

Qumranica Minora II

*Thematic Studies on
the Dead Sea Scrolls*

By

FLORENTINO GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ

Edited by

EIBERT J.C. TIGCHELAAR

Qumranica Minora II

Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

Edited by

Florentino García Martínez

Associate editors

Peter W. Flint

Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar

VOLUME LXIV

Qumranica Minora II

Thematic Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls

By

Florentino García Martínez

Edited by

Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON

2007

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication data

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

ISSN: 0169-9962
ISBN 13: 978 90 04 15683 8
ISBN 10: 90 04 15683 6

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

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

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

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

Foreword	vii
Acknowledgments	ix
Abbreviations	xi
1. The Interpretation of the Torah of Ezekiel in the Texts from Qumran	1
2. Two Messianic Figures in the Qumran Texts	13
3. Interpretations of the Flood in the Dead Sea Scrolls	33
4. Man and Woman: Halakhah based upon Eden in the Dead Sea Scrolls	57
5. Priestly Functions in a Community without Temple	77
6. The Traditions about Melchizedek in the Dead Sea Scrolls	95
7. Magic in the Dead Sea Scrolls	109
8. The Sacrifice of Isaac in 4Q225	131
9. Greek Loanwords in the <i>Copper Scroll</i>	145
10. Wisdom at Qumran: Worldly or Heavenly?	171
11. Invented Memory: the “Other” in the Dead Sea Scrolls	187
12. Creation in the Dead Sea Scrolls	219
13. The Genesis of Alexandria, the Rabbis, and Qumran	241
14. Divine Sonship at Qumran: between the Old and the New Testament	261
Index of Modern Authors	285
Index of Ancient Sources	290

FOREWORD

This second volume of *Qumranica Minora* contains a selection of thematic studies that Florentino García Martínez published mostly in the past ten years, including translations of four studies originally written in French and Spanish.

Many of these studies have been presented at conferences and symposia, or have been dedicated to colleagues in *Festschriften*. This explains to some extent the large variety of topics, ranging from important religio-historical or theological issues such as “Priestly Functions in a Community without Temple,” (presented at a congress devoted to the issue of *Communities without Temple*) to technical aspects such as “Greek Loanwords in the Copper Scroll” (included in the volume in honour of Ton Hilhorst). Yet this variety of themes comes foremost from the fact that Florentino considers the entire field of Qumran studies as his subject of research.

The studies collected in this volume are good examples of Florentino’s scholarly approach, which bases thematic studies on the analysis of texts with a keen eye for both textual details and the more general implications of those details. In many cases the approach is deceptively transparent: questions formulated on a specific topic are based on the *status quaestionis* and then answered by examining texts pertaining to that topic. This demonstrates exactly the nature of Florentino’s contributions to the field: the ability to formulate the important questions that can be answered on the basis of the available data.

The essays in this volume are presented in chronological order due to the difficulty of organizing them all in distinct categories. Nonetheless, it may be observed that several articles have been presented at the annual Groningen conferences on “Themes in Biblical Literature,” and deal with the reinterpretation of biblical narratives and themes, especially from Genesis. They include “Interpretations of the Flood in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” “Man and Woman: Halakhah based upon Eden in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” “The Sacrifice of Isaac in 4Q225,” and “Creation in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Another subcategory consists of articles dealing with texts and themes that in one way or another may be called “messianic.” These include “Two Messianic Figures in the Qumran Texts,” “The Traditions about Melchizedek in the Dead Sea Scrolls,”

and “Divine Sonship at Qumran: between the Old and the New Testament.” More general thematic overviews are found in “Magic in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” and “Wisdom at Qumran: Worldly or Heavenly?”

Here, as in the first volume of *Qumranica Minora*, we have generally maintained the text as it was first published, but we have updated the references to sigla, fragment and line numbers, in accordance with the present DJD references. Thanks are due to Birgit van der Lans for practical computer assistance, to Wilfred G.E. Watson for translating from French and Spanish the papers in chapters 1, 6, 11, and 12, to Mladen Popović for preparing the Indices and, last but not least, to the publishing house Brill, which agreed to finance those translations. *Thematic Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls* forms a rich and variegated collection of recent studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls by one of the world’s leading scholars in the field.

Eibert Tigchelaar
Groningen, 15 May 2006

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

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

“L’interprétation de la torah d’Ézéchiél dans les MSS de Qumran,” *RevQ* 13/49–52 (1988): 441–52; translated by W.G.E. Watson.

“Two Messianic Figures in the Qumran Texts,” in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995* (ed. D.W. Parry & S.D. Ricks; STDJ 20; Brill: Leiden, 1996), 14–40.

“Interpretations of the Flood in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Interpretations of the Flood* (ed. F. García Martínez and G.P. Luttikhuisen; TBN 1; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 86–108.

“Man and Woman: Halakhah based upon Eden in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Paradise Interpreted. Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. G.P. Luttikhuisen; TBN 2; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 95–115.

“Priestly Functions in a Community without Temple,” in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple* (ed. B. Ego, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 303–19.

“Las tradiciones sobre Melquisedec en los manuscritos de Qumrán,” *Biblica* 81 (2000): 70–80; translated by W.G.E. Watson.

“Magic in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Metamorphosis of Magic from Late Antiquity to the Early Modern Period* (ed. J.N. Bremmer and J.R. Veenstra; Groningen Studies in Cultural Change 1; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 13–33.

“The Sacrifice of Isaac in 4Q225,” in *The Sacrifice of Isaac. The Aqedah (Genesis 22) and its Interpretations* (ed. E. Noort and E. Tigchelaar; TBN 4; Leiden, Boston and Köln: Brill, 2002), 44–57.

“Greek Loanwords in the Copper Scroll,” in *Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome. Studies in Ancient Cultural Interaction in Honour of A. Hilhorst* (ed. F. García Martínez and G.P. Luttikhuisen; JSJS 82; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 119–45.

“Wisdom at Qumran: Worldly or Heavenly?” in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Tradition* (ed. F. García Martínez; BETL 168; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 1–15.

“La memoria inventada. El ‘otro’ en los manuscritos de Qumran,” in *Congreso Internacional Biblia, memoria histórica y encrucijada de culturas. Actas* (ed. J. Campos Santiago and V. Pastor Julián; Zamora: Asociación Bíblica Española, 2004), 49–71; translated by W.G.E. Watson.

“Creation in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Creation of Heaven and Earth. Re-interpretations of Genesis I in the Context of Judaism, Ancient Philosophy, Christianity, and Modern Physics* (ed. G.H. van Kooten; TBN 8; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 49–70.

“La Genèse d’Alexandrie, les rabbins, et Qumrân,” in *The Wisdom of Egypt: Jewish, Early Christian, and Gnostic Essays in Honour of Gerard P. Luttikhuisen* (ed. A. Hilhorst and G.H. van Kooten; Ancient Judaism & Early Christianity 59; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 21–41; translated by W.G.E. Watson.

“Divine Sonship at Qumran: between the Old and the New Testament,” in *Biblical Traditions in Transmission. Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb* (ed. Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu; JSJS 111; Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006), 109–32.

ABBREVIATIONS

- DJD I D. Barthélemy and J.T. Milik, *Qumran Cave I* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955)
- DJD III M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân. Exploration de la falaise. Les grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q à 10Q. Le rouleau de cuivre* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan III; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962)
- DJD IV J.A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QP^s^a)* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan IV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1963)
- DJD V J.M. Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4.I (4Q158–4Q186)* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan V; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968)
- DJD VI R. de Vaux and J.T. Milik, *Qumrân grotte 4.II: I. Archéologie; II. Tefillin, Mezuzot et Targums (4Q128–4Q157)* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert VI; Oxford: Clarendon, 1977)
- DJD VII M. Baillet, *Qumrân grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert VII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982)
- DJD VIII E. Tov with the collaboration of R.A. Kraft, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr) (The Seiyâl Collection I)* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert VIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990)
- DJD IX P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J.E. Sanderson, *Qumran Cave 4.IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert IX; Oxford: Clarendon, 1992)
- DJD X E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert X; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994)
- DJD XI E. Eshel et al., *Qumran Cave 4.VI: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 1* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XI; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998)
- DJD XII E. Ulrich et al., *Qumran Cave 4.VII: Genesis to Numbers* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994)
- DJD XIII H. Attridge et al., *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts Part 1* (Discoveries in the Judaean Desert XIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994)

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

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

CHAPTER ONE

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE TORAH OF EZEKIEL IN THE TEXTS FROM QUMRAN

Compared with the number of copies of the Psalms, of Deuteronomy or of Isaiah,¹ the number of copies of Ezekiel found at Qumran is rather limited: so far only the very doubtful copies of 1Q19 and 3Q1,² the meagre remains of 11QEzek,³ and the fragments from Cave 4, recently edited by Lust⁴ have been published. All in all, to judge from the number of copies preserved, the importance of Ezekiel for the members of the Qumran Community seems to have been quite limited. Skehan had already concluded that, in terms of textual criticism, “ni pour Ezéchiel ni pour les Petits Prophètes, les rouleaux de Qumran n’ont produit de nouveautés substantielles.”⁵

Nor is the number of explicit quotations from Ezekiel very impressive. In the texts published so far, only three can be noted: Ezek 37:23, cited in 4QFlorilegium I 16–17; Ezek 9:4, in CD XIX 11–12 and Ezek 44:15 in CD III 20–IV 2.

But on the other hand, the number of allusions to the text of Ezekiel or of reminiscences of its use to be found in the texts from Qumran

¹ We have a total of 31 copies of Psalms, as follows: 3 from Cave 1, 1 from Cave 2, 19 from Cave 4 [see P.W. Skehan, “Qumran and Old Testament Criticism,” in *Qumrán. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* [ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Paris-Gembloux: Duculot/Leuven: University Press, 1978], 181–82), 1 from Cave 5, 1 from Cave 6, 1 from Cave 8, and 6 from Cave 11 [see J.P.M. van der Ploeg, “Les Manuscrits de la Grotte XI de Qumran,” *RevQ* 12/45 (1985), 3–15]; no fewer than 30 copies of Deuteronomy have been preserved: 2 in 1Q, 3 in 2Q, 1 in 3Q, at least 17 in 4Q [P.W. Skehan, “Littérature de Qumran. A. Textes bibliques,” in *DBSup*, col. 809, speaks of 4QDeut^a, 1 in 5Q, 1 in 6Q, and 1 in 11Q; about 19 scrolls of Isaiah have been found: 2 in 1Q, 16 in 4Q [see Skehan, in *DBSup*, cols. 811–812], and 1 in 5Q. The numbers usually given are slightly different, see G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Qumran in Perspective* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 201.

² See DJD I, 68–69, pl. XII and DJD III, 94, pl. XVIII.

³ Published by W.H. Brownlee, “The Scroll of Ezekiel from the eleventh Qumran Cave,” *RevQ* 4/13 (1963): 11–28.

⁴ See J. Lust, “Ezekiel Manuscripts in Qumran : Preliminary Edition of 4QEz” and ^b,” in *Ezekiel and his Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and their Interrelation* (ed. J. Lust; BETL 74; Leuven: University Press and Peeters, 1986), 90–100.

⁵ See P.W. Skehan, “Littérature de Qumran. A. Textes bibliques,” col. 813.

is considerable. Rabin notes no fewer than 25 in the *Damascus Document* alone,⁶ and the eagle eye of Père Carmignac for re-use of the biblical text had revealed an important number of allusions scattered at every redactional level of the main documents.⁷ This widespread use of Ezekiel already indicates that the text of the prophet had a much greater importance for the Qumran Community than the number of copies or of explicit quotations would lead us to suppose.

The study of the Qumran interpretation of the whole of Ezekiel can only be made once the text known as 4QSecondEzekiel has been published, a composition attributed to the Prophet and preserved in at least six copies from Cave 4 (4Q385–390).⁸ Since the influence of Ezekiel on the spirituality of the Qumran group has already been studied by É. Cothenet,⁹ in this note¹⁰ we would like simply to examine the influence on the thought of the Community of a typical block from Ezekiel, i.e. chs. 40–48, known as the “Torah of Ezekiel,” and so honour Jean Carmignac, who has taken so much care to recover the re-interpretations of the Old Testament texts in the manuscripts from Qumran.

The interpretation of Ezek 44:15 in CD III 20–IV 2

The simplest way to begin is to examine the interpretation of Ezek 44:15 in the *Damascus Document*, given that in this case we have all the elements needed to get to the heart of Qumran interpretation and the application of that interpretation to understand another biblical text. In fact, CD III 20–IV 2, gives us an explicit exegesis of the text of Ezekiel.¹¹

⁶ See Ch. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (2d rev. ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1958), 82 and 84.

⁷ See the indices in J. Carmignac, *Les Textes de Qumrân, traduits et annotés II* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1963), 353–55, as well as the following articles: J. Carmignac, “Les citations de l’Ancien Testament dans la «Guerre des Fils de Lumière contre les Fils de Ténèbres»,” *RB* 63 (1956): 234–60 et 345–65; *idem*, “Les citations de l’Ancien Testament, et spécialement des poèmes du Serviteur, dans les Hymnes de Qumran,” *RevQ* 2/7 (1960): 357–94.

⁸ See J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 254; In this *Mémorial Jean Carmignac*, J. Strugnell and D. Dimant, “4QSecond Ezekiel (4Q385),” *RevQ* 13/49–52 (1988): 45–58, publish two fragments of 4Q385.

⁹ See his contribution: É. Cothenet, “L’influence d’Ézéchiël sur la spiritualité de Qumrân,” *RevQ* 13/49–52 (1988): 431–39.

¹⁰ This note was read at the Third Congress of the European Association for Jewish Studies which was held in Berlin in July 1987. We have retained its character of a lecture.

¹¹ O.J.R. Schwarz, *Der erste Teil der Damaskusschrift und das Alte Testament* (Lichtland/

In the biblical context of the Ezekiel Torah, our text asserts that in the future Temple of Jerusalem there will only be descendants of Zadok, “the priests, sons of Zadok” who have the right to officiate as priests, to offer “the fat and the blood.” In the Qumran pesher, only the first part of the quotation is retained, and each word is duly made clear: “The priests are the converts of Israel who left the land of Judah,” “the Levites¹² are those who joined them,” “the sons of Zadok are the chosen of Israel, men called by name who will appear at the end of days.”

I cannot say whether or not the replacement of the verb קרב used in the Masoretic text by the synonym ננש in the Qumran text, and the telescoped form of the second part of the quotation have a specific meaning.¹³ Nor would I dare to draw any conclusion from the fact that the reference to sacrifices, to fat and blood, are passed over in silence in the Qumran commentary. In the Qumran perspective in which the Community itself is conceived as a substitute for the Temple, this omission could be very significant. Even so, the fact remains that the interpretation only takes up the first part of the quotation and does not say to whom the right to exercise priestly functions falls, but does reveal who the persons to whom the text of Ezekiel refers really are.¹⁴

The essence of the interpretation given transposes the oracle of Ezekiel to the present time of the Community, which believes it is living in the final days. One could discuss the question of whether the three groups of pesher mentioned are not three ways of denoting all the

Diest, 1965), is still the most complete study on the use of the Old Testament in CD. Also of interest for our passage are: É. Cothenet, “Le Document de Damas,” in *Les Textes de Qumrân, traduits et annotés II*, 158–61; J. Murphy-O’Connor, “An Essene Missionary Document? CD II, 14–VI, 1,” *RB* 77 (1970): 201–29; G. Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 75–80, 130–43; P.R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant. An Interpretation of the “Damascus Document”* (JSOTSup 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), 90–96, and *idem*, *Behind the Essenes. History and Ideology of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (BJS 94; Atlanta: Scholars Press 1987), 52–56.

¹² The word seems to have been accidentally omitted from the manuscript.

¹³ Compare J.A. Fitzmyer: “There is here an accommodation of the text of Ezekiel, which consists in a deliberate manipulation of the text in order to suit the purpose of the passage in which it is quoted.” Cf. J.A. Fitzmyer, “The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament,” reprinted in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (rev. ed.; Sources for Biblical Study 5; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974), 36.

¹⁴ As M.A. Knibb stresses in his recently published commentary on CD; see *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish & Christian World 200 B.C. to A.D. 200 2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 36.

members of the Community of the last days,¹⁵ or whether they denote the three different components of this Community,¹⁶ or even whether they refer (as I think is most likely) to the three groups which have composed the Community over its history: the founders, those associated with them afterwards, and the members of the last days,¹⁷ all proposals that have been put forward. But the essence of all these interpretations is the same: Ezekiel's oracle has been transposed to the reality of the last days, to the present time of the Community. This process is exactly the same as the one we find in the pesharim and that we have defined as "eschatologisation" of the prophetic text.¹⁸ Here this eschatologisation is so deep and so complete that it even results in transforming the biblical text, making "levite priests, sons of Zadok" into "the priests and the Levites and the sons of Zadok."

It is highly likely¹⁹ that at one time this peshar of Ezek 44:15 was an independent unit. Its re-use in other Qumran texts²⁰ proves at least that it was well-known. But in any case, its function in the present *Damascus Document* is clear: it serves to spell out the meaning of the allusion to the "sure house" from 1 Sam 2:35 in CD III 19. The block formed by the quotation of Ezek 44:15 and its peshar serves to indicate that the found-

¹⁵ Thus Cothenet, Murphy-O'Connor and Klinzing in the works cited in note 11.

¹⁶ O. Betz, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte* (WUNT 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1960), 180–81 asserts: "Wie aus der darauffolgenden Deutung hervorgeht, sieht die Sekte in der nun entstandenen Aufzählung 'Priester und Leviten und Zadokssöhne' die drei Stände ihrer Vollmitglieder: Priester, Leviten und Laien"; see also *idem*, "Le Ministère cultuel dans la Secte de Qumrân et dans le Christianisme primitif," in *La Secte de Qumrân et les Origines du Christianisme* (ed. J. van der Ploeg; RechBib 4; Paris-Bruges: Desclée De Brouwer, 1959), 163–202.

¹⁷ An interpretation already proposed by A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les Écrits Esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte* (Paris: Payot, 1983), 142; it is shared to some extent by Schwarz, *Der erste Teil der Damaskusschrift und das Alte Testament*, 118: "Persönlich erscheint es mir am Wahrscheinlichsten, dass wir es in (1) und (3) mit Deutungen auf die Gemeinde in drei verschiedenen Stadien ihrer Entwicklung zu tun haben," and accepted by Davies, *Behind the Essenes. History and Ideology of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 54: "The priest, Levites and sons of Zadok respectively represent three chronological stages in the history of the community," and by Knibb, *The Qumran Community*, 36: "the three groups described in the interpretation of Ezek. 44, 15 are most probably the initial members of the movement, those who joined at a later stage, and all those who belonged to the movement 'at the end of days', the time in which the author believed himself to be living."

¹⁸ See F. García Martínez, "Profetie en profetie in de geschriften van Qumran," in *Profeten en profetische geschriften* (ed. F. García Martínez, C.H.J. de Geus, and A.F.J. Klijn; Kampen: Kok 1986), 119–32; *idem*, "Escatologización de los Escritos proféticos en Qumran," *EstBib* 44 (1986): 101–16.

¹⁹ As suggested by Davies, *The Damascus Covenant. An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"*, 90.

²⁰ 1QS V 2, 9; IX 7; 1QSa I 2, 24; II 3; 1QSB III 22.

ing of the Community, the enduring house built in Israel, is nothing other than the Community and that its foundation is the fulfilment of Ezekiel's oracle.

This means that in its approach to the prophet's text, the Community perceives its own reality as a hermeneutical principle, allowing it to grasp the true meaning of the text. This meaning (what is signified) is grasped as a revealed fact since its perception allows the Community to transform the text (the signifier).

The interpretation of Ezek 40–48 in ShirShabb

Does this example of explicit exegesis of a text from the Ezekiel Torah allow us to suppose that other elements of this Torah were also subjected to exegesis in Qumran?

M. Fishbane²¹ has established the criteria necessary for recognising this exegetical relationship between two texts in the absence of explicit citation formulae. In order to be able to speak of exegesis there must be:

- “multiple and substantial lexical linkages”;
- “use of a segment of the first text in a lexically reorganized and topically rethematized way.”²²

In my opinion, these two conditions occur in several Qumran texts in which we can note not only a re-use of the Torah of Ezekiel but also an exegetical transformation of that Torah. Here we will deal with only two of these texts: *New Jerusalem* (*NJ*) and the *Angelic Liturgy/Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* or *Shirot 'Olat ha-Shabbath* (*ShirShabb*). It is an undeniable fact that the first of the conditions noted by Fishbane (“Multiple and substantial lexical linkages”) is fulfilled in these two texts and we have good instances of this use of Ezekiel in *NJ*²³ and in *ShirShabb*.²⁴ The question that concerns us here is to determine whether this use of Ezekiel is only a borrowing or whether this is a conscious exegesis of the biblical text. In other words, whether in the use of Ezekiel in *NJ* and in

²¹ M. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985).

²² Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*, 285.

²³ By S. Fujita, “The Temple Theology of the Qumran Sect and the Book of Ezekiel: Their Relationship to Jewish Literature of the Last Two Centuries B.C.” (Princeton Diss. 1970, University Microfilms), 306–15.

²⁴ By C.A. Newsom, “4Q Serek Shirot 'Olat hassabbat (The Qumran Angelic Liturgy): Edition, Translation, and Commentary” (Harvard Diss. 1982, University Microfilms), 71–78.

ShirShabb there is what Fishbane calls a “Topical rethemization” and whether it is possible to determine the hermeneutical techniques use to obtain this “rethemization.”

The text in which this “rethemization” appears most clearly is undoubtedly the *Angelic Liturgy*.²⁵ The hymns for sabbaths 9 to 13 focus on the structures of the heavenly Temple, its vestibule, doors, walls, columns, figures engraved in the vestibule and in the *debir*, the veil (*paroket*), the divine throne, the sacrifices and the angel-priests who officiate in the celestial liturgy with their movement and vestments. This is how Newsom summarises the content of these hymns:

Despite the broken condition of the text, it appears that the ninth through the thirteen songs describe the heavenly temple in a systematic fashion, moving in a type of ‘temple tour’ from the description of the outer features of the heavenly temple to the holy of holies, the merkabah, and its attendant priestly angels.²⁶

Behind this description, the outline of Ezek 40–48 is apparent. It is also clear that this outline was used here to give organic structure to the praise of the heavenly beings. But of most interest is the transformation of all the constituent elements of the heavenly temple.

The way in which the idea of heaven as a temple in which the angels praise the Lord was developed in the post-exilic period, a conception that is already apparent in Isa 6 and in certain Psalms,²⁷ is not very explicit. It is certain that we find this conception present in the apocalyptic literature of the Hellenistic and Roman periods.²⁸ But it is clear that underlying Ezek 40–48 is not this idea of a heavenly Temple but

²⁵ We now have available a good edition that collects together in a single volume the various copies from Cave 4, from Cave 11 and from Masada by C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985). See the corrections provided by É. Puech, “Notes sur le manuscrit des Cantiques du Sacrifice du Sabbat trouvé à Masada,” *RevQ* 12/48 (1987): 575–83, as well as by the reviews by É. Puech, E. Qimron, and F. García Martínez, published in *RB* 94 (1987): 604–608, *HTR* 79 (1986): 349–71 and *Biblica* 69 (1988): 138–46 respectively. One of the last works published by Père J. Carmignac was prompted precisely by the preliminary publication of the *Angelic Liturgy* by Newsom, to wit, J. Carmignac, “Roi, Royauté et Royaume dans la liturgie angélique,” *RevQ* 12/46 (1986): 177–86.

²⁶ Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*, 16.

²⁷ And which would be developed extensively in rabbinic literature, as witnessed by the locus classicus: *b. Hag.* 12b, see H. Bietenhard, *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum* (WUNT 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1951), 123–42.

²⁸ For example in *1 En.* 90:28–29; *Jub.* 1:17, 26–29; 25:21; *2 Bar.* 4:1–6; 6:7–9; 32:2–4; *4 Ezra* 7:26; 10:25–28, 40–58, see A. Causse, “Le mythe de la nouvelle Jérusalem du Deutero-Esaïe a la III^e Sibylle,” in *RHPR* 18 (1938): 377–414.

the idea of a heavenly model of the Temple which is used to build the Sanctuary on earth.²⁹ What Ezekiel sees in a vision is the plan that has to be carried out when the land, the city and the Temple are restored. The biblical text is absolutely explicit:

Show them the form of the Temple and its layout, its exits and its entrances, its form, all its plans and all its instructions, all its form and all its laws. Put all that in writing before their eyes so that they may keep its form and all its plans, and follow them. (Ezek 43:11)

All these elements have been taken over by the author of *ShirShabb* and doubly “thematised.” On the one hand, they are no longer part of a model of what will have to be accomplished once on earth but components of the realisation of the heavenly Temple. On the other hand, they are no longer mere architectural components but have been transformed into animated beings who take part in the angelic praise. Here are a few texts chosen at random:³⁰

Praise with them, you, the foundations of the holy of holies, the supporting columns of the highest vault, and all the corners of his building. (4Q403 1 i 41)

And all the decorations of the debir hurry with wonderful psalms. (4Q403 1 ii 13)

The gates of the entrance and the gates of the exit declare the glory of the King who blesses. (4Q405 23 i 9)

In the same way that the traditions of the Merkabah of Ezekiel have been interpreted and re-used by the author of *ShirShabb* to reflect the celestial praise instead of being used to describe the divine chariot,³¹ the same author has thus transformed the prophetic description of the future Temple into a portrayal of the Temple and the heavenly cult.

Independently of its origin and its composite character, the block comprising chs. 40–48 functions in the present book of Ezekiel as a guarantee of restoration; it serves to assure the exiles that God’s judgment upon Israel and upon the Temple is not something definitive. One day there will be a new Temple to which Yahweh’s glory will return; and

²⁹ “You will follow exactly, in making the Tabernacle and all its furnishings, the patterns that I am going to show you,” is already stated in Exod 25:9; see also Exod 25:40; 26:30; 27:8; Num 8:4; 1 Chron 29:19, as well as Zech 2:5–9 and Tob 13:16–18.

³⁰ Cf. the author’s translation in *Apocalypses et voyages dans l’au-delà* (ed. C. Kappler; Paris: Cerf, 1987), 201–35.

³¹ As proved by C.A. Newsom, “Merkabah Exegesis in the Qumran Sabbath Shirot,” *JJS* 38 (1987): 11–37.

there will be a new priesthood (the sons of Zadok) who will guarantee the cult; there will be a new prince, a new city and a new division of the land, and the fountain of the Temple will transform the desert into a new paradise.

For the author of the *ShirShabb* his own community has become a (vicarious and temporary) substitute for the Temple and the cult, a spiritual temple in which they are also angels who serve in the celestial cult. The communion with the angelic world and the ensuing requirements of purity³² are characteristic of the Qumran conception of the community as a temple and allow us to grasp the function within it of this interpretation of the text of Ezekiel.

For the author of the *ShirShabb* and for the Qumran Community, the future temple of Ezekiel is a reality present in heaven. The liturgical recitation of angelic praise, culminating in the description of the sabbath of hymn thirteen, allows the members of the Community to be associated with this celestial cult and join in the joyful acclamations of all the elements of the heavenly temple. In this way, the promise of restoration in Ezekiel has been transformed into a possibility of participation.

The interpretation of Ezek 40–48 in the New Jerusalem

Less obvious than this “rethematisation” of the *ShirShabb* is the “rethematisation” at work in the Aramaic text known as *Description of the New Jerusalem*.³³ This work, composed in the wake of the Ezekiel Torah, imitates the structure of its model to the extent of allowing us to think

³² On the requirements for purity, see F. García Martínez, “Il problema della purità: la soluzione Qumranica,” in *Israele alla ricerca di identità tra il III sec. a.C. e il I sec. d. C. Atti del V Convegno di studi Veterotestamentari* (ed. G.L. Prato; Bologna: Edizioni Dehoniane, 1989), 169–91; and *idem*, “Les limites de la communauté: Pureté et impureté à Qumrân et dans le Nouveau Testament,” in *Text and Testimony: Essays on New Testament and Apocryphal Literature in Honour of A.F. J. Klijn* (ed. A. Hilhorst, G.P. Luttikhuisen, A.S. van der Woude, and T. Baarda; Kampen: Kok, 1988), 111–22.

³³ This work is partially preserved in five manuscripts: 1Q32, published by J.T. Milik in DJD I, 134–35, pl. XXXI; 2Q24, published by M. Baillet in DJD II, 84–89, pl. XVI; 5Q15, published by Milik in DJD III, 184–93, pls. XL–XLI; a column from another copy from Cave 4 has been published by J. Starcky, “Jérusalem et les manuscrits de la mer Morte,” *Le Monde de la Bible* 1 (1977): 38–39, and a fragment of the copy from Cave 11 has also been published by B. Jongeling, “Publication provisoire d’un fragment provenant de la grotte 11 de Qumrân (11Q Jér Nouv ar),” *JSS* 1 (1970): 58–64 and *idem*, “Note additionnelle,” *JSS* 1 (1970): 185–86. All these texts (except for the one published by Starcky) are easily available in the collections by J.A. Fitzmyer and D.J. Harrington, *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts* (BibOr 34; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978),

this is a carbon copy rather than exegesis. The Torah of Ezekiel draws a very precise and detailed plan of the future Temple, but the description of the city in which the Temple is set is rather succinct; only its dimensions (Ezek 48:16–17) and its doors (Ezek 48:30–35) are specified. Instead, the elements preserved in the *NJ* give us an exact and detailed plan of the city, its houses, streets, doors and gates.

Did not the author wish to complete the Torah of Ezekiel by making more exact its plan of the future Jerusalem in the way that the prophet had provided a specific plan of the future Temple?

And yet, more detailed analysis shows that in this case also the Qumran text does not confine itself to completing the Torah of Ezekiel but reinterprets and re-uses its components to transmit a different idea of it.

This appears clearly when we examine more closely the general plan of the city given in the *NJ*³⁴ and when we compare it with the one given in the Torah of Ezekiel. According to the prophet, the future city will be a square of four thousand five hundred cubits per side, that is, a total perimeter of eighteen thousand cubits (about 9 km). The author of the *NJ* has changed this square to a rectangle and above all he has altered its size. The description of the walls of the town in the copy of the *NJ* from Cave 4, which will be published by Starcky,³⁵ without any doubt gives 140 res or stadia for each long side and 100 stadia for the other two sides of the rectangle containing the town (a total perimeter of about 110 km)³⁶ and places the Temple inside the rectangle.

It is true that in his study of the *NJ*,³⁷ J. Licht prefers to suppose that the author followed Ezekiel's information closely and that he gives the plan of a square town of smaller dimensions. It is also true that in his

46–55 and K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 214–22.

³⁴ See J. Licht, "An Ideal Town Plan from Qumran. The Description of the New Jerusalem," *IEJ* 29 (1979): 45–59.

³⁵ And of which he published a photograph in "Jérusalem et les manuscrits de la mer Morte," specifically of col. ii, which contains the measurements in question (1. 1–5).

³⁶ According to our calculations, based on the equivalence of 1 res = 63 reeds or 441 cubits, established by the copy 4Q, which gives a total perimeter of 480 res and states that the city contains 480 posterns to which the alleyways reach which separate the blocks of houses with the width of the blocks also fixed at 51 reeds. For more details see F. García Martínez, "La 'nueva Jerusalén' y el Templo futuro en los MSS de Qumrán," in *Salvación en la Palabra: Targum—Derash—Berith: en memoria del profesor Alejandro Díez Macho* (ed. D. Muñoz León; Madrid: Ediciones Cristiandad, 1986), 563–90.

³⁷ Licht, "An Ideal Town Plan from Qumran," 49–50.

edition of texts from Cave 5,³⁸ J.T. Milik considers the rectangle encircled by the large wall measuring 140×110 res to include the city and the Terumah, and as a result reduces the city to one of four strips within this rectangle, with a total perimeter of about 61 km (35×100 res, according to Milik's calculations, about 31 km). But, as I think I have proved elsewhere, these two hypotheses are contradicted by the precise statements of the texts and are therefore untenable. Also untenable in my view is the way they place the Temple outside the city. In fact, for Licht, the Temple would be south of the city, separated from it by a sort of square.³⁹

For Milik the city would also be separated from the Temple by an empty strip the same size as the city, i.e. measuring 35×100 res.⁴⁰ But in fact the texts prove that the author of the *N7* has changed the small square of the Torah of Ezekiel into an enormous rectangle, inside which he has placed the Temple (a rectangle with a total surface area of about 736 km^2).⁴¹ This rectangle comprises the New Jerusalem, a magnificent city, with its walls covered with precious stones, sapphires and rubies, flanked, as in Ezekiel, by twelve large gates as well as by 480 posterns and protected by "one thousand four hundred and thirty-two towers."⁴²

This transformation of the plan of the city gives us the key to the Qumran interpretation of the text of Ezekiel. The author of the *N7* had not wanted to complete the prophet's text but uses it to express a different idea, he "rethematizes" it. The assuredly utopian measurements that he gives show us that he envisages this city and this Temple as a divine work. All these detailed but disproportionate measurements are not intended to give us the plan of the future Jerusalem and Temple that will have to be built after the restoration, but instead give us his vision of the eschatological Jerusalem and Temple that God himself will build at the end of days.

At Qumran they were quite able to be more specific about and complete Ezekiel's plans regarding what Jerusalem and the Temple should

³⁸ DJD III, 185.

³⁹ Licht, "An Ideal Town Plan from Qumran," 48.

⁴⁰ For Milik this empty strip "trahit le souci de Pureté cultuelle si caractéristique des sectaires de Qumran," DJD III, 185.

⁴¹ As I think I have proved in "La Nueva Jerusalem y el Templo futuro de los Mss. de Qumran," 566–72.

⁴² Details found in the Cave 4 copy, still unpublished, according to Starcky, "Jérusalem et les manuscrits de la mer Morte."

be, adapted to divine regulations. Indeed, the *Temple Scroll* gives us precisely this plan of the Temple and the city that we can call normative, an expression of God's authentic revelation to Moses exactly as it had been understood within the sect.⁴³ The hope was that these plans, which should already have been followed by Solomon, would one day be carried out; but, all in all, this temple and this city only had to be temporary; alongside them, another city and another Temple were expected, which would be definitive, created directly by God at the end of days. The same *Temple Scroll* gives us the proof of this expectation when it specifies that God will make his glory dwell in the normative Temple:

until the day of creation/blessing when I myself shall create My Sanctuary, establishing it forever, in accordance with the covenant that I made with Jacob at Bethel. (11QT^a XXIX 9–10)⁴⁴

This same eschatological Temple is mentioned in the Florilegium from Cave 4:⁴⁵

This is the House that they will build for him in the last days, as it is written in the book of the law: The Sanctuary, O Adonay, that your hands have established, Yahweh will reign eternally and perpetually / for ever and ever. (4Q174 1–2 i 2–5)

⁴³ This is how I understand the specifications in 11QTemple, see: F. García Martínez, "Essénisme Qumrânien: Origines, caractéristiques, héritage," in *Correnti culturali e movimenti religiosi del giudaismo. Atti del V Congresso internazionale dell' AISG (S. Miniato, 12–15 novembre 1984)* (ed. B. Chiesa; AISG Testi e studi 5; Roma: Carucci, 1987), 37–57.

⁴⁴ For the reading בררה instead of the editor's ברכה, see E. Qimron, "The Text of the Temple Scroll," *Leshonenu* 42 (1978): 142 (Hebrew) and A.S. van der Woude, "De Tempelrol van Qumrân I," *NTT* 34 (1980): 284, a reading that Y. Yadin himself acknowledged as possible in his English edition, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983), 1:412. The interpretation is very much debated; most commentators follow Yadin's interpretation and see in the text a reference to the eschatological Temple, but B.Z. Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran: the Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Monographs of the Hebrew Union College 8; Cincinnati: HUCP, 1983), 21–30, denies that two different temples are mentioned in this column, an opinion to some extent shared by P. Callaway, "Exegetische Erwägungen zur Tempelrolle XXIX, 7–10," *RevQ* 12/45 (1985): 95–104. The requisite bibliography is available in F. García Martínez, "El Rollo del Templo (11QTemple): Bibliografía sistemática," *RevQ* 12/47 (1986): 425–40.

⁴⁵ Edited by J. Allegro in DJD V, 53–67, Pl. XIX–XX, to be completed by the corrections of J. Strugnell, "Notes en marge du volume V des «Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan»,» *RevQ* 7/26 (1970): 220–21. The most complete study of the text is G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran. 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), with notes that refer to all previous studies. From our point of view, the most important work is D. Dimant, "4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple," in *Hellenica et Judaica. Hommage à Valentin Nikiprovetzky* (ed. A. Caquot; Leuven and Paris: Peeters, 1986), 165–89.

Proof that the Temple, to which these fragments of the *NJ* from Caves 2, 5 and 11 refer, is this very eschatological Temple is provided by a fragment of a copy of the *NJ* from Cave 4, still unpublished, from Starcky's lot, which speaks of the great final war in which the Kittim, Babel, Edom, Moab and the sons of Ammon will take part.⁴⁶

Now, these expressions have a perfect parallel in 1QM I 1–2, and a whole series of Qumran texts connect the war of final salvation with the end of days;⁴⁷ the *War Scroll*, 1QM II 1–6, also provides the organisation of the Temple cult during the final war. There can be no doubt, I think, that the Temple and the city that the author of the *NJ* describes in such detail are the eschatological, definitive Temple and the city, which will be created directly by God.

And this tells us that the author's purpose and the depth of his interpretation of the text of Ezekiel is not to make more precise the plan of the future city in order to complete the description in the Torah of Ezekiel. What he wishes to transmit to his readers is his dream (for him, a revelation) of the eschatological Jerusalem and the Temple which he obtained, thanks to exegesis of the text of Ezekiel.

In Qumran, then, the same signifier (the Ezekiel Torah) has been allowed to signify two different things: in the *Angelic Liturgy* its interpretation has made it possible to take part in the heavenly cult; in the *New Jerusalem*, it has inspired the hope of being able one day to take part in the perfect cult of the eschatological Temple.

⁴⁶ As noted by J. Starcky, "Jérusalem et les manuscrits de la mer Morte," 39.

⁴⁷ For example: 4Q174 i 18; 4Q161 8–10 17; 4Q162 ii 1; 1QpHab IX 16; 11QMelch ii 4.

CHAPTER TWO

TWO MESSIANIC FIGURES IN THE QUMRAN TEXTS

In the twenty-five years following the discoveries and first publications of the texts from Qumran, few topics were so widely discussed as the messianic expectations of the Qumran Community.¹ This interest is easy to understand. In most of the other Jewish writings of the Second Temple period, the figure of the Messiah either is not featured or plays a very secondary role. By contrast, the new texts express not only the hope of an eschatological salvation but also introduce into this hope the figure (or figures) of a messiah, to use technical terminology. Thus they promised to clarify the origins of the messianic hope that occupies such a central position in Christianity. However, the expectations of the first years of research were not fulfilled, and the subsequent reaction was not long in coming. Interest in Qumran messianism plunged to a low level in the agenda of Qumran studies, and the topic remained dormant for a long time.²

The situation has changed dramatically in recent years. In 1992, Émile Puech published several texts that brought new light to Qumran messianism.³ As a result, scholars started to study Qumran messianism

¹ From the basic work by A.S. van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân* (SSN 3; Assen: van Gorcum, 1957). A bibliography of the most important works from these twenty-five years is found in J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study* (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975), 114–18. An updated bibliography is found in F. García Martínez and D.W. Parry, *A Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah, 1970–95* (STDJ 19; Leiden: Brill, 1996).

² It is significant that the 1990 edition of Fitzmyer's bibliography, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study* (rev. ed.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 164–67, adds only six titles to the list published in 1975.

³ They are the *editio princeps* of three Aramaic texts completed by É. Puech, "Fragment d'une apocalypse en araméen (4Q246 = pseudo-Dan^d) et le 'Royaume de Dieu,'" *RB* 99 (1992): 98–131; *idem*, "Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521)," *RevQ* 15/60 (1992): 475–522; *idem*, "Fragments d'un apocryphe de Lévi et le personnage eschatologique—4QTestLevi^d et 4QA^aJa," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991* (ed. J. Trebelle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 449–501 and pls. 16–22, and of a Hebrew fragment published by G. Vermes, "The Oxford Forum for Qumran Research: Seminar on the Rule of War from Cave 4 (4Q285)," *JJS* 43 (1992): 85–94.

again, and a flood of new publications appeared.⁴ I wrote a long overview collecting the evidence of the use of the term *messiah* from all the

⁴ Among the studies published recently see M.G. Abegg, "Messianic Hope and 4Q285: A Reassessment," *JBL* 113 (1994): 81–91; O. Betz, "Spricht ein Qumran-Text vom gekreuzigten Messias?" in *Jesus, Qumran, und der Vatikan* (O. Betz and R. Riesner; Giessen: Brunner Verlag, 1993), 103–20 (published in English as "Does the Qumran Text Speak of a Crucified Messiah" in *Jesus, Qumran, and the Vatican: Clarifications* [trans. J. Bowden; London, SCM, 1994], 83–97); M. Blockmuehl, "A 'Slain Messiah' in 4Q Serek Milhamah (4Q285)?" *TynBul* 43 (1992): 155–69; G.J. Brooke, "The Messiah of Aaron in the Damascus Document," *RevQ* 15/57–58 (1991): 215–30; *idem*, "4QTestament of Levi(?) and the Messianic Servant High Priest," in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge* (ed. M.C. de Boer; Sheffield: JSOT, 1993), 83–100; A. Chester, "Jewish Messianic Expectations and Mediatorial Figures and Pauline Christology," in *Paulus und das antike Judentum* (ed. M. Hengel and U. Heckel; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 17–89; J.J. Collins, "A Pre-Christian 'Son of God' among the Dead Sea Scrolls," *BRev* 9/3 (June 1993): 34–38, 57; *idem*, "The Works of the Messiah," *DSD* 1 (1994): 98–112; *idem*, "Messiahs in Context: Method in the Study of Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (ed. M.O. Wise et al.; Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 213–29; C.A. Evans, "The Recently Published Dead Sea Scrolls and the Historical Jesus," in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research* (ed. B. Chilton and C.A. Evans; NTTs 19; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 547–65; J.A. Fitzmyer, "4Q246: The 'Son of God' Document from Qumran," *Biblica* 74 (1993): 153–74; F. García Martínez, "Nuevos textos mesiánicos de Qumrán y el Mesías del Nuevo Testamento," *Communio* 26 (1993): 3–31; *idem*, "Los Mesías de Qumrán: Problemas de un traductor," *Sefarad* 53 (1993): 345–60; M.A. Knibb, "The Teacher of Righteousness—A Messianic Title?" in *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (ed. P.R. Davies and R.T. White; Sheffield: JSOT, 1990), 51–65; *idem*, "The Interpretation of Damascus Document VII,9b–VIII,2a and XIX,5b–14," *RevQ* 15/57–58 (1991): 243–51; C. Martone, "Un testo qumranico che narra la morte del Messia? A proposito del recente dibattito su 4Q285," *RivB* 42 (1994): 329–36; G.S. Oegema, *Der Gesalbte und sein Volk: Untersuchungen zum Konzeptualisierungsprozeß der messianischen Erwartungen von den Makkabäern bis Bar Koziba* (Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1994), 86–99, 108–15; K.E. Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism: Its History and Significance for Messianism* (SBLEJL 7; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 171–216; P. Sacchi, "Esquisse du développement du messianisme juif à la lumière du texte qumranien 11QMelch," *ZAW* 100 supplement (1988): 202–14; L.H. Schiffman, "Messianic Figures and Ideas in the Qumran Scrolls," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Princeton Symposium on Judaism and its Origins 1; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 116–29; *idem*, *Law, Custom, and Messianism in the Dead Sea Sect* (Jerusalem: Merkaz Zalman Shazar le Toldot Yisra'el, 1993), 286–311 (in Hebrew); *idem*, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 315–50; F.M. Schweitzer, "The Teacher of Righteousness," in *Mogilany 1989: Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Jean Carmignac. Part 2, The Teacher of Righteousness, Literary Studies* (Z.J. Kapera; Cracow: Enigma Press, 1991), 53–97; S. Talmon, "Waiting for the Messiah—The Conceptual Universe of the Qumran Covenanters," in *The World of Qumran from Within—Collected Studies* (ed. Shemaryahu Talmon; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1989), 273–300 (this article originally appeared as "Waiting for the Messiah: The Spiritual Universe of the Qumran Covenanters," in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era* [ed. J. Neusner, W.S. Green, and E.S.

scrolls at Qumran for the *Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie*.⁵ Two lengthy contributions dealing with messianism in the scrolls appeared in the compilation of presentations given at the Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls of 1993,⁶ and in 1995 a booklength study on the topic by John J. Collins was published.⁷ Thus it is not lack of recent treatment that has motivated the choice of my topic, nor, to be honest, the incomparable cadre assembled at this meeting—in a setting across from the closed Golden Gate, to which so many messianic legends are attached. The reason for my choice is that some elements of the messianism of the scrolls remain unclear and problematic to me, and I hope that discussing them here might help to elucidate them. If a solution is not available, at least your comments will help me see the problems more clearly.

I would like to bring two points to your attention: (1) the heavenly messiah and (2) the messianic character of the expected prophet.

The Heavenly Messiah

Most scholars agree that the people of Qumran expected more than one eschatological figure whose coming would herald the era of salvation; they used the technical term anointed ones or messiahs to refer to these figures. The key text is 1QS IX 9–11:⁸

Frerichs; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987], 111–37); *idem*, “The Concept of Masiah and Messianism in Early Judaism,” in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, 79–115; C. Thoma, “Entwürfe für messianischen Gestalten in frühjüdischer Zeit,” in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity* (ed. I. Gruenwald, S. Shaked, and G.G. Stroumsa; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 15–29; J.C. VanderKam, “Jubilees and the Priestly Messiah of Qumran,” *RevQ* 13/49–52 (1988): 353–65; and M.O. Wise and J.D. Tabor, “The Messiah at Qumran,” *BAR* 18/6 (November/December 1992): 60–61, 65.

⁵ F. García Martínez, “Messianische Erwartungen in den Qumranschriften,” in *Der Messias* (ed. W.H. Schmidt; *Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie* 8; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1993), 171–208.

⁶ J.C. VanderKam, “Messianism in the Scrolls,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 211–34; É. Puech, “Messianism, Resurrection, and Eschatology at Qumran and in the New Testament,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant*, 235–56.

⁷ J.J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995).

⁸ Text and plates in M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery. Volume II, Fascicle 2: Plates and Transcription of the The Manual of Discipline* (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951). Colour photographs by J.C. Trever in *Scrolls from*

⁹ They should not depart from any counsel of the law in order to walk ¹⁰ in complete stubbornness of their heart, but instead shall be ruled by the first directives which the men of the Community began to be taught ¹¹ until the prophet comes, and the messiahs of Aaron and Israel. *Blank*

The text is clear and expresses firmly the hope, within the Qumran community, of the future coming of two anointed ones—the messiah of Aaron and the messiah of Israel—two figures who correspond to the priestly messiah and the royal messiah. A third figure, the Prophet, will occupy our attention later on in this discussion.

The Messiah Figure in the Bible

General consensus seems to indicate that the Dead Sea Scrolls can refer to these eschatological agents of salvation without using the term *messiah*. In fact texts vary in their use of the technical term when talking about the same eschatological figure. After all, the Old Testament texts, which later on will be used to express the hope of an eschatological savior, do not use the word *messiah*, and in none of the thirty-nine instances in which the Hebrew Bible uses the word *messiah* does this word have the precise technical meaning of the title used later to denote one of the figures who would bring eschatological salvation. Texts such as the blessings of Jacob (Gen 49:10), Balaam's oracle (Num 24:7), Nathan's prophecy (2 Sam 7), and the royal psalms (such as Pss 2 and 110) would be developed by Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel in the direction of hope in a future royal messiah, heir to the throne of David. The promises of the restoration of the priesthood in texts such as Jer 33:14–26 (missing from the Septuagint) and the oracle of the high priest Joshua included in Zech 3 were to act as a starting point for later hope in a priestly messiah. Similarly, the double investiture of the “sons of oil”—Zerubbabel and Joshua (Zech 6:9–14)—would be the starting point of the hope in a double messiah, reflecting a particular division of power already present since Moses and Aaron. In the same way, the presence of the triple office—king, priest, prophet—combined with the announcement of the future coming of a Prophet like Moses in Deut 18:15–18 and with the hope in the return of Elijah found in Mal 4:5–6, would act

Qumran Cave 1 (ed. F.M. Cross, D.N. Freedman, and J.A. Sanders; Jerusalem: Albright Institute of Archaeological Research and Shrine of the Book, 1972); translation in F. García Martínez, *DSS*, 13–14.

as the starting point for the development of a hope in the coming of another agent of eschatological salvation. Similarly, the presentation of the mysterious figure of the Servant of YHWH in chs. 40–55 of Isaiah, as an alternative to traditional messianism in the perspective of the restoration, would result in the development of a hope in a suffering messiah. Also, the announcement in Mal 3:1 that God was to send his angel as a messenger to prepare his coming would permit the development of hope in an eschatological mediator of nonterrestrial origin.

Thus we do not need to limit our search to texts which expressly use the term *messiah*; we can expect to find messianic figures designated by other titles as well. Expectation is fulfilled precisely with the first of the figures discussed here, designated as a heavenly messiah.

Messiah figure as both human and heavenly

It is perfectly understandable that the hope in a superhuman agent of eschatological salvation could have developed in the Judaism of the period. But to consider this agent of eschatological salvation as a messiah could appear to be not only an unacceptable broadening of the concept of messiah, but also an expansion which robs the concept of its deepest characteristic—its human dimension. It is difficult to imagine the possibility of a superhuman person being considered as anointed; angels, it appears, did not receive an anointing.⁹ The human character of all other messiahs is strongly stressed in the Davidic succession of the messiah-king and in the cultic perspective in which the messiah-priest performs his atonement.¹⁰

And yet it seems difficult to avoid using the adjective *messianic* to characterize this figure, since the functions attributed to him are messianic in nature. This seems to require a semantic widening of the term *messiah* to enable us to apply it to figures which are presented not only as human but also as superhuman. Other Jewish writings not from Qumran, the *Parables of Enoch* and *4 Ezra*, describe a superhuman agent of eschatological salvation, using the technical term messiah as one of the names for the saving figure. This suggests that the widening of the semantic field of messiah had already taken place in the Judaism of the period.

⁹ Although some angels did appear ministering as priests in the heavenly temple in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*.

¹⁰ Within the sacrificial cult of the Jerusalem temple.

We cannot, therefore, exclude a priori from our consideration the Qumran texts—which may refer to such figures without using the technical term—under pain of ignoring one of the possible developments of messianic hope reflected in the preserved manuscripts. In the *Parables of Enoch* (1 En.) 48:10 and 52:4 the term *messiah* is occasionally used together with the more common titles of *Chosen One* and above all *Son of Man* to denote an existing, transcendental figure of celestial origin.¹¹ In the vision of 4 Ezra 13, a person “like a man” (called *messiah* in 7:28 and 12:32 and more often *son/servant of God*) is clearly presented as a pre-existing, transcendental person of celestial origin.¹² The figures in these texts are called *messiah*, in spite of their superhuman nature and their description using images traditionally associated with divinity. Accordingly, as Collins correctly observes, “the understanding of ‘messiah’ is thereby qualified.”¹³ These parallels in compositions whose Jewish origin does not seem to be in question justify the use of the term *heavenly messiah* to designate an eschatological savior figure found in two of the Qumran texts, in which the word *messiah* itself is not used.

The heavenly messiah in a midrash from cave 11

The first of the Qumran texts (11QMelch) referred to is a midrash of eschatological content, which was preliminarily published by A.S. van der Woude as part of the Dutch lot of Cave 11.¹⁴ The protagonist of this text is a heavenly person, an אֱלֹהִים, called Melchizedek, who, at the end of times, will execute justice and be the instrument of salvation. The central part of the fragment (col. II 6–19) can be translated as follows:¹⁵

¹¹ See recently J.C. VanderKam, “Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 3–71,” in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, 169–91, with references to previous studies.

¹² M.E. Stone, “The Question of the Messiah in 4 Ezra,” in *Selected Studies in Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha* (ed. M.E. Stone; SVTP 9; Leiden: Brill, 1991), 317–32 (the article appeared earlier in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*, 209–24); and *idem*, “Excursus on the Redeemer Figure,” in M.E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 207–13.

¹³ In an excellent article in which he stresses how both figures represent a particular messianic interpretation of Dan 7, J.J. Collins, “The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism,” *NTS* 38 (1992): 466 n. 78, suggests that 4Q246 could contain a similar messianic interpretation of the Daniel figure, an intuition that seems absolutely correct and matches my own understanding of the text.

¹⁴ It will be included in *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* vol. XXIII.

¹⁵ See the manuscript published by A.S. van der Woude, “Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran

⁶ He (Melchizedek) will proclaim liberty for them, to free them from [the debt] of all their iniquities. And this will [happen] ⁷ in the first week of the jubilee which follows the ni[ne] jubilees. And the day [of atonem]ent is the end of the tenth jubilee ⁸ in which atonement will be made for all the sons of [God] and for the men of the lot of Melchizedek. [And on the heights] he will decla[re in their] favor according to their lots: for ⁹ it is the time of the “year of grace” for Melchizedek, to exa[lt in the tri]al the holy ones of God through the rule of judgment, as is written ¹⁰ about him in the songs of David, who said: “Elohim will stand up in the assem[bly of God,] in the midst of the gods he judges.” And about him he said: “Above it ¹¹ return to the heights. God will judge the peoples.” As for what he sa[ide]: “How long will yo[u] judge unjustly and show partiality to the wicked? Selah.” ¹² Its interpretation concerns Belial and the spirits of his lot, who were rebels [all of them] turning aside from the commandments of God [to commit evil.] ¹³ But, Melchizedek will carry out the vengeance of God’s judges [on this day, and they shall be freed from the hands] of Belial and from the hands of all the sp[irit]s of his lot.] ¹⁴ To his aid (shall come) all “the gods of [justice]: he] is the one [who will prevail on this day over] all the sons of God, and he will pre[side over] this [assembly.] ¹⁵ This is the day of [peace about which God] spoke [of old through the words of Isa]iah the prophet, who said: “How beautiful ¹⁶ upon the mountains are the feet of the mess[enger who announces peace, of the messenger of good who announces salvation,] saying to Zion: “Your God [reigns.”] ¹⁷ Its interpretation: The mountains are the pro[phets . . .] ¹⁸ And the messenger is [the anoi]nted of the spirit about whom Dan[iel] spoke [. . . and the messenger of] ¹⁹ good who announces saly[vation is the one about whom it is written that . . .]

In spite of the uncertainty of the reconstructions, the content seems clear. Here we need only to note the details concerning the messianic figures to whom the text refers. The weave of the text is formed by Lev 25:8–13 concerning the jubilee year, Deut 15 concerning the year of release, and Isa 52, which proclaims the liberation of the prisoners. The author also develops his ideas from interpretations of other texts from Isaiah, the Psalms, and Daniel, which he uses to refer to Melchizedek, the protagonist.

Melchizedek’s intervention is set specifically in the first week of the tenth jubilee, the final jubilee of human history in the text’s chronological

Höhle XI,” *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 14 (1965): 354–73; it was placed in the context of other Qumran writings by J.T. Milik, “Milki-sedeq et Milki-reša’ dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens,” *JJS* 23 (1972): 95–144, and has been extensively studied, for example, in P.J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša’* (CBQMS 10; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981). My translation (*DSST*, 139–40) incorporates most of the readings and reconstructions proposed by É. Puech, “Notes sur le manuscrit de 11QMelkisédeq,” *RQ* 12/48 (1987): 483–513.

system, equivalent to the last of the seventy weeks of other systems. The remission of debts in the biblical text is interpreted as referring to the final liberation that will occur during the Day of the Expiation. The agent of this liberation is Melchizedek, presented as the eschatological judge found in Ps 7:8–9 and Ps 82:1–2. This liberation will be preceded by a battle between Melchizedek and Belial and his spirits, and Melchizedek's victory will usher in an era of salvation described in Isa 52:7 and 61:2–3. In a typical pesher way the four key words of the biblical text are interpreted: the mountains are the prophets, the messenger is the anointed of the spirit, Sion is the faithful to the covenant, and מלְכִיזֶדֶק is Melchizedek himself.

The midrash text presents Melchizedek as the chief of the heavenly armies—the leader of the sons of God who destroys the armies of Belial—and identifies this figure, in terms of practical functions, with the “Prince of Light” (a figure we find in 1QS III 20, CD V 18 and 1QM XIII 10) and with the angel Michael (a figure appearing in 1QM XVII 6–7). But Melchizedek, although being presented as a heavenly being, is not described simply as an angel (he is called *elohim* but not *mal'ak*), and his earthly origins seem to serve as a backdrop for his exalted heavenly position. This fact suggests that this heavenly being is the same earthly Melchizedek of the Bible, the mysterious king of Gen 14:17–20 and the eternal priest of Ps 110:4. Although he is clearly a heavenly being and is called *elohim*, the text speaks of “the lot of Melchizedek” or “the year of grace of Melchizedek,” using Melchizedek's name in expressions that in the Bible are typically related to God himself.

Because the three basic functions the text ascribes to this heavenly being are messianic, we can designate this heavenly being as a heavenly messiah. These three functions are (1) to be an avenging judge (with reference to Ps 82:1–2 and 7:1), (2) to be a heavenly priest who carries out atonement for his inheritance on the Day of Atonement, and (3) to be the ultimate savior of “the men of his lot,” destroying the kingdom of Belial in the eschatological battle and restoring eternal peace.

The heavenly messiah in 4Q246

The same sort of heavenly messiah seems to be the protagonist of an Aramaic composition partially preserved in 4Q246.¹⁶ From this manuscript,

¹⁶ The text was presented by J.T. Milik in a lecture given at Harvard University in 1972 and was made known by J.A. Fitzmyer in his study “The Contribution of Qumran

copied in the first half of the first century, a complete column of nine lines and approximately half of the preceding column have reached us. The text can be translated as follows:¹⁷

4Q246 col. I

¹ [...] settled upon him and he fell before the throne ² [...] eternal king. You are angry and your years ³ [...] they will see you, and all shall come for ever. ⁴ [...] great, oppression will come upon the earth ⁵ [...] and great slaughter in the city ⁶ [...] king of Assyria and of Egypt ⁷ [...] and he will be great over the earth ⁸ [...] they will do, and all will serve ⁹ [...] great will he be called and he will be designated by his name.

Col. II

¹ He will be called son of God, and they will call him son of the Most High. Like the sparks ² of a vision, so will their kingdom be; they will rule several years over ³ the earth and crush everything; a people will crush another people, and a city another city. ⁴ *Blank* Until he rises up the people of God (or the people of God arise) and makes everyone rest from the sword. ⁵ His kingdom will be an eternal kingdom, and all his paths in truth and uprigh[tness] ⁶ The earth (will be) in truth and all will make peace. The sword will cease in the earth ⁷ and all the cities will pay him homage. He is a great God among the gods (?) (or: The great God will be his strength). ⁸ He will make war with him; he will place the peoples in his hand and cast away everyone before him. ⁹ His kingdom will be an eternal kingdom, and all the abysses.

Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament,” *NTS* 20 (1973–74): 382–407, and reprinted with an important supplement in J.A. Fitzmyer, *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979), 85–107. It has since then been extensively studied; see David Flusser, “The Hubris of the Antichrist in a Fragment from Qumran,” *Immanuel* 10 (1980): 31–37; also in *idem*, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988), 207–13; F. García Martínez, “4Q246: ¿Tipo del Anticristo o Libertador escatológico?,” in *El Misterio de la Palabra. Homenaje de sus alumnos al profesor D. Luis Alonso Schökel al cumplir veinticinco años de magisterio en el Instituto Bíblico Pontificio* (ed. V. Collado and E. Zurro; Madrid: Cristiandad, 1983), 229–44 (published in English as “The Eschatological Figure of 4Q246,” in F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic* [STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992], 162–79); and H.-W. Kuhn, “Röm 1.3 f und der davidische Messias als Gotessohn in den Qumrantexten,” in *Lese-Zeichen für Annelies Findeiß zum 65. Geburtstag am 15. März 1984* (ed. C. Burchard and G. Theissen; Dielheimer Blätter zum Alten Testament und seiner Rezeption in der Alten Kirche. Beiheft 3; Heidelberg, 1984), 103–13. The recent complete publication by Puech (“Fragment d’une apocalypse en araméen”) of the last five lines of col. II now allows a fuller analysis. See Fitzmyer, “4Q246: The ‘Son of God’ Document from Qumran”; J.J. Collins, “The Son of God Text from Qumran,” in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology*, 65–83; and E. Puech, “Notes sur le fragment d’apocalypse 4Q246—‘Le fils de dieu,’” *RB* 101 (1994): 533–58.

¹⁷ García Martínez, *DSS*, 138.

Although the first column is fragmentary, the broad meaning of the passage can be understood and has been accepted since 1974. The protagonist of the story falls down before the throne of a king and reveals to him a vision of a future conflagration in which the kings of Assur and Egypt will play a role. Then appears a mysterious personage to whom the names *Son of God* and *Son of the Most High* are given. Chaos will follow, but it will be resolved and followed by eternal peace and his eternal kingdom once the enemies are destroyed.

This mysterious person has been diversely interpreted—Milik identified him with a historical king, Alexander Balas; Fitzmyer applied the titles to an heir to David's throne, a royal but non-messianic person; and Flusser saw in this person a reference to the Antichrist.¹⁸ In 1983, after analyzing all these interpretations and pointing out why they seemed insufficient, I proposed interpreting the person to whom the text refers as an eschatological liberator of angelic (or non-human) nature, a figure similar in functions to those which 11QMelch ascribes to Melchizedek or 1QM assigns to the Prince of Light or to the archangel Michael.

Émile Puech, the editor of the whole text, thinks the preserved text does not allow definitive resolution between a “historicizing” interpretation like Milik's and a messianic interpretation, toward which his preferences seem inclined. Puech seems to exclude my interpretation of the text for two reasons: (1) because it is not certain that 4Q246 is a composition originating in Qumran, and because, in his opinion, “les figures ‘célestes’ qui sont les médiateurs de salut dans le judaïsme ancien, Hénoc, Elie, Melkisédek ou le Fils de l'Homme, n'ont pas, à proprement parler, reçu le titre de ‘messie.’”¹⁹ However, as indicated, the preceding statement is not completely accurate. Also, the parallels with ideas contained in other Qumran writings, although they may not be determinative in assigning a sectarian origin to the composition, do at least make the text compatible with the outlook of the Qumran group.

I maintain, therefore, that my interpretation of the first fragmentary column and of the first four lines of col. II still best explains the elements

¹⁸ All these interpretations are discussed in García Martínez, “4Q246: ¿Tipo del Anticristo o Libertador escatológico?” (“The Eschatological Figure of 4Q246”); Puech, “Fragment d'une apocalypse en araméen (4Q246 = pseudo-Dan^d) et le ‘Royaume de Dieu,’”; and Collins, “The *Son of God* Text from Qumran.”

¹⁹ Puech, “Fragment d'une apocalypse en araméen,” 102 n. 14, 124–25: “The ‘celestial’ figures who are the mediators of salvation in ancient Judaism—Enoch, Elias, and Melchizedek or the Son of Man—have not, strictly speaking, been given the title of *messiah*.”

preserved. But I do recognize, however, that the adjective *angelic* could be misleading. My description of the person in question as angelic was based on the parallel with other superhuman figures of the Qumran texts. But, as has been noted in the case of Melchizedek, the human components serve as backdrop for the heavenly figure. Although the human character of the mysterious personage of 4Q246 is not particularly emphasized, one can assume that he is understood to be, as Melchizedek, human and heavenly at the same time. Therefore it will be more correct to denote this superhuman figure of 4Q246 as heavenly rather than as angelic. The new lines now available confirm and emphasize this conclusion, since they ascribe to this figure the features of Daniel's Son of Man.²⁰

The quotations in 4Q246 from Dan 7 are especially striking. "His sovereignty/kingdom will be an eternal sovereignty/kingdom" (col. II 5) comes from Dan 7:27; here the phrase is applied to the "people of the holy ones of the Most High." "His kingdom will be an eternal kingdom" (col. II 9) comes from Dan 7:14 and refers to the Son of Man. In the biblical text, the parallelism of both expressions in the vision and in its explanation could favor the interpretation of the Son of Man as a collective figure. The author of our composition, however, seems to attribute both expressions to the mysterious protagonist of the narrative, whom he considers as an individual, thus anticipating the clear interpretation as an individual we find in the *Book of Parables*.

The preserved text does not completely exclude the possibility that the third person pronominal suffixes used, beginning with col. II 5, could refer to the people of God. In fact, biblical equivalents could be found for most of the expressions, some of which refer to an individual person and some to a person representing the people as a whole. In spite of this ambiguity, though, the lines published recently by Puech in *Revue biblique*²¹ suggest that I modify my 1983 position, in which I attributed these pronouns to the "people of God." Puech's interpretation of that as the protagonist mentioned at the end of col. I and at the beginning of col. II now seems more plausible to me.

Puech notes that "qu'il relève" ("he raises them [the people of God] up") can be read in col. II 4 instead of "que se (re)lève" ("they [the

²⁰ On the interpretation of the Son of Man in Daniel 7 as an individual with an angelic nature, see J.J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (HSM 16; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 144–47.

²¹ Puech, "Fragment d'une apocalypse en araméen."

people of God] rise up themselves”), and “(qu’il fasse tout reposer” (“he causes them to lie down”) instead of “tout reposera” (“all will lie down”). This enables line 4 to be understood as the climax of the period of crisis described beforehand; the lofty titles given to the protagonist to be understood, since the task he has to fulfill is to bring in the situation of eschatological peace; and the particle used to be given the value of “term/limit.”²² This interpretation is strengthened by the use of the phrase *he will judge* in col. II 5 and by the statement of the cosmic dimension of his kingdom in col. II 9.

This reading of the text is also strengthened by the way in which the phrase, *Until he raises up the people of God*, is set out in the manuscript. The blank that comes before mention of the people of God seems intended to emphasize that this situation of eschatological peace is precisely the conclusion of the situation described previously and is due to the activity of the protagonist, to whom the lofty titles *Son of God* and *Son of the Most High* are given. The blank that follows this expression on the same line removes the necessity of making a whole series of suffixes in the following lines refer to the nearest antecedent (the people of God, the object of the preceding phrase). They can refer to the subject of the phrases, the *son of God* and *son of the Most High*.

Understood in this way, 4Q246 describes an eschatological liberator, a heavenly being similar to Melchizedek of 11QMelch or the Son of Man of Dan 7, called *son of God* and *son of the Most High*. He will be the agent who will bring eschatological salvation, judge all the earth, and conquer all the kings through God’s power and rule over the whole universe. He is thus a messiah, an almost divinized messiah, similar to Melchizedek and the heavenly Son of Man. This is precisely the element that needs to be emphasized. In Qumran the coming of an agent of eschatological salvation, together with a messiah-king and a messiah-priest, was expected to be as exalted as the preexistent Son of Man of the *Parables of Enoch* or as the messiah of *4 Ezra*.

The messianic prophet

The figure of the eschatological prophet remains elusive. We have seen him appear in the first text quoted, 1QS IX 11: “until the prophet comes, and the messiahs of Aaron and Israel...” It is obvious from his

²² Puech, “Fragment d’une apocalypse en araméen,” 116–17.

juxtaposition with the two messiah figures that this person is an eschatological being. It is less evident that he is a true messianic figure, since, unlike the other two, he is not termed *anointed* here. The text speaks only of the hope in his coming, detailing nothing about his functions, the biblical basis that allowed this hope to develop, or his possible identification with other titles used in the texts for these figures. The text does not allow us to determine whether this figure—a prophet—does or does not have messianic features. Its contrast to the messiah would seem rather to indicate it does not in this text.

More promising is the material found in the text already quoted from 11QMelch. As indicated, the messenger of Isa 52:7 is identified there as *the anointed of the spirit*, an expression certainly identifying prophets, but used here clearly in the singular and referring thus to a prophet, an anointed one, or messiah, who is expected at the time of Melchizedek. Unfortunately, neither the text of Daniel nor further precision has been preserved. All we can assert about him, therefore, is that the text clearly distinguishes this prophet from the prophets of the past and seems to consider him as a precursor to the heavenly messiah. His identification as the eschatological Prophet cannot be considered completely proven, although it is certainly the most probable reading.²³ It cannot here be positively ascertained if his role was described as messianic.

The prophet as a messianic figure

Other texts, however, enable us to determine that this expected prophet was at times considered a messianic figure. The first of these texts is 4QTestimonia, a well-preserved, rectangular sheet written at the beginning of the first century.²⁴ It contains four quotations, without comments, separated by marks in the margin. Nevertheless, the contents and order of the quotations make clear the purpose of the writing—to collect references to the coming of the different messianic and anti-messianic figures at the end of time. The texts quoted are (1) Exod 20:21b according to the Samaritan Pentateuch, giving a text that combines Deut 5:28–29 and Deut 18:18–19 according to the Masoretic Text; (2)

²³ According to an explanation in A.S. van der Woude and M. de Jonge, “11QMelchizedek and the New Testament,” *NTS* 12 (1966): 307.

²⁴ Text and plates in J.M. Allegro, *DJD* V, 57–60 and pl. 21; translation in García Martínez, *DSS*, 137.

Num 24:15–17; (3) Deut 33:8–11; and (4) a fragment of the *Psalms of Joshua*, a composition known through two copies found in Cave 4,²⁵ The first quotation is the base text, which forms the foundation for hope in the coming of a Prophet like Moses, the Prophet awaited at the end of time. The second text, which concerns the scepter and star of Balaam's oracle, is the foundation for hope in the messiah-king. The third text, taken from the blessing of Levi, is the foundation for hope in the messiah-priest. The fourth quotation, from the Psalms of Joshua, announces the coming of “an accursed man, one of Belial,” an antagonist to these messianic figures, or an antimessiah.

In essence, my reasoning for the above interpretation consists of two elements:

1. 4QTestimonia contains a collection of texts that the community interprets messianically²⁶—these texts correspond, in the same order, to the three figures of 1QS IX 11. The three quotations parallel each other and therefore must refer to similar figures.
2. This figure of the prophet is identical to the figure denoted in the other texts as the Interpreter of the Law—the one who “teaches justice at the end of times”—and the messenger figures, which have a clear prophetic character and are considered as messianic figures. Like them, then, the Prophet must be considered a messianic figure.

We are told expressly in 11QMelch II 18 that the last of these figures, the messenger, is “anointed by the spirit.” In other words, the technical term, which in 1QS IX, 11 is applied to the other two messianic figures, is applied to him in the singular. Accordingly, it seems justifiable to consider this Prophet, whose coming is expected at the same time as the messiah of Aaron and the messiah of Israel, as a true messianic figure.

The first item in my argument is obvious and needs no explanation, although perhaps it might be useful to note that *anointed* can be applied

²⁵ Published by C. Newsom, “The ‘Psalms of Joshua’ from Qumran Cave 4,” *JJS* 39 (1988): 56–73. See also H. Eshel, “The Historical Background of the Peshar Interpreting Joshua's Curse on the Rebuilder of Jericho,” *RevQ* 15/59 (1992): 409–20; and T.H. Lim, “The ‘Psalms of Joshua’ (4Q379 fr. 22 col. 2): A Reconsideration of Its Text,” *JJS* 44 (1993): 309–12.

²⁶ The interpretation of John Lübbe, “A Reinterpretation of 4QTestimonia,” *RevQ* 12/46 (1986): 187–97, who sees the text as a condemnation of the apostasy of early dissenters from the sect and as essentially concerned with contemporary rather than future issues, has failed to oust the traditional interpretation, in which the text is viewed as a collection of messianic prooftexts.

to all three figures referred to by the biblical texts of this collection of testimonia. The choice of Deut 18:18–19 shows that the expected Prophet is a “Prophet like Moses.” At Qumran, both Moses and the prophets are called *anointed ones*, a title which seems to be based on the parallel between anointed ones and prophets in Ps 105:15 and in the Old Testament allusions to the anointing of prophets. The parallel with seers and the functions of announcing and teaching attributed to them in 1QM and CD make it clear that the anointed ones spoken of are none other than the prophets. 1QM XI 7 declares: “By the hand of your anointed ones, seers of decrees, you taught us the times of the wars of your hands.” And in CD II 12 we read: “And he taught them by the hands of his anointed ones through his holy spirit and through seers of the truth.” This allows us to interpret CD VI 1 in the same way, in that those who lead Israel astray rise not only against Moses but also against “the holy anointed ones.”²⁷ This seems to be nothing less than a description of Moses as a prophet.

It will be useful, perhaps, to quote Deut 18:18–19 as presented in 4QTestimonia, since it clarifies that this expected prophet, like Moses, is portrayed in the biblical text as a true interpreter of the Law:

⁵ I would raise up for them a prophet from among their brothers, like you, and place my words ⁶ in his mouth, and he would tell them all that I command them. And it will happen that the man ⁷ who does not listen to my words, that the prophet will speak in my name, I ⁸ shall require a reckoning from him. *Blank* (4Q175 5–8)²⁸

The second element of this argument is more complex and implies an examination of the texts in which these figures—such as the Interpreter of the Law—occur. The first such text is 4QFlorilegium:²⁹

¹⁰ And “YHWH de[clares] to you that he will build you a house. I will raise up your seed after you and establish the throne of his kingdom ¹¹ [for ev]er. I will be a father to him and he will be a son to me.” This (refers to the) “branch of David,” who will arise with the Interpreter of the Law

²⁷ A still-unpublished fragment of a pseudo-Mosaic composition, to be published by Devorah Dimant, can be read as “through the mouth of Moses, his anointed one”; cf. 4Q377 2 ii 5, PAM 43.372. The manuscript is labeled “Sl 12” in the *Preliminary Concordance to the Hebrew and Aramaic Fragments from Qumran Caves II–X*, in which the phrase in question is transcribed.

²⁸ Translation in García Martínez, *DSST*, 137.

²⁹ Text and plates in Allegro, *DJD V*, 53–57 and pls. 19–20; translation in *DSST*, 136. For commentary and bibliography see G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran. 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985).

who ¹² [will rise up] in Zi[on in] the last days, as it is written: “I will raise up the hut of David which has fallen.” This (refers to) “the hut of ¹³ David which has fallen,” who will arise to save Israel. *Blank* (4Q174 I 11–12).

This text refers to the Interpreter of the Law by name, together with the branch of David, a familiar expression to denote the messiah-king, called the “Prince of the whole congregation” in other texts. His identity with the messiah of Israel presents no problem. Apart from their future coming, the text reveals nothing about both figures. The requirement that this coming take place in the last days remains important since it stresses his clear eschatological character.

The second text is CD VII 18–21:³⁰

¹⁸ *Blank* And the star is the Interpreter of the law, ¹⁹ who will come to Damascus, as is written [Num 24:13]: “A star moves out of Jacob, and a scepter arises ²⁰ out of Israel.” The scepter is the prince of the whole congregation and when he rises he will destroy ²¹ all the sons of Seth. *Blank*

The Prince of the whole congregation is the already familiar messianic figure. As in other texts, he is equated here with the scepter. Therefore, no doubt exists about his identification with the messiah-king, the Davidic messiah of Jewish tradition, and the messiah of Israel in other texts in which the Davidic character of such titles is muted. This text only tells us about the one who “will destroy all the sons of Seth,” using the expression from Num 24:17, but without specifying its meaning (which in the original biblical text is not clear). Who is the Interpreter of the Law who appears here in parallel with him? Is he a figure from the past or from the future?

In CD VI 7 the staff of Num 21:18 is identified as the Interpreter of the Law to whom the text of Isa 54:16 is applied. In this case, the wording and context of the text are sufficient proof that he is a person from the past. Most scholars identify him as the historical Teacher of Righteousness, also a person from the past.³¹ One of the great merits

³⁰ I use the critical edition prepared by E. Qimron and included in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (ed. M. Broshi; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1992), which is accompanied by photographs of excellent quality, and which contains cross-references to the copies found in Qumran. CD VII 18–21 is found in part in the copy 4Q266 3 iii 19–22, and possibly in 4Q269 5; translation in *DSST*, 38.

³¹ See the arguments put forth by Van der Woude in *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân*, 69–71, and in *idem*, “Le Maître de Justice et les deux Messies de la Communauté de Qumrân,” in *La Secte de Qumrân et les Origines du Christianisme* (ed. J. van der Ploeg; RechBib 4; Paris-Bruges: Desclée De Brouwer, 1959), 123–24. This

of Van der Woude's work is his convincing argument that the epithets Interpreter of the Law and Teacher of Righteousness are used as titles in CD to denote both a figure from the past as well as an eschatological figure whose coming is expected in the future. This argument enabled him to resolve the problem posed by the reference to an Interpreter of the Law in CD VI 7 as a figure from the past. He was also able to solve the problem posed by the subsequent text (CD VI 11), which mentions a clearly eschatological figure from the future, with a title identical to that of Teacher of Righteousness: "until there arises he who teaches justice at the end of days."

The ambiguity of CD VII 18–21 arises from the use of a participle form that can have a past or future value. Some authors, convinced that only one messianic figure is spoken of in this Amos-Numbers Midrash,³² consider the Interpreter of the Law as a figure from the past, whereas those who see in the text an allusion to two messianic figures view in this same Interpreter of the Law a future figure contemporary with the Prince of the whole congregation.³³ The strict parallelism between the two figures, the fact that both are interpreted beginning with the same biblical text (to which later tradition was to give a clear messianic value) and, above all, the details that 4Q174 brings us about this Interpreter of the Law who will come at the end of time together with the "shoot of David"—a figure whom 4Q174 explicitly identifies with the Prince of the congregation—are enough to resolve the ambiguity of the text in favor of the interpretation which sees reflected here hope in two messianic figures.

The role of the Interpreter of the Law

A determination of the role of this Interpreter of the Law would seem to be more difficult, although two interpretations have been suggested.

figure occurs frequently in 1QpHab and in CD in which works he is called "Teacher of Righteousness," "Unique Teacher," "he who teaches justice," or "the unique teacher" in alteration.

³² As, for example, A. Caquot, "Le messianisme qumrânien," in *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Paris-Gembloux: Duculot/Leuven: University Press, 1978), 241–42.

³³ For example, G.J. Brooke, "The Amos-Numbers Midrash (CD 7,13b–8,1a) and Messianic Expectation," *ZAW* 92 (1980): 397–404. See most recently the detailed study of the passage by Knibb, "The Interpretation of *Damascus Document* VII,9b–VIII,2a and XIX,5b–14," 248–51.

Starcky identified him with the expected eschatological prophet,³⁴ although this identification starts from a seemingly false premise—the union of the two messiahs of Aaron and of Israel in CD. The more prevalent opinion, following Van der Woude,³⁵ identifies this Interpreter of the Law with the messiah of Aaron, i.e., the priest-messiah who should be identified with the eschatological figure of Elijah. Van der Woude’s reasoning is essentially as follows: The Interpreter of the Law is a person from the future and thus distinct from the Interpreter of the Law in CD VI 7, a person from the past; the Interpreter of the Law parallels the Prince of the whole congregation, a messianic figure identical with the messiah of Israel; this suggests he must also be a messianic figure. The title given him, Interpreter of the Law, is very general and can denote various figures, but the specification “who will come to Damascus” (meaning Qumran) is more significant. The clause comes from 1 Kgs 19:15, in which Elijah receives from God the order to go to Damascus to anoint the king of Syria, the king of Israel, and the prophet Elisha. In later tradition,³⁶ and in the Karaite material collected by N. Wieder,³⁷ Elijah is portrayed as the eschatological high priest who performs the anointing of the messiah. In rabbinic tradition, Elijah is also portrayed as one who will resolve the halakhic problems the rabbis are unable to solve, when he returns at the end of time as a forerunner of the messiah. This permits Van der Woude to conclude that the Interpreter of the Law denotes Elijah, whose coming is expected at the end of time. This figure is seen as a priestly messiah and thus is indistinguishable from the messiah of Aaron of the other Qumran texts.

The problems with this reasoning are that the two texts that mention the eschatological figure of the Interpreter of the Law describe nothing of his priestly character and that the features of prophet seem more characteristic of Elijah than those of a priest. Accordingly, for very different reasons from those of Starcky, it seems to make more sense to identify this messianic figure of the eschatological Interpreter

³⁴ Jean Starcky, “Les quatre étapes du messianisme à Qumrân,” *RB* 70 (1963): 497.

³⁵ Van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân*, 43–61.

³⁶ Justin, *Dialogus cum Tryphone* 49; see most recently P. Pilhofer, “Wer salbt den Messias? Zum Streit um die Chronologie im ersten Jahrhundert des jüdisch-christlichen Dialogs,” in *Begegnungen zwischen Christentum und Judentum in Antike und Mittelalter: Festschrift für Heinz Schreckenberg* (ed. D.-A. Koch and H. Lichtenberger; Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1993), 335–45.

³⁷ N. Wieder, “The Doctrine of the Two Messiahs among the Karaites,” *JJS* 6 (1955): 14–23.

of the Law with the messianic figure of the Prophet. He is the Prophet expected at the end of times, whose identification with Elijah redivivus can be accepted without difficulty.

Van der Woude assembled the main arguments provided by the text, proving that the historical figure referred to as Teacher of Righteousness and Interpreter of the Law was seen as a true prophet. This allowed him to conclude that this historical figure had been perceived as a Prophet like Moses, whose coming is foretold in 1QS IX 11. In my view this conclusion is wrong.

A text such as CD XIX 35 to XX 1 demonstrates that the period of existence of the “unique Teacher” (or of the “Teacher of the Community”) is seen as different from the future coming of the messiahs with whom the coming of the Prophet is associated. However, his arguments demonstrating the prophetic character of the person appear completely valid. Van der Woude’s points indicate that the figure called Interpreter of the Law or “he who teaches justice at the end of days” must be identified with this Prophet, expected together with the messiahs of Aaron and of Israel. Precisely because the historical Teacher of Righteousness was perceived as a true prophet like Moses, it was possible to use the titles he who teaches justice and Interpreter of the Law for this figure expected at the end of time and described as a Prophet like Moses.

The fundamental difference between my interpretation and Van der Woude’s is that for him the Prophet is not a messianic figure, but a forerunner of the messiahs. I, however, believe that the eschatological Prophet is a messianic figure. He can only be identified with a historical person from the past if this person is considered as redivivus. His messianic character is not an obstacle to his character as a forerunner, as shown by the messenger of 11QMelch—together with the heavenly messiah, whose coming is expected in the final jubilee of history. Furthermore, the manuscript presents this messenger not only as prophet, but also as one anointed of the spirit.

John J. Collins has speculated that the same messianic figure of the Prophet appears in another very important text, 4Q521.³⁸ This text does indeed mention a messiah,³⁹ however, because a full discussion would

³⁸ Collins, “The Works of the Messiah,” 98–112; and *idem*, *The Scepter and the Star*, 102–35.

³⁹ Published by Puech in “Fragment d’une apocalypse araméenne,” and studied in greater detail in his *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d’une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien* (2 vols.; Études Bibliques Nouvelle série 21–22; Paris: Gabalda, 1993), 627–92.

take too long and I am not sure that this messiah should be identified with the expected eschatological Prophet,⁴⁰ I will not review his arguments here.

Although not directly related to the two topics discussed, it seems appropriate to conclude this presentation by quoting one of the most beautiful fragments of the Qumran texts in which messianic expectation appears:

¹ [for the heav]ens and the earth will listen to his messiah, ² [and all] that is in them will not turn away from the holy precepts. ³ Be encouraged, you who are seeking the Lord in his service! Blank ⁴ Will you not, perhaps, encounter the Lord in it, all those who hope in their heart? ⁵ For the Lord will observe the devout, and call the just by name, ⁶ and upon the poor he will place his spirit, and the faithful he will renew with his strength. ⁷ For he will honor the devout upon the throne of eternal royalty, ⁸ freeing prisoners, giving sight to the blind, straightening out the twisted. ⁹ Ever shall I cling to those who hope. In his mercy he will jud[ge,] ¹⁰ and from no-one shall the fruit [of] good [deeds] be delayed, ¹¹ and the Lord will perform marvelous acts such as have not existed, just as he sa[id] ¹² for he will heal the badly wounded and will make the dead live, he will proclaim good news to the meek, ¹³ give lavishly [to the need]y, lead the exiled and enrich the hungry, ¹⁴ [...] and all [...].⁴¹

⁴⁰ The ambiguity of the fragmentary text cannot be resolved, as Jean Duhaime has indicated for frag. 2 in “Le Messie et les Saints dans un fragment apocalyptique de Qumrân (4Q521),” in *Ce Dieu qui vient: Études sur l’Ancien et le Nouveau Testament offertes au professeur Bernard Renaud à l’occasion de son soixante-cinquième anniversaire* (ed. R. Kuntzmann; *Lectio Divina* 159; Paris: Cerf, 1995), 265–74. I have considered the interpretation of frag. 2 as referring to the Royal or Davidic Messiah as the more likely (García Martínez, “Messianische Erwartungen in den Qumranschriften,” 182–85), and it cannot be ignored that other fragments of the same manuscript talk also of other messianic figures, such as the “priestly messiah” (frag. 8–9), and even of the “eschatological Prophet” (frag. 5–6).

⁴¹ *4QMessianic Apocalypse (4Q521)*, translation in García Martínez, *DSSS*, 394.

CHAPTER THREE

INTERPRETATIONS OF THE FLOOD IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

There is no reason to assume that the Flood narrative was not included in the biblical texts of Genesis used at Qumran. It is true that remains of Gen 6–9 are only preserved with certainty in one of the 17 biblical manuscripts of the book of Genesis, 6QpaleoGenesis;¹ but in view of the extremely accidental character of the discovery, recovery and preservation of the manuscripts, this fact need not be significant. The rather numerous allusions to Noah and to the Flood in the non-biblical manuscripts assures us that the Flood narrative was well known within the Qumran community. We can readily assume that the Flood narrative was read in Qumran as part and parcel of the words of Moses. This means that the Flood narrative was not known as a mythical account, nor as a folk tale, but as part of the Scriptures.

The accidental absence of the Flood narrative from the biblical manuscripts deprives us of the possibility of knowing exactly which of these allusions are the result of the exegesis of the biblical text done within the Qumran community and which elements come from a possibly different form of biblical text. This uncertainty does not matter too much for our purposes here, however, because within the Qumran community the biblical text was not only considered to be authoritative, but also the interpretation of the biblical text accepted within the community was considered as authoritative. In another context I have characterized the biblical interpretation of the Qumran community as an activity:—one which plays a central role in the life of the community;—which is a continuous activity;—which serves to define the identity of the

¹ 6Q1 (6QpaleoGen), edited by M. Baillet, DJD III, 105–106, pl. XX, has preserved parts of Gen 6:13–21 in palaeo-Hebrew writing. J.R. Davila, the editor of 4Q1 (4QGen-Exod^a), DJD XII, 29–30, pl. V, suggests that frag. 47 could possibly come from Gen 8:20–21, but only four letters are preserved in two lines, making all identification impossible. For a listing of all the biblical manuscripts from Qumran see U. Gleßner, “Liste der biblischen Texte aus Qumran,” *RevQ* 16/62 (1993): 153–92, and E. Ulrich, “An Index of the Passages in the Biblical Manuscripts from the Judean Desert,” *DSD* 1 (1994): 113–29; 2 (1995): 86–107.

group;—which is based on authority;—the non-acceptance of which could result in exclusion from the group;—which is ultimately founded on revelation;—and which could lead to the modification of the biblical text.² As we shall see in the second example (4Q252), a clearly sectarian perspective represented by the calendar of 364 days is introduced as a hermeneutical tool to resolve the chronological problems of the Flood narrative, leading to sensible modifications in the biblical text used.

My purpose here is to provide a rather summary overview of all the allusions to the Flood narrative found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and to present in greater detail the two best preserved fragments dealing with this narrative, 4Q252 and 4Q370.

1. *References to Noah and the flood narrative in the DSS*

As far as I can ascertain, Noah and the Flood narrative are mentioned, used or alluded to in one way or another in the following non-biblical texts from Qumran:

a) *CD II 17–21 and V 1*³

The *Damascus Document* contains two clear references to the Flood narrative. In CD II 17–21 we read:

For having walked on the stubbornness of their hearts the Watchers of the heavens fell; on account of it they were caught, for they did not follow the precepts of God. And their sons, whose height was like cedars and whose bodies were like mountains, fell. All flesh which there was in the dry earth decayed and became as if it had never been, for having realized their desires and failing to keep their creator's precepts, until his wrath flared up against them.

This text forms part of a summary of the history of Israel embedded in an address to the members of the movement in which the lessons of the past, from the antediluvian period to the time of the exile, are used to

² See F. García Martínez, "Biblical Interpretation in Qumran," in *The International Bible Commentary: A Catholic and Ecumenical Commentary for the Twenty-First Century* (ed. W.R. Farmer; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998), 40–42 where the relevant bibliography is given.

³ Edition of the Hebrew text by E. Qimron, in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (ed. M. Broshi; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1992). All translations in this paper are taken from F. García Martínez, *DSS*.

urge them to remain faithful or, as the text puts it, to “walk perfectly on all his paths and not follow after the thoughts of a guilty inclination and lascivious eyes.” The story of the Watchers and the generation of the Flood is used as the first example of going astray that brought punishment upon the people.

CD V 1 contains a direct quotation from Gen 7:9: “And the ones who went into the ark ‘went in two by two into the ark’”; in this case the biblical account is used as a proof text to condemn polygamy and possibly divorce.

b) *1QapGen*⁴

This is potentially the most interesting manuscript for the study of the Interpretations of the Flood at Qumran, because both the birth of Noah⁵ and the Flood narrative were apparently treated in a very thorough and detailed way,⁶ and because it certainly amplifies the biblical narrative in a way closely related to the book of *Jubilees*. Cols. VI–XII of the manuscript seem to contain a summary or a copy of the lost *Book of Noah*. The existence of this composition was relatively certain thanks to several allusions to it in *Jubilees*⁷ and in one of the additions to the *Testament of Levi* found in the manuscript Athos Koutloumous 39.⁸ Its

⁴ *1QapGen* has not yet been fully edited due to the poor state of the manuscript. N. Avigad and Y. Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon. A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press and Heihkal ha-sefer, 1956) published cols. II (which deals with the marvellous birth of Noah) and XIX–XXII (which paraphrase Gen 12–15), as well as some quotations from other columns. J.T. Milik published *1Q20*, some small fragments from the same scroll, apparently from the precedent columns, DJD I, 86–87, pl. XVII. J.C. Greenfield and E. Qimron recently published the remains of col. XII which deals with the planting of the vineyard and related rituals after the Flood: “The Genesis Apocryphon Col. XII,” in *Studies in Qumran Aramaic* (ed. T. Muraoka; *Abr-Nahrain* Supplement 3; Louvain: Peeters, 1992), 70–77. Recently a preliminary transcription of the better preserved of the missing materials has appeared, in M. Morgenstern, E. Qimron and D. Sivan, “The Hitherto Unpublished Columns of the Genesis Apocryphon,” *Abr-Nahrain* 33 (1995): 30–54.

