STUDIES ON THE TEXTS OF THE DESERT OF JUDAH [88]

New Perspectives on Old Texts

Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 9–11 January, 2005

Edited by
ESTHER G. CHAZON &
BETSY HALPERN-AMARU,
IN COLLABORATION WITH
RUTH A. CLEMENTS

BRILL

New Perspectives on Old Texts

Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

Edited by

Florentino García Martínez

Associate editors

Peter W. Flint
Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar

VOLUME 88

New Perspectives on Old Texts

Proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 9–11 January, 2005

Edited by

Esther G. Chazon
Betsy Halpern-Amaru

In collaboration with

Ruth A. Clements

BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2010

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature. International Symposium (10th : 2005 : Hebrew University of Jerusalem)
New perspectives on old texts : proceedings of the Tenth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 9–11 January, 2005 / edited by Esther G. Chazon, Betsy Halpern-Amaru in collaboration with Ruth A. Clements.
p. cm. — (Studies on the texts of the Desert of Judah ; v. 88)
Includes index.
ISBN 978-90-04-18307-0 (hardback : alk. paper) 1. Dead Sea scrolls—Congresses. I. Chazon, Esther G. II. Amaru, Betsy Halpern. III. Clements, Ruth. IV. Title. V. Series.

BM487.O75 2010
296.1'55—dc22

2009052231

ISSN 0169-9962
ISBN 978 90 04 18307 0

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

NEW APPROACHES

INNOVATIVE READINGS

REASSESSING OLD PERSPECTIVES

PREFACE

This volume contains a selection of papers presented at the Tenth Annual Orion International Symposium, sponsored by the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and held January 9–11, 2005. To celebrate its tenth anniversary and in anticipation of full publication of the Scrolls, slated for 2001 but actually completed in 2009, the Center decided that the program for this symposium would be framed to engage a wide range of scholarship on the theme of "New Perspectives on Old Texts."

Reflecting the broad scope of the tenth symposium, the papers in this volume demonstrate varied methodologies and treat major issues within the Qumran corpus. At the same time, each of these papers offers fresh insights into a particular text or genre of texts. Several papers demonstrate the fruitfulness of applying constructs and methods drawn from other disciplines to the study of the Scrolls. Others, grounded in the history of Judaism or the history of religion, explore issues hitherto not addressed, and in three instances, highlight the need for reassessment of earlier scholarship.

Noah Hacham adopts the sociohistorical construct of "diasporan identity" as an analytical tool to compare the mindset of the sectarian Qumran community with that of Hellenistic Jewish communities living outside the land of Israel. Applying social memory theory to texts and contexts dealing with the Teacher of Righteousness, Loren Stuckenbruck examines the reception of the "recorded memory" of the Teacher by later devotees and shows how that memory was employed to reinforce the self-perception of the Qumran community in its new circumstances. Michael Daise employs ritual theory and a modified version of Jacob Milgrom's approach to ritual in Leviticus to address the issue of ritual density in Qumran practice, particularly as demonstrated by the ablutions prescribed in *Serekh Ha-Yaḥad*. The fourth paper in this group, that of Eyal Regev, uses sociological distinctions between reform and sectarian movements to support an argument regarding the chronological relationship between *1 Enoch, Jubilees*, the Essenes, and the development of the Qumran sectarian community.

Among the papers grounded in the history of religion is Bilhah Nitzan's study of the philosophy of education embedded within Qumran

sapiential texts with a particular focus on their appropriation of traditional values and accommodation of the apocalyptic and deterministic worldviews of Qumran theology. A close analysis of biblical allusions in *1Q/4QMysteries*, Torleif Elgvin's paper uncovers deliberate borrowing, interpretation, conflation, recontextualization, and recasting of biblical phrases in the sapiential, eschatological, and hymnic sections of this composite work. Lawrence Schiffman examines writing as a mode of transmission at Qumran and explores the relationship between specific designations for written texts and their type of authority. Cana Werman's paper examines the interplay between popular custom and legal principles in the intricate development of the *halakhah* relating to the wood offering in Second Temple and rabbinic texts.

Reassessment is the primary theme of the last three papers. Exploring Qumran cosmology and anthropology, particularly its "liturgical anthropology," Crispin Fletcher-Lewis discloses a holistic worldview that calls into question the dualistic cosmology so often ascribed to the Qumran community. Looking anew at the issue of *ṭevul yom* in the *Temple Scroll*, 4QD, and 4QMMT, Martha Himmelfarb raises methodological questions regarding the reading of Qumran texts in the light of later rabbinic *halakhah* and cautions against necessarily presuming opposing streams of law in the centuries before 70 CE. Lastly, Philip Alexander's fresh examination of the evidence for mystical praxis in the Scrolls invites reconsideration of Scholem's construction of the development of Jewish mysticism and argues for integration of the Qumran evidence into the history of western mysticism.

We would like to thank the staff of the Orion Center for their assistance in production of the volume. Dr. Ruth Clements, head of Orion publications, prepared the manuscript. Orion research assistant Nadav Sharon prepared and checked the Hebrew and Greek texts; he and research assistant Hannah Wortzman helped proof the volume. As always, we are grateful to the editorial staff of Brill Academic Press, especially Mattie Kuiper and Peter Buschman, for its efforts in bringing the book to publication.

We particularly wish to express our appreciation to the Orion Foundation, the Sir Zelman Cowen Universities Fund, and the Hebrew University of Jerusalem for their generous support of the ongoing work of the Orion Center, in which the international symposia and symposium volumes play a major role.

Esther Chazon and Betsy Halpern-Amaru
Jerusalem, 2009

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	*Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Ed. D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
ANRW	*Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. Ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972–
ASOR	American Schools of Oriental Research
BASORSup	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research Supplement Series
BDB	Brown, F., S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1907.
BEATAJ	Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentum
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CEJL	Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature
CPJ	*Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*. Ed. V. A. Tcherikover, A Fuks and M. Stern. 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957–1964
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CSCO	Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DSD	*Dead Sea Discoveries*
EDSS	*Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2000

EncJud	*Encyclopedia Judaica*. Ed. C. Roth. 16 vols. [1st ed.] Jerusalem, Keter, 1972
HALOT	*Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Ed. L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner, and J. J. Stamm. Translated and edited under the supervision of M. E. J. Richardson. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994–1999; 2 volume Study Edition, 2001
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
IDB	*The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*. Ed. G. A. Buttrick. 4 vols. Nashville and New York: Abingdon, 1962
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal*
JAAR	*Journal of the American Academy of Religion*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JEA	*Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods*
JSJSup	Journal for the Study of Judaism: Supplement Series
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JSP	*Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha*
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
LSTS	Library of Second Temple Studies
NTS	*New Testament Studies*
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTP	*Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Ed. J. H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983–85
RB	*Revue biblique*
REJ	*Revue des études juives*
RelSRev	*Religious Studies Review*
RevQ	*Revue de Qumrân*
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series

SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series
SBLSP	Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SBLSymS	Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series
SCI	*Scripta Classica Israelica*
ScrHier	Scripta hierosolymitana
SFSHJ	South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism
SJ	Studia Judaica
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SSEJC	Sheffield Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
StPB	Studia post-biblica
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigraphica
TBN	Themes in Biblical Narrative
TDOT	*Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Ed. G. J. Botterweck, H. Ringgren, and H.-J. Fabry. Tr. J. T. Willis, D. E. Green, and D. W. Stott. 15 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974–
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Ed. G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Tr. G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1976
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
TZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*

NEW APPROACHES

EXILE AND SELF-IDENTITY IN THE QUMRAN SECT AND IN HELLENISTIC JUDAISM

Noah Hacham*
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

The nature and exact location of the Qumran sect's exile has occupied scholars from the time the Scrolls were discovered, and the subject continues to evoke interest and controversy today. Almost every possible scenario has been suggested: Damascus is actually Damascus; Damascus is only a symbolic designation; the desert is the actual location of the sect's sojourn; the desert is only a metaphor; Damascus and desert both denote geographical locations where the members of the sect resided at different times. To the best of my knowledge, the only possibility not raised in the scholarly literature is that both places are metaphorical and that the members of the sect resided in neither. Even those who deny that the desert was the habitat of any members of the sect, admit that the sect did experience exile.[1] Thus, all agree that the Teacher of Righteousness' "house of exile," (בית גלותו) (pHab 11:6), involved an actual physical exile. The disagreement concerns only its location.

Since the sect did experience physical exile, its self-identity would have been influenced by that experience and should exhibit characteristics associated with diaspora. The majority of the Jews in the Second Temple period lived in the Diaspora and passed on a vast literature that reveals more than a bit about their values and *Weltanschauung*. Obviously, the Babylonian Talmud, hundreds of years later, also reflects diasporan attitudes. However, the question of

* I wish to thank Dr. Esther G. Chazon and Prof. Betsy Halpern-Amaru for their assistance in presenting this paper at the Symposium and the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature for a postdoctoral grant in support of this research.

[1] Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1957), 256 (Hebrew); L. H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 93–94; D. Dimant, "Not Exile in the Desert but Exile in Spirit: The Pesher of Isa. 40:3 in the *Rule of Community*," *Meghillot* 2 (2004): 21–36 (Hebrew).

the affinity between the values and worldview of Diaspora Jewry and those of the Qumran sect has hardly ever been discussed. Contemporary scholars of the Dead Sea Scrolls seldom compare the sect's theology to that of Diaspora Jews, and historians who deal with the Diaspora almost never refer to the Scrolls. Thus, for example, four important monographs on the Jewish Diaspora that have appeared in the past fifteen years barely mention the Dead Sea Scrolls.[2] In this paper, I would like to begin a preliminary discussion of the subject and point to possible directions for future research.

Two methodological issues need to be clarified from the outset. First, a diasporan identity does not necessarily derive from a location outside of the Land of Israel. Rather, such an identity refers to values and outlook, not to geographical location.[3] Second, the attributes under discussion are not the general attributes of abstract group identities, but rather specific religious and cultural phenomena. As Philip Alexander noted in regard to Hellenism, the identity of a group can be described only in the light of the concrete details that define it.

In one paper it is not possible to cover the entire range of details that comprise the mosaic of the Qumran sect's identity. Therefore, I will focus on a selection of components that demonstrate significant similarities between the identity of the sect and certain patterns of identity among communities of the Jewish Diaspora. The highlighting of similarities will also point to some differences between the diasporan identities of these groups.[4] An overarching question to be addressed is to what extent the different historical circumstances, on

---

[2] In the index of I. M. Gafni, *Land, Center and Diaspora: Jewish Constructs in Late Antiquity* (JSPSup 21; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), there is not a single reference to the Dead Sea Scrolls; the few references to the Scrolls in J. M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996); E. S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998); and idem, *Diaspora: Jews Amidst Greeks and Romans* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002), do not relate to the question of Jewish diasporan identity but to technical and marginal topics.

[3] D. R. Schwartz, "From the Maccabees to Masada: On Diasporan Historiography of the Second Temple Period," in *Jüdische Geschichte in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit: Wege der Forschung—Von alten zum neuen Schürer* (ed. A. Oppenheimer; Munich: Oldenburg, 1999), 35 n. 17.

[4] For another discussion of this issue see D. R. Schwartz's introduction to *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity* (WUNT 60; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1992), 1–26, esp. 15–24.

the one hand, and the common phenomenon of exile, on the other, shape the ideology and the theology of diaspora, both for the Qumran sect and for Diaspora groups.

I

The first component involves the attitudes of the sect and of Hellenistic Jewry to the Temple. As is well known, the Qumran sect viewed the existing Temple in Jerusalem as a place of sin and pollution and forbade participation in the rituals conducted there. It is sufficient to point to comments in the *Damascus Document* about the Jerusalem priests who "continuously polluted the sanctuary" (CD 5:6): "And all who were brought into the covenant [are] not to enter the sanctuary to light his altar in vain, [but rather are] to be 'closers of the door' of whom God said, 'Who of you will close my door and not light my altar in vain?'" (CD 6:11–14).[5]

In Jewish Hellenistic literature, on the other hand, the Jerusalem Temple was perceived, not as a place of sin and pollution, but rather as a holy and distinguished place held in high repute even by Gentile kings. The author of 2 Maccabees relates how Seleucus IV defrayed all the expenses of the sacrificial ritual in the Temple; the *Letter of Aristeas* indicates that Ptolemy Philadelphus donated beautiful utensils to the Temple; and according to 3 Maccabees, Ptolemy Philopator was very positively impressed by its grandeur and organization.[6]

Nonetheless, one finds both in Jewish Hellenistic literature and in the Scrolls a perspective that seeks a substitute for the Jerusalem Temple and attempts to reduce its importance and centrality. This

---

[5] J. M. Baumgarten and D. R. Schwartz, "Damascus Document (CD)," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, 2: Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth et al.; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck]; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993), 21–23. See further *4QFlorilegium* (4Q174) and 11QT. Of the extensive scholarly literature on the sect's attitude toward the Temple, see B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament* (SNTSMS 1; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 16–46; D. R. Schwartz, "The Three Temples of 4Q Florilegium," *RevQ* 10 (1979): 83–91; D. Dimant, "4QFlorilegium and the Idea of the Community as Temple," in *Hellenica et Judaica: Hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky* (ed. A. Caquot, M. Hadas-Lebel and J. Riaud; Collection de la REJ 3; Leuven: Peeters, 1986), 187–88.

[6] 2 Macc 3:2–3; *Let. Aris.* 51–82; 3 Macc 1:9–10.

aspect of the sectarian literature is well known. The *Community Rule* says: "the Council of the Community (עצת היחד) shall be truly established as an eternal planting, a house of holiness for Israel and a foundation of the holy of holies for Aaron…chosen by God's will to atone for the land…for a covenant of justice and to offer a sweet savor.…And they will be accepted willingly to atone for the land."[7] According to this statement, the Council of the Community is "a house of holiness," a temple, and the Aaronites who are members of this council are "the holy of holies," the holiest part of that temple, which only the high priest may enter on the Day of Atonement. Through the uniqueness of their religious beliefs and actions the members of the group atone for the land and sacrifice a sweet savor just as was done in the physical Temple. It is clear that the community is the Temple itself, complete with its sacrifices and atonement, which has undergone a process of spiritualization.[8]

Although more subtly expressed, a similar perspective is evident in Hellenistic Judaism. In several works by Jews living in the Diaspora, we find expressions of concern with their physical distance from the Temple and the development of creative solutions to the problem. It is well known that the *Letter of Aristeas* praises Jerusalem and the Temple extensively. However, alongside the praise and glorification, one also finds a hint that Aristeas' affinity to the Temple is more complex than it might first appear. As noted earlier, Aristeas recounts the Ptolemaic king's generous donation to the Temple, which, among other things, includes a table and other Temple utensils. The *Letter of Aristeas* emphasizes that the king consulted with priests regarding the suitability of the table, and that the table was constructed according to

---

[7] My translation of 1QS 8:5–10: נכונה עצת היחד באמת למטעת עולם בית קודש לישראל וסוד קודש קודשים לאהרון…ובחירי רצון לכפר בעד הארצ…לברית משפט ולקריב ריח ניחוח…והיו לרצון לכפר בעד הארצ.

[8] See, inter alia, Gärtner, *Temple and Community*, 22–30; D. R. Schwartz, *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity*, 37; L. H. Schiffman, "Community Without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel (Community without Temple): Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kultus im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (ed. B. Ego, A. Lange and P. Pilhofer; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 272–74; and, using discourse studies terminology, C. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*: *Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 152–65; for a different interpretation, see Dimant, "4QFlorilegium," 186–89.

the size specified in the Torah in order to make it appropriate for the Temple service. It may be the case that one of the writer's aims in recounting these details was to detract from the Temple's association with the Jews of Jerusalem and to suggest its partnership with the Jews of the Egyptian Diaspora. Those Jews are represented in the story by their Ptolemaic king, who released them from bondage and initiated the translation of the Pentateuch into Greek, their language.[9]

Other Diaspora works express a different attitude toward the Temple. In his commentary on 2 Maccabees, Daniel Schwartz argues, in contrast to Robert Doran, that the work attributes only a secondary importance to the Temple. In his opinion, such a position reflects the thinking of a diasporan writer whose beliefs place God in heaven, not in a specific, delimited place on earth. Clearly, the Temple is of religious significance, but it is not the focus of the writer's religious world. This is how Schwartz accounts for the paucity of sources regarding Onias' temple. The absence of information should not be understood as criticism of a temple located outside of the only chosen site. Rather, it reflects a natural inclination to ignore temples when one's religion, like that of Diaspora Jews, does not focus on earthly temples but on a God who is in heaven.[10]

This last point requires some elaboration. The Temple is the house of God wherein he causes his Presence to dwell. Nevertheless, the members of the sect, who disdain the Temple, and the Diaspora Jews, who are distanced from it, could not accept the idea of God being present in a place other than among themselves. A religious person seeks his God, and if God is not with him, he is rendered religiously

---

[9] *Let. Aris.* 52–57 (on the dimensions of the table); 83–111 (on Jerusalem and the Temple). On the diasporan character and identity of the *Letter of Aristeas,* see also S. Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas* (London: Routledge, 2003), 37–63; N. Hacham, "The Letter of Aristeas: A New Exodus Story?" *JSJ* 36 (2005): 1–20.

