

COMPANION TO THE QUMRAN SCROLLS

# THE EXEGETICAL TEXTS

T&T CLARK BIBLICAL STUDIES

JONATHAN G. CAMPBELL



THE  
**EXEGETICAL  
TEXTS**

Companion to the Qumran Scrolls, 4

Other volumes in the Companion to the Qumran Scrolls series:

*The Damascus Texts* by Charlotte Hempel

*The Temple Scroll and Related Texts* by Sidnie White Crawford

*Pesharim* by Timothy H. Lim

*The War Texts* by Jean Duhaime

*The Purity Texts* by Hannah Harrington

THE  
**EXEGETICAL**  

---

**TEXTS**

**Jonathan G. Campbell**



T & T CLARK INTERNATIONAL  
*A Continuum imprint*  
LONDON • NEW YORK

For  
AP and Jonty  
'dans le Métro'

Published by T&T Clark International, a *Continuum imprint*  
The Tower Building, 11 York Road, London SE1 7NX  
15 East 26th Street, Suite 1703, New York, NY 10010

[www.tandtclark.com](http://www.tandtclark.com)

Copyright © 2004 Jonathan G. Campbell  
All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

The Scripture quotations contained herein are from the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible, Anglicized Edition, copyright © 1989, 1995 by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, and are used by permission. All rights reserved.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data  
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Typeset by Data Standards Ltd, Frome, Somerset BA11 1RE

EISBN 9785067045287

## Contents

Preface	vii
Abbreviations	ix
Editions, Translations and Bibliographies	1
1. Introduction	7
1.1. The Dead Sea Scrolls from Qumran	7
1.2. The Qumran–Essene Hypothesis	9
1.3. Recent Developments in Qumran Studies	10
1.4. ‘The <i>Peshet</i> Phenomenon’	12
1.5. The Exegetical Texts from Qumran	15
2. Scripture and Interpretation	20
2.1. Scripture in Second Temple Judaism	20
2.2. Scriptural Manuscripts from Qumran	22
2.3. Textual Fluidity in Scriptural Writings	24
2.4. Scripture Interpreting Scripture	25
2.5. Exegesis in Non-Scriptural Works	26
2.6. Exegetical Techniques	28
2.7. Scriptural Interpretation in the Exegetical Texts	29
3. 4QFlorilegium (4Q174)	33
3.1. Introduction	33
3.2. The Text of 4QFlorilegium	34
3.3. The Genre of 4QFlorilegium	35
3.4. The Content of 4QFlorilegium	37
3.5. Exegesis in 4QFlorilegium	39
3.6. 4QFlorilegium and the Reconstruction of Damaged Scrolls	41
4. 4QCatenae A-B (4Q177, 182)	45
4.1. Introduction	45
4.2. The Text of 4QCatena A	46
4.3. The Genre of 4QCatena A	47
4.4. The Content of 4QCatena A	49
4.5. Exegesis in 4QCatena A	51
4.6. The Fragmentary Nature of 4QCatena B	52
4.7. The Existence of 4QMidrash on Eschatology <sup>a-b</sup>	53

5. 11QMelchizedek (11Q13)	56
5.1. Introduction	56
5.2. The Text of 11QMelchizedek	57
5.3. The Genre of 11QMelchizedek	58
5.4. The Content of 11QMelchizedek	59
5.5. Exegesis in 11QMelchizedek	61
5.6. 11QMelchizedek and the Schematization of History	63
6. 4QAges of Creation A-B (4Q180–181)	67
6.1. Introduction	67
6.2. The Text of 4QAges of Creation A-B	68
6.3. The Genre of 4QAges of Creation A-B	69
6.4. The Content of 4QAges of Creation A-B	71
6.5. Exegesis in 4QAges of Creation A-B	73
6.6. 4QAges of Creation A-B and Other Sectarian Writings	75
7. 4QTanhumim (4Q176)	78
7.1. Introduction	78
7.2. The Text of 4QTanhumim	79
7.3. The Genre of 4QTanhumim	80
7.4. The Content of 4QTanhumim	82
7.5. Exegesis in 4QTanhumim	83
7.6. 4QTanhumim and 4QApoctyphal Lamentations A-B (4Q179, 501)	85
8. 4QTestimonia (4Q175)	88
8.1. Introduction	88
8.2. The Text of 4QTestimonia	89
8.3. The Genre of 4QTestimonia	90
8.4. The Content of 4QTestimonia	92
8.5. Exegesis in 4QTestimonia	94
8.6. The Historical Background of 4QTestimonia	96
9. Scripture and Interpretation in the Exegetical Texts	100
9.1. The Evidence of the Exegetical Texts	100
9.2. Scripture in the Exegetical Texts	102
9.3. Interpretation in the Exegetical Texts	103
9.4. The Exegetical Texts and 'the <i>Pesher</i> Phenomenon'	105
9.5. The Exegetical Texts and the Qumran Community	107
9.6. The Exegetical Texts and Other Late Second Temple Literature	109
Cumulative Bibliography	112
Index of References	124
Index of Authors	131

## Preface

This addition to the Companion to the Qumran Scrolls series aims to introduce a selection of eight sectarian manuscripts from among the Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls under the umbrella term of 'the Exegetical Texts'. This convenient but loose designation incorporates several Thematic Pesharim and various closely related documents which also seem to interpret scripture from a sectarian viewpoint. Most of these works have recently appeared in a new edition in the Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project series: J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents* (PTSDSSP, 6B; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr; Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2002). Most are also due to be published in a reworked Volume 5 of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series: M. Bernstein and G.J. Brooke with the assistance of J. Høgenhaven, *Qumran Cave 4, I (4Q158–4Q186)* (DJD, 5a; Oxford: Oxford University Press, forthcoming). In the present study, however, the English translations are the author's own, except for scriptural citations from the *New Revised Standard Version: Anglicized Edition with Apocrypha* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).

All eight Exegetical Texts to be examined are normally distinguished from the so-called Continuous Pesharim (already considered in another volume in the Companion to the Qumran Scrolls series). The former are broadly similar to the latter in important respects, however, especially when it comes to the use of the Hebrew term *peshet* ('interpretation') in the majority of the manuscripts concerned. Nevertheless, the Exegetical Texts constitute a particularly diverse strand of sectarian compositions among the Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls. For this reason, these eight documents will be treated in turn in more or less equal measure, with two introductory chapters to set the scene and a conclusion drawing the discussion to a close. As a result, it is hoped that any chapter can be read either alone in its own right or together with the others to gain a fuller picture. In order to encourage the reader to encounter the relevant Qumran documents first hand, moreover, extensive listings of editions in Hebrew and English are provided. These and other features will enable



students and researchers alike to place the Exegetical Texts in their broader historical and literary context in light of recent developments in Qumran Studies.

I am grateful to Prof. Philip Davies for asking me to contribute to the Companion to the Qumran Scrolls series. I would especially like to thank him and the team at Sheffield Academic Press for their patience in awaiting the arrival of the final typescript. Due to several factors beyond my control, its preparation took longer than originally foreseen.

Sincere thanks are also due to Dr W. John Lyons, who worked through the chapters and provided invaluable feedback, and to Mr Anthony M. Skates, who kindly agreed to the painstaking task of compiling the cumulative bibliography.

## Abbreviations

- ABD* D.N. Freedman (ed.), *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (6 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1992)
- ALUOS* *Annual of the Leeds University Oriental Society*
- BA* *Biblical Archaeologist*
- BAB* E.D. Herbert, and E. Tov (eds.), *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (London/New Castle, DE: The British Library/Oak Knoll Press, 2002)
- CBQ* *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
- DBI* R.J. Coggins, and J.L. Houlden (eds.), *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (London: SCM Press, 1990)
- DJD(J) Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (of Jordan)
- DJD, 1 J.T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD, 1; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955)
- DJDJ, 3 M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân: Exploration de la falaise, les grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q, le rouleau de cuivre* (DJDJ, 3; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962)
- DJDJ, 5 J.M. Allegro, with A.A. Anderson, *Qumran Cave 4, I (4Q158–4Q186)* (DJDJ, 5; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968)
- DJD, 7 M. Baillet, *Qumran Cave 4, III (4Q482–4Q520)* (DJD, 7; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982)
- DJD, 13 H. Attridge *et al.*, *Qumran Cave 4, VIII: Parabiblical Texts—Part 1* (DJD, 13; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994)
- DJD, 19 M. Broshi *et al.*, *Qumran Cave 4, XIV: Parabiblical Texts—Part 2* (DJD, 19; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995)
- DJD, 22 J.C. VanderKam *et al.*, *Qumran Cave 4, XVII: Parabiblical Texts—Part 3* (DJD, 22; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996)

- DJD, 23 F. García Martínez, E.J.C. Tigchelaar, and A.S. van der Woude, *Qumran Cave 11, II (11Q2–18, 11Q20–31)* (DJD, 23; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)
- DJD, 25 E. Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4, XVIII: Textes Hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)* (DJD, 25; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)
- DJD, 35 J. Baumgarten *et al.*, *Qumran Cave 4, XXV: Halakhic Texts* (DJD, 35; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999)
- DJD, 36 P. Alexander *et al.*, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea – Part 1* (DJD, 36; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000)
- DJD, 39 E. Tov *et al.*, *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (DJD, 39; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)
- DSD *Dead Sea Discoveries*
- DSS Dead Sea Scroll(s)
- DSSFD L.H. Schiffman *et al.* (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after their Discovery* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/Israel Museum, 2000)
- DSSFY 1–2 P.W. Flint, and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998, 1999)
- DSSHC T.H. Lim *et al.* (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000)
- ed(s) editor(s)
- EDSS L.H. Schiffman, and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2 vols.; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000)
- HJP, 2 E. Schürer, G. Vermes *et al.*, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (Vol. 2; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1979)
- HJP, 3.1 E. Schürer, G. Vermes *et al.*, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (Vol. 3.1; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1986)
- IEJ *Israel Exploration Journal*
- IOS *Israel Oriental Studies*
- JBL *Journal of Biblical Literature*
- JSJ *Journal for the Study of Judaism*
- JJS *Journal of Jewish Studies*
- LXX Septuagint
- MT Masoretic Text

NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OTS	<i>Old Testament Studies</i>
PTSDSSP	The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project.
PTSDSSP, 1	J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Rule of the Community and Related Documents</i> (PTSDSSP, vol. 1; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr; Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press: 1994)
PTSDSSP, 2	J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents</i> (PTSDSSP, vol. 2; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr; Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press: 1995)
PTSDSSP, 6B	J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), <i>The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents</i> (PTSDSSP, vol. 6B; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr; Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press: 2002)
QONT	F.H. Cryer, and T.L. Thompson (eds.), <i>Qumran between the Old and New Testaments</i> (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 290; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998)
RO	<i>Res Orientales</i>
RQ	<i>Revue de Qumrân</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>



## Editions, Translations and Bibliographies

### The Exegetical Texts: Thematic Pesharim and Related Works

#### 4QFlorilegium (4Q174)

J.M. Allegro, 'Florilegium', DJDJ, 5 (1968a), pp. 53–57; XIX–XX.

G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 29; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985), pp. 86–97.

J. Milgrom, 'Florilegium: A Midrash on 2 Samuel and Psalms 1–2 (4Q174=4QFlor)', PTSDSSP, 6B (2002), pp. 248–63.

A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie (4QMidrEschat<sup>a,b</sup>): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und Traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ('Florilegium') und 4Q177 ('Catena') repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 13; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994), pp. 23–29; Anhang A.

#### 4QTestimonia (4Q175)

J.M. Allegro, 'Testimonia', DJDJ, 5 (1968f), pp. 57–60; XXI.

F.M. Cross, 'Testimonia (4Q175=4QTestimonia=4QTestim)', PTSDSSP, 6B (2002), pp. 308–27.

#### 4QTanhumim (4Q176)

J.M. Allegro, 'Tanhūmīm', DJDJ, 5 (1986d), pp. 60–67; XXII–XXIII.

H. Lichtenberger, 'Consolations (4Q176=4QTanh)', PTSDSSP 6B: 329–349.

#### 4QCatenae A-B (4Q177, 182)

J.M. Allegro, 'Catena (A)' and 'Catena (B)', DJDJ, 5 (1968b), pp. 67–74, 80–81; XXIV–XXV, XXVII.

J. Milgrom, with L. Novakovic, 'Catena A (4Q177=4QCat<sup>a</sup>)' and 'Catena B (4Q182=4QCat<sup>b</sup>)', PTSDSSP, 6B (2002), pp. 286–303, 305–7.

A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie (4QMidrEschat<sup>a,b</sup>): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und Traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ('Florilegium') und 4Q177 ('Catena') repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (Studies in the Texts of the Judaean Desert, 13; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994), pp. 71–76, 152–54; Anhang B.

**4QAges of Creation A-B (4Q180–181)**

- J.M. Allegro, 'The Ages of Creation' and '181', *DJDJ*, 5 (1968c), pp. 77–80; XVIII, XXVII.
- J.J.M. Roberts, 'Wicked and Holy (4Q180–181)', *PTSDSSP*, 2 (1995), pp. 204–13.

**11QMelchizedek (11Q13)**

- F. García Martínez, E.J.C. Tigchelaar, and A.S. van der Woude (eds.), '11QMelchizedek', *DJD*, 23 (1998a), pp. 221–41; XXVII.
- E. Puech, 'Notes sur le manuscrit de XIQMelkisédeq', *RQ*, 12 (1987), pp. 483–513.
- J.J.M. Roberts, 'Melchizedek (1Q13=11QMelchizedek=11QMelch)', *PTSDSSP*, 6B (2002), pp. 264–73.
- A.S. Van der Woude, 'Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI', *OTS*, 14 (1965), pp. 354–73.

**The Continuous Pesharim****4QpIsaiah<sup>a-c</sup> (4Q161–165)**

- J.M. Allegro, 'Commentary on Isaiah (A)', 'Commentary on Isaiah (B)', 'Commentary on Isaiah (C)', 'Commentary on Isaiah (D)', 'Commentary on Isaiah (E)', *DJDJ*, 5 (1968g), pp. 11–30; IV–IX.
- M.P. Horgan, 'Peshar Isaiah 2 (4Q162=4QpIsa<sup>b</sup>)', 'Peshar Isaiah 3 (4Q163=4QpIsa<sup>a</sup>)', 'Peshar Isaiah 4 (4Q161=4QpIsa<sup>a</sup>)', 'Peshar Isaiah 5 (4Q165–4QpIsa<sup>a</sup>)', *PTSDSSP*, 6B (2002a), pp. 35–37, 39–45, 47–81, 83–97, 99–107.

**4QpHosea<sup>a-b</sup> (4Q166–167)**

- J.M. Allegro, 'Commentary on Hosea (A)' and 'Commentary on Hosea (B)', *DJDJ*, 5 (1968h), pp. 31–36; X.
- M.P. Horgan, 'Hosea Peshar 1 (4Q166=4QpHos<sup>a</sup>)' and 'Hosea Peshar 2 (4Q167=4QpHos<sup>b</sup>)', *PTSDSSP*, 6B (2002b), pp. 113–17, 119–31.

**IQpMicah, 4QpMicah (1Q14, 4Q168)**

- J.M. Allegro, 'Commentary on Micah (?)', *DJDJ*, 5 (1968i), p. 36; XII.
- M.P. Horgan, 'Micah Peshar 1 (1Q14=1QpMic)' and 'Micah Peshar 2 (4Q168=4QpMic)', *PTSDSSP*, 6B (2002c), pp. 133–39, 141–43.
- J.T. Milik, 'Commentaire de Michée', *DJD*, 1 (1955a), pp. 77–80; XV.

**4QpNahum (4Q169)**

- J.M. Allegro, 'Commentary on Nahum', *DJDJ*, 5 (1968j), pp. 37–42; XI–XIV.
- M.P. Horgan, 'Nahum Peshar (4Q169–4QpNah)', *PTSDSSP*, 6B (2002d), pp. 144–55.

**1QpZephaniah, 4QpZephaniah (1Q15, 4Q170)**

- J.M. Allegro, 'Commentary on Zephaniah', *DJDJ*, 5 (1968k), p. 42; XIV.
- M.P. Horgan, 'Zephaniah Peshar 1 (4Q170=4QpZeph)' and 'Zephaniah Peshar 2 (1Q15=1QpZeph)', *PTSDSSP*, 6B (2002e), pp. 187–89, 191–93.
- J.T. Milik, 'Commentaire de Sophonie', *DJD*, 1 (1955b), p. 80; XV.

**1QpHabakkuk**

M. Burrows, J.C. Trever, and W.H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery* (Vol. 1; New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950), pp. 55–61.

M.P. Horgan, 'Habakkuk Peshar (1QpHab)', PTSDSSP, 6B (2002f), pp. 157–85.

**1QpPsalms, 4QpPsalms<sup>a-b</sup> (1Q16, 4Q171, 173)**

J.M. Allegro, 'Commentary on Psalms (A)' and 'Commentary on Psalms (B)', DJDJ, 5 (1968l), pp. 42–50, 51–53; XIV–XVIII.

M.P. Horgan, 'Psalm Peshar 1 (4Q171=4QpPs<sup>a</sup>)', 'Psalm Peshar 2 (1Q16=1QpPs)', 'Psalm Peshar 3 (4Q173=4QpPs<sup>b</sup>)', PTSDSSP, 6B (2002g), pp. 6–23, 25–29, 31–33.

J.T. Milik, 'Commentaire de Psaumes', DJD, 1 (1955c), pp. 81–82; XV.

**Other Interpretative Writings from Qumran****1QWords of Moses (1Q22)**

J.T. Milik, 'Dires de Moïse', DJD, 1 (1955e), pp. 91–97; XVIII–XIX.

**1QLiturgical Text A (1Q30)**

J.T. Milik, 'Textes Liturgique (?)', DJD, 1 (1955f), pp. 132–34; XXX.

**3QpIsaiah (3Q4)**

M. Baillet, 'Commentaire d'Isaïe', DJDJ, 3 (1962b), pp. 95–96; XVIII.

M.P. Horgan, 'Isaiah Peshar 1 (3Q4=3QpIsa)', PTSDSSP, 6B (2002h), pp. 35–37.

**4QOrdinances<sup>a-c</sup> (4Q159, 513–514)**

J.M. Allegro, 'Ordinances', DJDJ, 5 (1968m), pp. 6–9; II.

M. Baillet, 'Texte Halachique', DJD, 7 (1982a), pp. 287–98; LXXII–LXXIV.

J. Milgrom, 'Purification Rule (4Q514=4QOrd<sup>c</sup>)', PTSDSSP, 1 (1994), pp. 177–79.

L.H. Schiffman, 'Ordinances and Rules (4Q159=4QOrd<sup>a</sup>, 4Q513=4QOrd<sup>b</sup>)', PTSDSSP, 1 (1994b), pp. 145–75.

**4QpUnidentified (4Q172)**

J.M. Allegro, 'Commentaries on Unidentified Texts', DJDJ, 5 (1968o), pp. 50–51; XVIII.

J.H. Charlesworth, and C.D. Elledge, 'Unidentified Pesharim Fragments', PTSDSSP, 6B (2002a), pp. 195–201.

**4QUnclassified Fragments (4Q178)**

J.M. Allegro, '178', DJDJ, 5 (1968p), pp. 74–75; XXV.

**4QMidrash on Eschatology<sup>et</sup> (4Q183)**

J.M. Allegro, '183', DJDJ, 5 (1968q), pp. 80–81; XXVI.

J.H. Charlesworth, and C.D. Elledge, 'Peshar-like Fragment', PTSDSSP, 6B (2002b), pp. 358–61.



**4QText with a Citation of Jubilees (4Q228)**

J.C. VanderKam, with J.T. Milik, '4QText with a Citation of Jubilees', DJD, 13 (1994), pp. 177–85; XII.

**4QPesher on the Apocalypse of Weeks (4Q247)**

M. Broshi, '4QPesher on the Apocalypse of Weeks', DJD, 36 (2000b), pp. 187–91; IX.

**4QCommentaries on Genesis A-D (4Q252–254a)**

G.J. Brooke, '4QCommentaries on Genesis A-D', DJD, 22 (1996a), pp. 185–236; XII–XVI.

G.J. Brooke, 'Commentary on Genesis B', 'Commentary on Genesis C', 'Commentary on Genesis D', PTSDSSP, 6B (2002b), pp. 220–23, 224–34, 235–39.

J.L. Trafton, 'Commentary on Genesis A', PTSDSSP, 6B (2002), pp. 203–19.

**4QCommentaries on Malachi A-B (4Q253a, 5Q10)**

G.J. Brooke, '4QCommentary on Malachi', DJD, 22 (1996b), pp. 213–15; XIV.

G.J. Brooke, 'Commentary on Malachi B', PTSDSSP, 6B (2002c), pp. 244–47.

J.H. Charlesworth, 'Commentary on Malachi A', PTSDSSP, 6B (2002b), pp. 240–43.

J.T. Milik, 'Ecrits avec Citations de Malachie', DJDJ, 3 (1962a), pp. 128–31, 181.

**4QExposition on the Patriarchs (4Q464)**

J.H. Charlesworth, and C.D. Elledge, 'Exposition on the Patriarchs', PTSDSSP, 6B (2002c), pp. 274–85.

M.E. Stone, and E. Eshel, 'Exposition on the Patriarchs', DJD, 19 (1995), pp. 215–30; XXVIII.

## Additional Manuscripts from Qumran

**The Damascus Document (CD, 4QD<sup>a-h</sup> [4Q266–273], 5QD [5Q12], 6QD [6Q15])**

M. Baillet, 'Document de Damas (6Q15)', DJDJ, 3 (1962a), pp. 128–31; XXVI.

J.M. Baumgarten, and D.R. Schwartz, 'Damascus Document (CD)', PTSDSSP, 2 (1995), pp. 4–57.

J.M. Baumgarten, *et al.*, *Qumran Cave 4, XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)* (DJD, 18; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).

J.T. Milik, 'Document de Damas (5Q12)', DJDJ, 3 (1962b), p. 181; XXXVIII.

**The Community Rule (1QS, 4QS<sup>a-j</sup> [4Q255–264], 5QS [5Q11])**

P. Alexander, G. Vermes, and G.J. Brooke, *Qumran Cave 4, XIX: 4QSerekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD, 26; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

M. Burrows, J.C. Trever, and W.H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery* (Vol. 2; fascicle one; New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951).

E. Qimron, and J.H. Charlesworth, 'Rule of the Community', PTSDSSP, 1 (1994), pp. 1–107.

**Rule of the Congregation (1QSa, 4QSE<sup>a-i</sup> [4Q249a-i])**

D. Barthélemy, 'Règle de la Congrégation', DJD, 1 (1955), pp. 108–18; XXII–XXIV.

- J.H. Charlesworth, and L.T. Stuckenbruck, 'Rule of the Congregation (1QSa)', *PTSDSSP*, 1 (1994a), pp. 108–17.  
 S. Pfann, '4Qpap cryptA 4QSerekh ha-'Edah<sup>a-i?</sup>', *DJD*, 36 (2000), pp. 547–74; XXXV–XXXVII.

**Temple Scroll (4QT [4Q524], 11QT<sup>a-c</sup> [11Q19–21])**

- F. García Martínez, E.J.C. Tigchelaar, and A.S. van der Woude (eds.), '11QT<sup>b</sup> and 11QT<sup>c?</sup>', *DJD*, 23 (1998b), pp. 357–414; XLI–XLVIII.  
 E. Puech, '4QRouleau du Temple', *DJD*, 25 (1996), pp. 85–114; VII–VIII.  
 Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (Vols. 1–3; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983).

**1QRule of the Blessings (1QSB)**

- J.H. Charlesworth, and L.T. Stuckenbruck, 'Blessings (1QSB)', *PTSDSSP*, 1 (1994b), pp. 119–31.  
 J.T. Milik, 'Recueil des Bénédiction', *DJD*, 1 (1995d), pp. 118–30; XXV–XXIX.

**4QReworked Pentateuch<sup>a-c</sup> (4Q158, 364–367)**

- J.A. Allegro, J.A. 'Biblical Paraphrase: Genesis, Exodus', *DJD*, 5 (1968n), pp. 1–6.  
 E. Tov, and S.A. White, 'Reworked Pentateuch', *DJD*, 13 (1994), pp. 187–351.

**4QApocryphal Lamentations A-B (4Q179, 501)**

- J.M. Allegro, 'Lamentations', *DJDJ*, 5 (1968e), pp. 75–77; XXVI.  
 M. Baillet, 'Lamentation', *DJD*, 7 (1982b), pp. 79–80; XXVIII.  
 J. Høgenhaven, 'Biblical Quotations and Allusions in 4QApocryphal Lamentations (4Q179)', *BAB* (2002), pp. 113–20.

**4QPseudo-Daniel<sup>a-c</sup> (243–245)**

- J.J. Collins, and P.W. Flint, '4Q243–245: Pseudo-Daniel', *DJD*, 22 (1996), pp. 95–164; VII–X.

**4QMSM (4Q249)**

- S. Pfann, 'Midrash Sefer Moshe', *DJD*, 35 (1999), pp. 1–24; I–II.

**4QLegal Texts A-B (4Q251, 4Q264a)**

- E. Larson, J. Baumgarten, *et al.*, 'Halakhot', *DJD*, 35 (1999), pp. 25–56; III–V.

**4QCurses (4Q280)**

- B. Nitzan, 'Curses', in E. Chazon *et al.*, *Qumran Cave 4, XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts – Part 2* (*DJD*, 29; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 1–8; I.

**4QHistorical Texts C-E (4Q331–333)**

- J.A. Fitzmyer, '4QHistorical Texts C-E', *DJD*, 36 (2000), pp. 275–89; XVII–XVIII.

**4QList of False Prophets (4Q339)**

- M. Broshi, and A. Yardeni, 'List of False Prophets', *DJD*, 19 (1995), pp. 77–79; XI.

**4QApocryphon of Joshua<sup>a-b</sup> (4Q378–379)**

C. Newsom, '4QApocryphon of Joshua<sup>a-b</sup>', DJD, 22 (1996a), pp. 237–88; XVII–XXV.

**4QMMT<sup>a-f</sup> (4Q394–399)**

E. Qimron, and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4, V: Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (DJD, 10; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

**4QBeatitudes (4Q525)**

E. Puech, '4QBéatitudes', DJD, 25 (1998), pp. 115–78; IX–XIII.

**11QPsalms<sup>a</sup> (11Q5)**

J.A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QP<sup>a</sup>)* (DJDJ, 4; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), pp. 187–351.

**Further Editions and Revisions**

- F. García Martínez, and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 Vols.; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997–1998).
- J. Strugnell, 'Notes en marge du volume 5 des "Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan"', *RQ*, 7 (1970), pp. 163–276.

**Standard English Translations**

- M. Abegg, P. Flint, and E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999).
- F. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2nd edn, 1996).
- M.A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- G. Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Penguin, 1997).
- M. Wise, M. Abegg, and E. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (London: HarperCollins, 1996).

**Bibliographies and Indices**

- F. García Martínez, and D.W. Parry, *Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1970–1995* (Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 19; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996).
- B. Jongeling, *A Classified Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1958–1969* (Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 7; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1971).
- W.S. LaSor, *Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls 1948–1957* (Fuller Library Bulletin 31; Pasadena CA: Fuller Theological Seminary Library, 1958).
- E. Tov, *et al.*, *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (DJD, 39; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).

### 1. The Dead Sea Scrolls from Qumran

The Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) constitute five caches of ancient texts retrieved from several locations across the Judaean desert. All were discovered by local bedouin or professional archaeologists in the middle decades of the twentieth century (Campbell 2002: 1–21; Davies, Brooke, and Callaway 2002: 1–29). The largest comes from Caves 1–11 around Khirbet Qumran, a ruined settlement almost certainly utilized by a religious movement that scholars name the ‘Qumran Sect’ or ‘Qumran Community’ (Dimant 2000a; Hempel 2000). Containing the remains of nearly 900 Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek manuscripts from the late Second Temple period (c. 250 BCE–68 CE), a proportion of these Jewish documents will be centre-stage in later chapters. Here, we shall make some preliminary comments about the Qumran corpus as a whole in order to set the scene.

Individual DSS from Caves 1–11 are normally denoted by a cave number, followed by the document’s name, often abbreviated and with additional letters. The sectarian composition from Cave 4 known by the abbreviation 4QMMT<sup>a-f</sup>, for example, denotes six copies of what scholars have called more fully 4QSome Precepts of the Law<sup>a-f</sup> (Hebrew, *Miqṣat Ma’āse ha-Torah*). Works which contain parallel, but not identical, material can be designated slightly differently, as in 4QAgos of Creation A-B. When a composition was retrieved from more than one cave, moreover, it is often referred to by name only, as with the Damascus Document which comprises 4QD<sup>a-h</sup>, 5QD, and 6QD (and two medieval copies, known as CD, discovered in late nineteenth-century Cairo). Furthermore, these three sets of Qumran manuscripts can be dubbed 4Q394–399, 4Q180–181, and 4Q266–273, 5Q12, and 6Q16, respectively, for nearly all the documents have been given sequential catalogue numbers by cave.

The Qumran DSS were discovered between 1947 and 1956. Although many were published in the 1950s and 1960s, much Cave 4 material failed to enter the public domain (Campbell 2002: 16–19). But with the release of outstanding writings in 1991, a renaissance in Qumran studies has taken place. Indeed, the official publication of the Qumran collection in the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series (Oxford: 1955– ) is virtually complete. Now that the whole corpus is available, it can tentatively be divided into three broad categories (Campbell 2002: 10–12).

First come writings known long before 1947 from the Rabbinic Bible, Apocrypha, and Pseudepigrapha. ‘Rabbinic Bible’ here denotes the threefold canon of scripture which emerged among Jews some time after 100 CE, with its Torah (Law), Nevi’im (Prophets), and Ketuvim (Writings). ‘Apocrypha’ was originally a fourth-century CE term for up to sixteen compositions (e.g. Tobit) excluded from that Rabbinic Bible but often included in the Christian Old Testament. The eighteenth-century CE label ‘Pseudepigrapha’ covers writings in neither the Rabbinic Bible nor mainstream Christian Bible (e.g. *1 Enoch*) but nevertheless preserved over the centuries (Campbell 2002: 38–42). No copy of any of these books from Caves 1–11 reflects the Qumran Community’s sectarian outlook, and so all the literature concerned presumably circulated widely in late Second Temple times. But we shall return to this question in the next chapter.

The diverse religious texts in our second category of Qumran DSS were likewise probably circulating beyond the Qumran sect, for, though unknown to scholarship before 1947, they too lack distinct sectarian features. Many of the manuscripts were only released in 1991 and require further research. But we can note that some seem to consist of pious late Second Temple writings of various sorts, such as 4QLegal Texts A-B (4Q251, 264a), while others are similar in content and genre to many of the long-known Pseudepigrapha mentioned above, as we shall see also more fully in Chapter 2.

In the third category, we have the so-called ‘sectarian’ manuscripts. Their distinct ideology and idiosyncratic vocabulary are thought to mirror the Qumran Community directly, although scholars have recently become less confident about which works to isolate here. This is largely because of the number of writings published since 1991 containing ideological overlaps with clearly sectarian works but lacking their peculiar vocabulary. For instance, the above-mentioned 4QLegal Texts A-B contain legal emphases familiar from the Damascus Document yet lack its sectarian nomenclature. As a result, works like the Temple Scroll (4QT, 11QT<sup>a-c</sup>), long assumed to be sectarian, may now be best placed alongside the likes

of 4QLegal Texts A-B within our second category of Qumran DSS, penned in some cases perhaps by the sect's spiritual ancestors rather than the community itself (Campbell 2002: 83–84).

Nevertheless, sectarian documents certainly include 4QMMT<sup>a-f</sup>, 4QAges of Creation A-B, and the Damascus Document, all mentioned earlier, as well as the Community Rule (1QS, 4QS<sup>a-j</sup>, 5QS), War Scroll (1QM, 4QM<sup>a-g</sup>), 1QpHabakkuk, 4QpNahum (4Q169), 4QFlorilegium (4Q174), 4QTanhumim (4Q176), 4QCommentaries on Genesis A-D (4Q252–254a), and 11QMelchizedek (11Q13). Such compositions presumably hold the key to grasping the overall significance of the Qumran corpus. Yet, neither their wide-ranging content nor the extent of the physical damage suffered by many should be underestimated, as we shall discover in Chapters 3–8.

This threefold division represents just one way the Qumran DSS can be subdivided to facilitate study (cf. Dimant 2000a), and some of the labels used (Rabbinic Bible, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha) come from long after the Second Temple period. We shall attempt to formulate a less anachronistic terminology in the next chapter.

## 2. The Qumran–Essene Hypothesis

The Qumran manuscripts constitute a vast and varied collection of ancient Jewish texts, as intimated above. Not only do we have materials from the three categories described, but within each one there is considerable variation.

Indeed, one of the surprises of recent research has been the extent of textual fluidity among manuscripts of individual books from the later Rabbinic Bible, Apocrypha, and Pseudepigrapha (Campbell 2002: 29–45). As for our second category, the number of such works circulating in Palestine in the last few centuries BCE and the first century CE is remarkable (Campbell 2002: 76–77). Turning to the sectarian manuscripts, the practices and beliefs described in them are diverse, while the 1991 releases highlight how some of these writings survive in divergent editions (Campbell 2002: 101–2). The Community Rule, for instance, long available in its Cave 1 version (1QS), has recently been published in ten Cave 4 exemplars (4QS<sup>a-j</sup>), several containing significant textual variants (Alexander, Vermes, and Brooke 1998; Vermes 1999: 33–35). Such features suggest that the outlook, organization, and lifestyle of the Qumran Community evolved over time, with diversity also existing at any given point in time (Sanders 2000).

Still, a consensus had emerged by the 1970s, linking the Qumran DSS

to the religious movement already known as the Essenes from two first-century CE Jewish authors, Philo and Josephus, and the first-century CE Roman geographer, Pliny the Elder (Beall 2000; Campbell 2002: 46–77; Vermes and Goodman 1989). Two overarching reasons for positing such an Essene connection remain powerful even after the 1991 releases. First, many practices and beliefs commended in sectarian writings like the Community Rule and Damascus Document are attributed to the Essenes by the three classical authors just listed. Such parallels often include substantial detail, outweighing contradictions and intermittent overlaps between the Qumran Sect and other Second Temple groupings such as the Pharisees or ‘Zealots’. Second, there is a clear geographical connection between Khirbet Qumran’s location by the Dead Sea and Pliny’s placement of an Essene settlement near the town of ‘Ein-Gedi (Campbell 2002: 59–70).

For these reasons, the contents of Caves 1–11 can be described as some kind of Essene library (Campbell 1999a: 812). Indeed, this conclusion represents one of two pillars in what may be called the ‘Qumran–Essene Hypothesis’. The second rests on de Vaux’s archaeological excavations in the 1950s that uncovered artefactual links between Caves 1–11, Khirbet Qumran, and the satellite settlement of ‘Ein-Feshkha (1973). Distinctive pottery recovered from these locations, for example, has long been taken to show that they were utilized by the same group. This connection between Caves 1–11 and Khirbet Qumran was confirmed by the discovery in 1996 of an ostrakon among the ruins of the latter. It almost certainly mentions the ‘community’ (Hebrew, *yahad*) featuring in sectarian manuscripts and certainly reflects a property transfer like that in 1QS 6.16–23 and in Josephus’ account of the Essenes (Campbell 2002: 97–98; Cross and Eshel 2000).

Such evidence means that most experts remain convinced that a community closely linked to the Essenes of the classical authors possessed the manuscripts in Caves 1–11 and inhabited Khirbet Qumran and ‘Ein-Feshkha from the mid- or late second century BCE until c. 68 CE. A version of the Qumran–Essene Hypothesis, therefore, is likely to persist well into the twenty-first century as the dominant scholarly explanation for the Qumran DSS (VanderKam 1999).

### 3. Recent Developments in Qumran Studies

Nevertheless, there have been serious challenges to the Qumran–Essene Hypothesis in recent years. Two types are worth mentioning.

The first comes from the radical theories of Schiffman and Golb, who

in different ways have rejected the hypothesis described above. The former scholar posits an alternative theory, highlighting parallels between the religious practices commended in the Qumran corpus and what we know from elsewhere about the Sadducees (Schiffman 1994a: 65–157). However, these parallels are outweighed by others pointing towards an Essene link, as observed already, although there may possibly have been a partial overlap in origin between the Essenes and Sadducees (Campbell 2002: 155–57; García Martínez and van der Woude 1990). Golb (1995) argues that the size and diversity of the Qumran collection show it is a random late Second Temple cache of writings from Jerusalem, hidden for safety in Caves 1–11 during the First Revolt. Yet, despite the corpus' real diversity, the sectarian manuscripts consistently reflect distinct historical, religious, and literary characteristics (e.g. mention of the Teacher of Righteousness; correct calendrical observation; the technical term *peshet*), while some features expected of a truly random body of writings are missing. No text obviously emanating from the Pharisees has come to light, for instance, nor are there thoroughly hellenized books like *Wisdom* (Campbell 2002: 158–61; VanderKam 1994: 95–97). Such absences render interesting Davies' suggestion that Jerusalem Essenes may have hidden materials with Essenes at Qumran for safety (2000a: 110–14). But the evidence, as it stands, militates against Golb's view.

A similar judgement applies to theories suggesting that Khirbet Qumran was either a country villa (Donceel-Voûte 1993; Hirschfeld 1998) or some kind of fortress unconnected with the literary contents of Caves 1–11 (Golb 1995). It is true that a small number of general parallels between Qumran and the remains of fortified palaces and villas elsewhere in Palestine from Hasmonean and Herodian times exist. However, as Magness has recently argued, these are outweighed by significant differences (2002: 90–100). The fact that the Qumran site lacks the elaborate decoration found in surviving palaces and villas, for example, effectively rules out the identifications proposed by Donceel-Voûte and Hirschfeld (Campbell 2002: 161–62; Magness 2002: 96–98). As for Golb's alternative that Khirbet Qumran was a fortress (1995: 36–41), this thesis cannot be sustained on the slender basis of the site's square tower and signs of Roman military attack (Campbell 2002: 160–61; Magness 2002: 99).

A second and more serious challenge comes from supporters of the Qumran–Essene Hypothesis itself, for many details are disputed in light of new evidence and re-estimations of old evidence (Campbell 2002: 73–77, 102–9). Two concrete examples will suffice. One concerns de Vaux's archaeological framework that, allowing an initial settlement at Qumran as early as c. 150 BCE, conveniently matched Jonathan Maccabee's



assumption of high-priestly office in 152 BCE (de Vaux 1973: 116–17), a development often held to be the catalyst for the Qumran Community's formation (Campbell 2002: 70–72). Re-evaluation of the archaeology, however, suggests that the site was almost certainly not settled before the accession of John Hyrcanus in 134 BCE (Broshi 2000a: 737) and probably not even before c. 100 BCE (Magness 1998: 64; 2002: 63–69). Although not all scholars agree with such re-dating (Charlesworth 2002a: 44), it reopens the question of the historical origins of the religious community inhabiting Qumran. Another example concerns the recently published fragmentary sectarian manuscripts known as 4QSE<sup>2-i</sup>. These are Cave 4 copies of 1QRule of the Congregation (1QSb) which, according to the results of palaeography and carbon dating, appear to stem from the mid-second century BCE or earlier (Campbell 2002: 82–83, 103; Pfann 2000). Such a date requires that the movement using Qumran after 134 BCE or 100 BCE must earlier have been based elsewhere, although precisely where is another matter.

These examples illustrate that the Qumran–Essene Hypothesis, though still broadly accepted, is in a state of flux, especially regarding the precise history and identity of the Qumran Community. For instance, we cannot presently be sure whether those belonging to the movement's pre-Qumranic phase were an Essene parent group or Essenes proper. How we might begin to answer such questions, moreover, necessarily impacts upon others. Thus, legal-cum-theological links between sectarian documents (e.g. the Damascus Document) and some writings best placed in our second category of DSS (e.g. 4QLegal Texts A-B) might be explained in one of several ways, depending on which of these options is taken (Campbell 1995a; 2002: 102–9; Davies 1987).