⁵ Described in cols. II–V of the manuscript, which apparently go back to a “Book of Lamech,” and which have Lamech as the protagonist of the narrative in the first person.

⁶ Contained in cols. VI–XII of the manuscript which, to judge by the elements that can be read, were certainly dependent on the lost “Book of Noah” and also used the first person with Noah as the protagonist.

⁷ *Jub.* 10:13: “And Noah wrote everything in a book just as we though him according to every kind of healing,” and 21:10: “Because thus I have found written in the books of my forefathers and in the words of Enoch and in the words of Noah.”

⁸ Manuscript *e* in the critical edition of M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (PVTG I 2; Leiden: Brill, 1978): “That is what

existence is now completely certain thanks to the discovery of the heading of this book in a blackened fragment of 1QapGen V 29,⁹ to which multi-spectral imaging techniques have been applied. This heading: כְּתָב נֹחַ מִלִּי נֹחַ “The book of the words of Noah,” which appears after a blank line, implies, as Steiner has emphasized, that what follows are the words of Noah, not words about Noah, a fact confirmed by the use of the first person in the narrative which follows.¹⁰ The remains or extracts of this *Book of Noah* preserved in 1QapGen would be an extremely interesting example of the interpretation of the Flood narrative for our purposes here, but the manuscript is so badly preserved that in most of its columns very few lines, or even sentences or words, can be read with any certainty; in addition, its precise relationship to *Jubilees* is so unclear and disputed that it would require a study of its own. Therefore the study of its interpretation of the Flood, as given by Noah in the first person, must be left for another occasion.

c) 1Q19¹¹

Fourteen very small fragments of this manuscript have been preserved. The fragments were originally published as a possible copy of the lost *Book of Noah*, but this ascription can be seriously disputed. The manuscript is in Hebrew, it does not contain any allusions to the Flood, and the narrative is cast in the third person. As far as can be ascertained, frags. 1–2 refer to the fall of the Angels and frag. 3 deals with the marvellous birth of Noah, which would rather suggest a relationship with the “Book of Lamech” as represented in 1QapGen I–V. However, the reference to Lamech in the third person shows that it cannot come from the same composition. In the preserved fragment Noah is not directly mentioned, nor is there any allusion to the Flood.

my father Abraham ordered me, because that is what he found written in the book of Noah on the blood.” For a reconstruction of this lost book, see F. García Martínez, “4QMess Ar and the Book of Noah” in *Qumran and Apocalyptic* (F. García Martínez; STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1–44.

⁹ See the photographic reproduction of the fragment in J.C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), facing page 83, and its study by R.C. Steiner, “The Heading of the Book of the Words of Noah on a Fragment of the Genesis Apocryphon: New Light on a ‘Lost’ Work,” *DSD* 2 (1995): 66–71.

¹⁰ As can be seen in the remains of 1QapGen XII already published.

¹¹ Published by Milik, DJD I, 84–86 and 154, pl. XVI.

d) 4Q176 8–11, 10–11¹²

This Hebrew text, known as 4Q*Tanhumim*, contains a secondary reference to the Flood narrative. This document is an anthology of biblical passages of consolation, taken primarily from Deutero-Isaiah, and intersected by commentaries of the *peshet* type. The fragment in question quotes MT Isa 54:8–9 without any major differences: “As in (the) days of Noah will this be for me; as [I swore] that the waters of Noah would not flood the earth, so have I sworn not to become angry with you again or threaten you.” Unfortunately, we do not know how this reference to the Flood of the Prophet Isaiah was interpreted in Qumran, because the following lines of the fragment, which contained the *peshet*, are very badly preserved.

e) 4Q244¹³

One of the fragments of this manuscript (4Q244 8) contains a clear reference to the Flood. Most of the small fragments of this Aramaic composition known as *Pseudo-Daniel*, of which at least two copies have been found, preserve part of a review of Israel’s history. This review, probably presented as an exposition on the book mentioned in 4Q243 frag. 6, is expounded by Daniel before a King. The narrative of the Flood was certainly part of it, but unfortunately almost nothing of it has been recovered. The text only reads: “[...] after the Flood [...] / [...] Noah from (Mount) Lubar [...] / [...] a city [...].” The reference to Mount Lubar shows that the narrative was not restricted to the details of the biblical text, but included other elements, in this case common to 1QapGen and the book of *Jubilees*.

f) 4Q252 (for this text see below: 3. 4QCommentary on Genesis A)

g) 4Q253¹⁴

This manuscript, known as 4Q*Commentary on Genesis B*, was previously considered to be a second copy of 4Q252 (4QpGen^b) although there

¹² Edition by J.M. Allegro, DJD V, 60–67, pl. XXII–XXIII.

¹³ Partially published by J.T. Milik, “Prière de Nabonide’ et autres écrits d’un cycle de Daniel, fragments de Qumrân 4,” *RB* 63 (1956): 407–15, and more completely by J.J. Collins, “Pseudo Daniel Revisited,” *RevQ* 17/65–68 (1996): 111–35. See F. García Martínez, “4QPseudo-Daniel Aramaic and the Pseudo-Danielic Literature,” in *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, 137–61.

¹⁴ The manuscript has not yet been fully published, but a transcription of the Hebrew

is no clear overlapping between the two texts. Now, as its official name indicates, it is considered rather to be a different composition, although similar to the other three “Commentaries on Genesis” both in content and in literary genre. Four small fragments have been recognized as belonging to this manuscript, but only frag. 1 can be related to the narrative of the Flood. Its only contribution is the mention “[...] from the ark [...]” in line 2, without any further context.

h) 4Q254¹⁵

This manuscript, too, was once considered to be a third copy of 4Q252 and it is now regarded as a similar though different composition, designated *4QCommentary on Genesis C*. To it have been assigned 21 fragments. Two of them deal with the blessings of the sons of Jacob, one of the main topics of 4Q252, although there is no overlapping between the two manuscripts. Lines 3–4 of frag. 1, the only ones connected with the Flood narrative, seem to correspond with 2Q252 ii 5–6, and they certainly contain Gen 9:24–25, the curse of Canaan; but the immediately preceding text in both manuscripts is different: in 4Q252 the curse of Canaan is preceded by a *vacat* and by the assertion that Noah has completed a full year in the ark, while in 4Q254 it is preceded by the introductory formula for a biblical quotation in line 1, and by the expression: “upon the openings and the win[dows...].” As Brooke notes, על פתוחים is an expression that never appears in the Scriptures, which makes it probable that it is here part of the explanation of the lost quotation. פתח is, of course, used to designate the door of the ark in Gen 6:16, but in the singular, so that it is not immediately apparent whether these “openings” or “doors” indeed refer to the only door of

text may be found in B.Z. Wacholder and M. Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four: Fascicle Two* (Washington: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1992), 216–17, and an English translation of the original photographs in *DSS*, 215. To my knowledge, the only introduction to its contents is to be found in F. García Martínez and A.S. van der Woude, *De rollen van de Dode Zee: Ingeleid en in het Nederlands vertaald* (2 vols.; Kampen: Kok, 1994–1995), 2:259–61. It will be edited by G.J. Brooke in *DJD XXII*.

¹⁵ Partially published by G.J. Brooke, “4Q254 Fragments 1 and 4, and 4Q254a: Some Preliminary Observations,” in *Proceedings of the Eleventh World Congress of Jewish Studies. Division A: The Bible and Its World* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1994), 185–92. This article studies frags. 1 and 4 of 4Q254. For a transcription and translation of the other fragments, see the works quoted in the previous note. The manuscript will be edited by G.J. Brooke in *DJD XXII*.

the ark, or whether the fragment is dealing with a completely different structure. The fragment only teaches us that 4Q252 was not the only extant commentary on the curse of Canaan.

i) 4Q254a¹⁶

The photograph PAM 43.239 contains three fragments which were thought to be part of the manuscript 4Q254 but are now considered to be the remains of a different manuscript. There are no physical joins between the three fragments, and no decisive arguments can be drawn from their physical shape concerning their relative positions in the original scroll. We cannot be completely certain about the order in which they should be read. My translation¹⁷ adopts the disposition of the PAM photograph, starting with the largest fragment which has preserved part of the upper margin; the actual editor favours a different arrangement and considers that this fragment should be located after the other two. In any case, it is clear that 4Q254a does not closely follow the order of the biblical text. Frags. 1–2 (in the numbering of the editor) start with the mention of the dove, which in the biblical narrative appears for the first time in Gen 8:8, and strangely enough continues with the recording of the dimensions of the ark according to Gen 6:15. Frag. 3 starts with the exit of Noah from the ark, in a formulation without an exact parallel in the biblical text but that closely resembles 4Q252 1 ii 1–5, and continues with the mention of the raven, which in the biblical narrative features in Gen 8:7 before the sending of the dove, but which does not appear at all in 4Q252. This detail, and the statement that the raven came back in order to make something known to the last generations, make this fragment very interesting. The uncertainties concerning the ordering of the fragments and their precise relationship with 4Q252 preclude its treatment here, however.

¹⁶ The actual editor of the manuscripts 4Q252–254, G.J. Brooke, considers (for palaeographic and orthographic reasons) that the three small fragments which were formerly considered to be frag. 15 of 4Q254 represent a different manuscript, 4Q254a, now designated *4QCommentary on Genesis D*. He published the text of these three fragments in the article quoted in note 15; in the transcription and translations quoted in note 14 they are still referred to as frag. 15 of 4Q254.

¹⁷ *DSS*, 216.

j) 4Q370 (*for this text see below: 2. 4QAdmonition on the Flood*)

k) 4Q422¹⁸

The manuscript, known as *4QParaphrase of Genesis-Exodus*, contains a paraphrase of the creation story of Gen 1–4 in its first fragment, a paraphrase of the Flood narrative in frags. 2–7, most of which have been grouped as col. II of the document, and a paraphrase of the plagues and some events leading to them in the book of Exodus in col. III. In spite of the efforts of the editors to reconstruct a whole column from the scattered fragments, very little can be concluded about the content of the fragments, about their relationship to the biblical text, or about the interpretation of the Flood narrative offered by its author. The fragments dealing with the Flood have more the character of a homily than of a paraphrase, and the treatment of the Flood narrative appears to have been very summary: half of the column seems to deal with the situation after the Flood, as a manifestation of “the glory of the Most High.”

l) 4Q504¹⁹

The allusion in this manuscript to the Flood narrative is uncertain. Frag. 8 of 4Q504 (4QDibHam^a = *4QWords of the Luminaries*^a) contains the remains of a prayer which is clearly centred on the narrative of the Eden, and the last preserved line (l. 14) uses a characteristic expression from Gen 6:11, 13: לַמַּלּוּאָה אֶת הָאָרֶץ הַמַּסַּחֵם, “to fill the earth with violence.” This may indicate that the Flood narrative was also used in the general argument of the prayer; but the conclusion cannot be established, because the expression is also used in the prophetic literature.

m) 4Q508²⁰

In this copy of the *4QFestival Prayers* (4QPrFêtes^b) there is a clear mention of Noah (in 3 2) which may refer to Gen 9:9, although it is only partially preserved: “[...] and for their multitude. With Noah you established [a covenant...]” The text continues with the mention of Isaac and

¹⁸ Published by T. Elgvin and E. Tov, DJD XIII, 427–41, pls. XLII–XLIII. See T. Elgvin, “The Genesis Section of 4Q422 (4QparaGenExod),” *DSD* 1 (1994): 180–96.

¹⁹ Edited by M. Baillet, DJD VII, 137–68, pl. XLIX–LIII, frag. 8 recto is on pp. 162–63.

²⁰ Edited by M. Baillet, DJD VII, 177–84, pl. LIV, fragment 3 is on pp. 179–80.

Jacob, and only allows us to conclude the liturgical use of the figure of Noah and the narrative associated with him.

n) 4Q534–536²¹

These three manuscripts are considered to be three copies of the same composition, although the only overlapping I have been able to discover is between frag. 3 of 4Q535 and frag. 2 of 4Q536. The contents of the three manuscripts are compatible, in so far as 4Q534 contains the two topics dealt with by the other two manuscripts. 4Q534, of which two fragmentary columns have been preserved, deals with the marvellous birth of the protagonist of the story called “Elect of God,” and details his great wisdom and his knowledge of all the secrets. 4Q535,²² of which four small fragments have been preserved, also deals with the birth of its protagonist whose weight is established as having been more than 350 shekels and mentions the angel Barakiel (see *1 En.* 6:7). 4Q536,²³ of which two fragments have been recovered, one of them with the remains of two consecutive columns (to which a small snippet can be joined at a distance), talks about the wisdom of the protagonist and about his knowledge of the secrets. It is true that the protagonist of 4Q534 is presented as receiving the knowledge through the reading of three books, whereas the protagonist of 4Q536 appears to receive his knowledge through revelation,²⁴ and that 4Q534 mentions the “Saints” and the “Watchers” (עִירִיָּן) to refer to the angels whereas 4Q536 uses “the most highest ones” (עֲלִיּוֹנִין) to designate them, but the general lines of the narrative of the three manuscripts are indeed compatible, and there is no reason to question its appurtenance to a single composition.

²¹ 4Q534, known as 4QMes Ar, was published as a Horoscope of the Messiah by J. Starcky, “Un texte messianique araméen de la grotte 4 de Qumrân,” in *Mémorial du cinquantième. École des langues orientales anciennes de l’Institut Catholique de Paris: 1914–1964* (Travaux de l’Institut Catholique de Paris 10; Paris 1964), 51–66. The text was first interpreted as referring to Noah by J.A. Fitzmyer, “The Aramaic ‘Elect of God’ Text from Qumran Cave IV,” *CBQ* 27 (1965): 348–72, an interpretation accepted later by J. Starcky and confirmed by J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 56. For a detailed study of the manuscript see García Martínez, “4QMess Ar and the Book of Noah.” 4Q535 and 4Q536 have not been edited yet, but a preliminary transcription of some fragments may be found in K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Ergänzungsband* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 125–27, and a complete translation in García Martínez and Van der Woude, *De Rollen van de Dode Zee. Ingeleid en in het Nederlands vertaald*, 2:373–75.

²² See PAM 43.572.

²³ See PAM 43.575.

²⁴ “The lights (?) will be revealed to him” and “mysteries will be revealed (or “he will reveal mysteries”) as the most highest ones,” in 4Q536 1 i 3 and 8.

As indicated,²⁵ 4Q534 was originally published as a horoscope of the Messiah, but it was soon recognized that the text fitted better as a description of Noah; and though this identification of its protagonist has recently been questioned,²⁶ I see no compelling reasons to doubt the correctness of this identification or not to consider this Aramaic composition as related to the lost *Book of Noah*, or as a witness to this lost book. But for our purposes here, the fragments do not add anything of interest and may be disregarded. The Flood seems to be clearly alluded to in 4Q534 1 ii 13–14: “they will destroy,” “water will cease,” and the story of the fallen angels seems to be the topic of the rest of this column. But nothing more can be extracted from the fragmentary remains.

o) 5Q13²⁷

This manuscript, a sectarian rule which mentions the *Mebaqqer* and quotes 1QS in frag. 4, contains an allusion to the Flood narrative in frag. 1 7. Again, the reference to Noah is embedded in a review of Israel’s history, and again the poor state of preservation of the manuscript prevents us from extracting anything more substantial than the mention of the Patriarch: “[...] and with Noah, your chosen one [...]” and his qualification as רציהה.

2. 4QAdmonition Based on the Flood (4Q370)

Under this title has been published a single fragment which preserves parts of two columns of text.²⁸ The manuscript, written in a late Hasmonaean semi-formal script, can be dated to the second half of the first c. B.C.E., and provides us with a good example of the re-use of the Flood narrative for parenetic or didactic purposes. The first column has

²⁵ See note 21.

²⁶ A. Caquot, “4QMess Ar 1 i 8–11,” *RevQ* 15/57–58 (1991): 145–55, considers Enoch *redivivus* to be the protagonist of the narrative, and the latest translation of the fragment reverts to the old messianic interpretation, see M. Wise, M. Abegg and E. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. A New Translation* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1996), 427–28. However, this translation completely omits the remains of col. ii, where the allusions to the Flood are found and which disproves the messianic attribution.

²⁷ Edited by J.T. Milik, DJD III, 181–83, pl. XXXIX–XL.

²⁸ Edited by C.A. Newsom, DJD XIX, 85–97, pl. XII. The text was the subject of a preliminary publication by the same author, “4Q370: An Admonition Based on the Flood,” *RevQ* 13/49–52 (1988): 23–43.

a narrative character and has clearly been influenced by the narrative in Gen 6–9; in a series of short sentences the author describes the happy condition in which humanity was created and God’s expectations that men will be faithful, the posterior rebellion of men and the subsequent punishment by means of the Flood. The preserved text may be translated as follows:²⁹

Col. I 1 And he crowned the mountains with produce and rained food upon them and satisfied every living thing with good fruit. “May all those who do what I want, / eat and be satisfied” / says YHWH 2 “and bless my [holy] name.” “But now they have done what is evil in my eyes,” says YHWH. And they rebelled against God with their deeds. 3 And YHWH judged them according to all their ways *and according to the thoughts of the [evil] inclination of their heart* (Gen 6:5b). And he thundered against them with his might. And all 4 the foundations of the earth shook, *and the waters overflowed from the abysses; all the sluice-gates of the heavens were opened* (Gen 7:11), and the abysses overflowed with mighty waters; 5 and the sluice-gates of the heavens poured out rain. And he destroyed them with the flood. [...] all of them... [...] 6 *This is why everything there was on dry land [vanished* (Gen 7:22),] *and men, the [animals and all the] birds, all winged things [died* (Gen 7:23),] And the gi[a]nts did not escape. 7 [...]...And God made [a sign of (the) covenant (?) and] *placed the rainbow [in the clouds] to remember the covenant* (Gen 9:13.15) 8 [...] *and never again will] the water of the flood [come] for [destruction, or] will the turmoil of the waters be opened* (Gen 9:11). 9 [...] they made, and clouds [...] for (the) waters [...] 10 [...]... [...]

This translation already suggests that the author used the biblical story of the Flood, but without directly quoting it. He did not intend to retell the story, but gives a summary partially using the wording of the biblical text. This implies that its readers were familiar with the story as recounted in the biblical text, and were able to recognize (and appreciate) the allusions. He also uses other traditions which were also supposed to be known by the readers, such as the fall and punishment of the Giants (line 6) which does not appear in the biblical narrative. The way he modifies the biblical texts appears clearly in a line by line comparison with the Hebrew text.³⁰

Line 3 uses the basic concept of the “evil inclination of the heart” of the biblical text as the basis of God’s judgement and not as a simple

²⁹ The italics indicate allusions to the biblical texts referred to within brackets, not direct quotations of these texts. Cf. *DSSST*, 224–25.

³⁰ See Table 1, DJD XXII, 87.

constatation of the sinful human condition. Line 4 records the two elements which brought the flood upon the earth, the waters from beneath and from above, but only for this second element is the precise wording of the biblical text used; the “great abyss” with its mythical connotations has been replaced by the more neutral plural. We cannot be sure which verb replaced “they died” in line 6, the space available is certainly too short for the verb of the biblical narrative. Also, in line 6 the wording used to describe the destruction of the birds is clearly different from the biblical text. Too little of line 8 is preserved to allow any conclusion, and a reconstruction on the basis of Gen 9:11b would have been possible if the other examples had not made it clear that the author of 4Q370 did not intend to re-write the biblical account or to paraphrase it, but was simply using a well-known story for a didactic purpose. The changes to the biblical text do not appear to reflect another form of the biblical text, nor do they seem to be motivated by exegetical concerns; the author simply gives the essentials which he thinks necessary in order to extract a moral teaching from the story.

It is clear that 4Q370 starts using the Flood narrative only in line 3. The first line contains a description of an almost paradisiac situation in which all material goods are overabundant. As the editor notes,³¹ in later rabbinic sources we find several references to the abundance which preceded the Flood,³² at the end it is even asserted that the abundance itself may have had a corrupting influence on human beings. It would be tempting to see here an early development of these ideas, were it not for the fact that the wording of this first line is so closely related to the wording of 11QP^sa XXVI 13³³ that we are obliged to conclude that this first line is a conscious re-wording of this Hymn to the Creator; and in this Hymn it is clear that the abundance described is the result of the creative activity of God. In the Hymn, this activity leads to the recognition of God’s greatness by the creatures and to their praising and blessing of God. This conscious allusion to the Hymn of the Creator forces us to conclude that the author of 4Q370 is not describing the situation

³¹ DJD XXII, 93. The editor sees attested here the three main elements of the rabbinic interpretation: “a period of antediluvian agricultural abundance, not referred to in biblical narrative,” “the close conjunction of abundance and rebellion against God,” and “the connection with the admonitions of Deuteronomy” (Deut 11:15–16).

³² *Gen. Rab.* 34:13; *Sipre Deut* 43, *t. Sota* 3:6, *b. Sanh.* 108b.

³³ Published by J.A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QP^sa)* (DJD IV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965). The manuscript contains a collection of Psalms together with other compositions, among which the “Hymn to the Creator.”

directly preceding the Flood, but is referring in a very compact way to the whole narrative of the creation (Gen 1–5).

This description of the abundance of creation is followed by a couple of sentences in direct speech which express God's expectations on the one hand ("do what I want, and praise my Name"), and human response on the other ("they have done what is evil"). It is interesting to note that the manuscript has an supralinear insertion "eat and be satisfied," which brings the text in line with Deut 8:13 where the same three verbs: eat, be satisfied, praise God, are linked to the giving of the land to the people, as if the author wanted to generalize God's graces and the abundance resulting from creation, and make a paradigm of all the actions of God with the people of Israel. Much in the same vein, all the concrete details of the human response in the Genesis story are left out of our narrative: no mention is made of Adam's sin, nor of the sin of Cain, nor of any other concrete sins before or after the giving of the land. The human response to God's goodness is reduced to the essential "do evil," a procedure which makes it easier to generalize and apply the paradigm to every circumstance. The third part of the paradigm is the reaction of God to the infidelity of man, and this reaction is the punishment. The rebellion of man is directly followed by God's judgement, exemplified by the Flood, to which is dedicated the rest of the column.

It is interesting to note that the first sentence taken from the biblical narrative of the Flood (Gen 6:5b) comes directly before the introduction of Noah in the story (in Gen 6:8–9 "But Noah found favour in the eyes of the LORD. These are the generations of Noah"). But the author omits the warning of the Flood and all the preparations, the construction of the ark and Noah's entering into it with the animals, in order to link the announcement of the punishment with its realization as described in Gen 7:11. In the biblical text Noah is presented as countering the evil of humanity, he is just and therefore elected by God: "Noah was a just man and perfect in his generation, and Noah walked with God," says Gen 6:9–10. As a result, the biblical narrative of the Flood is amenable to multiple readings. But 4Q370 does not even mention Noah. After asserting human infidelity, the text moves directly on to explain the punishment (the Flood) for this infidelity. It is thus clear that our text has not read the Flood story as a story of the deliverance of a just man, for example, or as a story of a reward for good deeds, but has interpreted it exclusively in terms of punishment for the rebellion against God. The inclusion of the punishment of the giants, which does not appear in the biblical text, reinforces the general application of the principle.

In this first example, the biblical Flood story is used as the starting point of the new composition. The Biblical text is still perceptible in the new text, but the author has transformed the concrete narrative into a general paradigm: God's generosity, exemplified in the creation/giving of the land, is answered by human rebellion, and the rebellion is inevitably followed by divine punishment, as exemplified by the Flood.

Because of the fragmentary nature of the remains of col. II, we do not know how the author would have further exploited this paradigm to instruct and exhort his readers. The remains of this column shows all the characteristics of the Sapiential literature and is closely related to 4Q185.³⁴ But even with the help of this text there is very little that we can conclude, except that the author has used this paradigm to issue a moralistic admonition: "do not disobey God's words." The meagre remains of col. II may be translated as follows:

Col. II 1 of sin, they will seek [...] 2 YHWH will justify [...] 3 and he will cleanse them from their sins [...] 4 their evil and their knowledge [...] 5 They jump, but their days are like a shadow [...] 6 and he is compassionate for ever [...] 7 YHWH's marvels; remember the won[ders...] 8 due to his fear and [your] soul will rejoice [...] 9 those who support you. Do not disobey [YHWH's] words...

3. *4QCommentary on Genesis A (4Q252)*

Our second example of the interpretation of the Flood narrative in the Qumran scrolls is more interesting, but also more complex, than the simple application of one of the possible interpretations of the biblical story as an admonition for human action of 4Q370. It shows that the sectarian interpretation does not hesitate to introduce its own agenda into the biblical text, going so far as to modify its wording accordingly.

The publication in the DJD Series of the composition, formerly designated *4Qpeshet Gen^a* and now known as *4QCommentary on Genesis A*, announced for 1996 (as part of *Qumran Cave 4: XVII [DJD XXII]*) has, as far as I am aware, not appeared yet.³⁵ But the section of the manuscript

³⁴ See the parallels in DJD XXII, 89–90 and Table 2.

³⁵ The Manuscript will be edited by G.J. Brooke. Col. V of the manuscript was already published in 1956: J.M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," *JBL* 75 (1956): 174–76, pl. 1.

dealing with the Flood narrative has been known since 1992³⁶ and has been the object of much study.³⁷

The composition is a collection of interpretations of passages taken from the Book of Genesis and presented in the same order in which they appear in Genesis. But its constituent pericopae have a generic diversity which makes it difficult to assess the overall purpose of the composition. In M. Bernstein's view, the diverse pericopae have been brought together because they contain exegetical difficulties,³⁸ with no overall design involved other than solving these difficulties. G.J. Brooke, on the other hand, sees an overall schema which has governed the selection of the pericopae: the gift of the land as represented in the blessings and curses, partially unfulfilled.³⁹ For our purposes here, this overall understanding of the composition is not particularly relevant because the section dealing with the Flood clearly shows not only that its author intended to solve the numerous problems of the biblical text, but also that he was pursuing a clearly sectarian agenda: bringing into the biblical text the peculiar calendar of 364 days used by the Qumran community.

That the composition was written within the Qumran sect is beyond doubt. Its sectarian origin is proved by the reference to "the men of

³⁶ T.H. Lim, "The Chronology of the Flood Story in a Qumran Text (4Q252)," *JJS* 43 (1992): 288–98. Cols. I 1–II 5 together with related biblical passages are printed in parallel columns in U. Gleßner, "Antike und moderne Auslegungen des Sintflutberichtetes Gen. 6–8 und der Qumran-Pesher 4Q252," *Theologische Fakultät Leipzig. Forschungsstelle Judentum: Mitteilungen und Beiträge* 6 (1993): 30–39.

³⁷ The most interesting contributions are: M.J. Bernstein, "4Q252: From Rewritten Bible to Biblical Commentary," *JJS* 45 (1994): 1–27; *idem*, "4Q252 i 2: לֹא יָדוּר רִחוּי בְּאֶדָם לְעוֹלָם: Biblical Text or Biblical Interpretation?" *RevQ* 16/63 (1994): 421–27; *idem*, "4Q252: Method and Context, Genre and Sources," *JQR* 85 (1994–95): 61–79; G.J. Brooke, "The Genre of 4Q252," *DSD* 1 (1994): 160–79; *idem*, "The Deuteronomic Character of 4Q252," in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (ed. J.C. Reeves and J. Kampen; JSOTSup 184; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 121–35; *idem*, "The Thematic Content of 4Q252," *JQR* 85 (1994–95): 33–59; *idem*, "4Q252 et le Nouveau Testament," in *Le déchirement: juifs et chrétiens au premier siècle* (ed. D. Marguerat; Le Monde de la Bible 32; Genève: Labor et Fides, 1996), 221–42; *idem*, "4Q252 as Early Jewish Commentary," *RevQ* 17/65–68 (1996): 385–401; I. Frölich, "Themes, Structure and Genre of Pesher Genesis," *JQR* 85 (1994–95): 81–90; R.S. Hendel, "4Q252 and the Flood Chronology of Genesis 7–8: A Text Critical Solution," *DSD* 2 (1995): 72–79; H. Jacobson, "4Q252 fr. 1: Further Comments," *JJS* 44 (1993): 291–93; T.H. Lim, "Notes on 4Q252 fr. 1, cols. i–ii," *JJS* 44 (1993): 121–26.

³⁸ See his articles quoted in the previous note.

³⁹ See Brooke, "The Thematic Content of 4Q252," 54–57.

the community” in col. V 5, 7–8 and by the use of the characteristic *peshar* method of interpretation used to explain Gen 49:3–4 (the blessing of Reuben) in col. IV 5–7 and Gen 49:10 (the blessing of Judah) in col. V 1–7. But only in the treatment of the Flood narrative and in the commentary of the Blessing of Jacob is a sectarian interpretation evident; the other comments on Genesis passages lack any apparent sectarian bias.

The manuscript was copied in the second half of the first c. B.C.E., and it has been preserved on seven fragments with the remains of six consecutive columns. The section dealing with the Flood narrative appears at the beginning of the composition (cols. I 1–II 7).⁴⁰ A large part of the text of this section is formed by direct quotations from the Flood narrative as we know it from the Masoretic Text (in the following translation printed in italics). The whole section may be translated as follows:

Col. I 1 [In the y]ear four hundred and eighty of Noah’s life, Noah reached the end of them. *And God 2 [sa]id: “My spirit will not reside in man for ever” (Gen 6:3a). Their days shall be fixed at one hundred and twenty 3 [y]ears (Gen 6:3c) until the end of the waters of the flood. And the waters of the flood burst over the earth. Blank In the year six hundred 4 of Noah’s life, in the second month, on the first (day) of the week, on its seventeenth (day). On that day 5 all the springs of the great abyss were split and the sluices of the sky opened (Gen 7:11). And rain fell upon 6 the earth forty days and forty nights (Gen 7:12a), until the twenty-sixth day of the third 7 month, the fifth day of the week. One hundred and fifty days did the wate[rs] hold sway over the [ea]rth (Gen 7:24), 8 until the fourteenth day in the seventh month, the third (day) of the week. At the end of 9 one hundred and fifty days, the waters came down (during) two days, the fourth day and the fifth day, and the sixth 10 day, the ark rested in the mountains of Hurrat (Gen 8:3b–4), the seventeenth of the seventh month. 11 And the waters continued [di]minishing until the [ten]th month (Gen 8:5ab). On its first (day), the fourth day 12 of the week, the peaks of the mountains began to be visible (Gen 8:5c). At the [e]nd of forty days (8:6a) after the peaks 13 of the moun[tains] began to be visible, Noah [op]ened the window of the ark (Gen 8:6b), the first day of the week, which is the tenth 14 of the el[eventh] month. And he sent out the dove to see whether the waters had diminished (Gen 8:8ab), but it did not 15 find a place of rest (Gen 8:9a) and returned to him, [to the] ark (Gen 8:9c). And he waited yet a[nother] seven days 16 and again sent it out (Gen 9:10a), and it returned to him, and in its beak there was a cut olive branch (Gen 8:11a). [It*

⁴⁰ According to Brooke, the first preserved column will correspond to the very first column of the composition, see Brooke, “The Thematic Content of 4Q252,” 36.

was day twenty-] 17 four of the eleventh month, the first (day) of the wee[k. *And Noah knew that the waters had diminished*] 18 *over the earth* (Gen 8:11b). And at the end of another seven days, [Noah sent the dove out, but it did not] 19 *come back* (Gen 8:12). It was the [fir]st day [of the twelfth] month, [the first day] 20 of the week. And at the end of the th[irty-one days from Noah having sent out the do]ve which did not re[turn to him] 21 again, *the wat[ers] dried up [from upon the earth and] Noah removed the cover of the ark* 22 *and looked, and behold [they had dried up* (Gen 8:13b) on the fourth day,] on the first (day) of the first month.

Col. II 1 *In the year six hundred and one of Noah's life* (Gen 8:13a), on the seven-teenth day of the second month 3 *the land dried up* (Gen 8:14), on the first (day) of the week. On that day, Noah went out of the ark, at the end of a complete 3 year of three-hundred and sixty-four days, on the first (day) of the week. On the seven-4 [teenth,⁴¹ on Noah's] one and six [hundred year, went out] Noah from the ark, at the appointed time of a complete 5 year. *Blank And Noah awoke from his wine and knew what 6 his youngest son had done. And he said: "Cursed be Canaan; he will be, for his br[others], the last of the slaves!"* (Gen 9:24–25) [But he did not] 7 curse Ham, but only his son, for God had blessed the sons of Noah. *And they dwelt in the tents of Shem* (Gen 9:27b), the land He gave to to Abraham his beloved. *Blank.*

This translation makes clear the two most characteristic elements of the composition: on the one hand the text does not reproduce the complete Flood story, only a selection of the biblical material is quoted, and on the other, these quotations are interspersed by small additions of elements which are not present in the biblical text. From both elements, the omissions and the additions, we can extract the interpretation its author gives to the Flood story.

According to the contents, we can divide the text into three sections of unequal length:

- (1) Col. I 1–3, which gives the interpretation of Gen 6:3.
- (2) Col. I 3–II 5, which interprets the chronological elements of Gen 7:1–8:14.
- (3) Col. II 5–7, which interprets Gen 9:24–27.

(1) In the first section the text deals with the problem of the meaning of the 120 years mentioned in Gen 6:3. The MT uses יָמָיו, and the antecedent of the 3rd. person singular pronoun is clearly אָדָם, the man.

⁴¹ I have here reconstructed the text in the two *lacunae* of line 4 according to the available space. In the manuscript there are two blank spaces, before and after וְשֵׁשׁ וְאַרְבָּעִים, with no trace of erasures or of peeling of the leather visible on the photographs. The translation is taken from my *DSSS*, 213–14, but there only the blank spaces are indicated.

The problem for the old translators was: are these 120 years the limit of the life span of the whole of humanity? Or is “the man” restricted to the generation of the flood? The problem is not one of grammar, but a problem originated by the long lives of some of the patriarchs after this divine pronouncement, a problem apparent within the Flood story itself on Gen 9:28 where the biblical text asserts that “Noah lived three hundred and fifty years after the flood.”

Both interpretations are attested in the old translations and interpretations. The *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (3:2), for example, adds for clarity the precision: “*in quos posuit terminos seculi*,”⁴² which is translated by Harrington as “For them he set the limits of life”⁴³ to “*Erunt autem anni eorum centum viginti.*” *Genesis Rabbah*⁴⁴ interprets the phrase: “But I shall bring upon them the diminution of years which I have decreed regarding them in this world” in the same way. On the other hand, the LXX makes clear, by the addition of τούτοις and of ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, that the limit of 120 years refers exclusively to the generation of the Flood. And the Targumim go even further; not only does ארבעה refer to the generation of the Flood, but the 120 years is the time given to this generation to repent. Neofiti translates: “Behold, I have given you [corr. them] the space of 120 years (hoping that) perhaps they might do repentance and they did not do (it).”⁴⁵

In this context the interpretation of our text is clear. Its author locates the announcement of the Flood in the year 480 of the life of Noah, changes the pronoun ארבעה into ארבעה and adds the precision: “until the end of the waters of the flood” to the biblical text. Specially with this last addition, the author makes it clear that the 120 years do not refer to the life span of men, but are the years before the Flood.

The first addition to our text, the age of Noah at the moment of the announcement of the Flood, is a clear exegetical conclusion by our author, deduced from the interpretation given to the 120 years. The biblical text specifies that Noah was 600 years old when the Flood started (Gen 7:6), and because its announcement happened 120 years before,

⁴² Pseudo-Philon, *Les Antiquités Bibliques* (Introduction et texte critiques par D.J. Harrington; SC 229; Paris: Cerf, 1976), 68.

⁴³ D. Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; 2 vols.; Garden City: Doubleday: 1986), 306.

⁴⁴ *Gen. Rab.* 26:6 to Gen 6:3 in the edition of J. Theodor and C. Albeck, *Midrash Bereshit Rabbah* (Jerusalem: Wahrman, 1965), 251–52.

⁴⁵ A. Díez Macho, *Neophyti I. Tomo I. Genesis* (Madrid-Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968), 511.

according to the interpretation of our text Noah must have been 480 years old at the moment of this announcement. It is true that the biblical text has already specified (in Gen 5:32) that Noah was 500 years old when he became the father of Shem, Ham and Japheth. But, as Bernstein indicates,⁴⁶ this could be an example of the application of the rabbinical principle: בתורה אין מקדם ומאחר, “there is no chronological order in Scripture.”

In addition to the above-mentioned additions and the change of pronoun, the quotation of the biblical text shows two other differences with the MT, the change of two of the verbs used (underlined in the translation): the *hapax legomenon* ידון of the MT, already translated “ad sensum” by the LXX and the Targumin, is changed into ידור, and the neutral ויהי is replaced by the more technical ויהתכו. It is difficult to ascertain whether these changes are textual variants, representing a different biblical text, or exegetical variants, the result of the interpretative labours of the author, who rather than quoting seems to be re-writing the text, but, as M. Bernstein has demonstrated,⁴⁷ the second alternative seems the most plausible.

(2) The second section of the text is the longest, and is more complex but also more interesting. This section deals with the chronology of the Flood and resolves the chronological problems of the biblical narrative⁴⁸ from the perspective of the calendar the author is using, the solar calendar of 364 days employed by the Qumran community.⁴⁹ Apparently the author intended to solve at least three problems:

a) *How long did the flood last exactly?*

According to the MT (Gen 7:11) the Flood starts precisely on the 17th of the second month of the 600 years of Noah (17/2/600), and ended exactly on the 27th of the second month (Gen 8:14) of the year after (27/2/601). This is a full calendar year plus ten days; but if the year is

⁴⁶ Bernstein, “4Q252: From Re-written Bible to Biblical Commentary,” 7.

⁴⁷ Bernstein, “4Q252 i 2: ללא ידור יהוה באדם לעולם: Biblical Text or Biblical Interpretation?”

⁴⁸ For a survey of the ancient sources on these problems, see “Appendix C: The Chronology of the Flood,” in J.P. Lewis, *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1968; repr. 1978), 190–92.

⁴⁹ For a general overview and translation of all the calendars found in Cave 4, see F. García Martínez, “Calendarios en Qumrán,” *EstBib* 54 (1996): 327–48 and 523–52. For a collection of detailed studies, see R. T. Beckwith, *Calendar and Chronology, Jewish and Christian. Biblical, Intertestamental and Patristic Studies* (AGAJU 33; Leiden: Brill, 1996).

considered to be a lunar year of 354 days, the total number of days will be 364, which are the number of days of a full year counted according to the solar calendar used at Qumran.

According to the LXX, the Flood started ten days later, on the 27/2 and ended also on the 27/2, having thus lasted a full calendar year (of 354 or of 364, according to the calendar used).

According to the Book of *Jubilees* the Flood also lasted a full year:⁵⁰ it started on 17/2 and ended on 17/2, when the earth was dry; but because its author is using the MT which specifies 27/2 as the end of the Flood, *Jubilees* lets the ark rest for 10 days before the exodus.⁵¹ *Jubilees*, however, uses a solar calendar of 364 days, which means that its total of days will amount to 374.

According to 4Q252 the Flood lasted exactly one (solar) calendar year and its author makes the Flood end not on the 27/2 but on the 17/2. He should know, as *Jubilees* does, the date of 27/2, but he does not hesitate to change it. At the end of his exposition the author emphatically says:

On that day, Noah went out of the ark, at the end of a complete year of three-hundred and sixty-four days, on the first (day) of the week. On the seven[teenth, on Noah's] one and six [hundred year; went out] Noah from the ark, at the appointed time of a complete year.

It cannot be ruled out that the change from the 27th day to the 17th day may go back to a textual variant, but it is much more probable that it is an exegetical variant, originated by the projection into the biblical text of the calendar of the author of the commentary. If we compare this text with the synchronistic calendars found in Cave 4, we note that in the first year of the cycle of three years the 27/2 of the lunar calendar and the 27/2 of the Qumran calendar fall on the same day, and that the 27/2 of the second year of the lunar calendar equals the 17/2 of the Qumran calendar. If the author of our text accepts, as he seems to, the tradition that the Flood lasted exactly one year, the change of 27 into 17 would appear to be no more than the translation into his own calendar of the data found in the biblical text.

⁵⁰ See further J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, "The Interpretation of the Flood Story in the Book of Jubilees," in *Interpretations of the Flood* (ed. F. García and G.P. Luttikhuisen; TBN 1; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 66–85.

⁵¹ *Jub.* 5:32: "And on the seventeenth day in the second month, the land was dry. And on its twenty-seventh day, he opened the ark and he sent out of it the beasts, and cattle and birds and whatever moved." Transl. by O.S. Wintermute in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2:66.

b) *How can the problem of the 40 plus 150 days between the beginning of the flood on 17/2 and the resting of the ark on 17/7 be solved?*

The author of our text seems to work out the chronological data of the biblical text systematically, translating it into his own calendar and annotating not only the days of the month in which each event took place, but also the days of the week in which they happened. The biblical text specifies that the Flood started on 17/2 (Gen 7:11) and that the ark rested on the top of the mountain on the 17/7 (Gen 8:4). These two dates are two fixed points, given by the biblical text. 4Q252 translates them directly into its own calendar, and specifies therefore that the first date was a Sunday, and that the second was a Friday, and counts the number of days between these two fixed points (which gives 152 days in its calendar). Between these two concrete dates, the biblical text mentions two other calendrical dates, which are not expressly united to the day of the month in which they occurred, but that are only expressed by the numbers of days of the duration of the event in question: “forty days and forty nights” for the falling of the water upon the earth (Gen 7:11, repeated in Gen 7:17), and “a hundred and fifty days” for the time the waters covered the earth (Gen 7:24, repeated on Gen 8:3). 4Q252 considers that the two numbers do not need to be counted separately (the sum would surpass the five months available between 17/2 and 17/7) but that the 40 days should be included within the 150 days. Therefore 4Q252 counts both dates successively from the starting point (17/2) arriving at 26/3 (a Thursday, 4Q252 I 6) and 14/7 (a Tuesday, 4Q252 I 8) respectively. The author of 4Q252 needs to solve the problem of the extra days in his calendar in order to let the ark rest on the mountain at the same point as the biblical text (17/7), and therefore interprets “and the waters receded” of Gen 8:3 as something that happened after the 150 days and before the ark rests on the mountain, an action which takes the two days he needs and allows him to let the ark rest on the mountain on the 17/7.

At the end of one hundred and fifty days, the waters came down (during) two days, the fourth day and the fifth day, and the sixth day, the ark rested in the mountains of Hurrat.

As with the previous problem, the changes in this one are clearly exegetical, originated by the application to the biblical text of the calendar used by the author of 4Q252. In this case, too, 4Q252 does not hesitate to introduce a new element into the biblical text (two extra days) in order to make it compatible with the hermeneutical tool used, the 364-day calendar.

c) *When did Noah send the dove?*

The solution given to the third problem is very simple. In the biblical text there is no indication of when Noah sent out the first dove (Gen 8:8–9), and of the second and the third doves is simply stated that Noah waited seven days after the first before sending out the second (Gen 8:10), and another seven days before sending out the third (Gen 8:12). 4Q252 starts counting from the latest date mentioned in the biblical text (the first day of the tenth month, 1/10) and adds the forty days mentioned in Gen 8:6, thus arriving at Sunday the tenth of the eleventh month (10/11). Although 4Q252 is completely silent about the sending of the raven, it is reasonable to assume that for its author it was sent out on this very date (10/11). In any case, he counts seven days after this date, as the biblical text does with the second and third doves, and concludes that the first dove was sent out on Sunday the seventeenth of the eleventh month (17/11). Now he can fix the sending of the second dove seven days later, on Sunday 24/11 (4Q252 I 17), and of the third, also seven days later, on Sunday 1/12 (4Q252 I 19). He arrives in this way at the next fixed chronological point in the biblical text 1/1/601 (Gen 8:13), exactly 31 days after the sending of the third dove, as emphatically noted in I 20.

(3) The third section of the text is rather short and gives the solution to two problems of the biblical text.

The first concerns the curse of Canaan as a result of the offense done by Ham against Noah. The implicit question in the commentary seems to be: Why did Noah curse Canaan and not Ham, the son who offended him? The answer is straightforward: God has already blessed all the sons of Noah, including Ham (Gen 9:1). This implies that the curse cannot be inflicted on somebody already blessed, as is made clear in a later dispute between R. Judah and R. Nehemiah reported in *Genesis Rabbah*.⁵²

And he says, 'Cursed be Canaan, etc.', Ham sins and Canaan is cursed? [A dispute between] R. Judah and R. Nehemiah: Rabbi Judah says, 'Because it is written, "And God blessed Noah and his sons," and there is no curse in the place of blessing, therefore, "And he said cursed be Canaan, etc."' ⁵³

⁵² Quoted by Bernstein, "4Q252: From Re-written Bible to Biblical Commentary," 10–11.

⁵³ *Gen. Rab.* 36:7, 340–41.

The second problem seems to have been the meaning of the poetic expression אֶדְלֵי שֵׁם “the tens of Shem.” The concise answer is: the expression means the land of Israel. With a wording clearly dependent on 2 Chron 20:7,⁵⁴ 4Q252 asserts that “the tens of Shem” is the land given to Abraham. No reasons for this interpretation are given, and we will not look for them. At this point, 4Q252 has already moved far away from the Flood.

⁵⁴ “Was it not you, our God, who drove out the inhabitants of this land before your people Israel and gave it forever to the descendants *of Abraham, your beloved?*”

CHAPTER FOUR

MAN AND WOMAN: HALAKHAH BASED UPON EDEN IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

1. *The Eden narrative in the Dead Sea Scrolls*

When we start reading the whole collection of manuscripts found at Qumran, looking for re-readings, interpretations or simply echoes or allusions to the Eden story as told in Gen 2–4, the biggest surprise is the small amount of material that this search brings to the fore. These chapters are scarcely represented in the biblical manuscripts preserved, and seem not to have had a strong influence in the non-biblical compositions found in the different caves.

In Qumran we have recovered twenty copies of the book of Genesis, but the remains of the Eden stories are extremely scarce; an isolated fragment (from 4Q7) with only the word יְהוָה [יהוה] could represent Gen 2:7 or Gen 2:19.¹ Another fragment (from 4Q8) has three incomplete words in two lines which could come from Gen 2:17–18.² We are on surer ground with the frags. 4 and 5 of 4Q10: the first, with remains of four lines but with only three complete words, has preserved parts of Gen 2:1–3 and presents no variants with MT; the second, with remains of three lines and eight complete words, contains part of Gen 3:1–2. Its only difference with MT is the specification of the *he* interrogative: הֲאֵיךְ, instead of הֲאֵיךְ of MT.³ The only other biblical manuscript with traces of the Eden story is 1Q1.⁴ 1Q1 2 is a fragment with remains of five lines in which almost 10 words are complete. Its identification with Gen 3:11–14 presents no problems, but the only difference with MT is (if *vera lectio*) the reading עַרְוִים (as the Samaritan Pentateuch) instead of עֵרְוָה of MT. This is all we can find in the Biblical texts from Qumran concerning the Eden stories. However, in view of the fragmentary nature of most of the biblical manuscripts of Genesis, this could be purely accidental.

¹ 4Q7 (4QGen^s) frag. 3, edited by J. Davila, DJD XII, 60.

² 4Q8 (4QGen^{h2}), edited by Davila, DJD XII, 62.

³ 4Q10 (4QGen^s), edited by Davila, DJD XII, 78.

⁴ 1Q1 frag. 2, edited by D. Barthélemy, DJD I, 49.

More surprising is the absence of non-biblical compositions which expand, comment or simply rewrite the Eden stories. In later Jewish and Christian literature these stories have led to the growth of a whole range of “Adamic” writings, and rewritings of the stories of the creation of Adam and Eve, the fall, the serpent, the garden itself and the four rivers (not to mention the stories about Cain and Abel), seem to have kept many generations of scribes and interpreters busy.⁵ This absence contrasts strongly with the abundance of materials we find in the Scrolls dedicated to expanding or commenting on the stories of protagonists of other Genesis narratives, such as Noah.⁶ Such an absence can hardly be accidental.

It is true that we cannot pretend to have recovered all the materials once present on the shelves of the library of Qumran, and that some of the compositions in which we would have expected to find a rewriting of these narratives are lacking precisely the sections in which this rewriting would have taken place. This is the case of 1QGenesis Apocryphon.⁷ The recovered sections (from column 1 to 22) are a rewriting of Gen 5 to 15, but Matthew Morgenstern recently noted that the surviving sheets containing columns 5 to 22 are marked with the consecutive letters of the Hebrew alphabet, *pe*, *tsade*, and *qof*.⁸ Since *pe* is the seventeenth letter of the Hebrew alphabet, he has inferred that fifteen or sixteen sheets must have preceded the one in which the actual column one is preserved. If this assumption proves to be true, we have lost more than seventy columns at the beginning of the scroll in which there may have been a whole series of developments of Gen 1–5.⁹ But this assumption is problematic, because, among other things, the scroll would have had an enormous length not attested in any other found scroll (more than 15 meters), and would have been unmanageable.

⁵ See, for example, M.E. Stone, *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve* (SBLEJL 3; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).

⁶ On the traditions about Noah see F. García Martínez, “Interpretations of the Flood in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Interpretations of the Flood* (ed. F. García Martínez and G.P. Luttikhuisen; TBN 1; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 86–108.

⁷ Edited by N. Avigad and Y. Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon. A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press and Heihkal ha-sefer, 1956).

⁸ M. Morgenstern, “A New Clue to the Original Length of the Genesis Apocryphon,” *JJS* 47 (1996): 345–47.

⁹ One of the scrolls of Isaiah from cave 1 (1QIsa^a), which has dimensions similar to those of 1QGenesis Apocryphon, has only sixty-four columns and contains the complete text of the Prophet.

On the length of 1QGenesis Apocryphon we can only speculate, as we can only speculate on the reasons for the absence of specific compositions commenting on, expanding or rewriting the Eden narratives. That at Qumran these narratives were known is completely certain, not only because of their presence in the biblical text (of which, as already said, we have marginal remains) but also because they figure prominently in the book of *Jubilees*, which at Qumran had very high status,¹⁰ and, albeit less prominently, in the *Books of Enoch*, also abundantly represented in the Qumran collection.¹¹

One possible reason for the absence of commentaries on these stories could be the fact that the Qumran community adopted an explanation of the origin of evil different from the one these stories advocate (and the one advocated by *Jubilees*).¹²

Maybe it is not mere coincidence that the exposition of the history of salvation offered by the *Damascus Document* (II 14ff.) starts not with the fall of Adam but with the fall of the Watchers:

For having walked in the stubbornness of their hearts the Watchers of the heavens fell; on account of it they were caught, for they did not heed the precepts of God. And their sons, whose height was like that of cedars and whose bodies were like mountains, fell. All flesh which there was on the dry earth expired and they became as if they had never been, because they had realized their desires and had failed to keep their creator's precepts, until his wrath flared up against them. (CD II 17–21)¹³

In fact, 4Q180 (“An interpretation concerning the ages which God has made”) also starts directly with “the sequence of the sons of Noah” followed by an “Interpretation concerning Azazel and the angels who came to the daughters of man and sired themselves giants.”¹⁴ But as

¹⁰ See the contribution of J.T.A.G.M van Ruiten, “Eden and the Temple: The Rewriting of Genesis 2:4–3:24 in *The Book of Jubilees*,” in *Paradise Interpreted. Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. G.P. Luttikhuisen; TBN 2; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 62–81.

¹¹ See the contribution of E.J.C. Tigchelaar, “Eden and Paradise: The Garden Motif in Some Early Jewish Texts (1 Enoch and other texts found at Qumran),” in *Paradise Interpreted. Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*, 37–62.

¹² See F. García Martínez, “The Origin of Evil and the Dualistic Thought of the Sect,” in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism* (B. McGinn, J.J. Collins, and S.J. Stein; 3 vols.; New York: Continuum, 1998), 1:166–72.

¹³ Hebrew text and translation in F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1:552–53. All quotations of Qumran texts (until 4Q273) are taken from this edition, the most easily accessible.

¹⁴ *DSSSE*, 1:370–71.

said, we can only speculate about the reasons for the absence. The fact is that the eden narratives are far less prominent in Qumran than we would have expected.

There are, of course, some tantalizing allusions which may imply the knowledge of some of the traditions associated in later literature with the Eden stories. One such allusion is the mention of the לשון הקודש (“the holy tongue”) in 4Q464 3 i 8,¹⁵ a fragment which may reflect the tradition known by *Jub.* 3:28 and 12:26 that Adam (and all the animals) spoke Hebrew before the fall.¹⁶ Others are the reference of the *Astronomic Enoch* to the קושטא פּרדס (“*Pardes* of Justice”),¹⁷ which also has a long development in later writings such as the *Slavonic Enoch*. And, of course, the disputed מקדש אדם (“Temple of man/Adam”) of 4QFlorilegium (4Q174 1 i 6).¹⁸

Even more tantalizing is a series of allusion which seems to indicate that a *Urzeit-Endzeit* typology of the Eden stories was already developed in the sectarian writings of Qumran. We have in CD III 20 and in 1QH^a IV 15 the use of the expression כבוד אדם (“the glory of Adam”) in an eschatological context:

But God, in his wonderful mysteries, atoned for their iniquity and pardoned their sins. And he built for them a safe home in Israel, such as there has not been since ancient times, not even till now. Those who remained steadfast in it will acquire eternal life, and all the glory of Adam is for them (CD III 18–20).¹⁹

Even though you burn the foundations of mountains and fire sears the base of sheol, those who . . . in your regulations. You protect the ones who serve you loyally, so that their posterity is before you all the days you have raised an eternal name, forgiving offense, casting away all their iniquities, giving them as a legacy all the glory of Adam and abundance of days. (1QH^a IV 13–15)²⁰

The same happens with the expression נהלת אדם (“the inheritance of Adam”) in 4Q171, a pesher on psalms, which applies Ps 37:19 “They shall not be ashamed in the evil time” to:

¹⁵ Edited by E. Eshel and M.E. Stone, DJD XIX, 215–30.

¹⁶ On this tradition, see DJD XIX, 219–21 and E. Eshel and M.E. Stone, “The Holy Language at the End of Days in Light of a New Fragment Found at Qumran,” *Tarbiz* 62 (1993): 169–77 (Hebrew).

¹⁷ Cf. Tigchelaar, “Eden and Paradise: The Garden Motif in Some Early Jewish Texts (1 Enoch and other texts found at Qumran),” 39–49.

¹⁸ *DSSSE*, 1:352–53, where the most relevant literature on the topic is given.

¹⁹ *DSSSE*, 1:554–55.

²⁰ *DSSSE*, 1:148–49.

Those who have returned from the wilderness, who will live for a thousand generations, in salvation; for them there is all the inheritance of Adam, and for their descendants for ever. (4Q171 1, 3–4 iii 1–2)²¹

And, of course, we have (if *vera lectio*) the clearly eschatological use of the expression of יום הברייה (“day of creation”)²² in col. XXIX of the *Temple Scroll*:

I shall sanctify my temple with my glory, for I shall make my glory reside over it until the day of creation, when I shall create my temple establishing it for myself for ever in accordance with the covenant which I made with Jacob at Bethel. (11QT^b XXIX 8–9)²³

But from these tantalizing expressions very little can be concluded as to the use, interpretation or transformation of the Eden stories in the Qumran writings. The Garden motif is also used as metaphor for the community in some poetical, liturgical and sapiential texts from Qumran, treated in the contribution of E. Tigchelaar to this volume. All that remains is the use of some elements of the Eden narrative in two halakhic texts, namely CD IV 20–21 and 4Q265 (*4Q Serek Damascus*) 7 11–17 which we will examine in some detail.

2. CD IV 20–21

This text is very well known and, because of its ambiguity and interest, has been discussed many times. The literature on the passage is therefore very extensive.²⁴ In what follows, I will limit myself to the essentials.

²¹ *DSSSE*, 1:344–45.

²² For the reading ברייה instead of the editor’s ברכה, see E. Qimron, “The Text of the Temple Scroll,” *Leshonenu* 42 (1978): 142 (Hebrew); the editor of the text read ברכה, see Y. Yadin, *Megillat ham-Miqdash* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977), 2:91 (Hebrew) and *idem*, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983), 1:412.

²³ Text according to E. Qimron, *The Temple Scroll. A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions* (Judean Desert Studies; Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press/Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1996), 44; translation from F. García Martínez, *DSS*, 162.

²⁴ The most important studies are collected in F. García Martínez, “Damascus Document: A Bibliography of Studies 1970–1989,” in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (ed. M. Broshi; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1992), 66. For a detailed bibliography from 1910 to 1956, see P. Winter, “Sadoqite Fragments IV 20, 21 and the Exegesis of Gen I 27 in Late Judaism,” *ZAW* 68 (1956): 71–84. The latest published studies on the topic are: J. Kampen, “A Fresh Look at the Masculine Plural Suffix in CD 4:21,” *RevQ* 16/61 (1993): 91–97; G. Brin, “Divorce at

The text reads in translation:

The builders of the wall who go after Zaw—Zaw is the preacher of whom he said (Mic 2:6) “Assuredly they will preach”—are caught twice in fornication: by taking two wives in their lives, even though the principle of creation is (Gen 1:27) “male and female he created them”; and the ones who went into the ark (Gen 7:9) “went in two by two into the ark.” And about the prince it is written (Deut 17:17) “He should not multiply wives for himself.”²⁵

Strictly speaking neither of the two references to Genesis belong to the Eden narratives. The last reference to Genesis is a quotation from Gen 7:9 and belongs to the narrative of Noah and the flood. The first is a quotation from Gen 1:27 and thus precedes the narrative of Eden. But its treatment here seems to be justified for the following reasons: a) because the same phrase is repeated in Gen 5:2 (with the pronoun suffixed), which makes of this expression a sort of frame of the whole Eden narrative, b) because the general formula which introduces it, *יסוד הבריא* (“the principle of creation”) implies the creation of Eve not yet mentioned in Gen 1:27, and c) because the same quotation of Gen 1:27 is followed by “therefore a man shall leave his father and mother and the two shall become as one; they are no longer two but one flesh” in the famous text of Mark 10:6–8, which shows that Gen 1:27 was already associated with Gen 2:24.

In order to understand the following discussion, both the immediate and the more general context of the passage of the *Damascus Document* need to be recalled, albeit summarily. Our passage is part of the so-called midrash on the three nets of Belial, with which the quotation of Isa 24:17 “Panic, pit and net against you, earthdweller” is explained. As our text says: “They [the three expressions used by Isaiah] are Belial’s three nets, about which Levi, son of Jacob spoke, by which he [Belial] catches Israel and makes them appear before them like three types of justice. The first is fornication; the second, wealth; the third, defilement of the temple. He who eludes one is caught in another, and he who is freed from that, is caught in another.”

Qumran,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Cambridge 1995, Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* (ed. M. Bernstein, F. Garcia Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 231–44; T. Holmén, “Divorce in CD 4:20–5:2 and in 11QT 57:17–18: Some Remarks on the Pertinence of the Question,” *RevQ* 18/71 (1998): 397–408.

²⁵ *DSSSE*, 1:557.

The text goes on with the already quoted section, by which the first net of Belial, הַזִּמְנוּת, is specified. The second of the nets הַדְּהוּן²⁶ (“wealth” or “riches”) is passed over without any comment at all, and the third, שְׁמֵאָה מִקֶּדֶשׁ (“defilement of the temple”) is explained as not keeping separated according to the law, which is concretized as “lying with her who sees the blood of her menstrual flow,” and as “taking as wife the daughter of his brother or the daughter of his sister,” matters which apparently have very little relationship with the temple. It is certainly possible to interpret the first of these two sins in the light of *Pss. Sol.* 8:12, which formulates the accusation in this way: “They walked on the place of the sacrifice of the Lord (coming) from all kinds of uncleanness; and (coming) with menstrual blood (on them), they defiled the sacrifices as if they were common flesh.”²⁷ It is true that sexual intercourse during the period prohibited by the law would certainly render a man unclean, and the presence of such a man in the temple would consequently pollute it. But even so, it must to be concluded that the author selected rather weak examples of temple pollution.

For these (and other) reasons most of the authors think that the redactor of the *Damascus Document* is using here a source dealing with sexual halakhah, and that from this source he extracts the offenses he attributes to the others.²⁸ These accusations have a precise purpose. In its larger context, the whole midrash of the three nets of Belial is adduced to reinforce the central assertion of the first columns of the *Damascus Document* that God has abandoned Israel and now deals only with the community. As Philip Davies says: “The passage is a demonstration that those outside the community are misled, and consequently that their halakhah is demonstrably wrong; it is thought to be right by those who follow it only because they themselves are misled by Belial.”²⁹ The justification of their own halakhah by means of proof texts taken from the Mosaic law, serves thus the purpose of proving that the halakhah followed by others is simply wrong. If they have arrived at a different interpretation of the law than the one normative within the group, it is only because they have been misled by Belial.

²⁶ The text apparently reads הַדְּהוּן, but there is no doubt that הַדְּהוּן is intended.

²⁷ In the translation of R.B. Wright in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; 2 vols.; Garden City: Doubleday: 1986), 2:659.

²⁸ See, for example, P.R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant. An Interpretation of the “Damascus Document”* (JSOTSup 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), 115–16.

²⁹ Davies, *The Damascus Covenant. An Interpretation of the “Damascus Document,”* 129.

With this larger and immediate context in mind, we can now look to our text in more detail in order to see what function it has in the reference to the assertion of Genesis that God זכר ונקבה ברא אותם “male and female created them.” But first we need to elucidate the meaning of several problematic expressions in the text and give an answer to the following questions:

1. Who are the “builders of the wall” (בניי ההיץ)?
2. At Qumran, what means זנות (which we have translated as “fornication”)?
3. What does it precisely mean to be caught בשתיים (which we have translated as “twice”)?
4. How should we interpret the pronominal suffix “in their lives” בבהיהם? In other words, does our text speak against polygamy or against divorce, or against both, or about something else?

1. “*The builders of the wall*”

The targets of the accusations of the group, the ones against whom the text is directed, are described rather cryptically as “the builders of the wall.” The expression appears twice more in the *Damascus Document* (in CD VIII 12 and 18), but also on these occasions its ambiguity remains. CD XII 12 makes clear that the biblical roots of the expression lie in Ezek 13:10 “and if anyone build a wall, these daub it with whitewash,” where it is used against the false prophets who misled the people of Israel. In the *Damascus Document* the phrase has been interpreted in two ways: as a designation of the whole Israel outside the community, and as the designation of a specific rival group; and both interpretations have very good grounds.

For P. Davies, for example, the expression must refer to Israel as a whole; otherwise the argument would not make sense because in the *Damascus Document* it is Israel as a whole which is contrasted with the community: “One could not establish that Belial is leading Israel astray by pointing to the excesses of a group which the rest of Jewish society would oppose.” He concludes: “The outcome of all the preceding discussions is as follows: the ‘builders of the wall’ are the whole of Israel outside the community.”³⁰

³⁰ Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 113.

For G. Jeremias,³¹ on the other hand, the expression designates an enemy group: otherwise it would be impossible to understand why the author, after having asserted that all of Israel is ensnared by Belial in all three nets and each single individual is ensnared by one or another, the “builders of the wall” are ensnared specifically twice. And since the expression is qualified by the phrase taken from Hos 5:11 “they go after Zaw” and Zaw is identified as מְטִיף (“preacher”), the group in question can be identified with the followers of the “Man of Lies,” the מְטִיף הַכּוֹזֵב which is mentioned not only in the *pesharim* but also at the beginning of the *Damascus Document* (CD I 14).

In my opinion, the most likely understanding of the expression, especially in light of its use in CD VIII 12, is as a designation for a rival group, but a group which is considered as representative of the whole of Israel outside the community. In CD XII 8 the same components appear, and the function of the one “who preaches lies” (מְטִיף כּוֹזֵב) is even more prominent and explicit. But in this case, the whole is situated in the context of the critique of the “Princes of Judah,” and it seems to me clear that the expression does not refer to the whole of Israel outside the community. I conclude, therefore, that the target of the accusations of the group, “the builders of the wall” is one of the adversaries of the community, a very prominent group indeed, a group that, if we take into account the halakhah of *MMT*, could even be identified with the Pharisees.

2. “Fornication”

On the meaning of זְנוּת in the Dead Sea Scrolls we can be very brief. In classical Hebrew זְנוּת means “prostitution,” “fornication,” and more generally “whoredom.”³² In Qumran the word, although remaining generally within the sexual sphere, is even more polyvalent:³³ generally it is employed in legislation concerning bigamy, divorce, incest, illegal sex with one’s own wife, improper marriages between priests and laity, marriages with foreigners, etc., but it also appears to be related to temple

³¹ G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 96–97.

³² See, for example, *DCH*, 3:123–24.

³³ For an analysis of all the occurrences of the word in the texts of Qumran, see J. Kampen, “The Matthean Divorce Texts Reexamined,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies. Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. G.J. Brooke and F. García Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994), 149–67.

defilement. It is even connected with pure food, not to mention a whole series of texts in which it is employed metaphorically in conjunction with “heart,” “eyes,” “ways,” etc. In short, from its semantic field we cannot expect any help in solving the problems of our text, because the word lacks the necessary precision (a conclusion which may surprise those who try to explain the exception clause of Matthew $\mu\eta\ \epsilon\pi\iota\ \rho\omicron\rho\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ with the help of the use of זנות in Qumran).³⁴

3. “Twice”

On the meaning of the בשתיים the scholars are divided, depending on their general understanding of the text. For the ones who interpret the text as referring both to polygamy and divorce, it means that the transgressors are caught in two sorts of זנות : marrying two women and divorcing their wives. For others, such as Chaim Rabin,³⁵ it means that “they are caught in two respects in whoredom.” This implies that, of the three nets, only זנות is discussed in the text: as taking two wives and as taking as wife a niece, although these two “respects” would have been separated by V 5–7 (the third net of the text) which Rabin considers a parenthetical addition.

In my opinion the wording of the text “he who eludes one is caught in another” with בזנה and בזנה certainly suggests that בשתיים indeed refers to the nets, and it can be translated “they are caught in two (of the three nets), namely in fornication . . . and in defiling the sanctuary.” The objection of Rabin and Davies³⁶ that this understanding left unexplained the accusation of marrying one’s niece does not hold if this accusation is seen as part of the defilement of the sanctuary. After all, marrying a niece is no more related to the sanctuary than lying with a menstruating woman. Since our text is completely silent about the second of the three nets of Belial and only explains the first and the third, it does seem logical that the “builders of the wall” are indeed caught in the two which are mentioned.

³⁴ See the studies listed by Kampen, “The Matthean Divorce Texts Reexamined,” 151–52.

³⁵ Ch. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (2nd rev. ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1958), 16–17.

³⁶ Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, 114.

4. "In their lives"

The central problem posed by this text is the precise meaning of the pronominal suffix of בְּחַיֵּיהֶם "in their lives."³⁷ In fact, the understanding of what the text is talking about, the accusation levelled against the enemies, depends primarily on the interpretation of the pronoun.

Vermes, in a famous article,³⁸ lists four main interpretations:—our text would prohibit both polygamy *and* a new marriage after divorce;—it would prohibit only polygamy (or, strictly speaking, bigamy) but not a new marriage after divorce;—it would only prohibit divorce;—it would prohibit every second marriage during one's whole life, even after the death of the first wife. Of these interpretations, only the last one interprets literally the masculine pronoun: every man who during his life takes two wives is caught in fornication, be it after divorce, after the death of the first wife or simultaneously. The other three interpretations (by far the more common) give the pronoun the value of a feminine pronoun, as if the text were talking of the wives' lives: the man would be caught in fornication if he marries two wives (simultaneously or successively) when they are alive. Either polygamy, divorce or both, would be forbidden in the text.

The Hebrew text is perfectly clear and employs a third person masculine pronominal suffix, בְּחַיֵּיהֶם. But the resulting assertion seems to be so strange in a Jewish context that, to my knowledge, only two interpreters have dared to defend it until now. The first was J. Murphy-O'Connor,³⁹ who could not find any compelling reasons not to give the suffix its normal value, and postulated a literal translation of the sentence. The other was P.R. Davies,⁴⁰ who systematically dealt with all the arguments put forth by G. Vermes and adduced Josephus' description of the practices of the married Essenes as a plausible context for the legal norm of our text.⁴¹ All the other interpreters, either assume a mistake in which the

³⁷ On the different interpretations proposed, see Kampen, "A Fresh Look at the Masculine Plural Suffix in CD 4:21."

³⁸ G. Vermes, "Sectarian Matrimonial Halakhah in the Damascus Rule," *JJS* 25 (1974): 197–202, reprinted in *Post-Biblical Jewish Studies* (G. Vermes; SJLA 8; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 50–56.

³⁹ J. Murphy-O'Connor, "An Essene Missionary Document? CD II,14–VI,1," *RB* 77 (1970): 201–29.

⁴⁰ Chapter "Marriage and the Essenes" in P.R. Davies, *Behind the Essenes. History and Ideology of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (BJS 94; Atlanta: Scholars Press 1987), 73–85 and 141–43.

⁴¹ L.H. Schiffman, "Laws Pertaining to Women in the Temple Scroll," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden:

scribe wrote the masculine suffix instead of the feminine (in Hebrew a simple change of the last letter, a *mem* into a *nun*) and correct the text accordingly, or give to the masculine suffix the value of a feminine suffix.⁴²

The interpreters who think that our text prohibits polygamy (to have simultaneously two wives), can claim a good reason to understand (or even to correct) the text as a statement prohibiting marrying two women when both are alive (בְּחַיֵּיהֶן): namely that the biblical phrase on which the expression is based is the text of Lev 18:18,⁴³ and this text employs the feminine pronoun בְּחַיֵּיהָ, “in her life.” Besides, the third of the proof-texts adduced in our fragment, the text of Deut 17:17 (“He [the king] shall not multiply wives for himself”) is also quoted in 11QT^a LVI 18–19, and a little later in this text it is interpreted in the following way:

He shall take for himself a wife from his father’s house, from his father’s family. He shall take no other wife apart from her, because she will be with him all the days of her life. If she dies, he shall take for himself another from his father’s house. (11QT^a LVII 15–19)⁴⁴

Here there is no doubt that polygamy is involved; this is the main issue, and the King is required to be monogamous. Divorce also may be involved, although indirectly, in so far as it is said that the wife shall remain with him all her life.⁴⁵ Remarriage after the death of the first

Brill, 1992): 210–28, explains the suffix in a different way, as referring to both parties in a divorce. After asserting that “This difficult passage indicates that it is considered fornication (*zenut*) to marry *two wives if they are both living*” [my emphasis], which apparently implies that he has read the suffix as feminine, Schiffman concludes: “The text seems to prohibit not only polygamy, but even remarriage after divorce. Neither party to the divorce may remarry as long as the other is alive. (This may be the reason for the difficult *be-hayyehem*, with a masculine suffix. It may refer to both parties to the divorce.)” (p. 217).

⁴² R.H. Charles, in his translation of 1913, after noting that the suffix is indeed masculine, justified this understanding with the observation that “But not infrequently in the O.T. the masc. suffix is used in reference to feminine nouns.” Cf. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (ed. R.H. Charles; 2 vols.; Oxford 1913, reprint 1973), 2:810.

⁴³ Which prohibits incest, forbidding taking the sister of the wife while she is alive.

⁴⁴ Text in Qimron, *The Temple Scroll*, 82; translation in *DSST*, 174.

⁴⁵ Schiffman, “Laws Pertaining to Women in the Temple Scroll,” 217 concludes “More difficult is the question of whether divorce is also prohibited by this law in the *Temple Scroll*.” Holmén, “Divorce in CD 4:20–5:2 and in 11QT 57:17–18: Some Remarks on the Pertinence of the Question,” 401–402, interprets the phrase in the light of Deut 17:19 which is also applied to “the royal guard” and to the “royal council” in the *Temple Scroll*. He consequently understands “she will be with him all the days of her life” not as referring to divorce but as a description of the ideal wife of Prov 31:12 who watches upon the King and keeps him from evil “all the days of her life.”

wife is also clearly allowed (no doubt to assure that there is always a Queen).

Even before the publication of the *Temple Scroll*, this text was brought into the discussion of the meaning of the *Damascus Document*.⁴⁶ And because here polygamy and possible divorce are clearly prohibited to the King, most of the interpreters concluded that the *Damascus Document* prohibits the same thing for everybody.

But in my view this conclusion is far from proven⁴⁷ and forgets two basic methodological points:—the text of CD as it stands yields perfect sense (even if it seems strange to us and it was indeed strange in the Jewish context of its time) and without very serious reasons should not be modified;—every text should be interpreted on its own, before importing into it the opinions of other (even if closely related) documents.

The first point was sufficiently emphasized by Murphy-O'Connor. The second point is especially important here, because the recently published⁴⁸ new fragments of the *Damascus Document* from cave four show without doubt that divorce was not only allowed, but clearly regulated.

A fragment which apparently implies divorce is a fragment of 4Q270, one of the copies of the *Damascus Document* which contains a penal code not preserved in the copy of the Genizah.⁴⁹ Among the sins punished with expulsion from the community we find the following:

And whoever approaches to have illegal sex with his wife, not in accordance with the regulation, shall leave and never return. (4Q270 7 i 12–13)⁵⁰

The type of sin involved does not concern us here.⁵¹ What is interesting is that only the man is expelled from the community, and not the wife.

⁴⁶ Y. Yadin, "L'attitude essénienne envers la polygamie et le divorce," *RB* 79 (1972), 88–89.

⁴⁷ Davies, "Marriage and the Essenes," 77–78 correctly underlines the differences between the King and the rest of the male species both in the *Temple Scroll* and in rabbinic literature.

⁴⁸ By J.M. Baumgarten, DJD XVIII.

⁴⁹ First edited by J.M. Baumgarten, "The Cave 4 Versions of the Qumran Penal Code," *JJS* 43 (1992): 268–76. See Ch. Hempel, "The Penal Code Reconsidered," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, 337–48 and *eadem*, *The Laws of the Damascus Document. Sources, Tradition and Redaction* (STDJ 29; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 141–48.

⁵⁰ *DSSSE*, 1:616–17.

⁵¹ A number of suggestions have been made on the exact nature of this offence. Baumgarten, "The Cave 4 Versions of the Qumran Penal Code," 270, hesitantly suggests "illicit marital relations during the menses"; M. Kister, "Notes on Some New Texts from Qumran," *JJS* 44 (1993): 281, proposes "sexual relations without intention of procreation"; S. Talmon, "The Community of the Renewed Covenant," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and

The text does not tell precisely what happens with her, but it is difficult to imagine that she would be condemned to remain a deserted wife all her life because of a transgression committed by her husband. This could imply that in this case divorce would be imposed upon the man in order to free the woman, who apparently remained a member of the community when the husband was expelled.

This text certainly does not prove that divorce was practiced in the community of the *Damascus Document*, but it suggests a circumstance when divorce could be applied within the community. The proof that divorce was indeed practiced by this community is provided by frag. 9 iii from 4Q266,⁵² which contains part of the tasks of the Instructor and allows us to complete the fragmentary lines of CD XIII 15–XIV 2. The composite text reads:

And likewise with regard to anyone who takes a wife; it should be with consultation. And likewise he (the Inspector of the camps) shall pay attention to anyone who divorces; he shall instruct their children [...] and their small children with a spirit of modesty and with compassionate love.⁵³

Although in the composite text there remains a small gap⁵⁴ and the two manuscripts present a somehow different text,⁵⁵ the new fragment makes it clear not only that marriage and divorce took place in the community of the *Damascus Document*, but that these matters were duly regulated and that the “Inspector of the camps” took an active role in counselling in these matters. The unavoidable conclusion is that the regulation of CD IV 20–21 cannot be taken as a ban on divorce, because the same document recognizes and legislates its practice within the community. Even

J. VanderKam; *Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 10*; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 9, interprets the text as referring to any kind of marital relation during the member’s permanence in the “commune” [the settlement at Qumran]; J. Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer. Band II* (UTB 1863; München: Reinhardt, 1995), 229, indicates “Abweichung von der festen Sitte (v.a. von ‘the missionary position’)”; A. Tosato, “Su di una norma matrimoniale 4QD,” *Biblica* 74 (1993): 401–10, understands the text differently, as prohibiting sexual relations with an illegitimate wife, referring the אִשָּׁרָה not to the offence but to the wife: “E Colui che si avvicina per ‘prostituzione’ a sua moglie, la quale non è secondo la normativa giuridica, dovrà uscire (dalla comunità) e non far(vi) più ritorno.”

⁵² DJD XVIII, 70–71.

⁵³ *DSSSE*, 1:572–73 (CD XIII 16–18); 594–95 (4Q266 9 iii).

⁵⁴ Baumgarten, DJD XVIII, fills it with “[and their daughters].”

⁵⁵ There is a variant, not recorded as such in the *editio princeps* (the omission of the verb בִּן in the text from the Genizah which reads simply לְמוֹנֵרֶשׁ (וְכִן לְמוֹנֵרֶשׁ), and in the same manuscript is a sizeable lacuna at the beginning of line 17 which cannot be filled with the words preserved in 4Q266 and which requires some additional text.

if the *Temple Scroll* contained a ban on divorce,⁵⁶ the introduction of this meaning into the *Damascus Document*, a text which has its own position on the matter, would be unwarranted.

Strange as it could appear, the literal interpretation of CD IV 20–21, which gives to the masculine suffix its normal value, is the one which is most coherent with the rest of the document. We can conclude that what this text forbids is not only having two wives simultaneously, but also that it forbids two marriages in a single lifetime, be it after the death of the spouse or after having divorced her.

The text of Gen 1:27 (as well as Gen 7:9 and Deut 17:17) is used in our fragment to ground and bolster a halakhic rule peculiar to the group. The conflict with their opponents was a conflict of interpretation of the law and the quotations are an essential part of the argument, intended to prove that the interpretation followed by the group of the *Damascus Document* and the consequent halakhic position was the only correct interpretation of the biblical text. In this perspective, the use of the Eden narrative we find in this text does not differ essentially from the use of the same narrative in the Gospel of Matthew. The only difference is in the halakhic position adopted. In Matthew the same text is used to ban divorce, while in CD it serves to ban not only polygamy but every second marriage.

3. 4Q265 7 11–17

The second halakhic text in which the Eden narrative is used was presented by Joseph Baumgarten for the first time during the Paris congress of the IOQS.⁵⁷ The text, which has not yet been published in the official DJD edition, is part of a very interesting composition which is somehow

⁵⁶ Which, as said, is possible but far from certain, and in any case it would be restricted to the King. In LXVI 11, in the law of the seduced or raped woman, we find the precision “she will be his wife, since he raped her, and he cannot dismiss her all her life,” which certainly asserts that in this case divorce is not allowed, but implies that in other normal cases it is allowed. Also in LIV 4–5 when dealing with the laws of vows, the author quotes Num 30:10 “But any vow of a widow or of a divorced woman, etc.” without making any restriction at all on the divorcee.

⁵⁷ J.M. Baumgarten, “Purification after Childbirth and the Sacred Garden in 4Q265 and Jubilees,” in *New Qumran Texts and Studies*, 3–10, pl. 1. As far as I am aware, the text has only been dealt with briefly in a study by E. Eshel, “Hermeneutical Approaches to Genesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Book of Genesis in Jewish and Oriental Christian Interpretation, A Collection of Essays* (ed. J. Frishman and L. van Rompay; Traditio Exegetica Graeca 5; Peeters: Leuven 1997), 1–12, on pp. 10–11.

a cross between the *Rule of the Community* and the *Damascus Document*.⁵⁸ It contains a penal code similar to the one in the Serek but also sabbath rules similar to the rules preserved in the CD.⁵⁹ The first ten lines of frag. 7 contain the end of sabbath rules, including the limit of two thousand cubits which a man can walk with animals on the sabbath, followed by a reference to the council of the community. And then, probably motivated by the desire to provide a rationale for the laws of purification after giving birth which the rest of the column addresses, the author introduces an elaboration on the Genesis narrative of the garden of Eden. In line 11, after a *blank*, starts the text which interests us here:

¹¹ In the first week [... be-] ¹² fore he was brought into the garden of Eden. *Blank* And bone [from his bones...] ¹³ was for her, before she was brought to his side [...]. ¹⁴ [for] holy is the garden of Eden. And every shoot which is in its middle, is holy. Therefore (Lev 12:2-5) [a woman who conceives and bears a male child] ¹⁵ shall be impure for seven days; as in the days of her menstrual impurity, she shall be impure. And thirty-three days she shall remain in the blood of] ¹⁶ her purification. *Blank* But if she gives birth to a baby girl, [she shall be impure for two weeks, as in her menstruation, and sixty-six days] ¹⁷ [she shall re] main in the blood of her purification. No holy thing [shall she touch...]. (4Q265 7 11-17)⁶⁰

Although the text is fragmentary and only can be reconstructed continuously from line 14 thanks to the quotation of Lev 12:2-5, the parallel offered by the book of *Jubilees* allows us to understand the general meaning of the first part in which the Eden narrative is thrust. *Jub.* 3:8-13 reads:⁶¹

⁸ In the first week Adam was created and also the rib, his wife. And in the second week he showed her to him. And therefore the commandment was given to observe seven days for a male, but for a female twice seven days in their impurity.

⁹ And after forty days were completed for Adam in the land where he was created, we brought him into the garden of Eden so that he might work it and guard it. And on the eightieth⁶² day his wife was also brought in. And after this she entered the garden of Eden. ¹⁰ And therefore the

⁵⁸ *DSSSE*, 1:546-49. [References now are to the edition of J.M. Baumgarten in DJD XXXV, where the text is titled 4QMiscellaneous Rules]

⁵⁹ For the studies on the penal code see the references given in note 49; for a listing of the most important studies on the Sabbath law see L. Doering, "New Aspects of Qumran Sabbath Law from Cave 4 Fragments," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, 251-74.

⁶⁰ *DSSSE*, 1:548-49.

⁶¹ In the translation of O.S. Wintermute, in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2:59.

⁶² Wintermute mistakenly print "eighth."

command was written in the heavenly tablets for one who bears. “If she bears a male, she shall remain seven days in her impurity like the first seven days. And thirty-three days she shall remain in the blood of her purity. And she shall not touch anything holy. And she shall not enter the sanctuary until she has completed these days which are in accord with (the rule for) a male (child).¹¹ And that which is in accord with (the rule for) a female is two weeks—like the two first weeks—in her impurity. And sixty-six days she shall remain in the blood of her purity. And their total will be eighty days.”

¹² And when she finished those eighty days, we brought her into the garden of Eden because it is more holy than any land. And every tree which is planted in it is holy.¹³ Therefore the ordinances of these days were ordained for anyone who bears a male or female that she might not touch anything holy and she might not enter the sanctuary until these days are completed for a male or female.

This parallel shows that the main points of our fragment are precisely the points which characterize the rewriting of the Eden narrative as it appears in *Jubilees*, some of which were until now only attested in this composition.⁶³ Which inevitably leads us to conclude that the author of 4Q265 is using the Eden story precisely in the rewritten form found in *Jubilees* as the source or inspiration of his narrative; in other words, our text appears to give us a summary of the story as retold in *Jubilees*. These main points are:

1. The creation of Adam and Eve outside the garden of Eden,
2. The garden as sanctuary,
3. The explanation of the period of purification after birth as a consequence of the time elapsed between the creation and the entrance into the Garden respectively of Adam and Eve.

Because all these points have been discussed in detail in the analysis of the narrative of *Jubilees* by J. van Ruiten, we only need to underline how these points appear in our text.

1. *The creation of Adam and Eve outside the garden*

Our text begins with something that happened “in the first week.” The parallel with *Jubilees* and the remains of line 12 allow us to reconstruct in line 11, as does Baumgarten, the editor, “In the first week Adam was created” (as in the first sentence of *Jub.* 3:8, which clearly specifies that

⁶³ See Van Ruiten, “Eden and the Temple: The Rewriting of Genesis 2:4–3:24 in *The Book of Jubilees*.”

Adam and Eve were created in the first week). This allows us to determine the subject of the verb in line 12, the person who is brought into the Garden. This line 12 states explicitly that whatever happened in line 11 happened before the entrance into the garden of Eden. We cannot know which event is referred to, but the negative construction used (עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא) before “he was brought” (הוּבֵא) suggests that the situation is seen in a negative way, contrasted with the new situation attained once the protagonist is introduced into the Garden. The same construction and the same verb are used in line 13 (this time in a feminine form) suggesting a similar negative situation of the second (feminine) protagonist.

After a *Blank* a new section starts in our text, of which only the word “bone” has been preserved. Again, in light of *Jub.* 3:5 and 3:8 it is possible to complete this line, as does the editor, as referring to the creation of Eve from a bone of Adam. In our text, as in *Jubilees*, Adam and Eve are not granted immediate access to the Garden but need to wait for a certain time outside. The reason for this delay is specified in line 14 and is the same reason put forth by *Jub.* 3:12: the Garden is holy and access to holiness requires purification.

2. *The garden as sanctuary*

This holiness of the Garden leads the author of *Jubilees* to equate it with the Temple. *Jubilees* also presents Adam as priest.⁶⁴ Although *Jub.* 3:27 (“And on that day when Adam went out from the garden of Eden, he offered a sweet-smelling sacrifice”) explicitly locates the first sacrifice of Adam after his expulsion from Eden, there is no doubt the Garden is presented as a prototype of the temple. The interdiction to enter the temple that Lev 12:3–5 imposes upon the parturient is here transferred to Adam and Eve who are not allowed to enter the Garden before the period of purification has been completed. Besides, *Jubilees* not only affirms that the garden “is more holy than any land” (*Jub.* 3:12), but it identifies explicitly the Garden with the Temple: “And he [Noah] knew that the garden of Eden was the holy of holies and the dwelling of the Lord” (8:19).⁶⁵

⁶⁴ See J.R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism. From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (JSPSup 1; Sheffield: JSOT, 1988), 92–95. On the priesthood of Adam in *L.A.B.* see C.T.R. Hayward, “The Figure of Adam in Pseudo-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities*,” *JStJ* 23 (1992): 1–20.

⁶⁵ See D.W. Parry, “Garden of Eden: Prototype Sanctuary,” in *Temples of the Ancient*

This idea was until now not found explicitly in the writings of Qumran. M. Wise⁶⁶ is the only one who has interpreted the disputed expression *מקדש אדם* of 4QFlorilegium as meaning “Temple of Adam,” although giving to it an eschatological meaning, based on the *Urzeit/Endzeit* typology and on the well-attested relationship of “Paradise” and Temple in Jewish tradition. But the new fragment of 4Q265 shows that the equation in *Jubilees* of Eden with the Temple was not only known, but was used for the same purpose as in *Jubilees*. 4Q265 7 14 reads almost as a direct translation of the second part of *Jub.* 3:12.

3. *The explanation of the period of purification after birth*

In *Jub.* 3:8–12 the idea of the Garden as Temple is used to explain the difference in length of the period of purification after childbirth in the case of a boy and of a girl required by the law of Lev 12:3–5. There it is established that a parturient should fulfil seven and thirty-three days of purification for a boy child before approaching the sanctuary in order to offer the prescribed sacrifices. During this time, the text specifies that “she shall not touch anything sacred nor enter the sanctuary.” For a baby girl, she should wait fourteen and sixty-six days.

This difference has always been difficult to explain, and *Jubilees* is the first known attempt to supply a rationale for it: that the origin of this difference is to be found in the different period of time that Adam and Eve expended before being allowed to enter the Garden, forty days for Adam and eighty for Eve. The underlying reason is that Adam and Eve need purification before being allowed to enter the Garden.⁶⁷

Jubilees makes this etiological explanation of Leviticus explicitly, quoting the biblical text as if it was written in the “Heavenly Tablets,”⁶⁸ although it is not completely clear how the author arrived at this etiology. In *Jubilees* the week and the two weeks (the seven and fourteen

World (ed. D.W. Parry and S.D. Ricks; Salt Lake City: Deseret/Provo: FARMS, 1994), 126–51.

⁶⁶ M. Wise, “4QFlorilegium and the Temple of Adam,” *RevQ* 15/57–58 (1991): 103–32.

⁶⁷ According to *Jub.* 3:6 Adam has intercourse with Eve (“knew her”) when she is presented to him the day of her creation, outside the Garden. On this see G. Anderson, “Celibacy or Consummation in the Garden? Reflections on Early Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Garden of Eden,” *HTR* 82 (1989): 121–48.

⁶⁸ See F. García Martínez, “The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of *Jubilees*,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ 64; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 243–60.

days) are related to the first week (in which Adam was created)⁶⁹ and to the second week (in which Eve was created and shown to Adam); and the forty and eighty days are related to the time of the respective entrances into the garden. The reason for observance of seven days for a male and “twice seven days” for a female is given (the difference in the time of the creation of Adam and Eve), but no reason is given for the difference of the additional 33 or 66 days for the male and the female other than the total of days that Adam was outside the Garden was 40, while 80 was the total of the days Eve needed to wait before being introduced into Eden. This would imply that the numbers in *Jubilees* are introduced expressly for the purpose of justifying the numbers given in the law of Leviticus.

If the way in which the author of *Jubilees* arrived at his conclusion is not completely clear, there is no doubt about his reason, the typological identification of the Garden with the Temple: “because it [the Garden of Eden] is more holy than any land, and every tree which is planted in it is holy.” This is the same identification we find in 4Q265 which uses the same etiological explanation for the period of purification after childbirth. The only difference is that 4Q265 gives this reason as part of the narrative (l. 14).⁷⁰

4. Summary

The two halakhic texts we have examined show two different approaches to the biblical text, although in both the biblical narrative of the Garden of Eden is used in order to base a halakhic rule. Both approaches are grounded in the centrality of Scripture for the Community of Qumran.

In CD, the text of Gen 1:27 (as well as Gen 7:9 and Deut 17:17) is adduced to ground and bolster a halakhic rule peculiar to the group and to prove that the halakhah followed by the opponents of the group is clearly wrong; the biblical narrative is used to justify a sectarian interpretation. 4Q256, on the contrary, uses a rewritten version of the Eden narrative (known to us only in the book of *Jubilees*) in order to justify a halakhic rule undisputed but unexplained in the biblical text.

