THE USE OF SOBRIQUETS IN THE QUMRAN DEAD SEA SCROLLS

MATTHEW A. COLLINS

t&t clark

This page intentionally left blank

THE USE OF SOBRIQUETS IN THE QUMRAN DEAD SEA SCROLLS

MATTHEW A. COLLINS

t & t clark

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

kept me going throughout the more difficult patches. Without their support the road would have been far rockier, and accordingly it is to them that this work is dedicated.

Abbreviations

AJS	*American Journal of Sociology*
ANRW	H. Temporini and W. Haase (eds), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (1972–)
Ant.	Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*
ARSSR	*Annual Review of the Social Sciences of Religion*
ASR	*American Sociological Review*
BA	*Biblical Archaeologist*
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
BHS	*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*
DJD(J)	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (of Jordan)
DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
DSSEL	E. Tov (ed.), *Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library* (rev. edn, 2006)
DSSERL	Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Reference Library
DSSR	D.W. Parry and E. Tov (eds), *Dead Sea Scrolls Reader* (6 vols; 2004)
DSSSE	F. García Martínez and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds), *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols; 1997–98)
ECDSS	Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls
ErIsr	*Eretz-Israel*
ESP	Early Sectarian Period
ETL	*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*
ExTim	*Expository Times*
FSP	Formative Sectarian Period
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
IOQS	International Organization for Qumran Studies
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JRH	*Journal of Religious History*
JSIJ	*Jewish Studies, an Internet Journal*

JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism*
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
LSP	Late Sectarian Period
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
PIBA	Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association
PTSDSSP	Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project
QC	*Qumran Chronicle*
RB	*Revue Biblique*
RevQ	*Revue de Qumrân*
SHS	Scripture and Hermeneutics Series
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
SocRel	*Sociology of Religion*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum*
War	Josephus, *The Jewish War*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

Abbreviations for the Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls (and related material) follow the extensive list provided in E. Tov (ed.), *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002).

Key to Symbols in Translated Passages[1]

] XXX [or] אאא [
legible text

]^XXX[or]^אאא[
legible text inserted above the line

[XXX] or [אאא]
text restoration

] . . . [
one or more illegible traces or untranslatable readings

[. . .]
lacuna of unspecified length

(XXX)
words supplied by way of explanation

(אאא)
suggested or alternative reading

(. . .)
omission in translation

{/XXX}
alternative translation for immediately preceding word(s)

{אאא}
underlying Hebrew text for immediately preceding word(s) in translation

This page intentionally left blank

INTRODUCTION

It is now over sixty years since Muhammad edh-Dhib purportedly clambered into a cave close to the north-western shore of the Dead Sea and discovered a hoard of ancient manuscripts. In doing so he sparked a series of similar discoveries in the area, a lengthy publication process and a debate about the origin of these texts which still rages today.[1] The 'Dead Sea Scrolls', as they have popularly become known, include discoveries from sites such as Wadi Murabbaʻat, Naḥal Ḥever and Wadi ed-Daliyeh.[2] However, we shall concern ourselves solely with the Qumran (or better, Qumran-related) Dead Sea Scrolls, those texts coming from the eleven caves commonly associated with the site of Khirbet Qumran.[3]

The remains of some nine hundred manuscripts have been recovered (bearing witness to 'around four hundred distinct compositions' [Campbell 2002: 10]) and include previously known works classed as biblical, apocryphal or pseudepigraphal in nature.[4] Further to these are hitherto unknown texts (with the exception of the Damascus Document [see Levy 1993]) some of which are regarded as 'sectarian', the literary creations of the 'sect' deemed responsible for the collection as a whole.[5]

---

1 For the oft-repeated account(s) of this discovery, see Campbell 2002: 1–12; Schiffman 1994: 3–16; Shanks 1999: 3–32; VanderKam 1994a: 1–12. For detailed summaries of the publication saga, see primarily Harding 2002; Schiffman 2002; Schuller 2006: 1–33; Shanks 1999: 33–60; Trompf 2002. Theories of origin will be discussed briefly in Chapter 1.

2 See primarily Reed 2007. Note further Eshel and Cotton 2000a; 2000b; Fields 2000; Lapp and Gropp 2000; Magness, Eshel and Talmon 2000; Patrich 2000; Pfann 2000; Stern and Eshel 2000.

3 Unless otherwise qualified, for the purposes of this examination the term 'Dead Sea Scrolls' will refer solely to the Qumran-related collection of manuscripts (thus often including, by association, the mediaeval copies of the Damascus Document from Cairo). See Talmon 1994a: 7–8.

4 See Dimant 2000.

5 It is unclear how many sects (if any) may be represented by this apparent 'sectarian' literature. See primarily the following discussions: Charlesworth and Knibb 2000; Collins 2003; 2006a; 2007; Davies 1994; 1996: 139–50; Golb 1995; Grossman 2002: 24–41; Metso 2006a; Regev 2003; 2007a. As will be elaborated upon in Chapter 1, given the 'surprisingly homogeneous' (van der Woude 1998: 3) nature of the texts, this study assumes the existence of (at least) one discernible group behind the collection. Furthermore, if scholars such as

One prominent feature used to distinguish 'sectarian' from 'non-sectarian' texts is the presence of so-called 'community terminology'.[6] Most notably this includes the employment of sobriquets, such as 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (מורה הצדק), 'the Spouter of the Lie' (מטיף הכזב) and 'the Wicked Priest' (הכוהן הרשע).[7]

The predominant approach to this phenomenon has been to attempt to identify the historical personages deemed to lie behind these nicknames.[8] However, after sixty years and countless proffered reconstructions, disagreement abounds within the scholarly community concerning these varied proposals. Indeed, some scholars have become increasingly critical either about the possibility of reading or reconstructing history from these texts (e.g., Brooke 1994a; Davies 1987) or in their approach towards such a goal (Grossman 2002). Nevertheless, the traditional method (indicative of a 'naïve historicism' [Brooke 1994a: 345]) is still prevalent (e.g., Gmirkin 2000) and, as Loren Stuckenbruck notes, 'despite the frequent cautions against any confident identification of the sobriquets with historical figures, the understanding of these nicknames *in relation to those who applied them* has not received proper attention' (2007a: 94 n. 55).

With the imminent completion of the DJD series and unprecedented availability of the Qumran-related material (e.g., *DSSR*; *DSSSE*; PTSDSSP; *DSSEL*), the time is ripe for a re-evaluation of the sobriquets themselves in terms of their use and function within the texts. In recent years some scholars have indeed begun to address this issue, notably Håkan Bengtsson (2000a; 2000b) and Ida Fröhlich (1999; 2004). Bengtsson's major study (2000a), however, while commendable with

---

Davies (1983), García Martínez (1995a) and Murphy-O'Connor (1974) are right to posit two related groups, one having sprung from the other, we may suppose that the origins and development of the earlier might nevertheless form part of the later group's perceived history (even if they were to expressly define themselves over and against the parent group). Thus, we are able to speak of a broad 'sectarian' movement whose history (including internal divisions) may be represented by the Qumran-related scrolls. In these circumstances, however, the final shape of the collection and the perspectives contained therein remain ultimately representative of the later group. For a recent examination of the employment of 'sect'-terminology in scholarship on the scrolls and the difficulties this raises, see Jokiranta 2001; also Collins 2007; Grabbe 2007; and, more extensively, Regev 2007a.

6   Indeed, Devorah Dimant employs this as the *sole* criterion for distinction (1995; 2000). This approach is problematic, however, as it (i) does not allow for fragmentary manuscripts which may at one time have attested such terminology, (ii) makes an unfounded assumption that *all* sectarian texts would have utilized it, and (iii) cannot objectively identify what would and would not constitute 'community terminology'. A broader approach is therefore required (see further Davies 2005: 71–73; Jokiranta 2001: 236–38; 2005a: 65–73; Rietz 2007).

7   Cf. Bengtsson 2000a: 8–11; 2000b: 243; Callaway 1988: 135.

8   To be discussed further in Chapter 1.

regard to its level of detail and sensitivity to intertextual connections, confines itself primarily to the sobriquets as they appear in the pesharim. Though he notes the possibility that 'variant' forms in other texts might represent different developmental stages (2000a: 3, 95; so too Fröhlich 1999: 300 n. 33), the issue of their precise relation to those found in the pesharim is left largely unexplored.

By contrast, this present study sets out to examine the differing form and function of the sobriquets across the range of texts in which they appear. More particularly, given the traditionally allotted time-span for sectarian composition and the evidence for ideological development attested by the texts, this study hypothesizes that the sobriquets may likewise have undergone a developmental process, changing in form and perhaps meaning and/or referent. It further speculates that this process might be evidenced within the scrolls themselves if examined in a manner sensitive to the varied composition dates of the texts and with particular reference to the precise forms taken by the sobriquets where they appear. The specific question under consideration therefore is whether convincing evidence of such development can indeed be found in the Qumran-related Dead Sea Scrolls.

In terms of overall structure, Chapter 1 will include a brief overview of scholarly work to date on the sobriquets. Then, focusing on 'the Teacher of Righteousness' and 'the Spouter of the Lie', we will examine the form and function of these designations against a particular chronological schema, based primarily upon the work of Philip Davies regarding the redaction history of the Damascus Document (1983) and the relationship between the Hodayot and the various pesharim (1987: 87–105). Thus, we shall consider in turn a 'Formative Sectarian Period' (Chapter 2), 'Early Sectarian Period' (Chapter 3) and 'Late Sectarian Period' (Chapter 4). Chapter 5 will comprise both an analysis of our results and a comparison with insights garnered from a sociological approach, specifically one drawing upon the sociology of deviance and 'labelling theory'. In this manner, we will examine the compliance of this study's findings with research carried out in another academic field. Finally, in our conclusions, we shall highlight the implications of this study and suggest new avenues for investigation.

In order to ensure consistency and accuracy with regard to the rendering of sobriquets and related terminology, all translations from the scrolls are essentially the present author's revisions of *DSSSE* (though indebted also to the official DJD publications, the PTSDSSP series, *DSSR*, and the insights of García Martínez [1996], Vermes [2004] and Wise, Abegg and Cook [1996]; any errors remain my own). Column and line numbering is likewise taken from *DSSSE*. Biblical references and Hebrew follow *BHS*, while translations are based upon NRSV (though with minor alterations for terminological consistency and with inclusive

language reversed where this provides a more accurate and/or literal rendering in the context). All references to the works of Josephus are from the Loeb Classical Library edition.

Chapter 1

THE SOBRIQUETS AND THE SCROLLS

1. *Introduction*

More than sixty years have passed since the discovery of the first Qumran-related Dead Sea Scrolls in 1947 and during this time numerous theories have been proposed concerning the origin of this enigmatic find. Most assume the existence of a discernible movement behind the collection and tend to link the scrolls in some way with the nearby site of Khirbet Qumran. Such theories have often sought to identify this group, either by comparing what we learn ideologically (or theologically) from the texts themselves with Jewish religious groups known to have existed at the time or by attempting to match up apparent historical references in the scrolls with known historical events from the Second Temple period. Central to most of these reconstructions have been the so-called Qumran sobriquets, 'nicknames' that occur with some frequency among the sectarian texts and are commonly taken to denote key individuals or groups in the life or history of the sect.[1] Indeed, many have considered that unlocking the identity of such principal characters as 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (מורה הצדק) and 'the Wicked Priest' (הכוהן הרשע) might be the key to unravelling the origins of the scrolls.

As a result, attempts to identify the referents of the sobriquets have been at the heart of most historical reconstructions and have formed the basis of numerous and varied hypotheses. Largely, however, these approaches have been inconclusive and have not led to a widespread consensus. Instead, the field of Qumran studies is littered with the debris of hard-fought, often bitter, battles over the identity of the sect.[2] Some theories have fallen, others continue to be vigorously defended, but none have survived unscathed. Many scholars have found themselves forced to adapt and refine their arguments in response to either the discovery or publication of new evidence or, more often than not, the criticisms of

---

[1] For a detailed discussion of the function and characteristic features of the Qumran sobriquets, see primarily Bengtsson 2000a (esp. 1–50).

[2] It should be noted that, as Schiffman points out, the battle over the identity of the sect is just one of many 'battles of the scrolls' that have been fought, including not least that over 'the publication of the texts and access to them for scholarly research' (2002: 157).

other scholars. This state of flux can make it quite difficult to outline the different major hypotheses in anything other than broad brushstrokes. Nevertheless, in this chapter we shall first endeavour a brief overview of these attempts to 'contextualize' the scrolls before examining the problems with such an approach. Subsequently we shall turn our attention to the nature of the sobriquets themselves and propose a fresh line of enquiry, one concerned with the apparent 'variant' forms and the possibility of sobriquet development. Finally, we shall attempt to chronologically layer key sectarian material as a backdrop to our investigation. Let us, therefore, begin by surveying some of the more notable scholarly hypotheses proposed since the scrolls' discovery, regarding the identification of the movement responsible and the referents of the sobriquets.

2. Contextualizing the Scrolls

a. Dating the Scrolls

A combination of textual and archaeological evidence allows us to establish a general time-span of some two hundred and fifty years or more in which to seek a historical context for the collection, ranging roughly from 180 BCE to 70 CE.[3] Dating of sample scrolls by palaeography and Accelerator Mass Spectrometry (Carbon-14) reveals that most appear to have been written within this period, though this of course only provides a *terminus ad quem* for their composition.[4] The AMS date of 1QpHab (sometime in the first century BCE) is particularly significant as it has been taken to indicate a latest possible date for the existence of 'the Teacher of Righteousness', 'the Wicked Priest' and 'the Spouter of the Lie', one that is notably prior to the Christian era.[5] In addition, the few people who are mentioned by name in the scrolls are likely from the second or first centuries BCE: e.g., דמ]ן[טרוס (4Q169 frgs. 3–4, 1.2); אנתיכוס (1.3); יוחנן (4Q331 frg. 1, 1.7); שלמצי]ון (4Q331 frg. 1, 2.7; 4Q332 frg. 2, 4); הרקנוס (4Q332 frg. 2, 6); אמל יום (4Q333 frg. 1, 4, 8); יונתן (4Q448 B.2; C.8).[6]

---

3 These termini, in particular the former, can however vary greatly in the eyes of individual scholars, allowing, for example, for an antecedent history of the movement (see the varied hypotheses below).

4 See Avigad 1958; Birnbaum 1951; Cross 1976; 1998; 2000. Israel Carmi has conducted a comparison of the various compiled palaeographic and AMS results, concluding that there is generally 'excellent agreement' between them all (2000: 888; so too Broshi 2004). Other scholars are rather more cautious, taking into consideration the severe limitations of these methods (Callaway 1994; Doudna 1998; 2006). See further Davies, Brooke and Callaway 2002: 68–75.

5 For a reassessment of the AMS results, defending the possibility of a first-century-CE origin, see Atwill and Braunheim with Eisenman 2004. However, note the critical response of J. van der Plicht (2007).

6 See Abegg 2002 (esp. 234–35); Atkinson 2007; Wise 1994.

Archaeological evidence from Khirbet Qumran has yielded a general consensus that, following an initial settlement in the eighth or seventh centuries BCE, the site was re-inhabited *around* 100 BCE (though this date often varies in scholarly hypotheses by up to fifty years either way) and occupied until its destruction by the Romans in 68 CE (a date that is also presented variously). Roland de Vaux, who led the initial excavation, believed that the ruins were those of an Essene 'monastery' inhabited by the writers of the scrolls between c.130 BCE and 68 CE (1973). However, his failure to produce an official site report has prompted scholars to review the evidence in recent years (e.g., Galor, Humbert and Zangenberg [eds] 2006) and in some cases arrive at very different conclusions regarding either the interpretation of the site (Donceel and Donceel-Voûte 1994; Donceel-Voûte 1993; Golb 1994; 1995; Hirschfeld 2000; 2004; 2006; Magen and Peleg 2007) or the dates of occupation (Magness 1998; 2000; 2002).

De Vaux suggested, on rather scanty evidence, that the site had been inhabited on a smaller scale for a short period in the latter half of the second century BCE (Period Ia: roughly 130–100 BCE).[7] Jodi Magness disagrees, rejecting the existence of Period Ia entirely (claiming it to be the product of de Vaux's desire to date the occupation of Qumran as close as possible to the reign of Jonathan Maccabee) and presents a revised chronology, arguing that the site was only inhabited from the first half of the first century BCE (Magness 2002, esp. 63–69).[8] De Vaux also claimed that an earthquake in 31 BCE (cf. Josephus, *Ant*. 15.121-22; *War* 1.370-72) caused the site to be abandoned for about thirty years, being reoccupied only at the beginning of the first century CE. Magness, however, noting the limited damage done by the earthquake, suggests that the inhabitants continued to live there until forced to leave when the site was apparently burned in 9/8 BCE, returning to Qumran around 4 BCE (1998: 57–59; 2002: 66–69). On the other hand, James Charlesworth argues that the site was abandoned as early as 40 BCE, at the time of the Parthian invasion, and left vacant for nearly forty years (2002: 50–52). According to the consensus view, the next phase of occupation (Period II) began around the turn of the era and lasted until June of 68 CE when the Romans destroyed the site and used it themselves as an outpost for a short time (Period III).

The result of this combined textual and archaeological evidence is that a context for the history of those responsible for the scrolls has been sought chiefly within the second and first centuries BCE (and to some extent the first century CE), drawing upon the historical framework(s) provided by

---

7 De Vaux 1973.

8 It is worth noting that Charlesworth (2002: 37–62) attempts to resurrect de Vaux's chronology, but does so rather unconvincingly in the opinion of this study.

the books of 1–2 Maccabees and the works of Josephus.[9] It is to these proposals that we now turn.

<div style="text-align:center">

b. *An Overview of Sobriquet Hypotheses*
1. *The Second Century* BCE
Pre-Maccabaean Hypotheses

</div>

In 1952, with only the evidence of Cave 1 and the Cairo Damascus Document (CD, see Schechter 1970) at his disposal, H.H. Rowley tentatively proposed that 'the Teacher of Righteousness' be identified with the deposed Zadokite High Priest, Onias III (190–175/4 BCE).[10] After being supplanted by his brother, Jason, in 175/4 BCE, Onias was forced into exile where, in 171/70 BCE, he was murdered at the instigation of Jason's successor, Menelaus (172–162 BCE). It is this latter, non-Zadokite High Priest, that Rowley identifies as 'the Wicked Priest' of the pesharim, while suggesting that the Seleucid king, Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175–164 BCE), should be considered 'the Man of Scoffing'/'the Spouter of the Lie' (איש הלצון/מטיף הכזב; Rowley equates the two sobriquets on the basis of CD 1.14-15).[11] He also suggests that the reference in 1QPesher on Habakkuk to 'the House of Absalom' (בית אבשלום; 1QpHab 5.8-12) might refer to the largely pro-Seleucid Tobiad family, who were intermarried with the priestly Oniad line yet without access to the High Priesthood (1952a: 69; 1952b: 383).

New evidence, arising from the discovery of further Qumran-related material in Caves 2 to 11, was soon incorporated by Rowley so as to support his proposed Onias–Menelaus–Antiochus context for the scrolls.[12] With regard to 4QPesher on Nahum, he suggested that the Demetrius mentioned was Demetrius I Soter (162–151/50 BCE) and that 'the Lion of Wrath' (כפיר החרון; frgs. 3–4, 1.5-6; cf. 4Q167 frg. 2, 2) be identified with:

> either Antiochus [IV] himself, or, more probably, his agent who was in charge of his affairs in Palestine, and who carried through with such ferocity the persecution ordered by the king. (Rowley 1956: 193)

More recently, and with the entire body of evidence now available, Russell Gmirkin has agreed with Rowley's central tenet, that 'the Teacher of Righteousness' should be identified with Onias III and 'the Wicked Priest' with Menelaus (Gmirkin 1998; 2000; so too Pfann 2004; note the

---

9   As shall be explored below, the inherent assumption that such 'historical' works contain an accurate portrayal of events is problematic, especially given the presence of conflicting accounts.

10   Rowley 1952a (esp. 62–70); 1952b.

11   Rowley 1952a: 67–70.

12   See Rowley 1958: 137–46.

competing theory identifying Onias III with 'the Wicked Priest': Freedman and Geoghegan 2006). However, Gmirkin emphasizes what he perceives to be the Hasidic nature of the scrolls, arguing that Onias was the leader of the conservative Hasidim. He consequently identifies the group's opponents, 'the Seekers of Smooth Things' (דורשי החלקות), with the pro-Hellenists and their apparent leader, 'the Man of the Lie' (איש הכזב), with Jason (Gmirkin 2000: 493–94).

A variation on these hypotheses is that of Paul Rainbow (1997), who begins by examining Josephus' two accounts regarding the founding of the temple at Leontopolis in 162 BCE.[13] He makes an argument for doubting the identification of Josephus' Onias (IV?) as the son of Onias III, claiming instead that this man (who he surnames Egypticus for purposes of distinction) was the son of Simon, the administrator of the temple (2 Macc. 3.4; 4.1; 4.23), and therefore also the nephew of Menelaus. Rainbow claims that Josephus, working from records that Menelaus had falsified in order to present himself as Onias III's brother and therefore a legitimate claimant to the High Priesthood (*Ant.* 12.237-39, 387; 20.235-36), inaccurately deduced that the Onias responsible for the temple at Leontopolis, known to be Menelaus' nephew, was therefore the son of Onias III.[14] Assuming the tradition that Onias III did indeed have a son to be true, however, Rainbow speculates as to his career. Naming him Simon III (following the alternating binary tradition of the Oniad family), he proposes an identification with 'the Teacher of Righteousness' and seemingly suggests that Jonathan Maccabee should be identified with 'the Wicked Priest' (Rainbow 1997: 44–52). This view has the support of Émile Puech, who posits further that Simon III may have been the High Priest during the apparent 'intersacerdotium' (159–152 BCE; Puech 1999; 2005).

---

13   In direct contradiction with his account in *Antiquities* that Onias III's son, Onias IV, built the temple at Leontopolis (12.387-88; 13.62-73), in his *Jewish War* Josephus attributes the building of the temple to Onias III himself, who did not die but went into exile, not to Daphne but to Egypt (*War* 1.31-33; 7.421-22). Given this confusion, some scholars have begun to doubt the existence of Onias IV, positing instead that he was a later invention to cover up the fact that Onias III himself built the rival temple; an act that would have been of questionable legitimacy (Grabbe 1994: 280–81; Soggin 1999: 338–39). The revised Schürer, on the other hand, highlights the role of Dan. 9.26 and 11.22 in appearing to confirm the version in 2 Macc. 4.7-10, 33-34 (Schürer with Vermes and Millar 1973: 148–50, see nn. 27, 30).

14   That Onias IV/Egypticus was the son of Simon the temple administrator may also explain why, in his other account, Josephus mistakenly identifies him with Onias III, son of Simon II (*War* 1.31-33; 7.421-22).

Maccabaean Hypotheses

One of the most notable Maccabaean hypotheses for the historical referents of the sobriquets is that as formulated chiefly by Geza Vermes, constituting a pillar of one of a number of 'Qumran-Essene' hypotheses.[15] He argues firstly that the scrolls were written by an Essene group resident at Khirbet Qumran and secondly that 'the Wicked Priest' (for whom Vermes regards 'the Man of the Lie', 'the Spouter of the Lie' and 'the Man of Scoffing' to be alternative sobriquets) should be identified with Jonathan Maccabee (152–143 BCE).[16] For 'the Teacher of Righteousness', no attempt at identification is made other than the argument that he was a priest and contemporary to Jonathan. With regard to other Qumran sobriquets, however, Vermes argues that 'the Lion of Wrath' is the later figure of Alexander Jannaeus and that 'the Seekers of Smooth Things' (which he equates with 'Ephraim', אפרים) are the Pharisees, thus rendering 'Manasseh' (מנשה) the Sadducees.

Variations of this Maccabaean Qumran-Essene hypothesis abound. Frank Cross, for example, agrees with Vermes almost entirely, differing only in his identification of 'the Wicked Priest' with Simon Maccabee (143–135/4 BCE), whom he equates with the 'cursed man' of 4QTestimonia (4Q175 23).[17] Jerome Murphy-O'Connor argues (on the basis of supposed historical information in the Damascus Document; e.g., CD 1.3–2.1; 6.2-11; 7.12-21) that the origins of the Essenes should be sought against the backdrop of the Babylonian exile, regarding 'Damascus' as a symbolic reference to Babylon.[18] Allowing for differences between the Essenes as described in the classical sources and the movement responsible for the scrolls, he suggests that, rather than being identical, the latter were an offshoot of the former.[19] Murphy-O'Connor agrees with Vermes' iden-

---

15   The establishment of some link between the movement responsible for the scrolls and the Essenes of the classical sources has a history as long as scrolls scholarship itself and in most circles is the closest thing to a consensus in the field. As a result, various 'Qumran-Essene' hypotheses have been proposed from all periods of the timeframe in question. This 'consensus' has increasingly come under fire in recent years (e.g., A.I. Baumgarten 2004; though cf. Broshi 2007) and some proponents have subsequently abandoned a straightforward equation of the two and adopted instead a more moderate position, accounting for points of difference as well as similarity (on 'Revising the Qumran-Essene Hypothesis', see Campbell 2002: 98–110). One of the most notable opposing identifications is that of Lawrence Schiffman, who argues that the scrolls are the product of a Sadducean or Sadducean-related group (1993; 1994: 83–95).

16   See primarily Vermes 2004 (10–90, esp. 46–66), though also Vermes 1981.

17   Cross 1993; 1995: 54–120. Note also, Nickelsburg 1976.

18   Murphy-O'Connor 1971a; 1974: 219–23; 1985.

19   Philip Davies has developed this hypothesis further, agreeing with it in essence but warning against Murphy-O'Connor's acceptance of CD as a largely Qumranic document and the dangers of taking too literally the apparent historical and historical data of the texts (1983: 46–47; 1987: 33–49; 1990a).

tification of 'the Wicked Priest' with Jonathan Maccabee and 'the Seekers of Smooth Things' with the Pharisees, and suggests further that 'the Teacher of Righteousness' was the acting High Priest during the 'intersacerdotium' (159–152 BCE).[20] However, unlike Vermes, he regards 'the Man of the Lie' to be a distinct figure from 'the Wicked Priest' and suggests that he should be identified with an authority within the larger Essene group, the rivalry between this figure and 'the Teacher of Righteousness' giving rise to the division within the movement (Murphy-O'Connor 1974: 233–38).

At odds with Murphy-O'Connor, Hartmut Stegemann argues that there was no internal split within the Essenes and that the movement as a whole was a mainstream 'Jewish Union' (including members of an earlier group, the 'New Covenant in the Land of Damascus', whose history is reflected in CD), centred in Jerusalem though with a library at Qumran.[21] This movement, he claims, was led by 'the Teacher of Righteousness', whom he likewise identifies with the ousted High Priest of the 'intersacerdotium', thus rendering Jonathan Maccabee 'the Wicked Priest'. Stegemann, like Vermes, identifies 'the Lion of Wrath' with Alexander Jannaeus and 'the Seekers of Smooth Things' with the Pharisees, though he agrees with Murphy-O'Connor that 'the Man of the Lie' should be regarded a separate figure from 'the Wicked Priest' (Stegemann 1998: 128; see further, 1971: 95–115).[22]

Multiple-Referent Hypotheses

The so-called 'Groningen hypothesis' of Florentino García Martínez and Adam van der Woude is in many ways similar to a number of the Maccabaean Qumran-Essene hypotheses outlined above. Notably, it shares with Murphy-O'Connor (and Davies; see n. 19 above) the argument that those responsible for the scrolls represent a splinter-group from a wider Essene movement, though places the origin of this parent group in 3rd/2nd-century-BCE Palestine rather than the Babylonian exile.[23] However, with regard to our examination of the sobriquets, its

---

20   Murphy-O'Connor 1974: 224–44.

21   See primarily, Stegemann 1992: 138–66; cf. 1971; 1998: 139–210.

22   A further variation on the above Qumran-Essene hypotheses is that of Gabriele Boccaccini (1998), who takes into account both Stegemann's suggestion that the Essenes proper were a mainstream Jewish movement and Murphy-O'Connor's argument that the movement responsible for the scrolls was an Essene splinter group. He proposes that the latter split from the Essenes in the second century BCE and, highlighting the prominence of Enochic thought and literature among the scrolls, suggests that this wider Essene movement grew out of an Enochic form of Judaism. Cf. Boccaccini (ed.) 2005.

23   García Martínez 1995a; 1996: lii–liv; 1998a; García Martínez and van der Woude 1990: 536–41. Cf. Boccaccini (ed.) 2005: 247–326; Hempel 2005.

main distinctive feature is the contribution of van der Woude, who proposes:

> to consider the designation 'Wicked Priest' as a generic one referring to different Hasmonean High Priests in chronological order. (García Martínez and van der Woude 1990: 537)

Through close examination of 1QPesher on Habakkuk, focusing in particular on the various apparent fates of 'the Wicked Priest', van der Woude concludes that the sobriquet cannot possibly be applied to a single historical individual and that a plurality of figures must lie behind the epithet. To be precise, he identifies six successive 'wicked priests' in 1QpHab: Judas Maccabee (8.8-13), Alcimus (8.16–9.2), Jonathan (9.9-12), Simon (9.16–10.5), John Hyrcanus I (11.4-8) and Alexander Jannaeus (11.12–12.10).[24] 'The Teacher of Righteousness' himself is not identified, though his death is dated to the reign of John Hyrcanus I (135/4–104 BCE), while 'the Man of the Lie', following Murphy-O'Connor, is assumed to be the leader of the wider Essene movement.

This approach is not unprecedented. William Brownlee also argued for a generic understanding of the sobriquet 'the Wicked Priest' on the basis of 'the multiple dooms which befall him' (1982: 4). He identified three 'wicked priests' in 1QPesher on Habakkuk: John Hyrcanus I, Aristobulus I and Alexander Jannaeus. In addition, Brownlee argued that the sobriquets 'the Man of the Lie' and 'the Spouter of the Lie' (as well as the 'cursed man' of 4QTestimonia) applied to the first of these 'wicked priests', John Hyrcanus I, while 'the Lion of Wrath' was an alternative title for the last, Alexander Jannaeus. Furthermore, 'the Seekers of Smooth Things' were once again linked with the Pharisees, while 'the Teacher of Righteousness' he identified as the known contemporary figure, Judah the Essene (Brownlee 1952; 1982). More recently, Igor Tantlevskij (1995) has argued for two 'wicked priests' in 1QPesher on Habakkuk: Jonathan Maccabee and Alexander Jannaeus (cf. van der Woude 1996).

2. *The First Century* BCE
Hasmonaean Hypotheses

A plural understanding of 'the Wicked Priest' was also an early proposal of André Dupont-Sommer, who at first identified two figures behind this sobriquet: Hyrcanus II (76–67, 63–40 BCE) and his brother Aristobulus II (67–63 BCE), the sons of Alexander Jannaeus.[25] However, he later revised his argument, identifying Hyrcanus II alone as 'the Wicked Priest' and

---

24   See initially van der Woude 1982; 1996. Also García Martínez and van der Woude 1990 (536–41). Cf. Lim 1993a.

25   Dupont-Sommer 1954 (cf. 1961: 355 n. 1).

rendering Alexander Jannaeus both 'the Lion of Wrath' and the 'cursed man' of 4QTestimonia (1961: 351–57). This latter theory has more recently been adopted and expanded upon by Michael Wise, Martin Abegg and Edward Cook in the introduction to their translation of the scrolls (1996: 13–34). They too identify Hyrcanus II as 'the Wicked Priest', highlighting in support of a first-century-BCE context the names that appear in 4QHistorical Texts C-E (4Q331–33; see n. 6 above).

According to Wise, Abegg and Cook, the movement responsible for the scrolls, who shared a Sadducean interpretation of many of the laws (a position they believe is evidenced in 4QMMT[a-f] [4Q394–99]), were an integral part of Jewish society during the reign of Alexander Jannaeus. The movement approved of the latter's pro-Sadducean tendencies and, in particular, his anti-Pharisaic stance which appears to have led to the crucifixion of eight hundred Pharisees and the expulsion of many more (an event they believe is alluded to in 4Q169 frgs. 3–4, 1.1-8). Alexander Jannaeus is thus considered both 'the Lion of Wrath' and the 'King Jonathan' prayed for in 4Q448. With Hyrcanus II's acquisition of the High Priesthood after Jannaeus's death (76 BCE), the Pharisees once again rose to prominence; Wise, Abegg and Cook therefore identify the leader of the Pharisaic party at this time (Shimeon ben Shetah) as 'the Man of the Lie'.[26]

Hasmonaean–Jerusalem Hypotheses

In recent years, further variations of the above Hasmonaean hypotheses have been proposed, taking into account the first-century-BCE context implied in 4Q331–33 (as Wise, Abegg and Cook) coupled with the arguments of scholars such as Norman Golb in favour of a Jerusalem origin for the scrolls. Golb, on the basis of observations such as the multiplicity of scribal hands, argues that the scrolls represent the contents of a Jerusalem library (or libraries), moved to the caves in the vicinity of Khirbet Qumran (which he identifies as a fortress) at the time of the First Jewish Revolt (66–70 CE).[27] The two main proponents of a *Hasmonaean–Jerusalem* hypothesis, Ian Hutchesson and Greg Doudna, have thus incorporated various strands into their reconstructions.

Hutchesson argues firstly that the scrolls represent a disparate collection of texts originating in the Jerusalem temple, though, unlike Golb, he dates their 'depositation' at Qumran to 63 BCE, shortly before Pompey's siege of Jerusalem (Hutchesson 1999). He further posits that the texts were

---

26   Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996: 26–34. So too Bruce 1956 (94–95); cf. M.H. Segal 1951. Wise (2003) has more recently gone into greater detail on some of these identifications, highlighting his interpretation of apparent historical allusions in the sectarian texts. See further, the discussion of this position in Collins 2006b.

27   See, primarily, Golb 1995 (also 1994).

given to the Sadducees who, under Aristobulus II, controlled the various Hasmonaean fortresses including, according to Hutchesson, Khirbet Qumran. He stops short, however, of identifying the referents of any of the sobriquets. Doudna on the other hand, while agreeing with Hutchesson and Golb that the texts represent a Jerusalem library, argues that they were deposited at Qumran in 40 BCE, in the face of invasion by the Parthians (2001: 698–754; 2006). Furthermore, at odds with Dupont-Sommer and Wise, Abegg and Cook, Doudna identifies Hyrcanus II not as 'the Wicked Priest' but as 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (2001: 683–754). He thus renders Hyrcanus' brother, Aristobulus II, 'the Wicked Priest', 'the Spouter of the Lie' and, intriguingly, 'Manasseh' (a sobriquet which Doudna argues should be taken in reference to a ruling individual) and further identifies Pompey as 'the Lion of Wrath' (2001: 627–74).[28]

3. *The First Century* CE
Christian-Related Hypotheses

Several theories have tried to understand the scrolls and their sobriquets in the context of nascent Christianity. Though often meeting with limited support (especially in the light of evidence arising from the various dating techniques; see n. 5 above) they are yet another example of the versatility with which the texts (and especially the sobriquets) can be applied to a given historical scenario. Some are more unlikely than others. Barbara Thiering, for example, has proposed an unconvincingly detailed reconstruction in which she argues that 'the Teacher of Righteousness' should be identified with John the Baptist, 'the Lion of Wrath' with Pontius Pilate, and 'the Wicked Priest' (and 'the Man of the Lie'/'the Man of Scoffing') with Jesus of Nazareth, relocating the events of the Gospels to Qumran.[29] She further identifies 'Ephraim' with the Therapeutae of Philo and 'Manasseh' with an order of celibate diaspora Essenes (1992: 71, 375).

Of the more reasonably argued proposals, Jacob Teicher (1954) likewise equated 'the Wicked Priest' with 'the Man of the Lie' but identified him

---

28   Philip Davies has offered a response to these various Jerusalem hypotheses, evaluating the arguments of Golb, Hutchesson and Doudna and their implications for the viability of a Qumran-Essene hypothesis (Davies 2000a; cf. 1994: 62). Denying that a Jerusalem origin and Essene authorship of the scrolls are mutually exclusive, Davies suggests the adoption of a 'sound Essene hypothesis' (2000a: 112) that regards the Essenes as a widespread movement (so Stegemann) centred in Jerusalem; a theory more compliant with Josephus' presentation of the group as a major party (*War* 2.119-161; *Ant.* 13.171-73). He leaves open questions concerning a connection between the scrolls and the site of Khirbet Qumran (though suggests the latter may have been occupied by 'sympathetic [even Essene?] inhabitants'; 2000a: 112) and whether the scrolls were deposited in the first century BCE or first century CE. This 'sound Essene hypothesis', incorporating the insights of Golb, Hutchesson, Doudna, Stegemann and others, may provide a nuanced approach for future discussion.

29   Thiering 1992.

with the apostle Paul, associating Jesus with 'the Teacher of Righteousness' instead. More recently, Robert Eisenman has similarly regarded the apostle Paul as 'the Man of the Lie' (also 'the Spouter of the Lie'/'the Man of Scoffing') but believes 'the Wicked Priest' to be a distinct figure. He identifies the latter as the High Priest Ananus and makes a case for identifying James the Just as 'the Teacher of Righteousness', thus placing the scrolls in the context of both the internal and external disputes of the early Christian church.[30]

Zealot–Qumran Hypotheses

In 1958, shortly after the discovery of Cave 11, Cecil Roth proposed a hypothesis identifying the movement responsible for the scrolls with the Zealots as described in Josephus, set against the backdrop of the First Jewish Revolt (66–70 CE).[31] The same premise was held and expanded upon by Godfrey Driver a few years later (Driver 1965). Highlighting the militant nature of the War Scroll (1QM; 4Q491–97), the presence of 'the Kittim' (הכתיאים; a foreign enemy whom Roth and Driver identified with the Romans) and the discovery of a copy of Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice at Masada (a text known otherwise only from Qumran; 4Q400–407; 11Q17), they concluded that, from the beginning of the first century CE, Qumran was a centre for the production of Zealot propaganda (having been abandoned by its previous inhabitants, perhaps the Essenes, in 31 BCE). Thus, Roth identified 'the Teacher of Righteousness' with either the leader of the Zealots, Menahem ben Judah (d. 66 CE) or his nephew, Eleazar ben Jair (d. 73 CE), and 'the Wicked Priest' with the captain of the temple, Eleazar ben Hananiah.[32] In addition, he suggested that 'the House of Absalom' (בית אבשלום) was a reference to Menahem's assistant, Absalom, who may have betrayed him (1958: 13–14).

Driver agreed with Roth's identifications, arguing in greater depth for their veracity, and further deemed 'the Man of the Lie' (equated with 'Ephraim') to be John of Gischala, 'the Lion of Wrath' (equated with 'Manasseh') to be Simon bar Giora, and the 'cursed man' of 4QTestimonia to be their father (a man named Levi).[33] Though he does not identify him, Driver argued that 'the Spouter of the Lie' and 'the Man of Scoffing' should be regarded as sobriquets referring to the same unknown figure, adding, as with many other scholars, that 'the Seekers of Smooth Things' should be identified with the Pharisees (Driver 1965: 94, 309).

30   Eisenman 1996: esp. 111–246, 332–51.
31   Roth 1958; cf. 1960; 1961.
32   Roth 1958: 18.
33   Driver 1965: 284–98.

c. *The Problems with a 'Naïve Historicism'*

As can readily be seen from the overview above (which, it should be remembered, deals only with the broad contours of the differing hypotheses proposed), the sobriquets and apparent historical allusions in the texts are vague enough as to be applied with ease to various given historical scenarios. The plethora of information and range of possible interpretation ensures at least one or two points of overlap with numerous and varied historical contexts, on which the remainder of a hypothesis can be pinned. However, this versatility with which the texts can be applied is a warning in itself against what George Brooke terms a 'naïve historicism':

> namely that wherever there are two phenomena with even the vaguest correspondences they must be related in some way in terms of cause and effect. (1994a: 345)

There is thus an inherent danger with any approach that seeks to simply equate textual references with historical realia on the basis of one or two points of comparison; such an approach results from an overly simplistic understanding of the nature of the texts themselves. With increasing frequency, however, scholars are recognizing some of the issues that impinge on any attempt to reconstruct history from texts and are incorporating this sensitivity into their readings and subsequent hypotheses.[34] There has therefore been a discernible move within Qumran studies towards a more cautious approach, comparable to what John Barton and John Muddiman more generally term a 'chastened' historical criticism.[35]

One immediate problem, as highlighted above (see n. 9), is the questionable assumption that 'historical' works such as Josephus and the books of 1–2 Maccabees (taken in the majority of contextual hypotheses as a given against which the origins of the scrolls can be sought) contain an accurate account of events. The contradictions that abound, not only between these sources but within Josephus' own works, prevent us from being able to take any of them as a wholly accurate historical account.[36] The approach therefore encounters problems at the first hurdle; one might argue that there is no adequately defensible account of the period against which apparent allusions in the scrolls may be judged.

Similarly, even if texts such as the pesharim *are* primarily attempts to relate history (something that is itself by no means beyond question; see Jokiranta 2005b: 33–34), there is no reason to assume that such a

---

34   See, for example, Berrin 2004a; 2004b; Brooke 1994a; Davies 1987; Grossman 2002; Metso 2004.

35   Barton and Muddiman (eds) 2001: 3. See also Jonathan Campbell's introduction to Campbell, Lyons and Pietersen (eds) 2005 (1–9).

36   For example, as noted above (n. 13), compare *Ant.* 12.387-88, 13.62-73 with *War* 1.31-33, 7.421-22. Also, 2 Macc. 4.7-10, 33–34 and *Ant.* 12.237-39.

historical account would be objective and/or accurate. Davies rightly points out that:

> sects cannot be relied upon to give an authentic account of their own history! They tend to prefer stories in which they are the initiators rather than passive victims, and they will also retroject issues that may arise subsequently into the origin process itself. The only example that needs citing here is the New Testament itself. If Qumran scholarship relies entirely on a rather credulous reading of Qumran texts it will emerge with a sectarian history, not the history of a sect! (2005: 81)[37]

Furthermore, the development and redaction of these texts over time raises other issues about the integrity of any historical information contained therein, as noted by Sarianna Metso:

> If the text passes through several editorial hands, the resulting text that we read may have been disconnected from its historical mooring and no longer reflect that history but a developed set of thoughts. (2004: 334)

Indeed, the possibility remains that, 'even in their original settings, these texts were perceived as ambiguous or potentially multivalent' (Grossman 2002: 38). Hence, a variety of obstacles prevent a straightforward reading of history out of these texts and raise questions about the manner of sobriquet-identification attempted in the hypotheses outlined above. These problems are compounded when the texts are uncritically amalgamated in the assumption that they are complementary, so as to provide, for example, apparent biographical information about the referents of the sobriquets. Such an approach is, more often than not, unjustified and does not allow for the individuality (in terms of origin, genre, purpose, etc.) of each text. Any composite biographical picture derived from amalgamating texts in this way is likely therefore to be false or, at the very least, misleading.[38]

The frequently occurring use of scripture, either explicitly or implicitly, in those texts most often deemed to be of some historical value (e.g., the Damascus Document, the pesharim, etc.), serves as yet another warning against a straightforward reading of history out of them. Various studies have demonstrated the complexity of this relationship between sectarian text and scriptural base text or secondary scriptural sources, most concluding that surprisingly little of what *appears* to be innovative in these texts is in fact unmotivated by or independent of an underlying scriptural allusion.[39] As Brooke notes with regard to the pesharim:

---

37 So too Jokiranta 2005b: 27, 29–30.

38 This leads Davies to argue that, with regard to the pesharim at least, 'we have no warrant to plunder them for historical data' (1987: 27).

39 With regard to the Damascus Document, see primarily Campbell 1995a. On the pesharim, see for example: Berrin 2000a; 2004a; Jokiranta 2005b. For an extensive list of

> When the scriptural citation is properly put first in our consideration of
> these texts, it immediately becomes apparent how much it determines
> the way the commentary runs. This in itself explains why the language
> of the interpretation in the pesher proper remains so stereotypical and
> why its possible historical referents continue to defy identification and
> *will continue to do so*. (1994a: 340)

This issue is further exacerbated by the possibility that, in addition to
scriptural influence, apparent historical information might be dependent
upon other, presumably earlier, sectarian texts. For example, citing both
explicit and implicit connections between the two, Davies has famously
suggested that, with regard to information concerning the career of 'the
Teacher of Righteousness' for example, the pesharim might be dependent
upon the Hodayot (1QH[a]; 1Q35; 4Q427–32), a question we shall return to
below.[40] In her recent analysis of the Damascus Document, Maxine
Grossman has similarly speculated about its literary relationship with
1QPesher on Habakkuk, suggesting that:

> the Habakkuk pesher may be understood as an outgrowth of and
> response to the tradition surrounding the Damascus Document. ... In
> this sense, the 'history' provided in the Habakkuk pesher itself may be a
> creative rereading of the Damascus Document. It offers no historical
> information but merely attempts to narrate, retrospectively, an account
> of the community's origins, based on a shared communal tradition, but
> not an outside source of confirmatory evidence. (2002: 156–57)[41]

Suggestions such as these, coupled with the other problems outlined
above, lead us to conclude that the extraction of historical information
from these texts is not only fraught with difficulty but might well prove to
be little short of impossible. In this light, any attempt to actually identify
the referents of the sobriquets could be construed as all but doomed from
the outset. That said, it may be that there is yet some hope for such an
endeavour but only if approached in a manner sensitive to the various
criticisms levelled at the 'naïve historicism' of the past. For the purposes
of this study, however, we shall refrain from seeking to identify the
referents of the sobriquets, acknowledging the many obstacles to such a
goal.[42] Instead, we shall continue by examining what can be said about
the sobriquets on their own terms as labels within the sectarian literature.

'Quotations and Allusions in the Nonbiblical Scrolls', see VanderKam and Flint 2002 (427–
33). On defining, identifying and studying allusions (and the question of authorial intention),
see Hughes 2006: 41–55.

40   Davies 1987: 87–105.
41   Also Brooke 1991a: 229.
42   See Callaway 1990: 639.

3. *Re-evaluating the Use of Sobriquets in the Scrolls*

a. *The Nature and Function of the Qumran Sobriquets*

A sobriquet, loosely defined, is a nickname. As with all nicknames, the individual or group referred to is not necessarily aware of its existence, but it serves as an alternative, and perhaps more appropriate, designation in the eyes of those who use it. Preference for its use might be heightened by the descriptive element it often includes.[43] More precisely therefore, a sobriquet is a label that can convey positive or negative connotations and which, given the subjective nature of the descriptive element, has validity only within the context of those who share such a viewpoint.[44] Its meaning and specific referent may well be clear to those 'in the know' yet perpetually obscure to outsiders. In this sense, a sobriquet is not strictly a codename (though it may seem it to outsiders), but a transparent label obvious to those among whom it is used.[45]

Among the scrolls, sobriquets appear chiefly in such sectarian texts as the Damascus Document, the Hodayot and the various pesharim. They include the following:[46]

מורה הצדק	The Teacher of Righteousness
מורה היחיד	The Teacher of the Community
דורש התורה	The Seeker of the Law
עושי התורה	The Doers of the Law
מטיף הכזב	The Spouter of the Lie
איש הכזב	The Man of the Lie
איש הלצון	The Man of Scoffing
הכוהן הרשע	The Wicked Priest
דורשי החלקות	The Seekers of Smooth Things

It should be noted that the precise form of each of these designations can vary from text to text (or even within a text). However, those listed here can be described as 'standard' forms, found most frequently among the scrolls themselves and/or cited most commonly in the secondary literature. Alternative forms, such as indefinite designations (e.g., מורה צדק), are also attested though commonly regarded as variants of no real consequence.[47]

---

43   On the 'striking similarity between the Qumranic sobriquets and the social phenomenon behind nicknaming', see Bengtsson 2000a: 37–39. Also, Fröhlich 2004.

44   A figure labelled 'the Wicked Priest' (הכוהן הרשע), for example, may not agree with such a description or recognize it as valid (see Bengtsson 2000b: 247–48).

45   So also Håkan Bengtsson who, in his examination of sobriquets in the pesharim, concludes that the 'assumption of secret codes is really unnecessary' (2000a: 282; see further 3–7, 281–82). Similarly, Jokiranta 2005b (27–28). Cf. Callaway 1988: 135–36.

46   For a more extensive list, see Bengtsson 2000a (8–11); 2000b (243); or Callaway 1988 (135). For the translations employed here, see the relevant discussions in Chapters 2–5.

47   E.g. Lim 2002: 75. See further, Jeremias 1963: 308–18.

Attempts have been made to categorize the different Qumran sobriquets, though the approach is problematic. Håkan Bengtsson, for example, identifies two essential types: 'circumstantially constructed sobriquets' and 'biblically adopted sobriquets' (2000a: 30–37). The first he regards as innovative constructions of the Yahad (though with evaluative features drawn from scriptural material), formed from the conjunction of a noun or participle with an adjective or *nomen rectum*, such as דורשי החלקות, איש הכזב, הכוהן הרשע, מורה הצדק. Bengtsson's second category refers to those designations ostensibly adopted from scriptural texts (some also in the construct state), such as מנשה, אפרים, בית אבשלום, בית יהודה, הכתיאים.[48] The distinction between these two is not clear-cut, however, as *both* draw similarly upon scriptural typologies.[49] The degree to which this can be regarded as explicit or implicit implies a subjectivism that prohibits this being a useful means of distinction between these two supposed groups.

Ida Fröhlich likewise distinguishes between 'symbolic names' (based on the characteristics of the referent: e.g., הכוהן הרשע, מורה הצדק) and 'typological names' (those utilizing scriptural typologies to perform an evaluative function: e.g., בית אבשלום, הכתיאים), comparable with Bengtsson's 'circumstantially constructed' and 'biblically adopted' categories.[50] However, more recently she has demonstrated an awareness of the problematic nature of this division:

> [A]fter a thorough analysis of the biblical background of some names it became obvious to me that certain names I called first symbolic, are nearer to the category of typological names, because they are rather based on some biblical expression or poetic image than the attributes of a real character. The biblical background is often not apparent at first approach. (Fröhlich 2004: 2)

Thus, while not always readily apparent, we should nevertheless not underestimate the role of scripture in the use and construction of the Qumran sobriquets. Accordingly, attempts to categorize the designations by reference to the degree to which this is explicit are unhelpful.

Other approaches have been made. Fröhlich elsewhere groups various epithets in relation to, for example, 'social terms' (e.g., 'authority', 'special religious practice and knowledge').[51] Alternatively, Bengtsson suggests

---

48   The examples here are Bengtsson's own (2000a: 30).

49   For example, דורשי החלקות might arguably be placed in the second category (cf. Isa. 30.10) while a case could be made for placing בית אבשלום in the first.

50   Fröhlich 1996: 160–61; 2004: 2. A further category of 'associative/topical names' is also highlighted, those suggested by the scriptural text under consideration (e.g., כפיר החרון in 4Q169 frgs. 3–4, 1.4-8; cf. Nah. 2.12-13).

51   Fröhlich 1999.

a division with regard to implied referent, listing the following six groups:[52]

1. Designations of enemies
   a) Singular persons (e.g., הכוהן הרשע)
   b) Groups (e.g., דורשי החלקות)
2. Honorary designations
   a) Singular persons (e.g., מורה הצדק)
   b) Groups (e.g., עושי התורה)
3. Designations of rulers
   a) Singular persons (e.g., כפיר החרון)
   b) Groups (e.g., הכתיאים)

However, such a schema makes an explicit historical assumption in as much as it regards from the outset certain of the sobriquets to refer to 'rulers'. The same criticism holds true for Bengtsson's four-way categorization employed elsewhere, in which he lists the sobriquets as: 'individual personal', 'individual impersonal', 'collective specific' and 'collective unspecific' (2000b: 243–45). It is his assumption that הכתיאים should be identified with the Romans or Seleucids that renders it a 'collective *specific* sobriquet' as opposed to 'collective unspecific' (e.g., the unidentified הבגדים).

Aside from matters of referent or scriptural dependence, both Bengtsson and Fröhlich recognize the intrinsic *evaluative* nature of the designations (Bengtsson 2000a: 30–39, 49–50; Fröhlich 1999; 2004). Whether explicitly or implicitly, the sobriquets perform an evaluative function (confirmation of which can often be found in the surrounding context), in that each 'conveys correctly the author's estimate of the characters concerned' (Harris 1966: 53–54). For example, Bengtsson's so-called 'circumstantially constructed sobriquets' (Fröhlich's 'symbolic names') are for the most part explicitly evaluative; they reveal something of the character of the person or group labelled. 'The Wicked Priest' is first and foremost a priest, but furthermore one deemed to be 'wicked' by those doing the labelling; the sobriquet itself performs judgement on the character. There can be no doubt, on the other hand, that 'the Teacher of Righteousness' is approved of. The specific construction of these sobriquets may also carry additional layers of meaning. For instance, it has been noted that הכוהן הרשע ('the Wicked Priest') may be a pun on הכוהן הראש ('the High Priest'), further emphasizing the character's shortfall in the eyes of those doing the labelling.[53]

---

52 Bengtsson 2000a: 7–11.

53 Brownlee 1979: 49; 1982: 9; VanderKam 1999a: 528. We may recognize a similar phenomenon with regard to the later figure Simeon bar Kosiba, punned both positively as 'bar Kokhba' and negatively as 'bar Koziba' (Bengtsson 2000b: 246; Campbell 2002: 192 n. 52; Vermes 1975: 48; 2001: 112; cf. Zeitlin 1952). See Radday 1990 (esp. 59–60, 65–66).

In contrast, Bengtsson's supposed 'biblically adopted sobriquets' (Fröhlich's 'typological names') are largely implicitly evaluative. Utilizing scriptural texts as 'character types' they are applied so as to demonstrate the nature of the individual or group labelled. Comment is therefore made by association rather than accusation, and requires a greater degree of prior knowledge for the connotations implied to be understood. However, given the prominence of scripture within the social context in which these sobriquets arose, this is not to suggest any deliberate secrecy or code. In fact, quite the opposite is true. As Bengtsson points out, the clarity with which the evaluative nature of the sobriquets is established (whether, in his opinion, 'circumstantially constructed' or 'biblically adopted') suggests that, far from being codenames, these sobriquets were transparent labels which served to 'corroborate the message' (2000a: 37) conveyed in the texts. Thus, given the problematic nature of the categorical distinctions outlined above, it may be preferable for our purposes (highlighting this evaluative function) to speak instead simply of 'positive' and 'negative' sobriquets, both categories containing labels applicable to individuals and labels applicable to groups.[54]

Bengtsson identifies three levels of meaning with regard to the function of the sobriquets: the textual, the symbolic and the historical (2000b: 248–49). Hence each sobriquet is simultaneously a textual expression, an evaluation and a historical reference. It is, however, the evaluative function that appears to take precedence:

> Even if the epithets originated in an historical situation, their primary function is to evaluate different characters and groups. (Bengtsson 2000a: ii)

Given this role, the transparent nature of the labels to those 'in the know' and the fact that the sobriquets have validity only within the context of those who share such a viewpoint, it is increasingly apparent that they were intended for internal use rather than direct confrontation. In this manner they constitute an 'insider terminology' (Bengtsson 2000a: 39), commenting upon individuals and groups by means of evaluative labels and demonstrating in no uncertain terms the position taken with respect to them by those doing the labelling.

---

54 We shall for the most part further reserve the term 'sobriquet' for those labels which appear specifically appellative (i.e., performing a titular, rather than merely descriptive, function). This may be indicated by form (e.g., use of the definite article) or context (e.g., consistent use of a designation to indicate an individual or group for whom there is a reluctance to provide any other concrete appellation). We shall similarly reserve the use of capital letters for rendering these titular designations.

b. *The Origins of the Qumran Sobriquets*

The influence of scriptural texts upon the construction and application of the Qumran sobriquets cannot be overemphasized (see Fröhlich 1999: 299–305).[55] Nevertheless, the experiences and writings of the movement itself must be recognized as a source of inspiration. As mentioned above, Davies has argued convincingly that historical information in the pesharim (in particular that relating to the career of 'the Teacher of Righteousness') is dependent upon the Hodayot (Davies 1987: 87–105). He posits firstly that, as often the case with modern scholars, similarly:

> within the Qumran community these hymns – and at the very least the autobiographical ones – were understood to be compositions of the 'Teacher'. Hence, they comprised a sort of hagiography; they enshrined what were seen as the most authentic data about the life and experiences of the founder of the community that could possibly exist. (Davies 1987: 89–90)[56]

Subsequently, Davies argues that a great deal of supposed 'historical information' in the pesharim (that which is 'not derivable from the [biblical] text but seems gratuitous'; 1987: 92), can in fact be derived instead from the Hodayot.[57] This indicates the distinct possibility that the scriptural lemma of the pesharim was taken in conjunction with the Hodayot in order to (re)construct the life of 'the Teacher of Righteousness' in the pesher. Hence:

> the pesher phenomenon at Qumran may well be a development late in the history of the community and have little to do with the activities of the 'Teacher'. Certainly, it may have little to do with real history. (Davies 1987: 104)

As already observed, Grossman similarly casts doubt upon our ability to extract historical information from the pesharim, arguing that the Damascus Document may also have influenced their content:

> [T]he historical claims of the Damascus Document – whether accurate or not – may have served as the inspiration for the creativity of the pesher's author/editor(s), who chose to clarify and expand upon an account that was presented only tangentially in the earlier Damascus Document, but which was understood as important in a larger

---

55   E.g., מורה הצדק (cf. Hos. 10.12?; Joel 2.23?), מטיף הכזב (Mic. 2.11?), דורשי החלקות (Isa. 30.10?).

56   Ever since their discovery, the Hodayot (or portions thereof) have frequently been attributed to 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (e.g., Sukenik [ed.] 1955: 39); see further our discussion in Chapter 3. It should be noted that Michael Knibb disagrees with Davies' suggestion (Knibb 1990: 54; cf. Newsom 2004).

57   This is demonstrated by comparison of 1QpHab 11.2-8 with 1QH[a] 12.6-12 (Davies 1987: 93–96; cf. Davies, Brooke and Callaway 2002: 95).

communally-shared interpretive and historical tradition. (Grossman 2002: 156–57)

Likewise Brooke:

The pesharim may thus be better understood as an attempt to rewrite the actual history of the Qumran community in terms of the fulfilment of prophetic texts read from within the tradition represented by such texts as the *Damascus Document*. (1991a: 229)

Such arguments not only advise caution for attempts to identify the referents of the sobriquets, but also, in suggesting the dependence of some sectarian texts upon others (in this case the various pesharim upon the Hodayot and/or the Damascus Document), may provide us with an approach for better understanding the sobriquets themselves.

We have noted that, in addition to the 'standard' form found most frequently among the scrolls themselves and/or cited most commonly in the secondary literature (usually attesting the definite article and performing an apparent titular function), many of the Qumran sobriquets appear in variant related forms throughout the texts. The accusation of 'seeking smooth things', for example, appears variously as:

1. דורשי החלקות (4Q163 frg. 23, 2.10; 4Q169 frgs. 3–4, 1.2; 1.7; 2.2; 2.4; 3.3; 3.6-7; 4Q177 2.12).
2. דורשי חלקות (1QHᵃ 10.15; 10.32).[58]
3. דרשו בחלקות (CD 1.18; 4Q266 frg. 2, 1.21).

Similarly, the 'teaching of righteousness' can be found in the following forms:

1. מורה הצדק (1QpHab 1.13; 5.10; 7.4; 8.3; 9.9-10; 11.5; 1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 6; 4Q173 frg. 1, 4).[59]
2. מורה הצדקה (1QpHab 2.2).
3. מורה צדק (CD 1.11; 20.32).
4. יורה הצדק (CD 6.11).[60]

---

58   Note also חלקות (1QHᵃ 12.10; cf. 4Q184 frg. 1, 17; 4Q185 frgs. 1–2, 2.14) and the verbal form החליקו (1QHᵃ 12.7).

59   Perhaps also to be restored with regard to the possible partial attestations at: 4Q163 frg. 21, 6; 4Q171 3.15; 3.19; 4.27; 4Q172 frg. 7, 1; 4Q173 frg. 2, 2; 4Q253a frg. 1, 1.5. The reconstruction of מורה הצדק has also been suggested by some scholars at 1Q14 frg. 11, 4 (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997), 4Q165 frgs. 1–2, 3 (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996) and 4Q171 4.8 (Horgan 1979; 2002; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996); these are highly speculative, however. Cf. Stuckenbruck 2007a: 77.

60   The following designations might also bear some relation to the sobriquet 'the Teacher of Righteousness': מורה היחיד (CD 20.1); יורה היחיד (CD 20.14); מורה (CD 20.28); משיח הצדק (4Q252 5.3).

If some sectarian texts are indeed dependent upon others (particularly with regard to supposed historical information), might such varying forms bear witness not to a certain looseness of usage but to the *development over time* of the Qumran sobriquets? Consequently, in addition to scriptural texts, might earlier *sectarian* texts have likewise influenced the specific construction and application of later sobriquets, indicative of an evolving sectarian context?[61]

Bengtsson makes a similar suggestion, taking the findings of Davies, Grossman and Brooke a step further by claiming:

> Thus, some passages in Damascus Document should be acknowledged as influential on the design and formation of some sobriquets in the pesharim. The formation of 'the Teacher of Righteousness', 'the Seekers of Smooth Things', 'the Man of the Lie', 'Ephraim' and 'Peleg' has very likely been influenced by the Damascus Document, and in some respects the Hodayoth. (Bengtsson 2000a: 290)

This is also supported by Ida Fröhlich's examination of 'Qumran names', where she suggests that 'antecedent forms' of the sobriquets might be found in texts such as the Damascus Document (1999: 299–300 n. 33). In fact, in the latter half of his chapter on 'History and Hagiography', Davies too, noting a discernible general shift from plural designations in the Hodayot to singular ones in the pesharim, tentatively ventures the suggestion that the sobriquets as they appear in the commentaries have been influenced by earlier sectarian texts (Davies 1987: 97–105).

Leaving aside temporarily the specific views of these scholars regarding the relative dating of such texts as the Damascus Document, the Hodayot and the various pesharim, let us examine the assumption that evidence of sobriquet development might be contained in these texts. As observed above, most hypotheses place supposed events concerning 'the Teacher of Righteousness', 'the Wicked Priest' and others, in the second or first centuries BCE, yet assume that the scrolls were abandoned around 68 CE.[62] These suppose therefore a movement spanning several generations and lasting perhaps some two hundred years or more. The wealth of texts considered 'sectarian' and the evidence for revision and redaction (for example, multiple attestations of so-called 'D' and 'S' ['Damascus' and '*Serekh*'] material) prohibits us from understanding their production as a singular, simultaneous event. In other words, these texts were composed, copied and redacted over an unspecified period of time (Dimant 2000). The variety of dates produced by palaeography and AMS, despite

---

61   As William Schniedewind observes, 'Khirbet Qumran existed for at least two hundred years. It must be assumed that the language of the community evolved over that period' (1999a: 237). So too, Fröhlich 1999 (294–95).

62   The Hasmonaean–Jerusalem hypotheses of Doudna (2001; 2006) and Hutchesson (1999) would be obvious exceptions to this.

criticisms of the accuracy of these procedures, likewise supports this suggestion.[63]

A movement with a history of some two hundred years, no matter how conservative in outlook, is likely to have undergone subtle changes and development in both ideology and standpoint (see Fröhlich 1999: 294–95; Lim 2002: 11). García Martínez, for example, highlights the 'evolutionary character of thought' and 'non-static vision' reflected in key sectarian texts (1995a: 86). In particular we might anticipate that a reactionary group, such as the Qumran-related movement is often assumed to be, would respond in some way to the changing political situation over such an extended period. Again, the multiple (differing) attestations of various sectarian texts inform us that such changes and developments did indeed take place.[64] Sarianna Metso states that furthermore:

> Methodologically, we should keep the option open that complex developments were likely to have been in place even in those parts of the Qumran library for which physical evidence attesting to these develop-ments is no longer preserved. (2004: 330)

Even assuming a 'single-generation' hypothesis, the evidence of such development (though forced into a shorter timescale) is undeniable. Indeed, from this perspective, hypotheses regarding the scrolls as the product of a disparate (rather than homogeneous) Jerusalem library (e.g., Golb 1995) are forced, on the grounds of evident redaction and similarity of terminology, to regard 'groups' of texts at least as having undergone such development.

The very existence of apparent 'standard' forms of the sobriquets, used across a number of texts (see, for example, the numerous occurrences of דורשי החלקות or מורה הצדק listed above), implies a process of some description by which this standardization was achieved. It appears reasonable, therefore, given changes over time and the potential depend-ence of some sectarian texts upon others, to admit the possibility that 'non-standard' forms, rather than variants, might represent earlier (or at least, other) stages of sobriquet development. Such a possibility at the very least warrants further investigation.

c. *Hypothesis and Method*

This study, as stated, constitutes an examination of key sobriquets found among the Qumran-related Dead Sea Scrolls. More specifically, however, it hypothesizes that, given the traditionally allotted time-span for

---

63   See, e.g., Carmi 2000.

64   Compare, e.g., 1QS 5.1-3 and 4Q258 1.2-3 (Campbell 2002: 80–81; Davies 1994: 63–68). See further, Davies 1992 (also 1996: 151–61); Metso 1997; 2000a; 2004; Schofield 2008. Cf. Strawn 2007: 87–111.

sectarian composition and evidence for ideological development attested by the texts, the sobriquets may likewise have undergone a developmental process, changing in form and perhaps meaning and/or referent. It further suggests that this process might be evidenced within the scrolls themselves if examined in a manner sensitive to the varied composition dates of the texts and with particular reference to the precise forms taken by the sobriquets where they appear. The specific question under consideration therefore, is whether convincing evidence of such development can indeed be found in the Qumran-related Dead Sea Scrolls.

In terms of method, this investigation necessitates in the first instance an agreed chronological schema for ordering the key texts to be examined. In the absence of consensus among scholars on this point, in the remainder of this chapter various proposals will be highlighted and a particular reconstruction adopted for the purposes of this study. Having established a schema and thus divided the relevant texts into 'sectarian compositional periods', these will be examined in subsequent chapters according to their groups. Note will be taken of the precise form and context of any relevant sobriquet occurrence, as well as instances of related terminology where appropriate. In this manner it is to be hoped that it will be possible to identify any trends or practices that may appear with regard to the (differing?) use and/or formation of sobriquets within or between these chronological groups.

Lack of available space prohibits a thorough investigation of *all* the sobriquets and hence this examination will focus chiefly upon the interplay between a significant oppositional pair. Not surprisingly, one of these is 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (מורה הצדק). The other, contrary perhaps to expectation, is 'the Spouter of the Lie' (מטיף הכזב). Despite the scholarly attention lavished upon 'the Wicked Priest', this sobriquet appears only in the pesharim (and always in the form הכוהן הרשע; 1QpHab 8.8; 9.9; 11.4; 12.2; 12.8; 4Q171 4.8).[65] It is entirely absent from other key texts concerning opposition to the 'teacher', such as the Damascus Document and (perhaps) the Hodayot.[66] Instead it is the various 'liar'-associated sobriquets ('the Man of the Lie'; 'the Spouter of

---

[65]   It has been suggested that הכוהן הרשע be reconstructed in the lacuna at 1QpHab 1.13 (e.g., Brownlee 1979; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; Lohse 1981; Vermes 2004), though this is contested by Timothy Lim (2000a; 2002: 33–36). Note also הכוהן (1QpHab 8.16; 9.16; 11.12). Furthermore, Allegro (1968) read [הכ]והן הרשע in 4Q163 frg. 30, 3 (cf. Abegg, Bowley and Cook 2003; Allegro *et al.* 2004a; Bengtsson 2000a: 51), though this is not acknowledged by Lim (2000b; 2002: 70) who lists the sobriquet as occurring only in 1QpHab and 4Q171. In either case, הכוהן הרשע is exclusive to the pesharim.

[66]   The extent to which we may regard the Hodayot as concerning opposition to the 'teacher' is largely dependent upon the question of (implied) authorship, to which we shall return in Chapter 3.

the Lie'; 'the Man of Scoffing'), and related designations, that occur with the greatest frequency in this role.

It has been suggested that איש הכזב and מטיף הכזב (and perhaps איש הלצון) refer to the same historical figure.[67] The historical question aside, the similarity between the labels certainly suggests the possibility of some relation with regard to origin or function and therefore requires an examination that encompasses both designations (just as our examination of מורה הצדק will include consideration of epithets such as מורה היחיד). Nevertheless, in terms of these sobriquets themselves, the greatest parallel is between מטיף הכזב and מורה הצדק. Here, as shall be examined in greater depth in subsequent chapters, we are presented with two pairs of corresponding root forms: ירה and נטף (both indicative of a didactic role, with positive and negative connotations respectively and a shared underlying metaphorical use of water imagery) and צדק and כזב (the polarized qualification of these two functions).[68] Both sobriquets refer to teachers, though, while one is associated with righteousness, the other is characterized by lies. Gert Jeremias notes, in relation to מטיף הכזב, 'Sein Titel ist darum mit Sicherheit im bewussten Gegensatz zu מורה (ה)צדק gebildet worden' (1963: 313). In terms of role, therefore, 'the Spouter of the Lie' (as a label denoting a 'false preacher') constitutes the perfect foil to 'the Teacher of Righteousness'.[69]

For the purposes of this investigation then, we shall effectively be focusing our examination upon the development and employment of the oppositional sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב, along with related designations where appropriate. The conclusions thus drawn will be further demonstrated by use of a supplementary case study involving the group sobriquet 'the Seekers of Smooth Things' (דורשי החלקות), itself the subject of intense speculation in numerous historical reconstructions.[70] The results obtained with regard to the possible development of these labels will be compared with insights garnered from a sociological approach (specifically one drawing upon the sociology of deviance and 'labelling theory') in order to investigate the compliance of this study's findings with research carried out in another academic field. In return, these sociological insights may shed further light upon the nature of our results.

---

67   See, initially, the discussion in Bengtsson 2000a (88–94).
68   See Clines (ed.) 1998; 2001; Davidson 2002; Holladay 2000; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995; 1996.
69   Bengtsson too notes this 'striking' parallel (2000a: 288) and further addresses the unjustified weighting often given to 'the Wicked Priest' in historical reconstructions (290–92).
70   See e.g. the varied hypotheses outlined above, also Bengtsson 2000a: 110–35.

4. Chronologically Ordering the Key Texts

a. Texts under Consideration

Before listing the texts to be considered for investigation, it would be helpful to note the various occurrences of forms related to the sobriquet 'the Spouter of the Lie', as indeed we have already done for 'the Teacher of Righteousness' above. The accusation of 'spouting lies' appears variously as:

1. מטיף הכזב   (1QpHab 10.9; 1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 4).[71]
2. מטיף כזב   (CD 8.13).
3. הטיף לישראל מימי כזב   (CD 1.14-15).
4. מטיף אדם לכזב   (CD 19.25-26).[72]

So armed, having now compiled a (preliminary) list of references for the sobriquets 'the Teacher of Righteousness', 'the Spouter of the Lie' and (pre-empting our discussion in Chapter 5) 'the Seekers of Smooth Things', we are in a position to clearly identify those texts which will be at the core of this examination:[73]

CD		(Qimron 1992a)
1QH[a]		(Sukenik [ed.] 1955: plates 35–58)
1QpHab		(Burrows [ed.] 1950: plates 55–61)
1QpMic	(1Q14)	(Milik 1955: plate 15)
4Qpap pIsa[c]	(4Q163)	(Allegro 1968: plates 7–8)
4QpNah	(4Q169)	(Allegro 1968: plates 12–14)
4QpPs[a]	(4Q171)	(Allegro 1968: plates 14–17)
4QpUnid	(4Q172)	(Allegro 1968: plate 18)
4QpPs[b]	(4Q173)	(Allegro 1968: plate 18)
4QCatena A	(4Q177)	(Allegro 1968: plates 24–25)
4QCommGen A	(4Q252)	(Brooke 1996: plates 12–13)

71   Perhaps also to be restored at 1QpHab 10.17–11.1 (e.g., Horgan 1979). We might further speculate that מטיף הכזב may at one time have appeared in the pesher following Isa. 9.13-16 in 4Q163 frgs. 4–6, 1.6-10 and following the citation of Mic. 2.10-11 in 4Q177 1.6-10, both providing a suitable terminological context for the epithet.

72   The following designations might also bear some relation to the sobriquet 'the Spouter of the Lie': מטיף (CD 4.19); איש הכזב (CD 20.15; 1QpHab 2.1-2; 5.11; 4Q171 1.26; 4.14); מליצי כזב (1QH[a] 10.31; 12.9-10); נביאי כזב (1QH[a] 12.16; 4Q430 frg. 1, 4). Furthermore, Lim makes the tentative suggestion that מ[טיף] (sic) be restored at 1QpHab 9.16 (1993a: 422).

73   The right-hand column here indicates the location of photographic plates of these manuscripts. Further bibliographical information will appear where appropriate in subsequent chapters. The following texts, which may contain related terminology (see nn. 58 and 59 above) but which are either too fragmentary to offer a significant contribution or utilize this terminology in a contextually distinct manner, will not form part of our overall survey but will be discussed where appropriate: 4Q165 [Allegro 1968: plate 9]; 4Q184 [Allegro 1968: plate 28]; 4Q185 [Allegro 1968: plates 29–30]; 4Q253a [Brooke 1996: plate 14].

| 4QD[a] | (4Q266) | (J.M. Baumgarten 1996: plates 1–17) |
| 4QH[d] | (4Q430) | (Schuller 1999: plate 12) |

b. *The Problems with a Chronological Schema*

Before attempting to line these texts up in some sort of chronological order, it would be prudent to examine the various problems inherent to such an approach. One that is immediately apparent is the lack of consensus among scholars regarding the relative composition dates of these texts (see Steudel 2000: 336). For example, the Damascus Document is variously presented as either for the most part one of the very earliest Qumran-related compositions (with quite possibly an antecedent history stretching back further still) or as one of the very latest compositions (appearing some time after other major sectarian works).[74] In these instances, dating techniques such as palaeography and AMS are of limited value. Firstly, serious questions have been raised about the accuracy of these techniques and the results are consequently often subject to interpretation.[75] Palaeography in particular has been accused of inherent subjectivism and of being grounded in suppositions that cannot necessarily be verified (e.g., a common [Qumran] origin for all the texts and a steady generational rate of change with regard to style).[76] Secondly, these techniques date only the extant manuscript (in fact, in the case of AMS, only the material the text is written on) and therefore provide merely a *terminus ad quem* for the composition of the text.

A further problem is posed by the existence of multiple recensions of texts.[77] These preserve different versions or editions and imply a redactional history lying behind the composition. In such cases it becomes hard, if not impossible, to speak of a 'definitive' or 'original' text and we are forced instead to speak of developing traditions and themes. Consequently, varied recensions of texts have, quite naturally, differing 'composition' dates, inasmuch as each recension might essentially be regarded a new composition. This problem is even apparent within given texts; it is often possible to recognize evidence of redaction in a single manuscript.[78] In terms of identifying the relative composition dates of

---

74   For the former position, see e.g. Davies (1983) and Hempel (1999a). For the latter, see Stegemann (1998: 116–18) and Thiering (2000).

75   Cf. Atwill and Braunheim with Eisenman 2004 (though note van der Plicht 2007); Callaway 1994; Davies, Brooke and Callaway 2002: 68–75; Doudna 1998; Golb 1995: 249–72.

76   See Wise 2003: 55–62.

77   See e.g. n. 64 above. In particular, see Davies 1992 (also 1996: 151–61); 1994.

78   Even prior to the release of the 4QD material, Davies argued that there was clear evidence of redaction in CD-A (1983). In particular he argued that much of the first column was a later gloss, post-dating the arrival of a historical 'teacher'.

specific texts, this redactional process (of unspecified length) can easily heighten confusion as composition is evidently ongoing.

Davies notes that this problem is compounded by the fact that, 'texts continue to exist side by side and can influence each other during their transmission history'.[79] In other words, the redactional process is not necessarily limited (or internal) to one body of tradition; varying recensions of one composition might be influenced by those of another, thus creating intrinsic ties between texts that further complicate the issue. On the other hand, if the scrolls represent a disparate (possibly Jerusalem) collection (so Golb and Hutchesson) we are perhaps unable to speak of such influence at all and questions are therefore raised about the viability of seeking relative compositional dates.

On this last point, an overview of the content of the collection reveals it to be 'surprisingly homogeneous' (van der Woude 1998: 3).[80] Emanuel Tov has further noted a degree of homogeneity with regard to scribal practices across the scrolls, concluding that:

> The data analysed here point to the existence of a Qumran scribal school which penned almost all the works often described as 'sectarian', and in addition sundry texts, among them several biblical texts. (2000: 216)

This does not deny a Jerusalem origin for some or indeed all of the scrolls, but does imply that the collection should be regarded as congruent rather than disparate.[81] Similarity of content, terminology and scribal practice, coupled with the evidence for the apparent dependence of some texts upon others and an intertextual redactional history, seems to point inexorably to this conclusion.

That aside, how are we to proceed in terms of establishing a chronological schema? For our purposes we need not assign specific dates to texts, merely order them relative to each other. The evidence, however, is not such that we can be so specific with regard to each of the 13 individual texts listed above. Though warning of the dangers of a rigid chronology, Davies does concede that, 'to some extent obviously literary dependence has chronological implications'.[82] Perhaps then we are best to avoid detailed chronological specifications and instead speak in broad terms of bodies of tradition or blocks of material against a backdrop of distinct sectarian compositional periods. If we look again at our list of texts to be considered, we have three clear bodies of tradition:

---

79 Kindly pointed out in personal correspondence of 22 July 2005.
80 Also Dimant 2000: 171.
81 For discussion of these scribal practices, see primarily Tov 1991; 1998; 2000. However, cf. D.-H. Kim 2004.
82 See n. 79 above.

1. D-material   (CD; 4QD[a]).
2. H-material   (1QH[a]; 4QH[d]).
3. P-material   (1QpHab; 1QpMic; 4Qpap pIsa[c]; 4QpNah; 4QpPs[a];
                 4QpUnid; 4QpPs[b]).

This leaves only 4QCatena A and 4QCommGen A, both of which constitute works of scriptural interpretation. 4QCatena A is regularly classed among the 'thematic pesharim' and so, in broad terms at least, is arguably best categorized as belonging with the other pesher material.[83] 4QCommGen A, on the other hand, exhibits traits similar to both those of the 'thematic pesharim' (Lim 2002: 16–18) and 'the legal, narrative, and theological sections of works like the Damascus Document' (Campbell 2004: 18). How best then to categorize it? On the one hand, we could give precedence to its exegetical character and assign it alongside the pesher material on these grounds (so *DSSR*). On the other hand, the precise exegetical method it employs is significantly different from that of the rest of the P-material delineated above (hence its official designation as a 'commentary' rather than 'pesher': see Brooke 1996).[84] Furthermore, while Brooke notes the 'amazing variety of genres' within the text (2005a: 156; though cf. Niccum 2006), the particular passage that interests us (4Q252 5.1-7) strongly parallels the language, structure and exegetical method of CD 6.2-11 (both, for example, make efforts to interpret the מחקק of Gen. 49.10 and Num. 21.18 respectively). Perhaps therefore we should acknowledge and take seriously the insight of Jonathan Campbell (2004: 17–18; also Brooke 1994b: 173, 176; 1994c: 56–57) and tentatively locate the text so as to be examined alongside the D-material.

Accordingly, we shall for the present divide our thirteen texts into the following three (slightly broader) bodies of tradition:

1. D-material   (CD; 4QD[a]; 4QCommGen A [?]).
2. H-material   (1QH[a]; 4QH[d]).
3. P-material   (1QpHab; 1QpMic; 4Qpap pIsa[c]; 4QpNah; 4QpPs[a];
                 4QpUnid; 4QpPs[b]; 4QCatena A [?]).

The fact remains that texts within a particular body of tradition may well have differing composition dates but, for now, we shall adopt this division as a potentially fruitful initial approach.

---

83   Berrin 2000b; 2005; Brooke 2000a; Campbell 2004: esp. 15–18, 45–55; Lim 2002: 14–18; Parry and Tov (eds) 2004a; Steudel 1992: 538. Also Brooke 2005a (esp. 149). For further discussion of the genre of 4QCatena A (4Q177) see Chapter 4.

84   Bernstein 1994a: 5; 1994b: 62; 2000a; Berrin 2005: 113 (n. 7), 122 (n. 47), 130–31 (esp. n. 81); Brooke 1994b: 173; 2000b; Tov 1994: 116–17, esp. n. 13. See further, Brooke 2005a: 153–55.

c. *Layering the Texts*

As has already been explored to some extent above, various proposals have been made with regard to the literary dependence and relative compositional dates of these three blocks of material. Most scholars regard the pesharim as one of the latest groups of sectarian texts to be produced.[85] Davies, for example, argues convincingly that much of the interpretive element in the P-material that cannot be derived from the scriptural lemma is dependent instead upon H-material (1987: 87–105). Brooke and Grossman, noting similarities in terminology and content, suggest that the P-material might represent 'an outgrowth of and response to' the D-material (Grossman 2002: 156).[86] Bengtsson combines these elements, claiming that the P-material has been shaped by both the H-material and the D-material (2000a: 288–90).