[10] D. R. Schwartz, *The Second Book of Maccabees: Introduction, Hebrew Translation, and Commentary* (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2004), 15–16, 36 (Hebrew); English edition: *The Second Book of Maccabees* (CEJL; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008), 46–48; idem, "From the Maccabees to Masada," 29; idem, "The Jews of Egypt between the Temple of Onias, the Temple of Jerusalem, and Heaven," in *Center and Diaspora: The Land of Israel and the Diaspora in the Second Temple, Mishnah, and Talmud Periods* (ed. I. M. Gafni; Jerusalem: The Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 2004), 37–55, esp. 48–55 (Hebrew); R. Doran, *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees* (CBQMS 12; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981).

inferior and dependent upon other people and other places for his relationship with the divine. Precisely such a dependency is expressed in an epistle the Jews in Jerusalem and Judaea sent to their brethren in Egypt. The epistle assures them that "we," the Jews of Jerusalem, pray for "you," the Diaspora Jews (2 Macc 1:6). Under such circumstances, Diaspora Jews would naturally try to position God closer to themselves in order not to feel rejected or inferior. Correspondingly, to the degree that the daily religious experience of Jews is independent of the Temple, the importance and centrality of that sanctuary will decline, and God's "place" will be relocated.[11] Indeed, Philo, a Diaspora Jew, relates to different temples in different places: the world as a temple (*Spec*. 1.66); the temple within each man's heart (*Somn*. 1.149); the temple within each congregation of believers (*Sobr*. 66); and the Jerusalem Temple as a concrete expression of the all-encompassing presence of God (*Spec*. 1.66–67).[12]

3 Maccabees seems to exhibit a position that is similar to that in the Scrolls. This work relates two conflicts between the Jewish people and Ptolemy IV Philopator. In the first, Philopator, after winning the Battle of Raphia (217 BCE), visited Jerusalem and wanted to enter the Holy of Holies, but was prevented from doing so when he fell unconscious as he approached the site. Despite this failure, the king did not repent; he returned to Egypt and initiated a policy of killing all its Jews by means of drunken elephants. Following two unsuccessful attempts to slaughter the Jews, who had been forcibly assembled in the Hippodrome, God revealed himself and saved his people. Instead of trampling the Jews, the drunken elephants stampeded the soldiers

---

[11] For other examples of such dependence and the reaction to it, see D. S. Williams, "3 Maccabees: A Defense of Diaspora Judaism?" *JSP* 13 (1995): 23–24; G. H. Howard, "The *Letter of Aristeas* and Diaspora Judaism," *JTS* 22 (1971): 342; P. S. Alexander, "*3 Maccabees*, Hanukkah and Purim," in *Biblical Hebrew, Biblical Texts: Essays in Memory of Michael P. Weitzman* (ed. A. Rapoport-Albert and G. Greenberg; JSOTSup 333; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 338–39; S. R. Johnson, *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity: Third Maccabees in its Cultural Context* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 165–66.

[12] On Philo's view of the Temple see, inter alia, V. Nikiprowetzky, "La Spiritualisation des sacrifices et le culte sacrificiel au temple de Jérusalem chez Philon d'Alexandrie," *Semitica* 14 (1967): 97–116. On the similarities and differences between Philo's conception and other diasporan concepts, including that of *Florilegium*, see C. Werman, "God's House: Temple or Universe?" in *Philo und das Neue Testament* (ed. R. Deines and K. W. Niebuhr; WUNT 172; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 309–20.

who led them. After the divine epiphany, the king repented and released all the Jews to their homes in safety.

In both instances the king failed in his attempts to hurt the Jews, but the descriptions of these failures are very different. Whereas in Jerusalem, the Temple was saved *without* a divine epiphany, in Egypt, where the *people* were saved, God revealed himself and the king repented. God's revelation and his ultimate resolution of the conflict between the king and the Jews seem to be related to the object of the salvation: in Jerusalem it was the Temple alone that was in danger, whereas in Egypt it was the people. In light of this, I have concluded elsewhere that the writer of 3 Maccabees was of the opinion that God is with his people more than he is within the Temple.[13] In order to illustrate this further, it suffices to mention that the verb ἁγιάζω and the nouns related to it in 3 Maccabees refer to place, people, and God. An examination of the occurrences of these words leads to the conclusion that the holiness of the people is the reason for the revelation of God's holy countenance and for the deliverance of the holy people, whereas the holiness of the place did not cause a comparable theophany.[14] This is an extension of a principle clearly asserted in 2 Macc 5:19: "It was not for the sake of the Place that the Lord chose the nation; rather, He chose the Place for the sake of the nation."[15]

There is a clear parallel in rabbinic literature. We read in *Sifre Numbers* (161) "Wherever they went into exile, the Divine Presence went with them" (כל מקום שגלו שכינה עמהם).[16] Egypt, Babylon, Eilam and Edom are enumerated as places to which Israel went into exile with the divine presence accompanying them. Thus, the divine presence is not dependent on place; indeed, in times of exile it attaches itself to the people: wherever the people are, the divine presence is.

To sum up this point, the Qumran sect and Diaspora Jewry differ in their basic attitudes to the Temple. The former views it as a place

---

[13] N. Hacham, "The Third Book of Maccabees: Literature, History and Ideology" (Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2002), 65–103 (Hebrew). See also Williams, "3 Maccabees," 17–29.

[14] 3 Macc 2:2, 6, 9, 13, 14, 16, 18, 21; 5:13; 6:1, 3, 5, 9, 18, 29; 7:10. In several manuscripts the word occurs also in 1:16; 7:16. See further Hacham, "The Third Book of Maccabees," 81–82.

[15] J. A. Goldstein's translation (idem, *2 Maccabees* [AB 41A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983]), 245.

[16] My translation.

of sin and pollution, and the latter views it as a place of holiness. Nevertheless, for both groups there is a decline in the importance assigned to the Temple, a search for a substitute, and an attempt to place God outside of a specific location in Jerusalem. Likewise for both, where a substitute is proposed, its base is usually the people, defined as the chosen group. On the other hand, whereas Diaspora Jews exhibit a tendency to abandon the Temple-related language of place, sacrifice, and atonement, the Scrolls use these very words to describe the community of the *Yaḥad* as a spiritual substitute for the Temple.[17]

II

A second component involves the location of religious authority. The central institutions of justice and instruction in the Second Temple period were located in proximity to the Temple and were directly connected to it. Furthermore, the Jews in Jerusalem viewed themselves as the central authorities in matters of Torah and law. This is the meaning of 2 Macc 2:13–15, where the Jews of Egypt are invited to use the books and histories of the library of Jerusalem; it is with this in view that the grandson of Ben Sira, in his introduction to the Greek translation of his grandfather's book, writes that there are significant differences between the original Hebrew of the Torah, Prophets, and other writings, and their translations. Such a claim, notably uttered by a Jew who emigrated from Judaea to Egypt, finds the translation of the Torah dear to the Jews of Egypt inherently flawed. By definition, it denigrates Torah knowledge based upon the Greek translation and concomitantly scorns the Jews of Egypt.[18]

The members of the sect clearly did not acknowledge the authority of the Jerusalem Torah instructors. They called their disputants דורשי חלקות ("seekers of smooth things") and considered their Torah to be

[17] On the ritual language of the sect, see for example the many occurrences of words like מקדש, ניחוח, מנחה, קרבן etc. in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In contrast, this type of language is rare in the diasporan books mentioned above.

[18] See further: M. H. Segal, *Sefer Ben Sira Ha-Shalem* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1972), 2 (Hebrew); G. H. Howard, "The *Letter of Aristeas* and Diaspora Judaism," 342. For a similar attitude reflected in the colophon of the Greek version of Esther, see V. A. Tcherikover, *CPJ*, "Prolegomena," 1:46 n. 119; Johnson, *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity*, 166; Alexander, "*3 Maccabees*, Hanukkah and Purim," 335–37.

teaching based on untruth. Another designation of the Jerusalemites who misunderstand the Law is "the men of mockery who are in Jerusalem…the ones who rejected the Torah of God and reviled the word of the Holy One of Israel."[19] In contrast, it is the Righteous Teacher who knows the true Torah, and "guides them in the way of his heart" (CD 1:11); and it is he to whom God had granted the ability to interpret "all the words of his servants, the prophets" (*Pesher Habakkuk* 2:8–9). According to the sect, the authority for establishing the Law lies in the revelation to and the divine inspiration of the Righteous Teacher and of the sect's priests and instructors, as well as in the sect's writings and interpretations, rather than in the traditional sources (or *loci*) of authority.[20] Such a perspective may have derived from or have been accentuated by the sect's exile: a group that went into exile because of a halakhic dispute must claim that its law is authoritative and deny any halakhic authority to the place and people of its origin.

A similar, albeit weaker, argument may be found in the *Letter of Aristeas.* According to Aristeas, the Greek translation of the Torah by the seventy-two elders sent from Jerusalem was entirely accurate (310, 314), so much so that the elders, priests, and members of the community agreed that it should neither be added to nor detracted from (311). That this translation attempt, in contrast to others, was successful, suggests that God viewed the project favorably and that the translation had divine approval. The Egyptian Jews, therefore, no longer required the Hebrew version of the Torah in order to know God's word, for they had an accurate and divinely recognized Greek version. Consequently, the Jews of Egypt were no longer dependent on the Jerusalem center for learning Torah. Moreover, God's involvement in the translation project indicates that even for the author of

---

[19] *Pesher Isaiah* 2:6–8; see "162. Commentary on Isaiah (B)," in *Qumrân Cave 4.I (4Q158–4Q186)* (ed. J. M. Allegro with A. A. Anderson; DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 15–16; M. P. Horgan, "Isaiah Pesher 2 [4Q162=4QpIsa^{b}]," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, 6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth et al.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 43. At certain points my translation differs from that of Horgan.

[20] On this central tenet of the sect, see among others L. H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (SJLA 16; Leiden: Brill, 1975), esp. 75–76; idem, *Law, Custom and Messianism in the Dead Sea Sect* (Jerusalem: The Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 1993), 88–89; 312 (Hebrew); idem, "The Pharisees and their Legal Traditions According to the Dead Sea Scrolls," *DSD* 8 (2001): 265–70.

the *Letter of Aristeas* (who views the Jerusalem Temple as a holy place), in matters concerning his Torah God reveals himself outside the Temple, even in Egypt.[21] I would suggest that living in the Diaspora functions as a stimulus to the formulation of such a position. While not denying the centrality of the Temple in matters of *halakhah*, the Diaspora Jew who composed *Aristeas* obviated his own need for that center by claiming an independent channel of access to the Torah and its correct interpretation.[22]

Of course, disputes over the source of halakhic authority were not unique to these Diaspora groups. Within Jerusalem itself such a dispute existed between the Sadducees and the Pharisees.[23] But these two factions struggled for their positions within the establishment accepted by both, namely, the Temple in Jerusalem. The writings of the sect and certain sources in Jewish Hellenistic literature, on the other hand, undermine the authority of the Jerusalem "establishment" and seek independence from it.

III

Another religious issue closely related to the previous ones is that of prayer. A number of scholars have noted the prominence of prayer in the Scrolls.[24] Not only are members of the sect obligated to pray at fixed times, but prayer is viewed as "an offering of the lips." Groups like the Qumran community, who reject the Temple and the sacrifices therein, require a different, more spiritual, form of worship, one that

---

[21] See H. M. Orlinsky, "The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators," *HUCA* 46 (1975): 94–103.

[22] See, e.g., Howard, "The *Letter of Aristeas* and Diaspora Judaism," 337–48.

[23] On the dispute between the Sadducees and Pharisees over the authority of *halakhah,* see inter alia M. Kister, "Marginalia Qumranica," *Tarbiz* 57 (1988): 315–16 (Hebrew); idem, "Some Aspects of Qumranic Halakha," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March, 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 2:571–76; C. Werman, "The *Torah* and the *Teʿudah* on the Tablets," *Tarbiz* 68 (1999): 485–90 (Hebrew); V. Noam, *Megillat Taʿanit: Versions, Interpretation, History* (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2003), 206–16 (Hebrew).

[24] On the character and meaning of prayer in the sect, see, for example, E. G. Chazon, "Psalms, Hymns, and Prayers," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 2:710–15; D. Falk, *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 27; Leiden: Brill, 1998); B. Nitzan, *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (trans. J. Chipman; STDJ 12; Leiden: Brill, 1994).

will compensate for the lack of sacrifices. However, not only those who have reservations about the legitimacy of the Temple, but also those who are physically distanced from it, make prayer their cardinal mode of worship. Thus prayers are more preeminent in Diaspora books than they are in Palestinian works. For example, whereas in 1 Maccabees sacrifices often appear alongside prayers, in the Diaspora-based 2 Maccabees the main way of addressing God is through prayer.[25] Similarly, in 3 Maccabees prayer figures as the central means of worship;[26] likewise Philo, describing the role of the high priest, emphasizes prayer over sacrifice.[27] The synagogue in the Diaspora is called προσεύχη, a house of prayer, while in Palestine it is called συναγόγη, a house of assembly. Each term reflects the essence of the institution in its particular locale.[28] The question of whether or not public prayer existed in the time of the Temple is not at issue here.[29] If public prayer did exist in Judaea, it was of marginal significance compared to the centrality of prayer in the Diaspora and in the Qumran community.

IV

The varied attempts to seek substitutes for the Temple and the center in Jerusalem bring the discussion around to the question of how Diaspora Jews accounted for their "off-center" situation. Isaiah Gafni has addressed this question and has shown that three patterns exist in different Jewish sources. Whereas Jewish writers in the homeland adopted the biblical position and stressed the facet of punishment inherent in exile, Jewish writers from the Diaspora did not view their situation as inherently negative. Rather, they perceived their exile as an expression of a blessing of natural proliferation not unlike the

---

[25] Schwartz, *2 Maccabees* (Hebrew), 36, 115; *2 Maccabees* (English), 48, 203.

[26] See Hacham, "The Third Book of Maccabees," 107 n. 1.

[27] Philo *Mos.* 2.5; *Spec.* 1.97.

[28] L. I. Levine notes the parallels between the Qumran and Diaspora approaches to prayer, which he attributes to, among other things, the distance of each from the Temple (*The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000], 153–55).

[29] On this important question, see J. Heinemann, *Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns* (SJ 9; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977), esp. 218–29; E. Fleischer, "On the Beginnings of Obligatory Jewish Prayer," *Tarbiz* 59 (1990): 397–441 (Hebrew); E. G. Chazon, "Prayers from Qumran and their Historical Implications," *DSD* 1 (1994): 277–84; Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, 151–58.

expansion of the Greek colonial world, or as a reality whose purpose was to be a mission to the nations of the world.[30]

The members of the Qumran sect saw themselves as exiles. However, if, as the Bible indicates (e.g., Deut 4:27), exile were a punishment, then they themselves would be the ones being punished. Such a conclusion would not be commensurate with their self-image as the chosen group that alone observes the Torah as it should be observed. How could it be that the enemies of the sect are not punished and the members of the sect are in exile? The sect's deterministic point of view and their conception of the current dominion of the forces of darkness may be understood as attempts to account for their present tribulation. Furthermore, in sectarian writings that relate the circumstances that gave rise to their exile, diaspora is presented neither as a punishment nor as an escape from persecution. The opposite is the case. The members of the sect *choose* to withdraw from the rest of the people and go into exile *voluntarily*, because of the latter's sinful way of life.

Thus, the *Damascus Document*, which describes the sect's loyal house, says: "and [he] built them a sure house…as God swore to them through the hand of Ezekiel, the prophet, saying: 'The priests and the Levites and the Sons of Zadok who kept the watch of my sanctuary when the children of Israel strayed from me, they shall present to me fat and blood (Ezek 44:15).' The priests are the penitents of Israel who depart(ed) from the land of Judah…."[31] Similarly, we find in 4QMMT (4Q397 14–21 7–8): "and you know that we have separated ourselves from the multitude of the people…and from being involved with these matters and from participating with them in these things."[32] Volunteers who join the sect are obliged to "separate themselves from the congregation of the men of deceit" (1QS 5:1–2).[33] And, in the words of the famous call in the *Rule of the Community* (1QS 8:13):

---

[30] Gafni, *Land, Center and Diaspora*, 19–40.

[31] CD 3:19–4:3 (Baumgarten and Schwartz, "Damascus Document (CD)," 17–19).

[32] לגב [מהם] ע[מלבוא ומהתערב בדברים האלה…]ו[פרשנו מרוב העם ש]יודעים [ואתם אלה, E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V (Miqsat Maase Ha-Torah)* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 59.

[33] להבדל מעדת אנשי העול, E. Qimron and J. H. Charlesworth, "Rule of the Community (1QS)", *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth et al.; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck]; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 18–19.

"they shall separate themselves from the dwelling of the men of deceit in order to depart into the wilderness to prepare there the Way of the Lord."[34] As Carol Newsom notes, the expression, "they shall be set apart (as) holy in the midst of the Council of the men of the Community" (1QS 8:11),[35] speaks of the separation of the holy from the unholy. The sect's voluntary departure thus points to its holiness and election by God.[36]

A similar motivation for the phenomenon of "exile" appears in Hellenistic sources. The famous description of the Jews in Strabo's *Geography* recounts that Moses, one of the Egyptian priests, went to Judaea because he could not bear the religious situation in Egypt. He arrived in Jerusalem, which was an unattractive rocky place, and settled there. In his voluntary exile, Moses established a worthy society, religion, and regime.[37]

The similarity between this story of the origins of the Jewish people and the Qumran sect's narrative is apparent. In both cases, a religious group, led by a priest, left its home, settled in a wasteland, and conducted a special religious life there. What is important for us is the similar attitude towards the abandonment of the original residence and the settlement in a new wasteland place. Strabo, or more precisely his source, who seems to be Posidonius, one of the important Stoic thinkers in the Hellenistic period,[38] viewed this exile as an act of separation or isolation, one that enabled the members of the special group to acquire conditions appropriate for observing and developing their philosophical religion without interference. Needless to say, we are noting here two similar opinions about exile, and not, of course, a direct influence of one source upon the other.

---

[34] יבדלו מתוך מושב הנשי העול ללכת למדבר לפנות שם את דרכ הואהא; Qimron and Charlesworth, "Rule of the Community," 37. My translation differs at points from that of Qimron and Charlesworth. On this sentence, see Dimant, "Not Exile in the Desert."

[35] יבדלו קודש בתוכ עצת אנשי היחד, Qimron and Charlesworth, "Rule of the Community," 34–35.

[36] C. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space*, 157.

[37] Strabo, *Geographica* 16.2.35–37 (M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* [3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974–1984], 1:294–311, no. 115).

[38] On Posidonius as Strabo's source, see B. Bar-Kochva, "Mosaic Judaism and Judaism of the Second Temple Period—The Jewish Ethnography of Strabo," *Tarbiz* 66 (1997): 328–31 (Hebrew).

The same idea appears with somewhat different hues in other sources as well. In a rejoinder to the people of Jerusalem, who claim that the Babylonian exiles "keep far from the Lord" and that "the land has been given as a heritage to *us* (= the people of Jerusalem)," Ezekiel says: "I…have scattered them among the countries, and I have become to them a diminished sanctity in the countries whither they have gone" (Ezek 11:15–16). In another prophecy Ezekiel proclaims against those survivors who have been left in the Land of Israel: "Yet you expect to possess the land?…They shall fall by the sword.…I will make the land a desolate waste" (Ezek 33:26–28). In other words, those in exile are the chosen ones with whom God will be, albeit in a diminished sanctity (מקדש מעט), whereas those who stay in the land and believe they will inherit it will in fact perish.[39] In this instance, as in the others, exile is presented as the situation of the chosen, the good people with whom God chooses to be, whereas the sinners remain in their homeland. This case, however, is slightly different from the above, because here the exile is not voluntary but rather a punishment. Nevertheless, it is clear that those who are in exile are the chosen people, who were separated from the evildoers—as were the members of the Qumran sect and Moses, according to Strabo.