⁶⁹ But also the rib, from which Eve will be formed, which the text defines as “his wife.”

⁷⁰ Although ׀ is reconstructed, the available space in the lacuna makes the reconstruction unavoidable and almost certain.

CHAPTER FIVE

PRIESTLY FUNCTIONS IN A COMMUNITY WITHOUT TEMPLE

In the best introductions to the Qumran scrolls, the leading role of priests in the Community is rightly emphasized. L. Schiffman, for example, states: “At the very founding of the sect, the Zadokite priests played a leading role... These priests were clearly at the heart of the sect’s early ideology.”¹ It is indeed evident, even during the most cursory reading of the scrolls, that priests play a very prominent role in the writings of Qumran. Kuhn’s *Konkordanz* lists already 92 occurrences of the word כוהנים/כוהן² and the Preliminary Concordance adds another 91 instances of the use of the word only in the Hebrew Texts.³ This frequent use of the word and the fact that most of its occurrences appear in writings generally considered to be products of the Qumran group, leaves no doubt as to the importance of priests within the Qumran community.

The reading of all these texts makes completely clear that “priest” is understood in a very concrete way. Although there is no definition of who is a priest, it is absolutely clear that priest and non-priest are different categories to which one belongs by birth, a fact emphasized by the use of the expression זרע אהרן (“offspring of Aaron”). The largest fragment of 4Q419 (one of the Wisdom compositions)⁴ mentions priests in line 3 and uses this expression in line 5 (4Q419 1 5). And the same

¹ L.H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 113–14.

² K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), 98–99.

³ *A Preliminary Concordance to the Hebrew and Aramaic Fragments from Qumrân Caves II–X Including Especially the Unpublished Material from Cave IV* (Printed from a card index prepared by R.E. Brown, S.S., J.A. Fitzmyer, S.J., W.G. Oxtoby, J. Teixidor. Prepared and arranged for printing by H.-P. Richter. Volumes I–V. Editorum in Usum; privately printed in Göttingen, 1988), 2:901–904.

⁴ PAM 43.534; for a transcription, see B.Z. Wacholder and M. Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four: Fascicle Two* (Washington: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1992), 155. Now edited by S. Tanzer, DJD XXXVI, 322–23, pl. XXII.

expression appears in such a typically sectarian composition as 4Q265 (*Serek Damascus*), which prescribes within the Sabbath law that “No one from the seed of Aaron may sprinkle the [cleansing] wa[ter on the Sabbath day]” (4Q265 7 3).⁵

Priesthood at Qumran thus is not understood metaphorically, but in the very concrete sense of belonging to the “seed of Aaron.” At Qumran there is nothing similar to the “universal priesthood” that appears in the New Testament interpretation of Exod 19:6: “You shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy people.”⁶ We do not find at Qumran the claim that the whole people and not just the Aaronites are priests; on the contrary, the distinction between priests, Levites and Israelites is asserted repeatedly. Priesthood is a matter of descent and at Qumran priests are and remain priests; as such are clearly distinct from the other members of the community which do not share priestly descent.

On the other hand, the same introductions accentuate also the fact that the Qumran Community has broken with the Temple of Jerusalem, as it is attested, for example, by 1QS IX 3–4 and CD VI 11–15. This separation from the Temple has many consequences for the life of the priests who are members of the community (as well as for non-priestly members): they do not participate in the Temple cult, they do not receive their dues of the sacrifices or the offerings, they do not make sacrifices at Qumran, they substitute prayer for the the sacrifices.

The same introductions emphasize rightly that this separation from the Temple and the sacrificial cult was perceived as a temporary matter until the imminent restoration of the Temple cult at the end of days, as it is attested, for example, by 1QM and 11QT. In the end, participation in the Temple cult is taken for granted, as is participation in the sacrifices, and the fulfilment of all other priestly duties. But the community’s members (including the priests) did not develop their own sacrificial cult in an alternative location either (as it was done by the Zadokite priests followers of Oniad III at Leontopolis).

The question of this paper follows directly from these undisputed conclusions of modern research: accepting that at Qumran there were priests (by descent) and that these priests were not taking part in the sacrificial cult of the temple, what were their functions within the community?

⁵ PAM 43.305. Hebrew text and translation in F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1:548–49. Now edited by J.M. Baumgarten, DJD XXXV, 69, pl. VII.

⁶ See 1 Pet 3:9 and Rev 1:6; 5:10; 20:6.

To the best of my knowledge, most of the research on this topic has focused on the different way in which some of the priestly functions directly dependent on the sacrificial cult were given a new content at Qumran: the new way to make atonement,⁷ the substitution of prayer for sacrifice,⁸ the participation in the angelic liturgy,⁹ the interpretation of the Scripture,¹⁰ the holding of supreme authority within the community,¹¹ etc. But very little, or no attention at all, has been paid to the fact that priests at Qumran continue to fulfill many traditional priestly functions.¹²

It is my intention to offer here an inventory of some of these functions, as they are attributed to priests in the Dead Sea Scrolls. I can only give a sampling of what the texts say about priests, ordering these quotations in what could be termed “a taxonomy of priestly functions in a community without temple.”

This taxonomy clearly will reveal that these priests, in addition to the new functions attributed to them, continue to practice within their community the traditional priestly functions which were not directly dependent upon the sacrificial cult in the temple, such as the use of lots, teaching, judging and blessing.

Priestly functions exercised at Qumran

The preserved texts do not give us a definition of priesthood from which we may extract a list of the priestly functions exercised at Qumran. In Kuhn's Konkordanz the abstract substantive כהונה (*k'huna*) appears three

⁷ See P. Garnet, *Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls* (WUNT 3; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1977), 57–111.

⁸ See G. Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament* (SUNT 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971).

⁹ See J. Maier, *Vom Kultus zu Gnosis* (Religionswissenschaftliche Studien 1; Salzburg: Otto Müller), and C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press 1985), 59–72.

¹⁰ See F. García Martínez, “Interpretación de la Biblia en Qumrán,” *Fortunatae. Revista Canaria de Filología, Cultura y Humanidades* 9 (1997): 261–86.

¹¹ At least according to the version of the *Rule of the Community* from Cave 1, see recently A.I. Baumgarten, “The Zadokite Priests at Qumran: A Reconsideration,” *DSD* 4 (1997): 137–56.

¹² This trend was already settled with the basic study of O. Betz, “Le Ministère cultuel dans la Secte de Qumrân et dans le Christianisme primitif,” in *La Secte de Qumrân et les Origines du Christianisme* (ed. J. van der Ploeg; RechBib 4; Paris-Bruges: Desclée De Brouwer, 1959), 163–87.

times; in Baillet's edition of materials from Cave 4¹³ we find five more occurrences; and four more in Newsom's edition of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*.¹⁴ Of these occurrences in *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* only one refers to the human priesthood (4Q400 2 6): וכוהנהנו מה במעונייהם ("And how shall our priesthood [be considered] in their habitations?"); all the others refer to the angelic priesthood, especially to the seven angelical priesthoods (4Q403 1 ii 22). But neither from this isolated mention of the human priesthood, nor from the other phrases in which the abstract substantive is used (most of them extremely fragmentary), can we conclude what the concrete functions of priests at Qumran were. To ascertain what these functions were we need to follow another path. The one I have taken is to look at priestly functions as described in different layers of the Old Testament in order to summarize the understanding of the priesthood which would have been common to all Jews of the time.

The first element which comes to the fore in all surveys of the biblical priesthood is that priestly functions were never restricted to the service of the altar, the maintenance of the Temple, and the performance of the sacrifices, even if the cultic and sacrificial ministry was the most characteristic element of the priesthood in the historical period we are concerned with. A perusal of a history of the Old Testament priesthood brings to the fore many other functions exercised by priests.¹⁵

1) In the old Israelite priesthood,¹⁶ for example, one of the basic components of the priestly functions was *oracular* activity (by means of the Urim and Thummim, or by the casting of lots), and equally basic was *teaching*, expressed in Deuteronomy as the giving of instruction in the *mishpatim* and the *Torah*. As it is put in the blessings of Levi (Deut 33:8–10):

8 וללוי אמר תמוך ואוריך לאיש חסידך ...
10 יורו משפטיך ליעקב ותורתך לישראל

And of Levi he said: Let your Thummim and your Urim be for the man of your favor . . . they shall teach your judgments to Jacob and your law to Israel.

¹³ M. Baillet, DJD VII, 324.

¹⁴ Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*, 418.

¹⁵ For a good survey of the scholarship on the priesthood, see J. Auneau, "Sacerdoce: II. Ancien Testament," *DBSup* 10:1203–54.

¹⁶ R. de Vaux, *Les institutions de l'Ancien Testament* (2 vols.; Paris: Cerf, 1960), 2:195–221.

Or, if we read Deut 33:10 according to *4QTestimonia*, with the *hiphil* of אור and the plural תורה instead of the singular: (4Q175 17–18): ויאירו משפטיך ליעקוב תורתכה לישראל “and they shall illuminate your judgments to Jacob, your laws to Israel.”¹⁷ In any case the *teaching* function of priests, the descendants of Levi, is clearly attested already in this old hymn (as it is the connection of the priesthood with the Torah) as well as the *oracular* function represented by the use of the Urim and Thummim.

2) The “deuteronomistic” reform of the cult brought to the fore the difficult relationship of priests and Levites and the role of the Levites in the central sanctuary. Although the terminology fluctuates, the Deuteronomist recognizes the priestly character of the Levites.¹⁸ In the texts reflecting this reform we can find another priestly function underlined: the *blessing* of the people in the name of the Lord. In the introduction to the priestly blessing, in Num 6:22–27, it is said: “And the Lord spoke to Moses saying: Speak to the sons of Aaron and to his sons, saying: In this way you shall bless the children of Israel.” It is true that this priestly blessing was uttered at the Temple as a cultic function, but it appears as something clearly distinct from sacrifice and the service of the altar.

The reform of Josiah and the centralization of the cult in the Jerusalem Temple, inevitably put new emphasis on the sacrificial function of the priests as one of the main characteristic of the priesthood, brought to the fore the importance of the Zadokite priesthood in Jerusalem, and settled the problematic relationship between priests and Levites. In the verse inserted at Deut 10:8 these elements are so formulated: “At that time the Lord separated the tribe of Levi, to bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord, to stand before the Lord to minister to Him, and to bless in His name, to this day.” The claim to the priesthood through the connection with the ark and the basic priestly rights of the Levites are thus recognized, but also the function of blessing is strongly underlined.

3) And when Ezekiel mentions the functions of the “priests Levites sons of Zadok” (הכהנים הלויים בני צדוק), together with the offering of the fat and the blood and with the ministry of the table of the Lord, the prophet

¹⁷ The singular reading of 4Q35 frags. 11–15 3 (יור, for יורה?) instead of the usual plural (יורו) is apparently an invocation of God’s blessing: “may he (Levi) teach to Jacob...” which is consequently followed in the next verse “May he place...” See J.A. Duncan, “New Readings for the ‘Blessing of Moses’ from Qumran,” *JBL* 114 (1995): 281 and *eadem*, *DJD* XIV, 68–69.

¹⁸ A. Cody, *A History of the Old Testament Priesthood* (AnBib 35; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1969), 120–23.

specifies as characteristic of the priests *teaching* and participation in the *judicial process*.¹⁹ Of the priests it is said in Ezek 44:23: וְאֵת עַמִּי יוֹדוּ בֵּין וְאֵת טְמֵאָה לְטָהוֹר לְיֹדְעֵם (“and they shall teach my people to distinguish between the sacred and the profane and to differentiate between the clean and the unclean”), and of them it is asserted in the following verse (Ezek 44:24): וְעַל רִיב הַמָּזָה יַעֲמְדוּ לְשַׁפֵּט בְּמִשְׁפָּטֵי וּשְׁפָטָהּ. Although this sentence is not without difficulties, it is usually understood (following the Ketiv in the first case and the Qere in the second) as “and in a dispute they shall stand to judge, they shall judge according to my judgments.” In any case here the judicial function of priests is as strongly asserted as their teaching function was in the previous verse.

Together with the service of the altar, the maintenance of the Temple, and the performance of the sacrifices, this rapid survey has shown that the biblical text also recognizes as priestly functions the following: oracular activity, teaching, blessing, judging, and the separation of the sacred from the profane and the pure from the impure.²⁰

Because the exercise of these priestly functions (except the cultic ones) were not directly dependent upon the service of the Temple, we may expect that in the Qumran community these functions were still performed by their priests. And indeed, the texts available show that the priests of the community continued to exercise all of them.

The oracular function

We have a tantalizing text, published some time ago by J. Strugnell²¹ and included now in the second volume of “Parabiblical-Texts” (DJD XIX),²² in which the oracular use of the Urim and Thummim is explicitly

¹⁹ J.D. Levenson, *Theology of the Program of Restoration of Ezekiel 40–48* (HSS 10; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1976), 40–48.

²⁰ More or less at the same conclusion arrives M. Haran in his survey article on “Priest and Priesthood,” *EncJud* 13:1069–86, at 1076: “The functions of the priest although mainly concerned with the cult, were not solely limited to it. In general four types can be distinguished among them: specifically cultic function; mantic functions, i.e. functions concerned with the solution of mysteries of the future or the past and the making of decisions in uncertain cases through the revelation of divine will, treatment of impurities and diseases with the special ceremonies involved; and judging and teaching people.”

²¹ J. Strugnell, “Moses-Pseudepigrapha at Qumran: 4Q375, 4Q376, and Similar Works,” in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. L.H. Schiffman; Sheffield: JSOT, 1990), 221–56.

²² DJD XIX, 121–36, pl. XV.

linked to the “anointed priest.” In the first column of 4Q376 (which runs parallel with 1Q29) the Urim is mentioned together with “the anointed priest.” The beginning of the second column of 4Q376 reads:

1 אִירוּכָה וַיֵּצֵא עִמּוֹ בְּלִשְׁנוֹת אֵשׁ הָאֶבֶן הַשְּׂמַאלִית אֲשֶׁר עַל צִדּוֹ
2 הַשְּׂמַאלִי תִגְלַה לְעֵינַי כּוֹל הַקְּהָל עַד כְּלוֹת הַכוּהֵן לְדַבֵּר

they shall give light and he shall go forth together with it with flashes of fire. The left-hand stone which is in his left hand side shall shine forth to the eyes of the assembly until the priest finishes speaking.

Unfortunately, because the literary genre of the composition (as far as it can be ascertained, a Moses pseudepigraphon), the fragmentary nature of the remains, and the lack of links to the Qumran community, I do not think we can use this text for our purpose.

Neither do I think we can use the reference in 11QT^a XLVIII 18–21 to the obligation imposed upon the King to obey the results of the consulting the Urim and Thummin by the High Priest before going out to battle.

I mention these references only as an indication that the oracular function of the priesthood need not to have been forgotten at Qumran, and because it provides a suitable background to the following text in which the oracular function of priests appears in greater relief.

4Q164²³ (4QpIsa^d) interprets Isa 54:11–12 in the following way:

1 וַיִּסְדַּחֲתִיךְ בְּסַפִּי [רִים פְּשָׁרוֹן]
2 [אֵשׁ] רַ יִסְדּוּ אֶת עֲצַת הַיְהוּדָי [הַ] כּוּהָנִים וְהַעַם [..].
3 עֲדַת בְּחִירוֹ כְּאֶבֶן הַסַּפִּיר בְּתוֹךְ הָאֲבָנִים [וְשִׁמְתִי כְּדַכּוֹר]
4 כּוֹל שְׂמֹשׁוֹתֶיךָ פְּשָׁרוֹ עַל שְׁנַיִם עֶשֶׂר [רֵאשֵׁי הַכּוּהָנִים אֲשֶׁר]
5 מְאִירִים בְּמִשְׁפַּשׁ הָאוּרִים וְהַתּוּמִים [.. ולוא]
6 הַנְּעַדְרוֹת מִהֵמָּה כְּשֶׁמֶשׁ בְּכוֹל אוֹרוֹ

“And I will found you in sapphi[res.]” Its interpretation:] ² they will found the council of the Community, [the] priests and the peo[ple...] ³ the assembly of his elect, like a sapphire stone in the midst of stones. [“I will make] ⁴ all your battlements [of rubies.”] Its interpretation concerns the twelve [chiefs of the priests who] ⁵ make shine in judgment the Urim and the Thummim [...without] ⁶ any from among them missing, like the sun in all its light.²⁴

Although there are some uncertainties due to the lacunae in the text, it is clear that Isa 54:11 is interpreted as referring to the council of the

²³ Edited by J.M. Allegro, DJD V, 27–28; transcription according to *DSSSE*, 1:326.

²⁴ All translations of Qumran texts are taken from F. García Martínez, *DSSST*.

community, composed by priests and laity, and Isa 54:12 to the use by the priests of the Urim and Thummim in judgment. I am not sure that we can conclude from this text the use of the Urim and Thummim at Qumran. But the last broken line of the passage²⁵ contains the term (גורל) which in my view most clearly attests to the oracular practice in the community: the casting of lots.

The texts which indicate the use of lots to decide the entrance to the community (1QS VI 16, 18–19 and 21) are well known and need not to be rehearsed again.²⁶ The phrases used are יצא הגורל (“the lot will come out”) and יצא לו הגורל (“the lot will come out for him”) which should be understood quite literally. The first and the third of these occurrences do not specify who casts the lots, simply says “and depending of the outcome of the lot,” but the second one says specifically that the casting is done על פי עמיתם (“on the authority of the priest and the multitude of the men of their covenant”). The same sort of precision is found in 1QS V 3: על פייהם (“by their authority”), the pronoun referring back to the “sons of Zadok the priests and the multitude of the men of the community” previously mentioned. This text, by the way, is very interesting because it proves that the casting of lots was not restricted to the admission process but could be used in very different contexts:

על פייהם יצא תכון הגורל לכול דבר לתורה ולהון ולמשפט

By their authority, decision by lot shall be made in every affair involving the law, property and judgment.

But the most explicit assertion that the casting of lots was indeed one of the priestly functions exercised within the community is found in 1QS IX 7, a text that is crystal clear and does not require further comment:

7 רק בני אהרון ימשלו במשפט ובהון ועל פייהם יצא והגורל לכול תכון אנשי
היהוד
8 והון אנשי הקודש ההולכים בתמים

Only the sons of Aaron will have authority in the matter of judgment and of goods, and by their authority will come out the lot for all decision of the men of the community and the goods of the men of holiness who walk in perfection.

²⁵ 4Q164 1 8.

²⁶ For the most recent treatment, see A. Lange, “The Essene Position on Magic and Divination,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Cambridge 1995, Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* (ed. M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 408–22.

Priests as teachers

Teaching was not an exclusively priestly function at Qumran as it was not in Israel in general. A good many references to the teaching function of the Mebaqqer and of the Maskil can be easily gathered; these two functionaries of the community may have been priests, but as far as we can ascertain they were not necessarily so. But at Qumran, as in the Old Testament, we do find a certain number of references which attest that יורה תורה (“teaching the law”) was indeed one of the functions of the priests in the community.

We could start, of course, with the founding figure of the community, the Teacher of Righteousness. That he was a priest is asserted in 4Q171 1, 3–4 iii 15, a *Pesher on Psalms*.²⁷ That the *Moreh* has an essential function concerning the teaching and interpreting the Torah is asserted unequivocally in the *Pesher on Habakkuk*, where the “traitors” are those who do not listen to the words of the Teacher (1QpHab II 2–3), “the Priest whom God has placed within the Community to foretell the fulfilment of all the words of his servants the Prophets” (1QpHab II 8–9), or (as it is put in 1QpHab VII 5–6) “to whom God has made known all the mysteries of the words of his servants, the Prophets.”²⁸

This and other references to the teaching activities of the Teacher of Righteousness could perhaps be dismissed as an accidental circumstance, due to the fact the historical Teacher happened to be a priest; and not to the necessity of listening “to the voice of the Teacher” (as it put by CD XX 32), as a permanent characteristic of the members of the community.²⁹

But it is clear that teaching duties were also attributed to other functionary of the Community who was also priest, the Inspector (*Paqid*), the functionary who in 4Q266 11 8 is called הכוהן המופקד [ע]ל הרבים (“the priest who governs upon the many”) and in 1QS VI 14 האיש הפקיד בראש הרבים “the man appointed at the head of the Many”, and who tested new candidates. CD XIV 6–8 says of him.³⁰

²⁷ Edited by Allegro, DJD V, 44, pl. XVI. See D. Pardee, “A Restudy of the Commentary on Psalm 37 from Qumran Cave 4,” *RevQ* 8/30 (1973): 163–94.

²⁸ See F. García Martínez, “El Pesher: interpretación profética de la Escritura,” *Salm* 26 (1979): 128–29.

²⁹ See P.R. Davies, “Communities at Qumran and the Case of the Missing ‘Teacher,’” *RevQ* 15/57–58 (1991): 275–86.

³⁰ *DSSSE*, 1:572.

6 והכהן אשר יפקד
7 א(ז)ש (בראש) הרבים מבן שלושים שנה ועד בן ששים מבונן בספר
8 ההני ובכל משפטי התורה לדברם כמשפטם

And the priest who shall govern at the head of the many shall be between thirty and sixty years old, learned in the book of Hagy and in all the regulations of the Torah to expound them according to their regulations.

Finally, the same teaching and interpretative function is assigned to priests in general, or at least to the “Priests the sons of Zadok” in 1QS V 8–9:³¹

8 ויקם על נפשו בשבועת אסר לשוב אל תורת מושה ככול אשר צוה בכול
9 לב ובכול נפש לכול הנגלה ממנה לבני צדוק הכהנים שומרי הברית ודורשי
רצונו

He shall swear with a binding oath to revert to the law of Moses, according to all that he commanded, with all (his) heart and all (his) soul, in compliance with all that has been revealed of it to the sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant and interpret his will.

One of the recently published copies of the *Damascus Document*,³² 4QD^a (4Q266) 5 ii which legislates about priests, provides us with glimpse into the way priests could have exercised this teaching function within the community by describing someone who is excluded from the practice of this function because of physical impediments:³³

1 [יכול אשר אינו ממהר להב]ין וכול א[שר נקל בלשונו או בקול טרוד]
2 [דבר לו ה]לא פצל דברו להשמיע [קולו איש מאלה לא יקרא בספר]
3 [התורה] למה ישנו בדבר מות [...]
4 [...] אהו הכהנים בעבודה

[And anyone who is not quick to under]stand and anyone who speaks weakly [or with] staccato [voice] without separating his words to make [his voice] heard, [such men] should not read in the book of the [Torah], so that he will not lead to error in capital matter [...] his brothers, the priests, in service.

The text continues with other norms concerning priests, with the further stipuations that a high priest who has been in foreign captivity could not minister in the sanctuary and that priests who migrated into

³¹ DSSSE, 1:86.

³² J.M. Baumgarten, DJD XVIII, 23–93, pls. I–XVII.

³³ See J.M. Baumgarten, “The Disqualifications of Priests in 4Q Fragments of the ‘Damascus Document,’ a Specimen of the Recovery of Pre-Rabbinic Halakha,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 503–13. Transcription from DSSSE, 1:588.

pagan lands and apostates were regarded as no longer belonging to the “council of the people.” But the lines quoted forbid any priest who is mentally or physically impaired to read and to expound the Torah, at least in a judicial context.

That the subject of the injunction is a priest, is clear from the mention “his brothers the priests” in line 4. Less clear is whether the priestly category is the “priests sons of Zadok,” which appears in the previous column of the manuscript (4Q266 5 i 5) or the “priests sons of Aaron” which is the subject of the following rules. In any case, that the text is dealing with priests is certain, as it is certain that what it is forbidden to the one who has a speech impediment is the reading “from the book of the Torah” in a judicial context in which capital punishment is involved (בדבר מות). This connection between teaching and judging leads us directly to the next topic.

Priests as judges

Judging was not an exclusively priestly right at Qumran, just as it was not in the rest of Israel. But priest were from the outset involved in the judicial process. It is significant that *Temple Scroll* imposes upon the king the obligation to create a large judicial council whose advice he is bound to obey (11QT^a XVII 11–15):³⁴

ושנים עשר	11
נשיי עמו עמו ומן הכהנים שנים עשר ומן הלויים	12
שנים עשר אשר יהיו יושבים עמו יחד למשפט	13
ולתורה ולוא ירום לבבו מהמה ולוא יעשה כול דבר	14
לכול עצה חוץ מהמה	15

He will have twelve princes of his people with him and twelve priests and twelve Levites who shall sit next to him for judgment and for the law. He shall not divert his heart from them or do anything in all his councils without relying upon them.

Of course, what interest us here is not the participation of priests in the judicial process in general, but their involvement in the judicial process which took place within the community. 1QS is not very explicit concerning the judicial powers of the community council formed by twelve

³⁴ Text from E. Qimron, *The Temple Scroll. A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions* (Judean Desert Studies; Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press/ Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1996), 82.

lay members and three priests (1QS VIII 1). The *Damascus Document*, however, contains a whole section dedicated to the judges of the congregation contained in CD X 4–10:³⁵

וזה סרך לשפטי העדה עד עשרה אנשים ברורים	4
מן העדה לפי העת ארבעה למטה לוי ואהרן ומישראל	5
ששה מבוגנים בספר ההני וביסודי חברית מבני חמשה	6
ועשרים שנה עד בני ששים שנה	7

And this is the rule of the judges of the congregation. Ten men in number, chosen from the congregation, for a period: four from the tribe of Levi and of Aaron and six from Israel, learned in the book of Hagy and in the principles of the covenant, between twenty-five and sixty years.

Although the text is open to several interpretations (it is not clear if the four mentioned are one priest and three Levites as interpreted by Schiffman,³⁶ or one Levite and three priests as interpreted by Milik,³⁷ or if the total priestly quota could be filled occasionally either by priests or by Levites or by any mix of both categories), the importance of the presence of four priests among the ten members of this judicial body is undeniable, and it shows that the judicial function of the priesthood was kept well alive within the community.

Several other texts speak of priests in judicial functions, although the composition of the judicial body varies. According to 4Q159 2–4 the number of judges if not ten but twelve: “And...] ten men and two priests, and they shall be judged before these twelve.” In any case, both the existence of this judicial body within the community and the presence of priests as members is assured.

In the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa) it is specified that every member of the community upon reaching the age of thirty may join the judicial counsel (1QSa I 13–16 “And at thirty years he shall approach to arbitrate in disputes and judgments,”) unless he is a simpleton, of course (1QSa I 19–20: “No man who is a simpleton shall enter the lot to hold office in the congregation of Israel for dispute or judgment”). But the text specifies that all this should happen “under the authority of the sons of Zadok, the priests” (1QSa I 24) suggesting that in this judicial body which deals with matters concerning the community the priests were not only members but members with preeminent status.

³⁵ DSSSE, 1:566.

³⁶ Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 283.

³⁷ J.T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (trans. J. Strugnell; London: SCM Press, 1959), 100.

Priestly blessings

It is true that many of the liturgical texts from Qumran present blessing as a normal activity of the whole community of prayer and that in the *Berakhot* texts and in other liturgical texts references to priests are rather sparse.³⁸ Nevertheless, it seems abundantly clear that at Qumran there was a clearly distinction between these *Berakhot* pronounced by the whole assembly, in which all the members blessed God or recounted the blessings of God in a liturgical setting, and the specifically priestly function of invoking the blessings of God upon the faithful. This is asserted clearly in the conclusion of the blessing of the priest in 1QSb III 28: “And by your hand may he (God) bless the council of all flesh.”

In the description of the ceremony of the entry into the covenant at the beginning of 1QS the priest and the Levites begin by recounting respectively the mighty works of God and the iniquities of the children of Israel, and after the communal confession we read (1QS II 1f. and 4f.):³⁹

והכהנים מברכים את כול 2 אנשי נורל אל...4...והלויים מקללים את כול אנשי
5 נורל בליעל

And the priests will bless all the men of God's lot... And the Levites shall curse all the men of the lot of Belial.

It is true that in a similar ceremony, the one for the expulsion of the unfaithful members, as preserved in two copies of the *Damascus Document* from Cave 4 (4Q266 11 16–18 and 4Q270 7 ii 11–12), neither the priests nor the Levites pronounce the curses, but the whole assembly:⁴⁰

וכול 17 [יושבין] המחנות יקהלו בחודש השלישי ואררו את הנוטה ימין 18 [ושמאול
מן ה]תורה

And all [those who dwell in] the camps will assemble in the third month and will curse whoever tends to the right [or to the left of the] law.

But the sentence, coming as it does directly after the conclusion of the long blessing and cursing which is explicitly put into the mouth of “the priest who governs [ov]er the Many” appears to me as the answer of the community to the blessing and courses pronounced by the priest,

³⁸ For an excellent survey of most of the liturgical texts from Qumran, see D.K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998).

³⁹ *DSSSE*, 1:70–73.

⁴⁰ *DSSSE*, 1:596, 616.

completely parallel to the “Amen, Amen” answer which close the blessing and curses of 1QS.

A noteworthy priestly blessing in Qumran is the blessing upon the meals. I refer, of course, to the well known communal meal of 1QS and the equally well known messianic banquet of 1QSa. In both cases, the texts explicitly state not only that priests are presiding over the meal, but that they are the ones who utter the benediction. 1QS VI 4–5 reads:⁴¹

4 כִּי־א יֵעֲרֹכּוּ הַשּׁוֹלְחַן לְאֹכֹל אִו הַתִּירוֹשׁ
5 לַשְּׁתוֹת הַכּוֹהֵן יִשְׁלַח יָדוֹ לְרִשּׁוֹנָה לְהַבְרִיךְ בְּרִאשִׁית הַלֶּחֶם

And when they prepare the table to dine or the new wine for drinking, the priest shall stretch out his hand as the first to bless the first fruits of the bread and the new wine.

And when 1QSa describes the gathering of the community in the presence of the Messiah, the text precises (1QSa II 17–20):⁴²

17 וְ[אם לְשׁוֹלְחַן יִהְיֶה יוֹעֵד] וְ[אִו לַשְּׁתוֹת הַתִּירוֹשׁ וְעֵרֹךְ הַשּׁוֹלְחַן
18 הַיְהוּדִי וְ[מִסּוֹךְ הַתִּירוֹשׁ לַשְּׁתוֹת] אֵל יִשְׁלַח [אִישׁ אֶת יָדוֹ בְּרִשְׁת
19 הַלֶּחֶם וְ[הַתִּירוֹשׁ] לְפָנֵי הַכּוֹהֵן כִּי־א] הוּא מְ[בָרֵךְ אֶת רִשִׁית הַלֶּחֶם
20 וְהַתִּירוֹשׁ] וְשִׁלַּח [יָדוֹ בְּלֶחֶם לְפָנִים

And when they gather at the table of the community or to drink the new wine, and the table of the community is prepared and the new wine is mixed for drinking, no-one should stretch out his hand to the first-fruit of the bread and of the new wine before the priest, for he is the one who blesses the first-fruit of bread and of the new wine and stretches out his hand towards the bread before them.

Priest as separating the sacred from the profane and the pure from the impure

We have several examples of the continuity of these functions, as specifically priestly functions within the community, as distinct from the general use of לְהַבְרִיךְ “to separate” in the manuscripts.

4Q266 6 i (completed with the parallels from 4Q272, 4Q273 and 4Q269) refers to the law of the צִרְעָת (“leprosy”) as established in Lev 13 which is explicitly quoted in the text. In this text the functions of the priest are specified for each one of the steps of the process: the priest shall confine the sick, the priest shall examine him, the priest shall even

⁴¹ DSSSE, 1:82. For other possible blessings after the meals, see M. Weinfeld, “Grace after Meals at Qumran,” *JBL* 111 (1992): 427–40.

⁴² DSSSE, 1:102.

count: “the dead and the living hairs, and see whether living (hairs) have been added to the dead one during the seven days,” in order to ascertain if the sick is pure or impure and if the disease has been healed. And the text ends by asserting (4Q266 6 i 13):⁴³

זה משפט [תורה] ת הצרעת לבני אהרון להבדיל לן

This is the regulation of the law of leprosy for the sons of Aaron, so that they can separate...

Even clearer in this aspect is CD XIII 4–7, in this case referring to the law of נגע (usually translated also as leprosy):⁴⁴

ואם 5 משפט לתורת נגע יהיה באיש ובא הכהן ועמד במחנה והבינו
6 המבקר בפרוש התורה Blank ואם פתי הוא הוא יסנירנו כי להם 7 המשפט

But if there is a judgment against anyone about the law of leprosy, the priest shall take his place in the camp and the Inspector shall instruct him in the exact interpretation of the law. *Blank* Even if he (the priest) is a simpleton, he is the one who shall intern him, for theirs (of the priests) is the judgment.

This text is crystal clear. Within the community priestly functions which were not dependent of the service in the temple, continue to be the exclusive domain of the priests, their prerogative, even if they were not specially qualified to fulfill these functions and need to be instructed in how to carry them out.

To the same category (it appears to me) belong the purification rituals with the ashes of the red heifer. This is a priestly ritual which according to the Bible should be performed outside the camp (Num 19:1–10) and was indeed performed outside the temple, and it is well known that the Samaritans performed it because they thought it does not require the existence of the sanctuary.⁴⁵ We will never know for sure if the Qumran community burned their own red heifer or not, but the following text seems to imply that they did. 4Q277 1 ii 3–10:⁴⁶

⁴³ *DSSSE*, 1:588.

⁴⁴ *DSSSE*, 1:570.

⁴⁵ J. Bowman, “Did the Qumran Sect Burn the Red Heifer?,” *RevQ* 1/1 (1958): 74–84.

⁴⁶ The text is known as *4QTohorot^c* and it is partially parallel to 4Q276 (*4QTohorot^b*). Both fragments are found in PAM 43.316. For a transcription see B.Z. Wacholder and M.G. Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four: Fascicle Three* (Washington: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1995), 86 and J.M. Baumgarten, “The Red Cow Purification Rites in Qumran Texts,” *JJS* 46 (1995): 112–19.

- 3 [] הכוהן המכפר בדם הפרה וכול []
 4 [א]ת [כלי]ת ההלמה [אש]ר כפרו כם את משפש [ה]הטאת ורדח[ן]
 5 במים [ויט]מה עד ה[ער]ב והנושא[ן] ק[ל]חת מי הנדה יט[מא] ואל יז[ן]
 6 איש א[ית] מי הנדה על טמאי נ[פש] [כ]יא איש כוהן שהור [רק הוא יזה]
 7 [על] יתן כי [י]כפר הוא על הטמ[א] ועלול אל יז על הטמא וה[מקבלים]
 8 [א]ת מי [הנ]דה יאביאו במים ויט[ה]רו מטמאת הנפש ב[] ומכל[]
 9 [טמא]ת אחרת [ויז]רוק עליהם [הכ]הן את מי הנדה לטהר[ם] כיא לוא
 10 [יתקדש]ן כיא אם [י]טהרו וט[הור] בשרהם

[...] the priest who atones with the heifer's blood. And all [...] the clay [vessels] with [which] they atoned the judgment of [impurity]. He shall bathe] in water and be impure until the ev[eni]ng. Whoever carr[ies the v]as of the water of purification will be im[pure]. No one should sprinkle] the water of purification upon the one defiled by a co[rpse] except a pure priest [Only he shall sprinkle] upon them, since he atones for the impure. And a child shall not sprinkle upon the impure. And [those who receive] the water of purification shall immerse themselves in water and be cleansed of the impurity of the corpse with[...and of every] other impurity. And the priest shall sprinkle the water of purification upon them to purify [them, for they cannot be sanctified] unless they are purified and their flesh is puri[fied].

In closing, I simply note it may be possible to find other traditional priestly functions exercised within the community. For example the blowing of trumpets, consistently assigned to the priest in the *War Scroll*. But it is better to leave them out of consideration, because I know of no other texts which deal with the blowing of trumpets in the everyday life in the community, and because I think my point is abundantly clear. In a community without the Temple, the priests not only found a new way to exercise the functions (such as atonement) which were dependent upon the sacrificial cult, but they continued to perform priestly duties which were not directly dependent upon the service of the Temple and of the sacrificial system.

Nothing represents better the blend of old and new functions than the blessing of the priests contained in the better preserved lines of column three of 1QSb III 22–28. After making explicit that the blessing is to be recited over the priests (in plural), the blessing itself, in the singular, contains a kind of summary of the functions of the priest we have reviewed. We find here a mix of the traditional priestly functions (judging, teaching) and the new functions attributed to the priests within the community (supreme authority), including communion with the priestly angels, a basic element of the priesthood in the community:⁴⁷

⁴⁷ DSSSE, 1:106.

Words of blessing. For the Ins[tructor. To bless] the sons of Zadok, the priest whom God has chosen to strengthen his covenant, for [ever, to dis]tribute all his judgments in the midst of his people, to teach them in accordance with his commandment. They have established [his covenant] in truth and have examined all his precepts in justice, and they have walked in accordance with tha[t] he chooses. May the Lord bless you from his [ho]ly [residence]. May he set you as a glorious ornament in the midst of the holy ones. [May he re]new the covenant of [eternal] priesthood for you. May he grant you your place [in the] holy [residence]. May he j[udge al]l the nobles by your works and by what issues from your lips all the [princes of] the nations. May he give you to inherit the first fruits of [all de]lights. And by your hand may he bless the counsel of all flesh.

CHAPTER SIX

THE TRADITIONS ABOUT MELCHIZEDEK IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

The references to the figure of Melchizedek in the Dead Sea Scrolls are as meagre as they are in the Hebrew Bible. Melchizedek appears, of course, in the *Genesis Apocryphon* from Cave 1 (1QapGen XXII 12–18), an Aramaic composition that rewrites the account in Gen 14. The origin of this composition is uncertain, but there is no element that allows it to be ascribed an origin in Qumran.¹ The only details that the Aramaic text provides in relation to the biblical text are the identification of “Salem” with Jerusalem and the “Valley of the King” with Beth ha-Kerem, as well as specifying that it is Abraham who pays the tithe to Melchizedek.² Probably the name Melchizedek occurs twice in a composition of which the Qumran origin seems certain to me, the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*,³ although in both cases the name is incomplete and occurs in such broken contexts that they prevent any definite identification. In this composition, Melchizedek (as in Ps 110) is portrayed as an angel; it is even possible that he is the only angel

¹ N. Avigad and Y. Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon. A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Magnes: Jerusalem, 1956). For a summary of the discussion on the origin of the composition see G. Aranda Pérez, F. García Martínez, and M. Pérez Fernández, *Literatura judía intertestamentaria* (Introducción al Estudio de la Biblia 9; Estella: Verbo Divino, 1996), 128–31.

² See J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I. A Commentary* (2nd rev. ed.; BibOr 18A; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971), 172–78.

³ The manuscripts from Cave 4 (4Q400–407) and the copy found in Masada (MasShir) have been published by C. Newsom, DJD XI, 173–401, pls. XVI–XXXI; the manuscript from Cave 11 (11Q17) has appeared in DJD XXIII, 259–304, pls. XXX–XXXIV, LIII. In the preliminary edition of the manuscripts from Cave 4, Newsom considered the Qumran origin of the composition as more probable (see C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* [HSS 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press 1985], 2), but later she changed her opinion and considers that the composition has an origin outside Qumran (see C. Newsom, “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran,” in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters* [ed. W.H. Propp, B. Halpern, and D.N. Freedman; Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California, San Diego 1; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990], 167–87. I think that I have proved that the Qumran origin of the work can be considered as certain; see Aranda Pérez, García Martínez, and Pérez Fernández, *Literatura judía intertestamentaria*, 205–10.

mentioned by name in the whole composition. In any case, Melchizedek (if the reading is certain) is presented in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* as a priest: “[Melchi]zedek, priest in the assemb[ly of God]” in Newsom’s reconstruction of 4Q401 11 3,⁴ and “[the chiefs of the princes of the marv]ellous [priesthoods] of Melch[izedek]” in our reconstruction of 11Q17 II 7.⁵ Due to the chances of preservation, the name of Melchizedek has not been preserved in a series of manuscripts in which we would have expected his presence since they deal with his enemy, his angelic opponent, Melkiresha^c (4Q^cAmram, 4Q280 and 4Q286).⁶ However, we do have a text from Cave 11 (11Q13) in which Melchizedek is a central figure.⁷ I am quite certain that this text is a product of the Qumran Community.⁸ So we can use it confidently as representing the understanding of the traditions about Melchizedek in the Qumran Community and as an example of the interpretation of the Bible practised in that Community.

The text has been known since 1965, when A.S. van der Woude published a preliminary edition,⁹ and has been studied so intensively since then that it is practically impossible to say anything new about it.¹⁰ This note will present only two aspects of the text that have not yet

⁴ DJD XI, 205: מלכי צדק כהן בעד[ת אל].

⁵ DJD XXIII, 269: ראשי נשיאי כהונות פלא למלכי צדק.

⁶ Preliminary editions of 4Q^cAmram and 4Q280 are found in J.T. Milik, “4Q Visions de ‘Amram et une citation d’Origène,” *RB* 79 (1972): 77–97; *idem*, “Milki-sedeq et Milki-reša^c dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens,” *JJS* 23 (1972): 95–144; É. Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future: Immortalité, résurrection, vie éternelle? Histoire d’une croyance dans le judaïsme ancien* (2 vols.; Études Bibliques Nouvelle série 21–22; Paris: Gabalda, 1993), 2:531–44; and *DSSSE*, 2:636–37 (4Q280), 2:644–53 (4Q286–90), 2:1084–95 (4Q543–548).

⁷ DJD XXIII, 221–41, pl. XXVII.

⁸ The parallels with the exegetical method used in other Qumran texts, the use of the technical term *pesher*, the mention of “the sons of light” and the attribution of “lots” both to Belial and to Melchizedek leave absolutely no doubt about this. See Aranda Pérez, García Martínez, and Pérez Fernández, *Literatura judía intertestamentaria*, 84–85.

⁹ A.S. van der Woude, “Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI,” *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 14 (1965): 354–73.

¹⁰ See F. Manzi, “La figura di Melchisedek: Saggio di bibliografia aggiornata,” *Ephe-merides Liturgicae* 109 (1995): 331–49. The most important works, in chronological order, are: A.S. van der Woude and M. de Jonge, “11QMelchizedek and the New Testament,” *NTS* 12 (1966): 301–26; J.A. Fitzmyer, “Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11,” *JBL* 86 (1967): 25–41, reprinted in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (rev. ed.; Sources for Biblical Study 5; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974), 245–67; J. Carmignac, “Le document de Qumrân sur Melkisèdeq,” *RevQ* 7/27 (1970): 343–78; Milik, “Milki-sedeq et Milki-reša^c dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens,” 95–112; F.L. Horton, *The Melchizedek Tradition: A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D.*

been sufficiently highlighted and which, in my opinion, contribute new elements to the complex problem of messianic hopes in the Qumran Community: 1) the extension of the concept of a redeeming figure in the eschatological period within pre-Christian Judaism, with the aim of including as an agent of salvation a non-human figure that we can denote as a “messiah”; 2) the identification of the messianic character of the figure of the “messenger” foretold by the Prophet Isaiah. However, before presenting these two points it is necessary to describe, even if in a summary fashion, the contents of 11Q13.

Of this manuscript, which can be dated to approximately the middle of the 1st c. B.C.E.,¹¹ 16 fragments have been recovered, grouped into 11 in the official edition in DJD XXIII. Most of these fragments were in two consecutive columns (cols. II and III). The text of col. II describes the events that would take place “at the end of time.”¹² Given that, in agreement with the understanding of this expression in the writings of the Community (which uses it to denote the final phase of the history in which the Community is living) it can refer to events that happened in the past, in the present or in the future from the author’s perspective, he is obliged to specify that the events it deals with will happen exactly “in the first week of the jubilee that follows the ninth jubilee” (II 7), or, as it then goes on to say, “at the end of the tenth jubilee,” the final jubilee in human history in the system used by the author and equivalent to the

and in the *Epistle to the Hebrews* (SNTSMS 30; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976); P.J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša* (CBQMS 10; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981); C. Gianotto, *Melchisedek e la sua tipologia. Tradizioni giudaiche, cristiane e gnostiche (sec. II a.C.–III d.C.)* (Brescia: Paideia, 1984); É. Puech, “Notes sur le manuscrit de 11QMelkisédeq,” *RevQ* 12/48 (1987): 483–513; *idem*, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 546–61; F. Manzi, *Melchisedek e l’angelologia nell’Epistola agli Ebrei e a Qumran* (AnBib 136; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1997); J. Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Könighche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftfunden von Qumran* (WUNT 104; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 389–417.

¹¹ The script seems very similar, to me, to what is called the “late Hasmonean or early Herodian book hand” in the terminology of Cross (cf. F.M. Cross, “The Development of the Jewish Scripts,” in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East. Essays in honor of William Foxwell Albright* [ed. G.E. Wright; Garden City: Doubleday, 1961], 133–202) which would point to about the second half of the 1st c. B.C.E. as the date when the copy was prepared; however, as Milik notes, a certain number of elements in the forms of the letters have more archaic features which would indicate about the first half of the 1st c. B.C.E.

¹² לְאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים as it says in II 4. On the meaning of the phrase in the writings from Qumran see A. Steudel, “אַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים in the Texts from Qumran,” *RevQ* 16/62 (1993): 225–46, and J.J. Collins, “The Expectation of the End in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. Evans and P. Flint; SDDSR 1; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 74–90.

last of the seventy weeks in other systems. These events are described by means of a thematic *pesher* on final salvation.¹³ In its first part, the *pesher* is based on Lev 25 (on the jubilee year), on Deut 15 (on the year of remission) and on Psalms 7 and 82 (which announce divine judgment). In its second half, the *pesher* quotes and explains Isa 52 (which proclaims the setting free of captives). All these biblical texts are interpreted and applied to the events that will take place at the end of time, focusing attention on the acts of redemption that will liberate the sons of light from the rule of Belial and the spirits of his lot and of whom the protagonist is Melchizedek. Although the name used is Melchizedek, neither Gen 14 nor Ps 110 is cited explicitly in the preserved parts of the document.¹⁴

1. *Melchizedek as a heavenly "Messiah"*

All the biblical texts cited in the first part of the manuscript are interpreted as referring to Melchizedek, presented as a clearly heavenly figure, one of the אֱלֹהִים.¹⁵ Speaking of him, our text uses various expressions, such as "the inheritance of Melchizedek" (II 5) or "the year of grace of Melchizedek" (II 9) which in the Bible are applied to God himself,¹⁶ and others, such as "the men of the lot of Melchizedek" (II 8), which in the other Qumran writings are also applied to God.¹⁷ In view of the exalted status as a heavenly figure that our text confers on Melchizedek, it is not surprising that some scholars have understood the protagonist of 11QMelch as representing a divine hypostasis,¹⁸ or even

¹³ On this peculiar way of interpreting the biblical text, see F. García Martínez, "El Peshet: interpretación profética de la Escritura," *Salm* 26 (1979): 125–39. The literature on the *pesher* is very extensive. The most important studies are indicated in F. García Martínez, "Interpretación de la Biblia en Qumrán," *Fortunatae. Revista Canaria de Filología, Cultura y Humanidades* 9 (1997): 261–86.

¹⁴ A. Aschim, "Melchizedek the Liberator: An Early Interpretation of Genesis 14?," in *SBL Seminar Papers 1996* (SBLSP 35; Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1996), 243–58, tries to prove that 11QMelch contains many echoes of Gen 14 and the figure of Melchizedek in 11QMelch is the result of a creative exegesis of this biblical text.

¹⁵ On the use of *Elohim* as one of the names of the angels in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, see Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* 24; on other terms for angels in Qumran see M.J. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian writings from Qumran* (JSPSup 11; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992).

¹⁶ The first in 2 Sam 14:16; 20:19; 21:13, for example. The second in Isa 6:12.

¹⁷ "The men of the lot of God" in 1QS II 2.

¹⁸ So Milik, "Milki-sedeq et Milki-reša' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens," 125, who, on the base of his interpretation of Ps 110:4 ("according to my order, [that] of

as a simple name of the godhead, one more of the divine names, “King of Justice.”¹⁹

Although these speculations are interesting and are based on certain elements present in the actual text, they do not seem to stand up before the clear statement in II 13: “And Melchizedek will carry out the vengeance of G[od]’s judgments,” which makes a clear distinction between Melchizedek and God; they are also disallowed by the clear parallelism that the text establishes between Melchizedek and his heavenly opponent Belial as well as by the opposition between the angelic armies of both protagonists, an opposition that is rooted in the dualistic vision of the world exactly as expressed in the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* in the *Rule of the Community* (1QS III–IV).

If in 11QMelch Melchizedek is neither God nor a divine hypostasis, he is definitely a heavenly and exalted being. The text attributes to him dominion over the heavenly armies: he is the chief of all the angels (the אַלְיִם) and of all the sons of God. In addition, he is one who leads the battle against Belial and the spirits of his lot, and carries out divine vengeance against them. Melchizedek is described with the same features used in the *Rule of the Community* and the *Damascus Document* to describe the “Prince of light”²⁰ and as a double of the archangel Michael, exactly as described in the *War Scroll*.²¹ This multiplicity of names for the same figure is not at all surprising in a Qumran context, since the composition

Milki-sedeq”) and on the identification of God and his angel in a whole series of biblical passages, concludes: “Milki-sedeq est par conséquent quelque chose de plus qu’un ange créé, ou même le chef des bons esprits, identifiable à Michaël (comme le soulignent à juste titre les éditeurs hollandais). Il est en réalité une hypostase de Dieu, autrement dit le Dieu transcendant lorsqu’il agit dans le monde. Dieu lui-même sous la forme visible où il apparaît aux hommes, et non pas un ange créé distinct de Dieu (Ex 23,20).”

¹⁹ According to Manzi, *Melchisedek e l’angelologia nell’Epistola agli Ebrei e a Qumran*, 101–102, who distinguishes three classes of figures called Melchizedek in the Qumran texts: a human figure (1QapGen), a royal angelic figure (in 4QAmram) and a priestly angelic figure (in 4QShirShabb) and God himself, given the title of “King of Justice” in 11QMelch: “È indubbio, ad esempio, che 1QapGen XXII 13–17 ripresenti in maniera storica il personaggio veterotestamentario. Ma non si può escludere che da 4QAmram^b e dai *Cantici* emerga la fede in un mediatore angelico ‘storicamente’ esistente ed attivo nelle vicende degli uomini [...] È chiaro, però, che il Malki sedeq angelico così delineato assurge a figura simbolica di mediatore salvifico, in grado di esprimere l’intervento sensibili di JHWH *ad extra*, salvaguardando l’assoluta trascendenza. Un intento simile soggiace probabilmente anche a 11QMelch, in cui si parla di JHWH senza nominare il tetragramma sacro, ma ricorrendo al titolo di ‘Re de Giustizia’.”

²⁰ 1QS III 20; CD V 18.

²¹ 1QM XVII 6–7.

known as *Visions of Amram*²² states explicitly that the two commanders of the heavenly armies have three names,²³ and one of the names of the one who “rules over all darkness” is Melki-resha,²⁴ the perfect antonym to Melchizedek.²⁵

Although described as a clearly heavenly person, Melchizedek is not called an “angel” in the fragments preserved.²⁶ The earthly origins of the person have not been forgotten completely and the primordial qualities of the Melchizedek of Gen 14 (royalty) and Ps 110 (the priesthood) have been preserved and transferred to the heavenly person.²⁷

Melchizedek’s royalty is implicit in his dominion over the heavenly beings and the sons of light, but it appears more clearly in his judicial functions. 11QMelch applies to him directly the first words of Ps 82: “as is written about him in the Songs of David: Elohim will [st]and up in the assem[bly of God], in the midst of the gods will he judge” (II 9–10). The continuation of the Psalm is applied to Belial and his angelic following: “And what he sa[id: How long] will you judge unjustly and show partiality to the wicked? *Selah* Its interpretation concerns Belial and the spirits of his lot” (II 11–12). Accordingly, 11QMelch preserves the heavenly setting of the judgment scene of the Psalm in which it is Melchizedek who judges his angelic opponents who have favoured injustice among men. However, in our text, Melchizedek is also the one who will judge all the sons of darkness, since to him are applied the words of Ps 7: “And about him he says: Above it return to the heights, God will judge the peoples” (II 10–11). Our text not only attributes to Melchizedek the judicial function that in the biblical text was attributed to God himself, but it also entrusts him with the execution of the sentence: he is the one who will carry out divine vengeance (II 13).

Although our text does not explicitly say that it is Melchizedek who makes atonement “in favour of the sons of [light and the] men of the lot of Mel[chi]zedek” (II 8), since the verb is used in the infinitive form (לכפר), the most likely interpretation of the passage is that it is he who is

²² For a preliminary edition of the various manuscripts of this composition see DSSSE, 2:1084–95 (F. García Martínez, *DSSST*, 274–75).

²³ 4Q544 3 2.

²⁴ 4Q544 2 3–5.

²⁵ On the possible reasons for the choice of one or other of these different names see Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 548–50.

²⁶ In spite of the temptation of the facile play on words between *Malak* and *Melek*.

²⁷ Although the abstract nouns מלכות (royalty) or כהנות (priesthood) do not appear in the preserved text.

presented as the High Priest who performs the rites of expiation on the eschatological *Yom hakippurim*.²⁸ Not only because of the Old Testament background of the conception of Melchizedek as priest, and because this priestly image of Melchizedek is attested in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, but also because one of the copies of the *Apocryphon of Levi* (4Q541 9 i 2)²⁹ uses the same expression to describe the functions of the earthly equivalent of the heavenly High Priest, the “messiah” of Aaron, and because 4Q266 10 i 12–13,³⁰ which enables the broken text of CD XIV 19 to be completed, contains exactly the same idea and uses the same verb.³¹

More important still than the royal and priestly functions is the description of the saving function of Melchizedek. 11QM_{Melch} portrays the protagonist as the agent of salvation in the eschatological period. He is the saviour of “the men of his lot” and his action inaugurates the year of grace and the day of eternal peace. Our text applies to him the biblical references of the jubilee year and of the year of remission. He is the one who redeems the captives and frees men from their sins and from the dominion of Belial.

This set of functions (final judgment, expiation for the men of his inheritance, destruction of the armies of Belial in the eschatological battle, restoration of eternal peace, salvation of the elect) is exactly the set of functions covered by the “Christian” concept of “messiah.” As Kobelski perceptively notes:

Although no relationship between the Melchizedek of 11QM_{Melch} and the Melchizedek of Hebrews 7 can be established beyond their attribution to each of a heavenly character, there are many points of comparison between the figure of Melchizedek in 11QM_{Melch} and *Jesus* in Hebrews.³²

The similarities that Kobelski notes are many and varied and concern both the persons and the activities of these two redeemer figures, but

²⁸ Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchirešaʿ*, 64–71; Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 551–53.

²⁹ É. Puech, “Fragments d’un apocryphe de Lévi et le personnage eschatologique — 4Q_{TestiLevi}^d et 4Q_{AJa},” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 2:449–501.

³⁰ J.M. Baumgarten, DJD XVIII, 72, pl. XII.

³¹ See J.M. Baumgarten, “Messianic Forgiveness of Sin in CD 14:19 (4Q266 10 i 12–13),” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Technological Innovations, New Texts, and New and Reformulated Issues* (ed. D.W. Parry and E.C. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 537–44.

³² Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchirešaʿ*, 128.

can easily be reduced to the Christian idea of “messiah.” 11QMelch describes a heavenly figure to whom he attributes the same set of functions that the New Testament attributes to the Messiah.³³

My reasoning is very simple: the basic functions that 11QMelch attributes to Melchizedek are messianic functions; so we can call the protagonist to whom these functions are attributed a “messiah” even though the text does not use the word “anointed.” And given that this protagonist is portrayed as a “heavenly” figure, we can then characterise him as a “heavenly messiah.”

The idea of a “heavenly messiah” is familiar to us through the New Testament but seems strange in a biblical context. In the Hebrew Bible, the idea of the “messiah” has a purely human dimension and is indissolubly linked to anointing with oil, something that can hardly happen with heavenly beings (angels, for example, are never the object of anointing). The purely human character of the expected “anointed one” (or of the “anointed ones” when the coming of more than one “messiah” is expected, as in the case of Qumran)³⁴ is accentuated by the emphasis placed on the Davidic origin of the “messiah-king” and in the union with the sacrificial cult of the Temple of Jerusalem of the “messiah-priest.” It is true that in two Jewish writings that are difficult to date (the *Parables of Enoch*³⁵ and the *Fourth Book of Ezra*)³⁶ we find, as

³³ D. Flusser, “Melchizedek and the Son of Man,” reprinted in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (D. Flusser; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988), 186, expresses a similar idea when he states: “According to the fragment, it would appear that at least some members of the Sect believed that the priestly Messiah of the Latter Days would be Melchizedek.” P. Sacchi, “Esquisse du développement du messianisme juif à la lumière du texte qumranien 11QMelch,” *ZAW* 100 supplement (1988): 209, acknowledges the messianic character of the functions attributed to Melchizedek in 11QMelch: “Toutes ses fonctions sont typiquement messianiques, parce qu’il s’agit de fonctions liées au salut.” And Puech, *La croyance des Esséniens en la vie future*, 558, when evaluating the judicial function of Melchizedek, concludes: “Par les attributions de roi et de juge eschatologique, la figure historique divinisé ou exalté de Milkisédek se rapproche le plus au plan de représentations symboliques de la notion “comme un fils d’homme” de Dn et “du Fils de l’homme” des Évangiles, en dépendance de leur source.”

³⁴ See F. García Martínez, “Messianische Erwartungen in den Qumranschriften,” in *Der Messias* (ed. W.H. Schmidt; Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie 8; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1993), 171–208; J.J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995); Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*.

³⁵ M.A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch. A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978); S. Chialà, *Libro delle parabole di Enoch* (StBi 117; Brescia: Paideia, 1997).

³⁶ A.F.J. Klijn, *Der Lateinische Text der Apokalypse des Esra* (TU 131; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1983); *idem*, *Die Esra-Apokalypse (IV. Esra) Nach dem lateinischen Text unter Benutzung*

in the New Testament, a messianic figure who is more heavenly than human, but even so receives the title of “messiah” (together with the more usual titles of “chosen one,” “just one” or “son of man”) when speaking of a figure who is presented as pre-existing, transcendent and of heavenly origin.³⁷ In a similar way, the person described “like a man” in chap. 13 and presented as pre-existing, transcendent and of heavenly origin in the *Fourth Book of Ezra*, is also called “messiah” in chaps. 7 and 12.³⁸ These two writings, then, document the same enlargement of the semantic field of the word “messiah” that we find within the New Testament: both use this title to denote a heavenly figure with which they associate images traditionally associated with the deity. However, since the date of the composition *Parables of Enoch* is much debated³⁹ and the date of the *Fourth Book of Ezra* is generally put later than the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus in 70 C.E.,⁴⁰ it was impossible to exclude the influence of the New Testament on the use by both writings of the word “messiah” to denote someone of heavenly origin.

If my way of understanding 11QMelch is acceptable, this text provides us with the proof that in pre-Christian Judaism the idea of a heavenly agent of eschatological salvation had already been developed. In Qumran, next to the “messiah-king,” David’s descendant, and the “messiah-priest,” Aaron’s descendant, at the end of time the saving action of a “heavenly-messiah” was hoped for. The fact that the extension of the idea of “messiah” so that it could include a heavenly figure is attested for the first time in the case of Melchizedek does not appear to be accidental. The Melchizedek of Gen 14 was a king and a priest,

der anderen Versionen übersetzt und herausgegeben (GCS; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1992; M.E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra. A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990).

³⁷ *1 En.* 48:10 and 52:4, see J.C. VanderKam, “Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37–71,” in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Princeton Symposium on Judaism and its Origins 1; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 169–91; Chialà, *Libro delle parabole di Enoch*, 219.

³⁸ *4 Ezra* 7:28 and 12:32, see M.E. Stone, “The Question of the Messiah in 4 Ezra,” in *Selected Studies in Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha* (ed. M.E. Stone; SVTP 9; Leiden: Brill, 1991), 317–32 (the article appeared earlier in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*, 209–24); Stone, *Fourth Ezra. A Commentary*, 207–13.

³⁹ M.A. Knibb, “The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review,” *NTS* 25 (1979) 345–59; Chialà, *Libro delle parabole di Enoch*, 77, after discussing the various proposals, tends to a date towards the end of the 1st c. B.C.E. or the beginning of the 1st c. C.E.

⁴⁰ Stone, *Fourth Ezra. A Commentary*, 10, opts for the reign of Domitian (81–96 C.E.), “probably in the latter part of his reign.”

and as such the perfect subject of “anointing.” And since Ps 110 portrays him as a heavenly priest in the context of divine judgment, it was easy to develop the two functions so as to include the functions traditionally attributed to the “messiah”: to provide eschatological salvation, to destroy the armies of Belial, to carry out the final judgment and to introduce the age of eternal peace for the chosen ones.

2. *The “Messenger” as “Messiah”*

The biblical text quoted in the second part of 11QMelch (II 15–16) is Isa 52:7 “[How] beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of the mess[enger] who announces peace, of the messenger of good who announces salvat[ion], saying to Zion: your God [reigns].” This text is not applied to Melchizedek but is provided with the following interpretation:

Its interpretation: “The mountains” [are] the prophet[s], they [...] every [...] And “the messenger” i[s] the anointed of the spir[it], as Dan[iel] said [about him: “Until an anointed, a prince, it is seven weeks.” And “the messenger of] good who announ[ces salvation”] is the one about whom it is written “[...] To comfo[rt] the [afflicted.” Its interpretation:] To [in]struct them in all the ages of the w[orld] in truth. (II 17–21)⁴¹

The other material preserved is too fragmentary to be used, although quite probably it preserves remains of the interpretation given both to “Zion” and to “your God.”⁴²

This second part of 11QMelch provides us with a perfect example of the kind of exegesis practised in the *pesharim*,⁴³ in which the meaning of the biblical text is applied to “the last times.”⁴⁴ Isaiah’s metaphor is clear. The Prophet speaks of a single person, the “messenger,” a messenger who announces peace and is also called “messenger of good” whose feet walk over mountains. However, as is normal in the atomistic exegesis of the *pesharim*, the various elements of the metaphor are duly separated and each of them is provided with its own interpretation, confirmed or

⁴¹ Translation of DJD XXIII, 230.

⁴² See the suggestions for reconstruction of ll. 23–25 in DJD XXIII: “‘[Zi]on’ i[s] the congregation of all the sons of justice, who] establish the covenant, who avoid walking [on the p]ath of the people. And ‘your G[o]d’ is...”

⁴³ The technical term פֶּשָׁר has been preserved in l. 17 and in all likelihood is reconstructed in l. 20.

⁴⁴ See F. García Martínez, “Escatologización de los Escritos profeticos en Qumran,” *EstBib* 44 (1986): 101–16.

not confirmed, as the case may be, by a supporting biblical text. In the *peshet* of 11QMelch, each of these elements concerns a different character, introduced by the corresponding pronoun: the mountains are ... and the messenger is ... and the messenger of good is ...

The additional specification in respect of the “messenger of good” as an explanation of the application made to it of Isa 61:2–3, namely, that it is he who will instruct them in all the ages of the world, allows a relatively easy identification of the character in question with the figure hoped for at the end of time, whom the manuscripts call “he who will teach the Torah at the end of time,”⁴⁵ the eschatological Teacher of Righteousness.⁴⁶ In short, the most characteristic function of the Teacher of Righteousness (both of the historical figure and of the figure expected in the eschatological future) is to instruct the members of the Community “to interpret all the words of his servants the Prophets, by means of whom God has declared all that is going to happen to his people, Israel”;⁴⁷ thanks to the revelation that the Teacher has received, the Community is aware of actually living in the “final period” of history.

The identification of “the mountains” with the biblical Prophets does not present serious problems either, even though the exegetical connection has been lost in a lacuna in the text. In my opinion, the interpretation of the text belongs to the same perspective that 1QpHab VII 1–5 provides in respect of Hab 2:1–2:

And God told Habakkuk to write what was going to happen to the last generation, but he did not let him know the end of the age. And as for what he says: “So that the one who reads it may run.” Its interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God has disclosed all the mysteries of the words of his servants, the Prophets.

For the Community, the words of the Prophets (and of the Torah) contain a twofold meaning: one meaning accessible to all and another that is mysterious, which only the Community knows thanks to the revelation that the Teacher has received.⁴⁸ If the “messenger of good” is

⁴⁵ CD VI 11, which is apparently inspired by Hos 10:12.

⁴⁶ On this identification see A.S. van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân* (SSN 3; Assen: van Gorcum, 1957), 67–74, and G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 268–307.

⁴⁷ 1QpHab II 8–10; *DSST*, 198.

⁴⁸ In the texts the first of these meanings is denoted as נַלְיָה and the second as נַסְתָּר. On these two concepts see L.H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (SJLA 16; Leiden: Brill, 1975).

the one who teaches about the ages of the world, it is hard to see how “the mountains” on which they walk could be anything other than the books of the Prophets in which the mystery of the ages of the world is concealed.

More problematic (and controversial) is the identification of the “messenger” who in our text is defined as “the anointed of the spirit” (מְשִׁיחַ הַרוּחַ, II 18). For Milik, it is the historical Teacher of Righteousness, the founder of the Qumran group,⁴⁹ however, Milik fuses together the two “messengers” in one reference and supposes that 11QMelch had been composed while he was still alive. Fitzmyer, who was the first to propose the reconstruction of the text of Daniel accepted in DJD XXIII, considers the possibility that this “anointed” could refer to the royal messiah (to whom Daniel alludes) or the priestly messiah if the “messenger” had to be identified with Melchizedek.⁵⁰ I do not believe that any of these possibilities is convincing and that the interpretation of the first editor, which sees in this figure the eschatological prophet hoped for in 1QS and 4Q175 is the most convincing.⁵¹ The echo of Isa 61:1⁵² in our text is certain and in practice forces the character in question to be understood as a prophetic figure.⁵³ It would seem that the “messenger” character of the expected eschatological prophet does not prevent him from being called “anointed.”

If I am not completely mistaken in the way I understand the text, the general meaning of the second part of 11QMelch is similar to the interpretation of Am 5:26–27 that we find in CD VII 13–VIII 1.⁵⁴ In

⁴⁹ Milik, “Milki-sedeq et Milki-reša’ dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens,” 126.

⁵⁰ Fitzmyer, “Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11,” 254 and 266.

⁵¹ Van der Woude, “Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt,” 367; Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 410–11.

⁵² Where the three keywords of our text occur: רוּחַ, מְשִׁיחַ, and לְבַשֵּׁר.

⁵³ The Prophets are called מְשִׁיחֵי הַרוּחַ in CD II 12.

⁵⁴ The passage is generally considered as an interpolation, inserted into Document A to replace the midrash on Zech 13:7 and Ezek 9:4 which appears in Document B, see J. Murphy-O’Connor, “The Original Text of CD 7:9–8:2 = 19:5–14,” *HTR* 64 (1971): 379–86; G.J. Brooke, “The Amos-Numbers Midrash (CD 7,13b–8,1a) and Messianic Expectation,” *ZAW* 92 (1980): 397–404; M.A. Knibb, “The Interpretation of *Damascus Document* VII,9b–VIII,2a and XIX,5b–14,” *RevQ* 15/57–58 (1991): 243–51. Some scholars, such as F.M. Stricker, “*Damascus Document* VII,10–20 and Qumran Messianic Expectations,” *RevQ* 12/47 (1986): 327–49, consider that the passage is original and later has been replaced by the midrash on Zecharian-Ezekiel, whereas others, such as S.A. White, “A Comparison of the ‘A’ and ‘B’ Manuscripts of the *Damascus Document*,” *RevQ* 12/48 (1987): 537–53, explain the differences between both manuscripts as mechanical mistakes of transmission rather than as indications of editorial activity.”

this passage, which expressly equates “the Kiyyun of the images” with the books of the Prophets (VII 17), the coming of two messianic figures is announced: the Interpreter of the Torah (VII 18) and the Prince of the whole congregation (VII 20). In a similar way, our text interprets Isa 52:7, applying “the mountains” to the prophets and announcing the coming of two “messengers,” two messianic figures whose coming is expected at the end of time: the Teacher and the eschatological Prophet. What is peculiar to our text, and which makes it particularly interesting, is that 11QMelch expressly describes one of these two figures (the eschatological Prophet) as “anointed,” that is to say, as a “messiah.”

If this way of understanding the fragmentary remains of the second part of 11QMelch is correct and if the identification of this “anointed of the spirit” with the eschatological Prophet expected at the end of time is accepted, we can draw some interesting conclusions.

11QMelch would provide us with the proof that the Prophet whose coming is awaited together with the coming of the Messiah of Aaron and the Messiah of Israel in 1QS IX 11, was considered as a “messianic” figure, a “messianic prophet,” even though he is not described as “anointed” in the text in question, which limits the use of this term to the “anointed of Aaron and Israel.”

11QMelch would provide us with the key to identifying the type of “messiah” to which 4Q521 refers,⁵⁵ since it deals with an “anointed” to whom the words of Isa 61:1 are also applied.

This interpretation of the second part of 11QMelch will allow us to resolve a fundamental objection to our interpretation of the first part of the text: the absence of the term “messiah” when it speaks of Melchizedek would prevent considering him as a “heavenly messiah.” The fact

⁵⁵ A fiercely debated question since the preliminary publication of the manuscript by É. Puech, “Une apocalypse messianique (4Q521),” *RevQ* 15/60 (1992): 475–522. The person has been identified as the messiah-king (Puech, *ibid.*, 487), as Elijah (J.J. Collins, “The Works of the Messiah,” *DSD* 1 [1994]: 98–112), as an “Elijah-like eschatological prophet” (Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 117) or as the eschatological prophet (R. Bergmeier, “Beobachtungen zu 4Q521 f 2, II, 1–13,” *ZDMG* 145 [1995]: 44, and Zimmerman, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran*, 382). In DJD XXV, 12, n. 16, Puech leaves open the possibility of understanding משיח as singular or plural [“Son(/Ses) (?), messie(/s)"]; read as a plural, it would refer to the messiah-king and the “messiah-priest,” read as a singular, it would refer to the priestly messiah; and according to K.-W. Niebuhr, “4Q521 2 II—Ein eschatologischer Psalm,” in *Mogilany 1985. Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls offered in memory of Aleksy Klawek* (ed. Z.J. Kapera; Cracow: Enigma, 1998): 160, “[4Q521] verweist weder auf den davidischen noch auf den prophetischen oder priesterlichen messias, sondern vielmehr auf die endzeitliche Autorität des Priestertums.”

that this second part describes as “messiah” a figure who in other Qumran texts is not so described shows us that the use or non-use of the title “messiah” is not the only criterion to determine the character messianic or otherwise of a function.

CHAPTER SEVEN

MAGIC IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

In the recently published *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Philip Alexander begins the article on “Magic and Magical Texts” as follows:

Though the Qumran community knew of the biblical prohibition against magic, both sectarian and nonsectarian texts from the Judean Desert prove that, like most of their contemporaries, they believed in and practiced certain types of magic. These magic and magical texts concern two areas: exorcism, healing and protection against demons (4Q510–511, 4Q560 and 11Q11), and divination, augury, and prediction of the future, specifically through physiognomy (4Q186, 4Q561) zodiology and brontology (4Q318), and astrology (4Q186, 4Q318).¹

In relation to the subject of this volume it is very tempting to analyse these magical texts as witnesses of a process of change in the approach to magic within the Jewish world.

A great distance indeed lies between the blanket condemnation of magic in all its forms in the Old Testament (“You shall not practice divination,” [Lev 19:26]; “You shall not let a sorceress live,” [Exod 22:17]) and the Jewish reputation, among Pagans, as practitioners of magic in the mishnaic epoch. Juvenal, for example, laughs at the Jews’ interpretation of dreams: *Implet et illa manum, sed parcius; aere minuto qualiacumque voles Iudaei somnia vendunt.*² And Lucian of Samosata mocks those fools who turn to Jewish incantations to be cured.³ The distance is even greater when we consider some Jewish magical manuals such as *Sefer ha-Razim* or *Harba de Moshel*, not to mention the “Hebrew Spell” of the Great Magical Papyrus of Paris (PGM iv), or the *Testament of Solomon*.⁴

¹ P.S. Alexander, “Magic and Magical Texts,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 1:502.

² Juvenal, *Saturae* 6.542–47; “She, too, fills her palm, but more sparingly, for a Jew will tell you dreams of any kind you please for the minutest of coins” (transl. G.G. Ramsay, *Juvenal and Persius* [LCL 91; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1918]).

³ Lucian, *Tragopodagra* 171–73; “Some purge themselves with sacred medicine, Others are mocked by chants impostors sell, And other fools fall for the spells of Jews” (transl. M.D. MacLeod, *Lucian: A Selection* [Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1991]).

⁴ See S.I. Johnston, “The Testament of Solomon from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance,” in *The Metamorphosis of Magic from Late Antiquity to the Early Modern Period* (ed.

Yet I will not use the paradigm of change, tempting as it is, for though I believe that it can describe the facts to us, it cannot help us explain the reasons for this changed view of magic, nor will it aid us in understanding the significant differences between the form used to express this magic in the Qumran texts, and the way it appears later in the Jewish Aramaic magic bowls, the amulets and magic texts of the Cairo Genizah, or the practices of the Hasidey Askenaz, who authored the *Sefer Raziel*.⁵ Furthermore, I am convinced that these Qumran texts offer us precisely the opportunity to understand the reasons for the change and for the development in Qumran of a magic perfectly integrated into the worldview of the community.

The magic revealed by these texts is not the magic of the marketplace and cannot be dismissed as an accidental expression of popular religion. Both types of the magic Alexander discovers at Qumran are learned magic: the first sort (exorcism) is clearly based upon the biblical text and is expressed within the dualistic worldview of the community; the second (divination) is a direct consequence of the community's determinism. Both forms are thus perfectly adapted to the needs of the community.

The biblical, blanket interdiction of magic was very well known at Qumran. In the final section of the *Temple Scroll* (11QT^a LX 16–21)⁶ we find a slightly reworked version of Deut 18:10–11:

When you enter the land which I am going to give you, you shall not learn to do the abominations of those peoples. Among you shall not be found anyone who makes his son or his daughter pass through fire, anyone who practices divination, astrologers, sorcerers, wizards, anyone who performs incantations, anyone who consults a spirit or oracles or anyone who questions the dead; because all those who do these things are an abomination to me.

The biblical interdiction is somehow accentuated here, because it is presented as a direct order of God, and is expressed in the first person. The

J.N. Bremmer and J.R. Veenstra; GSCC 1; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 35–49, and J.R. Veenstra, “The Holy Almandal: Angels and the Intellectual Aims of Magic. Appendix The Art Almandel of Solomon (BL, ms. Sloane 2731),” *ibidem*, 189–229.

⁵ Or, for that matter, the magical rituals that contemporary Hasidim from Jerusalem put to practice (according to the Israeli newspapers) short before Yitzhak Rabin was killed.

⁶ Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983), vol. 3, pl. 75. Hebrew text and translation in F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 2:1283.

Temple Scroll changes the indirect speech of the biblical texts—which is in the third person—into a direct speech in the first person, with God speaking directly, thus making the prohibition on all forms of magic a direct order of the divinity. In addition, this text, with its list of forbidden activities, gives us a practical definition of “magic,” including the two categories (divination and incantation) into which the texts indicated by Alexander fall.

Equally well known at Qumran was the Enochic tradition’s interdiction of magic, where the origin of evil is attributed to the fallen angels, who not only consorted with the daughters of men but taught them all sorts of magic. No less than ten fragmentary copies of the different parts of *1 Enoch* have been found at Qumran, including five that include remnants of the *Book of the Watchers* (4Q201–202, 204–206).⁷ In 4Q201 ii 13–15 and iii 1–5⁸ we can read:

They and their chiefs all took for themselves women, from all they chose, and they began to penetrate them, to be defiled by them, and to teach them sorcery, incantations and the cutting of roots and to explain herbs . . . Semihaza taught incantations, and (how) to cut roots; Hermoni taught (how) to undo magic spells, sorcery, magic and skills; Baraq’el taught the signs of the shafts; Kokab’el taught the signs of the stars; Zeq’el taught the signs of the lighting; ‘Arteqof taught the signs of the earth; Shamshi’el taught the signs of the sun; Sahari’el taught the signs of the moon. And all began to reveal secrets to their wives, and because of this doing men expired from the earth, and the outcry went right up to the heaven.

Aside from the emphasis on the biblical interdiction against all “magic,” and in spite of the use of the Watchers’ story to explain the origin of evil on the earth, a good number of other texts—both sectarian and nonsectarian—show us how this forbidden “magic” was adapted to the needs of a group: incantations, exorcisms and apotropaic prayers were used to defend the sons of light from the forces of darkness within the cosmic conflict in which they were locked. In this group, the predetermined future had to be ascertained before the aspirant-member was allowed to join it.

The main Qumran texts which attest to one or another form of magic are presented here serially, without regard to the chronological

⁷ Edited by J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch. Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), pls. I–XXIV; *DSSSE*, 1:398–429.

⁸ Completed with 4Q202 ii 18–20 and iii 1–6; the text closely correspond to *1 En.* 7:1–2 and 8:3–4.

date of the manuscripts, and are grouped in two general categories: literary texts with positive allusions to magical practices, and magical texts in the strict sense.

1. *Allusions to magical practices in literary texts*

We begin our inquiry by listing some allusions to these practices (exorcisms and divination) in literary texts that have nothing to do with magic, but which *en passant* allude to the activities directly condemned by the biblical text quoted in the *Temple Scroll*, or to those activities thought to be the result of the Watchers' instruction to the women. These allusions are not overtly clear, but they form a first indication of what we can expect to find in more explicit texts.

I will not comment on the book of Tobit—which provides the most complex and interesting example of magical practices in a narrative context—because the four Aramaic (4Q196–199) and one Hebrew (4Q200) fragmentary copies found at Qumran do not add details to the story as it is known from the two Greek and the Old Latin version.⁹ In this text, the protagonist, aided by the angel Raphael, expels the demon Asmodaeus from the bridal chamber through a combination of prayer and magical practice (the burning of parts of the fish's heart and liver on incense, using the smoke of the fish to chase the demon) and later uses the gall of the same fish to cure his blind father.¹⁰

A clear reference to some sort of "magic" is made in the composition known as the *Prayer of Nabonidus*. This is an Aramaic composition found in Cave 4 (4Q242). It is closely related to the stories told in the biblical book of Daniel yet lacks many of the legendary elements which colour Daniel 4, while it preserves some authentic elements of the original story, such as the name of Nabonidus and the name of the oasis of Teiman in the Arabian desert, the location of the King's exile.¹¹ The first four lines of the text read:

⁹ Edited by J.A. Fitzmyer, DJD XIX, 41–76, pls. I–X; *DSSSE*, 1:382–99.

¹⁰ See B. Kollmann, "Göttliche Offenbarung magisch-pharmakologischer Heilkunst im Buch Tobit," *ZWA* 106 (1994): 293–97; C.A. Moore, *Tobit* (AB 40A; New York: Doubleday, 1996).

¹¹ Edited by J.J. Collins, DJD XXII, 83–93, pl. VI; *DSSSE*, 1:486–89. Since the preliminary edition by J.T. Milik, "‘Prière de Nabonide’ et autres écrits d'un cycle de Daniel. Fragments araméens de Qumran," *RB* 63 (1956): 407–15, this text has been the object of many detailed studies. See A. Lange and M. Sieker, "Gattung und Quellenwert des Gebets des Nabonid," in *Qumranstudien: Vorträge und Beiträge der Teilnehmer des Qumranseminars*

Words of the prayer which Nabonidus, King of the land of Babylon, the great king, prayed when he was afflicted by a malignant inflammation, by decree of the God Most High, in Teiman. I, Nabonidus, was afflicted by a malignant inflammation for seven years, and was banished far from men, until I prayed to the God Most High and an exorcist forgave my sin. He was a Jew from the exiles, who said to me... (4Q242 1-3 1-4)

Following the *incipit* of the composition, we have a summary of the facts in autobiographical form: sickness of the king, retreat to Teiman, prayer to the true God, and forgiveness of sin by an exorcist. The text further specifies that for seven years the king prayed to all sorts of gods to no avail, and that the action of the exorcist—the forgiveness of his sins—also signified the cure of the king. The key elements are, of course, the prayer of the King and the intervention of the Jew who forgives the sins and who is described in the text as a 𐤒𐤍, a *gazer*.¹² The term is known in Aramaic and used to designate a “diviner,” “soothsayer,” and appears, for example, in the list of seers, fortune-tellers, astrologers, magicians, etc. who are incapable of interpreting the king’s dreams in the book of Daniel (Dan 2:27; 4:4; 5:7, 11). My translation of the word *gazer* as “exorcist” has been questioned,¹³ but in view of the connection between sickness and demons, the fact that this *gazer*’s function is to “forgive the sin,” and the results of this action (the curing of the king), I believe that my translation is perfectly appropriate.¹⁴

In any case, our text presents the action of this *gazer* in a positive way, without any indication that this profession (whatever it was, diviner, soothsayer or exorcist) could be considered as forbidden for a Jew; on the contrary, its practice led to the conversion of the King and his acknowledgement of the true God.

Unfortunately, the fragmentary state of the text does not allow us to ascertain which way the *gazer* acts. The following text, a few lines from

auf dem internationalen Treffen der Society of Biblical Literature, Münster, 25.–26. Juli 1993 (ed. H.-J. Fabry, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 31–34.

¹² Lange and Sieker, “Gattung und Quellenwert des Gebets des Nabonid,” 9–10 prefer to read the word as 𐤒𐤍 with the meaning of “Schutzbürger,” but this reading seems palaeographically excluded.

¹³ P.S. Alexander, “Wrestling against the Wickedness in High Places: Magic and the Worldview of the Qumran Community,” in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. S. Porter and C.A. Evans; JSPSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 329, n.18; Collins, DJD XXII, 89, opts for a more neutral term, “diviner.”

¹⁴ F. García Martínez, “The Prayer of Nabonidus: A New Synthesis,” in *Qumran and Apocalyptic* (F. García Martínez; STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 116–36.

another Aramaic composition found in Cave 1, the *Genesis Apocryphon*, provide us perhaps with a glimpse of the procedure.¹⁵

When Hirqanos heard Lot's words, he went and said to the king: All these plagues and punishments with which the king my Lord is afflicted and punished are on account of Sarai, Abram's wife. They should return Sarai, then, to Abram, her husband and this plague and the spirit of purulent evils will cease to afflict you. The king called me and said to me: What have you done to me with regard to Sarai? You told me: She is my sister, when she is your wife; so that I took her for myself for a consort. Here is your wife; take her away! Go! Depart from all the cities of Egypt! But now pray for me and for my household so that this evil spirit will be banished from us. I prayed that he might be cured and laid my hands upon his head. The plague was removed from him; the evil spirit was banished from him and he recovered. The king got up and gave me on that day many gifts... (1QapGen XX 24–30)

The story here, retold and embellished with many new details, is that of Gen 12:11–20. The King of Egypt, who has taken the wife of Abraham in exchange for many goods, becomes sick and is forced to dismiss her. The narrative of our text, intended to exculpate Abraham and to assure the reader that the Pharaoh Zoan has not touched his wife, adds many new details to the story (a dream of Abraham, which exculpates him for his lying; a first gift of many goods because Abraham reads from the books of Enoch to the Egyptians; a lengthy description of Sarai's beauty; a prayer by Abraham that Sarai be preserved from defilement; the decisive intervention of Abraham to heal the Pharaoh; and the giving of goods as a result of this intervention).¹⁶ But the elements which interest us here are the specific identification of the origin of the plague—caused by an evil spirit—which affects the Pharaoh, and the way Abraham cures the Pharaoh.

In the lines preceding those just quoted, the results of the prayer Abraham makes for Sarai's preservation are expressed thus:

That night, the God Most High sent him a chastising spirit, to afflict him and all the members of his household. And he was unable to approach her; let alone to have sexual intercourse with her, in spite of being with her

¹⁵ Cf. N. Avigad and Y. Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon. A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press and Heihkal ha-sefer, 1956); *DSSSE* 1:28–49. This text also has been intensively studied, but the standard commentary remains J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I. A Commentary* (2nd rev. ed.; BibOr 18A; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971).

¹⁶ On the structure and genre of the whole passage see A. Lange, "1QapGen XIX 10–XX 32 as Paradigm of the Wisdom Didactic Narrative," in *Qumranstudien*, 191–204.

for two years. At the end of the two years, the punishments and plagues, against him and against all the members of his household, increased and intensified. And he sent for all the wise men of Egypt (to be called, and all the wizards as well as all the healers of Egypt (to see) whether they could heal him of that disease, (him) and the members of his household. However, all the healers and wizards and all the wise men were unable to rise up to heal him. For the spirit attacked all of them and they fled. (1QapGen XX 16–21)

Here there is no doubt of the direct connection between demons (the evil spirit) and the sickness which afflicts the Pharaoh; the one is the origin and the other the cause. In fact, the evil spirit and the sickness are practically identified, since the prayer's expected effect is expressed by the Pharaoh (who is freed from the spirit) and by Abraham (who has the Pharaoh cured of the sickness).

Equally clear is the way Abraham carries out the operation: he prays, of course, but he also lays his hands upon the Pharaoh's head. He is thus clearly presented as an exorcist in spite of the explicit interdiction in Deuteronomy. If the double elements of this text (praying and laying on the hands) serve as an indication, we may assume that a similar procedure was involved in 4Q242.

My third example of allusions to magical practices in a non-magical literary text is taken from a very fragmentary manuscript, of which possibly three copies have been preserved. However, it is also possible that the three manuscripts—4Q375, 4Q376¹⁷ and 1Q29¹⁸—represent two related compositions on similar topics. The first manuscript (4Q375) discusses the procedure to follow when a false prophet appears, and it is clearly based on the discussions of the topic in Deut 13 and 18. But the test imposed upon this false prophet in 4Q375 is not that of Deut 13 (conformity with revealed teaching) nor that of Deut 18 (his word has no effect), but a rather complex procedure in which the prophet is brought before the High Priest. The High Priest performs some sacrifices similar to the sacrifices for the Day of Atonement, enters afterwards into the Ark of the Testimony in order to study, and then comes out to decide on the case. The second manuscript (4Q376), which is only a thin strip of leather with the remnants of three columns, apparently continues with the description of the same ritual, and shows how the decision is achieved: through the oracular use of the Urim and Thummim, the two

¹⁷ Edited by J. Strugnell, DJD XIX, 111–36, pl. XV; *DSSSE*, 2:740–43.

¹⁸ Edited by J.T. Milik, DJD I, 130–32, pl. XXX; *DSSSE*, 1:108–11.

stones engraved with the names of the sons of Israel, which were on the breastplate of the High Priest.

Col. I... and before the deputy of the anointed priest... a young bullock from the herd and a ram... for the Urim

Col. II they will provide you with light and he will go out with it with tongues of fire; the stone of the left side which is at its left side will shine to the eyes of all the assembly until the priest finishes speaking. And after it (the cloud ?) has been removed... and you shall keep and do all that he tells you

Col. III in accordance with all this judgement. And if there were in the camp the Prince of the whole congregation, and... his enemies, and Israel is with him, or if they march to a city to besiege it or any affair which... to the Prince... the field is far away (4Q376 1 i-iii)

In spite of the fragmentary state of the text, the mention of the Urim and the following description of the working of the left-hand-side stone (shining on the face of all the assembly when the priest is speaking) left little doubt about the procedure followed, a procedure which bestows divine confirmation on the Priest's decision. In addition, the copy of this composition preserved in Cave 1 (1Q29) mentions the right-hand stone when the priest goes out, as well as three tongues of fire, but we are not able to reconstruct the whole sequence. Nevertheless, it seems clear that this "oracle" of the shining stones is part of the procedure to decide of what sort the self-proclaimed prophet is, and probably also to decide the way to proceed during the eschatological battles, when the Prince of the community (a clear messianic title in the Scrolls) will lead the war against all the sons of darkness.

This oracular shining of the Urim and Thummim is not attested to in the biblical text, of course, but we do have an interesting text by Josephus which provides witness to the tradition regarding the shining of the stones and their use *in re militari*. In his *Jewish Antiquities* 3.215–218, he says:

Well, of those stones which, as I said before, the High-Priest wore upon his shoulders—they were sardonyxes, and I deem it superfluous to indicate the nature of jewels familiar to all—it came about, whenever God assisted at the sacred ceremonies, that the one that was buckled on the right shoulder began to shine, a light glancing from it, visible to the most distant, of which the stone had before betrayed no trace. That alone should be marvel enough for such as have not cultivated a superior wisdom to disparage all religious things; but I have yet a greater marvel to record. By means of the twelve stones, which the high-priest wore upon his breast stitched into the *essên*, God foreshowed victory to those on the eve of battle. For so

brilliant a light flashed out from them, ere the army was yet in motion, that it was evident to the whole host that God had come to their aid.¹⁹

Here Josephus emphasized the military use of the stones to predict victory. Yet his introduction to the entire narrative of the oracular flashing of the stones put the use of the Urim and Thummim in direct relationship with false prophecy:

However, I would here record a detail which I omitted concerning the vestments of the high-priest. For Moses left no possible opening for the malpractices of prophets,²⁰ should there in fact be any capable of abusing the divine prerogative, but left to God supreme authority whether to attend the sacred rites, when it so pleased Him, or to absent himself; and this he wished to be made manifest not to Hebrews only but also to any strangers who chanced to be present (*Ant.* 3.214).

We could go further in tracing allusions to magical practices in literary texts, reported without any indication that these practices (contrary to the biblical and Enochic traditions) were considered to be wrong. But these two examples of exorcisms and the one of divination should suffice. We can now proceed by looking for more explicit texts dealing with exorcisms, healing, and protection against demons, texts that can rightly be considered as magical texts.

2. *Magical texts*

The first text is a composition entitled *Songs of the Sage*, preserved in two copies from cave 4 (4Q510 and 4Q511),²¹ both written in a Herodian hand which can be dated to the turn of the Christian era. It is a rather extensive collection of songs with a strong incantatory character, although it has been badly preserved and no song can be reconstructed completely. The songs were numbered (first, second) but no other indications of the circumstances surrounding their usage has been preserved.²²

¹⁹ See Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities* (transl. H.St.J. Thackeray and R. Marcus; LCL; 9 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930–65), 4:419–21.

²⁰ This is the reading of the standard text, other manuscripts read *συκοφαντῶν*.

²¹ Edited by Baillet, DJD VII, 215–62, pls. LV–LXIII; *DSSSE*, 2:1026–37. See further B. Nitzan, “Hymns from Qumran ‘to Frighten and to Terrify’ Evil Spirits,” *Tarbiz* 55 (1985–86): 53–63 (Hebrew); *eadem*, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 227–72, and Alexander “‘Wrestling Against Wickedness in High Places,’” 319–24.