Hartmut Stegemann and Annette Steudel have further suggested that the H-material might represent an earlier sectarian period than the D-material. For Stegemann, who accepts that a historical figure referred to as 'the Teacher of Righteousness' authored a significant portion of the Hodayot, the Damascus Document's apparent allusion to this figure's death (CD 19.33–20.1; 20.13-15) renders it *ipso facto* a later text.[87] While he makes a good *prima facie* case, it may be observed that this position does not allow for the possibility that the D-material might contain later glosses (see, for example, n. 78 above). Further to this, note the apparent presentation of the 'teacher' as a future figure in CD 6.10-11.[88] Steudel's argument, on the other hand, for the relative dating of the H- and D-material is demonstrated by her examination of the developing concept of 'Belial' among the sectarian texts (2000: 338–39); though credible, this is at present only a tentative proposal.

It may be that, for the time being, we cannot clearly distinguish the H- and D-material. Nevertheless, there appears to be general agreement in most quarters, with regard to our three bodies of tradition, that these two blocks of material precede (and have quite possibly influenced) the

---

85   E.g., Bengtsson 2000a: 288–90; Brooke 1991a: 228–29; Cross 1995: 89–97; Davies 1987: 87–105; Grossman 2002: 155–57; Jokiranta 2005c: 256–57; Knibb 1994a: 13–15, 157–58, 209, 221, 247; Rabinowitz 1953; Stegemann 1998: 122–33; VanderKam 1994a: 106–108. One notable exception is Barbara Thiering (2000), who argues that various of the pesharim (including 1QpHab and 4Q171) pre-date the H-material, which in turn pre-dates the D-material. Her argument, however, relies heavily on the results of AMS dating (the problems associated with which we have already noted; see n. 75 above), the unfounded assumption that where texts have survived in only one copy they *must* be autographs, and her own historical presuppositions regarding the context in which the scrolls were produced.

86   Brooke 1991a: 228–29; Grossman 2002: 155–57.

87   Stegemann 1998: 107, 116–18.

88   This shall be discussed further in Chapter 2.

P-material.[89] In this way, and without assigning any specific dates to texts, we can tentatively line up two sectarian compositional periods relative to each other:

1. Early Sectarian Period   (H- and D-material)
2. Late Sectarian Period   (P-material)

However, with regard to the D-material in particular, there are further complicating factors. Several scholars have noted evidence of redaction in the Damascus Document and have suggested that it might contain earlier source material, perhaps pre-dating the formation of the specific group associated with the 'teacher' (see initially, Hempel 2000: 44–53). For instance, Murphy-O'Connor has argued that there are four main discernible sources in the 'Admonition' portion of CD: a missionary document (2.14–6.1), a memorandum (6.11b–8.3), a document criticizing the ruling class in Judah (8.3-18) and the *Grundschrift* of CD 19.33–20.22b aimed at disaffected members of the community (19.33–20.1b; 20.8b-13; 17b-22b).[90] The first two of these (2.14–6.1; 6.11b–8.3) he assigns to a group pre-dating that of the 'teacher'. In addition, he identifies various supplementary components and interpolations (1972: 562–63).[91]

Davies, however, has taken issue with aspects of Murphy-O'Connor's reconstruction (e.g., Davies 1983: esp. 41–47; 1987: 33–49) and, refining the approach further, argues instead that CD 1.1–7.9 and 20.27b-34 (plus the 'Laws'; CD 9–16) constitute the original document, with 7.10–8.19 as a subsequent addition.[92] He consequently views a third layer, CD 19.33b–20.27a, as the mainstay of a 'Qumranic', or, perhaps more accurately, 'Yahadic', redaction (constituting a revision by the 'Yahad', the community of the 'teacher', having split from the parent group responsible for the original document).[93] To this Yahadic redaction, Davies adds a number of other glosses, including notably for our purposes: 1.11a; 1.13-18a;

---

89   See for example: Bengtsson 2000a: 288–90; Brooke 1991a: 228–29; Charlesworth 2002: 74; Cross 1995: 89–97; Davies 1987: 87–105; Dupont-Sommer 1961: 114–20, 198–201, 255–58, 349; Grossman 2002: 155–57; Jokiranta 2005c: 256–57; Knibb 1994a: 13–15, 157–58, 209, 221, 247; Stegemann 1998: 80–138 (esp. 107), 116–18, 122–33; VanderKam 1994a: 106–108.

90   Murphy-O'Connor 1970; 1971a; 1971b; 1972; 1974; 1985.

91   See further Hempel 2000: 46–47.

92   Davies 1983 (esp. 198–201).

93   Davies 1983. Charlesworth likewise suggests that some texts, including the Damascus Document, appear to have 'obtained their present form through an evolutionary process that mirrors somewhat the historical stages of the Qumran Essenes' (1980: 233). See also, Boccaccini 1998: 120; Brooke 1991a: 218–21; Wassen 2005: 32–33; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996: 50. Note, however, the critique of Davies' hypothesis in Collins 1985. More recently, Eyal Regev has proposed, conversely, that the Damascus Document might post-date the 'Yahad', belonging to a later group (2003; 2007a: esp. 163–96). His argument, centred around the employment of הרבים in the D- and S-material, is intriguing but, for the present at least,

4.19b-20a; 6.18b-19; 7.14–8.1; 8.12b-13; 19.24b-26a; 20.28b; 20.30b-33a.[94]

In the context of her work comparing the Damascus Document and the Community Rule, Metso likewise stresses that:

> it is important to pay attention to the *composite nature* of the rule texts when they are compared and focus on *individual redactional units* rather than on complete documents as if they were literary unities. (2004: 330–31; my italics)

There are dissenting voices which argue for the literary unity of the text (e.g., Dimant 1984: 490–97; Wacholder 2007: 9–11; cf. Campbell 1999).[95] Nevertheless, a convincing case can seemingly be made that the Damascus Document should indeed be regarded as containing both Yahadic and pre-Yahadic material. More particularly, this present study finds Davies' proposal, defended and expanded upon in his subsequent works (see Bibliography; also n. 93 above), the most convincing and it is therefore this approach to the text that shall be adopted in our present investigation.[96]

By virtue of the pre-Yahadic nature of much of the Damascus Document (pre-dating the present redaction of the text, that has above already been equated with the H-material as the product of an 'Early Sectarian Period'), we are presented with *three* broad compositional periods:[97]

---

ultimately less convincing than the hypothesis of Yahadic redaction (note the criticisms of Regev's position in Kapfer 2007). We shall return to the issue of alternative textual layering in our final Conclusions.

94   See Davies 1983: 194–97, 232–67. Isaac Rabinowitz similarly highlights the presence of 'glosses and comments upon the admonitory discourse' (1953: 175 n. 2; also 1954). Note further, however, the recent detailed discussions regarding this material in Hultgren 2007 (esp. 5–76).

95   Furthermore, while Mark Boyce acknowledges the existence of a redactional process, his examination of the poetry of the Damascus Document leads him to suggest that references to 'the teacher' at least (e.g., CD 1.11) are original rather than the result of later redaction (Boyce 1990; *contra* Davies 1983). See also Knibb 1994b: 155–56; Wassen 2005: 33 n. 66.

96   Accordingly, we can highlight CD 1.1–8.19 and 20.27b-34 (plus the 'Laws'; CD 9–16) as pre-Yahadic D-material (Davies' first and second textual layers), while 19.33b–20.27a, along with the various glosses (e.g., 1.11a; 1.13-18a; 4.19b-20a; 6.18b-19; 7.14–8.1; 8.12b-13; 19.24b-26a; 20.28b; 20.30b-33a), constitutes Yahadic D-material (Davies' third textual layer; see n. 92 above).

97   4QCommGen A (4Q252) is to be placed alongside the specifically Yahadic D-material belonging to the Early Sectarian Period. Though, as noted above, the passage we are most concerned with (4Q252 5.1-7) parallels the language, structure and exegetical method of CD 6.2-11 (pre-Yahadic D-material according to Davies' schema), it does so in the context of אנשי היחד ('the Men of the Community/Yahad'; 4Q252 5.5) thereby explicitly revealing

1. Formative Sectarian Period   (pre-Yahadic D-material)[98]
2. Early Sectarian Period   (Yahadic D-material and
    H-material)
3. Late Sectarian Period   (P-material)

The extent to which these can be regarded as distinct remains questionable given the evidence for ongoing redaction. At best it is a blunt approximation, based on the evidence at our disposal, of the chronological development of these blocks of material. Nevertheless, in broad terms it appears to agree with both the relative dating of these texts suggested by Bengtsson (2000a: 288–90), Brooke (1991a: 228–29), Davies (1987: 87–105) and Grossman (2002: 155–57), and with the findings derived from a close textual analysis of the Damascus Document (e.g., Davies 1983; Murphy-O'Connor 1972; 1985; cf. Hempel 2000: 44–53).[99] It is therefore this threefold chronological schema that we shall employ as a backdrop to our present examination of the sobriquets in the Qumran-related scrolls.[100]

---

itself to belong with the other Yahadic material (cf. perhaps אנשי היחיד; CD 20.32). So too, Brooke (1994b: 174 n. 26), Falk (2007: 121) and García Martínez (1995b: 161). Note, however, that Curt Niccum (2006) questions the sectarian identity of this text.

98   The label 'Formative Sectarian Period' is preferable to either 'Pre-Sectarian' or 'Earliest Sectarian', making the point that this particular compositional period constitutes a 'pre-stage' to our subsequent (Yahadic) periods, while maintaining a certain ambiguity with regard to its precise relationship and origin. See n. 5 of the Introduction (also, Grossman 2002: 24–41; Wacholder 1990: 273).

99   It is to be acknowledged that the Damascus Document has received substantially more scholarly attention with regard to its redaction and literary development than the H- or P-material, hence our rather more thorough examination of the former here. Our chronological schema could therefore be further improved by the inclusion of similar data, if forthcoming, from an analysis of any evident redactional history in the H- or P-material. With regard to the H-material, the groundwork for this has already been laid by Svend Holm-Nielsen (1960: esp. 316–31).

100   It should be noted that undoubtedly more than three phases of composition are attested among the Qumran-related scrolls. Davies, for instance, highlights two distinct layers within the D-material that we have classed as 'pre-Yahadic' and assigned to the Formative Sectarian Period (see n. 96 above). Thus, our three sectarian compositional periods serve only to indicate broad phases of composition and textual dependency. It would, therefore, be possible to refine our approach further if one could clearly distinguish relative composition dates for individual texts and/or literary units. However, wary of the difficulties inherent to such an endeavour, this investigation will, for the time being, maintain the broad threefold schema outlined above. We shall, nevertheless, return to the question of increased specificity in our final Conclusions.

5. *Conclusions*

It should be apparent by this point that this investigation makes a number of important assumptions. Firstly, that the Qumran-related scrolls represent a homogeneous, rather than disparate, collection (regardless of whether their origin is to be sought in Jerusalem, Qumran or elsewhere).[101] Secondly, that we can speak in broad terms of a movement behind the scrolls with a possible history of internal division represented therein.[102] To what extent this movement might be regarded as Essene-related or otherwise will not be addressed here. Thirdly, the sobriquets appearing in the Qumran-related scrolls represent an internal labelling system adopted by this movement (or part thereof) as a means of character evaluation, transparent in its original context.[103] Fourthly, given that the scrolls themselves appear to have been written over a period of time and contain evidence of development and redaction (see n. 64 above), that the sobriquets may likewise have undergone a developmental process.[104] Fifthly, this investigation assumes as reasonable the possibility that 'non-standard' forms of these sobriquets might bear witness to this process.

Having now established a tentative chronological schema, we shall proceed by examining all apparent occurrences of the sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב (along with 'variant' forms) across our three sectarian compositional periods in order to see whether convincing evidence of sobriquet development can indeed be found therein. We shall also examine instances of related terminology where appropriate in order to facilitate our understanding of this process.[105] As already stated, it is to be hoped that in this manner it will be possible to identify any trends or practices that may appear with regard to the (differing?) use and/or formation of sobriquets within or between these chronological groups, thus informing us about the process of sobriquet development among the Qumran-related texts.

---

101   E.g., Davies 2000a; Dimant 2000; Tov 2000; van der Woude 1998.

102   See n. 5 of the Introduction.

103   So too Bengtsson 2000a.

104   As similarly suggested elsewhere: Bengtsson 2000a: 288–90; Davies 1987: 97–105; Fröhlich 1999.

105   It is important to assert that the focus of this study is literary rather than historical. Though we may touch upon it in places, our aim is not primarily to engage with the historical question. Our discussion focuses upon 'the Teacher of Righteousness' and 'the Spouter of the Lie' as *labels* without necessarily passing comment upon historical realia. We may assume that there is some relationship between the worlds of the literary and the historical, though whether or not we are able to comment upon the latter should not detract from our fundamentally literary investigation.

Chapter 2

FORMATIVE SECTARIAN PERIOD

1. *Introduction*

The first of our three broad compositional periods to undergo examination is what we have dubbed the 'Formative Sectarian Period'. Derived from our analysis in the previous chapter of pre-Yahadic material in the Damascus Document, this constitutes a discernible 'pre-stage' to our two other (Yahadic) sectarian compositional periods. Philip Davies suggests that CD 1.1–8.19 and 20.27b-34 (plus the 'Laws'; CD 9–16) pre-date the establishment of a 'Yahad' (יחד, 'community') under the leadership of 'the Teacher of Righteousness'.[1] To what extent therefore this material can be regarded as strictly 'sectarian' depends upon our definition of the term and whether we extend its application beyond the immediate group of 'the Teacher'. For the purposes of this investigation we shall maintain a definition that encompasses the broader movement behind the scrolls.[2] Nevertheless, our adoption of the term 'Formative Sectarian' (as opposed to either 'Pre-Sectarian' or 'Earliest Sectarian') makes the point that this particular compositional period constitutes a 'pre-stage' to our subsequent (Yahadic) periods, while maintaining a certain ambiguity with regard to its precise relationship and origin.[3]

For our present investigation of the sobriquets in the Qumran-related texts, this Formative Sectarian Period (FSP) contains only pre-Yahadic D-material.[4] Of all the various occurring forms of 'teaching righteousness' listed in the previous chapter, only one is to be located in this

---

1 See primarily, Davies 1983 (note that he further identifies two distinct layers *within* this pre-Yahadic material; see Chapter 1, nn. 92 and 100). CD 19.33b–20.27a, along with the various glosses (e.g., 1.11a; 1.13-18a; 4.19b-20a; 6.18b-19; 7.14–8.1; 8.12b-13; 19.24b-26a; 20.28b; 20.30b-33a), are considered the product of a Yahadic redaction (cf. Chapter 1, n. 93). This present study adopts such an approach; hence our use of the terms 'pre-Yahadic' and 'Yahadic' in reference to the D-material. Note, however, Boyce 1990; Campbell 1999; Dimant 1984: 490–97.

2 See further, n. 5 of the Introduction. Also, Jokiranta 2001.

3 See Chapter 1, n. 98.

4 However, other texts, not examined here, may also arguably belong to this 'pre-Yahadic' period, such as perhaps the Temple Scroll and 4QMMT (Callaway 1990: 647–49;

compositional period (CD 6.11), while none of the forms associated with 'spouting lies' are to be found (we shall, however, examine an instance of related terminology [CD 6.1] that may have some bearing upon our discussion).[5] This chapter is, accordingly, to be rather shorter than the two which follow it, though this enforced brevity may in itself be of some significance in our final analysis. In terms of how we shall proceed, while presented with only one text for investigation here, generally speaking with regard to our sectarian periods we shall treat each text to be considered in turn, examining all apparent occurrences of the sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב (along with both 'variant' forms and related terminology where appropriate). In this manner, attention can be paid to the interplay between designations within a given text, while such an approach will furthermore allow us to avoid artificially amalgamating texts too readily within a given compositional period.[6]

2. Sobriquets in the Formative Sectarian Period

a. The (Pre-Yahadic) Damascus Document
1. 'The Teacher of Righteousness'
CD 6.2-11a

As stated above, of all the various occurring forms of 'teaching righteousness' listed in the previous chapter, only one falls among the pre-Yahadic portions of the Damascus Document.[7] This forms the culmination of a passage that would appear to describe the origins of a group:

> [6.2]But God remembered the covenant of the forefathers, and he raised up from Aaron men of understanding and from Israel [3]men of wisdom and caused them to hear, and they dug the well; 'a well that the princes dug, that [4]the nobles of the people excavated with a sceptre'. The 'well' is התורה, and those who dug it are [5]the שבי ישראל who went forth

---

Davies 1989; 2000b: 40–42; Schiffman 1994: 83–95, 257–71; 2000a; cf. Lange 2006). 'Thus, the caves of Qumran may have preserved writings which antedate the foundation of the Yaḥad' (Wacholder 1990: 273).

5   An apparent reference to 'seeking smooth things' in CD 1.18 (paralleled in 4Q266 frg. 2, 1.21), also belongs to this compositional period, though this will be examined in Chapter 5.

6   As might, for example, be a danger if we were to examine all references to 'the Teacher of Righteousness' across a compositional period and then all references to 'the Spouter of the Lie'. We cannot, for instance, assume that the D- and H-material categorized as belonging to the Early Sectarian Period share an identical perspective. A comparison of various sobriquet occurrences across different texts within a compositional period can then take place retrospectively.

7   In terms of potentially related terminology, note the presence of צדיק in this period (e.g., CD 1.18–2.1). This will, however, be examined retrospectively by means of comparison in our analysis of the Hodayot in Chapter 3.

from the land of Judah and sojourned in the land of Damascus, [6]all of whom God called 'princes', for they sought him {דרשוהו} and their renown was not [7]rejected by anyone's mouth. And the 'sceptre' is דורש התורה, of whom [8]Isaiah said, 'He brings forth a tool for his work'. And the 'nobles of the people' are [9]those who come to excavate the 'well' with the sceptres {/decrees} which 'the sceptre' decreed [10]to walk in during all the age of wickedness *and without which they shall obtain nothing*, until there shall arise יורה הצדק[11] at the end of days. (CD 6.2-11a)[8]

This passage is paralleled in 4Q266 (frg. 3, 2.9b-17a) and partially in 4Q267 (frg. 2, 7-15) and 6Q15 (frg. 3, 5), though, due to the poor state of preservation, יורה הצדק is not attested. How are we best to understand this designation? Solomon Schechter, who first published the Damascus Document in 1910 after the discovery of the CD manuscripts in the Cairo genizah, opted for 'the teacher of righteousness', regarding יורה as a simple variant of מורה (cf. CD 1.11; 20.32).[9] Most scholars, however, render it more generally as either 'one who will teach righteousness' (Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995; Davies 1983; Knibb 1994a), 'he ... who shall teach righteousness' (Vermes 2004), 'one who teaches righteousness' (Roth 1963: 95; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996) or 'he who teaches justice' (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997). Though the majority regard יורה as a verbal form (specifically, an imperfect *hiphil* or *qal* participle from the root ירה), as Davies points out:

> since יורה הצדק and not יורה את הצדק is written, יורה is capable of being construed as nominal rather than verbal, forming a construct with the following noun. (Davies 1996: 89; cf. 1988: 313)[10]

Clearly there is some terminological similarity between יורה הצדק and the sobriquet 'the Teacher of Righteousness'. While a degree of ambiguity remains with regard to precise translation, we shall adopt 'one who will teach righteousness' as a suitable rendering, retaining fully both the apparent sense of the phrase (i.e., future-orientated teaching) and the association with מורה הצדק.

8   Italics signify a Yahadic interpolation, following Davies 1983: 247 (also Murphy-O'Connor 1971a: 230–31).

9   Schechter 1970: 70. Cf. Dupont-Sommer 1961: 131. Also, 'the True Lawgiver' (Wacholder 2007). See further Rabinowitz 1958: 393 (cf. 1954: 22 n. 52). Indeed, Gregory Doudna suggests that יורה הצדק is in fact a scribal error for מורה הצדק (2001: 686–89). Cf. Jeremias 1963: 308–18, esp. 312.

10   Loren Stuckenbruck, examining 1QpHab, stresses the difficulties of 'ascribing precise temporal meanings to the perfect and imperfect Hebrew verbs during the Second Temple period' (2007b: 126). Ben Zion Wacholder notes that, 'to determine whether an event ... refers to the past or the future, the verbal forms perfect, imperfect, the participle and imperative play an important but not exclusive role. Equally important are the general terminology and the context' (2002: 7). Cf. Thorion-Vardi 1985.

It is often suggested that the 'standard' form מורה הצדק has its origins in scriptural passages such as Joel 2.23 and Hos. 10.12 (e.g., Brownlee 1979: 47–48; Burrows 1956: 144–45; Jeremias 1963: 308–18; Lim 2002: 74–75; Pfann 2004: 180–81; Rabinowitz 1958: 397; Roth 1963).[11] Håkan Bengtsson disagrees, however, and, concerned primarily with the sobriquet as it appears in the pesharim, relegates these passages to the role of 'secondary biblical support' (2000a: 216).[12] In either case, it would be prudent to examine them here afresh in relation to our earliest discernible occurrence of terminology pertaining to the teaching of righteousness (יורה הצדק, CD 6.11). Joel 2.23 reads:

> O children of Zion, be glad and rejoice in the LORD your God; for he has given the early rain for your vindication {את־המורה לצדקה}, he has poured down {יורד} for you abundant rain, the early and the later rain {מורה ומלקוש}, as before. (Joel 2.23)

Significantly, the noun מורה (here in the sense of 'early rain', though it can also mean 'teacher'; cf. Clines [ed.] 2001; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995) is found in the context of צדק. Furthermore, *BHS* notes with regard to the second occurrence that multiple manuscripts read יורה instead (cf. CD 6.11). William Brownlee suggests that the writers of the scrolls understood this passage in reference to an individual (accordingly, 'for he has given you *the one who showers* [or, *teaches*] *righteousness*'; 1979: 47).[13] If there is any merit in the association of Joel 2.23 with CD 6.10-11 this may at least have been the position taken by the author of the (pre-Yahadic) Damascus Document; hence יורה הצדק('one who will teach righteousness'). However, aside from the coupling of the roots ירה and צדק, there is nothing in either Joel 2.23 or the surrounding text that bears any clear parallel to CD 6.2-11a; thus we cannot convincingly demonstrate a dependence upon this scriptural passage.

More intriguing, however, in terms of terminology and context is Hos. 10.12. This reads:

> Sow for yourselves righteousness; reap steadfast love; break up your fallow ground; for it is time to seek {לדרוש} the LORD, that he may come {עד־יבוא} and rain righteousness {ירה צדק} upon you.

---

11   See Schechter 1970: 63 n. 16. Note also the double appearance of מוריך in Isa. 30.20 (Campbell 1995a: 51–67; Pfann 2004: 180 n. 23).

12   Intriguingly, Bengtsson proposes that the Damascus Document itself should be considered the source of מורה הצדק (2000a: 191–96, 288–90), a hypothesis that our present investigation may further illuminate. It should be acknowledged that this position does not preclude the possibility that passages such as Joel 2.23 and Hos. 10.12 might have nevertheless influenced the employment and/or formation of designations in the Damascus Document.

13   So too Roth 1963. J.M. Baumgarten further notes that this is the understanding held in the Targum and Vulgate (1979: 231 n. 52).

The phrase עד־יבוא וירה צדק bears close structural and terminological resemblance to עד עמד יורה הצדק (CD 6.10-11). Furthermore, in both cases this event takes place as a consequence of 'seeking' God (cf. CD 6.6: דרשוהו). Cecil Roth suggests that, as with Joel 2.23, the scriptural passage may have been understood in reference to an individual teacher (thus, 'It is time to seek the Lord, until He shall come who shall teach righteousness to you' [1963: 93]).[14] Indeed, this is the understanding preserved in both the Targum and Vulgate (J.M. Baumgarten 1979: 230–31; Burrows 1956: 145; Reeves 1988: 289–90).[15] Of greater significance still, the Karaites shared this interpretation of Hos. 10.12 and from it derived the label מורה צדק for an anticipated eschatological messianic figure.[16]

Other, more obscure, scriptural provenances for the act of 'teaching righteousness' have also been suggested (see Bengtsson 2000a: 191–95; Fröhlich 1999: 302–305; Lim 2002: 74–75), though these bear little (if any) relation to the immediate context of CD 6.2-11a. While Joel 2.23 simply attests the combination of the relevant root forms (moreover in the distinct form המורה לצדקה), Hos. 10.12 shares several notable points of contact (terminological, structural and contextual) with CD 6.2-11a and therefore alone might be said to have perhaps had some influence on the shaping of יורה הצדק.[17] Thus, an expectation of the fulfilment of Hos. 10.12 (reinterpreted) can be seen to lie behind CD 6.10-11; seeking (דרש) God will lead to his coming and raining righteousness

---

14 Cf. Brownlee 1979: 47–48; Burrows 1956: 145.

15 Cf. n. 13 above.

16 See primarily, Polliack 2005: 191–95. Also, Brownlee 1979: 48–49. Note in this context the future orientation of עד עמד יורה הצדק באחרית הימים (CD 6.10-11).

17 So too Campbell 1995a: 88–99 (esp. 92). It should be noted that Bengtsson not only denies scriptural provenance to the 'standard' form, מורה הצדק (claiming its origins lie in the Damascus Document itself; see n. 12 above), but also to the 'antecedent forms' found in the latter text (2000a: 288–90). His reasoning is that, 'we do not have any evidence for the interpretation "teacher" of the יורה and the המורה in Hos and Joel in the Qumran context' (2000a: 289). This seems counterintuitive, especially since (as our examination above has demonstrated) CD 6.10-11 itself, at least, might appear to attest such an interpretation of Hos. 10.12. Indeed, Bengtsson concludes that, 'some sobriquets must have been moulded without suitable biblical passages' (2000a: 290). Conversely, Ida Fröhlich, in her examination of 'Qumran names', concludes emphatically that, 'they are not ad hoc inventions of the authors of the works ... This traditional language, worked into the community and contaminated with other systems, *issued from other biblical texts*' (1999: 305; my italics). While his suggestion that the origins of the 'standard' form, מורה הצדק, are to be sought in the Damascus Document would appear congruent with our examination thus far, this study remains unconvinced (and somewhat baffled) by Bengtsson's insistence that the designation יורה הצדק (CD 6.11) is without scriptural derivation.

(עד־יבוא וירה צדק, Hos. 10.12), understood as the arrival of 'one who will teach righteousness' (עד עמד יורה הצדק, CD 6.10-11).[18]

This event appears not yet to have happened in the context of this passage but is instead anticipated 'at the end of days' or, literally, 'in the last (of the) days' (באחרית הימים, CD 6.11).[19] Brooke prefers the translation 'the latter days', thus avoiding the apparent abrupt finality of 'the end of days', and argues that אחרית הימים denotes a period of time before the end which 'is already being experienced' (1985: 176; so too Stegemann 1992: 153–54).[20] Such an interpretation may influence our understanding of the implied timetable for the arrival of the 'one who will teach righteousness'. Though Phillip Callaway notes that CD 6.10-11 appears to concern a future figure, he astutely adds:

> This depends, of course on, when one dates the end of days. If the writer or reader viewed himself as living already in the last days, this figure might be considered a relative contemporary. (Callaway 1988: 115)

John J. Collins casts doubt on Brooke's assertion that אחרית הימים is already being experienced (from the perspective of the Damascus Document at least), though he concedes that 'the end of days' might refer to a period of time rather than the end of time itself (1994a: 195–99; cf. 2000a). A potentially useful approach might be borrowed from an analogy Albert I. Baumgarten draws between eschatological expectation as conceived by the authors of the scrolls and by contemporary millenarian movements such as Jehovah's Witnesses (2000: 13–14). In this light, 'the end of days' is the final climatic period (itself of unspecified length), the commencement of which can be both variously identified and indefinitely postponed. It follows therefore that at different times some or all of those responsible for the scrolls may have considered themselves as on the brink of, or even in the midst of, 'the end of days'.[21]

Consequently, CD 6.10-11 appears in general terms to have expressed an expectation of a figure yet to come. Exactly when this event was supposed to occur, however, may well have varied in the minds of both author and reader depending on the projected imminence of אחרית הימים. On the other hand, the reverse may also have been true. As Davies puts it:

---

18 Russell Fuller's analysis of the text of Hos. 10.12 in 4Q82 (4QXII^g) likewise supports this conclusion (1992: 254–56; cf. 1997). On the personification of צדק, see J.M. Baumgarten 1979 (esp. 230–33).

19 See Collins 2000a; Kosmala 1978a; Steudel 1993.

20 Cf. 4Q398 (4QMMT^e) frgs. 11–13, 4: וזה הוא אחרית הימים.

21 See further the discussion by Shemaryahu Talmon (2003).

The 'end of days' might signify the arrival of the Teacher: more pertinently, *the arrival of the Teacher would signify the 'end of days'.* (Davies 1988: 315; = 1996: 91)

In this sense the 'one who will teach righteousness' might be interpreted as an eschatological figure in the mindset of those awaiting his arrival. Might this furthermore have messianic undertones? Some support for this perspective may come from a parallel passage also constituting part of the pre-Yahadic Damascus Document. Compare:

> [6.10]to walk in during all the age of wickedness (. . .), until there shall arise [11]one who will teach righteousness at the end of days. (CD 6.10-11)

> [12.23]those who walk in these in the age of wickedness, until there shall arise the messiah of Aaron [13.1]and Israel. (CD 12.23–13.1)

That these statements existed alongside each other in the pre-Yahadic text of the Damascus Document may indicate that the 'one who will teach righteousness' was anticipated as the (singular?) 'messiah of Aaron and Israel' (משיח אהרן וישראל).[22]

   In the light of the above, there are three significant possibilities regarding the relationship (if any) between the 'one who will teach righteousness at the end of days' and the figure that appears elsewhere among the scrolls as 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (מורה הצדק). Firstly that, given the apparent references to the latter figure's death in CD 19.33–20.17, 6.10-11 anticipates his return 'at the end of days' (Dupont-Sommer 1961: 131 n. 6; Schechter 1970: 45). Secondly, that the expected

---

   22 משיח corrected from משוח (following Qimron 1992a). A messianic reading of CD 6.10-11 is advanced by Davies (1983; 1988; and especially 2000c) and Dupont-Sommer (1954: 54); see too Callaway (1988: 113), Knibb (1994a: 50) and Vermes (2004: 86). CD 19.10-11, also part of the FSP, similarly anticipates the 'visitation' (הפקדה) of 'the messiah of Aaron and Israel' (cf. 14.19). The issue of messianism is further complicated both by the suggestion elsewhere among the scrolls that individual messiahs from Aaron and Israel were expected (e.g., 1QS 9.11) and by the potential for uncritically conflating texts. Consequently Vermes, amalgamating the messianic perspectives of various sectarian texts, identifies the 'one who will teach righteousness' with 'the messiah of Aaron' alone (2004: 86; so too Knibb 1994a: 50). Brooke highlights, however, that the Damascus Document must be recognized as attesting more than one perspective (the product of redaction) and further suggests that, in its earliest form, only a single messianic figure was anticipated (1980; 1991a). On addressing the ambiguous nature of messianic expectation in the scrolls see: Collins 1995a; 2000b; Duhaime 2000a; Evans 2000a; 2000b; García Martínez 1995b (esp. 178–79); Horbury 1998 (esp. 59–63); Lichtenberger 2003. Despite the ambiguity that arises when the scrolls are conflated, with regard to the FSP of the Damascus Document at least it is certainly arguable that, on the grounds of similarity between CD 12.23–13.1 and 6.10-11 (and the use of a verb in the singular following the designation in CD 14.19; cf. Brooke 1991a: 222; García Martínez 1995b: 179; VanderKam 1994b: 228–31), the expectation was of a singular 'messiah of Aaron *and* Israel', described as 'one who will teach righteousness at the end of days'. We shall return to this issue in subsequent chapters.

messianic יורה הצדק is distinct from the historical מורה הצדק (Collins 1995a: 102–35; Knibb 1990: 56–60). Thirdly, that the figure appearing elsewhere among the (presumably later) texts as 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (מורה הצדק) was acclaimed as the 'one who will teach righteousness at the end of days' anticipated in CD 6.10-11 (Davies 1988; Wise 1999: 202–209).[23] The first of these, while understandable as a reading, has little in the way of corroborative evidence from the texts and has not found widespread acceptance.[24] The second is the most commonly held response but has been criticized on several counts, not least that it posits two teachers though nowhere else among the scrolls is an 'eschatological counterpart' to the role of 'the Teacher of Righteousness' implied.[25] The third has again been criticized on several counts, including notably that elsewhere the historical teacher appears to pre-date 'the end of days'.[26]

For our present examination we are prohibited from accepting the first of these possibilities since it would appear that the FSP knows of no historical 'Teacher of Righteousness' whose return could here be predicted. The only teacher to be found in this sectarian compositional period is the one who is awaited 'at the end of days'. Thus, of the two remaining alternatives, the third seems as if it might prove the most congruent with our chronological layering of the texts. This is hardly surprising since the proposal is that of Philip Davies, whose work on the redaction of the Damascus Document we have drawn upon heavily in the creation of our schema. Nevertheless it appears on other grounds the most convincing, being arguably more straightforward in its reconciliation of these 'teacher' designations (without resort to the reincarnation or multiplication of teachers) and displaying heightened sensitivity to the shifting perspectives that can accompany textual development and redaction.[27]

23　As a fourth possibility, Doudna attempts to remove the future orientation of CD 6.10-11 entirely by regarding יורה הצדק as a scribal error for מורה הצדק and suggesting that עד עמד is not in fact original to the text (2001: 686–89). His endeavour is contrived, however, and ultimately unconvincing.

24　Though on belief in resurrection in the scrolls, see Puech 1994: 246–56; 2006.

25　E.g., see Davies 1988: 313.

26　Cf. 1QpHab 2.1-10a. See Collins 1994a: 203–204. Michael Knibb further advances the criticism that nowhere else is it suggested that the 'teacher' was regarded in a messianic light, as would appear to be the case with יורה הצדק (1990: 59). This issue, along with the nature of the designation משיח הצדק (4Q252 5.3), will be discussed further in Chapter 3.

27　In response to Collins' criticism that elsewhere 'the Teacher of Righteousness' pre-dates אחרית הימים (see n. 26 above), we have already noted the flexibility with which 'the end of days' can be both applied and postponed. It is only to be expected that the calculation of this period might undergo reinterpretation in the light of subsequent events (perhaps represented in later sectarian writings), of which the eventual death of 'the Teacher of Righteousness' would surely count.

This expectation of 'one who will teach righteousness at the end of days' is set firmly in the context of a pre-existing group, consisting of:

> [6.2]from Aaron men of understanding and from Israel [3]men of wisdom (. . . [4]. . .) [5]the שבי ישראל who went forth from the land of Judah and sojourned in the land of Damascus. (CD 6.2-5)

Various translations of שבי ישראל have been suggested, including 'the converts of Israel' (deriving שבי from שוב; Knibb 1983: 105–107; 1994a: 48–49; Vermes 2004), 'the returnees of Israel' (similarly derived from שוב; Iwry 1969; 1994; Murphy-O'Connor 1970: 211–14; 1972: 545–46) and 'the captivity of Israel' (derived from שבה; Davies 1983: 92–95; 1987: 43–44; Rabinowitz 1954: 16–17 n. 20; Schechter 1970: 67, 70).[28] An exegetical approach to Num. 21.18 within the passage reveals this group to be those who 'dug the well' with the aid of 'a sceptre' (CD 6.3-4). The 'well' is further revealed to be התורה, while the 'sceptre' is דורש התורה ('the Seeker of the Law'), the 'tool' of Isa. 54.16.[29]

According to CD 6.7-11, 'the Seeker of the Law' is the one who issued the decrees that should be walked in 'during all the age of wickedness (. . .), until there shall arise one who will teach righteousness at the end of days' (CD 6.10-11). It is notable that this law is valid only for the interim period ('the age of wickedness'; cf. 15.6-10) and may therefore be abrogated (or confirmed?) by the anticipated יורה הצדק 'at the end of days'.[30] His very title is reminiscent of the fact that in Hos. 10.12 the act of 'seeking' (דרש) is a necessary prerequisite for the 'raining'/'teaching' of righteousness.[31] It has been claimed that 'the Seeker of the Law' (דורש התורה) is simply an

---

28   Also, 'the elders of Israel' (derived from שיב; M.H. Segal 1951). Note that in Murphy-O'Connor's later work he claims to find the translation 'returnees of Israel' 'impossible to maintain' (1985: 232) and instead gives support to the rendering 'the converts of Israel'. See further, Blenkinsopp 2006a: 212–16.

29   In addition to the meaning 'sceptre', as found in Num. 21.18, מחקק can also be taken (as a denominative of חק) to mean 'one who prescribes decrees' or 'lawgiver' (Clines [ed.] 1996; 2001; Koehler and Baumgartner 1994; 1995; cf. Victor 1966). This dual meaning presumably lies behind the Damascus Document's equivalence of the 'sceptre' (Num. 21.18) and 'the Seeker of the Law' (cf. Rabinowitz 1954: 21; Schonfield 1956: 32). It should be noted, however, that John Elwolde questions whether מחקק was ever understood as 'sceptre' within the context of the Qumran-related sectarian literature and proposes instead that, rather than the object of a pun, it was simply read unambiguously as 'lawgiver' (2000: 2–11).

30   Davies claims CD 4.8-9 (and perhaps 1.5-7) might indicate efforts to calculate the length of this interim period (2000b: 34).

31   It is in order to bring out this terminological context and maintain consistency that we have elected to render דורש התורה 'the *Seeker* of the Law' rather than, as would be equally valid, 'the Interpreter of the Law' (cf. דרש in Clines [ed.] 1995; Koehler and Baumgartner 1994). For a similar rendering, see Brin 1995: 51; Dimant 1984: 494; Rabinowitz 1954; 1958: 397–98; Wiesenberg 1955: 302–303. The implication of the title is, in either case, that it denotes an authority responsible for the correct discernment of התורה. Cf. דורשי החלקות (see Chapter 5).

alternative designation to 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (מורה הצדק) and that both refer to the same historical figure.[32] Others argue that two distinct figures are here referred to, the former being a precursor for the latter.[33] Certainly the evidence of CD 6.2-11a would indicate that 'the Seeker of the Law' pre-dates the anticipated יורה הצדק.[34] It will suffice for the present therefore to note that, with regard to the FSP, דורש התורה is presented as a figure of authority who has already come to a group described as the שבי ישראל and has issued decrees that are to be upheld 'until there shall arise one who will teach righteousness at the end of days' (CD 6.10-11a).

Within this compositional period, 'the Seeker of the Law' is a figure prior, both chronologically and ideologically, to any teacher-figure. More importantly for our purposes, however, in terms of sobriquet development the *only* known 'teacher' of the FSP is the one described as יורה הצדק (CD 6.11). The arrival of this figure, perhaps to be identified with 'the messiah of Aaron and Israel' (cf. CD 12.23–13.1), will herald 'the end of days'. His description as 'one who will teach righteousness' draws upon the language and structure of the prophetic expectation in Hos. 10.12 and is, according to our chronological schema, the earliest form to be found in the sectarian literature related to the sobriquet מורה הצדק.

2. *'The Spouter of the Lie'*
CD 5.20–6.2

As already stated, there are no explicit references to 'the Spouter of the Lie' (מטיף הכזב) in the pre-Yahadic D-material and equally none of the associated forms that we listed in Chapter 1 are to be found. However, one related phrase, reminiscent of מטיף הכזב, appears interestingly enough *immediately* before the passage considered above containing reference to יורה הצדק:

> 5.20And at the time of the destruction of the land, there arose those who moved the boundary and led Israel astray {יתעו את ישראל}. 21And the land became desolate for they spoke rebellion against the command-

---

32 E.g., Allegro 1956a: 176; Bengtsson 2000a: 182; Collins 1994a; 1995a: 102–104; Knibb 1990: 56–63; 2000a.

33 E.g., Callaway 1988: 108–16; Davies 1983: 123–25; 1988: 314–15; 1989: 205; Murphy-O'Connor 1985; Wise 1999: 202–209. Conversely, Hugh Schonfield suggests that 'the Seeker of the Law' might be a successor to 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (1956: 36).

34 The designation has furthermore been associated with Moses, Ezra or Nehemiah, or regarded as a title applied to a series of 'seekers' (cf. 1QS 6.6-8; 4Q174 frg. 1, 1.11-12); see the excellent summaries by Phillip Callaway (1988: 108–16; 1990: esp. 641–44). Even if the יורה הצדק was, on arrival, acclaimed as one of a series of 'seekers', he is nevertheless demonstrably distinct in CD 6.2-11a from the דורש התורה who is associated with the origins of the movement. Davies further suggests that 'the Seeker of the Law' might simply be a 'halakhic fiction' (1989: 204–206).

ments of God by the hand of Moses and also [6.1]by the holy anointed ones, and they prophesied falsehood {ינבאו שקר} to turn Israel away from following [2]God. (CD 5.20–6.2)

This passage (paralleled in 4Q266 frg. 3, 2.7-10; 4Q267 frg. 2, 4–7; 4Q269 frg. 4, 1–3; 6Q15 frg. 3, 2–5) refers to those who ינבאו שקר, translated here 'prophesied falsehood' (Bowley 1999: 365; cf. Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996).[35] This is one of only very few occurrences of the verb נבא among the scrolls (see Bowley 1999: 360; Flint 2005: 161–62, 166–67). The word שקר denotes 'lies'/'falsehood'/'deception' and is thus effectively synonymous in meaning to כזב (cf. Koehler and Baumgartner 1995; 1999).[36] Indeed, שקר and כזב appear alongside each other in Mic. 2.11 (along with נטף), a passage that as we shall see in the following chapter may have some bearing on the development of the sobriquet מטיף הכזב.[37] It is in order to maintain some distinction between the two that we have here elected to render שקר as 'falsehood', though the parallel with כזב should not be ignored.

The coupling of נבא and שקר has some scriptural precedence, of which the book of Jeremiah contains several notable examples: e.g., נבאי השקר (23.25); הנבאים בשמי שקר (5.31); הנביאים נבאו־בשקר (23.26); נבאי חלמות שקר (23.32). Jeremiah 23, in particular, concerns itself with false prophecy and similarly accuses such figures of having led Israel astray (תעה, 23.13, 32; cf. CD 5.20); this against the backdrop of the Babylonian exile and the desolation of the land, a theme that recurs throughout Jeremiah (cf. CD 1.3-8; 3.8-16; 5.20–6.5). The employment of נבא and שקר in this specific scriptural context may suggest that the book of Jeremiah (especially ch. 23) exerted some influence over the shaping of CD 5.20–6.2 and the description of those who ינבאו שקר.[38] Furthermore, forming a contrast with the false prophets, Jer. 23.5 reads:

> The days are surely coming, says the LORD, when I will raise up for David a righteous branch {צמח צדיק}.

It is interesting to speculate whether this might have had some effect on the pre-Yahadic D-material's reading of Hos. 10.12 or on the subsequent formulation of the messianic יורה הצדק, expected at 'the end of days' (CD 6.11).[39]

---

35 Other translations include 'prophesied falsely' (Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995; Davies 1983), 'prophesied lies' (Knibb 1994a; Vermes 2004), 'prophesied deceit' (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997).

36 Also, Davidson 2002; Holladay 2000.

37 See Bengtsson 2000a: 97 n. 48.

38 So too Campbell (1995a: 92, 97) and Knibb (1994a: 46–47). The passage may also echo Deut. 13.6; 19.14; 27.17; Hos. 5.10; 2 Chron. 36.15-16 (Campbell 1995a: 91–99).

39 Cf. 4Q174 frg. 1, 1.11-12; 4Q252 5.1-7. See further Ulfgard 2000.

The group portrayed in CD 5.20–6.2 as those who ינבאו שקר are described as having arisen 'at the time of the destruction of the land' and are also accused of having 'moved the boundary' (מסיגי הגבול, CD 5.20), 'led Israel astray' (יתעו את ישראל, CD 5.20) and having 'spoke rebellion against the commandments of God' (דברו סרה על מצוות אל, CD 5.21).[40] They are set in direct opposition to Moses and 'the holy anointed ones' (משיחי הקודש, CD 6.1) through whom God's commandments have been revealed.[41] The explicit presentation of the משיחי הקודש as God's true prophets (cf. CD 2.12-13; see Bowley 1999: 358–60) unmistakably renders the group who 'prophesied falsehood' (ינבאו שקר, CD 6.1) and 'led Israel astray' in the role of 'false prophets'.[42] The scriptural language employed casts this group in the typological mould of the false prophets spoken of in Jeremiah 23 (cf. Deuteronomy 13). Their prophetic status is thus undermined ('I did not send them or appoint them', Jer. 23.32) and truth is deemed to reside instead in the דורש התורה and שבי ישראל described immediately below.

The accusation contained in the phrase ינבאו שקר is evocative of the sobriquet 'the Spouter of the Lie' and encapsulates the *sense* of the designation in as much as one labelled a 'spouter'/'preacher' of a lie is thus presented in the mould of a false prophet (cf. Mic. 2.11).[43] Davies likewise notes the similarity 'in content if not in wording' between ינבאו שקר and מטיף הכזב, though emphasizes the influence of scripture upon the presentation of false prophets in this context (1983: 121). Nevertheless, if we were to view the Damascus Document as a unified text and thus attribute this passage to the same period as those passages which *do* make accusations of 'spouting lies' (see Chapter 3), we might consider the failure of CD 5.20–6.2 to utilize this typology something of a 'missed opportunity'. However, construed as a pre-Yahadic passage, we may conclude instead that this typology was simply yet to be adopted within sectarian vocabulary. Indeed, the absence of any identifiable form of the designation מטיף הכזב in the FSP and the consistent use of rather generalized scriptural terms to describe adversaries (e.g., 'those who moved the boundary', CD 5.20) might suggest that there was no significant polarized opposition at this point. Perhaps, given that it would appear no 'teacher' had yet arisen (cf. CD 6.10-11a), there was equally no specific counter-

40 Cf. מסגי גבול (4Q266 frg. 3, 2.7); דברו עצה סרה על מצוות אל (4Q266 frg. 3, 2.8; 4Q267 frg. 2, 5).

41 משיחי הקודש corrected from משיחו הקודש, following 4Q267 frg. 2, 6; 6Q15 frg. 3, 4 (cf. Fitzmyer 2000: 88–90; Qimron 1992a; Rabinowitz 1954: 20 n. 41).

42 On the identification (or self-proclamation) of 'charismatic preachers' as prophets and the notion of false prophecy, see Barton 1986: 105–16. See further, Bowley 1999; J.J.M. Roberts 1988: 216–20. Cf. 4Q339, a list of 'false prophets who arose in Israel' (4Q339 1).

43 Rowley 1958: 120.

title מטיף הכזב might be conferred.

3. *Conclusions*

The sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב do not occur in the FSP and there is no unequivocal indication that this compositional period is aware of any historical figures to whom these titles might have been applied.[44] Instead, with regard to מורה הצדק, we have only an abstract description of a future didactic figure, 'one who will teach righteousness {יורה הצדק} at the end of days' (CD 6.11a). A similar passage (CD 12.23–13.1) may suggest that this description applied to the anticipated (apparently singular) figure elsewhere labelled 'the messiah of Aaron and Israel' (משיח אהרן וישראל).[45] CD 6.10-11a shares terminological, structural and contextual affinities with Hos. 10.12, though (as with later exegetes; see nn. 15–16 above) interprets the scriptural text in relation to a 'teacher'. The roots ירה and צדק, the structure of the phrase עד עמד יורה הצדק, and the context of 'seeking' (root: דרש) can all be derived from Hos. 10.12. Thus, the occurrence of יורה הצדק at CD 6.11 can be described as a thoroughly contextualized adoption from the scriptural passage. The precise relationship (if any) between this attestation and the sobriquet מורה הצדק is something that we shall endeavour to explore as we continue our examination of the remaining sectarian compositional periods.

Not only is the title מטיף הכזב similarly absent from this period, but also any identifiable use of vocabulary that might constitute an antecedent form of the sobriquet. The closest reference, in terms of sense at least, is the description of a group who, among other things, 'prophesied falsehood' (ינבאו שקר, CD 6.1). The failure of the Damascus Document to utilize a 'spouting' typology in this context, as prevalent elsewhere in the (later) text, suggests that this motif was perhaps unknown to the FSP. Indeed, this compositional period attests no counter-figure to the anticipated יורה הצדק. Even the group who 'prophesied falsehood' belong to the past/present from the perspective of this passage and so are set in opposition to the prophets of the past, 'the holy anointed ones' (CD 6.1), rather than the 'teacher'.

As noted by Michael Knibb, there is a marked dualism in CD 5.16–6.11

---

44   It has been suggested by some that מורה הצדק was an alternative label for the figure deemed דורש התורה who *does* appear in the FSP (e.g., Bengtsson 2000a: 182; Collins 1994a; Knibb 1990: 56–63), though even if the case, the sobriquet itself, מורה הצדק, remains demonstrably absent from this compositional period.

45   See n. 22 above.

(1994a: 46).[46] 'The Prince of Lights' (שר האורים, 5.18) is opposed by 'Belial' (בליעל, 5.18) while 'Moses and Aaron' (משה ואהרן, 5.18) have their counterparts in 'Jannes and his brother' (יחנה ואת אחיהו, 5.18-19).[47] The 'men of understanding' (נבונים, 6.2) and 'men of wisdom' (חכמים, 6.3) raised up by God stand in sharp contrast to those described as 'not a people of understanding' (לא עם בינות הוא, 5.16; cf. Isa. 27.11) and of whom it is said 'there is no understanding in them' (אין בהם בינה, 5.17; cf. Deut. 32.28). The 'holy anointed ones' (משיחי הקודש, 6.1), as true prophets through whom God's commandments are claimed to have come, are juxtaposed with those who 'prophesied falsehood' (ינבאו שקר, 6.1).[48]

However, the anticipated 'one who will teach righteousness' (יורה הצדק, 6.11) has no counterpart and remains, for the purposes of this passage, unopposed. This may indicate that the movement behind the text did not expect there to be any opposition when this eschatological figure arrived, perhaps believing he would be universally recognized. We might posit that only at a later stage, after the arrival of a claimant to the role and in response to those who did not in fact recognize him as such, was it necessary to employ labels denoting opposition.[49] Nevertheless, the terminology and typological mould for describing these opponents is in place in the FSP. The anticipated 'teacher' is presented as an eschatological successor to משיחי הקודש; just as 'the holy anointed ones' were the instruments of God's teaching in the past, so the anointed יורה הצדק (cf. CD 12.23–13.1) will confer God's teaching 'at the end of days' (CD 6.11; cf. Hos. 10.12).[50] Formulated in this manner, we might suppose that any figure who did later arise in opposition to the 'teacher' would be cast in the mould of those who ינבאו שקר, the group that in this passage stands most clearly in contrast to משיחי הקודש. In other words, if we were to deduce an oppositional designation we would do so in terms of false prophecy. Might we here be able to detect the earliest traces of a dichotomy that was eventually to produce the sobriquet 'the Spouter of the Lie' (מטיף הכזב)?

---

46   Note, however, that Knibb regards CD 5.17b-19 as secondary (1994a: 46; so too Murphy-O'Connor 1970: 224–25), *contra* Davies (1983: 121) and Pietersma (1991: 384; 2000). On dualistic elements in the scrolls and Persian influences, see Collins 1979; 1995b; Davies 1978; 1985: 49–55; Duhaime 2000b; Hultgren 2007: 319–408; Levison 2006; Qimron 2006; van der Ploeg 1958: 95–105; Wilcox 1969.

47   Cf. Davies 2000b: 32 n. 6; Pietersma 1991; 2000.

48   One glaring omission from this otherwise fairly consistent duality is the absence of any counterpart to 'the Seeker of the Law' (דורש התורה, 6.7). This may have historical implications which could be pursued in a subsequent study.

49   This may in turn lend weight to the postulated existence of historical figures behind such epithets.

50   The passage notes that, during the interim 'age of wickedness', the decrees issued by 'the Seeker of the Law' are to be followed (CD 6.7-11).

Chapter 3

EARLY SECTARIAN PERIOD

1. *Introduction*

The second of our proposed compositional periods to be examined is the 'Early Sectarian Period'. This is the first of two broad periods that can perhaps be more readily classed as Yahadic or 'sectarian' in the strictest sense.[1] The designation 'Early Sectarian' has no specific bearing on the timescale in which these texts were produced and should not be taken to imply, for example, that these texts were all composed within a few years of the establishment of the 'Yahad'. Neither should it be assumed that the texts contained herein were all produced simultaneously; indeed the span of time covered by this compositional period might be quite extensive.[2] Instead 'Early Sectarian' serves only in a relative sense to distinguish these texts from those which, on literary grounds, appear to be dependent upon them and therefore somewhat later (dubbed for our purposes 'Late Sectarian'). In turn, both of these periods postdate the pre-Yahadic 'Formative Sectarian Period' examined in the previous chapter.

This Early Sectarian Period (ESP), in terms of our present investigation, consists chiefly of Yahadic D-material and H-material. As argued in Chapter 1, the Damascus Document might primarily be described as a pre-Yahadic text and this informed our adoption of the 'Formative Sectarian Period'. Yet, as Philip Davies notes, it is 'strictly speaking, also to be regarded as a *yaḥad* text' (2000b: 36), as the documents we have constitute a Yahadic revision of the earlier material.[3] It is these apparent revisions which comprise the Yahadic D-material and will be examined here.[4] The H-material will likewise be scrutinized for any apparent occurrences of the sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב (along with

---

1 See n. 5 of the Introduction.

2 This in turn raises the possibility that our approach could be further refined if evidence of textual dependency internal to this compositional period was discovered (see Chapter 1, n. 100). We shall return to this issue in our final Conclusions.

3 See primarily, Davies 1983. Cf. Chapter 1, n. 93.

4 This Yahadic redaction consists of CD 19.33b–20.27a, along with the various glosses (e.g., 1.11a; 1.13-18a; 4.19b-20a; 6.18b-19; 7.14–8.1; 8.12b-13; 19.24b-26a; 20.28b; 20.30b-33a). Note, however, Boyce 1990; Campbell 1999; Dimant 1984: 490–97.

both 'variant' forms and related terminology where appropriate). One further text to be examined in the ESP is 4Q252. In Chapter 1 we tentatively placed this text alongside the D-material (following Campbell 2004: 17–18) on the grounds of similarity in terms of language, structure and exegetical method. We furthermore placed it with the specifically Yahadic D-material after noting its use of אנשי היחד ('the Men of the Community/Yahad').[5] Though the text contains no discernible designations related to מטיף הכזב, we shall nevertheless consider what light one passage in particular might throw upon our understanding of the sobriquet מורה הצדק before proceeding to the 'Late Sectarian Period'. First, however, let us turn our attention once more to the Damascus Document.

2. Sobriquets in the Early Sectarian Period

a. The (Yahadic) Damascus Document
1. 'The Teacher of Righteousness'
CD 1.4-11a

The first of several possible allusions to 'the Teacher of Righteousness' in the Yahadic revision of the Damascus Document occurs early on in the text in the context of yet another passage that appears to describe the origins of a group:[6]

> [1.4]But when he remembered the covenant of the forefathers, he left a remnant [5]to Israel and did not give them to destruction. And at the time of wrath, *three hundred* [6]*and ninety years after he had given them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon,* [7]he visited them and caused to grow from Israel *and from Aaron* a root of planting to inherit [8]his land and to grow fat on the goodness of his soil. And they perceived their iniquity and knew that [9]they were guilty men, and they were like the blind and like gropers of a way [10]*for twenty years.* But God perceived their deeds, for they sought him {דרשוהו} with a whole heart, [11]*and he raised up for them* מורה צדק *to lead them in the way of his heart.* (CD 1.4-11a)[7]

This passage is paralleled in 4Q266 (frg. 2, 1.9-15) and partially in 4Q268 (frg. 1, 11–17), though, due to the poor state of preservation, מורה צדק is attested in neither. The text here is instantly reminiscent of CD 6.2-11a,

---

5   See Chapter 1, n. 97. So too Brooke 1994b: 174 n. 26; García Martínez 1995b: 161. Cf. perhaps אנשי היחיד (CD 20.32).

6   Charlotte Hempel identifies four such passages in the Damascus Document, each constituting an 'account of community origins': CD 1.3-11a; 2.8b-13; 3.12b–4.12a; 5.20–6.11a (1999a; also 2000: 26–43).

7   Italics signify the Yahadic glosses/expansions to the text, following Davies 1983 (233; cf. 61–69). Note however Wassen 2005: 33 n. 66.

examined in the FSP, and indeed is largely pre-Yahadic itself in terms of content, though ultimately the product of Yahadic revision; as such the passage as a whole has a distinctly Yahadic 'spin' to it. The designation מורה צדק would certainly appear to be related in some way to מורה הצדק, and in fact the only notable difference between the two is the absence of the definite article in the former (see Jeremias 1963: 308–18). Sensitive to this omission (and its potential significance), most scholars render the phrase 'a teacher of righteousness' (Davies 1983; Knibb 1994a; Schechter 1970; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996) or with capitals, '*a* Teacher of Righteousness' (Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Vermes 2004).[8] Of these two possibilities, this study shall adopt the former, leaving the designation un-capitalized ('a teacher of righteousness', מורה צדק) so as to distinguish it more obviously in our considerations from the 'standard' form title '*the* Teacher of Righteousness' (מורה הצדק).[9]

Whence then מורה צדק? Timothy Lim regards it as simply a variant form of מורה הצדק, believing the absence of the definite article to be the result of 'the poetic context in which the phrase is found' (Lim 2002: 75), and thus translates without distinction. Accordingly, he considers the origin of the phrase to lie in such scriptural passages as Hos. 10.12 and Joel 2.23 (as we examined in the FSP). Of these, Jonathan Campbell regards Hos. 10.12 (in conjunction with Isa. 30.20) as having some impact upon the formation of מורה צדק in CD 1.11 (1995a: 51–67).[10] It is perhaps worth re-examining this scriptural passage:

> Sow for yourselves righteousness; reap steadfast love; break up your fallow ground; for it is time to seek {דרוש} the LORD, that he may come {עד־יבוא} and rain righteousness {ירה צדק} upon you. (Hos. 10.12)

As was the case with CD 6.2-11a, there are likewise some significant parallels between this passage and CD 1.4-11a. In both cases the 'raining of righteousness' or the arrival of 'a teacher of righteousness' is at the instigation of God and in direct response to the act of seeking him (cf. CD 1.10: דרשוהו). It might even be possible that the planting metaphor of Hos. 10.12a consequently influenced the inclusion of such in CD 1.7 (the

---

8   Cf. 'a Righteous Teacher' (J.M. Baumgarten 1996; 2004: 83); '(the) Righteous Teacher' (Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995); 'a Guide of Righteousness' (Rabinowitz 1954; 1958); 'a Just Teacher' (Wacholder 2007). See Jeremias 1963: 308–18; cf. Charlesworth 2002: 12.

9   On the use of capitalization for titles, see Chapter 1, n. 54.

10   So too Schechter 1970: 63 n. 16. Stephen Pfann likewise notes the possible influence of Isaiah 30.20 (2004: 180 n. 23).

specific formation of which was perhaps more heavily influenced by Isa.
60.21; cf. Campbell 1995a: 56, 61–62).[11]

There are without doubt therefore some notable parallels between Hos.
10.12 and CD 1.4-11a, though it is significant that by and large these are
the same parallels as occur between the former and CD 6.2-11a. In the
FSP we noted the striking similarity between the phrases עד־יבוא וירה
צדק (Hos. 10.12) and עד עמד יורה הצדק (CD 6.10-11), both events
occurring as a consequence of 'seeking' God (cf. CD 6.6-7: כי דרשוהו).
This parallel is arguably stronger, for example in terms of such
phraseology, than that between Hos. 10.12 and CD 1.4-11a (the final
form of which has already been allocated on other grounds to a later
compositional period than CD 6.2-11a).[12] Might the Yahadic redaction of
CD 1.4-11a therefore be dependent only vicariously upon Hos. 10.12
through an actual dependence upon CD 6.2-11a? Furthermore, according
to the schema we have adopted from Davies, the act of seeking in CD 1.10
(דרשוהו), the planting metaphor of CD 1.7 and the occurrence of
טוב הצואר at CD 1.19 all belong to the original pre-Yahadic text, while
God's raising of 'a teacher of righteousness' (מורה צדק, CD 1.11) is a
Yahadic expansion.[13] To what extent therefore can we really regard Hos.
10.12 itself as having influenced the formation of מורה צדק in this
passage? Rather, it is over the pre-Yahadic text of the Damascus
Document that the scriptural passage appears to have exerted its greatest
influence.

In the absence of any other explanation we might consider the various
apparent parallels with Hos. 10.11-12 as evidence of the textual unity of
CD 1.4-11a (or at least of the originality of CD 1.11a), thus casting doubt
upon the assertions of Davies and others that the passage has undergone a
Yahadic revision.[14] However, the other possibility, as noted above, is that
CD 1.4-11a in its final form might be dependent upon CD 6.2-11a. The
pre-Yahadic elements of the first column (דרשוהו; טוב הצואר; etc.) may
still have been influenced by Hos. 10 (as identified by Campbell 1995a:
51–67), while the later Yahadic expansion of CD 1.11a might have been
fashioned *post factum* in accordance with the expectation of 'one who will
teach righteousness' (יורה הצדק) professed in CD 6.10-11a, itself directly
dependent upon Hos. 10.12.

The מורה צדק of CD 1.11a is generally interpreted by most scholars as
referring in some way to the same (historical) figure elsewhere given the

11   Campbell also notes the occurrence of טוב הצואר a little further down the column
(CD 1.19) which, being paralleled in Hos. 10.11, would appear to corroborate the influence of
this text on the passage in question (Campbell 1995a: 62).

12   Cf. Davies 1983.

13   Davies 1983: 233; cf. 61–69.

14   The various scholarly arguments for the existence of such a revision of this passage are
summarized in Davies 1983: 61–69.

title מורה הצדק.[15] The historical question aside, there does indeed appear to be some relation between the two designations on account of their remarkable similarity. Given the absence of the 'standard' form title מורה הצדק in the ESP, might מורה צדק represent not a variant (as Lim 2002: 75) but a developmental stage of the sobriquet, perhaps prior to such apparent standardization? With the adoption of Davies' interpretation of the Damascus Document, specifically the proposal that the expectation of יורה הצדק (CD 6.10-11a) pre-dates the Yahadic assertion of a מורה צדק (CD 1.11a), it becomes increasingly probable that the formulation (and insertion) of the latter was *primarily* dependent upon the existence of the former passage already within the pre-Yahadic form of the text. An association of CD 1.11a with Hos. 10.12 comes vicariously therefore through CD 6.2-11a and also through the apparent influence of Hos. 10 upon the pre-Yahadic context in which CD 1.11a is set (itself perhaps the reason for the inclusion of מורה צדק at this point).[16] That the figure raised up by God is described as 'a teacher of righteousness' owes more perhaps to the pre-existing expectation that there would arise 'one who will teach righteousness at the end of days' (itself an interpretation of the raining of righteousness in Hos. 10.12), than the scriptural text on which this expectation was based.

The use of the perfect in CD 1.4-11a (e.g., ויקם, ויבן) implies that a figure described as 'a teacher of righteousness' had already arisen by the time of this Yahadic revision of the text (though cf. Wacholder 2002). The association of this description with (and probable dependence upon) יורה הצדק of CD 6.10-11a suggests that the figure thus described was held (at least in some circles) to be the 'one who will teach righteousness' expected 'at the end of days'. Two further implications therefore become apparent. Firstly, those who subscribed to such an opinion may well have believed themselves to be living in 'the end of days' (cf.

---

15   See, e.g., Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995; Charlesworth 2002; Dupont-Sommer 1961; Grossman 2002; Hempel 1999a; Knibb 1994a; Lim 2002; Murphy-O'Connor 1974; Puech 1999; Schiffman 1994; Stegemann 1992; VanderKam 1994a; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996.

16   We are given perhaps to wonder whether, prior to Yahadic revision, CD 1.4-11a may have contained at this point an expectation akin to that of the יורה הצדק of CD 6.10-11a. If the case, the poetical metre of the passage, upon which Mark Boyce bases his arguments in favour of textual unity and the originality of CD 1.11a (Boyce 1990), might not have been so different in the pre-Yahadic stage. However, such would raise the question as to why an appropriate revision was not also made of CD 6.10-11a; a point noted by Campbell (1995a: 90 n. 71; 1999: 17–22) and which we shall discuss further in Chapter 5. Furthermore, it is arguable on specifically metrical grounds that CD 1.11a constitutes an insertion into the text rather than a replacement (e.g., Davies 1983: 61–69).

CD 6.10-11a).[17] Secondly, we noted in Chapter 2 that יורה הצדק באחרית הימים (CD 6.11a) might be read as a description of the anticipated 'messiah of Aaron and Israel' (cf. CD 12.23–13.1); might we then infer that the figure acclaimed as מורה צדק in CD 1.11a was regarded in this messianic light? In terms of the historical question, Davies goes so far as to suggest that such (loosely defined) 'messianic pretension' may provide the key to understanding the origins of the Yahad and its point of departure from the wider movement responsible for the pre-Yahadic material (1988: 316–17; cf. 1996: 92–94).[18]

With regard to context, this figure is explicitly described as having been 'raised up' for a pre-existing group who were 'like the blind and like gropers of a way *for twenty years*' prior to his arrival (CD 1.9-11). It would be consistent with our interpretation of the text so far to identify this group with that described in CD 6.2-11a as following the decrees issued for the interim period by 'the Seeker of the Law' while awaiting the arrival of 'one who will teach righteousness at the end of days'. Specifically, from the point of view of the (post- מורה צדק) Yahadic revision of the text, this unenlightened group represents the pre-Yahadic movement responsible for the earliest form of the text; by implication, any of this number who failed to acknowledge the figure acclaimed by the Yahad as מורה צדק (the time of whose arrival is clearly denoted) remain 'like the blind and like gropers of a way' (cf. Blenkinsopp 2006a: 178–85).

In the pre-Yahadic Damascus Document, the terms 'remnant' (שאירית, CD 1.4) and 'a root of planting' (שורש מטעת, CD 1.7) appear to be synonymous self-descriptions of the group responsible for the text.[19] The Yahadic redaction however, in particular the insertion of the phrase 'three

---

17   Note the insight of Davies with regard to the expectation of יורה הצדק and its relation to אחרית הימים in CD 6.2-11a: 'The "end of days" might signify the arrival of the Teacher: more pertinently, *the arrival of the Teacher would signify the "end of days"*' (Davies 1988: 315; = 1996: 91). Cf. 4Q398 frgs. 11–13, 4: וזה הוא אחרית הימים.

18   Difference of opinion regarding the authority of the 'teacher' has also been suggested by other scholars as a defining factor in the shaping of the Yahad, see e.g. Charlesworth 2002: 36; Murphy-O'Connor 1974: 233–38; VanderKam 1994a: 100–101; 1999a: 527; Vermes 2004: 54–66.

19   So too Davies 1983: 65. On the 'remnant' concept, see initially Blenkinsopp 2006a: 222–50. On the use of the planting metaphor elsewhere among Jewish literature, see Fujita 1976; Stuckenbruck 2005; Swarup 2006: 15–107 (esp. 75–88); Tiller 1997. Shozo Fujita notes the relationship in such literature between the planting metaphor and the existence of a 'righteous remnant' consisting of pious Jews who, in the aftermath of a period of wickedness, 'repent and return to God' (1976: 39; see too Swarup 2006). There is a clear similarity with the 'remnant'/'root of planting' group of the Damascus Document who, existing in the 'time of wrath' (CD 1.4-8), are elsewhere in the text described as the שבי ישראל (CD 4.2; 6.5; 8.16; 19.29). This leads Hempel to conclude that such texts (e.g., *Jubilees* and *1 Enoch*) were actually composed by the same group as that responsible for the Damascus Document (1999a: 329 n. 36).

hundred and ninety years after he had given them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon' (CD 1.5-6), results in the chronological distancing of the 'remnant' and the 'root', with the latter now appearing to designate a later group that sprang from the former. Accordingly, we should perhaps recognize the term 'a root of planting' as having been specifically adopted as a self-identification of the Yahad, a group from within the 'remnant' who, after a shared period of groping for the way (cf. 4Q306 frg. 1, 12), acknowledged the arrival of one acclaimed as the anticipated יורה הצדק of CD 6.11a.[20] Such a shift in the self-identification of the group responsible for the text as we have it is also evidenced by Charlotte Hempel's examination of 'accounts of community origins' in the Damascus Document. She claims that:

> [These accounts] convey a sense of temporal distance and remoteness of the writer(s) from the beginnings of the movement. One gains the impression that the writer(s) of these passages *no longer identify with the beginnings of the movement* but are very conscious of a considerable period of time having elapsed. (Hempel 1999a: 327–28, my italics)

As already stated, we may make an educated guess, based on the content of the Yahadic redaction of the text, that the point of departure was the arrival of a figure who was acclaimed by some as the messianic 'one who will teach righteousness' anticipated in CD 6.10-11a.[21] It is then the conviction of the Yahadic group that the יורה הצדק had indeed arrived (in the face of opposition from other members of the 'remnant' group) that caused this separation of 'remnant' and 'root of planting' in the ideology of the Yahad. Furthermore, it is this conviction that is directly responsible for the shaping of the designation מורה צדק ('a teacher of righteousness') in reference to this figure. In this sense, the formulation of מורה צדק (CD 1.11a) from יורה הצדק (CD 6.11a) can be viewed in a polemical light, aimed at establishing categorically the identity of this figure according to the understanding of the Yahadic group.

CD 19.33b–20.1a

Though no further instances of 'teacher' designations occur within manuscript A of the Cairo Damascus Document (save יורה הצדק at CD 6.11a, belonging to the FSP), several are to be found in manuscript B. The last line of column 19 preserves the words יור and מורה (CD 19.35),

---

20 Phillip Callaway has similarly identified the 'remnant' with the (pre-Yahadic) שבי ישראל who followed the decrees laid down by 'the Seeker of the Law' while awaiting the arrival of 'one who will teach righteousness at the end of days'. The 'root of planting' on the other hand, in the present form of the text at least, is taken to designate the (Yahadic) group who acknowledged the historical arrival of 'a teacher of righteousness' (מורה צדק, CD 1.11a). See Callaway 1990.

21 Cf. Davies 1988: 316.

though a horizontal line crossing them indicates a cancellation.[22] The resulting passage reads:

> [19.33]Thus all the men who entered the new [34]covenant in the land of Damascus and turned and betrayed and departed from the well of living water [35]shall not be reckoned in the council of the people and in their list they shall not be written from the day of the gathering in {האסף} of מורה היחיד[20.1] until there shall arise the messiah from Aaron and from Israel. (CD 19.33b–20.1a)

The meaning of the designation מורה היחיד is uncertain. Solomon Schechter rendered it 'the only teacher', taking היחיד as a subjective genitive derived from יחיד meaning 'only' (cf. Gen. 22.2).[23] His approach has been followed by several scholars who have translated the phrase similarly as 'the unique teacher' (Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995; Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Wacholder 2007). However, further down the same column, CD 20.31-32 reads:

> [20.31]and have been instructed in the first ordinances by which אנשי[32] היחיד were judged (CD 20.31-32).

An intriguing parallel exists in the Community Rule:

> and they shall be judged by the first ordinances in which אנשי היחד began to be instructed (1QS 9.10).

This suggests that היחיד might be a variant form of היחד ('the Yahad/ Community'), in which case אנשי היחיד could likewise be rendered 'the Men of the Community'.[24] Furthermore, it would follow that היחיד, taken as an objective genitive in this way, would render מורה היחיד 'the Teacher of the Community' (Davies 1983; Knibb 1994a; Vermes 2004).[25] Unfortunately we have only the mediaeval manuscript B of the Damascus Document upon which to found any assumptions as the passage is not paralleled among the fragmentary Qumran-related material. Nevertheless we shall follow the majority of scholars in rendering אנשי היחיד 'the Men

22 Qimron 1992a: 44–45; Schechter 1970: 75 n. 24. For the use of similar correction procedures among the Qumran-related Dead Sea Scrolls, see Tov 1999 (esp. 251).

23 Schechter 1970: 75.

24 Indeed, Elisha Qimron notes in his transcription of CD to read היחד for היחיד (1992a: 46–49). So too Eduard Lohse (1981: 104–107). See further, Claussen and Davis 2007; de Moor 1957; Metso 2006b: 292. Cf. Clines (ed.) 1998; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995. Note, however, 'the men of the Unique One' (Wacholder 2007).

25 It is intriguing that Baumgarten and Schwartz render מורה היחיד 'the unique Teacher', yet translate אנשי היחיד a few lines later as 'the men of the Community' (Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995). In similar fashion, Wise, Abegg and Cook refer to 'the Beloved Teacher' and 'the members of the *Yahad*' respectively (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996). Such an approach appears to be fundamentally inconsistent.

of the Community' and thus, adopting a consistent approach that regards היחיד as a variant form of היחד, render מורה היחיד 'the Teacher of the Community'.[26]

What then is the nature of this relationship between the sobriquet מורה היחיד and the other 'teacher' designations? Like מורה צדק of CD 1.11a, מורה היחיד would appear to describe a figure that has already arisen.[27] Rather than posit the existence of two historical teachers, 'the Teacher of the Community' may refer to the same figure elsewhere described as 'a teacher of righteousness'.[28] In our examination above, we concluded that מורה צדק in CD 1.11a was acclaimed as the 'one who will teach righteousness' (יורה הצדק) anticipated 'at the end of days' in the FSP (CD 6.10-11a). We can therefore further propose, at least tentatively, that this figure was given the titular designation 'the Teacher of the Community'.[29]

The passage mentions 'the day of the gathering in {האסף} of the Teacher of the Community' (CD 19.35b–20.1a), generally accepted as a reference to his death.[30] Although Ben Zion Wacholder has argued that this refers to 'the assembling of the community by the Moreh' (1988: 327), his approach has more recently been refuted by Joseph Fitzmyer who demonstrates beyond reasonable doubt that the death of 'the Teacher of the Community' is here indicated (2000: 261–65). From this point until the arrival of 'the messiah from Aaron and from Israel' (משיח מאהרן ומישראל, CD 20.1a),

> [19.33]all the men who entered the new [34]covenant in the land of Damascus and turned and betrayed and departed from the well of living water [35]shall not be reckoned in the council of the people and in their list they shall not be written. (CD 19.33b-35)

Why should the death of 'the Teacher of the Community' provide such a starting point? Perhaps it was considered that, with his death, there no longer existed the authority to allow re-admission (e.g., Murphy-O'Connor 1972: 546; cf. however, the alternative punctuation and interpretation of CD 19.33b–20.1a in Hultgren 2007 [esp. 47–53],

26   Likewise, Brownlee 1979: 48; Cross 1995: 73, 118; Davies 1983; Eshel 1999a; Fitzmyer 2000: 91; Fröhlich 1999: 296 n. 8; Knibb 1994a; Lohse 1981; Qimron 1992a; Roth 1963: 95 n. 1; Rowley 1952a: 32 n. 5; Stern 1950: 24; Talmon 1953; 1989: 53–60, 289; Vermes 2004; Wernberg-Møller 1953: 311–12.

27   However, cf. Wacholder 2002; Wiesenberg 1955: 306–308.

28   So too most scholars; see for example n. 26 above. Note however Roth (1963: 95 n. 1) and Wiesenberg (1955).

29   Of course one potential problem with such an assessment is that we have already identified יורה הצדק with 'the messiah of Aaron and Israel', whereas in CD 19.33b–20.1a 'the Teacher of the Community' is quite clearly distinct from משיח מאהרן ומישראל. We shall use the remainder of this section to explore this issue.

30   Cf. Gen. 25.8, 17; Num. 20.24-26; 2 Kgs 22.20. Note especially, Isa. 57.1-2, utilizing אסף in relation to הצדיק (see Blenkinsopp 2006a: 190–91; 2006b).

following Schechter 1970). Then again, perhaps it was his death itself that triggered this departure from the 'new covenant' and its 'well of living water' (cf. CD 3.12b-16; 6.2-5). We earlier hypothesized that the pre-Yahadic expectation of 'the messiah of Aaron and Israel' as 'one who will teach righteousness at the end of days' (cf. CD 6.10-11; 12.23–13.1) was deemed to have been fulfilled by the arrival of a figure acclaimed as such and described in these terms (e.g., מורה צדק, CD 1.11a). His death, and the understandable disappointment that would ensue for those whose messianic hopes were pinned upon him, may have prompted some to depart from the group, thus betraying the covenant in the eyes of those who remained steadfast.[31]

Whatever the circumstances, the death of 'the Teacher of the Community' appears to have necessitated an amendment of the Yahad's messianic expectations. While in the FSP, the pre-Yahadic period of the Damascus Document, a 'messiah of Aaron and Israel' is anticipated as 'one who will teach righteousness at the end of days' (cf. CD 6.10-11; 12.23–13.1), here the death of the figure to whom these descriptions were apparently applied results in the separation of the messianic and teacher roles. Though 'the Teacher of the Community' is dead, the 'messiah from Aaron and from Israel' (משיח מאהרן ומישראל; CD 20.1a) is still to come. In this context perhaps we might draw upon two passages that constitute part of the overlap between manuscripts A and B of the Cairo Damascus Document (CD 7.18–8.1; 19.10-11):

> [7.18]And the 'star' is דורש התורה, [19]who came {הבא} to Damascus, as it is written: 'A star shall come forth from Jacob and a staff shall arise [20]from Israel'. The 'staff' is נשיא כל העדה and when he arises he will destroy [21]all the sons of Seth. These escaped at the time of the first

---

31 Davies responds to the passage differently. Taking the '*new* covenant' as a gloss on the existing (old) covenant of the pre-Yahadic movement, he argues that those originally addressed here were members of the wider movement who did not accept the authority of 'the Teacher'; it is only with the addition of the gloss that the passage (wrongly?) suggests that defectors from the Yahad are addressed (Davies 1983: 176–81). The argument is certainly persuasive. However, Davies himself notes 'the fact that "new covenant" is a gloss on "covenant in the land of Damascus" at XX, 12 shows that at one point the older terminology persisted' (1983: 177). In other words, the Yahad believed themselves to be the true continuation of the (old) 'covenant in the land of Damascus' (the gloss 'new' becoming necessary only at a later stage in order to distinguish themselves from the still-existing wider movement). Therefore, it is possible that, even without the gloss, the reference to 'the covenant in the land of Damascus' might still here have referred to the Yahad. Conversely, Stephen Hultgren argues: 'The "new covenant" is the parent movement. The "covenant" is the group that rose out of the "new covenant" and that eventually became the Qumran community' (2007: 61). He nevertheless agrees that 'the Qumran community viewed itself as in continuity with its parent movement' (61), and so, as outlined above, it remains possible that either the original or the current covenant might be intended.

visitation ^{8.1}but those who drew back were delivered to the sword. (CD 7.18–8.1)

^{19.10}These will escape at the time of the visitation but those who remain will be delivered to the sword when there comes אהרן וישראל¹¹משיח. (CD 19.10-11)

It would appear that CD 7.18–8.1 is the later of the two and indeed for Davies constitutes a Yahadic revision of the passage (Davies 1983: 250–53).[32] We can discern two distinct messianic perspectives. The earliest (pre-Yahadic) period, taking CD 19.10-11 in conjunction with 6.10-11 and 12.23–13.1, looks forward to an upcoming 'visitation' and awaits the arrival of 'the messiah of Aaron and Israel' who 'will teach righteousness at the end of days'. The Yahadic period, however, knows of a 'first visitation' (and accordingly transfers the sentence into the perfect; e.g., מלטו [7.21] rather than ימלטו [19.10]), reveres 'the Teacher of the Community' who has died and awaits the arrival of 'the messiah from Aaron and from Israel' who is perhaps to be identified with 'the Prince of all the Congregation' (cf. CD 7.20-21; 20.1a). This latter figure is juxtaposed in CD 7.18–8.1 with 'the Seeker of the Law'. The דורש התורה 'who came to Damascus' represents the movement's origins (cf. CD 6.2-11a) while 'the Prince of all the Congregation' appears to represent the Yahad's renewed messianic eschatological expectations.[33] The occasion for such a renewal would appear on the strength of our analysis to be the death of the one in whom the group's messianic hopes had been invested, 'the Teacher of the Community'.[34]

---

32   That the Zechariah–Ezekiel midrash found in CD 19.10-11 is earlier than the Amos–Numbers midrash of 7.18–8.1 has been argued by several prominent scholars; see Brooke 1980 (cf. 1991a); Davies 1983; 1987; 2000c; Kister 2007; Knibb 1991; (originally) Murphy-O'Connor 1971a; 1971b; Wacholder 2002; Wise 1999: 323–24 n. 9. For the opposite interpretation of the text, see Murphy-O'Connor 1985; cf. Grossman 2002: 159–60. Note also, White Crawford 1987. The scholarly debate is summarized in Wassen 2005: 20 n. 5. See further, the recent discussion and reformulation in Hultgren 2007: esp. 29–39.