#### 4. 'The *Pesher* Phenomenon'

Among the sectarian Qumran literature are some thirty-six individual manuscripts that, taking duplicate and parallel copies into account, comprise around twenty compositions interpreting scripture in a more or less explicit manner. Over the years, scholars have focused on one characteristic common to many of these documents: their use of the Hebrew word *pesher* ('interpretation'). This term certainly originated outside the Qumran Sect, with related forms occurring in Akkadian, Aramaic, and Hebrew in the sense of 'to loose, to interpret' (Dimant 1992: 244). The Hebrew noun *pesher* occurs in Ecclesiastes 8.1, for example, while the verb *patar* is found in the Joseph narrative of Genesis 40–41 and the Aramaic noun *peshar* appears in Daniel 2.4–7.28. Yet,

*pesher* seems to have taken on special significance for members of the Qumran Community, for many sectarian works contain what we may call ‘*pesher* units’: portions in which scripture is overtly interpreted using the term *pesher*. Any composition made up largely of such units can be named a ‘*pesher* work’ or ‘Peshar’ (plural, ‘Pesharim’) (Aschim 1998: 20–21).

Following Carmignac (1970: 360–62), scholars have generally further subdivided the Pesharim into Continuous, Thematic, and Isolated Pesharim (Berrin 2000; Dimant 1992). The Continuous Pesharim, at the heart of Qumran Studies for many years, comprise fifteen manuscripts consisting almost entirely of *pesher* units:

- 4QpIsaiah<sup>a-c</sup> (4Q161–165) (Allegro 1968g; Horgan 2002a);
- 4QpHosea<sup>a-b</sup> (4Q166–167) (Allegro 1968h; Horgan 2002b);
- 1QpMicah (1Q14) (Allegro 1968i; Horgan 2002c; Milik 1955a);
- 4QpNahum (4Q169) (Allegro 1968j; Horgan 2002d);
- 1QpZephaniah, 4QpZephaniah (1Q15, 4Q170) (Allegro 1968k; Horgan 2002e; Milik 1955b);
- 1QpHabakkuk (Burrows, Trever, and Brownlee 1955; Horgan 2002f);
- 1QpPsalms, 4QpPsalms<sup>a-b</sup> (1Q16, 4Q171, 173) (Allegro 1968l; Horgan 2002g; Milik 1955c).

These manuscripts were the subject of an important study by Horgan (1979). They share certain characteristics, most noticeably a formal pattern in which lemmata from one scriptural book are usually followed in turn by sectarian comment (Lim 2002a: 24–39). Thematic Pesharim consist largely of *pesher* units in which a variety of scriptural sources are employed to support an overarching theme. They are normally thought to include at least 4QFlorilegium, 4QCatena A, and 11QMelchizedek (Berrin 2000: 646), documents which have also been available for several decades. But others consider extending the Thematic Pesharim to cover one or more of 4QOrdinances<sup>a-c</sup> (4Q159, 513–514), 4QTanhumim (4Q176), 4QAgnes of Creation A-B, and 4QCommentary on Genesis A (Aschim 1998: 22–24; Collins 1992a: 90; Lim 2002b: 72; Vermes in *HJP*, 3.1: 420).

As for the Isolated Pesharim, they consist of occasional *pesher* units within predominantly non-*pesher* documents. Evidencing the ad hoc employment of the term *pesher* to aid exegesis, the chief exemplars are found in the Community Rule (1QS 8.14–16) and Damascus Document (CD 4.12b–19a). Both the Community Rule (Alexander, Vermes, and Brooke 1998; Burrows, Trever, and Brownlee 1951; Qimron and Charlesworth 1994) and Damascus Document (Baillet 1962a; Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995; Baumgarten *et al.* 1996; Milik 1962b) have been part of Qumran studies since the beginning.

The above threefold distinction is certainly a helpful starting point. After all, 1QpHabakkuk represents a relatively straightforward example of a Continuous Peshet, for Habakkuk 1–2 are interpreted more or less verse by verse, no other scriptural source is cited, and the term *peshet* is employed throughout. 11QMelchizedek appears to be a clear-cut case of the Thematic Peshet, with numerous scriptural contexts marshalled to explicate the theme of salvation envisaged by the author. Again, CD 4.12b–19a constitutes an obvious example of the Isolated Peshet. Closer examination, however, renders these neat divisions problematic (Aschim 1998: 20–26).

Thus, not all Continuous Peshetim stick to one base text. 4QpIsaiah<sup>c</sup>, for example, preserves the remains of at least two citations from other scriptural works (Jeremiah in fragment 1; Zechariah 11.11 in fragment 21) (Allegro 1968g: 17, 23; Horgan 2002a: 48–49, 66–67). Similarly, it has been questioned whether Thematic Peshetim like 4QFlorilegium and 4QCatena A really do reflect easily discernible motifs controlling their interpretation of scripture (Lim 2002a: 46). As for Isolated Peshetim, it is to be noted that the Damascus Document regularly engages in overt interpretation which avoids the term *peshet* altogether in CD 3.20–4.1; 6.3–11; 7.14–21; 8.8–15; 19.7–13 (Campbell 1995b: 67–99; 131–60). These portions function like *peshet* units but employ pronouns instead of the technical term to the same effect. Such pronominal interpretation formulae also occur independently of *peshet* formulae in the Thematic Peshetim (e.g. 4QFlorilegium 3.1–4) and even the Continuous Peshetim (4QpIsaiah<sup>a</sup> fragments 8–10, 3.9–10). Indeed, Grabbe has proposed that *peshet* is really a primarily form-critical category (2000: 167).

In any case, the above difficulties suggest that the boundaries between the so-called Continuous, Thematic, and Isolated Peshetim are porous. The widespread use of pronominal formulae demonstrates, moreover, that overt Qumran exegesis is not simply coterminous with ‘the *peshet* phenomenon’, for manifestations of the latter often occur side by side with instances of the former. In addition, as Berrin points out, debates over the classification of the recently published 4QCommentary on Genesis A have further highlighted the above problems (2000: 647). This document includes the remains of *peshet* and pronominal interpretation units (4.3–7; 5.1–7), as well as less explicit exegesis on the chronology of the flood (1.1–2.5), leading to the suggestion that it is a ‘mixed’ commentary (Trafton 2002: 204). The latter characterization adds weight to Dimant’s insight that *peshet*-like exegesis also underlies a lot of less overt interpretation in the sectarian Qumran writings, as well as covert exegesis and even the coining of nicknames like ‘Seekers of Smooth Things’ and ‘Teacher of Righteousness’ (1992: 248).

Hence, although the designations Continuous Pesharim, Thematic Pesharim, and Isolated Pesharim remain helpful starting points, recent proposals that Qumran exegetical activity constitutes a continuum make sense (e.g. Aschim 1998: 26). At one end, we find compositions like 1QpHabakkuk with its programmatic use of the technical term *peshet* (e.g. 1QpHabakkuk 9.9). Towards the centre of the spectrum come the somewhat freer Thematic Pesharim like 4QFlorilegium, 4QCatena A, and 11QMelchizedek, employing *peshet* terminology but also drawing regularly on pronominal formulae. Alongside them are the Isolated Pesharim and similar units of material which, though preferring pronouns to the word *peshet*, contain exegesis which is otherwise identical in its outworking (CD 6.2b–11a). Towards the other side of the continuum, building upon Dimant's suggestion noted immediately above, we may perhaps include less overt forms of sectarian interpretation, although this requires further study.

A final area of debate in Qumran research which we must mention has been the process which led to the compilation of the various Pesharim now in our possession. More precisely, do they primarily reflect the end result of concrete exegetical techniques being applied to scriptural texts (Brownlee 1951) or, alternatively, do they embody 'revelatory' traditions akin to what is found in Daniel (Elliger 1953)? It seems that, in fact, we should see the literature as a combination of the two. That is, the practicalities of Qumran exegesis entailed the employment of concrete interpretative techniques, yet simultaneously presupposed an overarching revelation to the sect through inspired leaders (Brooke 1985: 166–67; Charlesworth 2002a: 14–16; Lim 2002a: 45–46).

In sum, underlying all the sectarian writings briefly considered in this section is the assumption that the Qumran Community was in receipt of a new divine revelation concretized through the application to scripture of exegetical techniques by an inspired leadership. The same combination almost certainly underlies other sectarian documents which interpret scripture less explicitly. Nevertheless, we will need to return to issues of terminology and definition in Chapter 3.

## 5. The Exegetical Texts from Qumran

'The Exegetical Texts' is the title given in this book to three Thematic Pesharim and a further five related works in need of re-evaluation in light of the recent scholarly developments described earlier. All have been in the public domain for many years, either in their *editiones principes* or preliminary publications; all have also been helpfully re-edited recently in

either PTSDSSP 2 or PTSDSSP 6B. We shall retain the names given to the documents by scholars in the early days of Qumran research, both for the sake of convenience and for want of adequate alternatives. The eight manuscripts will be discussed in the following order in Chapters 3–8, where further bibliographical information will be provided:

- 4QFlorilegium (4Q174);
- 4QCatenae A-B (4Q177, 182);
- 11QMelchizedek (11Q13);
- 4QAges of Creation A-B (4Q180–181);
- 4QTanhumim (4Q176);
- 4QTestimonia (4Q175).

These eight documents can be counted among the twenty or so sectarian Qumran writings described in the previous section. In fact, with the exception of 4QTestimonia, all have been classed as Thematic Pesharim by one scholar or another over the decades, as noted above, and they certainly share broadly similar traits (Berrin 2000: 646). With the exception of 4QTestimonia, more particularly, all engage in the overt interpretation of scripture, with four actually employing *peshet* and pronominal formulae (4QFlorilegium; 4QCatena A; 4QAges of Creation A; and 11QMelchizedek).

Three of the compositions, as stated, are regularly deemed Thematic Pesharim by nearly all scholars: 4QFlorilegium; 4QCatena A; and 11QMelchizedek. To be more precise, 4QFlorilegium appears to interpret 2 Samuel 7.10–14, Psalms 1.1 and 2.1, and other passages on the theme of the Qumran Community's status as an eschatological Temple in 'the end of days'. 4QCatena A also unpacks Psalms and other scriptures in terms of 'the end of days', although little can be said about the badly damaged 4QCatena B by way of comparison. As for 11QMelchizedek, it seems to interpret a range of scriptures to explain the role of a heavenly Melchizedek figure in 'the end of days'. The latter phrase, common to many other sectarian Qumran writings, probably denotes the final phase of world history in which the community believed it lived (Collins 2000a; Steudel 1993).

The other four Exegetical Texts are more disparate, though still concerned in one way or another with an eschatological interpretation of the scriptures. If we had to place 4QAges of Creation A on the spectrum envisaged in the last section, indeed, it would be close to the Thematic Pesharim. In any case, we can note that 4QAges of Creation A-B comment on Genesis 6–22 in the surviving portions of what seems to be an eschatological schematization of history broadly parallel to that in 11QMelchizedek. 4QTanhumim, although rather damaged, offers com-

fort for 'the end of days' from Isaiah and elsewhere to readers in need of encouragement. Lastly, 4QTestimonia combines eschatologically four scriptural passages which, though devoid of overt comment in the manuscript, seem to be linked to the advent of several messianic figures.

However, we must now return to our earlier observation about the fluid boundaries between different kinds of Pesharim and other sectarian exegetical works. This is because it is difficult to separate the Exegetical Texts just described from seventeen other manuscripts which, with two exceptions, have not yet been mentioned. Most, if not all, probably represent the remains of sectarian exegesis:

- 1QWords of Moses (1Q22) (Milik 1955e);
- 1QLiturgical Text A (1Q30) (Milik 1955f);
- 3QpIsaiah (3Q4) (Baillet 1962b; Horgan 2002h);
- 4QOrdinances<sup>a-c</sup> (4Q159, 4Q513–514) (Allegro 1968m; Baillet 1982a; Milgrom 1994; Schiffman 1994b);
- 4QpUnidentified (4Q172) (Allegro 1968o; Charlesworth and Elledge 2002a);
- 4QUnclassified Fragments (4Q178) (Allegro 1968p);
- 4QMidrash on Eschatology<sup>e</sup>? (4Q183) (Allegro 1968q; Charlesworth and Elledge 2002b; Steudel 1994: 156–157);
- 4QpApocalypse of Weeks (4Q247) (Broshi 2000b);
- 4QCommentaries on Genesis A-D (4Q252–254a) (Brooke 1996a; Brooke 2002b; Trafton 2002);
- 4QCommentaries on Malachi A-B (4Q253a; 5Q10) (Brooke 1996b; Brooke 2002c; Charlesworth 2002b; Milik 1962a);
- 4QExposition on the Patriarchs (4Q464) (Charlesworth and Elledge 2002c; Stone and Eshel 1995).

Some of these documents contain the word *peshet* (1Q30; 4Q159; 4Q252; 4Q464; 4Q172). But even as a starting point, none can be clearly identified as Continuous Pesharim, Thematic Pesharim, or the remnants of Isolated Pesharim. There are two main reasons for this uncertainty. Most straightforwardly, six manuscripts are extremely fragmentary (1Q30; 3Q4; 4Q172; 4Q178; 4Q183; 4Q247), despite the over-precise sigla officially given to some of them (3Q4; 4Q183; 4Q247). The second reason is that alternative designations may be preferable in other cases. Thus, because it is less than certain that 1QWords of Moses contains the remains of the word *peshet*, it may be a sectarian composition or a non-Qumranic work. Turning to 4QOrdinances<sup>a-c</sup>, we can say that these texts are certainly sectarian. But they engage in legal interpretations of scripture more akin to what is found in 4QMMT<sup>a-f</sup> and 4QMiscellaneous Rules (4Q265) than in the Exegetical Texts to be examined in this book.

In contrast, 4QCommentaries on Genesis A-D, 4QCommentaries on Malachi A-B, and 4QExposition on the Patriarchs share significant interpretative traits with the Exegetical Texts. On balance, however, they are probably closer to the legal, narrative, and theological sections of works like the Damascus Document. They will not receive extensive treatment in this book, therefore, but two will reappear in a later chapter. Meanwhile, in the next chapter, we shall examine the interrelated notions of scripture and interpretation in late Second Temple Judaism. We will then be able to proceed to the Exegetical Texts themselves in Chapters 3–8.

### Further Reading

#### Overviews of the DSS from Qumran and elsewhere

- J.G. Campbell, *Deciphering the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Blackwell, 2nd edn, 2002).  
 J.J. Collins, 'Dead Sea Scrolls', *ABD*, 1 (1992a), pp. 85–101.  
 P.R. Davies, with G.J. Brooke, and P.R. Callaway, *The Complete World of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2002).  
 D. Dimant, 'Qumran: Written Material', *EDSS* (2000a), pp. 739–46.  
 C. Hempel, 'Qumran Community', *EDSS* (2000), pp. 746–51.  
 G. Vermes, *Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: SCM Press, 1999).

#### Philo, Josephus, and Pliny on the Essenes

- T.S. Beall, 'Essenes', *EDSS* (2000), pp. 262–69.  
 J.G. Campbell, *Deciphering the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Blackwell, 2nd edn, 2002), pp. 59–67.  
 G. Vermes, and M. Goodman, *The Essenes According to the Classical Sources* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989).

#### Archaeology at Khirbet Qumran

- M. Broshi, 'Qumran: Archaeology', *EDSS* (2000a), pp. 733–39.  
 F.M. Cross, and E. Eshel, 'Ostraca from Khirbet Qumran', *DJD*, 36 (2000), pp. 497–512.  
 R. De Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Oxford University Press, 1973).  
 J. Magness, 'Qumran Archeology: Past Perspectives and Future Prospects', *DSSFY*, 1 (1998), pp. 47–77.  
 —*The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2002).

#### Qumran Essenes and their history

- J.G. Campbell, 'Essene-Qumran Origins in the Exile: A Scriptural Basis?', *JJS*, 46 (1995a), pp. 143–56.  
 —'The Qumran Sectarian Writings', W. Horbury *et al.* (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism* (Vol. 3; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999a), pp. 798–821.

- J.H. Charlesworth, *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002a).
- J.J. Collins, 'Eschatology', *EDSS* (2000a), pp. 256–261.
- P.R. Davies, *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987).
- S. Pfann, '4Qpap cryptA 4QSerekh ha-'Edah<sup>a-i?</sup>', *DJD*, 36 (2000), pp. 547–74.
- E.P. Sanders, 'The Dead Sea Sect and Other Jews: Commonalities, Overlaps and Differences', *DSSHHC* (2000), pp. 7–43.
- A. Steudel, 'אִתְּרִי הַיְמִינִי in the Texts from Qumran', *RQ*, 16 (1993), pp. 225–45.
- J.C. VanderKam, 'Identity and History of the Community', *DSSFY*, 2 (1999), pp. 487–533.

### **Alternatives to the Qumran–Essene Hypothesis and counter-arguments**

- P.R. Davies, 'Who Hid the Scrolls and When? Reflections on Some Recent Proposals', *The Qumran Chronicle* 9 (2000a), pp.105–22.
- P. Donceel-Voûte, '"Coenaculum" - La salle à l'étage du locus 30 à Khirbet Qumrân à la mer morte', *RO*, 4 (1993), pp. 61–84.
- F. García Martínez, and A.S. van der Woude, 'A "Groningen" Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History', in F. García Martínez (ed.), *The Texts of Qumran and the History of the Community* (Vol. 3; Paris: Gabalda, 1990), pp. 521–41.
- N. Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* (London: Michael O'Mara, 1995).
- Y. Hirschfeld, 'Early Roman Manor Houses in Judea and the Site of Khirbet Qumran', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 57 (1998), pp. 161–89.
- L.H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their True Meaning for Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Doubleday, 1994a).
- J.C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (London: SCM Press, 1994), pp. 92–95.

### **'The Pesher Phenomenon'**

- A. Aschim, 'The Genre of 11QMelchizedek', *QONT* (1998), pp. 17–31.
- S.L. Berrin, 'Pesharim', *EDSS* (2000), pp. 644–47.
- J.G. Campbell, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1–8, 1–20* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 228; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995b).
- J. Carmignac, 'Le document de Qumrân sur Melchisédeq', *RQ*, 7 (1970), pp. 343–78.
- D. Dimant, 'Pesharim, Qumran', *ABD*, 5 (1992), pp. 244–51.
- T.H. Lim, *Pesharim* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls, 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002a).
- 'Biblical Citations in the Pesharim', *BAB* (2002b), pp. 71–79.



### 1. Scripture in Second Temple Judaism

The question of which works were recognized as scripture by late Second Temple Jews, including the Qumran Sect, is complex. But there are essentially two competing theories among scholars (Campbell 2002: 42–45), and we shall say a little about each.

Beckwith (1985) gives fullest expression to what is a consensus upheld in broad outline by most scholars (Grabbe 2000: 150–82). Accordingly, what constituted scripture for late Second Temple Jews closely matched the later tripartite Rabbinic Bible—with its Torah (Law), Nevi'im (Prophets), and Ketuvim (Writings)—that was finalized some time after 100 CE, while most books among what came to be called the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha had no such status. Assuming the Torah was fixed during the Persian period (537–333 BCE), it is envisaged that a definitive Nevi'im emerged by the second century BCE, whereas the Ketuvim were only clearly demarcated in the course of the second century CE. Two pieces of evidence are central. First, because Daniel is in the Ketuvim of the Rabbinic Bible, the Nevi'im were presumably closed before Daniel was composed (c. 165 BCE), with only the limits of the Ketuvim still open. Secondly, several pre-100 CE Jewish and Christian references to scripture seem to reflect just such a tripartite arrangement. For instance, the *Prologue to Ecclesiasticus*, penned in Greek during the 130s BCE, describes 'the Law and the Prophets and the other books'. The late first-century CE Luke 24.44 speaks of 'the law of Moses, the prophets and the psalms', where the latter presumably heads a still open-ended third collection. Also in the late first century CE, Josephus mentions a scriptural canon of 'twenty-two' books under three broad headings (*Contra Apionem* 1.37–43), while twenty-four widely available books (plus seventy hidden ones) are attested in the more-or-less contemporary

4 *Ezra* 14.19–48. Lastly, the recently published 4QMMT<sup>d</sup> fragments 14–21 (line 10) reads:

... we [have written] to you so that you might understand the Book of Moses and the book[s of the pr]ophets and Davi[d] ...

This second-century BCE sectarian passage, that in the next extremely fragmentary line contains the obscure phrase ‘generation to generation’, appears to confirm the consensus (Qimron and Strugnell 1994: 58–59).

The evidence just adduced, however, is open to challenge. Thus, the reality is that bipartite references to scripture dominate late Second Temple literature, with 2 Maccabees 15.9 and Romans 3.21, for example, speaking of ‘the law and the prophets’. Furthermore, first-century BCE and CE authors regularly refer to Daniel as a ‘prophet’, as though no limits to that designation yet existed. Josephus says that ‘Daniel was a prophet of good things’ (*Antiquities* 10.268), for instance, while Matthew 24.15 refers to ‘the prophet Daniel’. It is, of course, possible to counter these points by adjusting the consensus. Accordingly, Abegg, Flint, and Ulrich (1999: 5–6) and Alexander (2000: 40) imply that various Jewish groups before 100 CE delineated the three scriptural divisions among themselves somewhat differently, while Brooke follows a suggestion that ‘generation to generation’ in 4QMMT<sup>d</sup> could denote an additional fourth scriptural division (2000b: 62).

Yet, Barton offers the more radical alternative that Second Temple Jews had an essentially twofold scripture of the Law and the Prophets (1986: 13–95). The former comprised the books of Moses and the latter was an open-ended collection linked to other heroes from ancient Israel and Judah. Those Prophets would normally have incorporated everything later found in the *Nevi'im* and *Ketuvim* of the Rabbinic Bible, but they would also have included many works subsequently dubbed Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. The threefold Rabbinic Bible accordingly took shape some time after 100 CE, and so earlier tripartite references are not really what they seem. ‘The Law and the Prophets and the other books’ in the *Prologue to Ecclesiasticus* probably refer to ancient scripture (‘the Law and the Prophets’) and more contemporary pious writings (‘the other books’) like the one composed by the author’s grandfather. Somewhat differently, the clear bipartite reference in Luke 24.27 suggests that Luke 24.44 merely subdivides secondarily an open-ended Prophets collection to highlight the Psalms. The 4QMMT<sup>d</sup> passage quoted above probably does likewise (Campbell 2000), because the sectarian manuscripts from Qumran normally speak of ‘Moses’ and ‘the Prophets’ (Brooke 2000b: 61). In that case, Josephus’ ‘twenty-two’ books may be an idealized presentation in which an open-ended scripture is artificially made to mirror the twenty-

two letters of the Hebrew alphabet (cf. Davies 1998: 107–8). Alternatively, Josephus' description may, like that in *4 Ezra* 14.19–48, reflect an embryonic fixed canon emerging for the first time in the aftermath of the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE.

To summarize, it is likely that Jews and Christians in late Second Temple times had a twofold scripture, where the Law comprised the books of Moses and the Prophets were open-ended (Campbell 2000: 186–90). Such writings were naturally believed to have originated among heroes like Moses, David, Daniel, and others, whatever modern scholars might conclude. However, one caveat must be added: whether a given composition was really what it purported to be may sometimes have been disputed. That much is suggested by that fact that early Jews and Christians knew that forgery was a possibility (Thiering 1990). In any case, we should avoid anachronistic terms such as 'Bible' and 'canon' in relation to late Second Temple Judaism (Talmon 2002). In future chapters, therefore, we shall speak simply of 'scripture' and 'the scriptures'.

## 2. Scriptural Manuscripts from Qumran

It is widely held that the Qumran scriptural manuscripts reflect the general situation prevailing in late Second Temple times, not just that at Qumran, for they contain no obviously sectarian traits (Ulrich 2002). That fact, coupled with the absence of any overt discussion of the limits of scripture among compositions that are manifestly sectarian, indirectly confirms that the fixed canons of later Judaism and Christianity only began to emerge from some time after c. 100 CE (Campbell 2002: 44).

Nonetheless, at least one copy of each of the twenty-four books of the later Rabbinic Bible was discovered in Caves 1–11, with the almost certain exception of Esther and the possible exception of Nehemiah (Tov *et al.* 2000; Tov 2001; Tov 2002a). Genesis, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, and Psalms, in fact, survived in multiple copies, with thirty-six constituting Psalms collections alone (1QPsalms<sup>a-c</sup>; 2QPsalms; 3QPsalms; 5QPsalms; 6QPsalms; 8QPsalms; 4QPsalms<sup>a-h</sup>, 4QPsalms<sup>i-u</sup>, 4QPsalms<sup>v</sup>, 4QPsalms 89; 11QPsalms<sup>a-e</sup>, 11QApocryphal Psalms). Among the Qumran manuscripts were also the remains of four writings from the Apocrypha: Tobit (4QTobit<sup>a-c</sup>); Psalms 151–54 (in 11QPsalms<sup>a</sup>); the Letter of Jeremiah (7QLetter of Jeremiah); and Ben Sira (2QSira; 11QPsalms<sup>a</sup>). Additionally, two Pseudepigrapha were found, as well as fragments relating to a third: *Jubilees* (1QJubilees<sup>a-b</sup>, 2QJubilees, 4QJubilees<sup>a-h</sup>, 11QJubilees); texts closely linked to *1 Enoch* (4QEnoch<sup>a-f</sup>); and sources

behind the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (1QAramaic Levi; 4QAramaic Levi<sup>a-f</sup>) (Campbell 2002: 38–42).

Given the conclusions of the last section, nearly all the writings just listed functioned as scripture for late Second Temple Jews, including the Qumran Community. After all, most purport to stem from ancient Israel and Judah, for even Psalms 151–54 are connected with King David, Tobit supposedly reflects the eighth century BCE, the Letter of Jeremiah is linked to its sixth-century BCE namesake, while something similar could be said for the material relating to the Pseudepigrapha. Flint has recently reached a similar, though somewhat more cautious, conclusion (1999: 62–66). And we may reasonably suppose that a number of other books later classed as Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha were treated similarly by at least some Second Temple Jews (e.g. 1 Esdras and *Psalms of Solomon*). Three qualifications, however, must be added.

The first relates to the Qumran Sect in particular, for the absence of Esther from Caves 1–11 was probably no accident in view of the book's advocacy of Purim, a festival which we know was rejected by the community (White Crawford 2000a: 269). Although we cannot be sure, we might cautiously suggest that the book of Esther was spurned, either as an impious ancient work or recent forgery, because of its propagation of a feast not sanctioned in the Law of Moses (Campbell 2002: 34, 42). In contrast, given the presence of the fragmentary remains of Ezra in Cave 4 (4QEzra [4Q117]), many scholars assume that the closely related Nehemiah simply failed to withstand the ravages of the Judean desert (Stegemann 1998: 86; cf. VanderKam 1994: 31).

The second qualification concerns the book of Ben Sira, both in its original Hebrew from the 180s BCE (Ben Sira proper) and the Greek translation of the 130s BCE (normally called Ecclesiasticus). On the basis of what we argued in the last section, the material's authorial modesty would have precluded it from gaining scriptural status, however authoritative in a different way it might have been in many circles. It is likely that a variety of other more-or-less contemporary works in the possession of the Qumran Community also circulated beyond its confines in late Second Temple times, if the size of our second category of manuscripts is an accurate guide. Like Ben Sira, some were pious compositions with wide appeal, probably including, for instance, a number of previously unknown Wisdom texts (Harrington 2000: 979–80). But others may have been the preserve of more partisan circles, including the Qumran Sect's spiritual ancestors (e.g. 4QLegal Texts A-C).

Our third qualification concerns yet further manuscripts within this second category apparently linked with ancient scriptural heroes, such as 4QReworked Pentateuch<sup>a-e</sup> (4Q158, 364–367) (Allegro 1968n; Tov and

White 1994), 4QApocryphon of Joshua<sup>a-b</sup> (4Q378–379) (Newsom 1996a), 4Qpseudo-Daniel<sup>a-c</sup> (4Q243–245) (Collins and Flint 1996), and new ‘Davidic’ pieces found in 11QPsalms<sup>a-b</sup> (11Q5–6) (Sanders 1965). Scholars regularly label such texts ‘Rewritten Bible’ or ‘Parabiblical Works’, because they complement and supplement writings familiar from the later Rabbinic Bible (Brooke 2000a; 2002a). But these designations are unlikely to reflect a late Second Temple perspective. Although their fragmentary state means caution is in order, there seems little by way of content or genre to distinguish at least some such compositions from other scriptural manuscripts. Indeed, when we learn that Josephus believed Daniel wrote ‘books’ (*Antiquities* 10.167) and that an editorial aside in 11QPsalms<sup>a</sup> 27.4–11 ascribes 4,050 compositions to David, it is likely that some previously unknown writings among our second category of Qumran DSS constituted scripture for those Second Temple Jews, including members of the Qumran Sect, who received them at face value. In Chapter 8, we shall return to this topic in relation to the appearance of 4QApocryphon of Joshua<sup>b</sup> in 4QTestimonia.

### 3. Textual Fluidity in Scriptural Writings

The Qumran scriptural manuscripts also demonstrate a surprising textual fluidity. Scholars have long been aware of textual variants, of course, within many of the books concerned. The clearest evidence comes from a comparison of the Masoretic Text or MT (medieval copies of the Rabbinic Bible), the Septuagint or LXX (the Old Testament in Greek surviving in copies from the third century CE onwards), and the Samaritan Pentateuch (Genesis–Deuteronomy in a Hebrew medieval Samaritan version). Between them, these witnesses show up myriad minor textual differences and more substantial divergences. Among the latter, Jeremiah in the MT and LXX constitute radically different editions of the book. Before the discovery of the DSS, the assumption was that sufficiently antique witnesses would determine which variants, both major and minor, represented the original form (Campbell 2002: 22–33).

Now we have such manuscripts, however, the situation is less straightforward. Two points are worth making. First, the innumerable small differences between the MT, LXX, and Samaritan Pentateuch are mirrored among Qumran scriptural manuscripts. The twenty-one copies of Isaiah, for example, represent essentially the same composition (1QIsaiah<sup>a-b</sup>, 4QIsaiah<sup>a-r</sup>, 5QIsaiah) but exhibit many minor variants (Flint 2002: 229–51). Often reflecting the MT, LXX, and Samaritan Pentateuch, the manuscripts also frequently present readings unknown

before 1947. A similar fluidity applies to copies of *Jubilees* (1QJubilees<sup>a-b</sup>, 2QJubilees, 4QJubilees<sup>a-h</sup>, 11QJubilees) (VanderKam 2000a) and, in all likelihood, to additional scriptural compositions among our second DSS category (e.g. 4QReworked Pentateuch<sup>a-c</sup>) (White Crawford 2000b).

The second point is that major divergent editions of scriptural books also existed during the late Second Temple period. Returning to Jeremiah, when five Cave 4 copies were found, the assumption was that either the longer (MT) or shorter (LXX) form would be shown to have priority. However, 4QJeremiah<sup>a,c,e</sup> reflect the MT, while 4QJeremiah<sup>b,d</sup> contain the remains of a Hebrew version akin to the LXX (Eshel 2000: 397–400). This proves that at least two Hebrew editions of Jeremiah circulated from the second century BCE onwards, while a similar situation prevailed for Exodus, sections of 1 Samuel, and Daniel 4–5 (Ulrich 1999: 34–50, 99–120).

#### 4. Scripture Interpreting Scripture

Fortunately, neither the wide range of Second Temple scriptures available nor their textual fluidity prevents us from observing certain broad features of the material concerned. One such feature is that some scriptural writings clearly interpret others, as Fishbane has amply shown for books making up the later Rabbinic Bible (1985; Alexander 2000: 36). Here, we can make two distinctions of our own.

The first is between overt and covert interpretation. The former can be seen in those scriptures which are explicit in their employment of existing scriptural material. The book of Daniel, for instance, openly interprets portions of Jeremiah, as when the ‘seventy years’ of Jeremiah 25.11–12 and 29.10–14 are re-interpreted in Daniel 9.24 to mean ‘seventy weeks [of years]’ (ie 70 × 7 years). We may presume that late Second Temple Jews would have been just as aware as we are of this overt appropriation of scripture. Some scriptural material, in contrast, interprets other scriptures more indirectly. Although the author nowhere proclaims it, for example, *Jubilees* is a careful rewriting of Genesis 1–Exodus 25. Thus, the massacre in Genesis 34 reappears in *Jubilees* 30 in a form justifying the patriarchs’ action in light of Dinah’s earlier rape. Such interpretation explains why scholars describe works like *Jubilees* as ‘Parabiblical Texts’ or ‘Rewritten Bible’, terms already encountered above. Yet, as also observed earlier, it is unlikely that such terminology reflects the way most Jews in the last centuries BCE and first century CE saw the relationship between Genesis 1–Exodus 25 and *Jubilees*.

That brings us to our second distinction, for dating is central to the

understanding of scripture interpreting scripture. We argued earlier that the Second Temple scriptures necessarily laid claim to an origin within ancient Israel and Judah, even if their authenticity was occasionally disputed. But modern scholars have challenged most scriptural pretensions in this regard, concluding that in reality the writings concerned were generally much younger than Second Temple Jews came to believe. In other words, academic analysis shows that the true historical origins of scriptural books are often quite different to what is seemingly claimed, directly or indirectly, within them. The technical term for the underlying phenomenon here is ‘pseudepigraphy’ (Charlesworth 1992).

In the examples given above, both the scriptures being interpreted and those providing the interpretation stem from later than the impression given in the texts concerned. On the surface, for instance, both Genesis 1–Exodus 25 and *Jubilees* are linked to Moses in a manner that was presumably accepted by virtually all late Second Temple Jews. However, we now know that the former comes from the 400s BCE and the latter from the second century BCE (VanderKam 2000a). A similar judgement applies to Jeremiah and Daniel, both of which were doubtless taken by Jews in late Second Temple times to originate among more-or-less contemporary exilic heroes (Barton 1986: 60). But modern scholars see the former as from no earlier than the early post-exilic period and the latter as reflecting the persecution of Jews under Antiochus IV Epiphanes (168–164 BCE) (Collins 1992b).

The above distinctions are complex but potentially enable the scholar to do two things simultaneously. On the one hand, they aid entry into the mind-set of late Second Temple Jews who, once scriptural writings were in the public domain, generally received them at face value. On the other hand, they allow us to grasp something of the true historical origins of particular scriptural works, even when that conflicts with their reception in late Second Temple times.

### **5. Exegesis in Non-Scriptural Works**

We can now turn to late Second Temple documents which, though not themselves scripture, interpret the scriptures as part of their message. Indeed, the widespread recognition of the Law and the Prophets encouraged the production of additional writings containing exegetically derived traditions. Aided by increasing literacy (Davies 1998: 79–83), this phenomenon probably first emerged during the Hellenistic period, for, as seen above, the earliest references to a bipartite scripture come from the second century BCE (Grabbe 2000: 165–70). Alongside the Temple and

priesthood, in other words, scripture became an important source of information for Jews on all kinds of matters, with analysis of the scriptures inevitably showing up further gaps and contradictions requiring explanation. Scripture could also act as a hook onto which extraneous traditions could conveniently be hung (Bernstein 2000a: 378). All in all, therefore, we see late Second Temple Jews increasingly grounding their identity in scriptural interpretation (Grabbe 2000: 178–82). That identity could even challenge priestly authority in Jerusalem, as was the case with the Qumran Community.

At this juncture, we need to make two further practical distinctions to aid our grasp of late Second Temple exegesis at Qumran and elsewhere. The first one is again between overt and covert interpretation. The clearest examples of the former can be found in the *‘peshet phenomenon’* at Qumran described in the last chapter. Primarily through citation formulae like ‘as it is written’ (Hebrew, *ka’asher katuv*), and interpretation formulae, such as ‘its interpretation concerns’ (*pishro ‘al*), the Continuous and Thematic Pesharim distinguish clearly between scripture and commentary.

Something similar, though less rigid, can be seen in Paul’s letters (e.g. Galatians 3.1–14). The scriptural sources in such explicit exegesis are sometimes linked to named ancient heroes, confirming the strength of traditions about scriptural origins by the first centuries BCE and CE (e.g. 4QFlorilegium 3.2–3, 16; Romans 9.25). As for covert interpretation, however, scriptural references tend to be more allusive. Sometimes, they merely reflect the author’s unconscious immersion in scriptural language. But many allusions are deliberate and derive from the conscious appropriation of scripture. The Damascus Document, for instance, in recounting the origins of the Qumran Community, contains narratives full of allusions to scriptural passages which then reappear as overt citations elsewhere in the work (Campbell 1995b: 175–89). Turning to 1 Maccabees, where the explicit appropriation of scripture is rarer, we nonetheless find many allusions to the scriptural past in descriptions of recent people and events (e.g. 1 Kings 4.25 in 1 Maccabees 14.12) (Bartlett 1998: 28–33).

The other helpful distinction we need to make concerns what Bernstein has called different ‘types’ of interpretation, ranging from ‘literal exegesis’ through ‘simple sense’ and ‘ideological’ readings to ‘extreme eisegesis’ (2000a: 376–77). All are evident in a range of late Second Temple interpretative writings but can again be illustrated most fully from the Qumran corpus. Some scriptural laws are interpreted fairly literally in the Damascus Document, for example, as with those concerning oaths in CD 16.6b–12. What seems to be a simple sense reading is found in 4QCommentary on Genesis A 2.5–8. There, it is explained that the



reason the curse in Genesis 9.25 unexpectedly falls on Canaan instead of his father Ham, the real culprit, is because God had already blessed the latter in Genesis 9.1. More ideologically motivated is 4QOrdinances<sup>a</sup> 2.6–7, for the author interprets scriptural laws (Exodus 30.11–16; Nehemiah 10.32) about the Temple tax to ensure it is payable once in a lifetime only, in line with his community's hostility to the Jerusalem hierarchy. A stronger case of eisegesis is found in CD 6.2b–11a. Although the sectarian author pays some attention to the rebellious background of Numbers 21, we find Numbers 21.18 and Isaiah 54.16 linked through particular vocabulary items. Both passages are then interpreted symbolically in a way that is divorced from their original contexts (Campbell 1995b: 95–97; Knibb 1987: 47–50). As this example illustrates, the kind of exegetical activity found in many late Second Temple interpretative writings, including those among the Qumran DSS, should not be confused with the sort of historical-critical exegesis normally recommended in modern university departments.

Finally, we need to add that several kinds of exegesis, including overt and covert interpretation, can occur within one document. For instance, the 'mixed' 4QCommentary on Genesis A (4Q252), noted in the last chapter, embodies various types of exegesis and both explicit and implicit interpretation (Brooke 1994; Trafton 2002: 203–7).

## 6. Exegetical Techniques

In addition to various types of exegesis, as well as overt and covert interpretation, scholars have drawn attention to a range of exegetical techniques employed by late Second Temple interpreters, including the Qumran Community (Brewer 1992: 177–225; Brooke 1985: 1–44; Dimant 1992: 250). In so doing, parallels with the *middot* (formal rules of interpretation) of the later rabbis have often been drawn (Brooke 1985: 6–25; Brewer 1992: 226–31; Vermes 1979a: 337–46). But the widespread existence of detailed rules of exegesis in the last centuries BCE and first century CE is doubtful (Grabbe 2000: 169). Nevertheless, late Second Temple writings do provide general pointers as to how Jews and Christians before c. 100 CE handled scriptural material to ensure it delivered the results required. Here, we can borrow from Bernstein again (2000a: 380–82), for he has usefully summarized several such methods. Three are worth mentioning.

The first and most prevalent exegetical technique is 'thematic association' (Bernstein 2000a: 380). It entails forging links between particular scriptural texts, either within one book or between books, that

share common themes or items of vocabulary. Such linkages can then be used either to solve particular problems within the scriptures or to extract new information relating to a given writer's particular needs. For example, Acts 13.33–37 emphasizes Jesus' status as God's special son by drawing on 2 Samuel 7.14 and Psalm 2.7, both of which share a common theme (the Davidic line) and language ('son') (Brooke 1985: 169, 209).