²² Two instances of the *incipit*, both incomplete, have been preserved: 4Q511 2 i 1: “For the sage, song [...],” and 4Q511 8 4: “[For the sage,] second [so]ng to.”

The songs, whoever their author may have been, are intended to be recited by the *משכיל* (“the sage,” “the Instructor”). On one occasion in which the *incipit* has been preserved, the song is attributed to the Sage (*למשכיל*), but we never know for sure whether the *lamed* is intended as a *lamed auctoris* in such cases,²³ and a translation “for the sage” and not “from the sage” is quite possible.²⁴ In any case, the songs are written in the first person, and the performer is always the same: the priestly functionary who cares for the spiritual welfare of the community: the *Maskil*. He is the one who does “shout with terrifying voice: ‘Woe on all those who break it’ (i.e. the covenant)” (4Q511 63–64 iii 5) and the one who does “spread the fear of God in the ages of my generations to exalt the name . . . and to terrify with his power all spirits of the bastards, to subjugate them by his fear, not for all eternal times, but for the time of their dominion.” (4Q511 35 6–8)

Characteristically, as in most compositions penned by the people of Qumran, the divine name is avoided. Not only do we not find any of the *nomina barabara*, but even the use of the tetragrammaton is avoided entirely; instead, *’el* or *’elohim* are regularly used, and in one case (4Q511 10 12) we find *yod* used as a substitute for the divine name (יוד),²⁵ unless this is a scribal error for ידו, “his hand.”

The background of these songs’ demonology is anchored in the demonology of *1 Enoch* and the story of the fallen angels, as illustrated by the use of the word “bastards” to designate them (several times we find רווחי ממזרים [“spirits of the bastards”] and even עדת ממזרים [“congregation of the bastards”]), besides other more common designations for demons, such as “ravaging angels, demons, Lilith, owls, jackals,” etc.:

And through my mouth he terrifies all the spirits of the bastards (which) subjugate all impure sinners. For in the innards of my flesh is the foundation of . . . and in my body wars. The laws of God are in my heart, and I get profit . . . all the wonders of man. (4Q511 48–50 2–5)

In these Songs the dualistic view of the community transpires, with the division of the human and angelic world into two conflicting camps.²⁶

²³ As לדוד, “Of David” in the Psalms.

²⁴ As it is in other cases in which the formula is used at Qumran, such as 1QS III 13.

²⁵ G.W. Nebe, “Der Buchstabenname YOD als Ersatz des Tetragramms in 4Q511, Fragment 10, Zeile 12?,” *RevQ* 12/46 (1986): 283–84.

²⁶ A. Lange, “The Essene Position on Magic and Divination,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Cambridge 1995, Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* (ed. M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 431–33.

The Songs are a product of the Qumran community, and are quite close, in language and content, to the communal blessing and curses we find in the *Rule of the Community* or in the Qumranic collections of liturgical blessing and curses, in which the priest and the Levites or the whole community ritually bless or damn the angels and the demons, as well as the faithful or unfaithful members of the group. But in these songs the blessing and cursing is done only by the Maskil, who engages in spiritual warfare against the forces of evil and combats them with these liturgical hymns. He is the one who proclaims the power of God, but his liturgical proclamation is clearly intended to frighten (לִפְחֹד) the demons:

And I, a sage, declare the splendor of his radiance in order to frighten and terrify all the spirits of the ravaging angels and bastard spirits, demons, Lilith, owls and jackals, and those who strike unexpectedly to lead astray the spirit of knowledge, to make their hearts forlorn. And you have been placed in the era of the rule of wickedness and in the periods of humiliation of the sons of light, in the guilty periods of those defiled by iniquities; not for an everlasting destruction but rather for the era of the humiliation of sin. (4Q510 1 4–8 [= 4Q511 10 1–6])

What this text implies, in practical terms, is that the Maskil's solemn proclamation of God's power will protect the community and its members from attacks by demons. It is not a question of expelling the demons (thus there are, properly speaking, no hymns of exorcism), but of creating a *cordon sanitaire* around the community that the demons cannot cross, and of defending the faithful in the time of trial. That Belial and his host repeatedly attempt to cause the Sons of Light to stumble, is a recurring theme in the scrolls. These Songs testify to the faith in the protective force of prayer in keeping the demons away, and in the efficacy of liturgy to abort their attacks. Although they are addressed to God rather than to the demons, the hymns use words of praise as words of power to achieve their prophylactic function.²⁷ That the Songs were intended for liturgical (public) use, is implied by their ending, preserved on the last column of 4Q511 frags. 63–64, which contains the response of the community, with a double "Amen, Amen" in the colophon: "May *they* bless your works always, and may your name be blessed for eternal centuries. Amen. Amen." The liturgical use of these songs with a general apotropaic function illustrates, as Alexander has remarked: "how fine is the line dividing prayer and hymn, on the one hand, from magical incantation, on the other."²⁸

²⁷ Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*, 253–59.

²⁸ Alexander, "Magic and Magical Texts," 503.

This line has apparently been crossed out in the next text, 4Q444,²⁹ which is very closely related to 4Q510–511 (with which it shares several expressions) but which also contains curse formulas against different classes of demons.

And I belong to those who spread the fear of God; he opened my mouth with his true knowledge, and from his holy spirit [...]... and they became spirits of dispute in my (bodily) structure. The precept of [...] the innards of the flesh. A spirit of knowledge and understanding, truth and justice, did God place in my heart [...]... and be strong in the precepts of God and in battling the spirits of iniquity, and not [...]... the wailing cries of her mourning. *Blank* Cursed be³⁰ [...] afflictions, and until its dominions are complete [...] those who inspire him fear, all the spirits of the bastards, and the spirit of uncleanness (4Q444 1–3 i 1–8)

Although the poor state of the text does not allow many conclusions to be drawn, it seems clear that the initial prayer is followed by a direct curse after the blank. The protagonist speaks in the first person and, in defining himself, uses the same expression found at the beginning of one of the hymns of the Sage, “the terrifier of God” (4Q511 35 6).³¹ He exhorts others to be strong in fighting the “spirits of iniquity,” and orders them to address these spirits directly when cursing them. The use of the words “bastards” in the descriptions of these demons assures us that we are within the same demonological context of the *Songs of the Sage*, but no *Maskil* is present here. The practitioner addresses the patient and the demons. Apparently, the protective barrier has not worked properly and the evil forces have taken hold of a community member, so that a direct intervention to expel them is called for.

The same situation also pertains to the collection of hymns against the demons that is attributed to David (לדוד with the *lamed* here clearly intended as a *lamed auctoris*, 11Q11 V 4), but which also mentions Solomon, the most famous exorcist in the Jewish tradition.

²⁹ Edited by E. Chazon, DJD XXIX, 367–78, pl. XXVI; *DSSSE*, 2:924–25.

³⁰ Reading ארור with the *editio princeps* (DJD XXIX, 372) instead of ארור (“I will subdue”) of *DSSSE*, 2:924, although the reading is far from certain, since the leader is broken at the only distinctive element which differentiates the *dalet* from the *resh* in this hand, the shoulder.

³¹ ואני מירא אל, an expression which is considered as a technical term to designate an exorcist, see J.M. Baumgarten, “The Qumran Songs Against Demons,” *Tarbiz* 55 (1985–86): 442–45. The expression מירא א appears also in 8Q5, a manuscript from Cave 8 edited by M. Baillet, DJD III, 181–82, pl. XXXV; *DSSSE*, 2:1166–67) which is, apparently, another exorcism and of which only two small fragments have been preserved.

This composition (11Q11),³² copied in a Herodian hand of the early 1st c. C.E., is called *Apocryphal Psalms*, because it consists of at least three apocryphal psalms followed by Ps 91, a psalm frequently quoted in Jewish amulets and incantations and considered in the talmudic literature as the most appropriate remedy against demons.³³ These compositions have been linked with the “four songs to sing over the stricken / afflicted / possessed” or whatever may be indicated by (הַפְּנוּעִים), listed among the David compositions which appear in 11Q5 XXVII 9–10.³⁴ The compositions are real exorcisms, in the strict sense of the term,³⁵ employed in chasing the demon away from the possessed person and to cure him from his sickness.³⁶ Here follows, as an example, the translation of the fourth of these psalms:

Of David: Against... an incantation in the name of YHWH. Invoke at any time the heavens. When he comes upon you in the night, you shall say to him: Who are you, oh offspring of man and of the seed of the holy ones? Your face is a face of delusion, and your horns are horns of illusion. You are darkness and not light, injustice and not justice... the chief of the army. YHWH will bring you down to the deepest Sheol, he will shut the two bronze gates through which no light penetrates. On you shall not shine the sun which rises upon the just man to... You shall say... (11Q11 V 4–11)

The song is addressed to a sick person (in the second person singular) who is exhorted to confront the demon and it is intended to remain the demon of God’s power and of the guardian angels’ strength, which can imprison him in the abyss. The demonology is complex; we find

³² Published originally by J.P.M. van der Ploeg, “Le Psaume XCI dans une recension de Qumran,” *RB* 72 (1965): 210–17, and *idem*, “Un petit rouleau de psaumes apocryphes (11QPsAp^a),” in *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt. Festgabe für Karl Georg Kuhn* (ed. G. Jeremias, H.-W. Kuhn, and H. Stegemann; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 128–39; edited by García Martínez *et al.*, *DJD* XXIII, 181–205, pls. XXII–XXV; *DSSSE*, 2:1200–1205. See also É. Puech, “11QPsAp^a: Un rituel d’exorcismes. Essai de reconstruction,” *RevQ* 14/55 (1990): 377–408; and *idem*, “Les Psaumes davidiques du rituel d’exorcisme (11Q11),” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet* (ed. D. Falk, F. García Martínez, and E.M. Schuller; *STDJ* 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 160–81.

³³ *g*. *Erub* 10.11 [26c]; *b*. *Shebu.* 15b; *g*. *Shabb.* 6.8b, where it is called שִׁיר שֶׁל פְּנוּעִים “the song of the stricken.”

³⁴ Edited by J.A. Sanders, *DJD* IV; *DSSSE*, 2:1172–79.

³⁵ So also Alexander, “Wrestling against Wickedness in High Places,” 326 and Puech, “11QPsAp^a: un rituel d’exorcismes,” 403.

³⁶ The text uses both the noun רְפִיאוֹתָ “cure, medicine” (11Q11 II 7), and the verb שָׁלַח in the *pi’el* form, “to heal” (11Q11 V 3) in the expression “Raphael has healed.”

references to demons, to the Prince of Animosity, and, in the quoted text, to the “bastards,” here described as “offspring of man and of the seed of the holy ones”; if the reference to the horns is not metaphorically intended, we may even have here the first allusion to “horned” demons. And equally complex is the angelology of the song: Raphael appears as the healer, but there are also references to a “powerful angel,” and the “chief of the army of YHWH” (which may be Michael); even Solomon is mentioned, although we cannot be sure about his function.³⁷ It is important to note that this angelology and demonology are deeply indebted to the dualistic world-view of the community, as reflected in the *Treatise of the Two Spirits* (1QS III 13–IV 26); these exorcisms and cursings of the demons echo the ritual cursing we find in 1QS II, in 4Q280³⁸ and in 4Q286 frag. 7.³⁹

Apparently the psalms are to be recited in the name of the afflicted, the one who is maltreated by a demon, the one who is stricken or possessed. We do not know who should recite the psalms, but in light of the *Songs of the Sage*, the Maskil might be a likely candidate,⁴⁰ although his name never appears in the preserved text. Neither can we be certain whether the exorcism was a public or a private affair. That the exorcists address the sick in second person singular is clear; at least in two cases, part of a response “Amen, Amen, Selah” has been preserved (11Q11 VI 3 and 14), although the verb is incomplete and can be reconstructed with a singular or plural ending. Alexander prefers to reconstruct a singular form, interpreting the procedure as follows: “The songs are recited over the sick one, who may be too weak to recite them himself, but who assents to them with the response ‘Amen, Amen, Selah’.”⁴¹ We have reconstructed a plural form,⁴² interpreting the liturgical acclamation as

³⁷ In the DJD edition of this text (DJD XXIII, 191) we have suggested that the manuscript could be a collection of different materials, some attributed to Solomon, the exorcist *per excellence* in the Jewish tradition, and we have proposed as a possible reconstruction for the line in which his name appears (11Q11 II 2): “he shall utter a spell which Solomo made, and he shall invoke the name of YWHW.” For Solomon, see also Johnston, “The Testament of Solomon from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance.”

³⁸ Edited by B. Nitzan, DJD XXIX, 1–8, pl. I; *DSSSE*, 2:636–37.

³⁹ Edited by Nitzan, DJD XI, 7–48, pls. I–IV; *DSSSE*, 2:644–49.

⁴⁰ So Alexander, “Wrestling against Wickedness in High Places,” 328.

⁴¹ “Rather an individual is in view, and the situation is one of specific crisis. Consequently the responsum “Amen, Amen, Selah” should be taken as the reply of the individual. I would, therefore, restore at col. v, l. 14, סלה אמן אמן סלה,” “Wrestling against Wickedness in High Places,” 326.

⁴² ויענה אמן אמן סלה, because of the parallel with Neh 8:6, with other curses found in 4Q286 7 and 1QS II where the double Amen with a plural verb appears, and, of

the expression of the community's presence near the sick bed and of its association with the exorcism.

A noteworthy difference between this text and the *Songs of the Sage* is that in these Psalms the sacred name YHWH is written in full and in normal square characters. For some, this would be an indication of a non-qumranic origin of the composition,⁴³ but I believe that a more probable explanation is that its use here depends on the magical character of the text and the efficacy of the divine name that is specifically invoked. Another noteworthy characteristic of the scroll is its very small size (less than 10 cm high) which could point to a sort of pocket edition of the composition, in an easy-to-carry format, ready for use at the sick bed.

Each of these three texts are basically learned literary compositions, with many biblical allusions and echoes of other Qumran writings. But happily, we have also recovered some fragments of a manuscript which has all the appearance of coming from a practical manual, a book of spells, or collection of adjurations, from which, depending on the circumstances, a spell could be copied and adapted to the needs of the client.⁴⁴ That this is the case, and that our text is not a charm intended to be directly used by the client (in the form of an amulet carried by the person, for example), is suggested by the appearance of the leather, which shows no trace of having been folded, as we find in the *tefillim*.

The text has not yet appeared in the DJD Series, but it was published in a learned article by Penny and Wise in 1994.⁴⁵ It is very difficult to read⁴⁶ (and even more difficult to understand), but apparently it contains

course, with the colophon of 4Q511 previously quoted, DJD XXIII, 203–205. Puech, “11QP^sAp”: un rituel d'exorcismes,” 381, and “Les psaumes davidiques du rituel d'exorcisme,” 162 also reconstructs the plural.

⁴³ So Puech, “11QP^sAp”: un rituel d'exorcismes,” 402.

⁴⁴ 8Q5 (see note 31) could be a manuscript of the same sort. The preserved text starts with an invocation of the name of God: “In your name, O Hero” (or “In your mighty name” if one prefers to reconstruct the article before נַהֲרֵי) followed by the formula identifying the action of the exorcist אֲנִי מַיְרֵא, “I terrify and...” The second line has preserved the designation of the subject of the action, designated in general terms as “from this man, who is from the sons of...” Still, the manuscript is so fragmentary that no much can be extracted from it.

⁴⁵ D.L. Penny and M.O. Wise, “By the Power of Beelzebub: An Aramaic Incantation Formula from Qumran (4Q560),” *JBL* 113 (1994): 627–50; see also J. Naveh, “Fragments of an Aramaic Magic Book from Qumran,” *IEJ* 48 (1998): 252–61 and Alexander, “Wrestling against Wickedness in High Places,” 329–40; *DSSSE*, 2:1116–17.

⁴⁶ For example, according to my reading of the photographs PAM 43.574 and 43.602, the assumed name of Beelzebub is only the result of a wrong reading of the editors.

an adjuration (or several, if the two columns do not concern the same spell) against demons which attack pregnant women and disturb the sleep. It has nothing “qumranic”, but it was found among the manuscripts of Cave 4, and after what we have seen in the previous texts, its presence is not surprising:

Col. I: ...and heart and...the midwife, the chastisement of girls. Evil visitor...who enter the flesh, the male penetrator and the female penetrator...iniquity and guilt, fever and chills,⁴⁷ and heat of the heart...in sleep, he who crushes the male and she who passes through the female, those who dig...wicked...

Col. II: before him...and...before him and...And I, oh spirit, adjure...I enchant you, oh spirit...on the earth, in the clouds...

In spite of the many uncertain aspects of the transcription and translation of the text, there can be no doubt as to the meaning of the verb used in the second column by the magician to address the demon: **אִמַּא**, used as a participle (**מִמְרִיחָה**) in line 5, and in the *ap'el* form with the suffix of second singular in line 6 (**אִמַּמְרִיחָךְ**), in both cases with **רוּחַ** as the object: “And I, O spirit, adjure...” and “I enchant you, O spirit.” The most characteristic element of the incantation is the specification of the demons as male and female evil beings. This all inclusive language appears in many magic texts of later date and is intended to prevent any loopholes. Perhaps its use was prompted here by the ambiguity of the word **רוּחַ** which, although technically feminine, is considered masculine in this text, as is shown by the masculine suffix used on col. II 5.⁴⁸

If the two columns of text preserve parts of the same incantation, the first one would have contained the description of the sickness and sickness-provoking demons, while the conjuring formula would have been written in second column. The intended use of the charm is to adjure the offending spirit, and to neutralise the nefarious effects of his acts on the person. The formulae of our text are not very different from the ones used in the vast corpus of Aramaic or Mandaic incantation bowls several centuries younger, and the concerns they reflect are the same. But this exemplar found at Cave 4, proves, even more clearly than the

⁴⁷ According to Naveh, “Fragments of an Aramaic Magic Book from Qumran,” 257, this is the designation of malaria “the most frequently mentioned illness in the fifth–seventh century Palestinian amulets.”

⁴⁸ In the already quoted 4Q510 1 5 “to frighten and terrify all the spirits of the ravaging angels and bastard spirits,” we find **רוּחַ** used both in the masculine (**רוּחַי מִלְאכֵי חֲבָל**) and in the feminine (**רוּחוֹת מִמְרִיחִים**) in the same sentence.

texts already presented, that magic was really used, and not only in a prophylactic way.

The following three texts belong to the other category of magic Alexander has listed: they all deal with divination, augury and prediction of the future.

The first, also an Aramaic scroll (4Q318),⁴⁹ is basically a *Brontologion*, a well known divinatory genre which interprets thunder as an omen of important events, preceded by a *Zodiology* or *Selenodromion*, which locates the position of the moon on the signs of the zodiac during each day of the year, month by month. Once this has been completed (it takes up the greater part of the scroll in spite of the use of numbers instead of words for the days), the author explains the significance of the thunder, by its occurrence in the diverse zodiacal signs. The last preserved part of the manuscript, with the end of the *Selenodromion* and the beginning of the *Brontologion*, reads:

(Month of) Adar: On the 1st and on the 2nd, Aries. On the 3rd and on the 4th, Taurus. On the 5th and on the 6th and on the 7th, Gemini. On the 8th, on the 9th, Cancer. On the 10th and on the 11th, Leo. On the 12th and on the 13th and on the 14th, Virgo. On the 15th and on the 16th, Libra. On the 17th, on the 18, Scorpio. On the 19th and on the 20th /21st/, Sagittarius. On the 22nd and on the 23rd, Capricorn. On the 24th and 25th, Aquarius. On the 26th and on the 27th and on the 28th, Pisces. On the 29th and on the 30th, Aries. *Blank*

If it thunders in (the sign of) Taurus, revolutions against... and affliction for the province and a sword in the court of the King and in the province... there will be. And for the Arabs... famine. And they will plunder each other. *Blank*

If it thunders in (the sign of) Gemini, fear and distress from the foreigners and... (4Q318 frag. 2 col. ii [col. viii of the *editio princeps*])

The *Selenodromion* is “a table in which the days of the twelve synodic months—in each of which the new moon occurs in one of the twelve zodiacal signs—are correlated with the sign in which the moon is on that day.”⁵⁰ As such it is very schematic, which allows the reconstruction

⁴⁹ Edited by Greenfield and Sokoloff, DJD XXXVI, 259–74, pls. XV–XVI with the title of *4QZodiology and Brontology ar; DSSSE*, 2:676–79. See also M. Albani, “Der Zodiakos in 4Q318 und die Henoch-Astronomie,” *Forschungsstelle Judentum. Mitteilungen und Beiträge* 7 (1993): 3–42, and M.O. Wise, “Thunder in Gemini: An Aramaic Brontologion (4Q318) from Qumran,” in *Thunder in Gemini and Other Essays on the History, Language and Literature of Second Temple Palestine* (M.O. Wise; Sheffield: JSOT, 1994), 13–50.

⁵⁰ According to D. Pingree, DJD XXXVI, 270.

of the whole year although only few remains have been preserved.⁵¹ The year is formed by twelve months, apparently of 30 days each,⁵² giving a year of 360 days.⁵³ The author has distributed the twelve zodiacal signs among the thirteen units of two or three days into which he has divided each month. The basic pattern, that can be recognised in the two best preserved months, Shevat and Adar, is the following:⁵⁴ 2 (days 1 and 2), 2 (3 and 4), 3 (5, 6 and 7); 2 (8 and 9), 2 (10 and 11), 3 (12, 13 and 14); 2 (15 and 16), 2 (17 and 18), 3 (19, 20 and 21);⁵⁵ 2 (22 and 23), 2 (24 and 25), 3 (26, 27 and 28); 2 (29 and 30). Each month, thus, begins and ends with the same zodiacal sign; each month begins always with a new zodiacal sign, and the signs rotate through the month, so that successive months begin with successive signs of the zodiac. Once the correlation of the moon with the zodiacal signs of the whole year has been completed, the brontological interpretation begins, in which the thunder allows the prediction of future events.

Very few elements of the *brontologion* have been preserved (when it thunders in Taurus and in Gemini) and the predictions are so general that from them no historical context can be extracted. The mention of the Arabs comes as no surprise: they also appear in other *brontologia* preserved in Greek.⁵⁶ Apparently the predictions were arranged according to the zodiacal signs, and not according to the months of the year, as is the case in Akkadian and Greek *brontologia*. Surprisingly, the first zodiacal sign is Taurus, not Aries. This has been interpreted in the light of the *thema mundi* or “world horoscope,”⁵⁷ but could be no more than an adaptation to the order of the *selenodromion* which, following the order of the MUL.APIN tablets, also begins with Taurus.⁵⁸

⁵¹ According to the editors, the *Selenodromion* would have covered 8 columns of 9 lines on the original manuscript.

⁵² The two preserved ends of a month (frag. 2 i 4 and 9) are clearly months of 30 days. Wise, “Thunder in Gemini: An Aramaic Brontologion (4Q318) from Qumran,” 20, assumes a year of 364 days and reconstructs Adar as a month of 31 days.

⁵³ This is neither the 364-day year used at Qumran of four three-month units of 30–30–31 days, nor the 354-day year of the Jewish lunar calendar, but reflects the calendar of the traditional Mesopotamian astronomical works which has also somehow remained under the 360-day calendar used in *1 Enoch*; see Albani, “Der Zodiakos in 4Q318 und die Henoch-Astronomie,” 27–32.

⁵⁴ In the *editio princeps* the pattern is wrongly given by Greenfield and Sokoloff (DJD XXXVI, 265), but correctly by Pingree, who studies the astronomical aspects of the manuscript (DJD XXXVI, 271).

⁵⁵ On 4Q318 2 ii 4, day 21, apparently forgotten, has been added above the line.

⁵⁶ See the extracts from Suppl. gr. 1191 quoted by Pingree, DJD XXXVI, 272, and the references given by Wise, “Thunder in Gemini,” 32–33.

⁵⁷ Wise, “Thunder in Gemini,” 39–48.

⁵⁸ See Albani, “Der Zodiakos in 4Q318 und die Henoch-Astronomie,” 27–32.

This fact, indicates that both parts of the text, the *selenodromion* and the *brontologion*, are not accidentally juxtaposed by a scribe, but were intended to be read together, as a unity. If both parts are read together, they do not predict what would happen when it thunders in a given zodiacal sign, but what will happen when it thunders at the moment the moon is in one of these zodiacal signs. Since these days are scattered throughout the year, the purpose of the first part of the text is to allow the practitioner to find out when these days occur. Once this has been ascertained, the second part allows him to predict what will happen.

In spite of its title (*4QHoroscope*), the second text (4Q186)⁵⁹ is really a physiognomy, in which the characteristics of a person, the character of his spirit, are deducted from his physical looks and linked with astrology. The text is rather curious and intriguing, but it supplies one of the keys to understand the background of “magic” within the Qumran community. Although the language of the text is Hebrew, the text is written with a mix of square (Aramaic) script, palaeo-Hebrew characters, some Greek letters and the script we know as “cryptic” from other Qumran manuscripts. Besides, it was written not from right to left, but from left to right. These peculiar characteristics show that the contents of the text were not intended for everybody, and that uttermost care was taken to keep them accessible only to a very few experts.

In the best physiognomical tradition,⁶⁰ the purpose of our text is to find out more about the character of a person with the help of his physical marks, such as the colour of the eyes or the form of the teeth; its author has coupled these characteristics with the zodiacal sign under which the person was born. This combination of physiognomy and astrology will enable the determination of the parts of light and of darkness that the spirit of the person in question really has.

Frag. 1 ii 5–9 And his thighs are long and slender, and his toes are slender and long. And he is in the second column. His spirit has six (parts) in the house of light and three in the house of darkness. And this is the sign in

⁵⁹ Edited by J.M. Allegro, DJD V, 88–91, pl. XXXI; *DSSSE*, 1:380–83. Among the recent studies of this text, cf. F. Schmidt, “Astrologie juive ancienne: Essai d’interprétation de *4QCryptique (4Q186)*,” *RevQ* 18/69 (1997): 125–41, which concentrates on its astronomic aspects, and P.S. Alexander, “Physiognomy, Initiation, and Rank in the Qumran Community,” in *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, and P. Schäfer; 3 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 1:385–94, which analyses its physiognomic elements in the context of the ideology of Qumran.

⁶⁰ T.S. Barton, *Power and Knowledge: Astrology, Physiognomics, and Medicine under the Roman Empire* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994), 95–131, summarises well the subject.

which he was borne: the period of Taurus. He will be poor. And his animal is the bull.

Frag. 1 iii 3–6 And his teeth are of differing length. His fingers are <stumpy>. His thighs are stumpy and each covered with hair, and his toes are stumpy and short. His spirit has eight parts in the house of darkness and one in the house of light.

Frag. 2 i 1–9 (on) their order. His eyes are of a color between black and striped. His beard is . . . and curly. The sound of his voice is simple. His teeth are sharp and regular. He is neither tall nor short, and like that from his conception. His fingers are slender and long. His thighs are smooth and the soles of his feet are . . . and regular. His spirit has eight (parts) in the house of light, in the second column,⁶¹ and one in the house of darkness. And the sign in which he was born is . . . His animal is . . .

While many of the physiognomical texts of Antiquity concentrate on a specific part of the body (chiromancy, metoposcopy, phrenology, etc.), our text considers the whole body, from head to toe, concentrating on the visible parts. The character of the spirit of the person in question (his $\Pi\Gamma$), determined in this way by the practitioner, is measured on a nine-point scale, according to how many parts of light or darkness the spirit possesses. Why there are nine points, it is not explained; but one of the clear advantages of this scale, is that nobody can have an equal share of light and darkness. Against the background of the dualistic and deterministic world-view of Qumran, as reflected in the *Tractate of the Two Spirits* of 1QS III 13–IV 26, and of the importance of the casting of lots at the moment of enrolling in the Community as a new member (1QS VI 13–23), it is easy to understand this need for specifying the measure of light and darkness in each person. Yet it also could have played a role in determining the rank of each member of the community.⁶²

⁶¹ It is not obvious what the expression means. For Schmidt, “Astrologie juive ancienne: Essai d’interprétation de *4QCryptique (4Q186)*,” 134–38, “column” here will have an astrological meaning, equal to each single quadrant in which the zodiacal circle could be divided, while Alexander, “Physiognomy, Initiation, and Rank in the Qumran Community,” 388, interprets the expression as a reference to a “second list,” (the list of the righteous, in this case), an allusion to “the heavenly books in which the history of the world, and the names of humanity are inscribed.”

⁶² Alexander, “Physiognomy, Initiation, and Rank in the Qumran Community,” 391–93. In 1QS V 23–24 we can read: “And they shall be recorded in order, one before the other, according to one’s insight and one’s deeds, in such a way that each obeys another, junior to the senior. And their spirit and their deeds must be tested, year after year, in order to upgrade each one to the extent of his insight and the perfection of his path, or demote him according to his failings.”

Next to providing the physiognomical determination of the nature of a person's spirit, our text also allots to each person a particular animal and a zodiacal sign (probably the birth sign). This link with the Zodiac makes it likely that only twelve human types were described. Since, in the preserved text, animal and sign (bull and Taurus) are identical, one may wonder what animals were listed alongside the zodiacal signs that do not represent an animal, in the parts of the text that were lost. Unfortunately, we do not know whether a person's characteristics were thought to be the result of the zodiacal sign under which he was born,⁶³ or whether his physiognomy was used for determining his birth sign. What seems clear is that all means available were used in examining the qualities of the incumbent members of the group and in determining their rank in the community.

The last of our texts can be dealt with very briefly, by simply noting in what ways it differs from the previous one, to which is closely related. This text, *4QPhysiognomy ar*, (4Q561)⁶⁴ was written in Aramaic, without recourse to the mixed scripts which accentuate the cryptic character of 4Q186. 4Q561 is purely physiognomical; it does not mix physiognomy with astrology, and it does not show the pronounced interest in the proportion of light and darkness which characterises 4Q186. The text is straightforward, and the preserved elements simply describe the future character of the person on the basis of his physical characteristics.

Frag. 1 i: ... his ... are mixed and not numerous. His eyes (will be) between pale and dark. His nose (will be) long and handsome. And his teeth (will be) well aligned. And his beard will be thin, but not extremely. His limbs (will be) smooth ... stumped and fat.

Frag. 1 ii: his voice will be ... and filled ... not long, And the hair of his beard (will be) abundant ... will be between fat and ... and they will be short ... somewhat fat. His nails (will be) ... And his height ...

It would be interesting to compare the physical characteristics reflected in these two physiognomical texts with the descriptions we encounter in other Qumran texts, such as the one which is called *Horoscope of the Messiah* (4Q534), and which deals with the birth of Noah,⁶⁵ or with the concrete description of the physical beauty of Sarai reported in

⁶³ Or it was conceived, according to the interpretation of Schmidt.

⁶⁴ This text has not yet been published in the DJD Series. For a preliminary transcription and translation, see *DSSSE*, 2:1116–19.

⁶⁵ See F. García Martínez, "4QMess Ar and the Book of Noah," in *Qumran and Apocalyptic* (F. García Martínez; STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1–44.

1QapGen XX 2–7, to quote two examples which may reflect similar concerns. Yet, this would lead us away from our main topic.

3. *Conclusion*

Our survey clearly shows that, within the Qumran community, the blanket condemnation of magic in the Old Testament and in the Enochic tradition, although theoretically sustained and even intensified, has already evolved into a practice in which at least two types of magic, exorcism and divination, were not only tolerated but actively used. The Dead Sea Scrolls thus bear witness the process of change in the approach to magic in the Jewish world long before the Christian era, and they show that this change has taken place within a very learned and secluded society.

But our survey has shown something more, and perhaps more interesting, namely the reasons why these two types of magic found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, exorcism and divination, were put to practice within this learned and biblically based community. In a dualistic world-view in which one of the basic tenets was the division of the angelic world and the individual person into two opposing camps of light and darkness, and in which these two opposing forces were locked in a perennial combat, the use of apotropaic prayers, incantations and exorcisms was necessary in order to erect a barrier to protect the sons of light against the assaults of all the forces of darkness; it was equally necessary in expelling evil forces that broke through the barrier and have got hold of some community member. In a deterministic world-view in which a person's future has been fixed from eternity and the parts of light and darkness allotted to each man have been determined from creation, divination is an indispensable tool for unravelling that predetermined future. This peculiar deterministic and dualistic world-view reflected in the magic texts of our survey allow us to understand why, in spite of the biblical prohibitions, magic was not only tolerated but actively practised by the Qumran community.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE SACRIFICE OF ISAAC IN 4Q225

We do not often encounter the name of the Patriarch Isaac in the non-Biblical manuscripts from Qumran. The orthography of the name fluctuates between the *tsade* and the *sin* (as in the Biblical text), although on the majority of occasions, the name is written with *sin*, and even once with *samek* (in 4Q225 2 i 9). Altogether, I have counted 22 occurrences of the name of the Patriarch. There are two mentions of Isaac in 4Q364 (the “Rewritten Pentateuch”)¹ in passages which reproduce Gen 25:14 and 35:28 but which do not add anything in this respect to the MT (4Q364 1 2 and 8 2). On three other occasions, only the name has been preserved, but without any context: 4Q273 4 i 9;² 4Q509 24 2;³ 6Q18 2 7.⁴ The name of Isaac is usually part of the classical list of Patriarchs: Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (CD III 3;⁵ 4Q180 1 5 and 4Q181 2 1;⁶ 4Q379 17 4;⁷ 4Q388 7 ii 2 par 4Q389 8 ii 8;⁸ 4Q393 4 5;⁹ 4Q505 124 6 and 4Q508 3 3).¹⁰ From these 14 references, we do not learn anything substantial about Isaac, and of course, nothing about the *Aqedah*; neither do we find the expected reworking of Gen 22 in the *Genesis Apocryphon* from Cave 1,¹¹ because the manuscript ends abruptly halfway through the re-writing of Gen 15, and there has been no sign of the remainder of the composition.

Happily though, seven of the eight other references to Isaac are concentrated in a single manuscript; 4Q225 (4Q225 2 i 9, 10, 11; 2 ii 2, 4, 10, 12).¹² The last reference is to be found in a fragment of another

¹ Edited by E. Tov and S. White, DJD XIII, 205 and 214, pls. XIII–XIV.

² Edited by J.M. Baumgarten, DJD XVIII, 196, pl. XLI.

³ Edited by M. Baillet, DJD VII, 193, pl. XIII.

⁴ Edited by Baillet, DJD III, 133, pl. XXVII.

⁵ Edited by E. Qimron in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (ed. M. Broshi; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1992).

⁶ Edited by J.M. Allegro, DJD V, 78 and 80, pls. XXVII and XVIII.

⁷ Edited by C. Newsom, DJD XXII, 274, pl. XXII.

⁸ Edited by D. Dimant, DJD XXX, 208, pl. VII.

⁹ Edited by D. Falk, DJD XXIX, 58, pl. III.

¹⁰ Edited by Baillet, DJD VII, 169 and 179, pls. XXIII and LIV.

¹¹ Edited by N. Avigad and Y. Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon. A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1956).

¹² Edited by J.C. VanderKam, DJD XIII, 141–55, pl. X.

manuscript; 4Q226 (4Q226 7 5), which may or may not be another copy of the same composition preserved in 4Q225, but which in any case is closely related to it and also deals partially with the *Aqedah* narrative.¹³ 4Q225 (as well as 4Q226 and 4Q227) have been classified by the editors as “Pseudo-Jubilees”¹⁴ in order to convey the idea that “the texts employ language that is familiar from and to some extent characteristic of *Jubilees*, but the documents themselves are not actual copies of *Jubilees*.”¹⁵

4Q225 is a manuscript copied in a Herodian formal hand, and can be dated around the end of the 1st c. B.C.E. or the beginning of the 1st c. C.E. From this manuscript, only three fragments have reached us. The first fragment speaks about the Covenant (the word has not been preserved) of Circumcision made with Abraham, but immediately after that goes on with a speech addressed directly to Moses and dealing with the Creation and a new (?) Creation. Although this first fragment certainly deals with Abraham, and the shape and the patterns of deterioration of the fragment suggest that it comes from a position in the scroll very closely related to that of frag. 2, its contents are not related to the story of the *Aqedah*. Of the contents of the third fragment, since it consists of only some isolated words from the end and the beginning of two consecutive columns, nothing can be said. However, in the two columns of frag. 2, which mentions the Patriarch Isaac seven times, we do find a re-telling of the narrative of Gen 22 with some interesting elements in spite of its fragmentary character.

The following is a transcription and translation of the two columns of Frag. 2 of this manuscript as presented in the *DSSSE*:¹⁶

Col. I	
1	[...] ת תכרת הנ[פש] ההיא
2	[מקרב ע] מיה[... י]ש] ב בחרן עשר[י]ם [ש]נה
3	[ויאמר א] ברהם אל אלוהים אדני הנני בא ע[ריר] ואל[עזר]
4	[בן בית] הואה וירשני <i>vacat</i>
5	[אמר אד]ני אל א[ב]רהם שא צפא את הכוכבים וראה
6	[וספור את] ה[כ] איל אשר על שפת הים ואת עפר הארץ כי אם

¹³ Edited by VanderKam, DJD XIII, 157–69, pl. XI.

¹⁴ The precise relationship of 4Q225 with the book of *Jubilees* has been examined by VanderKam in a paper dedicated “to weigh the utility of the label ‘PseudoJubilees.’” Cf. J.C. VanderKam, “The *Aqedah*, *Jubilees*, and Pseudojubilees,” in *The Quest for Context and Meaning. Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* (ed. C.A. Evans and S. Talmon; Biblical Interpretation Series 28; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 241–61 (243).

¹⁵ DJD XIII, 142.

¹⁶ F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1:478–81.

[יהיו נמ]ים אלה ווא [ף] אם לוא ככה יהיה זרעכה ויא [מין]	7
[אברהם] אלו [הי]ם ותחשב לו צדקה ויולד בן את [רי] כן	8
[לאברה]ם ו [י] קרא את שמו יסחק ויבוא שר המ [ש]טמה	9
[אל אל] והים ויששים את אברהם בישחק ויאמר [א] לוהים	10
[אל אבר] הם קח את בנכה את ישחק את יהוד [כה אשר]	11
[אותו אהב] תה והעלהו לי לעולה על אחד ההרי [ם הנבוה]ים	12
[אשר אומר] לכה ויק [ים וי]ל [ך] מן הבארות על . . .	13
[. . .] וישא אב [רהם] את	14

Col. II

[. . .] . . . [. . .]	1
[ויאמר] ישחק אל אברהם [. . .]	2
ל [ע] ולה ויאמר אברהם אל [. . .]	3
לו אמר ישחק אל אביו כ [. . .]	4
מלאכי קדש עומדים בוכים על [. . .]	5
את בניו מן הארץ ומלאכי המ [שטמה] . . .	6
שמחים ואומרים עכשו יאבד ו [. . .]	7
ימצא כחש ואם לא ימצא נאמן [. . .]	8
אברהם אברהם ויאמר הנני ויאמר ע [תה ידעתי כי . . .]	9
לא יהיה אהב ויברך אל יהיה את יש [חק כול ימי חיו ויוליד את]	10
יעקוב ויעקוב הוליד את לוי דו [ר שלישי vacat ויהיו כול]	11
ימי אברהם וישחק ויעקוב ולו [י . . .]	12
ושר המ [שטמה vacat אסור] . . .	13
שר המ [ש]טמה וישמע בליעל אל [. . .]	14

Col. I

¹ [...] that p[erson] shall be cut off ² [from the midst of] his [na]tion [...liv]ed in Haran twenty years. ³ [And A]braham [said] to God: "My Lord, see that I am going ch[ildle]ss, and Eli[ezer] ⁴ is [the son of my house], and he will inherit me." *Blank* ⁵ [The Lo]rd [said] to A[b]raham: "Lift up, observe the stars, and see ⁶ [and count] {it all} the sand on the shore of the sea, and the dust of the earth, whether ⁷ these [can be coun]ted, or not, thus your offspring shall be." And [Abraham] tr[usted] ⁸ Go[d], and righteousness was accounted to him. And af[ter] this a son was born ⁹ [to Abraha]m. And [he] called him Isaac, and the Prince of A[ni]mosity came ¹⁰ [to G]od and accused Abraham with regard to Isaac. And [G]od said ¹¹ [to Abra]ham: "Take your son, Isaac, [your] only one, [whom] ¹² you [love], and offer him to me as a burnt-offering on one of the [high] mountains ¹³ [which I will tell] you." And he ar[ose, and we]n[t] from the wells up to [...] ¹⁴ [...] and Ab[raham] lifted

Col. II

¹ [...] . . . [. . .] ² [and] Isaac [said] to Abraham [. . .] ³ for the [bur]nt-offering"? And Abraham said to [. . .] ⁴ for himself." Isaac said to his father: "[. . .] . . .] ⁵ the angels of holiness were standing weeping above [. . .] ⁶ his

son from the earth. And the angels of An[imosity . . .]⁷ were rejoicing and saying: “Now he will come to and end.” And [...whether]⁸ he would be found untruthful, and whether he would not be found faithful [...] ⁹ “Abraham, Abraham.” And he said: “Here am I.” And he said: “N[ow I know . . .]¹⁰ he will not be loving. And God $\Upsilon\text{H}\text{W}\text{H}$ blessed Isa[ac all the days of his life. And he begot]¹¹ Jacob, and Jacob begot Levi, a [third] ge[neration; *Blank* And all]¹² the days of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Lev[i were . . .]¹³ and the Prince of Animosity *Blank* Bind [...] ¹⁴ the Prince of An[im]osity, and Belial listened to [...]

The retelling of the *Aqedah* in our manuscript is extremely compact and most of the details of the Biblical text (such as the journey, the presence of the servants, the construction of the altar, the attempt to sacrifice Isaac, the first call of the angel arresting Abraham and even the replacement of Isaac by the ram) are not mentioned, and the narrative is entirely concentrated within the framework of the testing of Abraham’s “fidelity.” Strictly speaking, we should not even speak of the *Aqedah* story in our text, because the detail of the “binding” of Isaac is one of the elements about which the narrative is silent.

As seen by the author of our text, the whole story is directly linked to the promise made to Abraham and to the assertion of his fidelity. The wording of the promise is a combination of different versions of the patriarchal blessings (the stars come from Gen 15:5, the sands from the shore of the sea in Gen 22:17, and the dust of the earth comes from Gen 13:16, for example), but with a peculiar formulation which combines the positive conditional affirmation of the Masoretic text in Gen 13:16 (אם יוכל איש מנות) “if a man can number”) with the negative affirmation of 1QapGen XXI 13 and Neofiti (די לא ישכח כול בר) “no man can number”). The double conditional of our text (כי אם יהיו נמנים אלה ואף אם לוא) has it both ways: “whether these can be counted or not”; in both cases, the offspring of Abraham (to whom the fuller form of the name has already been given) shall be like the stars, the sand, or the dust.

More interesting is the wording of the theologically heavily loaded Gen 15:6 in our text. The phrase in question is differently worded in the MT and in the LXX.¹⁷ The Hebrew text reads והאמן ביהוה ויהשבה לו צדקה, while the LXX reads καὶ ἐπίστευσέ Αβραμ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην.

¹⁷ For a detailed study of both texts, see the two studies by R. Mosis, “‘Glauben’ und ‘Gerechtigkeit’—zu Gen 15,6” and “Gen 15,6 in Qumran und in der Septuagint,” collected in his *Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament* (Forschung zur Bibel 93; Würzburg: Echter, 1999), 55–93 and 95–118.

The LXX translates the unexpected hiphil perfect (וַיִּשְׁבַּח) of the MT with a aorist (καὶ ἐπίστευσέ); this has caused many problems for commentators. Our text has a more logical future with *waw*: וַיִּשְׁבַּח.¹⁸ Our text requires the reconstruction of Abraham in the lacuna, as in the LXX, but does not allow us to decide if the right translation of the Hebrew and of the Greek is *credere in deum* or *credere deo*. What our text clearly does with the use of the niphil form וַיִּשְׁבַּח is to prove that the translation of the *actif qal* וַיִּשְׁבַּח of the TM by the passive aorist ἐλογίσθη of the LXX does not need to be interpreted as a theological explanation, but it is most probably the result of the use of a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. Instead of MT “and he accounted it to him [as] righteousness,” our text (as does the LXX) reads “and [it] was accounted to him as righteousness,” or in a more literal translation (because neither the MT nor 4Q225 has the equivalent of the εἰς Greek) “and righteousness was accounted to him.” This allows us to conclude that the use of Gen 15:6 in the New Testament (Rom 4:3,9; Gal 3:6; James 2:23) may not be founded in the LXX reading, but in a Hebrew text form similar to the one of 4Q225, with a niphil reading.

As already mentioned, in our text, the story of the “testing” of Abraham is directly linked to the promise. The birth of Isaac follows directly the promise of posterity in Gen 15:6, and our story comes after the giving of the name and without any interruption, followed equally directly and without interruption, by a summary of the results of the promise, the lineage of Abraham through Isaac and Jacob until Levi.

If we carefully read the Hebrew text and compare it with the Masoretic text of Gen 22, some small differences in wording come to the fore: for example, the land of Moriah has been probably interpreted as “one of the high mountains”; the place where Abraham and Isaac are dwelling is called “the wells” and is apparently an allusion to Beer Sheva. But the most interesting elements of our text are those which *are not present in the Hebrew Bible* and which clearly anticipate some of the later developments of the *Aqeda* story, both in Judaism and in Christianity. I will consequently focus my attention on these elements.

¹⁸ Although the word has not been completely preserved, its reconstruction seems fairly certain. Taking into account the minimal remains of ink on the border, it will be even possible to transcribe וַיִּשְׁבַּח.

1. *The “testing” of Abraham is caused by Mastema*

I hesitate to use the word “testing” (והאלהים נסה את אברהם) “and God tested Abraham”) because the verb נסה “to try, to test” is not used in the preserved fragments (the editor reconstructs it in line 7 of col. ii,¹⁹ but this is most uncertain); in other versions of the story it is always God who “tests” Abraham (*Jubilees*, for example, lists in 17:17 seven “tests” that God made Abraham pass, although the classical number is ten, as *Jubilees* itself recalls en passant in 19:8 “This was the tenth test by which Abraham was tried”). In any case, the point of the whole story is indeed to prove “whether he would be found untruthful, and whether he would not be found faithful” as is said in ii 8, which certainly implies the idea of “testing.” The verb used in our fragment is שטם (I 10: וישטים) “to bear a grudge, to cherish animosity,” the verb used to characterize the hatred of Esau for Jacob (Gen 27:41), but also God’s assaults on Job (Job 16:9; 30:21), and from which the name Mastema (משטמה) has been constructed.

Be it an accusation or an attack, this work of hate against Abraham is done by the שר המשטמה, the Prince of Animosity, and it is done because of Isaac. The first element is present in several other forms of the story of the *Aqedah*, starting with *Jub.* 17:16, from which our text may depend;²⁰ the second one inaugurates, in my view, the shift which later on will led to consider Isaac (and not Abraham) the center of the story (for example, in *L.A.B.* 32:2–4).

In our text, Mastema appears suddenly, without any introduction, and the reasons for his intervention will only be revealed later, in the next column. In *Jubilees*, as in the later rabbinical tradition, the intervention of Mastema (or Satan in the Talmud) is related to the innocent sentence with which the Biblical narrative begins: ויהי אהר הדברים האלה. By taking אהר הדברים to mean “words”, the assumption is that there have been rumors in heaven concerning Abraham (“There were voices in heaven

¹⁹ DJD XIII, 151: “And [in all this the Prince Mastemah was testing whether] he would be found weak. . . .”

²⁰ “Then Prince Mastema came and said before God: ‘Abraham does indeed love his son Isaac and finds him more pleasing than anyone else. Tell him to offer him as sacrifice on an altar. Then you will see whether he performs this order and will know whether he is faithful in everything through which you test him’” (translation from J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* [CSCO 510–11, *Scriptores Aethiopic* 87–88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989], 2:105).

regarding Abraham, that he was faithful in everything . . .,” *Jub.* 17:15).²¹ In other witnesses to the tradition (the *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* for example), these “rumours” in heaven are explicitly attributed to the angels, who are jealous of Abraham, and this jealousy is the motive for the testing of Abraham: “All the angels were jealous of him, and the serving hosts envied him. Since they were jealous of him, God said to him . . .” (32:1–2).²² In the rabbinical tradition, several developments of this *midrash* can be found.²³ In Talmud Bavli,²⁴ הַדְּבָרִים refers precisely to the words of Satan, thus offering a close parallel to *Jubilees*; one of the three interpretations present on *Gen. Rab.* 55:4 (the one attributed to R. Eleazar) echoes the form of the *midrash* as it appears in the *L.A.B.*, since the “words” originate with the ministering angels, but another interpretation puts the origin of the rumours not in heaven but on the earth, with “the nations of the world.”²⁵ In the rabbinic interpretations, the pretext for the “words” is sought in the sacrificial sphere, while in older witnesses to the tradition, the jealousy of the angels comes to the fore. But all these texts use a common exegetical device: they anchor the independent exegetical development in the biblical text as a reflection on the הַדְּבָרִים. Our text, on the contrary, does not use any exegetical device to introduce Mastema, and goes directly to his accusation as being the motive for the accusation.

²¹ VanderKam’s translation (*The Book of Jubilees*, 105). M. Kister, “Observations on Aspects of Exegesis, Tradition, and Theology in Midrash, Pseudepigrapha, and Other Jewish Writings,” in *Tracing the Threads. Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (ed. J.C. Reeves; SBLEJL 6; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 26, n. 39 notes that as translation of הַדְּבָרִים “voices” is not the most adequate rendering of Ethiopic *qālāt*, an opinion now accepted by VanderKam in his article “The *Aqedah*, *Jubilees*, and Pseudojubilees,” where he recognizes that translating “words” instead of “voices” would have been a “more literal rendering in the context” (249, n. 19).

²² Translation from H. Jacobson, *A Commentary on Pseudo-Philo’s Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum. With Latin Text and English Translation* (AGLAJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 149.

²³ The main texts were already collected and discussed by G. Vermes in his “Redemption and Genesis XXII: The Binding of Isaac and the Sacrifice of Jesus,” in *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* (G. Vermes; SPB 4; Leiden: Brill, 1961), 193–227. M. Kister has analysed anew these texts in “Observations on Aspects of Exegesis, Tradition, and Theology in Midrash, Pseudepigrapha, and Other Jewish Writings,” 7–15.

²⁴ “After what words? Said R. Yohanan in the name of R. Yosi ben Zimran: After the words spoken by Satan. For the text earlier said: ‘and the boy grew up and was weaned, and Abraham made a great banquet on the day Isaac was weaned’ (Gen 21:8). At that time Satan said to God: ‘Master of the Universe! You have blessed this old man at the age of one hundred years with offspring. Yet amidst all this banquet that he prepared, was there no pigeon of fowl for him to sacrifice before You?’” *b. Sanh.* 89b.

²⁵ A third interpretation, the first presented in the text, makes Abraham himself the one who utters these “words.”

In our text, Mastema's accusation of Abraham is also different from the accusations in the other narratives, and the author of 4Q225 makes his main interpretative point at the hand of the accusation. Mastema's accusation is done "with regard to" or "because of" Isaac (בִּישָׁהֶךָ). The real meaning of the preposition is clarified later on, in the exclamations of joy of the angels of Mastema at the prospect of the death of Isaac (ii 7–8): "Now he will perish." Neither jealousy nor a desire to test Abraham direct his actions; what Mastema hopes to achieve with this stratagem is to cross God's plans and to make ineffective the promise to Abraham of a progeny numerous as the stars, the sand or the dust.

2. *The presence of fire to mark the place?*

The next element of our text which may not have a correspondence on the biblical text is, according to the editor, the mention of "fire" in 4Q225 2 ii 1. VanderKam notes the presence of fire in Gen 22:6,7, but recognizes that there is not enough room in the lacuna to insert even a summary of these two verses. For this reason, as background to the presence of this word he suggests the explanation given in the *Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer* (105): Abraham, who has not seen the place before, was able to recognize it because he and Isaac saw there "a column of fire from the earth until heaven."²⁶ But the reading of שס is problematic; the letter *shin* is certain on the photographs, but no trace of *alef* can be discerned; on the contrary, the *shin* is directly followed by two letters, best interpreted as *waw* and *yod* respectively, and besides, at the beginning of the line, the reconstruction of עֵינָיו "his eyes" is required in order to complete the sentence at the end of col. i: "and Abraham lifted his eyes"; this leaves a very short space available to reconstruct a complete sentence with the word "fire." Although this notion is present in *Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer* (*Tg. Ps.-J. Gen 22:4* and *Gen. Rab. 56:1–2* use the "cloud of glory" to point out the place to Abraham) nothing can be said about its presence in 4Q225.²⁷

²⁶ "There is insufficient space for the full expression שס עמוד אש on the fragment, but the text may have indicated in some way that he saw a fire on the mountain to explain how it was that Abraham recognized the place though he had never seen it before" (DJD XIII, 151).

²⁷ For G. Vermes, "New Light on the Sacrifice of Isaac from 4Q225," *JJS* 47 (1996): 140–46, the reading of שס is clear and the "pillar of fire" is identical with the "cloud of glory," and he lists the presence of this element in 4Q225 as a proof of the antiquity of the tradition (n. 10 and p. 146).

3. *Isaac consents and asks to be tied*

We are on firmer ground with the next element, although here again our transcription on the *DSSSE* is more conservative than DJD and we have not reproduced the letter *kaf* on the border of the line 4 of column two.²⁸ Although not complete, there can be no doubt of its presence in the photographs,²⁹ nor of its reading as a *kaf*. The Biblical text records only one speech by Isaac: the one we have here in lines 2–3. Afterwards he remains silent. But in our text, after Abraham’s answer, Isaac speaks again. Of this new speech, only the broken letter *kaf* has been preserved. As VanderKam remarks,³⁰ the Targumic tradition (Neofiti, PsJonathan, Fragment Targum) uniformly records a second speech by Isaac in Gen 22:10, as does *Gen. Rab.* 56:7, and in all these witnesses of the tradition the speech of Isaac starts with the same word, the imperative of כָּפַת: “tie” or “bind.”³¹ This makes the reconstruction כָּפַתִּי כְּפִיָּה proposed in DJD quite a reasonable one.

If this can be accepted, our text is a witness (and for the first time, because the issue is not mentioned in *Jubilees*) to one of the most important of the later developments of the story of the *Aqedah*, the one presenting Isaac as a willing victim, fully consenting to his own sacrifice. Josephus (*Ant.* 1.232) attests to this development already: “The son of such a father could not but be brave-hearted, and Isaac received these words [of Abraham, who explains that he has to be the victim] with joy... and with that he rushed to the altar and his doom.” The same theme is similarly expressed in *L.A.B.* 40:2 “Or have you forgotten what happened in the days of our fathers when the father placed the son as a burnt offering, and he did not dispute him but gladly gave consent to him, and the one offered was ready and the one who was offering was rejoicing?” This is, of course, a common feature of the rabbinical presentation of the *Aqedah*.

In the Targumic tradition, the reason given for the request to be tied is Isaac’s wish not to render the sacrifice invalid. As Neofiti says: “Father, tie me well lest I kick you and your sacrifice be rendered useless.”³² But

²⁸ PAM 43.251 which we used is darkened in this place.

²⁹ Particularly clear are PAM 41.518 and 42.361.

³⁰ DJD XIII, 151–52.

³¹ Pseudo Jonathan and Neofiti read כָּפַת יְהִי יְאוּרָה “tie me well,” while the Fragmentary Targums mss 110 and 440 read כָּפַתִּי [יְדֵי] יְדֵי יְאוּרָה “tie well my hands.” *Gen. Rab.* affixes the pronoun to the verb: כָּפַתִּי יְפָה יְפָה “tie me very well.”

³² Neofiti Margin specifies: “in the hour of my sorrow I move convulsively and

other witnesses insist more on the spiritual element of the acceptance: 4 Maccabees who sees the prototype of the martyr in Isaac, says for example in 14:20: “Isaac offered himself to be a sacrifice for the sake of righteousness.” And in the rabbinic tradition, the development of this idea went so far that in the words of Rabbi Akiva, as reported by R. Meir, “Isaac *bound himself* upon the altar.”³³

4. *The angels are present and weep*

The presence of many angels witnessing the sacrifice of Isaac is not attested to in the Biblical text, which speaks of only one angel, “the angel of the Lord” who does the talking to Abraham in Gen 22:11, 15. *Jubilees* implies the presence of other angels besides “the angel of the presence,” although, curiously enough, in his version of the story it is God himself who is doing the speaking, and not the “angel of the Lord” of the MT: “The Lord again called Abraham by his name from heaven, just as we had appeared in order to speak to him in the Lord’s name. He said: ‘I have sworn by myself . . .’”(18:14).³⁴ The presence of many angels at the scene visible only to Isaac is a standard feature in the version of the story of the Palestinian Targumim,³⁵ and later rabbinic writings will make the “ministering angels” (מלאכי השרת) witness the whole scene.

The detail that the holy angels (מלאכי קודש) were weeping is not present in these early traditions, but, as the editor notes,³⁶ they are prominent in the version of the story as recorded in *Gen. Rab.* 56:5. There the ministering angels are not only present and weeping, but the absence of the knife in Gen 22:12 (“lay not thy hand upon the lad”) is explained as being because “the tears of the ministering angels had fallen on it and dissolved it” (*Gen. Rab.* 56:7). Again, our text is the oldest attestation of an element which later on will be fully developed.

I create confusion and our sacrifice be found blemished.” English translation from M. McNamara and M. Maher in A. Díez Macho, *Neophyti 1. Tomo 1. Genesis* (Madrid-Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968), 551.

³³ *Sifre Deut.* 32 (ed. Finkelstein, p. 58): כיצחק שעקד עצמו על נבי המזבח.

³⁴ VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 2:108.

³⁵ In Neofiti we read: “The eyes of Abraham were on the eyes of Isaac and the eyes of Isaac were scanning the angels on high. Isaac saw them, Abraham did not see them” (*Neophyti 1*, 551).

³⁶ DJD XIII, 152.

5. *The demons are equally present and they rejoice at the expected death*

In the Biblical narrative, the only witness to the actions of Abraham and Isaac is the “angel of the Lord”; in other versions of the story, angels are also present (as we have seen). Our text adds more witness: “the angels of the Mastema” (מלאכי המשתמה). As far as I know, no other version of the story attests to the presence of the wicked angels at the scene. *Jubilees* says simply that “Prince Mastema was put to shame” (18:12). But for the purpose of the author of our text, the presence of the wicked angels is required as a contrast to the angelic hosts. Their cry “Now he will perish” expresses the main intention of our text’s narrative: Mastema’s intention in testing Abraham was to cross the divine plan and abort the promise of posterity through Isaac.

The next line of our text does not have a parallel in the Biblical text either. But it is not clear to whom the two parallel expressions (מִצָּא כֹהֵשׁ “to be found untruthful” and לֹא יִמָּצֵא נֹאמָן “not to be found faithful”) refer: to Isaac or to Abraham. VanderKam reads a doubtful *alef* at the end of the line,³⁷ and applies the expressions to Abraham, assuming that what it is tested is his “fidelity.” This is without doubt the reading of the somewhat parallel sentence in 4Q226 7 1, where we can read: נִמָּצֵא אֲבִרָהִם נֹאמָן לֵאלֹהִים “Abraham was found faithful to God.” But the order of the sentence is not the same, and in 4Q226 the fidelity of Abraham is expressed positively, while in 4Q225 the sentence is conditional and negative. In our text, the subject of the previous line 7 is clearly Isaac (the one expected to be killed) and the expressions of line 8 are apparently a continuation of the sayings of the angels of Mastema. Moreover, Abraham is directly addressed in the next line, which reproduces Gen 22:11 with the double call of his name. For these reasons, it seems more logical to consider Isaac, and not Abraham, to also be the subject of line 8.³⁸ If so, this expression may contain an allusion to the theme of the testing of Isaac found in Judith 8:26: “Remember what he [God] did with Abraham, and how he tested Isaac.”

³⁷ The photographs show indeed the remains of a letter in the border of the fragment, but its shape is hardly compatible with an *alef*, even in the somewhat irregular script of the manuscript.

³⁸ This is also the interpretation of Vermes, “New Light on the Sacrifice of Isaac,” 142, n. 17, who gives to כֹהֵשׁ the meaning of “weak” and translates: “whether he will be found weak and whether A[braham] will be found unfaithful [to God.]”

The subject of the first part of line 10 is most probably Abraham; after the direct speech addressed to him in line 9, he is by far the most likely candidate for the subject of the text. The speaker is also most probably God, who enters into a dialogue with Abraham in line 9 and is the subject of the second *וַיִּשְׁמַר* (since line 9 closely follows Gen 22:11). But we do not have a context into which to place the first sentence *לֹא יָדִיחַ אֹהֶב*, nor can we imagine who this negative expression, which is a reversal of the traditional title of Abraham, known as the *אֹהֶב*, the “lover” of God, refers to.³⁹

6. *The blessing of Isaac*

In Gen 22:17, at the end of the test is a solemn blessing of Abraham. Our text concludes in typical fashion with a blessing of Isaac in the second part of line 10, and with the listing of a third generation genealogy in lines 11 and 12. This genealogy lists not the first-born sons, but, as VanderKam notes,⁴⁰ the carriers of the priestly line. In this way, 4Q225 not only again underlines the essential role of Isaac in the story (he, and not Abraham, receives the blessing) but closes its retelling of the story within a strongly unified perspective: the fidelity of God to his promise.

The wording of the blessing contains an interesting detail: the name of God is worded *אל יהוה* “God the Lord,” and the *tetragrammaton* is not written in palaeo-Hebrew but in the same script as the rest of the fragment. This detail makes a Qumran origin for the composition less likely.⁴¹ Milik, and VanderKam after him, have labeled 4Q225 “Pseudo-Jubilees,” but the composition is certainly different from *Jubilees*. Indeed,

³⁹ Vermes, “New Light on the Sacrifice of Isaac,” understands the expression as coming from the Lord and addressed to Mastema: “The missing words are more likely to be those of God to Mastema, e.g. ‘Now I know that you have lied that he is not a lover (of God).’”

⁴⁰ DJD XIII, 153.

⁴¹ On the different ways of writing the divine name in the Qumran Scrolls, see H. Stegemann, “Religionsgeschichtliche Erwägungen zu den Gottesbezeichnungen in den Qumrantexten,” in *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Paris-Gembloux: Duculot/Leuven: University Press, 1978), 195–217. See also E. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran. A Pseudepigraphic Collection* (HSS 28; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 38–43 and É. Puech, “Le plus ancien exemplaire du *Rouleau du Temple*,” in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues. Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Cambridge 1995, Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* (ed. M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 59–61.

our text has some elements of language and of content which agree with *Jubilees*, but it also has other elements which are not present in it.⁴² It belongs thus neither to the *Jubilees* nor to the qumranic tradition. This characteristic makes it even more interesting, in so far as it is a witness to the development and growth of the traditions around the *Aqedah*, though not in a particular sectarian context but within the wider context of the Judaism of the time. In view of the date of the manuscript (around the turn of the era), it also assures us that some of the basic elements of the Christian interpretation of the *Aqedah* were already present in pre-Christian Judaism.

7. Conclusion

It would be also interesting to examine what elements of the story of the *Aqedah* as developed fully in rabbinical writings are *not* present in our text,⁴³ and to explore the reasons for this silence. But we will be in a better position for this after the presentation of the *Aqedah* in the Pseudepigrapha by Jacques van Ruiten and in the Rabbinical writings by Wout van Bekkum. I shall therefore conclude by summarizing the main points of interest of our text: 4Q225 shows us that these traditions were not restricted to the more or less sectarian circles around *Jubilees* or to the Qumran community, but that they also circulated among other Jewish groups; it attests that some of these traditions have developed much earlier than we previously thought; and it proves conclusively that, although the most advanced theological speculations of the Rabbis and of the Christians are still lacking, the *Aqedah* story was already used for purposes other than the ones in the Biblical text, namely to show God's fidelity to the promise done to Abraham manifested in the blessing of Isaac.

⁴² VanderKam, "The *Aqedah*, *Jubilees*, and Pseudojubilees," 261, concludes his analysis of the relationship between *Jubilees* and 4Q225: "the fact is that *Jubilees* and 4Q225 appear to be markedly different kinds of compositions... There appears to be no justification for classifying the cave 4 text as 'Pseudojubilees.'"

⁴³ For example: the age of Isaac, the blood of Isaac, the linking of the place of the sacrifice with the temple of Jerusalem and with Passover, the linking of Isaac with the sacrificial lamb of the Tamid sacrifice, the ashes of Isaac, etc.

CHAPTER NINE

GREEK LOANWORDS IN THE *COPPER SCROLL*

The *Copper Scroll* (3Q15) is certainly the most remarkable manuscript of the whole collection known to us under the name “Dead Sea Scrolls.”¹ Its unique support (two thin plates of almost pure copper), its contents (a dry list of hiding places of treasures) and its language (a Hebrew rather different from the other manuscripts), place it in a unique position among the collection of manuscripts from the Dead Sea. It is little wonder that the number of studies dedicated to unravelling its “mystery” could by now fill a well stocked library.²

¹ The first complete edition (with transcription of the Hebrew text, drawings of the Scroll and English translation) was the much disputed book by J.M. Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll: the opening and decipherment of the most mysterious of the Dead Sea scrolls, a unique inventory of buried treasure* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1960). It was preceded by the publication of a French and of an English translation by J.T. Milik in “Le rouleau de cuivre de Qumran (3Q15). Traduction et commentaire topographique,” *RB* 66 (1959): 321–57, and “The Copper Document from Cave III of Qumran. Translation and Commentary,” *ADAJ* 4–5 (1960): 137–55. The official edition was prepared by J.T. Milik, “Le rouleau de cuivre provenant de la grotte 3Q (3Q15),” in *Les ‘Petites grottes’ de Qumrân* (ed. M. Baillet, J.T. Milik and R. de Vaux; DJD III; Oxford: Clarendon, 1962), 198–302 (= DJD III). A new edition by É. Puech, prepared on the occasion of the restoration of the Scroll by the laboratories of the EDF—Valectra on 1994–1996, is soon to appear in the Series STDJ.

² P. Muchowski, “Bibliography of the Copper Scroll (3Q15),” *Folia Orientalia* 26 (1989): 65–70 lists the most important publications up to the 1980’s. The following titles complete this bibliography up to 2002.

M. Bar-Ilan, “The Process of Writing the Copper Scroll,” in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 198–209. K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Ergänzungsband* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 224–33 (3Q15: *Die Kupferrolle*). G.J. Brooke and P.R. Davies (eds.), *Copper Scroll Studies* (JSPSup 40; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002). R. Bertholon, N. Lacoudre, and J. Vasquez, “The Conservation and Restoration of the Copper Scroll from Qumran,” in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 12–24. P.R. Davies, “John Allegro and the Copper Scroll,” in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 25–36. H. Eshel, “Aqueducts in the Copper Scroll,” in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 92–107. J.E. Elwolde, “3Q15: Its Linguistic Affiliation, with Lexicographical Comments,” in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 108–21. R. Fidler, “*Inclusio* and Symbolic Geography in the Copper Scroll,” in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 210–25. F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1:232–39. S. Goranson, “Sectarianism, Geography, and the Copper Scroll,” *JJS* 43 (1992): 282–87; *idem*, “Further Reflections on the Copper Scroll,” in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 226–31. J.E. Harper, “26 Tons of Gold and 65 Tons of Silver,” *BAR* 19 (1993): 44–45. F. Jiménez Bedman, “Los términos (סדה ו סנה) en el *Rollo de Cobre* (3Q15),” *Miscelánea de Estudios Árabes y Hebreos* 45 (1996): 27–35; *idem*, “Lexical Analysis of the Copper Scroll from the Perspective of Mishnaic

Hebrew," in *Jewish Studies at the Turn of the 20th Century. Proceedings of the 6th EAJS Congress, Toledo, July 1998* (ed. J. Targarona Borrás and A. Sáenz-Badillos; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 1:65–71; *idem*, "El misterio del Rollo de Cobre (3Q15)," in *Paganos, Judíos y Cristianos en los Textos de Qumrán* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera; Madrid: Trotta, 1999), 229–41; *idem*, *El misterio del Rollo de Cobre de Qumrán. Análisis lingüístico* (Biblioteca Midrásica 25; Estella: Verbo Divino, 2002). W. Johnson, "Professor Henry Wright Baker: The Copper Scroll and his Career," in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 37–44. I. Knohl, "New Light on the Copper Scroll and 4QMMT," in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 233–56. A. Lange, "The Meaning of *Dema'* in the Copper Scroll and Ancient Jewish Literature," in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 122–38. J.M. Laperrousaz, "Méthodologie et datation des manuscrits de la mer Morte: le Rouleau de cuivre 3Q15," in *New Qumran Texts and Studies* (eds. G. Brooke and F. García Martínez; STDJ 15; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 233–41. J.K. Lefkowitz, *The Copper Scroll (3Q15): A Reevaluation, A New Reading, Translation, and Commentary* (STDJ 25; Leiden: Brill, 1999); *idem*, "The Copper Scroll Treasure: Fact or Fiction? The Abbreviation ככ versus ככרן," in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 139–54. B. Lesley Segal, "The Copper Scroll: Novel Approaches," in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 271–75. J. Lübke, "The Copper Scroll and Language Issues," in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 155–62. M.J. Lundberg and B. Zuckerman, "When Images Meet: The Potential of Photographic and Computer Imaging Technology for the Study of the Copper Scroll," in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 45–57. P. Mandel, "On the Duplicate Copy of the Copper Scroll (3Q15)," *RevQ* 16/61 (1993): 74. P.K. McCarter, "The Mysterious Copper Scroll. Clues to Hidden Temple Treasure," *Bible Review* 8/4 (1992): 34–41; *idem*, "The Copper Scroll Treasure as an Accumulation of Religious Offerings," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (ed. M.O. Wise et al.; Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 722; New York: New York Academy of Sciences, 1994), 461–63. L. Morawiecki, "The Copper Scroll Treasure: a Fantasy or Stock Inventory?," *Qumran chronicle* 4 (1994): 169–74. P. Muchowski, *Żwój miedziany (3Q15). Implikacje spornych kwestii lingwistycznych* (International Institute of Ethnolinguistic and Oriental Studies, Monograph Series 4; Postnau, 1993); *idem*, "Dysorthographic Forms *hapôn* and *'akôn* on 3Q15," in *Inter-testamental Essays in Honour of Józef Tadeusz Milik* (ed. Z.L. Kapera; Qumranica Moglinensia 6; Krakow: Enigma, 1992), 131–33; *idem*, "Language of the Copper Scroll in the Light of Phrases Denoting the Directions of the World," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site*, 319–27; *idem*, "Two Proposals of Reading in the Eight Column of 3Q15," *The Qumran Chronicle* 4 (1994): 183–85; *idem*, "The Origin of 3Q15: Forty Years of Discussion," in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 257–70. S.J. Pfann, "*Kelei Dema'*: Tithe Jars, Scroll Jars and Cookie Jars," in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 163–79. E. Puech, "Quelques résultats d'un nouvel examen du Rouleau de Cuivre (3Q15)," *RevQ* 18/70 (1997): 163–90; *idem*, "Some Results of the Restoration of the Copper Scroll by EDF Mécénat," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years After Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, The Shrine of the Book, 2000), 884–94; *idem*, "Some Results of a New Examination of the Copper Scroll (3Q15)," in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 58–89. L.H. Schiffman, "The Architectural Vocabulary of the Copper Scroll and the Temple Scroll," in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 180–95. H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus. Ein Sachbuch* (Freiburg: Herder, 1993), 104–108. B. Thiering, "The Copper Scroll: King's Herod Bank Account?," in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 276–87. L. Tov, "Some Palaeographical Observations Regarding the Cover Art," in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 288–90. M.O. Wise, "David J. Wilmot and the Copper Scroll," in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 291–310. A. Wolters, "The Copper Scroll and the Vocabulary of Mishnaic Hebrew," *RevQ* 14/55 (1990): 483–95; *idem*, "Apocalyptic and the Copper Scroll," *JNES* 49 (1990): 145–54; *idem*, "Literary Analysis and the Copper Scroll," in *Inter-testamental Essays in Honour of Józef Tadeusz Milik*, 339–52; *idem*, "History and the Copper Scroll," in *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site*, 285–98; *idem*, *The Copper Scroll: Overview, Text and Translation* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); *idem*, "The Shekinah in the Copper Scroll:

One of the characteristics of the scholarly work of Ton Hilhorst, since his seminal *Sémitismes et Latinismes dans le Pasteur d'Herma*,³ has been the search for cross-fertilisation among the Classical and Semitic cultures. It seems fitting, therefore, to honour his 65th birthday by looking once again at another unique feature of this composition: the presence of Greek words in Hebrew clothing. Greek loanwords are nothing unusual in the Hebrew and Aramaic literature of the time,⁴ and they represent a constant feature in later Rabbinic literature.⁵ In the Qumran collection of manuscripts, however, the *Copper Scroll* is the only place in which they appear. The assertion of E. Qimron: "There are no Greek and Latin loans, though some scholars consider such words as מִגְדָּל 'tower' as denoting a military structure to be Greek or Latin loan translations,"⁶ remains true even today, after the publication of the totality of the manuscripts. As a token of friendship to Ton, I would like to bring together the elements of this unique feature of the *Copper Scroll* and to offer some reflections thereupon.

There can be no doubt that both the author and the engraver of the *Copper Scroll* were somehow familiar with the Greek language, a fact

A New Reading of 3Q15 12.10," in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. S. Porter and C.A. Evans; JSPSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 282–91; *idem*, "The Copper Scroll," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. Flint and J. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999), 1:302–23; *idem*, "Copper Scroll," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 1:144–48; *idem*, "Palaeography and Literary Structure as Guides to Reading the Copper Scroll," in *Copper Scroll Studies*, 311–33.

³ A. Hilhorst, *Sémitismes et latinismes dans le Pasteur d'Herma* (Græcitas Christianorum Primæva 5; Nijmegen: Dekker & Van de Vegt, 1976).

⁴ In the list of musical instruments which appears in Dan 3:5, 7, 10 and 15, some of the musical instruments carry Greek nouns. It includes three stringed instruments with Aramaic names taken from Greek: קִיְהָרוֹס (according to the *Ketib*, the *Qere* reads קִיְהָרוֹס) which is obviously the zither; from κιθάρις or κιθάρα; סַבְכָּס, from σαμβύκη, a small triangular harp, the Latin *sambuca*; פִּסְתֵּהָרִין, from ψαλτήριον, the psaltery, a stringed instrument with a *testudo* or sounding board above the strings, the Latin *psalterium*. We also find the סוּמְפוּנִיָּה, from Greek συμφωνία, the double flute or bagpipe. See P. Grelot, "L'orchestre de Daniel III, 5, 7, 10, 15," *VT* 29 (1979): 23–38. For a very convenient comparison of the names given in the different witness, see K. Koch and M. Rösel, *Polyglottensynopse zum Buch Daniel* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2000), 60–69.

⁵ S. Krauss, *Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum* (2 vols. Berlin: Calvary, 1898–1899; reprint Hildesheim: Olms, 1964). Even if one accepts the opinion of Immanuel Löw, who revised the work and prepared the Register, and who reduces the quantity of loanwords (2:622), there remain more than enough to prove my point.

⁶ E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS 29; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press 1986), 117.

made evident by the presence of groups of Greek letters at the end of certain entries in the first columns of the Scroll. These letters (always in groups of two or three) are placed at the end of the line⁷ and, with one exception,⁸ are clearly separated from the Hebrew text by a longer or shorter empty space. On all but one occasion⁹ these letters follow the expression of a quantity, be it in numerical symbols (on three occasions)¹⁰ or in numbers (on three other occasions).¹¹ For this reason, Ullendorf suggested we read these letters as expressions of numerical value.¹² While it is true that Greek letters were used (like Roman or Hebrew letters) to express numerical values,¹³ the values of the Greek letters used in the *Copper Scroll* do not correspond to the values expressed in the document in Hebrew.¹⁴ In addition, it is completely unclear why, after having clearly expressed the value of the hidden treasures in Hebrew, the author would again repeat the same value cryptically in Greek. B. Thiering¹⁵ suggests a variant of this interpretation which gives numerical value to the Greek letters but this is even less plausible. According to her they are intended to refer to separate deposits of Greek coins, the quantity of which being indicated by the central letter (gold), by the right letter (silver) and the left letter (copper) respectively. But this system is not attested elsewhere and the relationship to the precious metals seems completely arbitrary. Most scholars consider the letters to be abbreviations of Greek names. This interpretation was first proposed by B. Pixner¹⁶ who understood them as the names of the people

⁷ Col. I 4 KEN; I 12 XAF; II 2 HN; II 4 ΘE; II 9 ΔI; III 7 TII; IV 2 ΣK. Milik, DJD III, 288, considers the first letter uncertain: “La premier lettre grecque est un σ, χ, ξ en surcharge sur une autre lettre?” ΣK is read by Allegro, *The Treasure*, 39, and by all other editions.

⁸ In II 4, where ΘE is written directly after the number sixty five, ששין ודבש, because the Hebrew text extends practically to the end of the line. E. Ullendorf, “The Greek Letters of the Copper Scroll,” *VIT* 11 (1961): 227–28, reads the letters as ΞE in order to obtain the value sixty-five in Greek, but, although badly written, the reading of Θ can be considered palaeographically assured.

⁹ In I 12 where it follows the description of the place, “the cave of the ablutions.”

¹⁰ In II 2 (42 ככרין, III 7 (40 ככ), and IV 2 (14[...]. ככ)

¹¹ In I 4 (seventeen ככרין, II 2 (sixty-five עשורת דבש), II 9 (ten ככרין).

¹² Ullendorf, “The Greek Letters of the Copper Scroll,” 227: “Connection between the numerical values of these letters and their context is too striking to invoke mere coincidence.”

¹³ Their use is well attested even on Jewish coins.

¹⁴ See Lefkovits, *The Copper Scroll (3Q15): A Reevaluation*, 499 and 502 for a comparison of the values given by Ullendorf and the current values of the preserved letters.

¹⁵ Thiering, “The Copper Scroll: King’s Herod Bank Account?,” 287.

¹⁶ B. Pixner, “Unravelling the Copper Scroll Code. A Study on the Topography of 3Q15,” *RevQ* 11/ 43 (1983): 323–61, at 335.

responsible for the treasures in the Jerusalem area and identified them with people mentioned in the writings of Josephus. Pixner's hypothesis has been adopted or adapted by many other scholars.¹⁷

Although for the present author, as for other scholars like Milik¹⁸ or Lefkovits,¹⁹ the precise meaning of these letters cannot be ascertained, their presence in the scroll provides a solid proof that both the author and the engraver of the *Copper Scroll* were somehow familiar with the Greek language. This is thus sufficient to seriously consider the possible presence of Greek loanwords in the *Copper Scroll*.²⁰

1. *Delimitation of the Greek loanwords*

Although the majority of scholars agree that the *Copper Scroll* does indeed contain a number of Greek loanwords, the precise number is difficult to ascertain. There is as yet no consensus on the number of Greek loanwords in the manuscript or on the identity of the words that should be considered as such. The reason for this uncertainty is related to some of the problems posed by the manuscript itself.

The first problem is caused by the peculiar writing of the manuscript and by its support. Cross has classified this script among the "Vulgar semiformal" Herodian hands, with a mix of formal and cursive forms." While he notes that this script is well adapted to be inscribed on hard surfaces, he also recognises that "the script of the Copper

¹⁷ For example, Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Ergänzungsband*, 225–27, who keeps three of the names proposed by Pixner and changes the four others; H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus. Ein Sachbuch*, 107–108, who understands the names as corresponding to the owners of the deposits kept in the Temple treasury and described in the *Copper Scroll* (for items 1 and 4 members of the House of Abbiadene, mentioned by Josephus); for L. Tov, "Some Palaeographical Observations Regarding the Cover Art," 289–90, who assumes no less than 25 different scribes at work on the *Copper Scroll*, the Greek letters would be the signatures of the experts who filled the value of the hidden treasure inscribed by the scribes who have written the place only known to them where the treasures were buried.

¹⁸ DJD III, 221: "Je n'ai trouvé aucune explication plausible pour la présence et la signification de ces syllabes grecques dispersées dans un document hébreu."

¹⁹ Lefkovits, *The Copper Scroll (3Q15): A Reevaluation*, 504: "Thus, the significance and mystery of the Greek letters in the Scroll may remain unsolved."

²⁰ Since the origin of the *Copper Scroll* and its relationship to the other documents found at Qumran is still a much disputed matter, recourse to the presence of Greek manuscripts in caves 4 and 7 of Qumran and in other finds of the Desert of Judah (for a complete list of those Greek documents cf. DJD XXXIX, 215–20), or the use of some Greek letters in the cryptic alphabet used in 4Q186 would not suffice to prove the case.

Document exhibits an excessively wide variety of letter forms.”²¹ This variety of forms (which has lead Lefkovits to postulate “several scribes”²² and L. Tov to suggest no less than 25 different hands at work in its 12 columns),²³ together with the practically identical form of several letters, such as *b/k*, *d/r*, *h/h*, *w/y/z*, etc. has resulted in a wild variety of readings of many words. The additional fact that the scribe does not always separate words (more often than not, in fact, he employs a sort of *scriptio continua*), frequently uses medial forms of several letters in final position (always in the case of *mem*) and often uses final forms in medial position, has simply encouraged the multiplicity of readings. Finally, some of the phonetic characteristics apparent in the document, such as the obvious weakening of the gutturals *’h* and *’h* (which has also affected the *r*), the neutralisation of the *r/n*, the confusion of the sibilants *s/š*, or the substitution of the sonorous *g/k*, have lead the copyist to confound several letters. This element, together with the real (or assumed) errors introduced during the process of copying the document, has led to an even greater multiplication of readings proposed by the scholars.²⁴

As a result of these factors, the document has been transcribed in a variety of often widely differing ways. This has led in turn to several different proposals suggesting loanwords for words in the text that would appear to be foreign to the Hebrew language. What follows is a list of the Greek and Latin loanwords that have been identified so far, in the chronological order of the publications in which the identifications appeared, starting with the book of John Allegro.

1.1 *Allegro 1960*

Although Allegro’s interest was centred on the topographical identification of the locations mentioned in the *Copper Scroll* and the potential discovery of the treasures to which it refers, his notes to the translation of the published transcription recognise the following words as loanwords:

²¹ F.M. Cross, DJD III, 217.

²² Lefkovits, *The Copper Scroll (3Q15): A Reevaluation*, 454: “Several scribes were involved in engraving the Copper Scroll, a fact reflected in the script.”

²³ Tov, “Some Palaeographical Observations Regarding the Cover Art,” 288: “I suggest that the scroll was not written by one scribe, as is generally assumed by scholars, but by 25 different ones.”

²⁴ For examples of these phonetic changes in the *Copper Scroll* see Jiménez Bedman, *El misterio del Rollo de Cobre de Qumrán. Análisis lingüístico*, 154–62.

ןַרְסְטְלוֹן περίστυλον. Allegro reads in I 6–7: “šbhšr hyrstlwn” and translates “which is in the Court of the Peristyle.”²⁵ His note to the passage leaves no doubt about the identification of ןַרְסְטְלוֹן as a Greek loanword from περίστυλον: “= *peristulon* ‘a colonnade round a temple or the court of a house,’ and thus here the Outer Court, or Court of the Gentiles, surrounded by porticoes.”²⁶

ןַרְסְטְלוֹן סְטַאֲתֵּר. Allegro reads in IX 3: “ystryñ rb” and translates “four staters”²⁷ from the Greek סְטַאֲתֵּר, as his note makes explicit: “(y)styr = Gk *stater* = the old shekel = the common (provincial *sela* ‘or *tetradrachma*.”)²⁸

ןַרְסְטְלוֹן סְטוֹא. The final nun is clearly written in the medial form.²⁹ Allegro reads in XI 2: “h’st’n” which he translates as “Portico” and again his note to the word makes clear he has identified it as the Greek loanword סְטוֹא: “Red. ’st’n for ’ystb’, y’stwew’ (Jastr. *Dict.* 54^a); Syr ’est’wa’ = Gk *stoa* ‘porch, portico.’”³⁰

ןַרְסְטְלוֹן עֲזֵדְרָא. Also here the final nun is clearly written in the medial form. Allegro has recognised this loanword in XI 3 and XI 5, reading respectively “h’ksdrn” and “b’ksdr’.”³¹ The notes on both these words are very instructive. With respect to XI 2 he writes: “Rdg. ’ksdrn for ’ksdr’ (cf. n. 263), GK *exedra*; as the vestibule of a tomb chamber” while in the second: “Rgd. b’ksdr’ for text’s bhkshr’ (the *r* has been inserted above and between de *h* and the ’aleph; for the confusion of *h* [sic] and *d*, cf. n. 84).”³² This means in practice that he has adapted the clear reading of the manuscript in line 5 to his reading of the word in line 3.

In addition to these four Greek loanwords, Allegro also suggested a couple of loanwords from Latin. In I 9 he reads “w’pwryn” and notes: “’apwryn for ’ampōrīn = *amphora* “two handled vase, pitcher, used for oil, wine, honey, etc.”³³ The word is indeed known as a Latin loanword

²⁵ Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*, 33. The omission of the *p* in his transcription (*hyrstlwn*) is certainly a printing error.

²⁶ Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*, 136.

²⁷ Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*, 49.

²⁸ Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*, 157.

²⁹ Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*, 53. The final *nun* is clearly written as medial, a phenomenon which happens often in this scroll: בְּאַחַדְעַן IV 7; שְׁבַעִי IV 12; כְּכַרְיִי VII 16; מִן IX 10; הָאֲכַסְדְּרִי XI 3, with no apparent reason, since on many other occasions the final form is employed.

³⁰ Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*, 164.

³¹ Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*, 53.

³² Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*, 164.

³³ Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*, 137.

in Rabbinic literature, although the *nun* is not elided: אַנְפּוֹרִין may be a variant plural form (the attested form is feminine אַנְפּוֹרוֹת). Also with *nun* אַנְפּוֹרִיִּס or אַנְפּוֹרִין is also attested as a Greek loanword from ἐμπορία.³⁴ The reading of -yn, however, seems palaeographically very difficult. Beyer, who also recognises the word as a Latin loanword, prefers the more plausible reading וַאֲפּוֹרֶה with a -t in place of the -yn, and translates “(25-Liter-)Amphoren.”³⁵ Milik reads וַאֲפּוֹרֶה, which seems palaeographically equally possible since it is difficult to distinguish *d* and *r*.³⁶

The other Latin loanword identified by Allegro (וַיָּבִיא *via*) does not seem necessary, since the Hebrew word (which should be read either בְּבוֹאָה or בְּבִיאָה, in both cases from the verb בּוֹא, “when coming,” or “at the entrance”) makes sense on its own. In V 13 Allegro reads: “*bby*’ *hmzthy*” which he translates: “in the eastern road.”³⁷ The corresponding note explains the reason: “Rdg. *biyyā*’ (= latin *via*) “road, highway” here appar. masc., rather than *bi’ah* ‘entrance,’ in which case the defining *mzthy* would lack both art. and fem. termination.”³⁸ The separation between the *he*, which in this instance is attached to the preceding *alef* but clearly separated from the following *mem*, has no basis in the manuscript, not even according to Allegro’s drawing, and the grammatical problem which forces him to make the separation is non-existent; it is due to his reading of *zayin* instead of *yod* in the following word. If this word is read (with Milik and the majority of other scholars) as מִירֵחוֹ “from Jericho,” there is no reason to introduce *via* into the text.

Allegro thus clearly recognised four Greek loanwords in the *Copper Scroll*: περίστυλον, στατήρ, στοά, and ἐξέδρα. He was very close to identifying a fifth: λάγηνος or λάγυνος. In I 9 he reads: “*blgyn*” and translates “of *lóg* vessels.”³⁹ In his note to the passage, Allegro suggests we read בְּלַגִּין as a plural or plural form of the Biblical *lóg*, a liquid measure used in the Temple, the contents of which would amount to about one pint. The same note also suggests, however, the alternative reading of the word as the singular, *lagín*: “or rd. sing. *lagín* ‘flagon,’ [smaller

³⁴ Krauss, *Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter*, 2:61; M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (London: Luzac, 1903), 1:87.

³⁵ Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Ergänzungsband*, 225–26, DJD III, 284.

³⁷ Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*, 41.

³⁸ Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*, 140.

³⁹ Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*, 33.

than a *kad* ‘jug, pitcher’ (cf. VII 16) and larger than a *kōs* ‘cup.’⁴⁰ without specifying that this word ultimately entered the Hebrew language via the Greek *λάγηνος* or *λάγυνος*, and has been considered by other scholars to be an additional Greek loanword (as we will see later).

1.2 *Milik 1962*

The “Préface” of DJD III (which has a copyright date in 1962) is signed by De Vaux in 1959, prior thus to the publication of Allegro’s book in 1960. A curious note by the author in an “Addenda à 3Q15” indicates that he knew Allegro’s book but that he decided to ignore it.⁴¹ The fact is that the four Greek loanwords noted by Allegro, appear as such in the DJD edition. Milik recognises “cinq ou six emprunts grecs”⁴² in the *Copper Scroll*. In practical terms, Milik adds one Greek loanword he considers certain and one he considers possible to Allegro’s list.

Milik’s notes add some precision to the summary identifications of Allegro. On the first (פֶּרֶסְטִילִין in I 7, as read by Milik) he notes: “‘petit péristyle’, i 7 (D 64) reproduit fidèlement le diminutif grec περιτύλιον. Ni ce mot ni περίστυλον ne sont pas attestés par les écrits talmudiques; un seul exemple fort douteux, qui exige d’ailleurs une correction, est proposé par S. Krauss, *Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum*, ii, p. 496.”⁴³ A little further, explaining the whole expression, he writes: “הַצֵּר פֶּרֶסְטִילִין de i 6 s. n’est probablement pas la ‘Cour des péristyles’, pluriel sémitique de περίστυλον mais plutôt la simple traduction de περιτύλιον (prononcé même en grec *peristūlin*) ‘petit péristyle.’”⁴⁴ Both notes are, apparently, intended as a correction of the reading פֶּרֶסְטִילִין by Allegro and of the Greek word he proposed (περίστυλον), although, as already noted, Allegro is never mentioned.

On the second loanword noted by Allegro (סִטְרִין in IX 3, which Milik translates by “livres”) he indicates: “(סִטְרִין) de ix 3 est évidemment égal à mishnique et araméen (סִטְרִין), emprunté au grec *στατήρ*

⁴⁰ Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*, 137. The reference to *kad* in VII 16 is based on a faulty reading of כַּכְרִין instead of כַּכְרִין.