33   On understanding דמשק הבא as a reference to the past arrival of דורש התורה, see Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995; Davies 1983: 147; 2000c; Dupont-Sommer 1961: 134; Murphy-O'Connor 1985: 242. However, הבא may also indicate a future event (so Brooke 1980; Collins 1994a; Knibb 1991; Vermes 2004). The depiction of דורש התורה as a figure of the past in CD 6.2-11a would lend weight to the former interpretation. Nevertheless, as Brooke astutely observes, 'by taking into account the redactional history of the Damascus Document both scholarly interpretations might be seen to be correct' (1991a: 225). In other words, the very ambiguity of this phrase may have given rise to an alternative reading within the community, reinterpreting דורש התורה as an eschatological figure. In this context, note 4Q174 frg. 1, 1.11-13 (cf. 1QS 9.11).

34   For a detailed overview of messianism in the scrolls, see Collins 1994b; 1995a; Duhaime 2000a; García Martínez 1995b; Knibb 1999; VanderKam 1994b. On shifting messianic perspectives, Davies notes, 'the utter unlikelihood of any group's sustaining such expectation in an unaltered form over two hundred years. ... Some kind of cognitive

CD 20.13-15

An apparent further reference to this figure appears at CD 20.13-15:

> [20.13]And from the day of [14]the gathering in {האספ} of יורה היחיד until the end of all the Men of War who turned back [15]with איש הכזב there will be about forty years.

The form יורה היחיד is reminiscent of יורה הצדק (6.11a) and it is tempting to think it might deliberately echo this scripturally-loaded 'original' expectation.[35] There is uncommon unanimity in translating יורה היחיד in identical fashion to מורה היחיד, regarding יורה as either nominal or an error for מורה.[36] Thus, we have here another reference to 'the day of the gathering in of the Teacher of the Community' (cf. CD 19.35–20.1). This sobriquet appears to borrow directly from the pre-Yahadic expectation of יורה הצדק in the FSP with regard to the prominence of a didactic role. The preservation of מורה/יורה in the ESP can be seen to hark back to the expectation of a 'teacher' in the earliest layer of the text. Thus, as a label, מורה/יורה היחיד functions in such a way as to echo the role prescribed in CD 6.10-11a; by utilizing the capacity of 'teacher', it makes the implicit claim that the figure so labelled is indeed the anticipated יורה הצדק. This is made all the more clear by the explicit description of this figure elsewhere in the text as 'a teacher of righteousness' (מורה צדק, CD 1.11).

As with CD 19.33b–20.1a, the death of 'the Teacher of the Community' in 20.13-15 signals the start of a specified period of time. In the former, the period will end with the arrival of 'the messiah from Aaron and from Israel'. In the latter, the period will last 'until the end of all the Men of War who turned back with איש הכזב' and will be 'about forty years' in length. The repetition of the formula 'from the day of the gathering in of the Teacher of the Community until' suggests the possibility at least that the same period is here referred to; in other words that the renewed messianic expectations of the group envisaged the arrival of 'the messiah

---

dissonance ... surely has to be reckoned with' (1985: 42; so too Blenkinsopp 2006a: 283; see further, Esler and Hagedorn 2005: 28–29; Rodd 1981). Cf. Elledge (2007) who warns against messianic harmonization in the scrolls, especially with regard to נשיא (כל) העדה.

35   For the reading יורה היחיד, see Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Lohse 1981; Qimron 1992a. Cf. however, יוריה היחיד (Schechter 1970: 76, 100; followed by Davies 1983: 262).

36   Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995; Davies 1983; Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Knibb 1994a; Schechter 1970; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996. Of course, this raises once again the question of whether יורה הצדק (CD 6.11) might be regarded a variant of מורה הצדק (see Rabinowitz 1958: 393). However, both the tense and context of CD 6.10-11 are clearly orientated towards the future (עד עמד יורה הצדק באחרית הימים; 6.10), supporting the legitimacy of the verbal form we find there; see our discussion in Chapter 2 (esp. n. 10; cf. Davies 1988: 313; Stuckenbruck 2007b; Wacholder 2002).

'teacher' (Callaway 1988: 111–12; Vermes 2004: 58–59; Wiesenberg 1955: 305–306). Campbell notes the influence of Deut. 2.14 upon both the proposed timeframe and the reference to the impending end of 'all the Men of War' (1995a: 161–171; cf. Steudel 1993: 238).[37] The 'cognitive dissonance' resulting from the death of one who had perhaps been perceived as the expected 'messiah of Aaron and Israel' (cf. CD 6.10-11; 12.23–13.1) is tackled by the use of scriptural terms, likening the group to the generation in the wilderness who had to wait until the faithless אנשי המלחמה among them had perished before God would fulfil his promise and allow them to occupy the land (cf. Deut. 1.35; 2.7; 2.14).[38] This affords us a glimpse of the self-understanding of the group and the mould in which they perceived themselves to be cast.

CD 20.27-34

The final passage from the Yahadic recension of the Damascus Document to contain relevant terminology is CD 20.27-34:

> [20.27]But all who hold fast to these ordinances, to go out [28]and to come in according to התורה and listen to the voice of מורה, and confess before God 'We have sinned, [29]we have done wickedly, both we and our fathers, in walking contrary to the decrees of the covenant, [30]and true are your judgements against us', and do not raise a hand against his holy decrees and righteous [31]ordinances and true testimonies, and have been instructed in the first ordinances by which אנשי היחיד[32] were judged, and listened to the voice of מורה צדק, and do not reject [33]the decrees of righteousness when they hear them, these will rejoice and be glad, and their heart will be strong, and they will prevail [34]over all the sons of the world, and God will atone for them and they will see his salvation for they have taken refuge in his holy name.

In contrast to those groups who are perceived to have in one form or another rejected the covenant and will be punished accordingly (CD 20.8b-27), this passage lists the various attainments by which those true to the covenant will be recognized and thus 'prevail over all the sons of the world' (CD 20.33-34). Among these feature adherence to התורה (the 'well' of CD 6.2-11a; cf. Num. 21.18) and instruction in 'the first ordinances by which אנשי היחיד were judged' (cf. 1QS 9.10). More interestingly for our purposes, significant import is attached to 'the voice of a teacher {מורה}' (CD 20.28) or 'the voice of a teacher of righteousness {מורה צדק}' (CD 20.32). We might justly assume that the same figure is here referred to rather than posit two teachers whose voices must be listened to, though of course the possibility cannot be entirely dis-

---

37   Also, Num. 14.32-34(?) See Eshel 1999a.
38   See further, Davies 1983: 187–88.

counted.[39] That this prominent authority's role is described as that of
מורה once again harks back to the FSP and its expectation of יורה הצדק
(CD 6.10-11a). Such an identification is made explicit by the further
description of this figure as מורה צדק (CD 20.32; cf. 1.10-11a). In other
words, the labels used to describe this figure deliberately echo the
language of CD 6.10-11a in such a way as to both imply and on occasion
make explicit that the 'teacher' whose voice must be listened to is in fact
the one who has been expected; the group's conviction that the anticipated
יורה הצדק had indeed arrived is therefore demonstrated and reinforced
through the labels they attach to him.

Further examples of this persuasive use of language come from a
comparison of this passage with that examined in the pre-Yaḥadic layer of
the text (CD 6.2-11a). The present passage advocates stringent adherence
to התורה. If we are right in assuming that, in the context of the Damascus
Document at least, this is synonymous with the 'well' of CD 6.2-11a (cf.
Num. 21.18), then while others have 'departed from the well of living
water' (CD 19.33b-35) the group considers itself to be the true inheritors
of this 'well' dug by the שבי ישראל. They perceive themselves therefore as
the legitimate continuation of the original pre-Yaḥadic group, one
defining characteristic being their recognition that the יורה הצדק has
arrived.[40] Such a claim is perhaps also to be recognized more subtly in the
insistence of the present passage that those here blessed 'do not reject the
decrees of righteousness {חקי הצדק} when they hear them' (CD 20.32-
33). This brings to mind the decrees issued by 'the Seeker of the Law' to be
followed for the interim period until the arrival of יורה הצדק באחרית
הימים:

> [6.8]And the 'nobles of the people' are [9]those who come to excavate the
> 'well' with the sceptres {/decrees; מחוקקות} which 'the sceptre' decreed
> {חקק} [10]to walk in during all the age of wickedness (…), until there
> shall arise [11]one who will teach righteousness at the end of days. (CD
> 6.8-11a)

The clear implication of the passage is that the decrees issued by 'the
Seeker of the Law' are valid only for 'the age of wickedness' and may be
abrogated by those issued by the יורה הצדק at 'the end of days'.
Acceptance of both the arrival of such 'a teacher of righteousness' and the
authority of his voice go hand in hand with accepting both his abrogation
of the previous decrees and their replacement (or supplementation) with
his own. Perhaps in this light we can better understand the reference to

---

39   E.g., Jerome Murphy-O'Connor argues that מורה (CD 20.28) should be understood
as a reference to God, while he considers מורה צדק (20.32) to refer to 'the Teacher of
Righteousness' (1972: 559). However, Davies regards his interpretation as 'improbable'
(1983: 195).

40   See n. 31 above.

'the decrees of righteousness' (חקי הצדק) in CD 20.32-33. Thus, those who will 'prevail over all the sons of the world' (CD 20.33-34) are those who 'listened to the voice of a teacher of righteousness, and do not reject the decrees of righteousness when they hear them' (CD 20.32-33); once again, the crux of the message is that the יורה הצדק has arrived.[41]

   Though it is unclear from this passage whether the 'teacher' whose authority carries such weight is alive or dead, if taken with the rest of our analysis of the ESP of the Damascus Document it would appear likely that *continued adherence to his teaching after his death* is here referred to (cf. CD 1.10-11a; 19.33b–20.1a; 20.13-15). That 'the voice of a teacher of righteousness' continued to be authoritative even after his death is significant as it indicates that, despite the need for renewed messianic expectations reinterpreting the arrival of 'the messiah from Aaron and from Israel' as an event yet to happen (cf. CD 19.35–20.1a), fidelity to the 'teacher' and the maintenance of his decrees remained a central qualification for membership of the group.

<div align="center">

Summary

</div>

Though the sobriquet מורה הצדק does not occur in the Damascus Document, it would appear that some development of related terms can indeed be traced. The pre-Yahadic expectation of 'one who will teach righteousness' (יורה הצדק, itself a designation drawn from an interpretation of Hos. 10.12) is deliberately echoed in the ESP labels applied to a figure who was held to fulfil this role. He is described as both 'a teacher' (מורה, CD 20.28) and, in more definite terms, as 'the Teacher of the Community' (מורה/יורה היחיד, CD 20.1; 20.14). It is his description twice-over as 'a teacher of righteousness' (מורה צדק, CD 1.11; 20.32), however, that draws most clearly in form upon the pre-Yahadic expectation and, in doing so, claims the fulfilment of the anticipated role.[42] This, which we might view in a polemical light (establishing in unambiguous terms the perceived identity of the so-called 'teacher' in the face of opposition), may go some way towards explaining the prominence elsewhere of what has come to be regarded as the 'standard' form, מורה הצדק.

---

41   In this context, we might understand 'the first ordinances' (CD 20.31) to refer to the original decrees issued by 'the Seeker of the Law' and now supplemented by 'the decrees of righteousness' (CD 20.33); cf. Davies 1983: 197.

42   Indeed, Bengtsson suggests that 'It can be assumed that at the time of the composition of the CD, there was no unified way of referring to the person we know as the Teacher' (2000a: 193). The consistently definite usage of מורה/יורה היחיד (CD 20.1; 20.14), however, and its similarity in form to the 'standard' מורה הצדק, might suggest that if the 'teacher' was known by any specific title in the Yahadic recension of the Damascus Document it was 'the Teacher of the Community'. See Chapter 1, n. 54.

2. 'The Spouter of the Lie'
CD 1.10-18a

The Yahadic recension of the Damascus Document contains several instances of terminology relevant to our examination of the sobriquet מטיף הכזב. The first of these passages appears immediately after the reference to מורה צדק in the first column of CD:

> [1.10]But God perceived their deeds, for they sought him {דרשוהו} with a whole heart, [11]*and he raised up for them* מורה צדק *to lead them in the way of his heart.* And he made known [12]to later generations what he had done to *the last generation,* a congregation of traitors. [13]*They are those who departed from the way. That was the time about which it is written, 'like a stray heifer,* [14]*so Israel strayed', when arose* איש הלצון *who spouted to Israel* [15]*waters of a lie* {הטיף לישראל מימי כזב} *and led them astray in a wilderness without a way, to bring low the everlasting heights and depart* [16]*from the paths of righteousness and to remove the boundary which the forefathers had established in their inheritance, in order that* [17]*the curses of his covenant would cling to them, delivering them to the avenging sword of the vengeance of the* [18]*covenant.* (CD 1.10-18a)[43]

This passage is paralleled in 4Q266 (frg. 2, 1.14-21) where the designation איש הלצון is partially attested. This would appear to be most suitably rendered 'the Man of Scoffing' (cf. Davies 1983; Schechter 1970) and occurs only once in the Damascus Document (though note the plural, אנשי הלצון, in CD 20.11).[44] According to Campbell, the designation itself stems from a reference to 'men of scoffing' (אנשי לצון) in Isa. 28.14 (cf. v. 22).[45] These are described as being in a position of authority in Jerusalem and having taken refuge in lies (כזב) and falsehood (שקר). The figure designated 'the Man of Scoffing' in the Damascus Document would presumably therefore, according to Campbell's analysis, encapsulate in a singular form the accusations levelled more generally at the אנשי לצון of Isa. 28.14. In this context it is interesting to note that he is accused of

---

43   Italics signify the Yahadic glosses/expansions to the text, following Davies 1983 (232–35; cf. 61–72).

44   Other translations of איש הלצון include 'the scoffer' (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Knibb 1994a; Vermes 2004; Wacholder 2007) and 'the man of mockery' (Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995; Dupont-Sommer 1961; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996).

45   Campbell 1995a: 51–67. The phrase אנשי לצון also appears in Prov. 29.8 where they are contrasted with 'the wise' (cf. Bengtsson 2000a: 95–96). Furthermore, note the reference to אנשי הלצון in CD 20.11, to be examined below. Richardson (1955), in his examination of forms derived from ליץ, suggests that לצון of Isa. 28.14 should be rendered in reference to drunken 'babbling'. Such a negatively associated form of speech would not be an incongruous interpretation of the sectarian polemic against איש הלצון (note also the use of נטף: CD 1.14; cf. 4.19-20; 8.13; 19.25). See further ליץ and נטף in Clines (ed.) 1998; 2001; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995.

having 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie' (הטיף לישראל מימי כזב, CD 1.14-15), a phrase that contains in some form both elements of the sobriquet מטיף הכזב. The metaphorical usage of 'waters of a lie' plays on the dual understanding of נטף as both 'to spout/drip' and 'to preach', and is reminiscent of the same duality with regard to ירה in reference to 'raining' or 'teaching'.[46] The proximity of these two terms in the first column of CD ensures that the one who arose and 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie' (CD 1.14-15) is set in sharp contrast both contextually and terminologically to the figure who was raised up as 'a teacher of righteousness' (CD 1.10-11).[47]

The pairing of נטף and כזב is often ascribed to a dependence upon Mic. 2.11, which reads:

> If a man, walking in wind and falsehood, lies {כזב} (saying), 'I will preach {/spout: אטף} to you of wine and strong drink', he would be a preacher {/spouter: מטיף} for this people.

Other than the appearance of נטף and כזב, nothing in particular about this passage is reminiscent of CD 1.10-18a. If, however, נטף was employed in CD 1.14 primarily to contrast the similarly ambivalent term ירה (itself drawn from Hos. 10.12 and interpreted in the FSP of the text in reference to the anticipated יורה הצדק, CD 6.10-11a) and therefore used to compare two types of teaching, the qualification of such spouting as כזב might well have been drawn from such a use of נטף in Mic. 2.11.[48]

'The Man of Scoffing' is thus described in terms that ideologically polarize him from the one who is 'a teacher of righteousness'. He is further accused of having 'led them (Israel) astray in a wilderness without a way' (יתעם בתוהו לא דרך, CD 1.15). Though this phrase may be drawn from Job 12.24 or Ps. 107.40 (Campbell 1995a: 51–67; Knibb 1994a: 24), Isa. 9.13-15 similarly links false teaching with being led astray and it is interesting to speculate whether this might also have had some bearing upon CD 1.14-15. It reads:

> [9.13]So the LORD cut off from Israel head and tail, palm branch and reed in one day–[14]elders and dignitaries are the head, and a prophet who teaches falsehood {נביא מורה-שקר} is the tail; [15]for those who led this people led them astray {מתעים}, and those who were led by them were left in confusion. (Isa. 9.13-15)[49]

---

46   See Clines (ed.) 1998; 2001; Davidson 2002; Holladay 2000; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995; 1996.

47   Jeremias 1963: 313. Also, Thiering 1978: 201; VanderKam 2003: 473.

48   Mic. 2.11 would certainly appear to have had a more specific influence upon passages containing related terminology elsewhere in the Damascus Document, as we shall examine below (e.g., CD 4.19-20; 8.12-13; 19.24b-26a).

49   Note the affinity with those who 'prophesied falsehood' (ינבאו שקר) in the FSP (CD 6.1) and the presence of מורה (cf. יורה הצדק; מורה צדק).

By comparison, the figure described as 'a teacher of righteousness' has been raised up by God 'to lead them in the way of his heart' (CD 1.11a). The two characters, 'the Man of Scoffing' and 'the Teacher of the Community' (if indeed such was the title applied to the figure described in CD 1.10-11a), are immediately set in opposition by the specific use of scriptural terminology employed to describe them. Two types of teaching and two brands of leadership are contrasted in this passage, represented by two opposing individual figures. It is noteworthy that the terminology used to describe their respective teaching employs (in an indefinite, descriptive sense) the very elements that comprise the two sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב, even though these titles themselves have not yet appeared.

The label 'the Man of Scoffing' would appear to refer to a figure of the past from the perspective of the ESP (though cf. Wacholder 2007). The Yahadic recension of the text identifies the 'congregation of traitors' (עדת בוגדים, CD 1.12) of the FSP as 'the last generation' (CD 1.12) and 'those who departed from the way' (CD 1.13). According to this revision they were led astray by איש הלצון, who 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie' (CD 1.14-15). However, as Phillip Callaway states, it is unclear whether this figure should be regarded as 'anterior to or relatively contemporary with the Teacher', noting further that: 'Even if one should consider them to be contemporary, there is still no information about a direct confrontation between them' (1988: 115).[50] Davies does not altogether discount the possibility that the passage is original and, in that context, referred to the pre-exilic generation having been led astray (Davies 1983: 70).[51] Nevertheless, the present text would appear to understand this passage in relation to more recent events (for example, the gloss (?) identifying 'the congregation of traitors' as 'the last generation').[52] In particular, the insertion of a figure described in distinctly opposing terms as 'a teacher of righteousness' (CD 1.11) invites the reader to understand the two figures as contemporaneous.

If, however, we are correct in identifying the reference to מורה צדק (CD 1.11a) as secondary, itself drawing upon the pre-Yahadic expectation of יורה הצדק (CD 6.11a), then the fact that the description of 'the Man of Scoffing' appears to have been deliberately conceived in opposition to this figure (e.g., נטף/ה/ירה) might suggest that it too is the result of

---

50   See further Callaway 1988: 116–21.

51   The secondary nature of CD 1.13-18a is upheld however by Michael Knibb, who argues that, unlike the original pre-Yahadic text, the inserted passage 'is concerned not with the nation as a whole, but with a specific group associated with "the scoffer" ... The effect of the insertion is to make the whole of I.13–II.1 refer to this rival group' (1994a: 23).

52   Davies 1983: 214 n. 33. Joseph Blenkinsopp (2006a: 25) notes that עדת בוגדים (CD 1.12) might be suggested by the use of בגד in Isa. 24.16-17 (cf. CD 4.14-19).

interpolation.[53] In either case, on a conceptual level at least (if not necessarily a historical one), the reader is presented with two figures set firmly in opposition; one who 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie and led them astray in a wilderness without a way' (CD 1.14-15) and one who was raised up by God as 'a teacher of righteousness to lead them in the way of his heart' (CD 1.11a). From the perspective of the *historical* question we are perhaps unable to ascertain the precise relationship between 'the Man of Scoffing' and 'the Teacher of the Community'; questions as to whether or not they were contemporary or came into confrontation remain unanswered (though, significantly, it appears likely that this was at least understood to be the case by readers of the Yahadic recension of the text).[54] Nevertheless, for our examination of the development of the sobriquets, it is sufficient to observe that, even without the appearance of the titles מטיף הכזב and מורה הצדק, a figure described as one who 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie' is in this passage set in marked opposition to 'a teacher of righteousness'.

In terms of such development, there is an intriguing parallel between CD 1.15-16 and a passage examined in the FSP. As seen, 'the Man of Scoffing', as well as having 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie', is accused of having:

> [1.15]led them astray {יתעם} in a wilderness without a way, to bring low the everlasting heights and depart [16]from the paths of righteousness and to remove the boundary {לסיע גבול} which the forefathers had established in their inheritance. (CD 1.15-16)

Similarly, in the FSP we are presented with those who 'prophesied falsehood' (ינבאו שקר, 6.1), who are described as:

> those who moved the boundary {מסיגי הגבול} and led Israel astray {יתעו את ישראל}. (CD 5.20)[55]

If we are right in identifying CD 1.13-18a as a Yahadic interpolation, then it would appear quite plausible that the pre-Yahadic CD 5.20–6.2 has exerted some influence upon the passage. Certainly, according to our analysis above, the arrival of 'a teacher of righteousness' in CD 1.10-11a is

---

53   The precedence of ירה over נטף is indicated by the clear dependence of the FSP's יורה הצדק (CD 6.11) upon ירה צדק of Hos. 10.12 (see Chapter 2). By comparison, the two elements מטיף and כזב have a weaker relationship in Mic. 2.11, suggesting that, while the passage may provide a likely scriptural precedent for the coupling of these elements, the inspiration for the employment of נטף was the use elsewhere in the text of the similarly ambivalent ירה.

54   Davies likewise notes that uncertainty with regard to the referent of איש הלצון, 'leaves open the question whether any particular individual in the history of the Qumran community can be associated with the soubriquet' (1983: 70).

55   Qimron notes that 4Q266 frg. 3, 2.7 reads מסני גבול in place of מסיגי הגבול (1992a: 19). Cf. 4Q267 frg. 2, 4.

directly dependent upon the expectation of יורה הצדק in CD 6.2-11a. In this context, Davies (1983: 120–21), following Stegemann (1971: 162–64, 184), rightly warns against taking all occurrences of boundary moving in the Damascus Document in reference to the same group and, while noting the ideological similarities between the prophesying of falsehood and the spouting/preaching of lies, is careful to distinguish between the two.[56] Such an approach is undoubtedly correct as those who 'prophesied falsehood' and 'moved the boundary' in CD 5.20–6.2 are presented as figures of the (pre-exilic?) past from the perspective of the FSP, while the later Yahadic recension of CD 1.10-18a appears to be concerned with more recent events.[57]

However, the possibility remains that, though different *historical* groups are here implied, the Yahadic edition of the text deliberately employs borrowed terminology to portray the later group as a 'continuation' of the earlier one, making the two ideologically identical. We examined in the previous chapter how the pre-Yahadic text anticipated the arrival of 'one who will teach righteousness' as an 'eschatological' successor to 'the holy anointed ones' (משיחי הקודש, CD 6.1).[58] Whilst these were the instruments of God's teaching in the past, the anointed יורה הצדק (cf. CD 12.23–13.1) will confer God's teaching 'at the end of days' (CD 6.11; cf. Hos. 10.12). In similar fashion, just as 'the holy anointed ones' of old had their counterparts in those who 'prophesied falsehood' (ינבאו שקר, CD 6.1), who 'moved the boundary and led Israel astray' (CD 5.20), so in the ESP a singular figure labelled 'a teacher of righteousness' (CD 1.11a) is set in opposition to one who 'spouted {/preached} to Israel waters of a lie' and 'led them astray (. . .) to remove the boundary which the forefathers had established in their inheritance' (CD 1.15-16). Though Davies and Stegemann are correct to distinguish between the groups of CD 1.11-18a and 5.20–6.2, the deliberate appropriation of terminology suggests that the two can be understood as ideologically identical and is perhaps crucial for our understanding of sobriquet development in the Damascus Document. 'The Man of Scoffing' would appear to have been deliberately cast in the mould of ינבאו שקר (CD 6.1), his description as one who 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie' demonstrating a preference for נטף over נבא, thus providing a sharper contrast with the act of ירה.[59]

---

56 See further R.T. White 1990: 92 n. 43.

57 E.g., the apparent gloss, בדור אחרון (CD 1.12); cf. Davies 1983: 214 n. 33.

58 משיחי הקודש corrected from משיחו הקודש, following 4Q267 frg. 2, 6; 6Q15 frg. 3, 4 (cf. Fitzmyer 2000: 88–90; Qimron 1992a; Rabinowitz 1954: 20 n. 41).

59 On this understanding, the replacement of שקר with the equivalent כזב would result from the subsequent prominence of Mic. 2.11 in the mind of the Yahadic redactor.

CD 4.19-20

The notion of 'spouting' recurs in a passage that warns of the 'three nets of Belial' (שלושת מצודות בליעל, CD 4.15; see Eshel 2007):

> [4.19]The 'builders of the wall' who walked after צו, *the* צו *is* מטיף [20]*of whom he said 'they shall surely spout* {הטף יטיפון}', are caught in two (nets). (CD 4.19-20)[60]

Schechter, noting the intrusive gloss concerning צו, translated this expression 'the commanding one' (Schechter 1970), taking it as a derivative of צוה.[61] More recently, however, while some scholars render it 'precept' (Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996), most have preferred to leave it effectively untranslated (Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995; Davies 1983; Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Knibb 1994a).[62] The accusation that the 'builders of the wall' are those who הלכו אחרי צו (CD 4.19) would appear to be dependent upon the similar phrase, הלך אחרי־צו, in Hos. 5.11 (made in reference to Ephraim and rendered by the NRSV, 'to go after vanity', with a note adding that the meaning of the Hebrew is uncertain).[63] Interestingly, this apparent scriptural precedent for walking 'after צו' occurs in the context of moving the boundary (מסיגי גבול, Hos. 5.10), reminiscent of CD 1.16 and 5.20, examined already. A further scriptural occurrence of צו, and one that is potentially even more significant for our purposes, occurs in Isa. 28.10-13, where the phrase צו לצו צו לצו appears twice (rendered by the NRSV, 'precept upon precept, precept upon precept', again with a note adding that the meaning of the Hebrew is uncertain). Here it is in the immediate context of the reference to the 'men of scoffing' (אנשי לצון, Isa. 28.14), those who have taken refuge in lies (כזב) and falsehood (שקר). As seen, Campbell deems this passage a likely scriptural precedent for the label 'the Man of Scoffing' (איש הלצון, CD 1.14).[64]

The scriptural association of צו with boundary-moving (Hos. 5.10-11) and 'men of scoffing' (Isa. 28.10-14) already highlights a relationship between CD 4.19-20 and 1.10-18a, and in particular between צו and 'the

---

60   Italics signify the Yahadic glosses/expansions to the text, following Davies 1983 (242–43; cf. 108–19). Paralleled in 4Q269 frg. 3, 1–2; 6Q15 frg. 1, 1–2. Interestingly, Milik in his preliminary transcription of 4Q269 proposed to read מטיף [הכזב] in order to extend the line (see J.M. Baumgarten 1996: 126), though the absence of this form elsewhere in the Damascus Document renders such a reconstruction highly unlikely. More probable would be the indefinite form מטיף כזב (cf. CD 8.13), though the lack of such in CD 4.19-20 means that this reconstruction in 4Q269 would be pure conjecture.

61   Schechter 1970: 68 n. 23.

62   See צו, צוה and שוא in Koehler and Baumgartner 1996; 1999.

63   Cf. Campbell 1995a: 116–31.

64   Campbell 1995a: 51–67. See n. 45 above.

Man of Scoffing'.[65] This is heightened by the Yahadic gloss identifying הצו as 'a spouter' (מטיף, CD 4.19), about whom the words 'they shall surely spout' (הטף יטיפון, CD 4.20) are quoted in an apparent allusion to Mic. 2.6. This latter citation appears in the same immediate context as Mic. 2.11, already identified as a likely scriptural precedent for the coupling of the two elements מטיף and כזב. The expression צו would appear then to be connected with the concept of false or unwholesome preaching both in its scriptural setting (Hos. 5.10-11; Isa. 28.10-14) and in its employment in the Damascus Document (CD 4.19-20). Indeed, André Dupont-Sommer goes so far as to suggest that צו may have an onomatopoeic function 'to describe ironically a prophet's prating' (1961: 128 n. 10).[66]

The followers of צו are described as the 'builders of the wall' (בוני החיץ, CD 4.19), seemingly an allusion to Ezek. 13 which refers to the people who build a wall (בנה חיץ, Ezek. 13.10) and the false prophets they follow who daub it with whitewash (טחי תפל, Ezek. 13.11).[67] Once again the expression צו is linked with the concept of false prophecy. Schechter claimed that it was the Pharisees who were here accused (1970: 68 n. 22) while others have identified the 'builders of the wall' with Israel at large, at least in the pre-Yahadic context of the passage (Davies 1983: 111–13; Knibb 1994a: 42). Michael Knibb notes that the accusations of taking two wives in a lifetime (CD 4.20–5.6) and niece-marriage (CD 5.7-11) made against the 'builders of the wall' applied to 'Jewish society in general' (1994a: 42), but adds that the Yahadic gloss, 'the צו is a spouter of whom he said "they shall surely spout"' (CD 4.19-20), has:

> the effect of making charges levelled against … Judaism in general refer to a specific group under the leadership of an individual called 'the preacher'. (Knibb 1994a: 42)

On this analysis, in the ESP the 'builders of the wall' have become synonymous with the followers of 'the Man of Scoffing' (איש הלצון) who 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie and led them astray' (CD 1.14-15). This may in turn suggest that 'Israel' in CD 1.14 could be understood in a narrow sense with regard to a specific group led astray by 'the Man of Scoffing'.

---

65 VanderKam even suggests: 'Perhaps the overlap in letters between צו and לצון is not accidental' (2003: 474).

66 Similarly, William Holladay renders צו a 'syllable mimicking prophetic speech' (2000: 304). Cf. Campbell 1995a: 125 n. 57. See further, Koehler and Baumgartner 1996.

67 בוני החיץ corrected from בוני החיץ (CD 4.19; 8.12, 18), following Schechter (1970) and Qimron (1992a). Cf. CD 19.24-25, 31 (בוני החיץ).

CD 8.12-13/19.24b-26a

The 'builders of the wall' reappear in the context of a highly significant passage for our examination of the development of the sobriquet, מטיף הכזב:

> [8.12]But all these things they did not understand, the 'builders of the wall' and the 'daubers of whitewash', because [13]a raiser of wind {שוקל רוח} and מטיף כזב spouted {הטיף} to them, against all of whose congregation the anger of God was kindled. (CD 8.12-13)

Here we are presented with a reference to מטיף כזב (note the absence of the definite article), rendered variously '[one who] dropped lies' (Schechter 1970), '[one who] preaches lies' (Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Knibb 1994a) or 'a spouter/ spewer of lies' (Davies 1983 and Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996 respectively). Baumgarten and Schwartz (1995) render the phrase 'the Spouter of the Lie', thus seemingly reading מטיף כזב as synonymous with the definite form מטיף הכזב. Sensitive to the absence of the definite article, however, we shall read 'a spouter of a lie', akin to our treatment elsewhere in the ESP of מורה צדק ('a teacher of righteousness', CD 1.11).

As already noted, the coupling of מטיף and כזב would appear to be dependant upon Mic. 2.11, which reads:

> If a man, walking in wind {הלך רוח} and falsehood, lies {כזב} (saying), 'I will preach {/spout; אטף} to you of wine and strong drink', he would be a preacher {/spouter; מטיף} for this people.

CD 8.12-13 describes the figure of 'a spouter of a lie' as 'a raiser of wind' (שוקל רוח; CD 8.13), thus forming another partial parallel with Mic. 2.11 where the 'spouter' is described as 'walking in wind' (הלך רוח).[68] The influence of Mic. 2.11 becomes indisputable once we consider CD 19.24b-26a, a passage from manuscript B of the Cairo Damascus Document that parallels the present passage from manuscript A:

> [19.24]But all these things they did not understand, the 'builders of [25]the wall' and 'daubers of whitewash', because of a walker of wind {הולך רוח} and raiser of storms {שקל סופות} and a spouter to men [26]of a lie {מטיף אדם לכזב}, against all of whose congregation the anger of God was kindled. (CD 19.24b-26a)

Here the 'spouter' is explicitly described as 'a walker of wind'. However, it is to be noted that the elements מטיף and כזב are no longer in such close association, having been separated by 'אדם ל', rendering the phrase 'a spouter to men of a lie' (CD 19.25-26).[69] Schechter notes that מטיף אדם

---

68   Cf. הנביאים יהיו לרוח (Jer. 5.13).
69   Literally, 'a spouter of men to a lie' (Davies 1983: 260–61).

(CD 19.25) is reminiscent of מטיף העם (Mic. 2.11).[70] Furthermore, the description in manuscript A of 'a raiser of wind' (שוקל רוח, CD 8.13) might be explained by the presence of שקל in manuscript B, in reference to a 'raiser of storms' (שקל סופות, CD 19.25). It would follow that manuscript B might preserve a slightly earlier reading of the variant phrase, directly dependent upon Mic. 2.11 for the elements מטיף, כזב and הולך רוח (and perhaps the inclusion of אדם, paralleling העם):

כי הולך רוח ושקל סופות ומטיף אדם לכזב (CD 19.25-26)

Manuscript A, by comparison, harbours less affinity with Mic. 2.11 and would appear instead to preserve a condensed form of the above phrase, replacing הולך רוח ושקל סופות, for example, with simply שוקל רוח:

כי שוקל רוח ומטיף כזב (CD 8.12-13)

According to this understanding, it is CD 8.12-13 that, abbreviating the passage in manuscript B, first establishes מטיף and כזב in a construct relationship (in the Damascus Document at least), a move that we might anticipate to be vital in the development of the sobriquet, מטיף הכזב.

In addition to Mic. 2.11, Ezekiel 13 would appear to have exerted some influence upon CD 8.12-13 and 19.24b-26a, as evidenced by reference to the 'builders of the wall' (בוני החיץ, CD 8.12; 19.24-25) and 'daubers of whitewash' (טחי (ה)תפל, CD 8.12; 19.25).[71] In Ezekiel 13, it is 'the people' who build the wall (בנה חיץ, Ezek. 13.10) and false prophets who daub it with whitewash (טחי תפל, Ezek. 13.11). However, in CD 8.12-13 and 19.24b-26a both of these groups are placed under the influence of a singular 'false prophet' cast in the language of Mic. 2.11 as 'a spouter of a lie'. Consequently, Knibb suggests that the 'daubers of whitewash' should be understood in the Damascus Document more generally as the leaders of the people (1994a: 68). The combination of scriptural passages in this context effectively *creates* a prominent individual role that does not independently exist in either Mic. 2.11 or Ezekiel 13.[72] Davies (1983: 156–69) and Knibb (1994a: 66–68) both regard the use of Mic. 2.11 as a further gloss on CD 8.12-13 and 19.24b-26a. The 'spouter' would appear to have been inserted into the text and as a consequence is placed in a position of authority over the 'builders of the wall' and 'daubers of whitewash' (so too as seen at CD 4.19-20; cf. 1.10-18a).[73] The primary concern of the

70 Schechter 1970: 74 n. 19.

71 See n. 67 above.

72 Davies notes that the 'builders of the wall' and the 'spouter' share an exegetical connection within their scriptural contexts, highlighting the parallel between Ezek. 13.8-10 and Mic. 3.5 (1983: 166–67). Cf. Eshel 1999a: 335.

73 In CD 1.10-18a, 8.12-13 and 19.24b-26a, it is noteworthy that this insertion brings him into association with a 'congregation' (עדה). The significance of this specific context will be examined further in Chapter 4.

Yahadic redaction of these passages is the presentation of an authoritative individual cast in scriptural language as an archetypal false prophet. The specific use of language employed renders this figure the ideological antithesis of the 'teacher', and thrusts him into an oppositional role within the text. It remains unclear however what, if any, historical realities might lie behind such claims.

CD 20.10-15

The final passage from the Damascus Document to be examined in relation to מטיף הכזב comes exclusively from manuscript B of CD:

> [20.10]Like the judgement {משפט} of their companions who turned back [11]with אנשי הלצון they shall be judged {ישפטו}, for they spoke perversely against the decrees of righteousness {חקי הצדק} and rejected [12]the covenant and the pact which they affirmed in the land of Damascus; *and that is the new covenant.* [13]And there shall not be for them or their families a share in the house of התורה. And from the day of [14]the gathering in {האסף} of יורה היחיד until the end of all the Men of War who turned back [15]with איש הכזב there will be about forty years. (CD 20.10-15)[74]

This is the only explicit reference in the Damascus Document to a figure designated איש הכזב (CD 20.15). There is a clear similarity between this sobriquet and מטיף הכזב. Given our understanding of the latter as 'the Spouter of the Lie', an appropriate rendering of איש הכזב, reflecting this parallel, would be 'the Man of the Lie' (so too Baumgarten and Schwartz 1995; Davies 1983; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996).[75]

Bengtsson highlights a scriptural occurrence of איש כזב in Prov. 19.22 (note, however, the absence of the definite article).[76] Interestingly, this appears in the general context of several references to the judgement (משפט) of scoffers (Prov. 19.25-29; cf. Richardson 1955), raising the possibility that this may have informed the (earliest?) employment of איש הכזב in the present passage from the Damascus Document.

How then should we interpret the relationship between 'the Man of the Lie' (CD 20.15) and 'the Man of Scoffing' (איש הלצון, CD 1.14) who 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie' (CD 1.14-15; cf. 4.19-20; 8.12-13; 19.24b-26a)? The judgement of those who are 'covert traitors' is here compared

---

74   Italics signify a later gloss to the Yahadic text of the passage following Davies 1983 (263, cf. 176–86). However, see n. 31 above.

75   Note also, however, 'the man of lies' (Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Schechter 1970) and 'the Liar' (Bengtsson 2000a: 107; Knibb 1994a; Vermes 2004).

76   Bengtsson 2000a: 98. A plural form, אנשי כזב, also appears in Sir. 15.8, reminiscent of אנשי לצון ('men of scoffing') in Isa. 28.14 and Prov. 29.8 (note אנשי הלצון in the present passage, CD 20.11).

with that dealt to 'overt traitors', 'their companions who turned back with the Men of Scoffing {אנשי הלצון}' (CD 20.10-11).[77] It would appear that it is the *latter* group of whom it is said that 'they spoke perversely against the decrees of righteousness {חקי הצדק} and rejected the covenant and the pact' and consequently they *and their families* are excluded from 'the house of התורה' (CD 20.11-13). By comparison, in the case of the 'covert traitors', only they themselves appear to be afforded the same judgement (CD 20.8-10).[78] It would seem reasonable to assume that, for the reader at least, 'the Men of Scoffing' (אנשי הלצון, CD 20.11) are in some way to be associated with 'the Man of Scoffing' (איש הלצון, CD 1.14) who is accused of having caused Israel to 'depart from the paths of righteousness' (CD 1.15-16; so too Stegemann 1971: 139).

In order to ascertain the relationship between 'the Man of Scoffing' and 'the Man of the Lie', it may be helpful to compare those 'who turned back with the Men of Scoffing' (CD 20.10-11) with those 'who turned back with the Man of the Lie' (CD 20.14-15):

(CD 20.10-11) אשר שבו עם אנשי הלצון

(CD 20.14-15) אשר שבו עם איש הכזב

The two phrases are constructed in identical fashion, inviting the reader to understand the two as comparable. Knibb suggests that those 'who turned back with the Men of Scoffing' are the same group mentioned a little way above in CD 19.33b–20.1a (1994a: 73).[79] Certainly, just as the former are described as having 'turned back' (שבו) and rejected the (new) covenant made 'in the land of Damascus' (CD 20.10-12), the latter are described as having 'entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus and turned {שבו} and betrayed and departed from the well of living water' (CD 19.33-34).

Furthermore, we have previously noted the similarity between the following two phrases:

> [19.35]from the day of the gathering in {מיום האסף} of [20.1]the Teacher of the Community until {עד} there shall arise the messiah from Aaron and from Israel. (CD 19.35–20.1)

---

77 See, for example, Davies 1983: 182–86.

78 Murphy-O'Connor (following Stegemann 1971: 174–78), adopts a different understanding of the passage, regarding the former group, the 'covert traitors', as the subject of דבר (CD 20.11) and hence as those who 'spoke perversely against the decrees of righteousness {חקי הצדק} and rejected the covenant and the pact' (20.11-12). He is forced therefore by the repetition of 'a share in the house of התורה' (CD 20.10, 13) to regard one instance as an interpolation (Murphy-O'Connor 1972: 552–56). The understanding outlined above, however, argued for by Davies (1983: 184–86), remains a simpler and more cogent explanation of the text.

79 Also Murphy-O'Connor 1972: 549.

^{20.13}from the day of ¹⁴the gathering in {מיום האסף} of the Teacher of the Community until {עד} the end of all the Men of War who turned back ¹⁵with the Man of the Lie there will be about forty years. (CD 20.13-15)

The first of these applies to the period during which the group who 'departed from the well of living water' in CD 19.33-34, 'shall not be reckoned in the council of the people and in their list they shall not be written' (CD 19.35). If we are right in identifying these two described periods, the start of each being signalled by the death of 'the Teacher of the Community', then as well as positing that renewed messianic expectations envisaged the arrival of 'the messiah from Aaron and from Israel' within 'about forty years', we might also assume that the faithless 'Men of War' (cf. Deut. 1.35; 2.7; 2.14) who 'turned back {שבו} with the Man of the Lie' are also to be identified with those who 'turned' (שבו) from the covenant in CD 19.33b–20.1a. Thus those 'who turned back with the Men of Scoffing' (CD 20.10-11), those 'who turned back with the Man of the Lie' (CD 20.14-15) and those who 'turned' from the covenant (CD 19.33b–20.1a) could, on the narrative level at least, be regarded as identical.

Such an interpretation would suggest that 'the Man of the Lie' (איש הכזב, CD 20.15) and 'the Man of Scoffing' (איש הלצון, CD 1.14) might, in this text, be (intended to be) read as labels denoting the same figure.[80] Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, following Stegemann (1971: 174–78), regards the reference to 'the Man of the Lie' as an interpolation, the purpose of which is 'to identify the men of mockery with the followers of the Man of Lies' (Murphy-O'Connor 1972: 552).[81] Whether a later interpolation or an intrinsic part of this Yahadic redaction, it remains a reasonable assumption that, in the present form of the text, at least, the titles איש הכזב and איש הלצון could have been understood as synonymous.[82] In

---

80   So too Bengtsson 2000a: 88–98; Brownlee 1982: 9–10; Callaway 1988: 116–21; Davies 1983: 187; Dupont-Sommer 1961: 122 n. 4; Fröhlich 2004: 4; Gmirkin 2000; Jeremias 1963: 89; Knibb 1994a: 23–24, 73–74; Stegemann 1971: 139; Vermes 2004: 54; Wacholder 2002.

81   See n. 78 above.

82   In addition, it may not be inconsequential that the only scriptural occurrence of איש כזב (Prov. 19.22), as noted above, appears in the general context of several references to scoffers (Prov. 19.25-29). It is the combination of scriptural allusions throughout the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document, in particular the use of כזב terminology (e.g., Mic. 2.11, in association with נטף) and reference to scoffers (e.g., Isa. 28.10-15, in association with צו and כזב), that may have suggested the suitability of Prov. 19.22-29 (mentioning scoffers in association with כזב) and hence first influenced the employment of the appellation איש הכזב as a suitable scripturally grounded alternative description of the figure otherwise known as איש הלצון. In this context, it is interesting to note that, according to Richardson, the verbal root ליץ (from which לצון is derived) could be interpreted (e.g., in the Septuagint rendering of Prov. 9.12) in reference to the noun forms 'lie, falsehood, untruth' (1955: 164–65). See further, Clines (ed.) 1998; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995.

that context, William Brownlee suggests that the label 'the Man of the Lie' deliberately 'parodies the Old Testament title "man of God" for a prophet' (1982: 10), thus bringing to mind the various accusations of false prophecy and spouting of lies associated seemingly with 'the Man of Scoffing' (CD 1.10-18a; 4.19-20; 8.12-13; 19.24b-26a).[83] We would appear, therefore, to be presented with an individual oppositional figure cast in the mould of a false prophet, referred to both as 'the Man of Scoffing' (איש הלצון, CD 1.14) and 'the Man of the Lie' (איש הכזב, CD 20.15), and described as 'a spouter {/preacher} of a lie' (CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26).[84]

Just as in the first column of CD, where 'the Man of Scoffing' is presented in opposition to the 'teacher' and his group are described as those 'who departed from the way' (CD 1.13) and have been caused to 'depart from the paths of righteousness' (CD 1.15-16), so here 'the Man of the Lie' is rendered in an oppositional role to 'the Teacher of the Community' and a group are described as having 'turned back' (CD 20.14) with him and spoken 'perversely against the decrees of righteousness' (CD 20.11). It is significant, as noted by Callaway, that in spite of the clear oppositional role played by 'the Man of Scoffing/the Lie', there is 'no evidence of any personal confrontation' (1988: 121).[85]

The relevant passages would appear to suggest that it was the 'teacher' and his group from whom the others departed, at least from the perspective of the Yahad (if those accused were members of the pre-Yahadic movement, they may well have viewed the Yahad as having departed from them).[86] This interpretation is supported by the accusation that they 'spoke perversely against the decrees of righteousness {חקי הצדק}' (CD 20.11). We have already noted how reference to הצדק might function as an implicit claim to the arrival of יורה הצדק and the supplementation of the decrees issued by 'the Seeker of the Law' for the interim period (CD 6.8-11a).[87] That the followers of 'the Man of Scoffing/the Lie' 'spoke perversely against the decrees of righteousness' may imply

---

83 Hanan Eshel similarly regards 'the Man of the Lie' as having been deliberately presented in the role of a false prophet (1999a: 335).

84 Bengtsson argues that, in principle, 'two different epithets could be invented for one and the same character . . . A weighty argument in favour of a single identity for two similar sobriquets would be that they are depicted correspondingly and associated with the same features' (2000a: 89). For the present, the points of correspondence between איש הלצון and איש הכזב are sufficient to favour such an understanding over an assumption of distinct identities.

85 Such an insight may have important historical implications. If a direct confrontation had indeed taken place historically between two so-named figures, would it not perhaps find mention here?

86 See Davies 2002: 93; Jokiranta 2001: 234; Murphy-O'Connor 1974: 236.

87 See n. 41 above.

that they rejected the claim of 'the Teacher of the Community' to be the anticipated 'one who will teach righteousness at the end of days' (CD 6.11a). They are the antithesis of the loyal members of the Yahad who 'listened to the voice of a teacher of righteousness, and do not reject the decrees of righteousness {חקי הצדק} when they hear them' (CD 20.32-33).

In this context, it is also interesting to note that the followers of 'the Man of Scoffing/the Lie' are further accused of rejecting

> the covenant and the pact which they affirmed in the land of Damascus;
> *and that is the new covenant.* (CD 20.12)[88]

This departure from the (new) covenant is echoed, as seen, in CD 19.33-34, where they are portrayed as those who 'entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus and turned {שבו} and betrayed and departed from the well of living water' (CD 19.33-34). Several scholars have noted that 'and that is the new covenant' (והוא ברית החדשה, CD 20.12) would appear to be a later gloss (e.g., Callaway 1988: 121–27; Davies 1983: 176–86, 263; Murphy-O'Connor 1972: 550 n. 20), implying that, in the first instance, it was simply 'the covenant' (without further qualification) that was rejected. Davies argues that 'the covenant in the land of Damascus' was a designation originally held by the pre-Yahadic movement but which continued to be used by the Yahad who, acknowledging the arrival of 'a teacher of righteousness', perceived themselves to be the legitimate continuation of that movement.[89] However, as the wider movement who rejected 'the Teacher of the Community', and presumably still awaited one who would 'teach righteousness at the end of days', held on to the same designation, it eventually became necessary for the Yahad to further qualify themselves as 'the *new* covenant in the land of Damascus', superseding the 'old' covenant.[90]

If we are to accept that the followers of 'the Man of Scoffing/the Lie' were originally accused of having rejected simply 'the covenant', as seems

---

88 Italics signify a later gloss to the Yahadic text of the passage following Davies 1983 (263; cf. 176–86). See n. 31 above.

89 As Davies notes: 'If indeed a small group adhering to a messianic leader seceded from a larger group, the texts from this smaller group present an inverted history . . . it was the larger group that deserted *them*, in rejecting the true leader' (2002: 93). See also Jokiranta 2001: 234; Murphy-O'Connor 1974: 236.

90 See Davies 1983: 176–86. Note Jer. 31.31 which mentions a 'new covenant' (ברית חדשה), interestingly in the context of a planting metaphor (Jer. 31.27-34; cf. CD 1.4-11a). In the light of this, Phillip Callaway interprets the evidence differently, regarding the gloss in CD 20.12 to reflect efforts to 'harmonize this reference to the Damascan covenant with others in CD, not to distinguish a parent from an offspring . . . community' (1988: 125). The position adopted by Davies, however, best accords with the other evidence of redaction present in the text and yet does not preclude the possibility that Jer. 31.31 may have influenced the adoption of the specific qualification '*new* covenant' (cf. Campbell 1995a). On the other hand,

likely, the question remains as to whether the 'old' covenant of the pre-Yahadic movement is meant or the continuation of that covenant within the Yahad (later to be qualified as 'the *new* covenant').[91] Was their departure from the pre-Yahadic movement or from the Yahad? In the present (glossed) form of the text at least, the latter is clearly suggested. However, was this always the case? As seen, Davies argues that the covenant 'entered' (באו) in CD 19.33-34 and 'affirmed' (קימו) in CD 20.11-12 originally referred to that of the pre-Yahadic movement, with the later inclusion of the qualification 'new' wrongly suggesting that 'those condemned had once been members of the Teacher's community' (1983: 177).[92] However, he himself notes:

> the fact that 'new covenant' is a gloss on 'covenant in the land of Damascus' at XX, 12 shows that at one point the older terminology persisted. (1983: 177)

It would remain equally possible, therefore, that the continuation of the covenant *within the Yahad* is here referred to, at a time when 'the older terminology persisted' prior to the need for further qualification. The followers of 'the Man of Scoffing/the Lie' could accordingly be defectors from the Yahad itself.

In fact, the difference between these two positions is not so great. That the Yahad appear to have perceived themselves as the legitimate continuation of 'the covenant in the land of Damascus' suggests that (originally at least) they would not have considered themselves to constitute a new or different movement (as indeed suggested by the persistence of the 'older terminology'). In other words, 'the covenant' in CD 20.12, even prior to the qualification 'new', referred to the Yahad in as much as the one was considered synonymous with the other. The rejection of the covenant in CD 20.10-15 appears in the context of the rejection of the 'teacher' and 'the decrees of righteousness'. Therefore, any among 'the covenant in the land of Damascus', a movement that has evolved into the Yahad (from a Yahadic perspective), who rejected the authority of the 'teacher' (whether at the moment of his arrival or at a later stage) were considered to have rejected 'the covenant'.[93] The only question that remains is whether those here accused had ever consciously accepted the 'teacher', later to reject him, or had merely been perceived as having 'affirmed' and subsequently 'turned back' from the Yahad in as much as it was considered synonymous with the forerunning 'covenant in the land of

---

the recent proposal by Hultgren that, conversely, the 'new covenant' was the parent movement (2007; see also n. 31 above) would allow for the originality of this biblical influence and, thus, may prove a fruitful avenue for future discussion (cf. 2007: 138–40).

91 Cf. Hultgren 2007. See also, Rabinowitz 1954: 31 n. 113.

92 See n. 31 above.

93 See n. 89 above.

Damascus'. Though defection from the Yahad is indeed the issue here, Davies is right, therefore, to note the possibility at least that 'those condemned had not "entered a *new* covenant" at all' (1983: 177).

Summary

The sobriquet מטיף הכזב does not appear in the Damascus Document, though we are presented with the sobriquets איש הלצון ('the Man of Scoffing'; CD 1.14) and איש הכזב ('the Man of the Lie'; CD 20.15), both seemingly synonymous titles for a figure described repeatedly as 'a spouter of a lie' (CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26). We have observed that the deliberate employment of such scriptural language (drawing, for example, upon Isa. 28, Ezek. 13 and Mic. 2) demonstrates 'the Man of Scoffing/the Lie' to have been conceived in opposition to 'the Teacher of the Community' (מורה/יורה היחיד, CD 20.1; 20.14), described as 'a teacher of righteousness' (CD 1.11; 20.32). The dual understanding of נטף as both 'to spout/drip' and 'to preach' (specifically indicative of false prophecy) is, for example, reminiscent of the same duality with regard to ירה in reference to 'raining' or 'teaching'.

We noted in Chapter 2 that in the FSP of the Damascus Document there existed a degree of dualistic phraseology in CD 5.16–6.11a.[94] In particular the text attested a dichotomy between the 'holy anointed ones' (משיחי הקודש, 6.1) as true prophets (cf. Bowley 1999: 359) and those who 'prophesied falsehood' (ינבאו שקר, 6.1). We observed that the anticipated 'one who will teach righteousness' (יורה הצדק, CD 6.11) was presented as an 'eschatological' successor to משיחי הקודש. Just as 'the holy anointed ones' were the instruments of God's teaching in the past, so the anointed יורה הצדק (cf. CD 12.23–13.1) would confer God's teaching 'at the end of days' (CD 6.11; cf. Hos. 10.12). While no opposition to this figure was seemingly envisaged, we posited that should any counter-figure arise he would by contrast be cast in the typological mould of those who 'prophesied falsehood'. Our examination of the ESP of the Damascus Document would appear to confirm this hypothesis, with 'the Man of Scoffing/the Lie' depicted in opposition to the 'teacher' as 'a spouter of a lie' (CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26) and in the role of a false prophet.[95]

---

94 See Chapter 2, n. 46.

95 Cf. Brownlee 1982: 10; Eshel 1999a: 335. John Collins, espousing the influence of Persian dualism upon the earliest layers of the Qumran-related texts, interestingly notes that: 'In the Gathas, the oldest part of the Avesta, which are generally considered to be the work of Zoroaster himself, . . . the opponents of Zoroaster are "the followers of the Lie", and the evil spirit is "He who is of the Lie"' (1995b: 32–33). It is tempting to speculate whether this typology may have had any influence on the predominant use of כזב and שקר terminology to describe the opponents of the 'teacher', in particular 'the Man of the Lie' and those who 'turned back' with him (CD 20.13-15). Note however Dimant 1984: 546 n. 295.

3. *Sobriquets in the (Yahadic) Damascus Document*

Though no occurrences of מורה הצדק or מטיף הכזב are to be found in the ESP of the Damascus Document, we are presented with 'the Teacher of the Community' and 'the Man of Scoffing/the Lie', described respectively as 'a teacher of righteousness' (מורה צדק, CD 1.11; 20.32; cf. 20.28) and 'a spouter of a lie' (מטיף כזב, CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26). These descriptions would appear to owe much to the FSP of the text, where the former figure is expressly anticipated as 'one who will teach righteousness' (יורה הצדק, CD 6.11) and the typology for describing the latter is readily available. Davies suggests that the 'teacher' is deliberately presented as a 'new Moses' while the 'spouter' is a 'false Moses', echoing perhaps the dualistic phraseology of CD 5.16–6.11 in the FSP.[96] However, as Callaway points out, despite the juxtaposition of 'the Teacher of the Community' and 'the Man of Scoffing/the Lie', there is 'no evidence of any personal confrontation' (1988: 121). Nevertheless, leaving aside the historical question, our analysis suggests that (with Eshel):

> we may categorize the debate that takes place between the Teacher of Righteousness and the Man of Lies as the major event in the life of the Teacher of Righteousness, at least in the eyes of the author of the *Damascus Document*. (Eshel 1999a: 333)

In other words, though the existence of a historical confrontation between these two figures is uncertain, the polarity between the 'teacher' and the 'spouter' (expressed both through context and terminology) remains a central theme throughout the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document. Their respective descriptions in the ESP as 'a teacher of righteousness' (מורה צדק) and 'a spouter of a lie' (מטיף כזב), drawing upon the FSP and relevant scriptural terminology, would appear to pave the way for the absent sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב.

b. *The Hodayot*[97]
1. *'The Teacher of Righteousness'*
1QH[a] *7.17b-22a [15.14-19]*

The elements ירה and צדק are not found in conjunction in the Hodayot and hence neither מורה הצדק, nor its indefinite counterpart מורה צדק,

---

96   Davies 1988: 316.

97   The large Cave 1 text of the Hodayot (or 'Thanksgiving Hymns'), 1QH[a], was originally published by Eliezer Sukenik (1955). Since then, however, the work of Émile Puech (1988) and Hartmut Stegemann (e.g., 1990; 1993; 2000) has contributed greatly to our understanding of the text and resulted in a re-ordering (and thus re-numbering) of the columns to reflect the original arrangement of the scroll (cf. Puech 2000). For the purposes of this study, we shall adopt the revised column and line numbering presented in *DSSSE*, with Sukenik's numbering in parentheses where appropriate.

are attested in the H-material. Forms of both ירה *and* צדק do, however, appear independently and, therefore, several passages are nevertheless worthy of consideration in our examination of the sobriquet's development. The first of these is from column 7 of the re-ordered 1QHᵃ:

> ⁷·¹⁷You alone have [creat]ed צדיק¹⁸ and from the womb you determined him for the time of approval to keep your covenant and to walk in all things, and to ... on him ¹⁹in the abundance of your compassion, and to open all the narrowness of his soul to eternal salvation and endless peace without want, and you have raised ²⁰his glory from flesh. But the wicked {רשעים} you have created for [the time] of your [w]rath and from the womb you have ordained them for the day of slaughter, ²¹for they walk in a way {בדרך} that is not good, and they reject your covenant, and your [. . .] their soul loathes, and they take no pleasure in what ²²you command but choose what you hate. (1QHᵃ 7.17b-22a) [= Sukenik 15.14-19]

The passage concerns the creation by God of צדיק, which can be rendered 'the just' (Dupont-Sommer 1961; Vermes 2004) or 'the righteous' (Holm-Nielsen 1960; Mansoor 1961). Other scholars, noting that צדיק would appear in the context of this passage to refer to a singular figure, have rendered more freely 'the just man' (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997) or 'the righteous one' (Hughes 2006; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; cf. Wernberg-Møller 1953: 315).⁹⁸ Acknowledging this insight, where the subject would appear to be contextually singular this study shall likewise adopt the latter approach (though, given the absence of the definite article, an indefinite variant is to be preferred; 'a righteous one'). Where it would seem advisable, however, to leave open the possibility of either interpretation, the general ('the righteous'; though note that the definite article is *not* present) or the indefinite singular ('a righteous one'), this study shall render צדיק 'the (/a) righteous (one)'.

Sung-Hae Kim notes the extensive employment of צדיק throughout the Hebrew Bible (206 times), often juxtaposed by reference to רשע ('the [/a]

---

98   Sung-Hae Kim, while condoning such renderings as 'the righteous' or 'the just man', claims that they are 'not completely satisfactory' as the meaning of צדיק 'changes within the Hebrew Bible' (1985: 153 n. 2). It can, for example, be used in a legal sense to indicate 'the innocent' or 'the vindicated', and often appears in the prophetic books 'for the innocent man who suffers at the hand of the persecutor' (166), an image that occurs frequently in the Qumran-related Hodayot texts. Kim likewise notes that, while צדיק can have a communal application (e.g., Isa. 26.2), it remains 'predominantly an individual image' (166–67), as indeed we would appear to find in the passage presently under consideration. See further, Blenkinsopp 2006a: 185–93; 2006b; Koehler and Baumgartner 1996.

wicked [one]').[99] Of particular significance for our examination of the Hodayot, he observes the usage of צדיק as a 'type' in the book of Psalms:

> Since the psalmists always presuppose the concept of righteousness and never explicitly describe their image of the righteous man, it is hard to extract a clear picture of *ṣaddîq* from the psalms. On the other hand, the image of the wicked as the persecutor of the righteous man does stand out; so there is a rich enough context for us to draw a clear picture: the righteous in the psalms ... is a passive sufferer who appeals his cause to God (Pss 7.8; 58.11; 75.7, etc.). ... Though *ṣaddîq* occurs in hymns and thanksgiving songs, it is found mostly in the individual laments, where both epithets – righteous and wicked – occur. (S.-H. Kim 1985: 170)

Given this general scriptural foundation we must be extremely cautious about attributing any especial note to the employment of צדיק in the Hodayot. As Kim observes of the book of Psalms, so in our passage the lot of 'a righteous one' (צדיק, 1QH^a 7.18) is set in opposition to that of the 'wicked' (pl. רשעים, 1QH^a 7.20). Indeed, of the seven occurrences of צדיק in 1QH^a, six appear discernibly in the context of the 'wicked' (6.14-16; 7.17b-20; 12.38; 15.12; 20.16-19; 25[top].13; the exception being 1QH^a 8.18).[100] Other instances of צדק-related terms likewise appear juxtaposed with רשע or רשעים (e.g., 1QH^a 4.20-21; 5.25-27; 6.9-10; 10.12-13).[101]

Such occurrences of צדיק, contextualized as they are, would appear to be the result of stock terminology and scriptural themes. They may therefore bear no relation whatsoever to the יורה הצדק of the FSP or מורה צדק appearing elsewhere in the ESP, and thus convey little with regard to specific sobriquet development. On the other hand, we have already witnessed in the Damascus Document the role of scriptural typologies in the development of apparent sobriquets or descriptive terminology. It is, therefore, worth perhaps taking a closer look at the 'righteous one' (צדיק) of 1QH^a 7.17b-22a.

The individual described as צדיק, determined from the womb 'for the time of approval' (למועד רצון), is charged to keep the covenant and 'to

---

99   S.-H. Kim 1985: 153 n. 1. There are 23 appearances of צדיק in the Tetrateuch and the Deuteronomic History, 45 in the Prophets, 51 in the Psalms, and 87 in the wisdom writings. Kim notes that in more than a third of these occurrences, צדיק is directly contrasted with רשע. See too, Blenkinsopp 2006a: 185–93; 2006b.

100   One of these occurrences of צדיק, 1QH^a 6.15, is in reference to God, thus indicating a plurality of application. Again the same phenomenon is true of the book of Psalms, where of the 51 appearances of צדיק, 'seven occurrences describe God as righteous (7.12; 11.7; 112.4; 116.5; 119.37; 129.4; 145.17)' (S.-H. Kim 1985: 170). In addition to these, a plural form, צדיקים, appears in 1QH^a 9.36. Cf. also אצדיק in 1QH^a 17.9.

101   It is tempting here to recall the apparent conflict between 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (מורה הצדק) and 'the Wicked Priest' (הכוהן הרשע) in the later pesharim. Might this have a typological foundation in the juxtaposition of צדק and רשע in the Hodayot and relevant scriptural passages?

walk in all things' (לתהלך בכול, 1QH[a] 7.18).[102] The 'wicked' (רשעים) however, created 'for [the time] of your [w]rath' (reconstructing לק[ץ] חר[ו]נכה, 1QH[a] 7.20) and ordained from the womb 'for the day of slaughter', are said to both reject the covenant and 'walk in a way that is not good' (הלכו בדרך לא טוב, 1QH[a] 7.21).[103] A sharp contrast is therefore drawn between the two. Indeed, the passage contains several elements reminiscent of the first columns of the (pre-Yahadic) Cairo Damascus Document. There a similar contrast is drawn between 'the life of a righteous one' (נפש צדיק, CD 1.20) and 'those who walk perfectly' (הולכי תמים, CD 1.20-21) on the one hand, and those who 'broke the covenant' (יעבירו ברית, CD 1.20) and 'depart from the way' (סררי דרך, CD 2.6) on the other.[104] The context in the Damascus Document is likewise 'the time of wrath' (בקץ חרון, CD 1.5) and interestingly those who 'broke the covenant' are further accused of having 'justified the (/a) wicked (one) and condemned the (/a) righteous (one)' (יצדיקו רשע וירשיעו צדיק, CD 1.19).[105] The insertion of מורה צדק and איש הלצון (who 'led them (Israel) astray in a wilderness without a way {לא דרך}, (...) delivering them to the avenging sword of the vengeance of the covenant', CD 1.14-17) in the Yahadic redaction of the text (ESP), imposes within the Damascus Document (intentionally or not) a reinterpretation of 'the (/a) righteous (one)' (צדיק, CD 1.19-20) and 'the (/a) wicked (one)' (רשע, CD 1.19) in the light of these figures. Might צדיק have been similarly understood in our present text from the Hodayot?

Though some thematic overlaps would appear to exist between 1QH[a] 7.17b-22a and the FSP of CD 1–2, in both instances it is primarily a scriptural typology contrasting צדק and רשע that would appear to be at work.[106] Certainly there is nothing to suggest that the 'righteous one' (צדיק) of the Hodayot should be understood as an explicit reference to the יורה הצדק of the FSP or indeed מורה צדק appearing elsewhere in

---

102 Assuming something has dropped out, some scholars supply 'to walk in all *your ways*' (Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Mansoor 1961; Vermes 2004). Svend Holm-Nielsen suggests that לתהלך בכול may have the meaning 'to walk (uprightly) in all things' (1960: 227, cf. 230 n. 15).

103 Cf. Isa. 65.2 (עם סורר ההלכים הדרך לא־טוב), also noted by Hughes (2006: 76–77). On the metaphorical significance of דרך, see Blenkinsopp 2006a: 178–85.

104 The identification of those who 'broke the covenant' (יעבירו ברית, CD 1.20) with those who 'depart from the way' (סררי דרך, CD 2.6) is made explicit in the Yahadic redaction of the text belonging to the ESP (הם סרי דרך, CD 1.13).

105 צדק and רשע here employed in the legal sense noted by S.-H. Kim (cf. n. 98 above) to indicate the innocent and the guilty. Note, by comparison, CD 4.7 (ויצדיקו צדיק וירשיעו רשע).

106 Nevertheless, such contextual thematic overlaps may yet indicate that CD 1–2 (FSP) bore some influence upon the author of 1QH[a] 7.17b-22a (ESP).

the ESP.[107] However, it is possible that this commonplace scriptural type, employed among the sectarian literature, may have influenced or helped shape the expectation of one who would embody such an ideal. The most, therefore, that can be said of the reference to צדיק in 1QH^a 7.17b-22a is that it may have been read and understood by sectarian readers in the retrospective light of 'the Teacher of Righteousness'.[108]

1QH^a 10.13-15a [2.13-15a]

A further passage from the Hodayot that may be of some significance in its employment of צדק comes from column 10 of the re-ordered 1QH^a, one of the so-called 'Teacher Hymns':[109]

---

107   Neither should the references to צדיק of the past in the FSP of the Damascus Document be associated too closely with the anticipated יורה הצדק of the future in CD 6.11a. It is only in the post-teacher Yahadic redaction that such an association might be retrospectively implied.

108   This figure may presumably have similarly been *read into* scriptural occurrences of צדיק. The contrast with רשע in such passages (scriptural and sectarian), as well as perhaps providing the impetus for the conflict between 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (מורה הצדק) and 'the Wicked Priest' (הכוהן הרשע) in the later pesharim (see n. 101 above), may have subsequently been read in the light of this apparent conflict.

109   Sukenik was the first to suggest that 'the Teacher of Righteousness' might have authored at least part of the Hodayot (1955: 39). Since then numerous scholars have adopted such a standpoint, basing the assumption upon significant similarities between events which befall 'the Teacher of Righteousness' in the pesharim and those experienced by the protagonist of the Hodayot (e.g., Abegg 1997; Allegro 1981; Bengtsson 2000a: 179–96; Douglas 1999; Dupont-Sommer 1961: 200; Fujita 1976: 40 n. 35; García Martínez 2002; Mowinckel 1956: 275–76; Stegemann 1998: 107). Other scholars, noting for example the Hodayot's heavy dependence upon scripture, have warned against reading too deeply into such an identification (e.g., Burrows 1958: 324–41; Callaway 1988: 185–97; Davies 1987: 87–105; Harkins 2005: 235 n. 6; Holm-Nielsen 1960: 39, 316–48; Kittel 1981: 9–11; Knibb 1990: 54; 1994a: 166; Vermes 1981: 27). A more cautious examination of these similarities has led Davies to conclude that the pesharim are dependent upon the Hodayot for their information concerning 'the Teacher of Righteousness', thus nullifying any theory of identification made on the grounds of similarity between the two, while affirming that '*within* the Qumran community these hymns – and at the very least the autobiographical ones – were *understood* to be compositions of the "Teacher"'' (Davies 1987: 89–90; my italics; cf. however Knibb 1990: 54). Note further the nuanced approach advanced by Carol Newsom, focusing on the function of the Hodayot within sectarian discourse and the creation of a 'leadership myth' (2004: 191–346; see too Hughes 2006: 234). Gert Jeremias (1963: 168–267) classified 1QH^a 10 (2).1-19, 10(2).31-39, 11(3).1-18, 12(4).5–13(5).4, 13(5).5-19, 13(5).20–15(7).5, 15(7).6-25 and 16(8).4-40 as 'Teacher Hymns' (*Lehrerlieder*) while others have come to be regarded as 'Community Hymns' (on further division of this second group, see Harkins 2008). An excellent summary of the 'Teacher Hymn Hypothesis', including differing identifications of the *Lehrerlieder*, appears in Douglas 1999 (see further Collins and Dimant 1994; Schuller 1994a). These classifications are useful as they do indeed appear to indicate separate blocks of material (often identified by use of 'I' or 'we' respectively). With regard to authorship, however, we shall for the present go only as far as Davies (in agreement with our findings above concerning צדיק; cf. nn. 107, 108), accepting the suggestion that the Hodayot 'were

^{10.13}But you have set me like a banner to the בחירי צדק, and a מליץ
דעת of wonderful mysteries, to test ¹⁴[the men of] truth and to try those
who love instruction. And I have become a man of dispute {ריב} to
מליצי תעות [but a man of ¹⁵pea]ce to all seers of truth {חוזי נכוחות}.
(1QH^a 10.13-15a) [= Sukenik 2.13-15a]

This passage, written in the first-person, speaks of those designated בחירי
צדק (cf. 4Q184 frg. 1, 14; 4Q215a frg. 1, 2.2), rendered variously 'the elect
of justice' (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997),
'the elect of righteousness' (Dupont-Sommer 1961; Vermes 2004) or 'the
chosen (ones) of righteousness' (Holm-Nielsen 1960; Knibb 1994a;
Mansoor 1961; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996). Similarly, in 1QH^a 6.15
we find 'all your elect/chosen are truth' (אמת כול בחיריך), interestingly
in the immediate context of the application of צדיק to God (see n. 100
above). This may suggest that בחירי צדק here should be taken in
conjunction with the '[men of] truth' (אנשי אמת], 1QH^a 10.14) and
perhaps also, though a synonym is used, the 'seers of truth' (חוזי נכוחות,
1QH^a 10.15).[110]

 The speaker describes himself as 'מליץ דעת of wonderful mysteries'
(1QH^a 10.13). מליץ would appear in this context to indicate a mediatory
role (cf. 2 Chron. 32.31; Job 33.23), thus suggesting 'a mediator of
knowledge' as a suitable rendering of מליץ דעת.[111] The speaker is set in
clear opposition in the passage to 'mediators of error' (מליצי תעות,
1QH^a 10.14).[112] Such conflicting mediatory roles are instantly reminiscent
of the two conflicting types of teaching, ירה and נטף, contrasted in the
Damascus Document and associated with 'the Teacher of the

---

regarded as compositions of the Teacher' as 'a more modest and indeed a more secure basis
on which to build a comparison between them and the *pesharim*' (Davies 1987: 93; so too
Callaway 1994: 417).

 110 Cf. חוזי אמת (CD 2.12-13).

 111 Other scriptural contexts may indicate an interpretive role for מליץ (cf. Gen. 42.23;
Isa. 43.27), though Richardson has cast doubt on the accuracy of these readings (Richardson
1955: 167–69). See further ליץ and מליץ in Clines (ed.) 1998; 2001; Koehler and
Baumgartner 1995. Both interpretations are represented in the variety of renderings proffered
for מליץ דעת: 'knowledgeable mediator' (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997); 'informed
mediator' (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996); 'discerning interpreter' (Vermes 2004); 'know-
ledgeable interpreter' (Knibb 1994a); 'knowing interpreter' (Holm-Nielsen 1960); 'interpreter
of knowledge' (Dupont-Sommer 1961; Mansoor 1961); cf. 'wise sower' (García Martínez
1996). Note the plural form מליצי דעת in 1QH^a 23[bottom].6.

 112 In addition to 'mediators of error' (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Wise,
Abegg and Cook 1996), other scholars have suggested: 'advocates of error' (Mansoor 1961);
'interpreters of error' (Holm-Nielsen 1960; Knibb 1994a; Vermes 2004); 'interpreters of
straying' (Dupont-Sommer 1961); 'those who spread fallacies' (García Martínez 1996). See n.
111 above.

Community' ('a teacher of righteousness') and 'the Man of Scoffing/the Lie' ('a spouter of a lie') respectively.[113]

The description of those tried by 'a mediator of knowledge' (מליץ דעת) as 'those who love instruction' (אוהבי מוסר; 1QH[a] 10.14) would appear to be dependent upon Prov. 12.1, which states that 'whoever loves instruction loves knowledge' (אהב מוסר אהב דעת).[114] Terms such as 'mediator', 'knowledge' and 'instruction' all imply a context of teaching behind the passage. The speaker, as 'a mediator of knowledge', performs a didactic (/prophetic?) role within a group who are characterized by truth (אמת, 1QH[a] 10.14 / נכח, 10.15), instruction (מוסר, 10.14) and, most significantly, righteousness (צדק, 10.13), while 'mediators of error' (מליצי תעות, 10.14) would thus appear in the role of false teachers. Small wonder then that many have associated the author of this passage with the figure elsewhere described as 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (מורה הצדק; see n. 109 above).

Further to such an identification, André Dupont-Sommer notes that the speaker refers to himself as 'a banner' (נס, 1QH[a] 10.13), the closest comparative use of which is Isa. 11.10 where the 'root of Jesse' is similarly described (Dupont-Sommer 1961: 205 n. 3). Thus Dupont-Sommer attributes a messianic claim to the speaker (a role we have likewise associated with the anticipated יורה הצדק of the FSP; cf. CD 6.10-11; 12.23–13.1). Svend Holm-Nielsen regards Dupont-Sommer's assumption as 'rash' (1960: 35 n. 27), though it is intriguing, with regard to the possible applicability of Isa. 11.10 to the 'teacher', that נס in that text appears in the immediate context of 'seeking' (דרש, Isa. 11.10) and 'a remnant' (שאר, Isa. 11.11), both similarly important themes in the Damascus Document.[115]

Despite the didactic role of the speaker, provided furthermore for 'the elect of righteousness' (בחירי צדק; cf. יודעי צדק in CD 1.1), we can yet again make no clear affirmation of identity with the figure described

---

113   In this context it is perhaps significant to note that מליץ ('mediator') comes from the root ליץ, from which לצון ('scoffing') is also derived (cf. Richardson 1955; also Clines [ed.] 1998; 2001; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995). Though no especial negative connotations can be inferred here (the protagonist is also designated מליץ, albeit one of 'knowledge'), might such negatively associated mediation (found also in similar phrases to be examined in due course) have had any influence on the use of לצון to describe one such false teacher in the Damascus Document?

114   On 'knowledge' in the Hodayot, see Mansoor 1961: 65–74. Note also, אנשי דעות in CD 20.4-5.

115   Not to mention the association with צדק (Isa. 11.4, 5) and דעת (Isa. 11.2). It is perhaps also worthy of note that the speaker in our present text refers to himself as 'a man of dispute' (איש ריב, 1QH[a] 10.14; cf. Jer. 15.10), ריב being another prominent theme in the Damascus Document (e.g., CD 1.2; 1.21; 14.12). Cf. the use of ריב in 1QH[a] 13.22 in the context of צדק, יחד and ברית.

elsewhere as 'a teacher of righteousness'.[116] More pertinently for our study, however, the thematic content of the passage (in particular the conflict between, and reception of, two types of mediation) may yet cast light on our perceived developmental process.

1QH^a 12.23b-25a [4.23b-25a]

It is with regard to the potential significance of such thematic content that we shall briefly consider a further passage which, despite an absence of discernible sobriquet-related elements, contains instances of related terminology which may prove informative:

> [12.23]And you have not covered in shame the faces of [24]all those sought {כול הנדרשים[ם]} by me, those who gather ^{יחד} to your covenant. And they have listened to me, those who walk in the way of your heart {ההולכים בדרך לבכה}, and have aligned themselves for you [25]in the council of the holy ones {קדושים}. (1QH^a 12.23b-25a) [= Sukenik 4.23b-25a]

This comes from another of the so-called 'Teacher Hymns' attributed to 'the Teacher of Righteousness'. Though the identity of the author may be beyond our ability to affirm, a number of elements here *are* reminiscent of the context in which 'a teacher of righteousness' (מורה צדק) is introduced to us in CD 1.11a. The act of seeking (דרש) is present both in CD 1.10-11 (cf. 6.6-11; Hos. 10.12) and in 1QH^a 12.24 (though significantly not of God here) and of course the theme of 'covenant' is prevalent throughout the Damascus Document (often in association with the 'teacher'; cf. CD 1.1–2.3; 6.2–7.1; 19.33–20.34). More interesting, however, is the claim that those who have listened to the speaker are 'those who walk in the way of your heart' (1QH^a 12.24). The glossed Damascus Document, belonging to the ESP, specifically assigns the guidance of such a group to 'a teacher of righteousness':

> [1.10]But God perceived their deeds, for they sought him with a whole heart, [11]and he raised up for them a teacher of righteousness to lead them in the way of his heart {להדריכם בדרך לבו}. (CD 1.10-11a)

Indeed, listening to the voice of this teacher is lauded in CD 20.27-34 and associated with אנשי היחיד ('the Men of the Community'; cf. אנשי היחד; 1QS 9.10).[117] It is perhaps of some significance then that יחד has been

---

116   Though, as Callaway points out, 'The language of this psalm does induce one to think of the one praying as the leader or role model for a group of righteous ones who are opposed by a group of wicked persons' (1988: 191).

117   See nn. 24 and 26 above.

inserted above the line in 1QH[a] 12.24.[118] Furthermore, those who have listened to the speaker and 'walk in the way of your heart' are said to have aligned themselves 'in the council of the holy ones {קדושים}' (1QH[a] 12.25).[119] It is tempting here to recall 'the holy anointed ones' (משיחי הקודש) of CD 6.1, to whom the anticipated יורה הצדק of the FSP was to be an eschatological successor (CD 6.11).[120]

It would certainly be possible to *infer* the presence of the Damascus Document's 'Teacher of the Community' behind this text (e.g., the themes of 'seeking', 'covenant', alignment with 'the holy ones', and more specifically the association with יחד and the importance of 'those who walk in the way of your heart' listening to the speaker's voice).[121] However, just because it is possible does not necessarily mean we would be justified to do so. Even if a direct correspondence between 1QH[a] 12.23b-25a and the Damascus Document could be demonstrated, we must not preclude the possibility that the former informed the Yahadic redaction of the latter (in the same manner that Davies considers the Hodayot to have likewise influenced the portrayal of the 'teacher' in the pesharim; 1987: 87–105). Thus, the identity of the speaker in this passage remains enigmatic, though we can acknowledge the presence of terminological and thematic elements which elsewhere pertain to descriptions of the 'teacher'.

1QH[a] 16.16-17 [8.16-17]

One final passage from the Hodayot to be considered with regard to the sobriquet מורה הצדק is from column 16 of the re-ordered 1QH[a]:

> [16.16]But you, my God, you have placed in my mouth as it were an early rain {כיורה}, a shower for all [. . .] and a spring of living water. And the heavens will not fail {לא יכזב} to open, [17]they will not stop but will

118   García Martínez and Tigchelaar translate accordingly: 'those who unite /together/ for your covenant' (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; cf. García Martínez 1996). Wise, Abegg and Cook translate similarly, though suggest 'in the Yahad' as a possible alternative (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996). Note Neh. 6.2 (נועדה יחדו); cf. Mansoor 1961: 127 n. 6.

119   Transcribed in error by García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997) as קודשים. So too Hughes 2006. Cf. Sukenik (ed.) 1955. Note בסוד־קדשים in Ps. 89.8.