Second, we have what might be called 'specification' (Bernstein 2000a: 381), whereby a generalized scriptural statement is further specified in one direction or another. This sometimes involves relatively straightforward explication of the scriptural passage, as when the righteous and wicked in Psalm 37 are identified in 4QpPsalms<sup>a</sup> (4Q171) as the Qumran Sect and its opponents, respectively, including what seem to be particular individual leaders (Knibb 1987: 247–55). But considerable exegetical creativity can also be seen, as when Paul in Galatians 3.16 rather unnaturally insists that the singular 'seed' in Genesis 12.7 and elsewhere signifies that Jesus was the one destined to inherit the divine promises to Abraham.

A third technique is 'atomization' (Bernstein 2000a: 381). Here, an excerpt from the scriptures is interpreted so that its constituent elements are unpacked individually, with little attention to the context in which the material originally appeared. Isaiah 24.17, for example, is treated in this way in CD 4.12–19. The former's threefold description of the terrible fate awaiting Judah ('Terror, and the pit, and the snare . . .') is atomized in the latter in terms of three sins thought to be prevalent among the sectarian author's enemies (fornication, pursuit of wealth, and Temple defilement).

These three interpretative methods can be seen in a wide range of late Second Temple writings, as the random examples given illustrate. They can also be found in subject matter that is legal (e.g. 4QOrdinances<sup>a-c</sup> [4Q159, 513–514]), historical (Acts 7.2–53), theological (Romans 3.9–20), or a mixture of these (the Damascus Document). Two or three can sometimes appear within one piece of interpretation, moreover, for the boundaries separating one from another are not as clear-cut as the above summary implies. Thus, Acts 13.33–37 engages in both thematic association and specification, while CD 4.12–19 contains specification and atomization. More generally, all three interpretative methods allow a good deal of interpretative licence on the part of the ancient exegete, as some of the above examples illustrate.

## 7. **Scriptural Interpretation in the Exegetical Texts**

In this chapter, we have concluded that the thread binding the scriptures together as scripture in Second Temple times was their ascription, direct

or indirect, to ancient heroes like Moses, David, or Daniel. This means that Second Temple Jews had a diverse range of scriptures which probably included compositions unknown to the scholarly world before their discovery at Qumran (e.g. 4QApocryphon of Joshua<sup>a-b</sup>). We have also noted the textual fluidity of the individual scriptural manuscripts retrieved from Caves 1–11, including the existence of multiple editions (e.g. Jeremiah). More complex is the fact that some scriptures appropriate other scriptural books exegetically, whether overtly or covertly (e.g. Daniel and *Jubilees*). Most significantly, a body of non-scriptural interpretative literature emerged during the last centuries BCE and first century CE, including important works among the Qumran sectarian writings. Such literature sets out in a variety of ways to interpret scripture, often explicitly but also implicitly, employing in the process a number of more-or-less detectable exegetical techniques.

We may now turn specifically to the Exegetical Texts from Qumran, the title given in this book to several Thematic Pesharim and related works. As we saw in the last chapter, these compositions are linked to the ‘*peshet* phenomenon’ found exclusively among the sectarian Qumran DSS. That distinctiveness, coupled with the broader exegetical factors summarized above, means that two related sets of questions will be central to our examination of the Exegetical Texts in turn in subsequent chapters.

One set could be asked of all late Second Temple interpretative writings: (1) Which books are cited or otherwise treated as scripture? (2) Which scriptural text form or forms were used? (3) Are the scriptures appropriated overtly or covertly? (4) What exegetical techniques seem to be employed?

The other set of questions focus on features marking out the Exegetical Texts as distinctive, whether as part of the Qumran corpus as a whole or as a discrete strand within that corpus: (5) To what extent are the Exegetical Texts part of the ‘*peshet* phenomenon’? (6) How far do the ideas expressed in the Exegetical Texts reflect the vocabulary, ideology, and history of the Qumran Community?

### Further Reading

#### Overviews of scripture and interpretation

M.J. Bernstein, ‘Interpretation of Scriptures’, *EDSS* (2000a), pp. 376–83.

—‘Scriptures: Quotation and Use’, *EDSS* (2000b), pp. 839–42.

G.J. Brooke, ‘Rewritten Bible’, *EDSS* (2000a), pp. 777–81.

J.G. Campbell, *Deciphering the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Blackwell, 2nd edn, 2002), pp. 59–67.

- J.H. Charlesworth, 'Pseudonymity and Pseudepigraphy', *ABD*, 5 (1992), pp. 540–41.  
 J.J. Collins, 'Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha', *EDSS* (2000b), pp. 35–39.  
 H. Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Leiden/New York: Brill/Eerdmans, 1998), pp. 80–138.  
 B. Thiering, 'Pseudonymity', *DBI* (1990), pp. 568–71.  
 E. Tov, *et al.*, 'Scriptures', *EDSS* (2000), pp. 832–42.

### **Detailed studies**

- P.S. Alexander, 'The Bible in Qumran and Early Judaism', in A.D.H. Mayes (ed.), *Text in Context: Essays by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 35–62.  
 G.J. Brooke, 'Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible', in *BAB* (2002a), pp. 31–40.  
 P.R. Davies, *Scribes and Scrolls: The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures* (London: SPCK, 1998).  
 M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985).  
 P.W. Flint, "'Apocrypha", Other Previously-Known Writings, and "Pseudepigrapha"', *DSSFY*, 2 (1999), pp. 24–66.  
 S. Talmon, 'The Crystallization of the "Canon of Hebrew Scriptures" in the Light of Biblical Scrolls from Qumran', *BAB* (2002), pp. 5–20.  
 E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2nd edn, 2001).  
 —'The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert – an Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts', *BAB* (2002a), pp. 139–66.  
 E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).  
 —'The Absence of "Sectarian Variants" in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran', *BAB* (2002), pp. 179–95.

### **Particular scriptural writings**

- M. Abegg, P. Flint, and E. Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999).  
 J.J. Collins, 'Daniel, Book of', *ABD*, 2 (1992b), pp. 29–37.  
 —'Daniel, Book of: Pseudo-Daniel', *EDSS* (2000c), pp. 176–78.  
 E. Eshel, 'Jeremiah: Biblical Text', *EDSS* (2000), pp. 397–400.  
 P.W. Flint (ed.), 'The Book of Isaiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls', *BAB* (2002), pp. 229–51.  
 J.C. VanderKam, 'Jubilees, Book of', *EDSS* (2000a), pp. 434–38.  
 S. White Crawford, 'Esther, Book of', *EDSS* (2000a), pp. 269–70.  
 —'Reworked Pentateuch', *EDSS* (2000b), pp. 775–77.

### **Competing theories on a Second Temple 'canon'**

- J. Barton, *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile* (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1986), pp. 13–95.  
 R.T. Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church* (London: SPCK, 1985).  
 J.G. Campbell, '4QMMT<sup>d</sup> and the Tripartite Canon', *JJS*, 51 (2000), pp. 181–90.

**Scriptural interpretation in its Second Temple context**

- J.R. Bartlett, *1 Maccabees* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).
- D.I. Brewer, *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992).
- G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 29 Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985).
- ‘The Genre of 4Q252: From Poetry to Peshet’, *DSD*, 1 (1994), pp. 160–79.
- ‘Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament’, *DSSFD* (2000b), pp. 60–73.
- J.G. Campbell, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1–8, 1–20* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 228; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995b).
- D.J. Harrington, ‘Wisdom Texts’, *EDSS* (2000), pp. 976–80.
- M. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200, 2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- T.H. Lim, *Pesharim* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls, 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002a).
- G. Vermes, ‘Torah Scholarship’, *HJP*, 2 (1979a), pp. 314–80.

### 1. Introduction

4QFlorilegium (4Q174) is an important interpretative Hebrew composition discovered in Cave 4 in 1952 and named ‘Florilegium’ in the early days of research (Allegro 1968a: 53). But it is more than an ‘anthology’ (Latin, *florilegium*) of scripture, as the titles supplied by Yadin (‘A Midrash on 2 Samuel and Psalms 1–2’) and Vermes (‘Midrash on the Last Days’) indicate (Yadin 1959: 95; Vermes 1986a: 445). Indeed, the twenty-six fragments of the document comment overtly on scriptural passages brought together on the theme of ‘the end of days’ (Hebrew, *’aharit ha-yamim*), an eschatological phrase occurring six times in the extant text. Although the work’s form and content resemble those of 4QCatenana A (4Q177), the two manuscripts are unlikely to be copies of the same writing, as we shall see in the next chapter.

4QFlorilegium draws on a range of scriptural books, most significantly Deuteronomy 33, 2 Samuel 7, and Psalms 1–2 and 5. The Hebrew words *peshet* (‘interpretation’) and *midrash* (‘explanation’) are used in the exegesis of Psalms 1 and 2, and *peshet* terminology probably occurred in the interpretation of Psalm 5. In order to bolster his arguments, the ancient author also liberally scattered citations from secondary contexts in Exodus 15, Isaiah 8 and 65, Ezekiel 37, Amos 9, and Daniel 11–12. We shall say more on this intricate scriptural web below.

Not surprisingly, 4QFlorilegium has often been treated as at least partially paradigmatic of the Thematic Peshet (Dimant 1992: 247; Knibb 1987: 257–58), with 1QpHabakkuk seen as the primary exemplar of the Continuous Peshet (Dimant 1992: 245; Knibb 1987: 221). Together, the two compositions have played a central role in shaping scholarly views on the Qumran sect’s interpretation of scripture (Brownlee 1979; Vermes in *HJP* 3.1: 420). However, with the release of fresh documents in 1991, as

well as the concomitant re-evaluation of works long in the public domain, knowledge has broadened and deepened. That is the overall context in which we shall proceed to our discussion of 4QFlorilegium and the other Exegetical Texts.

## 2. The Text of 4QFlorilegium

Following the original editor (Allegro 1956, 1958, 1968a) and subsequent improvements by Strugnell (1970) and Brooke (1985), Steudel (1994) has proposed a detailed reconstruction of 4QFlorilegium's fragments. She has drawn on Stegemann's methods for reconstructing fragmentary manuscripts on the basis of their damage patterns (Stegemann 1990). That approach often allows features of a complete manuscript to be restored with a high degree of probability, including the placement of small fragments in successive columns, although to a greater or lesser extent it is necessarily speculative (Steudel 2000a).

By adopting Stegemann's methodology in this case, Steudel has argued that eighteen of 4QFlorilegium's fragments constitute the remains of the first six columns of the manuscript (fragments 1–15, 19, 21, 24), while eight remain unplaced at present (fragments 16–18, 20, 22–24, 26). She admits that there are no clear indicators among surviving fragments as to how long 4QFlorilegium was when complete. It appears that the scroll's last user rolled it up in the 'wrong' direction, leaving the beginning in the well-preserved centre and the end exposed to the elements (Steudel 1994: 20–22). Nevertheless, all the fragments comprising columns 1–6 come from two separate sheets of parchment, and it is clear that columns 3–4 are the best preserved. Column 3, in fact, retains its top and bottom margins, showing that the whole manuscript once had nineteen lines per column.

Photographs of the fragments of 4QFlorilegium can be seen in Allegro (1968a: 19–20). An English translation roughly matching Steudel's reconstruction can be found in Wise, Abegg, and Cook (1996: 225–28); the renderings by García Martínez (1996: 136–37) and Vermes (1997: 493–94) translate portions classified by Steudel as 4QFlorilegium 3–4.

Most recently, Milgrom has presented a fresh edition of 4QFlorilegium's fragments in Hebrew and English (2002: 248–63). He has not followed Steudel's arrangement of six columns in succession, taking a more cautious approach both to the relationship between the fragments and to the restoration of damaged lines within individual fragments. However, although he does not call them columns 3–4, he reconstructs the best-preserved fragments (fragments 1–3, 21) in much the

same way as Steudel, for they clearly contain the remnants of two consecutive columns. Moreover, because Milgrom accepts that fragments 6–7 belong together, as do fragments 9–10, he largely follows Steudel's reconstruction of columns 1–2. While Milgrom rejects Steudel's combination of fragments making up columns 5–6, the small amount of material concerned renders this of little consequence.

In terms of palaeography, 4QFlorilegium's handwriting is early Herodian, stemming from the second half of the first century BCE (Strugnell 1970: 177; cf. Milgrom 2002: 248); the Hebrew spelling or orthography employed by the scribe is generally full (Steudel 1994: 6–8). But like all palaeographical and orthographical features, these characteristics only tell us when this particular copy was made (c. 30–1 BCE). They do not answer the more difficult question as to when the work was originally composed. However, Berrin (2000: 646) might well be right in suggesting that Thematic Pesharim like 4QFlorilegium may have developed earlier than the more tightly structured Continuous Pesharim.

### 3. The Genre of 4QFlorilegium

4QFlorilegium is an important sectarian document but determining its precise genre is complex. Earlier, we saw that it is often classed as a Thematic Peshar, although some doubt whether any overarching motif is present (Lim 2002a: 46). But our outline of the contents in the next section suggests that, drawing on a range of interrelated scriptural passages, the ancient writer focused on the theme of the Temple against an eschatological background.

More specifically, 4QFlorilegium 3.14 is significant because it employs the Hebrew word *midrash* prior to a citation of Psalm 1.1, before then using *peshar* to introduce the exegesis of that text. This unique combination of terms explains why the document's genre is bound up with scholarly attempts to understand scriptural interpretation at Qumran in general and the significance of the '*peshar* phenomenon' in particular. Hence, we must turn briefly to scholarly theories about 'Midrash Peshar' and 'Qumran Midrash'.

Brownlee (1979: 25) argued that the term *midrash* in 4QFlorilegium 3.14 is a title for a type of Qumran composition containing a distinctive form of interpretative genre akin to later Rabbinic Midrashim. On the basis of 1QpHabakkuk, Brownlee had earlier listed thirteen interpretative principles paralleling the so-called *middot* of the later rabbis (Brownlee 1951). Given similarities in exegetical method between the sect and the rabbis, Brownlee believed it was possible to isolate a distinctive Qumran



genre which he dubbed 'Midrash Peshet', with 1QpHabbakuk the chief exemplar (1979: 23–28).

However, the word *midrash* is rare in the Qumran DSS and, where it occurs, the term does not normally function as a title. The only clear titular example is in the phrase 'Midrash on the Book of Moses' (Hebrew, *midrash sefer Moshe*), written on a recently published fragmentary manuscript known as 4QMSM (4Q249) and otherwise penned in cryptic script (Pfann 1999: 1–24). But this composition is so damaged that the precise import of *midrash* in its ancient title is unclear (Campbell 2002: 79). It would seem unwise, therefore, solely on the basis of the occurrence of *midrash* in 4QFlorilegium 3.14, to conclude that the word justifies positing the existence of a whole Qumran genre that can be called 'Midrash Peshet'. Indeed, Lim has suggested that the term in 4QFlorilegium 3.14a may be shorthand for an existing sectarian interpretation of Psalm 1.1 (known regrettably only to the ancient readers of 4QFlorilegium) which goes on to receive its own *peshet* treatment in 4QFlorilegium 3.14b. Although this is speculative, Lim is at least right to highlight the paucity of evidence for the existence of a 'Midrash Peshet' genre at Qumran (2002a: 48–50).

The above conclusion brings us to 'Qumran Midrash', for Brooke (1979) proposed this alternative designation. For him, the main feature of Qumran scriptural interpretation is its structural combination of quotation and explanation. In unpacking this thesis, Brooke surveyed the interpretation of scripture in three portions of Qumran sectarian material: (1) CD 7.14b–21a; (2) 4QFlorilegium 3.10–13; and (3) 1QpHabakkuk 6.8–12. He concluded that, although the word *peshet* is not present in each case, the same broad exegetical phenomenon underlies all three passages. In his view, this means that scholars should avoid the term *peshet* when trying to define the essence of Qumran exegesis, for not all manifestations of it contain that word. At the same time, Brooke saw that the sectarian passages he had surveyed clearly used certain interpretative techniques, partially paralleling those of the later rabbis, as we shall see below in relation to 4QFlorilegium. Given the occurrence of *midrash* in 4QFlorilegium 3.14, therefore, Brooke argued for the existence of a 'Qumran Midrash' genre, of which 'Peshet' was deemed to be merely a sub-genre (1979: 502–3).

Brooke's discussion is certainly perceptive, drawing attention to the fact that overt Qumran exegesis is not simply coterminous with 'the *peshet* phenomenon'. We saw this ourselves in Chapter 1, and we shall return to the issue in our last chapter. Yet, his 'Qumran Midrash' is problematic for two reasons. First, it makes little sense to do away with the title *peshet* because the word is not universally present in Qumran exegesis, but then

adopt the rarer word *midrash*. Second, *midrash* in 4QFlorilegium 3.14, as noted, does not obviously function as a generic title, as Brooke now acknowledges (2000c: 298). For the ancient author and audience, therefore, the word *midrash* in 4QFlorilegium 3.14 signifies nothing more than ‘interpretation’ or ‘explanation’ (Alexander 2000: 36).

In conclusion, ‘Midrash Peshet’ and ‘Qumran Midrash’ are unsatisfactory designations. For the reasons highlighted above, indeed, they are not much employed by scholars today, and the titular usage of the word ‘midrash’ is arguably best avoided altogether in a Second Temple context. The safest approach, therefore, seems to be to continue to deem 4QFlorilegium a Thematic Peshet.

#### 4. The Content of 4QFlorilegium

It is worth saying more about each column of 4QFlorilegium as reconstructed by Steudel. This will help us consider in the next section the main features of the sectarian exegesis in the work.

Column 1 (made up of fragments 6–9) contains citations from Deuteronomy 33.8–11 and 33.12, with the remains of some intervening interpretation concerning the ‘Urim’ and the ‘Thummim’. These oracular objects are mentioned in Deuteronomy 33.8–11 which, with Deuteronomy 33.12, contain Moses’ blessings of the tribes of Levi and Benjamin. Deuteronomy 33.8–11 also appears in 4QTestimonia 14–20, as we shall learn in a later chapter.

In column 2 (fragments 4, 9–11), after the remains of some initial commentary, we find a citation of Moses’ blessing of the tribe of Gad from Deuteronomy 33.20–21. This is followed by sectarian comments about Belial’s attacks upon the faithful. Although Steudel speculates that a citation of Isaiah 24.17–18 (part of which features in CD 4.14) may have followed next (Steudel 1994: 40), there is no concrete evidence in favour of this. Last come the words of 2 Samuel 7.10–11a which, recounting God’s ancient promise of a ‘place’ (Hebrew, *maqom*) to king David, take us into the next column.

Indeed, column 3 (fragments 1, 2, 21), the best-preserved part of 4QFlorilegium, continues this citation of 2 Samuel 7.10–11a, employing Exodus 15.17b–18 secondarily to emphasize God’s power and purpose. The ‘place’ of 2 Samuel 7.10 is understood as an eschatological Temple to which only the chosen faithful will gain entry, with the ‘Ammonite, Moabite, bastard, foreigner, and stranger’ (3.4) excluded. Meanwhile, in 4QFlorilegium 3.6, that eschatological Temple to be established by God in the future is anticipated in the interim by a

*miqdash 'adam* ('temple of man' or 'Temple of Adam') which seems to denote the religious community behind the document (Dimant 1986; cf. Wise 1994). The words of 2 Samuel 7.11b, promising respite from enemies, enable the author to portray the eschatological rest to be enjoyed by the Sons of Light, when Belial's scheming is destined to cease. In column 3.10–11a, we find the dynastic promise to David in 2 Samuel 7.11c–14a cited in a truncated form and interpreted via Amos 9.11. Since the latter passage promises the restoration of the Davidic line (and is also used in CD 7.16 and Acts 15.16), the reader is told that the 'Branch of David' (3.11) and the 'Interpreter of the Torah' (3.12) will appear 'in the end of days' to bring about salvation. The 'Branch of David' is the Davidic messiah who features in other sectarian Qumran writings, either alone or alongside a priestly counterpart (Evans 2000: 539–40); the 'Interpreter of the Torah' is probably the priestly messiah himself and may have been mentioned already in association with Deuteronomy 33.8–11's blessing of Levi in the now damaged column 1.9–12.

In what constitutes a new paragraph at 4QFlorilegium 3.14, Psalm 1.1 is quoted with the unusual formula 'explanation of' (*midrash min*). Psalm 1.1, on the blessings of those who refuse to follow evil, is then interpreted using *peshet* terminology in a way that links the verse to the Sons of Zadok and their followers within the community behind 4QFlorilegium. Isaiah 8.11 (also used in CD 8.16) and Ezekiel 37.23, exhorting rejection of sin and idolatry, are brought in to emphasize this identification. Then comes a quotation of Psalm 2.1 that, again with the *peshet* term, is taken to denote the difficulties experienced by the faithful 'in the end of days' (3.19). This interpretation is continued into column 4 (fragments 1, 3, 5, 12, 24), where Psalm 2.1's language is specified more clearly as a depiction of the persecution of the community. Such strife will lead ultimately to the defeat of Belial and his lot, however, leaving the righteous free to lead upright lives. What seems like language based on Daniel 12.10 then precedes a citation from Daniel 11.32b to emphasize that the wicked will be left to their wickedness, but the righteous can look forward to a purified future in obedience to 'the whole Torah' (4.2).

All that remains of column 5 (fragments 13, 14) are a quotation of Psalm 5.2–3a, with its cry to God for help, and the beginnings of an interpretation for 'the end of days' (5.3) almost certainly employing *peshet* terminology. Column 6 (fragments 15, 19) is likewise poorly preserved, with the partial remains of Isaiah 65.22–23 on the blessed state of the returning exiles. Probably, this passage acted as a secondary citation to aid the interpretation of another Psalms extract which is now lost.

This outline demonstrates that, while 4QFlorilegium is certainly

diverse, its contents focus on several interrelated factors. In Brooke's words (2000c: 298):

The principal fragments are primarily concerned with the sovereignty of God himself and with the character of the community as the eschatological Temple in anticipation and as the elect of Israel who are enduring a time of trials.

As part of these concerns, *4QFlorilegium* 3.11b–13 refers to a future Davidic Messiah (Collins 2000d: 213). But Ulfsgard has pointed out that 2 Samuel 7.11b's promise to David is interpreted collectively in 3.7–8 (2000: 238). Likewise, Psalm 2.1's '[anointed one]' is applied in *4QFlorilegium* 3.18–19 to the community's tribulations 'in the end of days'. Given this subtle combination of the individual and communal fulfilment of what seem to have been understood as scriptural messianic promises, we may now examine *4QFlorilegium's* exegesis more closely.

### 5. Exegesis in *4QFlorilegium*

As the above overview suggests, the interpretation of scripture is central to *4QFlorilegium*. The primary scriptural texts come from five sources, to which secondary texts are attached: (1) Deuteronomy 33.8–11, 12, 20–21, with supplementary texts no longer surviving (*4QFlorilegium* 1.9–2.19a); (2) 2 Samuel 7.10–14, aided by Exodus 15.17b–18 and Amos 9.11 (2.19b–3.13); (3) Psalm 1.1, joined to Isaiah 8.11 and Ezekiel 37.23 (3.14–17); (4) Psalm 2.1, interpreted via Daniel 11.32 and 12.10 (3.18–4.11); and (5) Psalm 5.2–3, again with no supplementary texts extant (vv.2–4). We must also note that column 6 contains part of Isaiah 65.22–23, presumably in aid of a lost Psalms passage. It is also interesting to note, more broadly, that 2 Samuel 7 and Psalm 2 are used together in Acts 13.33–37. However, caution is in order regarding the suggestion that such passages were widely combined in association with late Second Temple festival liturgies (Brooke 1985: 169–74), for there is little evidence that hard and fast traditions had developed in this regard (Grabbe 2000: 174–75).

In view of *4QFlorilegium's* damaged state, all the scriptural citations listed above are incomplete in the surviving fragments. But we can tell that they often diverge slightly from the Masoretic Text and all other known versions of the scriptures that have come down to us. When they do so, it is hard to know whether such differences reflect alternative editions of the scriptural books in the possession of the ancient writer, divergences deriving from the fact that he paraphrased or abbreviated his text (possibly from memory), or deliberate changes introduced to encourage his own

particular interpretations. Despite careful investigation (Lim 2002a: 54–63), no foolproof criteria yet exist for deciding which of these possibilities best explains given instances where the form of the scriptural text cited is otherwise unknown. Each case has to be decided on its own merits in light of various factors, as far as is possible, including the sectarian interpretative context itself.

What is left of 2 Samuel 7.10 in 4QFlorilegium 3.1, for instance, suggests that 2 Samuel 7.10–11a was quoted in full in 2.19–3.2. However, 4QFlorilegium 3.1 contains the remnants of the word ‘enemy’ which does not feature in any known version of 2 Samuel 7.10–11. This may be because Psalm 89.22 (‘the enemy shall not outwit him’) was incorporated into 4QFlorilegium here (Steudel 1994: 41), but it may be that a previously unknown version of 2 Samuel 7.10–11 was used. On the other hand, in 4QFlorilegium 3.10–11a, we find a truncated form of 2 Samuel 7.11–14 (verses 11c, 12b, 13b, 14a) which is probably a deliberate abbreviation to heighten the author’s interpretation of the passage (Brooke 1985: 166; 2000c: 297; cf. Lange 2002: 26). Indeed, the use of 2 Samuel 7.10–14 in 4QFlorilegium 3.1–13 provides a good example of the document’s exegesis, as Brooke (1985: 129–44) has amply demonstrated in his detailed study. In particular, he has shown that a number of techniques of interpretation are at work in 4QFlorilegium, giving rise to a complex interpretative web focusing on the Temple and ‘the end of days’ (3.2, 12).

The technique most frequently employed is akin to what we named ‘thematic association’ in the last chapter and what the later rabbis called *gezera shava* (‘inference by analogy’) (Stemberger 1996: 15–30; Vermes 1979a: 339–55). This includes treating as significant the occurrence of the same Hebrew word in two or more scriptural contexts. Thus, 2 Samuel 7.10 (reconstructed as a citation in 4QFlorilegium 2.19–3.1) and the context immediately preceding Exodus 15.17b–18 (quoted in 3.3) both use the verb *nata* (‘to plant’). That seems to have encouraged the sectarian author to link the passages to show that the ‘place’ or ‘house’ in the former is not only Solomon’s Temple but also an eschatological sanctuary presaged in the present by the Qumran Community itself (Brooke 1985: 134).

In a similar vein, we find ‘and I will raise’ (Hebrew, *ve-haqimoti*) in 2 Samuel 7.12 and Amos 9.11 (4QFlorilegium 3.10 and 12), ‘path’ (*derekh*) in Psalm 1.1 and Isaiah 8.11 (4QFlorilegium 3.14–16), and ‘seat’ or ‘dwelling’ (*moshav*) in Psalm 1.1 and Ezekiel 37.23 (4QFlorilegium 3.14, 16–17). These cases form a deliberate pattern in 4QFlorilegium’s usage of scripture, and the subtlety of the interconnections is highlighted by the last example. While *moshav* undoubtedly links Psalm 1.1 and Ezekiel 37.23, the latter verse, which is rather long, is only cited in part in

4QFlorilegium 3.16–17, with the relevant word itself omitted. Hence, the ancient writer must have assumed his audience was sufficiently abreast of the scriptures to be aware of a linguistic connection not actually spelled out in the text of 4QFlorilegium.

To sum up, 4QFlorilegium contains a careful network of exegesis that would have impressed contemporary Jews who knew their scriptures. The fullest example of what the author has achieved in this regard is found in the best-preserved portion of the document, 4QFlorilegium 3.1–13. In lines 1–7a, 2 Samuel 7.10–14 undergo specification in terms of three interrelated entities: (1) the Solomonic Temple destroyed through Israel's sin (3.1–2a, 5b–6a); (2) the Qumran Sect as an interim 'Temple of man' (3.6b–7a) for 'the end of days' (3.2, 12); and (3) a future eschatological sanctuary to be established by God in due course (3.2b–5a). The first element also features in other sectarian Qumran writings (e.g. CD 1.3–4). The second implies that the Qumran Community viewed itself as a priestly body, though this notion doubtless evolved over time (Kugler 1999). As for the third, the specifically messianic significance of the scriptures is incorporated in lines 7b–13 with distinct communal overtones. Overall, this careful exegetical web is woven by linking the main passage, 2 Samuel 7.10–14, with other scriptural contexts. In doing so, the author takes full advantage of the inherent ambiguity of the Hebrew words for 'house', 'place', and even 'sanctuary' in those contexts (Brooke 1985: 178–94).

### 6. 4QFlorilegium and the Reconstruction of Damaged Scrolls

Much scholarly effort has gone into reconstructing fragmentary manuscripts like 4QFlorilegium over the years, although certainty is often impossible to achieve. In light of some excessive speculation in the past, indeed, the cautious reconstructions of 4QFlorilegium and other Exegetical Texts in PTSDSSP, 6B are welcome. More concretely, two observations will be helpful.

First, the identification of manuscripts and the interrelation of their constitutive fragments is an ongoing evolutionary process. This means that individual manuscripts and fragments are continually being reassessed and, on occasion, re-identified. For example, Steudel has shown that 4QFlorilegium fragment 27 (Brooke 1985: 91, 128) is really a piece broken away from fragment 1 (1994: 10). Studies in the 1980s, more substantially, have demonstrated that three fragments linked to 4QTanhumim (a document set to feature in a later chapter) are part of a separate *Jubilees* manuscript. More recently, fragments thought to belong

to 4QCalendrical Document C have been reclassified as three independent manuscripts, 4QHistorical Texts C-E (Fitzmyer 2000: 275–89). Such relatively clear-cut insights rarely provoke serious scholarly dissent.

However, our second observation is that there are inevitably disagreements among scholars dealing with ancient fragmentary manuscripts. Differences normally centre on how best to distinguish what is probable from what is possible in three broad respects: (1) reconstructing particular readings within individual fragments; (2) deciding how to interrelate a given manuscript's fragments; and (3) identifying correctly whole manuscripts. Returning to 4QFlorilegium, we can illustrate each of these difficulties in relation to the approaches of Milgrom (2002) and Steudel (1994).

In 4QFlorilegium 3.7, Steudel follows most experts in reading the Hebrew phrase *ma'ase todah* (Steudel 1994: 25, 44), normally translated as 'works of thanksgiving' (García Martínez 1996: 136). However, because the equivalent of the letter 'd' (daleth) is unclear and could easily be the Hebrew for 'r' (resh), giving *ma'ase torah* ('works of the Law'; Vermes 1997: 493), Milgrom prefers this phrase (2002: 250) which also occurs in 4QMMT<sup>a,c</sup>. Unfortunately, certainty in this and parallel cases is impossible. When it comes to conjoining two or more fragments to form the remnants of columns in 4QFlorilegium, we have already noted that Milgrom is more cautious than Steudel. On the basis of Stegemann's methodology, indeed, Steudel envisages the remains of six consecutive columns, even producing a pull-out appendix that arranges the fragments column by column to illustrate the regular damage patterns created in antiquity when the manuscript was still rolled up (1994: Anhang A). But although, in effect, Milgrom reconstructs Steudel's individual columns 1–4 and 6 in much the same way, he declines to speculate on the question of their relative order. The exception concerns Steudel's 4QFlorilegium 3–4, for fragments 1–2 clearly contain the remains of two successive columns, as can be observed in the relevant photograph (Allegro 1968a: XIX).

Finally, Milgrom is also cautious about Steudel's thesis regarding the relationship between 4QFlorilegium and 4QCatena A. But to this we shall return in the next chapter.

### Further Reading

#### Overviews of 4QFlorilegium

G.J. Brooke, 'Florilegium (4QFlor)', *ABD*, 2 (1992a), pp. 817–18.

—'Florilegium', *EDSS* (2000c), pp. 297–98.

M. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish

and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200, 2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 257–62.

- G. Vermes, 'Florilegium or Midrash on the Last Days (4QFlor=4Q174)', *HJP*, 3.1 (1986a), pp. 445–46.

### Detailed studies, including the text of 4QFlorilegium

- G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 29; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985).
- D. Dimant, '4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple', in A. Caquot *et al.* (eds.), *Hellenica et Judaica: Homage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky* (Paris: Editions Peeters, 1986), pp. 165–89.
- R.A. Kugler, 'Priesthood at Qumran', *DSSFY*, 2 (1999), pp. 93–116.
- A. Lange, 'The Status of the Biblical texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process', *BAB* (2002), pp. 21–30.
- J. Milgrom, 'Florilegium: A Midrash on 2 Samuel and Psalms 1–2 (4Q174=4QFlor)', *PTSDSSP*, 6B (2002), pp. 248–63.
- A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie (4QMidrEschat<sup>a,b</sup>): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und Traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ('Florilegium') und 4Q177 ('Catena') repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (Studies in the Texts of the Judaean Desert, 13; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994), pp. 5–56; Anhang A.
- M. Wise, 'That Which Has Been Is That Which Shall Be: 4QFlorilegium and the מִקְרָא מִקְרָא', in *Thunder in Gemini and Other Essays on the History, Language and Literature of Second Temple Palestine* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series, 15; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), pp. 152–85.

### Earlier presentations and discussions of the text

- J.M. Allegro, 'Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature', *JBL*, 75 (1956), pp. 174–87.
- 'Fragments of A Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrasim', *JBL*, 77 (1958), pp. 350–54.
- 'Florilegium', *DJDJ*, 5 (1968a), pp. 53–57; XIX–XX.
- J. Strugnell, 'Notes en marge du volume V des "Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan"', *RQ*, 7 (1970), pp. 163–276.
- Y. Yadin, 'A Midrash on 2 Sam. vii and Ps. i–ii (4QFlorilegium)', *IEJ*, 9 (1959) pp. 95–98.

### Reconstruction of damaged scrolls

- H. Stegemann, 'Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments', in L.H. Schiffman (ed.), *Archaeology & History in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series, 8; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), pp. 189–220.
- A. Steudel, 'Scroll Reconstruction', *EDSS* (2000a), pp. 842–44.



**'Qumran Midrash' and 'Midrash Peshet'**

G.J. Brooke, 'Qumran Peshet: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre', *RQ*, 10 (1979), pp. 483–503.

H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Peshet of Habakkuk* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979).

**Messianism at Qumran**

J.J. Collins, 'The Nature of Messianism in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls', *DSSHC* (2000d), pp. 119–217.

C.A. Evans, 'Messiahs', *EDSS* (2000), pp. 537–42.

H. Ulfsgard, 'The Branch in the Last Days: Observations on the New Covenant Before and After the Messiah', *DSSHC* (2000), pp. 233–47.

**Rabbinic techniques of interpretation and Qumran parallels**

W.H. Brownlee, 'Bible Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls', *BA*, 19 (1951), pp. 54–76.

D. Dimant, 'Pesharim', *ABD*, 5 (1992), p. 250.

G. Stemmerger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996), pp. 15–30.

G. Vermes, 'Torah Scholarship', *HJP*, 2 (1979a), pp. 314–80.

## 1. Introduction

4QCatena A-B (4Q177, 182) are normally identified as two related manuscripts, as the nomenclature we are using to describe them, also employed in the latest official listing of Qumran DSS (Tov *et al.* 2002: 50–51), implies. The name ‘catena’ (Latin for ‘chain’), employed by Allegro in his *editio princeps* (1968b: 67–75; 80–81), reflects the fact that we find what seem to be ‘chains’ of scriptural citations within these two Hebrew works. Psalms quotations predominate, aided by portions of Deuteronomy and a wide range of named prophetic books (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Micah, Nahum, Zephaniah, and Zechariah). However, interspersed between the citations are elements of interpretation which clearly reflect the outlook and terminology of the Qumran Community. 4QCatena A-B, therefore, are certainly to be counted among the sectarian manuscripts retrieved from Caves 1–11 which overtly interpret scripture.

Two specific factors have led scholars to link 4QCatena A and 4QCatena B together: both manuscripts utilize the phrase ‘the end of days’ (Hebrew, *’aharit ha-yamim*) and both introduce scriptural citations by employing distinct phrases like ‘[as it is wr]itten concerning them in the book of Jerem[iah]’ (4QCatena B, fragment 1, line 4). Yet, given that it is much more fragmentary than 4QCatena A, the nature of 4QCatena B remains elusive. The truth is that little can be said about it, as we shall see more fully below, including its precise relation to 4QCatena A.

Despite such uncertainty, it is fair to say that 4QCatena A is similar in form, content, and vocabulary to 4QFlorilegium, the sectarian document considered in the last chapter. Like 4QFlorilegium, more particularly, 4QCatena A has a striking preference for Psalms citations within an exegetical context that is thoroughly eschatological in orientation. In fact,

Stuedel (1992 and 1994) has proposed that 4QCatena A and 4QFlorilegium are different copies of the same composition which she has dubbed 4QMidrash on Eschatology<sup>a-b</sup>. We shall return to the viability of her thesis in the last section of this chapter.

## 2. The Text of 4QCatena A

We shall consider here the text of 4QCatena A. Because 4QCatena B is too fragmentary to describe in detail, we shall return briefly to that manuscript below. There is widespread agreement that 4QCatena A's handwriting is early Herodian (c. 30–1 BCE), while its orthography is generally full (Brooke 2000d: 121; Strugnell 1970: 236). Indeed, although 4QCatena A is fairly fragmentary, we nonetheless find the remnants of several columns of text. The top and bottom margins still visible in fragments 5–6 demonstrate that the manuscript had sixteen lines per column. A total of thirty-four fragments have survived: thirty were published by Allegro (1968b: 67–74), with Strugnell identifying four more in his lengthy review of Allegro's volume (1970: 236–48). In that review, Strugnell also proposed various new readings and fragment combinations. Chief among these refinements of Allegro's work were the conjoining of fragments 1–4, 14, 24, and 31 (1970: 237–41) and the bringing together of fragments 7, 9–11, 20, and 26 (1970: 244–45).

As with 4QFlorilegium, Stuedel has recently re-edited the material pertaining to 4QCatena A, drawing on Stegemann's reconstruction methods (Stegemann 1990; Stuedel 1994: 57–124). That approach is based on the patterns of damage often discernible in fragmentary manuscripts that, through careful analysis in this case, allow Stuedel to place twenty of 4QCatena A's fragments (1–15, 19–20, 24, 26, 31) into the remains of five consecutive columns of text. Because their damage patterns suggest to Stuedel that these five columns may come from somewhere in the middle of the complete manuscript, she designates them 4QCatena A 8–12, concluding that the whole of the 'Midrash on Eschatology' would have comprised some eighteen columns. Even in Stuedel's detailed reconstruction, however, fourteen of the fragments remain unplaced (fragments 16–18, 21–23, 25, 27–30, 32–34). This fact serves as a useful reminder that there is still much we do not know about 4QCatena A. In the remainder of our discussion, therefore, we shall leave to one side Stuedel's numbering of the columns and speak instead of 4QCatena A 1–5.

The Hebrew text of 4QCatena A with English translation, roughly following Stuedel's reconstruction, can be found in García Martínez and

Tigheelaar (1997: 362–67). The translation in Wise, Abegg, and Cook (1996: 233–37) reflects an older reconstruction of the material, while Vermes (1997: 504) offers the alternative title ‘Interpretation of Biblical Texts on the Last Days’ and translates a representative sample. Photographs of 4QCatena A fragments 1–30 are reproduced in Allegro (1968b: XXIV–XXV), and fragments 31–34 can be seen in Strugnell (1970: 261).

Most recently, Milgrom has produced a new edition of 4QCatena A in Hebrew and English (with Novakovic 2002: 286–303). He has not followed Steudel’s arrangement of five consecutive columns, taking a more cautious approach to the interrelationship of groups of fragments which might be deemed to belong together. Neither has he followed Puech’s suggestion that 4QCatena A fragment 19 really belongs to 4QBeatitudes (4Q525) (1998). However, Milgrom mirrors Steudel fairly closely in placing together four groupings of fragments, for both have built on Strugnell’s proposals in this regard mentioned above. The main difference between Steudel and Milgrom, therefore, is that the former believes that these groupings of fragments represent the remains of five successive columns whose order can be reconstructed with some certainty, whereas the latter remains agnostic on this point.