Another example of this perspective may be found in the Onias story. Onias moved from Jerusalem to Egypt and built a temple to God in the province of Heliopolis, constructing its furnishings and utensils like those of the Jerusalem Temple. Josephus reports this event in a number of places, some of which provide a similar justification for Onias' actions.[40] In *J.W.* 7.424–425 we are told that Onias claimed to have built his temple in order to worship God in Egypt according to the laws of the fathers, because Antiochus IV had sacked the Temple in Jerusalem. The beginning of the *Jewish War* reports that Onias had fled to Egypt because of the looting of the

---

[39] See: M. Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1–20* (AB 22; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 190; D. Rom-Shiloni, "Ezekiel as the Voice of the Exiles and Constructor of Exilic Ideology," *HUCA* 76 (2005): 17–18.

[40] Josephus, *J.W.* 1.32–33; 7.424–425; *Ant.* 12.387–388; 13.62–73; 20.236. On Onias' temple in general and on Josephus' description of the event, see, among others, F. Parente, "Onias III's Death and the Founding of the Temple of Leontopolis," in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith* (ed. F. Parente and J. Sievers; StPB 41; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 69–98; E. S. Gruen, "The Origins and Objectives of Onias' Temple," *SCI* 16 (1997): 47–70.

Temple and the cessation of sacrifices (*J.W.* 1.32–33). Thus, according to these sources, Onias acted out of concern for the continuation of divine worship. Similarly, in *Ant.* 13.62–63, Onias' decision to build a temple is attributed to the dire situation of Judaea, which was in the hands of the Macedonians and their kings. It seems that in this passage as well, Onias' escape from Jerusalem is justified by the fact that the temple in Egypt is to be the new place of worship, replacing the old one that had been looted and sacked. Onias left Jerusalem and the desecrated Temple, since he, a scion of the high priesthood, was obliged—in his view—to continue the priestly line and temple worship elsewhere. Indeed it is possible that Josephus's purpose in these passages is to ridicule Onias' temple, and, historically speaking, it is doubtful that these claims were argued by Onias himself. However it seems plausible that this kind of justification would have been offered, and we may assume that the basic motif of voluntary separation is the same: the chosen one left out of a sense of spiritual superiority and of a mission of religious continuity, and configured the place or group left beyond as sinful and rejected.

Clarification is needed: one should not, in light of the above, confuse the approach that finds substitutes for the Temple while in exile with the approach that views diaspora as preferable. A proposal for a substitute may assume that the source is preferable, and that the substitute is only a replacement. A claim to the Diaspora's superiority argues for the inferiority of the original homeland, whether due to its sin or to its destruction.

V

The similarities between the Jews of the Hellenistic Diaspora and the Qumran sect may also extend beyond the boundaries of theology into the realm of politics, and perhaps into the realm of discourse. First let me address the aspect of politics. Jewish Diaspora literature excels in its expressions of loyalty to the host government. This is the case in the biblical books of Esther and Daniel and in almost any postbiblical diasporan work. It is inconceivable to rebel against the host regime. Thus, for example, 3 Maccabees describes those Jerusalemites who want to take up arms to rebel against Philopator's plot as "arrogant" (3 Macc 1:22–23: οἱ περὶ τῶν πολιτῶν θρασυνθέντες). The leaders of the city, for their part, make every effort to prevent such an action

(3 Macc 1:23). It should be emphasized that the "arrogant" are from Judaea, not the Diaspora; nevertheless they are obligated to respect and acknowledge the Gentile rulers. A similar position is found in 2 Maccabees, which justifies the Maccabean wars by claiming that the Jews were not allowed to observe their ancestral laws. Indeed, some passages in the book appear to suggest that, had the Jews been allowed to observe their laws, peace would have prevailed.[41] Talmudic literature reveals comparable approaches. Certainly, the hostile attitude of the Babylonian Talmud toward attempts at rebellion as well as toward immigration to Palestine is well known.[42]

A similar viewpoint can be found in the writings of the Qumran sect. The account of the war at the end of the days is not a realistic, operative battle plan, but rather an ideological and utopian one. There is no actual cry to take arms and to fight. The battle array entails a religious mustering of priests, a taking of weapons constructed according to divine decree, and a religious ritual. Thus, according to its writings, the sect actually abandons the option of making war and chooses instead to wait for the eschatological war that God will fight against the Sons of Darkness. The description of the Essenes in Josephus matches this pacifist orientation, for according to him, the Essenes are loyal to the regime and do not fight.[43] Clearly, those descriptions are not free of tendentiousness. Obviously the Essenes would not have felt obligated to the Jewish regime towards which they were hostile; at the same time they would not have felt obligated toward the Romans. Nevertheless, it seems that they did not view the option of rebellion as a practical one.

I would like to propose that the lack of reference to a war option in the Scrolls is also related to the diasporan nature of the sect. Just as the Jews in the Hellenistic Diaspora could not assert themselves from a position of independent military power, so the members of the sect were unable to engage in actual warfare. Just as it was clear to the Diaspora Jews that there was no point in fighting against the

---

[41] On this feature of diasporan literature and historiography in general, see Schwartz, "From the Maccabees to Masada," 34–35; idem, *2 Maccabees* (Hebrew), 230; (English), 420 (on 2 Macc 12:1); and more generally, Schwartz, *2 Maccabees* (Hebrew), 36, 38–39; (English) 45–56. See also AddEsther E15; Hacham, "The Third Book of Maccabees," 163–69; Johnson, *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity*, 154–57.

[42] E.g. *b. Ned.* 28a; *b. Ket.* 110b.

[43] Josephus, *J.W.* 2.140.

regime, so the members of the sect also seemed to believe that undertaking an actual war against the Sons of Darkness in the present age was a hopeless endeavor. The difference between the two groups lies in the fact that the Gentile regimes granted the Diaspora Jews the right to live according to their religion, whereas the members of the sect lived according to their rules against the desires of a regime that was unable to stop their practice. That difference notwithstanding, in both situations the prevailing feeling is that it is God who actually protects the continuity of the group.[44]

One may argue that in my analysis I have fallen into a trap set by the members of the sect; namely, that they did not want to expose their real, operative plan to act against the regime, so they concealed it. Indeed, in the same manner, and probably for the same reason, they obfuscate the identity of historical figures through the use of sobriquets. If this is the case, it brings us to the form of discourse used by exilic communities; that is, one which hides or encodes problematic items and can be characterized as a hidden discourse. This mode of expression seems, once again, to derive from the circumstances of exile, since exiles and persecuted people cannot express criticism of the "host" regime openly and freely. It seems that this kind of discourse can also be found in Josephus and Philo's descriptions of the conflicts between Jews and Gentiles.[45] A more sophisticated mode of discourse is evident in 3 Maccabees. In this book one finds a description of the king's hostile attitude toward the Jews together with his recognition of their contribution and loyalty to the throne. I have shown elsewhere that the best way to solve the contradiction between the two is by assuming that there are two levels of discourse: the public transcript, which claims that relations are normal, and the hidden transcript, which depicts a substantial problem in the relationship between the Gentile regime and the Jews.[46]

---

[44] This is the case in 3 Macc 7:23; Dan 3:28–33; 6:23–28; 4Q171 (pPs[a]) 4:7–9; and many other texts.

[45] Philo, *Flacc* 29; *Legat*. 166–170; Josephus, *C. Ap*. 2.68–70. See also Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 196–97; J. J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 127.

[46] Hacham, "The Third Book of Maccabees," 147–73. On a similar phenomenon in talmudic literature see D. Boyarin, "Tricksters, Martyrs, and Appeasers: 'Hidden Transcripts' and the Diaspora Art of Resistance," *Theory and Criticism* 10 (1997): 145–62 (Hebrew).

Conclusions

I offer these conclusions, which pertain mainly to the similarities between the exile communities, with a word of caution and a warning. "Diasporan identity" is a widely used construct and its significations can differ greatly. In addition, not every diasporan attribute is adopted by everyone who has a diasporan identity. This is apparent, for example, in relation to the Temple and the expectation for return from exile. We have seen a variety of positions regarding the Temple in Jewish Hellenistic literature. None of these works condemns the Temple,[47] but neither do we find in them a strong desire to return to the Temple or even to the Land of Israel. Thus, for example, the author of 3 Maccabees presents an account of how the Jews of Egypt were almost annihilated, describes a holiday that was decreed in commemoration of the salvation, but nowhere does he refer to an actual expectation to leave Egypt and return to Judaea. The few references to the temporary nature of the Diaspora seem to be no more than lip service.[48] The *Letter of Aristeas* actually recounts a tale of a new exodus from Egypt, at the end of which the Jews, expressing no serious aspirations to migrate to the Land of Israel, settle, of all places, in Egypt.[49] In contrast, the actual Temple occupies a central place in the Scrolls.[50] In the *War Scroll,* for example, a desire to return to Jerusalem and to the Temple is apparent. This difference may derive from the fact that the Diaspora Jews might in theory choose to return to Jerusalem but do not wish to, whereas the members of the sect could not return. Thus, those who could return or visit the Jerusalem Temple would seek substitutes for it, but would not need to see themselves as voluntary dissidents; while those who desired to but were unable to return would redefine themselves as voluntary exiles.

---

[47] But note the exception of Stephen (Acts 7:46–48), and *Sib. Or.* 4.8, 24–27. See also M. Simon, "Saint Stephen and the Jerusalem Temple," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 2 (1951): 127–42; Hacham, "The Third Book of Maccabees," 95–96.

[48] 3 Macc 6:36; 7:19. See further Hacham, "The Third Book of Maccabees," 97–102.

[49] Honigman, *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship*, 53–55; Hacham, "New Exodus Story."

[50] As we can see from the *Temple Scroll*, *War Scroll* 2:3–6, *4QFlorilegium* (4Q174), and other writings.

It must be emphasized that other groups in the Second Temple period, especially in Palestine, did not necessarily display these diasporan characteristics. One such group is the Sadducean priests, who did not accept Roman rule, but spoke clearly against it; secure in their Temple power base, they did not face the issue of alienation from it. Another group is the Pharisees who, although opposed to Sadducee leadership, did not adopt the strategy of leaving Jerusalem and the Temple, but chose to promote their aims using existing channels of power. Unlike the diasporan-type groups, their opposition might actually include war against the rulers, as in the time of Jannaeus.[51]

With regard to the Qumran sect, we can arrive at two general conclusions. First, although the sect lived in Judaea, in many significant ways it had a Diaspora-like character. Second, there is a similarity between characteristics of the Diaspora phenomenon among Hellenistic Jewish communities (and probably also among talmudic Jewry) and the diasporan character of the sect. In light of these conclusions, exploring the Dead Sea Scrolls from the perspective of diasporan identity has produced new insights that can deepen our understanding of the Second Temple period.

[51] Josephus, *Ant.* 13.376–378; 4QpNah (4Q169) 3–4 i 1–3.

THE LEGACY OF THE TEACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS*

Loren T. Stuckenbruck
Princeton Theological Seminary

I. *Introductory Questions*

The present discussion is concerned with the legacy of an individual called the "Teacher of Righteousness," who comes down to us as an anonymous figure frequently mentioned in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Those who composed and copied the documents which refer to the Teacher are often associated with the community that lived at Khirbet Qumran.[1] It is by no means clear, however, that all the texts which mention this figure were actually composed during the time that the Qumran community occupied the site. Nevertheless, scholars interested in learning more about the origins and socioreligious history of the *Yaḥad* have sometimes gone to great lengths to investigate what can be known about his identity as a historical personage. Such an investigation, however, is anything but straightforward. The main difficulty is the indirectness and remoteness that characterizes the

---

* This paper presents a more detailed discussion of a similar study of mine published under the title, "The Teacher of Righteousness Remembered: From Fragmentary Sources to Collective Memory in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity: The Fifth Durham-Tübingen Research Symposium* (*Durham, September 2004*) (ed. S. C. Barton, L. T. Stuckenbruck, and B. G. Wold; WUNT 212; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 75–94. The English translations of texts below are my own, unless otherwise indicated.

[1] This point holds true even for the *Damascus Document*; although some scholars have maintained that its setting does not reflect a community that had as yet settled at Khirbet Qumran, its correspondences with the *Serek ha-Yaḥad*, which *is* associated with the Qumran community, are unmistakable, and thus enhance the likelihood of social continuity behind these documents. For this perspective, see C. Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Traditions, and Redaction* (STDJ 29; Leiden: Brill, 1998) and her discussion, "Community Structures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Admission, Organization, Disciplinary Procedures," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 2:67–92; for a recent refutation of other interpretations regarding the relationship between these two documents, see H. Evans Kapfer, "The Relationship Between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule: Attitudes Towards the Temple as a Test Case," *DSD* 14 (2007): 152–77.

relationship between the primary texts, on the one hand, and the historical Teacher, on the other. The Dead Sea texts, as I shall review below, are both fragmentary in themselves and distinct from one another, requiring close reading and inferential reasoning in order to account for the data without assuming that they must produce a fit as precise and smooth as the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle. In addition, there are sources apart from the Scrolls which do not mention the Teacher at all, but which do offer accounts of the events during the second and first centuries BCE from which historical reconstructions of the events reflected in the Scrolls are frequently derived (e.g., 1 and 2 Maccabees and the writings of Philo and Josephus). The attempts to read the Scrolls' references to the Teacher and the Qumran community in relation to these external sources has been a necessary step in helping to recover some aspects of Second Temple Judaism during the second century BCE that were unknown before the discovery of the Scrolls. As much as these attempts have shed light on our understanding of the Maccabean revolt and Hasmonean rule in Judea, the limits of this research have not always been formally recognized.

Given the predominantly historical interests among scholars, specialists have investigated texts which refer to the Teacher by asking primarily the following questions: (a) What personage mentioned among other Second Temple writings (for example, 1 and 2 Maccabees and the historiographical works of Josephus) might lie behind this enigmatic sobriquet?[2] (b) What "facts" can be reconstructed about the Teacher's life and persona on the basis of the explicit allusions to him in the *Damascus Document* and the *pesharim*, and what do these details reveal about the temporal and social origins of the Qumran community and the phases of its development? (c) Which documents or portions of documents amongst the Scrolls, if any, may be thought to have been composed by the Teacher himself? These questions, notwithstanding their importance, are dominated by an interest in events and people recoverable *behind* the texts and are shaped by an essentially *historical* reading.

---

[2] Scholarly discussion of this question has been closely bound up with similar attempts to decipher other sobriquets applied to other figures in the writings of the Qumran community, such as "Wicked Priest," "Man of the Lie," "Ephraim," "Manasseh," "Seekers of Smooth Things," "Furious Young Lion," "House of Absalom," "House of Judah," and so forth.

The discussion here takes a different approach. I shall focus on the twofold, and usually overlooked, dimensions of reception and legacy. While there is no question that a number of Dead Sea documents contain allusions to the *Yaḥad*'s formative past, I am ultimately concerned with another "history," that is, the context(s) within which the texts referring to the Teacher were composed and copied. Taking the concerns of the writers and copyists with their community's past as the essential point of departure, one may formulate another series of interrelated questions: (a) How was the Teacher of Righteousness "received" by community members who found themselves coping with newly emerging circumstances and problems; that is, in what way(s) did his teachings continue to be authoritative for everyday life? (b) How was he "remembered" by a community of his devotees at a later time?[3] (c) What factors may be said to have shaped their selection of what (and what not) to relate about him? And, finally, (d) how did the recorded memory of the Teacher reflect and reinforce the community's self-understanding?[4]

---

[3] There is some analogy between this question and those which have informed redaction-critical approaches to studies, for example, of the Synoptic Gospels. There is therefore potential for Gospel studies to be brought into conversation with the present investigation, and it may in turn become possible for the questions asked here to raise new issues for the presentation of Jesus in the New Testament. To enter into such deliberation goes beyond the limits of this study and would undermine the integrity it requires. However, the comparison illustrates one of several innovative ways Dead Sea Scrolls and New Testament studies can inform one another in future work.

[4] A focus on these particular questions is not a denial of the potential relevance of documents (or parts of documents) which the Teacher himself may have authored. Whatever the extent of the Teacher's authorial output, it remains significant that such pieces (e.g., parts of the *Hodayot* at 1QH[a] 10:1–19; 12:5–19; 13:20–14:36; 15:6–25; 16:4–40) never in themselves make such an explicit claim (although, in any case, they do not speak about the Teacher in the third person). To be sure, it is possible for the memory of a specific authorship to be sustained through the passing on of traditions, even anonymously. In this study, however, I concern myself with those texts in which the Teacher is *explicitly* mentioned, since it is precisely in such passages that he may be said to have been *formally* remembered. Nevertheless, in anticipation of the discussion below, I may note that the probable existence of anonymous traditions composed by the Teacher may in itself constitute evidence of the degree to which his legacy was intertwined with and absorbed into the emerging and different needs of the Qumran community, whose writers found themselves able to place their own compositions and ideas alongside his. A good example, which has been under discussion for a long time, is the *Hodayot*; concerning the mixed authorship of the *Hodayot* (Teacher and non-Teacher hymns), see G. Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit* (SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), 168–77. For a more recent study, which optimistically isolates fourteen "psalms" among the *Hodayot*

In order to address these questions, I have adopted the following procedure. First, it is essential to offer a synopsis of the relevant textual evidence, that is, to provide a broad overview of what is explicitly stated about the Teacher of Righteousness. In particular, I shall ask, where possible, how or to what degree the memory of the Teacher is bound up with, or indeed determined by, the community's self-understanding as presented by the authors of the documents. Second, and more briefly, while taking into account the nature of the data, I shall draw attention to its limitations and to unresolved issues that continue to impede scholarly attempts at any comprehensive historical reconstruction. This last point raises further issues: To what extent, for example, do the data available allow a coherent picture to emerge? Moreover, to what extent do any of the texts themselves signal or assume an interest in preserving a coherent, if not "comprehensive," memory of the Teacher? Third, and finally, making use of the analytical framework of "social memory theory,"[5] I shall inquire into the function of the statements made about the Teacher in relation to the community's own "collective memory."