120   On קדושים as 'holy ones' or 'saints', especially with regard to non-human entities (e.g., the heavenly court), see S.-H. Kim 1985: 193–210. Menahem Mansoor points out that קדושים could also be taken to indicate 'angels' (so too Collins 1992: 613–14), though suggests that in the context of 1QH[a] 12.25 it may refer to 'members of the sect themselves' (Mansoor 1961: 127 n. 9). Kim likewise notes that where holiness *is* applied to humans in a scriptural context, it is 'mostly to the community as a whole or the group who are close and loyal to God' (S.-H. Kim 1985: 205). See further, Blenkinsopp 2006a: 203–209.

121   Even the negative assertion 'And you have not covered {טחתה} in shame' (1QH[a] 12.23b) utilizes the same word טוח borrowed from Ezek. 13 and employed in the Damascus Document in reference to the 'daubers of whitewash' who follow false prophets (CD 8.12: טחי התפל; 19.25: טחי תפל). Cf. Holm-Nielsen 1960: 84 n. 53.

> become a stream overflowing up[on ...] water and to the seas without
> e[nd]. (1QH[a] 16.16-17) [= Sukenik 8.16-17]

This passage is again in the first-person and assigned by Gert Jeremias
among the 'Teacher Hymns' (see n. 109 above). The speaker claims that
God has placed 'an early rain' (יורה) in his mouth, a metaphor that is
extended to encompass 'a spring of living water' (מבוע מים היים, 1QH[a]
16.16) and other water imagery. It is hard not to see here the same dual
understanding of יורה employed in the FSP where it finds expression in the
expectation of 'one who will teach righteousness {יורה הצדק} at the end
of days' (CD 6.11a), drawing upon Hos. 10.12 (cf. Joel 2.23). Hence
perhaps the specific placement of 'an early rain' *in his mouth* (בפי; 1QH[a]
16.16)? The metaphor would appear to play on this dual understanding
and it is in fact *teaching* that is implied as having been placed in the
speaker's mouth (so too Hughes 2006: 156–57).[122]

   Such an understanding has two important implications. Firstly, we may
be given to wonder whether the speaker is deliberately applying the
professed expectation of CD 6.11a to himself and thus tacitly laying claim
to the role. Secondly, we may note that he is claiming divine authority for
his teaching; the words in his mouth have been placed there by God.[123]
Dupont-Sommer, who believes the speaker to be identical with the
'teacher', goes further, suggesting that he is here intentionally alluding to
'the title by which he was known by his followers' (1961: 228 n. 1; cf.
Hughes 2006: 106 n. 159, 157 n. 91), which, in Dupont-Sommer's opinion,
was מורה הצדק. Given that our analysis so far would appear to indicate
that the sobriquet מורה הצדק was not in use in the ESP, this would seem
unlikely. On the other hand, an allusion to the title מורה/יורה היחיד
(CD 20.1; 20.14) would be possible and certainly some reference to the
activity of teaching is implied (congruent with the similarly didactic role
implicit in the description 'a mediator of knowledge'; 1QH[a] 10.13).

   In the present passage, יורה is ostensibly used to indicate 'an early rain'
(cf. the abundant water imagery throughout 1QH[a] 16.4-26), indicative
perhaps of a dependence upon scriptural usage such as Hos. 10.12 or Joel
2.23 (Bengtsson 2000a: 192, 194; Dupont-Sommer 1961: 228 n. 1; Holm-
Nielsen 1960: 153 n. 32; Hughes 2006: 156–57), yet with metaphorical

---

122   Wise, Abegg and Cook render this implicit meaning *explicit* in their rather loose
translation, supplying the qualifying phrase 'your words' ('But You, O my God, have placed
Your words in my mouth, as showers of early rain'). In their opinion, the intention of 1QH[a]
16.16 is to present the speaker as 'a mouthpiece for God's words' (1996: 85). Cf. 1QH[a] 19.33:
'And you have placed in the mouth of your servant thanksgiving' (ותשם בפי עבדכה הודות).
Also, Num. 22.38 and 2 Sam. 14.3 (see Holm-Nielsen 1960: 153 n. 31).
   123   Bengtsson 2000a: 198; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996: 85.

undertones playing on the ambiguity of ירה.[124] In other words, 1QH[a] 16.16-17 is adopting a scriptural term that may be taken to indicate either 'an early rain' or the act of teaching, and employing it in such a way as to bring out *both* meanings within the text. Hence we have here an interpretation of the term akin to that of CD 6.11a. That the latter text belongs to the FSP (and we can perhaps assume was available to the author of 1QH[a] 16.16-17) lends further credence to our proposal above that the speaker is drawing upon CD 6.11a and, by implication, claiming (with divine authority) the role of the anticipated יורה הצדק.[125]

Other elements of this passage have a similarly distinctive sectarian character. The metaphor regarding the 'early rain' placed in the mouth of the speaker is extended to encompass 'a spring of living water' (מבוע מים חיים, 1QH[a] 16.16).[126] We have already seen a similar phrase occur in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document:

> [19.33]Thus all the men who entered the new [34]covenant in the land of Damascus and turned and betrayed and departed from the well of living water {באר מים החיים} [35]shall not be reckoned in the council of the people and in their list they shall not be written from the day of the gathering in of מורה היחיד [20.1] until there shall arise the messiah from Aaron and from Israel. (CD 19.33b–20.1a)

There, departure from the (new) covenant entails departure from 'the well of living water', seemingly representative of the תורה and teachings of the group (cf. CD 3.12b-16; 6.2-5). Might such an understanding lie behind 1QH[a] 16.16? It would follow that we should similarly regard 'a spring of living water' in the Hodayot as a metaphorical reference to a source of knowledge. Interestingly, 1QH[a] 10.17b-18 states of the speaker's opponents:

> [10.17]They throw into the pit the life of the man in whose mouth {בפי(ו)} you have established and imparted understanding. [18]You placed it in his heart to open a fountain of knowledge {מקור דעת} for all those who understand. (1QH[a] 10.17b-18) [= Sukenik 2.17b-18][127]

---

124 With regard to scriptural influence and typologies, see further Daise 2000 (esp. 297–305). Also Hughes 2006: 106–107, 156–57.

125 We have already speculated, in both the present chapter and previously in Chapter 2, that the figure acclaimed as 'a teacher of righteousness' in the ESP was considered the fulfilment of the expectation professed in the FSP regarding יורה הצדק באחרית הימים (CD 6.11a). If such a claim can indeed be recognized in 1QH[a] 16.16, expressed furthermore in the first-person, greater weight may perhaps be given to the identification of the (implied) author with this figure.

126 Mansoor draws attention to Isa. 35.7 (1961: 155 n. 4), but this has only מבועי מים. Cf. Jer. 2.13: 'a fountain of living water' (מקור מים חיים).

127 The text actually preserves בפי, as at 1QH[a] 16.16 (both texts likewise contain שמחה, though here qualified by בלבבו), though most scholars correct to בפיו (Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Mansoor 1961; Vermes 2004). Svend Holm-

The phrase 'a fountain of knowledge' (מקור דעת) appears also in 1QH^a
20.29, while our present passage mentions 'a fountain of life' (מקור חיים,
1QH^a 16.14; cf. Jer. 2.13: 'a fountain of living water'; מקור מים חיים).[128]
Furthermore, 1QH^a 23[top].10 states 'You have opened a [foun]tain in the
mouth of your servant' (מקור פתחתה בפי עבדכה).[129] The mesh of
similar phraseology, both scriptural and sectarian (in particular the use of
באר מים החיים in CD 19.34; cf. 3.12b-16; 6.2-5) provides some
justification for regarding the 'spring of living water' (מבוע מים חיים)
of 1QH^a 16.16 in reference to a metaphorical 'fountain of knowledge'
(מקור דעת, 1QH^a 10.18; 20.29). This would in turn appear to provide
independent confirmation of our analogous interpretation of יורה as an
allusion to teaching.

  It is perhaps significant that 1QH^a 16.16-17 is set within the wider
context of a planting metaphor (1QH^a 16.4-26; cf. 14.14-19). The use of
שורש ('root', 1QH^a 16.7, 10, 23) and מטע ('planting', 1QH^a 16.5, 6, 9, 10,
13, 20, 21) recall the 'root of planting' (שורש מטעת) of the Damascus
Document (CD 1.7), there used to designate the group responsible for the
text.[130] The language of 1QH^a 16.4-26 draws upon themes from Ezekiel 31
(cf. Isa. 60.21; 61.3) and contributes to a body of planting imagery found
among the Qumran-related texts (Dimant 1984: 539; Fujita 1976; Hempel
1999a: 329 n. 36; Stuckenbruck 2005; Swarup 2006: 15–107 [esp. 15–49];
Tiller 1997).[131] Patrick Tiller notes the following of 1QH^a 16.4-26:

> The images seem internally inconsistent and intermixed with inconsist-
> ent sorts of references by the psalmist to himself … The textual
> confusion and intermixture of poet and metaphor indicates that the
> writer felt that he participated in the planting or growth of the shoot
> that was to become an eternal plant of global proportions. (Tiller 1997:
> 332)[132]

Such an insight may prove to be of particular note if we were to accredit
authorship to the figure described as 'a teacher of righteousness'
(מורה צדק) who we are told was 'raised up' for 'a root of planting' in
CD 1.4-11a.[133]

Nielsen, however, warns against such corrections (1960: 36–37 n. 40) and so retains בפי,
translating 'through my mouth' (similarly García Martínez 1996; Wise, Abegg and Cook
1996).

   128   Cf. 'The words of a man's mouth {דברי פי־איש} are deep waters; the fountain of
wisdom {מקור חכמה} is a gushing stream' (Prov. 18.4).
   129   Cf. 1QH^a 19.33: 'And you have placed in the mouth of your servant thanksgiving'
(ותשם בפי עבדכה הודות).
   130   See nn. 19 and 20 above.
   131   Cf. Daise 2000.
   132   See further Charlesworth 1991.
   133   Note the use of יחד, albeit in the sense of 'together', within the planting metaphor of
1QH^a 16.4-26 (16.5). Dupont-Sommer attempts to identify further sectarian terminology

One last point worth mentioning with regard to 1QH^a 16.16-17 is the presence of the negative לא יכזב indicating that 'the heavens will not fail {לא יכזב} to open' (1QH^a 16.16-17). It appears in form and context to draw upon Isa. 58.11:

> And you shall be like a watered garden, like a spring of water, whose waters never fail {אשר לא־יכזבו מימיו}.

It is, however, derived from the root כזב which can also mean 'lie' as we find in, for example, מטיף כזב.[134] Indeed the form found in Isa. 58.11, pointed יְכַזְּבוּ, appears only once more in the Hebrew Bible, where it is rendered 'they lied' by the NRSV (Ps. 78.36).[135] The phrase לא יכזב appears in Prov. 14.5 and Hab. 2.3, both times most aptly translated 'does not lie'.[136] Though perhaps by accident rather than design, the proximity of the roots ירה and כזב in 1QH^a 16.16 do bring to mind the terminology of opposition between 'a teacher of righteousness' (מורה צדק) and 'a spouter of a lie' (מטיף כזב). Though it would go far beyond the evidence to suggest a deliberate allusion, in this context it is perhaps interesting to recall the description in CD 1.14-15 of one who 'spouted to Israel *waters of a lie*' (הטיף לישראל מימי כזב).

Summary

The sobriquet 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (מורה הצדק) does not appear in the H-material in either definite or indefinite form. Neither is the label 'the Teacher of the Community' employed. Given the frequency with which the text is attributed to the historical 'teacher' (see n. 109 above), it is arguably peculiar that none of the designations attributed to this figure in the D-material (FSP or ESP) appear here.[137] Håkan Bengtsson, assuming authorship by the 'teacher', suggests that since the title 'the Teacher of Righteousness' is absent:

---

within the passage, reconstructing 'the sons of men' or 'the sons of righteousness' in the lacuna at 1QH^a 16.16 (Dupont-Sommer 1961: 228 n. 1; cf. Holm-Nielsen 1960: 153 n. 33). In addition, rather than 'heavens' (השׁמַ[י]ם, 1QH^a 16.17), he elects to reconstruct 'princes' (השׂר[י]ם), thus drawing a parallel with the 'princes' who dug the well and sought God in CD 6.2-11a (cf. 1QH^a 14.14), an approach in which he has not been followed (Dupont-Sommer 1961: 228 n. 3; cf. Holm-Nielsen 1960: 153 n. 34).

134   Cf. Clines (ed.) 1998; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995.

135   'But they flattered him with their mouths, they lied to him {יכזבו־לו} with their tongues' (Ps. 78.36).

136   'A faithful witness does not lie {לא יכזב}, but a false witness breathes out lies' (Prov. 14.5); 'For there is still a vision for the appointed time; it speaks of the end, and does not lie (ולא יכזב)' (Hab. 2.3). Cf. Num. 23.19.

137   Mansoor similarly notes the apparent absence of 'the Teacher of Righteousness' from the Hodayot as problematic for the assumption of authorship by this figure (1961: 45).

> Consequently, it was not a self-designation. It is likely that the title was adopted and applied to him by the *Yahad*. (2000a: 195)

Such an interpretation, however, is grounded in the supposition that the speaker of the so-called 'Teacher Hymns' was in fact the figure to whom the title מורה הצדק was eventually applied. Most scholars have attempted to establish this by a comparison of apparent 'historical' events which befall 'the Teacher of Righteousness' in the pesharim with those experienced by the protagonist of the Hodayot.[138] However, as Bonnie Kittel notes:

> Attractive as this view is, it is built on a fallacious assumption and circular argument ... many scholars have concluded that since the Teacher of Righteousness is described as suffering and persecuted, and the author of the Hodayot also speaks of suffering, the two must be the same. Once having made this identification, they see the distresses related in these psalms as events in the life of the Teacher, and thus affirm by this circular argument that he wrote them. (Kittel 1981: 9–10)

Similarly, Carol Newsom highlights that these points of comparison are 'similarities of *theme*' (2004: 290) and suggests that the so-called 'Teacher Hymns' instead 'articulate a leadership myth' (292) and a symbolic reality (see too, Hughes 2006: 234). We have already seen that Davies likewise casts doubt upon the validity of the traditional approach, highlighting the apparent dependence of the pesharim upon the Hodayot for information concerning the 'teacher' (and thus explaining the similarity in content between the two).[139] Davies' suggestion is convincingly demonstrated, though carries with it the significant implication that:

> within the Qumran community these hymns – and at the very least the autobiographical ones – were *understood* to be compositions of the 'Teacher'. (Davies 1987: 89–90; my italics)[140]

---

138   See n. 109 above.

139   Davies 1987: 87–105.

140   Cf. Newsom 2004: 291–92. On 'The Teacher of Righteousness Remembered', see Stuckenbruck 2007a. The assertion by Michael Knibb that he cannot find any evidence for Davies' conclusion (Knibb 1990: 54) would suggest both a denial, in his opinion, of literary dependency upon the Hodayot by the pesharim *and* that the community who read the scrolls distinguished between 'the Teacher of Righteousness' as presented in the pesharim and the often near-identical descriptions of the protagonist of the Hodayot. The affinity between the two must surely suggest either (i) some form of literary dependency, (ii) an independent source upon which both drew, or, as many scholars would have it, (iii) that the two contain largely concurring (auto)biographical details concerning the life of an historical individual. Each of these possibilities entails the conclusion that the protagonist of the Hodayot was *understood* to be the 'teacher'. At the very least, even if the pesharim were written concerning a distinct individual and without regard for the Hodayot, modern scholars were quick to spot the points of contact between these two shadowy figures; would readers in the community not have done the same and thus read the 'teacher' within the Hodayot?

Thus, designations or descriptions within the Hodayot may likewise have been understood as applicable to the 'teacher' and, even if not influenced by, may have fed *into* the process of sobriquet development.

The description of 'a righteous one' (צדיק; e.g., 1QH^a 7.18) and the protagonist's portrayal of himself within a didactic role as 'a mediator of knowledge' (מליץ דעת) for the 'elect of righteousness' (בחירי צדק, 1QH^a 10.13) are in keeping with the description of 'the Teacher of the Community' in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document.[141] Further descriptive elements in the Hodayot, such as association with the term יחד (e.g., 1QH^a 6.18; 12.24; 13.22; 16.5), the 'spring of living water' (מבוע מים חיים, 1QH^a 16.16) and use of a planting metaphor (1QH^a 16.4-26; cf. 14.14-19), are similarly paralleled in this text. Even more striking is the claim that 'those who walk in the way of your heart' (ההולכים בדרך לבכה, 1QH^a 12.24) have 'listened' to the protagonist of the Hodayot (ישמעוני, 12.24), while in the Damascus Document the figure labelled 'a teacher of righteousness' (whose voice must be listened to; CD 20.27-34) is expressly described as having been raised up for a remnant by God 'to lead them in the way of his heart' (להדריכם בדרך לבו, CD 1.11).

Perhaps most significantly for our examination, though, is the use and application of the term יורה by the speaker in 1QH^a 16.16-17. The context would suggest a deliberate metaphorical use, playing on the ambiguity with regard to 'raining' and 'teaching' as alternative under-standings of the root ירה and employing the term in such a way as to bring out both meanings within the text. Hence we have here an interpretation of יורה akin to that of CD 6.11a. We have even tentatively suggested that 1QH^a 16.16-17 might represent an effort on the part of the speaker to claim identification with the anticipated יורה הצדק of the FSP.[142] Given the apparent application of this role to 'the Teacher of the Community' in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document (resulting in his description as 'a teacher of righteousness': מורה צדק, CD 1.11; 20.32) and furthermore the association of this figure with the protagonist of the Hodayot (see n. 140 above), such an approach might prove to reveal a crucial step in the development of the sobriquet מורה הצדק.

2. *'The Spouter of the Lie'*
1QH^a 10.9b-11 [2.9b-11]

Various designations and descriptions abound in the Hodayot for groups of opponents. It is perhaps significant that these are largely to be found

---

141 See in particular, CD 1.1–2.1; 19.33–20.34; cf. 6.2-11. Note also, אנשי דעות (CD 20.4-5), seemingly in reference to the followers of מורה היחיד (cf. CD 19.33b–20.15).

142 Cf. n. 125 above.

within the so-called 'Teacher Hymns' and thus denote, for the most part, opponents of the protagonist. Whether any of these might be said to bear relation to the sobriquet מטיף הכזב remains to be seen. The first passage we shall examine concerns a group of 'scoffers':

> [10.9]And you have set me as a reproach [10]and a mockery to traitors {בוגדים}, a foundation of truth and insight to the upright of way {ישרי דרך}. And I have become, because of the iniquity of the wicked {רשעים}, [11]slander on the lip of violent men, scoffers {לצים} gnash their teeth. (1QH[a] 10.9b-11) [= Sukenik 2.9b-11]

The term לצים, the plural of ליץ, comes from the root ליץ. Interestingly, this is the same root from which מליץ ('mediator', as in מליצי תעות, 1QH[a] 10.14) is derived (see Richardson 1955).[143] The same is also true of לצון ('scoffing'), employed in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document in reference to 'the Men of Scoffing' (אנשי הלצון, CD 20.11) and, crucially, 'the Man of Scoffing {איש הלצון} who spouted to Israel waters of a lie' (CD 1.14-15).[144] Thus we shall, with the majority of scholars, render לצים as 'scoffers' (e.g., García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Knibb 1994a; Mansoor 1961; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996).[145]

Of the various scriptural occurrences of לצים, two are of especial note. Prov. 1.22 reads:

> How long, O simple ones, will you love being simple? How long will scoffers {לצים} delight in their scoffing {לצון} and fools hate knowledge?

It thus demonstrates a close association between לצים (as found here in 1QH[a] 10.11) and לצון (employed as איש הלצון and אנשי הלצון in CD 1.14; 20.11). Even more intriguing is the appearance of לצים in Prov. 19.22-29:

> [19.22]What is desirable in a person is loyalty, and it is better to be poor than a man of a lie {איש כזב}. [23]The fear of the LORD is life indeed;

---

143   Though note also מליץ דעת (1QH[a] 10.13). See Clines (ed.) 1998; 2001; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995.

144   See n. 113 above.

145   Cf. 'mockers' (Dupont-Sommer 1961); 'scorners' (Holm-Nielsen 1960); 'babblers' (Richardson 1955). Richardson in particular outlines a convincing argument on the grounds of context for an understanding of ליץ and its derivatives within scripture in reference to 'talking freely' and the noun 'babbler', concepts that would tie in also with the notion of 'spouting' (cf. איש הלצון who spouted {הטיף} to Israel waters of a lie': CD 1.14-15). Nevertheless, some wider range of meaning for the derivatives of ליץ would appear necessary (e.g., מליץ, which Richardson concedes may on occasion be in reference to mediation, as indeed we translated above [Richardson 1955: 167]) and so, to make explicit the relationship to איש הלצון (CD 1.14) and אנשי הלצון (CD 20.11), we shall follow the majority of scholars in rendering לצים 'scoffers'.

filled with it one rests secure and suffers no harm. [24]The lazy person buries a hand in the dish, and will not even bring it back to the mouth. [25]Strike a scoffer {לץ}, and the simple will learn prudence; reprove the intelligent, and they will gain knowledge {דעת}. [26]Those who do violence to their father and chase away their mother are children who cause shame and bring reproach. [27]Cease straying, my child, from the words of knowledge {אמרי־דעת}, in order that you may hear instruction {מוסר}. [28]A worthless witness mocks {יליץ} at justice, and the mouth of the wicked {רשעים} devours iniquity. [29]Condemnation is ready for scoffers {לצים}, and flogging for the backs of fools.

References to 'scoffers' (including the use of לצים) here appear in the context of 'a man of a lie' (איש כזב: note the absence of the definite article), reminiscent of the association in the Damascus Document of איש הכזב with איש הלצון (CD 1.11b-17) and אנשי הלצון (20.10-15).[146] Furthermore, reference to the 'wicked' (רשעים; Prov. 19.28) and their iniquity (און) recalls that of 1QH^a 10.10 (though note עון, not און), while, as we have seen, 'knowledge' (דעת; Prov. 19.25, 27) and 'instruction' (מוסר; 19.27) likewise appear just a few lines later in 1QH^a 10.13-14.[147] Though there is nothing to suggest a direct dependence of 1QH^a 10.9b-11 upon Prov. 19.22-29, there is evidence of a contextually similar understanding of לצים.

There would also appear to be points of contact between 1QH^a 10.9b-11 and the redacted first column of CD. In the latter, a figure described as 'a teacher of righteousness' is raised up by God 'to lead them in the way {בדרך} of his heart' (CD 1.11a) but is set in opposition to 'a congregation of traitors' (עדת בוגדים, CD 1.12), 'those who departed from the way' (הם סרי דרך, CD 1.13), led by 'the Man of Scoffing' (איש הלצון, CD 1.14; cf. אנשי הלצון, CD 20.11).[148] In our present text, 1QH^a 10.9b-11, the protagonist has been established by God for 'the upright of way' (ישרי דרך, 1QH^a 10.10) but is likewise opposed by 'traitors' (בוגדים, 1QH^a 10.10) and 'scoffers' (לצים, 1QH^a 10.11). Is it possible to perceive a link here between the 'scoffers' of the Hodayot and those of the Damascus Document, in particular 'the Man of Scoffing' who we have seen described as 'a spouter of a lie' (CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26)?

That לצים and בוגדים appear only once in 1QH^a, and are to be found within the same passage (10.9b-11), lends credence to the suggestion of

---

146   See n. 76 above.

147   Mansoor suggests reading עין for עון at 1QH^a 10.10 (1961: 106 n. 2). Holm-Nielsen disagrees however, regarding such a rendering as contextually incongruent (1960: 35 n. 22).

148   Note also the role of 'the (/a) wicked (one)' (רשע) as a foil to 'the (/a) righteous (one)' in CD 1.19 (belonging originally to the FSP, as does the עדת בוגדים, CD 1.12).

some relationship with the Damascus Document, where the two themes are also brought into association in the redaction of the text belonging to this ESP (CD 1.11b-17). However, the use of slightly differing terminology with regard to 'scoffers' might warn against too close an identification. The designation איש הלצון (CD 1.14; cf. אנשי הלצון, CD 20.11), as we have already noted, would appear in context and form to draw upon Isa. 28.14 (אנשי לצון), while לצים (1QH^a 10.11) has more in common with occurrences of the same term throughout Proverbs.[149] In addition, the Hodayot would appear to draw heavily upon Proverbs (and to a lesser extent Psalms) for the opposition of צדיק and רשע (see n. 99 above). Phillip Callaway notes:

> The consistent use of comparison suggests that the speaker is not trying
> to communicate specific historical information about his adversaries.
> (1988: 195)

The most we can say for the present is that both the Hodayot and the Damascus Document share a general theme that portrays figures of opposition in the role of 'scoffers'; a theme that is founded in scriptural texts.

While the לצים of 1QH^a 10.9b-11 would thus appear a general label applicable to any opposition met by the protagonist, the title איש הלצון found in CD 1.14 is used in a far narrower sense (e.g., its association with specific deeds; CD 1.11-17; cf. 20.10-15). It would be unlikely therefore that we have in 1QH^a 10.9b-11 an oblique reference to 'the Man of Scoffing', though a movement in the other direction would be possible.[150] Given, however, our conclusion that the protagonist may retrospectively have been identified with the 'teacher' (see n. 140 above), we may tentatively postulate that 'the Man of Scoffing' ('a spouter of a lie': CD 1.14-15; cf. 4.19-20; 8.13; 19.25-26) and 'the Men of Scoffing' (CD 20.10) might also have been retrospectively 'identified' within this passage. While therefore of limited use for our investigation of sobriquet development, 1QH^a 10.9b-11 does highlight the prominence of a more general theme that portrays figures of opposition as 'scoffers', present in two distinct texts of the ESP. This may indicate additional reasoning for the employment of the designation איש הלצון in CD 1.14. As to this figure's

---

149   In fact, three out of the four scriptural occurrences of לצים, and eleven out of twelve of the singular form לץ, are to be found in Proverbs (the exceptions being Ps. 1.1 and Isa. 29.20 respectively). Note however the use of אנשי לצון in Prov. 29.8 (see n. 45 above).

150   Indeed, Davies' examination of the pesharim's dependence upon the Hodayot highlighted 'a more general phenomenon, whereby rather vaguer plural terms in the Hymns become soubriquets for discrete individuals, or for identifiable parties, in the pesharim' (1987: 97). This itself is something we shall evaluate in due course, though one is given to wonder whether the insight might also apply to the relationship between the Hodayot and the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document.

further characterization as 'a spouter of a lie' (מטיף כזב: CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26), 1QH^a 10.9b-11 reveals very little.

1QH^a 10.13-17a [2.13-17a]

A further passage of note, examined already with regard to the sobriquet מורה הצדק, appears two lines further down in the same column:

> $^{10.13}$But you have set me like a banner to the elect of righteousness, and a mediator of knowledge {מליץ דעת} of wonderful mysteries, to test ^{14}[the men of] truth and to try those who love instruction. And I have become a man of dispute {ריב} to מליצי תעות [but a man of ^{15}pea]ce to all seers of truth {חוזי נכוחות}. And I have become a spirit of zeal against [קות]דורשי חל. ^{16}[All] אנשי רמיה roar against me like the sound of the turbulence of many waters and schemes of Belial are [all] ^{17}their thoughts. (1QH^a 10.13-17a) [= Sukenik 2.13-17a]

The speaker, 'a mediator of knowledge' (מליץ דעת, 1QH^a 10.13), is here opposed by 'mediators of error' (מליצי תעות, 1QH^a 10.14).[151] Reference is also made to אנשי רמיה, which we shall render with the majority of scholars, 'men of deceit' (Dupont-Sommer 1961; Holm-Nielsen 1960; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Knibb 1994a; Mansoor 1961; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996).[152] Both descriptions entail a sense of falsehood, made more explicit by the contrasting presence in the passage of 'a mediator of knowledge' and '[men of] truth' (אמת [אנשי], 1QH^a 10.14). Indeed, with regard to 'mediators of error', we have already noted by token of its juxtaposition with the implied didactic role of 'a mediator of knowledge', that it would appear to indicate false teachers.

Though neither נטף nor כזב are attested in the passage, some similarities exist with associated terminology in the redacted first column of CD. Despite the fact that מליצי תעות and variant derogatory forms (to be examined below) are to be found in the Hodayot, Michael Douglas notes the uniqueness of this construction: 'In Jewish literature, the expression מליצי + pejorative noun is *only* found within 1QH cols 10–14' (1999: 249; my italics). However, as we have already remarked, מליץ ('mediator') comes from the root ליץ, from which לצון ('scoffing') is also derived, a term used to describe the false teacher of CD 1.13-15 who 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie' (cf. Richardson 1955; see n. 113 above). It is of further note that the qualification of such mediation in 1QH^a 10.14 is תעות, here rendered 'error' (cf. Isa. 32.6; see Holm-Nielsen 1960: 82 n. 24). The root תעה can additionally mean 'to go astray' (Koehler and

---

151 See n. 112 above.

152 Note, however, 'the deceivers' (Vermes 2004) and 'arrogant men' (García Martínez 1996). Also, while here providing 'men of deceit', García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997) translate אנשי רמיה at 1QH^a 6.14 as 'men of guile'. See רמה in Koehler and Baumgartner 1996. Cf. אנשי הרמיה in 1QS 9.8.

Baumgartner 1999; cf. Exod. 23.4) and significantly is *also* used of this figure in CD 1.13-15:

> [1.13]That was the time about which it is written, 'like a stray heifer, [14]so Israel strayed', when arose the Man of Scoffing {איש הלצון} who spouted to Israel [15]waters of a lie and led them astray {יתעם} in a wilderness without a way (CD 1.13-15).

Thus both elements of מליצי תעות are found in some form in the terminology used to describe one 'who spouted to Israel waters of a lie' in the Damascus Document.

We have similarly noted the presence of ריב at 1QH[a] 10.14, also appearing in the first column of CD (CD 1.2; 1.21; see n. 115 above), and the use of צדק (1QH[a] 10.13; cf. CD 1.1, 11, 16, 19, 20). In addition, דורשי חל]קות (1QH[a] 10.15) is paralleled by דרשו בחלקות (CD 1.18).[153] There is accordingly a significant contextual overlap between the employment of מליצי תעות in the Hodayot and the description of one 'who spouted to Israel waters of a lie' in the Damascus Document.

The descriptions 'mediators of error' (מליצי תעות, 1QH[a] 10.14) and 'men of deceit' (אנשי רמיה, 1QH[a] 10.16) have an inherent association with falsehood.[154] The former in particular shares with our sobriquet, 'the Spouter of the Lie', the concept of false teaching. These designations thus have much in common on a thematic level at least, if not a strictly terminological one, with the sobriquet מטיף הכזב. Along with their counterparts (אנשין] אמת; מליץ דעת), they mirror the distinction within the Yaḥadic redaction of the Damascus Document between the two types of teaching represented by 'a spouter of a lie' and 'a teacher of righteousness'.

1QH[a] 10.31b-34a [2.31b-34a]

Similar terminology to that employed in 1QH[a] 10.13-17a appears in a passage towards the bottom of the same column:

> [10.31]And you have saved me from the zeal of מליצי כזב [32]and from the congregation of דורשי חלקות. You have redeemed the life of the poor one whom they thought to finish off, spilling his blood [33]because he served you. But they did [not kn]ow that my steps come from you. And they have set me as an object of contempt [34]and reproach in the mouth of all דורשי רמיה. (1QH[a] 10.31b-34a) [= Sukenik 2.31b-34a]

We have noted already the insight of Douglas with regard to the unusual nature of the construction מליצי followed by a pejorative noun, a construction limited within Jewish literature to 1QH[a] 10–14 (Douglas

---

153   We shall examine this designation in greater detail in Chapter 5.
154   דורשי חל]קות (1QH[a] 10.15) should perhaps be viewed likewise; see n. 153 above.

have מליצי כזב (1QH[a] 10.31). This has been rendered variously as 'mediators of deceit' (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997), 'mediators of lies' (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996), 'interpreters of lies' (Holm-Nielsen 1960; Knibb 1994a), 'interpreters of falsehood' (Dupont-Sommer 1961), 'lying interpreters' (Vermes 2004), 'spokesmen of lies' (Mansoor 1961) and 'sowers of deceit' (García Martínez 1996). Our understanding of מליצי תעות (1QH[a] 10.14) as 'mediators of error' and מטיף כזב (CD 8.13) as 'a spouter of a lie', would suggest 'mediators of a lie' to be, for our purposes, a terminologically consistent rendering of מליצי כזב (1QH[a] 10.31).[155]

Quite apart from the question of whether specific historical groups can be deemed to lie behind these designations, should we regard מליצי תעות and מליצי כזב as indicative of two (fictional?/historical?) groups of opponents or as alternative labels for a single entity? In addition to terminological and structural similarities there are contextual parallels. As with the 'mediators of error' in 1QH[a] 10.13-17a, so too here the 'mediators of a lie' are brought into association with דורשי חלקות, 'seekers of smooth things' (1QH[a] 10.32; cf. 10.15).[156] The similar phrase דורשי רמיה (1QH[a] 10.34) is reminiscent of the 'men of deceit' (אנשי רמיה) in 1QH[a] 10.16, and should perhaps accordingly be rendered 'seekers of deceit'.[157]

Thus, in both 1QH[a] 10.13-17a and 10.31b-34a the forces of opposition are denoted by three discernible labels. Just as the speaker is set against (i) אנשי רמיה, (ii) מליצי תעות and (iii) דורשי חלקות in 1QH[a] 10.13-17a, so in 10.31b-34a he is opposed by (i) מליצי כזב, (ii) דורשי חלקות and (iii) דורשי רמיה. Assuming that דורשי חלקות in 1QH[a] 10.32 should be considered identical with those that appear in 10.15, might we perhaps further speculate that מליצי כזב and מליצי תעות (1QH[a] 10.14; 10.31), and similarly דורשי רמיה and אנשי רמיה (1QH[a] 10.16; 10.34), should also be regarded as synonymous designations?[158] In addition, Holm-Nielsen notes a supposedly deliberate parallel between מליצי כזב, which he renders 'interpreters of lies' (so too Knibb 1994a; cf. n. 111 above), and דורשי חלקות (Holm-Nielsen 1960: 48 n. 3). Might the two likewise be alternative designations for the same oppositional group? Indeed, given

---

155 As indeed Wise, Abegg and Cook (1996) elect to translate מליצי כזב when it reappears in 1QH[a] 12.9b-11a.

156 The designation would appear to draw upon Isaiah 30.10. Note also ולחזים לא תחזו-לנו נכחות (Isa. 30.10); cf. חוזי נכוחות (1QH[a] 10.15). See n. 153 above.

157 So too Holm-Nielsen (1960) and Mansoor (1961). Cf. '(those) who search deceit' (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997); 'those that look for deceit' (Dupont-Sommer 1961); 'those who seek deceit' (Knibb 1994a; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996); 'seekers of falsehood' (Vermes 2004); 'interpreters of trickery' (García Martínez 1996).

158 Knibb 1994a: 171–72.

the terminological similarity between דורשי רמיה and דורשי חלקות, it is possible that between these two passages we simply have five synonyms applicable to opponents in the text.

Such an understanding of general oppositional themes would appear congruent with the context of 1QH[a] 10.13-17a and 10.31b-34a, and simpler than positing three (or even five) distinct opposing groups in these passages. If this is the case, doubt is cast on the ability to identify (or even confirm the existence of) specific referents behind these designations:

> Although such interpretations cannot be precluded, one should use the same caution here as in the O.T. psalms, where formerly attempts used to be made to apply the stereotyped expressions for enemies to particular people. Not only are names never mentioned, but the conventionalised phraseology never makes it at all clear whom is meant. Until something else can be demonstrated, I find it most reasonable to understand the expressions as simply taken over from the O.T. terminology. (Holm-Nielsen 1960: 48 n. 3)[159]

For our purposes, however, these occurrences may yet be of some use. We have already noted that both elements of מליצי תעות (1QH[a] 10.14) are to be found in some form in the terminology used to describe one 'who spouted to Israel waters of a lie' in the Damascus Document (CD 1.13-15). How greater the significance then that in our present passage תעות is replaced by כזב. Let us examine once again the passage from the Damascus Document:

> [1.13]That was the time about which it is written, 'like a stray heifer, [14]so Israel strayed', when arose the Man of Scoffing {איש הלצון} who spouted to Israel [15]waters of a lie {כזב} and led them astray {יתעם} in a wilderness without a way (CD 1.13-15).

The designation מליצי כזב contains an element that shares a root with לצון, found in the sobriquet 'the Man of Scoffing' (איש הלצון; cf. Richardson 1955), and furthermore a qualification, כזב, that occurs in the description of the same figure as 'a spouter of a lie' (מטיף כזב, CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26). Indeed, Mansoor (who renders מליצי כזב, 'spokesmen of lies') implies an explicit connection between this designation and the sobriquet 'the Spouter of the Lie' (מטיף הכזב), drawing attention to the possible translation 'babblers of lies' (1961: 110 n. 5).[160]

Certainly, in terms of descriptive value, a distinct similarity exists

---

159   Knibb, on the other hand, argues that the various terms employed 'suggest that the activities of a distinct rival group of opponents are in mind, even though the precise circumstances are unclear' (1994a: 171).

160   Note that Richardson regards ליץ and its derivatives within scripture in reference to 'talking freely' and the noun 'babbler' (Richardson 1955; see n. 145 above).

between 'mediators of error' (1QHª 10.14), 'mediators of a lie' (1QHª 10.31) and 'a spouter of a lie' (CD 8.13). All indicate the proponents of false teaching, offset against the correct teachings of the protagonist of the Hodayot or the figure described as 'a teacher of righteousness' in the Damascus Document.[161] Knibb notes that the specific employment of מליצי כזב and מליצי תעות in the Hodayot 'suggests that *the major point at issue* between the psalmist and his enemies was false teaching' (1994a: 172; my italics). Such is what we also find between the 'teacher' and his opponents in the Damascus Document, reflected in the descriptive use of ירה and נטף with appropriate further qualification. One would again expect from this that a retrospective identification of the protagonist of the Hodayot with the 'teacher' would have entailed the designation מליצי כזב being read in the light of מטיף כזב. Consequently, though it may not have fed directly into the developmental process of the sobriquet, this and similar designations in the Hodayot provide us with a wider thematic background against which to understand such labelling.

1QHª 12.6b-11a [4.6b-11a]

The term מליצי כזב also appears in a passage from column 12 of the re-ordered 1QHª:

> [12.6]But they, your people [... [7]...] ... they smooth them {החליקו} and מליצי רמיה [le]ad them astray {[ה]תעום}, and they are brought to ruin without insight, for [...] [8]their deeds in folly. For (I) have been rejected by them and they do not esteem me when you make yourself great through me. For they banish me from my land [9]like a bird from its nest, and all my friends and my acquaintances have been driven from me and esteem me as a broken vessel. But they are מליצי [10]כזב and חוזי רמיה, they have schemes of Belial against me, to change your law which you engraved in my heart for חלקות [11]for your people. (1QHª 12.6b-11a) [= Sukenik 4.6b-11a]

Appearing in exactly the same form as at 1QHª 10.31, the 'mediators of a lie' again denote an opposing party to the speaker.[162] A third example of the construction מליצי followed by pejorative noun also appears in the

---

161 Cf. Mowinckel 1956: 271.

162 Given that מליצי כזב appears in identical form at 1QHª 10.31 and 12.9-10, there is a surprising degree of inconsistency within most translations. For example, 'mediators of deceit' and 'mediators of fraud' respectively (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997); 'mediators of lies' and 'mediators of a lie' (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996); 'interpreters of lies' and 'spokesmen of lies' (Holm-Nielsen 1960); 'lying interpreters' and 'teachers of lies' (Vermes 2004); 'spokesmen of lies' and 'preachers of lie' (Mansoor 1961). Perhaps this suitably demonstrates the generalized, stereotypical quality of these and similar labels. Nevertheless, while acknowledging the arguably non-specific nature of such designations, we shall attempt to maintain some consistency in translation in order to better reflect the underlying Hebrew text, lest otherwise important repetitions or parallels go unnoticed.

text: מליצי רמיה (cf. Douglas 1999: 249). In addition to the designations 'mediators of error' (מליצי תעות, 1QH^a 10.14) and 'mediators of a lie' (מליצי כזב, 1QH^a 10.31; 12.9-10), this recalls the 'men of deceit' (אנשי רמיה, 1QH^a 10.16) and 'seekers of deceit' (דורשי רמיה, 1QH^a 10.34) of earlier passages, thus suggesting 'mediators of deceit' as a suitable rendering.[163]

The passage would appear to confirm our earlier speculation that these designations for opposing forces in the Hodayot are interchangeable and therefore synonymous. The accusation that 'mediators of deceit [le]ad them astray' (מליצי רמיה [ה]תעום, 1QH^a 12.7) hints at the label 'mediators of error' (מליצי תעות, 1QH^a 10.14) and further recalls the use of תעה in CD 1.15. Indeed so far, by noting the use of the shared roots ליץ, תעה and כזב, we have in some form associated לצים (1QH^a 10.11), מליצי תעות (1QH^a 10.14), מליצי כזב (1QH^a 10.31; 12.9-10) and now מליצי רמיה (1QH^a 12.7) with the 'traitors' of CD 1.11-15.[164] Combined with the presence of *contextual* similarities within the Hodayot where these different designations occur, a strong case can accordingly be made for regarding them as synonymous labels, drawing upon a wealth of interchangeable stereotypical imagery.[165]

A further example of pejorative labelling within our present passage is the reference to 'seers of deceit' (חוזי רמיה, 1QH^a 12.10).[166] As well as terminological similarities with אנשי רמיה, מליצי רמיה and דורשי רמיה, an obvious parallel can be drawn with the 'seers of truth' (חוזי נכוחות) of 1QH^a 10.15 (cf. חוזי אמת, CD 2.12-13). James Bowley suggests that CD 2.12-13 should be taken in reference to the prophets, and further notes that חוזה is equated with נביא in 2 Sam. 24.11 (1999:

163   So too García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997 and Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996. Cf. 'interpreters of deceit' (Dupont-Sommer 1961; Mansoor 1961), 'spokesmen of deceit' (Holm-Nielsen 1960; Hughes 2006), 'sowers of fraud' (García Martínez 1996). Vermes' translation is problematic at this point as his use of brackets does not accurately reflect what is in the text and what constitutes reconstruction: 'Teachers of lies [have smoothed] Thy people [with words], and [false prophets] have led them astray' (Vermes 2004). Perhaps one may suggest: '[Teachers of lies] have smoothed Thy people [with words], and false prophets have [le]d them astray'. Thus Vermes would appear to render מליצי רמיה, 'false prophets'.

164   Note also דורשי חלקות (1QH^a 10.15; 10.32; cf. 12.7; 12.10) and perhaps דורשי רמיה (1QH^a 10.34); cf. CD 1.18. Furthermore, עדת דורשי חלקות (1QH^a 10.32) and עדת בוגדים (CD 1.12).

165   Other designations we have encountered, such as אנשי רמיה (1QH^a 10.16), would appear on the grounds of context and terminological similarities (e.g., with מליצי רמיה and דורשי רמיה) to likewise be understood within this framework.

166   So too Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Holm-Nielsen 1960; Hughes 2006; Mansoor 1961; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996. Cf. 'seers of falsehood' (Vermes 2004), 'seers of fraud' (García Martínez 1996).

359).[167] Given the sense of false teaching implied by designations such as 'mediators of a lie' and 'mediators of error', does this reference to 'seers of deceit' imply more specifically therefore a theme of false prophecy? We have already noted such an understanding to lie at least partially behind the description 'a spouter of a lie' in the Damascus Document (cf. CD 5.20–6.2; Ezek. 13; Mic. 2.11; 3.5). Bowley notes a significant difference, however, between the use of חוזה and נביא in the sectarian material:

> It is interesting to note that the term [חוזה] is never used in an absolute form, but always in construct with another noun, which may be negative (חוזי רמיה, 'seers of deceit', 1QH[a] 12.10; cf. 12.20) or positive (אמת חוזי, 'seers of truth', CD 2.12; cf. 1QH[a] 12.18). It also never occurs in construct with a definite noun, in contrast to נביא, which is usually found with the article. If these few uses of חוזה are representative, one may conclude that the title חוזה, besides being less frequent, was used *without definite reference* to the prophets of Israel's past. In the case of the more common sobriquet, הנביאים was simply employed to refer to a known group, which was apparently *not the case* with החוזים. (1999: 359–60; my italics)

Such would agree with our own interpretation of these designations, that they do not refer to specific opposing groups but represent a textual typology of opposition. We cannot therefore assert with the same confidence as Knibb that 'the activities of a distinct rival group of opponents are in mind' (1994a: 171; see n. 159 above), though if the case it was certainly one to whom a plurality of interchangeable labels could be applied. Instead, an equally valid case can be made that these designations denote a general theme of opposition such as is found in both scriptural texts and the Hodayot in the ideological dualism between the 'righteous' (צדיק) and the 'wicked' (רשע). Therefore, no 'distinct rival group' was necessarily in the mind of the author, though of course the text could retrospectively have been applied to such. Accordingly, *all* who might conceivably oppose the speaker (whether in the past or future) would be brought within the applicability of these labels.

The 'mediators of a lie and seers of deceit' (1QH[a] 12.9-10) are mentioned in connection with 'schemes of Belial' (1QH[a] 12.10), just as the 'men of deceit' are in 1QH[a] 10.16-17, again suggesting that in all likelihood חוזי רמיה and אנשי רמיה at least should be regarded as synonymous.[168] These schemes are further detailed, 'to change your law which you engraved in my heart for smooth things {חלקות} for your people' (1QH[a] 12.10-11), recalling the דורשי חלקות that appear in

---

167 'When David rose in the morning, the word of the Lord came to the prophet Gad, David's seer' (2 Sam. 24.11).

168 Devorah Dimant notes that בליעל is 'used in biblical parlance as an adjective meaning "base", "wicked" (e.g., Deut 13.14; Prov 6.12)' (1984: 534). Holm-Nielsen and

association with both 'interpreters of error' and 'men of deceit' in 1QH[a] 10.13-17a and the 'mediators of a lie' and 'seekers of deceit' in 10.31b-34a (cf. also החליקו at 1QH[a] 12.7, in association with 'mediators of deceit'). That this law is engraved on the speaker's heart is reminiscent in the first instance of 1QH[a] 10.17b-18:

> [10.17]They throw into the pit the life of the man in whose mouth you have established and imparted understanding. [18]You placed it in his heart {שמחה בלבבו} to open a fountain of knowledge for all those who understand. (1QH[a] 10.17b-18) [= Sukenik 2.17b-18]

However, more striking is the parallel with Jer. 31.33, part of a passage already noted in our examination of the Damascus Document for the presence of a 'new covenant' (ברית חדשה) in the context of a planting metaphor (Jer. 31.27-34; see n. 90 above):

> But this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the LORD: I will put my law within them, and I will write it on their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. (Jer. 31.33)

If we were to posit that the law engraved on the speaker's heart in 1QH[a] 12.10-11 purposefully alludes to Jer. 31.33, then a significant association would be established between the protagonist and the concept of a 'new covenant' (an association that would have considerable implications for an attempt to identify this figure with the 'teacher' of the Damascus Document, arguably the instigator of the *new* covenant there; cf. Davies 1983: 173–97).[169]

The overall picture from 1QH[a] 12.6b-11a confirms that of 10.13-17a and 10.31b-34a. Yet more designations are employed that display a thematic, if not strictly terminological, affinity with the description of 'a spouter of a lie' (מטיף כזב) in the Damascus Document. חוזי רמיה in particular has been demonstrated to imply an accusation of false prophecy (cf. 2 Sam. 24.11). These thematic links with 'a spouter of a lie' find expression in, for example, the rendering of מליצי כזב in 1QH[a] 12.9-10 by Mansoor and Vermes as 'preachers of lie' and 'teachers of lies' respectively (Mansoor 1961; Vermes 2004), both terms that could adequately apply to מטיף כזב when contrasted with מורה צדק. Nevertheless, in the Hodayot these designations would appear to remain

---

indicative of a general theme of opposition rather than having been conceived in reference to specific groups.

1QH*a* 12.14b-20 [4.14b-20]

The final passage we shall consider from the Hodayot with regard to the sobriquet מטיף הכזב is from a little further down the same column:

> [10.14]A root which produces poison and bitterness is in their thoughts, [15]and with stubbornness of heart they inquire and seek you among idols, and place in front of themselves the stumbling-block of their iniquities, and they come [16]to seek you in the mouth of נביאי כזב, deceived by error {תעות}. And they, [in] stam[mer]ing lip and another tongue, speak to your people, [17]to make folly all their deeds in deceit {רמיה}. For they have not chosen in the way {בדרך} of your [heart] and have not listened to your word. For they said [18]of the vision of knowledge {חזון דעת}, 'It is not sure', and of the way of your heart, 'It is not that'. But you, God, will reply to them, judging them [19]in your might [according to] their idols and the multitude of their sins, in order that they are caught in their plans those who separate from your covenant. [20]And you will cut off in ju[dgem]ent all אנשי מרמה, and חוזי תעות will no longer be found. (1QH*a* 12.14b-20) [= Sukenik 4.14b-20]

This passage is paralleled in 4Q430 (frg. 1, 2–7), though, due to the poor state of preservation, only כזב remains of the designation נביאי כזב (1QH*a* 12.16).[170] This significant phrase has been variously rendered 'prophets of fraud' (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997), 'prophets of deceit' (García Martínez 1996), 'prophets of falsehood' (Dupont-Sommer 1961; Hughes 2006), 'lying prophets' (Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996) and 'prophets of lies' (Holm-Nielsen 1960; Mansoor 1961). This last comes the closest to what would constitute for our present investigation a consistent translation, 'prophets of a lie'.

The term recalls the theme of false prophecy already mentioned as inherent in the designation חוזי רמיה (1QH*a* 12.10; cf. Bowley 1999: 359). More significantly, it echoes the phrase ינבאו שקר, indicating those who 'prophesied falsehood' in the FSP (CD 6.1). In CD 5.20–6.2, those who 'prophesied falsehood' are set in opposition to the 'holy anointed ones' (משיחי הקודש; 6.1), ranked as true prophets (Bowley 1999: 358–59). We speculated in Chapter 2 that, just as the anticipated 'one who will teach righteousness at the end of days' (6.11) would appear to have been cast in the role of an eschatological successor to these past conveyors of God's teaching, so an oppositional role to this figure would likely be cast in the mould of those who ינבאו שקר. In our examination of the Yahadic

---

170 אנשי מרמה and חוזי תעות (1QH*a* 12.20) are entirely absent from 4Q430 as the fragment breaks off at תענה לה[ם] (1QH*a* 12.18).

redaction of the Damascus Document, we found that the figure described as 'a spouter of a lie', set in clear opposition to 'a teacher of righteousness', was indeed depicted in terms that combined accusations of false teaching and false prophecy (CD 1.10-18a; 4.19-20; 8.12-13; 19.24b-26a; 20.10-15; cf. Isa. 9.14-16; 28; Ezek. 13; Mic. 2.11; 3.5). The designation 'prophets of a lie' (נביאי כזב, 1QH[a] 12.16) is terminologically closer to the specific description of this singular figure as 'a spouter of a lie' (מטיף כזב) than is the reference to those who 'prophesied falsehood' (ינבאו שקר, CD 6.1). Might it be arguable that we have, therefore, in 1QH[a] 12.16 an intermediary step between ינבאו שקר and מטיף כזב (or perhaps איש הכזב)?[171]

Such a bold movement would go beyond the available evidence, and indeed we have already identified some justification for the predominant use of כזב in the ESP of the Damascus Document (e.g., מטיף כזב, CD 8.13) over the more readily suggestible שקר (e.g., ינבאו שקר, CD 6.1 [FSP]), based upon an adoption of נטף (in opposition to ירה) and subsequent association with כזב on the grounds of Mic. 2.11.[172] It is perhaps enough to note that the Hodayot, belonging to the ESP, preserves a designation (נביאי כזב, 1QH[a] 12.16) that echoes the sentiment of a similar phrase in the FSP (ינבאו שקר, CD 6.1), yet whose main point of difference is the employment of a noun (כזב) that finds particular expression elsewhere among the sectarian literature in labels denoting an oppositional figure who embodies such false prophecy.

Bowley notes that the protagonist of the Hodayot is never, by contrast, expressly referred to as a 'true prophet' (though note: חוזי נכוחות, 1QH[a] 10.15; cf. חזון דעת, 1QH[a] 12.18).[173] Instead, false prophecy is contrasted with 'your law' (תורתכה, 12.10) and 'your word' (דברכה, 12.17), thus presenting the difference between the speaker and the 'prophets of a lie':

> not as a conflict between two equal but contradictory truth-claims (prophet versus prophet)–but rather as a conflict between self-pro-claimed prophets and the already accepted God-given Torah. (Bowley 1999: 372)

He further points to 4Q339, a list of 'false prophets who arose in Israel' (4Q339 1), as evidence that 'describing one's adversaries as false prophets was not merely a poetic flourish by the author of the *Hodayot*' (1999: 372). Such is indeed what we have also found to be the case in the Damascus Document, where the teachings of מורה צדק are likewise contrasted with those of false teachers and prophets.

---

171   William Brownlee suggests that 'the Man of the Lie' deliberately 'parodies the Old Testament title "man of God" for a prophet' (1982: 10; cf. Eshel 1999a: 335).

172   See n. 59 above.

173   Bowley 1999: 372.

It is stated that 'they come to seek you in the mouth of {מפי} prophets of a lie, deceived by error {תעות}' (1QHᵃ 12.15-16), reminiscent of the claim by the speaker that 'you have placed in my mouth {בפי} as it were an early rain {כיורה}' (1QHᵃ 16.16). Thus the 'teaching' of the protagonist (assuming such an understanding of יורה) is expressly contrasted with that issuing from the mouth of false prophets. The recurrence of תעה in this context brings to mind the 'traitors' of CD 1.11-17 who were similarly 'led astray' (יתעם) by one who 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie'.[174] It further recalls the 'mediators of error' (מליצי תעות, 1QHᵃ 10.14) and the accusation that 'mediators of deceit [le]ad them (your people) astray' (מליצי רמיה [ה]תעום, 12.7). In our present text, false prophecy and תעה are brought into even closer association within the designation חוזי תעות, accordingly rendered 'seers of error'.[175] Combining elements already encountered in the labels מליצי תעות (1QHᵃ 10.14) and חוזי רמיה (1QHᵃ 12.10), it would appear to once again demonstrate the interchangeable nature of the constituent elements of such designations in the Hodayot, and hence perhaps the synonymous quality of these labels applicable to opponents in the text.

A further designation to appear in 1QHᵃ 12.14b-20 is אנשי מרמה (1QHᵃ 12.20). The affinity with אנשי רמיה (1QHᵃ 10.16) is demonstrated by the fact that both are translated 'men of deceit' without distinction by Dupont-Sommer (1961), Holm-Nielsen (1960) and Mansoor (1961). Though the phrases may well be synonymous in meaning and are both derived from the root רמה, we shall nevertheless preserve the termino-logical distinction and thus render 'men of deception' (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997).[176] The designation may, like much in the Hodayot, draw upon the book of Psalms where the singular איש־מרמה appears (Ps. 43.1). A related singular form, 'a man of blood and deception' (איש־דמים ומרמה), occurs in Ps. 5.7, along with 'speakers of a lie' (דברי כזב), while Ps. 55.21-24 has the plural 'men of blood and deception' (אנשי דמים ומרמה, 55.24) in the context of covenant violation (חלל בריתו, 55.21), smoothness (חלק, 55.22) and 'the (/a) righteous (one)' (צדיק, 55.23). Each of these contextual references has some parallel in the Hodayot, suggesting once again that we are dealing with a pool of stereotypical imagery.

1QHᵃ 12.19 mentions 'those who separate from your covenant', once again highlighting the context of covenant defection and departure from

---

174   Note also that those who 'prophesied falsehood' (ינבאו שקר, CD 6.1) in the FSP are likewise accused of having 'led Israel astray' (יתעו את ישראל, CD 5.20).

175   So too Dupont-Sommer 1961; Holm-Nielsen 1960; Mansoor 1961; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996. Cf. 'seers of delusion' (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997).

176   Cf. 'deceitful men' (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996); 'men of lies' (Vermes 2004). See מרמה in Clines (ed.) 2001; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995. Cf. n. 152 above.

'the way' (cf. 1QH[a] 12.17-18). As we have seen, this theme is present also in the Damascus Document where such departure is likewise at the instigation or encouragement of false teachers (CD 1.11-17; 3.10-12; 19.33–20.1; 20.10-15). Even the reference to a 'root which produces poison and bitterness' (שורש פורה רוש ולענה, 1QH[a] 12.14), while drawing upon Deut. 29.17, recalls by way of contrast the 'root of planting' (שורש מטעת) of the Damascus Document (CD 1.7). We have already noted the use of planting imagery in 1QH[a] 16.4-26 and similar is to be found in 1QH[a] 14.14-19.[177] Interestingly, this latter passage is followed by a further designation of note:

> But those committed to my testimony have been deceived by [...]מל
> [...] in the service of righteousness {צדק}. (1QH[a] 14.19) [= Sukenik 6.19]

The immediately following text is parallelled in 4Q429 (frg. 2, 1.8), though, due to the poor state of preservation, none of the above text has survived; thus it is unclear what exactly appeared in the lacuna. Sukenik refrained from an attempt at reconstruction in his transcription (1955), as did Lohse (1981). Several scholars, however, have suggested reading the first word as מליצי (Davies 1987: 99; Douglas 1999: 249; Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Kuhn [ed.] 1960; Vermes 2004), coupled with either שקר (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997) or כזב (Douglas 1999: 249).[178] Hence proffered reconstructions include 'those spreading lies' (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997), 'teachers of lies' (Vermes 2004), 'lying mediators' (Douglas 1999) and 'interpreters of falsehood' (Dupont-Sommer 1961).

The designation מליצי שקר does not appear elsewhere in the Hodayot, though note לשון שקר (1QH[a] 13.27) and שפתי שקר (1QH[a] 15.11-12), which would suggest מליצי כזב to be a more likely reconstruction (cf. 1QH[a] 10.31, 12.9-10).[179] Though שקר and כזב are largely synonymous, the distinction is an important one. If García Martínez and Tigchelaar are right to reconstruct מליצי שקר, we have in this passage a juxtaposition of שקר and צדק such as is found by implication in CD 5.20–6.11 between נביאי and יורה הצדק and ינבאו שקר. Accordingly, ינבאו שקר (CD 6.1), מליצי כזב (1QH[a] 14.19) and כזב (1QH[a] 12.16), מליצי שקר (1QH[a] 10.31; 12.9-10) could be viewed as mutually enlightening and inform our

---

177   See further Dimant 1984: 539; Fujita 1976; Hempel 1999a: 329 n. 36; Stuckenbruck 2005; Tiller 1997. See n. 19 above.

178   Mansoor renders 'have been enticed by de[ceit ...]' (Mansoor 1961), indicative that he would reconstruct [... מרמה (cf. his translation 'men of deceit' for אנשי מרמה: 1QH[a] 12.20).

179   See Mowinckel 1956: 271.

understanding of the process of sobriquet development.[180] However, in the absence of the designation מליצי שקר elsewhere in the Hodayot (and given the rarity of the construction מליצי followed by pejorative noun, which would militate against positing an additional label of this form, cf. Douglas 1999: 249), מליצי כזב would prove a more modest reconstruction at 1QH[a] 14.19.

Summary

The sobriquet מטיף הכזב does not appear in the H-material in either definite or indefinite form. Neither are the labels 'the Man of Scoffing' or 'the Man of the Lie' employed. However, numerous related designations for opposing parties do appear, often utilizing similar terminology: scoffers (לצים, 1QH[a] 10.11), 'mediators of error' (מליצי תעות, 10.14), 'seers of error' (חוזי תעות, 12.20), 'mediators of deceit' (מליצי רמיה, 12.7), 'seers of deceit' (חוזי רמיה, 12.10), 'seekers of deceit' (דורשי רמיה, 10.34), 'men of deceit' (אנשי רמיה, 6.14; 10.16), 'men of deception' (אנשי מרמה, 12.20), 'mediators of a lie' (מליצי כזב, 10.31; 12.9-10; 14.19 [?]), 'prophets of a lie' (נביאי כזב, 12.16).[181] It is notable that these share remarkable terminological *and contextual* affinities, suggesting that we might perhaps regard these labels denoting opposition as interchangeable and synonymous. They also consistently appear in plural and indefinite form, at odds with the terminologically similar designations איש הלצון (CD 1.14) and איש הכזב (CD 20.15) considered in our examination of the Damascus Document.[182]

The terminological points of contact with designations in the Damascus Document are primarily scriptural in origin, drawing for example upon Isa. 30, Ezek. 13 and the books of Psalms and Proverbs. Accordingly, Callaway concludes of the protagonist of the Hodayot:

> He always uses biblical imagery to present them as a dominion of evil. Since specific examples of this general description of evil adversaries are never given, one should probably avoid historicizing this language. . . . Its conventionalized phraseology about enemies and the absence of names prevent one from saying anything about the actual identities of the protagonist and the antagonists nor concerning the historical nature of the conflict between them. (Callaway 1988: 192)[183]

180 מליצי שקר would thus be rendered most consistently 'mediators of falsehood'.
181 Also 'seekers of smooth things' (דורשי חלקות, 1QH[a] 10.15; 10.32; cf. 12.7; 12.10) and, according to García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997), 'mediators of falsehood' (מליצי שקר, 1QH[a] 14.19). See further, Holm-Nielsen 1960: 292–93; Mansoor 1961: 51.
182 The plural form אנשי הלצון does appear (CD 20.11) but with the article.
183 Similarly, Holm-Nielsen states that 'every effort to find a historical background for the stereotyped phraseology is over-interpretation' (1960: 47). Conversely, adopting perhaps an overly simplistic view of the relationship between the Hodayot and the pesharim, Bilhah

Nevertheless, while *historical* identification may be problematic to say the least, the shared use of imagery between the Hodayot and the Damascus Document suggest some association with regard to the terminology utilized and hence perhaps the development and employment of the labels found therein. There are some significant thematic overlaps, chiefly concerning the roots ליץ, תעה and כזב.[184]

The construction מליצי followed by pejorative noun (of which we have at least three examples: מליצי כזב מליצי רמיה, and מליצי תעות) is especially interesting as it is, according to Michael Douglas, unique among Jewish literature (1999: 249). The three examples given are largely identical in meaning, combining the action of mediation (derived from the root ליץ) with one of three synonyms for falsehood ('error'/'deceit'/'lie').[185] The purpose of such a construction is seemingly to offset the positive designation, מליץ דעת (1QH[a] 10.13), adopted by the speaker, and thus form a stark contrast between the two parties.[186] The association of ליץ and כזב in the label מליצי כזב is particularly striking given the prominence of the same association in the Damascus Document where an oppositional figure is given the alternative designations איש הלצון (CD 1.14) and איש הכזב (CD 20.15), and is also described as מטיף כזב (CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26). Of especial significance in this context is CD 1.13-15 which combines ליץ, כזב and תעה.

Aside from terminological similarities between their *constituent* elements, as construct units מליצי תעות (1QH[a] 10.14), מליצי רמיה (12.7) and מליצי כזב (10.31; 12.9-10; 14.19[?]), along with the other Hodayot designations (such as חוזי תעות [12.20] or אנשי רמיה [6.14; 10.16]), share with מטיף כזב (CD 1.14), איש הכזב (CD 20.15) and איש הלצון (CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26) a common theme denoting false teaching. In the Hodayot, the teachings of others are contrasted with that of the speaker (מליץ דעת, 1QH[a] 10.13; cf. 16.16-17), and labelled 'error', 'deceit' and 'a lie'. The polemic engaged in by this process, however, is so broad as to render in effect all teaching that does not conform with that of the speaker in this category. The Damascus Document, while utilizing the same terminology to highlight false teaching, does so in reference to an

---

Nitzan asserts of the conflict depicted in the former between the protagonist and his opponents: 'The resemblance of these details to the words of the *Pesher Scrolls* is proof of their being grounded in reality' (1994: 326). Cf. n. 109 above.

184   Though also of note are דרש and חלק. Cf. Hughes 2006: 104.

185   Though demonstrably unlikely to be the case, if García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997) are correct to reconstruct מל]יצי שקר at 1QH[a] 14.19, this designation, 'mediators of falsehood', would likewise fit this pattern.

186   Note also the plural form, מליצי דעת (1QH[a] 23[bottom].6). Cf. ואין מליץ בנים (1QH[a] 14.13), למליץ באלה (1QH[a] 23[top].11). On the literary and social functions of this contrast, see further Newsom 2004: 287–346.

individual figure and his followers; thus the labels function in such a way as to seemingly target a distinct group.

These similarities *and* differences between designations in the Hodayot and in the Damascus Document make significant for our purposes the following observation by Philip Davies:

> Is there any significance in the similarity between the 1QH *mlsy kzb* and the connection between *lswn* and *kzb* in CD? Are we, in other words, observing the formation of soubriquets for individual opponents out of more general terms characterizing opposition in 1QH but not applied to any specific group? (Davies 1987: 99–100)[187]

This insight, already anticipated in our present examination of the Hodayot (see n. 150 above), may provide us with a way forward for understanding the relationship between these two texts with regard to the employment of labels denoting opposition and the process of sobriquet development.

3. *Sobriquets in the Hodayot*

Though no occurrences of מטיף הכזב or מורה הצדק are to be found in the Hodayot, we are presented with a wealth of other designations which have terminological or contextual affinities with our sobriquets. The protagonist, often identified with the 'teacher' of the Damascus Document (see n. 109 above), is described as 'a mediator of knowledge' (מליץ דעת, 1QH^a 10.13) for the 'elect of righteousness' (בחירי צדק, 1QH^a 10.13) and 'seers of truth' (חוזי נכוחות, 1QH^a 10.15). He is further associated with the 'holy ones' (קדושים, 1QH^a 12.25), the term יחד (1QH^a 12.24), 'a spring of living water' (מבוע מים חיים, 1QH^a 16.16), and it is stated that those who listen to him 'walk in the way of your heart' (1QH^a 12.24). The imagery is nearly identical to that employed with regard to the מורה צדק of the Damascus Document.

Perhaps most significantly, in 1QH^a 16.16-17 the speaker claims to have been given teaching by God, playing on the dual understanding of ירה as part of an extended metaphor utilizing water imagery (ואתה אלי שמתה בפי כיורה, 1QH^a 16.16). Such corresponds to the interpretation of the term in CD 6.11a, suggesting that the speaker might be drawing upon this text from the FSP and, by implication, claiming (with divine authority) the role of the anticipated יורה הצדק (see n. 125 above).

The teaching of this 'mediator of knowledge' is, however, contrasted

---

187 Similarly Bengtsson notes (though presumably in reference to the pesharim): 'Even though not appearing in the Hodayoth, the designations איש הכזב and מטיף הכזב could also have been moulded in accordance with the abundance of disparaging epithets in columns ten and twelve in 1QH^a' (2000a: 289).

with that of 'mediators of a lie' (מליצי כזב, 1QH[a] 10.31; 12.9-10; 14.19[?]), 'seers of error' (חוזי תעות, 1QH[a] 12.20) and scoffers (לצים, 1QH[a] 10.11), to name but a few examples. Though plural and indefinite, these designations echo the terminology, context and sense of the sobriquets 'the Man of Scoffing' (איש הלצון, CD 1.14) and 'the Man of the Lie' (איש הכזב, CD 20.15), and the description מטיף כזב (CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26) from the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document. Likewise, 'prophets of a lie' (נביאי כזב, 1QH[a] 12.16) is reminiscent of the similar phrase denoting those who 'prophesied falsehood' (ינבאו שקר, CD 6.1) in the FSP, a type which we speculated may have provided the mould for מטיף הכזב.

The significance of the Hodayot designations, both positive and negative, for our examination of the process of sobriquet development is primarily *thematic*. There are no instances of מטיף הכזב or מורה הצדק in either definite or indefinite form in the Hodayot, yet the thematic overlap with the employment of such imagery in the Damascus Document nevertheless suggests the existence of some relationship between the labelling process in each. In both texts the issue of false teaching and being 'led astray' is the foremost characteristic employed in the description of opponents. In the Hodayot, the designations 'a mediator of knowledge' (מליץ דעת) and 'mediators of a lie' (מליצי כזב) represent two contrasted types of teaching (cf. Knibb 1994a: 172; Nickelsburg 1992: 653–54). The sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב, and the indefinite forms found in the ESP of the Damascus Document, express an identical concern.[188] While none of the designations in the Hodayot explicitly relate to the development of מורה הצדק or מטיף הכזב (though cf. 1QH[a] 16.16), there is some indication that specific labels applicable to individuals elsewhere in the sectarian literature may have been influenced by more general designations applied to opponents here. At the very least, the common use of 'generic biblical images and stereotypical phrases and expressions' in the Hodayot (Harkins 2005: 242) may have informed the portrayal of the 'teacher' and the specific accusations levelled against his opponents in the Damascus Document (cf. Hughes 2006: 127–28, 132–34).

---

188   This theme also finds expression within the Hodayot in the conflict between 'the (/a) righteous (one)' (צדיק) and 'the (/a) wicked (one)' (רשע); e.g., 1QH[a] 6.14-16; 7.17b-20; 12.38; 15.12; 20.16-19; 25[top].13. Cf. 1QH[a] 4.20-21; 5.25-27; 6.9-10; 10.12-13 (see Bengtsson 2000a: 65–67; Holm-Nielsen 1960: 290–93; S.-H. Kim 1985: 153–91). We speculated above that this may even have had some influence upon the apparent conflict between 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (מורה הצדק) and 'the Wicked Priest' (הכוהן הרשע) in the later pesharim (see n. 101 above).

c. *4QCommentary on Genesis A*[189]
1. *'The Teacher of Righteousness'*
4Q252 5.1-7

Though 4QCommGen A (4Q252) contains no discernible designations related to מטיף הכזב, before finishing our examination of sobriquets in the ESP we shall consider one passage from this text that may shed further light on מורה הצדק:

> [5.1]'A ruler {של יט} shall [no]t depart from the tribe {שבט} of Judah'. When there is dominion to Israel [2]'[there will not] be cut off one who sits on the throne for David'. For 'the sceptre' {המחקק} is the covenant of the kingship [3][and the thous]ands of Israel are 'the standards'. Until there comes משיח הצדק, the branch of [4]David. For to him and to his seed has been given the covenant of the kingship of his people for everlasting generations, which [5]he kept [...] התורה with the Men of the Community {אנשי היחד}, for [6][...] it is the assembly of the men of [7][...] he gave. (4Q252 5.1-7)

The passage comments upon Gen. 49.10, drawing in addition upon Jer. 33.17, in reference to משיח הצדק.[190] Noting the terminological and structural similarities with מורה הצדק, most scholars have rendered the designation 'the messiah of righteousness' (Brooke 1996; 2004; Burrows 1958; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997)/'the Messiah of

---

189   Fragment 6 of 4Q252, containing column 5, was previously titled '4QPatriarchal Blessings' (4QPBless: Allegro 1956a; cf. Callaway 1990: 643). The text as a whole later became known as '4QPesher Genesisᵃ' (4QpGenᵃ: see e.g. Bernstein 1994a; Fröhlich 1994) and was regarded by Robert Eisenman and Michael Wise as 'A Genesis Florilegium' (Eisenman and Wise 1992). However, George Brooke, responsible for the *editio princeps* in DJD 22, has confirmed the more accurate description of the text as 'a Commentary on Genesis' (1994b: 178) and hence it is now officially designated '4QCommentary on Genesis A' (4QCommGen A: Brooke 1996; Trafton 2002).

190   The cited text here differs somewhat from the MT which reads: 'The שבט shall not depart from Judah nor מחקק from between his feet {רגליו} until tribute comes to him [or 'until comes Shiloh']; and the obedience of the peoples is his' (Gen. 49.10). While שבט is the subject in Gen. 49.10, it is instead the object in 4Q252 5.1, demonstrating the dual understanding of the term as both 'staff' (cf. CD 7.18–8.1) and 'tribe' (see Koehler and Baumgartner 1999). של יט is consequently introduced to the text, rendered either 'sceptre' (Bernstein 1994a; Brooke 1996; 2004; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Vermes 2004) or 'ruler' (Allegro 1956a; Burrows 1958; Collins 1995a: 62; Elwolde 2000: 8–11; Trafton 2002; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996). It is the latter meaning that we shall primarily adopt seeing as the specific interpretation of the passage in 4Q252 concerns the continuation of the Davidic kingship (see Fitzmyer 2000: 87). Other scholars have accordingly rendered של יט, 'sovereign' (García Martínez 1996), 'monarch' (Dupont-Sommer 1961) and 'Government' (Eisenman and Wise 1992). Furthermore, 4Q252 follows the SP in reading דגליו ('his banners') rather than רגליו (MT: 'his feet', cf. Trafton 2002: 216 n. 118; Vermes 2004: 494 n. 1), though some scholars have indeed read הדגלים (4Q252 5.3) as הרגלים (e.g., Allegro 1956a; Bernstein 1994a; Burrows 1958; Dupont-Sommer 1961; Eisenman and Wise 1992; García Martínez 1996; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996).

Righteousness' (Allegro 1956a; Dupont-Sommer 1961; Eisenman and Wise 1992; Vermes 2004) or 'the righteous messiah' (Bernstein 1994a; Trafton 2002)/'the Righteous Messiah' (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996).[191] However, John Reeves states that צדק should be taken in the sectarian material to mean 'legitimate, proper, true' and remarks that:

> To translate the former [משיח הצדק] as 'Righteous Messiah' or 'Messiah of Righteousness' borders on the absurd. (1988: 293)

Instead he advocates the rendering 'true anointed one' (1988: 293) as more indicative of the sense of the phrase.[192]

However, in the opinion of this study, Reeves' claim is overstated. Other scholars have likewise allowed the meaning 'true Messiah' (Burrows 1958: 312) or 'Legitimate Messiah' (Allegro 1956a: 175), indicative perhaps of a 'polemical edge' to the designation (so Reeves 1988: 293 n. 40), while maintaining a suitably literal translation.[193] Our analysis of, for example, מורה צדק (CD 1.11; 20.32), יורה הצדק (CD 6.11a) and the use of צדיק (CD 1.19-20; 4.7; 1QHᵃ 6.14-16; 7.17b-20; 8.18; 12.38; 15.12; 20.16-19; 25[top].13) suggests that, while a plurality of nuanced meanings with regard to the root צדק must be borne in mind (including 'true', 'legitimate' and 'just': cf. S.-H. Kim 1985: 153–91), in these occurrences 'righteousness' remains a valid rendering incorporating these connotations where appropriate. Hence, 'the Messiah of Righteousness' constitutes an understanding of משיח הצדק that, far from 'absurd', is thoroughly consistent with our examination of other designations in the sectarian material while retaining the sense of 'truth' and 'legitimacy' inherent in the terminology.

Given that 4Q252 5.2 draws upon Jer. 33.17, the phrase 'the Messiah of Righteousness, the branch of David' (משיח הצדק צמח דויד, 4Q252 5.3-4) would appear dependent upon the wider context of Jer. 33.15-17:

> [33.15]In those days and at that time I will cause a righteous branch {צמח צדקה} to spring up for David; and he shall execute justice and righteousness {צדקה} in the land. [16]In those days Judah will be saved and Jerusalem will live in safety. And this is the name by which it will be called: 'The LORD is our righteousness' {יהוה צדקנו}. [17]For thus says the LORD: David shall never lack a man to sit on the throne of the house of Israel.

---

191   Note also, 'the messiah of justice' (García Martínez 1996).

192   Cross similarly suggests the reading 'legitimate Messiah' (1995: 91 n. 1).

193   E.g., García Martínez, while adopting the translation 'the messiah of justice', notes that 'its *meaning* is none other than the true, lawful Messiah' (García Martínez 1995b: 162; my italics). It should be acknowledged that Reeves utilizes such an understanding of משיח הצדק in 4Q252 5.3 to suggest the 'True Lawgiver' as a rendering of מורה הצדק (Reeves 1988). However, while the latter title may well imply such a meaning, this smacks more of interpretation than translation.

Also worthy of note is a similar passage in Jer. 23.5-6:

> [23.5]The days are surely coming, says the LORD, when I will raise up for David a righteous branch {צמח צדיק}, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness {צדקה} in the land. [6]In his days Judah will be saved and Israel will live in safety. And this is the name by which he will be called: 'The LORD is our righteousness' {יהוה צדקנו}.

The association between 'branch', 'righteousness' and 'David' is thus established in a context that lends itself to messianic exegesis.[194] The specific construction משיח הצדק, however, is unique to 4Q252 5.3 and it is tempting to see here some connection with the sobriquet מורה הצדק.

On the one hand, we might attempt to identify the two designations in some manner. We have already suggested on the grounds of similarity between CD 6.10-11a and 12.23–13.1 that the 'one who will teach righteousness at the end of days' (CD 6.11a) may have been anticipated as 'the messiah of Aaron and Israel', in which case 'the Messiah of Righteousness' would certainly form an apt designation for this figure (Lim 1997: 117; 2002: 75).[195] Furthermore, there is arguably some structural parallel between these phrases from the pre-Yahadic Damascus Document and 4Q252 5.3-4:

עד בוא משיח הצדק צמח דויד (4Q252 5.3-4)

עד עמד יורה הצדק באחרית הימים (CD 6.10-11a)

עד עמוד משיח אהרן וישראל (CD 12.23–13.1)[196]

The משיח הצדק of 4Q252 is also associated with 'the Men of the Community' (אנשי היחד, 4Q252 5.5), those who are described elsewhere

---

194   On the messianic interpretation of 'branch' (צמח), see further Ulfgard 2000 (also Collins 1995a; 2000b). Of significance perhaps, with regard to the establishment of the Davidic line in the context of משיח, is Ps. 132.9-12, 17: 'Let your priests be clothed with righteousness {צדק}, and let your faithful shout for joy. For your servant David's sake do not turn away the face of your anointed one {משיחך}. The LORD swore to David a sure oath from which he will not turn back: "One of the sons of your body I will set on your throne. If your sons keep my covenant and my decrees that I shall teach them, their sons also, for evermore, shall sit on your throne. ... There I will cause a horn to sprout up {אצמיח} for David; I have prepared a lamp for my anointed one {משיחי}"'. Cf. Collins 2000b: 204–206.

195   Michael Knibb, wary of attributing messianic status to the 'teacher', notes that, 'if this were so, we would expect to find some clear reflection of it in the Qumran scrolls... In fact, as we have seen, the teacher is explicitly mentioned in only a limited number of passages, and in none of these is it in any way suggested that he was regarded as the messiah' (1990: 59). Might the designation משיח הצדק in 4Q252, however, if shown to bear terminological and contextual similarity to descriptions of the 'teacher' elsewhere, reflect such an understanding of the role?

196   משיח corrected from משוח (following Qimron 1992a). Cf. 1QS 9.11: עד בוא נביא ומשיחי אהרון וישראל.

as having 'listened to the voice of a teacher of righteousness {מורה צדק}' (CD 20.32: cf. אנשי היחיד). Indeed, one of the scriptural passages presented above concerning the 'righteous branch', Jer. 23.5-6, we have already noted with regard to the 'teacher' on the basis of the general antithetical context of false prophecy in Jer. 23.9-40.[197] We speculated, in the light of an apparent association between the latter passage and CD 5.20–6.2 (e.g., the description of those who ינבאו שקר) that Jer. 23.5-6 may even have had some effect on the pre-Yahadic D-material's reading of Hos. 10.12 or on the subsequent formulation of the messianic יורה הצדק expected at 'the end of days' (CD 6.11).[198] That the יורה הצדק of CD 6.11 would appear to represent an 'eschatological' successor to 'the holy anointed ones' (משיחי הקודש, CD 6.1) further associates the designation with the term משיח.

The pre-Yahadic Damascus Document highlights the role of 'the sceptre' (המחוקק: cf. Num. 21.18), which it identifies with 'the Seeker of the Law' (דורש התורה, CD 6.7). In 4Q252, however, commenting upon Gen. 49.10, 'the sceptre {המחקק} is the covenant of the kingship'. While ostensibly distinct in the flavour of their exegesis, Callaway perceives that, as with CD 6.2-11a, so too in 4Q252, 'a chronological schema is set up between an earlier and a later entity' (1990: 643). Such an understanding would again indicate some similarity between the anticipated figures of יורה הצדק and משיח הצדק, each preceded by a 'sceptre'. Other scholars have noted that 'the Seeker of the Law' is anticipated to arise *alongside* 'the branch of David' in 4Q174 (frg. 1, 1.11-13) and furthermore that 'the branch' is identified with 'the Prince of the Congregation' (נשיא העדה) in 4Q285 (frg. 5, 4; cf. CD 7.18–8.1; 1Q28b 5.20).[199] Given this association between 'the Seeker of the Law' and 'the branch of David', John Allegro proposed reading דורש] התורה ...] at 4Q252 5.5, a view that George Brooke has more recently affirmed as probable.[200] Brooke continues:

> Thus while the Meḥoqeq is explicitly identified with the covenant of the kingship, it is appropriate to associate the overall significance of the exegesis with the interpretation of Numbers 21 in CD 6.2-11. (Brooke 1994c: 54)

197 See Chapter 2 n. 39. Blenkinsopp prefers the translation, 'legitimate branch' (2006a: 186).

198 Cf. Campbell 1995a: 92, 97; Knibb 1994a: 46–47.

199 See, e.g., Collins 1994b; 1995a; Fitzmyer 2000; García Martínez 1995b; Lichtenberger 2003. However, cf. Elledge (2007) who warns against associating נשיא (כל) העדה too closely with Davidic messianism.