### 3. The Genre of 4QCatena A

Sufficient text survives to allow us to characterize 4QCatena A as a document with an eschatological emphasis in which scripture is frequently cited. There can be no doubt as to 4QCatena A’s origin within the Qumran Community because of the vocabulary it contains, including sobriquets such as ‘the Interpreter of the Torah’ (2.5), ‘Sons of Light’ (2.7; 4.12, 16), ‘Seekers of Sm[o]oth Things’ (2.12), and ‘Council of the Community’ (3.5).

As for scripture, 4QCatena A seems primarily located within the Psalms which are sometimes quoted by their first line only but at other times more fully. Yet, if Steudel’s reconstruction is correct, with Psalm 6 cited in column 4 after the appearance of Psalms 12, 13, and 16 in columns 1–3, it is worth noting that the Psalms utilized in 4QCatena A do not follow any known order. In other words, even though Flint has amply shown, on the basis of the numerous surviving Qumran Psalms manuscripts, that several arrangements of the Psalms existed in late Second Temple times (1997 and 2000), the order found in 4QCatena A is not among them. Hence, as Brooke has pointed out (2000d: 121), 4QCatena A is unlikely to be a Continuous Peshet on the Psalms in the way that 4QpPsalms<sup>a</sup>

appears to be (cf. Vermes 1986b: 448). 1QpPsalms and 4QpPsalms<sup>b</sup> are, unfortunately, too fragmentary to be compared with 4QCatena A in this respect. But in any case, a more helpful guide to determining 4QCatena A's genre may be the frequent use of the phrase 'the end of days' (Hebrew, *'aharit ha-yamim*) in the document (2.10; 3.5; 4.7; 5.6). It suggests that 4QCatena A might have been organized on an eschatological theme or themes, explicated by a selection of Psalms and other scriptures. This explains why many scholars believe 4QCatena A is best categorized as a Thematic Peshet.

Lim, however, doubts that 4QCatena A should be classified in this way (2002a: 46–47). This is because the phrase 'the end of days' is so pervasive in sectarian writings from Qumran that it simply cannot constitute an overarching eschatological theme in 4QCatena A or anywhere else. Rather, taking a lead from a much earlier study (Hatch 1889), Lim suggests that 4QCatena A is an example of the 'biblical *excerpta*' or 'biblical excerpts' which probably circulated widely among Jews and Christians in late Second Temple times. Remnants of this multifarious literary category can be found in late first- and early second-century CE Christian writings and in some portions of Paul's epistles. Moreover, Lim posits that 4QReworked Pentateuch<sup>a</sup> (4Q158), 4QTestimonia (4Q175), and 4QTanhumim (4Q176), the last two of which will reappear later in this book, belong to it. Such documents collated scriptural passages, often supplemented by comment, and acted as notes for 'private devotion or disputation' (2002a: 47). Although the underlying theme or purpose would have been self-evident to an original writer or reader, they would not be so obvious to outsiders, whether ancient or modern, as inevitably tends to be the case when the latter encounter other people's notes.

Lim's proposal is interesting, but whether it makes sense to posit an umbrella category of 'scriptural anthologies' as wide-ranging as this is questionable. After all, 4QTestimonia, which may or may not be sectarian, is the only true anthology to have survived here, with four scriptural passages and no interpretation. But 4QCatena A and 4QTanhumim are different, at least at the formal level, containing a significant amount of explicit sectarian comment alongside their scriptural excerpts. As for 4QReworked Pentateuch<sup>a</sup>, we tentatively suggested in Chapter 2 that it probably constituted scripture proper for the Qumran Sect and others who accepted it at face value.

In any case, 4QCatena A is deemed a Thematic Peshet by many scholars not simply because of its use of the phrase 'the end of days'. The prevalence of that expression is merely one among several factors pointing to an overall eschatological character. In particular, we can also see three overarching and intertwined motifs in the work: (1) the sect behind the

composition is a persecuted community of the righteous which believes it is experiencing the events of 'the end of days' (1.1–7; 2.9–13); (2) although the hosts of Belial try to destroy the righteous, the community can look forward to their ultimate destruction (4.9–13); and (3) the trials of the present are intended to purify the Sons of Light in readiness for the blessings they are to receive in the future (4.14–16).

'Thematic Peshet', therefore, remains a helpful designation for 4QCatena A (Brooke 2000d: 122). The work comments on Psalms and other scriptures which, in the author's mind, could be related eschatologically to his own community in terms of the interrelated themes just described (Steudel 1990: 477).

#### 4. The Content of 4QCatena A

Before proceeding, it is worth outlining in a little detail the content of 4QCatena A as pieced together by Steudel, although we shall leave to one side some of her more speculative reconstructions of scriptural citations. We will then be able to make some comments in the next section on the nature of the exegesis underlying the material.

4QCatena A 1 (made up of fragments 5–6, 8) cannot represent the beginning of the manuscript. This is because it starts in the middle of a sectarian interpretation that, given the mention of 'boasters' in lines 1 and 4, probably commented on Psalm 10.3 ('For the wicked boast . . .'). In the remainder of the column, we find citations variously reassuring the faithful (Isaiah 37.30a), depicting the persecution of the righteous by the wicked (Isaiah 32.7; Psalm 11.1; 12.1), portraying the latter as misled by false teachers (Micah 2.10–11), and describing the disaster ultimately to overtake God's enemies (Isaiah 22.13; 27.11b). Linked to these passages are two distinctive introductory formulae: '[as written] about them in the book of . . .' (line 5) and '[written about th]em in the book of . . .' (line 9). Unfortunately, the sectarian commentary between the scriptural citations is rather damaged. But reference to 'the period of trial' (line 3) and other short phrases picture a community experiencing opposition or even persecution from outsiders.

Column 2 (fragments 7, 9–11, 20, 26) opens with Psalm 12.6 and Zechariah 3.9b, both concerned with the purity of God's word, and with a reference to healing which may reflect a LXX-like version of Isaiah 6.10 (Steudel 1994: 92). The wording of the latter is preceded by the introductory formula '[a]s written about them' (line 3). The presence of Psalm 5.10 in 4QCatena A 2.5 is possible (Steudel 1992: 533), but only two Hebrew words (*ki' 'en*) that can be translated as 'For there is no'

remain. Several lines later, however, we find a citation of the cry of the persecuted for God's help from Psalm 13.2–3 (lines 8–9), as well as Psalm 13.5a's plea for the defeat of the enemy (lines 11–12), followed by what seems to be part of Ezekiel 25.8, again in a version akin to the LXX (line 14) (Milgrom with Novakovic 2002: 294). Between these scriptural passages come mention of the 'Interpreter of the Torah' (line 5) and Belial's plots against the Sons of Light. More particularly, the community's trials are both linked to opposition from the 'Seekers of Smooth Things' (line 12) and seen as an opportunity for purification 'in the end of days' (lines 10 and 14). Indeed, like other Qumran writings, the material here and elsewhere in 4QCatena A envisages a sharp distinction between the sect's members and other Jews.

Turning to column 3 (fragments 1–4, 14, 24, 31), in the first four lines it variously cites part of Deuteronomy 7.15's covenantal blessings, Psalm 16.3's delight in the 'holy ones', Nahum 2.10b on 'trembling knees', and Psalm 17.1a's plea for divine help. However, apart from a possible reference to the 'reckless' prophets of Zephaniah 3.4 (line 7), the only other scriptural citation concerns the 'horn' sounded in Hosea 5.8a (line 13). This means that nearly all of what survives of lines 5–16 contains sectarian comment, although most of it is fragmentary. Nevertheless, the reader is told that those who have withstood Belial 'in the end of days' (lines 5 and 7) are promised great blessings, in accord with what is written on the heavenly tablets (line 12). As for the 'horn' of Hosea 5.8a, it appears to be identified as 'the book of the second Torah' or perhaps 'the second book of the Torah' (Hebrew, *sefer ha-Torah shenit*) (line 14). If some such translation is correct, the latter's identity is unclear, but it could be *Jubilees* or the Temple Scroll or, perhaps less likely, some sectarian composition (Allegro 1968b: 68; Wise, Abegg, and Cook 1996: 236–37; Yadin 1983 1: 396–97). Others, however, understand the Hebrew text here as 'the book of the Torah again' (Stegemann 1988: 243; Steudel 1994: 108–9; Strugnell 1970: 241), in which case the reference is probably simply to the 'book [of the Torah]' mentioned in the previous damaged line.

After what may be a reference to the divine wrath of Ezekiel 22.20, column 4 (fragments 12–13, 15, 19) proceeds to cite Jeremiah 18.18b on God's word through priests, prophets, and the wise. This is followed by Psalm 6.2–3a, 6.5, and possibly 6.6a, with their appeals for divine mercy. Again, much of lines 9–16 comprises sectarian comment of a fragmentary nature, mentioning *inter alia* Belial (lines 9, 11–12, 14, 16), 'a time of oppression' (line 13), and 'the end of days' (lines 4–5). Interestingly, these lines also speak of the 'Angel of his Truth' (line 12) and 'the great hand of God' (line 14) who are to rescue the Sons of Light from Belial, ensuring

that those who are faithful will ultimately rejoice together in an eschatological Zion.

Finally, column 5 (part of fragment 13) survives in only a few scraps, mentioning 'God', 'Belial', and once again 'the end [of days]'.

### 5. Exegesis in *4QCatena A*

As seen already, *4QCatena A* is replete with scriptural citations. Many quotations are fairly close to the MT, as far as we can tell, but other versions are reflected as well. Thus, Isaiah 6.10 and Ezekiel 25.8 probably appear in *4QCatena A* 2.3 and 14 in forms akin to the LXX. In any case, even where the manuscript is badly damaged, the scriptural passages cited can normally be reconstructed with a high degree of certainty. In contrast, *4QCatena A*'s interpretative elements are almost impossible to reconstruct when damaged. On the basis of what is cited from scripture and what can be gleaned from the author's own comment, however, several general points can be made about exegesis in *4QCatena A*.

First, Psalms are particularly prominent in *4QCatena A*, although the author also makes much use of Deuteronomy and various named prophetic books. These secondary citations tend to be introduced with formulae using the Hebrew verb *katav* ('to write'), whilst the primary Psalms texts are initiated with phrases utilizing *'amar* ('to say'), like 'as David said' in column 4.7 (introducing Psalm 6.2). The Hebrew word *peshet* ('interpretation') is found twice, at *4QCatena A* 2.9 and 3.6 (with a third occurrence likely to have been present once in the now damaged 1.8), but only in relation to the dominant Psalms quotations.

Second, Psalms and other scriptures are treated in *4QCatena A* as unfulfilled prophecy from the world of ancient Israel, destined to find their fulfilment in the time of the author and his community (Steudel 1990: 478). More particularly, happenings of the recent past, events of the author's own day, and what is due to take place in the not-too-distant future are understood to have been presaged in the ancient scriptures, even if the relevant passages must be interpreted freely to make this clear. An example of the latter phenomenon is the citation of Hosea 5.8a in *4QCatena A* 3.13. The 'horn' in the scriptural excerpt is separated from its original context, where the image is supposed to warn the Israelites of coming devastation, and instead it receives a rather creative sectarian specification as some kind of 'book'. The identity of the latter is no longer clear, as hinted above, but it may have signified the 'book [of the Torah]'.

At the same time, given the wide range of sources (Psalms, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Jonah, Micah, Nahum,



Zephaniah, and Zechariah) cited and interrelated in 4QCatena A, the writer also viewed the scriptures as a self-interpreting unity. Any part of the whole, as is evident from our outline of the contents in the last section, could be used to illuminate any other, especially if linked by ideas or wording. For instance, Isaiah 32.7; Psalm 11.1; Micah 2.10–11 and Psalm 12.1 appearing in 4QCatena A 1.6–12 are linked by both common themes (e.g. persecution of the righteous by the wicked) and by common vocabulary (e.g. ‘deceit’ in Isaiah 32.7 and Micah 2.11). Similarly, Psalm 12.6 and Zechariah 3.9b in 3.1–2 share imagery of precious materials and share particular words (‘seven’ and ‘land’/‘ground’).

Third, assurance is given that everything is written on God’s heavenly tablets, a theme found not only in other sectarian writings (e.g. 4QAgnes of Creation A, fragment 1) but also in late Second Temple works circulating more widely (e.g. *Jubilees* 23.32). The same central idea, albeit in less dramatic guise, is found in the common Qumran notion that God has foreordained all things (CD 2.7) and that history is accordingly divided into fixed ‘periods’ (Hebrew, *qisim*) under his guiding ‘hand’ (4QCatena A 4.14; see also 1QS 3.15). As Charlesworth has recently stated in relation to the Continuous Pesharim (2002a: 14), this too is part and parcel of what can be called a thoroughgoing ‘fulfilment hermeneutics’ that, as we saw above, is certainly a feature of 4QCatena A.

## 6. The Fragmentary Nature of 4QCatena B

The poorly preserved manuscript 4QCatena B has relatively little extant text, consisting merely of two small fragments. The first contains the remnants of five lines, while the second fragment has the partial remains of three lines. The material is to be found in Hebrew and English in García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997: 374–75) and, most recently, in Milgrom’s new edition (with Novakovic 2002: 305–7). In terms of palaeography, Strugnell judged the fragments to be either early or mid-Herodian in date, ranging from c. 30 BCE to c. 30 CE (1970: 250). Because 4QCatena B is so damaged, however, certainty in this regard is impossible.

Likewise, it is difficult to say much about the genre of 4QCatena B because of its fragmentary nature, although it may well have been broadly similar to 4QCatena A. The closeness in wording of the introductory formula in 4QCatena B, ‘[as it is wr]itten concerning them in the book of Jerem[iah]’ (fragment 1, line 4), to several parallel formulae found in 4QCatena A might indeed suggest that this is a correct assumption. For want of a better suggestion, therefore, we have retained the designation 4QCatena B in this book.

By way of content, when taking the two fragments of 4QCatena B together, we find unspecified criticism of those ‘who will stiffen their neck’, presumably in rebellion against God. To aid this description, Jeremiah 5.7b is cited (fragment 1, line 5). But the material is too fragmentary to see how the quotation was interpreted subsequently or to suggest that 4QCatena B was a Peshet on Jeremiah (cf. Lim 2002a: 16). Still, the exegetical context was presumably an eschatological one, for the phrase ‘the end of days’ occurs twice (fragment 1, line 1; fragment 2, line 1). This forms another linkage, albeit a general one, with 4QCatena A.

### 7. The Existence of 4QMidrash on Eschatology<sup>a-b</sup>

We have already noted that 4QFlorilegium and 4QCatena A are similar in terms of vocabulary, content, and genre. Following the earlier proposal of Strugnell (1970: 237), Steudel has concluded from such parallels that these two manuscripts are damaged copies of the same composition, each preserving different portions of what was once an original whole. When placed alongside the very fragmentary remains of what may be three further copies (4Q178, 182, 183), Steudel has dubbed the five manuscripts concerned 4QMidrasch zur Eschatologie<sup>a-c</sup> or, in English, 4QMidrash on Eschatology<sup>a-c</sup> (1992 and 1994). To support her thesis, she has engaged in a lengthy analysis of 4QFlorilegium and 4QCatena A, employing the reconstruction methods of Stegemann (1990) for damaged scrolls, as observed in our separate considerations of these documents. We shall now attempt to summarize and evaluate Steudel’s broader theory. Steudel argues that 4QFlorilegium represents columns 1–6 and 4QCatena A columns 8–12 of the same work, with one or two columns in between and the final third of the composition now missing altogether (1992: 533; 1994: 127–28). To justify this claim, she notes several traits shared by both manuscripts.

First, Psalms are central to 4QFlorilegium and 4QCatena A. They almost consistently follow the ‘correct’ order, moreover, with Psalms 1–5 being cited in 4QFlorilegium and Psalms 5–6 and 11–17 appearing in 4QCatena A. Second, each manuscript reflects a similar pattern of citation and interpretation formulae. Thus, Psalms quotations either have no formula at all or employ the verb ‘to say’ (Hebrew, *amar*), while other sources are quoted with ‘to write’ (*kataw*), often including some named reference to a prophet. Similarly, the word *peshet* (‘interpretation’) introduces sectarian exegesis after Psalms quotations only, whereas alternative terms are employed to begin the interpretation of other scriptures. Third, both manuscripts contain an interesting cluster of

sectarian vocabulary. In particular, the 'Interpreter of the Torah' (4QFlorilegium 3.11 and 4QCatena A 2.5; see also CD 6.7 and 7.18) and the 'coming time of testing' (4QFlorilegium 4.1 and 4QCatena A 1.2–3; see 4QpPsalms 2.18) occur together only in these compositions (Steudel 1992: 533–36).

Cumulatively, therefore, Steudel concludes that 4QFlorilegium and 4QCatena A are the same work, positing more tentatively that 4Q178, 4Q182, and 4Q183 are further copies. As the name implies, 4QMidrash on Eschatology<sup>a-c</sup> is 'eschatological' in outlook, for the author believed he lived in the last phase of world history, that he referred to as 'the end of days' and 'coming time of testing'. During this period, the faithful would undergo trials before attaining final salvation (Steudel 1993; see also Collins 2000a). The word 'Midrash' in Steudel's title reflects the fact that the work is concerned with scriptural interpretation and, more particularly, that its eschatological themes have scriptural underpinnings.

In evaluating Steudel's thesis, it is important to realize that her detailed reconstructions of 4QFlorilegium and 4QCatena A on the basis of Stegemann's methodology have much to commend them. Indeed, we followed their broad outline in this and the previous chapter. Steudel's general characterization of the material also makes sense, for both manuscripts are certainly sectarian compositions of an eschatological nature quoting Psalms and other scriptures in their exegesis. On the other hand, given what we learned in the last chapter about 'Midrash Peshar' and 'Qumran Midrash', her titular usage of 'Midrash' is unfortunate (see also Steudel 1990: 473).

More seriously, when it comes to the thesis that 4QFlorilegium and 4QCatena A are copies of the same work, caution is in order (Brooke 1995; VanderKam 1995). This is chiefly because no concrete textual overlaps whatsoever exist between the surviving fragments of each manuscript. At least one would be required to judge Steudel's theory probable rather than possible. The safest conclusion for the time being is that this aspect of her hypothesis remains unproven and that, as a result, 4QFlorilegium and 4QCatena A are to be characterized as broadly similar but not identical works. This conclusion is not very different to that which presumably underlies the alternative nomenclature Thematic Commentaries A-B adopted for the two manuscripts by Davies, Brooke, and Callaway (with Thematic Commentaries C-E for 4Q182, 4Q178, and 4Q183) (2002: 79).

### Further Reading

#### Overviews of 4QCatena A-B

G.J. Brooke, 'Catena', *EDSS* (2000d), pp. 121–122.

G. Vermes, 'Catena A or Midrash on the Psalms (4Q177)', *HJP*, 3.1 (1986b), pp. 448–49.

#### Detailed studies, including the text of 4QCatena A-B

J. Milgrom, with L. Novakovic, 'Catena A (4Q177=4QCat<sup>a</sup>) and 'Catena B (4Q182=4QCat<sup>b</sup>)', *PTSDSSP*, 6B (2002), pp. 286–303, 305–7.

E. Puech, '4QBéatitudes', *DJD*, 25 (1998), pp. 115–78; IX–XIII.

H. Stegemann, 'The Origins of the Temple Scroll', *VT*, 40 (1988), pp. 235–56.

A. Steudel, 'Eschatological Interpretation of Scripture in 4Q177 (4QCatena<sup>a</sup>)', *RQ*, 14 (1990), pp. 437–81.

—*Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie (4QMidrEschat<sup>a,b</sup>): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und Traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ('Florilegium') und 4Q177 ('Catena') repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (Studies in the Texts of the Judaean Desert, 13; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994), pp. 57–124; Anhang B.

#### Earlier presentations of the text

J.M. Allegro, 'Catena (A)' and 'Catena (B)', *DJDJ*, 5 (1968b), pp. 67–74, 80–81; XXIV–XXV, XXVII.

J. Strugnell, 'Notes en marge du volume V des "Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan"', *RQ*, 7 (1970), pp. 236–48, 256.

#### Psalms manuscripts at Qumran

P.W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

—'Psalms, Book of', *EDSS* (2000), pp. 702–10.

#### Steudel on 4QMidrash on Eschatology<sup>a-e</sup> and critical reviews

G.J. Brooke, Review of Stendel (1994) in *JSJ*, 26 (1995), pp. 380–84.

A. Steudel, '4QMidrEschat: "A Midrash on Eschatology" (4Q174 + 4Q177)', in J.T. Barrera, and L.V. Montaner (eds.), *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls Madrid 18–21 March 1991* (Vol. 2; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1992), pp. 531–41.

—*Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie (4QMidrEschat<sup>a,b</sup>): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und Traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ('Florilegium') und 4Q177 ('Catena') repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 13; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994).

J.C. VanderKam, Review of Stendel (1994) in *CBQ*, 57 (1995), pp. 576–77.

#### Qumran eschatology and 'the end of days'

J.J. Collins, 'Eschatology', *EDSS* (2000a), pp. 256–61.

A. Steudel, 'אחרית הימים' in the Texts from Qumran', *RQ*, 16 (1993), pp. 225–45.

### 1. Introduction

11QMelchizedek (11Q13) is a Hebrew work with scriptural exegesis and a thoroughgoing eschatology at its heart, and it contains the distinct vocabulary of other sectarian compositions (Brooke 1992b; Steudel 2000b). For example, we find '[the e]nd of days' (2.4), 'Sons of [Light]' (2.8), 'its interpretation' (2.12, 17), and 'Belial' (2.12, 13, 22, 25; 3.7; fragment 5, line 3). As the name scholars have given to the document implies, moreover, the central character is a heavenly Melchizedek figure who, as God's representative agent, is to preside over the eschatological climax to world history in its tenth and final 'jubilee'. A jubilee here appears to be a period of forty-nine years.

As is well known, a Melchizedek appears in Genesis 14.18–20 and in Psalm 110.4 (Astour 1992). In the New Testament, furthermore, the letter to the Hebrews 4.14–5.10 speaks of Melchizedek as a type of Jesus who, in the writer's estimation, is the true heavenly 'high priest according to the order of Melchizedek' (Hebrews 5.10). But the Qumran Melchizedek seems to be a hybrid of the elusive character from Genesis 14.18–20 and Psalm 110.4, on the one hand, and the supernatural personage appearing in a number of other Qumran writings who is variously called the Prince of Light (e.g. 1QS 3.20), the Angel of Truth (4QCatena A 4.12), and the archangel Michael (1QM 17.5–8), on the other (Vermes 1986c: 450). The same Melchizedek may feature in 4QSongs of the Sabbath Sacrifice<sup>b,d</sup> (4Q401, 403) (Steudel 2000b: 535).

The above factors combine to make 11QMelchizedek, despite its fragmentary nature, one of the most interesting Qumran sectarian writings. With the aid of Leviticus 25, Deuteronomy 15, Isaiah 52 and 61, Daniel 9, and Psalms 7 and 82, the ancient author explains that, in the tenth jubilee of a divinely preordained world history, Melchizedek will act

in 'the end of days' (2.4) as God's viceroy to help 'all the Sons of [Light]' (2.5–8) and finally destroy Belial (3.7). More especially, as heavenly High Priest, he will expiate the sins of the Sons of Light on the eschatological Day of Atonement in 'the year of favour of Melchizedek' (2.9).

## 2. The Text of 11QMelchizedek

The *editio princeps* of 11QMelchizedek was published by van der Woude (1965), although both van der Woude and de Jonge proceeded to produce a slightly different transcription and English translation (1966). Further improvements have been offered over the years by Yadin (1965), Fitzmyer (1967), Carmignac (1970), Milik (1972), and Puech (1987 and 1993: 522–26). Most recently, the Hebrew text has appeared, alongside an English translation, in the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series (García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude 1998a); it is now supplemented by the more cautiously restored Hebrew text of Roberts and his accompanying English rendering (2002: 264–73). Excellent photographs of the fragments of 11QMelchizedek are to be found in the former volume (1998a: XXVII).

García Martínez and Roberts ascribe eleven fragments in varying states of preservation to 11QMelchizedek, with fragments 1–4 containing most of the extant text. Some fragments are broken into smaller pieces, explaining why earlier descriptions of 11QMelchizedek often spoke of thirteen, fourteen, or fifteen fragments (Puech 1987: 485; van der Woude 1965: 355; Vermes 1986c: 449). Both García Martínez and Roberts also agree that 11QMelchizedek's fragments can be arranged into the remains of three columns.

Whereas column 1 contains only two complete words from one fragment (fragment 1a), the majority of more substantial fragments relate to columns 2–3 (fragments 1a-b, 2a-b, 3, 4a-d). Column 2 is the best preserved of these, with some twenty-five lines now substantially restored. In view of their content, it seems that columns 1–3 were from the end of the complete manuscript. Indeed, the eschatological nature of the tenth jubilee suggests that 11QMelchizedek might once have contained historical details from earlier jubilees in columns which are now lost, although this is necessarily speculative. Column 3 is less well preserved than column 2, with parts of fragments 2 and 3 certainly belonging to it. Although fragments 5–8 might have broken away from column 3, a lack of textual overlaps with the larger fragments 2 and 3 (that comprise most of column 3) means that their placement within the composition remains unclear. Nevertheless, two suggestions are worth considering with regard

to fragments 6 and 7. The former could be part of 11QMelchizedek 3.18, reflecting the end of a *Jubilees* citation; the latter may have been part of 11QMelchizedek 3.6ff., with its description of eschatological restoration. These suggestions will reappear later on, when we consider the contents of 11QMelchizedek in detail.

Turning to palaeography, there has been some disagreement about the date of the 11QMelchizedek manuscript. Van der Woude placed the fragments in the first half of the first century CE (1965: 356–57), but others have preferred an earlier dating (Kobelski 1986; Milik 1972; Puech 1987). On balance, it is sensible to follow the majority by positing a date for 11QMelchizedek in the middle decades of the first century BCE, c. 75–25 BCE (Roberts 2002: 264). The original date of composition is another matter, of course, and we shall return to it in the last section of the chapter.

### 3. The Genre of 11QMelchizedek

11QMelchizedek is too damaged for us to be certain about the original size and nature of the complete document (Steudel 2000b: 536). Nevertheless, in the portions that remain, the work is clearly concerned with overt exegesis in ways which connect the scriptural material cited (or alluded to) with the writer's eschatological interests in general and with his focus on the figure of Melchizedek in particular. Because no single scriptural book appears to dominate the whole composition, 11QMelchizedek is almost certainly not to be classed among the Continuous Pesharim. Indeed, most scholars have tended to see 11QMelchizedek as a Thematic Peshar (Brooke 1992b: 687; Lim 2002a: 46) broadly similar to 4QFlorilegium (4Q174) and 4QCatena A (4Q177), both of which have been discussed earlier in this book.

However, there have been other suggestions over the years as to the genre of 11QMelchizedek. One is that 11QMelchizedek has a close relationship with 4QAgnes of Creation A-B (4Q180–181), a thesis linked primarily to Milik (1972) and to which we shall return in our discussion of 4QAgnes of Creation A-B in the next chapter. Another proposal is that 11QMelchizedek is, after all, more thoroughly focused on a given scriptural book than the other Thematic Pesharim. For instance, Sanders (1969) and Aschim (1995) have argued that the work is some kind of Peshar on Isaiah. Certainly, Isaiah 61.1–2 is prominent within 11QMelchizedek by way of allusion and probably, when the document was in its complete state, in the form of a citation in 2.20. And in any case, Isaiah 52.7 is quoted in 11QMelchizedek 2.16 and 23. Yet, even

allowing for these significant features, a general lack of systematic citation from Isaiah in the extant fragments of the work renders rather unlikely the idea that 11QMelchizedek is a Continuous Peshar on the book of Isaiah.

Other scholars have posited that 11QMelchizedek may be some kind of Peshar on Leviticus (Dimant 1984: 521; Fitzmyer 1967: 29; Miller 1969: 469; Vermes 1986c: 449). Indeed, Aschim (1998: 28) has tentatively returned to this notion more recently. The main evidence in favour seems to be the existence of several references to Leviticus in 11QMelchizedek 2. But as Aschim himself admits (1998: 29), such references are fairly few in number among the surviving fragments of the composition. As for the citations of Leviticus 25.13 and 25.9 in 11QMelchizedek 2.2 and 25, respectively, they do not follow the appropriate order of the scriptural material that we would expect to find in a Continuous Peshar on Isaiah.

On balance, therefore, the designation Thematic Peshar seems as good as any other when trying to determine the genre of 11QMelchizedek (Lim 2002a: 46). Several decades ago, indeed, Fitzmyer noted the document's similarity to 4QFlorilegium (1967: 26), a Thematic Peshar examined in an earlier chapter. And we shall see for ourselves below that 11QMelchizedek consists of sectarian exegesis on a selection of scriptural contexts that have been drawn together to elucidate subject matter that is predominantly eschatological. More precisely, the composition centres on the events to take place during the last 'jubilee' of world history through the divine agency of the supernatural figure of Melchizedek himself.

#### 4. The Content of 11QMelchizedek

A detailed outline of 11QMelchizedek 1–3 is in order at this point. Unfortunately, nothing of column 1 remains except an addition in the marginal space which has survived between columns 1 and 2 (on fragment 1a), with only two words legible in what was probably a correction to line 12 of column 1: 'Moses, because'.

In contrast, most of the surviving text belongs to column 2 (fragments 1–4). Various scriptural citations can be reconstructed with reasonable certainty, leading García Martínez to calculate that we can be sure of some 65 per cent of this column (1998a: 226). In order of appearance, these quotations comprise the following: Leviticus 25.13 (line 2); Deuteronomy 15.2 (line 3); Psalm 82.1 (lines 10–11); Psalm 7.7–8 (line 11); Isaiah 52.7 (lines 16 and 23); Daniel 9.25 (line 18); Isaiah 61.2 (line 20); and Leviticus 25.9 (line 25). The citation of Isaiah 61.2 in 11QMelchizedek 2.20 is not certain, because no quotation formula has survived. But given



several allusions to Isaiah 61.1–3 throughout this column (lines 4, 6, 9, 13, 18), a citation here seems highly likely (cf. Roberts 2002: 268–69).

Opening column 2 are quotations from Leviticus 25.13 (concerning the jubilee) and Deuteronomy 15.2 (on the Sabbatical year), followed by an interpretation linking both to ‘the end of days’ (line 4) and the last jubilee in a ten-jubilee cycle. During that tenth jubilee, a proclamation of freedom is to be made, culminating in a Day of Atonement in which the Sons of Light will have their sins forgiven in ‘the year of favour of Melchizedek and [his] hos[ts]’ (line 9). Then come quotations from Psalm 82.1 and Psalm 7.7–8 to show how Belial and his angels will be destroyed, bringing about an eschatological peace expressed in terms of Isaiah 52.7. That verse about ‘good news’ is then linked to Daniel 9.25, with its mention of ‘an anointed one’ (line 18), and to Isaiah 61.2, with its promise ‘to comfo[rt] the [mourners]’ (line 20). The column closes with reference to those who turn from Belial and uphold the covenant. Language is borrowed from Isaiah 8.11 (line 24), culminating in what is either a paraphrase or LXX-like version of Leviticus 25.9 about the announcement with trumpets of the jubilee’s arrival on the Day of Atonement (García Martínez, Tigchelaar, and van der Woude 1998a: 223).

11QMelchizedek 3 (fragments 2–3) follows on from the reference to Leviticus 25.9 at the end of column 2, and possibly utilized the word *peshet* in the process (although, if it did, the word is now lost). It seems clear that 11QMelchizedek 3.7 tells of the consumption by fire of the evil counterpart of Melchizedek, Belial, who in some other Qumran documents is called Melchiresha (e.g. 4QCurses [4Q280] fragment 1, line 2). Because this is followed by the re-building of ramparts, walls, and columns, we may conclude that 11QMelchizedek 3.10 onwards proceeded to describe the eschatological restoration that would follow. Indeed, despite the damaged state of the eleven lines of fragment 7, overlapping vocabulary suggests it could have been part of column 3.6–16, inasmuch as ‘the rampart of Jer[usalem]’ (fragment 7, line 3) matches ‘the ramparts of Judah’ (3.9).

Further on, in column 3.18, we may have the remains of a reference to the book of *Jubilees*. Certainly, line 18 speaks of ‘[the di]visions [of the times]’ in a manner which, if accurately reconstructed by García Martínez (1998a: 234–35; cf. Roberts 2002: 270–71), echoes the ancient title of the book found in CD 16.2–4 (‘Book of the Divisions of the Times according to their Jubilees and in their Times’) and 4QText with a Citation of Jubilees (4Q228) fragment 1, column 1.9–10 (‘For thus it is written in the “Divisions [of the Times]”’). We might cautiously suggest that a concrete passage such as *Jubilees* 50.5 was cited at this point in 11QMelchizedek 3,

therefore, especially in view of '[its] interpreta[tion]' in fragment 6, line 4, which could well belong to this part of the document. *Jubilees* 50.5 would undoubtedly be fitting here, with its promise of an atoned people of Israel set free from evil powers and dwelling safely in the land.

### 5. Exegesis in 11QMelchizedek

Analysis shows that what might initially appear to be a mere conglomeration of proof-texts in 11QMelchizedek 1–3 turns out to entail the careful interweaving of base scriptures central to the document's argument (e.g. Leviticus 25; Deuteronomy 15) with supplementary ones used to enhance that argument (e.g. Daniel 9.25). Generally, we can tell that the MT is mirrored closely in the wording of these scriptural passages, with only Leviticus 25.9 (2.25) possibly being nearer to the LXX. At the same time, 11QMelchizedek's fragmentary nature makes it difficult in practice to be sure whether some of the scriptural contexts employed are core texts (presumably once introduced by citation formulae) or supplementary passages (that, even when the manuscript was complete, were not necessarily so introduced). Although no citation formula has survived linked to Isaiah 61.1–2, for example, repeated references to these verses suggest it too was foundational. It may even be that Isaiah 61.2 was originally quoted overtly in the now-damaged 11QMelchizedek 2.20, especially given that the phrase 'This is the one about whom it is written' stands in the previous line.

Despite such uncertainties, we can deduce much about the exegetical workings of 11QMelchizedek 1–3. In particular, Leviticus 25.13 (2.2) and Deuteronomy 15.2 (2.3) were easily connected: the latter deals with release from debt in Sabbatical years and the former with debt remission in the Jubilee year at the time of the Day of Atonement. Thus, both contexts contain a common theme (debt cancellation) and common vocabulary ('year' and 'years') in the form of laws which were supposed to be applied to ordinary life within the land of Israel. But by adding to the equation Isaiah 61.1–2's liberation imagery, the author injects an additional dimension: those upholding the covenant owe God a debt of sin, requiring 'release' on the eschatological Day of Atonement. Indeed, not only does Isaiah 61.1–3 contain the word 'year', like Deuteronomy 15.2 and Leviticus 25.13, but it also has 'release' (Hebrew, *deror*), as does Leviticus 25.10 specifically in relation to the Day of Atonement. These exegetical interconnections underpin the eschatological theme dominant in 11QMelchizedek and the occurrence of language from Isaiah 61.1–2 in six separate places (2.4, 6, 9, 13, 18, 20).

Just as vital in 11QMelchizedek's exegesis is Psalm 82.1,6–7 and, to a degree, Psalm 7.7–8. The former constitutes two verses in which God ('*elohim*') is portrayed as being angry with lesser supernatural beings, called 'gods' ('*elohim*'); they will 'die like mortals' in view of their unspecified irresponsible actions (82.7). But for the writer of 11QMelchizedek, because '*elohim*' in Psalms 82.1b and 6 clearly denotes angelic beings, the word's first occurrence in Psalm 82.1a is understood as a reference to Melchizedek, the heavenly angelic being par excellence, rather than God. Melchizedek himself is certainly not God in the scenario thereby envisaged but some kind of viceroy permitted to act with divine authority at 'the end of days' (Casey 1991: 78–96). Elsewhere in the psalm, '*elohim*' is taken by our author to denote other lesser divine beings, the wicked spirits of Belial, who are to be destroyed.

In 11QMelchizedek 2.16–23, we also find the employment of Isaiah 52.7. It was probably introduced on the basis of a vocabulary link with Isaiah 61.1, for the former has 'messenger' (*mevasser*) and the latter 'to bring good news' (*levasser*) (Brooke 1985: 321; de Jonge and van der Woude 1966: 306). In any case, Isaiah 52.7 is linked with the coming redemption, so that four scriptural referents ('the mountains', 'the messenger', 'Zion', and 'God' or '*elohim*' in Hebrew) are divided up atomistically and given further specification as 'the prophet[s]', 'the anointed of the spir[it]', those who 'establish the covenant', and Melchizedek, respectively. Although the latter name no longer stands in our fragmentary text (line 25), the logic of the argument and the earlier interpretation of '*elohim*' in Psalm 82 show it must have been present. As for the ones who 'establish the covenant', their description as those 'who avoid walking [in the p]ath of the people' in 11QMelchizedek 2.24 reflects the language of Isaiah 8.11, a supplementary allusion made clearer here by its appearance in other sectarian writings (4QFlorilegium 3.15–16; 1QS*a* 1.2–3; CD 8.16 and 19.29). Further, the identification of 'the messenger' as 'the anointed of the spir[it]' in 2.18 echoes the supplementary Daniel 9.25 ('an anointed') which was almost certainly quoted next and, more generally, the language of Isaiah 61.1 ('spirit ... anointed').

In sum, 11QMelchizedek 2.1–25 engages in scriptural exegesis in order to describe the events of the last phase of world history during the tenth jubilee. Two scriptural texts about release from debt (Leviticus 25.13 and Deuteronomy 15.2) are explicitly interpreted '[for the e]nd of days' (2.4; [*le-'a*]harit ha-yamim) in relation to the 'captives' (*ha-shevuuyim*), 'their teachers' (2.5), and 'the inheritance of Melchizedek' (2.5); to these is added the imagery of Isaiah 61.1–3. At the outset of this tenth jubilee, proclamation is to be made that the year of release is soon to arrive. We

cannot be sure, but the Teacher of Righteousness might well have been envisaged as the messenger of this initial good news (2.7), although, if the latter's advent is rather still to come, it may refer to Melchizedek himself. In any case, on the Day of Atonement at the end of the tenth jubilee, the sins of the Sons of Light would be forgiven and they would be freed from the spirits of Belial. To that day are overtly applied Isaiah 52.7 and Daniel 9.25. Other overt scriptural references include Psalms 7.8–9; 82.1–2; and Leviticus 25.9, as we have observed, while there are several strong allusions to Isaiah 61.1–3, one of which may originally have been a citation (2.20). Brooke follows earlier suggestions that some of these scriptural contexts, especially Isaiah 61.1–2 that also appears in Luke 4.18–19, were linked to a Day of Atonement liturgy in use during late Second Temple times (1985: 322–23). But our general ignorance about such matters means extreme caution is in order here (Grabbe 2000: 174–75). All in all, nevertheless, 11QMelchizedek provides clear evidence of thematic association, specification, and atomization in a thoroughly eschatological appropriation of scripture (VanderKam 2000b: 169–76).

## 6. 11QMelchizedek and the Schematization of History

11QMelchizedek purports to impart eschatological knowledge to those who uphold the covenant, so as 'to [in]struct them in all the ages of the w[orld]' (2.20). This statement strongly suggests that some kind of schematization of history is assumed within the document, although what exactly it might be is less than clear. The schema concerned could entail ten great jubilees stretching from the time of creation to the eschatological Day of Atonement in '[the] tenth [ju]bilee' (2.7), when final salvation will occur. Such a view would tie in well with other texts from Qumran and elsewhere (VanderKam 2000b: 177–78). Thus, the Apocalypse of Weeks (*1 Enoch* 91.12–17 and 93.1–10; 4QEnoch<sup>5</sup>) divides world history into ten great 'weeks', with eternal judgment taking place during the seventh part of the last week. 4QAgnes of Creation A-B (4Q180–181), to be considered in the next chapter, would be a parallel example composed within the Qumran sect.