II. *The "Teacher of Righteousness" in the Dead Sea Texts: An Overview*

The designation "Teacher of Righteousness" (or מורה הצדק/ה) occurs at least seventeen times among the Dead Sea documents, very often in fragmentary contexts. Those instances in which the sobriquet spe-

---

as having been composed by the Teacher, see H. Stegemann, "The Number of Psalms in *1QHodayot*[a] and Some of Their Sections," in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19–23 January, 2000* (ed. E. G. Chazon, with R. A. Clements and A. Pinnick; STDJ 48; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 191–234. The line numberings and readings of the *Hodayot* texts cited below are based on their official publication in *1QHodayot*[a] (ed. H. Stegemann, with E. Schuller and C. Newsom; DJD 40; Oxford: Clarendon, 2008).

[5] For an excellent, brief overview of this perspective, initially developed by Maurice Halbwachs (see n. 55 below), and its later adaptations, see A. Le Donne, "Theological Memory Distortion in the Jesus Tradition," in Barton et al., *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity*, 163–77 (esp. pp. 163–73). While Le Donne attempts to counter a straightforward application of the concept of "memory distortion" to the Jesus tradition in the New Testament gospels, the present emphasis lies more in appreciating the distance, remoteness and (perhaps even) discord between the traditions *about* the Teacher and the "historical Teacher" *himself*.

cifically occurs are the following: 1QpHab 1:13; 2:2; 5:10; 7:4; 8:3; 9:9–10; 11:5; 1QpMic (1Q14) 10 6; 4QpPs[a] (4Q171) 1–10 iii 15 and 19; iv 8; iv 27; 4QpPs[b] (4Q173) 1 4, 2 2; an unidentified *pesher* fragment (4Q172 7 1); CD A 1:11 and 6:11 ("one who teaches righteousness," יורה הצדק). In addition, there are six further texts which contain the use of similar or equivalent terminology; these are CD B 20:1 and 14 ("the Unique Teacher," מורה היחיד); 4QpPs[a] 1–10 i 27 ("the Interpreter of Knowledge," מליץ דעת); CD B 20:28; 4QpIsa[c] (4Q163) 21 6 ("the Teacher," [מורה]); and, depending on the correctness of a restoration, 4QpIsa[e] (4Q165) 1–2 3.[6] Purported references to the Teacher are much less certain in three other texts: the title "the Interpreter of the Torah" in CD A 6:7 (דורש התורה, par. 4Q267 2 15; cf. also CD A 7:18, pars. 4Q266 3 iii 19 and 4Q269 5 2), 4QpIsa[c] 47 3 ([מרה]) and a reference to "their teacher" in 4QpHos[b] 5–6 2 ([מוריהם.]).

Before we consider these texts more closely, it is important to draw attention to the scribal context of these materials. In particular, I have in mind the *pesharim* 1QpHab, 1QpMic, 4QpPs[a], 4QpPs[b], 4QpIsa[c], and the *Damascus Document* manuscripts in which the parallels between CD A and B, on the one hand, and the 4QD manuscripts, on the other, make it possible to restore references in the latter to the Teacher. Early on, Frank Cross noted that, in contrast to many of the other documents among the Dead Sea Scrolls, not one of the *pesharim* is preserved in more than one manuscript; he deduced from this that these manuscripts might well represent autographs.[7] Since this view regards the scribal hand as having been the same as that of the author, the manuscripts themselves represent "mostly original works"; i.e., the palaeographically derived date of the scribal hands of these manuscripts is indicative of the period in which these works were originally composed.[8] From this vantage point, the *pesharim* may be dated mostly to the second half of the first century BCE and the first

[6] Though the designation itself does not occur in the extant text, it is possible that the subject of the verb in the phrase "revealed the Torah of righ[teousness" is the Teacher of Righteousness.

[7] The only exception may be among the five mss. to 4QpIsa, which probably stem from at least two different works: the commentaries preserved in 4QpIsa[a,e] utilize an older form of commentary that includes cross-referencing and does not refer to the Teacher), while 4QpIsa[b,c,d], of which 4QpIsa[c] mentions the Teacher, may or may not belong to the same work.

[8] E.g., F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumrân* (The Biblical Seminar 30; 3d ed.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995; 1st ed. 1958), 91–92.

part of the first century CE[9] and would not have been copies of older manuscripts (which, in turn, would bring us closer to the time of the Teacher of Righteousness).

However, a number of copyist errors in our sampling of sources—for example, omissions through *homoioteleuton* (4QpPs[a] 1–10 iii 5), *parablepsis* (4QpIsa[e] 5 5), and dittography (1QpHab 7:1, 2; 4QpIsa[b] 1:4), as well as a change of scribal hands in at least one manuscript (1QpHab at 12:13)—indicate that these scribes were working from earlier (and now lost) literary *Vorlagen*, and were *not* simply relying on oral tradition.[10] This manuscript evidence is not entirely inconsistent with that preserved for the *Damascus Document*, the oldest manuscript of which, 4QD[a] (4Q266), is preserved in a late Hasmonaean hand (first half of the first century BCE; this early copy, however, contains none of CD's references to the Teacher). These considerations, which mitigate against the presumption that, on the whole, the *pesharim* are autographs, might lead one to think they were originally composed proximate to, or perhaps even within living memory of, the historical events to which they allude. However, this justifiable criticism of Cross's hypothesis does not provide a warrant to maintain the texts' historical proximity. On the contrary, my argument immediately below shall emphasize that our sources were composed in and for circumstances remote from the Teacher to whom they refer.

Since the beginning of Dead Sea Scrolls research, scholars have been nearly unanimous in regarding the Teacher as the single most important personage for the Qumran community.[11] His significance is easily

---

[9] Palaeographically, the following dates have been assigned: 1QpHab (early Herodian, last third of the first c. BCE); 1QpMic (early Herodian, last half of the first c. BCE); 4QpPs[a] (mid-Herodian, late first c. BCE to early first c. CE); 4QpPs[b] (early-/mid-Herodian, end of first c. BCE to early first c. CE); 4QpIsa[c] (late Hasmonean—early Herodian, mid-first c. BCE).

[10] In relation to the examples just cited, see the discussions of J. H. Charlesworth, *The Pesharim and Qumran History: Chaos or Consensus?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 78–80; and especially, E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 258–59. For a more general discussion, see H. Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 124–25.

[11] Only a few scholars have supposed that the designation refers to a function which could have been carried out by more than one person at different times during the community's history; so, e.g., I. Rabinowitz, "The Guides of Righteousness,"

ascertained on the basis of several key references. From this evidence, I present the available data about the Teacher under the following six points:[12]

1) *The Teacher, who is called "the priest"* (הכוהן)*, is unambiguously identified as a member of the priesthood.* This occurs in 4QpPs[a] (1–10 iii 15–16), following a citation of Ps 37:23–24 that refers to one who, "though he stumble, will not fall headlong, for Yahweh holds him by the hand." The *pesharist* identifies the one supported by the Lord in Psalm 37 as "the Priest, the Teacher of [Righteousness, whom] God [ch]ose as a pillar/to stand (לעמוד)." This same figure is associated in the next phrase with the claim that God "established him to build for him a congregation of (עדת) […" The interpretation of Psalm 37 as a whole highlights that it was *as* a priest that the Teacher founded and shaped the character of the community. This emphasis holds, regardless of whether the word לעמוד is taken as a verb *laʿamôd* (thus alluding to the performance of priestly duties) or as a noun *laʿamud* (metaphorically alluding to a supporting column in the Temple structure).[13] Either way, the Teacher's priestly function underpins the community's cultic understanding of itself.

Another passage that probably designates the Teacher of Righteousness as הכוהן is 1QpHab 2:8, which belongs to the second part of a twofold interpretation of Hab 1:5.[14] The first interpretation of

---

VT 8 (1958): 391–404; G. W. Buchanan, "The Priestly Teacher of Righteousness," *RevQ* 6 (1969): 553–58; idem, "The Office of Teacher of Righteousness," *RevQ* 9 (1977): 241–43; and J. Starcky, "Les Maitres de Justice et la chronologie de Qumran," in *Qumran: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (ed. M. Delcor; BETL 46; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1978), 249–56.

[12] What follows is based on the thirteen most substantive references to the Teacher, as four instances have little more extant than his title; i.e., 4Q172 7 1; 4QpPs[b] 1 4; 2 2; and 1QpHab 1:13.

[13] On these alternative construals, see M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (CBQMS 8; Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979), 219.

[14] Much less certain is the following passage in 4QpPs[a] 1+2 ii 18–20, following a citation of Ps 37:14–15: "Its interpretation concerns the wicked ones of Ephraim and Manasseh, who will seek to lay the hand on the Priest and upon the men of his council during the time of testing which is coming upon them. And God will save them from their hands, and after this they will be delivered into the hands of the ruthless ones of the nations for judgment." The punishment anticipated here against Ephraim and Manasseh is echoed further along in the description of God's future judgment against the Wicked Priest because of his desire to kill the righteous man, depicted in frgs. 3+5–10 iv 9–10. Despite this textual similarity, not enough details are provided in either passage to indicate whether the Teacher of Righteousness is in view.

Hab 1:5 (1QpHab 2:1–2) identifies the biblical phrase "they would not believe" (לוא האמינו, 2:3–4; cf. also 2:2, 6) with certain "traitors" (בוגדים, 2:3, 4) who, because of their association with "the Man of the Lie," have not aligned[15] themselves with the Teacher. The second interpretation of the same verse focuses on traitors (בוגדים) of the latter days who "will not believe when they hear all that is going to ha[ppen t]o the last generation from the mouth of the Priest" (2:6–8). Of course, the identity of the priest with the Teacher is suggested by the juxtaposition of the two interpretations for the same lemma. This association becomes even clearer in the next phrase, where the priest is identified as the one "to whom God gave…to interpret all the words of his servants the prophets" (ll. 8–9); this claim anticipates what later in the *pesher* is explicitly attributed to the Teacher of Righteousness, who is described as the one to whom God revealed the correct interpretation of the prophets (7:4–5).[16] In contrast to the passage from the Psalms *pesher* discussed in the previous paragraph, this text does not explicate or expound on the priestly designation in any way. If correct, the designation of the Teacher as הכוהן in a more casual (i.e., unexplained) sense is all the more significant; the author can take this aspect of the Teacher's identity for granted, even among his readers, and therefore does not have to provide a cult-related explanation. Instead, it is the priestly figure's *teaching* activity that is being highlighted. Whether or not the Teacher was a "high priest," that is, whether or not he presided over the cult in the Jerusalem Temple, is not made explicit. While there are some who doubt that he ever officiated at the Temple,[17] a number of scholars have argued that the use of the term should be understood in a titular sense, and go on to attempt identifications with this or that high priest or priestly figure known from Josephus and 1–2 Maccabees.[18]

---

[15] The text in 1QpHab 2:2 has a lacuna where the verb would have been located; האמין should arguably be restored, based on the text of Habakkuk.

[16] In addition, the passage in 1QpHab 11:2–8 implies the Teacher's prominent role in the community during the Day of Atonement.

[17] See, e.g., M. O. Wise, "The Teacher of Righteousness and the High Priest of the Intersacerdotium: Two Approaches," *RevQ* 56 (1990): 587–613; idem, *The First Messiah: Investigating the Savior before Jesus* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1999); and J. Y.-H. Yieh, *One Teacher: Jesus' Teaching Role in Matthew's Gospel Report* (BZNW 124; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004), 95–184.

[18] See, e.g., H. Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* (Bonn: privately published, 1971), 102, 202–7, and 210–20; J. Murphy-O'Connor, "The Essenes and their History," *RB* 81 (1974): 215–44; idem, "Demetrius I and the Teacher of

2) *In several texts the Teacher is marked out as an interpreter of biblical tradition par excellence.*[19] In particular, he is remembered as having been the source of the correct understanding of the prophets and the Torah. The extraordinary claims made in the *Habakkuk Pesher* regarding his authority have already been alluded to above, but require further attention here. In 1QpHab 7:4–5, the claim about the Teacher occurs after a re-citation of a part of Hab 2:2 which is cited more fully in the previous column (6:15–16). Regarding the lemma, "That the one who reads it *may run*" from Hab 2:2,[20] the *pesharist* states, "Its interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God made known (הודיעו) all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets." As has been frequently recognized, this view of divine inspiration behind the Teacher's instructions about the prophetic tradition is remarkable; its negative counterpart occurs in the preceding negative assertion that although Habakkuk had carried out God's command to write about future things, the prophet himself remained uninformed about the consummation of the age (7:1–2, ואת גמר הקץ לוא הודעו). The *pesharist* thus relegates the prophet Habakkuk to having been a recorder rather than an interpreter of God's future plan.[21] The temporal alteration in

---

Righteousness (1 Macc. 10:25–45)," *RB* 83 (1976): 400–420; idem, "Teacher of Righteousness," in *ABD*, 6:340–41; G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 137–62 ("The History of the Sect"); E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (rev. G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Black; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973–1987), 1:605–6, 2:586–87; W. H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk* (SBLMS 24; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979), 95–98 (esp. p. 98); Horgan, *Pesharim*, p. 7; M. A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish & Christian World 2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 6–10; F. García Martínez, "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* (trans. W. G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 77–96; and J. C. VanderKam, "Identity and History of the Community," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999), 2:487–533 (esp. p. 528). Charlesworth, *The Pesharim and Qumran History*, 88 n. 265, is more cautious, since the terminology is not straightforward.

[19] The discussion below focuses on the clearer evidence. For example, while in 4QpPs[a] 1–10 iv 27 it is possible that the "skilled scribe" of Ps 45:2b is identified as the Teacher (denoting his function as an interpreter), the salient terms have to be restored: סופר מהיר פשרו [על מורה הצדק]. The implication, nevertheless, remains: the Teacher's ability to interpret was linked to his function as a "scribe"; see further n. 21 below.

[20] The italicized words translate supralinear ירוץ.

[21] That being an *interpreter* of visions could be invested with so much, even superior, authority is well-established during the Second Temple period in relation to the

the explanation of the verse, from the present or future in the Habakkuk text ("that the one who reads may run") to the perfect ("God has made known [to him]") locates the interpretations revealed to the Teacher of Righteousness in the author's past. Nevertheless, the impression is left that the Teacher's interpretations of Habakkuk have a direct bearing on events which the author regards as yet to come: God "will prolong the final age and it will surpass everything the prophets have said" (lines 7–8).

As we have already seen, a similar claim is made in 1QpHab 2:8–10, where the Teacher is probably identified as "the Priest." There, adherence to the revelation given to the Priest is regarded as a criterion for loyalty to the covenant. Those who do not heed his interpretation of the prophets about what will happen to God's people Israel are called "traitors" (2:5, בוגדים; cf. 2:1, 3) and "ruthless [ones of the cove]nant" (2:6, ית[עריצי הבר]).[22] On the other hand, the text leaves no doubt that those who listen to the Priest are faithful to the covenant. The language applied to the detractors suggests that they had a sociogenetic relationship to the community: by referring to their reception of the Priest's words through "hearing" (cf. 2:7), the author implies that the "faithless" ones were associates who had been *expected* to trust the Teacher-Priest, but instead rejected him and, therefore, the covenant community as well.[23]

The authority ascribed to the Teacher in the *Habakkuk Pesher* is categorical; he is the index against which to recognize covenant loyalty and unfaithfulness; he was inspired to interpret "*all* the words of his servants the prophets" (2:8–9) and "*all* the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets" (7:4–5). In attributing such comprehensive authority to the Teacher, the *pesharist* seems to focus on what appears to have been the Teacher's own running interpretation of a prophetic text (that is, Habakkuk 1–2). However, the interpretations presented in the *pesher* are not *necessarily* interpretations that go back

---

figures of Enoch (so esp. the Birth of Noah in *1 En.* 106:7; the *Genesis Apocryphon*, 1Q20 2:20–22; the *Book of Giants*, 4Q530 2 ii + 6–7 i + 8–12 3–24) and Daniel (Dan 5:11–12, 14, 16), as a development from the portrait of Joseph in Gen 41:11–13. For further discussion, see L. T. Stuckenbruck, *1 Enoch 91–108* (CEJL; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007), 217–20 and 640–41.

[22] Restored according to the parallel phrase found in 4QpPs[a] (4Q171) 1–10 ii 14 and iii 12.

[23] See the fragmentary statement preserved from the previous column in the interpretation of Hab 1:4a: "they rejected the Torah of God" (1QpHab 1:10).

to the Teacher himself. In column 7, for example, the *pesharist* goes on, as he does throughout the work, to relate the words of Habakkuk to *his own time* and to *his own community*; although the Teacher and the *pesharist* both live in "the last generation" (7:2) or "last period" (7:7, 12), the era of the writer, described as a prolongation (7:7, יארוך; 7:12, בהמשך), is nonetheless *distinguishable* from that of the Teacher. This is not, however, a matter of assigning the Teacher's activity merely to the past; more accurately, the Teacher's revelatory authority to interpret the prophetic tradition serves as a model for the later generation of community interpreters. For the writer of the *pesher*, the Teacher's interpretations of the prophets are not simply remote activities that reinforce the uniqueness of the Teacher; instead, the author finds in the Teacher's authority a hermeneutical key that opens up, in principle, the way for him (and therefore for his community) to discover afresh the meaning of the text for circumstances in his own day. And the author does this without trying to recover what the Teacher himself said about this or that text and without resorting to the view that the Teacher himself foresaw the immediate events of the *pesharist*'s day. Thus, for all his emphasis on the Teacher's apparently unique authority, the author takes the mantel of the Teacher's authority upon himself, by providing a running commentary on Habakkuk with contemporary events in view. At 1QpHab 7, he thus finds in Hab 2:3 a description of the situation of his own community (i.e., the potential among them for slackness; ll. 9–14). In relation to his community, the writer thus maintains that the delay, or prolongation, of the last time, is only apparent (7:13); the increasing gap between the time of the Teacher and that of the *pesharist* is in fact a divine extension of the final age.[24] Therefore, "the men of truth," also called "doers of the Torah" (7:10–11), are *now* to orient themselves to this protracted period of divine revelation and not become lax in "the service of truth" (ll. 12–13).