200 Allegro 1956a; Brooke 1994c: 54. This reconstruction is questioned, however, in Niccum 2006: 259.

This being the case, room is perhaps left for an association of משיח הצדק (4Q252 5.3) with יורה הצדק (CD 6.11a) as indeed Callaway infers (1990: 643).

If, on the other hand, we are not to identify these two designations we must consequently posit two anticipated individuals, both seemingly messianic in character, both associated with דורש התורה (and אנשי היח(י)ד) and both labelled in similar fashion (יורה/משיח הצדק). Nevertheless, this does seem to be the correct approach; while the expectation of 'one who will teach righteousness' belongs to the FSP (CD 6.10-11a) and is fulfilled in the ESP by the arrival of 'a teacher of righteousness' (CD 1.11; 20.32), our present text, anticipating 'the Messiah of Righteousness', belongs to this ESP and so *postdates* the fulfilment of CD 6.10-11a.[201] Hence, משיח הצדק cannot it seems refer to the 'teacher' we have encountered elsewhere.[202] Instead, perhaps we should identify this post-teacher expectation with the *renewed* (post-teacher) messianic hopes of the Yahadic Damascus Document concerning 'the Prince of all the Congregation' (נשיא כל העדה, CD 7.20).[203] This latter figure is likewise brought into association with 'the Seeker of the Law' (CD 7.18) and furthermore identified with 'the staff' (השבט) of Num. 24.17 (CD 7.18–8.1), the same term used in 4Q252 5.1. Indeed we have already noted that 'the branch of David' is explicitly identified with 'the Prince of the Congregation' (נשיא העדה) in 4Q285 frg. 5, 4 (note, however, the absence of כל).

An identification of משיח הצדק (4Q252 5.3) with נשיא (כל) העדה (CD 7.18–8.1; 4Q285 frg. 5, 4) would accordingly make more sense of the evidence at hand and allow for the presence of אנשי היחד in the text. We may also be in a position to identify the source of the specific construction משיח הצדק. We have speculated that the death of 'the Teacher of the Community', deemed to be the anticipated יורה הצדק, necessitated an amendment of the Yahad's messianic expectations and resulted in a renewed expectation of the 'messiah from Aaron and from Israel' (משיח מאהרן ומישראל, CD 20.1) who would be 'the Prince of (all) the Congregation' (CD 7.18–8.1; cf. 19.10-11).[204] Consequently,

---

201 Cf. אנשי היחד (4Q252 5.5).

202 Note, however, that Eisenman and Wise conclude differently: 'the allusion in 5.5 to "the men of the Community" with "the Messiah of Righteousness" as "Keepers of the Covenant" implies that the Messiah has either already come, is eschatologically to return, or is, in fact, at that very moment connected to or among "the *Yahad*" (Community)' (1992: 85). Such an interpretation, regarding משיח הצדק as a figure of the present/past in the ESP, if adopted might yet allow an identification with the figure elsewhere described as מורה צדק (CD 1.11; 20.32).

203 See n. 32 above.

204 It is unclear to what extent this may be congruent with the apparent expectation of 'a prophet and the messiahs of Aaron and Israel' in 1QS 9.11 (see n. 196 above). The 'Prince of

draw not only upon scriptural references (e.g., the 'righteous branch' of Jer. 23.5 and 33.15) but also upon the terminology already in place to describe the messianic role (e.g., יורה הצדק).[205] It could be, therefore, that משיח הצדק is related to our question of sobriquet development after all, inasmuch as it may reflect a re-usage of the original label from the FSP in the light of the Yaḥad's renewed messianic expectations.

3. *Conclusions*

We observed that in the FSP, the sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב did not appear, though there was expressed an expectation of 'one who will teach righteousness {יורה הצדק} at the end of days' (CD 6.11a) and a general oppositional theme concerning those who 'prophesied false-hood' (ינבאו שקר, CD 6.1). Similarly, it would appear that neither מורה הצדק nor מטיף הכזב occur in the ESP. Instead we are confronted by a host of related designations, including most notably the indefinite descriptions 'a teacher of righteousness' (מורה צדק, CD 1.11; 20.32; cf. 20.28) and 'a spouter of a lie' (מטיף כזב, CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26). These appear only in the Yaḥadic redaction of the Damascus Document and serve to describe two figures there denoted by the sobriquets 'the Teacher of the Community' (מורה/יורה היחיד, CD 20.1; 20.14) and 'the Man of Scoffing/the Lie' (איש הלצון/הכזב, CD 1.14; 20.15).

The description מורה צדק functions as an implicit claim to the role of יורה הצדק prescribed in CD 6.10-11a. It would appear therefore to identify 'the Teacher of the Community' with this anticipated figure and so serves as an artful stratagem, re-using and applying the label of the FSP in such a way as to demonstrate its fulfilment in the present age. That the authority of the 'teacher' was not universally accepted is clear from the references to a schism and the labelling of these opponents as 'the Men of Scoffing' (אנשי הלצון, CD 20.11) and 'those who departed from the way' (CD 1.13) and 'departed from the well of living water' (CD 19.34). The

---

(all) the Congregation', or 'branch of David', has often been identified with 'the messiah of Israel' alone as a Davidic figure (though cf. Elledge 2007), while some scholars have suggested that 'the Seeker of the Law' be identified with 'the messiah of Aaron' on the strength of such passages as 4Q174 frg. 1, 1.11-13 (cf. CD 7.18–8.1; see n. 33 above); e.g., Collins 1994a; 1995a; Fitzmyer 2000: 73–110; García Martínez 1995b. Though the future orientation of 'the Seeker of the Law' is seemingly at odds with CD 6.2-11a, see Brooke 1991a: 225–27 (cf. n. 33 above). Note further that Vermes identifies the 'teacher' with the forerunning prophet of 1QS 9.11 (2004: 86–87).

205   Thus, 'memories of the teacher may have colored the Messianic expectations of his followers' (Burrows 1958: 336; see too, Schonfield 1956: 38–44). Conversely, Niccum regards 4Q252 as 'neither messianic nor eschatological' (2006: 258).

most significant use of labelling with regard to these opponents, however, is reserved for an individual rival authority to whom both the titles 'the Man of Scoffing' (CD 1.14) and 'the Man of the Lie' (CD 20.15) were seemingly applied. In addition to the accusations levelled against him (for example, that he 'led them [Israel] astray {יתעם} in a wilderness without a way'; CD 1.15), the terminology used to describe him (drawing upon scriptural passages such as Prov. 19.22-29; Isa. 9.14-16; 28; Ezek. 13; Mic. 2.11; 3.5) is distinctly polemical; the most notable example of which is his characterization as 'a spouter of a lie' (מטיף כזב, CD 8.13; cf. 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26). This specific accusation is terminologically polarized from the description of 'the Teacher of the Community' as 'a teacher of righteousness' (מורה צדק, CD 1.11; 20.32) and even parodies the same ambiguity with regard to ירה as both 'teaching' and 'raining' (cf. Hos. 10.12; Joel 2.23), for the root נטף can similarly be taken to mean 'preaching' (especially in a pejorative sense, cf. Mic. 2.6-11) or 'spouting' (e.g., the metaphorical use in CD 1.14-15: 'the Man of Scoffing who spouted to Israel *waters* of a lie'). While grounded in scriptural reference, the indefinite description מטיף כזב is constructed specifically in opposition to מורה צדק (itself an application of the FSP designation יורה הצדק drawn from Hos. 10.12) in order to contrast two rival teaching authorities and demonstrate the legitimacy of that expounded by 'the Teacher of the Community'.

Though neither definite nor indefinite forms of the sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב appear in the Hodayot we are presented with an identical thematic backdrop to the conflict depicted therein. The speaker (often identified with the 'teacher', see n. 109 above) is described as 'a mediator of knowledge' (מליץ דעת, 1QH^a 10.13) and associated with the 'elect of righteousness' (בחירי צדק, 1QH^a 10.13) and 'seers of truth' (חוזי נכוחות, 1QH^a 10.15). He is opposed, however, by those labelled, amongst other things, 'mediators of a lie' (מליצי כזב, 1QH^a 10.31; 12.9-10; 14.19[?]), 'prophets of a lie' (נביאי כזב, 1QH^a 12.16), 'seers of error' (חוזי תעות, 1QH^a 12.20) and scoffers (לצים, 1QH^a 10.11). Though no individual is highlighted among the opponents, the same terminology is therefore used as employed in descriptions of 'the Man of Scoffing/the Lie' in the Damascus Document (in particular, the roots ליץ, תעה and כזב). The designations in the Hodayot, as with those in the Damascus Document, contrast true and false teaching, seeking by the process of labelling to present all opponents of the speaker in the role of false teachers or prophets.[206] The teaching of the speaker, however, is described as having been given by God (ואתה אלי שמתה בפי כיורה, 1QH^a 16.16). Interestingly this passage utilizes water imagery and plays on the same dual understanding of ירה present in CD 6.11a, raising the possibility that

---

206 Cf. Knibb 1994a: 172; Nickelsburg 1992: 653–54.

we have here an implicit claim (in the first-person) to the role of
יורה הצדק.[207]

While no specific occurrences of definite or indefinite forms of מורה
הצדק or מטיף הכזב appear in the Hodayot, the primary importance of
this text for our understanding of sobriquet development is thematic. On
this level, the Hodayot and the Damascus Document are in near perfect
agreement, each depicting a conflict between rival teaching authorities and
using similar terminology and labelling processes to identify false teachers.
It may even be that more general designations in the Hodayot informed
the specific accusations of the Damascus Document.[208]

Our examination of the label 'the Messiah of Righteousness' (משיח
הצדק, 4Q252 5.3) in 4QCommentary on Genesis A suggested that,
despite both terminological and contextual similarities, it is unlikely to
have been applied to the same figure described as 'a teacher of
righteousness' in CD 1.11 and 20.32, even though the latter while alive
may well have been regarded in a messianic light (cf. CD 6.10-11a; 12.23–
13.1). Instead a more convincing argument could be made for an
identification with 'the Prince of (all) the Congregation' (cf. 4Q285 frg. 5,
4) who, in our analysis of the Damascus Document, was seen to perhaps
represent the renewed messianic expectations of the Yahad after the death
of the 'teacher' (CD 7.18–8.1; cf. 19.10-11). However, the lack of a specific
scriptural provenance for the form משיח הצדק and the ready availability
of the (messianic?) designation יורה הצדק in CD 6.10-11a offers the
possibility that משיח הצדק constitutes a re-usage of the label (drawing in
addition upon, and indeed suggested by, the 'righteous branch' of Jer. 23.5
and 33.15). Thus we may have at least two distinct examples of the
designation יורה הצדק from the FSP being used and applied as a label in
the ESP.[209]

Our examination above has demonstrated that the sobriquets מורה
הצדק and מטיף הכזב were not in use in the ESP. There does exist,
however, seemingly as a direct result of יורה הצדק in the FSP, the use of
related indefinite forms (מורה צדק and מטיף כזב). It is these, more than
any other designations in the ESP, that would appear key to the eventual
development of the forms מטיף הכזב and מורה הצדק.

207   Note further the association with the 'holy ones' (קדושים, 1QH[a] 12.25; cf. CD 5.20–
6.11a), the term יחד (1QH[a] 12.24; cf. יחיד, CD 19.33–20.1; 20.10-15, 27-34) and 'a spring of
living water' (מבוע מים חיים, 1QH[a] 16.16; cf. CD 19.33–20.1). It is further stated that those
who listen to him 'walk in the way of your heart' (1QH[a] 12.24; cf. CD 1.10-11a).

208   See n. 187 above.

209   Furthermore, 1QH[a] 16.16 may similarly reflect a deliberate use of CD 6.10-11a (see
n. 125 above).

Chapter 4

LATE SECTARIAN PERIOD

1. *Introduction*

The final compositional period to be examined consists of those works which we have classed as belonging to the 'Late Sectarian Period'. Again the purpose of such a broad designation is simply to distinguish these texts from those which would appear to represent earlier sectarian textual strata; it is not to suggest that they necessarily reflect an entirely homogeneous group. Similarly, no assumption is made as to the specific period of authorship in relation to the life of the 'Yahad', only that, broadly speaking, these texts would appear on literary grounds to post-date those examined in previous chapters.

   For our present investigation, this Late Sectarian Period (LSP) consists solely of P-material.[1] There is perhaps, therefore, a greater deal of homogeneity than is evident in the ESP, though, as indicated above, such should not be assumed *a priori*. We shall proceed, as in previous chapters, by examining each text in turn for evidence primarily of the development and employment of the oppositional sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב (though noting the presence of related terminology where appropriate). We turn first to the Pesher on Habakkuk.

2. *Sobriquets in the Late Sectarian Period*

a. *1QPesher on Habakkuk*
1. *'The Teacher of Righteousness'*
1QpHab 1.10b–2.10a

The first passage we shall examine is from the initial two columns of the Pesher on Habakkuk:

> [1.10]'Therefore the law is relaxed.' [11][Its interpretation: . . .] who rejected the law of God. [12]['And judgement does not go forth to victory for the

---

1   Made up predominantly of 'continuous pesharim', though also of note is the 'thematic pesher', 4QCatena A (4Q177). Note, however, Brooke's recent observation that 'the long-standing distinction between continuous and thematic commentaries no longer serves such a useful function as once it did' (2005a: 135).

'the wicked' is ... and 'the righteous'] is מורה הצדק [14]... 'Therefore] judgement goes forth [15][perverted.' Its interpretation: ...] and not [... [16]... 'Look, traitors, and see, [17]and be astonished, shocked, for a work is being done in your days that you would not believe if] [2.1]it were told.' [...The interpretation of the word concerns] the traitors with הכוב[2] איש, for [they did] not [believe in the words of] מורה הצדקה from the mouth of [3]God; and it concerns the trait[ors of the] new [covenant] f[o]r they did not [4]believe in the covenant of God [...] his holy na[me]; [5]and likewise the interpretation of the word [concerns the trai]tors in the end of [6]days. They are violator[s of the coven]ant who will not believe [7]when they hear all that is com[ing up]on the last generation from the mouth of [8]the priest {הכוהן} in [whose heart] God has given [understandi]ng to interpret all [9]the words of his servants, the prophets, by [whose] hand God has proclaimed [10]all that is coming upon his people and [...]. (1QpHab 1.10b–2.10a)

Though highly fragmentary, the formulaic structure attested in both the remainder of the text and other 'continuous pesharim' has allowed some reconstruction of the passage.[2] Significantly, however, 1QpHab 1.13 preserves the designation מורה הצדק, our first actual encounter with this 'standard' form of the sobriquet. Its similarity to the label מורה צדק found in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document (CD 1.11; 20.32) indicates that there may be some relation between the two. The presence of the definite article, however, suggests a titular function for מורה הצדק and thus the familiar rendering 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (cf. Chapter 1, n. 54).[3]

2   There is still disagreement with regard to the reconstruction of *pesher* elements, however. For example, while הכוהן אשר נתן אל ב[ן...]ה (1QpHab 2.8) is rendered 'the priest in [whose heart] God has given [understandi]ng' (as above) by the majority of scholars (e.g., Brownlee 1979; Horgan 1979; 2002; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; Wise *et al.* 2004a), other reconstructions include 'the Priest whom God has placed wi[thin the commun]ity' (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997), 'the Priest whom God placed in [the House of Jud]ah' (Dupont-Sommer 1961) and, in William Brownlee's original reconstruction, 'the priest whom He has given unto the Ch[ildren of Israel for a teach]er' (Brownlee 1948).

3   So too the following translations: Brownlee 1948; Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; Wise *et al.* 2004a. Note also, 'the Righteous Teacher' (Brownlee 1979; Horgan 2002). See further, Jeremias 1963: 308–18; also Stuckenbruck 2007a: 90–91; cf. Charlesworth 2002: 12. Isaac Rabinowitz renders the designation 'the guide of righteousness' (Rabinowitz 1958). However, he argues that צדק should be *understood* in 'the collective sense' so that the title 'means "the leader of the righteous" rather than "one who teaches righteousness"' (1958: 397). He draws a parallel with the designation מורה היחיד / יורה היחיד (CD 20.1; 20.14), indicating that here too the object denotes a collective entity (taking היחיד as a variant of היחד). Nevertheless, his treatment of Hos. 10.12 and Joel 2.23 is unconvincing and he fails ultimately to take account of the *qualifying nature* seemingly apparent among

Intriguingly, an apparent variation on מורה הצדק appears in 1QpHab
2.2: מורה הצדקה. An additional *hē* provides צדקה while the definite
article has been added above the line as a scribal correction. The latter is
significant as, if the designation as a whole is to be considered a scribal
error for מורה הצדק, when מורה צדקה was corrected to מורה הצדקה
why was the final *hē* not cancelled?[4] We must assume therefore that the
use of צדקה was deliberate.

With regard to translation, all commentators have effectively con-
sidered מורה הצדקה a variant of מורה הצדק and so translated in
identical fashion.[5] Håkan Bengtsson suggests that there is 'no difference in
meaning' between the two (2000a: 198; cf. 215 n. 207; also Blenkinsopp
2006a: 282 n. 70). Such begs the question, however, as to why צדקה and
not צדק as immediately above (1QpHab 1.13). Brownlee proposes that
'the variation must have been made for emphasis' (1979: 55). Though
possible, this explanation is rather unconvincing with no indication as to
what specifically might be achieved by such a variant or why it fails to be
used of the 'teacher' elsewhere. It may well be that a satisfactory
explanation is beyond us, though a potential avenue for further
investigation should involve some discussion of the use of צדקה both
in scriptural texts and among the sectarian literature. For example, we
have already highlighted in Chapter 3 the presence of צמח צדקה ('a
righteous branch') in Jer. 33.15 and speculated as to the influence this may
have had upon the messianic expectations of the movement. Sung-Hae
Kim further notes that in Deuteronomy, while צדק appears 'always in the
sense of right judgement, just weight, or lawful sacrifice', צדקה is used of

---

other sobriquets. Thus צדק, as with כזב לצון and חלקות, is best understood as a
qualification of the former noun (in this case מורה). While Rabinowitz is content, however,
to maintain the translation 'the guide of righteousness' (reflecting 'the practice of the ancient
authors'; 1958: 394 n. 2), John Reeves (1988) argues forcefully that מורה (ה)צדק should be
more accurately rendered the 'True Lawgiver'. Having already engaged with this position in
Chapter 3, in reference to משיח הצדק (4Q252 5.3), our conclusion still stands that
'righteousness' remains a valid rendering of צדק in the sectarian literature, incorporating a
plurality of associated connotations where appropriate (including 'true', 'legitimate' and
'just'; cf. S.-H. Kim 1985: 153–91).

4 On scribal correction procedures, see Tov 1999.

5 E.g., Brownlee 1948; Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez
and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; 2002; Rabinowitz 1950; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and
Cook 1996; Wise *et al.* 2004a. Cf. Schiffman 1994: 117–21. Håkan Bengtsson erroneously
suggests that Brownlee utilizes the rendering 'the Teacher of Right' in 1QpHab 2.2
(as opposed to 'the Righteous Teacher', e.g., 1QpHab 1.13) in order to signify the form
מורה הצדקה (2000a: 198). In fact, Brownlee simply uses (in a somewhat questionable
fashion) 'the Righteous Teacher' to translate מורה הצדק where it is seemingly set in
opposition to 'the Wicked Priest' while using 'the Teacher of Right' in the context of
'the Man/Spouter of the Lie' (1979: 46–47). He thus uses the latter rendering both of
מורה הצדקה in 1QpHab 1.16–2.10 and מורה הצדק in 1QpHab 5.8-12 (1979; 1982: 22).

'human righteousness' and 'conveys mainly human moral responsibility as one's righteousness' (1985: 160; cf. Koehler and Baumgartner 1996). Within the sectarian texts, צדקה is to be found most frequently in the Community Rule documents (that which we might deem S-material: 1QS; 4Q255–64; 5Q11) and the Hodayot.[6] Of particular note is 1QHª 19.7 which, following the phrase ותתן בפי הודות (19.4), continues:

> And I know that truth is your mouth {פיכה} and righteousness {צדקה} in your hand. (1QHª 19.7)

Perhaps some resemblance here can be found to '[the words of] מורה הצדקה from the mouth of God' (1QpHab 2.2-3) in as much as צדקה emanates from God (cf. 1QHª 9.26-27; 12.30-31).[7]

   The concept of divinely-authorized teaching has already been noted in both the Hodayot (e.g., 1QHª 16.16-17) and the Damascus Document (e.g., CD 1.10-11a).[8] The latter associates such with one labelled מורה צדק; there is thus a contextual link with the similar designation מורה הצדק(ה). Also of interest is our discussion of צדיק, 'a righteous one', in our examination of the Hodayot in Chapter 3 (e.g., 1QHª 7.17b-22a). There we speculated that this commonplace scriptural type may subsequently have been read and understood by sectarian readers in the retrospective light of 'the Teacher of Righteousness'.[9] Here, in the Pesher on Habakkuk, such an understanding is made explicit and הצדיק of Hab. 1.4 is identified as a veiled reference to מורה הצדק (1QpHab 1.12-13). Noting this, Joseph Baumgarten comments that:

> The title *Moreh ha-Ṣedeq* can be fathomed only if we take account of the role of personified *Ṣedeq* in Qumran thought. (1979: 233)

---

6   Cf. Abegg, Bowley and Cook 2003; Kuhn (ed.) 1960. Note also CD 8.14; 19.27; 20.20.

7   It may also be significant that Joel 2.23 attests the form המורה לצדקה: 'O children of Zion, be glad and rejoice in the Lᴏʀᴅ your God; for he has given the early rain for your vindication {את-המורה לצדקה}, he has poured down for you abundant rain, the early and the later rain, as before' (Joel 2.23). See Lim 2002: 75. Note that in Russell Fuller's initial analysis of Hos. 10.12 in 4Q82 (4QXIIᵍ) he read יורי צדקה (1992: 254–56), though later amended to ירו צדק (1997: 282–85; cf. ᴍᴛ: ירה צדק). See further our discussion of Joel 2.23 and Hos. 10.12 in Chapter 2.

8   Indeed James Bowley argues that, while נביא is not used of the 'teacher', such divine authorization should be taken as indicative of 'true prophecy' as opposed to that preached by those disparagingly given the titles 'prophets' and 'seers' (e.g., 1QHª 12.9-20; cf. Mic. 3.5-8). He even draws a comparison, as we have, with CD 5.20–6.2 and the past opposition depicted there between 'the holy anointed ones' and those who 'prophesied falsehood' (1999: 365, 371–73). In this light it is interesting to note that '[the words of] מורה הצדקה from the mouth of God' (1QpHab 2.2-3) has an antithesis already seen in the Hodayot: 'in the mouth of prophets of a lie, deceived by error' (1QHª 12.16). Cf. Bengtsson 2000a: 198.

9   See Chapter 3, n. 108.

Such would appear to lie also behind the interpretation of Hos. 10.12 in CD 6.2-11a of the FSP.

That 'the Teacher of Righteousness' is opposed by 'traitors' (הבוגדים) associated with 'the Man of the Lie' (איש הכזב, 1QpHab 2.1-3) recalls the same descriptions used to denote opposition to 'the Teacher of the Community' (מורה/יורה היחיד) in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document (cf. CD 19.33–20.1; 20.10-15). The latter figure is seemingly identical to one described as 'a teacher of righteousness' (מורה צדק) and similarly opposed by traitors in CD 1.10-17. This מורה צדק is invested with divine authority, has a didactic function and adherence to his voice is a defining feature of those considered loyal to the Yahad (CD 1.10-11a; 20.27-34). These same features appear in the current passage with regard to (מורה הצדק(ה (1QpHab 1.10b–2.10a).[10] Taken in conjunction with the terminological similarities (only the definite article distinguishes מורה הצדק from מורה צדק), it seems reasonable to assume that we have here a different form of the same designation found in the ESP. The presence of the definite article, however, appears to represent a shift from a descriptive function to an appellative or titular one. Hence, the sobriquet 'the Teacher of Righteousness' attests a further development from the indefinite description 'a teacher of righteousness', perhaps rivalling (or replacing?) the previous title by which this figure was labelled, 'the Teacher of the Community'. In order to assess the validity of these suppositions, let us turn to the other passages from the Pesher on Habakkuk concerning 'the Teacher of Righteousness'.

---

10   This passage also mentions 'the priest' (הכוהן) who, being similarly accredited with these three features and opposed by 'traitors' (1QpHab 2.5-10), could arguably be taken as a further description of (מורה הצדק(ה (Brownlee 1979: 57; Knibb 1994a: 223). Note also the following similarity:

> The interpretation of the word [concerns the trai]tors in the end of days. They are violator[s of the coven]ant who will not believe when they hear all that is com[ing up]on the last generation {הדור האחרון} from the mouth of the priest {הכוהן} in [whose heart] God has given [understandi]ng. (1QpHab 2.5-10)

> But God perceived their deeds, for they sought him with a whole heart, and he raised up for them a teacher of righteousness {מורה צדק} to lead them in the way of his heart. And he made known to later generations what he had done to the last generation {דור אחרון}, a congregation of traitors. (CD 1.10-12)

Some scholars have taken the usage of the term to indicate that the figure labelled 'the Teacher of Righteousness' was not only a priest, but must have been more specifically an ousted High Priest (e.g., Murphy-O'Connor 1974: 229–33; Stegemann 1971: 250; 1991: 200; 1992: 148–66; see further, Stuckenbruck 2007a: 80 n. 16). Such a leap has met with some criticism, however (e.g., Charlesworth 1980: 218–22). The term הכוהן functions primarily as a label; all it really tells us is that the 'teacher' could be considered in priestly terms by his adherents. They may even have considered him the priest *par excellence* though such does not necessarily entail that he was ever recognized as a priest outside of his own movement.

1QpHab 5.8-12

A number of the same themes found in 1QpHab 1.10b–2.10a reappear in the following passage from the fifth column of the manuscript:

> [5.8]'Why do you stare, traitors, and keep silent when [9]a wicked one {רשע} swallows up one more righteous than he {צדיק ממנו}?' Its interpretation concerns the House of Absalom [10]and the men of their council who kept silent at the rebuke of מורה הצדק [11]and did not help him against איש הכזב – who rejected התורה[12] in the midst of all their council. (1QpHab 5.8-12)

The sobriquet מורה הצדק appears in the same form here as at 1QpHab 1.13 and should accordingly be rendered 'the Teacher of Righteousness' in identical fashion.[11] The figure so labelled is again set in opposition to 'traitors' (appearing in the lemma and identified in the pesher as 'the House of Absalom and the men of their council', 1QpHab 5.9-10) and 'the Man of the Lie' (איש הכזב, 1QpHab 5.11). He is also identified as the referent of צדיק (again juxtaposed with רשע) as at 1QpHab 1.12-13.

The cited passage differs from the MT of Hab. 1.13; rather than God looking upon traitors, it is they themselves who look on while 'a wicked one swallows up one more righteous than he' (1QpHab 5.8-9). This reading is borne out by the interpretation concerning 'the House of Absalom and the men of their council who kept silent at the rebuke of מורה הצדק and did not help him against the Man of the Lie' (1QpHab 5.9-11).[12] It is also uncertain as to whether בתוכחת מורה הצדק refers to the 'rebuke' (or 'chastisement') *of* or *by* 'the Teacher of Righteousness'. The scriptural citation that 'a wicked one swallows up one more righteous than he' (1QpHab 5.8-9) would suggest an objective genitive is intended and that 'the Teacher of Righteousness' is the one rebuked (presumably by 'the Man of the Lie', the apparent referent of רשע). Such an interpretation has likewise been adopted by the majority of scholars (e.g., Bengtsson 2000a: 200; Bruce 1956: 94; Burrows 1956: 147–48; Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar

---

11   Note, however, that Brownlee, while translating 'the Righteous Teacher' at 1QpHab 1.13, here renders 'the Teacher of Right' (as at 1QpHab 2.2) in accordance with his custom in the context of 'the Man/Spouter of the Lie' (1979: 46–47, 93; 1982: 22). The present examination remains sceptical of such an approach to the sobriquet (see n. 5 above).

12   Knibb 1994a: 229. Note, however, תחריש (2nd person singular) in the scriptural citation, in accordance with the MT (cf. Horgan 1979: 33). On the significance of the Qumran-related scrolls for our understanding of the MT, see Brooke 2000c; Brownlee 1959; 1964; Lim 1990; 1997; 2002: 54–63; M. Segal 2005; Skehan 1959; Tov 1991; Trebolle-Barrera 2000; Ulrich 1999; 2000; 2001.

1997; Horgan 1979: 33–34; 2002; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; Wise *et al.* 2004a).[13]

Thus the passage interprets Hab. 1.13 in reference to a confrontation between מורה הצדק and איש הכזב, tacitly observed by 'the House of Absalom and the men of their council' (1QpHab 5.9-10) who made no protest when 'the Man of the Lie' rebuked 'the Teacher of Righteousness' and 'rejected the law {התורה} in the midst of all their council' (1QpHab 5.11-12). The terminological and contextual similarities between the use of the label מורה הצדק in 1QpHab 1.10b–2.10a (cf. מורה הצדקה) and 5.8-12 indicate a common understanding of the designation; one that has significant overlaps with the use of מורה צדק in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document.

1QpHab 7.1–8.3a

Greater insight into the sectarian understanding of the sobriquet מורה הצדק is to be gained from an extensive passage concerning the duration of 'the last time' or 'final age' (הקץ האחרון):[14]

> [7.1]And God told Habakkuk to write what was coming upon [2]the last generation but the fulfilment of that time he did not make known to him. [3]And as for what he says, 'So that ^(he can run) who reads it', [4]its interpretation concerns מורה הצדק to whom God has made known [5]all the mysteries {רזי} of the words of his servants, the prophets. 'For there is still a vision [6]for the appointed time, it witnesses to the end and does not lie.' [7]Its interpretation: the last time {הקץ האחרון} will be extended and will go beyond all [8]that the prophets said, for the mysteries of God {רזי אל} are wonderful. [9]If it tarries, wait for it, for it will surely come and not [10]delay.' Its interpretation concerns the Men of Truth {אנשי האמת}, [11]the Doers of the Law {עושי התורה}, whose hands will not slacken from the service of [12]the truth when the last time {הקץ האחרון} is extended beyond them, for [13]all the times of God will come according to their determination as he decreed [14]for them in the mysteries {רזי} of

---

13   For the opposite interpretation, see Brownlee 1979: 91–95 (though note 1948: 17 n. 38; cf. 1952: 17–18); Carmignac 1962a: 507–10; Lim 2005.

14   This phrase is variously rendered 'the final age' (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Vermes 2004), 'the final time' (Dupont-Sommer 1961), 'the final end' (Brownlee 1948), 'the last end-time' (Horgan 1979), 'the last period' (Horgan 2002) or 'the Last Days' (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; Wise *et al.* 2004a). No one translation is entirely satisfactory, though all entail the same connotations. Noting the similarity to הדור האחרון ('the last generation'; 1QpHab 2.7), we shall adopt 'the last time' as a terminologically consistent rendering of הקץ האחרון (so too Brownlee 1979; Knibb 1994a). The meaning is nevertheless that seemingly shared by the various translations above, denoting a final period of history. There are clear overlaps with the use of similar phrases in 1QPesher on Habakkuk expressing an interest in this period, such as הדור האחרון (1QpHab 2.7; 7.2) and אחרית הימים (1QpHab 2.5-6), though Annette Steudel warns against too close an identification (1993: 239–40).

his prudence. 'Behold, it is conceited, it is not upright [15][his soul within him.'] Its interpretation: they will double upon them [16][... and] n[ot] find favour when they are judged. [... [17]... 'But the righteous {צדיק} will live by their faithfulness.'] [8.1]Its interpretation concerns all עושי התורה in the House of Judah, whom [2]God will deliver from the house of judgement on account of their toil and their faith [3]in מורה הצדק. (1QpHab 7.1–8.3a)

The passage twice attests מורה הצדק (1QpHab 7.4; 8.3a). The first of these continues 'to whom God has made known all the mysteries {רזי} of the words of his servants, the prophets' (1QpHab 7.4-5). In the first instance, this recalls what is said of 'the priest' (הכוהן) in 1QpHab 2.5-10, 'in [whose heart] God has given [understandi]ng to interpret all the words of his servants, the prophets' (1QpHab 2.8-9), thus making an implied identification between the two more probable (see n. 10 above). Furthermore, however, it is reminiscent of what is said of 'a mediator of knowledge' (מליץ דעת) in the Hodayot:

> [10.13]But you have set me like a banner to the elect of righteousness, and a mediator of knowledge {מליץ דעת} of wonderful mysteries {רזי פלא}, to test [14][the men of] truth and to try those who love instruction. (1QH[a] 10.13-14)

'The Teacher of Righteousness' of the LSP is described as being party to 'mysteries' (רזים), as was the 'mediator of knowledge' (i.e., the protagonist of the Hodayot) in the ESP.[15] This may prove significant given the oft-held assumption that the 'teacher' himself authored the so-called 'Teacher Hymns' (or was at least considered retrospectively to have done so).[16]

In 1QPesher on Habakkuk, 'the Teacher of Righteousness' is thus seemingly portrayed in the role of a 'divinely inspired exegete' (cf. Bowley 1999: 371). Maurya Horgan notes that:

> The word *rāz* is a Persian loan-word that does not occur in biblical Hebrew but is found in biblical Aramaic. (1979: 237)[17]

Accordingly, John Barton, examining 'prophetic foreknowledge of the present day', draws comparisons with the book of Daniel in which רזים are similarly interpreted (1986: 179–213; see also, Thomas 2008).[18] Our present text details the 'mysteries' here concerned as 'the words of his servants, the prophets' (1QpHab 7.5) which require interpretation to elucidate 'all that is coming upon his people' (1QpHab 2.8-10). Such an approach would appear characteristic of the pesharim in general.[19]

---

15   Note also 1QH[a] 12.27-28; 15.26-27; 24[bottom].5.
16   See Chapter 3, esp. nn. 109, 140.
17   Also in later Hebrew (Horgan 1979: 37–38).
18   Note in particular Daniel 2.
19   See further, Brooke 1981; Lim 2002.

That 1QH^a 10.13-14 may bear some relation to the description of 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (מורה הצדק) as one 'to whom God has made known all the mysteries {רזי} of the words of his servants, the prophets' (1QpHab 7.4-5) is further suggested by the presence in 1QpHab 7.10 of אנשי האמת, 'the Men of Truth'. The same designation, though notably without the definite article, appears in 1QH^a 10.13-14 denoting the audience for whom the 'mysteries' are conveyed. Aside from ascertaining a probable link between the two passages, it is perhaps significant in itself that אנשי אמת of the ESP (cf. 1QH^a 6.2) is rendered אנשי האמת in the LSP, a phenomenon we have already noted of מורה צדק (ESP) and מורה הצדק (LSP). The אנשי האמת are here described as:

> ^7.11the Doers of the Law {עושי התורה}, whose hands will not slacken from the service of ^12the truth when the last time {הקץ האחרון} is extended beyond them. (1QpHab 7.11-12)

This phrase, עושי התורה ('the Doers of the Law', Bengtsson 2000a: 217–34; Brownlee 1979), is also found at the end of our present passage as the apparent referent of צדיק:[20]

> ^7.17'But the righteous {צדיק} will live by their faithfulness.'] ^8.1Its interpretation concerns all עושי התורה in the House of Judah, whom ^2God will deliver from the house of judgement on account of their toil and their faith ^3in מורה הצדק. (1QpHab 7.17–8.3)

It is notable that, in this instance, צדיק is interpreted as those who are loyal to מורה הצדק rather than in direct reference to the sobriquet itself (cf. 1QpHab 1.12-13; 5.8-12). Perhaps we might recall here the other phrase employed alongside (and seemingly synonymous with) [אנשי] אמת in 1QH^a 10.13-14, 'the elect of righteousness' (בחירי צדק).

The passage concerns itself with הקץ האחרון ('the last time', see n. 14 above), and in particular both the 'unforeseen' extension of the age and an emphasis on not losing faith.

> ^7.5'For there is still a vision ^6for the appointed time, it witnesses to the end and does not lie.' ^7Its interpretation: the last time {הקץ האחרון} will be extended and will go beyond all ^8that the prophets said, for the mysteries of God {רזי אל} are wonderful. (1QpHab 7.5-8)

Indeed the pesher serves as a reassurance that all is as it should be and that 'all the times of God will come according to their determination as he decreed for them in the mysteries {רזי} of his prudence' (1QpHab 7.13-14). While the topic is suggested by the lemma (a primacy we must acknowledge), the pesher would appear to be grappling more specifically

---

20 Alternatively, 'those who keep/observe the Law' (e.g., Vermes 2004).

with eschatological disappointment; the 'appointed time' has passed and thus requires explanation.[21]

We are reminded of the apparent renewed messianic expectations in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document following the death of the 'teacher' (e.g., CD 19.33–20.1) and the insistence in CD 20.27-34 on adherence to התורה (the 'well' of CD 6.2-11a; cf. Num. 21.18) and continued loyalty to 'the voice of מורה צדק'. These same features are to be found in our present passage in, for example, the reference to 'עושי התורה in the House of Judah, whom God will deliver from the house of judgement on account of their toil and their faith in מורה הצדק' (1QpHab 8.1-3).[22] It is these 'whose hands will not slacken from the service of the truth when the last time {הקץ האחרון} is extended beyond them' (1QpHab 7.11-12). Might the eschatological disappointment implied in 1QpHab 7.1–8.3a likewise be bound up with the death of the figure considered to be the anticipated 'one who will teach righteousness at the end of days' (CD 6.11a)?[23]

Philip Davies suggests along these lines that the text as a whole might reflect a reassessment of the role of the 'teacher' in the light of his death, highlighting the deliberate reinterpretation of the term רז from the Hodayot in reference to 'the words of his servants, the prophets' (1QpHab 7.5):

> That is, 'mysteries' are now scriptural texts, and 'knowledge' is their interpretation. What does this suggest? Not that a new kind of treatment of scripture is being developed – for the principle of such inspired exegesis is much older – but that the original teaching of the founder of the community is now being transformed into something more (or perhaps less) than it originally was. Instead of a religious leader and lawgiver, the 'Teacher' has become the founder of a school of exegesis. ... It explains, however, one of the ways in which religious communities sustain and redefine themselves after the removal of their founder, and especially encourage their faith in times of distress by assuring themselves that all was foretold and that they will be secure in that knowledge. (1987: 104)

---

21   The same conclusion is reached by John Collins, who adds: 'It is reasonable to infer, then, that the "end" was expected shortly before the pesher was written' (1997: 83; cf. Steudel 1993: 235–36; Talmon 1989: 296).

22   As opposed to, for example, 'the Man of the Lie' who 'rejected התורה in the midst of all their council' (1QpHab 5.11-12). Phillip Callaway similarly highlights that, 'The reference to the faithfulness of the Doers of the Law to the Teacher of Righteousness does suggest that the former lived *after* the Teacher' (1988: 152; my italics).

23   In this light, might הקץ האחרון refer obliquely to קץ חרון ('the time of wrath', CD 1.5), the period during which מורה צדק was raised up according to the Damascus Document? Collins suggests that קץ חרון is a deliberate wordplay on הקץ האחרון (1997: 81; 2000a).

We have noted that there would indeed appear to be evidence of some dependence upon both the Hodayot and the Damascus Document. With regard to the latter, another possibility presents itself; rather than the death of the 'teacher' *per se*, might the eschatological disappointment in 1QpHab 7.1–8.3a stem from the passing of the *revised* 'end-date', anticipated forty years after his death in CD 20.13-15?[24] Such would place the authorship of 1QPesher on Habakkuk some forty years at least after the death of the 'teacher', a proposal not incongruent with our analysis of the relevant texts so far.[25] Concerning CD 20.13-15 and its lack of specificity, John Collins suggests:

> Nonetheless, as the years passed, they were aware that the end time was prolonged. 'About forty years' could not be extended indefinitely. The lack of a specific date, however, mitigated the disappointment and made it easier for the community to adapt to the postponement of their expectations. (1997: 85)

Adaptation to this postponement would indeed appear to be evidenced in 1QpHab 7.1–8.3a.

This passage from 1QPesher on Habakkuk presents מורה הצדק as an authoritative figure (of the past?) and seemingly draws upon 1QH[a] 10.13-14 for both the 'mysteries' (רזים) to which he is party and 'the Men of Truth' who are associated with him (thus implicitly identifying him with מליץ דעת). The pesher on Hab. 2.3 is keen to demonstrate, in the face of 'hope for an imminent messianic age amongst the members of the "New covenant"' (Talmon 1951: 36), that the extension of הקץ האחרון is on account of such 'mysteries' (1QpHab 7.5-14) but that 'all the times of God will come according to their determination' (1QpHab 7.13).[26] In the meantime, continued adherence to התורה and loyalty to מורה הצדק are encouraged (1QpHab 7.9–8.3a), in accordance with (and perhaps reliant upon) the recommendations originally made in response to the death of the 'teacher' in CD 20.27-34.

1QpHab 9.8-12a

The following passage is the first of two in 1QPesher on Habakkuk in which מורה הצדק is set in opposition to a figure labelled הכוהן הרשע:

---

24 Cf. Collins 1997: 82–85; Steudel 1993: 238–39.

25 Note also Bengtsson: 'There is nothing in 1QpHab which hints that the Teacher was still alive when it was written' (2000a: 228 n. 64).

26 Indeed, Steudel suggests that the pesharim texts themselves were 'aimed exclusively at proving that the end was near because a book of the Prophets was completely fulfilled' (1993: 241–42). See also Berrin 2005: 116–17; Stegemann 1998: 128–29. See further VanderKam 2006.

[9.8]'Because of human bloodshed and violence to the land, the town and all [who dwell] in it.' [9]Its interpretation concerns הכוהן הר[ש]ע whom, because of wrong done to מורה הצדק[10] and the men of his council, God gave into the hand of his enemies to humble him [11]with disease, to destroy him in bitterness of soul because he had done wickedly [12]against his elect {בחירו}. (1QpHab 9.8-12a)

Here 'the Teacher of Righteousness' is associated with a group designated 'the men of his council' (אנשי עצתו, 1QpHab 9.10). There is some dispute as to whether עצה should be rendered 'council' or 'counsel' in this context (cf. Koehler and Baumgartner 1995). John Worrell, drawing upon scriptural use of the term (e.g., Isa. 40.13: איש עצתו; Ps. 119.24: אנשי עצתי), suggests 'counsel' to be 'the consistently preferable rendering' (1970: 71), though does allow that:

> there are also strong indications that it approached the status of a technical denomination for an important factor in their community structure. (Worrell 1970: 68)

Though either translation is possible, both are, thus, so similar in meaning that it should cause us no great concern.[27] For our purposes, either understanding would render אנשי עצתו a body of supporters or men of association, as with 'the House of Absalom and the men of their council {אנשי עצתם} who kept silent at the rebuke of מורה הצדק' (1QpHab 5.9-10).[28]

   Instead of איש הכזב (as in 1QpHab 1.10b–2.10a or 5.8-12), the figure placed in opposition to מורה הצדק in 1QpHab 9.8-12a is labelled הכוהן הרשע, unambiguous enough in form to warrant the common translation, 'the Wicked Priest'.[29] We shall return to this sobriquet in an excursus as part of our examination of 'the Spouter of the Lie' in the Pesher on Habakkuk below. For the present, however, it will suffice to highlight that 'the Wicked Priest' is accused of having wronged 'the Teacher of Righteousness and the men of his council' and is given by God 'into the hand of his enemies' (1QpHab 9.10) 'because he had done wickedly against his (i.e., God's) elect {בחירו}' (9.11-12). The referent of this last phrase (בחירו) must be either מורה הצדק if singular (so Bengtsson 2000a: 205–206) or מורה הצדק ואנשי עצתו if a defective plural (so Brownlee 1948: 17 n. 34; Horgan 1979).[30] In favour of the latter

---

27   As Brownlee notes, 'what is a "council" but "men of counsel"?' (1979: 155). He suggests, however, that the reference is probably to an 'organized group' and so prefers the translation, 'council' (so too Bengtsson 2000a: 205).

28   On the basis of such an understanding, Horgan (1979) renders 'his/their partisans'.

29   Cf. Brownlee 1948; 1979; Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; 2002; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; Wise *et al.* 2004a.

30   Note Qimron 1986: 33–35.

interpretation, Horgan notes that it is the plural בחירי אל that appears in 1QpHab 10.13 while the form בחירו, seemingly with a plural understanding, is attested also in 1QpHab 5.4 and elsewhere among the pesharim.[31] Brownlee argues that the singular may well be preferable but, if so, 'should be interpreted as a collective' (1979: 86; cf. 87, 157); in which case we should identify 'his elect' (1QpHab 9.12) with not only 'the Teacher of Righteousness' but also 'the men of his council' (1QpHab 9.10). Might אנשי עצתו bear some relation to 'the Men of Truth, the Doers of the Law' (1QpHab 7.10-11), associated with מורה הצדק in 1QpHab 7.1–8.3a?[32] In this context it may be informative to recall 'the elect of righteousness' (בחירי צדק), associated in 1QH^a 10.13-14 with 'a mediator of knowledge' and seemingly synonymous with the 'men of truth'.

1QpHab 11.2-8

The final passage from 1QPesher on Habakkuk to be examined in relation to the sobriquet מורה הצדק is the second in which this figure is set in opposition to הכוהן הרשע:

> [11.2]'Woe to him who makes his neighbour drink, pouring out [3]his anger, making him drunk so as to look upon their festivals.' [4]Its interpretation concerns הכוהן הרשע, who [5]pursued מורה הצדק, to swallow him up in the heat of [6]his anger, to the house of his exile. And at the time of the festival, the rest of [7]the Day of Atonement {יום הכפורים}, he appeared to them to swallow them up [8]and to make them stumble on the day of fasting, the sabbath of their rest. (1QpHab 11.2-8)

The form attested is once again מורה הצדק, to be rendered 'the Teacher of Righteousness'.[33] The text of Hab. 2.15 here exhibits some variance from the Masoretic Text, in particular the employment of מועדיהם ('their festivals') rather than מעוריהם (MT: 'their nakedness').[34] This is followed up by the reference to קץ מועד (1QpHab 11.6) in the pesher and strongly echoes an allusion found in one of the 'Teacher Hymns' of the Hodayot:

---

31 E.g., עדת בחירו in 4Q164 (frg. 1, 3) and 4Q171 (2.5; 3.5). See Horgan 1979: 32, 44; cf. Bengtsson 2000a: 206 n. 155.

32 Bengtsson wishes to disassociate the two groups, suggesting that, עושי התורה, is a more theologically distinguished label than אנשי עצתו, which appears to be some sort of organised circle around the Teacher' (2000a: 205). It is not clear, however, that the two labels must on these grounds designate distinct groups. Indeed, a more convincing argument for such a distinction would be that אנשי עצתו are presented as contemporary to the 'teacher' and share in the wrong done to him, while עושי התורה of 1QpHab 7.9–8.3a would appear to post-date this figure (see n. 22 above).

33 Cf. 'the Righteous Teacher' (Brownlee 1979; Horgan 2002).

34 See primarily, Brownlee 1959, though also Bengtsson 2000a: 75–78; Brownlee 1979: 179–89; Harris 1966: 33–35; Lim 2002: 54–63. Cf. n. 12 above.

^{12.11}And they withhold the drink of knowledge from the thirsty, and for their thirst give them vinegar to drink so as to look upon ¹²their error, that they act like fools in their festivals, so they are caught in their nets. (1QH^a 12.11-12)

A glance at the immediately preceding passage from 1QH^a (examined in Chapter 3) reveals yet more similarities between the two texts:

^{12.8}For (I) have been rejected by them and they do not esteem me when you make yourself great through me. For they banish me from my land ⁹like a bird from its nest, and all my friends and my acquaintances have been driven from me and esteem me as a broken vessel. But they are mediators of ¹⁰a lie and seers of deceit, they have schemes of Belial against me, to change your law which you engraved in my heart for smooth things ¹¹for your people. (1QH^a 12.8-11a)

The H- and P-material have in common reference to exile and error in festivals, both specifics absent from the MT of Hab. 2.15. An implicit association is thus made between 'the Teacher of Righteousness' of 1QpHab and the protagonist of the Hodayot.[35]

Philip Davies utilizes these passages to highlight the probable dependence of the pesharim upon the Hodayot, noting further that the intention of 'the Wicked Priest' to 'swallow him (i.e., מורה הצדק) up' (לבלעו, 1QpHab 11.5; cf. 11.7) seemingly draws upon the reference to schemes of 'Belial' (בליעל) in 1QH^a 12.10.[36] As a result, the reliability of the pesharim for the reconstruction of historical scenarios is potentially undermined (the very foundation upon which a number of the hypotheses examined in Chapter 1 are based). For our purposes, however, the accuracy of such historical information need not concern us; it is the understanding of, and connotations associated with, these sobriquets across the different sectarian texts and compositional periods that is our focus. Consequently, whether or not a historical confrontation, such as that detailed in 1QpHab 11.2-8, did indeed take place is not as important as the fact that a figure labelled מורה הצדק was *understood within the text* (and thus also perhaps by subsequent readers) to have come into conflict with הכוהן הרשע. The work of Davies is crucial, however, in allowing us to trace the development of such ideas through the texts themselves.[37]

---

35   Such would support either a strict identification of the two or the more moderate assertion that the Hodayot were *considered* to represent (auto)biographical details of the life of 'the Teacher of Righteousness'. See Chapter 3, esp. nn. 109, 140; cf. Davies 1987: 87–105.

36   See Davies 1987: 93–97. Note however בלע in Hab. 1.13 (cf. 1QpHab 5.8-12).

37   Accordingly, one question that should concern us is the presence of הכוהן הרשע in 1QpHab 11.2-8 when איש הכזב or מטיף הכזב would be more readily suggested by חוזי רמיה and מליצי כזב in 1QH^a 12.8-12 (cf. Davies 1987: 96–97). We shall return to this in the excursus below on הכוהן הרשע in the Pesher on Habakkuk.

In accordance with 1QH^a 12.8-12, 1QpHab 11.2-8 conceives 'the Teacher of Righteousness' as being in exile.[38] Hindy Najman, in her recent examination of the concept of wilderness, identifies this as an implied 'locus of suffering and isolation' (2006: 104), in which separation from the temple results in the state of wilderness. In establishing the conflict between מורה הצדק and הכוהן הרשע as having occurred on 'the Day of Atonement' (יום הכפורים, 1QpHab 11.7), the text further hints at calendrical differences underlying the dispute.[39] As in 1QpHab 9.8-12a, 'the Teacher of Righteousness' is here presented as an object of persecution by 'the Wicked Priest' and is implicitly to be understood against the typology of the righteous sufferer in the Psalms (S.-H. Kim 1985: 170–73) and, more specifically, the suffering protagonist of the Hodayot.

Summary

Despite its unequivocal absence in the FSP and ESP, the sobriquet מורה הצדק is to be found six times in 1QPesher on Habakkuk (1QpHab 1.13; 5.10; 7.4; 8.3; 9.9-10; 11.5). A seventh occasion witnesses the slightly different form, מורה הצדקה (1QpHab 2.2). While an altogether convincing explanation could not be reached for the presence of this variant, it is significant that the definite article was added above the line as a scribal correction; thus, unlike מורה צדק of CD 1.11 and 20.32, each occurrence of the designation in the Pesher on Habakkuk is definite.

Some relation to the 'teacher'-designations found in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document would appear nevertheless inescapable. There we observed that a figure, seemingly titled 'the Teacher of the Community' (מורה/יורה היחיד, CD 20.1; 20.14), had been acclaimed as the anticipated 'one who will teach righteousness at the end of days' (יורה הצדק באחרית הימים, CD 6.11a) and accordingly described as 'a teacher of righteousness' (מורה צדק, CD 1.11; 20.32). He was perceived as having been invested with divine authority (CD 1.10-11a) and set in opposition to 'traitors' (CD 1.10-12; 19.33–20.1; 20.10-15) and 'the Man of Scoffing/the Lie' (איש הלצון/הכזב, CD 1.14; 20.15). After his death he continued to be venerated and adherence to 'the voice of מורה צדק' was marked as a defining feature of those considered loyal to the Yahad (CD 20.27-34). We also noted similar characteristics of the protagonist of the Hodayot, including his didactic function and divine authority (1QH^a 10.13-15a; 16.16-17), association with an 'elect' group

---

38   Note Sukenik (ed.) 1955: 39.

39   See in particular Talmon 1989 (186–99) and 1999. In both of these essays, Talmon also highlights a similar calendrical dispute between Rabban Gamaliel and Rabbi Joshua, drawing several notable parallels with the apparent case of 1QpHab 11.2-8. See further, J.M. Baumgarten 1999; Stern 2000. Cf. CD 6.18-19.

(1QH[a] 10.13-15a), his opposition to 'traitors', 'scoffers' and 'mediators of a lie' (1QH[a] 10–12), and points of correspondence with descriptions of 'a righteous one' (צדיק, e.g., 1QH[a] 7.17b-22a).

In similar fashion, the teachings of (מורה הצדק(ה in 1QPesher on Habakkuk are attributed divine authority (1QpHab 2.2-10a; 7.3-5), he is opposed by 'traitors' and 'the Man of the Lie' (1QpHab 2.1-10; 5.8-12) and there is emphasis on continued loyalty to him even though he would no longer appear to be present (1QpHab 8.1-3a). He is identified as the referent of צדיק where it appears in the lemma (1QpHab 1.12-13; 5.8-12; though cf. 7.17–8.3), linked with an elect group (1QpHab 9.8-12a) and implicitly associated with the protagonist of the Hodayot (1QpHab 11.2-8; cf. 1QH[a] 12.8-12). If, as seems probable, we should associate the 'teacher'-designations of the ESP with those of the Pesher on Habakkuk by means of some continuity, then our most striking observation must be that the title 'the Teacher of the Community' is unattested in 1QpHab and instead the description 'a teacher of righteousness' (מורה צדק) acquires the definite article, thus providing the seemingly appellative form 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (מורה הצדק).[40]

2. *'The Spouter of the Lie'*
1QpHab 1.10b–2.10a

For our examination of the sobriquet מטיף הכזב in 1QPesher on Habakkuk we shall first return to 1QpHab 1.10b–2.10a, initially explored with regard to מורה הצדק above:

> [1.10]'Therefore the law is relaxed.' [11][Its interpretation: …] who rejected the law of God. [12]['And judgement does not go forth to victory for the wicked {רשע} surroun]ds the righteous {הצדיק}.' [13][Its interpretation: 'the wicked' is … and 'the righteous'] is מורה הצדק [14][… 'Therefore] judgement goes forth [15][perverted.' Its interpretation: …] and not [… [16]… 'Look, traitors, and see, [17]and be astonished, shocked, for a work is being done in your days that you would not believe if] [2.1]it were told.' […The interpretation of the word concerns] the traitors {הבוגדים} with איש [2]הכזב, for [they did] not [believe in the words of] מורה [7]צדקה from the mouth of [3]God; and it concerns the trait[ors of the] new [covenant] f[o]r they did not [4]believe in the covenant of God […] his holy na[me]; [5]and likewise the interpretation of the word [concerns the trai]tors in the end of [6]days. They are violator[s of the coven]ant who will not believe [7]when they hear all that is com[ing up]on the last generation {הדור האחרון} from the mouth of [8]the priest in [whose heart] God has given [understandi]ng to interpret all [9]the words of his servants, the prophets, by [whose] hand God has proclaimed [10]all that is coming upon his people and […]. (1QpHab 1.10b–2.10a)

---

40   A phenomenon witnessed also of אנשי אמת (ESP) and אנשי האמת (LSP).

While מטיף הכזב is not encountered, there is a reference to איש הכזב (1QpHab 2.1-2). This appears in exactly the same form as found in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document in the ESP (CD 20.15). As there, so here we shall translate 'the Man of the Lie' (so too Brownlee 1948; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; 2002; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; Wise *et al.* 2004a).[41]

In our present passage, איש הכזב is set in opposition to the 'teacher' and associated with 'the traitors' (הבוגדים) who rejected '[the words of] מורה הצדקה from the mouth of God' (1QpHab 2.1-3). This constitutes part of a pesher on Hab. 1.5 which, in the MT, refers to בגוים ('among the nations'); though the lemma is almost entirely missing, the pesher suggests that 1QpHab read בוגדים instead, in agreement with the Septuagint (see Horgan 2002: 160 n. 20).[42] The word finds expression three times in the pesher: 'the traitors with the Man of the Lie' (1QpHab 2.1-2), 'the traitors of the new covenant' (1QpHab 2.3) and 'the traitors in the end of days' (1QpHab 2.5-6). Accordingly, many have identified three distinct groups of traitors, 'traitors past, traitors present, and traitors yet to come' (Snyder 2000: 39 n. 44).[43] Phillip Callaway, on the other hand, distinguishes between only two groups of traitors: those of the past who rejected both the words of the 'teacher' and the 'new covenant' and associated themselves with 'the Man of the Lie' (1QpHab 2.1-4), and those contemporary to the pesharist, or of the future, who in 'the end of days' reject the words of 'the priest' and are 'violator[s] of the coven]ant' (1QpHab 2.5-10).[44] This interpretation is supported by the parallel structure of the dual pesher; both groups are seemingly introduced with פשר הדבר על, express disbelief in the words of God's mediatory figure and reject 'the covenant'.[45] The only significant difference between the two is the tense of the verb (לוא יאמינוא/לוא האמינו; see further, Stuckenbruck 2007b: esp. 137; cf. Wacholder 2002).

Hence, the text relates the lemma to traitors of the past, associated with the conflict between 'the Teacher of Righteousness' and 'the Man of the Lie', and those of the present/future who are described in the same terms and thus presented as their ideological successors. We have already

41 Cf. 'the Man of Lies' (Brownlee 1979; Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996) and 'the Liar' (Knibb 1994a; Vermes 2004).

42 Cf. Brownlee 1979: 54; Callaway 1988: 143; Harris 1966: 28; Horgan 1979: 23, 246; Knibb 1994a: 222–23. See n. 12 above.

43 So too Brownlee 1979: 54–58; Grossman 2002: 155–56; Horgan 1979: 23–24; Knibb 1994a: 223; VanderKam and Flint 2002: 223.

44 Callaway 1988: 142–49. In so doing, he follows the early observation of Sacha Stern (1950: 25) and has the support of Bengtsson (2000a: 165–78) and Charlesworth (2002: 94–95).

45 Note what is said of 'those who separate from your covenant' in 1QH[a] 12.17-18: 'For they have not chosen in the way of your [heart] and have not listened to your word. For they said of the vision of knowledge, "It is not sure", and of the way of your heart, "It is not that".'

suggested that 'the priest' (הכוהן, 1QpHab 2.8) should most likely be identified with 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (see n. 10 above; cf. 1QpHab 7.4-5). Brownlee notes, as we have, that it was possible to 'listen to the voice' of the 'teacher' after his death (CD 20.27-34, i.e., his teachings could still be either accepted or rejected), and so we need not necessarily assume on the basis of 1QpHab 2.5-10 that he is still alive (Brownlee 1979: 57). Accordingly, the contemporary traitors are those living after the time of the 'teacher' who nevertheless 'will not believe when they hear all that is com[ing up]on the last generation' (1QpHab 2.6-7). They are therefore contrasted with 'the Men of Truth, the Doers of the Law' who accept the interpretations of the 'teacher' regarding 'the words of his servants, the prophets' and display loyalty to him (1QpHab 7.1–8.3a; cf. CD 20.27-34).

The figure labelled 'the Man of the Lie' (איש הכזב) is associated with the former traitors who rejected the 'teacher' and the 'new covenant' (ברית החדשה, 1QpHab 2.1-4) and by implication thus belongs to an earlier age than the pesharist. This is congruent with what we know of איש הכזב in the Damascus Document:

> ^{20.10}Like the judgement of their companions who turned back ¹¹with the Men of Scoffing they shall be judged, for they spoke perversely against the decrees of righteousness and rejected ¹²the covenant {מאסו בברית} and the pact which they affirmed in the land of Damascus; *and that is the new covenant* {ברית החדשה}. ¹³And there shall not be for them or their families a share in the house of the law. And from the day of ¹⁴the gathering in of the Teacher of the Community until the end of all the Men of War who turned back ¹⁵with איש הכזב there will be about forty years. (CD 20.10-15)⁴⁶

While 'traitors' are not explicitly mentioned (though arguably implied), in Chapter 3 we identified those who 'turned back' (שבו) in this passage with those who 'turned' (שבו) from the covenant in CD 19.33b–20.1a:

> ^{19.33}Thus all the men who entered the new ³⁴covenant {ברית החדשה} in the land of Damascus and turned and betrayed {ויבגדו} and departed from the well of living water ³⁵shall not be reckoned in the council of the people and in their list they shall not be written from the day of the gathering in of ^{20.1}the Teacher of the Community until there shall arise the messiah from Aaron and from Israel.

Accordingly, these defectors from the 'new covenant', set in opposition to the teacher and associated with 'the Man of the Lie', should probably be identified with 'the traitors of the new covenant' of 1QpHab 2.1-4.⁴⁷

That איש הכזב in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document is

---

46   Italics signify a later gloss to the Yahadic text of the passage following Davies 1983 (263; cf. 176–86). See further, Chapter 3, n. 31.
47   Cf. Fabry 2003: 253–54.

seemingly identical to איש הלצון further suggests the potential signifi-cance of CD 1.10-15:

> [1.10]But God perceived their deeds, for they sought him with a whole heart, [11]*and he raised up for them a teacher of righteousness to lead them in the way of his heart.* And he made known [12]to later generations {דורות אחרונים} what he had done to *the last generation* {דור אחרון}, a congregation of traitors {עדת בוגדים}. [13]*They are those who departed from the way. That was the time about which it is written, 'like a stray heifer,* [14]*so Israel strayed', when arose* איש הלצון *who spouted to Israel* [15]*waters of a lie and led them astray in a wilderness without a way.* (CD 1.10-15)[48]

The phrase 'a congregation of traitors' (עדת בוגדים, CD 1.12) from the original FSP text is here expanded upon and associated with איש הלצון in opposition to 'a teacher of righteousness' (מורה צדק, CD 1.11). It is also of note that the Yahadic redaction further identifies the עדת בוגדים with 'the last generation' (דור אחרון, CD 1.12), a designation similarly used in 1QpHab 1.16–2.10a to indicate the present generation (הדור האחרון, 1QpHab 2.7).[49] Thus, the presentation of 'the Man of the Lie' in 1QpHab 1.10b–2.10a is strikingly similar on both a thematic and terminological level to that found in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document where this figure is further described as מטיף כזב.[50]

A source of more recent controversy with regard to the sobriquet איש הכזב is the lacuna at 1QpHab 1.13:

> [1.12]['And judgement does not go forth to victory for the wicked {רשע} surroun]ds the righteous {הצדיק}.' [13][Its interpretation: 'the wicked' is ... and 'the righteous'] is מורה הצדק. (1QpHab 1.12-13)

Given its presence elsewhere in the text, almost all commentators have restored 'the Wicked Priest' (הכוהן הרשע) as a natural referent of רשע.[51]

---

48   Italics signify the Yahadic glosses/expansions to the pre-Yahadic text, following Davies 1983 (232–35; cf. 61–72).

49   Cf. Callaway 1988: 146–47.

50   Note in addition the occurrence of בוגדים in 1QH[a] 10.9b-11, associated also with 'scoffers'. Bengtsson observes correctly that, 'In the Hodayoth these "traitors" appears not to be a reference to a specific group, but a general categorisation of enemies. However, in the Damascus Document the picture of "the traitors" is more specific than in 1QH[a]' (2000a: 168). This may have implications for our understanding of the relationship between these two texts and would certainly agree with our observation that the general עדת בוגדים of the FSP (CD 1.12) undergoes further specification in the ESP (e.g., the addition of דור אחרון and the entirety of CD 1.13-18a).

51   For example, see even the preliminary publication by Brownlee (1948: 8, 16 n. 12). Cf. Brownlee 1979; Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; Lohse 1981; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; Wise *et al.* 2004a. Note 4QpPs[a] (4Q171) 4.7-10, to be examined below.

However, Timothy Lim makes a convincing argument that 'the Man of the Lie' (איש הכזב) should be restored instead (2000a; 2002: 35–36). 'The Man of the Lie' and 'the Teacher of Righteousness' appear together just a few lines later (1QpHab 2.1-4), neither directly suggested by the immediately preceding lemma. While the 'teacher' is placed in this context by his appearance in 1QpHab 1.13, 'the Man of the Lie' is not grounded in the scriptural citation unless made the referent of רשע in 1QpHab 1.12-13.

Lim notes that the adjective רשע appears only one other time in Habakkuk 1–2 and in the pesher is there identified with איש הכזב (1QpHab 5.8-12).[52] It would not be unusual then for איש הכזב to be the referent of רשע in 1QpHab 1.12-13; indeed such a reconstruction would display greater internal consistency than הכוהן הרשע. Not only is no further comment made upon 'the Wicked Priest' in 1QpHab 1.10b–2.10a, but the sobriquet does not otherwise appear until column 8. This examination is, therefore, supportive of Lim's reconstruction of איש הכזב in 1QpHab 1.13.[53]

A rather more dubious reconstruction is that of Brownlee who suggests that our sobriquet מטיף הכזב should appear in the lacuna at 1QpHab 1.11:

> 1.10'Therefore the law is relaxed.' 11[Its interpretation: …] who rejected the law of God. (1QpHab 1.10-11)

Brownlee restores: '[Its prophetic meaning concerns מטיף הכזב and the men of his congregation] who rejected the Law of God' (1979: 43; followed also by Wise *et al.* 2004a). He notes that in 1QpHab 5.8-12, 'the Man of the Lie' is accused of having 'rejected the law' (מאס את התורה, 1QpHab 5.11-12) and suggests that either מטיף הכזב or איש הכזב could therefore appropriately be reconstructed at 1QpHab 1.11 (Brownlee 1979: 44). While he regards both sobriquets as identical in meaning, the preference given to מטיף הכזב is puzzling. If either is to be reconstructed, איש הכזב would appear the preferable choice given the parallel with 1QpHab 5.11-12 and employment of this sobriquet immediately below (1QpHab 2.1-2; and 1.13?). The lack of indication that a sobriquet is even required, however, suggests that we should refrain from speculating further as to the restoration of this lacuna.[54]

1QpHab 5.8-12
The following passage is another that we have already examined with regard to 'the Teacher of Righteousness':

---

52   Cf. also 4QpPs[a] (4Q171) 4.13-16, to be examined below.
53   So too Bernstein 2000b: 649–50.
54   See e.g. Horgan 1979; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996.

^{5.8}'Why do you stare, traitors {בוגדים}, and keep silent when ⁹a wicked one {רשע} swallows up one more righteous than he?' Its interpretation concerns the House of Absalom {בית אבשלום} ¹⁰and the men of their council who kept silent at the rebuke of מורה הצדק ¹¹and did not help him against איש הכזב – who rejected התורה ¹²in the midst of all their council. (1QpHab 5.8-12)

While מטיף הכזב is again absent, the related sobriquet איש הכזב is once more employed. As noted above, the sobriquet appears as the referent of רשע ('a wicked one'), in contrast to מורה הצדק, the referent of צדיק. Such lends weight to Lim's proposal that איש הכזב should likewise be restored alongside מורה הצדק in 1QpHab 1.13 (2000a; 2002: 35–36).

A confrontation is here described at which 'the Teacher of Righteousness' was seemingly rebuked (cf. n. 13 above) while 'the Man of the Lie' is accused of having 'rejected the law {מאס את התורה} in the midst of all their council' (cf. 1QpHab 1.11). While this specific accusation is not made against איש הכזב in the ESP, he is associated with those who 'rejected {מאסו} the covenant and the pact which they affirmed in the land of Damascus' (CD 20.11-12; cf. 1QpHab 2.1-4) and by implication, as a rival pedagogic figure, accused of having rejected the 'teacher' (CD 1.10-18a; 20.10-15; cf. 1QpHab 2.1-4).[55] Given that the latter figure is presented as the divinely authorized teacher and exponent of the law (e.g., CD 1.10-11a; 20.27-34; 1QH^a 10.13-15a; 16.16-17), particularly in the Pesher on Habakkuk itself (cf. 1QpHab 1.10b–2.10a; 7.1–8.3a), rejection of both him and 'the covenant' could be construed by the sect as rejection of התורה of God (1QpHab 5.8-12; cf. 1.11).[56]

'The Man of the Lie' (איש הכזב) is thus presented at odds with 'the Men of Truth' (אנשי האמת), not only with regard to the ideologically polarized labels employed but also since the latter are described as עושי התורה (cf. 1QpHab 7.1–8.3a). 'The Men of Truth' are furthermore linked with 'the House of Judah' while 'the Man of the Lie' is associated in our present passage with 'the House of Absalom' (בית אבשלום, 1QpHab 5.9). This designation constitutes the referent of בוגדים in the lemma and hence the association of איש הכזב with 'traitors' is again affirmed. The label בית אבשלום itself has been variously interpreted, either in reference to a historical individual named Absalom (Driver 1965: 271–72; Freedman 1949; Vermes 2004: 64) or as a type drawing upon the

---

55 Cf. 1QH^a 10–12.

56 Bengtsson highlights the potential significance in this regard of Amos 2.4b: 'because they have rejected the law of the LORD {על־מאסם את־תורת יהוה}, and have not kept his statutes, but they have been led astray by the same lies {ויתעום כזביהם} after which their ancestors walked.' See Bengtsson 2000a: 100–101. We have already noted the particular association of the root תעה with כזב (and ליץ) in Chapter 3 (e.g., CD 1.10-18a; 1QH^a 10–12).

treachery and silence of Absalom in 2 Samuel 13–18 (Brownlee 1948: 17 n. 36; 1979: 91–95; Callaway 1988: 150–51; Schiffman 1994: 119; Teicher 1954).[57] Of these, the latter opinion that it denoted 'a type representing treacherous behaviour' (Bengtsson 2000a: 176–77) would appear most congruent with its employment in 1QpHab 5.8-12. The usage here of the label איש הכזב, in association with this term, thus accords with what we find both in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document belonging to the ESP and 1QpHab 1.10b–2.10a.

1QpHab 10.5b–11.2a

The final passage from 1QPesher on Habakkuk we shall examine with regard to the sobriquet מטיף הכזב is 1QpHab 10.5b–11.2a:

> [10.5]'Woe [6]to him who builds {בונה} a city with bloodshed and founds a town on iniquity. Is it not [7]from YHWH of hosts that peoples labour for fire [8]and nations grow weary for nothing?' [9]The interpretation of the word concerns מטיף הכזב, who led many astray {התעה רבים} [10]to build a city of vanity {לבנות עיר שוו} with bloodshed and to establish a congregation in falsehood {עדה בשקר}, [11]for its glory making many labour in the service of vanity {שוו} and teaching them [12]wo[r]ks of falsehood {להרותם במעׂשׂי שקר} so that their toil is for nothing and that they come [13]to the judgements of fire those who reviled and reproached the elect of God {בחירי אל}. [14]'For the earth will be filled with the knowledge of the glory of YHWH, as the waters [15]cover the sea.' The interpretation of the word [is that] [16]when they return [. . . [17]. . .] הכזב[11.1], and afterwards knowledge will be revealed to them like the waters of [2]the sea in abundance.

Of especial significance is, in 1QpHab 10.9, our first encounter with the 'standard' form, מטיף הכזב. As with מורה הצדק, so here מטיף הכזב bears great resemblance to an indefinite label attested in the ESP (מטיף כזב, CD 8.13). While the latter seemingly performed a descriptive function, however (cf. CD 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 19.25-26), the definite article here suggests a titular role. Hence, while we translated מטיף כזב 'a spouter of a lie', the definite sobriquet מטיף הכזב should best be rendered 'the Spouter of the Lie'.[58]

Noting, as we did in Chapter 3, the dual meaning of נטף, indicative of 'spouting'/'dripping' and likewise 'preaching' or the activity of (false?) prophets (cf. Mic. 2.6-11), מטיף הכזב has also been rendered by such terms as 'the Oracle of Lies' (Brownlee 1948), 'the Prophet of Lies'

---

57 See the excellent summary in Bengtsson 2000a: 165–78. Also Nitzan 2000.

58 So too Horgan 2002. Similarly: 'the Spouter of Lies' (Vermes 2004); 'the One who Spouts the Lie' (Horgan 1979); 'the Spreader of the Lie' (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997); 'the Spreader of Lies' (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; Wise *et al.* 2004a); 'the Spreader of Deceit' (García Martínez 1996).

(Brownlee 1979) and 'the Preacher of Lies' (Dupont-Sommer 1961; Knibb 1994a).[59] This label thus stands in true antithesis to מורה הצדק ('the Teacher of Righteousness'), both sobriquets functioning as an explicit evaluation of relative didactic roles and utilizing terminology that betrays a metaphorical use of water imagery. As Brownlee comments:

> since the Hebrew word *môreh* can mean 'rain' as well as 'teacher' and can even be rendered as a participle, 'he who showers', the two men may be contrasted as 'he who drips lies' and 'he who showers truth'. (Brownlee 1982: 10)[60]

It is conspicuous, however, that the sobriquet מורה הצדק is absent from this passage, the only one in 1QPesher on Habakkuk to contain מטיף הכזב; what significance might this hold?

There are a number of thematic overlaps between this passage and those examined in the FSP and ESP in relation to the sobriquet 'the Spouter of the Lie'. For example, מטיף הכזב is here accused of having 'led many astray' (התעה רבים, 1QpHab 10.9). This particular accusation was made also of 'the Man of Scoffing' who 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie' in CD 1.13-15:

> [1.13]That was time about which it is written, 'like a stray heifer, [14]so Israel strayed', when arose the Man of Scoffing who spouted to Israel [15]waters of a lie {הטיף לישראל מימי כזב} and led them astray {ויתעם} in a wilderness without a way. (CD 1.13-15)[61]

Similarly in the Hodayot the opponents of the protagonist, identified with labels such as 'mediators of a lie' (מליצי כזב, 1QH[a] 10.31; 12.9-10) and 'prophets of a lie' (נביאי כזב, 1QH[a] 12.16), alike in sense and terminology to מטיף כזב, are frequently described by use of the root תעה: for example, מליצי תעות [ה]תעום (1QH[a] 10.14), מליצי רמיה (1QH[a] 12.7), נביאי כזב מפותי תעות (1QH[a] 12.16), חוזי תעות (1QH[a] 12.20).

Likewise מטיף הכזב is accused of establishing 'a congregation in falsehood' (עדה בשקר, 1QpHab 10.10). In the ESP, the indefinite label מטיף כזב is similarly associated with a congregation (עדתו, CD 8.12-13; cf. 19.24b-26a), as is 'the Man of Scoffing' (עדת בוגדים, CD 1.11b-18a).[62] The use of שקר, as well as reinforcing the theme of lies established by כזב (cf. Mic. 2.11), is reminiscent of those who 'prophesied falsehood'

---

59 See Clines (ed.) 2001; Koehler and Baumgartner 1995.

60 Cf. 'the dripper of untruth' (Rowley 1958: 122).

61 'The Men of Scoffing' in CD 20.10-12 are accused of דברו תועה על חקי הצדק (CD 20.11).

62 Note further, עדת דורשי חלקות (1QH[a] 10.32); cf. CD 1.18–2.1.

(ינבאו שקר, CD 6.1) encountered in the FSP.[63] We have speculated in previous chapters that CD 5.20–6.2a may have provided a typology for describing opposition to the יורה הצדק (CD 6.11a) in the sense of false teaching. While the accusation of such is implicit in the sobriquet מטיף הכזב, in 1QpHab 10.11-12 it is explicitly stated that this figure is 'teaching them wo[r]ks of falsehood' (להרותם במע[ש]י שקר).[64] Such action recalls CD 8.12-13 where we learn that:

> a spouter of a lie spouted to them, against all of whose congregation the anger of God was kindled. (CD 8.13)

The presentation of מטיף הכזב in 1QpHab 10.5b–11.2a thus accords with that of מטיף כזב in the ESP as a false teacher, in contrast to the true teacher.

The reference in the lemma to he 'who builds a city with bloodshed' (בונה עיר בדמים, 1QpHab 10.6) is interpreted in the pesher with regard to the efforts of מטיף הכזב 'to build a city of vanity with bloodshed' (לבנות עיר שוו בדמים, 1QpHab 10.10). The Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document, in an effort to portray מטיף כזב as a false prophet, draws upon Ezekiel 13 and so associates this figure with the 'builders of the wall' (בוני החיץ, CD 8.12; 19.24-25) and the 'daubers of whitewash' (טחי (ה)תפל, CD 8.12; 19.25).[65] A similar association between the 'builders of the wall' and 'a spouter' (מטיף) is to be found in CD 4.19-20. This may explain why מטיף הכזב was employed in 1QpHab 10.5b–11.2a and not איש הכזב, as attested in 1.10b–2.10a and 5.8-12; the suitability of the former might have been suggested to the pesharist by the reference to building in the lemma (Hab. 2.12-13), given the specific association of this

---

63 Cf. נביאי כזב in 1QHᵃ 12.16 (ESP). Note also that both ינבאו שקר (FSP) and נביאי כזב (ESP) are brought into association with the root תעה (CD 5.20–6.2a; 1QHᵃ 12.14b-16). Charlesworth highlights with regard to 1QpHab 10.5b–11.2a that neither כזב nor שקר are 'echo words'; neither appear in the lemma (2002: 96–97).

64 For discussion of the form להרותם, see Horgan 1979: 47–48. She derives it from the root רוה and so renders 'saturating them' though admits the reading is uncertain (see also Brownlee 1979; Knibb 1994a; Horgan 2002); cf. הרה, 'to conceive/be pregnant' (Dupont-Sommer 1961; García Martínez 1996; Vermes 2004). For a derivation from ירה, however, see García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; Wise *et al.* 2004a (cf. Abegg, Bowley and Cook 2003; Kuhn [ed.] 1960; also, note 1QHᵃ 14.9-10). A reference to 'teaching' would be appropriate to the context and indeed Brownlee notes that even a derivation from רוה should be interpreted as 'a sarcastic and punning surrogate' of this activity:

> *Rāwāh* means 'to drench, to saturate, to water abundantly'. It is thereby an apt figure of speech for instruction by the 'Dripper of Lies' ... It is this which makes it more suitable to the context than simply 'teach'. (1979: 172)

65 בוני החיץ corrected from בוני החוץ (CD 8.12; cf. 19.24-25), following Qimron 1992a and Schechter 1970.

label with building activity in the ESP.[66] In this context it should also be noted that Hab. 2.12 is echoed in Mic. 3.10:

בנה עיר בדמים וכונן קריה בעולה (Hab. 2.12)[67]

בנה ציון בדמים וירושלם בעולה (Mic. 3.10)

We have already highlighted the role of Mic. 2.6-11 with regard to the pairing of נטף and כזב, and further noted the reference to:

> the prophets who lead my people astray {הנביאים המתעים את־עמי},
> who cry 'Peace'. (Mic. 3.5)

This itself bears relation to Ezek. 13.8-16 (esp. 13.10) and hence Hab. 2.12, Micah 2–3 and Ezekiel 13 might be construed as a web of texts that have bearing (perhaps via CD 8.12-13 and 19.24b-26a) upon the pesher concerning מטיף הכזב (1QpHab 10.5b–11.2a).[68]

It is not clear whether the building activity attributed to מטיף הכזב is to be taken literally or metaphorically (cf. Burrows 1956: 153; Cross 1995: 117). That יכונן קריה בעולה is interpreted in reference to לקים עדה בשקר (1QpHab 10.6, 10) may suggest a similarly metaphorical understanding of לבנות עיר שוו (so Knibb 1994a: 243).

> It may be that the city imagery is not meant literally, but refers to construction of a community. (VanderKam and Flint 2002: 288)[69]

Brownlee, on the other hand, argues that this comparison indicates 'two types of building', the physical (עיר שוו) and the spiritual (עדה בשקר), the former referring to Jerusalem.[70] Of course, it may be that an association of the 'spouter' with metaphorical building activity in CD 4.19-20, 8.12-13 and 19.24b-26a (dependent upon the depiction of false prophets in Ezekiel 13) had, by the LSP, become entrenched and understood in a literal sense.

---

66   This may also explain why הכוהן הרשע is not employed despite the various references to this sobriquet surrounding the passage (cf. 1QpHab 8.3–9.12a; 11.2–12.10). See Grossman 2002: 156.