⁴¹ DJD III, 299: “J’ai ajouté aux épreuves un certain nombre de références aux études parues après l’envoi du manuscrit à l’éditeur. Je ne tiens pourtant pas compte du livre de J.M. Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*, Londres, 1960, et cela pour des raisons qu’on pourra deviner en lisant les remarques de R. de Vaux dans la *Revue Biblique*, lxxviii, 1961, pp. 146 s.”

⁴² DJD III, 230 (B 14).

⁴³ DJD III, 248 (C 104).

⁴⁴ DJD III, 273 (D 64).

‘statère, tétradrachme (ou didrachme)’. Mais ce poids est trop léger comparé à ceux des autres trésors du catalogue... Encore mieux, en partant de l’équivalence $\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho = \lambda\acute{\iota}\tau\rho\alpha$ (H.G. Liddell et R. Scott, *A Greek English Lexicon*, s.v. $\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$), on songera à la livre romaine, dont le poids était assez proche de la mine.”⁴⁵ Also here, Milik seems to dismiss Allegro’s calculations, increasing the value of the hidden treasures.

Milik does not expend much time on the third loanword, סוֹאָ סוֹאָ in XI 2. He translates the word by “portique,” notes that the word exhibits the usual prosthetic vowel, keeps the hiatus (without replacing it by a consonant, as in some rabbinic texts which reproduce the word as סוֹאָסוֹאָ) and has probably a masculine form in *-an*.⁴⁶ As for its location, he identifies it with $\eta\ \sigma\tau\omicron\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \Sigma\omicron\lambda\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$ of the New Testament, and not with the $\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\iota\ \sigma\tau\omicron\alpha\acute{\iota}$ of Josephus *J.W.* 1.401.

On בְּהַבְסָדָה in XI 3 which he translates by “vestibule” he notes: “ בְּהַבְסָדָה de xi 3 c’est encore une partie du monument des Bene Sadoq (D 40). Le terme *’aksadran* de 3Q15 est synonyme du mishnique *’aksadra* (voir B 14f), emprunté au grec $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\epsilon}\delta\rho\alpha$ ‘réduit, salle, fermés de trois côtés et ouverts sur un des côtés longs’. Cette définition s’applique bien à un vestibule d’hypogée, peu profond et avec un pilier au milieu.”⁴⁷ The second use of “exedra” found by Allegro in XI 5, is read differently (and more correctly) by Milik as בְּהַבְסָדָה .

To these four Greek loanwords Milik adds a fifth, reading הַלֹּח in XI 14 as a Greek loanword from $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\eta$. The line in question is fraught with difficulties, among other things the repetition of the word דַּמַּע which appears twice written as דַּמַּע and is only corrected the second time with an infralinear *’ayin*. For Milik הַלֹּח would be the complete form of the word, and explains the difference with the usual way the word is transcribed in Hebrew and Aramaic literature (הַלֹּחַ , הַלֹּחַ , or other forms, but always beginning with an *alef*): “ הַלֹּח de xi 14 cache, sur une graphie particulière (voir B 71 et 14a), le grec $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\eta$ (synonyme: $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\chi\omicron\nu\omicron$), nom du bois d’aloès dont les espèces les plus appréciées étaient l’Aloëxylon Agallochon Lour’ et *Aquilaria Agallocha Roxb.*”⁴⁸

Milik’s sixth possible Greek loanword is a fragmentary reading in III 1 חַלֹּח . The word comes from one of the isolated fragments that were

⁴⁵ DJD III, 253 (C 149).

⁴⁶ DJD III, 230 (B 14).

⁴⁷ DJD III, 246–47 (C 84).

⁴⁸ DJD III, 251 (C 128).

detached from the scroll, and the original has been apparently lost.⁴⁹ Milik does not give his reasons for considering the word as a possible Greek loanword, but he is probably guided by the ending in טס-, and by the fact that הצר is used governing the word פרכטלין on other occasion, as we have already seen. This uncertainty does not stop him from identifying the structure to which it refers, and he translates the phrase טס. [. . . בהצ] “Dans le Parvi[s du *péri*]bole.” He is equally assertive in his comments: “Le nom du péribole du sanctuaire, טס. [. . . בהצ] en iii 1, malheureusement incomplet, semble être d’origine grecque” and “Le nom du péribole du Temple טס. [. . . הצ], iii 1 (D 55), malheureusement acéphale, est sans doute emprunté au grec, cf. B 14e.”⁵⁰

In practical terms, thus, Milik suggests that we change one of the Greek words recognised by Allegro to περιτύλιον instead of περίστυλον and adds a new word to the list ἀλόη.

Milik also identifies a Persian loanword in the Scroll, the already mentioned בלנין from I 9. He translates the word as “bois de santal,” and notes: “בלנין de i 9 désigne le bois aromatique de santal dont la plus importante espèce est le ‘Santalum album L.’ Le mot est emprunté au sanscrit *valgu*, qui reparait en Syriaque sous la forme *blwg*.”⁵¹ Precisely this loanword, however, is considered by J.C. Greenfield “as a particularly bad example of a methodological flaw in the lexicography used in this list” by Milik.⁵² Greenfield concludes his analysis of Milik’s discussion with the question: “What then is *blgyn* of 3Q15? The answer is *b* ‘in’ *lgyn*, a ‘small flask or vessel’ used during this period. The word is frequent in Mishnaic Hebrew and is borrowed from Greek *lágēnos*. Instead of a new aromatic to add to our list, we have simply ‘in a flask.’”⁵³ The alternative suggestion by Allegro is here clearly stated and בלנין is considered as a Greek loanword from λάγηνος.

1.3 Beyer 1994

Although dedicated to the study of the Aramaic texts from the Dead Sea, the supplement to the *opus magnum* of K. Beyer also contains a

⁴⁹ DJD III, 287 and 212.

⁵⁰ DJD III, 274 (D 55) and 248 (C 103) respectively.

⁵¹ DJD III, 251 (C 127).

⁵² J.C. Greenfield, “The Small Caves from Qumran,” *JAOS* 89 (1969): 128–41, at 138; reprinted in *Al Kanfei Yonah. Collected Studies of Jonas C. Greenfield on Semitic Philology* (ed. S.M. Paul, M.E. Stone, and A. Pinnick; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill / Jerusalem: Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2001), 2:573–94, at 589.

⁵³ Greenfield, “The Small Caves from Qumran,” 138–39 [reprint 590].

new transcription and translation of the Hebrew letters of Bar Kokhba of the *Copper Scroll*.⁵⁴ While the format of his book does not allow for explanations, Beyer's translations take care to mark the loanwords, writing them in Greek or in Latin (within brackets) after his German translation. In this way he also notes the resolution of the abbreviations of Greek letters with Greek names. As for the loanwords, a reading of his translation gives the following results:⁵⁵

- “im Hof des kleinen Säulenganges (περιστύλιον)” (I 7)
- “Im (halbkreisförmigen?) Hof [des Laur]eatus (oder: [des Νικ]ίατος o.ä) (III 1)
- “Kästen (αἱ χηλοί) (V 6)
- “Silberstater(στατήρες)-Großbarren (IX 3)
- “der Säulenhalle” (ἡ στοά) (XI 2)
- “der kleinen Vorhalle (τὸ ἐξέδριον) (XI 3)
- “Priesterabgabe (“>”; a'a = ā) von Aloe” (XI 14)

In practical terms, thus, Beyer recognises the four loanwords common to Allegro and Milik, as well as the one proposed by Milik, ἀλόη (although offering a different explanation in order to account for the lack of the *alef*), resolves the tentative proposal of Milik on III 1 as a Greek personal name (similar to the Mannos of I 13 which he also considers as a possible Greek personal name: “(Μάνες, Μένης, Μηνάς u.a.),”⁵⁶ opts for Milik's reading of περιστύλιον and suggest that יְהוֹרָא would represent the genitive form στατήρες and not the plural. He does not mark וַאֲפֹרֶת בְּלִיָּן as loanwords but his translation “und zwar (Halbliter-) Flaschen und (25-Liter-)Amphoren” allows us to consider them as such. He likewise clearly adds a new loanword in V 6: כַּאֲלִיָּן from χηλός, not considering the *alef* as a simple *plene* form of the usual כַּלִּיָּן (as it appears in II 6, 8 and X 11) as Allegro,⁵⁷ nor as an exceptional effort of orthographically marking the full vowel *e* in medial position with an *alef* as Milik⁵⁸ or Thorion,⁵⁹ but as a completely different word.

⁵⁴ Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Ergänzungsband*, 4: “Wegen ihres starken aramäischen Einschlags sind auch neuhebräische Briefe des Simon bar Kosiba (→ N 216) und wegen ihrer Angaben über die Esserniederlassungen die neuhebräische Kupferrolle beigefügt (→ N 224).”

⁵⁵ Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Ergänzungsband*, 226–32.

⁵⁶ Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Ergänzungsband*, 226.

⁵⁷ Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*, 148.

⁵⁸ DJD III, 228 (B 5a).

⁵⁹ Y. Thorion, “Beiträge zur Erforschung der Sprache der Kupfer-Rolle,” *RevQ* 12/46 (1986): 163–76, at 168.

1.4 *Puech 1997*

Although Puech has not yet published his final transcription and analysis of the *Copper Scroll*, performed on the occasion of the restoration of the scroll with the benefit of new x-ray photographs, direct examination of the original and a new galvanoplastic copy of the scroll in flattened form, he has already published some of his conclusions.⁶⁰ Although these publications focus his attention on palaeographical questions and on the discussion of the topographical features of the scroll, his notes show that he has recognised two other Greek loanwords in addition to those noted so far. Both are located in col. III.

In III 1 Puech recognises that no reconstruction can be certain because neither the shape nor the distance among the letters of the lost fragment have been recorded.⁶¹ Nevertheless, he proposes that we read the unidentified consonant of Milik's transcription as a *dalet*. Puech calculates that the fragmentary word should consist of four or five letters and that it should be preceded either by the particle שׁל or by the relative -שׁ (which in the scroll appears on about 31 occasions, mostly combined with the preposition כּ in the form -שׁכּ preceding a topographical feature), if the incomplete word designates, as assumed by Milik, a place name. Assuming also, for the same reasons as Milik, that the incomplete word should be of Greek origin, he proposed that we read the word as דַּיִטָּא from the Greek δίαίτα (without any transcription of the vowel ending), which would mean "room, cell, seat of arbitration (or of judgment?)"⁶² and reconstruct the sentence בּוֹחַזְנִי שׁל / שׁב / שׁב / שׁל [שׁ דַּיִטָּא]. Puech quotes a parallel to the use of this Greek loanword in *Esther Rabbah*, where it has apparently the meaning of "prison" and considers that it could mean "salle, cellule, siège d'arbitrage (ou de jugement?)"

The second loanword proposed by Puech originates in a different reading of a word in III 9. Allegro has read the word in question as "wlbwhšyn," translated it as "garments,"⁶³ and noted that the *nun* was

⁶⁰ Puech, "Quelques résultats d'un nouvel examen du Rouleau de Cuivre (3Q15)"; *idem*, "Some Results of the Restoration of the Copper Scroll by EDF Mécénat"; *idem*, "Some Results of a New Examination of the Copper Scroll (3Q15)."

⁶¹ Puech, "Quelques résultats d'un nouvel examen du Rouleau de Cuivre (3Q15)," 171: "L'absence de tout relevé, faisant connaître les espacements et les traces de la lettre précédant le *yod*, interdit une quelconque décision." *idem*, "Some Results of a New Examination of the Copper Scroll (3Q15)," 67.

⁶² Puech, "Quelques résultats," 171; "Some Results of a New Examination," 67.

⁶³ Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*, 37. As his drawing and translation show, the *he* is clearly a printing error, as is the omission of the *ayin* of the preceding word (*dm* for *dm*⁶).

lost in the cutting of the segment.⁶⁴ Milik prefers to read it as לכושי, without the initial *waw* and the final *nun*. Puech prefers to read ולבישין (changing the *waw* from Allegro to a *yod*) and proposes that we understand the word as a loanword from the Greek λέβης, attested in Aramaic.⁶⁵ Puech suggests the meaning “cauldron, funeral urn” and proposes that we read the *waw* inserted before the *lamed* in an “explanatory sense” (in the English article) or “à sens explicatif” (in the French). He does not give a translation of the whole sentence, but if this “explanatory sense” of the copulative *waw* is taken seriously, it would imply that the *dema*’ vessels in question are “cauldrons or funeral urns.”⁶⁶

In practical terms, thus, Puech adds two new Greek loanwords to the list, both in column III: δίαιτα in III 1 and λέβης in III 9. As for the other Greek or Latin loanwords mentioned so far, Puech confirms Milik’s readings of בלנין and ונאפודת in I 9, disapproving thus of Allegro’s readings, but without any pronouncement on the meaning of the words or their origins. He does not comment on Beyer’s reading כאלני and its interpretation on the basis of χηλός, nor on the other loanwords proposed by other scholars, except in the case of ἀλόη in XI 14. Here, Puech discusses several possibilities of reading and interpretation, but in the end he remains undecided, although with a slight preference for Milik’s interpretation, but with Allegro’s reading (unless we have here a typing error of the letters *he* and *het* on which the readings of Allegro (לדה) and Milik (לה) differ, as suggested by Puech’s translation). I quote from the English version.⁶⁷

In line 14, one can envisage two possibilities for errors: either the passage of the sequence *m*’ to *ml* by haplography in the process of reading-engraving (notice the oblique stroke of the foot of the *lamedh*, which juts out), and one should therefore read *dm*[[[‘]*m*]]*l*’*h*, ‘imposi[tion of gr]ain’, or, with the

⁶⁴ Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*, 142.

⁶⁵ Krauss, *Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter*, II, 303.

⁶⁶ Puech, “Quelques résultats,” 172; “Some Results of a New Examination,” 68.

⁶⁷ Puech, “Some Results of a New Examination,” 76–77. The earlier French article (“Quelques résultats,” 179) seems to give preference to the reading of Milik, while reconstructing the missing *alef* in the lacuna: “A la l. 14, on peut envisager deux possibilités d’erreurs: soit le passage de la séquence *m*’ à *ml* par haplographie dans les lecture-gravure, voir le trait oblique du pied du *lamed* qui dépasse, et on devrait alors lire *dm*[[[‘]*m*]]*l*’*h* “imposi[tion du gr]ain”, soit le passage du début du *’ain* au pied du *lamed* par dessus le premier jambage d’un *’alef* et lire alors *dm*[[[‘]*’*]]*l*’*h* ‘aroma[te d’a]loès’, ce qui paraît matériellement meilleur que la proposition de l’édition *dm*[[[‘]]]*l*’*h* qui suppose une haplographie phonétique du *’alef* ou que *dm*[[[‘]]]*l*’*h* ‘liquid tithe’ (avec une orthographe inattendue) de Allegro.”

passing of the beginning of the *ayin* to the foot of the *lamedh* over the first downstroke of an *aleph*, the read $dm[[\text{' }]]l'h$, 'spic(e of a)loe', which would appear materially better than Milik's proposal $dm[[\text{' }]]l'h$, which presupposes a phonetic haplography of *aleph*, and better than $dm[[\text{' }]]l'h$, 'liquid tithe' (with an unexpected spelling), of Allegro.

In summary: Our review of the scholarly literature has shown that nine words have been identified as loanwords from Greek⁶⁸ (of a total of 204 words used in the *Copper Scroll*, excluding topographical and proper names, and the numerals according to the counting of Jiménez Bedman).⁶⁹ These are the nine words in the order in which they appeared in the Scroll: $\eta\lambda\upsilon\sigma\tau\upsilon\lambda\omicron\nu$, περίστυλον or $\eta\lambda\upsilon\sigma\tau\upsilon\lambda\omicron\nu$ περιστύλιον in I 7; $\lambda\acute{\alpha}\gamma\eta\nu\omicron\varsigma$ or λάγηνος in I 9; $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota\tau\alpha$ in III 1; $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\beta\eta\varsigma$ in III 9; $\chi\eta\lambda\acute{o}\varsigma$ in V 6; $\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\rho$ in IX 3; $\sigma\tau\omicron\acute{\alpha}$ in XI 2; $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\eta$ in XI 3; $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\eta$ in XI 14.

2. *Sifting the evidence*

Since scholars tend to disagree on the identification of several of these words, it is necessary to look carefully both at the arguments given and the different sets of drawings and photographs available to us⁷⁰ in order to ascertain how many of these words can be considered real loanwords from Greek. Only when its presence has been established with certainty can we attempt to extract some conclusions from this unique phenomenon.

$\eta\lambda\upsilon$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\eta$ in XI:14 presents problems both in terms of reading and in terms of explaining the Hebrew form of the word if considered a Greek loanword. Since $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\eta$, in all other known cases, is transcribed in Hebrew with an initial *alef*, all the scholars who recognise the presence

⁶⁸ Together with two Latin loanwords, "amphora" and "via," which will remain outside of our discussion.

⁶⁹ Jiménez Bedman, *El misterio del Rollo de Cobre de Qumrán*, 229.

⁷⁰ Allegro's drawings, Baker's drawing as reproduced on the Plates volume of DJD III, plate XLV, and Milik's corrected drawings as reproduced on the same volume, the even plates from XLVIII to LXX. As for the photographs, I have used those of Allegro, as reproduced in microfiche in *The Allegro Qumran Photograph Collection. The Dead Sea scrolls on microfiche: a comprehensive facsimile edition of the texts from the Judean desert* (ed. G. Brooke; Leiden: Brill and IDC, 1996), (frames 17–25, with 50 microfiches each), Starcky's photographs as published in DJD III, and as reproduced both in Brill's *Microfiche Edition* and in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library* (PAM 42.977–43.000), some of the Zuckerman photographs (not all of them were available to me), and the new photographs contained on a CD-ROM graciously offered by the EDF.

of the word in the *Copper Scroll* are forced to assume with Milik that the word is reproduced with a unique orthography (with the *alef* elided), or to assume with Beyer and Puech a chain of hypothesis: first the phonetic fusion of *ayin* and *alef*, and then the omission of the resulting unique letter (or the omission of both if the fusion did not take place), because the preceding word דג has not been corrected by the inclusion of the missing *ayin* (as has been done with the following עגד in the same line). Besides, and this is more important, Milik himself recognises that the final letter of הסל can be read both as a *he* and as a *het*. Allegro reads without hesitation a *het*, a reading also adopted by Pixner and Lefkovits among others.⁷¹ In spite of the similarity of the two letters in many occurrences in the Scroll, of the uncertainty of Puech's reading and of his apparent preference for reading a *he* at this juncture, a careful examination of the photographs confirms, in my opinion without doubt, the reading of Allegro and deprives the reading הסל and consequently (ἀ)λόη of any foundation.⁷²

זסג , δίαιτα, proposed by Puech in III 1 is, of course, purely hypothetical, as he himself recognises, since there are no drawings or photographs which could prove or disprove the reading, and since Milik, the only scholar who actually saw the fragments, was not able to ascertain the fragmentary first letter.⁷³ Besides, although the word δίαιτα⁷⁴ is indeed attested as a Greek loanword in rabbinic literature, mostly, if not always, it appears with a final *alef*, and the meaning given by Krauss varies from "Zimmer, Gemach, Stockwerk" to "Gefängnis,"⁷⁵ a meaning which does not seem adapted to a structure with a courtyard as required by the sentence in which the broken word appears, and which would be

⁷¹ Pixner, "Unravelling the Copper Scroll Code," 356; Lefkovits, *The Copper Scroll (3Q15): A Reevaluation*, 384.

⁷² Most recently, Lange, "The Meaning of *Dema* in the Copper Scroll and Ancient Jewish Literature," 136 has defended the reading of Milik and the presence of the Greek loanword ἀλόη here.

⁷³ There is also uncertainty as to the number of letters which may be fitted in the missing section. I fail to see, either in the drawings of in the photographs, traces of the *tsade*, reconstructed by Allegro, but transcribed as certain by Milik. Allegro, *The Treasure*, 141 asserts that "After a possible *hst*, there is room for 3 or 4 letters." Milik's transcription notes 3 letters before the ז (including the unidentified letter) and assumes two others in the lacuna in addition to the reconstructed *resh*, which gives a total of 5 letters for the same space.

⁷⁴ *LSJ*, 396, gives four different meanings to the word: 1) way of living, 2) dwelling, abode, room, 3) arbitration, 4) discussion, investigation.

⁷⁵ Krauss, *Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter*, 2:199.

not exactly “comparable to a ‘Roman praetorium, for which the existence of a square can be easily imagined” as Puech would like.⁷⁶

לְבִישִׁין, λέβης in III 9. This word also has been read in different ways, as already indicated. In this case, however, palaeography does not offer a completely satisfactory answer, since both *bet*, *kaf*, *waw* and *yod* can be easily confounded in this document. Nevertheless, the photographs assure us of the presence of the *waw* inserted below the *lamed* (not reproduced by Milik),⁷⁷ and show a clear distinction of the form of the medial *waw* and the final *yod*, making either the reading לְבִישִׁין or the reading לְכִוְשִׁין the most probable. This undermines Puech’s reading. The strongest argument against the understanding of this word as a Greek loanword, however, is that in all the examples given by Krauss,⁷⁸ the word is always written in Aramaic with *samek*, not with *shin*, a fact not indicated by Puech. Although there are examples of transcription of the Greek *sigma*, be it in initial, medial, or final position, by ש or by צ, by far the commonest transcription is ס, as attested by the other Greek loanwords found in the *Copper Scroll*. Although it is true that in Qumran, and particularly in the *Copper Scroll*, ס and ש are regularly confused,⁷⁹ it is mostly ס which replaces ש and not the contrary.⁸⁰ Since the alternative, and palaeographically the most probable, reading לְכִוְשִׁין makes perfect sense in Hebrew, there is no need to hypothesise a Greek loanword here.⁸¹

כְּאֵלִין in V 6 is recognised by Beyer as a loanword from χηλός. The reading is undisputed. The problem is posed by the *alef*, since in all other cases in which the word כְּלִי is used in the Scroll (כְּלִי: I 9; III 2, 9; VIII 3; XI 1, 4, 10, 14; XII 6; כְּלִין: II 6, 8; X 11; כְּלִיָּה: I 3; XII 5) it is written without it, and this would thus be the only case in which the word (if identical) will have been written *plene*. Milik’s explanation is rather convoluted: the *alef* would have been used to indicate the full vowel *e* in medial position in order to distinguish it from the *shwa* of the construct state. He recognises that this orthography is exceptional and that in the

⁷⁶ Puech, “Some Results of a New Examination,” 68; *idem*, “Quelques résultats,” 172.

⁷⁷ Lange, “The Meaning of *Dema*,” 132 considers the stroke under the *lamed* as “a scribal error probably caused by a slip of the chisel” and not as a *waw*.

⁷⁸ Krauss, *Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter*, 2:303.

⁷⁹ See Jiménez Bedman, *El misterio del Rollo de Cobre de Qumrán*, 157–58.

⁸⁰ Jiménez Bedman quotes וּמַעֲכָר שְׁנֵי (I 10–11), לְכַמֵּל (I 13), עֲסָרָא (II 8), and קְסָאוּתָא (III 4) as examples.

⁸¹ This is also the conclusion of Lange, “The Meaning of *Dema*,” 133.

other uses of the same plural כַּלִּין the writer has not differentiated the two vowels in this way⁸² (nor has he thus marked the two uses of the word with the suffix כַּלִּיה). Beyer takes the *alef* seriously and considers it be a completely different word, proposing αἱ κηλοί, the plural form of κηλός.⁸³ This seems to the present author to be extremely problematic. Apparently,⁸⁴ he is forced to assume the introduction of the loanword in the plural form, in order to explain the Hebrew form, which does not reflect the -s ending of the Greek word. This would be most unusual. He is forced also to assume the equivalence of the Greek χ with the Hebrew כ, certainly not impossible, but less usual than its translation by the Hebrew ה. In addition, he is forced to accept Milik's conclusion that the *alef* represents the vowel *e*. While these elements make Beyer's interpretation highly problematic, the element that definitively excludes this interpretation of כַּלִּין for the present author lies in the fact that κηλός is attested as a Greek loanword in Hebrew clothing in another form. According to Krauss,⁸⁵ the word was imported in the singular, as expected, and appears both as הלון (בהלון) in *b. Pesah.* 113a) and הילש (הילש) in *Tg Zech* 11:13). In both cases the vowel *e* is represented by *yod*, the *χ* is expressed with the Hebrew כ, and the *s* ending is reflected as *zayin* or *shin*. The most simple solution, thus, is to consider the word כַּלִּין as a different orthographic version of כַּלִּין, in which the *alef* has been introduced by error of the engraver (who was prone to use *alef* in medial position to represent a *patakh* or *qamets* vowel (in אססאן, XI 2 and צהיאן, XI 15).

The reading of בלנין in I 9 is assured. As we have already seen, Milik considered בלנין as a complete word, meaning “bois de santal,” while Allegro proposed that we read it as formed by the preposition *b-* (which he considered as a *beth essentialis*, “consisting of”)⁸⁶ and a plural form of the Biblical לנ. Lehmann⁸⁷ identified the word לנין with the Greek λάγυνος or Latin *lagoena*, though he proposed as alternative a reading of בלנין as פלנין “half-size” “because of the difficulty of translating the כ as ‘consisting of.’”⁸⁸ Greenfield, who, as we have seen, forcefully insisted

⁸² DJD III, 228 (5 b).

⁸³ Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Ergänzungsband*, 228.

⁸⁴ Due to the format of his book, Beyer does not explain his choices.

⁸⁵ Krauss, *Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter*, 2:251.

⁸⁶ Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*, 137.

⁸⁷ M.R. Lehmann, “Identification of the *Copper Scroll* based on its technical terms,” *RevQ* 5/17 (1964): 97–105, at 98.

⁸⁸ Lehmann, “Identification of the *Copper Scroll* based on its technical terms,” 99.

that the solution was in the *b* “in,” considered לַנִּין as a loanword from λάγηνος.⁸⁹ His translation “in a flask” is rather strange, however, when read in the sentence in which it is placed—כְּלֵי דַמַע בְּלַנִּין—, and not in the abstract. Since Greenfield understands כְּלֵי דַמַע as “a particular type of jar used for the storage of *terumah* and other types of sacred gifts,”⁹⁰ he would have been forced to translate the phrase in question as “jars of *terumah* in a flask,” which is certainly difficult to imagine.

Nevertheless, the identification of לַנִּין as a Greek loanword has been widely accepted (most recently by Lange)⁹¹ on the weight of its use in rabbinic literature in contexts dealing with sacred offerings, but apparently without realising the problem posed in this case by its singular form (in rabbinic literature attested both as a masculine form לַנִּין and as a feminine לַנִּינָה). In the attested cases of use of the loanword in rabbinic literature the plural form is לַנִּינִין (for example *m. Kel.* 16:2, 30:4). Since the following word in the Scroll (be it read as אֶפֶרֶת or as אֶפֶרֶת) is clearly plural and is joined by a *waw*, and the preceding כְּלֵי דַמַע is also plural, the reading of לַנִּין as singular is less than evident, and even more problematic if the preposition *b-* governs both לַנִּין and אֶפֶרֶת. This brings us back to the first suggestion of Allegro, reading לַנִּין as the plural of the Biblical לַנ. That the plural of לַנ is not attested in Biblical Hebrew is not a difficulty, in view of other previously unattested plurals (like אֶפֶרֶת). The introduction of a Greek loanword does not seem to be required to explain the word. The same conclusion is reached by Lefkovits who translates “dedicated objects consisting of flasks and jars with handles.”⁹²

Pixner has proposed a different Greek loanword to explain לַנִּין, considered as a singular preceded by a *b-* with a locative meaning “at”: λόγιον “oracle.”⁹³ He translates the whole sentence: “tithe vessels (ΚΛΥ ΔΕΜ^ε) at (the place) of the Logion (= breast plate) (ΛΓΥΝ) and the ephods (w’PWDOT).” His reasoning is rather convoluted: Josephus, when describing the garments of the high priest in *Ant.* 3.163, calls the breast plate

⁸⁹ Greenfield, “The Small Caves from Qumran,” 138–39 [590].

⁹⁰ Greenfield, “The Small Caves from Qumran,” 139 [591].

⁹¹ Lange, “The Meaning of *Dema*,” 129, on the basis of his conclusion that only vessels, gold, and silver are weighed in the Scroll. Lange subscribes to Allegro’s interpretation of the *b-* as *bet essentialiae*. For a complete overview of all the opinions on the matter, see Lefkovits, *The Copper Scroll*, 518–25.

⁹² Lefkovits, *The Copper Scroll (3Q15): A Reevaluation*, 73 and 76, where he vocalises the word as *belagin* or *belugin*.

⁹³ Pixner, “Unravelling the Copper Scroll Code,” 343.

ἑσσήν and gives as Greek equivalent of the word λόγιον Pixner thus concludes that “the CS uses here possibly the Greek term for the high-priestly breast plate which was inserted into its ephod” and that “the tithe vessels were therefore to be looked for near the ephod with breast plate.”⁹⁴ In my opinion, however, Josephus himself proves that λόγιον cannot be considered the Greek word behind יָגֵל, because after having explained that ἑσσήν is called λόγιον in Greek (proving simply that he is using the LXX, which translates the Hebrew שֵׁשׁ by λογεῖον), he continues to use ἑσσήν and not λόγιον in the rest of his description of the high priest’s ornaments (*Ant.* 3.166, 170, 171, 185). Neither λόγιον nor λάγυνος nor λάγηνος can be considered as established Greek loanwords in the *Copper Scroll*.

This leaves us only the four words recognised from the beginning both by Allegro and by Milik: פֶּרְטוּלָה, περίστυλον or פֶּרְטוּלָה περιστύλιον in I 7; סַטְוָה, στατήρ in IX 3; אֶסְטָה, στοά in XI 2; אֶסְטָה, ἐξέδρα in XI 3. Three of these words belong to the vocabulary of architecture: peristyle, stoa and exedra, and the fourth pertains to the economy: stater. Three of these words are attested as Greek loanwords in rabbinic literature (אֶסְטָה, אֶסְטָה and אֶסְטָה), the last one (פֶּרְטוּלָה or פֶּרְטוּלָה) is not.

אֶסְטָה is found often in rabbinic literature, under the feminine forms אֶסְטָה or אֶסְטָה in the singular and אֶסְטָה in the plural, and is registered as such in the dictionaries.⁹⁵ The final *nun* (written in medial form) of the form in our manuscript has been diversely explained. Milik, after having considered (and discarded) the possibility that it may reflect the genitive plural form of the Greek (-ων), prefers to see it as “l’afformante sémitique -an ou -on, les deux très fréquentes dans les emprunts talmudiques.”⁹⁶ Beyer prefers to give the *nun* a full value and proposes that we consider the diminutive ἐξέδριον (“little exedra”) as the Greek word from which the Hebrew word has been formed. It seems to me easier to connect the addition of the *nun* with the well known phenomenon attested in Galilean Aramaic and elsewhere of appending a final *nun* to a word which ended in a vowel,⁹⁷ particularly

⁹⁴ Pixner, “Unravelling the Copper Scroll Code,” 343, n. 8.

⁹⁵ For example, Jastrow, 64; *DCH* 1:249.

⁹⁶ *DJD* III, 230 (14f).

⁹⁷ See E.Y. Kutscher, *Studies in Galilean Aramaic* (Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University, 1976), 61, with the literature cited therein. Kutscher gives an example from an inscription from Jaffa in which a man is called Ιουδα (= *ywdh*) in Greek and *ywdh* in Hebrew.

since the same phenomenon seems to apply to the word אִסְטָא, from which no diminutive is at hand (in this case, Beyer did use this explanation of the final *nun*).⁹⁸

אִסְטָרִין⁹⁹ is likewise attested in rabbinic literature, albeit in the Aramaic singular forms אִסְתִּירָא or אִסְתִּירָא, but also אִסְטָרָא or אִצְטָרָא, and in the Aramaic plural אִסְתִּירִי or the Hebrew אִצְטָרָאוֹת. All these forms exhibit the incorporation of the prosthetic *alef* and the same fusion of consonants which appear in our scroll. The word as used in the Elephantine papyri (סְתִרִי, סְתִרִין)¹⁰⁰ does not yet exhibit this incorporation. The form in our manuscript is clearly masculine plural (as required by the אִרְבַּע which follows) as in Elephantine, as opposed to the feminine form of rabbinic literature.

אִסְטָא, as already indicated by Allegro, appears in rabbinic literature but under different forms (with or without *yod* after the *alef*, with *samek* or with *tsade* as second consonant, and always with a *bet* or a *waw* to resolve the hiatus of the Greek word): אִצְטָבָא, אִצְטָבָא, אִצְטָבָא, and several others, and has various meanings (from a portico or roofed colonnade, to a balcony or a bench or even a platform).¹⁰¹ Although most of the lexicographers acknowledge the equivalence of the form as attested in the *Copper Scroll* with the forms known from rabbinic literature and with the Greek *στοά*, Lefkovits,¹⁰² who summarises all interpretations, prefers to understand the word as related to אִסְטָן, which appears once in the tractate *Semakhot* 13:6 and which would have the meaning of “ossuary.” The rarity of this occurrence, the uncertainty of its meaning and etymology (it has been derived from Persian *astodan* “bone holder,” or from Greek *ὄστῶν* “ossuaries”),¹⁰³ the fact that he is forced to read it as a plural form

⁹⁸ Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer. Ergänzungsband*, 231: Säulenhalle (ἡ στοά + *n*) with a reference to p. 149 of the first volume of his work, where he gives many examples in order to prove that “spätestens vom 5. Jh. v. Chr. an wird drucklosen langen Auslautvokalen und Diphthongen teilweise -*n* angefügt.”

⁹⁹ The reading אִסְטָרִין of Allegro do not seem palaeographically possible; although the reading is somehow indistinct because a vertical fold in the metal, the assumed *yod* seems not to be anything other than the upper part of the *lamed* form the under line which joins the *samek*.

¹⁰⁰ See for the examples B. Porten and A. Yardeni, *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt* (4 vols. Jerusalem: Hebrew University, 1986–1999).

¹⁰¹ Krauss, *Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter*, 2:117–18. Krauss classifies the different meanings of the word in Hebrew in no less than five different categories. He also explains (in a long note, 1:253–54) the different explanations offered in order to explain the derivation of the Hebrew and Aramaic forms of the word from the Greek.

¹⁰² Lefkovits, *The Copper Scroll (3Q15): A Reevaluation*, 364–66.

¹⁰³ See Lefkovits, *The Copper Scroll (3Q15): A Reevaluation*, 365 for references.

(but translate it as a singular, because otherwise it would not serve as an identifier), and the impossibility of conciliating this meaning with the following indication of the place of burial of the cache (under the pillar or column of Zaok's tomb), makes his suggestion unlikely.

The latest loanword (פרסטלין as read by Allegro or פרסטלין as read by Milik) has been derived respectively from *περίστυλον* and from its diminutive *περιστύλιον*. Scholars have generally followed the reading of Milik, while adopting the translation of Allegro. Thorion hesitates between the two readings¹⁰⁴ and Lefkovits clearly opts for the reading of Allegro.¹⁰⁵ An examination of the photographs does not help much in this case, since the engraver of this column does not distinguish the two letters.¹⁰⁶ A decision should thus be taken on other grounds. Neither Allegro nor Milik (nor indeed Beyer) offer explicit reasons for their preference. One reason might be the influence on the engraver of the large number of plural ending in ך- in the manuscript, but everybody recognises that the word here is singular not plural.¹⁰⁷ Since we do not have comparative material from rabbinic literature in this instance to fathom the way the word would have been imported into Hebrew, the only argument that can be used in my opinion is the likelihood of a foreign word being imported from its most often used form. In this case, therefore, the normal *περίστυλον* is a more likely candidate than its diminutive form *περιστύλιον*. I thus consider *περίστυλον* to be the most likely origin of the פרסטלין of our text.

3. *Some reflections on the presence of Greek loanwords on the Copper Scroll*

What can we conclude from this review of the Greek loanwords used in the *Copper Scroll*? While the number of loanwords that have remained as such after having sifted through the evidence has certainly been reduced (only four), their presence in a manuscript found among others in one of

¹⁰⁴ Thorion, "Beiträge zur Erforschung der Sprache der Kupfer-Rolle," 169.

¹⁰⁵ Lefkovits, *The Copper Scroll (3Q15): A Reevaluation*, 64.

¹⁰⁶ In this column *waw/yod* are used 32 times. On 30 occasions the letter form is exactly the same and can be read either as *waw* or as *yod*. In only two cases a different form representing *waw* appears (the first *waw* of וַאֲפִדְוֹת on I 9, and the final *waw* of פְּתוֹ on I 11).

¹⁰⁷ Milik (DJD III, 230 [14e]) explicitly asserts that "la finale de פרסטלין n'est pas la désinence du pluriel sémitique mais la transcription de l'afformante diminutive -ov."

the Qumran caves remains a unique phenomenon and one that needs to be explained.

Usually, the presence of the Greek loanwords in the *Copper Scroll* is considered as proof that the manuscript has nothing to do with the Qumran community; although for the matter more attention is given to the Greek letters than to the loanwords. For Jiménez Bedman, the loanwords in question point towards an urban context as the place of origin of the scroll.¹⁰⁸ This leads him in turn to consider the *Copper Scroll* as an Essene but non-Qumranic document.¹⁰⁹ He, as the majority of scholars, see the absence of Greek loanwords in the rest of the Dead Sea Scrolls as a theologically motivated choice, a conscious refusal of interaction with a foreign culture.

In view of its strong opposition to all forms of Hellenism, of the closed character of the Qumran community and of the curtailing of contacts with outsiders attested in the Qumran manuscripts of sectarian origin, this explanation seems very appealing, at least at first sight. If the absence of Greek loanwords in the rest of the Qumran manuscripts was ideologically motivated, their presence in the *Copper Scroll* would be a clear indication of its different origin since it does not show the same ideological constraints. The fact, emphasised by Jiménez Bedman,¹¹⁰ that our scroll uses the word פֶּרִסְטִילִיּוֹן in order to name an architectural element for which the author could easily have used a Hebrew word (פֶּרוֹר), as is done in the *Temple Scroll*, seems to conclusively establish the argument, since it would prove that the authors had the choice between a “Hebrew” and a “foreign” word.

¹⁰⁸ Jiménez Bedman, *El misterio del Rollo de Cobre de Qumrán*, 229: “La prolija presencia de préstamos griegos referidos recurrentemente a la descripción de elementos arquitectónicos nos indica un contexto sociolingüístico netamente urbano donde la influencia del griego debiera ser harto notable.”

¹⁰⁹ Jiménez Bedman, *El misterio del Rollo de Cobre de Qumrán*, 230: “Se trata de un documento esenio pero no qumránico. Las marcas de identidad, a modo de impronta lingüística legada por la comunidad que originó el documento, nos dibujan un cuadro urbano y esenio cuya ubicación más probable, así lo presumimos, sería la comunidad esenia de Jerusalén.”

¹¹⁰ Jiménez Bedman, *El misterio del Rollo de Cobre de Qumrán*, 230–31: “El uso del préstamo griego פֶּרִסְטִילִיּוֹן περιστύλιον ‘peristilo’ para denominar el elemento arquitectónico que, presumimos, podría haber sido descrito perfectamente con términos hebreos פֶּרוֹר en 2 R 23, 11 y/o פֶּרֶבֶר en 1 Cr 26, 18 nos conduce a profundizar más en el calado del aserto de Rabin. Este uso diferente cobra mayor importancia en tanto y cuanto que documentos como el *Rollo del Templo*, con el que nuestro manuscrito ha compartido gran cantidad de léxico, sí muestra el término פֶּרוֹר en contextos semánticos idénticos al aportado por el término פֶּרִסְטִילִיּוֹן en el *Rollo de Cobre*.”

Upon reflection, however, precisely this example leads us to reach a different conclusion, namely that the presence of Greek loanwords in the *Copper Scroll* cannot be used as an argument to prove or to disprove the Qumran origin of the composition.

Three of the four loanwords attested in the *Copper Scroll* pertain to the architectural domain and we dispose of two other compositions found at Qumran where architectural terms are very prominent, namely the *Temple Scroll* and the *New Jerusalem*. A detailed comparison of the architectural vocabulary of the *Copper Scroll* with the vocabulary of the *Temple Scroll* has already been done by L. Schiffman.¹¹¹ In his study Schiffman organises the evidence into three categories:—architectural terms used in both compositions (where he lists 15 words);—architectural terms used in the *Copper Scroll* but not in the *Temple Scroll* (a category in which he places 33 entries); and—architectural terms used in the *Temple Scroll* but not in the *Copper Scroll* (a category to which he assigns 22 words). The sheer number of architectural terms used in the *Copper Scroll* but not in the *Temple Scroll* and vice versa (55 as against 15 common words) seriously diminishes the weight of a single case of possible use of a different word for the same reality in both compositions, since it points rather (even after discounting the different subject matter of the two compositions) to a language that is evolving and does not represent the same period of history.¹¹² Besides, Schiffman relates both אכסדרן and פרסטלון to the פרוור of the *Temple Scroll*. In his discussion of אכסדרן he notes that “it does not occur in the *Temple Scroll*, although the term פרוור denotes a similar structure in several passages.”¹¹³ In his discussion of פרסטלון he also asserts that “no Greek words at all appear in the *Temple Scroll*, but the difficult word פרוור is used for the same kind of colonnade or stoa.”¹¹⁴ Schiffman, surprisingly, does not include אסטאן in his lists (although it should have been considered as an architectural term, even according to the interpretation of Lefkovits, which he follows, as

¹¹¹ Schiffman, “The Architectural Vocabulary of the Copper Scroll and the Temple Scroll.”

¹¹² The dating of the *Temple Scroll* is a disputed matter, but 4Q524, the copy from Cave 4 published by Puech in DJD XXV, 85–114, shows that it cannot be dated later than the 1st half of the 2nd c. B.C.E. As for the *Copper Scroll* the accepted date is not earlier than the 2nd half of the 1st c. C.E. About two centuries thus separate the two compositions.

¹¹³ Schiffman, “The Architectural Vocabulary,” 187.

¹¹⁴ Schiffman, “The Architectural Vocabulary,” 191.

“ossuary”),¹¹⁵ but this word would have provided him with a third equivalent of the פרוור of the *Temple Scroll*, since Yadin in his edition of the manuscript describes the different פרוורים which appear in the *Temple Scroll* as “סטווים” and “סטיו או פריסטיל.”¹¹⁶

The comparison of the lexicon of the *Copper Scroll* with the vocabulary of the *New Jerusalem* text is more complicated because the latter text is written in Aramaic. The resulting general pattern, however, is similar to that discovered with respect to the *Temple Scroll*, with words common with the lexicon of the classical Hebrew appearing in the three documents (like סף “threshold” which appears in the *Temple Scroll* both in the biblical form used also by the *Copper Scroll* and in the Aramaic form of the *New Jerusalem*, אספא), with words previously only known from Mishnaic Hebrew (like אמה “canal or aqueduct”) absent from the *Temple Scroll* but frequently used in the *Copper Scroll* and in the *New Jerusalem*, and with the addition of the presence of at least another Persian loanword in it to express a measure of longitude equivalent to the stadium: ריס, which is not used in either the *Temple Scroll* or in the *Copper Scroll*. We may even find a new synonym for פריסטיל in the שבק of the *New Jerusalem* text, if we follow Milik’s interpretation of the term as “peristyle,”¹¹⁷ although Greenfield prefers to translate it by “left open” in parallel to the meaning of “open areas” he gives to בריהא, translated by Milik by “galerie, portique longeant la rue.”¹¹⁸

The weight of Jiménez Bedman’s argument is thus less strong than it appears at first glance and its value is reduced even more when one considers that פרוור is not an original Hebrew word, but rather a Persian loanword already introduced into Hebrew at the time of the composition of the biblical books of 2 Kings and 1 Chronicles.¹¹⁹ In practical terms this means that the author/redactor of the *Temple Scroll* drew from the vocabulary that was current in his own time or present in the literary sources he was using and the author of the *Copper Scroll* did the same.

The use, thus, of Greek loanwords in the *Copper Scroll* cannot be employed as an argument for or against the sectarian origin of the composition. Their presence in the *Copper Scroll* is simply an indicator of

¹¹⁵ Schiffman, “The Architectural Vocabulary,” 181–82, n. 9.

¹¹⁶ Y. Yadin, *Megillat han-Miqdash* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977), 2:16 and 1:183 respectively.

¹¹⁷ DJD III, 188–89.

¹¹⁸ Greenfield, “The Small Caves,” 133–34 [582–83].

¹¹⁹ See *HAL*, 3:905–906.

the evolution of the language during the chronological span that separates the *Temple Scroll* and the *New Jerusalem* on the one hand and the *Copper Scroll* on the other. The conclusion of Schiffman's article can be endorsed in its entirety:

All of this leads to an inescapable conclusion. The Temple Scroll is an older document and reflects an earlier stage in the development of the postbiblical Hebrew vocabulary. The Copper Scroll was composed at a later date, by which time this vocabulary had already replaced numerous terms.¹²⁰

More than an indication of sectarian or non-sectarian origin, the Greek loanwords of *Copper Scroll* witness, as do other grammatical and syntactical phenomena, to a different phase of the Hebrew language. The fact that its Greek loanwords evidently tend to be restricted for the most part to architectural vocabulary shows, as does the use of Greek loanwords for musical instruments in the book of Daniel,¹²¹ that the peculiar vocabulary of crafts and arts are fast evolving sectors of the language and consequently the most likely to be adapted to new circumstances and a changing society.

If this conclusion is acceptable, it would provide a new proof (if proof were needed) that Greek and Hebrew were part of a cultural continuum in which interaction was always possible, even within closed systems such as that represented by the community of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

¹²⁰ Schiffman, "The Architectural Vocabulary," 195.

¹²¹ See note 4.

CHAPTER TEN

WISDOM AT QUMRAN: WORLDLY OR HEAVENLY?¹

From 5–7 September 1957, under the presidency of Professor J. van der Ploeg, the 9th meeting of the “Journées Bibliques de Louvain” was dedicated for the first time to the study of the recently discovered Qumran manuscripts. The topic of the meeting was “La Secte de Qumrân et les Origines du Christianisme,” which was perfectly suited to the manuscripts as they were then known. At the time of this meeting, though all the manuscripts had already been unearthed, the only published materials were those found in Cave 1 (all published between 1950 and 1956) and a few preliminary descriptions of materials from other finds. In Cave 1 (as would become apparent on the publication of the rest of the finds) what could be called the prototypes of “sectarian manuscripts” (the *Serek*, *Hodayot*, *Milhama* and the *Pesher Habakkuk*) were unearthed, thus providing a paradigm for comparison with other, already known, Jewish groups of that period, and particularly with early Christianity. Six lectures were given in French (Van der Ploeg, Lambert, Jaubert, Barthélemy, Schmitt and Cerfaux), two in Dutch (Van der Woude and Coppens) and one in German (Nötscher), but all were published in French, including a contribution written in German by O. Betz expressly for the volume of the proceedings, which appeared two years later in the “Recherches Bibliques” series under the same title as the meeting.² The volume was correctly described by the editor, Van der Ploeg, as a “gerbe d’articles d’allure synthétique,” and it was intended to “faire saisir ce qui, au terme d’une dizaine d’années de recherches, s’avère solide et digne d’être retenu.”³ The most surprising feature of the volume was the President’s decision to replace his own

¹ Annotated version of the Presidential address. I have partially retained the characteristic style of the oral presentation.

² J. van der Ploeg (ed.), *La Secte de Qumrân et les Origines du Christianisme* (RechBib 4; Paris-Bruges: Desclée De Brouwer, 1959).

³ J. van der Ploeg, “Avant-Propos,” in *La Secte de Qumrân et les Origines du Christianisme*, 9–10.

presidential address (on the “Holy War at Qumran”)⁴ with a long bibliographical article surveying the years 1952–1958.⁵

Nineteen years later, in 1976, a new Colloquium, the 27th, was dedicated once again to the study of the Qumran manuscripts under the presidency of the late Professor M. Delcor. Half of the protagonists at the first qumranic Colloquium were also present at the second, (Coppens, Jaubert, Schmitt, Van der Ploeg and Van der Woude), but the number of participants had dramatically increased and the number of contributions published in the volume of proceedings was 28. The topic chosen then was the rather general “Qumrân: sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu.”⁶ Central to this Colloquium were the texts published since the previous one, five new volumes of the *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* series, and many preliminary publications of fragments from Cave 4 and 11,⁷ and particularly the new publications by the members of the original team, which were presented at the Colloquium by the authors themselves.⁸ There was a clash between Yadin and Van der Ploeg, who presented some fragments of 11Q20 as “Une halakha inédite de Qumrân” which had been identified by Yadin as parts of a copy of the *Temple Scroll* and whose photographs he was to publish in his forthcoming edition disregarding the rights of the Dutch Royal Academy of Science, and the ensuing dispute has remained notorious in the annals of Qumran research.⁹

A noticeable difference with the first Colloquium was the emphasis on Qumran as an independent entity and not as a background to Christian origins. Another was the presence of young scholars who presented the first fruits of their labours at this forum. The presidential address¹⁰ was a

⁴ Published in the meantime, see J. van der Ploeg, “L’idée de la guerre sainte dans la Règle de la guerre,” in *Mélanges bibliques rédigés en l’honneur de André Robert* (Travaux de l’Institut Catholique de Paris 4; Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1957), 326–33.

⁵ J. van der Ploeg, “Six années d’études sur les textes du Désert de Juda. Aperçu analytique et critique,” in *La Secte de Qumrân et les Origines du Christianisme*, 11–84.

⁶ M. Delcor (ed.), *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (BETL 46; Paris-Gembloux: Duculot / Leuven: University Press, 1978).

⁷ The contributions by A.S. van der Woude were dedicated to them (4QprNab), B. Jongeling (11QtgJob), H. Pabst (4Q179), H. Lichtenberger (4Q185).

⁸ M. Baillet presented the forthcoming DJD VII; J.T. Milik, a series of small 4QArabic fragments on the Patriarchs; J. van der Ploeg, some fragments of the Dutch lot from Cave 11; Y. Yadin, his forthcoming edition of the *Temple Scroll*; and P.W. Skehan, a collation and description of all fragments of Psalms from Cave 4.

⁹ A faint echo of the dispute is to be found in a P.S. added by Van der Ploeg to his contribution, in *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, 112–13.

¹⁰ M. Delcor, “Où en sont les études qumraniens?,” in *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, 11–46.

thorough bibliographical survey of 25 years of qumranic research, covering congresses, series, periodicals, books, articles, dissertations, and contributions of all sorts, country by country.¹¹

Now, 26 years after this second *Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniensis* dedicated to Qumran, the focus has returned once more to the Dead Sea Scrolls. If the precedent set at the two previous Colloquia is to be followed, I should treat you now to a survey of qumranic research in the form of a *status quaestionis*, which would be necessarily dry and much longer than the one provided by Delcor. During the last 25 years, the publication of the Scrolls has been virtually completed, increasing the volumes of the *DJD* series from the 5 available in 1976 to the 37 now at our disposal,¹² and the volume of research has increased exponentially with the number of texts available. Happily, I think there is no real need today for this sort of bibliographical survey or *status quaestionis*. The study of the Dead Sea Scrolls has become an independent academic discipline and, as such, is well provided with tools for research, such as bibliographies,¹³ encyclopaedias,¹⁴ and a whole host of general surveys published on the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the discoveries.¹⁵

Instead of a *status quaestionis*, I will first explain the reasons that led me to choose “Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the DSS and the Biblical Tradition” as the topic for the 51st Colloquium, and secondly will deal briefly with a single problem related to this topic.

¹¹ Even without the footnotes, it is difficult to imagine any audience listening to this long list of names and titles without falling asleep or running out of the lecture theatre. I cannot resist quoting a characteristic sentence from the section dealing with Spain, because I have discovered that even my name is mentioned there (p. 42): “Le professeur A. Diez Macho nous a signalé un important travail dactylographié d’un de ses élèves Florentino García Martínez, *Corpus qumranico. Textos arameos de Qumran*, Madrid, 1976.”

¹² See E. Tov, “A. The *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* Series: History and System of Presentation,” *DJD* XXXIX, 1–25.

¹³ F. García Martínez and D.W. Parry, *A Bibliography of the Finds of the Desert of Judah 1970–95* (STDJ 19; Leiden: Brill, 1996); A. Pinnick, *The Orion Center Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls (1995–2000)* (STDJ 41; Leiden: Brill, 2001), and the current Bibliography published in each issue of the *Revue de Qumran*.

¹⁴ L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2 vols.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

¹⁵ Among them, the two impressive volumes by P.W. Flint and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998–99), are arguably the most significant.

1. *Wisdom and apocalypticism in the DSS and the biblical tradition*

The sheer volume of new material published since the previous Colloquia dedicated to Qumran has rendered impossible a congress which could attempt to deal with all of them. A “general” qumranic congress, like the two previous ones, is no longer possible. The last congress of this sort was the gigantic marathon held in Jerusalem in 1997 in order to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the discoveries, at which more than 130 lectures, delivered by scholars from around the world, tried to present “the state of the art.”¹⁶ It was therefore necessary to change the model of the two previous Qumran Colloquia, to move from the general to the particular, and to chose a specific topic which could be of interest not only to the restricted field of Dead Sea Scrolls scholars, but also to students of both the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament alike.

When the Committee’s invitation to present a proposal for the 51st Colloquium reached me in Groningen in the summer of 2000, I was reading the recently published DJD XXXIV¹⁷ (the volume which contains the edition of the eight preserved copies of 4QInstruction), and at the same time, putting the final touches to the edition of the proceedings of the third meeting of the IOQS, a meeting dedicated to the study of the “Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical texts from Qumran.”¹⁸

During the introductory speech to the Oslo meeting, I gave a rather subjective list of what I considered to be the main problems common to the three categories of texts we were dealing with, and I also added a list of each of these categories’ specific problems. Concerning the sapiential texts, I indicated three areas in need of further research. I wrote in 1998:

Specific to the wisdom texts seems to me the acute need to analyze their relationship with Biblical wisdom compositions (in terms of ideas, vocabulary, compositional techniques, literary patterns, etc.) and with the larger continuum of the Near Eastern wisdom tradition. There is also the spe-

¹⁶ L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov, J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years After Their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, The Shrine of the Book, 2000).

¹⁷ J. Strugnell, D. Harrington, T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4. XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2* (DJD XXXIV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999).

¹⁸ D.K. Falk, F. García Martínez, E.M. Schuller (eds.), *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet* (STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000).

cific problem of the historical context in which these texts originated and their function there, as well as their function in the Qumran context in which they were transmitted, in which they were almost certainly used, and to which they may have been adapted. And finally, there is the specific problem of the relationship of these texts to the Wisdom of the Rabbis and to Christian Wisdom.¹⁹

As you can imagine, I was eager to see if those problems had been solved in the new, magnificent *editio major* of 4QInstruction, without any doubt the largest and most important sapiential composition recovered from Qumran, published in DJD XXXIV.

The editors had certainly tackled the first of the three problems indicated (the relationship to biblical wisdom) and had also dealt with the original *life-setting* of the work (a rather vague ‘school’ setting in their opinion).²⁰ They paid rather less attention to the Qumran location, where the work had been preserved, copied and read for a long time, which was rather surprising. They considered the idea that 4QInstruction came “neither from the Qumran sect, nor from any secular associates of the Qumran movement, nor yet from pre-sectarian groups, but rather was a general offshoot of Jewish wisdom, of uncertain date and not sectarian at all”²¹ as the most likely explanation of its origins. They did acknowledge that the work was very popular in Qumran though, as proved by the number and date of the copies found, but they left to others the task of ascertaining what purpose it could have served at the location where it was preserved.

I shall illustrate the answer Strugnell and Harrington gave to the first problem, that of the relationship of 4QInstruction to biblical wisdom, with a few quotes from their “General Introduction” to the volume.

Within these varying indications, then, it would be easiest to see in 4Q415 ff. a true ‘missing link’, to be set somewhere in the history of the common (i.e. non-sectarian) Jewish wisdom tradition, datable between Proverbs and Sirach, in vocabulary and in theology being sometimes closer to the one, sometimes to the other.²²

¹⁹ F. García Martínez, “Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran*, 8.

²⁰ They envision briefly the possibility of a different life-setting, associating the work with the foundational pre-qumranic stage of the group which later will become the Qumran community, but consider it less likely. DJD XXXIV, 21.

²¹ DJD XXXIV, 21–22.

²² DJD XXXIV, 31.

And a little further, they add:

In any case it represents a venerable ‘missing link’ in the development of ‘secular’ or common Israelite wisdom from Proverbs to Sirach.²³

They recognised that the sort of wisdom transmitted in 4QInstruction was not totally equivalent to the sort of wisdom transmitted in the sapiential books of the Bible, because a number of its elements are more characteristic of the apocalyptic than of the sapiential tradition. As they put it:

Thus this sapiential work joins (though in no clear pattern) ordinary practical instructions (about loans and surety, family relations, etc.) with cosmological and theological teachings familiar from Jewish apocalypticism.²⁴

But, basically, assuming I have understood them correctly, they placed 4QInstruction in a *continuum* within the biblical sapiential tradition, far from the apocalyptic world-view we can perceive in some of the Qumran compositions.

Indeed, it is only the frequent concern with רַן נְהִיָּה that differentiated 4Q4Q15 ff. from any general Jewish sapiential work (so long as that work also had strong eschatological concerns).²⁵

When I reflected on this answer, I had the strong impression that they have somehow downplayed the apocalyptic components of the composition. The fact is, we do not know of any other Jewish sapiential work with such strong eschatological concerns, and the only parallels to the expression רַן נְהִיָּה we have come from other Qumran manuscripts which reflect the apocalyptic world-view of the community.

I started to think that, if the editors were wrong in their appreciation of the importance of the apocalyptic elements of the work, it would be possible to consider 4QInstruction as evidence of a major development in the sapiential tradition. Much as Ben Sirach represents a new development with its fusion of traditional biblical wisdom with priestly elements,²⁶ 4QInstruction could represent a new development with its fusion of traditional biblical wisdom with apocalyptic elements. More

²³ DJD XXXIV, 36.

²⁴ DJD XXXIV, 33.

²⁵ DJD XXXIV, 30.

²⁶ See J.J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (The Old Testament Library; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), and D. Harrington, “Two Early Jewish Approaches to Wisdom. Sirach and Sapiential Work A,” *JSP* 16 (1997): 25–38.

than just taking its place in a continuum, 4QInstruction could represent a change, a new development, a new form of Jewish wisdom not previously attested to within the biblical tradition.

The problems I have outlined were thus not yet solved, it seemed to me. At least not all of them, or not in a complete satisfactory manner. It would therefore be worthwhile to examine the recently published Qumran wisdom texts, looking for clues which may illuminate their relationship to biblical wisdom and apocalyptic traditions. This was a concrete topic, but one which could be approached from different perspectives. It was a topic which would allow the presentation of discussions current among specialists of the Dead Sea Scrolls,²⁷ while at the same time having a certain appeal for people whose main interests are not the Dead Sea Scrolls but the Hebrew Bible or the New Testament. Since the model of the two previous Colloquia dedicated to Qumran could not be followed, why not try a thematic model, as used during other Colloquia, such as the Jubilee Meeting dedicated to the “Biblical

²⁷ The interest of Dead Sea Scrolls scholars in the wisdom texts preserved in the Qumran collection had burgeoned since the publication of the first DJD volume of sapiential texts, DJD XX in 1997, and particularly since the publication of the synthesis by D.J. Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran* (The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls; London: Routledge, 1996), which made the main lines and conclusions of the then unedited 4QInstruction available. For a summary description of the wisdom texts found at Qumran, see J.I. Kampen, “The Diverse Aspects of Wisdom in the Qumran Texts,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, 1:211–43. More comprehensive and detailed is the description by A. Lange, “Die Weisheitstexte aus Qumran: Eine Einleitung,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. Ch. Hempel, A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: University Press—Peeters, 2002), 3–30. The bibliography compiled by Ch. Hempel and A. Lange, “Literature on the Wisdom Texts from Qumran,” in *ibid.*, 445–54 is impressive, but goes only as far as the year 2000. To the titles there listed, two important monographs published in the Series STDJ should be added: C. Murphy, *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community* (STDJ 40; Leiden: Brill, 2001) [“Wealth in Instruction,” 163–209], and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones. Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden: Brill, 2001). Further, the following books and articles should be noted: D. Hamidović, “4Q279, 4QFour Lots, Une interprétation du Psaume 135 appartenant à 4Q421, 4QWays of Righteousness,” *DSD* 9 (2002): 166–86; G. Ibba, *La sapienza di Qumran. Il Patto, la luce e le tenebre, l'illuminazione* (Roma: Città Nuova, 2000); D.F. Jefferies, *Wisdom at Qumran: A Form-Critical Analysis of the Admonitions in 4QInstruction* (Gorgias Dissertations: Near Eastern Studies 3; Piscataway; Gorgias Press, 2002); J.L. Kugel, “Some Instances of Biblical Interpretation in the Hymns and Wisdom Writings of Qumran,” in *Studies in Ancient Midrash* (J.L. Kugel; Cambridge: Harvard University Center for Jewish Studies, 2001), 155–69; K.B. Larsen, “Vidom Og Apokalyptik I ‘Musar Lemevin’ (1Q/4QInstruction),” *Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 65 (2002): 1–14; É. Puech and A. Steudel, “Un nouveau fragment du manuscrit 4QInstruction (XQ7 = 4Q417 ou 4Q418),” *RevQ* 19/76 (2000): 623–27; D. Steinmetz, “Sefer HeHago: The Community and the Book,” *JJS* 52 (2001): 39–58.

Canons"? For these reasons I decided to propose the present topic to the committee, and I wrote the following description of its scope:

The apocalyptic component of the sectarian scrolls has been one of the key elements brought to the fore since the beginning of DSS research. The wisdom component of the Scrolls, on the other hand, has hardly been researched, no doubt because the main wisdom texts have been available only recently. The quantity of sapiential texts now available in two DJD volumes is great, but an in-depth study still needs to be done, and their relationship to the biblical wisdom tradition (Proverbs, Qohelet and Ben Sira in particular) need to be ascertained.

The combination of both lines of research (Apocalypticism and Wisdom) in a single Colloquium could be very fruitful. It may not only throw light on the old problem of the prophetic versus the sapiential roots of biblical apocalypticism, but because both are very much present and operative in the single concrete library of Qumran (as attested by the recent published texts), it could lead to a better understanding of *their mutual relationship*.

These were my reasons for choosing the topic which has brought us together today. I would now like to present briefly one point of possible relationship between wisdom and apocalypticism. This point is reflected in the title given to this address, and is inspired by the title of the Matthew Goff's Chicago dissertation, "The Worldly *and* Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction" (my italics).²⁸

2. *Wisdom at Qumran: worldly or heavenly?*

The title of Goff's dissertation apparently answers my question by asserting that in the case of 4QInstruction, the alternative is not compelling, and that the wisdom transmitted there is both worldly and heavenly at the same time.

When considering the 4QInstruction content, Goff's reasoning seems convincing. The knowledge the sage is communicating to his pupil²⁹

²⁸ M.J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*. A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, March 2002. The Dissertation will be published in a revised form in the Series STDJ.

²⁹ Whoever they may be. For the problems of determining their identity, see E. Tigchelaar, "The Addressees of 4QInstruction," in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts from Qumran*, 72–75.

belongs to both sorts of wisdom.³⁰ Most of the teachings concern very worldly matters and are perfect parallels to the secular wisdom communicated in biblical wisdom books like Qohelet or Sirach. Our sage deals with economic matters, poverty and riches, borrowing and repaying money, how to deal with loans and securities; he instructs the one seeking understanding on how to conduct himself in his social relations, both with superiors and inferiors, how to avoid shame, how to deal with strangers, and how to conduct himself in the event of a sudden change of fortune; he also admonishes the pupil on how to conduct himself in family matters, relations with parents and with his wife, the marriage of children, etc.

But juxtaposed with these very worldly concerns, the sage instructs the one seeking understanding on many other matters which pertain to the realm of heavenly wisdom. He teaches about God and God's plans, about creation, about the cosmos, about angels, about good and evil, about eschatology and the afterlife, and, quite characteristically, about the final judgement in which God will reward or punish the righteous and the wicked. In short, the teachings of our sage concern not only worldly wisdom but also heavenly "mysteries."

Although we can find parallels to some of these teachings in biblical wisdom, most of them belong to the areas which were excluded from biblical wisdom and which only appear in apocalyptic compositions (biblical or otherwise). Ben Sirach states explicitly:

Reflect upon what you have been commanded, for what is hidden is not your concern. Do not meddle in matters that are beyond you, for more than you can understand has been shown to you. (Sir 3:22–23)

The advice of our sage is exactly the opposite:

[Gaze upon the mystery] that is to come, and comprehend the birth-times of salvation. And know who is to inherit glory and toil (4Q417 2 i 10–11).

The presence of both elements is so obvious in 4QInstruction that Torleif Elgvin has proposed understanding the origins of the composition as a fusion of two different sources: a secular wisdom composition

³⁰ This characteristic has been emphasised by T. Elgvin, "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Early Second Century B.C.E.: The Evidence of 4QInstruction," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Fifty Years After Their Discovery*, 226–47, and *idem*, "Wisdom With and Without Apocalyptic," in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical Texts*, 15–38.

contained in what he call the “admonitions,” and an apocalyptic source most clearly apparent in the “discourses.”³¹ The apocalyptic redactor would have incorporated the wisdom instructions within his own framework, in a similar way to how the apocalyptic author of the Second Sibylline Oracle inserted a wisdom extract of Pseudo-Phocylides into his work.³² But, as Goff pointed out,³³ this understanding of 4QInstruction as a synthetic work is rather problematic because the fragmentary preservation of the composition reduces all discernment of strata to wild speculation. Besides, the way in which both elements are intermingled in the preserved text made their extraction impossible without some preconceived idea of what should or should not be present in a wisdom or an apocalyptic composition; or, to put it in the words of John Collins,³⁴ without a preconceived idea of the “generic compatibility” of both elements. This, of course, does not rule out the possibility that the author or authors of the composition may have made use of traditional wisdom sayings, and traditional apocalyptic elements. But what must count as decisive is both elements being clearly present together and intermingled in the same composition.

However, in my opinion, this fact does not totally justify Goff’s conclusion that the wisdom we do have in 4QInstruction is at once both worldly and heavenly. It is my contention that the interpretative cadre established by the work’s beginning, as preserved both in 4Q416 1 and in 4Q417 1 i, as well as the continuous reference to the *רַי נְהִיָּה* (“the mystery that is to come” in the translation of the editors),³⁵ gives a

³¹ T. Elgvin, “Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Early Second Century B.C.E.,” 227. He produced the first comprehensive analysis of 4QInstruction in his still unpublished dissertation, T. Elgvin, *An Analysis of 4QInstruction*, Thesis submitted to the Senate of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1997. It will soon appear in the Series STDJ in a thoroughly revised form.

³² Lines 5–79 of Pseudo-Phocylides has been inserted as lines 56–148 of the Second Sibylline Oracle, see P.W. van der Horst, *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides. With Introduction and Commentary* (SVTP 4; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 84–85.

³³ Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 19.

³⁴ J.J. Collins, “Wisdom, Apocalypticism and Generic Compatibility,” in *In Search of Wisdom. Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie* (ed. L.J. Perdue, B.B. Scott, W.J. Wiseman; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993), 165–85; reprinted in *idem, Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (JSJSup 54; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 385–404.

³⁵ The expression has been widely discussed and several different interpretations and translations proposed since A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination. Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 57–61. For a summary of the opinions, see D.J. Harrington, “The Raz Nihyeh in a Qumran Wisdom Texts (1Q26, 4Q415–418, 423),” *RevQ* 17/65–68 (1996): 449–53. Later, it was also discussed by J.J. Collins, “Wisdom Reconsidered in the Light of the Scrolls,” *DSD* 4

“revelatory” character to all the contents of 4QInstruction, including the most worldly ones, and makes of all of them “heavenly wisdom.”

(a) I think that Strugnell-Harrington were right in considering fragment one of 4Q416 as the very beginning of the composition,³⁶ and that this fragment provides a theological framework for the reading of the whole subsequent composition. As they also noted, the language of the fragment is that of the third person narrative, with no trace of a direct address.³⁷ In spite of its fragmentary state, the next five lines of fragment 1 (ll. 10–15) give a feel of its tenor:

¹⁰ in heaven He shall pronounce judgement upon the work of wickedness, and all His faithful children will be favourably accepted by [...] ¹¹ its end. And they shall be in terror. And all who defiled themselves in it, shall cry out. For the heavens shall fear, [and the earth too shall be shaken (from its place)]. ¹² The [se]as and the deeps shall be in terror, and every spirit of flesh will cry out. But the sons of heaven [...] in the day of] ¹³ its [judg]ment, And all iniquity shall come to an end, while the period of truth will be completed [...] ¹⁴ in all periods of eternity, for He is a God of truth. And from before the years of [...] ¹⁵ to let the righteous understand (the distinction) between god and evil, to [...] every regula[tion...] ¹⁶ [incl]ination of flesh is he/it. And from understanding (?) (4Q416 1:10–15).³⁸

The topics dealt with in this introduction are hardly unfamiliar, though in apocalyptic works, not in wisdom compositions. For example, the judgement upon wickedness, the vindication of righteousness, the end of evil and the arrival of the epoch of truth, etc., and the same can be said of the vocabulary used: רוח בשר, צר בשר, קץ האמת, עבודת רשעה, עבודת רשעה, etc.³⁹ The context thus established by this introduction for the

(1997): 265–81, esp. 274, and by A. Schoors, “The Language of the Qumran Sapiential Works,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*, 61–95, esp. 86–88.

³⁶ DJD XXXIV, 8 and 73. This was contested by Elgvin on both material and textual considerations, see T. Elgvin, “The Reconstruction of Sapiential Work A,” *RevQ* 16/64 (1995): 559–80, esp. 566–67. The matter has now been thoroughly dealt with by E. Tigchelaar, “Towards a Reconstruction of the Beginning of 4QInstruction (4Q416 Fragment 1 and Parallels),” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*, 99–126.

³⁷ Although Tigchelaar, “Towards a Reconstruction,” 216, tentatively concludes, on the basis that 4Q418 238 may also have belonged to the beginning of the column, “that the third-person description of 4Q416 1 and parallels was embedded in a second person address, which admonished the addressee to contemplate.”

³⁸ Translation by Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones*, 176.

³⁹ The vocabulary of 4QInstruction has already been extensively studied, see J. Strugnell, “The Sapiential Work 4Q415 ff. and pre-Qumranic Works from Qumran. Lexical Considerations,” in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls*,

whole work is an apocalyptic one. Furthermore, the function of this context, it seems to me, is none other than to legitimise the corpus of instructions which follow.

b) This strategy of legitimisation appears even more clearly in the first fragment of 4Q417, which also belongs to the theological cadre of 4QInstruction, and which deals with the same topics, but presented as instructions directly given to the “understanding one.” The first five lines are very fragmentary, but lines 6–19 of 4Q417 1 i are fairly well preserved and worthy of being quoted in full.⁴⁰

⁶ [And by day and by night meditate upon the mystery that is] to come, And study (*it*) continually. And then thou shalt know truth and iniquity, wisdom ⁷ [and foolish]ness *thou shalt* [recognize], every ac[t] in all their ways, Together with *their* punishment(s) in all ages everlasting, And the punishment ⁸ of eternity. Then thou shalt discern between *the* [goo]d and [evil according to their] deeds. For the God of knowledge is the *foundation* of truth. And *by/on* the mystery that is to come ⁹ He has *laid out* its (= truth’s) *foundation*, And *its* deeds [He has *prepared with all wis*]dom And with all [c]unning has *He fashioned it*, And the domain of its *deeds* (*creatures*) ¹⁰ with a[ll] *its secrets* [has He . . .] . . . [. . .] *He [ex]pounded* for their un[der]standing every *d[ee]d/cre[at]ure* So that *man* could walk ¹¹ in the [fashion (inclination)] of *their/his* understanding. And He will/did *expound* for *m[an . . .]* And in *abundance/property/purity* of understanding *were made kn[own the se]crets* of ¹² his (?man’s) plan, together with how he should walk [p]erfec[t in all] his [ac]tions. These things investigate/*seek early and* continually, and gain understanding [about a]ll ¹³ their *outcomes*. And then thou shalt know about the glory of [His] *m[ight]*, *Toge*ther with His marvellous mysteries and the *mighty acts He has wrought*. But thou, ¹⁴ O understanding one, study (*inherit*?) thy reward, Remembering *the re[quital, for]* *it* comes. Engraved is the/*thy ordinance/destiny*, And ordained is all the punishment. ¹⁵ For engraved *is* that which is ordained by God against all the *ini[quities]* of [the] children of רִיב . And written in His presence *is* a book of memorial ¹⁶ of those who keep His word. And that *is* the appearance/*vision of the meditation* on a book of memorial. And *He/רִיב (?) gave* it as an inheritance to *Man/Enosh Together with* a spiritual people. F[o]r ¹⁷ according to the pattern of the Holy Ones *is his* (man’s) fashioning. *But* no more *has* meditation been given to a (?) fleshy spirit, For *it* (sc. flesh) knew/knows not the difference between ¹⁸

Technological Innovations, New Texts, and New and Reformulated Issues (ed. D.W. Parry and E.C. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 595–608; Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones*, 237–44; J. Strugnell, “The Smaller Hebrew Wisdom Texts Found at Qumran. Variations, Resemblances, and Lines of Development,” in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought*, 31–60; Schoors, *The Language of the Qumran Sapiential Works*, esp. 77–94.

⁴⁰ In the translation by Strugnell and Harrington, DJD XXXIV, 154–55.

[goo]d and evil according to the judgement of *its* [sp]irit. *Vacat* And thou,
 O understanding child, gaze on the mystery that is to come, And know
¹⁹ [the *paths* of] everyone that lives And the manner of his walking that is
 appointed for [*his*] deed[s] (4Q417 1 i 6–19)

I have deliberately retained the DJD XXXIV translation, in spite of its old-fashioned (King James Bible) sound, instead of using our own translation (in *the Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*)⁴¹ or any other available, in order to avoid discussing the many interesting, but problematic, elements of this text which are not directly pertinent to the point I want to emphasise. Specifically, this fragment of admonition shares the same theological ideas we encountered in the previous one, but makes explicit that the theological cadre is intended as a *legitimisation* of the instruction given. The wisdom here communicated can hardly be called worldly wisdom. This wisdom is contained in the “mystery that is to come” (l. 6) whose continuous meditation brings forth knowledge of truth and of iniquity together with their punishment in everlasting ages (ll. 7–8). The addressee (singular, וְאִתָּהּ בֶּן מְבִיִן) is urged to gaze on the “mystery that is to come” (l. 18) in order to know “the paths of everyone that lives and the manner of his walking that is appointed for his deeds” (l. 19), and even to “get understanding about all the mysteries concerning thee” (l. 25). The result of this knowledge is nothing less than knowledge of the “glory of His [God’s] might” (l. 13), which is possible because he, as one of the spiritual people, has been fashioned “according to the pattern of the Holy Ones” (l. 17).

The references to the הַרְוֵת הַחֹקִים {כֹּה} “engraved ordinance” (l. 14) and to הַזֶּוֹן הַהַגְוִי לְסִפְרֵי זְכוֹרֹת the “vision of the meditation on a book of memorial” (l. 16) are more in line with the “heavenly tables” of certain apocalypses than with ordinary worldly knowledge, and they apparently have the same function within the composition.⁴²

c) However, the clearest indicator of the legitimisation strategy applied to the wisdom imparted is the frequent use of the רֵן נְהִיָּה (whatever it may be exactly), not only in the clearly apocalyptic sections of the

⁴¹ F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 2:859.

⁴² For the legitimisation function of the heavenly tables in *Jubilees*, see F. García Martínez, “The Heavenly Tablets in the Book of Jubilees,” in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ 64; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 243–60, and H. Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and its Authority Conferred Strategies,” *JSS* 30 (1999): 397–410.

composition, but all over 4QInstruction. Harrington, in the most detailed study of the expression published so far, concluded:

What is the *rz nhyh*? It seems to be a body of teaching. It could be written or oral. It appears to have some fixed form. It concerns behaviour and eschatology.⁴³

This last phrase is most significant here. The expression occurs in the 4QInstruction about thirty times (twice without prepositions, once with the preposition *m-*, but usually with the preposition *b-*) and it is, according to Harrington, “so frequent and so regular in the work that when we find either word alone and need to fill in the lacuna, we can add the missing word with some confidence.”⁴⁴

Here is a list of all these occurrences, with indication (within brackets) of the context, insofar as this can be ascertained:

- 1Q26 1 1 (no context); 1 4 (revelation).
 4Q415 6 4 (poverty); 24 1 (spirit); 25 1 (no context).
 4Q416 2 i 5 (birth-times of salvation); 2 iii 9 (its origins); 2 iii 14 (ways of truth and roots of iniquity); 2 iii 18 (parents); 2 iii 21 (wife); 17 3 (no context).
 4Q417 1 i 6 (truth and iniquity); 1 i 8 (truth’s foundation); 1 i 18 (the paths of all living); 1 i 21 (no context); 1 ii 3 (no context); 2 i 10–11 (birth-times of salvation).
 4Q418 10 1 (parents); 43 4 (truth and iniquity); 43 14 (the paths of all living); 43 16 (no context); 77 2 (nature of man); 77 4 (the weight of the times); 123 ii 4 (what God has uncovered); 172 1 (no context); 179 5 (no context); 184 2 (eating and being satisfied); 190 2 (no context).
 4Q423 3 2 (crops will multiply).

What is of interest in this list is that the contexts with which the use of the expression is associated are by no means restricted to the apocalyptic sections of the composition. Indeed, as Harrington has pointed out, they deal with eschatology as well as with behaviour. Even the most “secular” instructions are comprised within the *רז נהיה*. The instructions to honour father and mother (a very traditional topic in biblical wisdom) are motivated thus: “because they uncovered thy ear to the mystery that is to come” (4Q416 2 iii 18).⁴⁵ In talking about the wife it is said: “Thou has taken a wife in thy poverty, take her offspring in thy lowly state;

⁴³ Harrington, “The Raz Nihyeh in a Qumran Wisdom Text,” 552.

⁴⁴ Harrington, “The Raz Nihyeh in a Qumran Wisdom Text,” 550.

⁴⁵ DJD XXXIV, 110, 113.

but take care lest thou be distracted from the mystery that is to come while thou keepst company together” (4Q416 2 iii 20–21).⁴⁶ Many of the instances of the רַן נִדְהֵה are without immediate context, but in others, such as 4Q415 6 4,⁴⁷ the whole context is one of instruction on how to deal with poverty, 4Q418 184 2⁴⁸ deals with eating and 4Q423 3 2⁴⁹ is part of instructions given to a farmer.

In my view, this implies that the author of 4QInstruction considered all the knowledge he communicated, be it of an apocalyptic nature or similar to traditional biblical wisdom, as the same kind of knowledge. By also presenting his “secular” teachings as being included within the רַן נִדְהֵה , he gave them the same authority he gives to the other “mysteries” about which he instructed the “one seeking understanding.” He used the same strategy of legitimisation of his authority for the whole composition, without distinguishing between heavenly and worldly wisdom. His instructions’ most worldly concerns were also presented as “revealed” wisdom.

I think we may conclude that if Sirach represents “secular” Jewish wisdom, the wisdom of 4QInstruction is in every way closer to the “revealed” wisdom of a full-blown apocalypse, as in *4 Ezra*. In any case, I regard 4QInstruction as the representative of a new and different sort of Jewish wisdom, a wisdom whose authority is not grounded on human knowledge but on divine revelation.

I do not know whether we can use the term “apocalyptic wisdom” in the case of 4QInstruction. It is evident that the composition is not apocalyptic in the formal sense in which we are used to understanding the word, after the paradigm of *Semeia 14*. However, in my opinion, its author tries to present the knowledge he wants to communicate not as simple human knowledge (as in the biblical wisdom tradition) but as “revealed” knowledge, as heavenly wisdom. Therefore, I think we can answer the question posed in a different way to how Goff answered it. Qumran wisdom is not worldly *and* heavenly wisdom, it is revealed wisdom, and thus thoroughly heavenly.

It is time to end. Allow me to finish with the same words Matthias Delcor used to close the Qumran congress 25 years ago:

⁴⁶ DJD XXXIV, 110, 113.

⁴⁷ DJD XXXIV, 51.

⁴⁸ DJD XXXIV, 408.

⁴⁹ DJD XXXIV, 514.

Non, Qumrân n'a pas encore dit son dernier mot. Nous avons dépassé l'époque des révélations sensationnelles qui semblaient devoir bouleverser les fondements mêmes de la tradition chrétienne; mais une nouvelle ère d'études qumrâniennes, espérons-le moins passionnées et d'autant plus fructueuses, va sans doute commencer.⁵⁰

I am not sure that the last twenty-five years of qumranic research have been less "impassioned" than the preceding years (the controversies of the nineties were even stormier than any before), but I am sure that the last ten years have been the most fruitful for qumranic research. All the preparatory work has been completed; all the collections are now fully published and are easily available; all the necessary tools are ready. We are indeed at the beginning of a new era in qumranic research. It is now up to you to set an example and start working on these precious texts, so that at the end of these three days we will know more of the "Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition" and their mutual relationship.

⁵⁰ M. Delcor, "Conclusions. Lignes de force du Colloquium," in *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu*, 418.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

INVENTED MEMORY: THE “OTHER” IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

The topic that the organizers of the congress suggested for study (“The ‘other’ in the Dead Sea Scrolls”) fitted into a combined reflection on the attitudes towards “the other” in the biblical world (in the Old and New Testaments) and consisted of studying the topic of “memoria y mestizaje” in the manuscripts from Qumran as a whole.¹ It was logical to study the topic in the writings of a group or of some specific groups, such as those to whom we owe the Dead Sea Scrolls, since one of the characteristic elements of the thinking of these groups is the presence of the irreducible contrast not between Israel and the other peoples but between “us” and the “others,” even though these “others” form part of the historical Israel.² In itself, this type of thinking is not unusual, and is the common heritage of any sectarian group, at least if we accept Albert Baumgarten’s definition of “sect” as “a voluntary association of protest, which utilizes boundary marking mechanisms—the social means of differentiating between insiders and outsiders (the members and all the others)—to distinguish between its own members and those otherwise normally regarded as belonging to the same national or religious entity.”³

The interest in studying the writings of the specific groups that we find in the sectarian writings of Qumran (that is, texts the sectarian nature of which is not in any doubt)⁴ is that they are undoubtedly *Jewish*

¹ See J.L. Sicre Díaz, “Las tradiciones de Jacob; Búsqueda y rechazo de la propia identidad,” in *Congreso Internacional “Biblia, memoria histórica y encrucijada de culturas. Actas* (ed. J. Campos Santiago and V. Pastor Julián; Zamora: Asociación Bíblica Española, 2004), 11–23.

² In the words of J. Neusner, “What’s ‘A Judaism?’,” in *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part 5 Volume 1: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Theory of Israel* (ed. A.J. Avery-Peck, J. Neusner, and B. Chilton; HdO Section One 56; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 11: “As we shall see in these pages, the Qumran Library tells us about a community of Jews who saw themselves as Israel and the rest of the Jews as not-Israel.”

³ A.I. Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (JSJSup 55; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 7.

⁴ Whether one uses the third definition of C. Newsom (connected with the rhetorical function of the texts), “‘Sectually Explicit’ Literature from Qumran,” in *The Hebrew*

groups and that, by definition, the “others” are like themselves, “sons of Abraham,” “heirs of the promise” and “members of the covenant,” to cite some of the expressions used in both the Old and New Testaments as elements of self-definition and attitude towards the problem of the “other.”

As I understand this assignment, my study should deal with

- the problem of identity, or more accurately, of the group’s own definition of its identity, which obviously entails the problem of defining the identity of the “other”;
- the problem of boundaries, of demarcation of the space of the “others,” which obviously entails the problem of crossing boundaries, of the bridges that allow (or do not allow) passage from the space of the “other” to the space of “us”;
- the problem of relationship, that is of tolerance or intolerance in relations (or lack of relations) with the “other.”

As is evident, there are too many problems and too many texts for all of them to be tackled at the same time. Therefore I have decided to concentrate on the essential and only present the attitude towards the “other” as reflected in two of the most important of all the sectarian texts, the *Damascus Document* and the *Rule of the Community*, and I will discuss them in that sequence. Evidently they are two compositions that are directed towards (and legislate for) related but clearly different groups, so that their attitudes must be presented singly and separately in order to avoid any amalgam.⁵

Bible and Its Interpreters (ed. W.H. Propp, B. Halpern, and D.N. Freedman; Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California, San Diego 1; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167–87: “A sectarian text would be one that calls upon its readers to understand themselves as set apart within the larger religious community of Israel and as preserving the true values of Israel against the failures of the larger community” (178–79), or the (more theological) definition of G.W.E. Nickelsburg, “Religious Exclusionism: A World View Governing Some Texts Found at Qumran,” in *Das Ende der Tage und die Gegenwart des Heils. Begegnungen mit dem Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt. Festschrift für Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. M. Becker and W. Fenske; AGZJU 44; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 45–67: “I refer to texts whose religious world view portrays one group as the sole and exclusive arena of salvation and thus sees those who are not members of that community as cut off from God’s favor and bound for damnation” (46), or the (more sociological) definition of J.M. Jokiranta, “‘Sectarianism’ of the Qumran ‘Sect’: Sociological Notes,” *RevQ* 20/78 (2001): 223–39: “A sectarian text should contain clear evidence of a *sectarian stance*—that is, of the self-understanding as uniquely legitimate, and of the negative tension with the social environment as defined by the four-stance typology” (237).

⁵ See P.R. Davies, “Communities at Qumran and the Case of the Missing Teacher,”

However, before going into the topic directly, I think it necessary to stress something that in itself is obvious but which we cannot forget for a single moment without taking the risk of distorting the meaning of the specific texts on which my presentation of Qumran thought is based.

Any literary text that has developed over a lengthy period inevitably shows in the words it uses traces of ideological, sociological changes or any other type of change having an effect on its development. One of the ways of noticing these changes is to pay the requisite attention to the words that are used in the text and those that are not.

Changes in vocabulary (different words used in various periods to denote the same reality) are important, and these changes are used regularly to track the lines of development effected in a text that in its final form appears to be a more or less uniform and continuous fabric. These changes of vocabulary are eloquent testimony of growth and a large part of the exegetical study of the Old Testament over some two centuries (study that has allowed excellent results to be obtained by distinguishing different redactional levels in many of the books of the Bible, and allows us to speak with confidence of "sources," "revisions," "redactions," etc.) is based on this simple principle. However, along with this principle of the variety of vocabulary used, there is another principle also clear in any long-lived text and to which usually less attention is paid: not only can certain words be polysemes, they can even change their meaning.⁶ Certain words continue to be used over a long period, but their content has changed in such a way that their meaning is very remote from the original meaning.⁷ The use of the word "Israel" in the Hebrew Bible can serve perfectly to illustrate this point.

In the Hebrew Bible, the word "Israel" has several meanings.⁸ At first it is used to denote the union of tribes that descended from the sons of

RevQ 15/57–58 (1991) 275–86; *idem*, "The Judaism(s) of the Damascus Document," in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4–8 February, 1998* (ed. J.M. Baumgarten, E.G. Chazon, A. Pinnick; STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 27–43.

⁶ For an application of this principle to specific words in the Qumran texts, see S. Morag, "On some Concepts in the World of Qumran: Polysemy and Semantic Development," in *Diggers at the Well. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (ed. T. Muraoka and J.F. Elwolde; STDJ 26; Brill, Leiden, 2000), 178–92.

⁷ See J. Barr's caustic criticism of those who forget this fundamental principle in *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961).

⁸ On its origin, see O. Margalith, "On the Origin and Antiquity of the Name

Jacob, who in turn also receives the name “Israel” as an eponym. Over a period of about 200 years, the word was to have a more restricted meaning, denoting the kingdom of Israel, the northern kingdom as opposed to the southern kingdom, the kingdom of Judah. After the fall of the northern kingdom, the inhabitants of Judea present themselves as the heirs of all Israel, and the book of Deuteronomy addresses the community that survives the Assyrian invasions as if it were the “Israel” of the Mosaic period, even though the content of the word represents a different reality. The wording in 2 Chr 30, in which Hezekiah calls for the celebration of the Passover in Jerusalem in order to restore the unity of “Israel,” is a very good example of this,⁹ given that the word is used with three different meanings in a single passage:

Afterwards, Hezekiah sent messages throughout the whole of Israel and Judah and he even wrote letters to Ephraim and Manasseh so that they would come to the house of Yahweh, in Jerusalem, to celebrate the Passover in honour of Yahweh, God of Israel... Thus the children of Israel who were in Jerusalem celebrated the Feast of Unleavened Bread. (2 Chr 30:1, 21)

In the books of Ezra and Nehemiah “Israel” is again used with different meanings. On the one hand, it is used as a way of denoting the people as distinct from the priests and Levites: “The people of Israel, the priests and the Levites have not separated themselves from the peoples of the land... for they have taken their daughters for themselves and for their sons and have mingled the holy race with the peoples of the land” (Ezra 9:1–2). On the other hand, it is used to denote the whole community that returned from exile and is distinct from the inhabitants of the land, who are now called “foreigners,” with whom those who have returned from exile cannot intermingle: “On the twenty-fourth day of that same month, the children of Israel gathered together for a fast, clothed in sacks and covered in earth. And those of the lineage of Israel (liter-

‘Israel’,” *ZAW* 102 (1990): 225–37. On its meaning the various biblical books, see P. Weimar, “...inmitten der Söhne Israels’ (Ex. 29,45): Aspekte eines Verständnisses Israels im Rahmen der priesterschriftlichen Geschichtserzählung,” in *Garten des Lebens: Festschrift für Winfrid Cramer* (ed. M.-B. von Stritzky and Ch. Uhrig; Münsteraner theologische Abhandlungen 69; Altenberge: Oros-Verlag, 1999), 367–98; A.R. Hulst, “Der Name ‘Israel’ in Deuteronomium,” *Oudtestamentische Studies* 9 (1951): 65–106; A. Besters, “‘Israël’ et ‘Fils d’Israël’ dans les livres historiques,” *RB* 74 (1967): 5–23; W. Zimmerli, “Israel im Buche Ezechiel,” *VT* 8 (1958): 75–90; K.F. Van Rooy, “The Names of Israel, Ephraim and Jacob in the Book of Hosea,” *Old Testament Essays* 6 (1993): 135–49.