However, Steudel believes that the citation of Daniel 9.25 in 11QMelchizedek 2.18 is proof that the same detailed chronological schema underlies both 11QMelchizedek and the book of Daniel (Steudel 1993: 234–35). In other words, 11QMelchizedek's ten jubilees (i.e. 10 x 49 years) are the same as the 'seventy weeks of years' (i.e. 70 x 7 years) in Daniel 9.24–25, giving a scenario in which each writer counts 490 years from Nebuchadnezzar's capture of Jerusalem. For Steudel, this means that

11QMelchizedek's Day of Atonement was to take place in around 72 BCE. Such a date is confirmed by the Damascus Document, she claims, for that work places the formation of the 'plant root' and then the Teacher of Righteousness some '390' and 410 years, respectively, after Nebuchadnezzar's activity (CD 1.5f. and 10). Allowing forty years for the Teacher's own ministry and, following his death, a further forty before the eschaton (CD 20.15), this brings Steudel to c. 72 BCE. In reaching that date, she holds that the chronological calculations of the Qumran authors, like those of other Second Temple Jews, were several decades short compared to those of modern historians. In any case, her reconstruction further implies that the proclamation at the start of the tenth jubilee envisaged in 11QMelchizedek 2.6–7, if heralded by the Teacher of Righteousness himself, would have taken place a little under forty-nine years earlier, around 121–114 BCE. It also implies that 11QMelchizedek was composed towards the end of the second century BCE, probably making it the oldest exegetical writing among all the surviving Continuous and Thematic Pesharim (Steudel 1993: 236–37).

Linked to Steudel's approach to 11QMelchizedek is her hypothesis about 4QMidrash on Eschatology<sup>a-c</sup>, as summarized in the last chapter. She believes that 4QMidrash on Eschatology<sup>a</sup> (normally known as 4QFlorilegium) and 4QMidrash on Eschatology<sup>b</sup> (otherwise named 4QCatena A) must have been written when the hoped-for eschaton failed to materialize. Because she also believes that the Qumran Community expected that end to arrive around 72 BCE, as just seen, and because 4QMidrash on Eschatology<sup>a-b</sup> betray no awareness of the Roman conquest of Palestine in 63 BCE, Steudel concludes that the latter work was composed c. 72–63 BCE (Steudel 1993: 241–42). Mention of the 'Seekers of Smooth Things' in 4QMidrash on Eschatology<sup>b</sup> 9.12 (or 4QCatena A 2.12) acts as corroboration, for they represent the Pharisees who were in the ascendancy under Salome Alexandra (76–67 BCE). Scripture was used in 4QMidrash on Eschatology<sup>a-c</sup>, therefore, to counter the disappointment experienced in the wake of the failure of the eschatological climax to materialize. Its aim was to reassure the community that it was in the right, that its enemies were in error, and that the end would nonetheless come soon (1992: 538–41).

In evaluating Steudel's chronological calculations, her ingenious handling of complex data must be acknowledged. However, for several interrelated reasons, caution is in order when it comes to the precision with which she works out the eschatological expectations of 11QMelchizedek, as well as the original composition dates for what we have elsewhere called 4QFlorilegium and 4QCatena A. First, there is no evidence that all late Second Temple Jews, including members of the

Qumran Sect, consistently operated within a chronological framework which was two or three decades out by modern standards, although some clearly did so (Collins 2000a: 259). Second, in any case, the figures in CD 1.1–12 are largely symbolic, with ‘390 years’ in particular relating to Ezekiel 4.5 (Campbell 1995b: 61). They cannot, therefore, be taken at face value for the purposes of detailed historical reconstruction. Third, we should be wary of assuming that the Qumran Community had future expectations as precise as Steudel envisages. While some kind of eschatological disappointment in the mid-first century BCE is evident from 1QpHabakkuk 7.5b–14a, the fact that the movement continued to flourish for another century or so suggests that its hopes in this regard were flexible enough to cope with that disappointment (Collins 2000a: 259). Fourth, as both Sanders (2000) and Davies (2000a) have recently argued in different ways, we should be wary of artificially synthesizing even just the sectarian Qumran evidence into some kind of monolithic world-view.

In sum, therefore, just as Steudel’s thesis about 4QMidrash on Eschatology<sup>a-b</sup> is possible but not proven, so her timetable for Qumran eschatological expectation and literary composition is only possible. There is no evidence as yet which requires us to judge it probable.

### Further Reading

#### Overviews of 11QMelchizedek and related issues

- M.C. Astour, ‘Melchizedek (Person)’, *ABD*, 4 (1992), pp. 684–86.  
 G.J. Brooke, ‘Melchizedek (11QMelch)’, *ABD*, 4 (1992b), pp. 687–88.  
 A. Steudel, ‘Melchizedek’, *EDSS* (2000b), pp. 535–37.  
 G. Vermes, ‘The Melchizedek Midrash (11QMelch)’, *HJP*, 3.1 (1986c), pp. 449–51.

#### Hebrew text and English translation of 11QMelchizedek

- F. García Martínez, E.J.C. Tigchelaar, and A.S. van der Woude, ‘11QMelchizedek’, *DJD*, 23 (1998a), pp. 221–41; XXVII.  
 J.J.M. Roberts, ‘Melchizedek (11Q13=11QMelchizedek=11QMelch)’, *PTSDSSP*, 6B (2002), pp. 264–73.

#### Earlier presentations of the text of 11QMelchizedek

- J. Carmignac, ‘Le Document de Qumrân sur Melkisèdeq’, *RQ*, 7 (1970), pp. 343–78.  
 J.A. Fitzmyer, ‘Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11’, *JBL*, 86 (1967), pp. 25–41.  
 M. de Jonge, and A.S. van der Woude, ‘11QMelchizedek and the New Testament’, *NTS*, 12 (1966), pp. 301–26.

- J.T. Milik, 'Melkî-sedeq et Melkî-resa' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens', *JJS*, 23 (1972), pp. 95–144.
- E. Puech, 'Notes sur le manuscrit de XIQMelkîsèdeq', *RQ*, 12 (1987), pp. 483–513.  
—*La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien* (Vol. 2; Etudes Biblique 22; Paris: Gabalda, 1993).
- A.S. van der Woude, 'Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI', *OTS*, 14 (1965), pp. 354–73.
- Y. Yadin, 'A Note on Melchizedek and Qumran', *IEJ*, 15 (1965), pp. 152–54.

### **Detailed discussion of 11QMelchizedek and related issues**

- A. Aschim, 'Verdens eldste bibelkommentar? Melkisedek-teksten fra Qumran', *Tidsskrift for Teologi og Kirke* 66 (1995), pp. 85–103.  
—'The Genre of 11QMelchizedek', *QONT* (1998), pp. 17–31.
- M. Casey, *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God: The Origins and Development of New Testament Christology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- P.R. Davies, 'The Dead Sea Writings, The Judaism(s) of', in J. Neusner *et al.* (eds.), *The Encyclopaedia of Judaism* (Vol. 1; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2000a), pp. 182–96.
- D. Dimant, 'Qumran Sectarian Literature', in M.E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum; Assen/Philadelphia: van Gorcum/Fortress, 1984), pp. 483–550.
- P.J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchiresa'* (Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 10; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association, 1986).
- M.P. Miller, 'The Function of Isa 61 1–2 in 11QMelchizedek', *JBL*, 88 (1969), pp. 467–69.
- J.A. Sanders, 'Dissenting Deities and Philippians 2.1–11', *JBL*, 88 (1969), pp. 279–90.
- J.C. VanderKam, 'Sabbatical Chronologies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature', *DSSH* (2000b), pp. 158–78.

### **11QMelchizedek and 'the end of days' at Qumran**

- G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 29; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985), pp. 319–23.
- J.J. Collins, 'Eschatology', *EDSS* (2000a), pp. 256–61.
- A. Steudel, 'הַיָּמִים אֲשֶׁר בְּרִיבָה in the Texts from Qumran', *RQ*, 16 (1993), pp. 225–45.

### 1. Introduction

There is no unanimity on precisely how to name, categorize, or interrelate the pair of damaged Hebrew manuscripts that are the subject of this chapter. Probably, in light of a small but not insignificant textual overlap, 4QAgēs of Creation A-B (4Q180–181) represent two similar—but not identical—works. They certainly contain sectarian terminology, including the words ‘interpretation’ (Hebrew, *peshet*) and ‘Community’ (*yahad*), with 4QAgēs of Creation A apparently calling itself ‘Peshet about the Periods’ (fragment 1, line 1) (Dimant 2000b: 11; Vermes 1986d: 421).

Indeed, both works seem to be the remains of attempts to divide world history into divinely predetermined ‘ages’ or ‘periods’ (Hebrew, *qisim*) destined to run their course in line with what was written on the heavenly tablets. These tablets, including the idea that their contents are set in advance by God, appear in other late Second Temple writings in general (e.g. Apocalypse of Weeks in *1 Enoch* 93.1–10; 93.11–17) and in other Qumran documents in particular (e.g. 4QCatena A 3.12), as seen in an earlier chapter. And the same basic idea, albeit in less dramatic form, is found in the common Qumran notion that God has foreordained all things (CD 2.7) and that history’s ‘periods’ are fixed according to his will (4QCatena A 4.14 and 11QMelchizedek 2.20; see also 1QS 3.15 and 1QpHabakkuk 7.7).

Given the prevalence of such notions in the Qumran collection and elsewhere, 4QAgēs of Creation A-B may once have commented on a wider sweep of history than is now extant in the fragments. In fact, Milik’s linking of the two manuscripts with 11QMelchizedek, a proposal to be considered later, builds upon this possibility (1972). In any case, what survives in 4QAgēs of Creation A-B pertains to the stories of Genesis 6–22, especially the fall of the angels recounted briefly in Genesis 6.1–4 but



more fully in *1 Enoch* 6–11 and *Jubilees* 4–5. More generally, an appropriation of Genesis which is broadly similar is found in 4QCommentary on Genesis A (4Q252) and 4QExposition on the Patriarchs (4Q464), both mentioned in passing in Chapter 1.

## 2. The Text of 4QAges of Creation A-B

4QAges of Creation A-B are two manuscripts made up of eight fragments and three fragments, respectively. Following his preliminary versions (1964), both were published by Allegro (1968c: 77–80), although that edition was subject to an extensive critique by Strugnell (1970). Although the material has not been thoroughly subjected to Stegemann's reconstruction method (1990), Roberts now provides the best edition available (1995). And despite the damaged nature of 4QAges of Creation A-B, the physical features of the fragments divulge useful information about these two documents.

4QAges of Creation A has a late Herodian script, reflecting the first century CE. According to Strugnell (1970: 252–55) and Dimant (2000b: 11), eight fragments are left of this manuscript. However, only fragments 1–6 provide us with legible text. Photographs of the fragments can be found in Allegro (1968c: XXVII) and Strugnell (1970: 262).

Fragment 1 preserves the remains of one column of ten lines, with a top and bottom margin clearly showing. On the top right of the fragment, a right-hand margin is also visible, suggesting, in view of its contents, that line 1 of fragment 1 was the beginning of the work. Put another way, 4QAges of Creation A's opening words ('Peshar about the Periods which God made ...') may have been an ancient title for the whole work, although the closeness of the parallel phraseology in line 7 ('Peshar about Azazel and the angels ...') means we cannot be certain. In any case, the main focus of what follows in fragment 1 is the story of the fall of the angels (Genesis 6.1–4), and it is this fragment which contains the overlap with 4QAges of Creation B (4Q181, fragment 2).

Fragments 2–4 of 4QAges of Creation A contain the remains of another two columns, the first of which is so faint that it is barely readable. The second column gives us part of ten lines of text relating to the narrative in Genesis 18 about the angelic visitors to Abraham, including what seems to be a citation of Genesis 18.20–21. As for fragments 5–6, they supply five lines of damaged text from a further column. It is unclear, unfortunately, whether they come from before or after the material preserved in fragments 2–4, and both options have been put forward by scholars, as we shall see presently.

4QAg<sub>es</sub> of Creation B has three surviving fragments. The script is Herodian, probably from the mid- to late first century BCE (Roberts 1995: 205). Fragment 1 contains the remains of two columns. All that is left of column 1 is one Hebrew letter (mem) towards the top right. But column 2 of the same fragment has part of six lines intact, although they are damaged towards the bottom. Fragment 2 preserves the remains of ten lines of a further column that, because of the overlap with 4QAg<sub>es</sub> of Creation A, probably preceded fragment 1 when the manuscript was complete. To the right of lines 5–10 of fragment 2 is a margin, while a bottom margin is probably just visible below line 10. Fragment 3 contains a single Hebrew letter (aleph) from some unknown part of the manuscript. Photographs of all three fragments of 4QAg<sub>es</sub> of Creation B are to be found in Allegro (1968c: XVIII).

The short but significant overlap between 4QAg<sub>es</sub> of Creation A fragment 1 and 4QAg<sub>es</sub> of Creation B fragment 2 leads to the reasonable proposition that the two manuscripts represent related works (Dimant 1979: 91). It is worth setting out the overlap here:

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>4Q181, fragment 2 (lines 1–4)</i></p> <p><sup>1</sup>[to Abrah]m [until he bega]t Isaac [...]</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><sup>2</sup>the [daughters of] humankind and [they] bore to them mighty one[s ...]</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><sup>3</sup>Israel for seventy weeks to [...]</p> <p><sup>4</sup>And those who love iniquity and possess guilt [...]</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><i>4Q180, fragment 1 (lines 5–9)</i></p> <p><sup>5</sup>[unt]il he begat Isaac, the ten [...]</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><sup>6</sup>(<i>vacat</i>) <sup>7</sup>[And] Peshet about Azazel and the angels wh[o went in to the daughters of humankind], <sup>8</sup>[and] they [b]ore to them mighty ones And about Azazel [...]</p> <p><sup>9</sup>[to love] iniquity and to possess wickedness all [its] period ...</p>
---	--

This significant overlap allows each manuscript to be partly restored in light of the other. However, it is clear that the surrounding material of the fragments was not identical in all details, as can be seen by comparing line 9 (4Q180 fragment 1) and line 4 (4Q181 fragment 2) above. The most plausible notion, therefore, is that 4QAg<sub>es</sub> of Creation A-B (4Q180–181) represent similar but not identical compositions.

### 3. The Genre of 4QAg<sub>es</sub> of Creation A-B

We have just concluded that 4QAg<sub>es</sub> of Creation A-B are probably two related compositions of a sectarian nature. Indeed, their origin within the Qumran Community has not been seriously doubted, for we find vocabulary items such as ‘interpretation’ (Hebrew, *peshet*) in 4QAg<sub>es</sub> of

Creation A (fragment 1, lines 1 and 7) and 'Community' (*yahad*) in 4QAges of Creation B (fragment 1, 2.1). But other hypotheses have been put forward over the last three decades to explain the relationship between this pair of manuscripts. We shall consider two before returning to the preferred third option.

One proposal is that the two manuscripts are identical copies of the same work, though they are obviously now rather damaged. Roberts (1995) takes this view, employing the title 'Wicked and Holy (4Q180–181)' for both, with no qualification such as 'A-B' in his nomenclature. In this view, the manuscripts are duplicate copies of a single composition which could perhaps be more accurately represented as 4QWicked and Holy<sup>a-b</sup> (4Q180–81). If this hypothesis is correct, it so happens that only in the overlapping lines has the same part of the document been preserved, with the concomitant requirement that fragment 2 of 4QAges of Creation B should probably be read before fragments 1 and 3 (Roberts 1995: 208–9). Along similar lines, Milik earlier suggested an equation of the two manuscripts, but with one additional detail. For him, the sectarian document discussed in the previous chapter, 11QMelchizedek (11Q13), was a third copy (1972: 123–26), a proposal mentioned briefly above and to which we shall return. For now, in view of what has already been said, we can note that the main arguments against simply equating the manuscripts known as 4QAges of Creation A-B are twofold. First, the overlap between them is not sufficiently extensive or precise to demonstrate categorically that they once contained exactly the same material (Dimant 1979: 90). Indeed, we saw above that what does overlap is not quite identical. A second objection is that 4QAges of Creation B (fragment 1, column 2) contains distinctive emphases which are not present in 4QAges of Creation A, although, admittedly, this could be due to the chance nature of the damage suffered by each manuscript.

As a second contrasting proposal, some hold that what we are calling 4QAges of Creation A-B represent two quite separate compositions, despite the textual overlap noted already. This conviction explains the variations in name employed for the two manuscripts by different scholars. Vermes, for example, reserves the title 'Ages of Creation' for 4Q180 alone (1997: 520) and uses 'The Wicked and the Holy' for 4Q181 (1997: 229). Dimant appears to make the same distinction, calling only the former 'Peshar on the Periods' in light of the wording on line 1 of fragment 1 (2000b: 13), although she has also pointed to broad similarities between the two documents (1979: 91). In any case, the main argument against a complete separation of the manuscripts is that some closer relationship is implied by the short but significant textual overlap considered above. Furthermore, both have a related concern for matters

chronological and seem to emphasize the contrasting existence of the righteous and the wicked throughout history.

Our third explanation is the one preferred in this study. To repeat, it posits that 4QAges of Creation A-B represent similar—but not identical—works, as expressed by the supplementary ‘A-B’ in the title. Not only can this option take account of the similarities between the two manuscripts (e.g. the textual overlap) and the differences of content (e.g. 4QAges of Creation B fragment 1, column 2), but it also takes sufficiently seriously the difficulties inherent in the alternatives just outlined. Dimant, in practice, comes close to proposing this solution herself in light of similarities between the manuscripts (1979: 97–98). Hence, the nomenclature adopted in the remainder of the chapter, 4QAges of Creation A-B, is that found in the most up-to-date list of Qumran documents in the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series (Tov *et al.* 2002: 51).

We must note, finally, that some have deemed 4QAges of Creation A, if not 4QAges of Creation B in view of its damaged nature, a Thematic Peshet (Aschim 1998: 24–25; Collins 1992a: 90–91; Lim 2002b: 72), while Dimant has described it as ‘a particular type of Peshet’ (1979: 96). Certainly, the technical term *peshet* occurs twice in 4QAges of Creation A fragment 1 (lines 1 and 7), though unusually expounding subjects rather than scriptural texts. Having said that, the scriptures are cited elsewhere, and we have the probable remains of a pronominal interpretation formula in fragments 5–6, line 4 (‘[That i]s’). It is tempting, therefore, to include at least 4QAges of Creation A among the Thematic Pesharim. But we shall return to this question in our last chapter.

#### 4. The Content of 4QAges of Creation A-B

We shall now describe the manuscripts in more detail, since this will give us the information needed to consider the question of exegesis in the next section. Let us start with the longer 4QAges of Creation A.

4QAges of Creation A, as learned above, is made up of eight fragments, of which only six contain legible text. Overall, line 1 of fragment 1 (‘Peshet about the periods’) implies that the work is concerned with commenting on periods in a divinely preordained historical schema. This sort of schematization is known from several scriptural writings which emerged in late Second Temple times, including the Apocalypse of Weeks (1 *Enoch* 93.1–10; 93.11–17; 4QEnoch<sup>b</sup> [4Q212]) and Daniel 9.24–27. More particularly, 4QCatena A and 11QMelchizedek, both among the Qumran writings that comment on scripture, seem to reflect an outlook

parallel to that in 4QAgnes of Creation A. As is the case with the first of these sectarian compositions and probably with the second, it may be that the complete text of 4QAgnes of Creation A covered a wider sweep of history than is extant in its surviving fragments, although we cannot be certain. What does survive in 4QAgnes of Creation A pertains to the stories in Genesis 6–22.

After a short introduction (lines 1–4a), in which it is made clear that God has fixed everything in advance of its occurrence, fragment 1 proceeds to a historical period culminating in the time of Isaac, if the damaged wording '[unt]il he begat Isaac' is an accurate guide (line 5). In the remainder of the fragment, the only concrete scenario described in detail is the story about the fall of the angels briefly recounted in Genesis 6.1–4. The leader of this rebellion, known as Azazel here and as Asael in *I Enoch* 6.7 (Maurer 2000), and his angelic hosts procreate with human women. This illicit union leads to much evil, including the birth of destructive giants or 'mighty ones' (Hebrew, *gibborim*) (line 8) (Alexander 2002: 62–64).

Fragments 2–4 preserve parts of two columns dealing with Abrahamic material. Column 1 is so damaged that virtually nothing meaningful can be derived from its traces, although it is possible that Abram's change of name to 'Abraham' (Genesis 17.5) is described here (Dimant 1979: 81–82; Milik 1972: 119). Despite scholarly differences as to whether the material pertaining to the start of column 2 constitutes one line (Roberts 1995: 208; Strugnell 1970: 253) or several (Dimant 1979: 82–83; Milik 1972: 119–20), the column is clearly linked to Genesis 18, including mention of 'the three men' and 'the oaks of Mamre' (Genesis 18.1–2) in lines 3–4. Indeed, although no quotation formula (such as 'it is written') has survived intact, the remainder of column 2 consists almost entirely of a citation from Genesis 18.20–21, a passage in which God declares his intention to investigate the alleged evils of the city of Sodom. This portion of 4QAgnes of Creation A then breaks off with the reaffirmation that 'Before he (i.e. God) created them, he knew [their] plan[s . . .]' (2.10).

The more thoroughly damaged fragments 5–6 mention Pharaoh. If, as is possible, they dealt with Abraham's sojourn to Egypt in Genesis 12.10–20, they may originally have preceded fragments 2–4, as Dimant proposes (2000b: 12). However, since they also refer to 'Mount Zion' and 'Jerusal[em]', they may be concerned with Abraham's near-sacrifice of Isaac in Genesis 22.1–19. In that case, on the assumption that the order of events recorded in the Genesis narrative was followed by the sectarian author, fragments 5–6 would have come from a column later in the manuscript, as Roberts suggests (1995: 210). Unfortunately, we have no way of telling which of these options is most likely to be correct.

Turning to 4QAges of Creation B, we see that fragment 1 has the remains of two columns. Column 1 comprises only one letter, but column 2 contains a strident condemnation of the wicked, while holding out the promise of salvation to God's elect. Accordingly, the reader is informed that the former will be dealt with as their deeds deserve in the knowledge that their time is fixed in line with the divine plan. In contrast, the latter have their lot with God's 'Holy Ones' and will experience 'e[te]rn[al] life' (2.4) in due course. Fragment 2 contains an important overlap with 4QAges of Creation A, as seen already, and, like it, opens with reference to the story of the fall of the angels and the birth of the giants derived from Genesis 6.1–4 and its elaborations elsewhere. Line 3 of the fragment goes on to speak of 'seventy weeks', probably alluding to Daniel 9.24 and highlighting the historical schematization at the heart of 4QAges of Creation A-B. The remainder of the fragment utilizes sapiential language, describing in a contrastive manner 'those who love deceit' and 'possess guilt' (line 4), on the one hand, and God's 'goodness' and 'truth' (lines 6 and 8), on the other. Fragment 3, as noted, contains just one Hebrew letter (aleph).

### 5. Exegesis in 4QAges of Creation A-B

Several decades ago, Milik argued that 4QAges of Creation A-B were commentaries on a much earlier 'Book of Periods' that, though now lost, must have heavily influenced several later Second Temple works containing historical schematizations (1972: 95–144; 1976: 248–52). His main reason was the opening line of 4QAges of Creation A itself, rendered by him as 'Commentary on (the book of the) Periods' (1972: 251). However, the overall weakness of Milik's hypothesis has been demonstrated by Huggins (1992). It is true that the preponderance of historical schematizations in late Second Temple scriptural writings (e.g. *1 Enoch* 10.11–12; *1 Enoch* 89.51–90.25; Daniel 9.24–27; 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C) is noteworthy, as are those in 4QAges of Creation A-B and 11QMelchizedek 2.7–8 among the sectarian Qumran texts. Taken as a whole, however, the ancient authors concerned show 'considerable freedom in the invention and multiplication of numerically significant time schemes', effectively ruling out a single authoritative source in the form of Milik's hypothetical 'Book of Periods' (1992: 422). A little less speculatively, other scholars have argued that 4QAges of Creation A may be a commentary on 4QAges of Creation B (Strugnell 1970: 252) or vice versa (Dimant 2000b: 13). Or alternatively, quotation from a common source might conceivably explain the textual

overlap set out above (Dimant 1979: 90). But given the damaged nature of our two manuscripts, there is insufficient evidence to justify any of these theories.

Still, it remains safe to say that exegesis was central to 4QAges of Creation A-B. We found a citation of Genesis 18.20–21 in 4QAges of Creation A fragments 2–4, 2.5–7, for instance, and we may also note as significant in this regard the phrases ‘Peshar about the Periods’ (4QAges of Creation A, fragment 1, line 1), ‘[And] Peshar about Azazel and the angels’ (4QAges of Creation A, fragment 1, line 7), and ‘[whic]h is written about Pharaoh’ (4QAges of Creation A, fragments 5–6, line 5). Several further observations about the use of scripture in 4QAges of Creation A-B can be made.

First, in addition to the more-or-less clear-cut citation of Genesis 18.20–21, we find at least two, and possibly three, other allusions to scripture: Genesis 6.1–4 (in both 4QAges of Creation A fragment 1, lines 7–8 and 4QAges of Creation B fragment 2, line 2); Genesis 18.2 (in 4QAges of Creation A fragments 2–4, 2.3–4); and possibly Genesis 12.10–20 or 22.1–19 (in 4QAges of Creation A fragments 5–6, lines 2–5). Given the damaged formula ‘[which is wri]tten about the la[nd]’ in fragments 5–6 (line 2), one or more of these scriptural references may have constituted formal quotations when the composition was complete, although we cannot now be sure.

Second, the understanding of these scriptures is linked by the ancient author to the periodization of history. Throughout the divinely preordained phases of history, in other words, human beings have been either holy or wicked, depending on their faithfulness to God. This schematization is evident in specific phraseology such as ‘Peshar about the Periods’ (4QAges of Creation A fragment 1, line 1) and ‘seventy weeks’ (4QAges of Creation B fragment 2, line 3). But we have also noted that the apparent chronological flow of 4QAges of Creation A-B demonstrates that, as far as we can tell, the material in Genesis is employed in the order of the scriptural narrative itself. Although the manuscripts’ damaged state means we cannot now know exactly what this schema was (VanderKam 2000b: 177), it seems that mention of the ‘the periods’, ‘tablets’ (4QAges of Creation A, fragment 1, line 3), ‘ten [generations]’ (line 5), and ‘seventy weeks’ are part and parcel of an overarching conviction about the divine predetermination of all things (4QAges of Creation A fragment 2–4, 2.10) (Dimant 1992: 92–96).

Third, the sectarian community behind 4QAges of Creation A-B understood the scriptures to show that it embodied in its own day the true continuation of the line of God’s faithful people. In contrast, those outside were the equivalent of the wicked of old. This overarching theme seems to

pervade the background of 4QAges of Creation A, with its good and bad players in each episode of a given ‘period’ or ‘age’ (Hebrew, *qes*). It is also found in 4QAges of Creation B (4Q181 fragment 1, column 2) and appears, of course, in many other sectarian Qumran writings, especially CD 2.14–3.12 (Campbell 1995b: 67–87, 208; Dimant 1979: 97–99).

Fourth, despite the damaged nature of the manuscripts, we can tell that the fall of the angels is prominent in 4QAges of Creation A-B. This story is found in skeletal form in Genesis 6.1–4, but it is elaborated considerably in *1 Enoch* 6–11 and *Jubilees* 4–5 (Alexander 2002; Nickelsburg 2000; Reeves 2000). The presence of multiple copies of the latter two scriptural works among the Qumran corpus implies that this alternative explanation of evil in the world was central to the thought of the Qumran sect, as does the prominence of the theme in the likes of 1QapGenesis. The appearance of similar traditions in narrowly sectarian texts like 4QAges of Creation A-B confirms the importance of these ideas for the Qumran community in general and for its distinctive emphasis on matters angelic in particular (Mach 2000). The latter prominence of angels has been noticed already in association with the supernatural hero featuring in 11QMelchizedek (11Q13), for example, as discussed in the last chapter.

## 6. *4QAges of Creation A-B and Other Sectarian Writings*

We noted earlier that Milik (1972) suggested that an important sectarian document discussed in the previous chapter, 11QMelchizedek (11Q13), was a third copy of the two works discussed immediately above. Similarities across all three manuscripts led him to believe that they represent copies of a single work named ‘Commentary on (the Book of) the Periods’ (4QAges of Creation A fragment 1, line 1) (1972: 251). More particularly, 4QAges of Creation A-B divides history into divinely predetermined ‘periods’ (*qisim*) in a manner not very different from what is found in 11QMelchizedek 2.9, 20. If correct, Milik’s hypothesis means that 4QAges of Creation A-B happen to preserve material pertaining to Genesis, whereas 11QMelchizedek contains traditions from the other end of the historical spectrum.

Although Milik has been followed by some (e.g. Brooke 1992b), there are good reasons for rejecting his equation of 4QAges of Creation A-B and 11QMelchizedek. One textual overlap strongly suggests that 4QAges of Creation A-B represent two related works that are not identical. But if 11QMelchizedek has no such overlap, then the suggestion that ‘it belongs to a much larger document of which 4Q180 and 181 are also copies’



(Brooke 1992b: 687) cannot really stand. A more cautious conclusion is preferable, namely, that 4QAg<sub>es</sub> of Creation A-B are a distinct pair of compositions that happen to share traits with other late Second Temple writings also tending to divide history into predetermined 'periods'. 11QMelchizedek is among these, but it is not a third copy alongside 4QAg<sub>es</sub> of Creation A-B.

Nevertheless, 4QAg<sub>es</sub> of Creation A-B do show certain similarities with other Qumran sectarian compositions, especially 4QCommentary on Genesis A (4Q252) and 4QExposition on the Patriarchs (4Q464). We noted in Chapter 1 that the former is a 'mixed' interpretative writing difficult to categorize, despite the occurrence of *peshet* terminology (fragment 5, 4.5) and the phrase 'the end of days' (4.2). But we can say that the remains of its six extant columns interpret in a variety of ways scriptural material selected predominantly from the book of Genesis (7.10–8.13; 9.24–27; 22.10–12; 49.10). As for the damaged 4QExposition on the Patriarchs, its eleven fragments refer mostly to the Abraham and Jacob narratives in Genesis. In so doing, they also include the word *peshet* (fragment 3, 2.7), and they hint that the scriptural material retains an eschatological significance yet to be fulfilled. What is probably a secondary appropriation of Zephaniah 3.9 in fragment 3 (column 1.9), for instance, may have been part of a description of a latter-day reversal of the language divisions imposed on humanity at the Tower of Babel (Genesis 11.1–9) (Stone and Eshel 1995: 219–21).

More generally, an interesting feature of 4QCommentary on Genesis A and 4QExposition on the Patriarchs is the fact that both concentrate on scriptural material from Genesis, rather like 4QAg<sub>es</sub> of Creation A-B (Bernstein 1998: 139–40; Charlesworth and Elledge 2002c: 275). This similarity should caution us against assuming too readily that 4QAg<sub>es</sub> of Creation A-B in their complete state necessarily continued much beyond the patriarchal era. It is also worth noting that this preoccupation with Genesis probably stems from the Qumran sect's conviction that the traditions concerned were paradigmatic of their own day (Alexander 2000: 46). Much the same could be said, indeed, about the appropriation of scriptural narrative in general within other sectarian works, including the Damascus Document (Campbell 1995b: 205–8).

### Further Reading

#### Overviews of 4QAg<sub>es</sub> of Creation A-B

D. Dimant, 'Ages of Creation', *EDSS* (2000b), pp. 11–13.

G. Vermes, 'The Ages of the Creation (4Q180)', *HJP*, 3.1 (1986d), p. 421.

**Hebrew text of 4Agēs of Creation A-B, with English translation**

D. Dimant, 'The "Peshier on the Periods" (4Q180) and 4Q181', *IOS*, 9 (1979), pp. 77–89.

J.J.M. Roberts, 'Wicked and Holy (4Q180–181)', *PTSDSSP*, 2 (1995), pp. 204–13.

**Earlier editions**

J.M. Allegro, 'Some Unpublished Fragments of Pseudepigraphical Literature from Qumran's Fourth Cave', in *ALUOS* 4 (1964), pp. 3–5.

—'The Ages of Creation' and '181', *DJDJ*, 5 (1968c), pp. 77–80, XVIII, XXVII.

J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrān Cave 4* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1976).

J. Strugnell, 'Notes en marge du volume V des "Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan"', *RQ*, 7 (1970), pp. 252–55, 262.

**Other Studies**

M. Bernstein, 'Pentateuchal Interpretation at Qumran', *DSSFY*, 1 (1998), pp. 128–59.

D. Dimant, 'The "Peshier on the Periods" (4Q180) and 4Q181', *IOS*, 9 (1979), pp. 77–102.

R.V. Huggins, 'A Canonical "Book of Periods" at Qumran?', *RQ*, 15 (1992), pp. 421–36

M. Mach, 'Angels', *EDSS* (2000), pp. 24–27.

A. Maurer, 'Azazel', *EDSS* (2000), pp. 70–71.

J.T. Milik, 'Melkî-sédeq et Melkî-resa' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens', *JJS*, 23 (1972), pp. 95–144.

**Text of 4QCommentary on Genesis A (4Q252)**

G.J. Brooke, '4QCommentary on Genesis A', *DJD*, 22 (1996a), pp. 185–207; XII–XIII.

J.L. Trafton, 'Commentary on Genesis A', *PTSDSSP*, 6B (2002), pp. 203–19.

**Text of 4QExposition on the Patriarchs**

J.H. Charlesworth, and C.D. Elledge, 'Exposition on the Patriarchs', *PTSDSSP*, 6B (2002c), pp. 274–85.

M.E. Stone, and E. Eshel, 'Exposition on the Patriarchs', *DJD*, 19 (1995), pp. 215–30.

**Fall of the angels in 1 Enoch and elsewhere**

P. Alexander, 'The Enochic Literature and the Bible: Intertextuality and Its Implication', *BAB* (2002), pp. 57–69.

G.W.E. Nickelsburg, 'Enoch, Books of', *EDSS* (2000), pp. 249–53.

J.C. Reeves, 'Giants, Book of', *EDSS* (2000), pp. 309–11.

## 1. Introduction

4QTanhumim (4Q176), also known as 4QConsolations (Lichtenberger 2002: 329), is a fragmentary manuscript containing what seems to be an anthology of scriptural texts on the theme of divine comfort (Vermees 1986e: 448). In fact, the Hebrew word *tanhumim* ('consolations') occurs twice in the surviving fragments which, when taken together, appear to be made up of scriptural citations aimed at consoling the reader. Intermingled with the latter quotations, however, we find a modest amount of sectarian comment. These combined features have led Wise, Abegg, and Cook to dub the document 'A Commentary on Consoling Passages in Scripture' (1996: 231).

The first occurrence of the term *tanhumim* is expressed in the following manner: 'And from the book of Isaiah consolations ...' (fragments 1–2, 1.4). The work then proceeds to present a number of quotations from what modern scholars call Deutero-Isaiah (Isaiah 40–55), some containing up to the equivalent of seven verses from the MT. The second occurrence of *tanhumim* comes after this scriptural selection (fragments 8–11, line 13), so that the term acts as a kind of *inclusio* around the bulk of Deutero-Isaiah citations surviving in the material (Stanley 1992: 570). However, two other passages from scripture are preserved in 4QTanhumim: Psalm 79.2–3 (fragment 1) and Zechariah 13.9 (fragment 15). There may also be an allusion to *Jubilees* 23.13 in fragment 14.

Although it is not made explicit, the comfort offered in 4QTanhumim assumes a background in which the audience is experiencing some kind of distress. It is no longer possible to be sure what that might have been, in light of the damaged nature of the manuscript, but it gives the document a certain affinity with the traditional lament form, including, at least at first sight, 4QApoctyphal Lamentations A-B (4Q179, 501). Furthermore, it is

tempting to make a link between the unspecified difficulties apparently underlying 4QTanhumim and the various trials and tribulations referred to in other sectarian compositions already described in this book (e.g. 4QFlorilegium and 4QCatena A). We shall return to this possibility below.

## 2. The Text of 4QTanhumim

According to Allegro's *editio princeps* (1968d), 4QTanhumim consists of fifty-seven fragments. Strugnell noted that there are two scribal hands evident in the material, with the first hand in fragments 1–2 dated palaeographically to Hasmonean times (c. 150–30 BCE). The second hand in other fragments can be placed more precisely in the mid-Hasmonean period (c. 125–75 BCE) (Strugnell 1970: 229), and this is presumably a more accurate guide to when the manuscript as a whole was penned. Just over half of the fragments contain the remains of several sentences or words (fragments 1–30); the rest comprise scraps with only a few letters each (fragments 31–57). Its highly damaged nature means that 4QTanhumim has not received the scholarly attention it probably deserves, and as yet no one has thoroughly applied to it Stegemann's reconstruction methodology (1990).

Nevertheless, scholars have managed to piece together substantially three columns of 4QTanhumim. This is possible because much of what the complete manuscript contained clearly took the form of citations from scripture that, within certain limits, can be reconstructed by modern scholars with a fair degree of confidence. In contrast, a smaller amount of sectarian comment has survived and, unfortunately, full reconstruction in the same way is impossible. Indeed, we cannot be sure that the complete 4QTanhumim contained much more by way of comment than has come down to us in the surviving fragments.

Here, we must mention fragments 19–21. These three small pieces of what were originally deemed part of 4QTanhumim were re-identified by scholars working in the 1980s as the remnants of a copy of the book of *Jubilees*. We mentioned in Chapter 3 that this new identification seems almost certain, and so the three fragments are best reclassified as 4QJubilees<sup>1</sup> (4Q176a), containing the remains of *Jubilees* 23.21–23, 30–31. The Hebrew text of the fragments concerned and an English rendering can be found in García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997: 360–63) and is due to be published in the forthcoming Volume 5a of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series edited by Bernstein and Brooke. And as observed in our second chapter, we see again that *Jubilees* was a popular scriptural

book for the Qumran Community, surviving in some fifteen copies in total (1QJubilees<sup>a-b</sup>, 2QJubilees<sup>a-b</sup>, 3QJubilees, 4QJubilees<sup>a-i</sup>, 11QJubilees).

Returning to 4QTanhumim proper, fragments 1–2 provide us with the remains of two columns of text. Fragments 3–5 and 6–7 may well be part of the second of these columns, while fragments 8–11 can be pieced together to form a substantial part of a third column (Strugnell 1970: 229). Rather more tentatively, some sense can be made of fragments 15–18, although differences in the way this might reasonably be done are seen in the available English translations of 4QTanhumim (cf. García Martínez 1996: 209 and Wise, Abegg, Cook 1996: 233). An up-to-date and balanced approach can now be found in the recently published Hebrew text with English translation of Lichtenberger (2002: 332–49), while photographs of all of 4QTanhumim's fragments can be examined in Allegro (1968d: xxii–xxiii). A perusal of both these volumes will show that the divine name is represented in eight places within fragments 1–2 and 8–11 by four dots, while to the right of line 4 of fragments 1–2 is a peculiar marginal marking probably intended to set off a new paragraph (Tov 2002b: 345). Similar features are found in 4QTestimonia, as we shall observe in the next chapter.

