, 2nd ed, 165).

¹⁸⁶*T. Levi* 18:3-4 talks of the expected priest as a shining star (like that of the king) whose knowledge is illumination.

¹⁸⁷The relation of the messianic priest to the prince has already been described in Chapter III with reference to 1QSB, 1QM and 4QpPs^a.

¹⁸⁸J. Amusin ("4Q Testimona, 15-17," *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer*, eds. A. Caquot and M. Philonenko; Paris: Maisonneuve, 1971, 357-61) has stressed this section concerning denial of family in the Deuteronomy quotation, especially in relation to the similar aspect of Christian discipleship.

¹⁸⁹Cf. T. H. Gaster ("A Qumran reading of Deuteronomy XXXIII 10," *VT* 8 1958, 217-19) who comments upon the interplay between יאר and ירה, the latter represented in MT at this point; he points to LXX Ben Sira 45:17 for a similar wordplay (also LXX 2 Kgs 12:3,

17:28). Gaster's work was furthered in relation to the targumic understanding of MT light as the Law by Vermes ("The Torah is a Light," *VT* 8 1958, 436-38).

¹⁹⁰Not surprisingly the same three figures occur in 1QS 9:11. It appears that 1QS was written by the same scribe as 4QTest; the similarity with respect to eschatological expectations bears this out.

¹⁹¹First published by A. S. van der Woude, "Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran-Höhle XI.," *OTS* 14 (1965), 354-73; reprinted with revisions, M. de Jonge and A. S. van der Woude, "11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament," *NPS* 12 (1965-66), 301-26. Reprinted with assorted restorations: J. A. Fitzmyer, "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11," *JBL* 86 (1967), 25-41; J. Carmignac, "Le document de Qumrân sur Melkisédèq," *RQ* 7 (1969-71), 343-78; J. T. Milik, "Milki-šedeq et Milki-reša^c dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens (I)," *JJS* 23 (1972), 95-144.

¹⁹²Line 24 according to Milik, "Milki-šedeq et Milki-reša^c," 99.

¹⁹³The general similarity between 4QFlor and 11QMelch has been commented upon in particular by Fitzmyer ("Further Light on Melchizedek," 26).

¹⁹⁴Fitzmyer, "Further Light on Melchizedek," 29.

¹⁹⁵Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 118.

¹⁹⁶Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 105-6.

¹⁹⁷Alternatively, God sets the few לברית עם לאור גויים (Isa 42:6; cf. 49:8). Note the reading of this verse in 4QIsa^h: "I have formed you and given you as an eternal covenant" (Text:

P. Skehan, "The Qumran Manuscripts and Textual Criticism," *Volume du Congrès, Strasbourg 1966*, VTSup 4; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1957, 151).

198^a"11Q Melchizedek and the NT," 304.

199^a"11Q Melchizedek and the NT," 306.

200^a"11Q Melchizedek and the NT," 308.

201^a"Further Light on Melchizedek," 29; followed by Milik, "Milki-šedeq et Milki-reša^c," 100-01.

202^a"The Function of Isa 61:1-2 in 11Q Melchizedek," *JBL* 88 (1969), 467-69; taking up Y. Yadin's earlier remark ("A Note on Melchizedek and Qumran," *IEJ* 15 1965, 153).

203^a"The Function of Isa 61:1-2," 467.

204^a"From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4," *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults 1* (Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty; SJLA 12; ed. J. Neusner; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), 90-91.

205^aFr. H. Gaster Festschrift; ed. D. Marcus; *JANESCU* 5 (1973), 374-76.

206^aIn "Milki-šedeq et Milki-reša^c," 97-100; designated as 11QMelch 3 II.

207^aLev 25:9 in 11QMelch 7, Isa 61:3 and Ps 7:8 in line 14, Isa 52:7 in line 17, Dan 9:25 in line 18 and Isa 61:2-3 in line 19. If Milik's restoration is correct, it is no longer possible to uphold the suggestion of D. F. Miner ("A Suggested Reading for 11Q Melchizedek 17," *JSJ* 2 1971, 144-48) that line 17 contains an abbreviated citation of Isa 56:7. Both reconstructions, however, remain possible.

²⁰⁸See especially "11QMelch and the OT," 380-81: *gəzzērâ* šāwâ and 'asmaktâ.

²⁰⁹Isa 61:1-2 is thus a "haftarah portion" ("From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4," 92).

²¹⁰*Exégèse biblique et Judaïsme* (ed. J.-E. Ménard; Strasbourg: Palais Universitaire, 1973), 170-86.

²¹¹The literary influence of such liturgical texts together with the possibility that Luke understood Jesus' mission to have started in a jubilee year has been pointed out by A. Strobel ("Das apokalyptische Terminproblem in der sogen. Antrittspredigt Jesu [Lk 4, 16-30]," *TLZ* 92 1967, 251-54). Interestingly, W. Zimmerli ("Das „Gnadenjahr des Herrn", " *Archäologie und Altes Testament*, eds. A. Kuschke and E. Kutsch; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1970, 321-32) proposes that Isa 61:1ff. is in its very origin a sermonic treatment of Lev 25:10 and various parts of Deutero-Isaiah, including Isa 52:7.

²¹²"Luc 4, 16-30 et la lecture biblique," 173.

²¹³*The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue I*, 282-89.

²¹⁴"Luc 4, 16-30 et la lecture biblique," 178.

²¹⁵If these readings are those of the Day of Atonement (or possibly one of the days of Tabernacles), then these psalms could be among the thirty festival songs which David composed: 11QPs^a 27:8. Cf., J. A. Sanders, *DJD* IV, 91; W. H. Brownlee, "The Significance of 'David's Compositions'," 570-71.

²¹⁶And rests, anyway, on the reading of a *dālet* and a partial *nūn* proposed by Fitzmyer, and followed by Milik. None of the

text of Dan 9:25 is actually present. For a detailed treatment of 11QMelch 18-19, see D. E. Aune, "A Note on Jesus' Messianic Consciousness and 11HQ Melchizedek," *EvQ* 45 (1973), 161-65.

Chapter IV

CONCLUSIONS

In Chapter I the study of Jewish texts that were demonstrated as very probably belonging to the first centuries B.C. and A.D. showed that in using authoritative scripture the Jew made it relevant through the application of certain exegetical principles. These are dimly perceived by modern scholarship, but in relation to both indirect and direct use of the scriptures they formed the basis whereby a Jew talked validly of and with the scriptural text; often the use of such principles may have been subconscious. The study of passages from Philo and the Targums has shown the diversity and universality of these principles. With some hesitancy the later rabbinic designations for such principles have been used throughout.

Study of 4QFlor with such a background understanding has demonstrated several times the worth of being able to presuppose a particular exegetical principle at work. Although such a presupposition was based primarily on the study of the use of language rather than on particular comparisons of content, study of the text itself proceeded in terms of traditional higher criticism. At the start the perspective of the use of certain exegetical principles helped with textual restorations, e.g., at

4QFlor 1:1 (אוינ]ין) in relation to 1:7, at 1:14 (חטאים) in relation to Psalm 1, and at 1:19 (וה]וטי בוא) in relation to Psalm 2.

After the provision of an adequate text, a structural analysis enabled, above all, the intention of the fragments to come to light. Recognition of certain principles at work aided in such an analysis too: e.g., in discussing how 4QFlor 1:7 (2 Sam 7:11a^a) related to the whole context of 4QFlor but particularly 1:1-2 (2 Sam 7:10-11a^a). Again, though not ultimately determinative of it, the principles aided in the discussion of the genre of the parts of the text and also of the whole, for in examining the midrash as a whole the principles pointed to an overall unity within 4QFlor based on a combination of texts that historically almost certainly belonged in the liturgy (of the Feast of Tabernacles).

In discussing the theology of 4QFlor, the structural outline helped demonstrate the eschatological aspect of the whole as each major subsection contained the phrase "the latter days." More interestingly, for 4QFlor 1:1-9, the analysis revealed a certain ambiguity concerning the sanctuary and the community; neither is stressed to the ultimate denial of the other, nor is the language purely metaphorical. Rather, the explanation based on the structural outline maintained the ambiguity of the terms through concluding that the community understood itself as being the eschatological sanctuary in anticipation.