67   Cf. בונה עיר בדמים ויכונן קריה בעולה (1QpHab 10.6).

68   Noted also in Cross 1995: 116–17.

69   So too VanderKam 2003: 473–74. Cf. 4Q171 (4QpPs^a) 3.14-19, where בנה is used metaphorically in reference to עדה (to be examined below). Hugh Schonfield suggests that the language indicates merely 'an edifice of lies built up by the Prophesier of Untruth' (1956: 101). The following observation, drawing upon Philo of Alexandria's *De Decalogo* and the question as to 'why God gave the law to Israel in the desert', may perhaps be of significance: 'The law is the foundation of a new, pure city. As such, it must be given precisely in the desert, not in the city' (Najman 2006: 107). Might this lend support to a metaphorical understanding of the 'city of vanity' established by מטיף הכזב, perhaps in terms of a rival interpretation of the law? Such would indeed be congruent with the context of false teaching in which מטיף הכזב is consistently depicted.

70   Brownlee 1982: 14 (cf. 1979: 169–70). He thus concludes that מטיף הכזב was 'a chief priest' (1979: 44), to be identified specifically with Hyrcanus I (1952; 1979; 1982).

The qualification of the city as 'vanity' (שׁוו, 1QpHab 10.10) and the reference to 'the service of vanity' (עבודת שׁוו, 10.11) are perhaps to be read in the light of CD 4.19-20 concerning 'the builders of the wall who walked after צו'. We noted in Chapter 3 that the phrase הלכו אחרי צו (CD 4.19) echoes הלך אחרי־צו from Hos. 5.11 where צו is rendered 'vanity' by the NRSV, taking it as שׁוא following the Septuagint.[71] It is perhaps significant that עיר שׁוו is paralleled by עדה בשׁקר (1QpHab 10.10), while עבודת שׁוו is paired with מע[ע]שׁי שׁקר (1QpHab 10.11-12). Brownlee accordingly highlights that שׁוו is to be regarded a synonym of שׁקר and taken as a qualification of מטיף הכזב (1979: 169). In this context it is interesting to note that the Yahadic redaction of CD 4.19-20 states:

> the צו is a spouter {מטיף} of whom he said 'they shall surely spout
> {הטף יטיפון}'. (CD 4.19-20)

Indeed Ezekiel 13, concerning the 'builders of the wall', repeatedly attests שׁוא seemingly in the sense of 'falsehood'; for example, חזו שׁוא וקסם כזב which the NRSV renders: 'They have prophesied falsehood and lying divination' (Ezek. 13.6; cf. 13.6-9). The appropriateness of this language with regard to the pesher on Hab. 2.12, and in relation to מטיף הכזב in particular, is apparent.

Most of line 16 and all of line 17 are missing from column 10 of 1QpHab, though significantly הכזב appears as the first word of column 11 suggesting that it was immediately preceded by either מטיף (Eisenman 1996: 405–21; Horgan 1979; 2002; Knibb 1994a; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996) or אישׁ (Brownlee 1948; 1979). That מטיף הכזב appears as the subject of the previous lemma suggests that we should most likely restore the same here.[72] Hence 1QpHab 10.17–11.1 may witness a second attestation of מטיף הכזב.

The various thematic overlaps we have seen (e.g., false teaching, leading astray, building activity) and the use of identical terminology (e.g., שׁקר, עדה, תעה, not to mention the sobriquet itself) indicate that the presentation of מטיף הכזב in 1QpHab 10.5b–11.2a is remarkably congruent with that of the 'spouter' in the ESP (cf. CD 1.10-18a; 4.19-20; 8.12-13; 19.24b-26a). Perhaps, as with מורה הצדק, the evidence of some continuity between the ESP and LSP may lead us to observe the same phenomenon that the indefinite description 'a spouter of a lie' (מטיף כזב), by the acquisition of the definite article, has become in the LSP the seemingly appellative form 'the Spouter of the Lie' (מטיף הכזב).

---

71   See Campbell 1995a: 116–31; R.T. White 1990: 82; also Holladay 2000; Koehler and Baumgartner 1996; 1999.
72   So too Bengtsson 2000a: 88 n. 1.

Summary

The sobriquet מטיף הכזב is certainly attested at least once in 1QPesher on Habakkuk (10.9) and most probably appeared also in 1QpHab 10.17–11.1. The assertion by Brownlee (1979: 43; followed also by Wise *et al.* 2004a) that we should restore מטיף הכזב in the lacuna at 1QpHab 1.11 seems unlikely, however. One further place in which we might have *expected* to find מטיף הכזב is the pesher to Hab. 2.18 which, in the MT, refers to 'a teacher of falsehood' (מורה שקר; cf. Isa. 9.14). However, when cited in 1QpHab 12.10-12, the form attested is מרי שקר:

> ¹²·¹⁰'What use is an idol once its maker has shaped it, ¹¹a cast image and fatling of falsehood {מרי שקר}? For its maker trusts in what he has made, ¹²making dumb idols.' The interpretation of the word concerns all ¹³the idols of the nations which they have made to serve them and bow down ¹⁴to them, but they will not deliver them on the day of judgement. (1QpHab 12.10-14)

The fact that מטיף הכזב is absent from the pesher implies that מרי שקר is not simply a scribal error but was the understood reading, and similarly militates against viewing מרי as a variant form of מורה.[73] It is rendered here a 'fatling of falsehood' following Brownlee (1979) and Knibb (1994a; cf. Vermes 2004: 'fatling of lies').[74]

In addition to 'the Spouter of the Lie', 1QPesher on Habakkuk also refers to 'the Man of the Lie' (1QpHab 1.1-2; 5.11) utilizing the same form, איש הכזב, found in the ESP (CD 20.15). How should we regard these two sobriquets in relation to each other? In the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document we noted that מטיף כזב appeared to function as a description of the figure labelled 'the Man of Scoffing' (cf. CD 1.13-15) who in turn appeared to be identical to 'the Man of the Lie' (cf. CD 20.10-15).[75] Accordingly we could consider מטיף הכזב and איש הכזב to have the same frame of reference in the Pesher on Habakkuk, being synonymous titles for one figure.[76] Brownlee argues this position on terminological grounds:

> The latter term [מטיף הכזב] may also be translated Prophet of Lies or False Prophet, since the verb lying behind 'dripper' is used in Scripture for the 'distilling' of prophetic speech, as in Deut. 32.2. 'Man of Lies'

---

73 See Lim 2000a: 47–48; Rabin 1955: 153–54.

74 Reading מרי as מריא. Horgan (1979; 2002) and Rabin (1955: 153–54) opt to read מראה, 'vision' or 'image' (cf. LXX). Further possibilities are listed in Horgan 1979 (54) and Lim 2000a (48 n. 9).

75 See the relevant discussion in Chapter 3.

76 So, for example, the recent discussions of the pesharim by Charlesworth (2002: 94–97) and Lim (2002: 72–74). See too the classic studies of Jeremias (1963: 89) and Stegemann (1971: 41).

parodies the Old Testament title 'man of God' for a prophet. Thus most probably both terms are synonyms for the same person. (1982: 9–10)

Charlesworth suggests that likewise:

The Man of the Lie seems to perform *the same functions* as the Spouter of the Lie. The similar opposition to the Righteous Teacher and the similarity of the sobriquets suggest that these virtually identical terms refer to the same distinct person. (2002: 96; my italics)

However, is this really the case? 'The Spouter of the Lie' is not set opposite 'the Teacher of Righteousness' in 1QpHab 10.5b–11.2a (though the emphasis on false teaching may betray an implied ideological opposition), while both attestations of 'the Man of the Lie' are in the immediate context of the 'teacher' (1QpHab 1.10b–2.10a; 5.8-12). Similarly, in agreement with the portrayal of a 'spouter' in the ESP, 'the Spouter of the Lie' is associated with 'leading astray' (תעה), a congregation (עדה), falsehood (שקר) and building (בנה). These are not used (in the LSP) of 'the Man of the Lie', who is instead associated with traitors (בוגדים), the wicked (רשע), rejection of the law (מאס את התורה) and of both the covenant and 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (1QpHab 2.1-4; 5.8-12; cf. CD 20.10-15). Thus, both sobriquets come with their own individual connotations and associated terminology (seemingly drawn from a [re-]reading of the ESP, distinguishing between the actions of a 'spouter' and 'the Man of the Lie'). This may explain why the reference to building in Hab. 2.12 prompted the use of מטיף הכזב in the pesher rather than איש הכזב as previously employed. While the two sobriquets, מטיף הכזב and איש הכזב, may well have been (intended to be) *read* and *understood* as interchangeable titles for a single figure, it would appear that (*contra* Charlesworth) in the Pesher on Habakkuk they perform a distinct function as labels.

Excursus: 'The Wicked Priest'

We have observed above that a further sobriquet to be found in 1QPesher on Habakkuk is הכוהן הרשע, 'the Wicked Priest'. It appears five times altogether, twice in 1QpHab 8.3–9.12a (8.8; 9.9) and three times in 1QpHab 11.2–12.10 (11.4; 12.2, 8).[77] There are also, in close proximity to the appearances of this label, three occurrences of simply הכוהן that would appear to correspond to the sobriquet (8.16; 9.16; 11.12) and a reference to כוהני ירושלם האחרונים, 'the last priests of Jerusalem' (9.4-5).[78] A number of scholars have suggested that 'the Wicked Priest' should

---

77   There is, as noted, some dispute as to whether the title should also be reconstructed in the lacuna at 1QpHab 1.13 (see n. 51 above; cf. Lim 2000a; 2002: 35–36).

78   Seemingly distinct from the positive use of הכוהן in 1QpHab 2.8, which would appear to indicate מורה הצדק (see n. 10 above). Lim tentatively suggests that [מ]טיף (sic) should be restored instead at 1QpHab 9.16 (1993a: 422; cf. van der Woude 1996: 378).

be regarded as synonymous with 'the Spouter of the Lie' and 'the Man of the Lie' (e.g., Brownlee 1952; 1982; Cross 1995: 116–17; Dupont-Sommer 1961; Thiering 1978; Vermes 1981; 2004: 54–66). Therefore we shall briefly examine the specific employment of הכוהן הרשע in 1QpHab 8.3–9.12a and 11.2–12.10 in order to assess this claim:

[8.3]'And moreover wealth will betray the arrogant man and not [4]will he last, he who widens his throat like Sheol, and he, like death, cannot be satisfied. [5]And all the nations are gathered to him and all the peoples are assembled to him. [6]Will they not all of them raise a taunt against him and be mediators of riddles about him, [7]and say, "Woe to he who multiplies what is not his, how long will he burden himself with [8]debt?" ' Its interpretation concerns הכוהן הרשע who [9]was called by the name of truth when he first arose, but when he ruled [10]over Israel his heart became proud and he abandoned God and betrayed the decrees for the sake of [11]wealth. And he stole and gathered the wealth of men of violence who had rebelled against God. [12]And he took the wealth of the peoples, adding upon himself guilty sin, and ways of [13]abomination he followed in every unclean impurity. 'Will not they suddenly arise, [14]your creditors, and those who make you tremble awake, and you will be their booty? [15]For you have plundered many nations, but all the rest of the peoples will plunder you.' [16]The int[erpretation of the word] concerns הכוהן who rebelled [17][...] the decrees of [...] ... [...] [9.1]afflicting him with the judgements of wickedness and horrors of [2]evil diseases worked upon him, and vengeances on his body of flesh. And when [3]it says, 'For you have plundered many nations, but all [4]the rest of the peoples will plunder you', its interpretation concerns the last priests of Jerusalem [5]who will gather wealth and profit from plundering the peoples. [6]But at the end of days their wealth will be given, with their plunder, into the hand of [7]the army of the Kittim. For they are 'the rest of the peoples'. [8]'Because of human bloodshed and violence to the land, the town and all [who dwell] in it. [9]Its interpretation concerns הכוהן הר[שע] whom, because of wrong done to הצדק[10] מורה and the men of his council, God gave into the hand of his enemies to humble him [11]with disease, to destroy him in bitterness of soul because he had done wickedly [12]against his elect. (1QpHab 8.3–9.12a)

[11.2]'Woe to him who makes his neighbour drink, pouring out [3]his anger, making him drunk so as to look upon their festivals.' [4]Its interpretation concerns הכוהן הרשע, who [5]pursued מורה הצדק, to swallow him up in the heat of [6]his anger, to the house of his exile. And at the time of the festival, the rest of [7]the Day of Atonement, he appeared to them to swallow them up [8]and to make them stumble on the day of fasting, the sabbath of their rest. 'You are sated [9]with shame rather than glory. Drink also yourself and stagger. [10]It will turn against you, the cup of the right-hand of YHWH, and shame come [11]upon your glory.' [12]Its interpretation concerns הכוהן whose shame was greater than his glory,

> [13]for he did not circumcise the foreskin of his heart and walked in ways of [14]drunkenness in order to quench his thirst, but the cup of the anger of [15][Go]d will swallow him up, adding [...] his [s]h[am]e and the pain [16][... [17]'For the violence of Lebanon will cover you and the destruction of the animals] [12.1]will terrify you, because of human bloodshed and violence to the land, the town and all who dwell in it.' [2]The interpretation of the word concerns הכוהן הרשע, to pay him [3]his reward for that which he did to the poor. For 'Lebanon' is [4]the council of the Community {עצת היחד} and 'the animals' are the simple ones of Judah, עושה [5]התורה. God will condemn him to destruction – [6]just as he planned to destroy the poor. And when it says, 'Because of the bloodshed of [7]the town and violence to the land', its interpretation: 'the town' is Jerusalem [8]in which הרשע הכוהן performed works of abomination and defiled [9]the sanctuary of God. And the 'violence to the land' are the cities of Judah where [10]he stole the wealth of the poor. (1QpHab 11.2–12.10)

On the one hand, 'the Wicked Priest' is depicted in direct opposition to 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (1QpHab 9.8-12a; 11.2-8), as is 'the Man of the Lie' (1QpHab 2.1-4; 5.8-12).[79] The above passages also appear either side of that concerning 'the Spouter of the Lie' (1QpHab 10.5b–11.2a), raising the possibility that the same figure is here referred to. Furthermore, we noted above the apparent dependence of 1QpHab 11.2-8 (LSP) upon 1QH[a] 12.8-12 (ESP), and in particular the fact that הכוהן הרשע is employed in the pesher while we might have expected איש הכזב or מטיף הכזב since מליצי כזב and חוזי רמיה appear in the Hodayot (see n. 37 above; cf. Davies 1987: 96–97). While this may imply the 'possession of genuine historical information', it may also suggest 'the possibility that the writer is not aware of any historical differentiation between the characters' (Davies 1987: 97). Thus, איש הכזב, מטיף הכזב and הכוהן הרשע could be regarded as interchangeable.

However, as with מטיף הכזב and איש הכזב, there are some unique features with regard to the specific employment of הכוהן הרשע and the terminology associated with it. First and foremost, the sobriquet itself lays claim to a priestly role, something not associated with מטיף הכזב or איש הכזב, and the qualification of this is רשע rather than כזב.[80] 'The Wicked Priest' is further described as having 'ruled over Israel' (משל בישראל, 1QpHab 8.9-10) and 'performed works of abomination and defiled the sanctuary of God' (1QpHab 12.8-9), and is associated with the accumulation of wealth (הון), drunkenness (רוה) and Jerusalem

---

79 Cf. 1QpHab 1.13; הכוהן הרשע or איש הכזב? The latter figure is moreover the referent of רשע in 1QpHab 5.8-12, thus both labels are associated with wickedness (see Lim 1997: 99 n. 5).

80 Note however that איש הכזב is the referent of רשע in 1QpHab 5.8-12 (and 1.13?).

is also accused of attempting to 'swallow up' (בלע) 'the Teacher of Righteousness' and 'destroy the poor' (כלות אביונים). More notable still are the vivid, and varied, accounts of the punishments that have been/will be received by 'the Wicked Priest'.[82]

It is significant that most of these elements are suggested by the lemma. That there are no apparent preconceived connotations of הכוהן הרשע may result from the absence of this sobriquet in earlier compositional periods. Indeed the role of הכוהן attributed to this figure and the accusation that he 'defiled the sanctuary' are the only elements that cannot be straightforwardly derived from the lemma.[83] Even the presence of punishments, acted out or threatened, is suggested by the 'woes' of Hab. 2.5-20.[84] Thus, little of the terminology used of 'the Wicked Priest' is independent of the lemma, while *none* of that regularly associated with either מטיף הכזב or איש הכזב (for example, בנה, שקר, עדה, תעה, בוגדים) is employed.[85] Our inference must be that, while it is *possible* that מטיף הכזב ,הכוהן הרשע and איש הכזב were (considered to be) interchangeable, this is less plausible than the argument that מטיף הכזב and איש הכזב were understood to be synonymous, as the 'liar' and 'priest' labels 'have different spheres of action and characterization' (Dimant 1984: 543 n. 283).[86] In either case, the specific context and use (and absence) of terminology suggests that הכוהן הרשע likewise fulfilled a *distinct* function as a label in 1QPesher on Habakkuk.

81 Unless the 'city of vanity' of 1QpHab 10.10 is to be taken literally and מטיף הכזב accordingly to be associated with Jerusalem (so Brownlee 1979: 169–70; 1982: 14; see n. 70 above).

82 It is these which have primarily led to the suggestion that the sobriquet may have been used of multiple 'wicked priests' (cf. Brownlee 1952; 1982; García Martínez and van der Woude 1990; Lim 1993a; van der Woude 1982). On tenses in 1QpHab, see Stuckenbruck 2007b; Wacholder 2002; cf. Thorion-Vardi 1985.

83 We have already noted the probable dependence of בלע upon either Hab. 1.13 (cf. 1QpHab 5.8-9) or the schemes of 'Belial' (בליעל) in 1QHᵃ 12.10 (see n. 36 above). Similarly הון is suggested by Hab. 2.5-6 (cf. 1QpHab 8.3-8), רוה by Hab. 2.15-16 (cf. 1QpHab 11.2-3, 8-11) and משל by Hab. 2.6 (cf. 1QpHab 8.6-8; see Bengtsson 2000b: 252–53; Brownlee 1979: 131–44). It is perhaps also of significance that the three nets of Belial in CD 4.14b-18 (introduced by פשרו) are 'fornication', 'wealth' and 'defilement of the sanctuary'; by implication הכוהן הרשע is caught in at least two of these (cf. Kosmala 1978b; Eshel 2007). 1QpHab 12.6-10 may thus draw upon the phraseology of CD 4.14b–5.16. For an overview of scriptural dependence and exegetical technique in the Pesher on Habakkuk, see Brooke 1994a.

84 So too the 'judgements of fire' in the passage concerning 'the Spouter of the Lie' (1QpHab 10.5b–11.2a).

85 Note, however, יבגוד בחוקים in 1QpHab 8.10.

86 On this complex issue, see further the detailed studies by Gert Jeremias (1963: 36–126) and Hartmut Stegemann (1971: 39–197). Cf. Callaway 1988 (esp. 153); Charlesworth 2002; Lim 2002: 64–80.

3. *Sobriquets in 1QPesher on Habakkuk*

For the first time in the course of our examination we have a text that attests the 'standard' forms מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב, used so frequently in the secondary literature. Both bear great resemblance to the indefinite forms already seen in the ESP (מטיף כזב and מורה צדק) and the contextual and terminological presentation of these ESP descriptions is likewise echoed in 1QPesher on Habakkuk. There is accordingly a sense of continuity with regard to the understanding and employment of these labels. That both are to be found with the definite article (and performing a seemingly titular function) in this text, suggests that some developmental process is at work.

It is equally significant that the titles 'the Teacher of the Community' (מורה/יורה היחיד) and 'the Man of Scoffing' (איש הלצון), used in conjunction with the *descriptions* מורה צדק and מטיף כזב respectively in the ESP, are absent from 1QPesher on Habakkuk. However, 'the Man of the Lie' (איש הכזב), which we suggested may be synonymous with 'the Man of Scoffing' (and, therefore, accusations of 'spouting') in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document, *is* present in the Pesher on Habakkuk (1QpHab 1.10b–2.10a; 5.8-12). We must thus question the degree to which איש הכזב can be regarded as synonymous with מטיף הכזב in this text. We noted above that, while the two labels share some terminological and contextual similarities, there are also numerous distinctions. These draw primarily upon connotations derived from the employment of these designations (separately) in the ESP and provide the impetus for the use of both איש הכזב at 1QpHab 2.1-2 and 5.11 (in the context of בוגדים) and מטיף הכזב at 1QpHab 10.9 (and 10.17–11.1?; in the context of בנה). We must conclude, therefore, that while the two may have been *understood* as interchangeable designations for a single figure (certainly perhaps by later readers), the very specificities of their respective employment demonstrate that the pesharist was aware of the distinct connotations associated with each label. Thus, on the *textual* level with which we are concerned, these labels cannot straightforwardly be regarded as synonymous.[87]

A further sobriquet of some significance, הכוהן הרשע, is also to be found in 1QPesher on Habakkuk. It differs in form from מורה הצדק, מטיף הכזב and איש הכזב (consisting as it does of a definite noun followed by a definite adjective) and has no discernible antecedent in the FSP or ESP (unless we should recognize in the opposition of this label to מורה הצדק the dichotomy between צדק and רשע prevalent in scripture

---

87 This forces us to perhaps also re-question the relationship between איש הכזב and איש הלצון in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document. This may prove a fruitful avenue for further investigation.

and mediated likewise through the Hodayot, e.g., 1QH[a] 7.17b-22a).[88] In the excursus above we noted both the points of similarity and those of difference between this sobriquet and מטיף הכזב and איש הכזב. Similar observations lead Lim to conclude that:

> If the wicked priest and liar are separate individuals, then it has to be said that the Habakkuk pesherist does not always maintain this distinction. (Lim 2000a: 51)

Our conclusion with regard to מטיף הכזב and איש הכזב still stands here. The similarities between the employment of these three labels *allow* them to be read as interchangeable.[89] However, the points of difference indicate the undoubtedly distinct function of each on a literary level. The pesharist may have had no idea (or interest in?) how these sobriquets related to historical individuals (see Davies 1987: 97). The labels in 1QPesher on Habakkuk should be seen primarily as literary devices, governed by the lemma, thus perhaps undermining their potential value as sources of historical information. Nevertheless, of equal value is the wealth of information they can provide with regard to the use and development of sobriquets within the sectarian material.

b. *1QPesher on Micah*
1. *'The Teacher of Righteousness'*
1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 1b-9a

The Pesher on Micah from Cave 1 contains one passage that makes apparent reference to 'the Teacher of Righteousness':

> Frgs. 8–10, [1]'For the transgression [2][of Jacob is all of this and for the sins of the House of Israel. What is the transgression of Ja]cob? Is it not [3][Samaria? And what are the high places of Judah? Is it not Je]rusa[lem? I will make Samaria [4]a ruin of the country, a plantation of vines.'] Its interpretation concerns מטיף הכזב [5][who has led astray the] simple ones. 'And what are the high places of Judah? [6][Is it not Jerusalem?' Its interpretation con]cerns מורה הצדק who himself [7][teaches {יורה} התורה to] his [council] and to a[l]l those volunteering to be added to the elect of [8][God {אל}, {בחירי} עושי התורה] in the council of

88   On the juxtaposition of צדק and רשע, see S.-H. Kim 1985 (153–91) and our discussion in Chapter 3. Cf. 1QH[a] 4.20-21; 5.25-27; 6.9-10, 14-16; 7.17b-20; 10.12-13; 12.38; 15.12; 20.16-19; 25[top].13.

89   Indeed, the use of stereotypical language allows them to be interpreted in reference not just to the *same* historical individual but to a plurality of (distinct?) figures. Modern evidence of this comes from a cursory overview of the various hypotheses that have been advanced attempting to identify the referent(s) of these sobriquets (see Chapter 1; also VanderKam 1999a).

the Community {עצת היחד} who will be delivered from the day [9][of judgement . . .]. (1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 1b-9a)[90]

In the preliminary publication and subsequently in DJD 1, Josef T. Milik read מורי הצדק in line 6 and suggested that 'on y pourrait voir l'intensification du nom du Maître, par le pluriel' (1952: 415; cf. 1955). Theodor H. Gaster (1957) rendered the designation 'those who expound the Law correctly', adopting an explicitly plural understanding of the form. The use of the singular pronoun immediately after, however, militates against this approach. It has been suggested that מורי הצדק might represent an 'orthographic variant' (Bengtsson 2000a: 212) or even 'phonetic spelling' (Brownlee 1979: 47) of מורה הצדק, and should thus be translated in the usual fashion. Indeed, Horgan has argued that '*mwry* is not a good reading' and that:

> the traces that are visible on the photograph do not entirely exclude the usual spelling *mwrh*. The word is vertically aligned with other words that are partially obscured by some damage to the skin; . . . Thus, I transcribe *mw[r]h*. (Horgan 1979: 60)

The reading מורה has also been explicitly adopted by Bengtsson (2000a) and in the *DSSSE* of García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997).[91] In light of the doubt expressed above with regard to the implied meaning of מורי הצדק, and given that מורה הצדק (already noted on six occasions in 1QpHab) remains a viable transcription, the latter reading is to be preferred here.[92]

The 'high places of Judah' (Mic. 1.5), identified with Jerusalem, are here interpreted in reference to 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 5-6). Alternatively, 'the high places' could be understood as 'the council of the Community' (עצת היחד, 1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 8) and 'Judah' as 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (so Brownlee 1979: 203–204; cf. Brooke 1994a: 347). The presence of עצת היחד is significant given that, in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document, the 'teacher' is associated with 'the Men of the Community' (אנשי היחיד, CD 20.32) and himself titled 'the Teacher of the Community' (מורה/יורה היחיד, CD 20.1; 20.14).[93] Furthermore, 1QpHab 9.8-12a refers to 'the Teacher of Righteousness and the men of his council' (מורה הצדק ואנשי עצתו,

---

90   Following the structural reconstruction of Milik (1952; 1955; followed also by García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Vermes 2004; Wise *et al.* 2004b). Note, however, the alternative structure suggested by Horgan (1979: esp. 55–56; 2002).

91   See, in addition, PTSDSSP (Horgan 2002). Note that García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997) also reconstruct מורה הצדק in the lacuna at frg. 11, 4, though no traces remain in the text and so this is far from certain.

92   In either case, the sense מורה הצדק would appear to be assured.

93   Note also the association of the protagonist of the Hodayot with יחד (e.g., 1QH[a] 12.23b-25a; cf. Chapter 3, n. 118). Cf. אנשי היחד in 4Q252 5.5.

Community' are described as 'the elect of [God (?)]' (בחירי [אל], 1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 7-8; cf. 1QpHab 10.13), once more recalling בחירי צדק of 1QH[a] 10.13.

Other phrases, found in the reconstructed portions of the passage, are likewise reminiscent of descriptions of מורה הצדק elsewhere. For example, Milik suggests עושי התורה should be read in the lacuna at line 8, perhaps on account of the reference to delivery 'from the day [of judgement]' (1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 8-9; cf. 1QpHab 8.1-3) and '[the] simple ones' (1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 5; cf. 1QpHab 12.4-5).[94] He also offers יורה התורה in line 7 with regard to 'the Teacher of Righteousness', followed by García Martínez (1996), García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997) and Vermes (2004).[95] Both suggestions are feasible and fit with the context of the passage. Neither is certain, though, owing to the terminological overlaps with 1QPesher on Habakkuk, the presence of עושי התורה in line 8 is perhaps the likelier of the two.

2. *'The Spouter of the Lie'*
1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 1b-9a

The same passage from 1QPesher on Micah has, in most readings, also been thought to attest 'the Spouter of the Lie', as below:

> [Frgs. 8–10,] [1]'For the transgression [2][of Jacob is all of this and for the sins of the House of Israel. What is the transgression of Ja]cob? Is it not [3][Samaria? And what are the high places of Judah? Is it not Je]rusa[lem? I will make Samaria [4]a ruin of the country, a plantation of vines.'] Its interpretation concerns מטיף הכזב [5][who has led astray {יתעה} the] simple ones. 'And what are the high places of Judah? [6][Is it not Jerusalem?' Its interpretation con]cerns מורה הצדק who himself [7][teaches התורה to] his [council] and to a[l]l those volunteering to be added to the elect of [8][God, עושי התורה] in the council of the Community who will be delivered from the day [9][of judgement ...]. (1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 1b-9a)

In the preliminary publication, Milik read מיטיף כזב in line 4 (1952), though later amended this reading to מטיף הכזב in the *editio princeps* (1955), noting that מ and ה were uncertain. This has been rejected by Carmignac (1962a: 516) and Horgan (1979: 60; 2002), though no alternative restoration is proffered. The reading מטיף הכזב has the support, however, of Bengtsson (2000a: 105–106), Burrows (1958: 404), Dupont-Sommer (1961: 278), García Martínez (1996), García Martínez

---

94 See Milik 1952 and 1955; followed by: García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Gaster 1957; Horgan 1979; Vermes 2004; cf. Wise *et al.* 2004b.

95 Cf. Wise *et al.* 2004b.

and Tigchelaar (1997), Gaster (1957), Lim (2002: 73) and Vermes (2004), as well as *DSSEL*.[96]

This form, if accepted, is identical to that attested in 1QPesher on Habakkuk (1QpHab 10.9) and the addition of the definite article alone distinguishes it from the indefinite description מטיף כזב found in the ESP (e.g., CD 8.13). It is hardly surprising that some form of the sobriquet מטיף הכזב is to be found in the Pesher on Micah since we have already noted in Chapter 3 that the origin of the indefinite designation there is likely to be Mic. 2.11. Indeed it is interesting to speculate as to what the specific pesher on Mic. 2.11 might have been (only the interpretations of Mic. 1.2-9 and 6.15-16 have survived in 1Q14; cf. Mic. 4.8-12 in 4Q168 [4QpMic?]); if such existed, we would surely expect to find some reference to the false preaching of מטיף הכזב.[97]

It would appear that 'the transgression of Jacob', identified with Samaria (Mic. 1.5-6), is here interpreted in reference to 'the Spouter of the Lie' (1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 1-5). A dichotomy is thus established between Jacob/Samaria(/Israel) and Judah/Jerusalem in the lemma, and between 'the Spouter of the Lie' and 'the Teacher of Righteousness' in the pesher (cf. Brownlee 1979: 203–204). The reference in the lemma to 'the sins of the House of Israel' (Mic. 1.5), seemingly associated in the pesher with those led astray by 'the Spouter of the Lie', recalls the positive reference to 'עושי התורה in the House of Judah' who were loyal to 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (1QpHab 8.1-3). It is notable, however, that '[the] simple ones' (ה[פתא]ים, 1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 5) are in our present text likely 'the object of Jacob's transgression' (Brooke 1994a: 347) while in 1QpHab we find reference to פתאי יהודה עושה התורה (1QpHab 12.4-5).[98] The opposition of 'the Spouter of the Lie' to 'the elect of God' (בחירי אל, 1QpHab 10.13) in the Pesher on Habakkuk (10.5b–11.2a) is also significant given that in 1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 7-8 we have 'the elect of [. . .]'. At this point Milik proposes to reconstruct [אל] בחירי.[99] He also inserts יתעה in the lacuna at line 5; such would, of course, be in keeping with the terminology used of the 'spouter' elsewhere (e.g., CD 1.13-15; 1QpHab 10.9; cf. 1QHᵃ 10.14, 31; 12.7, 9-10, 16, 20) but cannot be made certain.

---

96   Also Wise *et al.* 2004b (following DJD 1).

97   In similar fashion, we might bemoan the fact that no pesher has survived on Hos. 10.12, a passage that we have argued influenced the expectation of יורה הצדק in CD 6.11a (cf. 4Q166 [4QpHosᵃ] and 4Q167 [4QpHosᵇ]).

98   The form עושה התורה, rather than עושי התורה, in 1QpHab 12.4-5 prompts Brownlee to translate 'the simple of Judah the Law Doer' and, drawing also upon the interpretation of 'Judah' in 1Q14, posit accordingly that we may here be able to identify 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (1979: 202–205). Cf. Brooke 1994a: 346–47.

99   Followed by García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; Vermes 2004; also Wise *et al.* 2004b.

3. *Sobriquets in 1QPesher on Micah*

In spite of some disagreement among scholars, 1QPesher on Micah would appear to attest both מורה הצדק (frgs. 8–10, 6) and מטיף הכזב (frgs. 8–10, 4) in the same form as found in the Pesher on Habakkuk. In addition, the terminology associated with each is congruent with that used of these figures elsewhere (e.g., בחר, עצה, יחד, תעה [?]). It would seem logical to conclude therefore that the sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב are used here with the same frame of reference as in 1QpHab and, as there, we can note that the indefinite descriptions מורה צדק and מטיף כזב of the ESP have seemingly been supplanted in the LSP by titles referring to 'the Teacher of Righteousness' and 'the Spouter of the Lie'.

c. *4QPesher on Isaiah^c*
1. *'The Teacher of Righteousness'*
4Q163 frg. 21, 1-6

Six pesher texts on Isaiah are to be found among the sectarian literature of the Qumran-related Dead Sea Scrolls, one from Cave 3 (3Q4) and five from Cave 4 (4Q161–165). One of the latter, written on papyrus (4Q163 [4Qpap pIsa^c]), may contain reference to 'the Teacher of Righteousness':

> Frg. 21, [1]'Shall [not, in a very little while, it return again, [2]Lebanon, to an orchard, as a wood it will be] reckoned?' The 'Le[b]anon' a[re [3]...] to an orchard and they will return [... [4]...] by the sword. And when [it says ... [5]...] ... [... [6]...] ... [...] מורה [...]. (4Q163 frg. 21, 1-6)

This passage is highly fragmentary and the lemma would appear to be from Isaiah 29.17 (so Allegro 1968; Allegro *et al.* 2004a; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996).[100] The pesher is likewise hard to decipher though line 6 attests [...] מורה. This has been translated 'the Teacher' (Horgan 1979; 2002; Allegro *et al.* 2004a), 'the teacher of' (García Martínez 1996) and 'the Teacher of' (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997), while Wise, Abegg and Cook (1996) go so far as to restore 'the Teacher of [Righteousness]'. While we are unable to judge with any certainty (it may, for example, have read מורה [היחיד], cf. CD 20.1), the restoration מורה [הצדק] is certainly plausible in the light of our examination so far of the LSP.

It should also be noted that 4Q163 frg. 23, 2.15-20 contains in the lemma the text of Isaiah 30.19-21 concerning 'your teacher' (MT: מוריך) and the dictation: 'This is the way; walk in it' (זה הדרך לכו בו, Isa. 30.21). Unfortunately the pesher to these lines is almost entirely missing so we can only speculate as to what the pesharist may have made of them. The association between the 'teacher' and 'the way' elsewhere, though

---

100   Horgan does not explicitly identify 4Q163 frg. 21, 1-2 as Isa. 29.17 though he does acknowledge the possibility (1979: 118; cf. 2002).

(e.g., CD 1.10-11a; cf. 1QH[a] 10.9b-10; 12.23b-25a) would strongly suggest the employment of מורה הצדק in the pesher.[101] 'The Teacher of Righteousness' may also have appeared in 4Q165 (4QpIsa[e]) in a lacuna immediately followed by גלה את תורה הצדק] (4Q165 frgs. 1–2, 3); such is the suggestion of García Martínez (1996), García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997), Horgan (1979) and Wise, Abegg and Cook (1996).

2. *'The Spouter of the Lie'*
4Q163 frgs. 4–6, 1.6-10

The sobriquet מטיף הכזב does not appear in 4Q163, though one passage is worthy of mention simply because it quotes Isa. 9.13-16 (a scriptural passage we have already examined in relation to the 'spouter' in Chapter 3) and thus may once have contained reference to 'the Spouter of the Lie':

> [Frgs. 4–6, 1.6][... 'And YHWH has cut off from Israel head and tail, palm branch and re]ed in one day; elders [7][and dignitaries are the head and נביא מורה שקר] is the tail. [8][Those who led this people led them astray {מתעים}, and those who were led by them are swa]llowed up. Therefore [9][the Lord does not rejoice over his young men, and with his orphans and] his [wi]dows he has no compassion.' [10][Its interpretation: ...]. (4Q163 frgs. 4–6, 1.6-10)

The lemma, as already seen, refers to 'a prophet who teaches falsehood' or 'a prophet, a teacher of falsehood' (נביא מורה שקר, 4Q163, frgs. 4–6, 1.7).[102] Moreover he is described as having 'led them astray' (מתעים, 1.8) causing the people to be '[swa]llowed up' (מבן]לעים], 1.8). The root תעה is used in conjunction with the 'spouter' throughout the sectarian texts we have examined hitherto and the description 'a prophet who teaches falsehood' is virtually synonymous with our understanding so far of the title 'the Spouter of the Lie'.[103] While the pesher is entirely missing it is tempting to speculate that נביא מורה שקר would have been interpreted in reference to מטיף הכזב.[104] Certainly, as John Reeves points out, the 'antithetical construction' מורה שקר (Isa. 9.14; Hab. 2.18) allows us

---

101   Indeed, Jonathan Campbell regards Isa. 30.20-21 as having directly influenced the presentation of מורה צדק in the first column of the Damascus Document (1995a: 51–67).

102   Rendered by the NRSV, 'prophets who teach lies'; cf. 'the prophet, the teacher of lies' (Horgan 1979; 2002) and 'the prophet, the Teacher of Lies' (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997).

103   It is also perhaps of interest that the root בלע is associated with 'the Man of the Lie' in 1QpHab 5.8-12 and 'the Wicked Priest' in 1QpHab 11.2-15 (cf. 'mediators of a lie' and 'seers of deceit' in 1QH[a] 12.6b-12). Clearly, no matter on what grounds we distinguish these sobriquets, there are terminological overlaps which indicate that the issue of their development is a complex one that may have resulted in a plurality of readings (just as we witness today).

104   Though note 1QpHab 12.10-14.

perhaps greater insight into the sectarian understanding of מורה הצדק
(1988: 290).

3. Sobriquets in 4QPesher on Isaiah[c]

The occurrence of '[. . .] מורה' in 4Q163 frg. 21, 6 lends itself to
the restoration [מורה [הצדק] (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996). While
מורה [היחיד] (cf. CD 20.1) would likewise be possible, the prevalence so
far of the former title in the LSP (and apparent absence of the latter)
renders 'the Teacher of [Righteousness]' the more likely alternative.
Unfortunately, nothing much can be learnt from the context other than an
association with the 'Lebanon'. Intriguingly 'Lebanon' is interpreted in
reference to 'the council of the Community' (עצת היחד) in 1QpHab
11.17–12.5a, supporting perhaps our reading of מורה הצדק in this
passage (cf. 1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 5-9a). 'The Teacher of Righteousness' may
also have appeared in 4Q163 frg. 23, 2.15-20 (and 4Q165 frgs. 1–2, 3),
while נביא מורה שקר may have been interpreted in reference to 'the
Spouter of the Lie' (4Q163 frgs. 4–6, 1.6-10).[105]

d. 4QPesher on Psalms[a]
1. 'The Teacher of Righteousness'
4Q171 1.25–2.1

The first of several important passages we shall examine from 4Q171
(4QpPs[a]) is from the bottom of the first column:

> [1.25]['Be si]lent before [YHWH and] wait for him, and do not be angry
> with the one who makes his way prosperous, with the man [26][who
> mak]es evil plots.' Its [interpretation] concerns איש הכזב who led many
> astray with words of [27]falsehood, for they chose worthless things and
> did not lis[ten] to מל יץ דעת, so [2.1]they will perish by the sword and by
> hunger and by plague. (4Q171 1.25–2.1)

In the pesher on Ps. 37.7 we find reference to מל יץ דעת (4Q171 1.27), a
designation already encountered in the Hodayot (1QH[a] 10.13) and which
we there rendered 'a mediator of knowledge' (cf. Richardson 1955: esp.
167). Given the trend we have noted for indefinite designations in the ESP
to acquire the definite article in the LSP (e.g., מטיף הכזב, מורה הצדק,
אנשי האמת), it is initially somewhat surprising that we do not also find

---

105   Allegro (1968) also read [הכ]וֹהֵן הרשע in 4Q163 frg. 30, 3 (cf. Abegg, Bowley and
Cook 2003; Allegro *et al.* 2004a; Bengtsson 2000a: 51), though this is not acknowledged by
Lim (2000b; 2002: 70) who lists the sobriquet as occurring only in 1QpHab and 4Q171.
Indeed, as Horgan comments, the fragment is 'almost completely illegible' (1979: 122) and
nothing is preserved of the context. In either case, as Bengtsson notes, 'no coherent
information can be retrieved from this fragment' (2000a: 51 n. 4).

מל יץ דעת in definite form.[106] However, since איש הכזב, for example, is already definite in the ESP, this appears to be indicative instead of varied rates of development (an issue we shall return to in Chapter 5).

In 1QH[a] 10.13-15a, מל יץ דעת is used of the protagonist of the Hodayot who is associated with both the 'elect of righteousness' (בחירי צדק) and 'men of truth' (אנשי] אמת]) as well as 'wonderful mysteries' (רזי פלא). We speculated that 'the Teacher of Righteousness' may have at least been perceived retrospectively as this figure (see n. 16 above), and in 1QpHab 7.1–8.3a is explicitly associated with 'mysteries' (רזים), the 'righteous' (צדיק) and 'the Men of Truth' (אנשי האמת). In our present passage, 'the Man of the Lie' has 'led many astray' so that they 'did not lis[ten] to מל יץ דעת' (4Q171 1.26-27). Similarly in a passage from the Pesher on Habakkuk we find:

> [2.1][...The interpretation of the word concerns] the traitors with the Man of [2]the Lie, for [they did] not [believe in the words of] the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of [3]God. (1QpHab 2.1-3a)[107]

Not only do these passages both indicate the oppositional role played by 'the Man of the Lie', but they also emphasize the importance attached to the words of a didactic figure, just as listening to 'the voice of מורה צדק' is lauded in CD 20.27-34 (cf. 1QH[a] 12.23b-25a). We might conclude therefore, with Bengtsson, that 'probably מל יץ דעת also denotes the Teacher' (2000a: 182; cf. 207–208), at least in 4Q171.[108]

We must ask consequently why we do not simply find מורה הצדק in 4Q171 1.25–2.1, as commonly found elsewhere in the LSP (and perhaps also elsewhere in 4Q171; see below). Horgan proposes an intriguing solution; she suggests that the pesharist has seized upon מצליח דרכו ('the one who makes his way prosperous') in the lemma (Ps. 37.7; cf. 4Q171 1.25) and, rearranging the consonantal order of מצל יח, derives מל יץ (Horgan 1979: 247). Thus מל יץ דעת is more readily suggested than מורה הצדק. However, this hypothesis is not thoroughly convincing as מצליח דרכו in the lemma is associated with 'the man [who mak]es evil

106   Note, however, the following suggested renderings: 'the Mediator of Knowledge' (Allegro 1968; Allegro with Gordon 2004a), 'the interpreter of knowledge' (Knibb 1994a; Vermes 2004), 'the Interpreter of Knowledge' (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; 2002), 'the spokesmen for true knowledge' (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996).

107   The '[trai]tors in the end of days' (1QpHab 2.5-6) likewise: 'will not believe when they hear all that is com[ing up]on the last generation from the mouth of the priest {הכוהן} in [whose heart] God has given [understandi]ng to interpret all the words of his servants, the prophets, by [whose] hand God has proclaimed all that is coming upon his people' (1QpHab 2.6-10a).

108   Accepting Richardson's proposal that מל יץ denotes not strictly an interpreter but an intermediary, the portrayal of the 'teacher' in the role of a 'mediator' would indeed be apt in the light of 1QpHab 2.1-10, 7.1-5 (cf. Richardson 1955: 167).

plots' (4Q171 1.25-26), seemingly identified in the pesher with 'the Man of the Lie'. Instead, if we were to follow Horgan's proposal, we might more appropriately expect מליצי רמיה, מליצי כזב or מליצי תעות to appear in place of איש הכזב (cf. 1QH^a 10.14, 31; 12.7, 9-10). Horgan is forced to state that the interpretation is subsequently built around מליץ דעת 'independent of the action described in the lemma' (1979: 247).

A potentially more fruitful derivation is suggested by Jutta Jokiranta who observes that מזמות ('evil plots'/'schemes', Ps. 37.7; 4Q171 1.26) are likewise attributed to the opponents of מליץ דעת in 1QH^a 10.13-17a (2005c: 344 n. 36).[109] If either Horgan or Jokiranta are right, this may at least explain why מליץ דעת remains an indefinite designation; it has not become a title in the LSP (so אנשי האמת; מטיף הכזב; מורה הצדק) but is instead a description suggested by the lemma and so imported directly from the ESP (1QH^a 10.13).

It would certainly appear, on the basis of comparison with 1QpHab 2.1-3a, 7.1–8.3a and 1QH^a 10.13-17a that the description in 4Q171 1.25–2.1 of an opponent of 'the Man of the Lie' as 'a mediator of knowledge' is likely in reference to 'the Teacher of Righteousness'.[110] This may in turn support our supposition in Chapter 3 that, rightly or wrongly, the 'teacher' was perceived by readers of the Hodayot to lie behind the so-called 'Teacher Hymns'.[111]

4Q171 3.14-19

A further passage of some significance from 4Q171 may, it is suggested, twice refer to 'the Teacher of Righteousness':

> [3.14]'For by YHW[H are the steps of a man] established [and] he delights in his [w]ay, for though he [stum]bles [he will not] [15]be hurled, for Y[HWH supports his hand.'] Its interpretation concerns הכוהן מורה [הצדק, [whom] [16]God [ch]ose to arise {לעמוד} [. . .] he established to build for him a congregation of [. . . [17]and] straightened his [wa]y to

---

109   Jokiranta also notes the scriptural association of זמם and דעת (e.g., Prov. 1.4; 5.2; 8.12).

110   So too, Bengtsson 2000a: 182, 207–208; Brownlee 1982: 25; Doudna 2001: 689; Jokiranta 2005c: 344 n. 31; Knibb 1990: 52; 1994a: 249; Lim 2002: 73. Charlesworth (2002: 83–84) chooses instead to identify מליץ דעת with 'the Seeker of the Law' (דורש התורה, e.g., CD 6.7), though this seems unlikely given that 'the Man of the Lie' and the 'teacher' are presented as contemporaries in both the ESP and the LSP while 'the Seeker of the Law' is a figure of the past/present in the preceding FSP, pre-dating the arrival of יורה הצדק (CD 6.2-11a; though cf. 4Q174 frg. 1, 1.11-13). 'The Seeker of the Law' is nowhere contrasted with 'the Man of the Lie' and furthermore Charlesworth's subtle efforts to associate him with מליץ דעת on the grounds of translation ('the Interpreter of Torah' and 'the Interpreter of Knowledge' respectively) do not adequately represent the terminological differences in the underlying Hebrew.

111   See n. 16 above.

truth. 'I have [been young] and now am old, but [I have] not [seen the righteous {צדיק}] [18]abandoned or his offspring begging bre[ad. All the day] he is generous and lends, and [his] offspr[ing become a blessing.' The interpretation] [19]of the word concerns מורה הצדק [...]. (4Q171 3.14-19)

Partial reconstructions have rendered, in 4Q171 3.15, the phrase פשרו על הכוהן מורה ה[צדק] (in relation to Ps. 37.23-24) and, in 3.18-19, [פשר] הדבר על מורה הצדק (in the almost entirely lost pesher on Ps. 37.25-26).[112] Neither מורה ה[...] nor מו[...] could be said to indisputably attest מורה הצדק (cf. מורה היחיד, CD 20.1), though it may be that such can be inferred from the context.[113] In the first instance, מורה ה[...] is a further qualification of 'the priest' (הכוהן); we have already noted in the Pesher on Habakkuk that הכוהן would appear to be synonymous with מורה הצדק (cf. 1QpHab 1.16–2.10; 7.1-5; see n. 10 above), an identification that is seemingly made explicit in 4Q171 3.15. Our present passage also refers to דר[כו] (4Q171 3.17), drawing upon the lemma (cf. 3.14), and אמת (3.17), both terms associated elsewhere with the 'teacher' (e.g., CD 1.10-11; 1QpHab 7.1–8.3a; cf. 1QH[a] 10.9b-10, 13-15a; 12.23b-25a). More striking is the statement that הכוהן מורה ה[...] is one '[whom] God [ch]ose to arise' (א[שר בח]ר בו אל לעמוד, 4Q171 3.15-16).[114] This echoes phrases such as 'his (God's) elect' (בחירו), made in reference to 'the Teacher of Righteousness' ('and the men of his council'?; 1QpHab 9.8-12a) and the fact that the FSP anticipates the rise (עמד) of 'one who will teach righteousness' (CD 6.10-11) while in the ESP the raising up of 'a teacher of righteousness' is explicitly attributed to God (CD 1.10-11).

   Thus the reconstruction הכוהן מורה ה[צדק] (4Q171 3.15) would appear valid, lending weight to the reading of מו[ר]ה הצדק immediately below (3.19), the latter suggested also by the presence of צדיק in the lemma (Ps. 37.25).[115] In the light of this interpretation of Ps. 37.23-24, it is

---

112   According to the reconstruction of Allegro (1968; followed by García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; 2002; Knibb 1994a; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996; cf. Allegro with Gordon 2004a). Vermes (2004) follows Allegro's reconstruction of 4Q171 3.15 though hesitates to restore מו[ר]ה הצדק at 3.19.

113   In fact, Allegro reads מורה[...] at 3.19 (1968; cf. Allegro with Gordon 2004a; Lohse 1981), though the more conservative מו[...] is read by both García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997) and Horgan (2002).

114   Following John Strugnell's reading [בח]ר in place of Allegro's [ב]בר (Strugnell 1970: 215).

115   Cf. van de Water 2003: 398. However, it should be noted that, in the preceding text, the pesharist does not take advantage of the four occurrences of צדיק in Ps. 37.12-22 to refer to מורה הצדק, interpreting the former instead with regard to עושי התורה and עדת האביונים (4Q171 2.13–3.13; cf. 1QpHab 7.17–8.3a).

also interesting to recall the words of the protagonist of the Hodayot in the ESP:

> [10.31]And you have saved me from the zeal of mediators of a lie [32]and from the congregation of seekers of smooth things. You have redeemed the life of the poor one whom they thought to finish off, spilling his blood [33]because he served you. But they did [not kn]ow that my steps come from you {מאתך מצעדי}. (1QH[a] 10.31b-33)

We might even venture that 1QH[a] 10.31b-33, understood as the words of the 'teacher', were brought to mind by the similar concept expressed in Ps. 37.23-24 and consequently resulted in the pesharist's inclusion of מורה הצדק at this point (while other seemingly more opportune occasions are missed; e.g., Ps. 37.12-13; cf. 4Q171 2.13-16a). Such a hypothesis must remain speculative, however.

As already seen, the description of מורה הצדק as הכוהן has led some to speculate that the 'teacher' must have been an ousted High Priest (e.g., Murphy-O'Connor 1974: 229–33; Stegemann 1971: 250; 1991: 200; 1992: 148–66), a claim that other scholars have refuted (e.g., Charlesworth 1980: 218–22; 2002: 88 n. 265).[116] More insightful is the following comment by Bengtsson:

> But too little attention has been paid to the fact that מורה ה[צדק] actually stands as an apposition to הכוהן. Consequently, the *Yahad* must have known the Teacher also as הכוהן, 'the Priest'... (Bengtsson 2000a: 209)

That 'the Teacher of Righteousness' could be referred to simply as 'the priest' is implied not only by 1QpHab 1.16–2.10 (cf. 7.1-5) but also by a further passage in 4Q171 which mentions 'the priest and the men of his council' (2.16-20; cf. 1QpHab 9.9-10). However, Bengtsson concludes that 4Q171 3.15 indicates 'a change of mission':

> First being a priest, his dominating function towards the *Yahad* became teaching and expounding the scriptures. Later on he was only known by the title מורה הצדק, since this was how his community perceived him. The legitimacy as a correct teacher was more crucial for the *Yahad* than his past as a priest. (Bengtsson 2000a: 209)

Our present examination would suggest otherwise. The expectation of יורה הצדק in the FSP (CD 6.2-11a), drawing upon Hos. 10.12, indicates that teaching was a function attributed to this figure from the very beginning and continued throughout the ESP (e.g., CD 1.11 and 20.32: מורה צדק; CD 20.1: מורה היחיד; CD 20.14: יורה היחיד; CD 20.28: מורה; cf. 1QH[a] 10.13: מליץ דעת).[117] By contrast, only in the LSP have

---

116 See n. 10 above.
117 Note also, ואתה אלי שמתה בפי כיורה (1QH[a] 16.16).

we found a priestly function ascribed to the 'teacher' (1QpHab 1.16–2.10; cf. 7.1-5; 4Q171 2.16-20; cf. 1QpHab 9.9-10; 4Q171 3.14-17). Our inference must be, *contra* Bengtsson, that only at a later stage was 'the Teacher of Righteousness' ever referred to as הכוהן and thus he may not have been attributed this role during his lifetime. It is perhaps no coincidence that we meet 'the Wicked Priest' (הכוהן הרשע), also referred to as simply הכוהן (1QpHab 8.16; 9.16; 11.12), only in the LSP; might the attribution of a priestly role to the 'teacher' be primarily in order to form a contrast with this figure? Thus, if we are to identify any 'change of mission' or reinterpretation of the 'teacher', rather than a move from priest to teacher (so Bengtsson 2000a: 209) we should see instead a move that tends the other way, incorporating in these later texts a priestly function with the didactic. Such may cause problems for those scholars whose historical reconstructions latch onto the supposed priestly nature of the 'teacher'.

The comment that God established מורה הצדק 'to build for him a congregation of [...]' (לבנות לו עדת [...], 4Q171 3.16) has likewise generated discussion and led to the suggestion that the 'teacher' was the founder of the community.[118] This is at odds, however, with the evidence of CD 1.4-11a which presents 'a teacher of righteousness' as having been 'raised up' for a pre-existing community (cf. CD 6.2-11a). On the one hand we may here witness a further reinterpretation of the role of the 'teacher', his role as founder being 'a concept later developed' (Charlesworth 2002: 87). Alternatively, yet still along the same lines, we saw in Chapter 3 that the arrival of the 'teacher' occasioned a split within the wider movement and thus the effective creation of the Yahad, those who recognized the 'teacher of righteousness' as the anticipated figure of CD 6.10-11a. In this sense, and certainly looking back upon the event, it would be possible to accredit 'the Teacher of Righteousness' with the founding of (specifically) the Yahad. More significant for our purposes, however, is the parallel between the following two phrases:

> [3.15]Its interpretation concerns הכוהן מורה ה[צדק], [whom] [16]God [ch]ose to arise [...] he established to build for him a congregation of [his elect in truth] (4Q171 3.15-16)[119]

> [10.9]The interpretation of the word concerns מטיף הכזב, who led many astray [10]to build a city of vanity with bloodshed and to establish a congregation in falsehood (1QpHab 10.9-10)

118   See e.g. the commentaries by Horgan (1979: 219) and Knibb (1994a: 254).

119   The reconstruction עדת [בחירו באמת] is suggested by Horgan (1979: 219) and followed by Bengtsson (2000a: 208) and García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997). Cf. עדת [האמת] (Dupont-Sommer 1961), עדת [בחירו] (García Martínez 1996).

Though from two different texts, it is hard not to see a deliberate comparison here between the 'congregations' established by מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב respectively. There is certainly an implied parallel that we may speculate would have been noted also by early readers of these pesharim.

4Q171 4.26b–5.2

The final passage we shall examine with regard to 'the Teacher of Righteousness' in 4QPesher on Psalms[a] is from the bottom of the fourth column (and top of the fifth):[120]

> 4.26'And my tongue is the pen of 27[a skilled scribe.' Its interpretation] concerns [הצדק] מורה [... befo]re God with the answer of the tongue 5.1[... and] with the lip of [...] to return together {יחד} to the תורה in [... 2...] the elect [of] Israel [...]. (4Q171 4.26b–5.2)

Here, as at 4Q163 frg. 21, 6, we have only [...] מורה (4Q171 4.27). The restoration of [הצדק] מורה, however, seems probable given our exam- ination of 4Q171 3.14-19 and other passages from the LSP.[121] The association with 'tongue' and 'lip' betray a possible didactic function (compare 1QH[a] 12.16-17), while the phrase 'the answer of the tongue' (מעני לשון, 4Q171 4.27) is used also in the so-called 'Teacher Hymns' (מענה לשון, 1QH[a] 10.7; cf. 4.17; 19.33-34). The presence of יחד (4Q171 5.1), albeit in the general sense 'together' (Allegro 1968; Allegro with Gordon 2004a; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; 2002; see Claussen and Davis 2007), and [בחירן] ישראל (4Q171 5.2) are likewise reminiscent of terminology used elsewhere of the 'teacher' (e.g., CD 20.1, 14, 27-34; 1QpHab 9.8-12a; 1Q14 frgs. 8– 10, 5-9a; cf. 1QH[a] 10.13; 12.23b-25a).

Summary

There are no indisputable occurrences of מורה הצדק in 4QPesher on Psalms[a], though [...] ה[מורה] (4Q171 3.15), [...] מן[ ] (3.19) and [...] מורה (4.27) are generally considered to partially attest this title.[122] In particular,

---

120   The *DSSSE* (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; also García Martínez 1996) follows column 4 with frgs. 11–12 to reconstruct the top of column 5 (so Strugnell 1970: 217).

121   So Allegro 1968; Allegro with Gordon 2004a; Bengtsson 2000a: 211; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; 2002; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996. However see n. 122 below.

122   See nn. 112 and 121 above. We should, nevertheless, be conscious of the fact that these restorations draw upon the appearance of מורה הצדק in other LSP texts and thus are based upon an amalgamation that may be unjustified. While מורה הצדק remains the more reasonable restoration (given the apparent prevalence of this term in the LSP), the possibility exists that one or more of these partial occurrences may have attested some other form no longer extant in the LSP (e.g., מורה היחיד).

the presence of the definite article at 4Q171 3.15 suggests that this text contained the form מורה הצדק (as elsewhere in the LSP, e.g., 1QpHab 1.13) rather than the indefinite form found in the ESP (CD 1.11; 20.32). The 'teacher' is presented as a priest and the founder of a community (4Q171 3.14-17a; cf. 2.16-20) though, while some regard these as 'two facts about the Teacher of Righteousness' (Horgan 1979: 219), our examination suggests they should not be taken at face value.

A further passage identifies an opponent of 'the Man of the Lie' as 'a mediator of knowledge' (מליץ דעת, 4Q171 1.25–2.1), found as a self-designation in the Hodayot (1QH[a] 10.13). Both in terms of context and associated terminology it would appear that this indefinite description has been imported directly from the ESP and is likely in reference to 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (see n. 110 above).

2. 'The Spouter of the Lie'
4Q171 1.25–2.1

With regard to 'the Spouter of the Lie' in 4QPesher on Psalms[a], we shall first return to a passage already considered in relation to 'the Teacher of Righteousness':

> [1.25]['Be si]lent before [YHWH and] wait for him, and do not be angry with the one who makes his way prosperous, with the man [26][who mak]es evil plots.' Its [interpretation] concerns איש הכזב who led many astray {התעה רבים} with words of [27]falsehood {אמרי שקר}, for they chose worthless things and did not lis[ten] to מליץ דעת, so [2.1]they will perish by the sword and by hunger and by plague. (4Q171 1.25–2.1)

Here we find once more, not מטיף הכזב, but איש הכזב (as 1QpHab 2.1-2; 5.11). 'The Man of the Lie' has caused many to fail to listen to 'a mediator of knowledge' (מליץ דעת) who, following our examination above, would appear to be 'the Teacher of Righteousness' (see n. 110 above). Such bears resemblance to 1QpHab 2.1-3a where איש הכזב is associated with 'the traitors' who '[did] not [believe in the words of] the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of God' (cf. 2.6-10a). As well as being pitted against מורה הצדק in 1QpHab 2.1-3a and 5.8-12, 'the Man of the Lie' is set at odds with the 'teacher' in the ESP:

> [20.13]And from the day of [14]the gathering in of יורה היחיד until the end {תם} of all the Men of War who turned back [15]with איש הכזב there will be about forty years. (CD 20.13b-15)

A few lines beneath our present passage, the interpretation of Ps. 37.10 reads similarly:

²·⁷Its interpretation concerns all the wicked, at the end of ⁸forty years, who will be finished {יתמו} and there will not be found on the earth any ⁹אִישׁ רָשָׁ[ע]. (4Q171 2.7-9a)[123]

We observed in Chapter 3 that the 'about forty years' of CD 20.13b-15 was seemingly dependent upon Deut. 2.14 (cf. Campbell 1995a: 161–71; Steudel 1993: 238), though the proximity of 4Q171 2.7-9a to the interpretation concerning אִישׁ הכזב (1.25–2.1) may suggest that the forty years here (only עוד מעט in the lemma) draws instead upon CD 20.13b-15 itself.

The presentation of אִישׁ הכזב in 4Q171 1.25–2.1 is so far similar to that found in both the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document (ESP) and the Pesher on Habakkuk (LSP). However, there would also appear to be similarities with the description of מטיף הכזב in 1QpHab 10.5b–11.2a. The latter was introduced as 'the Spouter of the Lie who led many astray' (מטיף הכזב אשר התעה רבים, 1QpHab 10.9), and so here we have 'the Man of the Lie who led many astray' (אִישׁ הכזב אשר התעה רבים, 4Q171 1.26). So far we have noted the persistent employment of תעה in relation specifically to the 'spouter', yet here it is not only used of אִישׁ הכזב but the phraseology is also identical to 1QpHab 10.9.[124] 'The Spouter of the Lie' was accused of 'teaching them wo[r]ks of falsehood' (ולהרותם במע[שׂ]י שקר, 1QpHab 10.11-12) while 'the Man of the Lie' is similarly accused of having led them astray 'with words of falsehood' (באמרי שקר; 4Q171 1.26-27).[125] The association of שקר with מטיף הכזב has a scriptural foundation (Mic. 2.11) that is echoed in the sectarian literature, yet hitherto we have observed no precedent (in the LSP) for the association of שקר with אִישׁ הכזב (though note our identification of 'the Man of the Lie' with the descriptions of a 'spouter' in the ESP). The specific terminology which thus far in the LSP has distinguished the two sobriquets with regard to their function as labels, here overlaps to a considerable degree.

In this light it may also be noted that the punishment decreed ('they will perish by the sword and by hunger and by plague'; 4Q171 2.1) is a scriptural idiom, whose immediate provenance, Horgan suggests, is Jer. 32.24 or Ezek. 14.21 (1979: 204; 2002: 11 n. 7; followed by Bengtsson 2000a: 104 n. 79). However, neither of these occurrences accurately reflects the phrasing or context found in 4Q171. Instead, the phrase בחרב וברעב ובדבר (4Q171 2.1) is attested in Jer. 14.12 (cf. Knibb 1994a: 249) where significantly it is set in the context of false prophets,

---

123   Cf. Horgan 1979: 205–206.
124   See Bengtsson 2000a: 103–105.
125   The 'worthless things' (קלות) of 4Q171 1.27 may likewise be understood in view of the 'vanity' (שׁוו) of 1QpHab 10.11; cf. Brownlee 1982: 25. Note Koehler and Baumgartner 1996; 1999.

qualified by שקר (Jer. 14.13-16). Accordingly this would prove a more apt provenance and again forces us to recognize an ideological overlap between איש הכזב in 4Q171 1.25–2.1 and מטיף הכזב as depicted elsewhere.

Bengtsson notes that this similarity 'supports the assumption that the epithets איש הכזב and מטיף הכזב refer to the same character in the Pesharim' (2000a: 104). More intriguing, however, is the apparent breakdown in this passage of the terminological boundaries distinguishing these two labels in the LSP. The specific resemblance to accusations made in 1QpHab 10.5b–11.2a regarding 'the Spouter of the Lie' may suggest some dependence one way or the other, though while the sobriquets function as distinct labels in the Pesher on Habakkuk (each with its own terminological associations) this distinction is seemingly less defined in 4Q171 1.25–2.1.[126]

4Q171 4.13-16

While מטיף הכזב is absent, a further passage from 4QPesher on Psalms[a] does mention 'the Man of the Lie' once more:

> [4.13]'I [have seen] a wicked one {רשע}, a ruthless one, and he pres[ented] himself [as a native tree of luxuriant growth. And] I passed by before his p[la]ce but be[hold] he was [not there], and I [looked for him] but he could not [14][be found.' Its interpretation] concerns [א]יש הכזב [...] ... [...] against the el[ect] of God [and loo]ked to end [15][...] ... [...] to carry out [...] ... judgement [...] acted arrogantly with a hand of deceit {רמה} [16][...] .... (4Q171 4.13-16)[127]

The lemma (Ps. 37.35-36) recalls Ps. 37.10, the interpretation of which, concerning the end of all the wicked in forty years (4Q171 2.5-9a), we noted bore similarity to CD 20.13b-15 regarding 'the end of all the Men of War who turned back with איש הכזב'. 'The Man of the Lie' is also mentioned in the present passage (4Q171 4.14); Allegro reads אי[ש] הכזב (1968; followed in Allegro with Gordon 2004a), though note the revised transcription [א]יש הכזב (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979: 224; 2002; also *DSSEL*).[128] Here he is the referent of 'a wicked one,

---

126 Indeed, if we were to posit dependence on these grounds we would perhaps tend towards regarding 1QpHab as the earlier of the two, since the distinct terminological connotations would appear to draw directly upon the ESP. The use of 'spouter' terminology to describe 'the Man of the Lie' in our current passage would thus result from a later understanding that perceived these LSP labels as synonymous. It remains possible, however, noting our identification in the ESP of 'the Man of the Lie' with the descriptions of a 'spouter', that 4Q171 represents the earlier text, pre-dating the terminological distinctions between these two labels found elsewhere in the LSP.

127 On the reconstruction of the lemma, following the MT, see Horgan 1979: 223–24.

128 We shall adopt the revised reading. So too Bengtsson 2000a: 105.

a ruthless one' (רשע עריץ, 4Q171 4.13), just as this sobriquet appears in relation to רשע in 1QpHab 5.8-12 (cf. Horgan 1979: 194).[129] He is also associated with 'deceit' (רמה, 4Q171 4.15), recalling the descriptions of opponents in the Hodayot, for example, אנשי רמיה (1QH[a] 10.16), חוזי רמיה (1QH[a] 12.7), מליצי רמיה (1QH[a] 10.34), דורשי רמיה (1QH[a] 12.10), cf. 1QH[a] 12.16-17.

Though the pesher is fragmentary, 'the Man of the Lie' would appear to be set against 'the el[ect] of God' (בחן]ירי אל, 4Q171 4.14). In 1QH[a] 10.13-17a the 'men of deceit' (אנשי רמיה) are placed in opposition to 'the elect of righteousness' (בחירי צדק). More striking, however, is the use of the same phrase בחירי אל in 1QpHab 10.13 (and perhaps 1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 7-8; see n. 99 above) in the context of 'the Spouter of the Lie'.[130] Here is perhaps yet more evidence of the blurring of the terminological boundaries between מטיף הכזב and איש הכזב in this text.

Summary

There are no occurrences of מטיף הכזב in 4QPesher on Psalms[a], though we do witness two attestations of איש הכזב (4Q171 1.26; 4.14). The first places him in opposition to מליץ דעת while the second associates him with 'deceit' (רמה) and sets him against an elect group (בחן]ירי אל); interestingly all three of these elements are present also in 1QH[a] 10.13-17a. 'The Man of the Lie' is presented as the referent of רשע in Ps. 37.35 (4Q171 4.13-16), in agreement with 1QpHab 5.8-12. However, in both passages terminology is used which, on the strength of our examination hitherto, we would most naturally associate in the LSP with the designation 'the Spouter of the Lie'. In particular there are various similarities with 1QpHab 10.5b–11.2a. Bengtsson notes that there are 'parallels of contents between Habakkuk 1–2 and Ps 37.7-40' (2000a: 105), yet the elements with which we are concerned (e.g., התעה רבים; בחירי אל; שקר) appear not to be dependent upon the lemma. Thus, we must conclude that the apparent terminological boundaries distinguishing the employment of מטיף הכזב and איש הכזב in, for example, the Pesher on Habakkuk (drawing upon the distinctions between the specific connotations associated with 'spouter' terminology and 'the Man of the Lie' in the Damascus Document) are not so strictly maintained in 4QPesher on Psalms[a].

129 Such may lend further weight to the proposed reconstruction of איש הכזב at 1QpHab 1.13 (Lim 2000a; 2002: 35–36; see however n. 51 above).

130 Cf. 1QpHab 9.8-12a.

Excursus: 'The Wicked Priest'

In addition to the occurrences of הכוהן הרשע in 1QpHab, this sobriquet is to be found on one occasion in our present text:[131]

> [4.7]'The wicked {רשע} watches for the righteous {צדיק} and looks [to kill him. YH]WH [will not abandon him into his hand and] n[ot] let him be condemned when he is judged.' [8]Its interpretation concerns [הכוה]ן הרשע who wa[tch]es for הצד]יק [and looks to] kill him [...] and התורה [9]which he sent to him, but God will not ab[andon him] and not [let him be condemned when] he is judged. But, for [him, God will] pay him his reward, giving him [10]into the hand of the ruthless ones of the nations to carry out upon him [...]. (4Q171 4.7-10)

Unlike 4Q171 4.13-16 (and 1QpHab 5.8-12), where רשע in the lemma is interpreted with regard to איש הכזב, here the referent is [הכוהן הרשע (4Q171 4.8).[132] Though the beginning of the sobriquet is missing, there is no good reason to doubt that the form is that attested in the Pesher on Habakkuk (הכוהן הרשע, 1QpHab 8.8; 9.9; 11.4; 12.2, 8). The restoration of אשר צו]ה הצד[...] (4Q171 4.8) on the other hand has proved more controversial. Allegro (1968) suggests צו]פה הצד]יק, while Horgan proposes 'moving frgs. 5 and 6 a little farther apart' so as to allow room for צופה למורה הצד]ק, arguing that this is justified in 'the light of similar descriptions of the aggressiveness of the Wicked Priest against the Teacher of Righteousness' (1979: 221; 2002). These 'similar descriptions' are, however, by necessity all from the Pesher on Habakkuk and we should be wary of amalgamating these texts uncritically. Furthermore, there 'the Wicked Priest' is not the referent of רשע (unless perhaps in 1QpHab 1.12-13). Admittedly where רשע and צדיק appear together in Hab. 1.13, the pesher interprets the latter with regard to מורה הצדק (1QpHab 5.8-12; also 1.12-13), yet it also interprets the former as איש הכזב (5.8-12) at odds with 4Q171 4.7-10. Thus, while Horgan has convinced some (Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996), we shall maintain the less ambitious reading צו]פה הצד]יק.[133]

It may nevertheless be that we should understand הצדיק to indicate the 'teacher', in which case the text implies that 'the Wicked Priest' sought unsuccessfully to kill him (cf. 1QpHab 9.8-12a; 11.2-8), though the strong correlation between lemma and pesher in 4Q171 4.7-10 casts doubt on the historical reliability of this claim. Indeed the only elements not to be derived straightforwardly from the lemma are 'התורה which he sent to

---

131   See also n. 105 above.

132   Cf. 1QpHab 1.13?

133   So, Allegro 1968; Allegro with Gordon 2004a; García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Lohse 1981. See too Bengtsson 2000a: 82–83, 181 n. 13, 210–11; 2000b: 265. Cf. Stuckenbruck 2007a: 88 n. 43. The suggestion by Dupont-Sommer that we should restore הכוהן מורה הצדק (as 4Q171 3.15) is implausible (1961: 272).

him' (4.8-9) and the reference to the punishment of הכוהן הרשע (4.9-10).[134] The latter is in agreement with 1QpHab where descriptions of this figure's punishment are prolific (e.g., 1QpHab 8.3–9.12a; 11.2–12.10). In particular, 1QpHab 9.9-10 states that God gave him 'into the hand of his enemies' while 12.2-3 preserves 'to pay him his reward', both paralleled here.[135] On a literary level, however, the passage could have been read so as to infer an attempt upon the life of the 'teacher' by 'the Wicked Priest'.

While we have less material at our disposal in 4QPesher on Psalms[a], the depiction of 'the Wicked Priest' here is congruent with that found in the Pesher on Habakkuk. He is seemingly accused of persecuting the 'teacher' (4Q171 4.8; cf. 1QpHab 9.9-10; 11.4-8) and will be punished accordingly (4Q171 4.9-10; cf. 1QpHab 8.3–9.12a; 11.2–12.10). However, we do not find specific indication that he 'ruled over Israel' (1QpHab 8.9-10) or 'defiled the sanctuary' (1QpHab 12.8-9). The limited information provided concerning 'the Man of the Lie' (4Q171 1.25–2.1; 4.13-16), and absence of מטיף הכזב, prohibits a detailed examination of the comparative function of these three sobriquets in 4Q171. Yet, while punishment is also prescribed for the followers of איש הכזב in 4Q171 2.1, the specific terminology employed in 1.25–2.1 and 4.13-16, though reserved for מטיף הכזב in 1QpHab, is not used of הכוהן הרשע in 4Q171 4.7-10. Thus we are led to tentatively reaffirm the conclusions made in the light of the Pesher on Habakkuk, agreeing with Dimant that the 'liar' and 'priest' labels 'have different spheres of action and characterization' (1984: 543 n. 283).[136]

3. *Sobriquets in 4QPesher on Psalms[a]*

There are three probable attestations of מורה הצדק in 4QPesher on Psalms[a]: [. . .]מורה ה (4Q171 3.15), [. . .]מו (3.19), [. . .] מורה (4.27). The sobriquet מטיף הכזב, on the other hand, does not appear at all. Instead we have two occurrences of איש הכזב (4Q171 1.26; 4.14) and one of הכוהן הרשע (4.8). While the terminological context of the latter would not be out of place in the Pesher on Habakkuk and remains distinct from that of איש הכזב, it is significant that 'the Man of the Lie' is, in both 4Q171 1.25–2.1 and 4.13-16, described in terms that, in the light of such texts as the Damascus Document (ESP) and the Pesher on Habakkuk (LSP), we would more readily associate with 'the Spouter of the Lie'.

---

134   Strugnell suggests]החחק והתורה (1970: 216), though others read ת והתורה[. . .] (Allegro 1968; Allegro with Gordon 2004a) or ן[. . .] והתורה (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979: 222; 2002).

135   This militates against the otherwise persuasive argument by van de Water that we should restore a third negation, [ולוא], in 4Q171 4.9 and thus read here that הצדיק will *not* be delivered into the hands of the nations rather than the assertion that 'the Wicked Priest' will be (2003: 414–15).

136   See n. 86 above.

Coupled with the absence of מטיף הכזב in this text, the grounds upon which we argued that the two labels perform a distinct function in 1QpHab are undermined in 4Q171. While our conclusions still hold true for the former text, we might consequently posit that these sobriquets were not used uniformly throughout the LSP.[137]

e. *4QUnidentified Pesher Fragments*
1. *'The Teacher of Righteousness'*
4Q172 frg. 7, 1-2

A group of fourteen unidentified fragments, which may belong to pesharim texts, are grouped together by Allegro as 4Q172 (4QpUnid). Of these, fragment 7 would appear to partially attest מורה הצדק:[138]

Frg. 7, ¹[. . .] מורה ה[צדק] [. . . ². . .] all [. . .]. (4Q172 frg. 7, 1-2)

We noted this reading, מורה ה[. . .], also in 4Q171 3.14 where we argued for the restoration מורה ה[צדק]. Likewise here this has been implied by Allegro, who translates 'Teacher of [. . .]' (1968; Allegro with Gordon 2004b), and made explicit in the reconstructed transcriptions by Charlesworth and Elledge (2002) and Horgan (1979).[139]

Little else can be derived from the fragment, though Doudna suggests that it may have come from 4Q167 (4QpHos^b), noting Allegro's remark that the script used in these fragments is 'reminiscent' of 4Q161, 166–67 and 171 (Allegro 1968: 50).[140] However, both Strugnell (1970: 218) and Horgan (1979: 263) argue for the exclusion of 4Q167 from this group. It is significant, however, that the presence of the definite article would again indicate the form מורה הצדק (as elsewhere in the LSP; e.g. 1QpHab 1.13) rather than the indefinite form found in the ESP (CD 1.11; 20.32).

f. *4QPesher on Psalms^b*
1. *'The Teacher of Righteousness'*
4Q173 frg. 1, 4-5

A second Pesher on Psalms from Cave 4, 4Q173 (4QpPs^b), also refers to 'the Teacher of Righteousness':

---

137   See n. 126 above.
138   Interestingly, fragment 6 contains שקר though nothing else can be ascertained. Allegro (1968) draws attention, however, to Ps. 38.20-21.
139   Also *DSSEL*.
140   Doudna 2003: 351–52.

^{Frg. 1, 4}[. . .hid]den things of מורה הצדק [. . . ⁵. . . pri]est at the end of ti[me . . .]. (4Q173 frg. 1, 4-5)¹⁴¹

The fragmentary nature of the text renders it hard to discern the context, though Allegro (1968) suggests an association with Ps. 127.2-3. The sobriquet מורה הצדק is preserved in the same definite form we have found elsewhere in the LSP and in the following line we have [. . .]הן לאחרית הק (4Q173 frg. 1, 5), unanimously (though without certainty) restored so as to read: [. . . כו]הן לאחרית הק[ץ . . .]. This reference to the '[pri]est at the end of ti[me]', if correct, recalls the 'last priests of Jerusalem' (1QpHab 9.4-5) and resembles the designation the 'last priest' (כוהן האחרון) in 4Q167 (4QpHos^b) frg. 2, 3.¹⁴² However, its proximity to מורה הצדק also recalls the phrase הכוהן מורה ה[צדק] (4Q171 3.15) in the other Pesher on Psalms from Cave 4 and the occurrences of הכוהן apparently in reference to the 'teacher' (1QpHab 1.16–2.10 [cf. 7.1-5]; 4Q171 2.16-20 [cf. 1QpHab 9.9-10]). Interestingly, while לאחרית הקץ does not appear elsewhere (see Horgan 1979: 228), the phrase הקץ האחרון is attested twice in 1QpHab 7.1–8.3a (cf. 1QS 4.16-17), a text concerning the 'teacher' which parallels what is said of 'the priest' in 1QpHab 1.16–2.10. Perhaps, given the priestly function seemingly attached to 'the Teacher of Righteousness' in the LSP, we might posit that in this text מורה הצדק was explicitly described as כוהן לאחרית הקץ.

4Q173 frg. 2, 1-2

A further probable reference to 'the Teacher of Righteousness' comes from 4Q173 frg. 2:

^{Frg. 2, 1}[. . .] The interpretation of the mat[ter . . . ². . .] [מ]ורה הצד[ק]
[. . .]. (4Q173 frg. 2, 1-2)

This is the entirety of the surviving text and reveals nothing of the context. Allegro (1968) suggests an association with Ps. 127.3b on the basis of his restoration פשרו הפר[ץ] (4Q173 frg. 2, 1), though Strugnell (1970: 219) amends this to פשר הפתג[ם] (cf. 4Q161 frgs. 2–6, 22).¹⁴³ While the text [. . .]ורה הצד[ק . . .] could attest יורה הצדק (cf. CD 6.11a), the absence of this designation elsewhere in the LSP and the prominence of the form

---

141 Horgan (1979; 2002) restores [נס]תרות ('[hid]den things'; cf. '[secr]et things': Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996). Other readings include [עת]רות ('[sup]plications': Allegro 1968; Allegro with Gordon 2004c) and תרות [. . .] ('the warnings (?)': García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997).

142 For '[pri]est at the end of ti[me]', see Allegro 1968; Allegro with Gordon 2004c; Horgan 1979. Also rendered '[pri]est at the end of the a[ge]' (Vermes 2004), '[pri]est in the final e[ra]' (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997), '[pri]est at the last per[iod]' (Horgan 2002), '[pr]iest for the t[ime] to come' (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996).

143 Also García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997) and Horgan (1979; 2002).

מורה הצדק (cf. 4Q173 frg. 1, 4) would render more probable the restoration [מ]ורה הצד[ק] at 4Q173 frg. 2, 2.

Summary

4QPesher on Psalms[b] would appear to twice attest the definite sobriquet מורה הצדק (4Q173 frg. 1, 4; frg. 2, 2). The fragments reveal very little with regard to context, though frg. 1, 4-5 associates this figure with the '[pri]est at the end of ti[me]'; while the precise relationship between them is unclear, it is possible that the two are to be identified.

g. *4QCatena A*[144]
1. *'The Spouter of the Lie'*[145]
4Q177 1.6-10

The following passage from 4QCatena A may have some bearing upon our examination of the sobriquet מטיף הכזב:

> [1.6]['He] hatches [p]lots to des[troy the poor [7]with words of falsehood {אמרי שקר[...].' ...] הלצון [...] to Israe[l .... 'For the leader.] Of David. In YHWH [I take refuge. [8]For, behold, the wicked bend the bow] and set arrows o[n the string, to shoot in the darkness at the upright of heart.' Its interpretation: th]at they will flee, the me[n of ... [9]... like a b]ird from its place and be exil[ed ... written about th]em in the book of [... [10]'On account of uncleanness that destroys with a griev]ous [destruction]. If a man, walking in win[d and falsehood, lies {כזב} ... he would be] מ[טף for this people.' [...]. (4Q177 1.6-10)[146]

In line 7, Allegro reads [ל]קל עין את ישראל[ל] which he translates 'to curse Israel' (1968; Allegro *et al.* 2004c; cf. 'to condemn Israel': Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996). However, Strugnell notes that upon more careful study 'on arrive à une lecture presque certaine de הלצון' (1970: 242). This has been followed by Milgrom with Novakovic (2002) who restore

---

144   Commonly designated 4QCatena A in relation to 4QCatena B (4Q182); cf. Allegro 1968; Tov (ed.) 2002. Note however 4QCatena[a] (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997). The resemblance of 4Q177 to 4Q174 (4QFlor), noted by Strugnell (1970: 237), has led Annette Steudel to suggest that they belong to the same document which she titles 4QMidrash on Eschatology[a-b] (Steudel 1992); accordingly 4Q177 = 4QMidrEschat[b]. In his summary of the issue, Jonathan Campbell (2004: 45–46, 53–54) concludes that, 'the safest conclusion for the time being is that this aspect of her hypothesis remains unproven and that, as a result, 4QFlorilegium and 4QCatena A are to be characterized as broadly similar but not identical works' (2004: 54; similarly Milgrom with Novakovic 2002: 287). Cf. 'Thematic Commentaries A-B' (4Q174, 177) in Davies, Brooke and Callaway (2002: 79).