### 3. The Genre of 4QTanhumim

4QTanhumim is made up largely of units from Deutero-Isaiah, with only two citations from elsewhere preserved in the extant fragments (Psalm 79.2–3 and Zechariah 13.9), as well as a relatively small amount of sectarian comment (mostly in fragments 1, 10–11, 14, 16–18, 22–23). The presence of the latter, as we saw with 4QCatena A in an earlier chapter, should caution us against designating the work merely as an 'excerpted text' (cf. Lim 2002b: 47). After all, as just mentioned, 4QTanhumim is a scriptural anthology which also contains a modest but significant quantity of more-or-less overt exegesis. It is noteworthy, indeed, that some scholars have drawn a direct comparison with the Thematic Pesharim (Flint 2002: 240; Trebelle-Barrera 2000: 92).

At the same time, unlike other sectarian writings analysed in this book that draw on a variety of scripture, 4QTanhumim does appear to concentrate narrowly on Isaiah 40–55. Yet, caution is in order here, for the latter manuscript has suffered more damage than works like 11QMelchizedek that appropriate a somewhat broader range of scriptures. We do not really know, therefore, whether the complete 4QTanhumim was concentrated quite so fully on one scriptural source. But the fact that

Psalms 79.2–3 and Zechariah 13.9 have survived in what remains suggests that it is unwise to deem the work a commentary on Isaiah (cf. Lange 2002: 23). More precisely, just as we earlier concluded that 4QFlorilegium and 4QCatena A are Thematic Pesharim located primarily in the Psalms but drawing on a spread of other scriptures as well, so 4QTanhumim may constitute the remains of an exegetical sectarian writing focused largely on Isaiah 40–55 but utilizing other scriptural contexts too.

Stanley posits a rather more distinctive genre for 4QTanhumim, however, proposing that it is the result of one person's note-taking while studying Deutero-Isaiah directly (1992: 576–82). That the author had the book of Isaiah in front of him is shown by the order of scriptural material and its closeness to the MT, he believes, and such a scenario is one for which there is considerable contemporary Graeco-Roman evidence. This suggests to Stanley that 4QTanhumim may be the sole surviving exemplar of a parallel practice in early Judaism (1992: 578–79). The practice envisaged is different, he argues, from that underlying the so-called 'testimonia' that has long been posited by scholars. Whereas the latter contained a mixture of scriptures from different contexts normally written from memory, Stanley maintains that 4QTanhumim provides concrete evidence that Jews and Christians at this time also handled scriptural manuscripts in a more direct and dependent manner.

This reconstruction of the origins of 4QTanhumim is interesting, and we shall return again to the related question of 'testimonia' in the next chapter. But for now, we can say that Stanley's hypothesis is rather speculative, hanging in equal measure upon the notion of an individual studying an Isaiah manuscript with notebook in hand and upon the closeness of 4QTanhumim's Isaiah quotations to the MT. However, the latter feature of 4QTanhumim is relative, for Stanley notes himself that the scriptural passages also diverge from the MT to a not insignificant degree (1992: 572–76). It is difficult to know whether such divergences reflect a concrete scriptural manuscript with these readings, a more deliberate alteration to the text for some literary or theological reason, or the imperfections of a sectarian author who was working from memory. More generally, while individuals studying particular manuscripts may well be one significant factor underlying the literary formation of the sectarian interpretative writings from Qumran, others are potentially just as important. Included among them are the complex sociological factors pertaining to the identities of religious communities and their manifestation in written form, as recently highlighted by Charlesworth (2002a: 6–14).

In sum, we cannot be sure of the processes by which 4QTanhumim

came into being, although they are likely to be similar to those which brought about the other sectarian works of scriptural exegesis being considered in our study. In terms of genre, therefore, it seems safe to say that 4QTanhumim is another interpretative anthology of scripture emanating from the Qumran Sect and evincing the same broad traits as those found in other Exegetical Texts (VanderKam 2002: 42).

#### 4. The Content of 4QTanhumim

4QTanhumim fragments 1–2 contain the remains of two columns of text, with the bottom margin clearly visible. Unfortunately, the top margin can no longer be seen. Although Stanley not unreasonably posits that the manuscript once had at least twenty-five lines per column (1992: 576), therefore, we cannot reach certainty on this point.

Still, clearly decipherable in column 1 is a damaged introduction that describes some kind of catastrophe involving strife with the nations and dead priests (fragment 1, lines 1–3), culminating in a reference to Psalm 79.3. The latter, because its precise wording matches no known version of Psalm 79, may be an allusion rather than a citation (Stanley 1992: 570), although again we cannot be sure in light of what we learned earlier about the general textual fluidity of late Second Temple scripture. It is followed, from line 4, by a citation of Isaiah 40.1–5a, introduced, as already noted, with the words: ‘And from the book of Isaiah consolations’ (lines 4–9). This introduction and quotation of Isaiah 40.1–5a, standing at the head of a major section within the book of Isaiah itself, might lead us to conclude that fragments 1–2 of 4QTanhumim stem from towards the beginning of the complete sectarian document.

Next comes another scriptural citation, this time from one of the so-called ‘Servant Songs’ embedded within Isaiah 40–55 in the form of Isaiah 41.8–9 (fragment 1, lines 9–11). Because column 2, visible on the far left of fragment 2, contains the remains of citations from Isaiah 49.7 and 49.13–17, it makes sense to follow Strugnell’s suggestion that fragments 3–5 preserve the preceding material once attached to the top of column 2, for they cite Isaiah 43.1–2 and 43.4–6 (Strugnell 1970: 229). We may also tentatively follow Stanley’s related proposal (1992: 571) that, given the sole surviving word ‘for’ (Hebrew, *ki*) in line 5 of fragment 4, Isaiah 44.3 followed next. Fragments 6–7 in that case may similarly derive from the bottom of column 2, with Isaiah 51.22–23a. Indeed, if such a positioning of the fragments is correct, we find material from Deutero-Isaiah quoted within 4QTanhumim in what appears to be the ‘correct’ order: Isaiah 40.1–5a; 41.8–9; 43.1–2, 4–6; 49.7, 13–17; and 51.22–23a.

Turning to fragments 8–11, which seem to constitute the substantial remains of a third column, we then have two further citations in the shape of Isaiah 52.1–3 and Isaiah 54.4–10a. As elsewhere in the fragmentary remnants of this manuscript, much of the text is regrettably missing. But because we are faced with what are obviously scriptural citations, we can be confident about how the material should be restored to something like its original form.

The end of this third column (lines 13–16), however, returns to the author's own thoughts on the scriptural 'words of consolation' (line 13). Although badly damaged, they seem to look forward to the future joy of the righteous when the end of Belial's oppression will finally come. We have encountered these themes before, of course, and their presence in *4QTanhumim* forms an important link with the other sectarian Qumran writings being surveyed in this book.

Next, we have a quotation of Isaiah 52.1–2a which is recoverable in part through a combination of fragments 12, 13, and 42. After more sectarian comment in fragment 14, possibly containing an allusion to the lament-like *Jubilees* 23.13, fragment 15 contains Zechariah 13.9a-b. Fragments 16–18, 22–23, 33, 51, and 53 once more reflect directly the voice of the ancient author, assuring the reader of *4QTanhumim* that God is in control of all things and will reward those who are faithful to his commandments. The language employed, in fact, echoes that found in other sectarian writings which highlight the divine predetermination of all things (e.g. *4QAgos of Creation B* fragment 1, column 2; CD 2.2–11).

Each of fragments 24–32, 34–41, 43–50, 52, and 54–57 contains no more than a few words at most. For obvious reasons, therefore, we cannot describe their contents nor can we at present place them, even tentatively, within the document as a whole.

### 5. Exegesis in *4QTanhumim*

Although the scriptural text itself seems generally to reflect the MT, with some minor differences (Stanley 1992: 573–76), the extremely fragmentary nature of *4QTanhumim* means it is difficult to say much in detail about its underlying appropriation of scripture. This factor is exacerbated by the likelihood that even the complete *4QTanhumim* consisted largely of an anthology of scriptural passages, with sectarian comment not much exceeding that which survives in the existing fragments. Nevertheless, several important points can be made.

First, Deutero-Isaiah clearly predominates among the scriptural passages cited in *4QTanhumim*. One section of *4QTanhumim*, as



observed already, even opens with 'From the book of Isaiah consolations' (fragment 1, line 4) and proceeds to cite Isaiah 40.1–5a. The remaining fragments of this manuscript go on to quote Isaiah 41.8–9; 49.13–17; 43.1–2, 4–6; 51.22–23; 52.1–3; and 54.4–10. As far as we can tell, all are cited in the 'correct' order (i.e. the order in which they appear within the book of Isaiah). There is admittedly a danger of circular argumentation here. But our conclusion is made more secure by the fact that all twenty-two Qumran copies of Isaiah, despite the many minor textual differences among them, represent a single edition essentially the same as that of the later MT (Flint 2002: 237).

Second, the notion that Isaiah 40–55 or 40–66 form a kind of 'book of consolation' within Isaiah 1–66 seems to be an old exegetical tradition going back to late Second Temple times (Maier 2000: 915). Indeed, the scribe of the well-preserved 1QIsaiah<sup>a</sup>, a scriptural manuscript dated to c. 125 BCE, heralds the start of Isaiah 40.1 with a special marking, while one or more of several fragmentary Isaiah manuscripts from Qumran may well have contained material only from Isaiah 40ff. even when complete: 4QIsaiah<sup>d,g,h,i,m,n,q</sup> [4Q58, 61, 62, 62a, 66, 67, 69a] and 5QIsaiah [5Q3] (Flint 2002: 234; Ulrich *et al.* 1997: 7–143). Luke 4.16–20, furthermore, portrays a scriptural reading on the Sabbath from Isaiah 61.1–2 in a first-century CE synagogue setting, and it is likely that Isaiah 40–66 were included among the regular prophetic supplements (Hebrew, *haftarot*) attached to the Pentateuchal weekly readings attested by the Mishnah for the second century CE (Vermes 1979b: 452). Eventually, three Haftarot of Tribulation (from Isaiah 1 and Jeremiah 1–2) followed by seven Haftarot of Consolation (from Isaiah 40–63) became a traditional part of the lectionary cycle in Rabbinic Judaism (Stemberger 1996: 242–43). But because it is impossible to know when such fixed liturgical patterns first emerged, as noted when discussing 4QFlorilegium, we should beware of projecting them anachronistically onto Second Temple Judaism in general or the Qumran Community in particular (Grabbe 2000: 174–75). Nevertheless, in 4QTanhumim we already have a collection of consoling passages from Isaiah 40–55, while the fact that Isaiah 40.3 is cited in 1QS 8.14 highlights the importance of this portion of the scriptures for the Qumran Community.

Third, the individual passages from Deutero-Isaiah chosen by the author for inclusion in 4QTanhumim have certain features in common. 'Thus says the LORD', for instance, occurs regularly within these excerpts, acting as a kind of catchphrase between them. Furthermore, they also tend to picture God speaking in the first person, giving assurance to his downtrodden people that a glorious future awaits them (Stanley 1992: 577). Given these apparent selection criteria on the part of the ancient

author, it is tempting to conclude that what remains of 4QTanhumim may preserve most of the document, however fragmentarily, after all (Stanley 1992: 580).

Fourth, 4QTanhumim has preserved little by way of overt exegesis and, though what survives is similar to that found in other Qumran sectarian writings, it is difficult to describe because of the extensive damage it has suffered. However, parallel in general terms to what we shall discover in the next chapter in relation to 4QTestimonia (4Q175), the selection of passages from Isaiah 40–55 contained in 4QTanhumim itself constitutes an exegetical arrangement, albeit a subtle one. More precisely, if we allow ourselves to speculate, we might connect the work's comforting words with a theme prominent in other sectarian writings: the trials and tribulations of the righteous in the end of days. Although the latter phrase is missing from the fragments of 4QTanhumim, the composition appears to constitute the sort of consolation aimed at community members experiencing rejection, hostility, or even persecution from outsiders, pending the advent of final salvation. Indeed, scriptural imagery from Isaiah 40–55 originally providing comfort to the holy city of Jerusalem and its Temple is in effect transferred to the Qumran Community itself in 4QTanhumim. This recalls 4QFlorilegium 3.6 in which, as we saw in Chapter 3, the sect portrays itself as an interim 'Temple of man' (Hebrew, *miqdash 'adam*) during the final phase of world history.

In sum, 4QTanhumim is at the minimalist end of the spectrum of sectarian works being examined in this book. It includes only a small amount of overt exegesis, in other words, without *peshet* or pronominal interpretation formulae. Nevertheless, 4QTanhumim contains enough for us meaningfully to link the work with the other Exegetical Texts, for it clearly engages in the sectarian interpretation of scripture.

## 6. 4QTanhumim and 4QApocryphal Lamentations A-B (4Q179, 501)

There are some superficial similarities between 4QTanhumim and 4QApocryphal Lamentations A-B (4Q179, 501). It is presumably for this reason that Maier briefly considers all three compositions together in one encyclopedia entry (2000: 915). Thus, as we have noted, most of the extant fragments of 4QTanhumim can be described as 'consolations'. Such material might be said to assume a lament-like background in which the document's words are a positive response to prior lamentation within some unspecified set of difficult circumstances, with the citation of encouraging passages from Isaiah, Psalms, and Zechariah aiding in this process. To that extent, Maier's joint encyclopedia article makes sense.

However, in contrast to 4QTanhumim, 4QApocryphal Lamentations A-B evince no sectarian traits at all. The latter manuscripts are more akin, in fact, to those Qumran works which modern scholars often call 'Rewritten Bible' or 'Parabiblical Texts'. Among these, as we saw in an earlier chapter, are the remains of a number of previously unknown writings that, in genre and content, are more or less indistinguishable from other scriptural compositions. Indeed, we seem to be dealing with an independent literary piece in its own right in 4QApocryphal Lamentations A, as Høgenhaven states (2002: 120). Given what we learned in Chapter 2, therefore, it probably constituted scripture for those Second Temple Jews who took it at face value, along with 4QApocryphal Lamentations B. In contrast, although scripture is of vital importance to it, 4QTanhumim is clearly a sectarian exegetical document originating within the Qumran Community. It does not, as far as we can tell, cite or allude to 4QApocryphal Lamentations A-B. This means that we have no evidence for any kind of direct relationship between 4QTanhumim and these two other manuscripts.

Similarly, 4QTahumim bears only a superficial resemblance to several versions of the later Rabbinic work usually referred to as Tanhuma or Yelammedenu. Taking shape between the fifth and seventh centuries CE, much of the latter is attributed to the late fourth-century CE rabbi known as Tanhuma ben Abba and frequently uses the expression 'let our master teach us' (Hebrew, *yelammedenu rabbenu*) (Stemberger 1996: 302–6). However, Tanhuma-Yelammedenu comprises interpretative homilies on the weekly Pentateuchal synagogue readings employed in Talmudic times, with no direct link to 4QTanhumim.

Maier has also characterized fragments 16–17, 22–23, 33, 51 of 4QTanhumim as a 'mixture of sapiential and hymnic elements' (2000: 915). The damaged nature of the material, however, makes it difficult to pursue further the significance of this general observation.

### Further Reading

#### Overview of 4QTanhumim

J. Maier, 'Tanhumim [*sic*] and Apocryphal Lamentations', *EDSS* (2000), p. 915.

G. Vermes, 'Tanhumim or Words of Consolation (4QTanh=4Q176)', *HJP*, 3.1 (1986e), p. 448.

#### Hebrew text of 4QTanhumim, with English translation

F. García Martínez, and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Vol. 1; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997), pp. 356–60.

H. Lichtenberger, 'Consolations (4Q176=4QTanh)', *PTSDSSP*, 6B (2002), pp. 329–49.

### Earlier presentations and other discussions

- J.M. Allegro, '*Tanhûmîm*', *DJDJ*, 5, pp. 60–67; XXII–XXIII.  
 A. Lange, 'The Status of the Biblical texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process', *BAB* (2002), pp. 21–30.  
 C. Stanley, 'The Importance of 4QTanhumim (4Q176)', *RQ*, 15 (1992), pp. 569–82.  
 J. Strugnell, 'Notes en marge du volume 5 des "Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan"', *RQ*, 7 (1970), pp. 229–36.  
 E. Tov, 'Scribal Notations in the Texts from the Judaean Desert', *DJD*, 39 (2002b), pp. 323–49.  
 J. Trebelle-Barrera, 'Qumran Evidence for a Biblical Standard Text and for Non-Standard and Parabiblical Texts', *DSSHC* (2000), pp. 89–106.  
 J.C. VanderKam, 'The Wording of Biblical Citations in Some Rewritten Scriptural Works', *BAB*: (2002), pp. 41–56.

### Fragments 19–21, now deemed 4QJubilees<sup>i</sup> (4Q176a)

- F. García Martínez, and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Vol. 1; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997), pp. 360–63.  
 M. Kister, 'Newly-identified fragments of the Book of Jubilees: Jub. 23.21–23, 30–31', *RQ*, 12 (1987), pp. 529–36.  
 W.G. Nebe, 'Ergänzende Bemerkung zu 4Q176, Jubiläen 23, 21', *RQ*, 14 (1989), pp. 129–30.

### Isaiah manuscripts from Qumran

- P.W. Flint, 'The Book of Isaiah and the Dead Sea Scrolls', *BAB* (2002), pp. 229–51.  
 E. Ulrich, *et al.*, *Qumran Cave 4, X: The Prophets* (*DJD*, 15; Oxford: Oxford University Press), 1997.

### Text of 4QApocryphal Lamentations A-B (4Q179, 501)

- J.M. Allegro, 'Lamentations', *DJDJ*, 5 (1968e), pp. 75–77; XXVI.  
 M. Baillet, 'Lamentation', *DJD*, 7 (1982b), pp. 79–80; XXVIII.  
 J. Høgenhaven, 'Biblical Quotations and Allusions in 4QApocryphal Lamentations (4Q179)', *BAB* (2002), pp. 113–20.

### Tanhuma-Yelammedenu and scripture reading in Talmudic times

- G. Stemmerger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996), pp. 241–43; 302–6.  
 G. Vermes, 'School and Synagogue', *HJP*, 2 (1979b), pp. 415–54.

## 1. Introduction

4QTestimonia (4Q175) is the only surviving copy of this important and well-preserved scriptural anthology, the handwriting of which can be dated palaeographically to c. 100–75 BCE (Vermes 1986f: 446). It is also clear that the scribe responsible contributed to the production of several other Qumran manuscripts (1QS, 1QSa and 1QSB, 4QSamuel<sup>c</sup>, and elements in 1QIsaiah<sup>a</sup>) (Cross 2002: 308). Despite its lack of typical sectarian vocabulary, therefore, 4QTestimonia is normally deemed a writing penned by the Qumran Community (e.g. Knibb 1987: 263–64). We shall return to this question, however, for it is less clear-cut than is often allowed by scholars.

For now, we can say that 4QTestimonia contains four scriptural citations, with nothing by way of introductory formulae or overt interpretative comment. If it is sectarian, the document is necessarily at the minimalist extreme of the spectrum of scriptural exegesis being described in this book. Nevertheless, two of the texts quoted were especially important for the Qumran Community, for they are cited within other sectarian works, as we shall discover below. But even if 4QTestimonia is not sectarian, it seems to engage in what may be called implicit exegesis by the mere juxtaposition of several interrelated scriptural passages by the ancient compiler.

In any case, the scriptures quoted in 4QTestimonia come from Exodus 20.21b, Numbers 24.15–17, Deuteronomy 33.8–11, and from what is almost certainly a portion of 4QApocryphon of Joshua<sup>b</sup> (4Q379 fragment 22, 1.7–14). If the latter is correctly identified, it confirms what we argued in Chapter 2 about the broad nature of scripture in late Second Temple Judaism. Furthermore, the scriptural selections concerned provide indirect information about the eschatological expectations of the compiler and his

community, whatever the latter's precise identity. The quotation from 4QApocryphon of Joshua<sup>b</sup>, indeed, may hint at a rejection of misplaced hopes in contemporary rulers among unnamed outsiders during Hasmonean times. We shall return to this question at the end of the chapter.

## 2. The Text of 4QTestimonia

After preliminary publication (Allegro 1956), 4QTestimonia's *editio princeps* was prepared by Allegro (1968f). Strugnell, in offering important critical notes on that edition by way of review, effectively provided a new edition (1970: 225–29). Most recently, the text has been reworked by Cross (2002: 308–27), and it is his Hebrew–English edition which underlies the present study. A black-and-white photograph of 4QTestimonia can be located in Allegro's volume (1968f: XXI) and a colour image in Davies, Brooke, and Callaway (2002: 131).

As mentioned, the manuscript is well preserved and, unusually, it is found on a single sheet of leather which is almost like a modern piece of paper. As such, it belongs with only 4QList of False Prophets (4Q339) among the Qumran DSS as a manuscript which we know was never rolled up in scroll fashion. We can also see that 4QTestimonia is made up of thirty lines, with missing or damaged words confined to the lower right-hand side of the document (lines 25–30). These lines pertain only to the fourth citation in 4QTestimonia and, for the most part, they can be restored in light of their relationship to 4QApocryphon of Joshua<sup>b</sup>. The main exception is part of the first half of line 25 where the wording is damaged in both 4QTestimonia itself and in the equivalent within 4QApocryphon of Joshua<sup>b</sup>.

4QTestimonia is, as already noted, written in the same hand responsible for the Cave 1 copy of the Community Rule (1QS) and Rule of the Congregation (1QSa), 1QRule of Blessings (1QSb), 4QSamuel<sup>c</sup>, and some secondary scribal activity within 1QIsaiah<sup>a</sup>. Like these other manuscripts, it stems palaeographically from around 100 to 75 BCE, a date confirmed by the results of radiocarbon tests through Accelerated Mass Spectrometry on 1QIsaiah<sup>a</sup> and 4QSamuel<sup>c</sup> in 1991 (Cross 2002: 308). This particular scribe generally preferred to represent the divine name with four dots in a row (e.g. 4QTestimonia, lines 1 and 19), while he sometimes employed a symbol in the right-hand margin (including three times in 4QTestimonia) to which we shall return. However, like 1QS and 4QSamuel<sup>c</sup>, 4QTestimonia also contains numerous scribal errors and emendations demonstrating considerable

carelessness. For instance, supralinear corrections and additions are visible in 4QTestimonia lines 3, 6, 12, 15, 16, 17, 19, and 23. This noticeable feature of the manuscript might suggest it is the autograph, although we cannot be sure.

As for the textual basis of the scriptures cited by the author, as well as their relationship to versions of the scriptures known to have been circulating in late Second Temple times, this is a complicated question. We shall consider it more fully below when unpacking the contents of 4QTestimonia in more detail.

### 3. The Genre of 4QTestimonia

The title 4QTestimonia points to the fact that this Hebrew manuscript contains a scriptural anthology with no overt interpretation, as though the mere collection itself was sufficient testimony to its underlying theme or themes. However, given the absence of exegesis and lack of sectarian terminology, 4QTestimonia might in fact be viewed as a scriptural selection inherited and copied—but not composed—by the Qumran sect. That is certainly the best way to characterize 1QIsaiah<sup>a</sup> and 4QSamuel<sup>c</sup>, neither of which is a sectarian composition, though both were penned by the scribe responsible for 4QTestimonia. Whether this characterization is correct or not, it is tempting to accept Thompson's suggestion that 4QTestimonia comprises the sort of scriptural anthology on which 4QFlorilegium and other obviously sectarian works of interpretation commented (1998: 265–67); Dimant makes a similar observation about the scriptural passages underlying 4QCatena A (1990: 480). In any case, two scriptural passages in 4QTestimonia feature in other works which are undoubtedly sectarian in origin: parts of Numbers 24.17–20 are found in CD 7.19–20 and 1QM 11.6; Deuteronomy 33.8–11 appears in 4QFlorilegium 1.9–12. The first three excerpts cited in 4QTestimonia, furthermore, are concerned with matters eschatological (Allegro 1956: 187) and/or messianic (Vermes 1986f: 447), features predominating in much sectarian Qumran literature, including most Exegetical Texts. Cumulatively, therefore, the evidence points in the direction of 4QTestimonia being a compilation of scripture put together by the Qumran Community, although regrettably there is no way to be sure about this.

4QTestimonia has also been linked to the idea of the so-called 'testimonies' or scriptural proof-texts which many scholars believe underlie much of the New Testament. It has long been held that such *testimonia* (singular, *testimonium*) were used in early Christian circles, and, aiming to

demonstrate that Jesus was the promised messiah for the end-times, they certainly existed in book form from the second century CE onwards. Almost a century ago, Harris hypothesized that a testimony book also existed in the early church before the contents of the New Testament were written down (1916, 1920). More recent scholars prefer to envisage looser oral and written testimony collections, reflected in the scriptural references embedded within the likes of Mark 1.2–3 and Hebrews 1.1–14 (Lindars 1990; Moyise 2001: 22, 99–100, 109–10). When compared with what seems to lie behind these examples, *4QTestimonia* might be taken to justify the validity of some kind of testimony hypothesis by providing a parallel early Jewish collection of messianic proof-texts.

However, as noted earlier in relation to *4QCatena A* and *4QTanhumim*, Lim has doubted the helpfulness of the ‘testimony label’. Drawing on Hatch (1889), he speaks instead of a broader and more diverse class of ‘Biblical Excerpts’ that contain a wide variety of scriptural collections for diverse devotional and disputational purposes (2002a: 47). This suggestion makes sense and allows us to posit the existence of what we might prefer to call ‘Scriptural Excerpts’ or ‘Excerpted Texts’, a varied genre of scriptural anthologies used for liturgical, legal, and theological purposes. A likely Jewish example from outside Qumran is the so-called Nash Papyrus, a second-century BCE version of the Ten Commandments (probably a combination of Exodus 20.1–17 and Deuteronomy 5.1–21) and the Shema (Deuteronomy 6.4–5). At Qumran, several manuscripts probably fall into the same broad category, most obviously the tefillin (1Q13, 4Q128–148, 8Q3) and mezuzot (4Q149–155, 8Q4) (Schiffman 2000), but also a few damaged texts previously assumed to be scriptural manuscripts proper (e.g. 4QExodus<sup>b</sup>, 4QDeuteronomy<sup>j,m</sup>) (Tov 2002a: 149–50). Hence, Qumran scholars increasingly agree that Excerpted Texts and Abbreviated Texts constituted a class of literature that brought together scriptural passages, with little or no interpretation, for studying, teaching, or devotional use as circumstances required (Steudel 2000c: 938; Tov 1995). Tov describes *4QTestimonia* in this way (2002a: 149–50), although it might still be reasonable to reserve the title ‘testimonia’ for those Scriptural Excerpts focusing on matters messianic. Yet, when Lim proposes to extend the class of Excerpted Texts to cover *4QCatena A* and *4QTanhumim* (2002a: 46–47), caution is in order, as seen in our earlier discussions. It is true that these undoubtedly Qumran writings contain scriptural excerpts, but they are more than the mere sum of their scriptural parts. Unlike *4QTestimonia*, more particularly, they contain sufficient interpretative comment to render the designation Scriptural Excerpts inappropriate.

In sum, *4QTestimonia* probably belongs to a diverse class of Excerpted



Texts in late Second Temple times. Unlike the few other examples that survived in Caves 1–11, it comprises scriptural passages probably drawn together by the Qumran Sect on matters eschatological-messianic. As well as providing indirect evidence for the existence of early Jewish and Christian *testimonia* as a sub-category of Scriptural Excerpts, its contents render 4QTestimonia a title as apt as any other for the work.

#### 4. The Content of 4QTestimonia

We have seen that 4QTestimonia consists of four quotations following on directly from each other, with no introductory formulae or overt exegesis. However, as also observed in passing, there are three hooked markings (almost like Cs written backwards) indicating the ancient equivalent of new paragraphs at the beginning of each of the second, third, and fourth citations (Tov 2002b: 345). These evidence a deliberate arrangement of the contents by the compiler that, in turn, implies an underlying exegesis. Not sufficient in themselves to signal the sectarian origin of 4QTestimonia, they are part of a body of circumstantial evidence pointing nevertheless in this direction, as argued above. The same applies to the representation of the divine name with four dots found in 4QTestimonia lines 1 and 19 (and 1QS; 4QTanhumim; 1QIsaiah<sup>a</sup>; 4QSamuel<sup>c</sup> [4Q53]; 4QPseudo-Ezekiel<sup>e</sup> [4Q391]; 4QNarrative C [4Q462]).

4QTestimonia 1–8 comprises a citation of Exodus 20.21b from a text close to the later Samaritan Pentateuch, predicting the advent of a future prophet like Moses. This version of Exodus 20.21b is a modified form of what in the MT appears only as Deuteronomy 5.28b–29 (lines 1–4) and Deuteronomy 18.18–19 (lines 5–8). The identification as Exodus 20.21b here is almost certain, however, not least because the first hooked symbol in 4QTestimonia to the right of line 9 implies that all that precedes in lines 1–8 constitutes a single scriptural entity (Tov 2002a: 155). If so, the ‘correct’ narrative order of the passages quoted in 4QTestimonia as a whole is maintained, from Exodus (lines 1–8) through Numbers (lines 9–13) and Deuteronomy (lines 14–20) to 4QApocryphon of Joshua<sup>b</sup> (21–30). None of the surviving scriptural manuscripts from the Judean desert has independently preserved Exodus 20.21b in a proto-Samaritan version intact. But some of the material, as well as part of the immediately preceding verses, has survived in 1QExodus (1Q2), 4QpalaeoGenesis-Exodus<sup>1</sup> (4Q11) and 4QpalaeoExodus<sup>m</sup> (4Q22), three manuscripts which represent expanded forms of Exodus close to the later Samaritan Pentateuch (Sanderson 1986). Such readings are not uncommon at

Qumran, whether in scriptural manuscripts proper or in citations within interpretative works (Tov 2002a: 150, 155).

Turning to lines 9–13, they quote Numbers 24.15–17 with small differences from the MT and Samaritan Pentateuch. But because the last phrase reads ‘and destroys’ (not ‘and the skull of’), it is nearer the MT on balance (Steudel 2000c: 936; cf. Cross 2002: 314). Interestingly, Numbers 24.17 is found in CD 7.19–20 (mirroring the MT exactly), Numbers 24.17–19 appears in 1QM 11.6 (departing from the MT in some details), and Numbers 24.17 is alluded to in 1QSb 5.27. Whatever its original import within the scriptural book, these varied sectarian contexts show that Numbers 24.15–17 was understood in a messianic sense by the Qumran Community. Though not made explicit in 4QTestimonia 9–13, therefore, it makes sense to assume that Qumran readers of 4QTestimonia 9–13 saw ‘a star comes forth from Jacob’ as denoting a Davidic messiah who can also be named the ‘messiah of Israel’. Similarly, ‘a sceptre arises from Israel’ pictures his superior priestly counterpart, often dubbed the ‘messiah of Aaron’. Elsewhere, these figures can either appear together (e.g. 1QS 9.11; CD 12.23) or apart (4QpPsalms<sup>a</sup> 3.15) (Collins 2000d: 208–17; Evans 2000).

4QTestimonia 14–20 cite Deuteronomy 33.8–11, containing Moses’ blessing of the tribe of Levi. Once more, the citation easily elicits a messianic understanding of the scriptural passage concerned. From the tribe of Levi, of course, all the priests and levites of the Second Temple period were thought to originate. But one particular messianic descendent was expected in the future, a ‘messiah of Aaron’ to accompany the ‘messiah of Israel’. Such could be the meaning here. However, since this figure was probably alluded to in the preceding paragraph, Cross may be right to envisage the Teacher of Righteousness here (2002: 309), especially given the language of lines 17–18 (‘... and they will teach ...’). More practically, the text cited from Deuteronomy 33.8–11, partially preserved in 4QDeuteronomy<sup>h</sup> (4Q35) and 4QpalaeoDeuteronomy<sup>f</sup> (4Q45), is not the same as the MT, with several affinities with the LXX (Cross 2002: 316; Steudel 2000c: 936) and the independent 4QDeuteronomy<sup>h</sup> (4Q35) (Tov 2002a: 150). Indeed, one dramatic variant reflects the LXX of Deuteronomy 33.8, containing the additional ‘Give to Levi’. This phrase probably dropped out of the MT through what scholars call homoioteleuton. A scribe’s eye accidentally slipped from the first to the second occurrence of ‘Levi’, in other words, as the following illustrates:

<i>LXX</i>	<i>4QTestimonia</i>	<i>Masoretic/Samaritan</i>
And of Levi he said:	And of Levi he said:	And of Levi he said:
‘Give to Levi	‘Give to Levi	
his lots and his	your Thummin and your	‘Your Thummim and your
emblem to the faithful	Urim to your faithful	Urim (belong) to your
man, whom they tested	man, whom you tested at	faithful man, whom you
with a test ...’	Massah ...’	tested at Massah ...’

This scriptural passage is cited in 4QFlorilegium 1.9–12, as noted in Chapter 3. Unfortunately, that manuscript is too damaged to know whether the phrase ‘Give to Levi’ was present or not.

Finally, 4QTestimonia 21–30 quote the text known as 4QApocryphon of Joshua<sup>b</sup> (*olim* 4QPsalms of Joshua<sup>b</sup>) fragment 22 (column 2.7–14). Less attractive is the proposal that we have a LXX-like citation of Joshua 6.26a in 4QTestimonia 22–23a, sandwiched between a smaller amount of 4QApocryphon of Joshua<sup>b</sup> in lines 22 and 23b–30 (cf. Brooke 1985: 313; Lübke 1986: 192; Vermes 1997: 495–96). Even less likely is the suggestion that 4QApocryphon of Joshua<sup>b</sup> cites 4QTestimonia (Newsom 1996b: 35–36, 74–78; cf. Eshel 1990: 412). In any case, like Joshua 6.26 in the LXX but unlike the MT of Joshua 6.26, Jericho is not mentioned by name in the text cited in 4QTestimonia but merely implied indirectly by the context. That vagueness has allowed the author of 4QTestimonia to re-apply ‘the city’ (line 22) to Jerusalem, which is explicitly mentioned in line 30. More particularly, depending on how line 25 is restored and related to what precedes, the city in question is linked to a wicked individual and either one or two other evil persons who have rebuilt it. Because the designation ‘instruments of violence’ in line 23 echos Genesis 49.5’s description of Levi and Simeon (regarding their attack on the Shechemites recorded earlier in the narrative in Genesis 34), the characters mentioned were probably either two brothers or a father and two sons. Given that the latter scenario seems to be envisaged in lines 22–23, it is to be preferred (Brooke 1985: 310). In any case, 4QTestimonia 21–30 has inspired numerous attempts to identify the individuals concerned, as we shall see later.

### 5. Exegesis in 4QTestimonia

We noted earlier that 4QTestimonia does not contain the introductory formulae or interpretative comments expected of an overtly exegetical composition and found in abundance in the other Exegetical Texts. Nevertheless, the overall arrangement of 4QTestimonia seems to reflect the order of the scriptural story, from Exodus 20 through Numbers 24

and Deuteronomy 33 to materials linked to Joshua in the form of 4QApocryphon of Joshua<sup>b</sup>. The way these citations relate in an apparently random manner to the MT, LXX, Samaritan Pentateuch, and independent readings suggests that they were drawn from memory, although certainty is impossible in this regard. In any case, the diverse nature of the scriptures reflected should come as no surprise in view of the fluid nature of the scriptural text we described in Chapter 2. Even in 4QTestimonia, therefore, there is no evidence of deliberate alteration of scripture for sectarian advantage (Ulrich 2002: 189).

Although the first three citations contain no explicit commentary, they appear to be messianic in the way they have been appropriated by the author. Thus, Exodus 20.21b refers to the prophet like Moses who is to come; Numbers 24.15–17 evokes a future Davidic messiah and his superior priestly equivalent; and Deuteronomy 33.8–11 focuses either on the latter or on the Teacher of Righteousness. Some such reading of the material in 4QTestimonia is confirmed by the appearance of two of the passages cited in other sectarian compositions that have their own eschatological-messianic emphases (Numbers 24.17 in CD 7.19–20; Deuteronomy 33.8–11 in 4QFlorilegium 1.1–5). It is also indirectly corroborated by the appearance of three parallel figures—the prophet and the messiahs of Aaron and Israel—in 1QS 9.11.

However, Lübbe (1986) has questioned the tendency to highlight the eschatological-messianic aspect of 4QTestimonia to the detriment of other features, although he does not deny altogether its presence in the manuscript; Hempel has argued something similar in relation to the Cave 1 copy of the Rule of the Congregation (1QSb) (1996). Lübbe, noting that each of the first three scriptural citations in 4QTestimonia concludes with a threat, believes that their primary significance was contemporary rather than future (1986: 192–93). Thus, Exodus 20.21b in 4QTestimonia 1–8 envisages the sect as the true home of Mosaic traditions and is only indirectly concerned with the advent of a messianic prophet. The use of Numbers 24.15–17 in lines 9–13 serves as a warning against apostasy in the present as much as a pointer towards future messianic figures, while Deuteronomy 33.8–11 in lines 14–20 evokes the image of the sect's own priestly identity. 4QTestimonia's excessive hostility expressed in this way to opponents suggests to Lübbe that these unnamed enemies are apostate former members of the Qumran Community who have become anti-sectarian. This is rather speculative. But given that most scholars accept that a real historical scenario underlies the use of 4QApocryphon of Joshua<sup>b</sup> in lines 21–30, there is doubtless some truth in the generality of what Lübbe says. On the other hand, if 4QTestimonia is a sectarian compilation of scriptural passages employed

in other Qumran writings to eschatological-messianic effect, it is difficult not to see the work as primarily focused on 'the cast of the eschatological struggle' (Brooke 1985: 313).

4QTestimonia also evidences an awareness of catchphrases connecting the portions of scriptural material cited, as Brooke has argued (1985: 317):

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 those texts.

Brooke is referring here to use of the verb 'to smite' (Hebrew, *mahas*) in both Numbers 24.17 and Deuteronomy 33.11, as well as the likely occurrence of either 'sons' or 'brothers' in line 25 of 4QTestimonia to match one or other of these words that are both found in Deuteronomy 33.8–11. In the eyes of the sectarian readers of 4QTestimonia, these interconnections were of significance and presumably account, at least in part, for the isolation and citation of these particular passages in this particular order within one document. In that case, it becomes clear that 4QTestimonia does in fact engage, albeit covertly, in scriptural interpretation in relation to matters eschatological-cum-messianic from a sectarian viewpoint.

## 6. The Historical Background of 4QTestimonia

To return to the appropriation of 4QApocryphon of Joshua<sup>b</sup> in 4QTestimonia 21–30: these lines have led to much discussion among scholars. The persons mentioned who reconstruct 'the city' and suffer the consequences have been identified with various players in late Second Temple history in Palestine. As summarized by Eshel (1991–2: 413–14), there have been four main proposals.

First, it has been suggested that 4QTestimonia 21–30 have Mattathias and his two sons Jonathan and Simon Maccabee (Milik 1959: 61–63) as their historical background. Second, Simon Maccabee and two of his sons, Judah and Mattathias, all murdered together at Doq near Jericho in 135 BCE, have been put forward (Cross 1995: 114–55; 2002: 309–10). Third, others have favoured a reference to John Hyrcanus I (134–104 BCE), who built a lavish residence at Jericho (Eshel 1991–2: 415), and to either his sons Aristobulus I and Alexander Jannaeus (Betz 1961: 42) or his sons Aristobulus I and Antigonus (Starcky 1978: 253). Fourth, Alexander Jannaeus and two of his sons, Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II, have also been suggested as contenders (Allegro 1956: 187). The palaeographical

dating of 4QTestimonia to c. 100–75 BCE would easily allow the first three possibilities but effectively rules out the fourth. The first proposal can also be dismissed because of the general historical mismatch between what is envisaged in 4QTestimonia 21–30 and the real fate of Mattathias and his sons (Cross 1995: 115). That leaves either Simon and his offspring (Judas and Mattathias) or Hyrcanus I and two of his sons (whether Aristobulus I and Alexander Jannaeus or Aristobulus I and Antigonus) as the most likely candidates for the personages described in 4QTestimonia 21–30. Both sets of characters can obviously be linked to Jerusalem as the seat of political and religious power during the relevant decades, whereas they have rather contrasting connections with Jericho.