As regards the actual use of scripture in 4QFlor, it was noted that while exegetical principles are used throughout, they do not of necessity require that one particular verse always be interpreted in the same way. Thus Amos 9:11 is used differently

in 4QFlor 1:10-13 from its use in CD 7:13b-8:1a, just as the technique of *gēzērā šāwā* is applied differently in each case. Conversely, that does not deny that certain scriptural passages were used consistently, at least for a while, to support theological views that were reached through the application of certain principles to such texts. For example, the messianism present in 4QFlor in the persons of the Shoot of David and the Interpreter of the Law is best understood in light of the occurrence of similar phrases in relation to scriptural passages in other Qumran scrolls, notably the later recension of CD. Indeed the similarity of certain texts to 4QFlor allowed some tentative traditio-historical remarks to be made.

The concluding illustrations examined in Chapter III have shown that, apart from the mere recognition of exegetical principles at work in the Qumran texts, such recognition can lead to fresh interpretations of those Qumran texts that cite scripture explicitly or implicitly. The examples from 11QtgJob, 1QpHab, 1QM and 1QS have provided examples of midrashic techniques at work in a wide variety of genres. The most noteworthy aspect of the study of CD 7:13b-8:1a was the conclusion that principles of exegesis had been used in the redaction of CD as well as in the actual composition of the Amos-Numbers Midrash. From the structural analysis of 4QTest could be determined the reasons for the order of the texts cited therein; also, the ambiguity of *גבר* and *כונן* was left intact by the editor of the texts. The brief remarks on 11QMelch support firstly the conclusion reached in relation to the use of Amos 9:11 at Qumran, that the same biblical quotation (in this case Isa 8:11) can be used in a variety of ways depending upon the

manner in which it is cited and the principles of exegesis involved; secondly, the combination of the major biblical texts in 11QMelch may originally have had a liturgical setting.

This study has shown that one cannot approach the use of the Bible at Qumran presupposing that such use was guided, for instance, by an overall eschatological perspective. Biblical exegesis at Qumran, and 4QFlor has shown this admirably, depended upon a correct use of certain principles by the interpreter. Some such quality as Qumran eschatology can only be discussed as it is derived from the texts. The scholar's primary task, therefore, is to understand the method of composition that lies behind the texts. It is hoped that this study has provided a somewhat exhaustive treatment of 4QFlor with such a primary concern in mind. The application of such an understanding to the treatment of most of the other Qumran scrolls has as yet hardly been overworked.

INDEXES

BIBLICAL PASSAGES

<i>Genesis</i>		<i>(Ex. Cont'd)</i>	
2:2	29-30	15:1	23
4:2	23	15:2	290
6:1-4	31	15:8	33, 74
6:1,4	31	15:9	34
6:13	266	15:17-18	98, 100, 101, 130, 134, 135, 137, 144, 166, 178, 189, 194, 225
15:1	62	15:17	99, 100, 166, 268
16:14	19	15:18	100, 227
17:5	20, 21, 47	15:21	23, 147
17:22	69	17:7	334
21:12	20	18:9	336
22:14	166, 228, 230	20:21	309, 311, 314, 317
25:8	24	22	75
28:3	62	22:4	34-36, 74, 75
32:25	32, 71	22:5	35
32:27	71	22:19	329
32:29	32, 71, 72	23:16	254
35:9ff	322, 323	34:9	334
35:11	62	34:29	125, 149, 159, 166
35:29	64	34:30	240
40	153	34:33	69
42:23	343		
43:12	110	<i>Leviticus</i>	
48:4	62	1:11	266
49	168, 318	16:33	136, 166
49:10	197, 343	18:24-28	196
49:17	23	18:24	196
49:23-24	160	18:29	196
49:33	24, 69	19	268
<i>Exodus</i>		19:2	196
	1, 221	20:3	196
14:15ff	257	20:6	196
15	135, 184, 216, 255, 257	20:22-24	196
15:1-18	47		

(Lev. Cont'd)

23:40	251
25	321, 322, 323
25:8-17	321
25:9	350
25:10	351
25:13	320, 321
25:14 ff	323

Numbers

6:24-26	295, 298, 300, 301, 338
6:24	296, 299
6:25	296, 297, 339
6:26	298
10:9	294, 295, 334-335
15:31	343
16:13	72
19:20	136, 166
21:18	199
24	164, 167, 205, 318
24:15-17	204, 309, 310, 312, 314, 315, 317, 318, 319
24:15-16	316
24:16-17	160
24:17	200, 305, 308, 318, 348
24:24	284, 327, 328
27:7-11	65
29:1	254
29:7	254
29:12	254

Deuteronomy

1	1
3:6	329
5:28-29	311, 345, 347
6:19	293
7:2	329
7:8	320
7:21	293, 294, 295
7:22	293

(Dt. Cont'd)

9:5	320
12:10	270
13:14	270
15	323
15:2	321
17	253
17:16	23
18:18-19	167, 312, 345, 347
18:18	311
20:1	23
20:2-5	293, 294, 295
20:2	293, 294
20:3	293, 294
20:4	293
20:5	294
20:5-8	334
22:23-27	65
23	102, 180, 181
23:1-4	251
23:2-4	193
23:2	101, 179
23:3-4	101, 130, 136, 179, 227
23:15	293
25:19	231
25:29	270
26:1 ff	261
26:3 ff	340
26:11	296, 300, 336
27:9-10	300
27:15-26	301
27:26	301
30:15	296, 338
31:16	327
32	208, 256
32:45	69
33	126, 159, 160, 164, 167, 174, 182, 204, 205, 208, 256, 257, 309, 317

(Dt. Cont'd)

33:3	105
33:8-11	89, 94, 159, 309, 312, 314, 317, 318, 345
33:9	318
33:10	204
33:12	89, 94
33:19-21	89, 95
33:19	90

Joshua

2:10	286
3:13	73
3:16	73
6:26	310, 313
23:1	270

Judges

2:14	270
5:18	228
5:26	34
8:34	270
10:15	336
19:22	270

1 & 2 Samuel 167*1 Sam.*

4:3	334
7:1	270
9:17ff	254
11:10	336
12:11	270
15:9	336
16:1ff	254
26:2	238

2 Samuel

	1, 221, 250,
7	45, 98, 111, 128, 129, 136, 139, 140, 143, 144, 159, 161, 163, 164, 166, 167, 169, 170, 171, 173-174, 178, 194, 204, 209, 216, 217, 218, 224, 225, 240, 257, 259, 276, 323
7:1	225, 231
7:5-6	134
7:9	225
7:10-14	242, 257
7:10-11	130, 133, 134, 137, 138, 149, 164, 166, 178, 354
7:10	97, 98, 99, 134, 135, 137, 158, 178, 191, 225
7:11-16	209
7:11-14	114, 132, 138, 148, 160, 165, 166, 188, 279, 304
7:11	98, 108, 111, 130, 131, 132, 136, 137, 138, 139 190, 192, 225, 232, 354
7:12	132, 166, 192, 199
7:13	112, 132, 192
7:14	132, 209, 213, 214
7:16-18	172-174
7:16	178
7:19	184, 192
12:9	343
13:20	264
13:39	30, 69
22:31	239
23:1-7	167
23:1-3	333