The Teacher is also probably regarded as an authoritative interpreter of the Torah, though the extant texts only leave these claims implicit. For this we have several examples. According to 1QpHab 5:10–12,

[24] This passage thus militates against the assertion of G. L. Doudna, *4QPesher Nahum: A Critical Edition* (JSPSup 35; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 625, that "None of the sobriquet-bearing figures in the Qumran *pesharim* [including the Teacher of Righteousness] are from a past generation in the world of these texts."

interpreting Hab 1:13b, "the Man of the Lie" is accused, in the course of his conflict with the Teacher, of having rejected the Torah (ll. 11–12: איש הכזב אשר מאס את התורה; cf. also 1:10). Moreover, according to 1QpHab 8 (on Hab 2:4b),[25] "all those who do the Torah in the house of Judah" are defined as the very ones who will be delivered by God "from the house of judgment" since they have toiled appropriately and have shown fidelity to the Teacher of Righteousness (ll. 1–3).[26]

In 4QpPs^{a} 1–10 iv 8–9, following a citation of Ps 37:32–33, another *pesharist* alludes to the conflict between the Wicked Priest and the Teacher of Righteousness and then refers, somewhat enigmatically, to "the Torah which he sent to him" (והתורה אשר שלח אליו). Admittedly, it is not clear what "the Torah" means, that is, whether it generally has "the (newly-revealed) instruction"[27] in view or, more specifically, refers to the Teacher's interpretations of the Pentateuchal tradition; it is likely, nonetheless, that the choice of one sense does not exclude the other. Moreover, the subject of the verb שלח ("he sent") is not clear; it could be the Wicked Priest, the Teacher of Righteousness, or God. This question is bound up with the problem of to whom "the Torah" is sent; if the Teacher is the recipient—a view that seems possible, though cannot be confirmed—then God is the subject. The *pesharist* would then be advancing a claim that God has inspired the Teacher in relation to "the Torah." If however, the Wicked Priest is the one to whom the Torah as been sent, then the Teacher would surely be the subject; in this case, the text implies that the Teacher's תורה, whether it be a specific instruction or his interpretation of the Five Books of Moses, was the correct one.

Finally, the link between the Teacher and the Torah is made in the *Damascus Document* (CD B 20:27–28), where heeding "the voice of the Teacher" corresponds to behaving in accordance with the Torah. This very point is picked up and reformulated in the following lines: by listening to the voice of the Teacher of Righteousness one does

---

[25] The biblical lemma is itself not extant on the lower part of the previous column, but it is clear that the *pesharist* is concerned with the statement: "the righteous one will live by faith."

[26] The reference to "their toil" (עמלם, 8:2) may allude to some form of suffering that the writer attributes to the community. If the next phrase about fidelity to the Teacher picks up on this, the text may be correlating the community's experience with a (paradigmatic) persecution reported about the Teacher in col. 11.

[27] This may be the way to understand 4QpIsa^{e} 1–2 3, if "Teacher" is to be restored. See n. 6 above.

not reject "the righteous statutes" (ll. 32–33). This link between the Teacher and the Torah is further apparent in statements earlier in the document about "the Interpreter of the Torah" (CD A 6:7 and 7:18—דורש התורה), to whose statutes members of the movement are to adhere "until there arises one who will teach righteousness in the end of days" (6:9–11). Even if, strictly speaking, neither the Interpreter nor the eschatological one teaching righteousness can be identified with the Teacher of Righteousness,[28] the passage strongly connects membership in the community with faithfulness to and observance of the Torah, with respect to which the Teacher was seen to have played an indispensable role.

We do not have among the Dead Sea materials the same extent of evidence for *pesharim* to Pentateuchal texts as exists for the prophets. Where remnants of a *pesher*-like form of interpretation of the Pentateuch are preserved (esp. the fragmentary 4QCommGen in 4Q252–254, 4Q254a),[29] there is no mention of the Teacher, and the *pesher* form—that is, a biblical lemma followed by the technical term "*pesher*"—does not predominate.[30] Moreover, in a document like *4QFlorilegium* (4Q174), interpretations for lemmata in Exodus (15:17–18) are interspersed among others for 2 Samuel (7:10, 11, 12–14), Psalms (89:23; 1:1; 2:1), Amos (9:11), Isaiah (8:11), and Ezekiel (44:10).[31] Again, in contrast to what we encounter in the *Habakkuk Pesher*, no claim emerges about any particular individual to whom these interpretations have been given or by whom they have been authorized. It is possible that eschatological interpretations like those in the *pesharim* on the prophetic books, specifically associated there with the Teacher, were being carried out widely in relation to

[28] See J. A. Fitzmyer, "Qumran Messianism," in idem, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 73–110 (pp. 99 and 103); Charlesworth, *The Pesharim and Qumran History*, 83.

[29] If the more "thematic" (rather than biblical-exegetical) commentaries specifically drawing on the Pentateuchal texts are included, we may also think of 4Q174 (*4QFlorilegium*), 4Q175 (*4QTestimonia*), 4Q177 (*4QCatena A*), 4Q180–181 (*4QAges of Creation*), 4Q464 (*4QExposition on the Patriarchs*), and 11Q13 (*11QMelchizedek*).

[30] The *pesher* formula known elsewhere is only preserved once, i.e., in 4Q252 5 iv 5 (פשרו אשר), while other, less genre-specific formulae denoting the use of scripture occur throughout, using the terms (a) אמר—4Q252 5 iv 6, 4Q254 1 1; 10 2; (b) כתוב—4Q252 1+3–5 1; and (c) דבר—4Q252 5 iv 2.

[31] A similar concatenation of lemmata, this time including Deut 7:15, occurs in *4QCatena A* 1–4+14+24+31 2; cf. also the citations of Lev 25:13 and Deut 15:2, respectively, in *11QMelchizedek* 2:2, 3–4.

other biblical traditions, though less formally so. We are not in a position to know, however, whether the *pesher*-like formulae that explicitly interpret texts in the Pentateuch derive from the Teacher's own instructions or reflect the community's expansions upon his interpretative authority to a wider range of biblical tradition. Whatever the case, I am surely not wrong to propose that the community regarded the Teacher as the quintessential exponent of a form of biblical interpretation that expressed itself in a "fulfillment hermeneutics"; i.e., a hermeneutics that read sacred traditions as repositories of divine promises coming to fruition in the community's recent past and more contemporary circumstances. The *pesharist* form of interpretation, which derives from the extraordinary claims made about the Teacher in 1QpHab columns 2 and 7, is—from our vantage point—not so extraordinary. What the Teacher did ultimately crystallized in the form adopted by the "classic" *pesharim*, in which interpretations are provided for lemmata taken seamlessly from one book or tradition. Thus, while the Teacher probably did not ever compose such a *pesher*, the community—drawing inspiration from his instructions and claims—did. The Teacher may *initially* have been considered unique in recent times as a receptor of divine revelation; however, in composing the *pesharim*, the later authors of the community were, in his wake, indirectly laying claim to the same authority. What is related biographically about the Teacher, then, is in itself very little. For the community, the appropriate memory of him is through the *mimesis* of the authority that he claimed and the praxis that he initiated.

3) *The Dead Sea texts remember the Teacher as one who played a key role in the formation of the community*. This memory is expressed in the passage from 4QpPs^{a} 1–10 iii 15–16 cited above, in which the Teacher is called "the Priest": God "established him to build for him a congregation…." This claim about the Teacher may be a selective collective memory. We know from the *Damascus Document* that the Teacher did not in fact found the group out of which the community was formed, but rather joined up with the movement and, in effect, inherited it:[32] the document refers to a group who, as "a root of plant-

[32] As correctly emphasized by P. R. Davies, "The Teacher of Righteousness and the 'End of Days,'" in idem, *Sects and Scrolls: Essays on Qumran and Related Topics* (SFSHJ 134; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 89–94 (esp. p. 90).

ing" flourishing (untended) "in the goodness of his [God's] soil," "were as blind as those who grope for a way for twenty years." For this already existing movement, God subsequently raised up the Teacher of Righteousness "to guide them in the way of his heart" (cf. CD A 1:1–17).[33] So, in remembering the Teacher as the community's founder, the *pesharist* of 4QpPs[a] was selecting the advent of the Teacher as the essential beginning point, rather than reflecting on or recalling the community's earlier origins.

4) *The Teacher of Righteousness is remembered as having been in open conflict with the "Man of the Lie"* (איש הכזב)*, probably the same individual who was also called the "Spouter of the Lie"* (מטיף הכזב).[34] Whereas the latter designation does not occur in immediate conjunction with the Teacher (so 1QpHab 10:9–13; 11:1–2; cf. also 4QpPs[a] 1–10 iv 13–14), several passages involving the former refer explicitly to a conflict that led to a breach in the group. According to 1QpHab 2:1–4, the "Man of the Lie" was associated with "the traitors" (הבוגדים) who did not show fidelity either to the Teacher or to God's covenant. A little more is remembered about this altercation later on in the *pesher* at 5:8–12:

> "Why do you listen to traitors, but are silent when a wicked one swallows up one more righteous than he?" (Hab 1:13b). Its interpretation concerns the House of Absalom and the men of their counsel, who were quiet at the rebuke of the Teacher of Righteousness and did not support him against the Man of the Lie who rejected the Torah in the midst of all their council.

The Man of the Lie, associated again (as in col. 2) with traitors (called the "House of Absalom" by the *pesharist*), seems to have rebuked the Teacher "in the midst of all their council." It is difficult to know to what the term "council" refers; that is, whether it denotes a general consultation involving a more open debate with outsiders or a meeting that took place within the community. In the former case the "traitors" would, along with this Man of the Lie, have belonged to an outside group from which the Teacher mistakenly expected support,

---

[33] This would be consistent with the view that the "Interpreter of the Torah" (CD A 6:7; 7:18) does not denote the Teacher of Righteousness. See section 2) above.

[34] It is not necessary to follow Geza Vermes who infers, on the basis of 1QpHab 8:8–9, that the "Man of the Lie" was the same person as the "Wicked Priest" (initially "called by the name of truth"); cf. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*, 139; cf. Brownlee, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk*, 95–98.

while in the latter case these opponents could have been part of the community itself. The depth of disappointment behind the terms "lie" and "unfaithful" suggests that the "traitors" were at one time active in the same community as the Teacher. If this is the case, it is likely that the same can be maintained about the Man of the Lie, who goes by another, though similar, name at the opening of the *Damascus Document*. The latter passage, at CD A 1:10–2:1, refers to the advent and activity of the Teacher at the end of the twenty years of groping. The Teacher

> made known to the latter generations what he would do in the last generation in the congregation of traitors (בוגדים)—they are those who depart from the Way; that is the time of which it was written, "As a wayward cow, so did Israel stray" (Hos 4:16)—when arose the Man of Mockery (איש הלצון) who sprinkled/spouted (אשר הטיף) on Israel waters of the lie (כזב) and led them into a chaos without a way.... For they sought smooth things (דרשו בחלקות) and chose delusion and sought out loopholes and allowed the covenant to be broken and the statute to be violated, and they banded together against the life of the just one; their soul despised all those who walk in perfection; they persecuted them with the sword and treated with glee the dispute of the people....

The terms applied here to the Teacher's opponent are reminiscent of the designations "Man of the Lie" and "Spouter of the Lie." One may infer that the Teacher was remembered as having been critical—and rightly so, according to the writers of this part of the *Damascus Document*—of this man's leadership (cf. also 1QpHab 10:5–13; 4QpPs^{a} 1–10 iv 14). According to 1QpHab 10:5–13, his corrupting influence, perhaps in the aftermath of the altercation between him and the Teacher, resulted in the establishment of "a congregation of falsehood" (l. 10), the members of which "reviled and reproached the elect of God" (l. 13).

The texts suggest that the Man of the Lie was also associated with a group nicknamed the "Seekers of Smooth Things" (דורשי החלקות; cf. CD A 1:18–20, cited above), who may have already emerged during the lifetime of the Teacher,[35] but who appear mostly in passages that are linked with events from a later period (4QpNah 3–4 i 2, 7; ii 2, 4; iii 3, 6–7).[36] Thus, the later writer of the *Nahum Pesher* may have found in

[35] That is, if his composition of certain of the *Hodayot* is accepted; see 1QH 10:15.

[36] On these allusions, which include an explicit reference to Demetrius, king of Greece (4QpNah 3–4 i 2) and suggest that these "Seekers" were executed by "the Lion of Wrath" (probably Alexander Jannaeus), see the thorough discussion by Doudna,

this group a continuation of the opposition displayed earlier against the Teacher himself by the Man of the Lie.[37] In this way, the conflict during the lifetime of the Teacher was understood by the *pesharist* as replicated for the community in his own time. The "traitors" of the *Habakkuk Pesher* (which is concerned with earlier events) are, as a group, equivalent to the "Seekers of Smooth Things" in the *Nahum Pesher* (which is concerned with a later period).

5) *The texts remember the Teacher as having been actively persecuted by "the Wicked Priest"* (הכוהן הרשע). Here I will sidestep the endless discussions concerning the historical figure behind the Wicked Priest, and neither do I seek a synthesis of everything that is said of him in the texts; instead, I focus here on what the texts recall about him in relation to the Teacher of Righteousness. Preliminarily, however, it must be observed that the Wicked Priest is a more slippery figure than the Teacher of Righteousness. Whereas the Teacher is almost invariably mentioned utilizing verbs in the perfect, that is, as a figure in the past,[38] the Wicked Priest—as is well known—is spoken of not only as an individual of the past[39] but also as one whose activity, mediated through verbs in the imperfect, extended beyond the time of the Teacher; he even turns up in the (eschatological) future.[40] Furthermore, it is difficult to match all the details given concerning the Wicked Priest with any *one* of the Maccabean/Hasmonaean high priests. Therefore, some scholars have proposed that the Wicked Priest is a more general sobriquet that applied to any

---

4QPesher Nahum, 389–433 and 627–37. The mention of the Seekers of Smooth Things in 4QCat[a] 7+12 is fragmentary, and its temporal context is unclear.

[37] So Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde*, 72, 76–79, and 120–27; see also P. R. Callaway, *The History of the Qumran Community* (JSPSup 3; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988), 158–61, who, while agreeing with Stegemann, cautions that, given the absence of the Man of the Lie in 4QpNah, the "Seekers of Smooth Things" are not necessarily or merely the Man's contemporaries.

[38] So in the *pesharim*. The possibility remains that he may also be thought of as an eschatological figure, as "the one who will teach righteousness in the end of days" (CD A 6:11).

[39] 1QpHab 8:9–13, 16; 9:10; 11:5–8, 12–14; 4QpPs[a] 1–10 iv 9 (though the subject of the verb is uncertain).

[40] In 1QpHab, see 10:3–5; 11:14; 12:5 (all impf. verbs); in 4QpPs[a] 1–10 iv 8, a participial form is restored by F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998), 1:346 (צ[ופ]ה), following the participial form used in the biblical citation of Ps 37:32. The perfect verb in l. 9 (שלח), however, makes it more likely that a perfect should be restored here as well, i.e., צ[פה.

high priest who was inimical to the community, at any point in its history.[41] While I myself am not sure that this nickname was generally transferable in such a sense,[42] it may at least be noted that this hypothesis proceeds on one correct observation: "the Wicked Priest" often appears in the texts without any mention of the Teacher. In other words, his significance for the *pesharist*s and writers was larger than his immediate relation to the Teacher.

Most famously, the Wicked Priest is remembered in two *pesharim* as having persecuted, or even having tried to kill, the Teacher. The passages in which this event is remembered are 1QpHab 11:4–8 and 4QpPs[a] 1–10 iv 7–8. It is worth citing each of these texts in succession:

> "Woe to anyone who causes his companion to be drunk, mixing in his anger, making drunk in order that he might gaze upon their feasts" (Hab 2:15). Its interpretation concerns the Wicked Priest, who pursued the Teacher of Righteousness, to swallow him up with his poisonous fury to the House of Exile. And at the end of the feast, the repose of the Day of Atonement, he appeared to them to swallow them up and to make them stumble on the day of fasting, their restful Sabbath. (1QpHab 11:4–8)
>
> "The wicked one lies in ambush for the righteous one and seeks [to put him to death. Yah]weh [will not abandon him into his hand,] n[or will he] allow him to be condemned as guilty when he comes to trial" (Ps 37:32–33). Its interpretation concerns [the] Wicked [Pri]est, who w[aited in ambush for the Teach]er of Right[eousness and sought to] have him put to death.... (4QpPs[a] 1–10 iv 7–8)

The *Habakkuk Pesher* assumes a dispute between the Teacher and the Wicked Priest, and implies that this had something to do with the Teacher's use of a different calendar for his group than the one in use at the Temple in Jerusalem.[43] The magnitude of the dispute is reflected

---

[41] As, e.g., is claimed in the "Groningen hypothesis"; cf. A. S. van der Woude, "Wicked Priest or Wicked Priests? Reflections on the Identification of the Wicked Priest in the Habakkuk Commentary," *JJS* 23 (1982): 349–59; García Martínez, inter alia, in "The Origins of the Essene Movement and of the Qumran Sect," 83–84.

[42] In particular, see T. H. Lim, "The Wicked Priests of the Groningen Hypothesis," *JBL* 112 (1993): 415–25.

[43] So esp. S. Talmon, "The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judean Desert," in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. C. Rabin and Y. Yadin; ScrHier 4; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1965), 162–99; and W. H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk*, 179–89. Callaway is overly cautious when he doubts that calendar had much to do with the conflict (*The History of the Qumran Community*, 160–61).

by the extent of the measures taken by the Wicked Priest in order to subvert the Teacher's activity: he (or those under his charge) visits the community in order to ruin their observance of Yom Kippur. The *Psalms Pesher* of 4Q171 may well refer to the same event in more general terms, though the language is stronger: the Wicked Priest wanted to kill someone, who was probably the Teacher of Righteousness.[44] We may assume that this attempt was unsuccessful, as nothing is related about the Teacher's death in either passage.