⁹ See H.G.M. Williamson, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).

ally, the "seed of Israel") separated themselves from all the foreigners and presented themselves and confessed their sins and the sin of their fathers" (Neh 9:1–2).

In the summary of history that follows, also in Neh 9 (and which in the Greek Bible is presented as a speech by Ezra) the identity of this "Israel" of the Persian period is constructed on the basis of an ideological identification with the "people of Yahweh." The speech lists creation, the choice of Abraham, the exile in Egypt, the covenant and the gift of the Torah, and continues with the whole history of the unfaithfulness of the people in the distant past but also in the immediate present ("from the time of the kings of Assyria until the present day" [9:32]), in which this God is invoked to establish a new pact with him, with the strict (and written!) provision to adhere to a whole series of specified prescriptions in 9:29–40. It is evident that this "Israel" is different from the preceding ones, as is also evident that this "Israel" includes, on the one hand, an ethnic component (all those who swore the oath were the "seed of Israel") and an intentional component: not all the "seed of Israel" swore an oath, "the people of the land" are marginalised and all those intermingling with them is excluded.¹⁰

This rapid summary shows us, then, that in the Hebrew Bible a single word ("Israel") has a great variety of meanings and that, as well as being used to denote the non-priestly class of the people, it is used to denote a "historical Israel" (with different definitions in different periods) and a "carnal Israel," in which ethnicity is the defining element, but also an "intentional Israel," in which what counts is personal commitment and the promise of religious faithfulness to certain rules.

In Ezra and Nehemiah an attempt has been made to combine both elements, even if it is *manu militari*,¹¹ going as far as the use of public

¹⁰ In the most literal meaning, since the condemnation of "mixed" marriage is one of the hobby-horses of both books. For example, see D.M. Bossman, "Ezra's Marriage Reform: Israel Redefined," *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 9 (1979): 32–38, D.L. Smith-Christopher, "The Mixed Marriage Crisis in Ezra 9–10 and Nehemia 13: A Study of the Sociology of Post-Exilic Judaeon Community," in *Second Temple Studies. 2. Temple and Community in the Persian Period* (ed. T.C. Eskenazi and K.H. Richards; JSOTSup 175; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 243–65; C. Pichon, "La prohibition des mariages mixtes par Néhémie (XIII 23–31)," *VT* 47 (1997): 168–99.

¹¹ For example, the "separation" from everything foreign after the reading of Deut 23 about the Moabites and Ammonites, in Neh 13:3: "Thus, when they heard the Law, they separated from Israel everything foreign;" or the use of guards to ensure the fulfilment of the sabbath regulations in Neh 13:15–22; or the flogging and tearing out of hair from the *yehudim* who had married Ashdodite, Ammonite and Moabite women in Neh 13:23–24.

force to ensure that the “offspring of Israel” is really “Israel.” We do not know to what extent such politics were effective, nor to what extent this segregation of “Israel” was imposed during the Persian and Hellenistic periods. What is clear is that in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, “crossing the boundary” took place only in one direction: the direction of expulsion (“separation,” to use the terminology of the Hebrew text), as in the case of “one of the sons of Joiada, son of the High Priest Eliashib” (and therefore with an unimpeachable genealogy) for the crime of “being the son-in-law of Sanballat.”¹²

This fleeting and schematic survey of the variety of meanings of the word “Israel” in the Hebrew Bible seemed necessary, not only as a methodological warning (in each case it is the literary context in which the word is used that tells us its specific meaning) and as an introduction to one of the key terms in our investigation (“Israel”), but because the Dead Sea Scrolls are so steeped in biblical language that we can state, without any doubt, that the various meanings of the words in the biblical text form the co-texts that determine, together with the actual literary context, the meaning that these very words acquire in Qumran.

In the texts from Qumran, as we shall see, the word “Israel,” besides the biblical meanings, will take on other new meanings, since it is also the name used by the group for themselves, both as the name of a “utopian” reality, the “ideal Israel” exactly as it should exist, which is very different from the existing “Israel,” and to denote an eschatological reality, the “Israel” that will exist at the end of time. Having made this clear, we can now begin to analyse the topic of the “other” in the texts selected.

1. *The “Other” in the Damascus Document*

I will begin by showing how a group of the *Damascus Document*¹³ defines its identity and marks off its boundaries with the “others.” The basic narrative occurs in the first column of the *Damascus Document*:¹⁴

¹² Neh 13:28.

¹³ The two copies from the Cairo Genizah were published by S. Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries. 1. Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1910). The standard transcription, with excellent photographs, is by E. Qimron, in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (ed. M. Broshi; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1992), 9–49. This edition also contains a bibliography covering the years 1970–1990. There is a more recent edition

For when they were unfaithful in forsaking him, he hid his face from Israel and from his sanctuary and delivered them up to the sword. However, when he remembered the covenant of the very first, he saved a remnant for Israel and did not deliver them to destruction. And at the moment of wrath, three hundred and ninety years after having delivered them into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, he visited them and caused to sprout from Israel and from Aaron a shoot of the planting, in order to possess his land and to become fat with the good things of his soil. And they realised their sin and knew that they were guilty men; but they were like blind persons and like those who grope for the path over twenty years. And God appraised their deeds, because they sought him with a perfect heart, and raised up for them a Teacher of Righteousness, in order to direct them in the path of his heart. (CD I 3–11)¹⁵

The text is dense and rich in allusions so that it merits a more detailed examination than we can provide here. I will restrict myself, then, to the essential.¹⁶

The first statement provides us with the general picture and the context in which the group arose, strongly anchoring their own history in the history of "Israel." The prehistory of the group begins with the unfaithfulness of "Israel" that culminates in divine punishment, in the

by J.M. Baumgarten and D.R. Schwartz, "The Damascus Document (CD)," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 2. Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; PTS DSSP 2; Tübingen & Louisville, 1995) 4–57. The manuscripts from the various Qumran Caves were published by Milik (Cave 5) and Baillet (Cave 6) in DJD III, and Baumgarten (Cave 4) in DJD XVIII. The edition used here is our own, published in F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1:550–627. The translation of the Qumran texts is taken from F. García Martínez, *DSST*. For a short introduction to the *Damascus Document* see F. García Martínez, "Textos de Qumrán," in *Literatura judía intertestamentaria* (G. Aranda Pérez, F. García Martínez, and M. Pérez Fernández; Introducción al Estudio de la Biblia 9; Estella: Verbo Divino, 1996), 46–54.

¹⁴ For a sober presentation of the various texts related to the origins of the Community of the *Damascus Document*, see C. Hempel, "Community Origins in the Damascus Document in the Light of Recent Scholarship," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Technological Innovations, New Texts, and New and Reformulated Issues* (ed. D.W. Parry and E.C. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 316–29, and the detailed analysis of M.L. Grossman, *Reading for History in the Damascus Document* (STDJ 45; Leiden: Brill, 2002).

¹⁵ *DSST*, 33.

¹⁶ For more details, see P.R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant. An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"* (JSOTSup 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), 56–104; M. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish & Christian World 200 B.C. to A.D. 200 2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 23–25; J.M. Boyce, "The Poetry of the Damascus Document and its Bearing on the Origin of the Qumran Sect," *RevQ* 14/56 (1990): 615–28; C. Hempel, *The Damascus Texts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 27–28.

form of the exile, and with the preservation of a “remnant” in remembrance of the “covenant.” The mention of Israel together with the reference to the temple proves that the author is not using the word “Israel” in a restricted sense to mean the northern kingdom, but as the name of all the people of God: Israel has been punished but has not been destroyed completely. In the formulation of its own identity, the group begins, then, by planting its roots directly into “Israel,” accepting a past of unfaithfulness, and establishing a relationship with the saved “remnant.” The expression used is “he saved a remnant *for* Israel” (השׂוּר שְׂאִירֵיהֶם לְיִשְׂרָאֵל) and not “a remnant *in* Israel,” which does not allow this “remnant” to be located with certainty either in the Babylonian exile or in the land of Israel, since the “remnant” is in terms of “Israel” as God’s people.¹⁷ The saving of this remnant is due to the divine remembrance of the בְּרִית רִאשׁוֹנִים “the covenant of the very first,” also an ambiguous expression, but which has to be interpreted as a reference to the divine covenant with the patriarchs, as indicated by the other description of the prehistory of the group in CD III 8–12:

And the wrath of God flared up against their congregation. And their sons died through it, and through it their kings were cut off and through it their warriors perished and through it their land was laid waste. Through it, the very *first to enter the covenant* made themselves guilty and were delivered up to the sword, for having deserted God’s covenant and for having chosen their whims, and for having followed the stubbornness of their heart, each man doing (what was) his desire.¹⁸

In this text the expression is used with the article: בְּאֵי הַבְּרִית הַרִאשׁוֹנִים, and the covenant is then specified as the בְּרִית אֵל, God’s covenant which they had forsaken and caused them to be delivered up to the sword, which

¹⁷ On the Babylonian origins of the group, see J. Murphy-O’Connor, “The Essenes and Their History,” *RB* 81 (1974): 215–44; *idem*, “The Essenes in Palestine,” *BA* 40 (1977): 100–124, and *idem*, “The Damascus Document Revisited,” *RB* 92 (1985): 223–46. On its Palestinian origins, see F. García Martínez, “The Origins of the Essene Movement and of the Qumran Sect,” in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices* (F. García Martínez and J. Trebolle Barrera; transl. W.G.E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 77–96, originally “Orígenes del movimiento esenio y orígenes qumránicos: Pistas para una solución,” in *Il Simposio Bíblico Español* (ed. V. Collado Bertomeu and V. Vilar Hueso; Valencia-Cordona: Fundación Bíblica Española, 1987), 527–56, reprinted in F. García Martínez and J. Trebolle Barrera, *Los Hombres de Qumrán: Literatura, estructura social y concepciones religiosas* (Estructuras y Procesos: Serie Religión; Madrid: Trotta, 1993), 91–117 and *idem*, “Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis,” *Folia Orientalia* 25 (1988), 113–36. See also P.R. Davies, “The Birthplace of the Essenes: Where is ‘Damascus’?,” *RevQ* 14/56 (1990): 503–19.

¹⁸ *DSST*, 34–35.

makes it very unlikely that "the first to enter the covenant" refers to the first members of the group, as some scholars claim.¹⁹ Later I will show how the group appropriated this "covenant," making it their own.

The second statement of the first text cited (CD I 3–11) provides us with a specific chronological picture of the origins of the group in a time that is called "the moment of wrath" which happened "three hundred and ninety years after having delivered them into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon." It is clear that this exact chronological reference is an exegesis of the text of Ezek 4:4–8, one of the symbolic actions by which the prophet Ezekiel foretells the exile both of the "house of Israel" and of the "house of Judah" (the 390 [150 according to the LXX] days that he had to remain lying on his left side bearing the sins of Israel, and the 40 days that he had to remain lying on his right side bearing the sins of Judah).

For this reason it cannot be given a purely chronological value and so date the year in question.²⁰ What is clear is that here the 390 years do not refer to the exile of the Northern Kingdom, as is the case in Ezekiel, but to the exile of the Southern Kingdom linked to the conquest of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. And this implies that with this date the author of the *Damascus Document* provides his (own) interpretation of the duration of the Babylonian exile, very much like what is done in Dan 9:24–27, when it reinterprets Jeremiah's seventy years as seventy weeks of years (490 years). It is also clear, and this seems much more important, that the author completely ignores the restoration of the Persian period. The birth of the "shoot of the planting" is the first divine intervention after the punishment. From his point of view, "the remnant for Israel" from which the group was to emerge was still in exile, a situation that would end only with the emergence of the group.²¹ This means that group invented for itself a historical memory in which the return of Ezra and Nehemiah does not exist and in which the situation of the exile only ends with the emergence of the group.

¹⁹ See E.M. Laperrousaz, "Les 'ordonnances premières' et les 'ordonnances dernières' dans les manuscrits de la Mer Morte," in *Hommages à André Dupont Sommer* (ed. A. Caquot and M. Philonenko; Paris: Maisonneuve, 1971), 405–19.

²⁰ Although this does not imply that the date has a purely symbolic meaning, see P. Sacchi, "Il problema degli anni 390 nel Documento di Damasco I, 5–6," *RevQ* 5/17 (1964): 89–96 and A. Laato, "The Chronology in the *Damascus Document* of Qumran," *RevQ* 15/60 (1992): 605–607.

²¹ See M. Knibb, "The Exile in the Literature of the Intertestamental Period," *Heythrop Journal* 17 (1976): 253–72, and *idem*, "Exile in the *Damascus Document*," *JSOT* 25 (1983): 294–300.

Another interesting fact suggested by this text is that the birth of the group coincides with the beginning of the “end of time” and that this decisive moment in history should not be considered as a single act but as a period of indeterminate length.²² This is evident from the reference to this period as “at the moment of wrath” (בְּקֵץ הַיּוֹם) (with its implicit reference to the קֵץ אֲחֵרֹן [“the final era”] and especially in the reference to divine intervention as “he visited them” (בְּפָקֵדִים), using the same root that is used in Qumran to denote “the visit,” or divine judgment at the end of history. It is not a single intervention but the beginning of a new period of history, as shown by the reference to the 20 years that will follow the birth of the group before the Teacher of Righteousness appears.

In our text, the group defines itself as “the shoot of the planting,” “the root of the plantation,” or however the metaphor used should be translated (שָׂרֵשׁ מִטְעָה), that God has caused “to sprout from Israel and Aaron” (וַיִּצְמַח מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל וּמֵאַהֲרֹן). In this formula, Israel denotes the non-priestly component and Aaron the priestly component. Both elements belong to the self-definition of the group and both elements appear in the definition of the saviours expected at the end of time, the hoped-for messiahs “of Aaron and Israel.”

In the text quoted there is no clear assertion of the appropriation of the name “Israel” as an expression of the group’s own identity. However, it does occur in other passages in the *Damascus Document*. In XII 19 we find a “Rule for the assembly of the cities of Israel,” which refers to the places where the group resides; in XII 8 it is “the company of Israel” that decides whether the possessions that a member has taken and that come from gentiles should be accepted or not, and in XII 22 the group even defines itself as זֵרַע יִשְׂרָאֵל “the seed of Israel”: “And in accordance with this regulation shall the seed of Israel walk and it will not be cursed.” The members of the group are called “the converts of Israel” (IV 2; VI 5; VIII 16), or “the chosen of Israel” (IV 2–4), expressions that show the mechanism of appropriation that ultimately would call the other “sons of Israel” “sons of the pit” (בְּנֵי הַשְּׁחִתָּה) in VI 15.²³

²² See A. Steudel, “אַחֲרֵית הַיָּמִים in the Texts from Qumran,” *RevQ* 16/62 (1993): 225–46; J.J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls; London, Routledge, 1997); F. García Martínez, “Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism* (ed. B. McGinn, J.J. Collins, and S.J. Stein; 3 vols.; New York: Continuum, 1998), 1:162–92.

²³ In CD XIII 14, Ch. Rabin also reads בְּנֵי הַשְּׁחִתָּה (*The Zadokite Documents* [2nd rev. ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1958], 67), but although the manuscript has deteriorated at this

The text in which the identity of the group as the true "Israel" appears in its clearest form is the following:

But with those who remained steadfast in God's precepts, with those who were left from among them, God established his covenant with Israel for ever, revealing to them hidden matters in which all Israel had gone astray: his holy sabbaths and his glorious feasts, his just stipulations and his truthful paths, and the wishes of his will which men must do in order to live by them. (CD III 12–16)²⁴

This text also connects with the past of the unfaithfulness of the people of Israel, in which only a remnant remains faithful to God. This remnant,²⁵ which is the group itself, is the one with which God establishes his eternal covenant, a covenant that is significantly called "his covenant with Israel for ever" (אֶת בְּרִיתוֹ לְיִשְׂרָאֵל עַד עוֹלָם). This shows us that the concept of the Old Testament covenant, with its ethnic dimension ("the people of the covenant") has not been eliminated, even though it has been transformed considerably and has been transferred to the group.²⁶ The divine covenant is for ever, but now not every Israelite is automatically a member. Only those who are faithful to his precepts are members.²⁷

point, in this case the reading בני השֹׁמֵר seems certain. This reading has been adopted in the editions by Qimron, *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*, 35; Baumgarten and Schwartz, "The Damascus Document (CD)," 54; as well as in *DSSSE*, 1:572. On this appropriation of the name "Israel" see P.R. Davies, "Who Can Join the 'Damascus Covenant,'" *JJS* 46 (1995): 134–42 and J.J. Collins, "The Construction of Israel in Sectarian Rule Books," in *Judaism in Late Antiquity: Part 5 Volume 1: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Theory of Israel*, 25–42.

²⁴ *DSSST*, 35.

²⁵ Here the Hebrew text does not use word "remnant" but instead describes the same thing using a circumlocution, "those that remained from among them" (אֲשֶׁר נִוְרְרוּ מִזֶּהָם), those who had not been destroyed for having remained faithful, the "rest for Israel" whom God did not deliver up to destruction, according to CD I 4–5, where they are called "a remnant" (שְׂאִירֵיהֶם).

²⁶ See E.J. Christiansen, "The Consciousness of Belonging to God's Covenant and What it Entails According to the Damascus Document and the Community Rule," in *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments* (ed. F.H. Cryer and T.L. Thompson; JSOTSup 290; Copenhagen International Seminar 6; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 69–97.

²⁷ Similar conclusions are reached by detailed studies on the concept of "covenant" in Qumran, included in S.E. Porter and J.C.R. de Roo (eds.), *The Concept of Covenant in the Second Temple Period* (JSJSup 71; Leiden: Brill, 2003); C.A. Evans, "Covenant in the Qumran Literature," 55–80; M.G. Abegg, "The Covenant of the Qumran Sectarians," 81–97, and M.O. Wise, "The Concept of a New Covenant in the Teacher Hymns from Qumran (1QH^a X–XVII)," 99–128.

If the Old Testament covenant was one of the clearest defining characteristics to separate the people of Israel from all the other peoples (since it belonged to that covenant by birth), this new covenant requires not only race but also personal choice and complete faithfulness. This concept of covenant serves to mark off the boundaries of the group not only in respect of the gentiles (who are not Israel) but also in respect of other Israelites. The simple fact of having been born an Israelite is no longer enough to belong to this covenant. Within the continuity, then, there is a clear break from the previous situation and we can speak of a “new covenant” (ברית חדשה). The *Damascus Document* uses precisely this terminology and defines this covenant as “the new covenant in the land of Damascus” (VI 19; VIII 21; XIX 34), which is obviously different from “the covenant of the fathers” (ברית האבות) in VIII 18 and from the “covenant of Abraham” (ברית אברהם) (circumcision)²⁸ in XII 11.

The expression “new covenant” refers to Jer 31:31–34, and indicates the continuity and the break with the “covenant that I made with their fathers on the day that I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt” (as the Prophet Jeremiah says).²⁹ One does not belong to this “new covenant”³⁰ by birth but one enters it by a voluntary decision. One of the expressions for the members of the group is precisely “those entering [or have been brought into] the covenant” (באי ברית) with no additional qualifiers (CD II 2; VI 11; VIII 1; IX 3; XVI 12; XIX 14; XX 25).³¹ This twofold aspect, of continuity and

²⁸ In rabbinic literature, ברית, used alone or in various combinations, always refers to circumcision. For a description of the rabbinic view of the “covenant” see A. Segal, “Covenant in Rabbinic Writings,” in *The Other Judaism of Late Antiquity* (A. Segal; BJS 127; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 147–65.

²⁹ R.F. Collins, “The Berith-Notion of the Cairo Damascus Covenant and its Comparison with the New Testament,” *ETL* 39 (1963): 555–94, denies any reference to Jeremiah in the Qumran expression, but forgets that this type of allusion is very common in the Qumran writings, and that Jeremiah is cited by name in CD VIII 20. See the thesis of Y. Ki Yu, “The New Covenant Concept of Jer 31:31–34 in Later Religious Thought with Particular Reference to the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament” (Ph.D. Thesis, Durham, 1989).

³⁰ Talmon prefers to use “renewed” both for Jeremiah and for Qumran, see S. Talmon, “The Community of the Renewed Covenant,” in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. Ulrich and J. VanderKam; Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series, 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 3–24.

³¹ Ch. Rabin, *Qumran Studies* (Scripta Judaica 2; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957), 1–21 had already noted the similarity between the vocabulary used in the Damascus Document to express “entry into the covenant” and the vocabulary used

break at the same time, is expressed in all its ambiguity in the following sentence from the *Damascus Document*: "Whoever enters the covenant, which for all Israel is an eternal law, must impose upon his sons who belong to those who are enrolled, the oath of the covenant" (XV 5–6). Originally, the covenant was for all Israel (the Israel "according to the flesh," we could say) and this is an eternal law, but even the sons of those who freely accepted to enter the "new covenant" (those who are enrolled) must express their choice of belonging, of entering this new covenant, by an oath similar to one made by the other members.

The demarcation of the boundaries is clear, not only in respect of the gentiles, but in respect of the rest of Israel that no longer belongs to this "new covenant." CD VIII 16–18 and XIX 29–31 express this idea succinctly: "So is the judgment of the converts of Israel who turned away from the path of the people on account of God's love. He loves the (very) first who testified against the people, following God, and those who came after them, because to them belongs the covenant of the fathers" (כִּי לָהֶם בְּרִית הָאֲבוֹת).

CD III 12–16 is also instructive in another way. This "new covenant" entails an aspect of revelation in which God himself reveals those things in which all Israel had broken the original covenant ("hidden matters [נסתרות] in which all Israel had gone astray"). This concept of hidden matters, revealed only to the members of the group, often occurs in the other writings from Qumran.³² In this case, the expression of its content is not sufficiently specific to allow a list to be drawn up of the motives that caused the group to be formed, apart from the case of the dispute over the calendar and the feasts: "his holy sabbaths and his glorious festivals." Obviously the calendar is a fundamental problem in the formation of the sect's identity, but of course it is not the only one.³³ Other passages from the *Damascus Document* show that the problems were many and complex: IV 17 mentions Belial's three nets into which Israel had

in the Tosefta to describe entry into pre-rabbinic *haburot*. See V. Pasquetto, "Analisi esegetico-dottrinale dell'espressione qumranica 'entrare nell'alleanza'," *EphCarm* 32 (1981): 3–34.

³² The *nif'al* participle נסתרות occurs 16 times according to the recently published concordance. See M.G. Abegg, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 2:535. The contrasting use of "hidden things" and "revealed things" had already been studied by L.H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (SJLA 16; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 22–32.

³³ See F. García Martínez, "Calendarios de Qumrán," in *Para comprender los Manuscritos del Mar Muerto* (ed. J. Vázquez Allegue; Estella: Verbo Divino: 2004), 157–75.

strayed (“fornication, wealth, defilement of the temple”), for example, and VI 13–VII 5 is a long list contrasting the behaviour of those who are in the covenant to the behaviour of the sons of the pit who do not act “in accordance with the exact interpretation of the law for the age of wickedness.” Separation from the “other” is expressed by two basic metaphors: the wall that separates (the building of the wall is attributed to “the others,” to “the builders of the wall” in IV 19 and XIX 24–25) and straying from the path (I 13; II 13; IV 1) which causes the “others” to go away from God and lose their way.

This boundary that separates the members of the group from the other Israelites can be crossed by voluntary membership of the group and acceptance of all the conditions imposed; although, as we shall see, not everyone can cross it and the possibility of belonging is limited to the present time, the “age of wickedness” since “when the period corresponding to the number of these years is complete, there will no longer be any joining with the house of Judah,” as IV 10–11 says. CD XV 6–17 includes the procedure by which “whoever goes back from his path of corruption” (לכלל השב מדרכו הנשחתה) can enter and belong to the new covenant. The terminology used in this case is very informative, since it plays both on the name the members give themselves and with the adjective used for other people: “the sons of the pit.” The word השב “to convert” refers to the שבי ישראל (“the converts of Israel”),³⁴ and the paths of corruption מדרכי הנשחתה refers to “the pit” as the destiny of non-sectarian Israel.

Instead, it seems that the boundary separating the members of the group from the pagans cannot be crossed, corresponding to the principle of ethnicity preserved in the concept of the new covenant. However, this element has no particular emphasis in the manuscript, which in the opposition between “us” and the “others” pays more attention to the other Israelites than to pagans. The *Damascus Document* uses three words for the non-Israelite “other”: גוי, בן נכר and נר. גוי or גוים (“people,” “gentiles”) is the word that is most common and has a less problematic meaning: in general it denotes the other peoples, the gentiles, the non-Israelites in the ethnic sense. Of the eight times that the word

³⁴ The expression occurs in CD IV 2; VI 5 and VIII 16 = XIX 29. For a defence of this translation, in parallel with the expression “converts from sin” of CD II 5; XX 17; 1QS X 20 and 1QH^a VI 24, X 9; XIV 6 instead of those “who returned” or “the captives,” see García Martínez, “Orígenes del movimiento esenio y orígenes qumránicos,” 98–99.

occurs in the *Damascus Document*, in two cases (VIII 15 and XIX 27) it is an explicit biblical quotation (Deut 9:15) and in another (V 17) there is a clear allusion to Deut 32:28. In IX 1 it specifies that "every man who gives a human person to anathema shall be executed according to the laws of the gentiles."³⁵ From the other references we can conclude that the dealings of the group with the pagans were subject to certain restrictions. In CD XII 6–11 there is a collection of regulations concerning various aspects of dealings by the members with non-Jews.³⁶ There it specifies:

He is not to stretch out his hand to shed the blood of one of the gentiles for the sake of riches or gain. *Blank*. Neither should he take any of his riches, so that they do not blaspheme, except on the advice of the company of Israel. *Blank*. No-one should sell an animal, or a clean bird, to the gentiles lest they sacrifice them. *Blank*. And he should not sell them anything from his granary or his press, at any price. And his servant and his maidservant: he should not sell them, for they entered the covenant of Abraham with him. (XII 6–11)³⁷

This type of regulation tells us that dealings with pagans were subject to certain restrictions but shows no particular animosity. It is interesting to compare the restrictions imposed in respect of the other Israelites who are not members of the group. In XI 14 it is laid down: "No-one should stay in a place close to gentiles on the sabbath," without further ado. But in V 13–14 we can read in respect of the other Israelites: "They are all igniters of fire, kindlers of blazes; webs of a spider are their webs, and their eggs are viper's eggs." The rhetoric of the passage clearly shows us the author's sentiments and where the real problem lay, for

³⁵ This is a text that has given rise to several studies concerning its exact meaning and the period in which this type of legislation could have been applied and how: P. Winter, "Sadoquite Fragments IX,1," *RevQ* 6/21 (1967): 131–36; I. Rabinowitz, "The Meaning and Date of 'Damascus' Document IX,1," *RevQ* 6/23 (1968): 433–35; Z.W. Falk, "'BEHUQEY HAGOYIM' in Damascus Document IX,1," *RevQ* 6/24 (1969): 569; J.D.M. Derret, "'BEHUQEY HAGOYIM': Damascus Document IX,1 Again," *RevQ* 11/43 (1983): 409–15.

³⁶ See L.H. Schiffman, "Legislation Concerning Relations with Non-Jews in the *Zadokite Fragments* and in Tannaitic Literature," *RevQ* 11/43 (1983): 379–89, who stresses that no scriptural foundation is provided for these regulations so that he considers that "They deal with legal matters, part of what the sect calls the *nistar*, the hidden laws, those known only to the sect." (389). See also Schiffman, "Non-Jews in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* (ed. C.A. Evans and S. Talmon; Biblical Interpretation Series 28; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 153–71.

³⁷ *DSST*, 42.

him; boundaries with the gentiles were not the main concern of the group.

In XIV 15 we find the word נכר (“foreign”) in combination with נוי, in the expression לאשר ישבה לנוי נכר (“and to the prisoner of a foreign people”). Whoever is “a prisoner of the gentiles” must be provided (such as orphans, old people, young girls) for using the money from the salary of two days each month that the members have to place in the hands of the Inspector. The word is also used in XI 2 in the familiar expression בן הנכר that in biblical Hebrew denotes the “foreigner.” So נכר, like נוי are practically synonyms in the *Damascus Document* and are used to denote non-Jews.

The specific meaning of נר in CD presents more problems, even though the word is only used three times (in VI 21 and in XIV 4 and 6).³⁸ Already its meaning in the Hebrew Bible was problematic,³⁹ and in rabbinic literature it has a completely different meaning, since it was used to denote a proselyte, the non-Jew converted to Judaism, someone belonging to the chosen people. In the Hebrew Bible this meaning simply does not occur and the word is used to mean “newly arrived,” “immigrant,” “resident” or however the word should be translated (the LXX frequently translates נר as προσήλυτος which presents new problems in respect of rabbinic “convert”). A large number of biblical texts stress the social connotation of the term.

The נר, as a disadvantaged social class, like widows or orphans, is protected: he must be allowed to collect fruit that has fallen to the ground, or prune the vine, or gather ears (of wheat) on the edge of a field, etc. However, this disadvantaged social position is not the most important characteristic of the נר. The Masoretic Text of Deut 24:14 specifies “You shall not exploit a poor or needy day-labourer, whether one of your brothers or someone newly arrived (באדניך או זנרך) who stay in your country and in your cities.” This implies that both the נר and “your brothers” can also be poor but that the two are clearly distinct. The most important connotation of נר is not at the level of social class but in its opposition to אזרח, “native,” “autochthonous,” “citizen” or “indigenous”

³⁸ See K. Berthelot, “La notion de נר dans les textes de Qumrân,” *RevQ* 19/74 (1999): 171–216.

³⁹ For example, compare Lev 17:15 which forbids the *ger* to eat a dead animal, with Deut 14:21 which allows him to eat it or sell it to a foreigner (*nekav*). See the monograph by Ch. van Houten, *The Alien in Israelite Law* (JSOTSup 107; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991).

(which is how the LXX translates: αὐτόχθων). The basic difference between both categories is that the אֲזַרְתָּה belongs to "the sons of Israel," whereas the נֵר does not. In spite of this, priestly legislation would make him equal to an Israelite before the law and like a native, require him to offer sacrifices, observe the sabbath or eat unleavened bread; he can even take part in the passover sacrifice if he is circumcised. As Exod 12:49 says: תורה אחת יהיה לאזרתה ולנר הגר בתוכם "There shall be one law for the native and for the נֵר who dwells among you." Furthermore, a whole series of texts (Num 15:22–26, Deut 29:9–12; 31:10–13; Josh 8:33–35) indicate that the נֵר belong to the "people" (עַם), although not to the "assembly" (קְהִלָּה). When the texts speak of "all Israel," the נָרִים are included, but they can never become בני ישראל. The ethnic barrier cannot be crossed.

Ezek 47:21–23 imagines a future in which the situation may be different, and foretells that both the בני ישראל and the נָרִים "who have engendered sons in your midst" will participate in the future division of the land by lot and that the נָרִים "they will be for you like natives among the sons of Israel" (והיו לכם כאזרתה בבני ישראל). Later, and under the influence of Hellenistic ideas (where one could be a "Greek" citizen even without coming from the Greek γένος, and as a result of the situation of the diaspora (as well as forced or willing "conversions" effected by the Hasmonaean kings), the content of the word would be redefined, and in rabbinic literature it would ultimately mean simply "converts" to the "Jewish religion." A rapid glance at two of the books of the Greek Bible, the First and Second Books of Maccabees, can illustrate this change of view.

In 1 Maccabees, non-Jews are portrayed as fundamentally evil, whereas in 2 Maccabees the gentiles are portrayed neutrally or with a degree of sympathy. The basic difference consists of the conception of their own identity, which differs in the two books.⁴⁰ 1 Maccabees conceives it in purely ethnic terms:⁴¹ if one is a Jew by birth, the opposition between Israel and the nations is insuperable, and therefore in

⁴⁰ See D.R. Schwartz, "The Other in 1 and 2 Maccabees," in *Tolerance and Intolerance in early Judaism and Christianity* (ed. G.N. Stanton and G.G. Stroumsa; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 30–37.

⁴¹ In 1 Maccabees Ἰουδαῖος always means (even in 2:23) "Judaean," an inhabitant of Judaea, whereas in 2 Maccabees sometimes it can mean "Jew;" see S.J.D. Cohen, "Ioudaios: 'Judaean' and 'Jew' in Susanna, First Maccabees, and Second Maccabees," in *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, and P. Schäfer; 3 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 1:211–20.

theory neither conversion nor apostasy is a possible option. Although in 1 Maccabees (in which conversion to Judaism is not possible, the forced conversions of the Hasmonaeans reported by Josephus would occur at a time later than the period covered by the book) there are numerous cases of apostasy: all those Jews considered by the author as “evil” (“the wicked of Israel” as they are called in 6:18 and 7:5) end up “joining the gentiles” (1 Macc 1:15) and end up as non-Jews. And for the author of 1 Maccabees, the catalyst for the Maccabean revolt is the king’s order for “all to become one people” (1 Macc 1:41), something unthinkable when identity is defined exclusively in ethnic terms. Its concept of “being a Jew” is dominated by ancestry and refers to the Jews as a ἔθνος and to non-Jews as τὰ ἔθνη. In 2 Maccabees, instead, to be a Jew is not determined only by ancestry. Ἰουδαῖος has a clear religious meaning in texts such as 2 Macc 6:6 and 7:37. One is a Jew, in the religious sense, not only by belonging to a people but by adherence to “Judaism” (Ἰουδαϊσμός):⁴² “Judas, also called Maccabeus, and his companions were entering the villages secretly, calling those of the same race and enlisting those who had remained in Judaism” (8:1).⁴³ 2 Maccabees, the product of a diaspora where one could be “Greek” even though not coming from the Greek “*genos*,” had thus found a way of surmounting the dualism of 1 Maccabees, also making it possible to cross the boundaries in both directions, in the direction of apostasy and in the direction of conversion. It even went as far as portraying Antiochus Epiphanes on his death-bed (9:13–17) promising not only to declare Jerusalem as free, to rebuild and embellish the temple and to pay for the sacrifices but even makes that persecutor the prototype of the rabbinic נִי: “he would turn Jew and visit every inhabited place, proclaiming God’s might” (9:17), where it is clear that “Jew” does not mean an inhabitant of Judea but refers to religious belief, to belonging to the Jewish religion. Of course, 2 Maccabees is a Greek book, so that it is useless to search it for the word נִי, but it does illustrate beautifully the change of mentality required to be able to speak of “conversion to Judaism.” Once the idea of “religious conversion” has been introduced and accepted, the rabbinic use of the word נִי to denote a “convert” is not only logical but

⁴² A word that occurs for the first time precisely in 2 Maccabees.

⁴³ See also 2 Macc 14:38, where it says of Razis, who was called the “father of the Jews” “Because in the times before the secession he had been taken to court for Judaism and had exposed his body and his life for Judaism with complete constancy.”

perfectly appropriate, in view of the characteristics of the biblical נר who already belonged to an intermediate class in his association with Israel.

This digression on the term נר, perhaps rather long although I hope not completely useless, allows us to establish precisely the meaning of the word נר in the *Damascus Document*. In VI 21 its meaning is the same as in the biblical texts, where the emphasis is on the social attribute of a נר, his poverty, since the text, after requiring that "each one must love his brother like himself" requires each one "to strengthen the hand of the poor, the needy and the נר." The two other uses of the word have been interpreted in very different ways. The text is as follows:

Rule of the session of all the camps. All shall be enlisted by their names: the priests first, the Levites second, the children of Israel third and the נר fourth. And they shall be inscribed by their names, each one after his brother; the priests first, the Levites second, the children of Israel third and the נר fourth. And thus shall they sit and thus shall they be questioned about everything. (CD XIV 3–6)⁴⁴

There is no doubt that this list enumerates the various categories of persons who are members of the group as determined by the regulations of rank that have to be followed in these meetings. Whereas in the *Rule* the Community is composed of only three groups: "the priests will sit down first, the elders next and the remainder of all the people will sit down in order of rank" (1QS VI 8–9), in the *Damascus Document* four categories are distinguished, and the fourth category is the נר. Who were these נר who in the *Damascus Document* are, without any doubt, members of the group? Are they the "non-Jewish residents" of the Hebrew Bible? Or are they pagans converted to Judaism, the "proselytes" of rabbinic literature? Or are they the "novices" of the sect, as they are called by Lignée?⁴⁵

In this case, Philip Davies attributes the meaning proselyte to נר, but a proselyte of the sect, that is, a new member whose initiation process is not complete (termed "novice" by Lignée):⁴⁶

⁴⁴ DSST, 44.

⁴⁵ J. Carmignac, E. Cothenet, H. Lignée, *Les Textes de Qumrân, traduits et annotés II* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1963), 203: "Le GR 'étranger', serait-il le novice? Josephé connaît quatre classes d'Esséniens selon l'ancianité de leurs pratiques."

⁴⁶ P.R. Davies, "The 'Damascus' Sect and Judaism," in *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben-Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (ed. J.C. Reeves and J. Kampen; JSOTSup 184; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 70–84.

The last word could, without consideration of its context, mean either ‘proselyte’ or ‘non-Jew.’ ‘Proselyte’ is surely meant, though a proselyte to the sect, and thus one in the process of initiation into it, who does not yet have a full place in ‘Israel’ or ‘Aaron’ . . . Thus, new entrants to the sect, Jews living among Israel, are regarded analogously to Ezekiel’s non-Jews living among Israel, which would be consistent with the sect regarding itself as the true Israel.⁴⁷

There are two problems with this interpretation:—there is no parallel for this meaning of the word;—and the initiation process of the *Damascus Document* is not comparable to the complex system we find in the *Rule*; since, according to XV 7–8, the candidate is enrolled by oath on the same day that he speaks to the Inspector, which does not leave much margin for the supposed “novitiate” or for being a “proselyte” here.⁴⁸

For other scholars they are clearly “proselytes” in the correct sense, pagans already converted from Judaism, giving the word the meaning that it will have in rabbinic writings. The problem with this interpretation is not only that in the *Damascus Document* another word is used to mean religious conversion (from the root שׁוּב, “to return to, to return” and not the root נָח “to occupy, dwell”) and that the very age of the text makes the existence of the concept at this period questionable, but especially that the *Damascus Document* (as we have seen), although it acknowledges the need to “be converted” and return to the Law of Moses exactly as it was revealed to the members of the group as a requirement for being able to enter the “new covenant,” retains intact the concept of ethnicity (one is Israelite by birth) and is not interested in the fate of the gentiles.

This is why I think that here the word נָח has the same meaning as in most of the texts in the Hebrew Bible and denotes a non-Israelite in origin, a member of the group who belongs to this intermediate category of “resident.” From the viewpoint of the *Damascus Document*, the נָחִים can belong to the “new covenant.” The boundary with “carnal Israel” still cannot be crossed; even after becoming part of the group by freely deciding to submit to the covenant, a נָח continues to be a נָח. However, the boundary with the “true Israel” can be crossed, and a נָח can become a “brother.”

This interpretation seems confirmed by the short list of those excluded for ever from the “new covenant,” in which the נָח does not appear:

⁴⁷ Davies, “The ‘Damascus’ Sect and Judaism,” 75.

⁴⁸ A detail already noted by C. Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document. Sources, Traditions and Redactions* (STDJ 29; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 135.

And no-one stupid or deranged should enter; and anyone feeble-minded or insane, those with sightless eyes, the lame or one who stumbles, or a deaf person, or an under-age boy, none of these should enter the congregation, since the holy angels are in its midst. (CD XV 15–17)⁴⁹

Here we cannot go into this list in detail, nor into its dependence on the list of those excluded from priestly functions in Lev 21:16–23, nor yet compare it with other lists of those excluded from taking part in the eschatological war (in the *War Scroll*, 1QM VII 3–6) or in the eschatological community (in the *Rule of the Congregation*, 1QSa II 3–9), nor examine the motive given, the presence of angels. However, I cannot end this presentation of the attitude towards the “other” in the *Damascus Document* without contrasting it with the attitude adopted by the famous fragment of *4QFlorilegium*,⁵⁰ now considered part of an “eschatological Midrash,”⁵¹ which specifies those who cannot enter the eschatological temple when explaining the quotation from 2 Sam 7:10:

This (refers to) the house which they will establish for him at the end of time, as is written in the book of Moses (Exod 15:17–18): “The temple of YHWH, that your hands established: YHWH shall reign for ever and ever.” This (refers to) the house into which you shall never enter [there is a lacuna in the text which Strugnell reconstructs as: ‘neither the uncircumcised of heart nor the uncircumcised in his flesh’],⁵² neither the Ammonite, or the Moabite, nor the bastard (וּמְזוּר), nor the foreigner (וּבֵן נֹכַר), nor the *ger* (גֵּר), ever; because there are his holy ones. “YHWH will reign for ever.” For ever he will reveal himself over it; foreigners (זָרִים) shall never again lay it waste as they laid waste, at the beginning, the temple of Israel for its sins. (4Q174 1 2–6)⁵³

In this text, not only the ambiguous category of the גֵּר, but the mixed category of מְזוּר, “the bastard,” are relegated, like the בֵּן נֹכַר, to the category of “foreigners,” for which here the word זָרִים is used, which in the Hebrew Bible denotes otherness at all levels.

⁴⁹ DSST, 39.

⁵⁰ Edited by J.M. Allegro, DJD V, 53–57, pl. XIX–XX.

⁵¹ See A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidr-Eschat^{a,b}). Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 (‘Florilegium’) und 4Q177 (‘Catena A’) repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranden* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994) and F. García Martínez, *Literatura Judía Intertestamentaria*, 108–11.

⁵² J. Strugnell, “Notes en marge du Volume V des «Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan»,” *RevQ* 7/26 (1970): 163–276, p. 221, following a suggestion by P.W. Skehan, with reference to Ezek 44:9.

⁵³ DSST, 136.

This text proves that the otherness of the other lies largely in the spectacles through which one looks at them, and the spectacles through which 4Q174 looks at the other, are the spectacles of “the sons of light,” an expression missing from the *Damascus Document*, but explicit in *4QFlorilegium*: “When they come with the plans of Belial to make the sons of light fall” (4Q174 1 8–9). This leads us directly into the second manuscript in which I wish to examine both how the members define themselves and their attitude towards the “other,” the *Rule of the Community*.

To summarise the attitude of the *Damascus Document* towards the “other” we can say that the members of the group consider themselves to belong to a “new covenant” from which are excluded all other Israelites who are unfaithful to the *Torat Moshe* exactly as it had been revealed to them. The borders of this elitist group, to which the covenant made between God and Israel has been transferred, remain open (although temporarily) to all those (including the נְרִיִּם) who freely decide to acknowledge their faults and join the elitist and reformist group that they form, and is “the remnant of Israel.” As CD III 19–20 tells us, God “built for them a safe home in Israel, such as there has not been since ancient times, not even till now. Those who remained steadfast in it will acquire eternal life, and all the glory of Adam is for them.”

2. *The “Other” in the Rule of the Community*

I do not think there can be any doubt that the Community which the *Damascus Document* addresses is related in some way to the Community to which we owe the *Rule of the Community*.⁵⁴ Nor do I think that there can be any doubt that, although closely related, the two communities

⁵⁴ The copy from Cave 1 was published by M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery. Volume II, Fascicle 2: Plates and Transcription of the The Manual of Discipline* (New Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research, 1951). The edition by E. Qimron and J.H. Charlesworth, “Rule of the Community,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck/Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 1–54, is more recent. The best photographs of this manuscript are in the multilingual edition edited by J.H. Charlesworth, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Rule of the Community. Photographic Multi-Lingual Edition* (Philadelphia: The American Interfaith Institute/World Alliance, 1996). The copies from Cave 4 were published by P.S. Alexander and G. Vermes, DJD XXVI. The edition used here is our own, *DSSSE*, 1:68–99 (1QS) and 1:510–45 (4QS). For a short introduction to the *Rule of the Community*, see F. García Martínez, “Textos de Qumrán,” in *Literatura judía intertestamentaria*, 38–45.

are different.⁵⁵ So it is not at all unusual that the definition of themselves that we find in the *Rule* is different from the one in the *Damascus Document*, and that there are different boundaries with the "other" in the *Rule*.⁵⁶

In the *Rule* we do not find a concept of the "new covenant," which gives structure to the self-identification of the group of the *Damascus Document*. The group of the *Rule*, which exhibits a much more accentuated sectarian awareness that does the group of the *Damascus Document*, prefers other metaphors and uses other expressions to indicate its self-understanding, such as "the elect," members of the "community" (יהד), or the "sons of light." This does not mean that the concept of "covenant" is not found very much in the *Rule* (the word occurs 32 times). But the meaning is different from the one that the word has in the *Damascus Document*. The *Rule* does not explicitly set the history of the Community in the context of the history of Israel, as does the *Damascus Document*, but instead expresses a theology of the "covenant" in which the personal decision of joining the group and separating from the others is the main referent.⁵⁷ This element was one of the components of the concept of the "covenant" in the *Damascus Document* but in the *Rule* it is much more prominent, to the point of seeming almost exclusive.

In the *Rule* there is no mention of the "covenant of the fathers." There are very few references to the "covenant of God" (V 8 and X 10), and both these and the larger number of references to "his covenant," in which the pronoun refers to the God of column V (V 11, 18, 19, 22 [2×]), refer to the covenant established between God and the members of the Community, the covenant for which the initiation ceremony is described at the beginning of the *Rule* (1QS I 16–III 12) and there is called simply ברית הוזה "this covenant." The most frequent

⁵⁵ The exact relationships between both communities is still the subject of discussion and the bibliography on the subject is enormous. For a summary of the various positions see S. Metso, "Constitutional Rules at Qumran," and C. Hempel, "Community Structures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Admission, Organization, Disciplinary Procedures," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. Flint and J. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999), respectively 1:186–210 and 2:67–92. The most recent study on the topic is E. Regev "The *yahad* and the *Damascus Covenant*: Structure, Organization and Relationship," *RevQ* 21/82 (2003): 233–62.

⁵⁶ P.R. Davies, "The Torah at Qumran," in *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part 5 Volume 2: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systemic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. World View, Comparing Judaism* (ed. A.J. Avery-Peck, J. Neusner, and B. Chilton; HdO Section One 57; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 23–44: "The scriptural distinction between 'Israel' and 'gentiles' is, from the perspective of the *yahad*, theologically almost irrelevant compared to that between those inside and those outside the realm of God's saving 'mystery'." (p. 36).

⁵⁷ See the studies mentioned in note 27.

uses of the word are those that indicate the “covenant” as a relationship into which the members of the group enter (eight times with the verb **בוא** and another six with the verb **עבר**), either that they establish, or in which they remain steadfast, or from which the unfaithful members keep apart, or which is maintained by the sons of Zadok.⁵⁸ In effect, the word **ברית** functions practically in the *Rule* as the name the group gave themselves, in parallel to the word **יהד**, which is their most frequent name for themselves.⁵⁹

Particularly interesting are the times in which both words appear together, since the alternation of formulae shows us that they are used as synonyms: “In this way he will be admitted by means of atonement pleasing to God, and for him it will be the covenant of an everlasting Community” (והיתה לו לברית יהד עולמים) (III 11–12). “No-one should walk in the stubbornness of his heart in order to go astray following his heart and his eyes and the musings of his inclination. Instead he should circumcise in the Community the foreskin of his tendency and of his stiff neck in order to lay a foundation of truth for Israel, for the Community of the eternal covenant” (ליהד ברית עולם) (V 4–6). “And anyone of the men of the Community, the covenant of the Community, (וכול איש מאנשי) היהד ברית היהד who shuns anything at all” (VIII 16–17).

The “spiritualization” of the sign of the covenant of Israel (circumcision) and its transformation into an activity that takes place within the Community, is particularly noteworthy as an indication of the transformation of the concept of covenant effected within the group.⁶⁰

The only purpose of this covenant is perfect observance of the divine will:

⁵⁸ See Christiansen, “The Consciousness of Belonging to God’s Covenant.”

⁵⁹ This conclusion had already been reached by A.S. Kapelrud, “Der Bund in den Qumran-Schriften,” in *Bibel und Qumran: Beiträge zur Erforschung der Beziehungen zwischen Bibel- und Qumranwissenschaft. Hans Bardtke zum 22.9.1966* (ed. S. Wagner; Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1968), 137–49. See also N. Ilg, “Überlegungen zum Verständnis von **ברית** in den Qumrāntexten,” in *Qumrān. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Paris-Gembloux: Duculot/Leuven: University Press, 1978), 257–64.

⁶⁰ As noted by P.R. Davies, “The Torah at Qumran,” 35: “It is a covenant with a group, and every new adherent of the group must individually “enter the covenant.” It is an elective covenant, entered after conversion (hence the use of the verb *shub*, which connotes repentance as well as return); and it is a sectarian covenant, since it excludes those outside the group who do not “return” or “repent” and yet would also call themselves “Israel” and claim allegiance to the covenant.”

And all those who enter the Rule of the Community shall establish a covenant before God in order to carry out all that he commands and in order not to stray from following him for any fear, dread or grief that might occur during the dominion of Belial. (1QS I 16–18)⁶¹

This divine will is expressed in the Law, the Torah. It implies some continuity with the Sinaitic covenant, since the Law is nothing less than the “Law of Moses” (תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה). But in the *Rule*, even more clearly than in the *Damascus Document*, understanding of this *Torat Moshe* is completely changed by how it is interpreted within the Community. The *Torat Moshe* to which the members of the Community must “return” is an “interpreted” Torah, a Law that only the guardians of the covenant know, thanks to the revelation received.

Whoever enters the council of the Community enters the covenant of God in the presence of all who freely volunteer. He shall swear⁶² with a binding oath to revert to the Law of Moses with all that it decrees, with whole heart and whole soul, in compliance with all that has been revealed concerning it to the sons of Zadok, the Priests who keep the covenant and interpret his will (הַכֹּהֲנִים שׁוֹמְרֵי הַבְּרִית וְדוֹרְשֵׁי רִצְוֹנוֹ), and to the multitude of the men of their covenant (בְּרִיתָם) who freely volunteer together for his truth and to walk according to his will (וְלַאֲמַתּוֹ יִהְיוּ לְאִמְתּוֹ) (V 7–10)⁶³

In this text (as in VI 19: “And if the lot results in him joining the foundations of the Community according to the priests and the majority of the men of the covenant”) the word בְּרִית occurs with the third person plural suffix: בְּרִיתָם. The most logical interpretation seems to be that this suffix refers to the priests, the nearest plural antecedent. The specification in 1QS that it is precisely the priests who receive the revelation of the interpretation of the Law emphasises that the Community understood itself to be a “priestly” community. Instead, in 4Q258 (one of the copies of the *Rule* from Cave 4) the recipients of this revelation are all those who enter the Community. The text parallel to the one cited from 1QS (4Q258 I 5–7) says: “And whoever enters the council of the

⁶¹ DSST, 3.

⁶² Literally “he will impose on his soul” יִקַּם עַל נַפְשׁוֹ.

⁶³ DSST, 8. Two of the copies from Cave 4 (4Q256 and 4Q258) contain a high number of interesting variants in this case. See the monographs C. Martone, *La ‘Regola della Comunità’. Edizione critica* (Quaderni di Henoch 8; Turin: Silvio Zamorani, 1995) and S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997), as well as the detailed commentaries and comparative tables in the edition of the first columns of 4Q258 by Alexander and Vermes, DJD XXVI, 90–98.

Community shall make a binding promise to return to the Law of Moses with all that it decrees, with all his heart and soul (according to) all that has been revealed about the Law for those of the council of the men of the Community.” Both in the more theocratic system of 1QS and in the more democratic system of 4Q258,⁶⁴ what really counts is that the Law to which the members of the Community are converted is the interpreted Law.

The copy of the *Rule* from Cave 1 begins with the description of the ceremony of entry into this covenant, a ceremony that is performed each year and in which the promise made on entry is renewed. In this text, the group’s understanding of themselves and their attitude towards the “other,” is very clear and also shows us the principle on which this attitude is based:

In order to welcome into the covenant of kindness all those who freely volunteer to carry out God’s decrees, so as to be united in the counsel of God and walk in perfection in his sight, complying with all revealed things concerning the regulated times of their stipulations; in order to love all the sons of light, each one according to his lot in God’s plan, and to detest all the sons of darkness, each in accordance with his blame in God’s vindication. (1QS I 7–10)⁶⁵

Here the “covenant” into which one enters is qualified as a ברית חסד, which, since the covenant entails promises and obligations, we can translate as “covenant of faithfulness.”⁶⁶ The attitude towards the “other” is absolutely clear: to love “the sons of light” and to hate “the sons of darkness.” Here the distinction between “us” and the “others” is absolute, detached from any principle of ethnicity.

The division is not established at the level of Israel and the other peoples but at the level of good and evil people, light and darkness. On the one hand are those who have entered this covenant and on the other all the rest (whether or not they are “sons of Abraham”). At least this is the logical outcome of the attitude of the *Rule*, although in fact the text works from a different perspective and does not draw the conclusions that it should.

⁶⁴ See G. Vermes, “The Leadership of the Qumran Community: Sons of Zadok—Priests—Congregation,” in *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*, 375–84.

⁶⁵ *DSST*, 3.

⁶⁶ Christiansen, “The Consciousness of Belonging to God’s Covenant,” 91.

The principle by which the *Rule* expresses its attitude towards "others" is the principle of dualism set out in columns three and four, which in essence says that from God downwards, all reality (both the angelic world and the world of men and even each man's heart) is divided into two camps, one of light and the other of darkness, created as such directly by God, and that belonging to one or other camp depends on the divine will, which has determined it that way from eternity and is therefore independent of both sacred history and human will.⁶⁷ But in the ceremony of entry into the covenant, although insisting that everything happens in the age of Belial, and therefore in the perspective of creation in which both good and evil come directly from God, as explained in columns three and four, the "curses" and the "blessings" of the covenant are in fact worded from a purely inner-Jewish perspective:

The priests shall recite (sing?) the just deeds of God in his mighty works, and they shall proclaim all his merciful favours towards Israel. And the Levites shall recite the sins of children of Israel, all their blameworthy transgressions and their sins during the dominion of Belial. (I 21–24)⁶⁸

What the Levites are going to curse are the "sons of Israel" and their sins. Of course, these curses must be extended *a fortiori* to all blame-worthy and sinful non-Israelites. But the text does not draw this conclusion. What lies beyond the boundary of Israel apparently does not interest them at all. Although the curses that follow are directed expressly against "all the men of the lot of Belial," without any restrictions, in fact they concern Israelites who have not entered the covenant of the Community:

And the Levites shall curse all the men of the lot of Belial. They shall begin to speak and shall say: Accursed are you for all your wicked, blame-worthy deeds. May he (God) hand you over to dread, into the hands of those carrying out acts of vengeance. Accursed, without mercy, for the darkness of your deeds, and sentenced to the gloom of everlasting fire. May God not be merciful to you when you entreat him, nor pardon you when you do penance for your faults. May He lift the countenance of his anger to avenge himself on you, and may there be no peace for you in the mouth of those who intercede. (IQS II 4–9)⁶⁹

⁶⁷ See F. García Martínez, "Dualismo y el origen del mal," in *Para comprender los Manuscritos del Mar Muerto*, 103–18.

⁶⁸ *DSST*, 3.

⁶⁹ *DSST*, 4.

It seems to me that the *Rule's* perspective is purely between Jews, as indicated not only by the express mention of the “sons of Israel” before the curses but also by the identification of the categories of members that make up the Community (co-extensive with “the sons of light”) and that are expressed by the categories of “sons of Israel” (“priests, Levites, and all the people of the Rule” [II 21]) or of “the remainder of all the people” (VI 9) who are the non-priestly members of the Community, called “sons of Israel” in these texts and in V 22 as “the majority of Israel.” Also clear, it seems to me, are the specifications given in the description of the “others,” explaining why they cannot belong to the covenant:

He should swear by the covenant to be segregated from all the men of sin who walk along paths of irreverence. For they are not included in his covenant, since they have neither sought nor examined his decrees in order to learn the hidden matters in which they err by their own fault and because they treated revealed matters with disrespect; this is why wrath will rise up for judgment in order to effect revenge by the curses of the covenant, in order to administer fierce punishments for everlasting annihilation without there being any remnant. (1QS V 10–13)⁷⁰

The reference to “hidden matters” (הנסתרות) that have not been examined and the “revealed matters” (הנגלות) that the “others” practise insolently, is a clear allusion to the two aspects of the *Torat Moshe*, the text in common with the other Jews and the revealed interpretation within the Community. Thus, in spite of the *Treatise of the Two Spirits*, the “other” to whom the members of the Community are opposed are the other sons of Israel, Jews like themselves, who do not belong to the Community.⁷¹

The radical nature of this opposition to the “other” is evident in the transformation of a large number of words that in the Hebrew Bible indicated relationships among the members of Israel at the family, tribal or national level, but are used in the *Rule* exclusively to indicate relationships among the members of the Community.

⁷⁰ *DSST*, 8.

⁷¹ Collins, “The Construction of Israel in Sectarian Rule Books,” 37, expresses this conclusion admirably: “The Sons of Light never encompass all the Israelites, but there is no suggestion that they include any gentiles. The dualism of light and darkness is fundamentally different from the opposition of Israel and the nations, but the difference is not explored or developed in a consistent way. It was attractive to the sectarians as a way of explaining why much of Israel deviated from the way of truth, as they saw it. In the end, however, the identity of the sectarians was deeply rooted in the traditions of Israel, and consequently the dualism of light and darkness has only an occasional and subordinate role in the scrolls.”

A good example is the use of אָח "brother," which in the *Rule* denotes a fully-fledged member, one who has fully completed the entry process: "they shall enter him in the *Rule* according to his rank among his brothers for the law, for the judgment, for purity and for the placing of his possessions in common." (VI 22) and is strictly synonymous with רֵעַ "fellow": "No-one should talk during the speech of his fellow before his brother has finished speaking." (VI 10). Even more remarkable is the restriction of this word רֵעַ, since in the 22 times that it is used in the *Rule* this "fellow" is exclusively a fellow-member; the relational dimension of the word remains, but only within the sphere of "us." The "others" are not fellowmen.

The same appropriation occurs with many other key terms such as "elect" (בְּחִירָה) In the *Rule*, its use is not so conspicuous as in other manuscripts (in which the Community would even be called עֵדוּת בְּחִירָה, "the congregation of his elect")⁷² but the three times that the word is used (1QS VIII 6; IX 14 and XI 16) the "elect" are the members of the Community. The only relationship possible with the "others" is one of hatred: "Everlasting hatred for the men of the pit in clandestine spirit." (IX 22)

With these premisses it is easy to understand the option in the *Rule* to break all contact with the "sons of darkness" by physical separation from the "others." And this is what the Qumran Community did, withdrawing to the shores of the Dead Sea, to live their own "covenant" there, a life of absolute faithfulness to the Torah, far from all the "sons of the pit." At the beginning of column 5 of the manuscript from Cave 1, which at least in 4Q258 is the beginning of the composition, we are told:

This is the *Rule* for the men of the Community who freely volunteer to convert from all evil and to keep themselves steadfast in all he prescribes in compliance with his will. They should keep apart from men of sin in order to constitute a Community in law and possessions, and acquiesce to the authority of the sons of Zadok, the priests who safeguard the covenant, and to the authority of the multitude of the men of the Community, those who persevere steadfastly in the covenant. (1QS V 1–3)⁷³

To keep themselves faithful to the covenant they were left with no other solution except to cut off all contact with the "others," including "the

⁷² 4Q164 1 3; 4Q171 1–2 ii 5; 1, 3–4 iii 5.

⁷³ *DSST*, 8.

congregation of the men of sin.” The use of the word עדה (“congregation”) in this context, as referring to what the men of the Community should “keep apart” from, is very significant and one of the reasons why I think that the Qumran Community kept apart not only from Jerusalem and the temple but from the Essene movement from which it originally came.⁷⁴ But this is not too important here. And in fact, in another key passage, which is very similar, the word עדה is replaced by “dwelling” (בִּישׁוּב):

And when these exist / as a community / in Israel /in compliance with these arrangements / they are to be segregated from within the dwelling of the men of sin to walk to the desert in order to open there His path. As it is written: «In the desert, prepare the way of ****, straighten in the steppe a roadway for our God». (1QS VIII 13–14)⁷⁵

The reference to Isaiah and to the desert tells us that the Community of the *Rule* also invented for itself a historical memory in which Israel is still in exile and in which they themselves, “the sons of light,” comprise the ideal “Israel” which makes possible the restoration and return to the land that God would perform by means of it. The “covenant” which is the Community defines its objectives as follows:

to implement truth, justice, judgment, compassionate love and unassuming behaviour of each person to his fellow, to preserve faithfulness on the earth with firm purpose and repentant spirit, in order to atone for sin, doing justice and undergoing trials in order to walk with everyone in the measure of truth and the regulation of time. When these things exist in Israel, the Community council shall be founded on truth, like an everlasting plantation, a holy house for Israel and the foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron, true witnesses for the judgment and chosen by the will (of God) to atone for the earth and to render the wicked their retribution. (1QS VIII 2–7)⁷⁶

The aim of the Community established in the desert is, evidently, to make it possible for its members to live the “covenant” by perfect conduct. But what most attracts attention in this passage is the insistence on the atoning function of the Community: “to atone for sin,” “to atone for the earth.”

The original function of the temple and its sacrifices has been transferred to the Community, which defines itself as a temple (“holy house

⁷⁴ See my articles cited in note 17.

⁷⁵ *DSST*, 12.

⁷⁶ *DSST*, 12.

[בית קודש] for Israel and foundation of the holy of holies [סוד קודש] [קודשים] for Aaron") and so replaces the Temple of Jerusalem. To this temple, which is the Community, the "other," "the wicked," have no entry. The function of the Community towards them is as agent of the divine punishment they deserve: "to render them their retribution." Both aspects are combined in summary form a little further on, in an interlinear addition to line 10, that specifies the function of the "covenant according to the eternal precepts": "to atone for the earth and to determine the judgment of the wicked."

From this "covenant," then, the "other" is completely excluded and must not have any relationship at all with it. The physical separation from the "other," the move to the desert, is the ultimate consequence of the radical form of the sectarian self-understanding of the Community, for which every "other" is wicked.

In other Qumran texts, such as the *Rule of the Congregation* and the *War Scroll*, this utopian "Israel" that is the Community and that now represents exclusively the ideal Israel wanted by God, will end, at the end of time, by being co-extensive with Israel, by including "the whole congregation of Israel" (כול עדה ישראל). When God engenders the Messiah in the Community, and when, with the help of the angelic forces, all "the sons of darkness" have been completely destroyed and annihilated, Israel will comprise exclusively "the sons of light," and "the exiles of the desert" will be able to return to Jerusalem and live in perfect harmony with the angels with no need to be separated from anyone. The "other" will no longer exist, it will have received its "retribution" and its "judgment." And "we" will be the eschatological Israel who will live in perfect observance of the Law.

Even though the dualistic thought of the *Rule* implies both the suppression of the concept of the chosen people and of the Law as an instrument of salvation, the *Rule* does not draw these conclusions.⁷⁷

⁷⁷ In the words of Collins, "The Construction of Israel in Sectarian Rule Books," 42: "Followed to its logical conclusion, this dualistic theology might have yielded a definition of Israel as a purely ethical, voluntary community, where ethnicity, and even particularistic revelation of the Torah, was of no account. Hellenistic Jewish writers such as Philo often speak as if Israel should be understood in this way but nonetheless retain both ethnicity and the literal Torah as a data of Israel's identity. Early Christianity would go further in redefining "the Israel of God" as independent of considerations of ethnicity and the Torah. The scrolls, ultimately, are not so radical. Their definition of Israel remains rooted firmly in the Torah, however sharply they might disagree with their contemporaries over its interpretation."

Ultimately, neither the concept of “ethnicity” nor the concept of faithfulness to the historical Torah are abandoned completely in Qumran. This step would be taken later, from different perspectives, by the New Testament.

CHAPTER TWELVE

CREATION IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

The topic of creation in the Dead Sea Scrolls can be approached from many different perspectives. A few years ago, we concentrated on the “micro level,” on the two parallel accounts of the creation of man and woman in Genesis and on its interpretation.¹ The idea of this year’s meeting was to focus on the “macro creation,” and my task was to examine how the “creation” on this level has been interpreted in the Scrolls. To me this implies a certain level of abstraction, of going a step further than the narrative of the biblical text of Genesis in which God’s creative action is described using the verb ברא, but where we do not find an abstract name to designate the divine action or all things created. In fact, this level of abstraction, if we may judge from the absence of a name for the results of God’s creative act in a general way or this action in itself, is absent from the entire Hebrew Bible, with the exception perhaps of Num 16:30, which is a notoriously problematic verse.

1. *The abstract substantive for “creation” in the biblical texts*

Within the discourse of Moses which precedes the punishment of Dathan and Abiram, the MT put the following words in the mouth of Moses:²

[I]f these men die as all men do, if their lot is the common fate of all mankind, it was not the Lord who sent me to do all these things; ואם בריאה ואם בריאה יהיה, ³ so that the ground opens its mouth and swallows them up with all that belongs to them, and they go down alive into Sheol, you shall know that these men have spurned the Lord. (Num 16:29–30)

The problematic phrase, ואם בריאה יברא יהיה, can be literally translated: “If the Lord will create a creation,” if we ascribe בריאה the meaning

¹ G.P. Luttikhuisen (ed.), *The Creation of Man and Woman: Interpretation of Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian traditions* (TBN 3; Leiden: Brill, 2000).

² According to the JPS translation.

³ “But if the Lord brings about something unheard of” according to the JPS translation.

the word has in later rabbinic Hebrew, where the basic word to designate “creation” has the abstraction level we are looking for.⁴ But this meaning does not seem to make much sense in the biblical context of Numbers.⁵

The LXX, in Rahlfs’ edition, gives as a translation: ἄλλ’ ἢ ἐν φάσματι δείξει κύριος, “But if the Lord will show in a wonder,” or something similar, since the meaning of φάσμα, as given in Liddell & Scott, varies from “apparition, phantom, a sign from heaven, portent,” to “monster or prodigy.”⁶ Other Greek manuscripts read ἐν χάσματι δείξει which seems to me a simple (and later) adaptation to the context, what we could call a rendering *ad sensum*, χάσμα meaning precisely “chasms, gulf, gapping mouth, or generally any wide opening,” and being thus quite well adapted to the story that follows. Maybe for this reason the *New English Bible* translates simply: “But if the Lord makes a great chasm.”

Kittel’s edition of the *Biblia Hebraica* proposes to correct the Hebrew according to the Greek and to read: ברֵאשִׁי יֵרָאֶה “will show in my seeing,” a conjecture retained with a question mark in the *Stuttgartensia*, although this edition is less prone to textual corrections than its predecessor, which indicates that the masoretic reading is indeed problematic. Unfortunately, this unique mention of ברֵאשִׁי is lacking in the Qumran manuscripts of Numbers, since not one manuscript has preserved the passage, which deprives us of the possibility of deciding on the matter.⁷

⁴ As does B.A. Levine, *Numbers 1–20* (AB 4A; Garden City: Doubleday, 1993), 408, who translates “But if YHWH creates [a special] creation.”

⁵ Howard E. Hanson, “Num. XVI 30 and the Meaning of bara’,” *VT* 22 (1972): 353–59, which proposes to give the verb בָּרָא here the primary meaning of “to cut,” and translates “But if the Lord splits open a crevice.” See further J. Körner, “Die Bedeutung der Wurzel bara im Alten Testament,” *OLZ* 64 (1969): 533–40, and M. Miguéns, “BR’ and Creation in the Old Testament,” *LASBF* 24 (1974): 38–69, which traces the semantic development of the verb through the whole Hebrew Bible. R.J. Clifford and J.J. Collins, *Creation in the Biblical Traditions* (CBQMS 24; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1992), 140–42 contains a well-chosen bibliography on the topic.

⁶ LSJ, 1919. In *Le Pentateuque: La Bible d’Alexandrie* (Paris: Cerf, 2001), 382, G. Dorival translates: “Seulement le Seigneur fera montre d’un prodige” and adds in a note: “TM: «Si YHWH crée une création», peut être au sens d’une chose nouvelle, un prodige” (p. 775).

⁷ A total of 11 manuscripts of the Hebrew texts have been recovered from the different collections: 1Q3 frags. 8–21 (1QpaleoNum) published by D. Barthélemy, *DJD* I, 53–54; 2Q6–9 (2QNum^{a-d}) published by M. Baillet, *DJD* III, 57–60; 4Q23 (4QLev-Num^a) published by E. Ulrich, *DJD* XII, 153–76; 4Q27 (4QNum^b) edited by J. Nastram, *DJD* XII, 205–67; Mur 1 published by J.T. Milik, *DJD* II, 78; 5/6Hev 1a, XHev/Se 1 published by P. Flint, *DJD* XXVIII, 137–40 and 173–77; and 34 Se 2 published by M. Morgenstern, *DJD* XXXVIII, 209, as well as a copy of LXX Numbers, 4Q121, edited by P. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J.E. Sanderson, *DJD* IX, 187–94.

Be that as it may, it is clear that this single use of the abstract substantive for “creation” in the biblical texts is not without its problems. And we may conclude that the abstraction level we are looking for was not yet reached in the Biblical text.⁸

2. *Ben Sira and the Targumim*

This level may be present in Ben Sira. In 16:16, MS A from the Genizah reads in Beentjes’s edition:⁹ רַחֲמָיו יִרְאוּ לְכֹל בְּרִיּוֹתָיו, which is translated by Skehan and Di Lella as “His mercy was seen by all his creatures.”¹⁰ We find here בְּרִיּוֹתָיו, the plural of בְּרִיאָה, used (as in later rabbinic literature) to designate the results of the creative act of God, the creatures. But some uncertainty also remains in this case since this verse is absent from the Greek I and from the Latin translations, and we cannot confirm its antiquity nor exclude the intrusion of later vocabulary.¹¹

The targumim, of course, have no problems with the meaning of the word in Num 16:30, and they understand it in the meaning the word בְּרִיאָה has in rabbinical literature. They are, of course, too late to be of interest for our purpose, but a quick look at them, nevertheless, is helpful in understanding an important element of the interpretation of creation we will find in the scrolls: that many other things not expressly mentioned in the narrative of Genesis were also created in the first week.

Onqelos, as usual, remains the closest to the MT. Neofiti¹² translates “But if the Lord creates a *new* creature,” adding thus the word הַדְּרָהָה, and reflecting the interpretation which was current in rabbinical circles and is already reflected in Jerome’s translation in the Vulgate “Sin autem

⁸ I do not think that the correction of MT לְבְרִיתָה (“upon the covenant”) of Ps 74:20 into לְבְרִיּוֹתָה (“upon the creation”) proposed by Kittel is needed, nor Dahood’s emendation into *l’binateka* (“upon your temple”) (M. Dahood, *Psalms II: 51–100* [AB 17; Garden City: Doubleday, 1968], 208) since the Hebrew text makes perfect sense as it is.

⁹ P.C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of all Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and A Synopsis of all Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* (VTSup 68; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 46.

¹⁰ P.W. Skehan and A.A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 37; Garden City: Doubleday, 1987), 268.

¹¹ “These two verses (15–16) are present in MS A, in Greek II, and in Syr; they are not vouched for by GI or Lat, and represent a late expansion of the text,” conclude Skehan and Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 270.

¹² A. Diez Macho, *MS. Neophytií I. Tomo IV. Números* (Textos y Estudios 10; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1971), 157.

novam rem fecerit dominus.” But in the margin of the Neofiti manuscript appears a completely different interpretation of the biblical text which can be rendered: “If from the days of the world,¹³ death was created in the world, behold it is a good thing for this world; if not, let it be created now; and let (the earth) open, . . .”¹⁴ The meaning of this interpretation is not obvious, but it seems to imply that the new thing created by God to which the main text alludes is nothing other than death, which if it had not been created by God from the beginning would have been created specially for the punishment of the two rebels. This is at least what the translation of Pseudo-Jonathan explicitly says,¹⁵ of which Neofiti Margin in my view represents a garbled reflection:

And if the death has not been created for them (לֹא אִתְּבְרִיית מִתּוֹהֵא לְהוֹן), from the days of the (beginning of) the world it is created for them now (כְּדוֹן תְּחַבְרִי לְהוֹן), and if a mouth has not been created for the earth (פּוּם לְאֶרֶץ) from its beginning, it is created for it now; and the earth shall open the mouth and shall swallow them up and all that is theirs, etc.¹⁶

Pseudo-Jonathan is here alluding to the well-known rabbinic midrash of the ten things that were created at twilight between the sixth day and the Sabbath,¹⁷ a midrash he curiously does not place when translating Num 16:32 (although he faithfully translates the expression partially omitted by the LXX, וּפְתַחַה אֶרֶץ יְהוָה פּוּמָה), but in Num 22:28 (the episode of the ass of Balaam, the last of the wonderful things created in its list):

¹³ Or “from eternity” (מִן וְמִי [יְוִמִי עֲלָמָא]).

¹⁴ Translation by M. McNamara, in Diez Macho, *MS. Neophyti I. Tomo IV. Números*, 562.

¹⁵ I use the edition by T. Martínez Sáiz and A. Diez Macho (eds.), *Biblia Polyglotta Matritensis. Series IV; Targum Palestinense in Pentateuchum. Additur Targum Pseudojonathan ejusque hispanica versio. L. 4 Numeri* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1977), 157.

¹⁶ Translation by E.G. Clarke in *Targum Neofiti I: Numbers. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Numbers* (M. McNamara and E.G. Clarke; The Aramaic Bible 4; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995, 235).

¹⁷ The enumeration of the ten things that were created at twilight occurs often in rabbinic literature and is found in at least five different forms depending on the way these marvellous things are grouped. In *Pirke Abot* 5:6 and *Pirke R. El.* 19:1 “the mouth of the earth” is the first thing enumerated in the list. A.J. Saldarini, *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan (Abbot de Rabbi Nathan Version B)* (SJLA 11; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 306–10 contains a very useful appendix on the different lists and show clearly that the lists of *Abot R. Nat.* 37 and the list of *tg. Ps.-J. Num* 22:28 “have no close similarity in groupings or overall pattern to any of the list or to each other.”

Ten things were created after the world was established, with the coming in of the Sabbath between the suns: the manna, the well, Moses' staff, the diamond, the rainbow, the clouds of Glory, the earth's mouth, the writing of the tables of the covenant, the demons, and the mouth of the speaking ass.¹⁸

3. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*

Thus, except for the dubious usage in Ben Sira, the earliest attestations of the use of the word that will become the standard word in later Hebrew to designate both the creative act by God (the singular noun *בריאה*, “the creation”) and the results of this creative act (its plural *ברייאות*, “the creatures”) are found in the Dead Sea Scrolls.¹⁹ Of course, the use of the verb *ברא* to indicate God's creative action is overwhelming within the Hebrew Bible, and the derivation of the abstract substantive from it poses no particular problems. We cannot thus rule out that the word was already used before the time of the Scrolls. But it is a curious fact that in the Hebrew Bible the abstract word “creator” is never expressed with the participle of *ברא*, but with the participles of other roots, *יוצר* (Jer 10:16; 51:19; Sir 51:12), *עשה* (Isa 22:11; 27:11; 44:2; 51:13; 54:5; Hos 8:14; Amos 4:13; 5:8; Ps 115:5; 121:2; 124:8; 134:3; 136: 4; Job 4:17; 35:10; Prov 14:31; 17:5; 22:1), or *פעל* (Job 36:3), for example.

This may or may not explain why the word *בריאה* and its plural *ברייאות* are not used. But the fact remains that in the literature known to us they are attested for the first time in the Scrolls. And this proves in my opinion that the level of abstraction we are looking for was already reached at Qumran.

Therefore I will first offer an overview of the uses of (1) *ברייאות* and (2) *בריאה* in the Scrolls. Afterwards I will examine (3) a short hymn included in 11QP^s^a, most probably of non-sectarian origin, entitled *Hymn of the Creator*.²⁰

¹⁸ Translation by Clarke, 254.

¹⁹ M.G. Abegg, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 1:157–58 lists 52 occurrences of the verb *ברא*, and 23 occurrences of the noun *בריא* or *ברייאה*, of which 18 in the singular and 6 in the plural (*ברייאות*).

²⁰ I will leave for another occasion the analysis of the use of the creation story of Genesis in a typical Qumran composition, the first column of the Sukenik edition of the *Hodayot* (column IX in the new numbering of the *Hodayot*) and the study of three aspects of creation in the *Treatise of the Two Spirits*: the creation of man (1QS III 17–18), the creation of the spirits (1QS III 25) and the new creation (1QS IV 25).

3.1 הבריאות: “the creatures”

Let us start with the uses of הבריאות in the Scrolls.²¹ Some of the uses cannot be exploited because of the lack of concrete context. In 4Q181 2 10,²² for example, the last preserved word of the fragment, which because of the large margin could have preserved the beginning of the composition called *Ages of Creation*, is certainly בריאות, but the word is without context and incomplete. The editor reads it as if it had a feminine suffix בריאותיה “her creatures,” but as Strugnell observes, the word could equally be read with a plural suffix בריאותיהם “their creatures.”²³ But we cannot say anything about its concrete meaning, nor ascertain to whom the suffix refers. Even less can be concluded from the single occurrence registered in the indexes of *4QInstruction* and translated by “His creatures” by the editors.²⁴ The reading is most uncertain, and the form of the orthography of the word (without *yod*) equally uncertain.²⁵ In the rest of the occurrences, the meaning seems to be all inclusive, alluding to everything God has created, and we can consequently translate the plural as “creatures.”

(a) Fragment 3 of one of the copies of *4QBerakhot* (4Q287 3) has preserved part of an interesting blessing, which I quote in the translation of the editor, Bilha Nitzan:²⁶

1. [in] their [awes]ome deeds, and they will bless Your holy name with blessings of [... the holiest of the holy ones]
2. [And] all creatures of flesh (בריאות הבשר), all those [You] created (כולמה אשר בראתה) [will ble]ss you...

²¹ 4Q181 2 10; 4Q216 V 9; 4Q266 10 ii 10; 4Q287 3 2; 4Q416 1 7; 4Q504 1–2 vii 9.

²² Edited by J. Allegro, DJD V, 79–80, pl. XVIII.

²³ J. Strugnell, “Notes en marge du volume V des «Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan»,” *RevQ* 7/26 (1970): 163–276, esp. 255. This is the reading adopted by J.J.M. Robert in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 2. Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; PTS-DSSP 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck / Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 208, who translates “their creations.”

²⁴ 4Q416 1 17, edited by J. Strugnell and D.J. Harrington, DJD XXXIV, 81, pl. III. The editors register the word as such in the Concordance to the volume (550), suggesting that the word is possibly “a participle נבראתי *Nip'al*; the *Nip'al* of ברא occurs once in the Bible, but at least three more times in the 1–11Q texts” (88).

²⁵ The substantive is read by E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstruction the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 176.

²⁶ DJD XI, 54.

3. [...ca]ttle and birds and creeping things and fish of the [s]eas and all... [
 4. [...Y]ou created them all anew [...(אתה בראתה את כולמה מחדש)].

This blessing, obviously based on the narratives of Genesis, and combining 1:24–26 with other passages as shown by the vocabulary, has several interesting features. It designates the creatures as such, using the plural בריאות, and specifically connecting this name with the creative act of God בראתה. It designates all the creatures as “creatures of flesh,” which could be read in the light of the peculiar meaning of “flesh” in the Scrolls,²⁷ although in this case the expression could be simply a way of distinguishing these creatures from the angelic ones mentioned in the first line (“the holiest of the holy ones”), according to the editor, who thinks the fragment may overlap in this way with frag. 12 of 4Q286. The fragment specifies further that these creatures have been created anew (מחדש), which could also be interpreted in the light of the new creation theology (the עשות חדשה of 1QS IV 25, for example), but which most probably means simply that creation is the very beginning of the creatures, or may allude to the creatures born after the flood, as Nitzan suggests.

(b) In column seven of the first copy of the composition known as *4QWords of the Luminaries* (4Q504 1–2 vii),²⁸ we find a prayer specifically composed to be said on the Sabbath, and designated in the manuscript both as “Hymns” (הודות) and as “song” (שיר). Only the right part of the column has been preserved. In the translation of the *Study Edition* (vol. 2, 1017) we can read:

Praise, /A song/ for the Sabbath day. Give thanks...
 his holy Name for ever...
 all the angels of the holy vault (מלאכי רקיע קודש) and...
 to the heavens, the earth and all its schemers (לשמים הארץ וכול מהשביה)...

²⁷ See J. Frey, “The Notion of Flesh in 4QInstruction and the Background of Pauline Usage,” in *Sapiential, Liturgical and Poetical texts from Qumran: Proceedings of the Third Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Oslo 1998, Published in Memory of Maurice Baillet* (ed. D. Falk, F. García Martínez, and E.M. Schuller; STDJ 35; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 197–226.

²⁸ Edited by M. Baillet, DJD VII, 150. É. Puech offered a reconstruction of the manuscript on the basis of the shape of the fragments and the formulaic content in his review of DJD VII in *RB* 95 (1988): 404–11. See also E. Chazon, “On the Special Character of Sabbath Prayer: New Data from Qumran,” *Journal of Jewish Music and Liturgy* 15 (1992/93): 1–21, and D.K. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 59–94.

the great abyss, Abaddon, the water and all that there [is in it . . . all its creatures (כול בריאותיו) always, for centuries [eternal (תמיד לעולמים) (עד). Amen. Amen.

Here, too, the reference to the Genesis narrative is evident. Here, too, the angels are present, associated expressly with the רַקִיעַ. Here, too, are the “creatures” as a collective designation, although the preceding lacuna has deprived us of knowing to whom the third person singular pronoun refers. It is particularly unfortunate that the reading מַחֲשָׁבִיה is uncertain. We have translated it (with Baillet) as from הַשָּׁב, and understood it as referring to the earthly “schemers”²⁹ because the word appears in 1QH^a XI 32–33, a passage which has several word links with ours, although in this description of the eschatological destruction the word has a clear negative connotation, which is not apparent here.³⁰ But the word could equally well be read מַחֲשָׁבִיה and interpreted as the “dark places” of the earth, from הַשָּׁךְ, as in Ps 74:20: “for the dark places (מַחֲשָׁבִיה) of the land are full of the haunts of lawlessness.” In this text the references to the creatures are also linked to the action of giving thanks to God.

(c) The plural בְּרִיאוֹת also appears in one of the copies of the *Damascus Document*, where its editor translates it with “people.” But in my opinion this restrictive meaning is unwarranted. In 4Q266 10 ii 9–10 we can read in the translation of the editor:³¹

He who goes about naked in the house in the presence of his fellow, or out in the field in the presence of people (הַבְּרִיאוֹת),³² shall be excluded for six months.

The first part of this text is a clear parallel of one of the specifications of the penal code of the *Rule of the Community* (1QS VII 12): “And whoever walks about naked in front of his fellow, without needing to, shall be punished for six months.” The *Damascus Document* distinguishes two sorts of transgressions, one done in the house and the other outside the house, in the field; the one is done in front of the fellow (רַעְהוּ) and the

²⁹ “Être pensants” in the translation by Baillet, DJD VII, 151.

³⁰ In the translation in F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1:167: “It consumes right to the great abyss. The torrents of Belial break into Abaddon. The schemers of the abyss (מַחֲשָׁבִיה תְּהוֹרִים) howl at the din of those extracting mud. The earth cries out at the calamity which overtakes the world, and its schemers (מַחֲשָׁבִיה) scream, and all who are upon it go crazy, and melt away in the great calamity.”

³¹ J.M. Baumgarten, DJD XVIII, 74.

³² The reading is uncertain since the *bet* is missing (see DJD XVIII, pl. XIII), but the reconstruction seems assured.

other in front of the הבריאות. Baumgarten seems to have been guided in his restrictive interpretation of the word by the way the sentence appears in another copy of the *Damascus Document*, 4Q270 7 i 2,³³ where the text reads בבית או בשדה, apparently abbreviating the full expression of 4Q266 and mixing up one of the two transgressions.³⁴ But this interpretation forgets that in the same manuscript, the sentence has been corrected by an addition above the line of which enough has been preserved to assure us that the abbreviation of the sentence was nothing more than a copyist's mistake.³⁵ The restriction of the meaning of הבריאות to "human beings" instead of the more general "creatures" seems thus unjustified. What the texts intend to punish is exhibitionism (going around naked) in all circumstances. The restrictive clause of the *Rule of the Community* ("without needing to") has disappeared in the *Damascus Document*, and now it is punishable to go naked both inside and outside, not only in front of fellow members but also in front of any "creature."

(d) הבריאות also appears in one of the copies of the *Book of Jubilees* (4QJub^a) found in Cave 4: 4Q216 v 9.³⁶ The Ethiopic text of *Jub.* 2:2 contains a long list of the angels which were created on the first day of the creation, and concludes with a summary statement indicating that besides all the specified angels, "the spirits of all his creatures which are in heaven and in earth" were also then created.³⁷ Two fragments of 4Q216, frag. 12 ii and 13³⁸ allow the editors to reconstruct most of *Jub.* 2:2, including the summary. The key words "the spirits of his creatures" (רוחות בריותו) have been preserved and can be read clearly in frag. 12 ii 4, but the space to be filled to the next preserved word in frag. 13 is a little too large for the Ethiopic text. Therefore the editors reconstruct: "[all] the spirits of his creatures [what he made in the heavens, which he made on the ear]th, and in every (place)." As in the previously quoted texts, "creatures" here apparently refers to all the results of the creative work of God. In the Ethiopic version, the phrase could be understood

³³ DJD XVIII, 162.

³⁴ DJD XVIII, 75.

³⁵ See DJD XVIII, pl. XXXIV.

³⁶ Edited by J.C. VanderKam and J.T. Milik, DJD XIII, 13.

³⁷ See O.H. Steck, "Die Aufnahme von Genesis 1 in Jubiläen 2 und 4. Esra 6," *JStJ* 8 (1977): 154–82; J.C. VanderKam, "Genesis 1 in Jubilees 2," *DSD* 1 (1994): 300–21; J.T.G.A.M. van Ruiten, *Primeval History Interpreted: The Rewriting of Genesis 1–11 in the Book of Jubilees* (JSJ Sup 66; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 20–27.

³⁸ DJD XIII, pl. I.

as referring both to humans and to celestial phenomena like the winds, the clouds, the thunder, which as humans have a “spirit” (רוח). But the specification of וכול in the Hebrew original (although grammatically a little awkward)³⁹ indicates clearly that the plural ברייה “creatures” was already used as the common designation for all things God (to whom the pronoun refers) had created. To the best of my knowledge, the plural is only used with this meaning in the texts of Qumran. The singular בריאה, is never used to designate a single “creature,” but as we shall see is used to designate the creative act of God, the “creation.”

3.2 הבריאה, “the Creation”

The word הבריאה appears fourteen times in the manuscripts, sometimes only partially preserved and always with the determinative.⁴⁰ We can group these occurrences into three categories: when it is used as a temporal reference, when it is used a-temporally to express the results of God’s activity, and when it is applied to a future reality.

(a) “Creation” as a reference to the very beginnings of things

הבריאה is sometimes used as a *temporal reference*, a shorthand expression to indicate the very beginnings of things. This is the meaning which the word has in one of the Commentaries on Genesis, *4QCommentary on Genesis B* (4Q253).⁴¹ In frag. 2 3 we read טהורים מן הבריאה, which, if we take into consideration the next line which speaks of “holocaust for acceptance,” should be translated as “pure (animals) from the creation” as we have done in the *Study Edition*,⁴² rather than as “pure things from creation” as the editor does. Independent of the plural subject of which the purity is asserted, these texts clearly affirm that it has this quality from the very beginning, “from the creation.”

The word appears with the same meaning (as a temporal reference) in two closely related texts: 4QOtot (4Q319)⁴³ and 4Q320, one of the *Mishmarot* or Calendars,⁴⁴ and the same meaning is the most logical

³⁹ In *DSSSE*, 1:461 we have translated it by “and in everything.”

⁴⁰ CD IV 21 (and partially in the parallel passage from 6Q15 1 3); 4Q216 V 1; 4Q217 2 2; 4Q223–224 43 4; 4Q225 1 7; 2 3; 4Q253 2 3; 4Q267 1 8; 4Q319 4 11, 12; 4Q320 3 i 10; 11QT^a XXIX 9.

⁴¹ Edited by G. Brooke, *DJD* XXII, 209–12.

⁴² *DSSSE*, 1:505.

⁴³ Edited by J. Ben-Dov, *DJD* XXI, 195–244.

⁴⁴ Edited by Sh. Talmon and J. Ben-Dov, *DJD* XXI, 35–63.

when it appears in a manuscript closely related to the *Book of Jubilees* from Cave 4 (4Q217),⁴⁵ which may be a similar and closely related composition, or another copy of the same *Book of Jubilees* in which the fragment preserved does not correspond exactly to the Ethiopic text.⁴⁶

Notwithstanding its separate publication as an independent manuscript, 4Q319 is part of one of the copies of the *Rule of the Community* found in Cave 4 (4QS^c), where its contents replaced the section known as the “Hymn of the Maskil” in the copy from Cave 1.⁴⁷ The beginning text of 4QOtot is fragmentary, but nevertheless the first three lines (col. IV 9–11 in the DJD edition)⁴⁸ can be read:

[...]blessed [...]
 [...] its light on the fourth day of the wee[k...]
 [...] the] creation (בריאה) in the fourth (day) in Ga[mul...].

The reading of בריאה in IV 11 is practically certain, even if the *bet* is partially covered by a fold of the leather.⁴⁹ In the same column, in IV 17, the editors read again the word בריאה, but its occurrence here seems to me less assured on palaeographical grounds. In the calendrical text 4Q320 we find another mention of הבריאה, this time undisputed, in frag. 3 i 10. This fragment, which preserves the left part of a column, reads, according to the editors:⁵⁰

[...] the years of holiness
 [...] the] Creation holy (הבריאה קדש)
 [...] on the fo]urth day in the week
 [of Gam]ul, head of all the years (רוש כול השנים)
 [ot]ot of the second jubilee.

These two texts obviously echo Gen 1:14–19, the basic reference text for all calendrical texts from Qumran, and more concretely 1:14 when,

⁴⁵ Edited by VanderKam and Milik, DJD XIII, 23–33.

⁴⁶ For these texts, see E.J.C. Tigchelaar, “‘Lights serving as Signs for Festivals’ (Gen 1:14b) in *Enūma eliš* and Early Judaism,” in *The Creation of Heaven and Earth. Re-interpretations of Genesis I in the Context of Judaism, Ancient Philosophy, Christianity, and Modern Physics* (ed. G.H. van Kooten; TBN 8; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 31–48.