<i>1 & 2 Kings</i>	167		
		(2 Chr. Cont'd)	
		36:16	343
<i>1 Kings</i>			
1:32-48	171	<i>Ezra</i>	180
8:66	336	2:2-65	261
11:29ff	254	2:58	261
14:9	64	2:70	261
19:16ff	254	2:77	261
21:11	252	3:11	243, 337
		7:10	203
<i>2 Kings</i>		7:24	261
11:12-20	171		
12:3	348	<i>Nehemiah</i>	180
17:28	348-349	7:60	261
		8:14	254
<i>1 & 2 Chronicles</i>		10:29	261
	167, 180	13:1	251
<i>1 Chr.</i>		<i>Job</i>	
5:2	290	24:13	280, 281
16:27	259	25:3	280, 324
16:34	337	26:10	281
16:41	337	32:1	282
17:10	98, 233	32:13	282
17:14	178	33:23	343
23:25	233	33:28-30	324
28:7	233	33:28	281
		36:30	281
<i>2 Chr.</i>		37:10-11	282
5:13	337	37:10	282
7:3	337	37:11ff	282
7:6	337	37:11	280, 281
13:7	270	37:15	281
13:22	248	38:7	283
20:21	337	41:10	280, 281
24:27	248	42:6	281
29:23	343		
30:2	343	<i>Psalms</i>	1, 221
30:4	343	1	45, 121, 123, 126, 129, 133,

(Psalms Cont'd)

1 (Cont'd)	144, 145, 147, 148, 149, 150, 156, 159, 162, 163, 164, 167, 172-174, 215, 217, 234, 254, 257, 307, 319, 320, 323, 354
1:1	145, 147, 157, 165, 166, 249
1:2	115
1:6	240
2	45, 120, 121, 124, 125, 129, 133, 144, 145, 147, 148, 149, 150, 156, 158, 159, 160, 163, 164, 166, 167, 169, 172-174, 209, 217, 219, 234, 253, 257, 261, 307, 323, 354
2:1-2	146, 156, 165
2:1	120, 122
2:2	86, 120, 158, 268
2:4	122
2:6	236
2:7	209, 243
2:9	343
2:11	125, 240
2:12	121, 122, 236
3:1-2	125
5:3	127
5:12	239
7:8-9	321, 323
7:8	350
12	55
16:3	182
16:10	276
18:3	228

(Psalms Cont'd)

18:10,12	125
18:31	239
29	338
31:20	239
34:10	182
34:11	296, 336
34:23	239
41:4	64
45:5	328
51:9-11	266
67:2	300
74:11	34
78:13	73
82:1-2	321, 323
84:3	69
84:10	228
84:12	228
89	99, 170, 225
89:2	337
89:6	240
89:19	228
89:23	98, 224, 225
89:29	337
92:13	77
96:6	259
104:31	230
105	298, 301
106	298, 301
114:2	240
116	147
118	298
118:1	340
119:29	300
119:49	235
119:81	69
119:82	69
119:123	69

(Psalms Cont'd)

121	340
121:7	296, 301
136	147, 243, 298
136:1	243
138:8	337
143:7	69
<i>Proverbs</i>	
12:4	20
16:21	297
16:22	296, 297, 299, 301
16:23	297
29:2-5	333
30:15-16	290

Isaiah

5:14	290
7:17	206
8	148
8:11	115, 128, 145, 147, 148, 166, 208, 237, 319, 320, 355
8:14	268
11:4	343
11:5	271
13:18	331
23:12-13	284, 328
24:17	196
24:23	233
30:8	102
38:14	69
40:3	104
40:5	104
42:6	349
43:27	343
47:1	330
48:8	290

(Isa. Cont'd)

48:13	34
49:8	349
52:3ff	323
52:7-10	253
52:7	320, 321, 323, 350, 351
55:3	276
56:3-7	180
56:7	350
57:5	325
57:15 - 58:14	322, 323
58:5	323
58:6	7
60:2	229
61	322, 323
61:1ff	322, 351
61:1-3	322, 323
61:1-2	321, 322, 351
61:1	321
61:2-3	350
61:2	321, 323
61:3	350
63:19	125, 243
65	216
65:6	266
65:10-11	333
65:22-23	90, 95, 127, 257
65:24ff	257
<i>Jeremiah</i>	
2:22	266
5:17	331
7:12-14	259
12:11	264
14:9	334
23:9	348
23:29	291
28:16	64

(Jeremiah Cont'd)

28:42	64
29:3	64
31:21	347
31:31-34	297, 301
31:33	297
32:42	336
33:9	336
33:11	147, 337
51:1	27
51:51	264
<i>Ezekiel</i>	1, 107
6:4	264
11:16	268
20:7	236
20:34	236
37	118, 206, 216, 218
37:15-28	118
37:16	157
37:23	116-118, 146, 148, 166, 211-212, 235, 236, 237
37:26-28	216
37:26	99
37:27	211-212, 216
37:28	218
39:10	236
43:2-5	104
43:8	196
44 - 48	343
44:6-9	179
44:9	101
44:10	116-117, 235
44:15	237

<i>Daniel</i>	1, 5, 41, 124, 155, 176, 194, 221
5:24-28	155
5:26	155
7	182
7:13	251
9:13	252
9:25	323, 350, 352
11:3	114
11:15	160, 164
11:18	332
11:24	160
11:30	284, 328
11:32	124, 147, 342
11:33	275
11:35	124, 125, 147, 149, 166, 240, 275
12:1	239
12:4	239
12:9	239
12:10	124, 147, 149, 166, 175, 275
12:13	199
<i>Hosea</i>	
12:4-5	72
<i>Joel</i>	
3:14	64
4	125
4:16	125
<i>Amos</i>	
4:5	268
5:14	338

(Amos Cont'd)

5: 23	64
5: 26	304, 342
5: 27	304, 305, 307, 342
9: 11	100, 114, 133, 135, 139, 166, 174, 188, 189, 208, 210, 234, 241, 251, 302, 302, 305, 307, 320, 354, 355

Micah

2: 2-4	333
3: 11	334
4: 7	233

Nahum

1: 7	239
------	-----

Habakkuk

1: 6	122, 284, 288, 330, 331
1: 8-9	283
1: 8	106, 327
1: 9	285, 286, 287, 327
1: 10	122
1: 11	288, 332
1: 12	327
1: 16	285, 327
1: 17	329
2: 2	291
2: 4	237, 288
2: 5-6	285, 333
2: 5	289, 290
2: 6	286, 287
2: 11	329
2: 12	330
2: 13	330
2: 15	286, 289, 328

(Habakkuk Cont'd)

2: 16	328
2: 20	286, 287

Zechariah

9: 6	260
14	125
14: 16	125, 254

Malachi

3: 1-3	347
--------	-----

Matthew

6: 13	231
11: 25-30	336
22: 37-40	55

Mark

14: 58	259
--------	-----

Luke

1: 67-75	335
2: 30	271
4: 16-30	322

John

1: 46-51	64
----------	----

Acts

2: 30	252
3: 22	241
4: 25-28	276
7: 43	342
10: 35-38	323
13: 33-37	169, 209
13: 33	172, 243, 276
15: 16	114, 210, 234

Corinthians

1 Corinthians

3:16-17 277

11:10 263

2 Corinthians 212,214

4:6 336

6 212,216

6:14 - 7:1 211-217,236,255

6:15 211

6:16 212,215,216

6:18 214

Ephesians

2:21-22 277

Hebrews

1:5 209

James 55

Jude 55

Revelation

22:16 348

APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

<i>2 Apocalypse of Baruch</i>	(<i>Jubilees Cont'd</i>)
32:4	269
56:11-14	69, 70
<i>1 Enoch</i>	37
6-11	31, 70
6:8	71
8:3	71
10:1	33
12:2	262
14:23	262
20:6	71
39:5	262
65:12	182
90:15,18,20,37	243
90:28	265
90:28-29	259
91:13	269
93:6	182
99:2	343
104:9	343
106:18	64
<i>Jubilees</i>	37
1:12	203
1:17,27	269
1:26-28	229
1:28	265
2:24	186
4:15	70
4:15,22,5:1	69
6:17	339
12:29	335, 336, 338
16:25	260
31:19	271
31:24	336
32:16-29	251, 259
	32:30
	322
	<i>1 Maccabees</i>
	1:46
	182
	10:10-11:45
	346
	12:36-37
	346
	13:10,48
	346
	14:14
	203
	<i>Psalms of Solomon</i>
	11:1
	321
	<i>Sibylline Oracles</i>
	5:433
	269
	<i>Sirach</i>
	37
	32:15
	203
	44:19
	62
	45:17
	348
	51:12
	243
	TESTAMENTS
	<i>T. Dan</i>
	5:10
	271
	5:11
	337
	<i>T. Gad</i>
	8:1
	271
	<i>T. Joseph</i>
	18:1
	336
	19:11
	271
	<i>T. Judah</i>
	24:1-6
	204, 343