Of significance here is the commemorative framework for an event, especially as related in the *Habakkuk Pesher*. The event is remembered as happening, not to the Teacher alone, but also to his community, as the plural suffixes (both obj. acc. and pron.) suggest. The community of the *pesharist* understood themselves as heirs to (and, hence, as sharing in the persecution of) the Teacher. While this may seem so obvious as to require no mention, it is significant that the *pesharist* has interpreted the general biblical reference to "their feasts" (plur.) as a much more specific occasion, "the Day of Atonement." The association between the Wicked Priest's persecution of the Teacher and the Day of Atonement thus means that the *pesharist* not only retells a past event, but also stresses its timing at a festival that was no doubt being observed by the *pesharist*'s own community, which could not mark the event without recalling what had happened to the Teacher. Here the analogy between Teacher and later community emerges: the passage refers to the observance of Yom Kippur, a festival at which the high priest in the Jerusalem Temple officiated. The Teacher and his group, however, are said to have been pursued to their "House of Exile," that is, away from Jerusalem. Therefore, the memory of this event, when the Teacher was unjustly pursued by the Wicked Priest, would have functioned to reinforce the community's self-perception that its observance of the Torah—*away from the Jerusalem cult*, where an erring calendrical system remained in use—was correct. Thus a ritual "site of memory" would have provided a

---

[44] The length of the restoration, צ[פה למור]ה הצד[ק (l. 8; cf. n. 40 above), is based on the restoration in the next line in correlation with the wording of the biblical citation and gains strength from the parallel in 1QpHab 11; see M. P. Horgan, "Psalm *Pesher* 1 (4Q171 = 4QPs[a] = 4QpPs37 and 45)," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth and H. W. Rietz; The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project 6B; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 6–23 (pp. 18–19).

rallying point for the *pesharist*'s community. On this day the pronouncement of the biblical "woe" (Hab 2:15) against the Wicked Priest both castigated the operation of the Temple cult and, in portraying how it clashed with observances of the Teacher and his community, reinforced and defined the community's self-understanding as the faithful receptacle and expression of divine revelation.[45]

The Habakkuk *pesharist*'s recollection of the Wicked Priest does not begin with an allusion to his conflict with the Teacher of Righteousness. The first statements about the Wicked Priest emerge in interpretations of Habakkuk that underscore his past and future condemnation. The *pesharist* recounts the Wicked Priest's initially good standing (8:9, "he was called by the name of truth"), and then refers to his moral decadence, brought about through haughtiness, illegitimate amassing of wealth, and religious impurity (8:8–13). Then the author focuses on the result of this decline, based on a double interpretation of Hab 2:7–8a. Two related phrases from Hab 2:7b and 8a ("…and you will become to them as booty" and "…all the rest of the peoples will plunder you"), are taken to refer to (divine) punishments heaped upon the body of the Wicked Priest: "evil diseases worked in him, and vengeful acts (worked) on the carcass of his flesh (בגוית בשרו)." Here the author's account draws on the sort of language which leaves no doubt that the Wicked Priest's lot, related in perfect verbs, reflects telltale signs of divine punishment inflicted on a notorious evildoer.[46] In addition, Hab 2:8a is taken to denote the (future) punishment of "the last priests of Jerusalem," whose demise will parallel that of the Wicked Priest, for they too "amass wealth"

---

[45] In addition to 1QpHab 11, echoes of Yom Kippur as a significant feast for the Qumran community may be inferred from 1QS 8:6 (par. 4Q259 2:15–16), 10; 9:4 (par. 4Q258 7:4–5); and 11Q13 (*11QMelchizedek*) 2:7–8. Less certain as Qumran compositions, but surely materials collected by the community, are 4Q156 (4QTgLev; 2 frgs. corresponding to Leviticus 16) and *11QTemple* 25:10–27:10 (amplifying the biblical account, the text asserts: יהיה היום הזה להמה לזכרון, 27:5); note also the interest in ʿAzʾazel in 4Q180 (*4QAges of Creation A*) 1 7–10; 4Q203 (4QEnGiants[a]) 7 i 6; and *Jub.* 5:17–19 (esp. l. 18) which, in turn, reflect the influence of the fallen angels traditions developed in the early Enochic works (e.g., the Book of Watchers in *1 Enoch* 6–16).

[46] Much attention has been devoted to such *topoi* in the Graeco-Roman world, early Judaism, and Christian antiquity; for a recent convenient listing and discussion of typical descriptions of punishment meted out to God's enemies, see H. Lichtenberger, "The Down-Throw of the Dragon in Revelation 12 and the Down-Fall of God's Enemy," in *The Fall of the Angels* (ed. C. Auffarth and L. T. Stuckenbruck; Themes in Biblical Narrative 6; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 119–47.

and make illegitimate profits (9:5); as punishment, "they will be delivered into the hands of the army of the Kittim" (9:6–7). The analogies drawn between the Wicked Priest and "the last priests" show how the author regards the latter as the legitimate heirs to the former. Thus events related about the Wicked Priest provide the mold for activities and problems that are being replicated in the author's more recent past and present.

The *pesharist*, however, is not merely interested in the activities and punishments of the Wicked Priest and the last priests for their own sakes. What really, and perhaps ultimately, concerns him is the iniquity (9:9, עוון) committed by the Wicked Priest against "the Teacher of Righteousness and the men of his council," perhaps already a reference to the persecution recounted later in column 11. Significantly, the *pesharist* picks up on the language of punishment already used at the beginning of column 9 to rehearse again the consequences of the Wicked Priest's moral and religious demise: "God gave him into the hand of his enemies to humble him with a plague for annihilation in bitterness of soul, because he acted against his chosen ones" (9:10–12). Having referred both to the Wicked Priest and to the "last priests" who, respectively, come from the time of the Teacher and from the more recent past/present, the author, in the next column, considers the future (10:3–5). Here the text cites Hab 2:9–11, which refers to "evil gain" (בצע רע, Hab 2:9), and to the "cutting off many peoples and the threads of your soul" (Hab 2:10b). The *pesharist* relates these phrases to "the house of judgment" into which God "will bring him (i.e., the Wicked Priest) up for judgment" and where, in the midst of the peoples, he will "condemn him as wicked (ירשיענו) and punish him with brimstone fire (ובאש גופרית ישפטנו)" (10:5).[47] At this point, instead of understanding the prophetic text in relation to events that have already occurred, the author invokes events from the remote and very recent past, extending the pattern of the past to project with assurance what will happen in the future.[48] The realities represented by the Wicked Priest thus transcend time in a way that blurs chronological distinctions between past,

[47] On the Wicked Priest's eschatological punishment, see further 1QpHab 11:14 and 12:5.

[48] This was, of course, a common procedure among historical apocalyptic writings, such as *1 Enoch* 85–90 (Animal Apocalypse), *1 En.* 93:1–10 and 91:11–17 (Apocalypse of Weeks), and Daniel 7–12.

present, and future. The memory of the Wicked Priest remains alive as more than just a record of *what happened in the past*; it is activated through biblical interpretation as a way of coming to terms with *what is happening in the present* and *what will, in consequence, happen in the future*. The persecution of the Teacher of Righteousness recalled in column 11 is regarded as an event that defines the community's own continuing story.

In one sense, we might say that it is not the events surrounding the Teacher, the Wicked Priest, and other figures that gave rise to the *pesher*, but rather—and more fundamentally—that the author is determined to interpret the contemporary circumstances of his community, circumstances in which the anticipated advent of the Kittim invited dynamic prophetic commentary within the context of the community's present self-understanding. Though one can allow for a degree of continuity, the time and particular concerns of the author are, in principle, to be distinguished from the time and concerns with which the Teacher of Righteousness was faced. Perhaps this explains why so much of the focus is devoted to the activities of the Kittim in columns 3–9 of the *Habakkuk Pesher*. Since both the Teacher's claims to be the correct interpreter of sacred tradition and his struggle against his opponents provided the frame of reference for this self-understanding, the remembrance of selected moments in the Teacher's life, which are seen to have consequences in the future (e.g., in relation to the punishment of the Wicked Priest), functions as a way of reassuring, exhorting, and challenging the community in the present to adhere to its identity as "men of truth" and "doers of the Torah" (col. 7).

6) *What does the expression "Teacher of Righteousness" mean in the texts that refer to him?* The two main views are (1) one who teaches righteousness (obj. gen., so that "righteousness" is the content of the instruction given);[49] and (2) the "right teacher" (gen. qual., emphasizing either his unique status as the *only* right teacher[50] or his righteous character). While the latter is grammatically possible, the former seems preferable, given the designation's probable derivation from

[49] So, e.g., Jeremias, *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, 308–18.
[50] So esp. Charlesworth, *The Pesharim and Qumran History*, 12.

Joel 2:23 and Hos 10:12, in which צדק/ה follows the verbal root ירה as its object.[51]

III. *What, Then, is Historically Remembered About the Teacher?*

After the review of the evidence above, my answer to this question can only be: very little. We may suppose that when referring to the Teacher of Righteousness, the community in which the *pesharim* were composed knew exactly who he was (i.e., which historical personage) and probably knew a great deal more about him than the extant evidence provides. Such assumptions on our part, given their plausibility, are not the problem. What is surprising is that, given the Teacher's obvious importance to the *Yaḥad*, the details we have just reviewed in the texts constitute almost all the explicit information that we have about him; that is—making allowance for the likelihood that we do not possess everything the community wrote about him—what the *pesharist*s decided to remember about him. If the unpreserved portions of the *pesharim* contained much the same sorts of details as we find among the extant materials, then we are in a position to state what the materials do *not* explicitly reveal about him.

First, and most obviously, the Teacher is not explicitly named. Not anonymous to the community, he is anonymous to us (who are outsiders); and, more importantly, he remains without a proper name in the narrative world of the text.[52] As I noted at the outset, many, if not most, discussions about the Teacher are devoted precisely to the question of which historical figure he may have been.[53] While this does not mean that the community would have known precisely to whom all the nicknames were being applied, the almost exclusive

---

[51] As Jeremias notes (*Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*, 312), in the texts, המורה and ירה, respectively, mean "early rain" (n.) and "to let rain" (vb.). However, when read as the verb "to instruct," the meaning is transformed, respectively, to "the one who teaches," and "he will teach." For this meaning in the *Damascus Document*, see CD A 6:11: "until one who will teach righteousness stands at the end of days."

[52] This is true for almost all the personages and groups mentioned in the *pesharim*, with the exception of the reference to Demetrius in 4QpNah 3–4 i 2.

[53] For discussions of scholarly theories and reconstructions of the history of the Qumran community, including the identity of the Teacher of Righteousness, see Callaway, *The History of the Qumran Community*, 12–20. The literature devoted to this question is wide-ranging in opinion and legion, though many are convinced that the Teacher was the unnamed high priest who officiated in the Temple between the time of Alcimus and Jonathan (158–150 BCE).

choice to use sobriquets in the texts reveals something about how they wished to remember these personages; in our case, they wished the Teacher to be remembered as מורה הצדק.

Second, in addition to not knowing the Teacher's name, we have very little biographical information about him (even in the ancient sense of "biography"). Of the writings composed by the Qumran group, the Teacher of Righteousness is only expressly mentioned in a few documents (1QpHab, 1QpMic, 4QpPs^{b}, *Damascus Document*), and he is certainly *not* mentioned in a number of the *pesher*-like documents (as fragmentary as they may be). We have neither storyline nor running account of the Teacher's life in general or even of his life in the community. No attempt seems to have been made within the Qumran community to produce a portrait which in itself could have inspired others both within the community and beyond its bounds. In other words, no "comprehensive memory" (or anything close) exists, even in reconstructable form, in the documents we have to hand.

Third, and most importantly, the texts do not tell us very much about the content of his teachings. While scholars have suggested that his writing activity is reflected, for example, among the *Hodayot* or even among the *pesharim*, it remains difficult to ascertain with any confidence just *what*, concretely, he taught. Despite the claim in 1QpHab 7 that "all the mysteries of his servants the prophets" were revealed to the Teacher of Righteousness, the texts have nothing direct or specific to tell us about these mysteries.[54] We are left with the impression that the strands of information about the Teacher of Righteousness are not actually based on the writers' immediate experiences of him. Drawing on the distinction of Maurice Halbwachs, one might conclude that their memory of him was less "biographical" or direct than "historical" or remote.[55] At the same time, the Teacher's

[54] The closest we come is the mention in CD A 3:12–16 of the group which remained steadfast, after "the first ones" who had entered the covenant became guilty; with this remnant, "God established his covenant with Israel for ever, to reveal to them hidden things in which all Israel had erred: his holy Sabbaths, his glorious feasts, his righteous stipulations and his truthful paths, and the desires of his will which man shall do in order to live by them (cf. Hab 2:4b)." Since this passage alludes to the narrative concerning the origins of the community at the opening of the *Damascus Document*, it may be that the Teacher's instructions are in view.

[55] M. Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory* (trans. L. A. Coser; Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1992; French ed., 1925). In making this distinction, I do not, in contrast with Halbwachs, find it necessary to press too far the notion of discontinu-

instructions and activities were not considered ideologically remote by those members of the *Yaḥad* who referred to him. The inevitable distortion that came with remembering the Teacher in relation to the community's evolving self-understanding betrays, at the same time, the community's undeniable indebtedness to this figure.

In the end, we are left with a conundrum: the Teacher's unparalleled importance, on the one hand, and the very little explicit information about him in the texts. What, then, can we say, on the basis of the Dead Sea materials we have looked at, was his *discernible* legacy? How are the concrete "fragments of memory," isolated as they are, related to the wider memory about him shared by a community that distinguished itself sharply from other groups?

Answer: The Qumran community developed a "collective memory" about the Teacher of Righteousness, a process that was well underway from his own time and that continued to be shaped by the community's own (later) self-understanding. We may assume that there was a "collective memory" in this case, since the texts about the Teacher preserve interpretations that were shared between the authors and readers of those texts which were but fragments of a larger framework that could be taken for granted (and therefore did not have to be expressed in the sources before us).

(a) The statements about the Teacher that recall his conflicts with others (Man of Lies, Wicked Priest) are told precisely because the dynamics generated by these conflicts persisted into the time of the community out of which the documents (*pesharim*) were authored. The community of the Man of the Lie and the sacerdotal community of Jerusalem were both inimical to the Qumran community during the first century BCE. It would, therefore, have been significant for the authors of the *pesharim* to "remember" the Teacher's conflicts with figures associated with these communities. In the Teacher of Righteousness, inasmuch as he was in conflict with his opponents, the authors of the *pesharim* found an exemplary figure whose fortitude was inspiring and who, they were convinced, was and would be

---

ity, so that, for example, "historical memory" invariably distorts or is discontinuous with the event or person being remembered; cf. B. Schwartz, "The Social Context of Commemoration: A Study in Collective Memory," *Social Forces* 61 (1982): 374–97.

supported by God in the coming eschatological showdown, in marked contrast to the divine punishment (past and future) against the Wicked Priest and his ilk.

(b) Statements about divine revelation given to the Teacher are likewise significant, not so much on account of the fact that the Teacher is singled out as one who was of unique importance, but because the community understood itself as participating in the mode of revelation given to him. Although, for example, the *Habakkuk Pesher does not actually reveal anything about what the Teacher of Righteousness taught in relation to the biblical texts cited*, the document is written in a way that *re-presents* and carries out, perhaps even more systematically than the Teacher did himself, the method of interpretation that the Teacher originated. Stories told about the Teacher, then, are *sacred history*, that is, selected fragments that reinforced and guided the collective self-understanding of the community as reflected in those documents that refer to him.

IV. *Conclusion*

In other words, the documents which refer to the Teacher are essentially *presentist*. Whereas the community would doubtless have "received" and known a great deal about the Teacher of Righteousness, including his name, the formal "memory" or record about him in the extant texts was far more selective. Certain events from the Teacher's life were chosen to be preserved because they were closely bound up with the community's self-understanding and activity. The "collective memory" of the community about the Teacher was thus inextricably determined by an ideology of *mimesis*. Memory and application, *mnemonic mimesis* (if you will), are not so much two distinct steps taken up in sequence, but rather two sides of the same coin. Of course we may infer that the community probably regarded itself as adhering to the instructions of the Teacher; more important for this discussion, however, is the further point that it was above all else the perspective brought by and attributed to the Teacher that shaped the community's self-understanding (in regard to, e.g., calendar, halakhah, hermeneutical perspective).

These considerations lead us to propose new questions for discussion. Scholars have frequently read the community's documents about the Teacher by asking, "What do the Dead Sea Scrolls tell us

about who the Teacher was?" or "To what extent can we learn about past events by studying the Qumran *pesharim*?"[56] We do well to devote more attention at this stage of Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship to the question: "What can we learn about the later authors of the *pesharim* (and other documents) by studying what they have to say about their community's formative past?"

[56] So the question raised by Charlesworth, *The Pesharim and the Qumran Community*, 83. As emphasized throughout this discussion, my argument does not deny the importance of the question in itself; rather, I mean to highlight the fact that, 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.

RITUAL DENSITY IN QUMRAN PRACTICE: ABLUTIONS IN THE *SEREKH HA-YAḤAD*[1]

Michael A. Daise
The College of William and Mary

Ritual Density and Sectarian Texts

In this article I address the issue of "ritual density" in Qumran sectarian practice. "Ritual density" is defined by Catharine Bell as "why some societies or historical periods have more ritual than others."[2] It implies a distinction between a group's ritual activity and the other components of which its life consists, and on that assumption represents the measure of one in relation to the other at any given point in the group's history. Ritual density, it may be said, is the degree to which rites play a role in the life and/or piety of any given society; otherwise put, it is the ratio of ritual to other aspects of life in the day-to-day operations of a community. Conclusions about such a ratio will, of course, depend on how broadly or narrowly one defines "ritual." But, bracketing that ambiguity for the moment, the objective is worth considering. When applied to the Qumran sect, ritual density can offer a valuable lens for assessing the community's fundamental character.

Measuring ritual density in sectarian *practice* faces a number of challenges, especially when one seeks to do it through the group's texts. Some of these challenges obtain for any reconstructive work done on the Dead Sea Scrolls.[3] Others, however, pertain more specifically to the issue of sectarian ritual: determining what amount of rites

[1] My gratitude to several institutions: the W. F. Albright Institute of Archaeological Research, the Education and Cultural Affairs division of the U. S. Department of State, and the Horace Goldsmith Foundation, for supporting my work as Annual Professor at the Albright Institute for 2004–2005; and to the College of William and Mary for granting me research leave to accept that offer.

[2] C. Bell, *Ritual: Perspectives and Dimensions* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 173.