⁴⁷ See S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 48–51. P.S. Alexander and G. Vermes, the editors of 4QS^c, also conclude, DJD XXVI, 131: “The fragments of 4QS^c and of the calendrical work known as 4QOtot (4Q319) belong to the same scroll. 4QS^c ends in col. IV with text corresponding to 1QS IX 20–24 and 4QOtot follows immediately.”

⁴⁸ DJD XXI, 214.

⁴⁹ The *bet* is clear in PAM 41.479.

⁵⁰ DJD XXI, 50.

on the fourth day of creation God creates the luminaries to divide the day from the night, and placed them לַאֲהָת וְלַמּוֹעֵדִים וְלַיָּמִים וְשָׁנִים “for signs and for festivals and for years and for days.” On the fourth day of creation, which is here defined as “holy,” the luminaries start pouring out their light, allowing the measurement of time, the days, years and jubilees, and this absolute beginning (“the head of all the years”) can be traced exactly back using the *mishmarot* system. It happened during the week of Gamul. Because of the fragmentary character of these texts, it remains uncertain whether the luminary they are speaking about is the sun or the moon. But in my opinion, there is no doubt that the moon is the protagonist, as I proposed in an article years ago based on the beginning of 4Q320 1 i 1–5.⁵¹ Precisely for this passage, the editors of DJD XXI reconstruct another mention of הַבְּרִיאָה. The text reads in their translation:⁵²

[...] to its being seen (or: appearance) from the east
 [...] to shine in the middle of the heavens at the foundation of
 [creatio]n from evening until morning on the 4th (day) of the week (of
 service)
 of Gamul in the first month of the first (solar)
 year.

That this text is speaking of the moon is certain, since the luminary in question shines “from evening until morning.” The editors reconstruct the expression בִּיסוּד [הַבְּרִיאָה] הַ, basing themselves on the parallel found in the *Damascus Document* that we will discuss below, and asserting that the two strokes (which are the only preserved part of the word) should be read as *he* because they are parallel and perpendicular according to PAM photograph 41.700.⁵³ But in the oldest photo of the fragment (PAM 40.611), the first stroke joins the second at a clear angle, making the reading of the remains as an *ayin* the most logical solution, which makes the reading of the *Study Edition* הַרְקִי עַ בִּיסוּד [הַרְקִי] “at the base of the [vaul]t” the more plausible.⁵⁴ With or without a new mention of הַבְּרִיאָה, this text (with its clear reference to the fourth day of the creation in Gen 1:14–18) confirms our understanding of the use of the word in the

⁵¹ F. García Martínez, “Calendarios en Qumrán (II),” *EstBib* 54 (1996): 523–52.

⁵² DJD XXI, 42–45.

⁵³ DJD XXI, 43. In the photograph which they publish as Pl. I (PAM 43.330), only one of the two strokes is visible. The other is very faint, but certainly not perpendicular.

⁵⁴ *DSSSE*, 2:679.

other two calendrical texts as a clear temporal reference to the beginning of the days.

This temporal reference appears in its clearest form in the passage from 4Q217 2 2.⁵⁵ This text has been published as a possible copy of the *Book of Jubilees* (4QpapJub^{b?}), but the few elements that have been preserved do not have exact correspondence in the Ethiopic text.⁵⁶ The temporal meaning of “the creation” as a temporal reference point, sandwiched as it is between the two temporal prepositions בְּ... עַד, is so clear that it needs no comment. The editors’ translation reads:⁵⁷

[...] the divisions of the times for the law and for the [testimony ...]
 [...] for all the ye[ars of] eternity, from the creatio[n ...] (בְּ... הַבְּרִיאָה)
 [...] *m ad all* [that has been] created until the day wh[ich ...] (עַד הַיּוֹם).

(b) “Creation” as the result of God’s activity

The word הַבְּרִיאָה in other texts does not have any temporal connotations and it simply expresses the results of God’s activity. One example of this use is found in one of the copies of *Jubilees* from Cave 4, 4QJub^a, already quoted in the first section.⁵⁸ In 4Q216 V 1, which closely corresponds to the beginning of chap. 2 of the Ethiopic book, Moses is ordered to write “all the words of the creation” (כּוֹל דְּבַרֵי הַבְּרִיאָה). Which is exactly what Moses does, of course, and in a very detailed way when compared with the masoretic text.

The two instances in which the word הַבְּרִיאָה appears in the *Damascus Document*⁵⁹ also lack any temporal connotation in my view.

In CD IV 21 we read: בִּיְסוּד הַבְּרִיאָה זָכַר וְנִקְבָּה בְּרֵאשִׁית אוֹתָם.⁶⁰ What is important in our present perspective is not the quote from Gen 1:27

⁵⁵ See note 46. Equally clear is the temporal reference of the expression הַבְּרִיאָה, but its precise meaning is rather complex and needs to be dealt with separately below.

⁵⁶ DJD XIII, 24: “The contents of the text are largely unknown, but it does mention the years (frag. 1,2), מְדַלְקוֹת הַעֲתִים, which is the Hebrew name of *Jubilees* (frag. 2,1), the day of creation, and possible Jerusalem (2,4). The contents of the second fragment resemble what is said in *Jub.* 1:26–29.”

⁵⁷ DJD XIII, 25–26.

⁵⁸ See above, notes 36 and 37.

⁵⁹ Edited by S. Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries. 1. Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (Cambridge, 1910). A better transcription with excellent photographs is the one prepared by E. Qimron in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (ed. M. Broshi; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1992), 9–49. J.M. Baumgarten and D.R. Schwartz have produced a new edition in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Vol. 2. Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*, 4–57.

⁶⁰ The phrase has not been preserved in any of the copies of the *Damascus Document*

“male and female he created them,” but the explicit assertion that this is *יסוד הבריאה*, an expression that can be translated as “the principle of creation,”⁶¹ or “the foundation of creation.”⁶² From the perspective of the text and its defence of monogamy, we could even translate the whole sentence as “the essence of creation is: they were created as a single male and single female.” The exegetical point is clearly the singular form of both *ונקבה* and *זכר*, and since the phrase is taken from Gen 1:27, where Eve has not yet been mentioned, the singularity of man and woman is considered essential to the human race.⁶³ Creation is not seen here as a temporal marker of the beginning of mankind,⁶⁴ but as an expression of its nature:⁶⁵ God has created mankind sexed, and from this characteristic follows that a man cannot take two wives.

The other occurrence of the word in CD XII 14–15⁶⁶ does not refer to humans but to the locusts or grasshoppers of Lev 11:22 (*ההנבים*), and does not use *יסוד* but *משפט*. The text reads *כי הוא משפט בריאותם*, where the plural suffix refers back to the *ההנבים במיניהם*, and the meaning of the sentence is similar to the expression used in CD IV 21. In the translation in the *Study Edition*:⁶⁷

And all the locusts, according to their kind, shall be put into fire or into water while they are still alive, as this is the regulation for their species.⁶⁸

Locusts come in many sorts. Lev 11:22 mentions specifically four kinds: *הארבה*, *הסלעם*, *החרגל* and *ההנב*. We cannot be precise about to which sort of locust each name corresponds, but it is clear that in later times

found in Cave 4, edited by J.M. Baumgarten, DJD XVIII, but is partially in the copy from Cave 6 edited by Baillet, DJD III, 129.

⁶¹ As we have done in *DSSSE*, 1:557.

⁶² Which is the translation given by Baumgarten and Schwartz, *Damascus Document*, 19.

⁶³ See F. García Martínez, “Man and Woman: Halakhah based upon Eden in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Paradise Interpreted. Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. G.P. Luttikhuisen; TBN 2; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 95–115.

⁶⁴ In DJD XXI, 45 the editors explicitly assert the temporal aspect of *ביסוד הבריאה* they reconstruct in 4Q320, in my opinion without any basis.

⁶⁵ Ch. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (2nd rev. ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1958), 16–17 translates “the principle of nature” and adds in a note: “Perhaps this is nothing but a translation of *φύσις*.”

⁶⁶ Partially preserved in 4Q266 9 ii 1–2, see DJD XVIII, 68.

⁶⁷ *DSSSE*, 1:571.

⁶⁸ Literally: “because this is the norm of their creation.” Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents*, 62, translates “for this is what their nature requires,” and Baumgarten and Schwartz, *Damascus Document*, 53: “for this is the precept of their creation.” C. Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Traditions and Redaction* (STDJ 29; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 160 offers a translation *ad sensum*: “for this is how they are to be eaten.”

החנב has become a sort of collective name for all these species. In rabbinic literature, החנב is the word used almost exclusively to designate locusts. In *m. Ter.* 10:9 and *m. Ed.* 7:2, for example, pure and impure החנבים are distinguished, while in *m. Abod. Zar.* 2:7 its suitability for consumption depends on where one has bought them—those from the stock of a shop are suitable whilst those from the [shopkeeper's] basket are not. *m. Hul.* 3:7 shows clearly that in rabbinic times החנב has become the collective name for locust.⁶⁹ Apparently, this was already the case at Qumran, since, except when clearly quoting or alluding to biblical texts,⁷⁰ החנב is the only name used for locust.

Also in CD XII 15, the temporal connotation of הבריאה is absent; the text underlines that the nature of each species is fixed from their creation. God has created different sorts of locusts, and this determines the way they should be consumed, boiled in water or roasted on the fire.⁷¹ But not cooked in milk, a practice permitted by the rabbis according to *m. Hul.* 8:1.⁷²

(c) “Creation” as reference to a future reality

At Qumran we also find two occasions where although the word הבריאה has a clear temporal dimension, it does not seem to refer to the past “creation” but is applied to a future reality, a “creation” which has not yet taken place.

In the *Temple Scroll*⁷³ XXIX 8–9, Yadin read the expression ער יום הברכה in the following phrase:

⁶⁹ In *m. Hul.* 3:7 we can read: “And among locusts (וּבַחֲנָבִים): Any which have (1) four legs, (2) four wings, and (3) jointed legs [Lev. 11:21], and (4) the wings of which cover the greater part of its body. R. Yose says, “And (5) the name of which is locust (וְשֵׁמוֹ חֲנָב)” (translation by J. Neusner, *The Mishnah: A New Translation* [New Haven, 1988], 772).

⁷⁰ As is the case in *11QTemple* (11QT^a) XLVIII 3–4 and *4QReworked Pentateuch* (4Q365 15a–b 5) which quote Lev 11:22 and thus use the different names for locusts, and of *4QParaphrase of Genesis and Exodus* (4Q422 III 5) which retells the story of the plagues of Egypt, using both אַרְבֵּבָה from Exod 10:4 and חֲסִיל from Ps 78:46 (written חֲסִיל in the manuscript); see E. Tov, “The Exodus section of 4Q422,” *DSD* 1 (1994): 197–209.

⁷¹ Rabin, *The Qadokite Documents*, 62, explains that the locusts should be put into fire or water while they are alive because “they were created from these elements,” and notes that drawing the locusts in water is demanded by the Samaritans and Karaites.

⁷² “Every [kind of] flesh [of cattle, wild beast, and fowl] is prohibited to be cooked in milk, except for the flesh of fish and locust.” Neusner, *The Mishnah: A New Translation*, 780.

⁷³ Y. Yadin, *Megillat ham-Miqdash* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977), and revised English edition, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983).

I shall sanctify my temple with my glory, for I shall make my glory reside over it *until the day of blessing*, when I shall create my temple establishing it for myself for ever, in accordance with the covenant I made with Jacob at Bethel.

The phrase has certain difficulties, of course, but it makes perfect sense. The temple for which the *Temple Scroll* legislates is not the final one. On the “day of blessing” God himself will create a new one which will be the definitive temple and will endure forever. But Qimron⁷⁴ proposed reading the key expression as *עד יום הבריה*, “until the day of creation,” where *הבריה* is a different way of writing *הבריאה*. From a palaeographical point of view, this reading is, if not certain, at least clearly to be preferred. And if this reading is accepted, the “day of creation” in question cannot refer back to the first creation, since this “day of creation” is clearly in the future, and still out of sight. This is made clear by the future form of the verb used (*אברא* “I shall create”) and especially by the use of *עד* “until.” Are we dealing here with an *Urzeit-Endzeit* typology? Or has *יום הבריאה* (“the day of creation”) become one of the designations of eschatological time?

That both elements may have been combined in this expression seems proved by the only other occasion when the expression is used, in one of the manuscripts called *Pseudo-Jubilees*: 4Q225 1 6–7.⁷⁵ There we can read:⁷⁶

[...] *vacat* And you, Moses, when I speak with [you...]
 [...] the creation until the day of the [new] creation [...] (*יום הבריאה עד יום הבריאה* [ההרשה]).

As so often happens in Qumran research, the frustrating fragmentary state of the manuscript precludes all certainty. But in this case, the editor VanderKam has build a very strong case to complete the sentence in the light of *Jub.* 1:27 and 1:29.

In *Jub.* 1:27 God tells the angel of the presence to dictate to Moses the events “...from the beginning of creation until the time when my temple is built among them throughout all the ages of eternity.” And

⁷⁴ First in E. Qimron, “The Language of the Temple Scroll,” *Leshonenu* 42 (1978): 136–45 (Hebrew), on 142, and later in *idem*, *The Temple Scroll. A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions* (Judean Desert Studies; Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press / Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1996), 44.

⁷⁵ Edited by J.C. VanderKam, *DJD XIII*, 141–55, pl. X. See also R. Kugler and J.C. VanderKam, “A Note on 4Q225,” *RevQ* 20/77 (2001): 109–15.

⁷⁶ *DJD XIII*, 143–44.

in *Jub.* 1:29, which is textually garbled but is usually restored according to the suggestion of M. Stone, we read:⁷⁷ “from [the time of creation until] the time of the new creation when the heavens, the earth, and all their creatures shall be renewed. . . .” Based on these two quotations, VanderKam most plausibly suggests completing the broken sentence of our manuscript with the word הַהַרְשָׁה. The temporal connotation of the “day of creation” is retained, and the “day of the new creation” also takes on a temporal connotation (עַד), which is clearly situated in the eschatological future, the moment of the renewal of everything: “the heavens, the earth and all their creatures.” As the *Temple Scroll* shows, this moment, this “new creation,” could simply be called יוֹם הַבְּרִיָּה “the day of creation.”

At Qumran the word “creation” is not only used to express the creative act of God, or the temporal beginning of the reality created by God, but also the expected renewal of the reality (“the heavens, the earth, and all their creatures”) in the eschatological future. The “day of creation” is not only the model of the end times but one of its names as well.

3.3 *Hymn to the Creator*

Since my specific topic was the interpretation of the biblical narrative of the creation at Qumran, I cannot close without giving at least one example of how some of its elements were developed in the writings found there. I have selected a short poem,⁷⁸ not particularly original,⁷⁹

⁷⁷ M. Stone, “Apocryphal Notes and Readings,” *Israel Oriental Studies* 1 (1971): 125.

⁷⁸ Edited by J.A. Sanders, DJD IV, 47. The Hymn has attracted the attention of scholars and the number of studies dedicated to it is rather great: J. Carmignac, “Le texte de Jérémie 10,13 (ou 51,16) et celui de 2 Samuel 23,7 améliorés par Qumrân,” *RevQ* 7/26 (1970): 287–90; P. Skehan, “A Liturgical Complex in 11QPs^a,” *CBQ* 35 (1973): 195–205; *idem*, “Jubilees and the Qumran Psalter,” *CBQ* 37 (1975): 343–47; F. García Martínez, “Salmos Apócrifos en Qumrân,” *EstBib* 40 (1982): 197–220; M. Weinfeld, “The Angelic Song over the Luminaries in the Qumran Texts,” in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness* (ed. D. Dimant and L.H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 131–57; K. Seybold, “Das Hymnusfragment 11QPs^a XXVI 9–15,” in *Studien zur Psalmenauslegung* (K. Seybold; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1998), 188–207; G. Xeravits, “Notes sur le 11QPs^a Creat 7–9,” *RevQ* 18/69 (1997): 145–48; E.G. Chazon, “The Use of the Bible as a Key to Meaning in Psalms from Qumran,” in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. S.M. Paul, R.A. Kraft, L.H. Schiffman, and W.W. Fields; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 85–95.

⁷⁹ In the words of the editor (DJD IV, 89): “The metre is highly irregular, and the language is forced and pedestrian. The imagery and vocabulary are late, in biblical terms.” Carmignac, “Le texte de Jérémie,” 287 defined it as “en fait un centon de citations bibliques.”

which has been transmitted in one of the manuscripts (11Q5 or 11QP^s^a) of what many authors consider to be a “Qumran Psalter,” different from the masoretic Psalter in the ordering of the Psalms included, and with several other known or previously unknown compositions included as part of it.⁸⁰ Col. 26 of this manuscript, after the end of Pss 149 and 150, has preserved this little poem almost completely⁸¹ in ll. 9–15, which I quote in the versified translation of its editor J. Sanders:⁸²

Great and holy is the Lord,
 the holiest unto every generation.
 Majesty precedes him,
 and following him is the rush of many waters.
 Grace and truth surround his presence;
 truth and justice and righteousness are
 the foundation of his throne.

Separating light from deep darkness,
 by the knowledge of his mind he established the dawn.
 When all his angels had witnessed it they sang aloud,
 for he showed them what they had not known:
 Crowning the hills with fruit,
 good for every living being.

Blessed be he who makes the earth by his power,
 establishing the world in his wisdom.⁸³
 By his understanding he stretched out the heavens,
 and brought forth [wind] from his st[orehouses].
 He made [lightning for the rai]n,
 and caused mist[s] to rise [from] the end of the [earth.]

The structure of the poem is quite simple, with three sections, each composed of three stanzas: the description of God’s glory, its own description of His act of creation, and the transformation of the traditional description of creation into the closing blessing.

⁸⁰ See P.W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997) and U. Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption im Frühjudentum: Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Struktur und Pragmatik der Psalmenrolle 11QP^s^a* (STDJ 49; Leiden: Brill, 2003).

⁸¹ See Seybold, “Das Hymnusfragment 11QP^s^a XXVI 9–15,” 199. In the reconstruction by Dahmen, only one and a half lines separate the Hymn from the following text from 2 Sam 23:1–7; see Dahmen, *Psalmen- und Psalter-Rezeption*, 96 and 249. Carmignac, “Le texte de Jérémie 10,13,” 289 is the only scholar who considers that the Hymn ended in the next column with the text of 2 Sam 23:7, quoted by the author of the poem in a similar way to the way he had already quoted the text of Jeremiah.

⁸² DJD IV, 47, 89–91.

⁸³ In the light of the exegetical traditions which apparently underlie the poem, I would rather translate “with his wisdom,” as we have done in the *DSSSE*, 2:1179.

The most characteristic element of the poem is its reuse of materials attested elsewhere. And this phenomenon is evident in the three components of the hymn. The most obvious and best studied is the presence of the “floating” piece we know from its double appearance in the book of Jeremiah, in 10:12–13 and 51:15–16, and from its presence in Ps 135:6–7, which is reused with little variation in the last section of our poem.⁸⁴

E. Chazon, in her very illuminating article,⁸⁵ has shown how the author of the hymn has transformed Jeremiah’s text with the simple introduction of the word ברוך, the omission of the difficult לקול תרו (also omitted by the LXX in Jer 10:13, but not in Jer 28:16, which corresponds to the Hebrew 51:16) and the transposition of the line “and brought forth [wind] from his st[orehouses].” In this way the author of the poem deeply transforms a prophecy of doom (against Israel in Jer 10 and against Babylon in Jer 51) into blessing and thanksgiving.

Chazon also suggests reading the first section in the light of the *merkavah* visions of Ezek 1 and Isa 6. She even entertains the idea that the three repetitions of the word *holy* in the first bicolon⁸⁶ could be an echo of the *trishagion* and that the hymn is witness to the “praying with the angels” tradition, though she does not agree with the suggestion by Weinfeld that the Hymn would preserve an ancient form of the *Qedushah* liturgy.⁸⁷ But in the light of the targumic texts quoted at the beginning (of the many things that were created before creation), and of the *Jubilees* text about the creation of the angels on the first day, also quoted above, I am also more inclined to see the opening stanza as a witness to the very old exegetical traditions which try to solve the problems posed by the irregularities in the text of the biblical narrative.⁸⁸

⁸⁴ Xeravits, “Notes sur le *11QP^s* Creat 7–9,” proposes an order of dependence Ps 35 > Jeremiah > Qumran, as against Sanders who postulated a Ps 35 > Qumran > Jeremiah relationship. Chazon, “The Use of the Bible as a Key to Meaning in Psalms from Qumran,” 92 assumes that our text quotes Jer directly.

⁸⁵ Chazon, “The Use of the Bible as a Key to Meaning in Psalms from Qumran,” 90–94.

⁸⁶ Of which a literal translation would be: “Great and *holy* is YHWH, the *holy* of the *holiest* [or the holiest of the holy ones] for generation to generation.”

⁸⁷ Weinfeld, “The Angelic Song over the Luminaries in the Qumran Texts,” has suggested that our hymn reflects an ancient form of the morning liturgy, the *Qedusah Yoser*.

⁸⁸ See P. Schäfer, “Berešit Bara’ Elohim: Zur Interpretation von Genesis 1,1 in der rabbinischen Literatur,” *JSS* 2 (1971): 161–66; F. García Martínez, “Interpretación de la creación en el Judaísmo antiguo,” in *La Creació* (ed. M.L. Sánchez León; Religions del món antic 2; Palma: UIB Sa Nostra, 2001), 115–35. For a synthetic treatment of the exegetical developments, see G. Vermes, “Genesis 1–3 in Post-Biblical Hebrew and Aramaic Literature before the Mishnah,” *JJS* 43 (1992): 221–25; M.D. Goulder, “Exegesis

This is clearer in the second section which elaborates on the biblical narrative of the creation (already used in Jeremiah and in the Psalm), and where several of the basic components of the narrative of Genesis are cleverly incorporated: the separation of light and darkness, the heavens and the earth, and all its produce as nourishment for every living being.

The presence of the angels need not refer to the Ezekiel or Isaiah descriptions. For our poet, as for the author of *Jubilees*, angels were already present since the first day of creation. *Jubilees* reaches this conclusion from the presence of the **רוח אלהים** in Gen 1:2.⁸⁹ Our text does not make explicit the exegetical “peg” but firmly asserts that they were created before the world was and were present and acclaiming God’s creation.

Nor does the presence of God’s heavenly throne need to lead us to Ezekiel or Isaiah. God’s heavenly throne is one of the seven things created before the world’s creation, according to *b. Pesah.* 54a, for example. The exegetical conclusion could have been derived from Ps 93:1–2 “your throne stands firm from of old,” and it is attested in 2 *En.* 25:3–4. The personification of the divine attributes can also be exegetically explained, and even more easily the creation of the world through God’s wisdom, its “establishment” as our text calls it.

That God established the world with Wisdom, was also exegetically acquired from old. At least since the **קנני האשית דרכו**, which starts the description of Wisdom in Prov 8:22 and implies considering **האשית** to be one of the names of Wisdom (as Philo explicitly says), and leads to the translation of the **בראשית** of the biblical text, as “together with Wisdom” created God, etc.⁹⁰ We find this translation in the Fragment Targum, and as a double translation in Neofiti.⁹¹ The presence of Wisdom, and co-operation in the creation work, will also be gratefully used to explain the plurals of the creation of man, of course, and in the Chris-

of Genesis 1–3 in the New Testament,” *JJS* 43 (1992): 226–29; P. Alexander, “Pre-Emptive Exegesis: Genesis Rabba’s Reading of the Story of Creation,” *JJS* 43 (1992): 230–45.

⁸⁹ See J. van Ruiten, *Primeval History Interpreted*, 25. Rabbinic tradition, which places the creation of the angels on different days of the creation week usually deducts its creation (of which the biblical text is completely silent) from the **צבאם** of Gen 2:1, which is read as the creation of the angelic “hosts.”

⁹⁰ B.L. Mack, *Logos und Sophia: Untersuchungen zur Weisheitstheologie im hellenistischen Judentum* (SUNT 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973).

⁹¹ See G. Anderson, “The Interpretation of Gen. 1:1 in the Targums,” *CBQ* 52 (1990): 21–29.

tian tradition it will lead to the involvement of the Son in the creation, both via his identification with Wisdom (as in the *Epistle of Barnabas* 5:5), or through his identification with the Logos of John 1:1 as in Col 1:13–15 or Heb 1:12.⁹²

The article by Skehan⁹³ brought to light a parallel between the beginning of the second section of our poem and the book of *Jub.* 2:2–3.⁹⁴ Both texts share the phrase “Separating light from darkness he established the dawn by the knowledge of his heart” in very similar or identical wording.⁹⁵ They also seem intended to solve a well-known exegetical problem: the creation of light on the first day and the posterior creation of the luminaries only on the fourth day. The light of the luminaries, although not yet created on the first day, was already established in God’s mind.

Jubilees is not the only composition which has been influenced by this poem. *4QAdmonition Based on the Flood* (4Q370)⁹⁶ has reworked the last part of the second section of our hymn. The phrase “Crowning the hills with fruit, good food for every living being,” has been transformed into “And he crowned the mountains with produce and poured our food upon them. And with good fruit he satisfied all.”⁹⁷ And it is perhaps also significant that 4Q370 follows the phrase quoted with an exhortation to blessing: “Let all who do my will eat and be satisfied” said YHWH. “And let them bless my holy name.” Although here worded as divine speech, and possibly motivated by the presence of the three verbs “eat, be satisfied, and bless” in the same order as Deut 8:10, this exhortation to blessing corresponds with the introduction of the same verb that is used by the poet in order to transform the meaning of the old “floating” piece of Jeremiah and Ps 135.

⁹² J.L. Moreno Martínez, “El Logos y la creación,” *ST* 15 (1983): 381–419.

⁹³ P. Skehan, “*Jubilees*, and the Qumran Psalter.”

⁹⁴ Partially preserved in 4Q216 V 10–11, translated by the editors: “darkness, dawn, [light, and evening which he prepared through] his knowledge. Thus we saw his works and we [blessed him], regarding all his [wo]rks” (DJD XIII, 14).

⁹⁵ Van Ruiten, *Primeval History Interpreted*, 26 offers a useful synopsis of the two texts, underlining the similarities and the differences, and concludes that our hymn has influenced the author of *Jubilees*.

⁹⁶ Edited by C. Newsom, DJD XIX, 85–97.

⁹⁷ Newsom shows clearly the dependence: “Although the priority of 11QPs^a cannot be independently demonstrated, it appears that the author of 4Q370 has cited the first colon of 11QPs^a XXVI 13 in a slightly adapted form, and then paraphrased or expanded each of the following terms of the second colon in order to create his own text. Thus אֹכֵל becomes אֹכֵל; אֵשׁ becomes אֵשׁ; וְיָרַד מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם becomes וְיָרַד מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם; וְיָרַד מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם becomes וְיָרַד מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם; וְיָרַד מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם becomes וְיָרַד מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם; וְיָרַד מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם becomes וְיָרַד מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם” (DJD XIX, 91–92).

I will certainly not claim that such a later interpretation as the one in *y. Hag* 2,77c, in *b. Ber.* 55a or in *Gen. Rab.* 1:10 on the creation of the world by using the letter *bet*, or the one so beautifully worded in the mediaeval midrash known as *Alphabet of Rabbi Akiva* of the contest of the letters for getting the honour to be the first of the Torah,⁹⁸ is already present in our text. But the addition of ברוך, which transforms the quotation into a blessing, as well as the correspondences between creation and blessing noted when dealing with the word הבריאה, seems to indicate that at the time of the composition of this poem, the בריאה was already linked with the ברכה.

⁹⁸ See L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia, 1968¹²), 1:5–8, where the *bet* wins the contest, using as argument that all humanity shall bless God continuously through it.

CHAPTER THIRTEEN

THE GENESIS OF ALEXANDRIA, THE RABBIS AND QUMRAN

In the writings of rabbinic tradition we find a whole series of lists recording the changes of the biblical text that had been made intentionally by the translators when the Hebrew Bible was translated into Greek. These lists often occur in tannaitic midrash (such as the *Mekilta of Rabbi Ishmael*, in the commentary on Exod 12:40), in the Talmud (*b. Meg.* 9a–b; *y. Meg.* 71d, treatise *Sopherim* 1.7–8), as well as in the collections of late midrashim, such as *Avot of Rabbi Nathan* (version B, chap. 37), *Tanhuma Exod* (para. 22) or the *Midrash Hagadol* (Exod 4:20) and in later compositions such as *Yalkut Shimoni* (Gen 3).¹

Obviously, these lists are not consistent, either in the number of corrections made or in the places in the Pentateuch affected by the corrections. Some lists give the total of the corrections at the beginning, although often the number of corrections recorded does not correspond to the actual number of corrections transmitted in the text. Thus, version B of the *Avot of Rabbi Nathan* tells us “Five old men (not seventy or seventy-two) wrote the Torah in Greek for King Ptolemy. They changed ten things in it. They are, etc.” But when the changes are added up, the result is eleven. *Tanhuma* also mentions ten corrections, but refers to no fewer than fourteen passages, and *Exod. Rab.* 5:5 tells us that 18 changes were made, without specifying which. It is true that in the case of *Avot*, the corrections occur in the sections of the book that give lists of ten things (as mnemonics). After the ten corrections, *Avot* lists the ten things planned since the beginning of the world, the ten things created at the dawn of the world, the ten names for naming prophecy, the ten persons

¹ The most complete study of the lists is the chapter “Die Devarim für Talmai,” in G. Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König Talmai. Untersuchungen zum Übersetzungsverständnis in der jüdisch-hellenistischen und rabbinischen Literatur* (TSAJ 41; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 22–112. More concise, but also fundamental is the article by E. Tov, “The Rabbinic Tradition concerning the ‘Alterations’ Inserted into the Greek Pentateuch and Their Relation to the Original Text of the LXX,” *JSS* 15 (1984): 65–89, republished with some changes in *idem*, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible. Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 1–18 (the quotations from this article are always from the version published in *JSS*).

who were called “men of God,” and many other lists of ten, ending with the ten times that the word “generations” occurs in the Torah, for which it only gives us seven. This makes us think that the number ten is completely artificial. Instead, other lists (such as the *Mekilta* or *b. Megillah*) do not mention the total number of corrections but simply give the corrected passages, which oscillate between 13 and 15. Nor is there complete consistency in the lists concerning the passages corrected, even though the variations are not very large, and in respect of Genesis there is strong consistency. In fact, almost half the corrections affect the text of Genesis.

In this contribution, written to honour the “Alexandrian” passion of Gerard Luttikhuisen, a colleague and a very dear friend from my very first hours in Groningen, who has taught me so much not only about the polymorphic nature of Christianity in its Greek context but also about the interpretations and transformations of Genesis in the Gnostic writings, I would like to consider these corrections from the perspective of Qumran, where the text of Genesis is often interpreted and transformed. In view of the limits imposed on our contributions, only four of the seven corrections affecting Genesis are presented here.

My first intention was to examine the *biblical* manuscripts of Genesis from Qumran to see whether it was possible to discover traces of these corrections. I did not expect to find the Greek form of these corrections in Qumran, because we have not found manuscripts of Genesis in Greek in Qumran,² but I thought that in the many Hebrew manuscripts

² Genesis was not among the Greek manuscripts found in Qumran. In Cave 4, two copies of Leviticus were found (4Q119 = 4QLXXLeviticus^a and 4Q120 = pap4QLXXLeviticus^b), one copy of Numbers (4Q121 = 4QLXXNumbers) and a copy of Deuteronomy (4Q122 = 4QDeuteronomy), see P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich, and J.A. Sanderson, DJD IX, 161–97. In Cave 7 were found a fragment of Exodus (7Q1) and a fragment of the Letter of Jeremiah (7Q2), see M. Baillet, DJD III, 142–43. On the biblical manuscripts in Greek found in Qumran see A.R.C. Leany, “Greek Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert,” in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text* (ed. J.K. Elliott; Leiden: Brill, 1976), 283–300; E. Ulrich, “The Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran: A Reappraisal of Their Value,” in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings. Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings* (ed. G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars; SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 48–80; *idem*, “The Greek Manuscripts of the Pentateuch from Qumran. Including Newly Identified Fragments of Deuteronomy (4QLXXDeut),” in *The Septuagint: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers* (ed. A. Pietersma *et al.*; Mississauga; Benben, 1984), 71–82; L.J. Greenspoon, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Greek Bible,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. Flint and J. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999), 1:101–27.

of Genesis from the various caves,³ traces could have remained from which we could determine whether these corrections correspond to old forms of the biblical text, as Tov assumes,⁴ or whether they were the result of exegetical activity by the rabbis, as Veltri concluded, without them having any textual value at all.⁵

But unfortunately, the accidents of preservation of the manuscripts have not allowed me to progress along this line of research. Of all the verses of Genesis corrected according to the rabbis, only Gen 1:1 has been partially preserved in two manuscripts (4Q2, 4Q7, and in 4Q8c, which seems to be the title of a book) in the form represented both by the Masoretic text and by the LXX. Therefore, I had to change perspective and approach these corrections from the viewpoint of the *non-biblical* texts from Qumran, in the hope that these texts would provide some light, if not on the Genesis of Alexandria, at least on the reasons for these rabbinic corrections.

Evidently, these corrections have been transmitted in Hebrew; but according to the rabbis, they would have been made in Greek, at the time of the Alexandrian translation. The fact that only a part of these corrections corresponds to the known text of the LXX,⁶ has led some

³ No fewer than 19 copies, see E. Tov, "Categorized List of the 'Biblical Texts'" in DJD XXXIX, 167–68.

⁴ Tov, "The Rabbinic Tradition concerning the 'Alterations,'" 74: "If our analysis up to this point is correct, it is difficult to avoid the unconventional assumption that the nine biblical passages which do not agree with the transmitted text of the LXX reflect another textual form of the translation. This other text of the LXX evidently contained the original text of the translation which differs from its form which has been handed down in all manuscripts," and 76: "Accordingly, in view of this situation, we may presume that the biblical passages mentioned in this list of alterations reflect the original text of the LXX, while the archetype of all manuscripts known to us was corrected to MT."

⁵ Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König Talmai*, 112: "Die *Devarim* sind keine textkritische Liste. Vielmehr stellen sie eine "fiktive Überlieferung" dar, mit deren Hilfe die Rabbinen/Redaktoren Schwierigkeiten der Bibelexegese auszuräumen versuchen. Mit Ausnahme von Num 16,15 sind die *Devarim* keine "Lesarten" des hebräischen Textes; waren sie "Lesarte," so spräche dies für ihren textkritischen Ursprung. In der Mehrzahl aber sind sie *exegetische* Änderungen und setzen den MT voraus. Die *Devarim erklären* ihn, sie stellen keine *Alternative* dar! Das rabbinische Verständnis der "Tora für Talmai" läßt sich also *in nuce* folgendermaßen definieren: eine Tora, bei der die Erklärung des Textes *im Text* stattfindet—und zwar dadurch, daß er *verändert* wird."

⁶ Scholars do not agree either on the number of corrections or to which corrections exactly the known text of the LXX corresponds. For Tov, "The Rabbinic Tradition concerning the 'Alterations,'" 73, Gen 2:2, Exod 4:20; 24:5 and 24:11, Num 16:15 and Lev 11:6 would be identical with the passages from the LXX, and Exod 12:14 fairly close. For Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König Talmai*, 98, only Gen 2:2, Exod 12:40, Lev 11:6 and Num 16:15 could be considered as retroversions from the Greek: "Die übrigen

scholars (such as Shemaryahu Talmon)⁷ to think that these corrections had been made on the Hebrew text and that these lists would then be like the *tikkune soferim* or corrections of the scribes, which list changes made on the actual Hebrew text.⁸

King Ptolemy's reference to the Greek translation in the introductions that precede the lists of corrections is too constant, too explicit and too emphatic for it to be completely due to chance. It can only be explained if the corrections were made on the Greek translation, that is, if the Hebrew text had been intentionally translated into Greek in a way that does not correspond to the Hebrew text of the Masoretes. The clearest text in this sense is *b. Meg.* 9a, which begins as follows:⁹

This concerns the account of an incident in connection with King Ptolemy, as it is taught: It is told of King Ptolemy that he had assembled seventy-two old men and had put them into seventy-two rooms, and he did not tell them why he had assembled them; and he spoke to each one of them and said to them: "write for me the Torah of Moses, your Master." The Holy One, may he be blessed, put some counsel into the heart of each one, and they all agreed and wrote for him . . . (what follows is the list in question).

Furthermore, some of these corrections have been preserved in the Greek text exactly as we know them. But the clearest example is the correction concerning Lev 11:6 (11:5 in the LXX), because it is explicit in rabbinic tradition and leaves no doubt at all.

In the Masoretic text of Lev 11:6 (LXX 11:5) there is a *hapax* (used only here and in Deut 14:7), the word תַּבְּרַשׁ, of uncertain meaning, but usually translated "hare." In the LXX, this word is translated δασύποδα, (δασύπους) not λαγῶν (λαγῶς).¹⁰ As explained in a note on the Greek of the Alexandrian Pentateuch of Michel Casevitz, δασύπους means "one with hairy feet" and belongs to technical vocabulary, "the word is already attested in the Comics of the classical period and in Aristo-

Textänderungen zu den Bibelversen spiegeln lediglich textkritische und exegetische Schwierigkeiten eines schon fixierten hebräischen Textes wider."

⁷ S. Talmon, "The Three Scrolls of the Law that were found in the Temple Court," *Textus* 2 (1962): 14–27 (26).

⁸ See D. Barthélemy, "Les *tikkuné soferim* et la critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament," in *Congress Volume Bonn 1962* (VTSup 9; Leiden: Brill, 1963), 285–300, and C. McCarthy, *The Tikkune Soferim and Other Theological Corrections in the Masoretic Text of the OT* (OBO 36; Freiburg: Editions Universitaires, 1981).

⁹ Unless otherwise indicated, all the translations are my own.

¹⁰ In this case, Aquila translates תַּבְּרַשׁ accurately by λαγῶν.

tle, and replaces older and more banal λαγώς.¹¹ This last detail gives us the key to the change. In the list of *b. Megillah* (and also in *y. Megillah*, the treatise *Sopherim*, *Mekilta*, and the *Avot of Rabbi Nathan*) ארנבת is in fact changed to צעירת הרגלים, which is usually translated “light of foot” (the expressions being understood as שערית הרגלים due to the phonetic change of ש to צ)¹² an expression translated accurately enough as δασύποδα. Thus, the change would have been made to avoid using the dynastic name of Ptolemy.¹³ The text of the Talmud tells us this expressly:

And they did not write ארת הארנבת for him because the name of Ptolemy’s wife was הארנבת (i.e. λαγώς) so that he would not say: “the Jews mocked me and placed my wife’s name in the Torah.”

So rabbinic tradition states that when the biblical text was translated into Greek a certain number of corrections was made, chiefly to the text of Genesis. According to *y. Megillah*, the person whose name was *Lagos* would have been Ptolemy’s mother, though we know it was his father’s name, from which the dynastic name of the Lagides is derived. But this is not important. What matters is that the text of the Talmud proves without doubt that in this case the change was made in the Greek text, not in the Hebrew text.

And I think that in this tradition there could be a kernel of historical truth, the extent of which it is impossible to determine, but which allows these corrections to be considered as witnesses to the efforts made to impose a particular exegesis of the biblical text already at the time of

¹¹ *Le Pentateuque. La Bible d’Alexandrie* (under the direction of C. Doigniez and M. Harl; Folio essais 419; Paris: Gallimard, 2003), 638. In *La Bible d’Alexandrie 3: Le Lévitique* (Paris: Cerf, 1988), 128, P. Harlé and D. Pralon emphasize “Le choix de *dasypous* préféré à celui de *lagos* ne poserait aucun problème si la tradition rabbinique n’avait relevé ici un cas d’évitement délibéré de la part des LXX . . . Il nous paraît plus vraisemblable que le nom *lagos* a été évité par les LXX parce qu’il évoquait le nom du père du premier Ptolomé, *Lagos*, fondateur de la lignée des Lagides.”

¹² Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König Talmai*, 101–102, has correctly noted that all the manuscript witnesses, except for München 117 of the *Mekilta*, have the reading צעירת הרגלים, literally “junge/kleine’ oder ‘schnelle’ (?) Füße” and notes “Der Ausdruck ergibt zwar einen Sinn, der aber weder im biblischen noch in rabbinischen Sprachgebrauch geläufig ist und überdies keine Parallele zur LXX von Lev 11,6(5) aufweist” and therefore “daß der Fehler zwar früh in den rabbinischen Schriften auftrat, nicht aber zur selben Zeit, da die Änderung festgestellt wurde.”

¹³ E. Tov, “The Rabbinic Tradition concerning the ‘Alterations’,” 89 is indecisive: “it may be that this claim is nothing but a *post factum* explanation; on the other hand, it is just possible that λαγών is the original translation of ארנבת which was later supplanted by δασύποδα.”

the first Greek translation. Examination of these corrections in the light of the exegetical traditions documented in Qumran (and thus chronologically closer to the Genesis of Alexandria than to the rabbinic world) can help us understand the motives for and extent of these corrections.

1. *Gen 1:1*

We find the first correction in the first clause of Genesis.¹⁴ In this case it is not a question of a change of words, but of a change in the order of the words. The first translators of the LXX would have translated the Masoretic text *בראשית ברא אלהים* “In the beginning God created” by *אלהים ברא בראשית* “God created in the beginning” the lists tell us; i.e. by *ὁ θεός ἐποίησεν ἐν ἀρχῇ*, instead of the familiar *ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός* of the LXX.¹⁵ Such a correction seems completely innocent, but in my opinion it is not innocent at all.

For Tov this change of sequence could have been motivated by the translator’s wish to begin the Torah with the name of God.¹⁶ He says, “In this instance the inversion of the word order can be ascribed to the exegetical motivation of the translator who, it seems, wanted to begin the Pentateuch with *ὁ θεός*.”¹⁷ Thus the correction would be more literary in nature, an anticipation of some kind of the very beautiful *disputation* related by the *Alphabet of Rabbi Akiva*, in which each letter of the alphabet appears before God to convince him (with proofs taken from Scripture!) to begin writing the Torah with that letter, and finally the letter *bet* wins because with it everyone “will bless” the Lord.¹⁸ Of course, this interpretation cannot be excluded, nor that the change of order

¹⁴ This clause has given rise to innumerable interpretations, old and new, both in Judaism and in Christianity. For our purposes see P. Schäfer, “Berešit Bara’ Elohim: Zur Interpretation von Genesis 1,1 in der rabbinischen Literatur,” *JStJ* 2 (1971): 161–66; G. Anderson, “The Interpretation of Gen. 1:1 in the Targums,” *CBQ* 52 (1990): 21–29; F. García Martínez, “Interpretación de la creación en el Judaísmo antiguo,” in *La Creación* (ed. M.L. Sánchez León; Religions del món antic 2; Palma: UIB Sa Nostra, 2001), 115–53.

¹⁵ Aquila preserves the same word order as in Hebrew, but alters the Greek translation of *בראשית* to *κεφάλαιον*, taking up the etymological connection of the Hebrew word with “head,” and he translates *ברא* by *κτίζω*: *ἐν κεφαλαίῳ ἐκτίσεν θεός*.

¹⁶ An explanation already to be found in *Tanhuma B Bereshit* 4, where God’s humility is contrasted (with reference to Gen 1:1) to the pride of the Kings who mention their works before their own names.

¹⁷ Tov, “The Rabbinic Tradition concerning the ‘Alterations,’” 87.

¹⁸ See L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia, 1968¹²), 1:5–8. The same tradition occurs in *ḡ. Hag.* 2,77c, *b. Ber.* 55a and in *Gen. Rab.* 1:10.

is purely stylistic. But I think that there is very much more than that behind this change in the word order.

For Hüttenmeister, in his translation of the treatise *Megilla* of the Talmud Yerushalmi,¹⁹ the purpose of the correction would have been to make it impossible to interpret the clause where בראשית would have been considered the subject of the clause and אלהים as the object (“Bereshit created God”) and therefore to cut short any polytheistic interpretation. But this interpretation does not work in Greek, unless instead of $\acute{\omicron}\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ an indeclinable noun would have translated “God.”

For Veltri, the reason for the correction would be to state, without circumlocution, a *creatio ex nihilo* and to avoid the impression given by Genesis (if 1:1–2 is read as a single clause acting as an introduction to 1:3) that before the creation of the land there was already something.²⁰ It is true that in the Greek world, opinion on *creatio ex nihilo* was divided. Wis 11:17, for example, says: “she who created the world from unformed matter ($\acute{\epsilon}\xi\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\omicron}\rho\phi\omicron\upsilon$)” repeating the Platonic expression of *Tim.* 51a, while 2 Macc 7:8 seems to react specifically to this idea: “look at the heavens and the earth and see all that is in them, and know that God made them from nothing ($\omicron\upsilon\kappa\ \acute{\epsilon}\xi\ \acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omega\upsilon$).” But scholars are divided on the exact interpretation of these allusions,²¹ and the idea of pre-existing matter does not seem to have played any part in the oldest interpretations of Genesis.

As for myself, I think instead that the correction implies a polemical and emphatic statement that it is God, and God alone, who is the creator of everything, with no-one’s help, and its purpose is to cut short an instrumental interpretation of *bet* (“by” or “with”). The first note in *La Bible d’Alexandrie*,²² emphasises admirably the deep ambiguity of the Greek and the Hebrew:

¹⁹ F.G. Hüttenmeister, *Megilla. Schriftrolle* (Übersetzung des Talmud Yerushalmi II/10; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 56.

²⁰ Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König Talmai*, 30: “Demnach wird die Umstellung in der ‘rabinischer’ LXX wohl eine deutliche Antwort auf die Frage der *creatio ex nihilo* bzw. der seit den Anfängen wädhenden Existenz des Urstoffes dargestellt haben. Den Rabbinen zufolge ist die Interpretation der griechischen Tora eine eindeutige Stellungnahme für eine Schöpfung ohne Urstoff, und zwar insofern, als die Umstellung von בראשית an die dritte Stelle im Satz einen Temporal- bzw. Modalsatz unmöglich macht. Somit ist die Absolutheit des göttlichen Schaffens festgeschrieben.”

²¹ See J. Goldstein, “The Origins of the Doctrine of Creation Ex Nihilo,” *JJS* 35 (1984): 127–35 and D. Winston, “Creation Ex Nihilo Revisited. A reply to Jonathan Goldstein,” *JJS* 37 (1986): 88–91.

²² *Le Pentateuque. La Bible d’Alexandrie*, 694.

Au commencement: cette initiale du récit, en grec (*en arkhēi*) comme en hébreu (littéralement «en tête»), a donné lieu à d'innombrables interprétations juives ou chrétiennes. Pour les lecteurs grecs, l'expression prise au sens temporel indique un début, mais peut aussi indiquer, en un sens instrumental, que Dieu a créé «par son principe», «par son pouvoir», autres sens possibles du mot *arkhē*.

It is easy to prove that this second interpretation is not something imaginary. A hymn found in Cave 11²³ tells us expressly: ברוך עושה ארץ בכוחו ברוך עושה ארץ בכוחו, מכין חבל בהוכמתו, “Blessed be he who created the earth by his power, who established the world with his wisdom!”²⁴ This sentence clearly proves the possibility of interpreting the *bet* of בראשית as instrumental and also helps us, by mentioning “with his wisdom” (בהוכמתו), to understand the exegetical process which led to the interpretation of the Hebrew text that the correction tries to exclude.

In a very beautiful poem from the book of Proverbs, Wisdom personified says of herself:

YHWH created me (קניי),²⁵ beginning (ראשית) of his path,
the first of his oldest works.
From eternity I was formed,
from the start (מראש), before the origin of the earth. (Prov 8:22–23)

And Wisdom again tells us in a text from Ben Sira (24:9), unfortunately not preserved in Hebrew, although its Greek translation was circulating in Alexandria: πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς ἔκτισέν με “before the centuries, from the beginning he created me.”

So, if Wisdom had been created first, before anything else, if she had been created as a “beginning” as “the start” (ראשית) of everything, then it would be possible to consider the word ראשית as Wisdom’s name, and therefore to translate בראשית not as “in the beginning” but as “with wisdom.” This, effectively, is the translation given by the hymn found in Qumran, the composition of which goes back to the third or second century (the hymn is not a Qumran composition).

²³ 11Q5 XXVI 9–15, published by J.A. Sanders, DJD IV, 47. On this poem, known as, “Hymn to the Creator,” see F. García Martínez, “Creation in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *The Creation of Heaven and Earth. Re-interpretations of Genesis I in the Context of Judaism, Ancient Philosophy, Christianity, and Modern Physics* (ed. G.H. van Kooten; TBN 8; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 49–70; in note 78 of this article there is an extensive bibliography on this hymn.

²⁴ 11Q5 XXVI 13–14.

²⁵ The exact meaning of the verb קנה (“to create” or “to acquire”) has been discussed extensively because the verb was used to prove the eternity of Wisdom, identified with the Word, but the following context leaves no doubt that Wisdom is portrayed as being

And it is also the translation that we find in certain Aramaic versions of the Pentateuch of the first verse of Genesis.²⁶ The fragmentary manuscripts 110, 240 and 440 of the Palestinian Targum translate Gen 1:1: “With wisdom (בהוכמה) God created the heavens and the earth.” Apparently, Targum Neophyti hesitates and gives us two translations: “From the beginning (בְּלִקְדָּמִין), with wisdom (בהוכמה) the *memra* of Yahweh completed the heavens and the earth.”

In the Greek world, permeated with Platonism, the creation of wisdom before the heavens and the earth must have had a special attraction. Had not Aristobulus already said (in frag. 5 cited by Eusebius in his *Preparatio Evangelica*)²⁷ that “one of our ancestors, Solomon, had said better and more clearly that wisdom existed before the heavens and the earth, this agrees with what the Greek philosophers said”? And would Philo of Alexandria, not say later that *Arkhé* is one of the names of wisdom? In his *Legum Allegoriae* I § 43, commenting on Gen 2:8, we read, in Colson and Whitaker’s translation: “By using many words for it Moses has already made it manifest that the sublime and heavenly wisdom is of many names (πολυώνυμον; for he calls it “beginning” (ἀρχήν), and “image” (εἰκόνα), and “vision of God” (ὄρασιν θεοῦ).²⁸

So I think that I can conclude that this first correction was specifically intended to avoid this type of exegesis and to emphasise that God, and God alone, is the creator.

2. Gen 1:26

The second correction in our lists corresponds to Gen 1:26, and has a clear theological implication. The Masoretic text reads נַעֲשֶׂה אָדָם בְּצַלְמֵנוּ כְּדְמוּתֵנוּ “Let us make man in our image, in our resemblance.”

created, and that is how it was understood by the LXX translation: κύριος ἔκτισέν με ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ.

²⁶ For these texts see *Biblia Polyglotta Matritensia. Series IV: Targum Palaestinense in Pentateuchum. L.I. Genesis* (Editio critica sub directione A. Diez Macho; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1988).

²⁷ The fragments attributed to Aristobulus are easily accessible in A.M. Denis, *Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt graeca* (PsVTG 3; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 217–28. The fundamental study is still N. Walter, *Der Thorausleger Aristobulos. Untersuchungen zu seinen Fragmenten und zu pseudepigraphischen Resten der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur* (TUGAL 86; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag; 1964).

²⁸ F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker, *Philo I* (LCL 226; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929), 174–75. See also C. Mondésert, *Legum Allegoriae I–III* (Les œuvres de Philon d’Alexandrie 2; Paris: Cerf, 1962), 52–53. In the note, Mondésert suggests that Philo could have been inspired by the text of Prov 8:22, quoted in *Ebr.* 31.

Unlike the previous correction, which implies a simple change of word order, in this case the actual text would have been corrected. Although there are some small differences among the witnesses (the second preposition is suppressed in *Avot* ודמורנו בצלמנו ובדמותו, and in the *Midrash Hagadol* a modified quotation of Gen 1:27 is added) they all agree on the two changes of text: the plural “let us make” would have been translated by the singular אעשה “I am going to make,” and the plural pronominal suffixes “our” would have been deleted. Thus, the text would have been changed to אעשה אדם בצלם ובדמותו “I am going to make the man in image and likeness,” i.e. ποιήσω ἄνθρωπον ἐν εἰκόνι καὶ ἐν ὁμοιώσει instead of ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ’ εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν of the LXX.²⁹

With one stroke this correction removes not only the risk of a polytheistic interpretation of the plural “let us make,” but also the even more troublesome pronouns with their evident risk of anthropomorphism. The LXX that we know had already deleted the second pronoun, translating בצלמנו by κατ’ εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν, but כדמורנו simply by καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν, without a pronoun, but had preserved the meaning of the original by the insertion of a καί which does not occur in the Hebrew text and allows image and likeness to be joined by a single pronoun.³⁰

It is easy to prove that the Hebrew text has lent itself to all kinds of interpretations in the Alexandrian context. In the Wisdom of Solomon, we find the following interpretation in 9:1–2: “Oh God of our fathers and Lord of mercy, You have made everything with your word and with your Wisdom you have fashioned man.” And in his *De confusione linguarum* § 179³¹ Philo states:

Thus it was meet and right that when man was formed, God should assign a share in the work to His lieutenants, as He does with the words “let us make men,” that so man’s right actions might be attributable to God, but

²⁹ Tov translates into Greek (“The Rabbinic Tradition concerning the ‘Alterations’,” 78) is ποιήσω ἄνθρωπον κατ’ εἰκόνα καὶ καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν, because, even though he surmises that the LXX probably read the prepositions ו et ו of MT as ו and ו, “it is impossible to be precise in regard to this type of grammatical phenomena.”

³⁰ Perhaps this is why *La Bible d’Alexandrie*, 94, translates the text of the LXX “Let us make man according to our image and according to our likeness” (emphasis FGM) in spite of the absence of the second pronoun. The other versions preserve both plural pronouns, and Aquila even makes a distinction between the prepositions: ἐν εἰκόνι ἡμῶν καὶ καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν ἡμῶν.

³¹ F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker, *Philo IV* (LCL 261; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1932), 108–109. See also J.G. Kahn, *De confusione linguarum* (Les œuvres de Philon d’Alexandrie 13; Paris: Cerf, 1963), 142–45.

his sins to others. For it seemed to be unfitting to God the All-ruler that the road to wickedness within the reasonable soul should be of His making, and therefore He delegated the forming of this part to His inferiors. For the work of forming the voluntary element to balance the involuntary had to be accomplished to render the whole complete.

Christian exegesis, where Wisdom is identified with Christ, would skilfully exploit these ambiguities. Already in the *Epistle of Barnabas* (5:5) we can read in respect of Jesus Christ: “If the Lord has endured suffering for us, even though he was the Lord of the whole world, to Whom God said at the creation of the world: ‘Let us make man in our image and likeness’ . . .”³² The same idea is found more concisely in a lovely poem by Ephraim the Syrian: “The Father commanded with his voice, but it is the Son who did the work.”³³

The targumim provide a literal translation of the Hebrew text, without changing the plurals. Neophyti and ms 110 avoid the use of the word “image” (צלם) and translate “in our likeness, as similar to us” (בדמותן כד נפק בן), whereas Pseudo-Jonathan avoids the use of “likeness” (דמות) and translates “in our image, according to our icon” (בצילמנא כד יוקננא). Pseudo-Jonathan is the only one to try and avoid the danger of polytheism of the plurals by inserting a conversation by God with his angels, to whom the difficult plurals clearly refer, “And God said to the angels who serve before him, who were created on the second day of the creation of the world: Let us make Adam, etc.”³⁴

In rabbinic literature we find, obviously, many explanations both for the plural of the verb “let us make” (including the one by Pseudo-Jonathan) and for the plural forms of the suffixes, all intended to safeguard the idea that it is God, and he alone, who created man (chapter eight of *Genesis Rabba* provides a long list), as against less orthodox interpretations. But none is as radical as the corrections that resolve the problem simply by changing the text. *Gen. Rab.* 8:8 tells us how Moses himself was troubled when writing this verse:

³² P. Prigent and R.A. Kraft, *L'Épître de Barnabé* (SC 172; Paris: Cerf, 1971), 108–09. See F.R. Prostmeier, *Der Barnabasbrief* (Kommentar zu den Apostolischen Vätern 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999), 242.

³³ Quoted by T. Kronholm, *Motifs from Genesis 1–11 in the Genuine Hymns of Ephrem the Syrian* (ConBOT 11; Lund: Gleerup, 1978).

³⁴ See M. Pérez Fernández, “Targum y midrás sobre Gen 1,26–27; 2,7; 3,7.21. La creación de Adán en el Targum de PseudoJonatan y en Pirque de Rabbi Eliezer,” in *Salvación en la palabra. Targum. Derash. Berith. En Memoria del profesor A. Díez Macho* (ed. D. Muñoz León; Madrid: Christiandad, 1986), 471–87.

Rabbi Shemuel bar Nachman said in Rabbi Jonathan's name: "When Moses wrote the Torah and had to write down the work of each day, when he came to the verse 'And God said: 'Let us make man in our image, etc.,'' he cried out: 'Lord of the universe, why do you want to give a pretext to the heretics?' 'Moses, you write!—He answered him—whoever wants to be mistaken can be mistaken!'"

I have already mentioned that the version of the list transmitted in the *Midrash Hagadol* preserves a longer form than all the other witnesses and in which the quotation of Gen 1:26 is directly followed by the beginning of Gen 1:27. In translation, the form of the correction says: "I am going to make man according to the image and likeness, and God created Adam according to the image and according to the likeness" (ויברא אלהים את האדם בצלם וברמות).

I am convinced that this addition is secondary and later because, besides the correction, it gives us the explanation, according to the rabbinic principle, that the difficulties of the biblical text are explained by what follows in the text. In this case, the verb in the singular of the correction is explained by the use of the verb in the singular in Gen 1:27 (ויברא, "and he created"). In a dialogue between Rabbi Shimlay and the heretics in *Gen. Rab.* 8:9 we can read:

Rabbi Shimlay says: In every place where you find an argument (תשובה) in the edition) for the *minim*, you find its healing (רפואה) nearby. They (the heretics) again asked him: Why is it written: "And God said: let us make man, etc." Read what follows, he answered them. It is not written: "And the gods created (ויבראו) man," but "And God created (ויברא) man."

In Qumran we do not find exegetical elaborations on this text of Genesis, but instead we find the explicit and emphatic statement that it is God, and God alone (רק אתה בראתה) who created man, in this case a just man. In the *Hymns Scroll*, in col. VII 17–18 in the new numbering³⁵ (Sukenik's XV 14), we can read: ואיכה יוכל כול להשנות דבריכה רק אתה "How could anyone change your words? You alone, you have created the just man."

On the other hand, in the manuscripts preserved there is absolutely no mention of man as God's image. The word "image" (צלם) is used only twice in the *Damascus Document* (and in two copies from Cave 4) which quotes and interprets the mention of the "pedestals of your images" in Amos 5:26. And the word דמות, so dear to Ezekiel, occurs

³⁵ F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1:154–55.

only once (apart from *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* where it has a special meaning), in 4Q504 8, a collection of prayers, which has the title *Words of the Luminaries*. In the prayer for the first day of the week, which focuses on creation, we can read in line 4 “[Adam] our [fat]her, You fashioned (him) in the likeness of [Your] glory” (אדם א[ב]ינו יצרתה ברמות כבוד[כה]).³⁶ The use of the verb צר “fashion,” and not the verbs ברא “create” or עשה “make,” indicates that the author is really thinking of the second creation, Gen 2, where God formed man from clay. But what is interesting is the substitution of the pronoun with a reference to God’s glory, which allows the author to introduce the topic of Adam’s glory (a common topic in Qumran) as a reflection of God’s glory. These two Qumran texts, then, prove that this “correction” of Gen 1:26 was completely compatible with the utterly orthodox interpretation of this biblical text in Qumran.

3. Gen 1:27

The third correction in our lists concerns the text found in Gen 1:27 and also in Gen 5:1. The Masoretic text reads זכר ונקבה ברא אלהם in Gen 1:27 and זכר ונקבה בראם in Gen 5:1, i.e. “male and female he created them,” which in both cases is translated by the LXX by ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς “male and female he made them.” Instead of this text, the lists provide as a correction a text that is constant in the essential element, the change from plural to singular of the object, whether written as a suffix בראו (as in Gen 5:1), or as a separate pronoun ברא אהו (as in Gen 1:27), but varies in the element that specifies the exact modality of the basic general idea which the correction is attempting to insert into the text.

Some of the witnesses³⁷ give as a correction: זכר ונקבה בראו “male and female he created him.” The result of the correction gives the following clause in Greek: ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν, and this clause, like the clause in Hebrew, simply wishes to say that the first man was created by God as man and woman at once, the androgynous being of the tradition of Greek thought. Clearly the purpose of the correction is to resolve the incongruity of the MT, which in v. 27 changes directly from

³⁶ Edition by M. Baillet, DJD VII, 162–63.

³⁷ For a complete list of all the variants in the manuscripts, see Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König Talmi*, 37.

singular to plural, but it also serves to emphasise that the biblical text speaks of primordial man and to insert ideas about primordial man into the text, in this case, the concept of androgyny imported from Greek thought. This is a direct import, as seems proved by the fact that in *Gen. Rab.* 8:1, in an explanation of Gen 5:1–2 attributed to Rabbi Yirmeyah (in which it says explicitly “When the Holy One, may he be blessed, created the first man, he created him androgynous”), he uses the Greek word ἀνδρογύνοϋς, transcribed into Hebrew as אַנְדְּרוֹנִיָּס.

In the other part of the witnesses of the list, the word וַנְקַבֶּה is replaced by וַנְקַבֵּי or וַנְקַבִּי, that is, a word in the plural with a masculine suffix referring to the male whom God created, i.e. the first man. The word denotes orifices and is usually translated by female genital organs (for example, Saldarini, in his translation of version B of *Avot*, translates “A male with corresponding female genitals he created him”,³⁸ Lauterbach translates the version of the *Mekilta* “A male with corresponding female parts created He him.”³⁹ Thus, this interpretation sees in this variant a confirmation of the androgynous character of the first man. Even Tov indicates in a note: “It appears that וַנְקַבֵּי/וַנְקַבִּי refers to the female orifices of the primeval man who was thus androgynous”⁴⁰ although he acknowledges that נַקְבֵּ/נַקְבֶּ “in rabbinic literature is used only in connection with the male sexual organ.”

And yet, both in the Rabbinic Hebrew and in the Aramaic, the word has the general meaning of opening, hole, even in respect of a man’s orifices. The plural used with the masculine suffix must simply be translated as “his orifices.” According to the witnesses of the list, the correction is וַנְכַר וַנְקַבֵּי בְרָא “he created a male and his orifices.” Thus, what God created in Gen 1:27 was only man, he alone, with his orifices, and not man and woman, nor yet an androgyne, man and woman at the same time. I think that the correction, in the form transmitted to us by half the witnesses, represents a denial of the androgynous nature of the first man and therefore a denial of any feminine element in the divinity of which man (with his orifices) is an image.

For Veltri,⁴¹ the meaning of the correction in this form would be to introduce into the text the creation of the first man as a *prototype* formed

³⁸ A.J. Saldarini, *The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan (Abot the Rabbi Nathan) Version B* (SJLA 11; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 215.

³⁹ J.Z. Lauterbach, *Mekilta de-Rabbi Ishmael. Vol. I* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1976), 111–12.

⁴⁰ Tov, “The Rabbinic Tradition concerning the ‘Alterations,’” 87.

⁴¹ Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König Talmai*, 42.

(according to Gnostic ideas) from a heavenly element and an earthly element: on the one hand, “image and likeness” of God (the divine component, in common with heavenly beings) and on the other, “male with his orifices” (the earthly component, in common with animals). Veltri uses the text of *Gen. Rab.* 8:11, and the discussion of the rabbis that follows the quotation certainly proves that the correction was understood in this way, for the connection with *בצלם ובדמות* is explicit in the words of R. Tiflai. But this is the only text to combine Gen 1:27 and 5:2, and the only one to give this explanation. In the version provided by *b. Megilla*, the correction reads: *זכר ונקבה בראו ולא כתבו בראם* “male and female he created him, and they did not write he created them.” This last detail indicates that the reason for the correction is to make the sentence agree with the form of the immediately preceding verb in the Masoretic text of Gen 1:27 *ברא אהו*, “in the image of Elohim he created him,” where it is also a question of God’s image, although this has no significance in respect of the “correction.” The first man, then, is “male and female” and this because he was created in God’s image.

The same kind of reflection on man as God’s image led Philo (*De opificio mundi* § 134)⁴² to deny his corporality and to consider him instead as an idea, neither man nor woman:

After this he says that “God formed man by taking clay from the earth, and breathed into his face the breath of life” (Gen 2:7). By this also he shows very clearly that there is a vast difference between the man thus formed and the man that came into existence earlier after the image of God: for the man so formed is an object of sense-perception, partaking already of such quality, consisting of body and soul, man or woman, by nature mortal; while he that was after the (Divine) image was an idea or type or seal, and object of thought (only), incorporeal, neither male nor female (*ἀσώματος, οὐτ’ ἄρρεν οὔτε θήλυ*) by nature incorruptible.

In Qumran, the text of Gen 1:27, in the form transmitted by the Masoretes, was used to justify a legal opinion that is completely distinctive and peculiar to the sect. In the *Damascus Document*, the “builders of the wall” are condemned for having fallen into Belial’s nets and for having fornicated “by marrying two wives during their lifetime (that is their lives), even though the principle of creation is: male and female He created them; and the ones who went into the ark: went in two by two

⁴² Colson and Whitaker, *Philo I*, 106–107. See also R. Arnaldez, *De Opificio mundi* (Les œuvres de Philon d’Alexandrie 1; Paris: Cerf, 1961), 230–31.

into the ark” (CD IV 20–21).⁴³ This text is intensely discussed,⁴⁴ because taken in its literal sense it proposes a regulation for life considered to contradict all that we know about the Judaism of the time. For that reason, a large majority of scholars have suggested changing the masculine pronoun to a feminine (for example, Dupont-Sommer, says “Entendons sans doute: de leur vivant à *elles deux*”)⁴⁵ and therefore understand that the text forbade both bigamy and any other marriage after divorce, or simply bigamy, or a new marriage while the first wife is still alive. But what the text really forbids is any second marriage, even after the death of the first wife.⁴⁶ The text of Genesis is interpreted by putting all the weight on the singular זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה. Thus God created only one man and only one woman, and this interpretation is considered as “the foundation of creation,” and God also made only one male and only one female of each species enter the ark. Whereas the “builders of the wall” believe that man can have several wives in succession, either because his wife is dead or because they have divorced, for the members of the Damascus community the text of Genesis means that the law of creation requires absolute monogamy: a man can have only one wife during his whole lifetime; of course, he can divorce her, but neither after divorce nor in the event of his wife’s death, can he take another. In Qumran then there is no room for the correction of the plural בְּרֵאשִׁיתוֹ to בְּרֵאשִׁיתָהּ, and נְקֵבָה is always the woman.

4. Gen 2:2

The fourth correction in our lists concerns Genesis 2:2. The Masoretic text reads: וַיִּכְלֵ אֱלֹהִים בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי “And God completed on the seventh day (the work that he had done).” The Hebrew text has given rise to many difficulties because God himself seems to break the Sabbath rest,

⁴³ The best edition of the text is by E. Qimron in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (ed. M. Broshi; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1992), 9–49; the text is on 17.

⁴⁴ The most important studies are collected in F. García Martínez, “Damascus Document: A Bibliography of Studies 1970–1989,” in *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*, 63–83.

⁴⁵ “No doubt we understand: while *both of the women* were still alive”: A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte* (Bibliothèque historique; Payot, Paris, 1983), 144.

⁴⁶ See F. García Martínez, “Man and Woman: Halakhah based upon Eden in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Paradise Interpreted. Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. G.P. Luttikhuisen; TBN 2; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 95–115.

since he finished his work on the seventh day. The lists agree on the essential: the change of the seventh day to the sixth: ויכל ביום השש “and he ended on the sixth day” (most of the witnesses omit “God”). In this case, we are certain of the Greek translation, because in the Septuagint (as in the Samaritan and Syriac versions) there is the ordinal six and not seven καὶ συνετέλεσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἕκτῃ “And on the sixth day, God finished his works, which he had done.”

The presence of the same reading in other witnesses such as the Samaritan Pentateuch could lead us to believe that this is a true textual variant. On the other hand, the explicit statement in Exod 20:11 “For in six days Yahweh had made the heavens, the earth, the sea and all that they contain, but he was idle on the seventh day,” and repeated in 31:17 “For in six days, Yahweh had made the heavens and the earth, but the seventh day, he was idle and drew breath,” would instead lead to believe that the aim of the “correction” is to harmonise the discordant biblical text and to make the two visions of the sabbath rest agree.⁴⁷

Etienne Nodet, who is never short of original ideas, suggests that behind the change there is a polemic about the start of the Sabbath, Friday afternoon according to the Masoretic text and Saturday morning according to the other witnesses.⁴⁸ Instead, I think that this is an exegetical “correction” due to greater rigour in the observance of the Sabbath,⁴⁹ of which the rest should not be disturbed by any work (מלאכה), even if it were divine.

Many of the witnesses of the ancient Greek world, which mention the number six instead of seven, go in this direction. Thus, in *Ant.* 1.33 Josephus says:⁵⁰

Thus, so Moses tell us, the world and everything in it was made in six days in all; and on the seventh God rested and had respite from His labours, for which reason we also pass this day in repose from toil and call it the sabbath, a word that in the Hebrew language means “rest.”

And Philo says that the world was completed in six days (*De opificio mundi* 89) and speaks of the *hexaeméron* of creation (*Leg.* 2:12). Or else in the *Epistle of Barnabas* 15:2–3.⁵¹

⁴⁷ On the various rabbinic interpretations see B. Grossfeld, “Targum Onqelos and Rabbinic Interpretation to Genesis 2:1,2,” *JJS* 24 (1973): 176–78.

⁴⁸ E. Nodet, “Josephus and the Pentateuch,” *JSS* 28 (1997): 154–94 (p. 179).

⁴⁹ Suggested as a possibility by Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König Talmai*, 48–49.

⁵⁰ In the translation by H.St.J. Thackeray, *Josephus Jewish Antiquities. Books I–IV* (LCL 242; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930), 17.

⁵¹ Cf. the edition by P. Prigent and R.A. Kraft, *Épître de Barnabé* 182–85.

If my sons observe the sabbath, then I will extend mercy upon them. He mentions the sabbath at the beginning of creation: And in six days God made the works of his hands. He finished them on the seventh day during which he rested and which he sanctified.

But this fact is clearer in the two Palestinian writings that have best preserved for us the discussions about the sabbath: the *Book of Jubilees* and the *Damascus Document*.⁵² Now, in *Jub.* 2:1 we may read:⁵³

On the Lord's orders the angel of the presence said to Moses: "Write all the words about the creation—how in six days the Lord God completed all his works, everything that he had created, and keep Sabbath on the seven day. He sanctified it for all ages and set it as a sign for all his works.

And before describing the sabbath and its laws in detail, he repeats in 2:16–17:

He finished all his works on the sixth day: everything in heaven, on the earth, in the seas, in the depths, in the light, in the darkness, and in every place. He gave us the Sabbath day as a great sign so that we should perform work for six days and that we should keep Sabbath from all work on the seventh day.⁵⁴

At Qumran we have found at least fifteen copies of the *Book of Jubilees* in its original language (previously known chiefly through the Ethiopic translation), distributed over five caves,⁵⁵ and the work is also quoted as a composition with authority in the *Damascus Document*.⁵⁶ It is no surprise, then, that in the code on the sabbath in the *Damascus Document*⁵⁷ and in other Qumran texts we find the same strict interpretation of the biblical laws concerning rest during the sabbath.

No copy of Gen 2:2 has been found in Qumran, either in the biblical manuscripts or in the quotations in non-biblical manuscripts; but I am convinced that if the verse had been preserved, we would have found the "correction" there duly attested, because in Qumran no-one hesitated to change the biblical text in respect of the interpretation that

⁵² For the sabbath in *Jubilees* and in Qumran, see L. Doering, *Schabbat* (TSAJ 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 43–118 (*Jubilees*) and 119–282 (Qumran).

⁵³ According to the translation by J.C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (CSCO 511: Scriptores Aethiopicci 88; Leuven: Peeters, 1989), 7.

⁵⁴ VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 12.

⁵⁵ 1Q17–18 published in DJD I; 2Q19–20 and 3Q5 published in DJD III; 4Q176a published (but not identified) in DJD V; 4Q216–224 published in DJD XIII, and 11Q12 published in DJD XXIII.

⁵⁶ Dans CD XV 2–4.

⁵⁷ CD X 14–XI 18.

was considered to be the true one, and the Qumran regulations on the sabbath exhibit a strictness comparable to the *Book of Jubilees*.

But if this correction had been inserted in the context of discussions about the sabbath rest, why was it connected with King Ptolemy? Were the disputes about the sabbath a hot item in Alexandria? I cannot give a conclusive answer. But perhaps it is significant that in the fragment on the sabbath transmitted by Eusebius, Aristobulus (who addressed his work to Ptolemy) quotes the biblical text with the “correction” included (“It clearly says in our law that God rested on the seventh day . . . Because the law says the He made the heavens and the earth in six days . . .”). In *Gen. Rab.* 10:9, we find an isolated reference to this “correction” (“This is one of the texts that he altered for King Ptolemy: And he ended on the sixth day and rested on the seventh day”), but we also find the following commentary:

King Ptolemy asked the old men of Rome: “In how many days did the Holy One, blessed be he, create the world?” “In six,” they answered him. “And since that time does Gehenna burn for the wicked? Woe betide the world which has such a judge!”

At all events, the discussion about the sabbath was to continue for a long time, and the biblical text would continue to be used against the Jews even at a very late date. In his commentary on Gen 2:2, Jerome provides a good example:⁵⁸

Pro die sexta in Hebraeo diem septimam habet. Artabimus igitur Iudaeos qui de otio Sabbati gloriantur, quod iam tunc in principio sabbatum dissolutum sit, dum Deus operatur in sabbato, complens opera sua in eum, et benedicens ipsi diei quia in illo universa compleverit.

It is no surprise, then, that the change from seven to six had already been inserted at the time of King Ptolemy and that, unlike the other changes we have examined, it can still be found today in the Bible of Alexandria.⁵⁹

⁵⁸ CCL 72,4 quoted by Veltri, *Eine Tora für den König Talmi*, 51.

⁵⁹ A preliminary version of this contribution was read at the École Normale Supérieure de Paris in the presence of a group carrying out research on *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, directed by M. Harl. My very sincere thanks to the valuable comments made by all those who joined in the discussion after the lecture.

CHAPTER FOURTEEN

DIVINE SONSHIP AT QUMRAN: BETWEEN THE OLD AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

In col. XVII of the *Hodayot* the poet addresses God with the following words:

For you have known me since my father
from the vitals [you have established me,]
[from the womb of] my mother you have filled me,
from the breast of her who conceived me
your compassion has always been upon me,
from the lap of my wet-nurse [you have looked after me.]

...

For my mother did not know me
and my father abandoned me to you.
Because you are father to all sons of your truth.
In them you rejoice,
like one full of gentleness for the child,
and like a wet-nurse,
you clutch to your chest all your creatures.¹

In the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, as well as in Biblical Hebrew, there are no specific words to express the abstract concept of “fatherhood” or of “sonship.” A study of divine sonship at Qumran should thus start from an analysis of the words that normally express the genetic relationship among humans (such as father, son, first-born, etc.) or from the words that express the actions that bring about such genetic relationships (such as conceive, engender, beget, give birth, etc.). In the fragment of the poem just quoted, the author expresses his sonship very concretely (“my father,” “the vitals,” “the womb of my mother,” “the breast of her who conceived me”), but the same poet does not hesitate to use the same concrete language when speaking about God, presenting him like a wet-nurse and asserting the he is “father to all the sons of your truth” *כי אתה אב לכל בני אמתכה*.

¹ 1QH^a XVII 29–31 and 35–36, *Editio princeps*, E.L. Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press and The Hebrew University, 1955), col. XI. The Hebrew text used, the numbering of columns and lines, are from F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *DSSSE*, 1:184. The translation is taken from F. García Martínez, *DSSST*, 349–50.

Obviously, such a full study is out of the question here, even if it were to be restricted to the most characteristic word that expresses sonship: the substantive “son.”² Hebrew בן (be it in the singular or in the plural) is found no less than 628 times in the non-biblical texts from Qumran, and the Aramaic ܢܪ 325 times (ܢܫ father and ܢܝܡ mother are less frequently used, respectively 171 and 43 times).³ I thought for a moment of the possibility of restricting the study to the quotes in which “son” is used clearly as a metaphor, without reference to the carnal generation that is the basis of “sonship.” In the quoted text, the divine sonship that the author claims is clearly metaphoric, since it is directly opposed to the real human paternity. Very common expressions, such as “sons of light” or “sons of darkness” are also clearly metaphorical. Determining the precise extent and meaning of these metaphors, however, seems to me an impossible task. A single example, familiar to students of the New Testament should serve to provide a clear illustration of the difficulty involved in determining the precise meaning of metaphors that express sonship.

In the first letter of John 3:10, the antithetical expressions τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου “sons of the devil” and τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ “sons of god,” are used, and all the interpreters understand them in a metaphorical sense.⁴ A little further in the same Letter (1 John 3:12), however, we are told that Cain was ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ, a parallel expression to τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου, which in this case could refer to genetic sonship if the Letter is alluding to the tradition preserved in the Targum Pseudo Jonathan.⁵ According to the said Targum, Adam is not the true father of Cain but rather Samma’el.⁶ Thus if Cain is a son of the Devil in the most basic

² É. Puech, “Dieu le Père dans les écrits péritestamentaires et les manuscrits de la mer Morte,” *RevQ* 20/78 (2001): 287–310 has recently attempted an overview of the theme of “fatherhood” of God, also at Qumran.

³ M.G. Abegg, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* (Leiden: Brill, 2003).

⁴ See, for example, G. Strecker, *The Johannine Letters* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 105.

⁵ As it is interpreted by a good numbers of commentators. See, for example, R.E. Brown, *The Epistles of John* (Anchor Bible; Garden City NY: Doubleday, 1982), 442–43. T.C. de Kruyf, ‘Nicht wie Kain (der) vom Bösen war . . . (1 Joh 3,13),’ *Bijdragen* 41 (1980): 47–63. On the related text, John 8:44 see the classic work N.A. Dahl, “Der Erstgeborene Satans und der Vater des Teufels (Polyk. 7:1 und Joh. 8:44),” in *Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen zu seinem 70. geburtsstag am 10. Dezember 1964* (ed. W. Eltester and F.H. Kettler; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964), 70–84, and more recently G. Reim, “John. 8:44—Gotteskinder-Teufelskinder,” *NTS* 30 (1984): 619–24.

⁶ On this topic see F. García Martínez “Caín, su padre y el origen del mal,” in *Pal-*

meaning of the word, how far does the metaphor reach in the parallel expressions τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου and τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ?

For these reasons, and because I am now developing a new hermeneutic paradigm to look at the relationship between the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament which is based on the common use in both corpora of the elements provided by the Hebrew Bible, I have chosen to look at the three categories in which texts are commonly grouped that speak of divine sonship in the Hebrew Bible (—1: the angelic “sons of God”;—2: Israel “son of God”;—3: the king “son of God”) in order to show, with the help of some selected texts, the progress (or the modifications) that we can register in the Dead Sea Scrolls in each one of these categories with respect to the idea of sonship. To these three classical categories I will add a fourth that is not found in the Hebrew Bible, but which appears in some Qumranic texts:—4: the Messiah “son of God.”

1. *The angelic “Sons of God”*

The expression “sons of (the) God(s)” (בני אלהים [ה])⁷ used as a collective name to designate angelic beings in Gen 6:2, 4 and Job 1:6; 2:1; 28:7⁸ is not used at Qumran where is usually replaced by “sons of heavens” (בני שמים)⁹ an expression already used in *1 Enoch* to designate the “son of the gods” that consorted with the “daughters of men” according to Gen 6:2–4. The בני אלהים of Ps 29:1 and 89:7 are present in a few texts (like 4Q381 15 4, which is a direct reference to Ps 89:7, and in two

abra, Prodigio, Poesía. in Memoriam P. Luis Alonso Schökel, S.J. (ed. V. Collado Bertomeu; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico/Jávea: Huerto de Enseñanzas, 2003), 17–35.

⁷ There is abundant literature on the topic. Among the classic studies, see W. Schlisske, *Gottessöhne und Gottessohn im Alten Testament. Phasen der Entmythisierung im Alten Testament* (BWANT 97; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973); O. Loretz, “Aspekte der kanaänischen Gottes-So(/ö)hn(e)-Tradition im Alten Testament,” *UF* 7 (1975): 586–89 and J. Luis Cunchillos, *Cuando los ángeles eran dioses* (Bibliotheca Salmanticensis 14; Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 1976). Among the more recent studies, see M.S. Smith, *The Early History of God. Yahweh and the Other Deities in Ancient Israel* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1990).

⁸ And originally in Deut 32:8, as proved by a copy of Deut from Cave 4 (4Q37, 4QDeut^f) which uses it (as the LXX) where MT has changed it to “sons of Israel.” See DJD XIV, 90. On the meaning, within the context of the poem, see Paul Winter, “Der Begriff ‘Söhne Gottes’ im Moselied Dtn 32.1–43,” *ZAW* 67 (1955): 40–48.

⁹ Both in the Hebrew texts (1QS IV 22; XI 8; 1QH^a XI 2; 2 i 10; 4Q181 1 ii 2; 4Q416 1 12; 4Q418 2+2a–c 4; 69 ii 12), as in the texts in Aramaic (1Q20 II 5, 16; V 3; VI 8; 4Q546 14 4).

other fragmentary texts)¹⁰ and are mentioned twice in frag. 2 of the Sukenik edition of the *Hodayot*, a fragment that is probably part of the present col. XXIII. The first of these two references to the בני אלים in the *Hodayot* (line 3: “and in your land and among the sons of gods and among the sons of . . .”) implies the presence of these angels in the land of Israel. The second (line 10) is important, not only because it proves that the two angelic names (“sons of gods” and “sons of heavens”) are equivalent, but because it suggests that it is the (divine) spirit who makes the author, who has identified himself as dust in the poem, form a community with the angels: “and upon the dust you stretch out the spirit [. . .] in the mud [. . . the so]ns of gods, to be in communion with the sons of heavens (להחיד עם בני שמים) [. . . et]ernal without return of darkness.”¹¹

The unique expression of Ps 82:7 “sons of the Most High” (בני עליון) is not found in plural in the Qumran texts, although we do find two instances of the expression בני אל that does not occur in the Hebrew Bible (in 1QH^a 2 ii 13 and in 11Q13 II 14),¹² always within a fragmentary context.

In the Hebrew Bible the divine sonship of the angels represents either an echo of the original plurality of divine beings, an adaptation of the Canaanite divine council,¹³ or the remains of an already surpassed mythology. It was used more as a taxonomic element intended to underline its appurtenance to the celestial order and its distinction from the realm of humans than to indicate a father-son relationship. The occasional and very restricted survival of this terminology within the angelology of Qumran seems to have the same function. This appears most clearly when considering one of the most frequently used generic names for the angels: אלים (divine beings). The name appears more than 50 times (20 in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*)¹⁴ and it is only surpassed by מלאך.¹⁵ The name אלים underlines the heavenly nature of the angels,

¹⁰ 4Q381 has been published by E. Schuller in DJD XI. Only here it is used with the article, בני האלים. The other two occasions, as in the biblical text, appear without it. These two occasions are 4Q491 24 4 “in praise together with (ידד עם) the sons of gods” (published by M. Baillet, DJD VII, 43) and 5Q13 1 6 “you chose from the sons of gods,” published by J.T. Milik in DJD III, 183.

¹¹ DSSSE, 1:198.

¹² Published in F. García Martínez, E.J.C. Tigchelaar and A.S. van der Woude, DJD XXIII, 225.

¹³ See T.E. Mullen, *The Assembly of the Gods. The Divine Council in Canaanite and Early Hebrew Literature* (HSM 24; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980).

¹⁴ Published by C. Newsom in DJD XI, 173–401.

¹⁵ The word appears some 115 times.

leaving aside the theme of divine sonship. The same happens with the use of other divine names that are used of angels, including אֱלֹהִים. While it is true that some of the uses of אֱלֹהִים are ambiguous and could refer equally to God, other texts, such as “the glory of the King of the god-like beings (מֶלֶךְ אֱלֹהִים) they declare in the dwellings where they have their station,”¹⁶ or “O you chiefs of the princes of all the god-like beings, praise the majestically praiseworthy God (כֹּל אֱלֹהִים שְׁבַחוּ) (לְאֱלֹהֵי הַשְּׁבַחֹתָהּ),”¹⁷ leave no doubt that אֱלֹהִים is also used for the angels.¹⁸ At Qumran the angels are not “sons of God,” but their heavenly nature is strongly underlined.¹⁹ On this point, the texts from Qumran are no different from the rest of the Jewish literature of the time, and show the same general development of angelology of the period.²⁰

Other aspects of Qumran angelology, however, offer us a clear development of the “divine sonship of the angels” because they extend to human beings angelic characteristics. In the *Genesis Apocryphon* (in the first fragmentary columns of which we find four references to the בְּנֵי שָׁמַיִם) the story of the birth of Noah is told, which we can complete thanks to *I En.* 106. The description of the physical appearance of Noah has not been preserved, but the parallels show that the child does not have a human but an angelic appearance (“And his father Lamech was afraid of him and fled and went to his father Methusalah. And he said to him, I have begotten a strange son: he is not like a man, but is like the children of the angels of heaven, of a different type, and not like us.”)²¹ The reaction of the father Lamech, preserved in col. II is totally

¹⁶ 4Q400 2 5, cf. Newsom, DJD XI, 187.

¹⁷ 4Q403 1 i 32–33, cf. Newsom, DJD XI, 269.

¹⁸ See C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), 23–29.

¹⁹ On qumranic angelology see M.J. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran. A comparative study of I Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and sectarian writings from Qumran* (JSPSup 11; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992).

²⁰ See G. Dellling, “Die Bezeichnung ‘Söhne Gottes’ in der jüdischen Literatur der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit,” in *God’s Christ and His People. Studies in Honour of Nils Alstrup Dahl* (ed. J. Jervell and W. Meeks; Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1977), 18–281 and B. Byrne, “Sonship of God in the Intertestamental Literature,” in “*Sons of God*”—“*Seed of Abraham*” *A Study of the Idea of the Sonship of God of All Christians in Paul against the Jewish Background* (AnBib 83; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1979), 18–70. The most complete overview is given by M. Mach, *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit* (TSAJ 34; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992).

²¹ *I En.* 106:5, translation by M.A. Knibb in *The Apocryphal Old Testament* (ed. H.F.D. Sparks; Oxford: Clarendon, 1984), 314. In 106:2 the boy is described: “And his body was white like snow and red like the flower of a rose, and the hair of his head was white like wool... and his eyes were beautiful; and when he opened his eyes, he made the whole house bright like the sun so that the whole house was exceptionally bright.”

clear: “Behold, then, I thought in my hart that the conception was (the work) of the Watchers, and the pregnancy of the Holy Ones, and it belonged to the Nephilin, and my heart within me was upset on account of this boy.”²² In other Aramaic text, originally published as a *Horoscope of the Messiah*,²³ but which is now interpreted as dealing also with the birth of Noah,²⁴ it is said of a boy of a portentous appearance that “Counsel and prudence will be with him and he will know the secrets of men. And his wisdom will reach to all the peoples. And he will know the secrets of all living things.” (4Q534 1 i 7–8)²⁵ This text does not use the language of sonship, but rather the language of election, since it defines the protagonist as **בְּחִיר אֱלֹהִים** “elect of God.” It reveals, nevertheless, that a human person (an exceptional one, of course)²⁶ can be equal to angelic beings, “the sons of God.”

The same equation appears in other elements of the Qumranic angelology. The polysemic word **רוּחַ** is used both for angels and for the human “spirit.”²⁷ The beginning of a new Hymn in 1QH^a XI can be used as example:

I thank you, Lord,
 because you saved my life from the pit,
 and from Sheol and Abaddon you have lifted me up
 to an everlasting height,
 so that I can walk on a boundless plain.
 And I know that there is hope
 for someone you fashioned out of clay
 to be an everlasting community. (**לְסוּד עוֹלָם**).
 The corrupt spirit (**וְרוּחַ נְעוּדָה**) you have purified
 from the great sin
 so that he can take his place

²² 1QapGen XX 1, published by N. Avigad and Y. Yadin, *A Genesis Apocryphon. A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1956). *DSSSE*, 1:29.

²³ J. Starcky, “Un texte messianique araméen de la grotte 4 de Qumrân,” in *Mémorial du cinquantenaire. École des langues orientales anciennes de l’Institut Catholique de Paris: 1914–1964* (Travaux de l’Institut Catholique de Paris 10; Paris 1964), 51–66.

²⁴ The text has been published with the title *4QNaissance de Noé^a ar*, see É. Puech, *DJD XXXI*, 132.

²⁵ *DSSSE*, 2:1073.

²⁶ A couple of texts present the figure of Moses in this way. In 4Q374 2 ii 6 it is said that God “made him like a God” (**שִׁתְּנֵנוּ לְאֱלֹהִים**) (*DSSSE*, 2:740) and in 4Q377 1 ii 11 it is asserted that Moses “spoke as an angel through his mouth” (**וּכְמִלְאֲךָ יִדְבֵר מִפִּיּוֹ**) (*DSSSE*, 2:744). In other literary traditions, of course, we find the same phenomenon attributed to other characters like Adam, Seth, or even Cain.

²⁷ See A.E. Sekki, *The Meaning of Ruah at Qumran* (SBLMS 110; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).

with the host of the holy ones (עם צבא קדשים),
 and can enter in communion
 with the congregation of the sons of heaven (לבוא ביהוד עם עדת בני שמים).
 You cast eternal destiny for man
 with the spirits of knowledge (רוחות דעת),
 so that he praises your name together in celebration (ביחד רנה),
 and tells your wonders before all your works.²⁸

In this text “spirits of knowledge” is parallel to “sons of heaven” and to “host of the holy ones,” and is clearly an angelic designation. The “corrupt spirit” is the poet (and everybody who recites the Hymn) saved by God from the pit. רוח is thus used both for angels and for men. The same is the case with the word קודש, which is applied to both categories. In col. X of the *War Scroll*²⁹ we read:

And who (is) like your people, Israel,
 whom you chose
 from all the peoples of the earth,
 a people of holy ones of the covenant (עם קדושי ברית),
 learned in the law, wise of knowledge [...]
 alert to the voice of Glory,
 seers of the holy angels (רואי מלאכי קודש),
 with open ears, hearing of profound things.³⁰

And in col. XII:

For there is a multitude of holy ones in heaven
 and a host of angels in your dwelling
 to [praise] your [name.]
 And the chosen ones of your holy people
 you have established for yourself among t[hem].³¹

The use of both words (“spirits” and “holy ones”) as angelic names has obvious roots in the Hebrew Bible.³² Both terms come from the heavenly sphere, and both are used here also to name human beings. Other words used for angels come from the human realm, particularly in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*.³³ In this composition (besides the omnipresent מלאך and many other angelic names) angels are called “priests” (כוהנים),

²⁸ 1QH^a XI 19–23; *DSST*, 332.