Deciding between these two options is difficult, for both have their attractions. And just as García Martínez and others have proposed that the ‘Wicked Priest’ who features in 1QpHabakkuk and 4QpPsalms<sup>a</sup> is an epithet intended to evoke several wicked rulers during the Hasmonean period (García Martínez and van der Woude 1990), so the referents in 4QTestimonia 21–30 may be deliberately ambiguous. In that case, this scriptural passage may have been chosen as a general condemnation of the Hasmonean dynasty. Going even further, if 4QTestimonia 21–30 are intended as a negative literary or theological foil to the preceding positive citations, scholars may be wrong to look for real people behind the employment of 4QApocryphon of Joshua<sup>b</sup> at all.

But because Josephus speaks of Hyrcanus I in a threefold manner as prophet, secular ruler, and priest (*Jewish War* 1.69; *Antiquities* 13.299–300), it is tempting to view 4QTestimonia, especially in lines 21–30, as a polemic against him (Steudel 2000c: 937). In that case, whether the composition originated within the Qumran sect or not, it encourages its readers to look for the fulfilment of their eschatological hopes to a more scriptural prophet, king, and priest who are still to come (Steudel 2000c: 937). Such a scenario would require that 4QTestimonia was composed some time after the death in 103 BCE of Aristobulus I, son of Hyrcanus I. This date would allow our manuscript to be the original autograph. Yet, against this proposal is the fact that John Hyrcanus I and his son Alexander Jannaeus both died natural deaths, leaving only the former’s other son, Aristobulus I, as a victim of murder.

In contrast, the details surrounding the fate of the ‘cursed man’ (line 23) and the two ‘weapons of violence’ (line 25) probably sit most comfortably with Simon and his two sons, Judah and Mattathias (Brooke 1992c: 392; Cross 2002: 309–10). This is because all three were brutally murdered near Jericho in 135 BCE, as mentioned above. If this proposal is correct, our copy of 4QTestimonia is perhaps unlikely to have been the first exemplar of the work.

**Further Reading****Summary overviews of 4QTestimonia**

- G.J. Brooke, 'Testimonia (4QTestim)', *ABD*, 6 (1992c), pp. 391–92.  
 A. Steudel, 'Testimonia', *EDSS* (2000c), pp. 936–38.  
 G. Vermes, 'Testimonia or Messianic Anthology (4QTest=4Q175)', *HJP*, 3.1 (1986f), pp. 446–47.

**Text of 4QTestimonia in Hebrew and English**

- F.M. Cross, 'Testimonia (4Q175=4QTestimonia=4QTestim)', *PTSDSSP*, 6B (2002), pp. 308–27.  
 F. García Martínez, and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Vol. 1; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997), pp. 354–57.

**Earlier presentations of 4QTestimonia**

- J.M. Allegro, 'Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature', *JBL*, 75 (1956), pp. 182–87.  
 —'Testimonia', *DJDJ*, 5 (1968f), pp. 57–60; XXI.  
 J. Strugnell, 'Notes en marge du volume 5 des "Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan"', *RQ*, 7 (1970), pp. 225–29.

**'Testimonia' and Excerpted Texts**

- R.J. Harris, *Testimonies* (2 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916, 1920).  
 E. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1889).  
 B. Lindars, 'Testimonia', *DBI* (1990), pp. 675–77.  
 T.H. Lim, *Pesharim* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls, 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002a), pp. 46–48.  
 S. Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New: an Introduction* (The Continuum Biblical Studies Series; London/New York: Continuum, 2001).  
 E. Tov, 'Abbreviated and Excerpted Biblical Texts from Qumran', *RQ*, 16 (1995), pp. 581–600.  
 —'The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert – an Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts', *BAB* (2002a), pp.139–66.  
 —'Scribal Notations in the Texts from the Judaean Desert', *DJD*, 39 (2002b), pp. 323–49.

**The proto-Samaritan text of Exodus from Qumran**

- J.E. Sanderson, *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran* (Harvard Semitic Series, 30; Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1986).

**Discussion of 4QApocryphon of Joshua<sup>a-b</sup>**

- C. Newsom, '4Q378–379: 4QApocryphon of Joshua<sup>a-b</sup>', *DJD*, 22 (1996a), pp. 237–88.  
 —'4Q378 and 4Q379: An Apocryphon of Joshua', in H.-J. Fabry *et al.* (eds.), *Qumranstudien. Vorträge und Beiträge der Teilnehmer des Qumranseminars auf dem internationalen Treffen der Society of Biblical Literature, Münster, 25–26 Juli 1993* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1996b), pp. 35–85.

**The Nash Papyrus and Qumran Tefillin and Mezuzot**

J.A. Duncan, 'Deuteronomy, Book of', *EDSS* (2000), pp. 198–202.

L.H. Schiffman, 'Phylacteries and Mezuzot', *EDSS* (2000), pp. 675–77.

**Detailed studies, including the historical background of 4QTestimonia**

O. Betz, 'Donnersöhne, Menschenfischer unter der Davidische Messias', *RQ*, 3 (1961), pp. 41–70.

G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 29; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985), pp. 309–19.

F.M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 3rd edn, 1995), pp. 111–15.

E. Eshel, 'The Historical Background of the Peshet Interpreting Joshua's Curse on the Rebuilder of Jericho', *RQ*, 15 (1991–92), pp. 409–29.

C. Hempel, 'The Earthly Essene Nucleus of 1QSa', *DSD*, 3 (1996), pp. 253–69.

J. Lübke, 'A Reinterpretation of 4QTestimonia', *RQ*, 12 (1986), pp. 187–97.

J.T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (Studies in Biblical Theology, 25; London: SCM Press, 1959).

J. Starcky, 'Les Maîtres de Justice et la chronologie de Qumrân', in M. Delcor (ed.), *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 46; Leuven: Duculot, 1978), pp. 249–56.

T.L. Thompson, '4QTestimonia and Bible Composition: A Copenhagen Lego Hypothesis', *QONT* (1998), pp. 261–76.



### 1. The Evidence of the Exegetical Texts

In this book, we have examined eight Qumran documents under the convenient label of the 'Exegetical Texts'. This broad term, as explained at the outset, was intended to include several works normally classed as Thematic Pesharim: 4QFlorilegium (4Q174), 4QCatena A (4Q177), and 11QMelchizedek (11Q13). It was also intended to cover a number of related compositions: 4QCatena B (4Q182), 4QAges of Creation A-B (4Q180–181), 4QTanhumim (4Q176), and 4QTestimonia (4Q175). The former, when compared to Continuous Pesharim like 1QpHabakkuk, are less programmatic in their internal arrangement and relationship to the scriptures. The latter are even more loosely organized, although scholars sometimes designate any or all of them Thematic Pesharim too (Aschim 1998: 22–24; Collins 1992a: 90; Eshel 1991–2: 4; Lim 2002b: 72; Vermes in *HJP*, 3.1: 420).

'The Exegetical Texts' is indeed a useful designation for these eight documents, for we have seen in previous chapters that enough similarities exist to justify including them together in one study. Not least, like other Qumran sectarian writings, all are in Hebrew. This is unsurprising regarding 4QTestimonia's scriptural selections. But it is significant in the other cases, inasmuch as the Qumran Sect probably had an ideological attachment to Hebrew as an expression of its link, exclusive in its own eyes, to the scriptural past of ancient Israel and Judah. Hence, Hebrew was the natural choice for its own exegesis of scripture, even if in practice it could not avoid appropriating Danielic and Enochic materials in Aramaic (Campbell 1999b).

More significantly, all the Exegetical Texts engage in the eschatological interpretation of scripture from a sectarian viewpoint—with the possible

exception of 4QTestimonia. That interpretation is overt in seven cases, but in 4QTestimonia it remains covert. As though confirming such kinship between the documents, Steudel has argued that 4QFlorilegium and 4QCatenae A-B are copies of the same piece (1992 and 1994), while Milik proposed that 4QAgnes of Creation A-B represent the same document as 11QMelchizedek (1972). While we were not persuaded by these theories, the fact that they have been put forward bears testimony to the closeness of the materials.

At the same time, the Exegetical Texts evince considerable variety compared to the relatively homogeneous Continuous Pesharim. This has little to do with the diverse scriptural books employed, with 4QFlorilegium and 4QCatenae A concentrating on Psalms, 11QMelchizedek focusing on Leviticus 25 and Isaiah 61, 4QAgnes of Creation A-B concentrating on Genesis 6–22, 4QTanhumim focusing on Isaiah 40–55, and 4QTestimonia combining four disparate scriptural passages. Individual Continuous Pesharim, after all, are located in a range of scriptural books. Rather, whereas scripture determines the shape of the Continuous Pesharim and sectarian notation remains secondary, it is scripture that is subordinate to comment in the Exegetical Texts (Alexander 2000: 43). This only operates at the formal level, of course, for both the Continuous Pesharim and the Exegetical Texts emanate from the same community. But for the authors of the Exegetical Texts, the resultant freedom gave them leeway to shape their compositions according to overarching themes of their choosing.

That freedom is seen most clearly in 4QTanhumim and 4QTestimonia which, for different reasons, might be deemed the odd ones out among the Exegetical Texts. Thus, 4QTanhumim interprets scripture more or less overtly and has an eschatological emphasis like other Exegetical Texts, yet it is without *peshet* or pronominal formulae in its surviving fragments. But since it contains 'It is written in' (fragment 8–11, line 13) and 'And from the book of Isaiah consolations' (fragment 1, line 4), the document might have contained such formulae when complete. In contrast, 4QTestimonia stands alone among the Exegetical Texts in engaging in covert interpretation. It could be non-sectarian in origin, although most think that unlikely in view of the cumulative force of characteristics detailed in the last chapter.

Notwithstanding the differences between them, the Exegetical Texts can be characterized as a collection of related sectarian interpretative writings sandwiched, as it were, between the Continuous Pesharim and a number of other exegetical documents not easily defined because of their damaged state or mixed content. Among the latter are 4QCommentary on Genesis A (4Q252) and 4QExposition on the Patriarchs (4Q464), both of

which appeared briefly in Chapter 6's examination of 4QAgnes of Creation A-B in light of a common interest in Genesis. As such interconnections demonstrate, the Exegetical Texts are part and parcel of the broad phenomenon of the Qumran appropriation of scripture which space has prevented us from examining more fully (see Maier 1996).

## 2. Scripture in the Exegetical Texts

Back in Chapter 2, we noted two features of the scriptures in late Second Temple Judaism. First, we accepted the argument of Barton (1986: 13–95) that scripture constituted the books of Moses and an open-ended collection of Prophets. Second, we learned from scholars like Tov (2002a) about the textual fluidity of scriptural writings. Neither issue is directly addressed in sectarian compositions from Caves 1–11, including the Exegetical Texts, but both conclusions are indirectly confirmed by the Qumran scriptural manuscripts and the way they are used in the community's interpretative writings (VanderKam 2002: 52–53).

Thus, we have seen a broad range of scriptural books employed in the Exegetical Texts through citation and allusion: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, 1–2 Samuel, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Nahum, Zephaniah, Zechariah, Malachi, Psalms, *Jubilees*, and 4QApocryphon of Joshua. If we incorporate scriptural works appropriated in other sectarian compositions, the list would grow to include *inter alia* the Apocalypse of Weeks (interpreted in 4QpApocalypse of Weeks [4Q247]) and material related to the Testament of Levi (in CD 4.15). However, that the scriptures comprised not just these writings but others likewise believed to stem from ancient Israel and Judah is more satisfactory than restricting scripture to what happens to be quoted in surviving exegetical literature, as proposed by Lange (2002: 21–24). The latter scholar grants scriptural status to 4QApocryphon of Joshua, since it is quoted in 4QTestimonia, but denies it to Ecclesiastes and other books found in Cave 4 but not appearing in sectarian documents. This fails to take sufficient account of late Second Temple assumptions about the origins of such writings, whether they are actually cited or not in a given group's own literature.

As for textual fluidity, the scriptures quoted in the Exegetical Texts sometimes match the later MT, elsewhere are close to the LXX's presumed Hebrew *Vorlage*, in other places relate to the Samaritan Pentateuch, or contain previously unknown readings. These textual variables are usually of little consequence either within the scriptural books themselves or in terms of their sectarian appropriation. It is interesting to note, however,

that when the same passage is cited in more than one Qumran composition, alternative versions can be used. For example, the precise textual form of Numbers 24.17 varies across several sectarian documents, including 4QTestimonia (Brooke 2000e: 113–14).

A last point concerns the phenomenon of scripture interpreting scripture. We noted in Chapter 2 that some scriptural books interpret others, either overtly as with Jeremiah in Daniel or covertly as with Genesis 1–Exodus 25 in *Jubilees*. In our analysis, we saw that these four scriptural works are appropriated in various Exegetical Texts, with references to Daniel certainly occurring in 4QFlorilegium 4.3–4 (Daniel 12.10), 11QMelchizedek 2.18 (Daniel 9.25), and 4QAgnes of Creation B fragment 2, line 3 (Daniel 9.24) and *Jubilees* probably appearing in 11QMelchizedek 3.18 (with the passage cited now unclear) and 4QTanhumim fragment 14 (*Jubilees* 23.13). There is no sign, however, that these latter two books were taken at anything other than face value by the Qumran Community, for they are utilized in the same way as other scriptures. Although they may strike modern scholars as much younger than Genesis–Exodus and Jeremiah for obvious reasons (Alexander 2000: 41), we cannot doubt that the sectarian authors assumed that both Genesis–Exodus and *Jubilees* derived from the Mosaic era, while Jeremiah and Daniel came from exilic times. This is largely an argument from silence, based on the fact that nothing suggests the Qumran sect itself composed these works. Hence, its members were presumably unaware that *Jubilees* and Daniel were what we would call second-century BCE pseudepigraphs, just as they did not know that Genesis–Exodus and Jeremiah were themselves late exilic or early post-exilic in origin.

### 3. Interpretation in the Exegetical Texts

We proposed in Chapter 2 that, alongside the Temple and priesthood, Jews increasingly treated the scriptures as a source of authoritative information during the last centuries BCE. Sometimes, the identity derived thereby challenged the established authority of the Jerusalem hierarchy. At Qumran, indeed, it was believed that a true understanding of scripture came from the Teacher of Righteousness and his successors, whereas the Jerusalem priesthood was in error over matters of Temple purity and, presumably, in rejecting the community's privileged knowledge. That is the background to what is distinctive about the Qumran Sect's origin and identity in general and its exegesis in particular, as seen in works like 4QMMT<sup>a-f</sup>, the Damascus Document, and the Community Rule. In the much-quoted 1QS 8.12–16, for instance, we read:

And when these become a community in Israel according to these rules, they shall be separate from the dwelling of the men of injustice to go into the desert to prepare there the way of him, as it is written, *Prepare in the wilderness the way of \*\*\*\*; make straight in the desert a highway for our God* (Isaiah 40.3). This is the study of the Torah which he commanded by the hand of Moses to do according to everything revealed from time to time, just as the prophets revealed through his holy Spirit.

The same background is evident in 1QpHabakkuk 7.1–8:

And God told Habakkuk to write down the things to come upon the last generation, but he did not let him know about the completion of the age. And when it says, *So that he who reads it may run* (Habakkuk 2.2c), its interpretation is about the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God made known all the secrets of the words of his servants the prophets. *For there is still a vision for the appointed time; it speaks of the end and does not lie* (Habakkuk 2.3a). Its interpretation is that the final age will be prolonged and exceed all that the prophets have spoken, for God's secrets are astounding.

Such passages underscore the Qumran Community's heightened eschatological awareness, its belief that it operated under special divine inspiration, and its devotion to the correct interpretation of the Torah (Maier 1996: 121–22). The Exegetical Texts, as regularly observed, reflect the same intertwined convictions, often—though not exclusively—expressed through use of *peshet* and pronominal interpretation units.

In other respects, however, Qumran exegesis reflects the types and methods of interpretation found in other contemporary literature. Thus, in studying the detail of the Exegetical Texts, we have noted examples of 'simple sense' exegesis, as well as more ideologically based interpretation and what, to modern eyes at least, appears to be eisegesis. These merge into one another in practice, of course, and do not exist as separate categories. Nevertheless, as far as the Exegetical Texts are concerned, we can detect a fondness for poetic scriptural passages that, on the assumption that they contained veiled information for the latter days rather like the dreams in Daniel (Brooke 2000e: 117), encouraged creative interpretations (Berrin 2000: 646).

We have also seen many instances of overt scriptural interpretation and some more covert examples. Once more, it is often difficult to separate these in a given context, especially if a manuscript is damaged. Although in 11QMelchizedek 2.20, for instance, we now have only an allusion to Isaiah 61.2, that passage may have been overtly cited in the complete manuscript in view of the remnants of a citation formula in the previous line. Our detailed study has also highlighted the outworking of the various interpretative methods mentioned in Chapter 2, whether 'thematic association', 'specification', or 'atomization' (Bernstein 2000a: 380–82).

In 4QFlorilegium 3.1–7a, for instance, the ‘place’ and ‘house’ of 2 Samuel 7.10–11 are specified not just as Solomon’s Temple but also in terms of the sectarian community as an interim sanctuary and in relation to a future eschatological Temple. Atomization can be found in 11QMelchizedek 2.17–25, where the elements of Isaiah 52.7 are split up and specified as four entities. As this example’s combination of atomization and specification shows, two or more techniques can be applied together.

These types and methods of interpretation can be paralleled in general terms within the writings of Philo (Borgen 1992; Williamson 1989), Josephus (Bartlett 1985; Feldman 2003), and the New Testament (Hübner 1996; Moyise 2001). What binds the Exegetical Texts together and with other Qumran literature, therefore, is the partisan content of their interpretation. Indeed, Brooke has argued that, despite the wide range of textually fluid scriptures at its disposal, the Qumran Sect produced a relatively homogeneous message through its exegesis (2000e: 115–19). This is interesting and requires further investigation in light of equally valid but contrasting recent insights from Davies (2000) and Sanders (2000), for these scholars emphasize the diversity of the Qumran Sect’s practices and beliefs over the course of its existence. Indeed, when it comes to exegesis, Brooke has shown that a given scriptural passage does not necessarily receive the same interpretation across different sectarian contexts. The appropriation of Isaiah 8.11 in 4QFlorilegium 3.15–16, for example, is distinct from that in 11QMelchizedek 2.24; 1QSa 1.2–3; and CD 8.16 (Brooke 1985: 319–20).

#### 4. The Exegetical Texts and ‘the *Pesher* Phenomenon’

We confirmed above that the ‘Exegetical Texts’ is a suitable description of the similar-yet-diverse interpretative documents examined in our study. But this judgement requires us to revisit the complex question of the ‘*pesher* phenomenon’ discussed in Chapter 1. There, we saw that much interpretative material from Qumran contains *pesher* units that, in certain combinations or in isolation, can be variously described as Continuous Pesharim, Thematic Pesharim, or Isolated Pesharim. We also saw that exegetical units with pronominal formulae are identical, apart from the absence of the technical term. We followed Brooke (1979: 500–1) and Dimant (1992: 248), therefore, in concluding that explicit Qumran exegesis was not simply coterminous with the *pesher* phenomenon. Indeed, there is also much covert interpretation—either on its own or alongside overt exegesis—in sectarian Qumran literature, underlying which the same or similar interpretative processes must have operated.

Our own survey of the Exegetical Texts has again confirmed these observations. Most contain *peshet* and pronominal interpretation units. But they are not consistent or uniform in this respect, while some Exegetical Texts or parts thereof avoid these forms altogether. The latter applies most clearly to 4QTestimonia. However, it also applies to 4QTanhumim, although this manuscript's fragmentary nature means we cannot be sure that such units were not once present. In any case, 4QTanhumim and even 4QTestimonia evince alternative interpretative and thematic connections with the other Exegetical Texts. We saw that Deuteronomy 33.8–11 is cited in both 4QFlorilegium 1.9–12 and 4QTestimonia 14–20, for example, while 4QTanhumim's motif of divine comfort in troubled times closely resembles themes in 4QFlorilegium and 4QCatena A.

Therefore, it seems clear that, as hinted by Dimant (1979: 96; 1992: 248), the processes underlying the '*peshet* phenomenon' also gave rise to related exegetical realia that, though less distinctive in appearance, are just as important for grasping the Qumran appropriation of scripture. After all, the employment of the term *peshet* in 4QAges of Creation A in association with a topic ('the periods') is somewhat unusual, while we have seen that Qumran sectarian interpretation hinges upon more than the presence of *peshet* units. Upon analysis, in other words, such *peshet* units constitute what seems to be an essentially formal category (Grabbe 2000: 167). Consequently, both *peshet* units and the *peshet* term are of less direct significance for understanding the heart of Qumran exegesis than might otherwise be thought (Campbell 1995b: 21).

In light of these points, it is not unreasonable to apply the label 'Thematic Pesharim' to six manuscripts analysed in this book: 4QFlorilegium, 4QCatena A-B, 11QMelchizedek, and 4QAges of Creation A-B. Assuming 4QCatena A-B and 4QAges of Creation A-B are related pairs of manuscripts, then all six employ—or at least once employed—*peshet* and pronominal formulae in their interpretation. But because of clear thematic and exegetical overlaps with 4QTanhumim and 4QTestimonia, all eight documents seem to be organically connected, again affirming the suitability of the 'Exegetical Texts' designation. But we must also here add that our Exegetical Texts are similarly connected to other interpretative works, including the Continuous Pesharim and those less easy to categorize like 4QCommentary on Genesis A. We are returned, therefore, to the notion of a continuum of Qumran exegesis in which the boundaries between Continuous, Thematic, and Isolated Pesharim merge into one another and into other sectarian interpretative writings not normally deemed Pesharim at all.

At one end of this spectrum comes the overt interpretation of the

'Continuous Pesharim' like 1QpHabakkuk, with their concentration on a single scriptural book and programmatic use of the *peshet* term. Towards the centre, we find the somewhat looser 'Thematic Pesharim' such as 4QFlorilegium, 4QCatenae A-B, 11QMelchizedek, and, as just suggested, 4QAges of Creation A-B. These works employ *peshet* and pronominal interpretation formulae but also engage in less distinctive overt exegesis at points. Towards the other side of the spectrum are assorted Qumran writings containing Isolated Pesharim (e.g. 1QS 8.14–16) and independent pronominal units (e.g. CD 6.2b–11a) which are surrounded by material of a different or mixed nature. Next to them, we might place less overt sectarian interpretation such as that in 4QTanhumim. If it is deemed sectarian, the covert exegesis in 4QTestimonia comes at the far end of the spectrum.

### 5. The Exegetical Texts and the Qumran Community

The Exegetical Texts, with the possible exception of 4QTestimonia, are sectarian compositions penned by the Qumran Community. That much is evident from three interrelated factors. First, seven of the documents use vocabulary common to sectarian works such as the Continuous Pesharim, Damascus Document, and Community Rule. For example, we have regularly met words and phrases such as 'Belial', 'the Community', 'the end of days', 'interpretation', and 'the Sons of Light'. Second, we have encountered distinctive *peshet* and pronominal units in 4QFlorilegium, 4QCatenae A, 11QMelchizedek, and 4QAges of Creation A. Third, several themes occur in the Exegetical Texts linking the documents to the Qumran Community as a whole, for they appear in a range of other sectarian compositions. The most prominent themes are the belief that the community lived in the end of days, that it was experiencing various trials as expected, that the forces of Belial were destined for destruction, and that community members would soon receive divine vindication. The advent of messianic figures is obviously an important theme in the latter connection, although its prominence should not be exaggerated (Grabbe 2000: 273–76). Alongside it, indeed, occurs the related idea that the Qumran Sect itself embodies a messianic community of the Sons of Light already partially enjoying the latter-day fulfilment of the ancient scriptural promises.

For the Qumran exegetes, these themes were linked by a common grounding in the scriptures and, although all are not present in each Exegetical Text, they bind 4QTanhumim and even 4QTestimonia to the



other six documents that contain or once contained *peshet* and pronominal units.

The question remains, however, whether the Exegetical Texts can be more precisely related to the origins and history of the Qumran Sect. This is not easy, for Qumran Studies is in a state of flux on these interrelated issues. That is not to deny that some kind of Essene identity is almost certainly correct or that genuine historical reminiscences are to be found in sectarian documents. But only the broadest of parameters are widely agreed by scholars at present, as seen in Chapter 1 (Campbell 1999a; 2002: 82–83, 102–9). Two further points are worth making.

First, in our examination of 4QFlorilegium, 4QCatenae A, and 11QMelchizedek, we were not persuaded by Steudel's reconstruction of Qumran eschatological expectations and the likely composition date of what she calls 4QMidrash on Eschatology<sup>a-b</sup>. That being the case, there are no clear-cut historical referents in the Exegetical Texts. Even 4QTestimonia 21–30 have been understood to reflect various historical scenarios in the late second and early first centuries BCE. Only in the Continuous Pesharim and Damascus Document, therefore, does the Qumran Sect seem to have left behind concrete historical allusions, albeit normally in coded terms (Charlesworth 2002a: 80–118).

Secondly, the Exegetical Texts have nevertheless, been given palaeographical dates providing us with fairly accurate pointers to when they were copied (Strugnell 1970: 229; Webster 2002: 371–75), though not necessarily when they were originally composed:

4QFlorilegium	early Herodian (c. 30–1 BCE)
4QCatenae A-B	early Herodian (c. 30–1 BCE)
11QMelchizedek	late Hasmonean (c. 75–25 BCE)
4QAges of Creation A	late Herodian (c. 30–68 CE)
4QAges of Creation B	early Herodian (c. 30–1 BCE)
4QTanhumim	Hasmonean (Hand 1); mid-Hasmonean (Hand 2) (c. 150–30 BCE; 125–75 BCE)
4QTestimonia	mid-Hasmonean (c. 125–75 BCE)

Taking the second hand in 4QTanhumim as the more accurate guide, these datings mean that the Exegetical Texts were copied and used by the Qumran Sect around 125 BCE to 68 CE. That time span covers the period during which the Qumran Community is thought to have flourished, with Khirbet Qumran settled some time after 134 BCE. Furthermore, this scenario is compatible with Charlesworth's recent conclusion that most Pesharim were first written c. 100–40 BCE, with a few older ones stemming from c. 110–100 BCE (2002a: 118). Such a proposal ties in with Berrin's suggestion that, given a likely literary development from simpler

to stricter forms, the more loosely organized Pesharim are older than others that follow a narrower pattern (2000: 646). Some Exegetical Texts, therefore, may originally have been composed in the late second century BCE.

On the other hand, how that tentative conclusion might fit in with other questions, old and new, being asked about the Qumran Community in general and the sectarian Qumran DSS in particular is another matter. Thus, how far back and to whom do the interpretative traditions in the Exegetical Texts go? If Khirbet Qumran was settled some time after 134 BCE but works like 4QSE<sup>a-i</sup> show that the community or its parent existed beforehand, do any traditions in the Exegetical Texts reach back to that earlier stage? Such issues, needless to say, require further study.

## 6. The Exegetical Texts and Other Late Second Temple Literature

The Exegetical Texts are most easily paralleled with other interpretative writings of the Qumran Community for obvious reasons. As observed, however, they bear resemblances to other exegetical literature produced in late Second Temple times. These similarities extend to types of exegesis, the employment of overt and covert interpretation, and the techniques witnessed in a range of material, including individual works like Ben Sira and 1 Maccabees, the writings of Philo and Josephus, and various New Testament books. Among these, parallels between the Exegetical Texts and the New Testament stand out. We cannot unpack this in detail (see Brooke 2000b; Hübner 1996). But three points are worth making.

First, some Exegetical Texts and New Testament passages combine the same scriptures in their interpretative argument. We noted this in the use of 2 Samuel 7 and Psalm 2 in Acts 13.33–37 and 4QFlorilegium 3.1–7a, and this combination also underlies Hebrews 1.5–14 (Brooke 1985: 209; Moyise 2001: 98–100). Amos 5.26–27 similarly appears in both Acts 7.42–43 and CD 7.14–15, although in the former it follows the LXX and in the latter abbreviates something like the MT (Campbell 1995b: 149). The scriptural passage, furthermore, is put to rather different use by these respective interpreters. Amos 9.11 can be found in CD 7.16 and 4QFlorilegium 3.12 and in Acts 15.16. While the immediate context of 4QFlorilegium 3.12 interprets this passage in terms of a Davidic messiah, CD 7.16 and Acts 15.16 appropriate it in a way that gives it communal messianic significance.

Second, there is an equally interesting parallel emphasis on the figure of Melchizedek in 11QMelchizedek and the letter to the Hebrews. In the former, Melchizedek is identified with a supernatural figure appearing in

other Qumran writings, while Jesus is identified in Hebrews as a superior high-priestly type of the ancient Melchizedek. Naturally, both draw on the scriptures in their employment of the Melchizedek motif, especially Genesis 14.18–20 and Psalm 110.4 (Casey 1991: 78–96).

Third, connected to such concrete examples are the related notions of Scriptural Excerpts and *testimonia*, as considered in the previous chapter. We concluded there that a broad genre of Excerpted Texts existed in late Second Temple times, including a distinct strand of what scholars often call ‘testimonia’. The latter comprised collections focusing on those scriptures thought to have eschatological or messianic import for the time of the compiler. 4QTestimonia seems to be an early Jewish example of this, while scriptural usage in the New Testament suggests similar collections circulated among early Christians (Moyise 2001: 22, 99–100, 109–10). Indeed, some of the exegetical connections between Qumran and the New Testament described briefly above might be explained as the result of similar testimonies held in common.

However, although the New Testament shares traits with the Exegetical Texts, especially regarding interpretative assumptions and techniques, the two bodies of literature are different when their content is analysed in detail. Most obviously, the latter are generally older than the former. The lead characters and main events featuring in each corpus necessarily differ, therefore, while the message of each is likewise distinctive. To be more precise, the Qumran Community’s religious agenda was set in large measure by the scriptures of Second Temple Judaism, however distinctively those scriptures were then interpreted in a variety of ways. New Testament writers, in contrast, though frequently appealing to scriptural proof-texts, have their main focus elsewhere (Hübner 1996: 371–72). This was almost certainly not the case for the earliest Christian community which, during the 30s and 40s CE, was a religious movement rooted in late Second Temple Judaism (Campbell 2002: 139–50). But by the time of the epistles and gospels of the New Testament, Christians were concentrating on a small proportion of the available Jewish scriptures to justify their focus on Jesus to the exclusion of large parts of those scriptures (Brooke 2000b: 63).

### Further Reading

#### Overviews of scripture and interpretation at Qumran

M.J. Bernstein, ‘Interpretation of Scriptures’, *EDSS* (2000a), pp. 376–83.

—‘Scriptures: Quotation and Use’, *EDSS* (2000b), pp. 839–42.

E. Tov, *et al.*, ‘Scriptures’, *EDSS* (2000), pp. 832–42.

**Scripture and history in the Exegetical Texts**

- P.S. Alexander, 'The Bible in Qumran and Early Judaism', in A.D.H. Mayes (ed.), *Text in Context: Essays by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 35–62.
- G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 29; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985).
- 'Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament', *DSSFD* (2000b), pp. 60–73.
- 'E Pluribus Unum: Textual Variety and Definitive Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls', *DSSHC* (2000e), pp. 107–19.
- J.G. Campbell, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1–8, 19–20* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 228; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995b).
- 'Hebrew and Its Study at Qumran', in W. Horbury (ed.), *Hebrew Study from Ezra to Ben-Yehuda* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1999b), pp. 38–52.
- J.H. Charlesworth, *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002a).
- A. Lange, 'The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process', *BAB* (2002), pp. 21–30.
- T.H. Lim, *Pesharim* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls, 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002a).
- J. Maier, 'Early Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Literature', in M. Saebø (ed.), *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, Volume I.1: Antiquity (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1996), pp. 108–29.
- J.C. VanderKam, 'The Wording of Biblical Citations in Some Rewritten Scriptural Works', *BAB* (2002), pp. 41–56.
- B. Webster, 'Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judean Desert', *DJD*, 39 (2002), pp. 351–446.

**Scriptural interpretation in Philo, Josephus, and the New Testament**

- J.R. Bartlett, *Jews in the Hellenistic World: Josephus, Aristaeus, The Sibylline Oracles, Eupolemus* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).
- P. Borgen, 'Philo of Alexandria', *ABD*, 5 (1992), pp. 333–42.
- L.H. Feldman, 'Josephus, Biblical Figures in', in J. Neusner *et al.* (eds.), *The Encyclopaedia of Judaism* (Vol. 4; Supplement 1; Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2003), pp. 1778–94.
- H. Hübner, 'New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament', in M. Saebø (ed.), *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*, Volume I.1: Antiquity (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1996), pp. 332–72.
- S. Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New: an Introduction* (The Continuum Biblical Studies Series; London/New York: Continuum, 2001).
- R. Williamson, *Jews in the Hellenistic World: Philo* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

## Cumulative Bibliography

- Abegg, M., P. Flint, and E. Ulrich  
 1999 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark).
- Alexander, P.S.  
 2000 'The Bible in Qumran and Early Judaism', in A.D.H. Mayes (ed.), *Text in Context: Essays by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study* (Oxford: Oxford University Press): 35–62.  
 2002 'The Enochic Literature and the Bible: Intertextuality and Its Implication', *BAB*: 57–69.
- Alexander, P.S., G. Vermes, and G.J. Brooke  
 1998 *Qumran Cave 4, XIX: 4QSerekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD, 26; Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Allegro, J.M.  
 1956 'Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature', *JBL*, 75: 174–87.  
 1958 'Fragments of A Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrašim', *JBL* 77: 350–54.  
 1964 'Some Unpublished Fragments of Pseudepigraphical Literature from Qumran's Fourth Cave', *ALUOS*, 4:3–5.  
 1968a 'Florilegium', DJDJ, 5: 53–57; XIX–XX.  
 1968b 'Catena (A)' and 'Catena (B)', DJDJ, 5: 67–74, 80–81; XXIV–XXV, XXVII.  
 1968c 'The Ages of Creation' and '181', DJDJ, 5: 77–80, XVIII, XXVII.  
 1968d '*Tanḥumim*', DJDJ, 5: 60–67; XXII–XXIII.  
 1968e 'Lamentations', DJDJ, 5: 75–77; XXVI.  
 1968f 'Testimonia', DJDJ, 5: 57–60; XXI.  
 1968g 'Commentary on Isaiah (A)', 'Commentary on Isaiah (B)', 'Commentary on Isaiah (C)', 'Commentary on Isaiah (D)', and 'Commentary on Isaiah (E)', DJDJ, 5: 11–30; IV–IX.  
 1968h 'Commentary on Hosea (A)' and 'Commentary on Hosea (B)', DJDJ, 5: 31–36; X.  
 1968i 'Commentary on Micah (?)', DJDJ, 5: 36; XII.  
 1968j 'Commentary on Nahum', DJDJ, 5: 37–42; XI–XIV.  
 1968k 'Commentary on Zephaniah', DJDJ, 5: 42; XIV.  
 1968l 'Commentary on Psalms (A)' and 'Commentary on Psalms (B)', DJDJ, 5: 42–50, 51–53; XIV–XVIII.  
 1968m 'Ordinances', DJDJ, 5: 6–9; II.  
 1968n 'Biblical Paraphrase: Genesis, Exodus', DJDJ, 5: 1–6.  
 1968o 'Commentaries on Unidentified Texts', DJDJ, 5: 50–51; XVIII.  
 1968p '178', DJDJ, 5: 74–75; XXV.  
 1968q '183', DJDJ, 5: 80–81; XXVI.

- Aschim, A.  
 1995 'Verdens eldste bibelkommentar? Melkisedek-teksten fra Qumran', *Tidsskrift for Teologi og Kirke* 66: 85–103.  
 1998 'The Genre of 11QMelchizedek', *QONT*: 17–31.
- Astour, M.C.  
 1992 'Melchizedek (Person)', *ABD*, 4: 684–86.
- Baillet, M.  
 1962a 'Document de Damas (6Q15)', *DJDJ*, 3: 128–31; XXVI.  
 1962b 'Commentaire d'Isaïe', *DJDJ*, 3: 95–96; XVIII.  
 1982a 'Texte Halachique', *DJD*, 7: 287–98; LXXII–LXXIV.  
 1982b 'Lamentation', *DJD*, 7: 79–80; XXVIII.
- Bartlett, J.R.  
 1985 *Jews in the Hellenistic World: Josephus, Aristaeus, The Sibylline Oracles, Eupolemus* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).  
 1998 *1 Maccabees* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
- Barthélemy, D.  
 1955 'Règle de la Congrégation', *DJD*, 1: 108–18; XXII–XXIV.
- Barton, J.  
 1986 *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile* (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd).
- Baumgarten, J.M., and D.R. Schwartz  
 1995 'Damascus Document (CD)', *PTSDSSP*, 2: 4–57.
- Baumgarten, J.M., et al.  
 1996 *Qumran Cave 4, XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)* (*DJD*, 18; Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Beall, T.S.  
 2000 'Essenes', *EDSS*: 262–69.
- Beckwith, R.T.  
 1985 *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church* (London: SPCK).
- Bernstein, M.J.  
 1998 'Pentateuchal Interpretation at Qumran', *DSSFY*, 1: 128–59.  
 2000a 'Interpretation of Scriptures', *EDSS*: 376–83.  
 2000b 'Scriptures: Quotation and Use', *EDSS*: 839–42.
- Berrin, S.L.  
 2000 'Pesharim', *EDSS*: 644–47.
- Betz, O.  
 1961 'Donnersöhne, Menschenfischer unter der Davidische Messias', *RQ*, 3: 41–70.
- Borgen, P.  
 1992 'Philo of Alexandria', *ABD*, 5: 333–42.
- Brewer, D.I.  
 1992 *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr).

- Brooke, G.J.  
 1979 'Qumran Peshet: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre', *RQ*, 10 (1979): 483–503.  
 1985 *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, 29; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).  
 1992a 'Florilegium (4QFlor)', *ABD*, 2: 817–18.  
 1992b 'Melchizedek (11QMelch)', *ABD*, 4: 687–88.  
 1992c 'Testimonia (4QTestim)', *ABD*, 6: 391–92.  
 1994 'The Genre of 4Q252: From Poetry to Peshet', *DSD*, 1: 160–79.  
 1995 Review of Stendel (1994) in *JSJ*, 26: 380–84.  
 1996a '4QCommentaries on Genesis A–D', *DJD*, 22: 185–207; XII–XIII.  
 1996b '4QCommentary on Malachi', *DJD*, 22: 213–15; XIV.  
 2000a 'Rewritten Bible', *EDSS*: 777–81.  
 2000b 'Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament', *DSSFD*: 60–73.  
 2000c 'Florilegium', *EDSS*: 297–98.  
 2000d 'Catena', *EDSS*: 121–22.  
 2000e '*E Pluribus Unum*: Textual Variety and Definitive Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls', *DSSHC*: 107–19.  
 2002a 'Rewritten Law, Prophets and Psalms: Issues for Understanding the Text of the Bible', *BAB*: 31–40.  
 2002b 'Commentary on Genesis B', 'Commentary on Genesis C', and 'Commentary on Genesis D', *PTSDSSP*, 6B: 220–23, 224–34, and 235–39.  
 2002c 'Commentary on Malachi B', *PTSDSSP*, 6B: 244–47.
- Broshi, M.  
 2000a 'Qumran: Archaeology', *EDSS*: 733–39.  
 2000b '4QPeshet on the Apocalypse of Weeks', *DJD*, 36: 187–91; IX.
- Broshi, M., and A. Yardeni  
 1995 'List of False Prophets', *DJD*, 19: 77–79; XI.
- Brownlee, W.H.  
 1951 'Bible Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls', *BA*, 19: 54–76.  
 1979 *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk* (Missoula: Scholars Press).
- Burrows, M., J.C. Trever, and W.H. Brownlee  
 1950–1 *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery* (2 Vols.; New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research).
- Campbell, J.G.  
 1995a 'Essene-Qumran Origins in the Exile: A Scriptural Basis?', *JJS*, 46: 143–56.  
 1995b *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1–8, 1–20* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 228; Berlin: de Gruyter).  
 1999a 'The Qumran Sectarian Writings', in W. Horbury *et al.* (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Judaism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), Vol. 3: 798–821.