[3] E.g., hazarding reconstructions from the meager amount of texts preserved (or preserved intact enough to offer meaningful data); tracing halakhic changes through redactional strata; judging whether a document (and its halakhah) is "sectarian" or not and, if so, whether it would have been currently in use, antiquated, eschatological, or schematic.

prescribed in a document were actually performed; reconstructing the sect's nonritual life, against which its ritual activity is to be weighed; and, as Ithamar Gruenwald has recently suggested, uncovering ritual details behind summary headings and commentary.[4] The problem engaged here is the reticence texts sometimes have about ritual. Halakhic documents, even the most forthcoming of them, often assume as much as they state when prescribing rites: where, in some instances, not all the ritual stated was actually performed, in others, not all the ritual performed may have been stated. Several reasons for this could be adduced: an oral tradition working in tandem with the written one; an "in-house" audience, expected to be familiar with fundamental customs; the use of literary genres, such as "rules," that are less exhaustive compilations than they are suggestive digests. The result, however, is the same. Even the richest and best preserved of sectarian writings may rehearse less ritual in their directives than was actually performed by their practitioners.

A way forward on this matter may be found by considering further the approach that Jacob Milgrom has taken to Leviticus.[5] Milgrom's method has already been applied to Qumran studies, as a means for understanding the way the sect read Torah (see below). Here I will press further, suggesting that the same method can be applied to the way *we* read sectarian halakhah. In what follows, I will explore the dimensions this method can bring to the search for ritual density in Qumran practice. First, I will articulate the specific aspect of Milgrom's approach that forms my point of departure. Second, I will apply that aspect to one rite in one sectarian document—ablutions as prescribed in the *Serekh Ha-Yaḥad*. Third, I will offer a caveat to Milgrom's method by noting two counterexamples. And finally, I will outline the complexity this caveat brings to the issue, revisiting the topic of ablutions in the *Serekh Ha-Yaḥad*.

---

[4] I. Gruenwald, *Rituals and Ritual Theory in Ancient Israel* (Brill Reference Library of Judaism 10; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 140–41.

[5] J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1991); idem, *Leviticus 17–22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3a; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 2000); idem, *Leviticus 23–27: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 3b; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 2001).

Jacob Milgrom and Leviticus

For Milgrom, Levitical ritual is gestured theology. The components and choreography of Levitical rites, he is persuaded, symbolize tacit beliefs. "Theology is what Leviticus is all about," he writes in the introduction to the first volume of his Anchor Bible commentary:

> It pervades every chapter and almost every verse. It is not expressed in pronouncements but embedded in rituals. Indeed, every act, whether movement, manipulation, or gesticulation, is pregnant with meaning; "at their deepest level rituals reveal values which are sociological facts."[6]

In addition, argues Milgrom, these symbolized beliefs are coherent. The undergirding theological tenets, as well as the rituals in which they are couched, relate to one another with logical consistency, though less so for rites of exchange (i.e., sacrifices). Milgrom concedes that "no single theory embraces the entire complex of sacrifices." And, though he claims that well-being, purification and reparation offerings "can be satisfactorily explained," he admits that "comprehensive rationales" for the burnt and cereal offerings "still elude us."[7] That said, logical consistency certainly does obtain, believes Milgrom, for purity rites. He argues that the three sources of Levitical impurity—the corpse/carcass, scale disease, and genital discharge—carry connotations that can be traced to a common denominator: death. For corpse and carcass, that connection is self-evident. For scale disease, it comes through the suggestion of approaching death. And for genital discharge, it occurs through the implication of lost fecundity. Since death's opposite is life, reasons Milgrom, the state of holiness (which is the opposite of impurity) indicates the same. Purity rites, with their ebb and flow between defilement and holiness, reflect a cogent theology of what constitutes

---

[6] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 42. Here Milgrom cites Victor Turner, who in turn references Monica Wilson in his own account of a debate ensuing between anthropologists and psychoanalysts on "the relative depth of different ways of interpreting symbols"; cf. Turner, *The Forest of Symbols: Aspects of Ndembu Ritual* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1967), 44 (in Turner's text, "deepest level" is in parentheses). On Milgrom's (perhaps stronger) theoretical dependence on Mary Douglas (see *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* [London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966], 5–6, 34–36, 41–57), see J. Klawans, "Ritual Purity, Moral Purity, and Sacrifice in Jacob Milgrom's *Leviticus*," *RelSRev* 29 (2003): 5–6.

[7] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 49–50; quotations from p. 49.

death, life, and the passage from one to the other. As such, Milgrom concludes, purity rituals cohere with a certain cogency into a single, homogeneous, symbolic system.[8]

To be sure, I do not concur with Milgrom that Leviticus (and its ritual) is all about theology. Conceiving rites solely as symbols for theological tenets reduces them to mere kinesthetic servants of belief, and thereby minimizes the role they play as religious acts vital in and of themselves. I may not go so far as Gruenwald in characterizing ritual as "an autonomous expression of the human mind." But Gruenwald conveys my own reservations about this part of Milgrom's thesis when he elsewhere notes that "from a theological point of view, rituals play a subservient role in religion," and declares, rather, that, "in principle, rituals function *beyond* and *apart from* theology and other ideational components and, at times, in spite of them."[9]

My point of departure from Milgrom's work is a more marginal implication of his thesis, drawn from his assumption that Levitical rites cohere as a system. Since rites in Leviticus relate to one another systematically, he reasons, the principles on which they turn can be distilled from passages in which they are explicitly prescribed, then applied to less forthcoming ones, so that rites may be inferred where they are otherwise unstated. A salient example—and the one most often cited—is the matter of ablutions and laundering for the menstruant in Leviticus 15. In that chapter, one or both of these rites are explicitly prescribed for purification from other defilements: a man with a flow (15:13/both) and a man with a seminal emission (15:16, 18/ablutions), as well as a woman who comes into contact with that semen in sexual relations (15:18/ablutions). For the menstruant, however, a seven-day passage of time is prescribed (15:19), but no directive is given to wash either her body or her clothes. A cursory reading of the text might lead one to conclude that ablutions and laundering were, therefore, not required for purification of a menstruant. But, according to Milgrom, an array of principles distilled from other *loci* in Leviticus suggests that they were:[10]

---

[8] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 45–49.

[9] *Rituals and Ritual Theory in Ancient Israel*, 143; italics his. See also pp. 2–6, 11–12, 34–35.

[10] On the following, see Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 667–668, 746, 934–935.

(1) Purification after eating the carcass of a clean animal at Lev 11:39–40 does not explicitly prescribe ablutions (though it does require laundering). Rubrics for that same impurity at Lev 17:15 (cf. 22:6), however, show clearly that ablutions were indeed required.
(2) Regulations for corpse contamination (Num 19:14–19),[11] which similarly lasted seven days, require that those days culminate with ablutions and laundering. If such was the case for them, so, deduces Milgrom, "it must also be assumed for the menstruant."[12]
(3) Purification laws for carrying a carcass at Lev 11:25, 28, 40, similarly make no mention of ablutions. They do, however, include a requirement for laundering that can only imply washing of the body[13]—showing, again, that ablutions are to be inferred when absent from the text.
(4) And—perhaps most importantly—since ablutions or laundering were necessary for the lesser matter of impure vessels (Leviticus 11)[14] and for the lesser impurity of a seminal discharge (Lev 15:16),[15] *a minori ad maius* they had to have been considered necessary for the menstruant, as well.[16]

As mentioned above, this method is not new to Qumran studies.[17] It is Hannah K. Harrington's thesis that the Qumran sect itself (as well as the rabbis) read Torah this way.[18] And this idea has been more

---

[11] This, as well as other "severe impurities," such as skin disease (Lev 14:1–9) and abnormal male discharge (Lev 15:13).

[12] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 935.

[13] Cf. inter alia Lev 15:5–8, 11, 13.

[14] The specific verse of chapter 11 is not cited but is probably Lev 11:32.

[15] H. K. Harrington (*The Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis: Biblical Foundations* [SBLDS 143; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993], 14) and Klawans ("Ritual Purity, Moral Purity, and Sacrifice in Jacob Milgrom's *Leviticus*," 20) add contact with the bedding of a menstruant (Lev 15:21).

[16] Milgrom argues the same point for the woman with chronic discharges (Lev 15:28) and for the parturient (Lev 12:2); *Leviticus 1–16*, 746, 934–35.

[17] Nor is this way of reading new to biblical interpretation in general. It is arguably not unlike some rabbinic *middot*: certainly *qal waḥomer*, as it moves *a minori ad maius*; but perhaps also *binyan ʾab* (*mikatub ʾeḥad* or *mishne ketubim*), since rites prescribed for purification from one type of impurity are sometimes assumed to exist for related types in similar texts.

[18] Harrington, *Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis*, 47–67, esp. pp. 58–63. Harrington equates Milgrom's method of reading with "gap filling," a technique of inferring missing elements of plot and character into a story: it has been broadly discussed in literary criticism and applied to biblical narrative by Adele Berlin, Meir

recently worked out in further detail by Martha Himmelfarb, particularly with regard to 4QD.[19] Here I would suggest that, in the service of reconstructing ritual density in sectarian practice, the method can be taken a step further and applied, not only to the way sectarians read the Levitical text, but to the way we read sectarian texts. That is to say, on the assumption that sectarian, no less than Levitical, rites cohered into a system, we can employ the same technique for teasing out tacit rites in the Dead Sea Scrolls themselves, as Milgrom and the writers of those Scrolls have done to tease out tacit rites in Leviticus.

Ablutions in the Serekh Ha-Yaḥad: *First Scenario*

As an example of how this approach might serve to determine ritual density I will treat a well-trodden area in Qumran studies: ritual ablution as set out in the *Serekh Ha-Yaḥad*, particularly as attested in 1QS.[20] On the face of it, the *Serekh Ha-Yaḥad* gives the practice of ritual ablution relatively scant attention. 1QS 5:13b forbids the men of wickedness (1QS 5:10) to "enter the waters (אל יבוא במים) to touch the purity of the men of holiness."[21] 1QS 3:4b–6a declares that the person

---

Sternberg and Daniel Boyarin; see pp. 27, 27 nn. 74–75 (on the related issue of "ambiguity," Harrington also cites Robert Alter). Conclusions to be drawn here, however—and already noted elsewhere (see on Himmelfarb, below)—question whether such a technique likewise applies to halakhic texts. A guiding assumption behind "gap filling" is that omissions in a narrative can (though not always do [see Sternberg, below]) render a story impossible to follow apart from inferences made by the reader; see A. Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative* (Bible and Literature Series 9; Sheffield: Almond, 1983), 136–37; M. Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Indiana Literary Biblical Series; Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1985), 186–229, esp. pp. 186–87, 189, 191–93, 217, 222; D. Boyarin, *Intertextuality and the Reading of Midrash* (Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature; Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1990), 39–56, esp. p. 41. As will be elaborated below, however, whether omissions in halakhot similarly render their texts impossible to follow is open to question.

[19] See M. Himmelfarb, "Impurity and Sin in 4QD, 1QS, and 4Q512," *DSD* 8 (2001):13–29; idem, "The Purity Laws of 4QD: Exegesis and Sectarianism," in *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone* (ed. E. G. Chazon, D. Satran and R. A. Clements; JSJSup 89; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 155–69, esp. pp. 155, 161–66, 168–69.

[20] In this discussion I use the generic terms "ablution" and "washing" to embrace all methods by which ritual cleansing might have been performed among the Qumran sectarians—immersion, pouring, sprinkling, and the like.

[21] Text of 1QS: C. Martone, *La "Regola della Comunità": Edizione critica* (Quaderni di Henoch 8; Torino: S. Zamorani, 1995). All translations in this article are mine unless otherwise indicated.

who refuses to enter the covenant (1QS 2:25–26) will not be cleansed "by purification waters (במי נדה)," "seas and rivers" (בימים ונהרות) or "all the waters of ablution" (בכול מי רחץ).[22] And, conversely, 1QS 3:8c–9a states that, "by the humility of his soul toward all the statutes of God," the person who does enter the covenant "will be purified (יטהר)…so as to be sprinkled with purification waters (להזות במי נדה) and made holy by waters of purity" (ולהתקדש במי דוכי).[23] Much more can be gleaned, however, if certain systematic principles couched in these passages are distilled and then applied to related matters at other places in the document. A sufficient illustration can be made from the first passage mentioned, 1QS 5:13.

1QS 5:13 makes a systematic connection between ablutions and "the purity" (טהרה; hereafter, the *tohorah*). The passage states this connection in the negative, with a prescription directed against anyone among the "men of wickedness": "Let him not enter the waters to touch the purity (*tohorah*) of the men of holiness." The tie emerges more clearly, however, when this thought is recast into its positive obverse: if someone outside the community was denied the *tohorah* by first being kept from ablutions, then ablutions likely brokered access to the *tohorah* as part of standard communal protocol—to safeguard the integrity of the *tohorah* and/or to put those who would access it in a state suitable to receive it. With this sequence in hand, passages referencing access to the *tohorah* elsewhere in the *Serekh Ha-Yaḥad* become data for ablutions as well, even if ablutions are not mentioned in them. Inasmuch as access to the *tohorah* requires prior participation in ablutions, it follows that any reference to the former presumes the previous observance of the latter.

The *tohorah* appears elsewhere in the *Serekh Ha-Yaḥad* at two major places: in the initiation process (column 6), where it is permitted

---

[22] Cf. also 4Q257 3:6–8; 4Q262 1 1–4.

[23] Cf. 4Q255 2 2c–4a; 4Q257 3:11c–13a. Inasmuch as the phrase "sprinkled with purification waters" may allude to the red heifer rite in Numbers 19 (cf. vv. 9, 13, 18–21), it may represent a metaphorical use of purity terminology and at best yield only indirect data about the actual observance of ablutions. The same might be said for 1QS 3:7b–8a (cf. 4Q255 2 1–2a; 4Q257 3:10b–11a), which declares that "by the holy spirit of the community, in its truth," a person "will be purified (יטהר) from all his iniquities", as well as 1QS 4:20b–22c, which speaks of God, "at the appointed time of visitation" (4:18c–19a), "cleansing" (ולטהרו) humanity "with the holy spirit" and "sprinkling upon it (ויז עליו) the spirit of truth like purification waters" (כמי נדה). Even less information about such practices is offered in the purity language at 1QS 9:15c–16a; 11:14c–15a (cf. 4Q258 7:13; 8:1a; 13:2b; 4Q259 3:12b–13a; 4Q264 2b).

to a candidate for membership after one year of successful probation (1QS 6:16–17, 20–21);[24] and in the penal code (1QS 6:24–7:25; 8:16b–9:2).[25] Several penalties listed in that code prohibit the *tohorah* to members under discipline for periods of various durations: one year (6:25; 7:2–3, 15–16);[26] the first year of a two-year penalty (7:18–19); two years (8:24–9:2); and an indefinite interval, measured in relation to the rectification of the offender's deeds (8:16b–19). The access to the *tohorah* that was suspended during these periods would have been reinstated at their conclusion, presumably in a manner similar to the way it was first granted in the initiation process.[27] And so, the act of gaining access to the *tohorah*, which was spelled out in the initiation process at column 6, is further implied in the penal process at columns 6–9. If ablutions typically preceded such points of access, as suggested by 1QS 5:13, they can thereby be inferred to have been performed at all these junctures as well: on a candidate for membership after his first successful year of probation; and on disciplined members at various stages, when their one or two year bans from the *tohorah* were lifted. As such, a certain "density" in the practice of ablutions begins to emerge from the *Serekh Ha-Yaḥad* that was not apparent at first blush.

This density intensifies when one considers the relationship that the *tohorah* likely sustained to the משקה (hereafter, *mashqeh*). There is some question as to what the sectarian use of the term *tohorah* pre-

---

[24] Cf. the parallel at 4Q256 11:12.

[25] Cf. parallels at 4Q258 5:1; 6:8b–12; 7:1–3; 4Q259 1:4–15; 2:3–9a; 4Q261 3 2–4; 4a–b 1–5; 5a–c 1–9; 6a–e 1–5. *Tohorah* also appears in 1QS 4:5c (cf. 4Q257 5:2c–3a), where it "merely describes one of the qualities of the sect" (M. Newton, *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul* [SNTSMS 53; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985], 21–22); that is, one of the "ways" (4:2) by which the Sons of Light conduct themselves in the world is listed as "glorious purity (וטהרת כבוד), which abhors all impure idols." See also H. Huppenbauer, "טהר und טהרה in der Sektenregel von Qumran," *TZ* 13 (1957): 350.

[26] Also possibly 1QS 6:27; see L. H. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code* (BJS 33; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983), 159–60, 177 n. 38, following W. H. Brownlee (*The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline* [BASORSup 10–12; New Haven: ASOR, 1951], 28 n. 59), as well as J. Licht (*The Rule Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea: 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSb: Text, Introduction and Commentary* [Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965], 160 [Hebrew]).

[27] On this, see, among others, G. Forkman, *The Limits of the Religious Community: Expulsion from the Religious Community within the Qumran Sect, within Rabbinic Judaism, and within Primitive Christianity* (trans. P. Sjölander; Lund, Sweden: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1972), 63.

cisely entailed.[28] Here, following Saul Lieberman,[29] Jacob Licht,[30] and Lawrence H. Schiffman,[31] I understand both *tohorah* and *mashqeh* as somewhat analogous to the Tannaitic אוכלין (*ʾokhlin*) and משקין (*mashqin*), respectively—*tohorah*, like *ʾokhlin*, refers to dry solids; *mashqeh* (drink), like *mashqin*, to liquids and perhaps moistened solids. Because the *mashqin* were always defiled only to the first remove from an original source of impurity, they were deemed more potentially threatening (to purity) and more capable of polluting than the *ʾokhlin*; as such, they were guarded more carefully than the *ʾokhlin* from contaminants and contaminators. This is also the case for the *mashqeh* in relation to the *tohorah*, as represented in the *Serekh Ha-Yaḥad*. Although, as Licht pointed out, the Qumran documents lack the nuance and complexity that characterizes Tannaitic discussion on the issue, the *mashqeh* was likely considered more threatening if defiled and more apt to defile than the *tohorah*.[32] This probably explains why it was withheld from a candidate for membership until he had completed his second successful year of probation—one year after he had been granted access to (and proven trustworthy with) the *tohorah* (1QS 6:20c–21a).

In the *Serekh Ha-Yaḥad*, the *mashqeh* appears twice, each time together with the *tohorah*: in the description of the initiation process, where, as we have seen, it is permitted to the candidate after two years probation (1QS 6:20c–21a); and in the penal code, where it is forbidden to a disciplined member for (at least) the second year of a two-year punishment,[33] then (as was the case with the *tohorah*) reinstated in a manner similar to the way it was first accessed in the initiation process (1QS 7:18b–20). But further, as Schiffman has noted, since the *mashqeh* was guarded more carefully from impurity than the *tohorah*, one might deduce that the *mashqeh* was included in the aforementioned one- and two-year bans on the *tohorah* (1QS 6:25;

---

[28] See, for instance, the review discussions in Huppenbauer, "טהר und טהרה," 350–51; Forkman, *Limits of the Religious Community*, 55–56; Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 162–63; and Newton, *Concept of Purity*, 11–12, 20, 24, 26, 29.