145   It should also be acknowledged that דורש התורה appears in 4Q177 2.5 (cf. CD 6.7; 7.18; 4Q174 frg. 1, 1.11-13) though, as this sobriquet does not fall within the immediate scope of this examination, it is enough simply to note its presence in the LSP. We shall return to דורשי החלקות (cf. 4Q177 2.12) in Chapter 5.

146   Following the numbering and reconstruction of columns in *DSSSE*.

אנשי] הלצון[, and by García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997) who restore
איש] הלצון[(also García Martínez 1996).

The former, אנשי הלצון ('the Men of Scoffing'), is found in both the ESP (CD 20.11), where they are seemingly associated with 'the Man of the Lie', and the LSP (4Q162 [4QpIsa^b] 2.6, 10), where they are associated with a 'congregation' in Jerusalem and, drawing upon Isa. 5.24, have מאסו את תורת (note the same accusation of איש הכזב in 1QpHab 5.8-12; cf. Bengtsson 2000a: 223). Appropriately, the designation אנשי לצון, without the definite article, appears in Isa. 28.14 in reference to a group in Jerusalem who have taken refuge in lies (כזב) and falsehood (שקר).[147] The restoration אנשי הלצון would thus prove apt in relation to the immediately preceding citation of Isa. 32.7 (4Q177 1.6).[148]

On the other hand, איש הלצון ('the Man of Scoffing'), described in CD 1.14-15 as one who 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie', would more readily apply to the description of he (הוא) who 'hatches plots to destroy the poor with words of falsehood {אמרי שקר}' (Isa. 32.7; cf. 4Q177 1.6).[149] In the ESP we speculated that איש הלצון was an alternative designation for the figure labelled איש הכזב (see Chapter 3, esp. nn. 80, 82). It is therefore perhaps significant that, in the LSP, 'words of falsehood' (אמרי שקר) are explicitly attributed to איש הכזב and he is furthermore the referent of 'the man who makes evil plots' in Ps. 37.7 (4Q171 1.25–2.1).

In possible favour of the reading איש] הלצון in 4Q177 1.7, after the interpretation of Isa. 32.7 and subsequently Ps. 11.1 (cf. 1QH^a 12.8-9; 1QpHab 11.4-6?), there follows a citation of Mic. 2.10-11 (4Q177 1.10).[150] As previously noted, this scriptural text, coupling נטף and כזב, likely influenced the description איש הלצון אשר הטיף לישראל מימי כזב (CD 1.14-15) and ultimately the sobriquet מטיף הכזב. It is not clear what followed this citation, though, given the presence of מטיף הכזב elsewhere in the LSP, an attestation of this label would certainly be appropriate.

With regard to הלצון [. . .] (4Q177 1.7), either איש הלצון or אנשי הלצון could feasibly be restored and it is not an easy choice between these two alternatives (cf. VanderKam 2003: 472 n. 22). Given the otherwise apparent absence of the title איש הלצון in the LSP, we should perhaps more cautiously restore אנשי] הלצון (the label is attested twice in 4Q162 2.6-10). However, the nature of Isa. 32.7 and the similarities with the exposition of Ps. 37.7 in 4Q171 1.25–2.1 leave open the possibility that the

---

147   See Chapter 3, n. 45.
148   Cf. Strugnell 1970: 242.
149   So VanderKam and Flint 2002: 287.
150   Not recognized by Allegro (1968; Allegro *et al.* 2004c; followed by Milgrom with Novakovic 2002), though pointed out by Strugnell (1970: 241–42) and followed by García Martínez (1996); García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997) and Wise, Abegg and Cook (1996); cf. VanderKam and Flint (2002: 431).

singular designation (hitherto found only in CD 1.14) may have been employed.

3. *Conclusions*

Unlike the Formative or Early Sectarian Periods, the Late Sectarian Period *does* attest both מטיף הכזב and מורה הצדק. Not only that, but these forms are used consistently (with one exception: מורה הצדקה; 1QpHab 2.2).[151] With regard to מורה הצדק, in total there are eight full occurrences of the form (1QpHab 1.13; 5.10; 7.4; 8.3; 9.9-10; 11.5; 1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 6; 4Q173 frg. 1, 4) and six partial attestations (4Q163 frg. 21, 6; 4Q171 3.15; 3.19; 4.27; 4Q172 frg. 7, 1; 4Q173 frg. 2, 2), in addition to מורה הצדקה (1QpHab 2.2).[152] The prevalence of the form מורה הצדק in this compositional period, and the preservation of the definite article in some of the disputed cases (4Q171 3.15; 4Q172 frg. 7, 1; 4Q173 frg. 2, 2), suggests that these partial attestations should all likewise be restored מורה הצדק (as opposed to the indefinite form מורה צדק found in the ESP [CD 1.11; 20.32] or the designations יורה הצדק [CD 6.11a] or מורה/יורה היחיד [CD 20.1; 20.14] found in the FSP and ESP respectively though entirely absent from the LSP).[153] This figure is also seemingly described as 'a mediator of knowledge' (מליץ דעת, 4Q171 1.27) and 'the priest' (הכוהן, 1QpHab 2.8; 4Q171 2.19; 3.15 [and 4Q173 frg. 1, 5?]); while the former draws upon 1QH^a 10.13 (ESP) the latter would appear innovative to this compositional period.

With regard to מטיף הכזב, there are two full occurrences of the form (1QpHab 10.9; 1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 4) and one probable partial attestation (1QpHab 10.17–11.1).[154] The context of the latter, and preservation of the definite article, suggests that the form מטיף הכזב should be restored (as opposed to איש הכזב or the indefinite form מטיף כזב found in the ESP [CD 8.13]). In addition, the sobriquet איש הכזב appears four times (1QpHab 2.1-2; 5.11; 4Q171 1.26; 4.14) and הכוהן הרשע six (1QpHab

---

151   According to Milik (1952; 1955) also מורי הצדק (1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 6), though see Horgan 1979: 60 (cf. Bengtsson 2000a; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 2002).

152   The restoration of מורה הצדק has also been suggested by some scholars at 1Q14 frg. 11, 4 (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997), 4Q165 frgs. 1–2, 3 (García Martínez 1996; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 1979; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996) and 4Q171 4.8 (Horgan 1979; 2002; Vermes 2004; Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996); these are highly speculative, however.

153   See n. 122 above.

154   Additionally, the restoration of מ[טי]ף (sic) has tentatively been suggested at 1QpHab 9.16 (Lim 1993a: 422; cf. van der Woude 1996: 378), while מטיף הכזב may have at one time appeared in the pesher following Isa. 9.13-16 in 4Q163 frgs. 4–6, 1.6-10 and following the citation of Mic. 2.10-11 in 4Q177 1.6-10.

8.8; 9.9; 11.4; 12.2; 12.8; 4Q171 4.8).[155] While the former appeared once in the ESP (CD 20.15), the latter (described also as הכוהן, 1QpHab 8.16; 9.16; 11.12) is unique to the LSP. There are two occurrences of אנשי הלצון (4Q162 2.6; 2.10) and one, הלצון [. . .] (4Q177 1.7), that could be restored to read either [אנשי] הלצון (cf. CD 20.11 [ESP]; 4Q162 2.6; 2.10 [LSP]) or [איש] הלצון (cf. CD 1.14 [ESP]).

In terms of context and terminology, the sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב are thoroughly consistent with their indefinite counterparts in the ESP (with the addition of one or two notable innovations, e.g. the priestly role assigned to the 'teacher'). Thus, our most significant observation must be the shift from an indefinite form to a consistently definite one and, by implication, from a descriptive function to an appellative one.[156] Hence, only in the LSP would we appear to meet the titles 'the Teacher of Righteousness' and 'the Spouter of the Lie'. With regard to the latter, its role as a distinct label in 1QPesher on Habakkuk (despite its appearance alongside איש הכזב and הכוהן הרשע) is highlighted by the specific use of terminology and thematic association, drawing upon the occurrences of the 'spouter' in the ESP (CD 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 8.13; 19.25-26). Its very employment by the pesharist, rather than simply reusing איש הכזב for example, demonstrates the fact that it must perform a distinct function; consequently the two cannot be straightforwardly equated in the LSP.[157] The use of 'spouter' connotations in relation to איש הכזב in 4Q171 1.25–2.1 and 4.13-16, however, suggests that these terminological boundaries are not consistent and are apparently less defined in 4QPesher on Psalms[a].[158]

Having now completed our survey of all apparent occurrences of the sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב (along with 'variant' forms and related terminology where appropriate) across these three sectarian compositional periods, we shall, in the next chapter, consider the overall developmental process we have witnessed in the hope that further light can be shed upon the shifting form and function of sobriquets in the Qumran-related literature.

---

155   Furthermore, it has been suggested that one or the other be restored at 1QpHab 1.13 (see the discussion above). הכוהן הרשע may perhaps also be found at 4Q163 frg. 30, 3 (see n. 105 above).

156   Similarly, אנשי אמת ('men of truth', 1QH[a] 6.2; 10.14 [ESP]) and אנשי האמת ('the Men of Truth', 1QpHab 7.10 [LSP]).

157   Nevertheless, for scholars in pursuit of the historical question, these distinct labels (along with הכוהן הרשע perhaps?) may have applied to the same figure (at least for some readers; the possibility cannot be ignored that these labels were understood differently by different readers).

158   See n. 126 above.

Chapter 5

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUMRAN SOBRIQUETS

1. *Introduction*

In the previous three chapters we have examined in turn the Formative, Early and Late Sectarian Periods, according to the broad chronological layering of textual material (notably that classed as D-, H- and P-material) established in Chapter 1. In particular, our examination has focused on the (apparent) variant forms of the sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב to be found across these periods, along with related designations where appropriate.

In this present chapter we shall firstly review our findings so far, thus drawing tentative conclusions as to the seemingly developmental process witnessed, before further demonstrating this observed trend by means of a supplementary case study involving the group sobriquet, 'the Seekers of Smooth Things' (דורשי החלקות). We shall follow this with some discussion of the varying use and function of sobriquets across the sectarian compositional periods as well as noting the problems with our developmental model. In the latter part of the chapter we shall compare our results with the insights to be garnered from a sociological approach, specifically one drawing upon the sociology of deviance and 'labelling theory'. In this manner, we will examine the compliance of this study's findings with research carried out in another academic field, and hope to illustrate both the labelling process and apparent development of 'master status' attested by the Qumran-related sobriquets.

2. *The Evidence for Sobriquet Development*

a. *'The Teacher of Righteousness' and 'the Spouter of the Lie'*

In the FSP we examined the pre-Yahadic D-material, in particular CD 5.20–6.11a.[1] There we found a professed expectation of 'one who will teach righteousness {יורה הצדק} at the end of days' (CD 6.11a), drawing

---

1 Partially paralleled in 4Q266 (frg. 3, 2.7-17a), 4Q267 (frg. 2, 4-15) and 6Q15 (frg. 3, 2b-5). Our identification of pre-Yahadic D-material was based primarily upon the redaction history posited by Philip Davies (1983) and discussed in Chapter 1.

primarily upon Hos. 10.12 in terms of terminology and context (though to a lesser extent perhaps also Joel 2.23). This designation, set firmly in the scriptural context of 'seeking' God (CD 6.6-7; cf. Hos. 10.12) and utilizing similar phraseology (CD 6.10-11: עד עמד יורה הצדק; Hos. 10.12: עד־יבוא וירה צדק), appeared to attest an implicit reliance upon the scriptural passage (Campbell 1995a: 88–99) and would seem to be our earliest instance of any antecedent form of מורה הצדק.

The יורה הצדק of CD 6.11 is ideologically lined up with 'the holy anointed ones' (משיחי הקודש, CD 6.1) who were the instruments of God's teaching in the past.[2] These are set in opposition to those who 'prophesied falsehood' (ינבאו שקר, 6.1), a designation seemingly drawing upon the language of Jer. 23.25-32. The latter are further characterized as having 'moved the boundary' (מסיגי הגבול, CD 5.20) and 'led Israel astray' (יתעו את ישראל, CD 5.20).[3] While no counterpart to the eschatological יורה הצדק is mentioned (perhaps none was expected?), the language was clearly in place to describe such a figure.

In the ESP we looked first at the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document where we found the indefinite designation 'a teacher of righteousness' (מורה צדק, CD 1.11; 20.32; cf. 20.28). The redaction of CD 1.4-11a presents this figure as having been raised up for the 'root of planting' in direct response to their act of 'seeking' God (דרשוהו, 1.10), reminiscent of both Hos. 10.12 and CD 6.2-11a. Our analysis demonstrated, however, that the influence of Hos. 10.12 upon the passage relates primarily to the pre-Yahadic text and that the specific formation of the label מורה צדק owes more to the professed expectation of 'one who will teach righteousness' in CD 6.2-11a.[4] The description 'a teacher of righteousness' is seemingly applied to a figure titled 'the Teacher of the Community' (מורה/יורה היחיד, CD 20.1; 20.14), thus portraying him (in what may be a distinctly polemical move in the face of opposition) as indeed the anticipated יורה הצדק.

Similar language to that used of the 'teacher' appeared in relation to the protagonist of the Hodayot (note in particular 1QH[a] 12.23b-25a and the play on ירה in 16.16-17). More specifically he was described in a didactic role as 'a mediator of knowledge' (מליץ דעת, 1QH[a] 10.13) and associated with the 'elect of righteousness' (בחירי צדק, 10.13) and '[men] of truth' ([אנשי] אמת, 10.14). A passage from 4QCommentary on Genesis A was also examined and found to contain reference to 'the Messiah of

---

2   משיחי הקודש corrected from משיחו הקודש, following 4Q267 frg. 2, 6; 6Q15 frg. 3, 4 (cf. Fitzmyer 2000: 88–90; Qimron 1992a; Rabinowitz 1954: 20 n. 41).

3   Cf. Jer. 23.13 (יתעו את־עמי את־ישראל).

4   In this light, the oft-noted dependence of מורה צדק upon Hos. 10.12 (e.g., Campbell 1995a: 51–67; Schechter 1970: 63 n. 16) is better understood as coming vicariously through CD 6.2-11a (so Davies 1988).

Righteousness' (משיח הצדק, 4Q252 5.3). The fact that this figure is associated in some way with 'the sceptre' (המחקק, 5.2; cf. CD 6.2-11a) and 'the Men of the Community' (אנשי היחד, 5.5; cf. CD 20.27-34) suggested some continuity with the 'teacher' designations of the Damascus Document, though our analysis ruled a straightforward identification with the figure designated מורה צדק unlikely.

While it may have been thought that the eschatological יורה הצדק would be universally recognized and thus unopposed (cf. CD 6.2-11a), the presence of disparaging epithets in the ESP would suggest that the figure acclaimed as such did indeed encounter opposition. In CD 1.10-18a, we observed that a מורה צדק is set against 'the Man of Scoffing' (איש הלצון, 1.14) who 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie' (הטיף לישראל מימי כזב, 1.14-15), suggestive of false prophecy.[5] Moreover, he is further accused of having 'led them astray' (יתעם, 1.15) so as 'to remove the boundary' (לסיע גבול, 1.16), reminiscent of the description of those who 'prophesied falsehood' (ינבאו שקר) in CD 5.20–6.2. The specific accusation of having 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie' is revisited in the indefinite description of this figure as מטיף כזב (CD 8.13; cf. 4.19-20; 19.25-26), drawing upon Mic. 2.6-11 and thus providing an apt foil to the figure described as מורה צדק. Furthermore, it appeared on balance that the designation 'the Man of the Lie' (איש הכזב, 20.15), associated with 'the Men of Scoffing' (אנשי הלצון, 20.11), may well have been understood (by the readership at least) as synonymous with איש הלצון.

Once again similar terminology was to be found in the Hodayot, describing the opposition in terms of false teaching and prophecy. While the constructions מטיף כזב, איש הלצון and איש הכזב were absent, we did find reference to: scoffers (לצים, 1QH^a 10.11); 'mediators of error' (מליצי תעות, 10.14); 'seers of error' (חוזי תעות, 12.20); 'mediators of deceit' (מליצי רמיה, 12.7); 'seers of deceit' (חוזי רמיה, 12.10); 'seekers of deceit' (דורשי רמיה, 10.34); 'men of deceit' (אנשי רמיה, 6.14; 10.16); 'men of deception' (אנשי מרמה, 12.20); 'mediators of a lie' (מליצי כזב, 10.31; 12.9-10; 14.19[?]); 'prophets of a lie' (נביאי כזב, 12.16).[6] While indefinite and plural, the use of roots such as ליץ and כזב (as well as תעה) betray some functional similarity with the labels איש הלצון and איש הכזב to be found elsewhere in the ESP, along with the description מטיף כזב.

In the LSP we examined a number of the pesharim and found that, where identifiable, the definite form מורה הצדק was consistently

---

5   Cf. Mic. 2.6-11.
6   Also 'seekers of smooth things' (דורשי חלקות, 1QH^a 10.15; 10.32; cf. 12.7; 12.10) and, according to García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997), 'mediators of falsehood' (מליצי שקר, 14.19). See further, Holm-Nielsen (1960: 292–93) and Mansoor (1961: 51).

employed (with one exception: מורה הצדקה, 1QpHab 2.2) rather than any of the other explicit 'teacher' designations encountered in the FSP or ESP (e.g., מורה/יורה היחיד, מורה צדק, יורה הצדק).[7] There are eight full occurrences of the form (1QpHab 1.13; 5.10; 7.4; 8.3; 9.9-10; 11.5; 1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 6; 4Q173 frg. 1, 4) and six partial attestations (4Q163 frg. 21, 6; 4Q171 3.15; 3.19; 4.27; 4Q172 frg. 7, 1; 4Q173 frg. 2, 2).[8] Conceptual and contextual similarities indicate that the same figure titled מורה/יורה היחיד in the ESP and described as מורה צדק (drawing upon the expectation of יורה הצדק in the FSP), is here known instead by the sobriquet מורה הצדק. This figure is further described as 'a mediator of knowledge' (מליץ דעת, 4Q171 1.27), drawing upon 1QHᵃ 10.13, and (seemingly innovative to the LSP) 'the priest' (הכוהן, 1QpHab 2.8; 4Q171 2.19; 3.15 [and 4Q173 frg. 1, 5?]).

Similarly, while the label איש הלצון is ostensibly absent, the description of this character in the ESP as מטיף כזב was found to be preserved in definite form in the LSP as the designation מטיף הכזב (1QpHab 10.9; 10.17–11.1[?]; 1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 4).[9] In addition to this sobriquet, we observed the continued employment of איש הכזב (1QpHab 2.1-2; 5.11; 4Q171 1.26; 4.14) and אנשי הלצון (4Q162 2.6; 2.10), both present in the ESP.[10] It is notable that the sobriquet הכוהן הרשע is unique to the LSP (1QpHab 8.8; 9.9; 11.4; 12.2; 12.8; 4Q171 4.8).[11] This may, in turn, shed light upon the positive description of מורה הצדק as 'the priest', peculiar to this period.

Concerning the complex relationship between 'the Spouter of the Lie' and 'the Man of the Lie', while in the ESP the *description* מטיף כזב seemingly functions as a qualification of the title איש הכזב (and איש הלצון), by the LSP the *title* מטיף הכזב (drawing upon the ESP) functions as a distinct label from איש הכזב (though, of course, both sobriquets may still [have been intended to] denote the same figure[s]). Our analysis further suggested that, while the specific use of terminology and thematic association in 1QPesher on Habakkuk thus presented מטיף הכזב as effectively distinct from איש הכזב or הכוהן הרשע, these boundaries were not consistent and were, for example, less defined in 4QPesher on Psalmsᵃ.

With regard to the sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב, it is significant that they do not in fact appear in this form until our final sectarian period, despite the presence of so-called 'variant' forms in earlier

7   Milik (1952; 1955) reads מורי הצדק in 1Q14 (frgs. 8–10, 6), though see Horgan 1979: 60 (cf. Bengtsson 2000a; García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997; Horgan 2002).
8   See further Chapter 4, n. 152.
9   See further Chapter 4, n. 154.
10   Cf. 4Q177 1.7: [איש] הלצון or [אנשי] הלצון?
11   Cf. הכוהן (1QpHab 8.16; 9.16; 11.12). הכוהן הרשע may perhaps also be found at 4Q163 frg. 30, 3 (see Chapter 4, n. 105). It has further been suggested that either איש הכזב or הכוהן הרשע be restored at 1QpHab 1.13 (see the relevant discussion in Chapter 4).

periods. It is the proposal of this examination that a developmental process can be witnessed, drawing initially upon scriptural terminology and typologies but increasingly upon previous sectarian compositional periods. Thus, we find specific elements of contextualized scriptural terminology being adopted and re-employed within the tradition of sectarian literature (so, for example, the indefinite descriptive forms מורה צדק and מטיף כזב, themselves the product of scriptural exegesis) before arriving ultimately at the definite 'titular' forms found in the LSP.

Our examination has noted the subtle complexities of this process, manifest in the use and repetition of associated terminology and the explicit, or often implicit, influence of relevant scriptural and/or sectarian passages. So for example with regard to מטיף הכזב we have uncovered a web of inter-related texts and root forms that lie behind the epithet, providing an extensive *implicit context* which itself may then influence the subsequent employment of the sobriquet.[12] In effect we have witnessed the *development* of these sobriquets from scriptural reference to sectarian terminology, noting in the process the ultimate acquisition of a definite form.

b. *'The Seekers of Smooth Things'*
1. *The Formative Sectarian Period*

One further example may be desirable in order to more confidently illustrate this developmental process. We shall, therefore, briefly turn our attention to another sobriquet that clearly exhibits the same trend, 'the Seekers of Smooth Things' (דורשי החלקות), and track its development across our three sectarian periods.[13] As listed in Chapter 1, 'variant' forms of the label appear in the scrolls. However, the only one to fall within the Formative Sectarian Period comes from the first column of the (pre-Yahadic) Cairo Damascus Document where, in reference to 'a congregation of traitors' (עדת בוגדים, CD 1.12; cf. 2.1), it states:

---

12   Thus an implicit association of מטיף הכזב with e.g. Isa. 9.13-15, 28.10-15, Jer. 23.9-32, Ezek. 13.1-16, Mic. 2.6-11, 3.5-10 and CD 1.10-18a, 4.19-20, 5.20–6.2, 8.12-13, 19.24b-26a (and accordingly: עדה, צו, בנה, תעה, ליץ, שקר, כזב, נטף), would appear to have influenced both its inclusion in the interpretation of Hab. 2.12-13 (1QpHab 10.5b-13, e.g., noting the presence of בונה in the lemma) and moreover the specific direction taken by the pesher itself (e.g., the establishment of 'a congregation in falsehood' (עדה בשקר); 1QpHab 10.10). Cf. Hughes 2006: 104.

13   This literal rendition of the epithet (following Allegro *et al.* 2004d; Knibb 1994a; Vermes 2004 and others), which 'encompasses the polemic content intended with this sobriquet, but is open to different specific interpretations' (Bengtsson 2000a: 135) is preferable to other more interpretive translations such as 'the Flattery-Seekers' (Wise, Abegg and Cook 1996) or 'those looking for easy interpretations' (García Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997). For a summary of historical hypotheses regarding this designation, see Bengtsson 2000a (110–14) and Callaway 1988 (164–68).

[1.18]For they sought smooth things {דרשו בחלקות} and chose illusions and watched for [19]breaches and chose the fair neck. (CD 1.18-19a)[14]

Significantly, this passage attests a verbal form (דרשו) rather than the construct noun witnessed in the 'standard' form of the sobriquet. Here it functions as the first in a list of accusations brought against the עדת בוגדים and would appear to have a scriptural foundation in Isa. 30.9-11:

[30.9]For they are a rebellious people, faithless children, children who will not hear the instruction of the LORD; [10]who say to the seers, 'Do not see'; and to the prophets, 'Do not prophesy to us what is right; speak to us smooth things {דברו-לנו חלקות}, prophesy illusions, [11]leave the way, turn aside from the path, let us hear no more about the Holy One of Israel.' (Isa. 30.9-11)

Here, as in CD 1.18-19, חלקות are coupled with מהתלות. A reference to 'a breach' (פרץ) also appears in Isa. 30.13, further strengthening the case for a dependence of CD 1.18-19a upon this passage.[15]

The Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document identifies the עדת בוגדים with 'the last generation' and the followers of 'the Man of Scoffing' (CD 1.11b-18a). Accordingly the accusation of seeking smooth things and preferring illusions is, in its new context, brought against those who rejected the 'teacher' (CD 1.10–2.1). Interestingly, the rival pedagogical figure is said to have 'led them astray in a wilderness without a way' (1.15) and they are further described as 'those who departed from the way' (1.13) and who 'depart from the paths of righteousness' (1.15-16). These elements may likewise draw to an extent upon Isa. 30.9-11 where we have not only 'speak to us smooth things, prophesy illusions' but also 'leave the way, turn aside from the path'.

Having established the influence of Isa. 30.9-11 we must ask whence דרש (CD 1.18) since it does not appear in the scriptural passage. We might argue that the 'rebellious people' of Isa. 30.9 are in fact by implication actively 'seeking' חלקות by virtue of their request, though such does not provide provenance for the root. Instead we might well highlight the presence of the positive appellation דורש התורה in the pre-Yahadic text (CD 6.7) and posit some dichotomy between the two expressions (note Bengtsson 2000a: 117–18). More revealing, however, is the use of דרש in CD 1.10, especially when we consider that, according to

14 Partially paralleled in 4Q266 frg. 2, 1.21-22.
15 See Campbell 1995a: 56. Interestingly, note also the double appearance of מוריך in Isa. 30.20 (Campbell 1995a: 51–67; Pfann 2004: 180 n. 23). Håkan Bengtsson regards Ps. 12.3-4 as equally influential upon the designation in question (2000a: 117–20), though the present examination is unconvinced, at least with regard to this specific (earliest) occurrence. Cf. Ezek. 12.24; Ps. 5.10; Dan. 11.32.

our analysis, prior to Yahadic redaction the text currently preserved in CD 1.10-19a would have read simply:

> But God perceived their deeds, for *they sought him* [דרשוהו] with a whole heart. And he made known to later generations what he had done to a congregation of traitors, for *they sought smooth things* {דרשו בחלקות} and chose illusions and watched for breaches and chose the fair neck.[16]

Thus, the remnant who 'sought' God are contrasted with the עדת בוגדים who instead 'sought smooth things'. The seeking of God in CD 1.10 is comparable with that in 6.2-11a (which plays on Hos. 10.12), shown for example by the inclusion of מורה צדק in the redaction of the passage. The influence of Hos. 10.12 upon the pre-Yahadic passage above is further demonstrated by the presence of טוב הצואר in CD 1.19 (cf. Hos. 10.11). CD 1.10–2.1 would appear therefore to provide us with a suitably transparent context for the pairing of דרש and חלק. Specifically, the reason we find חלק coupled with דרש and not דבר (Isa. 30.10) is on account of the prevalent theme of 'seeking' in the pre-Yahadic layer of the text (deriving ultimately from Hos. 10.12) and in order to contrast the remnant who sought God (CD 1.10; 6.6).

This attestation in the FSP arguably represents contextualized scriptural terminology, reliant primarily upon the scriptural passage that underlies it. Hence this reference to the seeking of 'smooth things' remains coupled with the same preference for 'illusions' that appears in Isa. 30.9-11.[17] Rather than a specific epithet we have a description thoroughly grounded in the scriptural text and applied to a group who are twice described as 'a congregation' (CD 1.12 and 2.1) and later, in the redaction belonging to the ESP, associated with the followers of איש הלצון.

2. *The Early Sectarian Period*

In the Early Sectarian Period we find a similar pairing of דרש and חלק on two occasions within the so-called 'Teacher Hymns' of the Hodayot:[18]

> [10.14]And I have become a man of dispute to mediators of error [but a man of [15]pea]ce to all seers of truth. And I have become a spirit of zeal against seekers of smoo[th things] {[דורשי חל]קות}. (1QH[a] 10.14-15) [= Sukenik 2.14-15]

---

16   Following Davies' identification of pre-Yahadic material (1983: 232–35; my italics).

17   Likewise פרץ (Isa. 30.13; CD 1.19). Isa. 30.9-11 may also have influenced the redaction of CD 1.11b-18a.

18   See Chapter 3, n. 109.

> [10.31]And you have saved me from the zeal of mediators of a lie [32]and from the congregation of seekers of smooth things {דורשי חלקות}. (1QH[a] 10.31-32) [= Sukenik 2.31-32][19]

Interestingly these attest an indefinite construct form (hence 'seekers of smooth things') comparable with those designations found elsewhere in the Hodayot (e.g., חוזי רמיה, מליצי תעות, etc.).[20] James VanderKam suggests that מליצי כזב and דורשי חלקות in 1QH[a] 10.31-32 are 'poetic parallels' (2003: 476; Holm-Nielsen 1960: 48 n. 3) and indeed we have already noted in Chapter 3 the likely synonymity of the Hodayot's pejorative expressions. In this light it is noteworthy that just two lines later we also find the designation 'seekers of deceit' (דורשי רמיה, 1QH[a] 10.34).[21]

   With regard to דורשי חלקות it is significant that the description would appear dependent upon the FSP not only for the coupling of דרש and חלק but also for the portrayal of this group as a 'congregation' (עדה, 1QH[a] 10.32; cf. CD 1.12; 2.1), there being no other discernible provenance for the term in the Hodayot. No other elements of Isa. 30.9-11, such as the preference for 'illusions' (found in CD 1.18), are attested; instead we have simply the isolated accusation of seeking 'smooth things'. Crucially it would appear therefore to have been removed from its original scriptural context and consequently highlighted as an individual charge. Rather than a direct dependence upon Isa. 30.9-11 (as is seemingly the case in CD 1.18-19a), this appears rather, given its association of דורשי חלקות with a 'congregation', to be dependent upon the pre-Yahadic text of the Damascus Document itself. These attestations in the ESP arguably therefore indicate a degree of de-contextualization from the original scriptural passage and a subsequent partial-adoption of the phrase (complete with new connotations) within the sectarian tradition.[22]

3. *The Late Sectarian Period*

The Late Sectarian Period contains no less than eight occurrences of the combination דרש and חלק across three texts (4Q163, 4Q169 and

---

19   Note also however the use of חלק as a verb in 1QH[a] 12.7 (החליקו) and the noun חלקות in 1QH[a] 12.10, again associated with such designations as מליצי רמיה (12.7), מליצי כזב (12.9-10) and חוזי רמיה (12.10). The noun חלקות (without דרש) likewise appears in 4Q184 (frg. 1, 17; cf. Prov. 2.16; 5.3; 6.24; 7.5, 21) and 4Q185 (frgs. 1–2, 2.14), the former associated with attempts to lead astray the 'elect of righteousness' (בחירי צדק, 4Q184 frg. 1, 14; cf. 1QH[a] 10.13; 4Q215a frg. 1, 2.2).

20   See Chapter 3 for a complete list.

21   See further n. 19 above.

22   Given this apparent acquisition of new connotations (e.g., עדה), it is perhaps worth noting that the designations מליצי תעות (1QH[a] 10.14) and מליצי כזב (10.31) interestingly combine root forms (כזב, תעה, ליץ) found in the (new) context of those who 'sought smooth things' in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document (CD 1.11b-18a).

4Q177). Each of these consistently attests the definite construct form דורשי החלקות. For example, 4Q163 (4Qpap pIsaᶜ) states in relation to Isa. 30.15-18:[23]

> ᶠʳᵍ· ²³, ²·¹⁰The interpretation of the word for the end of days concerns the congregation of the S[eekers of] Smooth Things {ד]ורשי] החלקות} ¹¹who are in Jerusalem. (4Q163 frg. 23, 2.10-11)

Similarly, 4Q169 (4QpNah) refers six times to 'the Seekers of Smooth Things'.[24] To give just two examples, in quoting Nah. 3.1 it states:

> ᶠʳᵍˢ· ³–⁴, ²·¹'Woe the city of bloodshed, all of it [deceit,] full of [plund]er.' ²Its interpretation, it is the city of Ephraim, the Seekers of Smooth Things {דורשי החלקות} at the end of days who walk in deceit and falsehood[s]. (4Q169 frgs. 3–4, 2.1b-2)

Likewise it asserts with regard to Nah. 3.1-3:

> ᶠʳᵍˢ· ³–⁴, ²·⁴Its interpretation concerns the dominion of the Seekers of Smooth Things {דורשי החלקות}, ⁵from the midst of whose congregation the sword of the nations will not be lacking. (4Q169 frgs. 3–4, 2.4b-5a)

In similar manner a rather fragmentary passage from 4Q177 (4QCatena A) preserves:

> They are the congregation of the Seekers of [Smoo]th Things {דורשי ה]חל[קות}. (4Q177 2.12)

The association of this label with a 'congregation' (עדה), observed in the ESP (1QHᵃ 10.32) and seemingly drawn from the FSP (cf. CD 1.12; 2.1), is continued with surprising uniformity in the LSP (4Q163 frg. 23, 2.10; 4Q169 frgs. 3–4, 2.4-5; 4Q177 2.12). The new connotation (absent from Isa. 30.9-11) has clearly stuck.

A number of descriptive features in this period further suggest that in the LSP the דורשי החלקות were (on a literary level) implicitly identified with the followers of מטיף הכזב (1QpHab 10.9; 10.17–11.1[?]; 1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 4).[25] They are accused of leading astray (תעה, 4Q169 frgs. 3–4, 2.8; 3.5, 7), associated with lies, deceit and falsehood (4Q169 frgs. 3–4, 2.2, 8) and mentioned with regard to 'the city of bloodshed' of Nah. 3.1 (4Q169 frgs. 3–4, 2.1b-2). In 1QpHab 10.5b-13, 'the Spouter of the Lie' is

---

23   Unfortunately we can only speculate as to what the pesher on Isa. 30.10 may have been, though this interpretation of vv. 15–18 would strongly suggest that it contained reference to דורשי החלקות.

24   4Q169 frgs. 3–4, 1.2; 1.7; 2.2; 2.4; 3.3; 3.6-7. Maurya Horgan also suggests reconstructing עדת דורשי החלקות in the lacuna at frgs. 1–2, 7, though this cannot be substantiated (1979: 162, 170).

25   See also Callaway 1988: 158–59.

identified with the one 'who builds a city with bloodshed' (Hab. 2.12) and is accused of having 'led many astray' (1QpHab 10.9; cf. 4Q169 frgs. 3–4, 2.8) and establishing 'a congregation in falsehood' (עדה בשקר, 1QpHab 10.10). Furthermore, the reference to עדת דורשי החלקות אשר בירושלים (4Q163 frg. 23, 2.10-11) recalls עדת אנשי הלצון אשר בירושלים in 4Q162 (2.10; cf. 2.6-7). Our analysis would suggest that the foundation for this implicit association with מטיף הכזב and אנשי הלצון in the LSP was the Yahadic redaction of CD 1.11b–2.1 in the ESP, identifying the 'congregation of traitors' who 'sought smooth things' with the followers of איש הלצון (who 'spouted to Israel waters of a lie', 1.14-15).

Thus, a suitable provenance for the various connotations associated with the sobriquet דורשי החלקות in the LSP can be found in the ESP.[26] No discernible trace of the scriptural context (Isa. 30.9-11) remains and instead these attestations, all with the definite article and performing a seemingly titular function for a specific group (cf. 4Q169 frgs. 3–4, 1.1b-4a), indicate an adoption of the phrase as a discrete element of sectarian terminology.

The sobriquet 'the Seekers of Smooth Things' (דורשי החלקות) exhibits the same developmental process observed with regard to מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב. In essence, this involves a move from an indefinite scripturally-grounded description to a definite titular form, explicable by reference to an expanding web of inter-related texts and root forms that directly influence the employment and development of the epithet.[27]

c. *Sobriquets across the Scrolls*

In examining the development of מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב, and more briefly דורשי החלקות, we have noted a process by which scriptural

26   Writing of the relationship between the Hodayot and the pesharim, Davies likewise suggests that 'the phrase has been borrowed from the Hymns in order to coin a soubriquet' (1987: 101). So too Bengtsson 2000a: 120.

27   This may indicate that at different stages in its development the accusation of seeking 'smooth things' was applied to different (historical?) groups who are ideologically lined-up with their 'predecessors'. For example, 'a congregation of traitors' are described as having 'sought smooth things' in the FSP (CD 1.11b–2.1), but the Yahadic redaction of the passage (postdating the split from the wider movement responsible for the original text) identifies the עדת בוגדים with the Yahad's erstwhile companions. Anselm Hagedorn notes with regard to 'otherness' that when the 'reference group' changes, 'it is possible to transfer set stereotypes to a new entity' (2005: 234). Furthermore, it has been suggested that דורשי החלקות is a deliberate pun on הלכה (e.g., Brownlee 1951: 59–60). While it is conceivable that Isa. 30.9-11 was alluded to for just this reason in the pre-Yahadic text of CD 1.18-19a, our analysis provides a sound account of the sobriquet's development and function on literary grounds without resort to this assumption. Of course, this is not to deny that the label may retrospectively have been understood in a punning capacity.

terminology is employed descriptively (in order to identify an individual or group, positively or negatively, with a scripturally-grounded typology) though may subsequently be isolated so as to perform a titular function. In so doing, the designations become increasingly stereotypical (and/or prototypical); the implied referents are made personifications of these qualities.[28] The core of this process with regard to these three sobriquets can be sketched accordingly (see Table 1).[29]

	'The Teacher of Righteousness'	'The Spouter of the Lie'	'The Seekers of Smooth Things'
FSP	'one who will teach righteousness' יורה הצדק [cf. Hos. 10.12]		'they sought smooth things' דרשו בחלקות [cf. Isa. 30.10]
ESP	'a teacher of righteousness' מורה צדק	'a spouter of a lie' מטיף כזב [cf. Mic. 2.11]	'seekers of smooth things' דורשי חלקות
LSP	'the Teacher of Righteousness' מורה הצדק	'the Spouter of the Lie' מטיף הכזב	'the Seekers of Smooth Things' דורשי החלקות

Table 1: The Development of the Qumran Sobriquets

Ida Fröhlich (speaking specifically of the 'spouter' designations) suggests that attestations in the Damascus Document (ESP) 'can be considered as antecedent forms of the surname used in the pesharim' (1999: 300 n. 33).[30] Bengtsson likewise notes that 'the Damascus Document thus contains many concepts and expression [sic] appearing in a more definite form in the Pesharim' (2000a: 95). The same phenomenon has been observed of the Hodayot's influence upon the terminology and sobriquets of the LSP (see Davies 1987: 97–105). In addition to the indefinite form דורשי חלקות (1QH[a] 10.15, 32), it also attests the label 'men of truth' (אנשי אמת, 1QH[a]

28   On prototypicality in the scrolls, see initially Jokiranta 2005c.
29   Ignoring for now the various related designations which have further fed into (or resulted from) this process (e.g., איש הלצון, איש הכזב, משיח הצדק, מורה/יורה היחיד, מל יצי כזב).
30   See further Fröhlich 1996: 155 (n. 6), 161 (n. 20).

6.2; 10.14) yet we find 'the Men of Truth' in the LSP (אנשי האמת, 1QpHab 7.10).[31]

In spite of this apparent developmental template, it is clear that, while the above sobriquets share an 'evolutionary timetable', these stages are not intrinsic to a given sectarian period. We find definite forms not only in the LSP but also in the ESP (e.g., CD 1.14: איש הלצון; 20.1: מורה היחיד; 20.11: אנשי הלצון; 20.14: יורה היחיד; 20.15: איש הכזב; 20.32: אנשי היחיד) 5.5: משיח הצדק :4Q252 5.3; אנשי היחיד) and even the FSP (e.g., CD 6.7: דורש התורה). Thus, we cannot say that titular sobriquets in general were a late sectarian development, even if some of the better known appear only in the LSP (e.g., דורשי החלקות, הכוהן הרשע). We can, however, note that, where we do have evidence for variant forms or a scriptural origin, the direction of change is consistently towards a definite titular form. We can only speculate as to the origin of those sobriquets for which this evidence is lacking; they may either have undergone a similar developmental process (whether or not this was ever reflected in the texts) or perhaps appeared without discernible antecedent forms (e.g., הכוהן הרשע?). In either case, the trend we have observed (a move towards definite titular forms) would appear, within the scope of the present study, to hold true for all instances in which variant forms *can* be found to exist.[32]

d. *The Problems with this Model*

We should, at this juncture, address some of the potential criticisms of our developmental model. Firstly, in the course of our investigation, 4Q252 (allotted to the ESP) was shown to be somewhat anomalous. It was examined on account of the designation משיח הצדק (4Q252 5.3) and the obvious similarities with מורה הצדק. However, despite distinct terminological and contextual affinities, it could not easily be incorporated within our otherwise rather linear development of the sobriquet. On the one hand, this may raise questions about the overall accuracy of our model, though, on the other, it should be acknowledged that the issue of messianic expectation within the scrolls is a complex one displaying a diversity that is yet to be adequately reconciled.[33] Nevertheless, Davies is surely right to recognize the role of 'cognitive dissonance' in this respect (1985: 42; 1988: 317; cf. Rodd 1981). Our tentative proposal that the

---

31 Note similarly אנשי רמיה (1QH[a] 6.14; 10.16) and אנשי הרמיה (1QS 9.8). We have not, in this examination, undertaken an analysis of the S-material or assigned it to any compositional period; a synthesis incorporating other blocks of sectarian material is therefore to be desired.

32 Though cf. 1QS 6.6 and 8.11-12, to be discussed below.

33 Collins 1995a (esp. 77–83); García Martínez 1995b; VanderKam 1994b. Cf. Smith 1959.

construction משיח הצדק may reflect an amended (post-teacher) expectation, drawing not only upon Jer. 23.5 and 33.15 but also upon the terminology already in place to describe the messianic role (e.g., יורה הצדק, CD 6.11; cf. 12.23–13.1), might yet provide a suitable context for this designation within our model. In terms of future study, it may prove fruitful to examine the specific theme of messianic expectation against the backdrop of the chronological schema and process of sobriquet development advocated here.[34]

More seriously, questions can be raised regarding our textual layering. What, for example, would happen if we were to adopt a different chronological schema? Furthermore, our establishment of a Formative Sectarian Period was based upon the redaction history of the Damascus Document posited by Philip Davies (1983).[35] While others have argued similarly (see our discussion in Chapter 1), Jonathan Campbell suggests that there is 'no need to go down the interpolatory route' (1999: 19):[36]

> [H]ow can it be, on the one hand, that an individual or group was happy to propagate the Damascus Document *in its extant form* and, on the other, that we apparently can detect all kinds of vestiges of earlier editions that undermine its status as a unified piece? (1999: 18; my italics)

If indeed the מורה צדק of the Yahadic Damascus Document was regarded as the anticipated יורה הצדק (CD 6.11) of the FSP, why did the latter (future-orientated) expectation remain in the Yahadic text?[37]

John Barton argues that 'in ancient times' scriptural texts were read 'with an assumption of coherence' (1986: 145) and not necessarily as a 'unitary whole' (150).[38] With regard to the Qumran-related sectarian material, Sarianna Metso likewise suggests that we should 'focus on individual redactional units rather than on complete documents as if they were literary unities' (2004: 330–31). For example, the *redaction* of the Damascus Document by the Yahad would not necessarily entail the deletion of all parts no longer directly relevant. Accordingly:

> one group formulated the material, which presumably matched the activity of that group. When a different group borrowed that material because they thought it was valuable, *it is not necessary to conclude that the new group acted out every detail of the passage*; thus it would be misleading to make the direct connection between that group's texts and

---

34 See further, our comments in Chapters 2 and 3 regarding משיח אהרן וישראל (CD 12.23–13.1; 19.10-11) and משיח מאהרן ומישראל (CD 20.1).

35 Cf. Collins 1985.

36 Also Campbell 1995a: 90 (n. 71), 205–206; Dimant 1984: 495–97; Knibb 1994b: 155–58. See Rendtorff 1988: 300.

37 So Collins 1994a: 194.

38 See further Rodd 1981: 102–103.

its historical activity.

It is true that, when the community actually used a manuscript, it presumably functioned as a unified document, and the separate sections that comprised the document may have gained a new focus in the new context of the newly redacted document. *But there may well have been an understanding that certain parts were important and their details corresponded with the activities of the group, but that other parts were less so and those details had little or no correspondence to the historical activity of that group.* (Metso 2004: 331; my italics)[39]

Moreover, while the predominantly incompatible nature of the 'teacher' designations in the text is suggestive of a redactional history, there is at least a sense in which CD 6.10-11 may have continued to hold meaning for the movement. Given that the text was redacted after the death of the 'teacher' (cf. CD 19.33b–20.1a; 20.13-15), in a period of reformulation of community expectation, when it came to it CD 6.10-11 may have been regarded as still relevant to the group's (reformulated) eschatological hopes.[40]

One further criticism of our developmental model is the fact that it is not clearly demonstrable of all the sobriquets. In particular, 'the Seeker of the Law' is to be found in the form דורש התורה in the FSP (CD 6.7), ESP (CD 7.18) and LSP (4Q174 frg. 1, 1.11; 4Q177 2.5). This in itself is not a problem, since it merely indicates varied rates of development (e.g., איש הכזב appears in the ESP) and does not contradict the move towards an ultimately definite titular form. Indeed, as mentioned above, lack of evidence in the extant texts need not preclude the possibility that other sobriquets underwent a similar developmental process. More difficult, however, is the fact that, while the title דורש התורה is given to a figure of the past in the FSP, it is assigned to an eschatological figure (perhaps to be identified with the Aaronic messiah) in the LSP (Brooke 1985: 202–205).[41] Furthermore, 1QS refers in general terms to 'a man seeking the law' (איש דורש בתורה, 1QS 6.6; cf. 8.11-12), seemingly applicable to a plurality of 'seekers'.[42] How are we to account for this?

The latter problem may solve the first, as if the designation דורש התורה primarily indicated an ongoing activity within the community (as

---

39 Likewise, Grossman notes that, 'the arguments presented in a text that receives ongoing use cannot be understood as static, unitary, or transparent. Although in its original setting a text may be intended to present a specific view, this in no way ensures that the text will be understood in terms of its original claims whenever it is read or interpreted' (2002: 5). On the capacity for diverse readings of the Damascus Document, see Grossman 2002: 127–61.

40 Cf. 4Q252 5.3.

41 We have already noted the possibility that CD 7.18 (ESP) likewise portrays the דורש התורה as a future figure; see Chapter 3, n. 33 (also Brooke 1991a: 224–25).

42 Collins 1994a: 194.

evidenced by 1QS 6.6-7) then we might well expect to find a more conspicuous re-usage of the epithet.[43] However, the use of the seemingly indefinite description איש דורש בתורה in 1QS (almost certainly postdating the pre-Yahadic FSP; though cf. Regev 2003; 2007a), while contextually admissible in the light of the plurality of 'seekers' (i.e., any דורש התורה is here referred to), is ostensibly incongruent with our proposed developmental model. This may call into question once again our chronological layering of material, or at least the veracity of the developmental process we have advocated, though we might justifiably appeal on the grounds that the sobriquet דורש התורה is clearly a special case (with explicit provision for a plurality of 'seekers') and thus not representative of the other epithets we have witnessed.[44] In either case, we shall proceed by now turning our attention to sociological approaches, drawing specifically upon the sociology of deviance and 'labelling theory', in order to examine the compliance of our results with research carried out in another academic field.

3. *The Qumran Sobriquets and the Sociology of Deviance*

a. *Sociological Approaches to the Scrolls*

Sociological lines of enquiry, part of the wider field of social-scientific criticism, have a history of application to the study of religious belief.[45] The use of these approaches within biblical studies has been especially pervasive (Esler 2005; Robbins 1995; Rodd 1981).[46] In general we may note, in recent years, the production of several volumes devoted to the application of varying sociological models as a means by which we might better understand both the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament as well as the social contexts that produced them.[47] More specifically we may highlight individual works which pursue lines of enquiry that may prove relevant to our own examination; in particular those concerning prophecy (Petersen 1991), sects and popular religious movements (A.I. Baumgarten 2005; Berlinerblau 1996; Blenkinsopp 1981; Chalcraft [ed.] 2007; Elliott 1995; Grabbe 2007; Malina 1995; Piovanelli 2007; Stark 1967; L.M. White

---

43   George Brooke even notes that the plural מחוקקות (CD 6.9), in the context of a/the past דורש התורה identified with מחוקק (6.7), 'would suggest that there was a succession of Interpreters' (1985: 200). See Fitzmyer 2000: 99 n. 78; Wise 1999: 202–209, 238–39.

44   Might we observe here the apparent 'democratization' of a title that was applied in the first instance to a prominent figure of the past?

45   See initially, Goldthorpe 1974 (183–204) and Macionis and Plummer 1998 (502–28). Also the more detailed studies of Hill (1973) and Weber (1966).

46   Note the following useful summaries: Elliott 1986; Esler 1995; Esler and Hagedorn 2005; Pietersen 2005: 166–67; Rogerson 1985.

47   For example, Esler (ed.) 1995; 2005; Gunn and McNutt (eds.) 2002; Neyrey (ed.) 1993; Simkins and Cook with Brenner (eds) 1999. Also, Elliott (ed.) 1986.

1988; Theissen 1978) and deviance and labelling (Barclay 1995; Lipp 1977; Malina and Neyrey 1993; Pietersen 1997; 2004; J.T. Sanders 1993).[48]

Pierluigi Piovanelli suggests, however, that sociological approaches such as these are 'conspicuously absent from the literature on the Qumran sectarian landscape' (2005: 368).[49] While their use in the field of Qumran studies is certainly less extensive than in biblical studies, there are, nevertheless, some notable exceptions and increasingly scholars have, implicitly or explicitly, begun to draw upon sociological models in order to facilitate our understanding of the scrolls (see Jokiranta 2005a: 21–28). Early on, Johannes van der Ploeg noted the pertinence of a sociological understanding of sects to an examination of the Qumran-related movement (1958: 90–95). More recently, the volume entitled *New Directions in Qumran Studies* (Campbell, Lyons and Pietersen [ed.] 2005) serves as a good example of how a wide range of interdisciplinary methodologies, including the social-scientific, can and have been applied to Qumran scholarship. This and other similar studies have shed light upon such areas as the sectarianism behind the scrolls (Blenkinsopp 2005; Collins 2007; Davies 1996: 163–77; 2005; 2007; Jokiranta 2001; 2005a; Piovanelli 2005; Regev 2004; 2007a; 2007b; E.P. Sanders 2000; Stanton 1993; Wassen and Jokiranta 2007) and messianism (Duhaime 2000a), utilizing, for example, Weber typology and a sociology of millenarianism (Chalcraft 2007; Talmon 1989; 1991a; 1994a; 1994b; Wise 1999), study of relative deprivation (Duhaime 1993), social conflict models (Douglas 1999), spatial theory (Davies 2002; Lied 2005; Økland 2005), conversion theory (Brooke 2005b), social identity theory (Charlesworth and McSpadden 2006; Jokiranta 2005a; 2005c; Lawrence 2005), discourse analysis (Newsom 2004) and the sociology of deviance (Pietersen 2005). It is upon the latter approach that we shall now focus.

b. *The Sociology of Deviance and Labelling Theory*
The sociology of deviance is concerned with the behaviour of (and reaction to) 'those individuals or groups which deviate from social norms' (Barclay 1995: 114).[50] It thus addresses the processes by which we identify and define deviance, noting also its relevance to social control.[51] Accordingly it may pertain to an examination of the community behind the scrolls, since, as Brooke notes:

---

48   See too the multifaceted work by Norman Gottwald (1979).
49   Also Charlesworth 2002: 6 n. 10.
50   A history of the discipline and its critics can be found in Sumner 1996.
51   The approach is outlined in the following: Becker 1973; Box 1971; Kelly (ed.) 1989; Macionis and Plummer 1998: 204–35; Rock 1973; Rock and McIntosh (eds) 1974; Schur 1980; Scott and Douglas (eds) 1972.

the minority status of the Qumran group suggests that those who became members could well be considered by others, or have considered themselves, as deviating from normative Jewish behaviour in certain ways. (2005b: 73)[52]

More crucially, evidence from the scrolls themselves (e.g., 4QMMT) would suggest that conversely the movement viewed the rest of Israel as deviant or in error (cf. CD 1.1-8a).[53] Thus we can speak of 'positive', as well as 'negative', deviance; the community behind the scrolls would have viewed in a positive light their deviance from 'normative Jewish behaviour' (so Pietersen 2005: 171).

Edwin Lemert (1989) distinguishes between primary and secondary deviation, the former concerned with the act of deviance itself and the latter with reactions to it. Secondary deviation focuses therefore on the interaction between 'society' and the deviant. This issue has been addressed by the 'interactionist' or 'societal reaction' perspective, known more commonly as 'labelling theory'.[54] The classic expression of this is by Howard Becker:

> [S]ocial groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance, and by applying those rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders. From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to an 'offender'. The deviant is one to whom that label has successfully been applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label. (1973: 9)

Deviance can accordingly be viewed as a social construct, the perception of which results in 'negative labelling' (Malina and Neyrey 1993: 100).[55]

Bruce Malina and Jerome Neyrey (1993) together identify three stages to the labelling process: (i) denunciation, (ii) retrospective interpretation and (iii) status degradation ritual. The first of these reflects accusations of deviance made, for example, on account of behaviour perceived as such (e.g., 'thief', 'murderer', 'heretic'). Accusations of this type may betray an implicit moral judgement. John Barclay notes in this respect the activity in

---

52   See further the comments by Stark (1967: 174) and L.M. White (1988: 14) on the deviant nature of sectarian movements. Also, Blenkinsopp 1981: 1–2; Goldthorpe 1974: 198–99; E.P. Sanders 2000: 42–43; Stanton 1993: 90. Cf. Talmon 1994b: 6.

53   Goranson 1999.

54   See primarily, Becker 1973; 1974; Schur 1971; Sumner 1996: 197–248. Becker has expressed his dislike of the broad term 'labelling theory', preferring 'an interactionist theory of deviance' (1973: 181). Nevertheless for the sake of convenience, and having acknowledged the more specific terminology, it is the expression we shall continue to use.

55   Critiques of this approach have further refined the issue: Box 1971: 11–15; Schur 1971: 13–23; 1980: 17–21; Scott and Douglas (eds) 1972: 37–116; Sumner 1996: 249–315. Cf. Barclay 1995: 126 n. 6; Becker 1973: 177–208; 1974; Pietersen 2005: 172–73.

1 Corinthians of 'Paul labelling as deviant those he considers should be excluded from the church' (1995: 123). The result of this social distancing is that:

> it becomes more and more possible to describe the deviant in impersonal and abstract terms ... The consolidation of stereotypes can engender a punitive stance which allows the deviant less and less freedom to play anything but a deviant role. (Rock 1973: 31)

Increased tension may in turn cause these accusations to become 'more pronounced and hostile' (Hagedorn 2005: 237).

The second stage of the labelling process involves the reinterpretation of past actions 'in the light of this newly perceived deviant status' (Schur 1980: 14). Through this process of retrospective interpretation, drawing selectively upon biographical information, it is demonstrated that the deviant was always thus.[56] As a result:

> the deviant actor is made into a typical case of the thing the deviant is alleged to have done ... from crime perpetrator to 'a criminal'. Behavior is fused with character, as the devious action and its actor become one in the deviant. (Malina and Neyrey 1993: 106)

In this sense, and crucially for our purposes, 'The deviance is personified so that the person can be depersonalized' (Malina and Neyrey 1993: 106), a move aimed ultimately at 'role engulfment' and the attribution of 'master status'. Consequently five criteria, if met, enable the widespread recognition of deviant status and are seen therefore to legitimize the label: (i) affirmation of responsibility, (ii) affirmation of injury, (iii) affirmation of the victim, (iv) condemnation of the deviant, (v) appeal to authority.[57]

Finally the status of the deviant is degraded by means of a ritual intended to stigmatize and engulf the accused in the deviant role:[58]

> [T]he actor's former identity is virtually destroyed and a totally new identity established, a *master status* which engulfs all others. (Malina and Neyrey 1993: 107)

This 'master status' has an overriding quality which accordingly comes to define the deviant and is thus considered representative of the whole character.[59] One who steals is no longer simply described as 'a thief' but is formally labelled as such and subsequently regarded (primarily) in relation to this role. He is a personification of the deviant act and so 'at

---

56   Malina and Neyrey note that, 'Positive information about the alleged deviant is left open to doubt or simply ignored' (1993: 106). See further Schur 1971: 52–56.

57   Malina and Neyrey 1993: 105–107.

58   See Garfinkel 1956.

59   Becker 1973: 33–34; Schur 1980: 12–14.

the same time, exposed, prosecuted, and sentenced' (Lipp 1977: 65). Barclay again reads 1 Corinthians 5 in this light:

> Paul selects from this individual's many activities the one feature of which he disapproves and makes that the defining character of his identity: this man does not just *indulge in* some *porneia*, he *is* a *pornos* and must be treated as that, whatever else he might also be in character or behaviour. (1995: 124)

Similarly we might consider the portrayal of Judas as 'a thief' in John 12.4-6, a master status which comes to define him and through which his past is retrospectively interpreted:[60]

> [12.4]But Judas Iscariot, one of his disciples (the one who was about to betray him), said, [5]'Why was this perfume not sold for three hundred denarii and the money given to the poor?' [6](He said this not because he cared about the poor, but because he was a thief; he kept the common purse and used to steal what was put into it.) (John 12.4-6)

Role engulfment and the attribution of master status, being by nature both overriding and personifying (while simultaneously depersonalizing the one labelled), may thus advocate an appellative use of the deviant label. Paul Rock notes that we 'impose increasingly anonymous and general characteristics on people ... as they become socially removed from us' (1973: 29) and so the deviant is frequently referred to as 'the thief', 'the addict', 'the murderer'.[61] In the case of Judas, William Klassen observes that:

> [He] is portrayed as the epitome of evil in the form of hypocrisy, greed, unfaithfulness, ingratitude, and, above all, betrayal. His name is equivalent to 'traitor'. In many writings about him, *authors spare themselves the effort of using Judas's name and refer to him mainly as 'the traitor'*, implying thereby that his act of betrayal of Jesus is what made him stand out among the twelve apostles. (1996: 4; my italics)[62]

To give another, more contemporary example, we might note Peter Sutcliffe, more commonly known as 'the Yorkshire Ripper'.[63] With the

---

60   Cf. Pietersen 2005: 174.

61   See Becker 1973: 25–39; Malina and Neyrey 1993: 106; Rock 1973: 33–34; Schur 1971: 69–81; 1980: 12–17, 146–50.

62   Also Malina and Neyrey 1993: 101.

63   It should be acknowledged that acquisition of master status can similarly result in *positive* labels becoming appellative (Hagedorn 2005: 231; Malina and Neyrey 1993: 99). To use an example from nascent Christianity, we have only to note the appropriation of Jesus as 'the Christ', with regard to which Horbury observes 'the development of the title towards the status of a proper name' (1998: 142). Perhaps also we might consider the appellative use of 'Augustus' for the first Roman emperor, (previously known as) Octavian; see e.g., Boardman, Griffin and Murray (eds) 1991.

establishment of master status the labelling process is successfully completed and a new overarching role ascribed to the deviant.

Malina and Neyrey point out that deviant status can be resisted and accusations of deviance can be neutralized (1993: 108–10).[64] In this respect, five criteria are employed (the reverse of those listed above to enable the recognition of deviant status): (i) denial of responsibility, (ii) denial of injury, (iii) denial of the victim, (iv) condemnation of condemners, (v) appeal to higher loyalties. Two further neutralization techniques are noted by Lloyd Pietersen (2005: 170–71): (vi) claim of benefits, (vii) basking in the reflected glory of related others (BIRGing). The fourth of these, the condemnation of condemners, entails what Edwin Schur describes as 'stigma contests' (1980: 8); in effect, 'I am not a crook; you are the crooks' (J.T. Sanders 1993: 144).[65] Inasmuch as the community behind the scrolls can be regarded as deviant, this insight may prove enlightening in the context of the group's own deviantizing of those external to the community.

c. *The Qumran Sobriquets and the Acquisition of Master Status*
Robert Scott makes the following observation:

> There are at least two features of a [negative] deviant label that make it distinctive; one is that it carries an imputation of moral inferiority and culpability, and the other, that it is an essentializing label. (1972: 14)

These qualities are likewise true of the disparaging sobriquets found among the scrolls, such as 'the Spouter of the Lie' or 'the Seekers of Smooth Things'. The same essentializing quality, along with an assertion of moral *superiority*, is also demonstrable with regard to the positive epithets such as 'the Teacher of Righteousness' or 'the Men of Truth'. Might the sociological model of labelling outlined above, in particular the insights concerning the acquisition of master status, shed light upon the developmental process witnessed of the Qumran-related sobriquets?[66]

---

64 As originally outlined in Sykes and Matza 1957. See further Lipp 1977: 65–67; J.T. Sanders 1993: 232–33; Schur 1971: 148–54.

65 Also Becker 1973: 1–2.

66 Cyril Rodd cautions against the application of sociological models to ancient documents, as the only available evidence is that which has survived by chance and thus the approach is 'not likely to be fruitful' (1981: 104). He does concede however the possibility of a heuristic employment. Similarly, Pietersen states that:

> [W]hen we come to ancient texts ... we do not have any access to the 'deviants'. We only have the point of view of those doing the labelling as embedded in the texts. Nevertheless, the value of labelling theory ... is precisely due to the fact that it begins with the assumption that no act is intrinsically deviant. Labelling theory thus draws attention to the significance of the labellers in the deviance defining process.

We have seen that the sobriquets are primarily evaluative in nature (Bengtsson 2000a: 38, 49–50; Brownlee 1979: 35–36; Harris 1966: 53–54; Jokiranta 2005b: 27–28). Moreover, our examination demonstrates a shift from a descriptive or indefinite use of these evaluative traits to an appellative one. Hence a figure is initially described as 'a teacher of righteousness' (CD 1.11; 20.32; drawing on CD 6.2-11a) and ultimately confirmed as 'the Teacher of Righteousness', indicating a subsumption within the prescribed role. Similarly, an accusation of spouting lies (CD 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 8.13; 19.25-26) ultimately becomes an appellative designation, 'the Spouter of the Lie', associating the referent intrinsically with his deviant behaviour. The final form of the sobriquets thus reflects a master status which is both definitive of the person so labelled and personifying of the evaluative trait. The designation 'the Seekers of Smooth Things' is stereotypical of the accusations of Isa. 30.9-11. The use of such terminology is indicative of role engulfment and governs all subsequent interpretation of character and actions (see Schur 1980: 12–14).

In the first instance, Pietersen notes the use of four neutralization techniques within the scrolls, aimed at resisting the accusations of deviance brought against the community (2005: 175–81): (i) condemnation of condemners, (ii) appeal to higher loyalties, (iii) claim of benefits, (iv) basking in the reflected glory of related others. Of these the first and fourth are most pertinent to our examination of the use and function of sobriquets in the texts. Significantly, Pietersen observes 'the condemnation of condemners' to be 'the favourite strategy of the *pesharim*' (2005: 179), indicating that other strategies might have been more prevalent in earlier compositional periods.[67] That the use of labels in the scrolls may arise from such a neutralization technique prompts him to state that:

> in the case of Qumran, the process can best be described as 'reverse labelling' as the Qumran community seeks to define itself over and against the rest of society by deviantizing all those who are not members of the community. (Pietersen 2005: 173)

Michael Wise similarly notes the use of reversal in the texts (for example, the Hodayot) and suggests that the various derogatory designations indicating false prophecy (e.g., נביאי כזב, חוזי רמיה, חוזי תעות) may

---

This aspect can usefully be employed heuristically to ask fresh questions of the text. (2004: 30)

So too Philip Esler: 'Models are heuristic tools, not ontological statements. Accordingly, they are either useful or not, and it is meaningless to ask whether they are "true" or "false" ' (1995: 4). See further the discussion in Jokiranta 2005a: 29–36.

67   See further, Pietersen 2005: 179–80.

imply that the 'teacher' was himself accused of such.[68] This is reminiscent of Schur's concept of 'stigma contests' (1980: 8; cf. J.T. Sanders 1993: 144).

The effect of this neutralization technique is the affirmation of the deviance of those external to the community. With regard to the labelling process engaged in by the group, the same three stages identified by Malina and Neyrey ('denunciation', 'retrospective interpretation' and 'status degradation ritual') can be witnessed. Initially those who are at odds with the group's ideology are denounced on account of their deviant behaviour, drawing upon scriptural typologies where appropriate. In this light, the description of one who spouts lies (CD 1.13-18a; 4.19-20; 8.13; 19.25-26) can be understood in relation to the positive attributes of 'a teacher of righteousness' (CD 1.11; 20.32):

> [T]he symbolic quality of the perpetrator and the trait are seen by witnesses as stark opposites of the counter symbolic figures available ... so much so that it only makes sense to condemn the perpetrator. Not to condemn him/her is to reject the opposite. (Malina and Neyrey 1993: 105)[69]

Likewise those who 'sought smooth things' (CD 1.18), borrowing imagery from Isa. 30.9-11, are contrasted with those who sought God (CD 1.10). The denunciation of opponents in this manner is such that their deviant status is readily apparent.

Through a process of retrospective interpretation these opponents of the community are identified as having always fulfilled such a role. The followers of the 'spouter' are recognized to be the 'congregation of traitors' of CD 1.12, while in the Hodayot the labels given to opponents (e.g., 1QH^a 10.14: 'mediators of error'; 12.10: 'seers of deceit'; 12.16: 'prophets of a lie') indicate that they are viewed as *typifying the deviant behaviour of which they are accused*. Thus, just as Malina and Neyrey recognize the move 'from crime perpetrator to "a criminal"' (1993: 106), so here we see a shift from those who 'sought smooth things' (CD 1.18) to 'seekers of smooth things' (1QH^a 10.15, 32).

Finally, a status degradation ritual takes place. In his examination of the concept, Harold Garfinkel asserts that:

> *Any communicative work* between persons, whereby the public identity of an actor is transformed into something looked on as lower in the local scheme of social types, will be called a 'status degradation ceremony'. (1956: 420; my italics)

---

68   Wise 1999: 97–99. Note that Gershon Brin interprets 4Q375 as 'a polemic against ... a spiritual leader, defined by Jerusalem as a seducer prophet, but whom the Sect evaluated positively' (1995: 59).

69   Also Garfinkel 1956: 422–23.

In the Qumran-related material this ritual is a literary one, played out in the texts themselves.[70] The labelled opponents are imbued with a master status and are engulfed in the deviant role; their public identity is transformed and their social status degraded. The deviant is depersonalized and the label comes to define the character, the result of which is that in the final analysis 'the enemies of the Community were, to them, not historical people or peoples, but the actual personifications of their biblical prototypes' (B.J. Roberts 1968: 198–99). Derived from these scriptural typologies we accordingly find the stereotypical, role-personifying designations such as 'the Spouter of the Lie' (1QpHab 10.9; 10.17–11.1[?]; 1Q14 frgs. 8–10, 4), 'the Men of Scoffing' (CD 20.11; 4Q162 2.6; 2.10; 4Q177 1.7[?]) and 'the Seekers of Smooth Things' (4Q163 frg. 23, 2.10; 4Q169 frgs. 3–4, 1.2; 1.7; 2.2; 2.4; 3.3; 3.6-7; 4Q177 2.12). These not only serve an appellative function but one that is intrinsically evaluative and definitive.[71]

In addition to negative labelling we find positive affirmations of role and identity in the scrolls. These perform a similar function inasmuch as they confirm the social distancing between the community and those they perceive to be deviant.[72] The process of negative labelling already witnessed 'naturally involves two-way stereotyping, since every image we create of the other is tied – subconsciously – to a stereotypic image of ourselves' (Hagedorn 2005: 233). Harold Garfinkel, in relation to the practice of status degradation, likewise states that:

> The witness must appreciate the characteristics of the typed person and event *by referring the type to a dialectical counterpart*. Ideally, the witnesses should not be able to contemplate the features of the denounced person without reference to the counterconception, as *the profanity of an occurrence or a desire or a character trait, for example, is*

---

70   '[T]he question is: Starting from any state of a society's organization, what program of communicative tactics will get the work of status degradation done?' (Garfinkel 1956: 421). To what degree a historical/physical 'ceremony' may be deemed to lie behind such a literary degradation ritual is not clearly evidenced by the texts (though note, for example, 1QpHab 5.8-12 according to the interpretation of Brownlee [1979: 91–95]; Carmignac [1962a: 507–10] and Lim [2005]; see Chapter 4, n. 13). On status degradation within texts, see further Garfinkel 1956. Pietersen likewise views the Pastoral Epistles as attesting 'a literary version of a status degradation ceremony' (2004: 110; cf. 31–33, 110–11). This difference in medium may also explain why, with regard to the Qumran-related sobriquets (as we find them within the scrolls, at least), the acquisition of master status does not occur 'overnight'. As Garfinkel notes: 'Face-to-face contact is a different situation from that wherein the denunciation and reply are conducted by radio and newspaper' (1956: 424; cf. Nielsen 1961: 32–38). The speed of the process can likewise be affected by other factors such as social distance (Rock 1973: 29).

71   See Pietersen 2005: 176–77.

72   William Schniedewind suggests that the community 'used language ideologically as a means of differentiating and further insulating themselves' (1999a: 235).

*clarified by the references it bears to its opposite, the sacred ... * [T]he
alternatives must be such that the preferred is morally required. (1956:
422–23; my italics)

Thus the affirmation of positive ideals goes hand-in-hand with the
denunciation of negative deviance. As Fröhlich notes, '[t]he definition of
"the other" is possible in the light of their self-definition, the definition of
"we"' (2004: 1). Sobriquets such as 'the Teacher of Righteousness' or 'the
Men of Truth' exhibit an acquired master status (e.g., 'one who will teach
righteousness' → 'a teacher of righteousness' → 'the Teacher of
Righteousness') and are presented as both archetypal and personifying
of the positive qualities by which the negative might be better known.[73]

It is notable that '[s]uch rhetoric betrays a rigid dualism of insiders and
outsiders' (Anderson 2005a: 354), thereby lending itself to the intricacies
of social control:[74] '[D]enouncement speech can be used as a means of
propaganda to marginalize outsiders while exercising control over the
behavior of insiders' (Anderson 2005a: 354).[75] Through the identification
of deviants, the symbolic and moral boundaries of the group are
reaffirmed, solidifying community identity and serving as a warning to
potential deviants.[76] The role-engulfing labels, having acquired a master
status, 'create a dichotomy between the righteous and the wicked, and
thus call for identification with the right side, the right group' (Jokiranta
2005c: 256). One strength of the labels' stereotypical nature is that it
allows for transferable application (see Hagedorn 2005: 234, 238–39). As
Bengtsson puts it, '[n]ew opponents could also have been disparaged by
old designations' (2000a: 297).[77] In terms of social control and boundary
maintenance, the master status acquired by the deviant labels provides 'an
example of how to handle covenant members who refuse to stay within
their proper bounds. In the language of these texts, anyone who leaves the
community – whether in its present state or in the distant past – is, in fact,
a follower after "the Man of the Lie"' (Grossman 2002: 157).[78]

The use of the Qumran-related sobriquets in this fashion, and their
development as noted in previous chapters, accords with the sociological
model of 'labelling theory' and the development of master status. A
sociology of deviance approach can, therefore, be seen to perhaps shed
light upon the function and employment of the sobriquets and lend

---

73 So too Jokiranta 2005c: 257; also Callaway 1994: 417–18.
74 See further Rock 1973: 66; Rock and McIntosh (eds) 1974.
75 On propaganda and subversion in the Hebrew Bible, see Mason 1997.
76 See primarily Erikson 1989. Also Barclay 1995: 117–18, 123–25; Davies 2002: 88;
Scott 1972: 10. Note in this context CD 20.8b-13 and 1QpHab 2.1-10a.
77 See van der Woude 1982.
78 So too Bengtsson 2000a: 109.

support to our findings above. This may prove a fruitful avenue for further investigation.

4. *Conclusions*

Our examination of the sobriquets מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב (along with דורשי החלקות) has uncovered a complex process by which these labels were formulated and subsequently employed. In their earliest forms they draw primarily upon scripture in order to perform an evaluative, descriptive function grounded in this shared tradition.[79] Increasingly, however, they become stereotypical designations such that any historical referent to the label is engulfed within the prescribed role. In this sense the sobriquet itself, as personified typology, becomes its own character within the text, overshadowing that of any historical referent it may once have had.[80] Accordingly, 'the presentation of various persons and groups in Qumran *pesharim* is determined not so much by the historical reality as by literary stereotypes' (Fröhlich 1996: 159 n. 11). This allows Jutta Jokiranta to comment that, despite references to his death in the ESP (CD 19.33b–20.1a; 20.13-15), in the pesharim the 'teacher' could still be construed as a contemporary figure.[81] More particularly, our examination has focused on the process by which this shift is achieved, noting the specific form and context of employment across our three sectarian compositional periods. As a result we have witnessed a developmental tendency from an indefinite, scripturally-grounded descriptive function towards a definite titular form.

A comparison with the insights to be garnered from a sociology of deviance perspective, drawing in particular upon labelling theory, has engendered a fruitful fresh approach to the labelling processes within the scrolls.[82] The sociological labelling of deviants and affirmation of positive counterparts bears great resemblance to our findings concerning the Qumran-related sobriquets. The process of denunciation, retrospective interpretation and status degradation can be demonstrated, as well as the presence of neutralization techniques where relevant. Moreover, the move towards role engulfment, and thus the acquisition of master status,

---

79   See Fröhlich 1999: 305; Jokiranta 2005b: 24–25.

80   Hence, perhaps, the problems encountered with attempts to identify the referents of the sobriquets; see Chapter 1.

81   Jokiranta 2005c: 262–63.

82   The groundwork for which has been laid by Pietersen (2005). James Charlesworth likewise notes that: 'It is imperative to comprehend the sociological dimensions of knowledge and language developed within the Community. One might miss some dimensions of Qumran history and sociology by seeking to discern the identities of those named only by sobriquets' (2002: 72).

provides a suitable backdrop to the developmental process witnessed with regard to the sobriquets. While this sociological model is a 'heuristic tool' and so 'yields insight rather than necessarily embodying truth' (Esler 1995: 7), it does provide us with a lens through which we might better understand the sobriquets and lends weight to our own observations regarding their developing function across the compositional periods (and thus, by implication, our chronological schema). Consequently, we can now perceive this development as one from indefinite, scripturally-grounded accusations of deviance (denunciation) towards a definite stereotypical and appellative form denoting role engulfment and the personification of the deviant act (master status). By the same measure, the positive designations, through their acquisition of master status, represent 'the maximum *difference* to the out-groups' (Jokiranta 2005c: 257); this enables boundary affirmation and the successful completion of the labelling process, identifying as deviant all those external to the group and so reaffirming community identity.

Conclusions

We began this investigation with the recognition of 'standard' forms among the sobriquets, those forms found most frequently among the texts themselves and/or cited most commonly in the secondary literature (e.g., דורשי החלקות, מטיף הכזב, מורה הצדק). We also noted the existence of alternative forms (e.g., מורה צדק), often regarded as variants of no real consequence.[1] We hypothesized that, given the traditionally allotted time-span for sectarian composition and evidence for ideological development attested by the texts, the sobriquets may likewise have undergone a developmental process, changing in form and perhaps meaning and/or referent. We further speculated that this process might be evidenced within the scrolls themselves if examined in a manner sensitive to the varied composition dates of the texts and with particular reference to the specific forms taken by the sobriquets where they appear.

Concentrating our investigation on the labels מורה הצדק and מטיף הכזב, and adopting a chronological schema that posited a Formative, Early and Late Sectarian Period, we proceeded to examine the various sobriquet occurrences across the sectarian texts.[2] In addition to fascinating insights regarding the development of terminological and contextual connotations governing both the employment of the designations and the direction taken by the passages in which they are set (see Chapter 5, n. 12), we also noted a more general evolutionary trend towards a definite ('standard') form, with the so-called variants representing earlier stages in this process. The same development, ostensibly from scriptural reference to sectarian terminology, was similarly demonstrated with regard to the sobriquet דורשי החלקות in Chapter 5.

We further augmented our study by utilizing the insights of a sociology of deviance approach, drawing heavily upon 'labelling theory', in order to investigate the compliance of our findings with research carried out in another academic field. The use of this model proved to be fruitful, providing a template for such a move towards definite or appellative labels

---

1 So, e.g., Lim 2002: 75.
2 FSP: (Pre-Yahadic) D-material; ESP: (Yahadic) D-material and H-material; LSP: P-material.

and thus some explanation for the process witnessed within the scrolls. Viewed from a sociological perspective, the Qumran-related sobriquets function as tools for labelling deviance and affirming positive counterparts. As a result, we can propose with some confidence that the move from indefinite designations (e.g., 'a teacher of righteousness') to definite ones ('the Teacher of Righteousness') reflects a process of role engulfment geared towards the personification of the quality and the acquisition of 'master status'.[3]

Our investigation has a number of implications and above all promotes the need for a heightened sensitivity regarding the unique and/or interrelated nature of individual texts and the designations found therein.[4] It can no longer be assumed uncritically that different forms of the sobriquets are merely insignificant variants. Instead our approach has uncovered the intricacies of a developmental process, the broad contours of which find both support and explanation within the sociology of deviance and labelling theory. The acknowledgement of such development entails a recognition that, in the course of this process, these labels may have altered in terms of associated connotations and/or referent. Certainly it is to be conceded that the stereotypical nature of the 'standard' form sobriquets denoting master status (coupled with the inherent depersonalization of the individual labelled) lends itself to reapplication.[5] Furthermore, such reinterpretation of the referent might not be restricted to the texts alone; while the Pesher on Habakkuk may have intended to refer to a specific, individual 'Wicked Priest', the stereotypical (and anonymous) nature of the designation would allow readers to 'identify' later figures within the text.[6] Moreover, the web of scriptural and sectarian material drawn upon, along with the not-always-consistent employment of relevant terminology, allows the reader scope to perceive (to a varying degree from text to text) different sobriquets as either synonymous or distinct. This was demonstrated most clearly with regard to איש הכזב, מטיף הכזב and איש הלצון. Thus, we may speak of an evolution of 'perceived history' within the group, the results of which are displayed most prominently in the later texts (e.g., the pesharim), though

---

3 In this context, we might note by way of interest a potentially similar phenomenon with regard to various of the New Testament titles applied to Jesus. Ferdinand Hahn (1969) argues for a conceptual development of these labels towards definite, more specific forms. As summarized by Geza Vermes, 'the vocative "lord!" paved the way to the absolute designation, "*the* lord", in the same way that the appellation "rabbi!/teacher!" led to the definition of Jesus as "*the* teacher" ' (2001: 86, see further 64–194). Note also Horbury 1998: 140–50. Cf. Chapter 5, n. 63.

4 See Davies 1985: 48.

5 Note e.g., the 'Multiple-Referent Hypotheses' of Chapter 1 (e.g., van der Woude 1982, etc.).

6 So too Bengtsson 2000a: 41–42.

the phenomenon itself would continue with the response of readers to this material. Accordingly, the problems other scholars have noted with a 'naïve historicism' (see Chapter 1) are confirmed in detail here. Serious questions are raised about the reliability of historical/biographical information in the scrolls and hence concerning those approaches to the sobriquets which seek primarily to identify historical referents behind them.