²⁹ Published by Sukenik, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*.

³⁰ 1QM X 9–11; *DSST*, 102–103.

³¹ 1QM XII 1–2; *DSST*, 105.

³² Ps 89:6; Job 5:1; 15:15, Zech 14:5; Dan 4:14; 8:13, and Num 16:22 and 27:16 respectively.

³³ Published by C. Newsom in DJD XI.

“princes” (נְשִׂאִים) and “chiefs” (רֹאשִׁים). “Priest” comes from the cultic realm, “princes” and “chiefs” from the tribal organisation, both military and political. These words are used generally in plural, as class names, and are sometimes combined as a single title (“chiefs of the princes”), and on one occasion they are joined to the abstract כוהנות “the chiefs of the princes of the wondrous priesthood.”³⁴

If angels are presented in the *Songs* as heavenly priests, human priests are equated to angels in the *Rule of Blessings*.³⁵

You shall be like an angel of the face in the holy residence for the glory of the God of the Hosts [...] You shall be around, serving in the temple of the kingdom, sharing the lot with the angels of the face and the council of the community [...] for eternal time and for all the perpetual periods.³⁶

The community between angels and men is expressed here as “sharing the lot” (נִוְרָל), a term that appears more than 100 times in the preserved texts and that reveals the ultimate origin of this belief: the dualistic thinking of the group in which humanity is divided in two camps: “sons of light” and “sons of darkness,” a division that corresponds directly to the division of the angelic world as expressed in the *Treatise of the Two Spirits*:³⁷ “In the hand of the Prince of Lights (שֵׁר אֲוִרִים) is dominion over all the sons of justice; they walk in the paths of light. And in the hand of the Angel of Darkness (מַלְאָךְ הַחֹשֶׁךְ) is total dominion over the sons of deceit; they walk on paths of darkness.”³⁸ Angels and men share indeed the same “lot.”

The intimate association of the “sons of light” with the angelic host³⁹ appears explicitly in the context of the eschatological war, where both fight together:⁴⁰ “On this (day) the assembly of the gods and the

³⁴ In 4Q403 1 ii 21 = 4Q405 8–9 5–6.

³⁵ Published by J.T. Milik in DJD I.

³⁶ 1QSb IV 24–26, *DSS*, 433.

³⁷ That is part of the *Community Rule*, 1QS III 14–IV 26. The text has been very intensively studied, lately by J. Duhaime, “Cohérence structurelle et tensions internes dans l’Instruction sur les Deux Esprits (1QS III 13–IV 26),” in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition* (ed. F. García Martínez; BETL 80; Peeters, Leuven 2003), 103–31, with references to previous studies.

³⁸ 1QS III 20–21, *DSS*, 6.

³⁹ The association of the impious with the host of evil angels is even expressed with the terminology of “sonship,” since the expression בני בלעל “sons of Belial” is found five times: 4Q174 I 8; 4Q286 7 ii 6; 4Q386 1 ii 3; 4Q525 25 2 and 11Q11 VI 3.

⁴⁰ The reason given for exclusion from the camp and from the battle to all those who are not in state of perfect purity is precisely the presence “of the angels of sanctity who are with their armies” 1QM VII 6.

congregation of men shall confront each other for great destruction. The sons of light and the lost of darkness shall battle together for God's might, between the roar of a huge multitude and the shout of gods and men, in the day of calamity."⁴¹ And this association is intended to endure forever. In the hymn that closes the *Rule of the Community* we can read in the copy from Cave 1:

To those whom God has selected he has given them
 as everlasting possession (לאִוְדוֹת עוֹלָם);
 until they inherit them
 in the lot of the holy ones (בְּנֹרֶל קְדוּשִׁים).
 He unites their assembly to the sons of heavens (בְּנֵי שָׁמַיִם)
 in order (to form) the council of the Community
 and a foundation of the building of holiness
 to be an everlasting plantation (לְמִשְׁעַת עוֹלָם)
 throughout all future ages (עַם כּוֹל קִיץ נְהִיָּה).⁴²

The language of election and inheritance and the references to communal structures show us that this communion with the angelic world is an exclusive privilege of the members of the community in the present time and that it is destined to endure forever. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the members of the community were able to appropriate angelic language in a famous hymn, partially preserved in four different copies, in which the protagonist presents himself as someone superior to the angels, whose glory cannot be compared, dwelling in heaven and sitting on a throne in the middle of the congregation of the gods. The "I" from this hymn has been interpreted in many different ways: an angel, a man, an "angelic" or divine man, the priestly Messiah, the Messiah King, the historical Teacher, or the Teacher expected at the end of times. Elsewhere,⁴³ I have argued convincingly that the protagonist of this poem, in the form in which the text has been preserved in one of the manuscripts related to the *War Scroll* from Cave 4,⁴⁴ is the archangel Michael, the chief of the angelic host who intervenes during the decisive phase of the eschatological battle. In the form in which the poem has been transmitted in the three copies of the *Hodayot*,⁴⁵ it contains ideas and expressions common to both the Hymns of the

⁴¹ 1QM I 10–11, *DSST*, 95.

⁴² 1QS XI 7–8, *DSST*, 18.

⁴³ F. García Martínez, "Old Texts and Modern Mirages: The "I" of Two Qumran Hymns," *ETL* 78 (2002): 321–39.

⁴⁴ 4Q491 11.

⁴⁵ 1QH^a XXVI 2–18; 4Q427 7 and 4Q431 1.

Teacher and the Hymns of the Community, which proves that the poem has been reinterpreted in such a way that the words of the archangel at the moment of the eschatological battle can now be appropriated by each single member of the community in order to express their communion with the angelic world.

In this poem, the protagonist (Michael, the Teacher, or each single member who appropriates the words) expresses himself primarily with the mythical images of the heavenly court: “a mighty throne in the congregation of the gods,” (כסא עוז בערת אלים). However, there is also a subtle allusion to sonship: “for among the gods is my position and my glory is with the sons of the King” (כיא אניא עם אלים מעמדיא) (וכבוריא עם בני המלך).⁴⁶ In so far as I am aware, this is the only occasion in Qumran in which angelic divine sonship is expressed with the image of the “sons of the King.” But “King,” “King of Kings,” and “King of Glory” appear as a divine titles about 50 times in the preserved parts of *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*.

Summarising this first point: the divine sonship of the angels is practically reduced at Qumran to an indication of the heavenly nature of the angels. At the same time, however, this angelic nature is extended somewhat to human beings, the members of the community who are in communion with the heavenly beings, partake of the heavenly cult, fight together the eschatological battle, and use angelic language to express their community with the angelic “sons of God.”

2. Israel “Son of God”

The idea that a clan, a tribe or an entire people has a special relationship with its own god is something common in the semitic world. This idea is frequently expressed with the metaphor of sonship, which does not intend to express any genetic relationship.⁴⁷ In Jer 2:27, in what seems to be a clear allusion to the *Ashera* and the *Massebah*, God reproaches the Israelites: “They said to wood ‘You are my father,’ and to stone ‘you gave birth to me.’” He explains to them that he is “his master” (3:14)⁴⁸ and hopes that they will finish by calling him “my father” (אבי תקראו לי)

⁴⁶ 4Q491 11 i 11.

⁴⁷ The “canticle of Moses” in Deut 32 is a good example, with a concentration of the uses of the metaphor.

⁴⁸ Or that he has espoused them, the meaning of בעלתי is uncertain.

(3:19). This idea of a peculiar relationship is expressed in the theophoric names with the component *ab-* (which expresses the appurtenance to the group from which the god is “father” more than a father-son relationship) and in the expression of possession which indicates the appurtenance of a people to its god (“my people”). Hos 1:8, 2:1 and 2:25 give us a good example of the interchange of expressions of possession and sonship which help to define the meaning of the metaphor. In Hos 1:9 God orders that the prophet give the name “not my people” (לֹא עַמִּי) to one of the sons of the prostitute “for you are not my people and I will not be your God.” Hos 2:25 presents the transformation of the situation with the expected antithesis (“And I will say to Lo-ammi, ‘You are my people,’ and he will respond ‘[You are] my God,’”) but in 2:1 the expected equivalent does not appear and it is replaced by the metaphor of sonship: “and instead of being told, ‘you are not my-people’ they shall be called children of the living God.” (בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים).

The themes which express this special relationship of God with the people of Israel in terms of sonship are many, and all of them underline its metaphoric character: the father-creator,⁴⁹ the father-corrector,⁵⁰ the father-helper in danger,⁵¹ and the father full of tenderness⁵² are the more frequent. The motifs are formulated in terms of election, covenant and the promise of inheritance (the land of Israel). Exod 4:22 expresses the same motif in terms of primogeniture: “Israel is my first-born son,” and Jer 31:9 announces the renewal of this relationship in terms of the new covenant: “For I am ever a father to Israel, Ephraim is my first-born.” Even in the most solemn and strong expression of the divine sonship of Israel in Deut 14:1 (“You are the children of YHWH your God” בְּנִים אַתֶּם לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם), the rest of the sentence makes clear that the metaphor does not imply any genetic relationship but expresses rather the peculiar relationship of Israel with God in the context of election and the covenant: “For you are a people consecrated to YHWH your God: YHWH your God chose you (בָּחַר) to be his treasured people from among all other peoples (לְעַם סֻגְלָה מִכָּל הָעַמִּים) on earth.”

⁴⁹ For example, Isa 64:7: “But now, YHWH, You are our father; we are the clay, and You are the potter. We are all the work of your hands.”

⁵⁰ For example, Deut 8:5: “Bear in mind that YHWH your God disciplines you just as a man disciplines his son.”

⁵¹ For example, Wis 2:18: “For if the just one be the son of God, he will defend him and deliver him from the hand of his foes.”

⁵² For example, Hos 11:1: “I fell in love with Israel, when he was still a child; and I have called (him) my son ever since Egypt.”

The use of this metaphor continues, of course, in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In one of the prayers from the composition known as *Words of the Luminaries*⁵³ (a prayer destined to be recited on Thursday) we read:

Behold, all the peoples are like nothing in front of you; they are reckoned as chaos and nothing in your presence. We have invoked only your name; for your glory you have created us; you have established us as your sons in the sight of all the peoples. For you called Israel “my son, my first born” and have corrected us as one corrects a son.⁵⁴

In these few lines, full of allusions to biblical texts, many of the threads that form the metaphor of divine sonship in the Hebrew Bible converge: appurtenance of the people to God, exclusivity of this relationship, creation, election, paternal correction, filiation and primogeniture.

Besides this reproduction of the data of the Hebrew Bible, I think that at Qumran we can ascertain two lines of development of the idea of the divine sonship of Israel. On the one hand we can observe the use of the metaphor at an individual level to express the inner relationship with God not of Israel as such but of a single person. On the other hand, the extension of the divine sonship of Israel tends to be restricted to the members of the group only.

As an example of the first line of development (together with the poem with which I have started) I can quote a prayer previously known as the *Apocryphon of Joseph* and now published as 4Q372, 4QNarrative and Poetic Composition^{b,55}:

And in all this, Joseph [was delivered] into the hands of foreigners, consuming his strength and breaking all his bones up the time of his end. And he shouted [and his call] summoned the powerful God to save him from their hands. And he said: “My father and my God (אֱלֹהֵי וְאָבִי), do not abandon me in the hands of gentiles, do me justice, so that the poor and afflicted do not die. You have no need on any people or of any help. Your finger is bigger and stronger than any there are in the world. For you choose truth and in your hand there is no violence at all. And your tenderness is great and great is your compassion for all who seek you; they are stronger than me and all my brothers who are associated with me.”⁵⁶

The protagonist, the eponymous ancestor of the tribes of the North, presents himself in an anguishing situation, in exile, surrounded by

⁵³ Published by M. Baillet, DJD VII, 137–77.

⁵⁴ 4Q504 1–2 iii 3–7, *DSS*, 414.

⁵⁵ Published by E.M. Schuller in DJD XXVIII, 165–97.

⁵⁶ 4Q372 1 14–20, *DSS*, 225.

enemies, and having recourse to God as saviour, appealing directly to the theme of “sonship.” The narrative context of the composition as a whole makes clear that the Patriarch represents the people and contains a clear polemic against the Samaritans and their pretension of being the true descendants of the Patriarch. The true descendants of Joseph are, however, in a situation of exile, and in this situation each one of them may call upon God for salvation as Joseph did. This prayer, calling God “my father,” has preserved the oldest attestation of the expression by a person other than David.⁵⁷

An alternative text in which the same expression appears is 4Q460, where we can read at the end of a section: “[...] for you have not abandoned your servant (לְעַבְדְּכֶם) [...] my Father and my Lord (אָבִי וַאֲדֹנָי).”⁵⁸ The “servant” could be the collective Israel, of course, but it seems to me more likely that he is no other than the individual who speaks in the first person in line 2 of the fragment, who does something “in Israel” in line 3, who considers himself a servant of God to whom he appeals in line 6. Although the formula employed looks different from the one used in 4Q372 because of the changing of “my God” to “my Lord,” this difference may only be an expression of the tendency to avoid not only the divine name but also its synonyms in later compositions.

These two texts and the references to God’s paternity in the *Hodayot*, illustrate the first of the two tendencies: the use of the theme of sonship to express the inner relationship with God at a personal level. The second tendency, to reduce divine sonship to the members of the group, is a logical and unavoidable consequence of the premises articulated by two basic documents: the *Damascus Document* and the *Rule of the Community*.⁵⁹ The means employed are different in each document, but the results obtained are the same: only the members of each group, as the angels, are true “sons of God.” In the *Damascus Document* “Israel” is appropriated as a designation of the group, whose members are defined as “the

⁵⁷ The origin of the expression is to be found on the אָבִי אֲדֹנָי אֱלֹהֵי וְצֹרֵר יְשׁוּעָתִי from Ps 89:27, which puts it in the mouth of David, and corresponds to the use of “father” in the Nathan oracle, 2 Sam 7:14. On the position of this composition within the context of Second Temple prayers, see E. Schuller, “The Psalm of 4Q372 1 within the Context of Second Temple Prayer,” *CBQ* 54 (1992): 67–79.

⁵⁸ 4Q460 9 i 5–6. The text has been published by E. Larson in DJD XXXVI, 382.

⁵⁹ For a detailed treatment of this point see F. García Martínez, “La memoria inventada. El ‘otro’ en los manuscritos de Qumran,” in *Congreso Internacional “Biblia, memoria histórica y encrucijada de culturas. Actas* (ed. J. Campos Santiago and V. Pastor Julián; Zamora: Asociación Bíblica Española, 2004), 49–71.

converts of Israel” or the “chosen of Israel.” These members form a “New Covenant,” which is not with all Israel but only with a “rest of Israel” constituted by the group which one enters. The *Rule of the Community* does not use the concept of the “new Covenant” but transforms even more radically the concept of the covenant which is now restricted to the “covenant of the community,” a covenant which seems void of all ethnicity, which the members enter “in order to love all the sons of light, each one according to his lot in God’s plan, and to detest all the sons of darkness, each one in accordance with his blame in God’s vindication.”⁶⁰ In other texts of a more eschatological character, such as the *War Scroll* or the *Rule of the Congregation*, after the destruction of all “sons of darkness” the “new covenant” and “the covenant of the community” will be co-extensive with “Israel” and it will form “all the congregation of Israel.” At this moment, of course, all the sons of Israel will be “sons of light,” and consequently “sons of God.”

Summarizing this point: the divine sonship of Israel maintains in the Qumran texts the same collective and metaphoric character it has in the Hebrew Bible. At the same time, however, the metaphor starts being used to express a personal, inner relationship with God on the one hand (and we find there the earliest uses of the invocation of God as “my father”) and on the other hand (and for the time being) divine sonship of Israel tends to be restricted only to the members of the group, the same group to which divine angelic sonship has already been extended.

3. *The King, “Son of God”*

In the Hebrew Bible the King is the only individual who is called “son of God.” This special relationship of the King with God has been explained in many ways:—as a divinization of the King, influenced by the model of the Egyptian religion;⁶¹—as due to the influence of the Assyro-Babylonian idea of the King as “image of God;”⁶²—as result of the “divine

⁶⁰ 1QS I 9–11, *DSST*, 3.

⁶¹ By H. Donner, *Adoption oder Legitimation: Erwägungen zur Adoption im Alten Testament auf dem Hintergrund der altorientalischen Rechte* (Aufsätze zum Alten Testament aus vier Jahrzehnten; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994); H. Merklein, “Ägyptische Einflüsse auf die messianische Sohn-Gottes-Aussage des Neuen Testaments,” in *Geschichte—Tradition—Reflexion. Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, and P. Schäfer; 3 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 3:21–48, applies this idea to the New Testament.

⁶² By J.-G. Heinz, “Royal Traits and Messianic Figures: A Thematic and Icono-

adoption” of the King at the moment of his enthronement;⁶³—or as a simple intensification of the divine sonship of Israel within the context of the covenant.⁶⁴ Whatever the explanation, there is no doubt at all that this “divine sonship of the King” expresses a very peculiar relationship of the King with the divinity.⁶⁵

The classic proof-texts with respect to this “divine sonship of the King” are those provided by the royal Psalms (Ps 2, Ps 110 [at least according to the interpretation of the LXX] and for some scholars Isa 9:1–6) on the one hand,⁶⁶ and on the other the oracle of Nathan on the Davidic dynasty preserved in 2 Sam 7:14, repeated in 1 Chron 17:13–14; 22:10–11, clearly evoked in Ps 89:27–30, to which 1 Chron 28:9–10 alludes in when David transmits the instructions for the building of the temple to Solomon, and 2 Chron 7:17–20 after the dedication of the temple.⁶⁷

The expressions used in the royal Psalms present the King, “the anointed,” as engendered by the divinity: “You are my son, I have fathered you this day” says Ps 2:7. Ps 110 (which also promises the King an eternal priesthood) presents the King sitting to the right hand of God, and possibly also uses the same language of sonship, since it employs the same term found in Ps 2:7 (לְיָהוָה), although the massoretic text vocalises it here otherwise.⁶⁸ At least the LXX (A) has understood the Hebrew in this way since it translates “I have begotten you from the

graphic Approach,” in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Princeton Symposium on Judaism and its Origins 1; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 52–66.

⁶³ By R. de Vaux, “L’adoption divine,” en *Les Institutions de l’Ancien Testament. I* (Paris: Cerf, 1958), 171–73.

⁶⁴ By Byrne, “Sons of God”—“Seed of Abraham,” 17–18.

⁶⁵ The topic has been studied from many different perspectives. See T.N.D. Mettinger, *King and Messiah. The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings* (ConBOT 8; Lund: Gleerup, 1976). The study of G. Cook, “The Israelite King as Son of God,” *ZAW* 73 (1961): 202–25, is still valuable in spite of its age.

⁶⁶ For a classic statement over the royal ideology of Israel in its oriental context, see S. Mowinkel, *He That Cometh* (transl. G. Anderson; Nashville: Abingdon, 1955), and his *The Psalms in Israel’s Worship* (2 vols.; Nashville: Abingdon, 1962).

⁶⁷ The most complete study of the dynastic oracle and of its interpretation is K.E. Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism* (SBLEJL 7; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998).

⁶⁸ Compare the translation of M. Dahood in *Psalms III: 101–150* (AB 17A; New York: Doubleday 1970), 112: “In the battle with your foes he was your Strong One, your Valiant on the day of your conquest. When the Holy One appeared he was your Comforter; the dawn of life for you, the dew of your youth,” with the translation by R. Tournay, “La Psaume CX,” *RB* 67 (1960): 5–41: “A toi le principat au jour de ta naissance, l’éclat sacré dès le sein, dès l’aurore de ton enfance” (14).

womb, before the morning” ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐγέννησά σε.⁶⁹ The royal Psalm 45 (a psalm which does not employ the language of sonship) addresses the King as a divine being, an אֱלֹהִים: “your throne, O God, is everlasting” (according to the plain meaning of the Hebrew text, interpreted in this way by the LXX: ὁ θρόνος σου, ὁ θεός, εἰς αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνιτος, 44:7).

Nathan’s oracle uses the language of paternity and sonship (“I will be a father to him and he will be a son to me”), but royal sonship thus expressed could mean no more than the sonship of Deut 8:5 (the father as corrector) because the text continues “when he does wrong, I will chastise him with the rod of men and the affliction of mortals.” This dynastic oracle is transmitted in two forms: one which alludes to the perpetuity of the promise without the terminology of sonship (1 Chron 28:8–19 and 2 Chron 7:17–20) and another in which this vocabulary is used and somehow intensified, because the second part of the sentence which alludes to paternal reproof has been omitted (1 Chron 17:13–14 and 22:10–11) and the emphasis is on the divine sonship of David. This emphasis is even greater in the form of the oracle reflected in Ps 89:27–30. There David will invoke God “You are my father, my God, the rock of my deliverance.” God will appoint him first-born (אֶתְּנֵהוּ בְּכֹרֵי אֱוֹנֵהוּ), while the second part of the oracle is explicitly applied not to David but to his descendants (Ps 89:31–34).

At Qumran we find some echoes of these biblical texts on the divine sonship of the King where the motif of sonship has disappeared. In the *Dibrey ham-meorot*, for example, there is a clear allusion to Nathan’s oracle without the language of sonship:

And you chose the land of Judah and established your covenant with David so that he would be like a shepherd, a prince over your people, and would sit in front of you on the throne of Israel for ever.⁷⁰

In other texts, however, like 4Q174,⁷¹ the language of sonship of the biblical text has been preserved, although the text is applied not to an existent King but to the King expected at the end of times:

⁶⁹ Other MSS read ἐξεγέννησά, which is the preferred reading of Rahlfs.

⁷⁰ 4Q504 1–2 iv 6–8, DJD VII, 143–44, *DSS*, 415.

⁷¹ Published by J.M. Allegro, DJD V, 53–57. See the study by G.J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran. 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (JSOTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985). The text is now considered to be part of a larger composition, part of which will be also 4Q177, see A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat^{a,b}). Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 (‘Florilegium’) und 4Q177 (‘Catena A’) repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1994).

And “YHWH declares to you that he will build you a house. I will rise up your seed after you and establish the throne of his kingdom for ever. I will be a father to him and he will be a son to me.” This (refers to the) “branch of David” who will arise with the Interpreter of the law who will rise up in Zion in the last days.⁷²

This text quotes and interprets 2 Sam 7, applying it directly to the “branch” of David, the נֶצֶחַ of Jer 23:5; 35:15, Zech 3:8 and 6:12,⁷³ which is identified with a royal figure at the end of times. The manuscript continues with a commentary on Ps 2, of which only the comments on the first verse have been preserved. The royal personage to which the text refers is identified in other Qumran texts (in 4Q285) with the “Prince of the Congregation,” which is one of the names of the messiah in the texts of Qumran and which is described with the words of Isa 11:1–5, messianically interpreted, in 4Q161. Another text, 4Q252,⁷⁴ which interprets the blessing of Jacob to Judah from Gen 49:10, will explicitly call the expected descendant of David “messiah of justice”:

A sovereign shall not be removed from the tribe of Judah. While Israel has the dominion, there will not lack someone who sits on the throne of David. For “the staff” is the covenant of royalty, the thousand of Israel are “the feet.” Until the messiah of justice comes, the branch of David. For to him and to his descendants has been given the covenant of royalty over his people for all everlasting generations.⁷⁵

These texts prove that the mythological language of the royal Psalms and the dynastic oracle of Nathan have provided the textual basis for the development of the messianic idea also at Qumran, and have contributed definitely to the formulation of the expectation “at the end of times” of a Royal Messiah. They have done this, however, without having recourse to the language of divine sonship for this figure. Nevertheless, other texts found at Qumran did use the language of sonship when talking of an expected saviour at the end of times that enjoys all the characteristics of a messianic figure, thereby allowing us to suggest that the title “son of god” could be used as a messianic title at Qumran.

⁷² 4Q174 1–2 i 10–12, DJD V, 53, *DSS*, 136.

⁷³ See W. Rose, *Zemah and Zerubbabel. Messianic Expectations in the Early Postexilic Period* (JSOTSup 304; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).

⁷⁴ Published by G. Brooke as “Commentary on Genesis A” in DJD XXII, 185–207. The fragment in question was originally published as “Patriarchal Blessings” by J. Allegro, “Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature,” *JBL* 75 (1956): 174–75.

⁷⁵ 4Q252 col. V frag. 6, *DSS*, 215.

4. *The Messiah Son of God*

The interpretation of the texts in question as messianic is generally accepted, although the scholars do not agree on what type of “anointed” is precisely alluded to within the plurality of messianic hope attested in the Scrolls.⁷⁶ This discussion is irrelevant here, however, since what it is important in our context is the use of sonship language applied to this expected figure.

The first text is part of a manuscript known as *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa) which was originally attached to the *Rule of the Community* from Cave 1:

This is the assembly of the famous men, [those summoned to] the gathering of the community when [God] begets the Messiah with them. [The] chief [priest] and all the congregation of Israel shall enter, and all [his brothers, the sons] of Aaron, the priests [summoned] to the assembly, the famous men, they shall sit befo[re him, each one] according to his dignity. After, [the Me]ssiah of Israel shall ent[er] and before him shall sit the chiefs...⁷⁷

According to this reading and reconstruction of the text, the language of sonship is applied directly to the expected Messiah, who is “begotten” or “fathered” by God within the community. The reading of the key word, *ויליד*, is uncertain and very much disputed.⁷⁸ In my opinion,

⁷⁶ See F. García Martínez, “Messianic Hopes in the Qumran Writings,” in *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices* (F. García Martínez and J. Trebelle Barrera; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 159–89.

⁷⁷ 1QSa II 11–14. The text was edited by D. Barthélemy in DJD I, 108–18. *DSS*, 127.

⁷⁸ The reading *ויליד* is the one of the first editor, Barthélemy, and the excellent photographs in my possession confirm it. But Barthélemy, following a suggestion by Milik, understands the word as an copyist’s error for *ויליך*, which would give to the whole sentence the meaning “au cas où Dieu mènerait le Messie avec eux” (DJD I, 117). Y. Yadin, “A Crucial Passage of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *JBL* 78 (1959): 238–41, reads *ויעד*, and J. Licht, *The Rule Scroll. A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea* (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1965) (Hebrew), 27, lists eight different readings and prefers *ויעד* “will unite,” which is the reading followed by L.H. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls. A Study of the Rule of the Congregation* (SBLMS 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 53–54. É. Puech, “Présence sacerdotale et Messie-Roi dans la Règle de la Congrégation (1QSa ii 11–12),” *RevQ* 16/63 (1996): 351–65, proposes to read *והגלה* and interprets the sentence “quand sera révélé le Prince Messie parmi eux.” H. Stegemann, “Some Remarks to 1QSa, to 1QSa and to Qumran Messianism,” *RevQ* 17/65–68 (1996): 478–505, suggests to read *וואכלו*, “When they eat together, and the messiah is together with them.” All these readings seem to me very difficult palaeographically, and clearly inferior to the original reading of the first editor.

however, it represents the best reading and in view of the use of ילדתיך in Ps 2 it is quite normal. This serves as evidence that the language of sonship used of the Davidic descendants could be employed for the expected (Davidic) messiah of Israel.

The next text is unproblematic in terms of uncertain readings, but its fragmentary character leaves us uncertain as to whom the language of sonship (indicated with the use of בן בכור “first born,” and with the expression “like a father to his son” כאב לבני) is being applied. The text (4Q369) has been named the *Prayer of Enosh* by the editors on the basis of the genealogy that appears in the first column of the manuscript and that allows us to assume that Enosh is the protagonist. From the second column of this fragment only the right hand segment has been preserved with the beginning of several lines:

for his seed according to their generations an eternal possession, and all
[...]
and your good judgements you explained to him to [...]
in eternal light, and you made him for you a first-born son [...]
like him, to (be) a prince and ruler in all /your/ inhabited world [...]
the crown of the heavens, and the glory of the clouds. You have placed
on him [...]
the angel of your peace in his congregation and [...]
for him righteous rules, as a father to his son [...]⁷⁹

Two different interpretations of the identity of the protagonist have been proposed. The first sees him as an individual figure that will arise to guide and rule the Israel of the end of times.⁸⁰ The second sees this

⁷⁹ 4Q369 1 ii 4–10. Edited by H. Attridge and J. Strugnell, DJD XIII, 356–57. *DSSSE*, 1:731.

⁸⁰ The editors remark: “The prayer or prophecy mentions a place, most likely Jerusalem, and a ‘prince’ or ‘ruler’ (cf. line 7) whose identity remains obscure. If there is only one figure involved, he is to ‘establish God’s name’ in a special place (line 1); have descendants who will have an eternal possession (line 4); be purified by God’s judgements (line 5); enjoy the status of God’s son (line 6), as well as heavenly glory (line 8). Such an individual may be either a biblical figure such as Abraham or David, or, more likely, an eschatological messianic figure.” (DJD XIII, 358). The messianic interpretation has been strongly defended by C.A. Evans, “A Note on the ‘First-Born Son’ of 4Q369,” *DSD* 2 (1995): 185–201 and in “Are the ‘Son’ Texts at Qumran Messianic? Reflections on 4Q369 and Related Scrolls,” in *Qumran-Messianism. Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth, H. Lichtenberger, and G.S. Oegema; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 135–53. Also by M. Philonenko, “De la ‘Prière de Jésus’ au ‘Notre Père’ (*Abba*, targum du Psaume 89,27; 4Q369 1, 2, 1–12; *Luc* 11,2,” *RHPR* 77 (1997): 133–40, and G. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet. Positive Eschatological Protagonists in the Qumran Library* (STDJ 47; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 89–94.

figure as a collective expression for Israel.⁸¹ The strongest argument in favour of this collective interpretation is the use of בְּכָרִי בְּכָרִי in Exod 4:22, and the application in ancient Jewish literature of some of the motifs that appear in our text to Israel. The strongest argument in support of the individual and messianic interpretation is the influence of Ps 89:27–28, where we find three of the elements appearing in the text applied to the King: God will make him “first-born” (בְּכוֹר), he will establish him as the most exalted King on earth, and the King will call God “father.” If we add to these elements from Ps 89 a possible parallel with another fragmentary Qumran text where the same expression בְּכָרִי also appears,⁸² I think that the balance ultimately inclines us towards the individual and messianic interpretation.

In this text, 4Q458, published as *4QNarrative A*,⁸³ the expression appear without any context. In the best preserved fragments (4Q458 1) we find other expression, “the beloved” (לִידִיד in line 1, and הִידִיד in line 2), which could refer to the same personage, as well as the expression “anointed with the oil of kingship” מְשִׁיחַ שֶׁמֶן מַלְכוּת (4Q458 2 ii 6) which clearly refers to the royal Messiah, because, as the editor notes, “the establishment of his kingdom is apparently connected with both the destruction of the uncircumcised referred to in line 4 and the establishment of righteousness among the chosen people of God.”⁸⁴ In spite of the uncertainties brought about by poor preservation, these texts also show that the language of sonship was applied to the royal Messiah as an extension of the sonship language originally applied to the King.

Also 4Q246, the famous “son of God” text, now published under the official title *4QApocryphe de Daniel ar*,⁸⁵ applies the language of sonship to the Messiah (whether he be the royal Messiah, son of David, or what I call the “heavenly Messiah”).⁸⁶

⁸¹ Strongly defended by J. Kugel, “4Q369 ‘Prayer of Enosh’ and Ancient Biblical Interpretation,” *DSD* 5 (1998): 119–48.

⁸² 4Q458 15 1.

⁸³ 4Q458 has been published by E. Larson in *DJD XXXVI*, 353–65.

⁸⁴ *DJD XXXVI*, 360.

⁸⁵ Published by É. Puech in *DJD XXII*, 165–84.

⁸⁶ F. García Martínez, “Two Messianic Figures in the Qumran Texts,” in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls. Conference on the Texts from the Judean Desert, Jerusalem, 30 April 1995* (ed. D.W. Parry and S.D. Ricks; STDJ 20; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 14–40.

He will be called son of God, and they will call him son of the Most High. Like the sparks of a vision, so will their kingdom be; they will rule several years over the earth and crush everything; a people will crush another people, and a city another city. Until the people of God arises and makes everyone rust from the sword. His kingdom will be an eternal kingdom, and all his paths in truth and uprightness. The earth (will be) in truth and all will make peace.

Although the word “anointed” does not appear in this Aramaic text, the messianic interpretation of its exalted protagonist is generally accepted⁸⁷ (now, even by its editor,⁸⁸ who in the official edition left open the possibility of a negative interpretation of the protagonist). This text likewise offers us a perfect parallel to the messianic titles used by Luke 1:32. Since I have dealt repeatedly with this text,⁸⁹ I will add no further comment at this juncture. Together with the other texts quoted, 4Q246 offers us the proof not only that the sonship terminology of the King as “son of God” was transferred to the future Messiah at Qumran, but that the title “son of God” could be applied to the Messiah without the need to specify its character as “anointed.”

* * *

If at the end of this overview we ask what is precisely the meaning of “son of God” in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the answer must be that the texts do not allow a clear-cut answer to the question because they do not allow us to determine the exact meaning of the metaphor used in any of the four categories of sonship presented.

⁸⁷ See the presentation of part of the very abundant bibliography originated by the text (before and after the official publication) in J. Zimmermann, “Observations on 4Q246—The ‘Son of God’” in *Qumran-Messianism. Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 175–90. In the same volume J.J. Collins strongly defends the messianic character of the text in the section “Messias and Son of God” (107–12) of his contribution, “Jesus, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 100–19.

⁸⁸ É. Puech, “Le ‘Fils de Dieu’ en 4Q246,” *Eretz Israel* 26 (1999): 143–52 (FS F.M. Cross): “Ceux-ci conviennent mieux, il faut le reconnaître, au roi messie, ainsi que la séquence en rapport avec la victoire eschatologique du roi à la tête de son peuple, car il n’y a pas de royaume sans roi” (149).

⁸⁹ Long before its official publication, see F. García Martínez, “4Q246: ¿Tipo del Anticristo o Libertador escatológico?,” in *El Misterio de la Palabra. Homenaje de sus alumnos al profesor D. Luis Alonso Schökel al cumplir veinticinco años de magisterio en el Instituto Bíblico Pontificio* (ed. V. Collado and E. Zurro; Madrid: Cristiandad, 1983), 229–44 (published in English as “The Eschatological Figure of 4Q246,” in F. García Martínez, *Qumran and Apocalyptic* [STDJ 9; Leiden: Brill, 1992], 162–79).

A final example, taken from the same *Hodayot* as that quoted at the beginning of this paper, can serve to illustrate the difficulty of determining the exact signification of the language of sonship used. 1QH^a XI 6–18 (III 6–18 in the numbering of Sukenik) has preserved a poem that can be interpreted (and has been interpreted) in very different ways.⁹⁰ Some scholars have seen in it a description of the Messiah and of the anti-Messiah; others see in it a description of the birth of the community and its opponents; and others still see in the serpent an echo of Eden and in the two women the primordial Eve from whom both good and bad originate:

I was in distress
 like a woman giving birth the first time
 when her birth-pangs come on her
 and a pain racks her womb
 to begin the birth in the “crucible” of the pregnant woman.
 Since sons reach the frontiers of death
 and the woman expectant with a man is racked by her pains,
 for from the shores of death
 she give birth to a male,
 and there emerges from the pains of Sheol,
 from the “crucible” of the pregnant woman
 a splendid counsellor with his strength,
 and the man is freed from the womb.
 Into the woman expectant with him rush all the spasms
 and the wrenching pains of his birth;
 terror (sizes) those giving birth,
 and at his birth all the pains come suddenly,
 in the “crucible” of the pregnant woman.
 And she who is pregnant by the serpent
 is with a wrenching pain;

⁹⁰ See, among others, A. Dupont-Sommer, “La mère du Messie et la mère de l’aspic dans un hymne de Qumran (DST iii,6–18),” *RHR* 147 (1955): 174–88; L.H. Silberman, “Language and Structure in the *Hodayot* (1QH 3),” *JBL* 75 (1956): 96–106; M. Delcor, “Un psaume messianique de Qumran,” in *Mélanges bibliques rédigés en l’honneur de André Robert* (Travaux de l’Institut Catholique de Paris 4; Paris: Bloud et Gay, 1957), 334–40; O. Betz, “Das Volk seiner Kraft. Zur Auslegung der Qumran-Hodayah III,1–18,” *NTS* 5 (1958–59): 65–75; P.S. Brown, “Deliverance from the Crucible: Some Further Reflections on 1QH III,1–18,” *NTS* 14 (1967–68): 247–59; E.M. Laperrousaz, “La mère du Messie et la mère de l’aspic dans les ‘hymnes’ de Qumrân: Quelques remarques sur la structure de ‘1QH’ III,1–18,” en *Mélanges d’histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech* (Paris: Presse universitaires de France, 1974), 173–85. For a complete bibliography of this poem, see E.M. Schuller and L. DiTomasso, “A Bibliography of the Hodayoth, 1948–1996,” *DSD* 4 (1997): 70–72.

and the edge of the pit
is with all the deeds of terror.⁹¹

In this poem, the language of sonship is very concrete, both when the text speaks about the giving birth to “a splendid counselor with his strength,” as when it speaks of the woman who is pregnant of the serpent and gives birth to “all deeds of terror.” The poet makes clear (in the last line of the hymn, XI 18) the demonic character of the serpent, with his cohort of malignant spirits, because the woman is pregnant with wickedness and gives birth to demons:

And the gates of the pit close
upon the woman expectant with wickedness,
and the everlasting bolts
upon all the spirits of the serpent.⁹²

To this woman, who is pregnant by the serpent and who gives birth to demons, the poem opposes the pregnant woman who gives birth to the “splendid counselor,” an expression based on Isa 9:5–6, a text which has been messianically interpreted and could allow us to see in our text an allusion to the birth of the Messiah. From the metaphoric character of the “wickedness” from which “all the spirits of the serpent” are born we might conclude that the “sonship” of the “splendid counselor” is equally metaphoric, not only here but in all other texts that speak of the “divine sonship of the Messiah.” Nevertheless, the shadow of Samma’el introduces the same doubts at this juncture as it cast on the interpretation of 1 John 3:12.

⁹¹ 1QH^a XI 7–12, *DSST*, 331.

⁹² 1QH^a XI 18; *DSST*, 332.

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- Abegg, M.G. 14, 38, 42, 77, 91, 197,
 199, 223, 262
 Albani, M. 125, 126
 Albeck, C. 50
 Alexander, P.S. 109–111, 113, 117,
 119, 121–123, 127, 128, 208, 211,
 229, 238
 Allegro, J.M. 11, 25, 27, 37, 46, 83,
 85, 127, 131, 145, 148, 150–160,
 162–166, 207, 224, 276, 277
 Anderson, G. 75, 238, 246
 Aranda Pérez, G. 95, 96
 Arnaldez, R. 255
 Aschim, A. 98
 Attridge, H.W. 279
 Auneau, J. 80
 Avigad, N. 35, 58, 95, 114, 131, 266

 Baillet, M. 8, 33, 40, 80, 117, 120, 131,
 172, 193, 220, 225, 226, 242, 253,
 264, 272
 Baker, H.W. 159
 Bar-Ilan, M. 145
 Barr, J. 189
 Barthélemy, D. 57, 171, 220, 244, 278
 Barton, T.S. 127
 Baumgarten, A.I. 79, 187
 Baumgarten, J.M. 69–71, 78, 86, 91,
 101, 120, 131, 193, 197, 226, 227,
 231, 232
 Beckwith, R.T. 51
 Beentjes, P.C. 221
 Bekkum, W.J. van 143
 Ben-Dov, J. 228
 Bergmeier, R. 107
 Bernstein, M.J. 47, 51, 54
 Berthelot, K. 202
 Bertholon, R. 145
 Besters, A. 190
 Betz, O. 4, 14, 79, 171, 282
 Beyer, K. 9, 41, 145, 149, 152, 155,
 156, 158, 160–162, 164–166
 Bietenhard, H. 6
 Blockmuehl, M. 14
 Bossman, D.M. 191
 Bowman, J. 91
 Boyce, J.M. 193
 Brin, G. 61

 Brooke, G.J. 11, 14, 27, 29, 38, 39,
 46–48, 106, 145, 159, 228, 276, 277
 Brown, P.S. 282
 Brown, R.E. 77, 262
 Brownlee, W.H. 1
 Burrows, M. 15, 208
 Byrne, B. 265, 275

 Callaway, P. 11
 Caquot, A. 29, 42
 Carmignac, J. 2, 6, 96, 205, 235, 236
 Casevitz, M. 244
 Causse, A. 6
 Cerfaux, L. 171
 Charles, R.H. 68
 Charlesworth, J.H. 208
 Chazon, E.G. 120, 225, 235, 237
 Chester, A. 14
 Chialà, S. 102, 103
 Christiansen, E.J. 197, 210, 212
 Clarke, E.G. 222
 Clifford, R.J. 220
 Cody, A. 81
 Cohen, S.J.D. 203
 Collins, J.J. 14, 15, 18, 21–23, 31, 37,
 97, 102, 107, 112, 113, 176, 180, 196,
 197, 214, 217, 220, 281
 Collins, R.F. 198
 Colson, F.H. 249, 250, 255
 Cook, E. 42
 Cook, G. 275
 Coppens, J. 171, 172
 Cothenet, É. 2–4, 205
 Cross, F.M. 97, 149, 150

 Dahl, N.A. 262
 Dahmen, U. 236
 Dahood, M. 221, 275
 Davidson, M.J. 98, 265
 Davies, P.R. 3, 4, 63, 64, 66, 67, 69,
 85, 145, 188, 193, 194, 197, 205, 206,
 209, 210
 Davila, J.R. 33, 57
 Delcor, M. 172, 173, 185, 186, 282
 Delling, G. 265
 Denis, A.M. 249
 Derret, J.D.M. 201
 Dimant, D. 2, 11, 27, 131

- DiTomasso, L. 282
 Di Lella, A.A. 221
 Díez Macho, A. 50, 140, 173, 221, 222, 249
 Doering, L. 72, 258
 Donner, H. 274
 Dorival, G. 220
 Duhaime, J. 32, 268
 Duncan, J.A. 81
 Dupont-Sommer, A. 4, 256, 282

 Elgvin, T. 40, 174, 179–181
 Elwolde, J.E. 145
 Eshel, E. 60, 71
 Eshel, H. 26, 145
 Evans, C.A. 14, 197, 279

 Falk, D.K. 89, 131, 174, 225
 Falk, Z.W. 201
 Fidler, R. 145
 Fishbane, M. 5, 6
 Fitzmyer, J.A. 3, 8, 13, 14, 20–22, 41, 77, 95, 96, 106, 112, 114
 Flint, P.W. 173, 220, 236
 Flusser, D. 21, 22, 102
 Frey, J. 225
 Frölich, I. 47
 Fujita, S. 5

 García Martínez, F. 4, 6–11, 13–16, 21, 22, 25, 27, 32, 34, 36–38, 41, 51, 58, 59, 61, 75, 78, 79, 83, 85, 95, 96, 98, 100, 102, 104, 110, 113, 121, 129, 132, 145, 173–175, 183, 193, 194, 196, 199, 200, 207, 208, 213, 226, 230, 232, 235, 237, 246, 248, 252, 256, 261, 262, 264, 269, 273, 278, 280, 281
 Garnet, P. 79
 Gianotto, C. 97
 Ginzberg, L. 240, 246
 Gleßner, U. 33, 47
 Goff, M.J. 178, 180, 185
 Goldstein, J. 247
 Goranson, S. 145
 Goulder, M.D. 237
 Greenfield, J.C. 35, 125, 126, 155, 162, 163, 169
 Greenspoon, L.J. 242
 Grelot, P. 147
 Grossfeld, B. 257
 Grossman, M.L. 193

 Hamidović, D. 177
 Hanson, H.E. 220

 Haran, M. 82
 Harlé, P. 245
 Harper, J.E. 145
 Harrington, D.J. 8, 50, 174, 175, 177, 180–182, 184, 224
 Hayward, C.T.R. 74
 Heinz, J.-G. 274
 Hempel, C. 69, 177, 193, 206, 209, 232
 Hendel, R.S. 47
 Hilhorst, A. 147
 Holmén, T. 62, 68
 Horst, P.W. van der 180
 Horton, F.L. 96
 Houten, Ch. van 202
 Hulst, A.R. 190
 Hüttenmeister, F.G. 247

 Ibba, G. 177
 Ilg, N. 210

 Jacobson, H. 47, 137
 Jastrow, M. 152, 164
 Jaubert, A. 171, 172
 Jefferies, D.F. 177
 Jeremias, G. 65, 105
 Jiménez Bedman, F. 145, 150, 159, 161, 167, 169
 Johnson, W. 146
 Johnston, S.I. 109, 122
 Jokiranta, J.M. 188
 Jonge, M. de 25, 35, 96
 Jongeling, B. 8, 172

 Kahn, J.G. 250
 Kampen, J.I. 61, 65–67, 177
 Kapelrud, A.S. 210
 Kister, M. 69, 137
 Kittel, R. 220, 221
 Ki Yu, Y. 198
 Klijn, A.F.J. 102
 Klinzing, G. 3, 4, 79
 Knibb, M.A. 3, 4, 14, 29, 102, 103, 106, 193, 195, 265
 Knohl, I. 146
 Kobelski, P.J. 19, 97, 101
 Koch, K. 147
 Kollmann, B. 112
 Körner, J. 220
 Kraft, R.A. 251, 257
 Krauss, S. 147, 152, 153, 158, 160–162, 165
 Kronholm, T. 251
 Kruyf, T.C. de 262
 Kugel, J.L. 177, 280

- Kugler, R. 234
 Kuhn, K.G. 21, 77
 Kutscher, E.Y. 164
- Laato, A. 195
 Lacoudre, N. 145
 Lambert, G. 171
 Lange, A. 84, 112–114, 118, 146, 160, 161, 163, 177, 180
 Laperrousaz, J.M. 146, 195, 282
 Larsen, K.B. 177
 Larson, E. 273, 280
 Lauterbach, J.Z. 254
 Leany, A.R.C. 242
 Lefkovits, J.K. 146, 148–150, 160, 163, 165, 166, 168
 Lehmann, M.R. 162
 Lesley Segal, B. 146
 Levenson, J.D. 82
 Levine, B.A. 220
 Levison, J.R. 74
 Lewis, J.P. 51
 Licht, J. 9, 10, 278
 Lichtenberger, H. 172
 Liddell, H.G. 220
 Lignée, H. 205
 Lim, T.H. 26, 47
 Loretz, O. 263
 Löw, I. 147
 Lübbe, J. 26, 146
 Luis Cunchillos, J. 263
 Lundberg, M.J. 146
 Lust, J. 1
 Luttkhuizen, G.P. 219, 242
- Mach, M. 265
 Mack, B.L. 238
 MacLeod, M.D. 109
 Maher, M. 140
 Maier, J. 70, 79
 Mandel, P. 146
 Manzi, F. 96, 97, 99
 Marcus, R. 117
 Margalith, O. 189
 Martínez Sáiz, T. 222
 Martone, C. 14, 211
 McCarter, P.K. 146
 McCarthy, C. 244
 McNamara, M. 140, 222
 Merklein, H. 274
 Metso, S. 209, 211, 229
 Mettinger, T.N.D. 275
 Miguéns, M. 220
 Milik, J.T. 2, 8, 10, 19, 20, 22, 35–37, 41, 42, 88, 96, 98, 106, 111, 112, 115, 142, 145, 149, 152–162, 164, 166, 169, 172, 193, 220, 227, 229, 264, 268, 278
- Mondésert, C. 249
 Moore, C.A. 112
 Morag, S. 189
 Morawiecki, L. 146
 Moreno Martínez, J.L. 239
 Morgenstern, M. 35, 58, 220
 Mosis, R. 134
 Mowinckel, S. 275
 Muchowski, P. 145, 146
 Mullen, T.E. 264
 Murphy, C. 177
 Murphy-O'Connor, J. 3, 4, 67, 69, 106, 194
- Najman, H. 183
 Nastram, J. 220
 Naveh, J. 123, 124
 Nebe, G.W. 118
 Neusner, J. 187, 233
 Newsom, C.A. 5–7, 26, 42, 79, 80, 95, 98, 131, 187, 239, 264, 265, 267
 Nickelsburg, G.W.E. 188
 Niebuhr, K.-W. 107
 Nitzan, B. 117, 119, 122, 224, 225
 Nodet, E. 257
 Nötscher, F. 171
- Oegema, G.S. 14
 Oxtoby, W.G. 77
- Pabst, H. 172
 Pardee, D. 85
 Parry, D.W. 13, 173
 Paquette, V. 199
 Penny, D.L. 123
 Pérez Fernández, M. 95, 96, 251
 Philonenko, M. 279
 Pichon, C. 191
 Pilhofer, P. 30
 Pingree, D. 125, 126
 Pixner, B. 148, 149, 160, 163, 164
 Ploeg, J.P.M. van der 1, 121, 171, 172
 Pomykala, K.E. 14, 275
 Porten, B. 165
 Porter, S.E. 197
 Pralon, D. 245
 Prigent, P. 251, 257
 Prostmeier, F.R. 251
 Puech, É. 6, 13, 15, 19, 21–24, 31, 96, 97, 100–102, 107, 121, 123, 142, 145, 146, 157, 158, 160, 161, 168, 177, 225, 262, 266, 278, 280, 281

- Qimron, E. 6, 11, 28, 34, 35, 61, 68,
87, 131, 147, 192, 197, 208, 231, 234,
256
- Rabin, Ch. 2, 66, 196, 197, 232, 233
- Rabinowitz, I. 201
- Rahlf's, A. 220, 276
- Ramsay, G.G. 109
- Regev, E. 209
- Reim, G. 262
- Robert, J.J.M. 224
- Roo, J.C.R. de 197
- Rose, W. 277
- Rösel, M. 147
- Ruiten, J.T.A.G.M. van 52, 59, 73, 143,
227, 238, 239
- Sacchi, P. 14, 102, 195
- Saldarini, A.J. 222, 254
- Sanders, J.A. 44, 235–237, 248
- Sanderson, J.E. 220, 242
- Schäfer, P. 237, 246
- Schechter, S. 192, 231
- Schiffman, L.H. 14, 67, 68, 77, 88,
105, 146, 168–170, 173, 174, 199,
201, 278
- Schlisske, W. 263
- Schmidt, F. 127–129
- Schmitt, J. 171, 172
- Schoors, A. 181, 182
- Schuller, E.M. 142, 174, 264, 272, 273,
282
- Schwartz, D.R. 193, 197, 203, 231,
232
- Schwarz, O.J.R. 2, 4
- Schweizer, F.M. 14
- Scott, R. 220
- Segal, A. 198
- Sekki, A.E. 266
- Seybold, K. 235, 236
- Sican, D. 35
- Sicre Díaz, J.L. 187
- Sieker, M. 112, 113
- Silberman, L.H. 282
- Skehan, P.W. 1, 172, 207, 220, 221,
235, 239, 242
- Smith, M.S. 263
- Smith-Christopher, D.L. 191
- Sokoloff, M. 125, 126
- Starcky, J. 8–11, 30, 41, 159, 266
- Steck, O.H. 227
- Stegemann, H. 142, 146, 149, 278
- Steiner, R.C. 36
- Steinmetz, D. 177
- Studel, A. 97, 177, 196, 207, 276
- Stone, M.E. 18, 58, 60, 103, 235
- Strecker, G. 262
- Stricker, F.M. 106
- Strugnell, J. 2, 11, 82, 115, 174, 175,
181, 182, 207, 224
- Sukenik, E.L. 252, 261, 264, 267, 282
- Tabor, J.D. 15
- Talmon, S. 14, 69, 198, 228, 244
- Tanzer, S. 77
- Teixidor, J. 77
- Thackeray, H.St.J. 117, 257
- Theodor, J. 50
- Thiering, B.E. 146, 148
- Thoman, C. 15
- Thorion, Y. 156, 166
- Tigchelaar, E.J.C. 59–61, 78, 110, 132,
145, 177, 178, 181–183, 193, 224,
226, 229, 252, 261, 264
- Tosato, A. 70
- Tournay, R. 275
- Tov, E. 40, 131, 173, 174, 233, 241,
243, 245, 246, 254
- Tov, L. 146, 149, 150
- Trebolle Barrera, J. 194
- Treuer, J.C. 15
- Ullendorf, E. 148
- Ulrich, E. 33, 220, 242
- VanderKam, J.C. 15, 18, 36, 103, 131,
132, 136–143, 173, 174, 227, 234,
235, 258
- Van Rooy, K.F. 190
- Vasquez, J. 145
- Vaux, R. de 80, 153, 275
- Veenstra, J.R. 110
- Veltri, G. 241, 243, 245, 247, 253–255,
257, 259
- Vermes, G. 1, 13, 67, 137, 138, 141,
142, 208, 211, 212, 229, 237
- Wacholder, B.Z. 11, 38, 77, 91
- Walter, N. 249
- Weimar, P. 190
- Weinfeld, M. 90, 235, 237
- Whitaker, G.H. 249, 250, 255
- White, S.A. 106, 131
- Wieder, N. 30
- Williamson, H.G.M. 190
- Winston, D. 247
- Winter, P. 61, 263
- Wintermute, O.S. 52, 72

- Wise, M.O. 15, 42, 75, 123, 125, 126,
146, 197
- Wolters, A. 146
- Woude, A.S. van der 11, 13, 18, 25,
28–31, 38, 41, 96, 105, 106, 171, 172,
264
- Wright, R.B. 63
- Xeravits, G.G. 235, 237, 279
- Yadin, Y. 11, 35, 58, 69, 95, 110, 114,
131, 169, 172, 233, 266, 278
- Yardeni, A. 165
- Zimmerli, W. 190
- Zimmermann, J. 97, 106, 107, 281
- Zuckerman, B. 146, 159

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

1. HEBREW BIBLE

<i>Genesis</i>	47	7:17	53
1:1	243, 246, 249	7:22	43
1:1–2	247	7:23	43
1:2	238	7:24	48, 53
1:3	247	8:3	53
1–4	40	8:3–4	48
1–5	45, 58	8:4	53
1:14–19	229	8:5	48
1:24–26	225	8:6	48, 52
1:26	249, 252, 253	8:7	39
1:27	62, 71, 76, 232, 250, 252–255	8:8	39, 48
2	253	8:8–9	54
2–4	57	8:9	48
2:1	238	8:10	54
2:1–3	57	8:11	49
2:2	243, 256, 258, 259	8:12	49, 54
2:7	57, 255	8:13	49, 54
2:8	249	8:14	49, 51
2:17–18	57	8:20–21	33
2:19	57	9:1	54
2:24	62	9:9	40
3	241	9:10	48
3:1–2	57	9:11	43, 44
3:11–14	57	9:13	43
5–15	58	9:15	43
5:1	253	9:24–25	38, 49
5:1–2	254	9:24–27	49
5:2	62, 255	9:27	49
5:32	51	9:28	50
6–9	33	12:11–20	114
6:2	263	13:16	134
6:2–4	263	14	95, 98, 100, 103
6:3	48–50	14:17–20	20
6:4	263	15	131
6:5	43, 45	15:5	134
6:8–9	45	15:6	134, 135
6:9–10	45	22	131, 132, 135
6:11	40	22:6	138
6:13	40	22:7	138
6:16	38	22:10	139
7:1–8:14	49	22:11	140–142
7:6	50	22:12	140
7:9	35, 62, 71, 76	22:15	140
7:11	43, 45, 48, 51, 53	22:17	134, 142
7:12	48	25:14	131
		27:41	136

35:28	131	<i>Deuteronomy</i>	1
49:3-4	48	5:28-29	25
49:10	16, 48, 277	8:5	271, 276
		8:10	239
<i>Exodus</i>		8:13	45
4:20	241, 243	9:15	201
4:22	271, 280	10:8	81
10:4	233	13	115
12:14	243	14:1	271
12:40	241, 243	14:7	244
12:49	203	14:21	202
15:17-18	207	15	19, 98
19:6	78	17:17	62, 68, 76
20:11	257	17:19	68
20:21	25	18	115
22:17	109	18:10-11	110
24:5	243	18:15-18	16
24:11	243	18:18-19	25, 27
25:9	7	23	191
25:40	7	24:14	202
26:3	7	29:9-12	203
27:8	7	31:10-13	203
31:17	257	32	270
		32:8	263
<i>Leviticus</i>		32:28	201
11:5	244	33:8-10	80
11:6	243, 244	33:8-11	26
11:22	232, 233	33:10	81
12:2-5	72		
12:3-5	75	<i>Joshua</i>	
13	90	8:33-35	203
17:15	202		
18:18	68	<i>1 Samuel</i>	
19:26	109	2:35	4
21:16-23	207		
25:8-13	19	<i>2 Samuel</i>	
		7	16, 277
<i>Numbers</i>		7:10	207
6:22-27	81	7:14	273, 275
8:4	7	14:16	98
15:22-26	203	20:19	98
16:15	243	21:13	98
16:22	267	23:1-7	236
16:29-30	219	23:7	236
16:30	221		
16:32	222	<i>1 Kings</i>	
21:18	28	19:15	30
22:28	222		
24:7	16	<i>2 Kings</i>	169
24:15-17	26		
24:17	28	<i>1 Chronicles</i>	169
25	98	17:13-14	275, 276
27:16	267	22:10-11	275, 276
30:10	71	28:8-19	276

28:9–10	275	89:27–28	280
29:19	7	89:27–30	275, 276
		91	121
<i>2 Chronicles</i>		93:1–2	238
7:17–20	275, 276	105:15	27
20:7	55	110	16, 95, 98, 100,
30	190		104, 275
30:1	190	110:4	20, 98
30:21	190	115:5	223
		121:2	223
<i>Ezra</i>	190–192	124:8	223
9:1–2	190	134:3	223
		135	239
<i>Nehemiah</i>	190–192	135:6–7	237
8:6	122	136:4	223
9	191	149	236
9:1–2	190–191	150	236
9:29–40	191		
9:32	191	<i>Proverbs</i>	
13:3	191	8:22	238, 249
13:15–22	191	8:22–23	248
13:23–24	191	14:31	223
13:28	192	17:5	223
		22:1	223
<i>Job</i>		31:12	68
1:6	263		
2:1	263	<i>Qohelet</i>	179
4:17	223		
5:1	267	<i>Isaiah</i>	1, 16, 19, 238
15:15	267	6	6, 237
16:9	136	6:12	98
28:7	263	9:1–6	275
30:21	136	9:5–6	283
35:10	223	11:1–5	277
36:3	223	22:11	223
		24:17	62
<i>Psalms</i>	1, 6, 19	27:11	223
2	16, 275, 277, 279	40–55	17, 37
2:7	275	44:2	223
7	98, 100	51:13	223
7:1	20	52	19, 98
7:8–9	20	52:7	20, 25, 104, 107
29:1	263	54:5	223
37:19	60	54:8–9	37
44:7	276	54:11	83
45	276	54:11–12	83
74:20	221, 226	54:12	84
78:46	233	54:16	28
82	98, 100	61:1	106, 107
82:1–2	20	61:2–3	20, 105
82:7	264	64:7	271
89	280		
89:6	267	<i>Jeremiah</i>	16, 239
89:7	263	2:27	270
89:27	273	3:14	270

3:19	270–271	5:7	113
10	237	5:11	113
10:12–13	237	7	18, 23, 24
10:13	237	7:14	23
10:16	223	7:27	23
23:5	277	8:13	267
28:16	237	9:24–27	195
31:9	271		
31:31–34	198	<i>Hosea</i>	
33:14–26	16	1:8	271
35:15	277	1:9	271
51	237	2:1	271
51:15–16	237	2:25	271
51:16	237	5:11	65
51:19	223	8:14	223
		10:12	105
<i>Ezekiel</i>	1, 2, 16, 238	11:1	271
1	237		
4:4–8	195	<i>Amos</i>	
9:4	1, 106	4:13	223
13:10	64	5:8	223
37:23	1	5:26	252
40–48	2, 3, 5–10, 12	5:26–27	106
43:11	7		
44:9	207	<i>Micah</i>	
44:15	1, 2, 4	2:6	62
44:23	82		
44:24	82	<i>Habakkuk</i>	
47:21–23	203	2:1–2	105
48:16–17	9		
48:30–35	9	<i>Zechariah</i>	
		2:5–9	7
<i>Daniel</i>	19, 170	3	16
2:27	113	3:8	277
3:5	147	6:9–14	16
3:7	147	6:12	277
3:10	147	13:7	106
3:15	147	14:5	267
4	112		
4:4	113	<i>Malachi</i>	
4:14	267	3:1	17
		4:5–6	16

2. APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

<i>2 Baruch</i>		6:7	41
4:1–6	6	48:10	18, 103
6:7–9	6	52:4	18, 103
32:2–4	6	90:28–29	6
		106	265
<i>1 Enoch</i>	59, 111, 118	106:2	265
<i>Book of the Watchers</i>	111	106:5	265
<i>Book of Parables</i>	17, 23, 24,		
	102, 103	<i>2 Enoch</i>	60
<i>Astronomical Book</i>	60	25:3–4	238

<i>4 Ezra</i>	17, 24, 102, 103, 185	<i>Judith</i>	141
7	103	8:26	
7:26	6	<i>Testament of Levi</i>	35
7:28	18, 103		
10:25–28	6	<i>1 Maccabees</i>	203, 204
10:40–48	6	1:15	204
12	103	1:41	204
12:32	18, 103	2:23	203
13	18, 103	6:18	204
		7:5	204
<i>Jubilees</i>	35–37, 52, 59, 72–76, 132, 136, 139, 140, 142, 143, 183, 229, 231, 237–239, 258, 259	<i>2 Maccabees</i>	203, 204
1:17	6	6:6	204
1:26–29	6	7:8	247
1:27	234	7:37	204
1:29	234, 235	8:1	204
2:1	258	9:13–17	204
2:2	227, 231	9:17	204
2:2–3	239	14:38	204
2:16–17	258	<i>4 Maccabees</i>	
3:5	74	14:20	140
3:6	75	<i>Pseudo-Phocylides</i>	180
3:8	73, 74	5–79	
3:8–12	75	<i>Sirach</i>	179, 185, 223
3:8–13	72–73	3:22–23	179
3:12	74	16:16	221
3:27	74	24:9	248
3:28	60	51:12	223
5:32	52	<i>Sybilline Oracles</i>	
8:19	74	2	180
10:13	35	2.56–148	
12:26	60	<i>Tobit</i>	112
17:16	136	13:16–18	7
17:17	136	<i>Wisdom of Solomon</i>	
18:12	141	2:18	271
18:14	140	9:1–2	250
19:8	136	11:17	247
21:10	35		
25:21	6		

3. DEAD SEA SCROLLS

<i>Damascus Document</i>	2–4, 27, 29, 30,	I 3–11	193, 195
(CD)	59, 62–65, 69–72, 76, 99, 188, 192, 195, 196, 198–202, 205–209, 211, 227, 230, 231, 252, 258, 273	I 4–5 I 13 I 14 II 2 II 5 II 12 II 13	197 200 65 198 200 27, 106 200

II 14ff.	59	XII 14–15	232
II 17–21	34, 59	XII 15	233
III 3	131	XII 19	196
III 8–12	194	XIII 14	196
III 12–16	197, 199	XIII 15–XIV 2	70
III 18–20	60	XIII 16–18	70
III 19	4	XIV 3–6	205
III 19–20	208	XIV 4	202
III 20–IV 2	1, 2	XIV 6–8	85
III 20	60	XIV 15	202
IV 1	200	XIV 19	101
IV 2	196, 200	XV 2–4	258
IV 2–4	196	XV 6–17	200
IV 10–11	200	XV 7–8	206
IV 14–19	62	XV 15–17	207
IV 17	199	XVI 12	198
IV 19	200	XIX 11–12	1
IV 19–V 1	62	XIX 14	198
IV 20–21	61, 70, 71, 255–256	XIX 24–25	200
IV 21	228, 231, 232	XIX 27	201
V 1	34, 35	XIX 29	200
V 5–7	66	XIX 29–31	199
V 13–14	201	XIX 34	198
V 17	201	XIX 35–XX 1	31
V 18	20, 99	XX 17	200
VI 1	27	XX 25	198
VI 5	196, 200	XX 32	85
VI 7	28–30	1Q1 (<i>Gen</i>)	57
VI 11	29, 105, 198	2	57
VI 11–15	78		
VI 13–VII 5	200	1Q3 (<i>paleaNum</i>)	
VI 15	196	8–21	220
VI 19	198		
VI 21	202, 205	1Q4–5 (<i>Deut^{a-b}</i>)	1
VII 13–VIII 1	106		
VII 17	107	1QIsa ^{a-b}	1
VII 18	107	1QIs ^a	58
VII 18–21	28, 29		
VII 20	107	1Q10–12 (<i>Ps^{a-c}</i>)	1
VIII 1	198		
VIII 12	64, 65	1QPesher to <i>Habakkuk</i>	
VIII 15	201	(1QPHab)	29, 171
VIII 16	196, 200	II 2–3	85
VIII 16–18	199	II 8–9	85
VIII 18	64, 198	II 8–10	105
VIII 21	198	VII 1–5	105
IX 1	201	VII 5–6	85
IX 3	198	IX 16	12
X 14–XI 18	258		
XI 2	202	1Q17–18 (<i>Jub^{a-b}</i>)	258
XI 14	201		
XII 6–11	201	1Q19 (<i>Noah</i>)	1, 36
XII 8	65, 196	1–2	36
XII 12	64	3	36

1Q20 (<i>apGen ar</i>)	35-37, 58, 59, 99, 131, 265	V 7-10 V 8 V 8-9 V 10-13 V 11 V 18 V 19 V 22 V 23-24 VI 4-5 VI 8-9 VI 9 VI 10 VI 13-23 VI 14 VI 16 VI 18-19 VI 19 VI 21 VI 22 VII 12 VIII 1 VIII 2-7 VIII 6 VIII 10 VIII 13-14 VIII 16-17 IX 7 IX 7-8 IX 9-11 IX 3-4 IX 11	211 209 86 214 209 209 209 209, 214 128 90 205 214 215 128 85 84 84 211 84 215 226 87 216 215 217 216 210 4, 84 84 15 78 24, 26, 31, 107 215 215 88 88 209 200 269 263 215
1Q26 (<i>Instruction</i>)	184	1Q28a (<i>Sa</i>)	90, 207, 217, 274, 278
<i>Rule of the Community</i> (1QS)	42, 72, 87, 90, 99, 106, 119, 171, 188, 205, 206, 208-217, 227, 229, 273, 274, 278	I 2 I 13-16 I 19-20 I 24 II 3 II 3-9 II 11-14 II 17-20	4 88 88 4, 88 4 207 278 90
<i>Treatise of the Two Spirits</i>	99, 122, 128, 214, 223, 268		
I 7-10	212		
I 9-11	274		
I 16-18	211		
I 16-III 12	209		
I 21-24	213		
II	122		
II 1-5	89		
II 2	98		
II 4-9	213		
II 21	214		
III 11-12	210		
III 13	118		
III 13-IV 26	122, 128, 268		
III 17-18	223		
III 20	20, 99		
III 20-21	268		
III 25	223		
IV 22	263		
IV 25	223, 225		
V 1-3	215		
V 2	4		
V 3	84		
V 4-6	210		

1Q28b (<i>Sb</i>)		2Q19–20 (<i>Jub^{a-b}</i>)	258
III 22	4		
III 22–28	92–93	2Q24 (<i>NJ ar</i>)	5, 8–10, 12, 168–170
III 28	89		
IV 24–26	268	3Q1 (<i>Ezek</i>)	1
1Q29 (<i>Lit. of 3 Tongues of Fire</i>)	115, 116	3Q5 (<i>Jub</i>)	258
1Q32 (<i>NJ² ar</i>)	8	3Q15 (<i>Copper Scroll</i>)	145, 147–150, 153, 156, 159–161, 166–70
1Q33 (<i>M</i>)	22, 27, 78, 92, 99, 171, 207, 217, 274	I 3	161
I 1–2	12	I 4	148
I 10–11	269	I 6–7	151
II 1–6	12	I 7	153, 156, 159, 164
VII 3–6	207	I 9	151, 152, 155, 158, 159, 161, 162
VII 6	268		
X 9–11	267	I 12	148
XI 7	27	I 13	156
XII 1–2	267	II 2	148
XIII 10	20	II 4	148
XVII 6–7	20, 99	II 6	156, 161
<i>1QHodayot^a (H^a)</i>	171, 273	II 8	156, 161
IV 13–15	60	II 9	148
IV 15	60	III 1	154, 156–160
VI 24	200	III 2	161
VII 17–18	252	III 7	148
IX	223	III 9	157–159, 161
X 9	200	IV 2	148
XI 2	263	IV 7	151
XI 6–18	282–283	IV 12	151
XI 7–12	283	V 6	156, 159, 161
XI 18	283	V 13	152
XI 19–23	266–267	VII 16	151, 153
XI 32–33	226	VIII 3	161
XIV 6	200	IX 3	151, 153, 156, 159, 164
XVII 19–31	261		
XVII 35–36	261	IX 10	151
XXIII	264	X 11	156, 161
XXVI 2–18	269	XI	161
2	264	XI 2	151, 154, 156, 159, 164
2 i 3	264		
2 i 10	263, 264	XI 3	151, 154, 156, 159, 164
2 ii 13	264	XI 4	161
<i>1QHodayot^b (H^b)</i>	171, 273	XI 5	151, 154
2Q6–9 (<i>Num^{a-d}</i>)	220	XI 10	161
2Q10–12 (<i>Deut^{a-c}</i>)	1	XI 14	154, 156, 158, 159, 161
2Q14 (<i>Ps</i>)	1	XII 5	161
		XII 6	161

4Q1 (<i>Gen-Exod^a</i>)	33	1-2 i 2-6	207
47	33	1-2 i 6	60
		1-2 i 8	268
4Q2 (<i>Gen^b</i>)	243	1-2 i 8-9	208
4Q7 (<i>Gen^c</i>)	57, 243	1-2 i 10-12	277
4Q8 (<i>Gen^{h2}</i>)	57	1-2 i 11-12	27-28
4Q8 (<i>Gen^{h-till^e}</i>)	243	1-2 i 16-17	1
4Q10 (<i>Gen^k</i>)	57		
4	57	4Q175 (<i>Test</i>)	25-27, 106
5	57	5-8	27
		17-18	81
4Q23 (<i>Lev-Num^a</i>)	220		
		4Q176 (<i>Tanh</i>)	37
4Q27 (<i>Num^b</i>)	220	8-11	37
		10-11	37
4Q28-46 (<i>Deut^{a-3}</i>)	1		
4Q35 (<i>Deut^h</i>)	81	4Q176a (<i>Jubⁱ?</i>)	258
11-15 3	81		
4Q37 (<i>Deutⁱ</i>)	263	4Q177 (<i>Catena A</i>)	276
4Q55-69b (<i>Isa^{a-7}</i>)	1	4Q179 (<i>apocrLam A</i>)	172
4Q73-75 (<i>Ezek^{a-7}</i>)	1	4Q180 (<i>AgesCreat A</i>)	59
		1 5	131
4Q83-98g (<i>Ps^{a-x}</i>)	1, 172	4Q181 (<i>AgesCreat B</i>)	
		1 ii 2	263
4Q119 (<i>LXXLev^a</i>)	242	2 1	131
4Q120 (<i>papLXXLev^b</i>)	242	2 10	224
4Q121 (<i>LXXNum</i>)	220, 242	4Q185 (<i>Sapiential Work</i>)	46, 172
4Q122 (<i>LXXDeut</i>)	242	4Q186	109, 127, 129, 149
		1 ii 5-9	127-128
4Q159 (<i>Ordinances^a</i>)		1 iii 3-6	128
2-4	88	2 i 1-9	128
4Q161 (<i>pIsa^a</i>)	277		
8-10 17	12	4Q196-199 (<i>Tob^{a-d} ar</i>)	112
4Q162 (<i>pIsa^b</i>)		4Q200 (<i>Tob^a</i>)	112
II 1	12		
4Q164 (<i>pIsa^d</i>)		4Q201-202 (<i>AQEn^{a-b} ar</i>)	111
1 1-6	83	4Q201 (<i>AQEn^a ar</i>)	
1 3	215	ii 13-15	111
1 8	84	iii 1-5	111
		4Q202 (<i>AQEn^b ar</i>)	
4Q171 (<i>pPs^a</i>)	60	ii 18-20	111
1-2 ii 5	215	iii 1-6	111
1, 3-4 iii 1-2	61	4Q204-206 (<i>AQEn^{c-e} ar</i>)	111
1, 3-4 iii 5	215		
1, 3-4 iii 15	85	4Q216-224 (<i>Jub^{a-h}</i>)	258
		4Q216 (<i>Jub^a</i>)	
4Q174 (<i>Flor</i>)	27, 29, 75, 207, 208, 276	V 1	228, 231
		V 9	224, 227
1-2 i 2-5	11	V 10-11	239

12 ii	227	I 1-3	49
12 ii 4	227	I 1-II 5	47
13	227	I 1-II 7	48-49
4Q217 (<i>papʿjubʿ?</i>)	229	I 3-II 5	49
2 2	228, 231	I 6	53
4Q223-224 (<i>papʿjubʿ</i>)		I 8	53
43 4	228	I 17	54
		I 19	54
4Q225 (<i>psʿjubʿ</i>)	132, 135, 138, 141-143	I 20	54
	132	II 1-5	39
1	234	II 5-6	38
1 6-7	228	II 5-7	49
1 7	132	II 7	49
2	228	IV 5-7	48
2 3	132-134	V	46
2 i-ii	131	V 1-7	48
2 i 9	131, 136	V 5	48
2 i 10	131	V 6	277
2 i 11	138	V 7-8	48
2 ii 1	131	4Q253 (<i>CommGen B</i>)	37
2 ii 2	139	1 2	38
2 ii 2-3	131, 139	2 3	228
2 ii 4	141	4Q254 (<i>CommGen C</i>)	38, 39
2 ii 7	138	1	38
2 ii 7-8	136, 141	1 3-4	38
2 ii 8	142	4	38
2 ii 9	131, 142	15	39
2 ii 10	142	4Q254a (<i>CommGen D</i>)	39
2 ii 11	131, 142	1-2	39
2 ii 12	132, 141	3	39
4Q226 (<i>psʿjubʿ</i>)	141	4Q255-264 (<i>S^{a-j}</i>)	208
7 1	132	4Q256 (<i>S^b</i>)	211
7 5	132	4Q258 (<i>S^d</i>)	211, 212, 215
4Q227 (<i>psʿjubʿ?</i>)	112, 115, 172	I 5-7	211-212
4Q242 (<i>PrNab ar</i>)	113	4Q259 (<i>S^e</i>)	229
1-3 1-4		4Q265 (<i>Miscellaneous Rules</i>)	73, 75, 76, 78
4Q243 (<i>psDan^a ar</i>)	37	7 1-10	72
6	37	7 3	78
4Q244 (<i>psDan^b ar</i>)	37	7 11-17	61, 71, 72
8		7 11	72-74
4Q246 (<i>apocrDan ar</i>)	18, 20, 22-24, 280-281	7 12	73, 74
	21-23	7 13	74
I	21-23, 281	7 14	72, 75, 76
II	23-24	4Q266 (<i>4QD^a</i>)	70, 227
II 4	23, 24	3 iii 19-22	28
II 5	23, 24	5 i 5	87
II 9		5 ii	86
4Q252-254		5 ii 1-4	86
(<i>CommGen A-D</i>)	39	5 ii 4	87
4Q252 (<i>CommGen A</i>)	34, 3-39, 46, 52-55, 277	6 i	90
		6 i 13	91

9 ii 1-2	232	4Q364 (<i>RP^b</i>)	131
9 iii	70	1 2	131
10 i 12-13	101	8 4	131
10 ii 9-10	226	4Q365 (<i>RP^a</i>)	
10 ii 10	224	15a-b 5	233
11 8	85-86		
11 16-18	89	4Q369 (<i>Prayer of Enosh</i>)	279
4Q267 (<i>4QD^b</i>)		1 ii 4-10	279
1 8	228		
4Q269 (<i>4QD^d</i>)	90	4Q370 (<i>AdmonFlood</i>)	34, 40, 42,
5	28		44, 46, 239
4Q270 (<i>4QD^a</i>)	69	I 1-10	43
7 i 2	227	I 3	43
7 i 12-13	69	I 4	44
7 ii 11-12	89	I 6	43, 44
4Q272 (<i>4QD^e</i>)	90	II	46
4Q273 (<i>4QD^b</i>)	90	II 1-9	46
4 i 9	131		
		4Q372 (<i>Narrative and Poetic Composition B</i>)	273
4Q276 (<i>Tohorot B^a</i>)	91	1 14-20	272
4Q277 (<i>Tohorot B^b</i>)			
1 ii 3-10	91-92	4Q374 (<i>Exod/Conq. Trad.</i>)	
		2 ii 6	266
4Q280 (<i>Curses</i>)	96, 122		
		4Q375 (<i>apocrMoses^a</i>)	115
4Q286-290 (<i>Ber^{a-e}</i>)	89, 96	4Q376 (<i>apocrMoses^{b,2}</i>)	115
4Q286 (<i>Ber^a</i>)	96	1 i	83
7	122	1 i-iii	116
7 ii 6	268	1 ii 1-2	83
12	225		
4Q287 (<i>Ber^b</i>)		4Q377 (<i>apocrPent. B</i>)	27
3 1-4	224-225	1 ii 11	266
3 2	224		
		4Q378-379 (<i>apocrJosh^{a-b}</i>)	26
4Q318 (<i>Zodiacology and Brontology ar</i>)	109, 125	4Q379 (<i>apocrJosh^b</i>)	
2 i 4	126	17 4	131
2 i 9	126		
2 ii	125	4Q381 (<i>Non-Canonical Psalms B</i>)	264
2 ii 4	126		
		4Q385 (<i>psEzek^a</i>)	2
4Q319 (<i>Otot</i>)	228, 229	4Q385b (<i>psEzek^c</i>)	2
4 11	228	4Q386 (<i>psEzek^b</i>)	2
4 12	228	1 ii 3	268
IV 9-11	229	4Q388 (<i>psEzek^d</i>)	2
IV 11	229	7 ii 2	131
IV 17	229		
		4Q389 (<i>apocrJer C^d</i>)	131
4Q320 (<i>Cal.Doc./ Mishmarot A</i>)	228	8 ii 8	
1 i 1-5	230		
3 i 10	228, 229	4Q391 (<i>pap psEzek^c</i>)	2

4Q393 (<i>Communal Confession</i>)		1 i 17	183
4 5	131	1 i 18	183, 184
		1 i 19	183
4Q394–399 (<i>MMT^{e-f}</i>)	65	1 i 21	184
		1 i 25	183
4Q400–407 (<i>ShirShabb^{g-h}</i>)	5–8, 12, 17, 80, 95, 98, 99, 101, 253, 264, 267, 268, 270	1 ii 3 2 i 10–11 4Q418 (<i>4QInstruction^d</i>) 2+2a–c 4 10 1 43 4	184 179, 184 263 184 184
4Q400 (<i>ShirShabb^a</i>)		43 14	184
2 5	265	43 16	184
2 6	80	69 ii 12	263
4Q401 (<i>ShirShabb^b</i>)		77 2	184
11 3	96	77 4	184
4Q403 (<i>ShirShabb^a</i>)		123 ii 4	184
1 i 32–33	265	172 1	184
1 i 41	7	179 5	184
1 ii 13	7	184 2	184, 185
1 ii 21	268	190 2	184
1 ii 22	80	4Q423 (<i>4QInstruction^e</i>)	
4Q405 (<i>ShirShabb^f</i>)		3 2	184, 185
8–9 5–6	268		
23 i 9	7	4Q419 (<i>Instruction-like Composition A</i>)	77
4Q415–418, 423	174–182, 184, 185, 224	1 3 1 5	77 77
4QInstruction ^{e-g}			
4Q415 (<i>4QInstruction^e</i>)		4Q422 (<i>Paraphrase of Gen and Exod</i>)	40
6 4	184, 185	II	40
24 1	184	III	40
25 1	184	III 5	233
4Q416 (<i>4QInstruction^b</i>)	181		
1	180	4Q427 (<i>H^e</i>)	
1 7	224	7	269
1 10–15	181	4Q431 (<i>H^f</i>)	
1 12	263	1	269
1 17	224		
2 i 5	184	4Q444 (<i>Incantation</i>)	120
2 iii 9	184	1–3 i 1–8	120
2 iii 14	184		
2 iii 18	184	4Q458 (<i>Narrative A</i>)	280
2 iii 20–21	185	1 1	280
2 iii 21	184	1 2	280
17 3	184	2 ii 6	280
4Q417 (<i>4QInstruction^e</i>)	182	15 1	280
1 i	180		
1 i 6	183, 184	4Q460 (<i>Narrative Work and Prayer</i>)	
1 i 6–19	182–183	9 i 2	273
1 i 7–8	183	9 i 3	273
1 i 8	184	9 i 5–6	273
1 i 13	183	9 i 6	273
1 i 14	183		
1 i 16	183		

4Q464 (<i>Exposition on the Patriarchs</i>)		4Q534 (<i>Birth of Noah^a ar</i>)	41, 42, 129, 266
3 i 8	60	1 i 7–8	266
4Q491 (<i>M^a</i>)		1 ii	42
11	269	1 ii 13–14	42
11 i 11	270	4Q535 (<i>Birth of Noah^b ar</i>)	41
24 4	264	3	41
4Q504 (<i>DibHam^a</i>)	40	4Q536 (<i>Birth of Noah^c ar</i>)	41
1–2 iii 3–7	272	1 i 3	41
1–2 iv 6–8	276	1 i 8	41
1–2 vii 4–9	225–226	2	41
1–2 vii 9	224	4Q541 (<i>apocrLevi^b? ar</i>)	
8	40, 253	9 i 2	101
8 4	253	4Q543–549 (<i>Visions of Amram^{e-g} ar</i>)	96, 99, 100
8 14	40	4Q544 (<i>Visions of Amram^b ar</i>)	
4Q505 (<i>papDibHam^b</i>)		2 3–5	100
124 6	131	3 2	100
4Q508 (<i>PrFêtes^b</i>)	40	4Q546 (<i>Visions of Amram^d ar</i>)	
3	40	14 4	263
3 2	40	4Q554–555 (<i>NJ ar</i>)	5, 8–10, 12, 168–170
3 3	131	4Q560 (<i>Exorcism ar</i>)	109
4Q509 (<i>papPrFêtes^c</i>)		1 i–ii	124
24 2	131	1 ii 5	124
4Q510–511 (<i>Shir^{a-b}</i>)	109, 117, 120, 122, 123	1 ii 6	124
4Q510 (<i>Shir^a</i>)		4Q561 (<i>Physiognomy ar</i>)	109, 129
1 4–8	119	1 i–ii	129
1 5	124	5Q1 (<i>Deut</i>)	1
4Q511 (<i>Shir^b</i>)	123	5Q3 (<i>Isa</i>)	1
2 i 1	117	5Q5 (<i>Ps</i>)	1
8 4	117	5Q13 (<i>Rule</i>)	42
10 1–6	119	1 6	264
10 12	118	1 7	42
35 6	120	5Q15 (<i>NJ ar</i>)	5–10, 12, 168–170
35 6–8	118	6Q1 (<i>paleoGen</i>)	33
48–50 2–5	118	6Q5 (<i>papPs.[?]</i>)	1
63–64	119	6Q15 (<i>D</i>)	
63–64 iii 5	118	1 3	228
4Q521 (<i>Messianic Apocalypse</i>)	31–32, 107		
2	32		
2 ii 1–14	32		
4Q525 (<i>Beatitudes</i>)			
25 2	268		
4Q534–536 (<i>Birth of Noah^{a-c} ar</i>)	41		

6Q18 (<i>papHymn</i>)		II 11–12	100
2 7	131	II 13	100
		II 14	264
6Q20 (<i>Deut?</i>)	1	II 15–16	104
		II 17	104
7Q1 (<i>papLXXExod</i>)	242	II 17–21	104
		II 18	26, 106
7Q2 (<i>papEpJer gr</i>)	242	II 20	104
		III	97
8Q2 (<i>Ps</i>)	1		
8Q5 (<i>Hymn</i>)	123	11Q17 (<i>ShirShabb</i>)	5–8, 12, 17, 80, 95, 98, 101, 253, 264, 267, 268, 270
11Q3 (<i>Deut</i>)	1	II 7	96
11Q4 (<i>Ezek</i>)	1		
11Q5–9 (<i>Ps^{a-c}</i>)	1	11Q18 (<i>Nj ar</i>)	5, 8–10, 12, 168–170
11Q5 (<i>Ps^a</i>)	223, 236		
XXVI 9–15	236, 248	11Q19 (<i>11QT^a</i>)	11, 68, 69, 71, 78, 111, 167–170, 172, 235
XXVI 13	44		
XXVI 13–14	248	XVII 11–15	87
XXVII 9–10	121	XXIX 8–9	61, 233–234
		XXIX 9	228
11Q10 (<i>tgJob</i>)	172	XXIX 9–10	11
		XLVIII 3–4	233
11Q11 (<i>apocrPs</i>)	121	XLVIII 18–21	83
II 2	122	LIV 4–5	71
V 4	120	LVI 18–19	68
V 4–11	121	LVII 15–19	68
VI 3	122, 268	LX 16–21	110
VI 14	122	LXVI 11	71
		11Q20 (<i>11QT^b</i>)	11, 68, 69, 71, 78, 111, 167–170, 172, 235
11Q12 (<i>Jub</i>)	258		
11Q13 (<i>Melch</i>)	18, 22, 24, 25, 31, 96–107	Mur 1 (<i>Gen^{aj}</i>)	220
II	97		
II 4	12, 97	5/6Hev 1a (<i>Num^a</i>)	220
II 5	98		
II 6–19	18–19	XHev/Se 1 (<i>Num^a</i>)	220
II 7	97		
II 8	98, 100	34 Se 2 (<i>Num</i>)	220
II 9	98		
II 9–10	100	Mas 1k (<i>ShirShabb</i>)	95
II 10–11	100		

4. NEW TESTAMENT

<i>Matthew</i>	71	<i>Colossians</i>	239
		1:13–15	
<i>Mark</i>	62	<i>Hebrews</i>	239
10:6–8		1:12	
<i>Luke</i>	281	<i>James</i>	135
1:32		2:23	
<i>John</i>	239	<i>1 Peter</i>	78
1:1	154	3:9	
10:23		<i>1 John</i>	262
<i>Acts</i>	154	3:10	262, 283
5:12		3:12	
<i>Romans</i>		<i>Revelation</i>	
4:3	135	1:6	78
4:9	135	5:10	78
<i>Galatians</i>		20:6	78
3:6	135		

5. ANCIENT JEWISH WRITERS

Aristobulus		<i>Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum</i>	
5	249	3:2	50
		32:1–2	137
Flavius Josephus		32:2–4	136
<i>Jewish War</i>		40:2	139
1.401	154		
<i>Jewish Antiquities</i>		Philo of Alexandria	
1.33	257	<i>De confusione linguarum</i>	250–251
1.232	139	179	
3.163	163	<i>De ebrietate</i>	
3.166	164	31	249
3.170	164	<i>Legum allegoriae</i>	
3.171	164	1.43	249
3.185	164	2.12	257
3.214	117	<i>De opificio mundi</i>	
3.215–218	116–117	89	257
		134	255

6. RABBINIC LITERATURE

<i>m. Abodah Zarah</i>		<i>m. Kelim</i>	
2:7	233	16:2	163
<i>m. Eduyyot</i>		30:4	163
7:2	233	<i>m. Terumat</i>	
<i>m. Hullin</i>		10:9	233
3:7	233	<i>t. Sota</i>	
8:1	233	3:6	44

<i>b. Berakot</i>		<i>ʿAbot de Rabbi Nathan</i>	241, 245, 254
55a	240, 246	37	222, 241
<i>b. Hagigah</i>		<i>Mekilta de Rabbi Işmael</i>	241, 242, 245, 254
12b	6		
<i>b. Megillah</i>	242, 245, 255	<i>Pirqe ʿAbot</i>	
9a	244	5:6	222
9a–b	241	<i>Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer</i>	138
<i>b. Pesahim</i>		19:1	222
54a	238	105	138
113a	162	<i>Genesis Rabbah</i>	50, 54, 251
<i>b. Sanhedrin</i>		1:10	240, 246
89b	137	8:1	254
108b	44	8:8	251–252
<i>b. Shebuʿot</i>		8:9	252
15b	121	8:11	855
		10:9	259
<i>y. Erubin</i>		26:6	50
10.11 [26c]	121	34:13	44
<i>y. Hagigah</i>		36:7	54
2.77c	240, 246	55:4	137
<i>y. Megillah</i>	245, 247	56:1–2	138
71d	241	56:5	140
<i>y. Shabbat</i>		56:7	139, 140
6.8b	121	<i>Exodus Rabbah</i>	
		5:5	241
<i>Targum Onqelos</i>	221	<i>Esther Rabbah</i>	157
<i>Fragmentary Targum</i>	139	<i>Semakhot</i>	
110	139, 249, 251	13:6	165
240	249	<i>Sipre</i>	
440	139, 249	Deuteronomy	
<i>Targum Neofiti</i>	134, 139, 140, 221, 251	32	140
		43	44
<i>Targum Pseudo-Jonathan</i>	139, 222, 251, 262	<i>Soperim</i>	245
		1.7–8	241
Genesis		<i>Tanhuma</i>	246
22:4		22	241
Numbers		<i>Midrash ha-Gadol</i>	241, 252
22:28	222	<i>ʿAlqut Shimoni</i>	241

7. CLASSICAL AND EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

Juvenal		<i>Barnabas</i>	
<i>Saturae</i>		5:5	239, 251
6.542–547	109	15:2–3	257–258
Lucian of Samosata		Jerome	
<i>Tragopodagra</i>		<i>Commentary on Genesis</i>	259
171–173	109		
Plato			
<i>Timaeus</i>			
51a	247		