TESTAMENTS (Cont'd)

<i>T. Levi</i>	37
8:14	343
18:2-3	343
18:3-4	348
18:3	204
<i>T. Naphtali</i>	37
8:2	271
<i>T. Reuben</i>	
5:6-7	69
<i>Tobit</i>	
12:15	182

DEAD SEA SCROLLS

<i>CD</i>		<i>(CD Cont'd)</i>	
	37, 118, 139, 176,	5:12	270
	177, 195, 198, 200,	5:18	195
	202, 205-208, 210,	5:19	198, 207
	241, 258, 268, 273,	6	176
	275, 276, 302-309,	6:1	308
	320, 341, 355	6:2 - 8:3	302
1:1	259	6:2-11a	302
1:4-11	188	6:4ff	236
1:5-10	78	6:7-10	272
1:7	160	6:7	199, 208, 343
1:14	124	6:8-11	175
1:20	270	6:10	199
2:12	308	6:11-14	207, 270
3:11	270	6:11b - 8:3	302
3:12b - 8:20	205-209	6:11b - 7:4a	302
3:12b	205	6:11	151, 206
3:18	269	6:13-21	207
3:20-4:4	157	6:17	277
3:21	342	6:19-20	161
4	176	6:19	256
4:1	237	6:21	181, 207, 209
4:3ff	236	7 - 8	249
4:3-4	120, 175, 206	7:3	270, 277
4:3	206, 237	7:4-6	302
4:4	199, 206	7:4b - 8:3	302
4:11	206, 237, 239	7:6b-8	302
4:12-19	196	7:8-9	207
4:12-198	207	7:9 - 8:3	302
4:13-18	207	7:9-13b	302, 303
4:13	342	7:9	252
4:14	140, 207	7:10-21	341, 344
4:16ff	109	7:10-12	207
4:19	346	7:12ff	236
5:1	343	7:12	206, 237
5:6-7	196, 207	7:13	206, 237, 303
5:6	270	7:13b - 8:1a	279, 302-309, 320, 355

CD (Cont'd)

7:13b	303, 342
7:14-21	188, 189
7:14b-21a	243, 304
7:14b-15a	304
7:15-16	207
7:15b-21a	304
7:16	114, 208, 210, 302, 320
7:18-20	204, 310, 317
7:18	199, 200, 208
7:21b	341
8:1	303, 341
8:1b-3	303
8:2	108
8:4	234
8:9	234
8:12	346
8:13	346
8:14	137
8:16	208, 234, 319
8:18	346
8:20	205-206
9 - 16	344
9:2	137, 252
9:9	198
9:10	198
9:21	277
10:6	242
10:9	344
11:2	180
11:21	267
12:22	273
12:23	126, 342, 344
13:2	242
13:12	277
14:1	206, 207
14:4-6	261
14:4	102, 207, 208

CD (Cont'd)

14:6	207, 208
14:9	342
14:19	126, 273, 344
16:2	76
16:5	195
16:6	137, 252
19:5-14	302
19:7-13a	303
19:7b-14	302, 303
19:7-9	341
19:10-11	304
19:10	126, 239, 275, 344
19:11	273
19:13	239
19:13a	303
19:14	342
19:24-26	346
19:29	234, 319
20:1	126, 342, 344
26:6	245
20:9	277
20:14	78
20:20	271
20:23f	270
20:27	257
<i>1Q22</i>	334
<i>1QapGen</i>	37
19:14-21	77
<i>1QH</i>	37, 83, 126, 168, 194, 198, 268, 273, 335
1:2	230
1:10	230
2:16-17	231

1QP Hab (Cont'd)

10:1	240
10:2-5	288, 329
10:2	250, 252
10:9-10	346
10:13	158
1:2-8	286, 326, 328
11:3	288
11:4-8	256
11:6-8	256
11:6	286
11:8-14	328
11:9	288
11:13	287
12:1-10	243
12:1	250
12:2-3	153
12:3-4	239
12:6-7	250
12:6	240, 252
12:15	286
13:2-4	287
13:4	286
<i>1QS</i>	37, 157, 173, 194, 198, 234, 249, 268, 270, 273, 295-301, 347, 349, 355
1:1-3	76
1:4	119
1:9-11	277
1:16 - 2:25a	299
1:17	257
1:18 - 2:18	300
1:26	344
2:2-4	279, 295-301, 335, 338
2:2-3	296
2:2	277, 296

1QS (Cont'd)

2:3	296, 297, 299, 318, 336
2:4-10	261
2:4	298
2:5-9	301
2:5	318
2:6-7	296
2:10	301
2:11	277
2:16-17	211
2:17	277
2:19	173
3:1	344
3:2	298
3:3	298
3:4-12	267
3:4	256
3:13 - 4:14	270
3:15	339
3:19	300
3:24	109
4:2	339
4:3	298, 339
4:4	339
4:5	277
4:10	277
4:18	339
4:20-22	315, 316
4:20	316, 347
5:6	269, 277
5:9	249
5:13-14	277
5:16	124
5:17	252
5:21	339
6:3-8	142
6:6	142, 272
6:8-9	239

IQS (Cont'd)

6:18	187, 339
6:24	245
6:27	198
8:1	187
8:2-4	267
8:2	124
8:4-6	259, 277
8:4	257
8:5	269
8:8-9	277
8:9-10	187
8:9	269, 337
8:11-12	142
8:12	272
8:14	228, 252
8:15	245
8:26	245
9:3-6	186
9:3-5	267
9:4-5	267
9:5-7	277
9:6	269
9:8-9	277
9:10-11	206
9:11	126, 203, 275, 349
9:19	228
10	255
10:12	337, 339
11:2-3	157
11:7	182, 262, 263
11:8	259, 277
11:11	339
11:15	339

IQSa

	37, 157, 206, 273, 307, 319-320
1:1	151, 238

IQSa (Cont'd)

1:2-3	235, 237, 319
1:2	117, 118, 234
1:9	117
1:24	117
2:3ff	269
2:3	117
2:4	102
2:8-9	183, 263
2:9-10	102-103
<i>IQSb</i>	37, 157, 236, 273, 348
1:2	238
3:5	337
3:20	337
4:27	336
5:20	343
<i>2Q15</i>	324
<i>3Q15</i>	36
<i>4Q186</i>	76
<i>4QaHa</i>	273
<i>4QarP</i>	273
<i>4QBibParaph</i>	71

frg

6	347
---	-----

<i>1QH</i> (Cont'd)		<i>1QIsa^a</i> (Cont'd)	
2:23	198	53:4-6	127
3	233, 347	56:12	235
3:3	336		
3:5-10	316	<i>1QIsa^b</i>	83
3:6	198		
3:7-10	315, 316, 347	<i>1QM</i>	6, 37, 40, 83, 126, 181, 194, 203, 230, 256, 268, 270, 273, 292, 334-335, 348, 355
3:10	347		
3:28	231		
4:5	336, 339		
4:12-13	109		
4:19	110, 277		
4:27	336, 339	1	239
5:4	344	1:1	231
5:5	344	1:5	277
5:11-12	271	1:15	277
5:12	271	2:1-6	186
5:16	257	2:5-6	267
6:15	259	2:11	239
6:27-28	228	3:2 - 4:16	228
8:6-10	259	3:3	343
8:8	235	3:5	182
8:14	323	3:15	343
8:17	235	4:1	343
8:18	235	5:1-2	228
11:1ff	182	6:2-3	228
11:18	271	6:6	182
		7:4-5	101
<i>1QIsa^a</i>	116, 127, 168, 235, 331	7:6	107, 182, 269
3:11	230	9:12-15	32, 71
8:4	116	9:15	71
23:12b-13	328	10:1 - 12:17	335
29:15	235	10:1-8	279, 292-295, 320
37:7	230	10:1-2	293, 295
40:15	73	10:1	293, 294
42:18-19	271	10:2-5	293
		10:2	293, 294