While we have addressed a number of issues with regard to our understanding of the Qumran-related sobriquets, we have nevertheless generated many more questions that must for the moment remain unanswered but which may prove fertile avenues for future investigation or refinement. For example, while labelling theory ostensibly supports the internal coherence of our chronological schema, it would be interesting to consider what effect a different construal of the compositional periods might have upon our reading of the sobriquets. Can an equally convincing case be made for an alternative reconstruction?[7] In addition, can we further refine our own schema? If, for instance, we accept the commonly held view that the 'Teacher Hymns' were indeed composed by the 'teacher' (e.g., Douglas 1999), then we may be able to further divide the ESP on the grounds that the death of this figure appears in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document (accordingly, ESP-1: H-material; ESP-2: Yahadic D-material).[8] Thus, the accusations of lying (e.g., אנשי הלצון) and scoffing (איש הלצון, מטיף כזב, איש הכזב) in the Yahadic redaction of the Damascus Document may be dependent upon the less specific references to liars and scoffers in the H-material.[9]

Furthermore, consideration should be given as to where in our chronological schema we might place other texts such as 4Q174, 4Q175 or 4Q253a and, more generally, M- and S-material.[10] The 'anomalous' designations we have encountered, such as משיח הצדק (4Q252 5.3) and מורה הצדקה (1QpHab 2.2), also need to be convincingly synthesized

---

7   In this context, note again Eyal Regev's recent proposal that the Damascus Document might post-date the 'Yahad', belonging to a later group (2003; 2007a: esp. 163–96; see Chapter 1, n. 93 of our present study; cf. Kapfer 2007). If our arguments for sobriquet development, increased definition and acquired 'master status' hold water, adoption of Regev's proposal might entail regarding the P-material, for instance, as similarly the product of a post-Yahadic group.

8   See e.g., Stegemann 1998 (107, 116–18) and Steudel 2000 (338–39). Note our discussion of this position in Chapter 1.

9   See Chapter 3, n. 150.

10   4Q253a (4QCommentary on Malachi) frg. 1, 1.5 for instance, as observed in Chapter 1 (n. 59), preserves הצדק […]. George Brooke suggests this may either be restored [מורה] הצדק, as found in the pesharim, or [משיח] הצדק as found in 4Q252 5.3, one of the 'Commentaries on Genesis' with which this text was previously associated (Brooke 1995: 237–38; cf. 1996: 213–15; 2002). Our positioning of 4Q253a in either the ESP or LSP may consequently inform our reconstruction of this phrase (or vice-versa?).

within our developmental model; while explanations have been offered, no entirely satisfactory solution to their presence has yet been found. Indeed, a thorough investigation of *all* the sobriquets in the scrolls along the lines proposed here is desirable (including perhaps the use of such designations as מבקר and משכיל).[11] In particular, further examination is required of the label דורש התורה and its relationship with מורה הצדק.[12]

We have thus, in this present study, really only scratched the surface, but nevertheless have hopefully paved the way for future critical examinations of the Qumran-related sobriquets. We have demonstrated the *development* of these labels and have proposed a potentially fruitful model for understanding both this specific process and the function played by the designations within the sectarian literature and worldview of the community. That there is a clear development of usage indicates that these texts, and in particular the sobriquets themselves, cannot be read indiscriminately or uncritically as a homogeneous collection, even if deemed to be the product of a single group, but must be considered individually and in a manner sensitive to the shifting perspectives within the Qumran-related community.

---

11   Cf. Hempel 2006; Kosmala 1978c; Metso 2006b; Schiffman 1994: 113–26; 2003: 422–23.

12   Our examination of labelling theory and the acquisition of master status would appear to support our chronological schema and developmental model. Therefore, for the present, the occurrence of איש דורש בתורה in 1QS 6.6 (and the future orientation of דורש התורה in 4Q174 frg. 1, 1.11-12) can be attributed only to the apparent plural nature of the designation (see our discussion in Chapter 5).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abegg, M.G., Jr.
    1995   'The Messiah at Qumran: Are We Still Seeing Double?',
           DSD 2: 125–44.
    1997   'Who Ascended to Heaven? 4Q491, 4Q427, and the Teacher
           of Righteousness', in C.A. Evans and P.W. Flint (eds),
           Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls (Grand
           Rapids: Eerdmans): 61–73.
    1998   'The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls', in Flint and
           VanderKam (eds) 1998: 325–58.
    2002   'Concordance of Proper Names in the Non-Biblical Texts
           from Qumran', in Tov (ed.) 2002: 229–84.
Abegg, M.G., Jr., J.E. Bowley and E.M. Cook
    2003   *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance, Volume One: The Non-*
           Biblical Texts from Qumran, Parts 1–2 (Leiden: Brill).
Allegro, J.M.
    1956a   'Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature', *JBL*
           75: 174–87.
    1956b   'Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect', *JBL* 75:
           89–95.
    1968   *Qumran Cave 4, I (4Q158–4Q186)* (DJDJ 5; Oxford:
           Clarendon Press).
    1981   *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Myth* (London:
           Abacus).
Allegro, J.M. with N. Gordon
    2004a   '4Q171 (4QpPs^{a})', in Parry and Tov (eds) 2004a: 96–105.
    2004b   '4Q172 (4QpUnid)', in Parry and Tov (eds) 2004a: 140–43.
    2004c   '4Q173 (4QpPs^{b})', in Parry and Tov (eds) 2004a: 104–105.
Allegro, J.M. with M.O. Wise, M.G. Abegg Jr., E.M. Cook and N.
   Gordon
    2004a   '4Q163 (4Qpap pIsa^{c} [pesher Isaiah (1)])', in Parry and Tov
           (eds) 2004a: 30–47.
    2004b   '4Q165 (4QpIsa^{e} [pesher Isaiah (1)])', in Parry and Tov (eds)
           2004a: 46–49.
    2004c   '4Q177 (4QCatena A)', in Parry and Tov (eds) 2004a: 8–17.

2004d   '4Q169 (4QpNah)', in Parry and Tov (eds) 2004a: 72–79.
Amit, Y.
    1990   'Hidden Polemic in the Conquest of Dan: Judges XVII–
             XVIII', *VT* 40: 4–20.
Anderson, J.S.
    2005a   'From ''Communities of Texts'' to Religious Communities:
             Problems and Pitfalls', in Boccaccini (ed.) 2005: 351–55.
    2005b   'Denouncement Speech in Jubilees and Other Enochic
             Literature', in Boccaccini (ed.) 2005: 132–36.
Applebaum, S.
    1989   *Judaea in Hellenistic and Roman Times: Historical and
             Archaeological Essays* (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
Atkinson, K.
    2007   'Representations of History in 4Q331 (4QpapHistorical
             Text C), 4Q332 (4QHistorical Text D), 4Q333
             (4QHistorical Text E), and 4Q468e (4QHistorical Text F):
             An Annalistic Calendar Documenting Portentous Events?',
             DSD 14: 125–51.
Atwill, J. and S. Braunheim with R. Eisenman
    2004   'Redating the Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls',
             DSD 11: 143–57.
Avigad, N.
    1958   'The Palaeography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related
             Documents', in C. Rabin and Y. Yadin (eds), *Scripta
             Hierosolymitana: Publications of the Hebrew University,
             Jerusalem; Volume IV, Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*
             (Jerusalem: Magnes Press): 56–87.
Barclay, J.M.G.
    1995   'Deviance and Apostasy: Some Applications of Deviance
             Theory to First-Century Judaism and Christianity', in Esler
             (ed.) 1995: 114–27.
Bartholomew, C., C.S. Evans, M. Healy and M. Rae (eds)
    2003   *'Behind' the Text: History and Biblical Interpretation* (SHS 4;
             Carlisle: Paternoster Press).
Barton, J.
    1986   *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel
             after the Exile* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd).
    1996   *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study*
             (London: Darton, Longman and Todd).
Barton, J. and J. Muddiman (eds)
    2001   *The Oxford Bible Commentary* (Oxford: Oxford University
             Press).

Baumgarten, A.I.
    2000   'The Perception of the Past in the Damascus Document', in Baumgarten, Chazon and Pinnick (eds) 2000: 1–15.
    2004   'Who Cares and Why Does it Matter? Qumran and the Essenes, Once Again!', *DSD* 11: 174–90.
    2005   *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).
Baumgarten, J.M.
    1979   'The Heavenly Tribunal and the Personification of Ṣedeq in Jewish Apocalyptic', in *ANRW*, II 19.1: 219–39.
    1996   *Qumran Cave 4, XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)* (DJD 18; Oxford: Clarendon Press).
    1999   'Yom Kippur in the Qumran Scrolls and Second Temple Sources', *DSD* 6: 184–91.
    2000   'Damascus Document', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000a: 166–70.
    2004   'Damascus Document (D)' [4Q266–73; 4Q269 with H. Stegemann], in Parry and Tov (eds) 2004b: 79–175.
Baumgarten, J.M., E.G. Chazon and A. Pinnick (eds)
    2000   *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* (Leiden: Brill).
Baumgarten, J.M. and D.R. Schwartz
    1995   'Damascus Document (CD)', in Charlesworth (ed.) 1995: 4–57.
Beall, T.S.
    1988   *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Becker, H.S.
    1973   *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance* (New York: The Free Press).
    1974   'Labelling Theory Reconsidered', in Rock and McIntosh (eds) 1974: 41–66.
Bengtsson, H.
    2000a   *What's in a Name? A Study of Sobriquets in the Pesharim* (Uppsala: Uppsala University).
    2000b   'Three Sobriquets, Their Meaning and Function: The Wicked Priest, Synagogue of Satan, and the Woman Jezebel', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Hebrew Bible and Qumran* (Richland Hills: BIBAL Press): 241–73.
Berlinerblau, J.
    1996   *The Vow and the 'Popular Religious Groups' of Ancient*

Israel: A Philological and Sociological Inquiry (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Bernstein, M.J.
1994a   '4Q252: From Re-Written Bible to Biblical Commentary', *JJS* 45: 1–27.
1994b   '4Q252: Method and Context, Genre and Sources: A Response to George J. Brooke', *JQR* 85: 61–79.
2000a   'Interpretation of Scripture', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000a: 376–83.
2000b   'Pesher Habakkuk', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000b: 647–50.

Berrin, S.L.
2000a   'Lemma/Pesher Correspondence in Pesher Nahum', in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam (eds) 2000: 341–50.
2000b   'Pesharim', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000b: 644–47.
2004a   'The Use of Secondary Biblical Sources in Pesher Nahum', *DSD* 11: 1–11.
2004b   *The Pesher Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169* (Leiden: Brill).
2005   'Qumran Pesharim', in Henze (ed.) 2005: 110–33.

Birnbaum, S.A.
1951   'How Old are the Cave Manuscripts? A Palaeographical Discussion', *VT* 1: 91–109.

Blasi, A.J.
1997   'Sociology of Early Christianity – By Way of Introduction', *SocRel* 58: 299–303.

Blenkinsopp, J.
1981   'Interpretation and the Tendency to Sectarianism: An Aspect of Second Temple History', in E.P. Sanders with A.I. Baumgarten and A. Mendelson (eds), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, vol. 2: *Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period* (London: SCM Press): 1–26.
2005   'The Qumran Sect in the Context of Second Temple Sectarianism', in Campbell, Lyons and Pietersen (eds) 2005: 10–25.
2006a   *Opening the Sealed Book: Interpretations of the Book of Isaiah in Late Antiquity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
2006b   'Who is the Ṣaddiq of Isaiah 57.1-2?', in Flint, Tov and VanderKam (eds) 2006: 109–20.

Boardman, J., J. Griffin and O. Murray (eds)
1991   *The Oxford History of the Roman World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Boccaccini, G.
    1998   *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways
                between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids:
                Eerdmans).
Boccaccini, G. (ed.)
    2005   *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten
                Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
Bowley, J.E.
    1999   'Prophets and Prophecy at Qumran', in Flint and
                VanderKam (eds) 1999: 354–78.
Box, S.
    1971   *Deviance, Reality and Society* (London: Holt, Rinehart and
                Winston).
Boyce, M.
    1990   'The Poetry of the Damascus Document and its Bearing on
                the Origin of the Qumran Sect', *RevQ* 14: 615–28.
Brin, G.
    1995   'The Laws of the Prophets in the Sect of the Judaean Desert:
                Studies in 4Q375', in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *Qumran
                Questions* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press): 28–60.
Brooke, G.J.
    1980   'The Amos-Numbers Midrash (CD 7.13b–8.1a) and
                Messianic Expectation', *ZAW* 92: 397–404.
    1981   'Qumran Pesher: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre',
                RevQ 10: 483–503.
    1985   *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context*
                (Sheffield: JSOT Press).
    1991a   'The Messiah of Aaron in the Damascus Document', *RevQ*
                15: 215–30.
    1991b   'The Kittim in the Qumran Pesharim', in L. Alexander (ed.),
                Images of Empire (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press): 135–
                59.
    1994a   'The Pesharim and the Origins of the Dead Sea Scrolls', in
                Wise *et al.* (eds) 1994: 339–52.
    1994b   'The Genre of 4Q252: From Poetry to Pesher', *DSD* 1: 160–
                79.
    1994c   'The Thematic Content of 4Q252', *JQR* 85: 33–59.
    1995   '4Q253: A Preliminary Edition', *JSS* 40: 227–39.
    1996   'Commentaries on Genesis and Malachi', in G.J. Brooke *et
                al.*, *Qumran Cave 4, XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD
                22; Oxford: Clarendon Press): 185–236.
    1998   'Parabiblical Prophetic Narratives', in Flint and
                VanderKam (eds) 1998: 271–301.

1999	'4Q252 and the 153 Fish of John 21.11', in Kollmann, Reinbold and Steudel (eds) 1999: 253–65.
2000a	'Catena', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000a: 121–22.
2000b	'Genesis, Commentary on', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000a: 300–302.
2000c	'*E Pluribus Unum*: Textual Variety and Definitive Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls', in Lim (ed.) 2000: 107–19.
2000d	'Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament', in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam (eds) 2000: 60–73.
2002	'Commentary on Malachi B (4Q253a)', in Charlesworth (ed.) 2002: 244–47.
2004	'4Q252 (4QCommGen A)', in Parry and Tov (eds) 2004a: 106–11.
2005a	'Thematic Commentaries on Prophetic Scriptures', in Henze (ed.) 2005: 134–57.
2005b	'Justifying Deviance: The Place of Scripture in Converting to a Qumran Self-Understanding', in De Troyer and Lange (eds) 2005: 73–87.
2005c	'The Qumran Scrolls and the Demise of the Distinction Between Higher and Lower Criticism', in Campbell, Lyons and Pietersen (eds) 2005: 26–42.

Broshi, M.
1992	'Anti-Qumranic Polemics in the Talmud', in Trebolle Barrera and Vegas Montaner (eds) 1992b: 589–600.
2004	'The Dead Sea Scrolls, the Sciences and New Technologies', *DSD* 11: 133–42.
2007	'Essenes at Qumran? A Rejoinder to Albert Baumgarten', *DSD* 14: 25–33.

Broshi, M. (ed.)
1992	*The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society).

Brown, R.E.
1969	'The Teacher of Righteousness and the Messiah(s)', in M. Black (ed.), *The Scrolls and Christianity: Historical and Theological Significance* (London: SPCK): 37–44.

Brownlee, W.H.
1948	'The Jerusalem Habakkuk Scroll', *BASOR* 112: 8–18.
1949a	'Further Light on Habakkuk', *BASOR* 114: 9–10.
1949b	'Further Corrections of the Translation of the Habakkuk Scroll', *BASOR* 116: 14–16.
1951	'Biblical Interpretation among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls', *BA* 14: 54–76.

1952   'The Historical Allusions of the Dead Sea Habakkuk
        Midrash', *BASOR* 126: 10–20.
1959   *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from
        Qumrân* (Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature).
1964   *The Meaning of the Qumrân Scrolls for the Bible: With
        Special Attention to the Book of Isaiah* (New York: Oxford
        University Press).
1979   *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk* (Missoula: Scholars
        Press).
1982   'The Wicked Priest, the Man of Lies, and the Righteous
        Teacher – The Problem of Identity', *JQR* 73: 1–37.

Bruce, F.F.
1956   *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London:
        Paternoster Press).

Burrows, M.
1956   *Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Secker & Warburg).
1958   *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls: New Scrolls and New
        Interpretations* (London: Secker & Warburg).

Burrows, M. (ed.)
1950   *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, Vol. 1: The
        Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary* (New
        Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research).
1951   *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery, Vol. 2, Fasc.
        2: Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline* (New
        Haven: The American Schools of Oriental Research).

Callaway, P.R.
1988   *The History of the Qumran Community: An Investigation*
        (Sheffield: JSOT Press).
1990   'Qumran Origins: From the *Doresh* to the *Moreh*', *RevQ* 14:
        637–50.
1994   'Methodology, the Scrolls, and Origins', in Wise *et al.* (eds)
        1994: 409–27.

Campbell, J.G.
1995a   *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1–8, 19–20*
        (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter).
1995b   'Essene-Qumran Origins in the Exile: A Scriptural Basis?',
        JJS 46: 143–56.
1999   'The Historical-Critical Method and Late Second Temple
        Judaic Writings', in J. Neusner and A.J. Avery-Peck (eds),
        Judaism in Late Antiquity, part 3, vol. 2: *Where We Stand:
        Issues and Debates in Ancient Judaism* (Leiden: Brill): 1–22.
2002   *Deciphering the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2nd
        edn).
2004   *The Exegetical Texts* (London: T&T Clark International).

2005   ' "Rewritten Bible" and "Parabiblical Texts": A Terminological and Ideological Critique', in Campbell, Lyons and Pietersen (eds) 2005: 43–68.

Campbell, J.G., W.J. Lyons and L.K. Pietersen (eds)
2005   *New Directions in Qumran Studies: Proceedings of the Bristol Colloquium on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8–10 September 2003* (London: T&T Clark International).

Carmi, I.
2000   'Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls', in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam (eds) 2000: 881–88.

Carmignac, J.
1962a   'Notes sur les Peshârîm', *RevQ* 3: 505–38.
1962b   *Christ and the Teacher of Righteousness: The Evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (trans. K.G. Pedley; Baltimore: Helicon Press).

Chalcraft, D.J.
2007   'Towards a Weberian Sociology of the Qumran Sects', in Chalcraft (ed.) 2007: 74–105.

Chalcraft, D.J. (ed.)
2007   *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (London: Equinox).

Charlesworth, J.H.
1980   'The Origin and Subsequent History of the Authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Four Transitional Phases Among the Qumran Essenes', *RevQ* 10: 213–33.
1991   'An Allegorical and Autobiographical Poem by the Moreh Haṣ-Ṣedeq (1QH 8.4-11)', in M. Fishbane and E. Tov (eds), *'Sha'arei Talmon': Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns): 295–307.
2002   *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Charlesworth, J.H. (ed.)
1983   *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1: *Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd).
1995   *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, vol. 2: *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (PTSDSSP; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press).
2002   *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*, vol. 6B: *Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents* (PTSDSSP; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press).

2006   *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 2: *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community* (Waco: Baylor University Press).

Charlesworth, J.H. and C.D. Elledge
2002   'Unidentified Pesharim Fragments (4Q172 = 4QpUnid)', in Charlesworth (ed.) 2002: 195–201.

Charlesworth, J.H. and M.A. Knibb
2000   'Community Organization', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000b: 133–40.

Charlesworth, J.H. and J.D. McSpadden
2006   'The Sociological and Liturgical Dimensions of Psalm Pesher 1 (4QpPs[a]): Some Prolegomenous Reflections', in Charlesworth (ed.) 2006: 317–49.

Chazon, E.G.
1998   'Hymns and Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in Flint and VanderKam (eds) 1998: 244–70.
1999   'A Case of Mistaken Identity: Testament of Naphtali (4Q215) and Time of Righteousness (4Q215[a])', in Parry and Ulrich (eds) 1999: 110–23.

Chazon, E.G. and M.E. Stone
1999   '4QTime of Righteousness (4Q215[a], olim 4QTNaphtali): A Preliminary Publication of Fragment 1 II', in Parry and Ulrich (eds) 1999: 124–25.
2000   '215a. 4QTime of Righteousness', in S.J. Pfann *et al.*, *Qumran Cave 4, XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD 36; Oxford: Clarendon Press): 172–84.

Claussen, C. and M.T. Davis
2007   'The Concept of Unity at Qumran', in Davis and Strawn (eds) 2007: 232–53.

Clines, D.J.A. (ed.)
1993   *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, vol. 1: א (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
1995   *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, vol. 2: ב – ו (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
1996   *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, vol. 3: ז – ט (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
1998   *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, vol. 4: י – ל (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
2001   *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, vol. 5: מ – נ (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Cohen, S.J.D.
1989   'Roman Domination: The Jewish Revolt and the Destruction of the Second Temple', in H. Shanks (ed.),

Ancient Israel: A Short History from Abraham to the Roman Destruction of the Temple (London: SPCK): 205–35.

Collins, J.J.

1979 'Dualism and Eschatology in 1QM: A Reply to P.R. Davies', *VT* 29: 212–16.

1985 Review of Davies 1983, *JBL* 104: 530–33.

1992 'In the Likeness of the Holy Ones: The Creation of Humankind in a Wisdom Text from Qumran', in Trebolle Barrera and Vegas Montaner (eds) 1992a: 609–18.

1994a 'Teacher and Messiah? The One Who Will Teach Righteousness at the End of Days', in Ulrich and VanderKam (eds) 1994: 193–210.

1994b 'Messiahs in Context: Method in the Study of Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in Wise *et al.* (eds) 1994: 213–29.

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

1995b 'The Origin of Evil in Apocalyptic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Paris 1992* (VTSup 61; Leiden: E.J. Brill): 25–38.

1997 'The Expectation of the End in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in C. A. Evans and P.W. Flint (eds), *Eschatology, Messianism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans): 74–90.

1999 'Apocalypticism and Literary Genre in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in Flint and VanderKam (eds) 1999: 403–30.

2000a 'Eschatology', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000a: 256–61.

2000b 'The Nature of Messianism in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls', in Lim (ed.) 2000: 199–217.

2003 'Forms of Community in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in Paul *et al.* (eds) 2003: 97–111.

2006a 'The Yaḥad and "The Qumran Community"', in Hempel and Lieu (eds) 2006: 81–96.

2006b 'The Time of the Teacher: An Old Debate Renewed', in Flint, Tov and VanderKam (eds) 2006: 212–29.

2007 'Sectarian Consciousness in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in LiDonnici and Lieber (eds) 2007: 177–92.

Collins, J.J. and D. Dimant

1994 'A Thrice-Told Hymn: A Response to Eileen Schuller', *JQR* 85: 151–55.

Cook, E.M.

1998 'The Aramaic of the Dead Sea Scrolls', in Flint and VanderKam (eds) 1998: 359–78.

Cross, F.M.
    1976   'The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran', in F.M. Cross and
              S. Talmon (eds), *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*
              (Cambridge: Harvard University Press): 147–76.
    1993   'The Historical Context of the Scrolls', in Shanks (ed.) 1993:
              20–32.
    1995   *The Ancient Library of Qumran* (Sheffield: Sheffield
              Academic Press).
    1998   'Palaeography and the Dead Sea Scrolls', in Flint and
              VanderKam (eds) 1998: 379–402.
    2000   'Paleography', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000b:
              629–34.
Daise, M.A.
    2000   'Biblical Creation Motifs in the Qumran Hodayot', in
              Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam (eds) 2000: 293–305.
Davidson, B.
    2002   *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon* (Peabody:
              Hendrickson).
Davies, P.R.
    1977   'Hasidim in the Maccabean Period', *JJS* 28: 127–40.
    1978   'Dualism and Eschatology in the Qumran War Scroll', *VT*
              28: 28–36.
    1982   *Qumran* (Guildford: Lutterworth Press).
    1983   *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the 'Damascus
              Document'* (Sheffield: JSOT Press).
    1985   'Eschatology at Qumran', *JBL* 104: 39–55.
    1987   *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea
              Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars Press).
    1988   'The Teacher of Righteousness and the "End of Days"',
              RevQ 13: 313–17.
    1989   'The Temple Scroll and the Damascus Document', in G.J.
              Brooke (ed.), *Temple Scroll Studies: Papers Presented at the
              International Symposium on the Temple Scroll; Manchester,
              December 1987* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press): 201–
              10.
    1990a   'The Birthplace of the Essenes: Where is "Damascus"?',
              RevQ 14: 503–19.
    1990b   'Halakhah at Qumran', in Davies and White (eds) 1990: 37–
              50.
    1992   'Redaction and Sectarianism in the Qumran Scrolls', in F.
              García Martínez, A. Hilhorst and C.J. Labuschagne (eds),
              *The Scriptures and the Scrolls: Studies in Honour of A.S. van
              der Woude on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (Leiden: E.J.
              Brill): 152–63.

1994 'Communities in the Qumran Scrolls', in PIBA 17: 55–68.

1996 *Sects and Scrolls: Essays on Qumran and Related Topics* (Atlanta: Scholars Press).

2000a 'Who Hid the Scrolls, and When? Reflections on Some Recent Proposals', *QC* 9: 105–22.

2000b 'The Judaism(s) of the Damascus Document', in Baumgarten, Chazon and Pinnick (eds) 2000: 27–43.

2000c 'Judaisms in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Case of the Messiah', in Lim (ed.) 2000: 219–32.

2002 'Space and Sects in the Qumran Scrolls', in Gunn and McNutt (eds) 2002: 81–98.

2005 'Sects from Texts: On the Problems of Doing a Sociology of the Qumran Literature', in Campbell, Lyons and Pietersen (eds) 2005: 69–82.

2007 'Sect Formation in Early Judaism', in Chalcraft (ed.) 2007: 133–55.

Davies, P.R., G.J. Brooke and P.R. Callaway

2002 *The Complete World of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Thames & Hudson).

Davies, P.R. and R.T. White (eds)

1990 *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (Sheffield: JSOT Press).

Davila, J.R.

2000 *Liturgical Works* (ECDSS 6; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Davis, M.T. and B.A. Strawn (eds)

2007 *Qumran Studies: New Approaches, New Questions* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

De Moor, J.C.

1957 'Lexical Remarks Concerning Yaḥad and Yaḥdaw', *VT* 7: 350–55.

De Troyer, K. and A. Lange (eds)

2005 *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).

De Vaux, R.

1973 *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Oxford University Press).

Dimant, D.

1984 'Qumran Sectarian Literature', in Stone (ed.) 1984: 483–550.

1991 'Literary Typologies and Biblical Interpretation in the Hellenistic-Roman Period', in Talmon (ed.) 1991: 73–80.

1995 'The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance', in D. Dimant and L.H. Schiffman (eds), *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by*

Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989–1990 (Leiden: E.J. Brill): 23–58.

2000   'The Library of Qumran: Its Content and Character', in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam (eds) 2000: 170–76.

Donceel, R. and P. Donceel-Voûte

1994   'The Archaeology of Khirbet Qumran', in Wise *et al.* (eds) 1994: 1–38.

Donceel-Voûte, P.

1993   ' "Coenaculum" – La salle à l'étage du *locus* 30 à Khirbet Qumrân sur la mer morte', *Res Orientales* 4: 61–84.

Doudna, G.L.

1998   'Dating the Scrolls on the Basis of Radiocarbon Analysis', in Flint and VanderKam (eds) 1998: 430–71.

2001   *4Q Pesher Nahum: A Critical Edition* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

2003   '4Q Pesher Hosea[b]: Reconstruction of Fragments 4, 5, 18, and 24', *DSD* 10: 338–58.

2006   'The Legacy of an Error in Archaeological Interpretation: The Dating of the Qumran Cave Scroll Deposits', in Galor, Humbert and Zangenberg (eds) 2006: 147–57.

Douglas, M.C.

1999   'The Teacher Hymn Hypothesis Revisited: New Data for an Old Crux', *DSD* 6: 239–66.

Driver, G.R.

1965   *The Judaean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).

Dubnov, S.

1967   *History of the Jews*, vol. 1: *From the Beginning to Early Christianity* (South Brunswick: Thomas Yoseloff).

Duhaime, J.

1993   'Relative Deprivation in New Religious Movements and the Qumran Community', *RevQ* 16: 265–76.

2000a   'Recent Studies on Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam (eds) 2000: 789–99.

2000b   'Dualism', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000a: 215–20.

Dupont-Sommer, A.

1954   *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes: New Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (trans. R.D. Barnett; London: Vallentine, Mitchell & Co.).

1961   *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (trans. G. Vermes; Oxford: Blackwell).

Eisenman, R.
　　1996　　*The Dead Sea Scrolls and the First Christians: Essays and Translations* (Shaftesbury: Element).
Eisenman, R. and M. Wise
　　1992　　*The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered: The First Complete Translation and Interpretation of 50 Key Documents Withheld for Over 35 Years* (Shaftesbury: Element).
Eissfeldt, O.
　　1968　　'Renaming in the Old Testament', in P.R. Ackroyd and B. Lindars (eds), *Words and Meanings: Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 69–79.
Elledge, C.D.
　　2005　　*The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).
　　2007　　'The Prince of the Congregation: Qumran "Messianism" in the Context of Milḥāmâ', in Davis and Strawn (eds) 2007: 178–207.
Elliott, J.H.
　　1986　　'Social-Scientific Criticism of the New Testament: More on Methods and Models', in Elliott (ed.) 1986: 1–33.
　　1995　　'The Jewish Messianic Movement: From Faction to Sect', in Esler (ed.) 1995: 75–95.
Elliott, J.H. (ed.)
　　1986　　*Social-Scientific Criticism of the New Testament and its Social World* (Semeia 35; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).
Elwolde, J.
　　2000　　'Distinguishing the Linguistic and the Exegetical: The Biblical Book of Numbers in the Damascus Document', *DSD* 7: 1–25.
Erikson, K.T.
　　1989　　'On the Sociology of Deviance', in Kelly (ed.) 1989: 63–70.
Eshel, H.
　　1999a　　'The Meaning and Significance of CD 20.13-15', in Parry and Ulrich (eds) 1999: 330–36.
　　1999b　　'The Identification of the "Speaker" of the Self-Glorification Hymn', in Parry and Ulrich (eds) 1999: 619–35.
　　2002　　'Qumran Studies in Light of Archeological Excavations Between 1967 and 1997', *JRH* 26: 179–88.
　　2007　　'The Damascus Document's "Three Nets of Belial": A Reference to the Aramaic Levi Document?', in LiDonnici and Lieber (eds) 2007: 243–55.

Eshel, H. and H.M. Cotton
    2000a   'Ḥever, Naḥal', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000a: 357–61.
    2000b   'Ṣe'elim, Naḥal', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000b: 859–61.

Esler, P.F.
    1995   'Introduction: Models, Context and Kerygma in New Testament Interpretation', in Esler (ed.) 1995: 1–20.
    2005   'Social-Scientific Models in Biblical Interpretation', in Esler (ed.) 2005: 3–14.

Esler, P.F. (ed.)
    1995   *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context* (London: Routledge).
    2005   *Ancient Israel: The Old Testament in its Social Context* (London: SCM Press).

Esler, P.F. and A.C. Hagedorn
    2005   'Social-Scientific Analysis of the Old Testament: A Brief History and Overview', in Esler (ed.) 2005: 15–32.

Evans, C.A.
    1999   '"The Two Sons of Oil": Early Evidence of Messianic Interpretation of Zechariah 4.14 in 4Q254 4 2', in Parry and Ulrich (eds) 1999: 566–75.
    2000a   'Diarchic Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Messianism of Jesus of Nazareth', in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam (eds) 2000: 558–67.
    2000b   'Messiahs', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000a: 537–42.

Fabry, H.-J.
    2003   'The Reception of Nahum and Habakkuk in the Septuagint and Qumran', in Paul *et al.* (eds) 2003: 241–56.

Falk, D.K.
    2007   *The Parabiblical Texts: Strategies for Extending the Scriptures among the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: T&T Clark).

Fassberg, S.E.
    2000   'The Linguistic Study of the Damascus Document: A Historical Perspective', in Baumgarten, Chazon and Pinnick (eds) 2000: 53–67.

Fields, W.W.
    2000   'Discovery and Purchase', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000a: 208–12.

Fitzmyer, J.A.
    1975   *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study* (Missoula: Scholars Press).

2000   *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Flint, P.W.
1999   ' "Apocrypha,'' Other Previously-Known Writings, and "Pseudepigrapha'' in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in Flint and VanderKam (eds) 1999: 24–66.
2005   'The Prophet David at Qumran', in Henze (ed.) 2005: 158–67.

Flint, P.W., E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds)
2006   *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint: Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (Leiden: Brill).

Flint, P.W. and J.C. VanderKam (eds)
1998   *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill).
1999   *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, vol. 2 (Leiden: Brill).

Flusser, D.
1984   'Psalms, Hymns and Prayers', in Stone (ed.) 1984: 551–77.

Freedman, D.N.
1949   'The "House of Absalom'' in the Habakkuk Scroll', *BASOR* 114: 11–12.

Freedman, D.N. and J.C. Geoghegan
2006   'Another Stab at the Wicked Priest', in Charlesworth (ed.) 2006: 17–24.

Fröhlich, I.
1992   'Pesher, Apocalyptical Literature and Qumran', in Trebolle Barrera and Vegas Montaner (eds) 1992a: 295–305.
1994   'Themes, Structure and Genre of Pesher Genesis: A Response to George J. Brooke', *JQR* 85: 81–90.
1996   *'Time and Times and Half a Time': Historical Consciousness in the Jewish Literature of the Persian and Hellenistic Eras* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
1999   'Qumran Names', in Parry and Ulrich (eds) 1999: 294–305.
2004   'Defining by Nicknames in Qumran Literature' (Paper given at Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS; Groningen, 27–28 July 2004): 1–9.

Fujita, S.
1976   'The Metaphor of Plant in Jewish Literature of the Intertestamental Period', *JSJ* 7: 30–45.

Fuller, R.E.
1992   'Textual Traditions in the Book of Hosea and the Minor Prophets', in Trebolle Barrera and Vegas Montaner (eds) 1992a: 247–56.

1997 'The Twelve', in E. Ulrich *et al.*, *Qumran Cave 4, X: The Prophets* (DJD 15; Oxford: Clarendon Press): 221–318.

Galor, K., J.-B. Humbert and J. Zangenberg (eds)

2006 *The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates; Proceedings of a Conference held at Brown University, November 17–19, 2002* (Leiden: Brill).

García Martínez, F.

1995a 'The Origins of the Essene Movement and of the Qumran Sect', in F. García Martínez and J. Trebolle Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices* (trans. W.G.E. Watson; Leiden: E.J. Brill): 77–96.

1995b 'Messianic Hopes in the Qumran Writings', in F. García Martínez and J. Trebolle Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Writings, Beliefs and Practices* (trans. W. G.E. Watson; Leiden: E.J. Brill): 159–89.

1996 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* (trans. W.G.E. Watson; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 2nd edn).

1998a 'The History of the Qumran Community in the Light of Recently Available Texts', in F.H. Cryer and T.L Thompson (eds), *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press): 194–216.

1998b 'New Perspectives on the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls', in F. García Martínez and E. Noort (eds), *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism: A Symposium in Honour of Adam S. van der Woude on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday* (Leiden: Brill): 230–48.

2002 'Old Texts and Modern Mirages: The "I" of Two Qumran Hymns', *ETL* 78: 321–39.

García Martínez, F. and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds)

1997 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill).

1998 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, vol. 2 (Leiden: Brill).

García Martínez, F. and A.S. van der Woude

1990 'A "Groningen" Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History', *RevQ* 14: 521–41.

Garfinkel, H.

1956 'Conditions of Successful Degradation Ceremonies', *AJS* 61: 420–24.

Gaster, T.H.

1957 *The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect* (London: Secker & Warburg).

Gibbs, J.P.
    1972   'Issues in Defining Deviant Behavior', in Scott and Douglas (eds) 1972: 39–68.

Glessmer, U.
    1999   'Calendars in the Qumran Scrolls', in Flint and VanderKam (eds) 1999: 213–78.

Gmirkin, R.
    1998   'Historical Allusions in the War Scroll', *DSD* 5: 172–214.
    2000   'The War Scroll, the Hasidim, and the Maccabean Conflict', in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam (eds) 2000: 486–96.

Golb, N.
    1994   'Khirbet Qumran and the Manuscript Finds of the Judaean Wilderness', in Wise *et al.* (eds) 1994: 51–72.
    1995   *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York: Scribner).

Goldthorpe, J.E.
    1974   *An Introduction to Sociology* (London: Cambridge University Press).

Goranson, S.
    1999   'Others and Intra-Jewish Polemic as Reflected in Qumran Texts', in Flint and VanderKam (eds) 1999: 534–51.

Gottstein, M.H.
    1954   'Anti-Essene Traits in the Dead Sea Scrolls', *VT* 4: 141–47.

Gottwald, N.K.
    1979   *The Tribes of Yahweh: A Sociology of the Religion of Liberated Israel, 1250–1050 BCE* (London: SCM Press).

Grabbe, L.L.
    1994   *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian* (London: SCM Press).
    1996   *An Introduction to First Century Judaism: Jewish Religion and History in the Second Temple Period* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark).
    2007   'When is a Sect a Sect – or Not? Groups and Movements in the Second Temple Period', in Chalcraft (ed.) 2007: 114–32.

Grossman, M.L.
    2002   *Reading for History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Method* (Leiden: Brill).

Gunn, D.M. and P.M. McNutt (eds)
    2002   *'Imagining' Biblical Worlds: Studies in Spatial, Social and Historical Constructs in Honor of James W. Flanagan* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Hagedorn, A.C.
    2005   'Nahum – Ethnicity and Stereotypes: Anthropological Insights into Nahum's Literary History', in Esler (ed.) 2005: 223–39.

Hahn, F.
1969   *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity* (London: Lutterworth Press).
Harding, M.
2002   'Introduction II: Recent History of Dead Sea Scrolls Scholarship', *JRH* 26: 145–56.
Harkins, A.K.
2005   'Observations on the Editorial Shaping of the So-Called Community Hymns from 1QH^a and 4QH^a (4Q427)', *DSD* 12: 233–56.
2008   'The Community Hymns Classification: A Proposal for Further Differentiation', *DSD* 15: 121–54.
Harris, J.G.
1966   *The Qumran Commentary on Habakkuk* (London: A.R. Mowbray & Co.).
Hempel, C.
1999a   'Community Origins in the *Damascus Document* in the Light of Recent Scholarship', in Parry and Ulrich (eds) 1999: 316–29.
1999b   'Community Structures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Admission, Organization, Disciplinary Procedures', in Flint and VanderKam (eds) 1999: 67–92.
2000   *The Damascus Texts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
2005   'The Groningen Hypothesis: Strengths and Weaknesses', in Boccaccini (ed.) 2005: 249–55.
2006   'Maskil(im) and Rabbim: From Daniel to Qumran', in Hempel and Lieu (eds) 2006: 133–56.
Hempel, C. and J.M. Lieu (eds)
2006   *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb* (Leiden: Brill).
Hengel, M.
1974   *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (2 vols; London: SCM Press).
Henze, M. (ed.)
2005   *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
Hill, M.
1973   *A Sociology of Religion* (London: Heinemann Educational Books).
Hirschfeld, Y.
2000   'The Architectural Context of Qumran', in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam (eds) 2000: 673–83.

2004   *Qumran in Context: Reassessing the Archaeological Evidence* (Peabody: Hendrickson).

2006   'Qumran in the Second Temple Period – A Reassessment', in Galor, Humbert and Zangenberg (eds) 2006: 223–39.

Holladay, W.L.

2000   *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Leiden: Brill).

Holm-Nielsen, S.

1960   *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran* (Aarhus: Universitets-forlaget I).

Horbury, W.

1998   *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ* (London: SCM Press).

Horgan, M.P.

1979   *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America).

2002   'Pesharim', in Charlesworth (ed.) 2002: 1–193.

Horrell, D.

1997   'Leadership Patterns and the Development of Ideology in Early Christianity', *SocRel* 58: 323–41.

Hughes, J.A.

2006   *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot* (Leiden: Brill).

Hultgren, S.

2007   *From the Damascus Document to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical, and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill).

Hutchesson, I.

1999   '63 BCE: A Revised Dating for the Deposition of the Dead Sea Scrolls', *QC* 8: 177–94.

Hutt, C.

1999   'Qumran and the Ancient Sources', in Parry and Ulrich (eds) 1999: 274–93.

Iwry, S.

1969   'Was There a Migration to Damascus? The Problem of שבי ישראל', *ErIsr* 9: 80–88.

1994   'The Exegetical Method of the Damascus Document Reconsidered', in Wise *et al.* (eds) 1994: 329–38.

Jacobson, H.

1993a   '4Q252: Addenda', *JJS* 44: 118–20.

1993b   '4Q252 fr.1: Further Comments', *JJS* 44: 291–93.

Jeremias, G.
    1963   *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck &
              Ruprecht).
Jokiranta, J.
    2001   ' "Sectarianism" of the Qumran "Sect": Sociological Notes',
              RevQ 20: 223–39.
    2005a   *Identity on a Continuum: Constructing and Expressing
              Sectarian Social Identity in Qumran Serakhim and
              Pesharim* (Helsinki: Yliopistopaino).
    2005b   'Pesharim: A Mirror of Self-Understanding', in De Troyer
              and Lange (eds) 2005: 23–34.
    2005c   'Qumran – The Prototypical Teacher in the Qumran
              Pesharim: A Social Identity Approach', in Esler (ed.) 2005:
              254–63.
Kampen, J.I.
    1998   'The Diverse Aspects of Wisdom in the Qumran Texts', in
              Flint and VanderKam (eds) 1998: 211–43.
Kapfer, H.E.
    2007   'The Relationship Between the Damascus Document and
              the Community Rule: Attitudes Toward the Temple as a
              Test Case', *DSD* 14: 152–77.
Kelly, D.H. (ed.)
    1989   *Deviant Behaviour: A Text-Reader in the Sociology of
              Deviance* (New York: St. Martin's Press).
Kim, D.-H.
    2004   'Free Orthography in a Strict Society: Reconsidering Tov's
              "Qumran Orthography" ', *DSD* 11: 72–81.
Kim, S.-H.
    1985   *The Righteous and the Sage: A Comparative Study on the
              Ideal Images of Man in Biblical Israel and Classical China*
              (Seoul: Sogang University Press).
Kister, M.
    2007   'The Development of the Early Recensions of the Damascus
              Document', *DSD* 14: 61–76.
Kittel, B.P.
    1981   *The Hymns of Qumran: Translation and Commentary*
              (Chico: Scholars Press).
Klassen, W.
    1996   *Judas: Betrayer or Friend of Jesus?* (London: SCM Press).
Knibb, M.A.
    1983   'Exile in the Damascus Document', *JSOT* 25: 99–117.
    1990   'The Teacher of Righteousness – A Messianic Title?', in
              Davies and White (eds) 1990: 51–65.

2a and XIX, 5b-14', *RevQ* 15: 243–51.

1994a   *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

1994b   'The Place of the Damascus Document', in Wise *et al.* (eds) 1994: 149–62.

1999   'Eschatology and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in Flint and VanderKam (eds) 1999: 379–402.

2000a   'Interpreter of the Law', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000a: 383–84.

2000b   'Teacher of Righteousness', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000b: 918–21.

Knight, D.A.

2002   'Joshua 22 and the Ideology of Space', in Gunn and McNutt (eds) 2002: 51–63.

Koehler, L. and W. Baumgartner

1994   *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, vol. 1: א – ח (trans. and ed. under the supervision of M.E.J. Richardson; Leiden: E.J. Brill).

1995   *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, vol. 2: ט – ע (trans. and ed. under the supervision of M.E.J. Richardson; Leiden: E.J. Brill).

1996   *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, vol. 3: פ – שׂ (trans. and ed. under the supervision of M.E.J. Richardson; Leiden: E.J. Brill).

1999   *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, vol. 4: שׁ – ת (trans. and ed. under the supervision of M.E.J. Richardson; Leiden: E.J. Brill).

2000   *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*, vol. 5: *Aramaic, Supplementary Bibliography*, (trans. and ed. under the supervision of M.E.J. Richardson; Leiden: E.J. Brill).

Kollmann, B., W. Reinbold and A. Steudel (eds)

1999   *Antikes Judentum und Frühes Christentum: Festschrift für Hartmut Stegemann zum 65. Geburtstag* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter).

Kosmala, H.

1978a   'At the End of the Days', in H. Kosmala, *Studies, Essays and Reviews*, vol. 1: *Old Testament* (Leiden: E.J. Brill): 73–83.

1978b   'The Three Nets of Belial: A Study in the Terminology of Qumran and the New Testament', in H. Kosmala, *Studies, Essays and Reviews*, vol. 2: *New Testament* (Leiden: E.J. Brill): 115–37.

1978c   'Maskîl', in H. Kosmala, *Studies, Essays and Reviews*, vol. 1: *Old Testament* (Leiden: E.J. Brill): 149–55.

Kuhn, K.G.
1958   'The Two Messiahs of Aaron and Israel', in K. Stendahl (ed.), *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (London: SCM Press): 54–64.

Kuhn, K.G. (ed.)
1960   *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Lange, A.
2005   'Reading the Decline of Prophecy', in De Troyer and Lange (eds) 2005: 181–91.
2006   'Pre-Maccabean Literature from the Qumran Library and the Hebrew Bible', *DSD* 13: 277–305.

Lapp, N.L. and D.M. Gropp
2000   'Daliyeh, Wadi ed-', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000a: 161–65.

Lawrence, L.J.
2005   ' "Men of Perfect Holiness" (1QS 7.20): Social-Scientific Thoughts on Group Identity, Asceticism and Ethical Development in the Rule of the Community', in Campbell, Lyons and Pietersen (eds) 2005: 83–100.

Lemert, E.M.
1989   'Primary and Secondary Deviation', in Kelly (ed.) 1989: 195–200.

Levine, L.I.A.
1989   'The Age of Hellenism: Alexander the Great and the Rise and Fall of the Hasmonean Kingdom', in H. Shanks (ed.), *Ancient Israel: A Short History from Abraham to the Roman Destruction of the Temple* (London: SPCK): 177–204.

Levison, J.R.
2006   'The Two Spirits in Qumran Theology', in Charlesworth (ed.) 2006: 169–94.

Levy, R.
1993   ' "First Dead Sea Scroll" Found in Egypt Fifty Years Before Qumran Discoveries', in Shanks (ed.) 1993: 63–78.

Lichtenberger, H.
2003   'Qumran-Messianism', in Paul *et al.* (eds) 2003: 323–33.

LiDonnici, L. and A. Lieber (eds)
2007   *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism* (Leiden: Brill).

Lied, L.I.
2005   'Another Look at the Land of Damascus: The Spaces of the Damascus Document in the Light of Edward W. Soja's

Thirdspace Approach', in Campbell, Lyons and Pietersen (eds) 2005: 101–25.

Lim, T.H.
  1990   'Eschatological Orientation and the Alteration of Scripture in the Habakkuk Pesher', *JNES* 49: 185–94.
  1993a   'The Wicked Priests of the Groningen Hypothesis', *JBL* 112: 415–25.
  1993b   'Notes on 4Q252 fr.1, cols. i-ii', *JJS* 44: 121–26.
  1997   *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
  2000a   'The Wicked Priest or the Liar?', in Lim (ed.) 2000: 45–51.
  2000b   'Wicked Priest', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000b: 973–76.
  2000c   'Liar', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000a: 493–94.
  2002   *Pesharim* (London: Sheffield Academic Press).
  2005   'The Translation of NDMW and Its Significance for the Groningen Hypothesis', in Boccaccini (ed.) 2005: 291–93.

Lim, T.H. (ed.)
  2000   *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark).

Lipp, W.
  1977   'Charisma – Social Deviation, Leadership and Cultural Change: A Sociology of Deviance Approach', *ARSSR* 1: 59–77.

Lohse, E.
  1981   *Die Texte Aus Qumran: Hebräisch und Deutsch* (München: Kösel-Verlag).

Macionis, J.J. and K. Plummer
  1998   *Sociology: A Global Introduction* (London: Prentice Hall Europe).

Magen, Y. and Y. Peleg
  2007   *The Qumran Excavations 1993–2004: Preliminary Report* (Jerusalem: Judea & Samaria Publications).

Magness, J.
  1998   'Qumran Archaeology: Past Perspectives and Future Prospects', in Flint and VanderKam (eds) 1998: 47–77.
  2000   'A Reassessment of the Excavations of Qumran', in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam (eds) 2000: 708–19.
  2002   *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

Magness, J., H. Eshel and S. Talmon
  2000   'Masada', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000a: 515–25.

Malina, B.J.
  1995   'Early Christian Groups: Using Small Group Formation
          Theory to Explain Christian Organizations', in Esler (ed.)
          1995: 96–113.
Malina, B.J. and J.H. Neyrey
  1993   'Conflict in Luke-Acts: Labelling and Deviance Theory', in
          Neyrey (ed.) 1993: 97–122.
Mandel, P.
  2001   'Midrashic Exegesis and its Precedents in the Dead Sea
          Scrolls', *DSD* 8: 149–68.
Mansoor, M.
  1961   *The Thanksgiving Hymns* (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
  1964   *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
Mason, R.
  1997   *Propaganda and Subversion in the Old Testament* (London:
          SPCK).
McCullough, W.S.
  1975   *The History and Literature of the Palestinian Jews from
          Cyrus to Herod: 550 BC to 4 BC* (Toronto: University of
          Toronto Press).
McNutt, P.M.
  2002   '"Fathers of the Empty Spaces" and "Strangers Forever":
          Social Marginality and the Construction of Space', in Gunn
          and McNutt (eds) 2002: 30–50.
McQueen, R.A. and C. Knussen
  2002   *Research Methods for Social Science: A Practical
          Introduction* (Harlow: Pearson Education).
Metso, S.
  1997   *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule*
          (Leiden: Brill).
  1998   'Constitutional Rules at Qumran', in Flint and VanderKam
          (eds) 1998: 186–210.
  1999   'In Search of the *Sitz Im Leben* of the *Community Rule*', in
          Parry and Ulrich (eds) 1999: 306–15.
  2000a   'The Redaction of the Community Rule', in Schiffman, Tov
          and VanderKam (eds) 2000: 377–84.
  2000b   'The Relationship Between the Damascus Document and
          the Community Rule', in Baumgarten, Chazon and Pinnick
          (eds) 2000: 85–93.
  2004   'Methodological Problems in Reconstructing History from
          Rule Texts Found at Qumran', *DSD* 11: 315–35.
  2006a   'Whom Does the Term Yaḥad Identify?', in Hempel and
          Lieu (eds) 2006: 213–35.
  2006b   'Qumran Community Structure and Terminology as

Theological Statement', in Charlesworth (ed.) 2006: 283–300.

Milgrom, J. with L. Novakovic
    2002   'Catena A (4Q177 = 4QCat^a)', in Charlesworth (ed.) 2002: 286–303.

Milik, J.T.
    1952   'Fragments d'un Midrash de Michée dans les Manuscrits de Qumran', *RB* 59: 412–18.
    1955   'Textes Non Bibliques', in D. Barthélemy and J.T. Milik, *Qumran Cave 1* (DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon Press): 77–149.

Morag, S.
    1988   'Qumran Hebrew: Some Typological Observations', *VT* 38: 148–64.

Mowinckel, S.
    1956   'Some Remarks on Hodayot 39.5-20', *JBL* 75: 265–76.

Mowry, L.
    1962   *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early Church* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Murphy-O'Connor, J.
    1970   'An Essene Missionary Document? CD II, 14 – VI, 1', *RB* 77: 201–29.
    1971a   'A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document VI, 2 – VIII, 3', *RB* 78: 210–32.
    1971b   'The Original Text of CD 7.9-8.2 = 19.5-14', *HTR* 64: 379–86.
    1972   'A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document XIX, 33 – XX, 34', *RB* 79: 544–64.
    1974   'The Essenes and Their History', *RB* 81: 215–44.
    1985   'The Damascus Document Revisited', *RB* 92: 223–46.

Najman, H.
    2006   'Towards a Study of the Uses of the Concept of Wilderness in Ancient Judaism', *DSD* 13: 99–113.

Newsom, C.A.
    2004   *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (Leiden: Brill).

Neyrey, J.H. (ed.)
    1993   *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (Peabody: Hendrickson).

Niccum, C.
    2006   'The Blessing of Judah in 4Q252', in Flint, Tov and VanderKam (eds) 2006: 250–60.

Nickelsburg, G.W.E.
    1976   'Simon – A Priest with a Reputation for Faithfulness', *BASOR* 223: 67–68.

1992   'The Qumranic Transformation of a Cosmological and Eschatological Tradition (1QH 4.29-40)', in Trebolle Barrera and Vegas Montaner (eds) 1992b: 649–59.

Nielsen, E.
1961   *Oral Tradition: A Modern Problem in Old Testament Introduction* (London: SCM Press).

Nitzan, B.
1994   *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (trans. J. Chipman; Leiden: E.J. Brill).
2000   'Absalom, House of', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000a: 4–5.
2003   'Approaches to Biblical Exegesis in Qumran Literature', in Paul *et al.* (eds) 2003: 347–65.

Økland, J.
2005   'The Language of Gates and Entering: On Sacred Space in the Temple Scroll', in Campbell, Lyons and Pietersen (eds) 2005: 149–65.

Parry, D.W. and E. Tov (eds)
2004a   *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, part 2: *Exegetical Texts* (Leiden: Brill).
2004b   *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, part 1: *Texts Concerned with Religious Law* (Leiden: Brill).
2004c   *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, part 4: *Calendrical and Sapiential Texts* (Leiden: Brill).

Parry, D.W. and E. Ulrich (eds)
1999   *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (Leiden: Brill).

Patrich, J.
2000   'Mird, Khirbet', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000a: 563–66.

Paul, S.M., R.A. Kraft, L.H. Schiffman and W.W. Fields (eds)
2003   *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (Leiden: Brill).

Petersen, D.L.
1991   'Israelite Prophecy: Change Versus Continuity', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Leuven 1989* (VTSup 43; Leiden: E.J. Brill): 190–203.

Pfann, S.J.
2000   'Archaeological Surveys', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000a: 52–57.
2004   'Historical Implications of the Early Second Century Dating of the 4Q249–250 Cryptic A Corpus', in E.G. Chazon, D. Satran and R.A. Clements (eds), *Things Revealed: Studies in*

Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone (Leiden: Brill): 171–86.

Pietersen, L.K.

1997 'Despicable Deviants: Labelling Theory and the Polemic of the Pastorals', *SocRel* 58: 343–52.

2004 *The Polemic of the Pastorals: A Sociological Examination of the Development of Pauline Christianity* (London: T&T Clark International).

2005 '"False Teaching, Lying Tongues and Deceitful Lips" (4Q169 Frgs 3–4 2.8): The Pesharim and the Sociology of Deviance', in Campbell, Lyons and Pietersen (eds) 2005: 166–81.

Pietersma, A.

1991 'The Apocryphon of Jannes and Jambres', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Leuven 1989* (VTSup 43; Leiden: E.J. Brill): 383–95.

2000 'Yohanah and his Brother', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000b: 1000–1001.

Piovanelli, P.

2005 'Some Archaeological, Sociological, and Cross-Cultural Afterthoughts on the "Groningen" and the "Enochic/Essene" Hypotheses', in Boccaccini (ed.) 2005: 366–72.

2007 'Was There Sectarian Behaviour Before the Flourishing of Jewish Sects? A Long-Term Approach to the History and Sociology of Second Temple Sectarianism', in Chalcraft (ed.) 2007: 156–79.

Polliack, M.

2005 'Wherein Lies the Pesher? Re-Questioning the Connection between Medieval Karaite and Qumranic Modes of Biblical Interpretation', *JSIJ* 4: 151–200.

Puech, É.

1988 'Quelques aspects de la Restauration du Rouleau des Hymnes (1QH)', *JJS* 39: 38–55.

1994 'Messianism, Resurrection, and Eschatology at Qumran and in the New Testament', in Ulrich and VanderKam (eds) 1994: 235–56.

1999 'Le Grand Prêtre Simon (III) fils d'Onias III, le Maître de Justice?', in Kollmann, Reinbold and Steudel (eds) 1999: 137–58.

2000 'Hodayot', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds) 2000a: 365–69.

2005 'The Essenes and Qumran, the Teacher and the Wicked Priest, the Origins', in Boccaccini (ed.) 2005: 298–302.

2006   'Resurrection: The Bible and Qumran', in Charlesworth
            (ed.) 2006: 247–81.
Qimron, E.
    1986   *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars
                Press).
    1992a   'The Text of CDC', in Broshi (ed.) 1992: 9–49.
    1992b   'Observations on the History of Early Hebrew (1000 B.C.E.–
                200 C.E.) in the Light of the Dead Sea Documents', in D.
                Dimant and U. Rappaport (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls:
                Forty Years of Research* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press): 349–61.
    1995   'The Biblical Lexicon in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls', *DSD*
                2: 295–329.
    2006   'Dualism in the Essene Communities', in Charlesworth (ed.)
                2006: 195–202.
Rabin, C.
    1955   'Notes on the Habakkuk Scroll and the Zadokite
                Documents', *VT* 5: 148–62.
Rabinowitz, I.
    1950   'The Second and Third Columns of the Habakkuk
                Interpretation-Scroll', *JBL* 69: 31–49.
    1953   'Sequence and Dates of the Extra-Biblical Dead Sea Scroll
                Texts and "Damascus" Fragments', *VT* 3: 175–85.
    1954   'A Reconsideration of "Damascus" and "390 Years" in the
                "Damascus" ("Zadokite") Fragments', *JBL* 73: 11–35.
    1958   'The Guides of Righteousness', *VT* 8: 391–404.
Radday, Y.T.
    1990   'Humour in Names', in Y.T. Radday and A. Brenner (eds),
                On Humour and the Comic in the Hebrew Bible (Sheffield:
                Almond Press): 59–97.
Rainbow, P.A.
    1997   'The Last Oniad and the Teacher of Righteousness', *JJS* 48:
                30–52.
Rajak, T.
    1990   'The Hasmoneans and the Uses of Hellenism', in Davies and
                White (eds) 1990: 261–80.
Reed, S.A.
    2007   'Find-Sites of the Dead Sea Scrolls', *DSD* 14: 199–221.
Reeves, J.C.
    1988   'The Meaning of Moreh Ṣedeq in the Light of 11QTorah',
                RevQ 13: 287–98.
Regev, E.
    2003   'The Yaḥad and the Damascus Covenant: Structure,
                Organization and Relationship', *RevQ* 21: 233–62.
    2004   'Comparing Sectarian Practice and Organization: The

Qumran Sects in Light of the Regulations of the Shakers, Hutterites, Mennonites and Amish', *Numen* 51: 146–81.

2007a   *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter).

2007b   'Atonement and Sectarianism in Qumran: Defining a Sectarian Worldview in Moral and Halakhic Systems', in Chalcraft (ed.) 2007: 180–204.

Reif, S.C.
2000   'The Damascus Document from the Cairo Genizah: Its Discovery, Early Study and Historical Significance', in Baumgarten, Chazon and Pinnick (eds) 2000: 109–31.

Rendtorff, R.
1988   'Between Historical Criticism and Holistic Interpretation: New Trends in Old Testament Exegesis', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Jerusalem 1986* (VTSup 40; Leiden: E.J. Brill): 298–303.

Richardson, H.N.
1955   'Some Notes on ליץ and its Derivatives', *VT* 5: 163–79.

Rietz, H.W.M.
2007   'Identifying Compositions and Traditions of the Qumran Community: The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice as a Test Case', in Davis and Strawn (eds) 2007: 29–52.

Robbins, V.K.
1995   'Social-Scientific Criticism and Literary Studies: Prospects for Cooperation in Biblical Interpretation', in Esler (ed.) 1995: 274–89.

Roberts, B.J.
1968   'Bible Exegesis and Fulfilment in Qumran', in P.R. Ackroyd and B. Lindars (eds), *Words and Meanings: Essays Presented to David Winton Thomas* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 195–207.

Roberts, J.J.M.
1988   'Does God Lie? Divine Deceit as a Theological Problem in Israelite Prophetic Literature', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Jerusalem 1986* (VTSup 40; Leiden: E.J. Brill): 211–20.

Rock, P.
1973   *Deviant Behaviour* (London: Hutchinson University Library).

Rock, P. and M. McIntosh (eds)
1974   *Deviance and Social Control* (London: Tavistock Publications).

Rodd, C.S.
   1981   'On Applying a Sociological Theory to Biblical Studies',
           JSOT 19: 95–106.
Rogerson, J.W.
   1985   'The Use of Sociology in Old Testament Studies', in J.A.
           Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Salamanca 1983* (VTSup
           36; Leiden: E.J. Brill): 245–56.
Roth, C.
   1958   *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford:
           Basil Blackwell).
   1960   'The Subject Matter of Qumran Exegesis', *VT* 10: 51–68.
   1961   'The Era of the Habakkuk Commentary', *VT* 11: 451–55.
   1963   'The Teacher of Righteousness and the Prophecy of Joel',
           VT 13: 91–95.
Rowley, H.H.
   1952a   *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford:
           Basil Blackwell).
   1952b   'The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls', *ExTim*
           63: 378–84.
   1956   '4QpNahum and the Teacher of Righteousness', *JBL* 75:
           188–93.
   1958   'The Teacher of Righteousness and the Dead Sea Scrolls',
           BJRL 40: 114–46.
   1959   'The Qumran Sectaries and the Zealots: An Examination of
           a Recent Theory', *VT* 9: 379–92.
   1963   *From Moses to Qumran: Studies in the Old Testament*
           (London: Lutterworth Press).
Sanders, E.P.
   2000   'The Dead Sea Sect and Other Jews: Commonalities,
           Overlaps and Differences', in Lim (ed.) 2000: 8–43.
Sanders, J.A.
   1999   'The Impact of the Scrolls on Biblical Studies', in Parry and
           Ulrich (eds) 1999: 47–57.
Sanders, J.T.
   1993   *Schismatics, Sectarians, Dissidents, Deviants: The First One*
           Hundred Years of Jewish–Christian Relations (London: SCM
           Press).
Schäfer, P.
   1977   'The Hellenistic and Maccabaean Periods', in J.H. Hayes
           and J.M. Miller (eds), *Israelite and Judaean History*
           (London: SCM Press): 539–604.
Schechter, S.
   1970   *Documents of Jewish Sectaries* (New York: KTAV
           Publishing House).

Schiffman, L.H.
    1991   'Qumran and Rabbinic Halakhah', in Talmon (ed.) 1991: 138–46.
    1993   'The Sadducean Origins of the Dead Sea Scroll Sect', in Shanks (ed.) 1993: 35–49.
    1994   *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society).
    2000a   'The Relationship of the Zadokite Fragments to the Temple Scroll', in Baumgarten, Chazon and Pinnick (eds) 2000: 133–45.
    2000b   'The Judean Scrolls and the History of Judaism', in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam (eds) 2000: 542–57.
    2002   'The Many Battles of the Scrolls', *JRH* 26: 157–78.
    2003   'Utopia and Reality: Political Leadership and Organization in the Dead Sea Scrolls Community', in Paul *et al.* (eds) 2003: 413–27.
    2005   'Contemporizing Halakic Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in De Troyer and Lange (eds) 2005: 35–41.
Schiffman, L.H. (ed.)
    1990   *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (Sheffield: JSOT Press).
Schiffman, L.H., E. Tov and J.C. VanderKam (eds)
    2000   *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society).
Schiffman, L.H. and J.C. VanderKam (eds)
    2000a   *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
    2000b   *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 2 (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Schniedewind, W.M.
    1994   'King and Priest in the Book of Chronicles and the Duality of Qumran Messianism', *JJS* 45: 71–78.
    1999a   'Qumran Hebrew as an Antilanguage', *JBL* 118: 235–52.
    1999b   'Structural Aspects of Qumran Messianism in the *Damascus Document*', in Parry and Ulrich (eds) 1999: 523–36.
Schofield, A.
    2008   'Rereading S: A New Model of Textual Development in Light of the Cave 4 Serekh Copies', *DSD* 15: 96–120.
Schonfield, H.J.
    1956   *Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Studies Towards Their Solution* (London: Vallentine Mitchell & Co.).

Schuller, E.M.
    1994a   'The Cave 4 Hodayot Manuscripts: A Preliminary Description', *JQR* 85: 137–50.
    1994b   'Prayer, Hymnic, and Liturgical Texts from Qumran', in Ulrich and VanderKam (eds) 1994: 153–71.
    1999   'Hodayot', in E. Chazon *et al.*, *Qumran Cave 4, XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (DJD 29; Oxford: Clarendon Press): 69–254.
    2001   'Some Contributions of the Cave Four Manuscripts (4Q427–432) to the Study of the Hodayot', *DSD* 8: 278–87.
    2006   *The Dead Sea Scrolls: What Have We Learned 50 Years On?* (London: SCM Press).
Schuller, E.M. and L. DiTommaso
    1997   'A Bibliography of the Hodayot, 1948–1996', *DSD* 4: 55–101.
Schur, E.M.
    1971   *Labeling Deviant Behavior: Its Sociological Implications* (New York: Harper & Row).
    1980   *The Politics of Deviance: Stigma Contests and the Uses of Power* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall).
Schürer, E. with G. Vermes and F. Millar
    1973   *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C –A.D. 135)*, vol. 1 (rev. and ed. G. Vermes and F. Millar; Edinburgh: T&T Clark Ltd.).
Scott, R.A.
    1972   'A Proposed Framework for Analyzing Deviance as a Property of Social Order', in Scott and Douglas (eds) 1972: 9–35.
Scott, R.A. and J.D. Douglas (eds)
    1972   *Theoretical Perspectives on Deviance* (New York: Basic Books).
Segal, M.
    2005   'Between Bible and Rewritten Bible', in Henze (ed.) 2005: 10–28.
Segal, M.H.
    1951   'The Habakkuk "Commentary" and the Damascus Fragments (A Historical Study)', *JBL* 70: 131–47.
Shanks, H.
    1999   *The Mystery and Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Vintage Books).
Shanks, H. (ed.)
    1993   *Understanding the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: SPCK).
Shavit, Y.
    1994   'The "Qumran Library" in the Light of the Attitude

Towards Books and Libraries in the Second Temple Period', in Wise *et al.* (eds) 1994: 299–317.

Silberman, L.H.
1955 'The Two ''Messiahs'' of the Manual of Discipline', *VT* 5: 77–82.

Simkins, R.A. and S.L. Cook with A. Brenner (eds)
1999 *The Social World of the Hebrew Bible: Twenty Five Years of the Social Sciences in the Academy* (Semeia 87; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).

Skehan, P.W.
1959 'Qumran and the Present State of Old Testament Text Studies: The Masoretic Text', *JBL* 78: 21–25.

Smith, M.
1959 'What is Implied by the Variety of Messianic Figures?', *JBL* 78: 66–72.

Snyder, H.G.
2000 'Naughts and Crosses: Pesher Manuscripts and their Significance for Reading Practices at Qumran', *DSD* 7: 26–48.

Soggin, J.A.
1999 *An Introduction to the History of Israel and Judah* (London: SCM Press).

Soja, E.W.
1996 *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places* (Oxford: Blackwell).
1999 'Thirdspace: Expanding the Scope of the Geographical Imagination', in D. Massey, J. Allen and P. Sarre (eds), *Human Geography Today* (Cambridge: Polity Press): 260–78.

Stanton, G.N.
1993 'Matthew's Gospel and the Damascus Document in Sociological Perspective', in G.N. Stanton, *A Gospel for a New People: Studies in Matthew* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press): 86–106.

Stark, W.
1967 *The Sociology of Religion: A Study of Christendom,* vol. 2: *Sectarian Religion* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul).

Steckoll, S.H.
1967 'The Qumran Sect in Relation to the Temple of Leontopolis', *RevQ* 6: 55–69.

Stegemann, H.
1971 *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* (Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität).
1990 'Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments', in Schiffman (ed.) 1990: 189–220.

1991   'The "Teacher of Righteousness" and Jesus: Two Types of
        Religious Leadership in Judaism at the Turn of the Era', in
        Talmon (ed.) 1991: 196–213.
1992   'The Qumran Essenes – Local Members of the Main Jewish
        Union in Late Second Temple Times', in Trebolle Barrera
        and Vegas Montaner (eds) 1992a: 83–166.
1993   'How to Connect Dead Sea Scroll Fragments', in Shanks
        (ed.) 1993: 245–55.
1998   *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the
        Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
2000   'The Material Reconstruction of 1QHodayot', in Schiffman,
        Tov and VanderKam (eds) 2000: 272–84.

Stern, E. and H. Eshel
2000   'Murabba'at, Wadi', in Schiffman and VanderKam (eds)
        2000a: 581–86.

Stern, S.M.
1950   'Notes on the New Manuscript Find', *JBL* 69: 19–30.
2000   'Qumran Calendars: Theory and Practice', in Lim (ed.)
        2000: 179–86.

Steudel, A.
1992   '4QMidrEschat: "A Midrash on Eschatology" (4Q174 +
        4Q177)', in Trebolle Barrera and Vegas Montaner (eds)
        1992b: 531–41.
1993   'אחרית הימים in the Texts From Qumran', *RevQ* 16: 225–
        45.
2000   'God and Belial', in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam (eds)
        2000: 332–40.

Stone, M.E. (ed.)
1984   *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha,
        Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*
        (Assen: Van Gorcum).

Strawn, B.A.
2007   'Excerpted "Non-Biblical" Scrolls at Qumran? Background,
        Analogies, Function', in Davis and Strawn (eds) 2007: 65–
        123.

Strugnell, J.
1970   'Notes en Marge du Volume V des "Discoveries in the
        Judaean Desert of Jordan"', *RevQ* 7: 163–276.

Strugnell, J. and E. Schuller
1999   'Further Hodayot Manuscripts from Qumran?', in
        Kollmann, Reinbold and Steudel (eds) 1999: 51–72.

Stuckenbruck, L.T.
2005   'The Plant Metaphor in Its Inner-Enochic and Early Jewish
        Context', in Boccaccini (ed.) 2005: 210–12.

2007a   'The Teacher of Righteousness Remembered: From Fragmentary Sources to Collective Memory in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in S.C. Barton, L.T. Stuckenbruck and B.G. Wold (eds), *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity: The Fifth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium (Durham, September 2004)* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck): 75–94.

2007b   'Temporal Shifts from Text to Interpretation: Concerning the Use of the Perfect and Imperfect in the Habakkuk Pesher (1QpHab)', in Davis and Strawn (eds) 2007: 124–49.

Sukenik, E.L. (ed.)
1955   *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press).

Sumner, C.
1996   *The Sociology of Deviance: An Obituary* (Buckingham: Open University Press).

Swarup, P.
2006   *The Self-Understanding of the Dead Sea Scrolls Community: An Eternal Planting, A House of Holiness* (London: T&T Clark International).

Sykes, G. and D. Matza
1957   'Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency', *ASR* 22: 664–70.

Talmon, S.
1951   'Notes on the Habakkuk Scroll', *VT* 1: 33–37.
1953   'The Sectarian יחד – A Biblical Noun', *VT* 3: 133–40.
1978   'The "Comparative Method" in Biblical Interpretation – Principles and Problems', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume: Göttingen 1977* (VTSup 29; Leiden: E.J. Brill): 320–56.
1989   *The World of Qumran From Within: Collected Studies* (Leiden: E.J. Brill).
1991a   'The Internal Diversification of Judaism in the Early Second Temple Period', in Talmon (ed.) 1991: 16–43.
1991b   'Between the Bible and the Mishnah: Qumran From Within', in Talmon (ed.) 1991: 214–57.
1994a   'The Community of the Renewed Covenant: Between Judaism and Christianity', in Ulrich and VanderKam (eds) 1994: 3–24.
1994b   'Qumran Studies: Past, Present, and Future', *JQR* 85: 1–31.
1999   'Calendar Controversy in Ancient Judaism: The Case of the "Community of the Renewed Covenant"', in Parry and Ulrich (eds) 1999: 379–95.
2003   'The Signification of אחרית and אחרית הימים in the Hebrew Bible', in Paul *et al.* (eds) 2003: 795–810.

2005 'Comments Concerning the "Qumran-Essenes" Hypothesis', in Boccaccini (ed.) 2005: 294–97.

Talmon, S. (ed.)
1991 *Jewish Civilization in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* (Sheffield: JSOT Press).

Tantlevskij, I.R.
1995 *The Two Wicked Priests in the Qumran Commentary of Habakkuk* (Kraków: Enigma).

Teicher, J.L.
1954 'The Habakkuk Scroll', *JJS* 5: 47–59.

Theissen, G.
1978 *The First Followers of Jesus: A Sociological Analysis of the Earliest Christianity* (trans. J. Bowden; London: SCM Press).

Thiering, B.
1978 'Once More the Wicked Priest', *JBL* 97: 191–205.
1992 *Jesus the Man: A New Interpretation from the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: BCA).
2000 'The Date and Order of Scrolls, 40 BCE to 70 CE', in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam (eds) 2000: 191–98.

Thomas, S.I.
2008 '"Riddled" with Guilt: The Mysteries of Transgression, the Sealed Vision, and the Art of Interpretation in 4Q300 and Related Texts', *DSD* 15: 155–71.

Thompson, T.L.
1999 *The Bible in History: How Writers Create a Past* (London: Jonathan Cape).

Thorion-Vardi, T.
1985 'The Use of the Tenses in the Zadokite Documents', *RevQ* 12: 65–88.

Tiller, P.A.
1997 'The "Eternal Planting" in the Dead Sea Scrolls', *DSD* 4: 312–35.

Tov, E.
1991 'Hebrew Bible Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism', in Talmon (ed.) 1991: 107–37.
1994 'Biblical Texts as Reworked in Some Qumran Manuscripts with Special Attention to 4QRP and 4QParaGen-Exod', in Ulrich and VanderKam (eds) 1994: 111–34.
1998 'Scribal Practices Reflected in the Texts from the Judaean Desert', in Flint and VanderKam (eds) 1998: 403–29.
1999 'Correction Procedures in the Texts from the Judean Desert', in Parry and Ulrich (eds) 1999: 232–63.

2000 'Further Evidence for the Existence of a Qumran Scribal School', in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam (eds) 2000: 199–216.

2002 'Copying of a Biblical Scroll', *JRH* 26: 189–209.

Tov, E. (ed.)

2002 *The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series* (DJD 39; Oxford: Clarendon Press).

2006 *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library* (DSSERL; Brigham Young University; Leiden: E.J. Brill, rev. edn).

Trafton, J.L.

2002 'Commentary on Genesis A (4Q252 = 4QCommGen A = 4QPBless)', in Charlesworth (ed.) 2002: 203–19.

Trebolle-Barrera, J.

2000 'Qumran Evidence for a Biblical Standard Text and for Non-Standard and Parabiblical Texts', in Lim (ed.) 2000: 89–106.

Trebolle Barrera, J. and L. Vegas Montaner (eds)

1992a *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991*, vol. 1 (Leiden: E.J. Brill).

1992b *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991*, vol. 2 (Leiden: E.J. Brill).

Trompf, G.W.

2002 'Introduction I: The Long History of Dead Sea Scrolls Scholarship', *JRH* 26: 123–44.

Ulfgard, H.

2000 'The Branch in the Last Days: Observations on the New Covenant Before and After the Messiah', in Lim (ed.) 2000: 233–47.

Ulrich, E.

1999 *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).

2000 'The Qumran Biblical Scrolls – The Scriptures of Late Second Temple Judaism', in Lim (ed.) 2000: 67–87.

2001 'The Bible in the Making: The Scriptures Found at Qumran', in P.W. Flint (ed.), *The Bible at Qumran: Text, Shape, and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans): 51–66.

Ulrich, E., and J.C. VanderKam (eds)

1994 *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press).

VanderKam, J.C.
    1993a   'The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essenes or Sadducees?',
            in Shanks (ed.) 1993: 50–62.
    1993b   'The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christianity', in Shanks (ed.)
            1993: 181–202.
    1994a   *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
    1994b   'Messianism in the Scrolls', in Ulrich and VanderKam (eds)
            1994: 211–34.
    1999a   'Identity and History of the Community', in Flint and
            VanderKam (eds) 1999: 487–533.
    1999b   'The Judean Desert and the Community of the Dead Sea
            Scrolls', in Kollmann, Reinbold and Steudel (eds) 1999:
            159–71.
    2003   'Those Who Look for Smooth Things, Pharisees, and Oral
            Law', in Paul *et al.* (eds) 2003: 465–77.
    2006   'To What End? Functions of Scriptural Interpretation in
            Qumran Texts', in Flint, Tov and VanderKam (eds) 2006:
            302–20.
VanderKam, J.C. and P.W. Flint
    2002   *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Their Significance for
            Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity*
            (New York: HarperSanFrancisco).
Van der Plicht, J.
    2007   'Radiocarbon Dating and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Comment
            on "Redating" ', *DSD* 14: 77–89.
Van der Ploeg, J.
    1958   *The Excavations at Qumran: A Survey of the Judaean
            Brotherhood and its Ideas* (trans. K. Smyth; London:
            Longmans, Green and Co.).
Van de Water, R.
    2003   'The Punishment of the Wicked Priest and the Death of
            Judas', *DSD* 10: 395–419.
Van der Woude, A.S.
    1982   'Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the
            Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk
            Commentary', *JJS* 33: 349–59.
    1996   'Once Again: The Wicked Priests in the Habakkuk Pesher
            from Cave 1 of Qumran', *RevQ* 17: 375–84.
    1998   'Fifty Years of Qumran Research', in Flint and VanderKam
            (eds) 1998: 1–45.
Vermes, G.
    1975   *Post-Biblical Jewish Studies* (Leiden: Brill).
    1977   *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (London: SCM
            Press).

1981   'The Essenes and History', *JJS* 32: 18–31.
1989   'Biblical Proof-Texts in Qumran Literature', *JSS* 34: 493–508.
2001   *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels* (London: SCM Press).
2002   'Significance of the Scrolls for Understanding Christianity', *JRH* 26: 210–19.
2004   *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Penguin Books).

Victor, P.
1966   'A Note on חֹק in the Old Testament', *VT* 16: 358–61.

Wacholder, B.Z.
1988   'Does Qumran Record the Death of the Moreh? The Meaning of he'aseph in Damascus Covenant XIX.35, XX.14', *RevQ* 13: 323–30.
1990   'The Ancient Judaeo-Aramaic Literature (500–164 BCE): A Classification of Pre-Qumranic Texts', in Schiffman (ed.) 1990: 257–81.
2002   'The Righteous Teacher in the Pesherite Commentaries', *HUCA* 73: 1–27.
2007   *The New Damascus Document; The Midrash on the Eschatological Torah of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Reconstruction, Translation and Commentary* (Leiden: Brill).

Warren, C.A.B. and J.M. Johnson
1972   'A Critique of Labeling Theory from the Phenomenological Perspective', in Scott and Douglas (eds) 1972: 69–92.

Wassen, C.
2005   *Women in the Damascus Document* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).

Wassen, C. and J. Jokiranta
2007   'Groups in Tension: Sectarianism in the Damascus Document and the Community Rule', in Chalcraft (ed.) 2007: 205–45.

Weber, M.
1966   *The Sociology of Religion* (trans. E. Fischoff; London: Methuen).

Werman, C.
2000   'The Sons of Zadok', in Schiffman, Tov and VanderKam (eds) 2000: 623–30.
2006   'Epochs and End-Time: The 490-Year Scheme in Second Temple Literature', *DSD* 13: 229–55.

Wernberg-Møller, P.
1953   צֶדֶק, צַדִּיק and צָדוֹק in the Zadokite Fragments (CDC),

Commentary (DSH)', *VT* 3: 310–15.

White, L.M.
   1988   'Shifting Sectarian Boundaries in Early Christianity', *BJRL* 70: 7–24.

White, R.T.
   1990   'The House of Peleg in the Dead Sea Scrolls', in Davies and White (eds) 1990: 67–98.

White Crawford, S.
   1987   'A Comparison of the "A" and "B" Manuscripts of the Damascus Document', *RevQ* 12: 537–53.

Wiesenberg, E.
   1955   'Chronological Data in the Zadokite Fragments', *VT* 5: 284–308.

Wilcox, M.
   1969   'Dualism, Gnosticism, and Other Elements in the Pre-Pauline Tradition', in M. Black (ed.), *The Scrolls and Christianity: Historical and Theological Significance* (London: SPCK): 83–96.

Wise, M.O.
   1994   'An Annalistic Calendar from Qumran', in Wise *et al.* (eds) 1994: 389–408.
   1999   *The First Messiah: Investigating the Savior Before Jesus* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco).
   2003   'Dating the Teacher of Righteousness and the *Floruit* of his Movement', *JBL* 122: 53–87.

Wise, M.O., M.G. Abegg Jr. and E.M. Cook
   1996   *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (London: HarperCollins).

Wise, M.O., M.G. Abegg Jr. and E.M. Cook with N. Gordon
   2004a   '1QpHab', in Parry and Tov (eds) 2004a: 78–93.
   2004b   '1Q14 (1QpMic)', in Parry and Tov (eds) 2004a: 66–71.

Wise, M.O., N. Golb, J.J. Collins and D. Pardee (eds)
   1994   *Methods of Investigation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Khirbet Qumran Site: Present Realities and Future Prospects* (New York: The New York Academy of Sciences).

Worrell, J.
   1970   'עצה: "Counsel" or "Council" at Qumran?', *VT* 20: 65–74.

Young, I.
   2002   'The Stabilization of the Biblical Text in the Light of Qumran and Masada: A Challenge for Conventional Qumran Chronology?', *DSD* 9: 364–90.

Zeitlin, S.
   1952   'Bar Kokba and Bar Kozeba', *JQR* 43: 77–82.

INDEX OF AUTHORS