- 1999b 'Hebrew and Its Study at Qumran', in W. Horbury (ed.), *Hebrew Study from Ezra to Ben-Yehuda* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark): 38–52.
- 2000 '4QMMT<sup>d</sup> and the Tripartite Canon', *JJS*, 51: 181–90.
- 2002 *Deciphering the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Blackwell, 2nd edn).
- Carmignac, J.  
1970 'Le document de Qumrân sur Melchisédeq', *RQ*, 7: 343–78.
- Casey, M.  
1991 *From Jewish Prophet to Gentile God: The Origins and Development of New Testament Christology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Charlesworth, J.H.  
1992 'Pseudonymity and Pseudepigraphy', *ABD*, 5: 540–41.
- 2002a *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
- 2002b 'Commentary on Malachi A', *PTSDSSP*, 6B: 240–43.
- Charlesworth, J.H., and C.D. Elledge  
2002a 'Unidentified Pesharim Fragments', *PTSDSSP*, 6B: 195–201.
- 2002b 'Peshar-like Fragment', *PTSDSSP*, 6B: 358–61.
- 2002c 'Exposition on the Patriarchs', *PTSDSSP*, 6B: 274–85.
- Charlesworth, J.H., and L.T. Stuckenbruck  
1994a 'Rule of the Congregation (1QSa)', *PTSDSSP*, 1: 108–17.
- 1994b 'Blessings (1QSB)', *PTSDSSP*, 1: 119–31.
- Collins, J.J.  
1992a 'Dead Sea Scrolls', *ABD*, 1: 85–101.
- 1992b 'Daniel, Book of', *ABD*, 2: 29–37.
- 1995 *The Sceptre and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday).
- 2000a 'Eschatology', *EDSS*: 256–61.
- 2000b 'Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha', *EDSS*: 35–39
- 2000c 'Daniel, Book of: Pseudo-Daniel', *EDSS*: 176–78.
- 2000d 'The Nature of Messianism in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls', *DSSHC*: 119–217.
- Collins, J.J., and P.W. Flint  
1996 '4Q243–245: Pseudo-Daniel', *DJD*, 22: 95–164; VII–X.
- Cross, F.M.  
1995 *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 3rd edn).
- 2002 'Testimonia (4Q175=4QTestimonia=4QTestim)', *PTSDSSP*, 6B: 308–27.
- Cross, F.M., and E. Eshel  
2000 'Ostraca from Khirbet Qumran', *DJD*, 36: 497–512.
- Davies, P.R.  
1987 *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- 1998 *Scribes and Scrolls: The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures* (London: SPCK).
- 2000a 'The Dead Sea Writings, The Judaism(s) of', in J. Neusner *et al.* (eds.), *The Encyclopaedia of Judaism* (Leiden/Boston: Brill), Vol. 1: 182–96.



- 2000b 'Who Hid the Scrolls and When? Reflections on Some Recent Proposals', *The Qumran Chronicle* 9: 105–22.
- Davies, P.R., with G.J. Brooke, and P.R. Callaway  
2002 *The Complete World of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Thames and Hudson).
- De Vaux, R.  
1973 *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Oxford University Press).
- Dimant, D  
1979 'The "Pesharim on the Periods" (4Q180) and 4Q181', *IOS*, 9: 77–89.  
1984 'Qumran Sectarian Literature', in M.E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus* (Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum; Assen/Philadelphia: van Gorcum/Fortress): 483–550.  
1986 '4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple', in A. Caquot et al. (eds.), *Hellenica et Judaica: Homage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky* (Paris: Editions Peeters): 165–89.  
1992 'Pesharim, Qumran', *ABD*, 5: 244–51.  
2000a 'Qumran: Written Material', *EDSS*: 739–46.  
2000b 'Ages of Creation', *EDSS*: 11–13.
- Donceel-Voûte, P.  
1993 "'Coenaculum" – La salle à l'étage du locus 30 à Khirbet Qumrân à la mer morte', *RO*, 4: 61–84.
- Duncan, J.A.  
2000 'Deuteronomy, Book of', *EDSS*: 198–202.
- Elliger, K.  
1953 *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer* (Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie, 15; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr).
- Eshel, E.  
1991–2 'The Historical Background of the Pesharim Interpreting Joshua's Curse on the Rebuilder of Jericho', *RQ*, 15: 409–29.  
2000 'Jeremiah: Biblical Text', *EDSS*: 397–400.
- Evans, C.A.  
2000 'Messiahs', *EDSS*: 537–42.
- Feldman, L.H.  
2003 'Josephus, Biblical Figures in', in J. Neusner et al. (eds.), *The Encyclopaedia of Judaism* (Vol. 4; Supplement 1; Leiden/Boston: Brill): 1778–94.
- Fishbane, M.  
1985 *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Fitzmyer, J.A.  
1967 'Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11', *JBL*, 86: 25–41.  
2000 '4QHistorical Texts C-E', *DJD*, 36: 275–89; XVII–XVIII.
- Flint, P.W.  
1997 *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 17; Leiden: Brill).  
1999 "'Apocrypha", Other Previously-Known Writings, and "Pseudepigrapha"', *DSSFY* 2: 24–66.

- 2000 'Psalms, Book of, *EDSS*: 702–10.
- 2002 'The Book of Isaiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls', *BAB*: 229–51.
- García Martínez, F.  
1996 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2nd edn).
- García Martínez, F., and D.W. Parry  
1996 *Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1970–1995* (Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 19; Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- García Martínez, F., and A.S. van der Woude  
1990 'A "Groningen" Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History', in F. García Martínez (ed.), *The Texts of Qumran and the History of the Community* (Paris: Gabalda), Vol. 3: 521–41.
- García Martínez, F., and E.J.C. Tigchelaar  
1997–8 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden: E.J. Brill), Vols. 1–2.
- García Martínez, F., E.J.C. Tigchelaar, and A.S. van der Woude (eds.)  
1998a '11QMelchizedek', *DJD*, 23: 221–41; XXVII.  
1998b '11QT<sup>b</sup> and 11QT<sup>c2</sup>', *DJD*, 23: 357–414; XLI–XLVIII.
- Golb, N.  
1995 *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls?* (London: Michael O'Mara).
- Grabbe, L.L.  
2000 *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh* (London/New York: Routledge).
- Harrington, D.J.  
2000 'Wisdom Texts', *EDSS*: 976–80.
- Harris, R.J.  
1916, 1920 *Testimonies*, (Vols. 1–2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Hatch, E.  
1889 *Essays in Biblical Greek* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Hempel, C.  
1996 'The Earthly Essene Nucleus of 1QSa', *DSD*, 3: 253–69.  
2000 'Qumran Community', *EDSS*: 746–51.
- Hirschfeld, Y.  
1998 'Early Roman Manor Houses in Judea and the Site of Khirbet Qumran', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 57: 161–89.
- Høgenhaven, J.  
2002 'Biblical Quotations and Allusions in 4QApocryphal Lamentations (4Q179)', *BAB*: 113–20.
- Horgan, M.P.  
1979 *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretation of Biblical Books* (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America).  
2002a 'Pesharim Isaiah 2 (4Q162=4QpIsa<sup>b</sup>)', 'Pesharim Isaiah 3 (4Q163=4QpIsa<sup>c</sup>)', 'Pesharim Isaiah 4 (4Q161=4QpIsa<sup>a</sup>)', and 'Pesharim Isaiah 5 (4Q165–4QpIsa<sup>e</sup>)', *PTSDSSP*, 6B: 35–37, 39–45, 47–81, 83–97, and 99–107.  
2002b 'Hosea Pesharim 1 (4Q166=4QpHos<sup>a</sup>)', and 'Hosea Pesharim 2 (4Q167=4QpHos<sup>b</sup>)', *PTSDSSP*, 6B: 113–17 and 119–31.  
2002c 'Micah Pesharim 1 (1Q14=1QpMic)', and 'Micah Pesharim 2 (4Q168=4QpMic)', *PTSDSSP*, 6B: 133–39 and 141–43.

- 2002d 'Nahum Peshier (4Q169=4QpNah)', PTSDSSP, 6B: 144–55.
- 2002e 'Zephaniah Peshier 1 (4Q170=4QpZeph)', and 'Zephaniah Peshier 2 (1Q15=1QpZeph)', PTSDSSP, 6B: 187–89 and 191–93.
- 2002f 'Habakkuk Peshier (1QpHab)', PTSDSSP, 6B: 157–85.
- 2002g 'Psalm Peshier 1 (4Q171=4QpPs<sup>a</sup>)', 'Psalm Peshier 2 (1Q16=1QpPs)', and 'Psalm Peshier 3 (4Q173=4QpPs<sup>b</sup>)', PTSDSSP, 6B: 6–23, 25–29, and 31–33.
- 2002h 'Isaiah Peshier 1 (3Q4=3QpIsa)', PTSDSSP, 6B: 35–37.
- Hübner, H.  
1996 'New Testament Interpretation of the Old Testament', in M. Sæbø (ed.), *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht), Volume I.1: Antiquity: 332–72.
- Huggins, R.V.  
1992 'A Canonical "Book of Periods" at Qumran?', *RQ*, 15: 421–36.
- Jonge, M. de, and A.S. van der Woude  
1966 '11QMelchizedek and the New Testament', *NTS*, 12: 301–26.
- Jongeling, B.  
1971 *A Classified Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah 1958–1969* (Studies in the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 7; Leiden: E.J. Brill).
- Kister, M.  
1987 'Newly-identified fragments of the Book of Jubilees: Jub. 23:21–23, 30–31', *RQ*, 12: 529–36.
- Knibb, M.  
1987 *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Kobelski, P.J.  
1986 *Melchizedek and Melchiresa* (Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, 10; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association).
- Kugler, R.A.  
1999 'Priesthood at Qumran', *DSSFY*, 2: 93–116.
- Lange, A.  
2002 'The Status of the Biblical texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process', *BAB*: 21–30.
- Larson, E., J. Baumgarten, *et al.*  
1999 'Halakhoh', *DJD*, 35: 25–56; III–V.
- LaSor, W.S.  
1958 *Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls 1948–1957* (Fuller Library Bulletin 31; Pasadena, CA: Fuller Theological Seminary Library).
- Lichtenberger, H.  
2002 'Consolations (4Q176=4QpTanh)', PTSDSSP, 6B: 329–49.
- Lim, T.H.  
2002a *Pesharim* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls, 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).  
2002b 'Biblical Citations in the Pesharim', *BAB*: 71–79.
- Lindars, B.  
1990 'Testimonia', *DBI*: 675–77.

- Lübbe, J.  
1986 'A Reinterpretation of 4QTestimonia', *RQ*, 12: 187–97.
- Mach, M.  
2000 'Angels', *EDSS*: 24–27.
- Magness, J.  
1998 'Qumran Archeology: Past Perspectives and Future Prospects', *DSSFY*, 1: 47–77.  
2002 *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans).
- Maier, J.  
1996 'Early Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Literature', in M. Saebø (ed.), *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht), Volume I.1: Antiquity: 108–29.  
2000 'Tanhumim [*sic*] and Apocryphal Lamentations', *EDSS*: 915.
- Maurer, A.  
1988 'Azazel', *EDSS*: 70–71.
- Milgrom, J.  
1994 'Purification Rule (4Q514=4QOrd<sup>c</sup>)', *PTSDSSP*, 1: 177–79.  
2002 'Florilegium: A Midrash on 2 Samuel and Psalms 1–2 (4Q174=4QFlor)', *PTSDSSP*, 6B: 248–63.
- Milgrom, J., with L. Novakovic  
2002 'Catena A (4Q177=4QCar<sup>a</sup>)', and 'Catena B (4Q182=4QCar<sup>b</sup>)', *PTSDSSP*, 6B: 286–303, 305–7.
- Milik, J.T.  
1955a 'Commentaire de Michée', *DJD*, 1: 77–80; XV.  
1955b 'Commentaire de Sophonie', *DJD*, 1: 80; XV.  
1955c 'Commentaire de Psaumes', *DJD*, 1: 81–82; XV.  
1955d 'Recueil des Bénédictiones', *DJD*, 1: 118–30; XXV–XXIX.  
1955e 'Dires de Moïse', *DJD*, 1: 91–97; XVIII–XIX.  
1955f 'Textes Liturgique (?)', *DJD*, 1: 132–34; XXX.  
1959 *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (Studies in Biblical Theology, 25; London: SCM Press).  
1962a 'Ecrits avec Citations de Malachie', *DJDJ*, 3: 128–31, 181.  
1962b 'Document de Damas (5Q12)', *DJDJ*, 3: 181; XXXVIII.  
1972 'Melkî-sédeq et Melkî-resa' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens', *JJS*, 23: 95–144.  
1976 *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Miller, M.P.  
1969 'The Function of Isa 61 1–2 in 11QMelchizedek', *JBL*, 88: 467–69.
- Moyise, S.  
2001 *The Old Testament in the New: an Introduction* (The Continuum Biblical Studies Series; London/New York: Continuum).
- Nebe, W.G.  
1989 'Ergänzende Bemerkung zu 4Q176, Jubiläen 23, 21', *RQ*, 14: 129–30.

- Newsom, C.  
 1996a '4Q378–379: 4QApocryphon of Joshua<sup>a-b</sup>', DJD, 22: 237–88; XVII–XXV.  
 1996b '4Q378 and 4Q379: An Apocryphon of Joshua', in H.-J. Fabry *et al.* (eds.), *Qumranstudien: Vorträge und Beiträge der Teilnehmer des Qumranseminars auf dem internationalen Treffen der Society of Biblical Literature, Münster, 25–26 Juli 1993* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht): 35–85.
- Nickelsburg, G.W.E.  
 2000 'Enoch, Books of', *EDSS*: 249–53.
- Nitzan, B.  
 1999 'Curses', in E. Chazon *et al.*, *Qumran Cave 4, XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts – Part 2* (DJD, 29; Oxford: Oxford University Press): 1–8; I.
- Pfann, S.  
 1999 'Midrash Sefer Moshe', DJD, 35: 1–24; I-II.  
 2000 '4Qpap cryptA 4QSerekh ha-'Edah<sup>a-i2</sup>', DJD, 36: 547–74; XXXV–XXXVII.
- Puech, E.  
 1987 'Notes sur le manuscrit de XIQMelkîsédeq', *RQ*, 12: 483–513.  
 1993 *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d'une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien* (Vol. 2; Etudes Biblique 22; Paris: Gabalda).  
 1996 '4QRouleau du Temple', DJD, 25: 85–114; VII–VIII.  
 1998 '4QBéatitudes', DJD, 25: 115–78; IX–XIII.
- Qimron, E., and J.H. Charlesworth  
 1994 'Rule of the Community', *PTSDSSP*, 1: 1–107.
- Qimron, E., and J. Strugnell  
 1994 *Qumran Cave 4, 5: Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (DJD, 10; Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Reeves, J.C.  
 2000 'Giants, Book of', *EDSS*: 309–11.
- Roberts, J.J.M.  
 1995 'Wicked and Holy (4Q180–181)', *PTSDSSP*, 2: 204–13.  
 2002 'Melchizedek (11Q13=11QMelchizedek=11QMelch)', *PTSDSSP*, 6B: 264–73.
- Sanders, E.P.  
 2000 'The Dead Sea Sect and Other Jews: Commonalities, Overlaps and Differences', *DSSHC*: 7–43.
- Sanders, J.A.  
 1965 *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QP<sup>a</sup>)* (DJDJ, 4; Oxford: Oxford University Press): 187–351.  
 1969 'Dissenting Deities and Philipians 2.1–11', *JBL*, 88: 279–90.
- Sanderson, J.E.  
 1986 *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran* (Harvard Semitic Series, 30; Harvard: Harvard University Press).

- Schiffman, L.H.  
 1994a *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their True Meaning for Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Doubleday).  
 1994b 'Ordinances and Rules (4Q159=4QOrd<sup>a</sup>, 4Q513=4QOrd<sup>b</sup>)', *PTSDSSP*, 1: 145–75.  
 2000 'Phylacteries and Mezuzot', *EDSS*: 675–77.
- Stanley, C.  
 1992 'The Importance of 4QTanḥumim (4Q176)', *RQ*, 15: 569–82.
- Starcky, J.  
 1978 'Les Maîtres de Justice et la chronologie de Qumrân', in M. Delcor (ed.), *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 46; Leuven: Duculot): 249–56.
- Stegemann, H.  
 1988 'The Origins of the Temple Scroll', *VT*, 40: 235–56.  
 1990 'Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments', in L.H. Schiffman (ed.), *Archaeology & History in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series, 8; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press): 189–220.  
 1998 *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Leiden/New York: Brill/Eerdmans).
- Stemberger, G.  
 1996 *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark).
- Studel, A.  
 1990 'Eschatological Interpretation of Scripture in 4Q177 (4QCatena<sup>a</sup>)', *RQ*, 14: 437–81.  
 1992 '4QMidrEschat: "A Midrash on Eschatology" (4Q174 + 4Q177)', in J.T. Barrera and L.V. Montaner (eds.), *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls Madrid 18–21 March 1991*, (Leiden: E.J. Brill), Vol. 2: 531–41.  
 1993 'מִדְרָשׁ הַיְיָ הַיְיָ הַיְיָ in the Texts from Qumran', *RQ*, 16: 225–45.  
 1994 *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie (4QMidrEschat<sup>a,b</sup>): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und Traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ('Florilegium') und 4Q177 ('Catena') repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 13; Leiden: E.J. Brill).  
 2000a 'Scroll Reconstruction', *EDSS*: 842–44.  
 2000b 'Melchizedek', *EDSS*: 535–37.  
 2000c 'Testimonia', *EDSS*: 936–38.
- Stone, M.E., and E. Eshel  
 1995 'Exposition on the Patriarchs', *DJD*, 19: 215–30; XXVIII.
- Strugnell, J.  
 1970 'Notes en marge du volume 5 des "Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan"', *RQ*, 7:163–276.
- Talmon, S.  
 2002 'The Crystallization of the "Canon of Hebrew Scriptures" in the Light of Biblical Scrolls from Qumran', *BAB*: 5–20.

- Thiering, B.  
1990 'Pseudonymity', *DBI*: 568–71.
- Thompson, T.L.  
1998 '4QTestimonia and Bible Composition: A Copenhagen Lego Hypothesis', *QONT*: 261–76.
- Tov, E.  
1995 'Abbreviated and Excerpted Biblical Texts from Qumran', *RQ*, 16: 581–600.  
2001 *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2nd edn).  
2002a 'The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert – an Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts', *BAB*: 139–66.  
2002b 'Scribal Notations in the Texts from the Judaean Desert', *DJD*, 39: 323–49.
- Tov, E., *et al.*  
2000 'Scriptures', *EDSS*: 832–42.
- Tov, E., *et al.*  
2002 *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (*DJD*, 39; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- Tov E., and S.A. White  
1994 'Reworked Pentateuch', *DJD*, 13: 187–351.
- Trafton, J.L.  
2002 'Commentary on Genesis A', *PTSDSSP*, 6B: 203–19.
- Trebolle-Barrera, J.  
2000 'Qumran Evidence for a Biblical Standard Text and for Non-Standard and Parabiblical Texts', *DSSHC*: 89–106.
- Ulfsgard, H.  
2000 'The Branch in the Last Days: Observations on the New Covenant Before and After the Messiah', *DSSHC*: 233–47.
- Ulrich, E.  
1999 *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).  
2002 'The Absence of "Sectarian Variants" in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran', *BAB*: 179–95.
- Ulrich, E., *et al.*  
1997 *Qumran Cave 4, X: The Prophets* (*DJD*, 15; Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- VanderKam, J.C.  
1994 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (London: SCM Press).  
1995 Review of Stendel (1994) in *CBQ*, 57: 576–77.  
1999 'Identity and History of the Community', *DSSFY*, 2: 487–533.  
2000a 'Jubilees, Book of', *EDSS*: 434–38.  
2000b 'Sabbatical Chronologies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature', *DSSHC*: 158–78.  
2002 'The Wording of Biblical Citations in Some Rewritten Scriptural Works', *BAB*: 41–56.

- VanderKam, J.C., with J.T. Milik  
 1994 '4QText with a Citation of Jubilees', *DJD*, 13: 177–85; XII.
- Vermes, G.  
 1979a 'Torah Scholarship', *HJP*, 2: 314–80.  
 1979b 'School and Synagogue' in *HJP*, 2: 415–54.  
 1986a 'Florilegium or Midrash on the Last Days (4QFlor=4Q174)', *HJP*, 3.1: 445–46.  
 1986b 'Catena A or Midrash on the Psalms (4Q177)', *HJP*, 3.1: 448–49.  
 1986c 'The Melchizedek Midrash (11QMelch)', *HJP*, 3.1: 449–51.  
 1986d 'The Ages of the Creation (4Q180)', *HJP*, 3.1: 421.  
 1986e 'Tanhumim or Words of Consolation (4QTanh=4Q176)', *HJP*, 3.1: 448.  
 1986f 'Testimonia or Messianic Anthology (4QTest=4Q175)', *HJP*, 3.1: 446–47.  
 1997 *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Penguin).  
 1999 *Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: SCM Press).
- Vermes, G., and M. Goodman  
 1989 *The Essenes According to the Classical Sources* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
- Webster, B.  
 2002 'Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert' in *DJD*, 39: 351–446.
- White Crawford, S.  
 2000a 'Esther, Book of', *EDSS*: 269–70.  
 2000b 'Reworked Pentateuch', *EDSS*: 775–77.
- Williamson, R.  
 1989 *Jews in the Hellenistic World: Philo* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Wise, M.  
 1994 'That Which Has Been Is That Which Shall Be: 4QFlorilegium and the **שְׂרָקָם סֵרָא**', in *Thunder in Gemini and Other Essays on the History, Language and Literature of Second Temple Palestine* (Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series, 15; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press): 152–85.
- Wise, M., M. Abegg, and E. Cook  
 1996 *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (London: HarperCollins).
- Woude, A.S. van der  
 1965 'Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösgestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI', *OTS*, 14: 354–73.
- Yadin, Y.  
 1959 'A Midrash on 2 Sam. vii and Ps. i-ii (4QFlorilegium)', *IEJ*, 9: 95–98.  
 1965 'A Note on Melchizedek and Qumran', *IEJ*, 15: 152–54.  
 1983 *The Temple Scroll* (Vols. 1–3; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society).



## INDEXES

### INDEX OF REFERENCES

#### BIBLE

##### Old Testament

###### *Genesis*

1 25, 26  
6–22 16, 67, 72, 101  
6.1–4 67, 68, 72, 73, 74, 75  
9.1 28  
11.1–9 76  
12.7 29  
12.10–20 72, 74  
14.18–20 56, 110  
17.5 72  
18 68  
18.1–2 72  
18.2 74  
18.20–21 68, 72, 74  
22.1–19 72, 74  
34 94  
49.5 94

###### *Exodus*

15 33  
15.17–18 37, 39, 40  
20 94  
20.1–17 91  
20.21b 88, 92, 95  
25 25, 26, 103  
30.11–16 28

###### *Leviticus*

25 56, 61, 101  
25.9 59, 60, 61, 63  
25.10 61  
25.13 59, 60, 61, 62

##### *Numbers*

21 28  
21.18 28  
24 94  
24.15–17 88, 93, 95, 96  
24.17 93, 96, 103  
24.17–19 93  
24.17–20 90

##### *Deuteronomy*

5.1–21 91  
5.28b–29 92  
6.4–5 91  
7.15 50  
15 56, 61  
15.2 59, 60, 61, 62  
15.22 60  
18.18–19 92  
33 33, 95  
33.8 93  
33.8–11 37, 38, 39, 88, 90, 95, 96, 106  
33.11 96  
33.12 37, 39  
33.20–21 37, 39

##### *Joshua*

6.26a 94

##### *2 Samuel*

7 33, 39, 109  
7.10 37, 40  
7.10–11 105  
7.10–11a 37, 40

7.10–14 16, 39, 40, 41  
 7.11b 38, 39  
 7.11c–14a 38, 40  
 7.12 40  
 7.14 29

*1 Kings*  
 4.25 27

*Nehemiah*  
 10.32 28

*Psalms*  
 1.1 16, 35, 38, 39, 40  
 1–2 33  
 1–5 53  
 2 39, 109  
 2.1 16, 38, 39  
 2.7 29  
 5 33, 53  
 5.2–3a 38  
 5.10 49  
 6 47, 53  
 6–7 62  
 7 56  
 7.7–8 59, 60, 62  
 7.8–9 63  
 10.3 49  
 11.1 49, 52  
 11–17 53  
 12 47  
 12.1 49, 52  
 12.6 49, 52  
 13 47  
 13.2–3 50  
 13.5a 50  
 16 47  
 79.2–3 78, 80, 81  
 79.3 82  
 82 56, 62  
 82.1 59, 60, 62, 63  
 82.1–2 63  
 82.6 62  
 82.7 62  
 89.2 40  
 110.4 56, 110

*Ecclesiastes*  
 8.1 12

*Isaiah*  
 6.10 49, 51  
 8 33  
 8.11 38, 39, 40, 60, 62, 105  
 22.13 49  
 24.17 29  
 24.17–18 37  
 27.11b 49  
 32.7 49, 52  
 37.30a 49  
 40–55 78, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 101  
 40–66 84  
 40.1 84  
 40.1–5a 82, 84  
 40.3 84, 104  
 41.8–9 82, 84  
 43.1–2 82, 84  
 43.4–6 82, 84  
 44.3 82  
 49.7 82  
 49.13–17 84  
 51.22–23a 82, 84  
 52 56  
 52.1–2a 83  
 52.1–3 83, 84  
 52.7 58, 59, 60, 62, 63, 105  
 54.4–10a 83, 84  
 54.16 28  
 61 56  
 61.1 62  
 61.1–2 58, 61, 63, 84  
 61.1–3 61, 62, 63  
 61.2 59, 60, 61, 104  
 65 33  
 65.22–23 38, 39

*Jeremiah*  
 18.18b 50  
 25.11–12 25  
 29.10–14 25

*Ezekiel*  
 4.5 65  
 22.20 50

*Ezekiel – continued*

25.8 50, 51  
 37 33  
 37.23 38, 39, 40

*Daniel*

2.4–7.28 12  
 4–5 25  
 9 56  
 9.24 25, 63, 73, 103  
 9.24–27 71, 73  
 9.25 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 103  
 11–12 33  
 11.32b 38, 39  
 12.10 38, 39, 103

*Hosea*

5.8a 50, 51

*Amos*

5.26–27 109  
 9 33  
 9.11 38, 39, 40, 109

*Micah*

2.10–11 49, 52

*Nahum*

2.10b 50

*Zephaniah*

3.4 50  
 3.9 76

*Zechariah*

3.9b 49, 52  
 11.11 14  
 13.9 78, 80, 81, 83

## New Testament

*Matthew*

24.15 21

*Luke*

4.16–20 84  
 4.18–19 63  
 24.27 21  
 24.44 20, 21

*Acts*

7.2–53 29  
 7.42–43 109  
 13.33–37 29, 39, 109  
 15.6 38  
 15.16 109

*Romans*

3.9–20 29  
 3.21 21  
 9.25 27

*Galatians*

3.1–14 27  
 3.16 29

*Hebrews*

1.1–14 91  
 4.14–5.10 56  
 5.10 56

## QUMRAN

*IQpHab*

1–2 14  
 2.2c 104  
 2.3a 104  
 6.8–12 36  
 7.1–8 104  
 7.5b–14a 65  
 7.7 67  
 9.9 15

*IQM*

11.6 90, 93  
 17.5–8 56

*IQS*

3.15 52, 67  
 3.20 56  
 6.16–23 10  
 8.12–16 103  
 8.14 84  
 8.14–16 13, 107  
 9.11 95

*IQSa*

1.2–3 62, 105

- 1QSb*  
 5.27 93
- 4QpIsa<sup>c</sup>*  
 1 14  
 21 14
- 4QpIsa<sup>d</sup>*  
 8–10 14  
 3.9–10 14
- 4Q174*  
 1–3 34  
 1–5 34  
 1.1–5 95  
 1.9–12 38, 90, 94, 106  
 1.15–16 62  
 2.19–3.2 40  
 3–4 42  
 3.1 40  
 3.1–4 14  
 3.1–7a 105, 109  
 3.1–13 40, 41  
 3.2–3 27  
 3.6 37, 85  
 3.7 42  
 3.7–8 39  
 3.10 40  
 3.10–11a 38  
 3.10–13 36  
 3.11 38, 54  
 3.11b–13 39  
 3.12 38, 40, 109  
 3.14 35, 36, 37, 38, 40  
 3.14a 36  
 3.14b 36  
 3.14–16 40  
 3.15–16 62, 105  
 3.16–17 41  
 3.18–19 39  
 4.1 54  
 4.2 38  
 4.3–4 103  
 5.3 38  
 6–7 34  
 6–9 37  
 9–10 34
- 13 38  
 14 38  
 15 38  
 16 27  
 16–17 40  
 16–18 34  
 19 34, 38  
 20 34  
 21 34  
 22–24 34  
 24 34  
 26 34
- 4Q175*  
 (lines)  
 1 89, 92  
 1–4 92  
 1–8 92, 95  
 3 90  
 6 90  
 9 92  
 9–13 92, 93, 95  
 12 90  
 14–20 37, 92, 93, 95, 106  
 15 90  
 16 90  
 17 90  
 17–18 93  
 19 89, 92  
 21–30 94, 95, 96, 97, 108  
 22 94  
 23 90, 94, 97  
 23b–30 94  
 25 89, 94, 96, 97  
 25–30 89
- 4Q176*  
 1 80, 101,  
 1–2 78, 79, 80, 82  
 1–30 79  
 3–5 80, 82  
 6–7 80, 82  
 8–11 78, 80, 82, 101  
 10–11 80  
 12 83  
 13 80, 83  
 15 83

*4Q176 – continued*

15–18 80  
 16–17 86  
 16–18 80, 83  
 19–21 79  
 22–23 80, 83, 86  
 24–32 83  
 31–57 79  
 33 83, 86  
 34–41 83  
 42 83  
 43–50 83  
 51 83, 86  
 52 83  
 53 83  
 54–57 83

*4Q177*

1 52, 53  
 1–4 46, 50  
 1–5 46  
 1–15 46  
 1–30 47  
 1.1–7 49  
 1.2–3 54  
 1.8 51  
 2.5 47, 49, 54  
 2.7 47  
 2.9 51  
 2.9–13 49  
 2.10 48  
 2.12 47, 64  
 3.1–2 52  
 3.5 47, 48  
 3.6 51  
 3.12 67  
 3.13 51  
 4.7 48, 51  
 4.9–13 49  
 4.12 47, 56  
 4.14 52, 67  
 4.14–16 49  
 5–6 46, 49  
 5.6 48  
 7 46, 49  
 8 49  
 8–12 46

9–11 46, 49  
 14 46, 50  
 16 47  
 16–18 46  
 19 47  
 19–20 46  
 20 46, 49  
 21–23 46  
 24 46, 50  
 25 46  
 26 46, 49  
 27–30 46  
 31 46, 50  
 31–34 47  
 32–34 46  
 56 48

*4Q180*

1 69, 70, 71, 74, 75  
 1.1 67  
 1–6 68  
 2 103  
 2–4 68, 72, 74  
 2.10 74  
 5–6 71, 72, 74

*4Q181*

1 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75  
 2 68, 69, 74  
 2.1 70  
 2.4 73  
 2.5–7 74  
 3 69, 70, 73

*4Q182*

1.4 45

*4Q252*

1.1–2.5 14  
 2.5–8 27  
 4.2 76  
 4.3–7 14  
 4.5 76  
 5 76  
 5.1–7 14  
 7.10–8.13 76  
 9.24–27 76

- 22.10-12 76  
49.10 76
- 4Q280*  
1.2 60
- 4Q397*  
14-21 21
- 4Q464*  
2.7 76  
3 76
- 11Q5*  
27.4-11 24
- 11Q13*  
1a-b 57  
1-3 61  
1-4 57  
2a-b 57  
2.1-25 62  
2.2 59, 61  
2.3 61  
2.4 56, 61, 62  
2.5 61  
2.5-8 57  
2.6 64  
2.7 63, 64, 73  
2.8 56, 73  
2.9 57, 75,  
2.12 56  
2.16 58  
2.16-23 62  
2.17-25 105  
2.18 62, 63, 103  
2.20 58, 59, 61, 63, 67, 104  
2.24 62, 105  
2.25 61  
3 57, 60  
3.6-16 60  
3.7 56, 57, 60  
3.9 60
- 3.10 60  
3.18 58, 60, 103  
4a-d 57  
5-8 57  
6 58, 61  
7 58, 60  
9 61  
13 56, 61  
17 56  
18 61  
20 61, 75  
22 56  
23 58  
25 56, 59
- CD*  
1.1-12 65  
1.3-4 41  
1.5 64  
2.14-3.12 75  
2.2-11 83  
2.7 52, 67  
3.20-4.1 14  
4.12-19 29  
4.12b-19a 13, 14  
4.14 37  
4.15 102  
6.2b-11a 15, 28, 107  
6.3-11 14  
6.7 54  
7.14-15 109  
7.14-21 14, 36  
7.16 109  
7.18 54  
7.19-20 90, 95  
8.16 38, 62, 105  
8.8-15 14  
10 64  
16.2-4 60  
16.6b-12 27  
19.7-13 14  
19.29 62  
20.15 64

## OTHER ANCIENT REFERENCES

1 Enoch	2 Maccabees
6–11 68, 75	15.9 21
6.7 72	
10.11–12 73	Jubilees
89.51–90.25 73	4–5 68, 75
91.12–17 63	23.13 78, 83, 103
93.1–10 63, 67, 71	23.21–23 79
93.11–17 67, 71	23.32 52
	30–31 79
1 Maccabees	50.5 60, 61
14.12 27	

## INDEX OF AUTHORS

- Abegg, M. 21, 34, 47, 50, 78, 80  
 Alexander, P.S. 9, 13, 21, 25, 37, 72, 75, 76, 101, 103  
 Allegro, J.M. 13, 14, 17, 23, 33, 34, 45, 46, 47, 50, 68, 69, 79, 80, 89, 90, 96  
 Aschim, A. 13, 14, 15, 58, 59, 71, 100  
 Astour, M.C. 56  
  
 Baillet, M. 13, 17  
 Bartlett, J.R. 27, 105  
 Barton, J. 21, 26, 102  
 Baumgarten, J.M. 13  
 Beall, T.S. 10  
 Beckwith, R.T. 20  
 Bernstein, M.J. 27, 28, 29, 76, 104  
 Berrin, S.L. 13, 14, 15, 35, 104, 108  
 Betz, O. 96  
 Borgen, P. 105  
 Brewer, D.I. 28  
 Brooke, G.J. 7, 9, 13, 15, 17, 21, 24, 28, 29, 34, 36, 39, 40, 41, 46, 47, 49, 54, 56, 58, 62, 63, 75, 76, 89, 94, 96, 97, 103, 104, 105, 109, 110  
 Broshi, M. 12, 17  
 Brownlee, W.H. 13, 15, 33, 35  
 Burrows, M. 13  
  
 Callaway, P.R. 7, 54, 89  
 Campbell, J.G. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 36, 65, 75, 76, 100, 106, 108, 109, 110  
 Carmignac, J. 13  
 Casey, M. 62, 110  
 Charlesworth, J.H. 12, 13, 15, 17, 26, 52, 76, 81, 108  
 Collins, J.J. 13, 15, 24, 26, 39, 54, 65, 71, 93, 100  
  
 Cook, E. 34, 47, 50, 78, 80  
 Cross, F.M. 10, 88, 89, 93, 96, 97  
  
 Davies P.R. 7, 11, 12, 22, 26, 54, 65, 89, 105  
 de Vaux, R. 12  
 Dimant, D. 7, 9, 12, 13, 14, 28, 33, 38, 59, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 90, 105, 106  
 Donceel-Voûte, P. 11  
  
 Elledge, C.D. 17, 76  
 Eshel, E. 10, 16, 25, 76, 94, 96, 100  
 Evans, C.A. 38, 93  
  
 Feldman, L.H. 105  
 Fishbane, M. 25  
 Fitzmyer, J.A. 42, 57, 59  
 Flint, P. 21, 23, 24, 47, 80, 84  
  
 García Martínez, F. 11, 34, 42, 46, 52, 57, 59, 60, 79, 80, 97  
 Golb, N. 10, 11  
 Goodman, M. 10  
 Grabbe, L.L. 14, 20, 26, 27, 28, 39, 84, 106, 107  
  
 Harrington, D.J. 23  
 Harris, R.J. 91  
 Hatch, E. 91  
 Hempel, C. 7, 95  
 Hirschfield, Y. 11  
 Høgenhaven, J. 86  
 Horgan, M.P. 13, 14, 17  
 Hübner, H. 105, 109, 110  
 Huggins, R.V. 73



- Knibb, M. 28, 29, 33, 88  
 Kobelski, P.J. 58  
 Kugler, R.A. 41
- Lange, A. 40, 81, 102  
 Lichtenberger, H. 78, 80  
 Lim, T.H. 13, 14, 15, 35, 36, 40, 48, 53,  
 58, 59, 71, 80, 91, 100  
 Lindars, B. 91  
 Lübke, J. 94, 95
- Mach, M. 75  
 Magness, J. 11, 12  
 Maier, J. 84, 85, 86, 102, 104  
 Maurer, A. 72  
 Milgrom, J. 16, 35, 42, 47, 50, 52  
 Milik, J.T. 13, 17, 57, 58, 67, 70, 72, 73,  
 75, 96, 101  
 Miller, M.P. 59  
 Moyise, S. 91, 105, 109, 110
- Newsom, C. 24, 94  
 Nickelsburg, G.W.E. 75  
 Novakovic, L. 47, 50, 52
- Pfann, S. 12, 36  
 Puech, E. 57, 58
- Qimron, E. 13, 21
- Reeves, J.C. 75  
 Roberts, J.J.M. 57, 58, 60, 68, 70, 72
- Sanders, E.P. 9, 24, 58, 65, 105  
 Sanderson, J.E. 92  
 Schiffman, L.H. 10, 11, 17  
 Schwartz, D.R. 13  
 Stanley, C. 78, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85
- Starcky, J. 96  
 Stegemann, H. 23, 34, 42, 46, 50, 53, 68,  
 79  
 Stemberger, G. 40, 84, 86  
 Steudel, A. 15, 16, 17, 34, 35, 37, 40, 41,  
 42, 46, 47, 49, 50, 51, 54, 56, 58, 63, 64,  
 91, 93, 97, 101, 108  
 Stone, M.E. 17, 76  
 Strugnell, J. 21, 34, 35, 46, 47, 50, 52, 53,  
 68, 72, 73, 79, 80, 82, 89, 108
- Talmon, S. 22  
 Thiering, B. 22  
 Thompson, T.L. 90  
 Tigchelaar, E.J.C. 47, 52, 57, 60, 79  
 Tov, E. 23, 80, 91, 92, 93, 102  
 Trafton, J.L. 14, 17  
 Treballe-Barrera, J. 80  
 Trever, J.C. 13
- Ulfgard, H. 39  
 Ulrich, E. 21, 22, 25, 95
- VanderKam, J.C. 10, 11, 23, 25, 26, 54,  
 63, 74, 82, 102  
 Vermes, G. 9, 10, 13, 28, 33, 34, 40, 42,  
 47, 48, 56, 59, 67, 70, 78, 84, 88, 90, 94,  
 100
- White Crawford, S. 23, 25  
 White, S.A. 24  
 Williamson, R. 105  
 Wise, M. 34, 38, 47, 78, 80  
 Woude, A.S. van der 11, 57, 58, 60, 62,  
 97
- Yadin, Y. 33, 50, 57