IQM (Cont'd)

10:3	293,294
10:4	198,293
10:6-8	294
10:8	198,294
10:9	238
10:10	182
10:18	335
11:3	198
11:15	239
12:1,4	158
13:5-6	277
13:5	277
13:9	277
13:11	108
15:1	277
15:3	231
16:1	182
16:15	175
17:1	175
17:7	277
17:8	337
17:9	175
18:1-2	183
18:2	119
18:3	231
19	194

IQpHab

	4,5,39,41, 83,136,151, 152,168,242, 268,283-292, 326,327,330, 333,335,273, 355
1:2	252
1:13	239
1:16 - 2:10	326

IQpHab (Cont'd)

2	249
2:1-10	162
2:4	229
2:7-10	246
2:11-15	284
2:11-14	330
2:11-12	122,327
3:1	288
3:4-5	122
3:6-14	285,286
3:6-7	106
3:7-13	283,287
3:7-12	327
3:8-14	287
4:1-3	122
4:4-6	329
4:9	288
4:11	288
4:13	288
5:13	106
6:2-5	243,285,288,327
6:2	240
6:8-12	243
6:8	288
6:11-12	331
6:15-17	291
7:3-5	141
7:3	240,252
7:4-5	76,246
7:14	288
7:15	288
8:1	157,237,239
8:3-13	285,287,289,290
8:9	114,241,286
8:13	287
9:2	240
9:3	252
9:14	250,288

<i>4QBibParaph (Cont'd)</i>		<i>4QFlor (Cont'd)</i>	
<i>frgs</i>		1:1-13	129-144, 148, 149,
10 - 12	74, 75		161, 162, 163, 164,
			166, 169, 215, 242
<i>4QCatena^a</i>	127, 240	1:1-9	130, 134, 164, 354
		1:1-7	178, 183, 189, 190,
<i>frgs</i>			195, 215, 240
5, 6	257	1:1-6	207
		1:1-2	354
<i>frgs</i>		1:1	97-99, 228, 264,
10 - 11:9	239		354
		1:2-7	130-131, 135
<i>4QD^b</i>	182, 269, 273, 344	1:2-6	149
		1:2-4	213
<i>4QDeut^j</i>	84	1:2-3	207
		1:2	99-100, 134, 151,
<i>4QEn^a 1 iii</i>			161, 175, 206, 235,
11	71		252
		1:2-7	134-135, 136
<i>4QEn^a 1 iv</i>		1:3-4	212
6	71	1:3	100, 106, 128, 161,
			168, 230
<i>4QEn^c 5 ii</i>		1:4-9	212
22 - 24	64	1:4-7	108
		1:4-5	100-107, 235
<i>4QExod^c</i>	73	1:4	84, 207, 228, 262,
			263
<i>4QFlor Text</i>	86-91	1:5	166
<i>Translation</i>	91-96	1:6	100, 107, 185, 192
		1:7-9	131-132, 137, 194-
<i>4QFlor</i>	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 37, 38		195, 207
	43, 80-278, 279,	1:7	108, 136, 185, 190,
	304, 307, 309, 323,		192, 239, 252, 354
	334, 349, 353-356	1:8	108-109, 125, 183,
			232
<i>frgs 1 - 3:</i>		1:9	97, 109-111, 232
1	81-82		
1:1-19	86-87		

frgs 1 - 3: (Cont'd)

1:10-13	111, 132-133, 135, 138-139, 165, 198, 204, 218, 232, 243, 257, 355
1:10-11	85, 279
1:10	97, 100, 111-112, 148, 168, 192
1:11-13	188, 207
1:11-12	114
1:11	100, 112-113, 122, 139, 161, 199, 208
1:12	100, 113-114, 125, 134, 135, 139, 151, 166, 175, 197, 206, 208, 223, 252, 302, 320, 343
1:13-14	250
1:13	113, 114, 129, 207, 233
1:14 - 2:6	129, 144-159, 161, 162, 163, 165, 166, 240
1:14-17	145-146
1:14-16	207
1:14	114-116, 121, 145, 153, 188, 245, 354
1:15-16	319, 320
1:15	116, 134, 135, 175, 206, 208, 237, 252
1:16-17	126, 206, 207
1:16	116-118, 135, 169, 236, 320
1:17-19	206
1:17	85, 117, 118-119, 206, 215, 236, 250
1:18 - 2:6	146-147
1:18-19	188
1:18	120, 168

frgs 1 - 3: (Cont'd)

1:19 - 2:1	175
1:19	86, 120-123, 125, 134, 153, 157, 183, 206, 235, 354
2:1-6	88, 197
2:1-4a	123
2:1-2	194
2:1	123, 124, 125, 128, 203
2:2	123-124, 196, 207
2:3-4	124, 175
2:3	124, 125
2:4	111, 124
2:4a	124-125, 239, 275
2:5-6	125
2:5	124, 125
<i>frg</i>	
4	88, 123, 125, 160, 168, 204, 236
5	88, 126, 160, 167, 204, 275
6-11	159, 204, 208, 257, 309
6, 7	89, 126, 204, 309
8	89, 126, 204
9, 10	89, 126, 159
11	90, 126
12	90, 127, 161
13	90, 127
14	90, 127, 175
15-26	161
15, 19	90, 127-128
16	90, 128
17	90, 128, 211
18	91, 128
20	90, 128
21	91, 128, 226

<i>frg</i> (Cont'd)		<i>4QPisa</i> ^a	122, 203, 252
22	91, 128		
23	91, 128, 272	<i>frgs</i>	
24	91, 128	8 - 10	122
25	91, 128	8 - 10:17	317
26	91, 128	8 - 10:24	271
27	91, 128		
<i>4QIsa</i> ^h	349	<i>4QPisa</i> ^a	252
<i>4QJob</i> ^{a, b}	324	<i>4QPisa</i> ^b	
		2:1	115
<i>4QOrd</i>	37, 83, 222	<i>4QPNah</i>	162
		3:3-5	250
<i>4QpaleoExod</i> ^m	226		
<i>4QpaleoJob</i> ^c	324	<i>4QPPs</i> ^a	162, 168, 203, 250, 268, 273, 348
		1:19	343
<i>4QPBless</i>	37, 160, 188-189, 203, 230, 273, 274	2:17-19	250
		2:18	257
		3:4	239
<i>frg</i>			
2:1:2	226	<i>4QPr Nab</i>	37
<i>frgs</i>		<i>4QPssJosh</i>	37, 310, 313, 318
3 - 4	122		
		<i>4QS</i> ^e	249
<i>frg</i>			
3	197	<i>4QSam</i> ^{a, b, c}	224
<i>4QPHos</i> ^b		<i>4QTest</i>	37, 126, 160, 167
2:14	198		

<i>4QTest (Cont'd)</i>		<i>11QMelch (Cont'd)</i>	
	203, 204, 212, 273, 279, 309-319, 320, 345, 346, 349, 355	25	249, 319
1 - 20	311	<i>11QPs^a</i>	162, 167
1 - 8	311	3:1	301
7	348	3:5	336
9 - 13	312	18:17	267
10	348	27:2-4	316
14 - 20	159, 309, 312	27:8	351
17	318	<i>11QTemple</i>	187, 190, 191, 193
21 - 30	310, 312	3:3	108, 231
22	318	3:4	230
23	318	4:8	226
25	310, 313	7:3	240
<i>4QtgJob</i>	66	25:10-27:10	256
<i>4QtgLev</i>	37, 66	25:10	256
<i>6QD</i>		27:10	256
3:2	198	28	256
<i>11QMelch</i>	37, 128-129, 279- 280, 319-323, 349, 350, 355, 356	29:7-10	229
1:2	252	29:7	235
2	320	29:8-10	104, 105, 191, 235, 269
3 - 4	321	29:9	226
7	321, 350	29:10	251, 257
14	350	40:6	181, 207
17	350	45:12	230
18 - 19	352	45:13	227
18	350	45:14	227
19	350	<i>11QtgJob</i>	37, 66, 279, 280- 283, 324, 355
		8:3	280
		9:6	280
		10:1	281

11Q¹ Job (Cont'd)

21:4-5	282, 325
23:7	281
28:7	281
29:1	282
29:2	280, 325
29:6	281
30:5	69
31:2	325
36:4	280
37:8	281

ANCIENT AUTHORS AND WORKS

'Abot R. Nat.	74	Josephus	8,45
12	260		
33	74	Antiquities	
36(B)	74	18:19	186
37(A)	51-52		
		Mekilta, Exodus	
Aquila	32	15:8	74
		22:4	36,75
Aristotle, Rhetoric			
1:2:19	53	Midrash Rabbah	
2:23:4f	9	Gen	
		10:9	29
Artemidorus, Onirocriticon		17:5	20
	53	20:12	328
		26:5	69
Auctor ad Herennium		40:5	328
2:13:18	9	46:7	47,61
		47:1	61
Cicero, Topica			
4:23	9		
		11:6	338,339
Demotic Chronicle			
	242		
		90:19	269
Eusebius, Prep. Evang.			
9:17	62		
		12:1	245
Heraclitus, Homeric Allegories			
5:2	17,57	MISHNAH	
		'Abot	
Hermas	255	5:5	74
Hillel	9-12,25,52	Ba. Qam.	
		6:4	34,36

<i>Bikkurim</i>		<i>Gig.</i>	
1:4	261	2:6ff	69
<i>Pesaḥim</i>		<i>Jos.</i>	
10:4	340	28	57
<i>Qiddushin</i>		<i>Mig.</i>	
4:1	102, 180	89-94	57
<i>Yadayim</i>		<i>Mut.</i>	
4:5	168	60-76	19
		61-63	62
PHILO	8, 16-25, 36, 45, 56, 50, 62, 63, 179, 185-186, 262, 265, 353	<i>Praem.</i>	
		61	57
		<i>Prob.</i>	
<i>Abr.</i>		75	266
61-84	61		
		<i>Quaest. Gen.</i>	
<i>Agr.</i>	22, 24, 58	3:36	19
72-77, 82, 84, 94, 123	23	<i>Sac.</i>	
		1-10	23
<i>Cher.</i>		5, 6, 10	64
7	19	8-10	24
		<i>Som.</i>	
<i>Cong.</i>		1:120	57
73	65		
172	57	<i>Spec.</i>	
		1:326	261
<i>Cont.</i>	142	2:132	65
10:75	242		
10:78	242	<i>Pirge de Rabbi Eleazar</i>	
			13
<i>Fug.</i>		22	69, 70
213	19		

<i>Plato</i>	265	<i>Ber.</i>	
		13a	62
<i>Pliny</i>	8	28b	338
<i>Plutarch</i>	265	<i>‘Erub.</i>	
		54a	227
<i>Porphyry</i>	8	<i>Menah.</i>	
<i>Ps. -Clem. Hom.</i>		36b-37a	34,74
8:11-15	70	<i>Nid.</i>	
<i>Ps. -Philo</i>	32,71	61a	69
<i>Sifra</i>	12	<i>Sanh.</i>	
<i>Lev</i>		34a	291
23:40	251	90b	327
		97a	251
<i>sifre</i>		<i>Šabb.</i>	
<i>Num</i>		63a	251,328
6:25	339	105a	20,21,61
27:7-11	65	115a	51
<i>deut</i>		<i>Yebam.</i>	
22:23-27	65	11b	57
23:12	230	11b-12a	292
33:12	269	24b	261
<i>solinus</i>	8	<i>Yoma</i>	
<i>Symmachus</i>	32,282	67b	69
TALMUD (BABYLONIAN)		TALMUD (JERUSALEM)	
<i>‘Abod. Zar.</i>		<i>Pesaḥ</i>	
3b	261	6a	52

<i>Ta'an.</i>		<i>Onqelos (Cont'd)</i>	
68d	348	<i>Exod</i>	
		22:4	34
TARGUMS		34:33	69
<i>Fragmentary</i>			
<i>Gen</i>		<i>Deut</i>	
2:2	30, 31	32:45	69
32:25	70, 71		
		<i>Palestinian</i>	25
<i>Exod</i>		<i>Gen</i>	
15:8	33	32:25	32
22:4	34-35, 74		
		<i>Ps. -Jonathan</i>	
<i>Num</i>		<i>Gen</i>	
24:17	348	2:2	30
		6:1,4	31, 32, 70
<i>Neofiti</i>		32:25	70
<i>Gen</i>	30	32:27	71
2:2	26, 66, 73, 74	32:29	72
6:1,4	31		
15:1	62	<i>Exod</i>	
32:25	32	15:8	33
32:27	71		
32:29	32, 72	<i>Num</i>	
35:9	322	24:17	348
<i>Exod</i>		<i>Targum of the Prophets</i>	
15:8	33	<i>Jer</i>	
15:9	34	31:21	347
22:4	35, 75		
		<i>Hab</i>	
<i>Onqelos</i>	26	1:17	329
<i>Gen</i>			
2:2	30	<i>Mal</i>	
6:1,4	31	3:1-3	347
17:22	69		
32:25	32, 70	<i>TOSEFTA</i>	11, 12
32:29	72		
49:33	69		

TOSEFTA (*Cont'd*)

Pesahim

4:13 52

Qiddushin

5:4 260

Sanhedrin

7:11 10, 51

Xerxes 265

Zeno 265

Full bibliographical details of works cited are given in the text and the notes.

The following author index is therefore a substitute for a bibliography.

INDEX OF AUTHORS

- Aalen, S. 179, 276
 Aland, K. 273
 Alexander, P. 31, 69
 Allegro, J.M. 81-83, 99, 100, 101,
 105, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111,
 112, 113, 115, 116, 120, 123,
 124, 126, 127, 128, 221, 224,
 225, 228, 231, 237, 238, 240,
 241, 250, 264, 265, 309, 310,
 344, 346
 Amusin, J.D. 199, 229, 265, 348
 Anderson, A.A. 221
 Audet, J.P. 347
 Aufrecht, W.E. 66
 Aune, D.E. 352
 Avigad, N. 83, 222

 Baars, W. 33
 Bacher, W. 50, 54, 70
 Baillet, M. 324
 Baltzer, K. 300, 340
 Bamberger, B.J. 58
 Bardtke, H. 220, 232, 241, 272
 Barthelemy, D. 183, 263, 264
 Baumgartel, D.F. 338, 340
 Baumgarten, J.M. 102, 103, 179-181,
 189, 227, 241, 260, 261
 Belkin, S. 24, 57, 60, 61, 62
 Ben-Yashar, M. 192, 221, 231
 Bergmeier, R. 249
 Betz, H.D. 277
 Betz, O. 41-42, 186, 247, 264, 265,
 296, 299, 310, 336, 337, 339
 Billerbeck, P. 15
 Birdsall, J.N. 270
 Birnbaum, S.A. 83, 220, 252
 Black, M. 8, 48, 50, 54, 67, 73, 253,
 255, 273

 Blidstein, G. 227, 260, 261
 Blinzer, J. 276
 Bloch, R. 40, 150, 153, 244, 246
 Bonsirven, J. 50, 55
 Bowker, J.W. 65, 66, 69, 70
 Bowman, J. 267
 Brock, S.P. 68
 Brockington, L.H. 67
 Brown, R.E. 202, 343, 345
 Brownlee, W.H. 4, 39, 41, 75, 78,
 82, 84, 99, 104, 122, 128, 152,
 153, 154, 173, 210, 220-224,
 227, 232, 233, 234, 238, 240,
 242, 243, 246, 248, 250, 251,
 255, 267, 271, 272, 273, 282,
 283-288, 292, 311, 316, 325,
 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331,
 332, 333, 336, 338, 339, 346,
 351
 Bruce, F.F. 41, 78, 220, 247
 Buchanan, G.W. 176
 Buffiere, F. 57
 Burney, C.F. 228
 Burrows, M. 80, 232, 252

 Caird, G.B. 64
 Caquot, A. 231, 274, 344, 348
 Carlson, R.A. 171, 253
 Carmignac, J. 101, 106, 111, 128,
 175, 176, 199, 224, 228, 231,
 234, 241, 247, 258, 267, 292,
 302, 334, 340, 349
 Cashdan, E. 74
 Casper, B.M. 50
 Cazeaux, J. 18, 61
 Cazelles, H. 66, 265
 Chamberlain, J.V. 75, 78, 326, 330
 Charles, R.H. 71, 72, 306, 342, 343

- Charlesworth, J.H. 348
 Christiansen, I. 22, 57
 Churgin, P. 68, 262
 Clements, R.E. 230
 Colson, F.H. 57, 242, 261, 266
 Congar, Y. 259
 Coote, R. 72
 Coppens, J. 238, 253
 Cross, F.L. 273, 338
 Cross, F.M. 73, 83, 143, 186, 220,
 223, 226, 241, 255, 310-311, 324,
 345, 346
 Cullmann, O. 266
- Danby, H. 51
 Daniélou, J. 257
 Daube, D. 9-11, 15, 49, 53, 65
 Davies, P.R. 270, 272, 276, 306,
 307, 341
 Davies, W.D. 6, 55, 336
 Déaut, R. 27-28, 66, 67, 246, 247
 Deichgraber, R. 344
 Delcor, M. 247, 258, 265, 269
 Delsman, W.C. 255, 338
 Denis, A.M. 341
 Díez Macho, A. 25, 26, 66, 68, 75
 Dupont-Sommer, A. 97, 101, 105, 113,
 114, 224, 225, 228, 231, 234,
 235, 237, 238, 239, 264, 265,
 274, 307, 310, 327, 344, 346
- Ehrlich, E.L. 275
 Eissfeldt, O. 45
 Elliger, K. 5, 247, 291, 326, 327,
 328, 331, 332
 Ellis, E.E. 55
 Enelow, E.G. 13, 41
 Engnell, I. 171, 172
 Epstein, I. 74
- Feillet, A. 265
 Finkei, A. 39, 77, 248, 285,
 288, 329, 331, 336
 Finkelstein, L. 54
 Fischel, H.A. 56
 Fitzmyer, J. A. 8, 26, 67, 135,
 202, 207, 210, 211-213, 217,
 233, 241, 252, 257, 263, 271,
 274, 275, 277, 309, 310, 321,
 324, 334, 340, 341, 345, 349
 Flusser, D. 178, 184, 264, 273,
 274
 Foerster, W. 270
 Forkman, G. 260
 Fraine, J. de 254
 Freedman, D.N. 73, 242, 251
 Freedman, H. 61
 Fritsch, C.T. 68
- García Martínez, F. 246, 247
 Garnet, P. 270
 Gärtner, B. 157, 187, 188-189,
 211, 214-215, 216, 229, 265,
 271
 Gaster, T.H. 83, 100, 105, 107,
 222, 226, 228, 237, 238, 239,
 264, 337, 346, 348, 349, 350
 Geiger, A. 27
 Gelston, A. 259
 Gerhardsson, B. 55
 Gertner, M. 55, 335
 Ghilka, J. 211, 213-214, 215, 217,
 335
 Goldin, J. 50
 Goldsmith, D. 169, 209
 Goodenough, E.R. 63
 Goulder, M. 47, 55
 Gowan, D.E. 8
 Green, W. S. 72, 229

- Grelot, P. 248
 Grossfeld, B. 30, 65, 69
 Grundmann, W. 199, 241
 Gundry, R.H. 55
- Habermann, A.M. 82, 99, 100, 102,
 105, 108, 110, 113, 115, 116,
 119, 121, 226, 231, 233, 234,
 237, 238, 239
 Hammerton-Kelly, R.G. 22-23, 55, 58,
 64, 65
 Hanson, A.T. 19, 20, 55, 59, 63
 Harris, J.R. 309
 Hecht, R.D. 18, 59, 65
 Heinemann, J. 36, 75
 Helfmeyer, F.J. 335
 Hengel, M. 6, 8, 9, 49, 62, 254,
 275
 Herr, M.D. 244
 Horgan, M.P. 43, 150, 154, 155, 242,
 244, 246, 248, 249, 326, 332, 333
 Horton, F.L. 168-169, 252
 Huppenbauer, H.W. 275
- James, M.R. 71
 Jastrow, M. 330
 Jellicoe, S. 68
 Jones-Mackenzie, 53
 Jonge, M. de 320, 349
 Jongeling, B. 325
- Kahle, P. 25, 34, 74
 Kahn, J.G. 60, 63
 Kapelrud, A.S. 272
 Kapera, Z. 229
 Kisch, G. 71
 Klinzing, G. 186, 189-190, 199, 211,
 215-216, 229, 230, 258, 264, 265,
 268, 269
- Knierim, R. 45, 231
 Kosmala, H. 176, 196, 268, 347
 Kraus, H. J. 170, 172, 253, 254
 Kuhn, H.W. 181
 Kuhn, K.G. 230
 Kuschke, A. 351
 Kutsch, E. 339, 351
- Lamberigts, S. 229, 263
 Lane, W.R. 152
 Laubscher, F. du T. 116, 235, 236
 Lauterbach, J.Z. 75
 Leaney, A.R.C. 359
 Lehmann, M.R. 256
 Lehmann, O.H. 298, 338
 Levey, S.H. 45
 Levine, E. 34, 73
 Lichtenberger, H. 229, 241
 Lidde11, H.G. 53
 Lieberman, S. 10-12, 13-16, 52,
 53, 54
 Liver, J. 157, 201
 Livingstone, E.A. 59
 Lods, A. 70, 72
 Loewe, R. 52, 53
 Lohse, E. 101, 105, 115, 224, 228,
 231, 237, 238, 239, 337, 340,
 341
 Longenecker, R.N. 45, 54, 57
 Lövestam, E. 243, 276
- Maag, V. 270
 Maass, F. 52, 53
 Mack, B.L. 18, 59
 Maier, J. 101, 102, 109, 226, 228,
 231, 234, 237, 239, 264, 265
 Mann, J. 255, 322
 Marcus, D. 350
 Massingberd Ford, J. 255, 265, 274

- McKane, W. 336
- McKelvey, R. 259
- McNamara, M. 67
- McNicol, A.J. 259, 264, 267
- Ménard, J.E. 58, 351
- Meyer, M.W. 59
- Milik, J.T. 63, 220, 310, 321, 324, 349, 350, 351
- Millar, F. 8, 48, 50, 54, 253
- Miller, M.P. 5, 42, 65, 75, 249, 321
- Miner, D.F. 350
- Moehring, H. 18, 59
- Morawe, G. 334
- Moraldi, L. 101, 226, 227, 228, 234, 235, 238
- Morgenstern, J. 69
- Morrow, F.J. 280
- Mowinckel, S. 171, 301, 340
- Moyné, J. 237
- Munz, S. 54
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. 268, 302-304, 341, 342
- Neusner, J. 9-10, 51, 52
- Nikiprowetzky, V. 18
- Noth, M. 46
- Osten-Sacken, P. von der 194-195
- Patai, R. 254
- Patte, D. 3, 42, 46, 51, 68, 78
- Paul, A. 68
- Perrot, C. 322-323
- Philonenko, M. 348
- Ploeg, J.P.M. van der 248, 324, 334
- Prigent, P. 345
- Rabin, C. 256, 266, 306, 307-308, 340, 342
- Rabinowitz, I. 150, 152, 153, 241, 247, 331, 340
- Rad, G. von 339, 340
- Reicke, B. 142, 347
- Reider, D. 75
- Rengstorff, K.H. 56
- Richter, W. 45
- Ringgren, H. 262
- Robinson, J.M. 46
- Rokeah, D. 63, 64
- Roop, E.F. 335, 339
- Rosenbloom, J.R. 73
- Roth, C. 151, 184, 258
- Rothfuchs, W. 55
- Rowley, H.H. 327
- Sanders, J.A. 321, 351
- Sandmel, S. 57, 59, 60, 62
- Schechter, S. 52, 340
- Schelbert, G. 35, 75
- Schiffman, L.H. 76
- Schmid, J. 270, 276
- Schubert, K. 258
- Schürer, E. 48, 54, 253
- Schwab, M. 52
- Schwartz, D.R. 104, 191, 225, 231, 242, 250, 265, 268
- Scott, R. 53
- Scroggs, R. 55, 58, 64
- Seeligmann, I.L. 47
- Segal, M.H. 168
- Shires, H.M. 55
- Siegfried, C. 58, 62, 63
- Silberman, L.H. 5, 39, 78, 151, 154, 155, 233, 251, 291, 329-330, 331, 332, 347
- Skehan, P.W. 250, 324, 345, 346, 347, 350
- Slomovic, E. 40, 101, 102, 109, 154, 224, 225, 226, 231, 233, 234, 236, 237, 248, 251, 289-291, 334

- Smith, J.J. 274
- Smith, M. 56
- Sokoloff, M. 324, 325
- Sowers, S.G. 57, 58, 265
- Starcky, J. 201-202, 273, 274, 343, 346
- Steckoll, S.H. 267
- Stefaniak, L. 270
- Stegemann, H. 257, 335
- Stein, E. 60, 63
- Stendahl, K. 55, 248, 267, 326
- Stitskin, L.D. 60
- Stone, M.E. 8
- Strack, H.L. 15, 51, 54, 150, 243, 244
- Strobel, A. 351
- Strugnell, J. 83, 99, 101, 102, 103, 108, 109, 110, 113, 115, 117, 121, 125, 126, 127, 128, 224, 225, 226, 228, 231, 234, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 268, 344
- Talmon, S. 76, 256
- Teichner, J.L. 34-35, 81-83
- Theodor, J. 244
- Thompson, R.W. 270
- Thrall, M. 277
- Tocci, F.M. 101, 225, 226, 228, 231, 234, 237, 238, 239, 264, 265
- Towner, W.S. 56
- Trever, J.C. 222, 235
- Treves, M. 345
- Tuinistra, E.W. 280, 324
- Ulrich, E.C. 224
- Vaux, R. de 84, 220, 266, 324
- Vermes, G. 8, 32, 40, 48, 50, 54, 66, 67, 71, 72, 76, 82, 98-99, 101, 102, 104, 105, 108, 113, 114, 117, 220, 221, 225, 226, 228, 231, 234, 235, 237, 238, 239, 245, 246, 253, 263, 264, 265, 510, 315-316, 332, 337, 342, 344, 348, 349
- Villalón, J.R. 275
- Vööbus, A. 73
- Waard, J. de 114, 210, 211, 233, 234, 236
- Warren, A. 241
- Wcela, E.A. 344, 345
- Weis, R. 332
- Weise, M. 299-300, 301, 337, 338, 339
- Weiser, A. 340
- Weiss, J.G. 53
- Weiss, J.H. 53
- Weiss, K. 272
- Wellek, R. 241
- Wernberg-Møller, P. 66, 336, 337
- Westermann, C. 46
- Widengren, G. 172
- Wieder, N. 329
- Williamson, R. 56
- Winter, J. 54
- Winter, P. 346
- Winton Thomas, D. 270
- Witaker, H. 57
- Wolfson, H.A. 59, 62, 262
- Worrell, J. 337
- Woude, A.S. van der 113, 114, 232, 272, 310, 320, 321, 324, 344, 349
- Wright, A.G. 150, 245, 248
- Wright, G.E. 223

Yadin, Y. 82, 85, 86, 97, 99, 101,
102, 105, 107, 108, 109, 110,
113, 115, 116, 117, 120, 122,
157, 184, 188, 191, 221, 223,
224, 227, 229, 231, 233, 234,
237, 238, 256, 264, 334, 344,
350

York, A.D. 282, 324

Zeitlin, S. 51, 262

Zimmerli, W. 351

Zuckerman, M.S. 51

JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Supplement Series

- 1 I, HE, WE AND THEY:
A LITERARY APPROACH TO ISAIAH 53
David J.A. Clines
- * 2 JEWISH EXEGESIS OF THE BOOK OF RUTH
D.R.G. Beattie
- * 3 THE LITERARY STRUCTURE OF PSALM 2
Pierre Auffret
- 4 THANKSGIVING FOR A LIBERATED PROPHET:
AN INTERPRETATION OF ISAIAH CHAPTER 53
R.N. Whybray
- 5 REDATING THE EXODUS AND CONQUEST
John J. Bimson
- 6 THE STORY OF KING DAVID:
GENRE AND INTERPRETATION
David M. Gunn
- * 7 THE SENSE OF BIBLICAL NARRATIVE:
THREE STRUCTURAL ANALYSES IN THE OLD TESTAMENT
David Jobling
- * 8 GENESIS 1-11: STUDIES IN STRUCTURE AND THEME
Patrick D. Miller, Jr.
- * 9 YAHWEH AS PROSECUTOR AND JUDGE:
AN INVESTIGATION OF THE PROPHETIC LAWSUIT (RIB-PATTERN)
Kirsten Nielsen
- 10 THE THEME OF THE PENTATEUCH
David J.A. Clines
- * 11 STUDIA BIBLICA 1978. I:
PAPERS ON OLD TESTAMENT AND RELATED THEMES
Edited by E.A. Livingstone
- 12 THE JUST KING:
MONARCHICAL JUDICIAL AUTHORITY IN ANCIENT ISRAEL.
Keith W. Whitelam
- 13 ISAIAH AND THE DELIVERANCE OF JERUSALEM
R.E. Clements
- 14 THE FATE OF KING SAUL:
AN INTERPRETATION OF A BIBLICAL STORY
David M. Gunn
- 15 THE DEUTERONOMISTIC HISTORY
Martin Noth
- 16 PROPHECY AND ETHICS:
ISAIAH AND THE ETHICAL TRADITIONS OF ISRAEL
Eryl W. Davies
- 17 THE ROLES OF ISRAEL'S PROPHETS
David L. Petersen
- 18 THE DOUBLE REDACTION OF THE DEUTERONOMISTIC HISTORY
Richard D. Nelson
- 19 ART AND MEANING:
RHETORIC IN BIBLICAL LITERATURE
Edited by David J.A. Clines, David M. Gunn and Alan J. Hauser
- 20 THE PSALMS OF THE SONS OF KORAH
Michael D. Goulder
- 21 COLOUR TERMS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT
Athalya Brenner
- 22 AT THE MOUNTAIN OF GOD:
STORY AND THEOLOGY IN EXODUS 32-34
R.W.L. Moberly

- 23 THE GLORY OF ISRAEL:
THE THEOLOGY AND PROVENIENCE OF THE ISAIAH TARGUM
Bruce D. Chilton
- 24 MIDIAN, MOAB AND EDOM:
THE HISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY OF LATE BRONZE AND IRON AGE
JORDAN AND NORTH-WEST ARABIA
Edited by John F.A. Sawyer and David J.A. Clines
- 25 THE DAMASCUS COVENANT:
AN INTERPRETATION OF THE 'DAMASCUS DOCUMENT'
Philip R. Davies
- 26 CLASSICAL HEBREW POETRY
W.G.E. Watson
- 27 PSALMODY AND PROPHECY
W.H. Bellinger Jr.
- 28 HOSEA:
AN ISRAELITE PROPHET IN JUDEAN PERSPECTIVE
Grace I. Emmerson
- 29 EXEGESIS AT QUMRAN:
4Q FLORILEGIUM IN ITS JEWISH CONTEXT
George J. Brooke
- 30 THE ESTHER SCROLL:
THE STORY OF THE STORY
David J.A. Clines
- 31 IN THE SHELTER OF ELYON:
ESSAYS ON ANCIENT PALESTINIAN LIFE AND LITERATURE,
IN HONOR OF G.W. AHLSTRÖM
Edited by W. Boyd Barrick and John S. Spencer
- 32 THE PROPHETIC PERSONA:
JEREMIAH AND THE LANGUAGE OF THE SELF
Timothy Polk
- 33 LAW AND THEOLOGY IN DEUTERONOMY
J.G. McConville

*Out of Print