[29] S. Lieberman, "The Discipline in the So-Called Dead Sea Manual of Discipline," *JBL* 71 (1952): 202–3. Reprinted in idem, *Texts and Studies* (New York: Ktav, 1974), 200–207.

[30] Licht, *The Rule Scroll*, 299–302; cf. also p. 296 and p. 296 n. 4.

[31] Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 163–64.

[32] Licht, *The Rule Scroll*, 299 n. 12.

[33] Written as a supralinear just left of the erased original {טהרת}ב.

7:2–3, 15–16; 8:24–9:2), as well as in the ban on the *tohorah* for the first year of the two-year disciplinary period at 1QS 7:18–19, and in the indefinite interval prescribed at 1QS 8:16b–19.[34] That the *mashqeh* is sometimes implied in references to the *tohorah* can also be deduced from the end of the initiation process at 1QS 6:21c–22c: though the successful candidate by that point is clearly given access to both the *tohorah* and the *mashqeh* (6:16c–21a), his final registration into the rule is described simply as being "for *tohorah,*" a use of the term which doubtless includes both.

This graded relationship between the *tohorah* and the *mashqeh* may signal that ablutions attended both, each in sequence. If ablutions preceded the *tohorah* (so as to guard its integrity and/or render its practitioners fit to receive it), and if the *mashqeh* was deemed more apt to be defiled and to defile than was the *tohorah, a minori ad maius* ablutions must have been performed before the *mashqeh*, just as they were before the *tohorah*. That is to say, besides occurring when access was attained to dry solids (after the first successful year of a candidate's probation and after the first year of the two-year penalty at 1QS 7:18–20), ritual ablution would also have been observed before access to moistened solids and liquids: at the end of the second successful year of a candidate's probation (1QS 6:18–21); and, for members under a two-year sentence such as that at 1QS

[34] A further basis noted for this inference is that members are commanded not to mingle with an apostate's *tohorah* (1QS 7:22–25), which must have included liquids along with solids. On these points see Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 161–68, esp. pp. 167–68; with the corrective note by C. Milikowsky, "Law at Qumran: A Critical Reaction to Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony, and the Penal Code*," *RevQ* 12 (1986): 247. On the premise that penal bans on the *tohorah* mirrored the initiation process, Schiffman argued that the two-year ban on the *tohorah* at 1QS 8:24–9:2 must have included the *mashqeh* in the first year; that the one-year bans on the *tohorah* at 1QS 6:25; 7:2–3, 15–16 (and one might add the second year of the two-year ban at 1QS 8:16–19) would only have been on the *mashqeh*; and that, accordingly, the term *tohorah* at times expands to "refer to all victuals" (pp. 167–68). Milikowsky noted, however, that, with respect to the one-year bans on the *tohorah* (and, again, one might add the second of the two-year ban on the *tohorah* at 1QS 8:16–19), Schiffman's assumption requires that the term *tohorah* refer, not to all victuals, but to liquids (that is, to the *mashqeh*) only. The unlikelihood of such a semantic jump for the term *tohorah* led Milikowsky to suppose that a one-year ban from the *tohorah*, instead, "separated the offender from both pure drink and pure food, and is not analogous to the last year of the novice."

7:18–20, after the second year of their separation from the *mashqeh*.[35] The scenario (and its reasoning) is not unlike that proposed earlier by Michael Newton in his *Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul*.[36] For the point at issue here, enough ablutions may be teased from latency to show that sectarian practice was far more "dense" with ritual ablution than the *Serekh Ha-Yaḥad* suggests on its face.

A Further Factor: Deliberate Omissions

But to this method of reading another factor must be added: omissions in halakhic texts may just as likely *reflect* ritual observance as *assume* it. Himmelfarb has argued this in relation to the example presented earlier from Leviticus 15. Concerning that chapter Himmelfarb notes that, if ablutions and laundering are absent for the menstruant (and for the woman with an abnormal flow) because they were already stated earlier in the text for other impurities, an anomaly appears later regarding the requirement of sacrifice for the woman with an abnormal flow. This regulation, too, had been explicitly stated earlier in Leviticus 15 for a man with a flow (Lev 15:14–15). Yet later in the chapter, where one expects it to have been assumed (and therefore omitted), it is found repeated explicitly for the woman with an abnormal flow

[35] For the instances in which the *tohorah* and the *mashqeh* were simultaneously banned for one- or two-year periods, there seems no reason to speculate that they ended with two separate ablutions, one for renewed access to each. Further, a second hypothetical (albeit perhaps unlikely) possibility should at least be noted: namely that, for the initiation process and the two-year successive ban from the *tohorah* (first year) and the *mashqeh* (second year) at 1QS 7:18–20, ablutions may have been performed only after both years had been completed—not when the *tohorah* was granted or reinstated after the first year of those periods had passed. Since the semantic range of *tohorah* can expand to embrace *mashqeh*—especially when the term *tohorah* is not set over against *mashqeh* in the text—such a range must also be allowed for the use of *tohorah* at 1QS 5:13. That is to say, the *tohorah* which is preceded by ablutions at 1QS 5:13 may designate, not dry solids alone (as it does in 1QS 6:16–17), but dry solids, moistened solids and liquids, as it likely does in 1QS 6:25; 7:2–3, 15–16; 8:24–9:2; and 6:21–22. In such a case, ablutions would not attend the end of a candidate's first year of probation; nor would they be performed after the first year of the two-year proscription listed at 1QS 7:18–20—at which points only dry solids were (re)gained. Rather, they would be done at the conclusion of the entire initiation process, as well as at the completion of the penalty prescribed at 1QS 7:18–20—when access was (re)granted to both solids *and liquids*.

[36] Newton, *Concept of Purity*, 21–30, 40–49; esp. pp. 24–26, 29–30, 42.

(Lev 15:29–30) "in language virtually identical to that [which] it uses for the man with a flow (Lev 15:14–15)."[37] The implication is that, if a prescription is repeated where required (sacrifice for the woman with an abnormal flow), it may have been omitted because it was not so required (ablutions and laundering for the menstruant and the woman with an abnormal flow) and, thus, perhaps ought *not* be inferred at that juncture.

Supporting (and in some ways anticipating) Himmelfarb is a passage in the *Sifra* on Lev 11:24 (*Shemini, Parashah* §4:7). Yigael Yadin and Harrington cited this text as a rabbinic foil for the *Temple Scroll*'s more stringent rules on carcass defilement.[38] But it also shows that gaps in halakhic texts (or, at least, the interpretation of those gaps) might just as well resist logical inference as they do invite it. At issue is whether or not someone who touches the carcass of an animal need launder clothing. The Levitical text prescribes laundering explicitly for anyone who carries a carcass, saying s/he will then be unclean till evening. But for the person who touches one, it only specifies the latter—his or her impure status. The *Sifra* passage begins by noting this: it quotes Leviticus, "(every) one who touches (their carcass) is impure until evening"; then it observes "but (it does) not (say), 'the one who touches defiles clothing.'"[39] Since carrying was deemed a lesser transmitter of impurity than touching (notwithstanding that "carrying" implies "touching"), and since carrying is, itself, said to defile clothing, one might reason that touching, too, defiled clothing and thus should also be taken to require laundering. This is, in fact, considered in the *Sifra*'s discussion:

> And is it not the rule that, if "carrying," (having) the lesser degree (of impurity), does defile clothing, "touching," (having) the greater (degree of impurity)—is it not the rule that it (also) defiles clothing?

But the current of the *Sifra*'s argument, in fact, runs the other way. It concludes that touching the carcass of a clean animal *does not* defile

---

[37] Himmelfarb, "Impurity and Sin," 15.

[38] Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, The Institute of Archaeology of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, The Shrine of the Book, 1977/1983), 1:339–40; Harrington, *Impurity Systems of Qumran and the Rabbis*, 96–97.

[39] The text of the *Sifra* at *Parashah* 4:7 omits כל and בנבלתם from its citation of Lev 11:24. The text used here is the edition of I. H. Weiss, *Sifra* (Vienna: Jacob Schlossberg, 1862).

clothing. And, for the basis of this decision, it cites the *absence* of any explicit scriptural rubric for the defilement of clothing in this case, over against the presence of such a rubric for those who carry the carcass of an animal. "Scripture (*only* says)," reads the *Sifra*, that "'the one who touches is impure until evening' (Lev 11:24a), and *not*, 'the one who touches defiles clothing.'"[40]

Neither this passage from the *Sifra* nor Himmelfarb's observation on Leviticus 15 contravene the idea that purity laws (or other rites) relate as a system. Nor do they altogether forbid inferences into texts made on that assumption. They do, however, suggest that the systems in question may be more elusive than has been supposed, and therefore, that the presence or absence of halakhic directives in a text may be as deliberate at some points as they are inadvertent at others. Regarding Leviticus 15, Himmelfarb writes, "The assumption that P's laws form a system by no means explains all aspects of their literary expression."[41] While some silences may beg to be filled, others may be meant as omissions. Consequently, any systematic reading of halakhic texts ought not be done mechanically, but circumspectly, on a case by case basis. That is, if we assume that halakhot connect in a system, that assumption must be treated as an exegetical criterion and, as such, be weighed against other factors in any given text to determine whether absent rubrics are to be inferred. Since such factors will vary from one text to another, no rigid *modus operandi* can be established for making such inferences. A salient example emerges, however, if ablutions in 1QS are revisited with this caution in mind.

Revisiting Ablutions in the Serekh Ha-Yaḥad: *Further Scenarios*

Since no passage in 1QS explicitly ties ablutions to the *mashqeh* (as 1QS 5:13 does to the *tohorah*), the question now arises, how should such an absence be read? Should it be taken as above—a chance omission that invites inference? Or should it be interpreted as intentional—a

[40] Emphases mine. The penchant of the *Sifra* to advocate the explicit text of Leviticus over against *middot*(-like) inferences (see the discussion by Jacob Neusner in *Sifra: An Analytical Translation* [3 vols.; BJS 138–140; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988], 1:19, 24, 27–31, 38, 47, 51–52) suggests wider implications for Milgrom's assumptions than can be pursued here.

[41] Himmelfarb, "Impurity and Sin," 15.

conscious omission that betrays something else about ablutions in the Qumran sect?

Supporting the first option are the context of 1QS 5:13 and the logistics of the initiation and penal processes. The link between ablutions and the *tohorah* at 1QS 5:13 is cast within a prohibition against allowing "men of wickedness" to enter the sect: "Let him not enter the waters to touch the *tohorah* of the men of holiness." Since, in the order of initiation, access to the *tohorah* came at least one year before access to the *mashqeh*, anyone denied access to the *tohorah* would not get close enough to the *mashqeh* to make the matter of ablutions before the *mashqeh* an issue. As such, a connection between ritual ablution and the *mashqeh* may have been omitted in the text, not because ablutions did not precede the *mashqeh* for members, but because, for the "men of wickedness," the prospect was moot. No such person would have advanced far enough in the initiation or penal processes to threaten the purity of the *mashqeh*: legislating against such would have been superfluous.

Regarding the second option—that the lack of any mention of ablutions before the *mashqeh* was deliberate—two further possibilities emerge. Theoretically it might signal that ritual ablution was simply not observed before the *mashqeh* as it was before the *tohorah*. If the presence or absence of rubrics for a rite are taken at face value, the absence of any statement prescribing ablutions before the *mashqeh* may simply mean they were not done at that point. What is inherently problematic about this model, however, is that it runs counter to the graded relationship the *mashqeh* appears to have had with the *tohorah*. Whether one accepts the above-stated analogy between *tohorah*/*mashqeh* and *ʾokhlin*/*mashqin* or not, it is clear from the text of the *Serekh Ha-Yaḥad* that the *mashqeh* was guarded more closely than the *tohorah* and thereby, in some way, appraised more highly. That being the case, it is unlikely that a purification rite required for the latter (the *tohorah*) would not also have been obligatory for the former (the *mashqeh*).

But on this same assumption—namely, that the lack of any mention of ablutions before the *mashqeh* was deliberate—another, more plausible scenario offers itself: that ablutions, once begun, were thereafter performed regularly. That is, that ritual washings were iterative, not punctiliar, acts; that, once begun, were observed routinely

throughout the remainder of candidacy, reconciliation or—for that matter—membership; once access was (re)gained to the *mashqeh*, those same washings counted as much for it (the *mashqeh*) as they had for the *tohorah*. If this were the case, legislating ablutions explicitly before the *mashqeh* would have been unnecessary, since the candidate or disciplined member who reached that point in the initiation or penal processes would have already been taking them repeatedly. In such a scenario, the density of ablutions in Qumran practice would, in fact, exceed that of the two models sketched above: ritual ablutions would have been performed, not only at annual transitions in the initiation and penal processes—whether one (second scenario) or both (first scenario) of those transitions—but repeatedly, from the point the *tohorah* was first accessed (in admission) or reaccessed (in discipline), through the remainder of probation and on into membership.

Conclusion

The problem of determining ritual density in Qumran sectarian practice can be partly addressed through a modified application of Jacob Milgrom's approach to Leviticus. Milgrom's assumption that rites are systematically related furnishes a framework in which rituals explicitly described in some passages can be used to deduce rituals only implied in others. When mechanically applied to ablutions in the *Serekh Ha-Yaḥad*, such an approach yields the prospect that, though they are not mentioned as such in the document, ablutions were performed at key stages in the admission and penal processes. Complications arise, however, when one recognizes that ostensible anomalies in the text may, in fact, reflect rather than eclipse the logic of such systems; and that, in the *Serekh Ha-Yaḥad*, ablutions are not explicitly tied to the *mashqeh* as they are to the *tohorah*. If this silence on the relation of ablutions to the *mashqeh* was somehow deliberate, two further scenarios become possible: that ablutions were simply not performed before access to the *mashqeh*; or, better, that, once begun, they occurred regularly from the moment at which the *tohorah* was first attained (in admission) or reinstated (in discipline) and would have subsequently counted for the *mashqeh*, as well.

Whichever the case (and addressing the issue requires more data to be assessed than have been here), the potentially greater concentration of ablutions in the *Serekh Ha-Yaḥad* suggested by this inferential approach carries implications for measuring the ritual density of other rites, in this and in other documents. If the results seen here for ritual ablution are replicated for other rites in additional sectarian works, the proportion of ritual to other aspects of life in the day-to-day operations of the Qumran sect may prove even more stunning than has heretofore been surmised.

FROM *ENOCH* TO JOHN THE ESSENE—AN ANALYSIS OF SECT DEVELOPMENT: *1 ENOCH, JUBILEES*, AND THE ESSENES

Eyal Regev
Bar Ilan University

Introduction

Even as our knowledge of the literature composed or copied by the so-called "Qumran movement" increases, our curiosity concerning the origin and history of these people grows. How did it all begin? What is the historical and social relationship between the different documents? More particularly, how are the members of the "Qumran movement" (the *Yaḥad* and the so-called Damascus Covenant) related, if at all, to the Essenes of Philo and Josephus? In the early days of Qumran research sweeping theories were proposed. Now, when all the evidence is at hand and the texts have been carefully studied from a literary perspective, it may be possible to reexamine the question of the origin and development of the Qumran-related sects in some detail.

Sociologists have observed that throughout time sects develop and transform their character. Some become established movements ("denominations"), while others create new sects, and in certain cases sects split into different subgroups.[1] One may wonder whether it is possible to reconstruct this procedure in reverse, deducing the origin of the sect from its subsequent development. The obsession with understanding the origins of an historical phenomenon was criticized by Marc Bloch, who called it "the idol of origins." Bloch argued that a historian should study the available evidence and not search after elusive explanations for a mysterious prehistory, since "a historical phenomenon can never be understood apart from its moment in

[1] B. Wilson, "An Analysis of Sect Development," *American Sociological Review* 24 (1959): 3–15; R. Stark and W. S. Bainbridge, *The Future of Religion: Secularization, Revival, and Cult Formation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), 25, 102–4, 134–67; H. R. Niebuhr, *The Social Sources of Denominationalism* (New York: Henry Holt, 1929).

time."[2] However, in our case, the "problem of origins" is only another expression for finding the relationship between already available texts. In the scholarly quest for creating order in the dense and at times chaotic world of the Dead Sea Scrolls and related texts, suggesting loose historical and sociological relationships between some major compositions (and groups) may be helpful.

The aim of this article is twofold. In the first two sections I will examine the ideology of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, two extensive literary compositions that are indirectly related to the sectarian movement of Qumran. Keeping in mind the general sociological characteristics of sectarianism, I will compare the ideological traits of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* with those of the Qumran movement. In the third section I will compare the ideologies and behavior ascribed to the Essenes by Philo and Josephus with those advanced in *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* (as far as they are comparable), the *Community Rule*, and the *Damascus Document*. The overall result may shed light on the relationship between *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, and the Essenes, as well as the relationship between each of these and the "Qumran sectarians" (i.e., the *Yaḥad* and the so-called Damascus Covenanters). Indeed, it is problematic to compare a social movement, the Essenes, with the texts of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*. One should be cautious in juxtaposing literary compositions, whose main concern is expressing ideology by means of a narrative, with secondhand descriptions which focus on regulations and modes of behavior (and this may explain why scholars have customarily avoided such comparisons). Perhaps the best way to facilitate such a comparison is to follow a general sociological theory of sectarianism and extract some basic ideological principles from *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees* and the ancient descriptions of the Essenes, respectively. Such a method, however, can only highlight what already exists in the sources themselves and draw our attention to differences in their worldviews as embedded in both narratives and rules of behavior.

When referring to ideology, worldview, etc., I take into account the definition of sectarianism coined by Stark and Bainbridge. Sectarian ideology is in a state of tension with the world, and includes elements

---

[2] M. Bloch, "The Idol of Origins," in idem, *The Historian's Craft* (trans. P. Putnam; Manchester: Manchester University Press; New York: Knopf, 1954), 29–35. Bloch observed that "origins" means both "beginnings" and "causes." My discussion concerns the first sense, although the framework of sectarianism also implies the causes of the historical developments, which should be treated separately.

of antagonism, separation, and difference.[3] The historical reconstructions that I will present should be regarded as tentative, and are mostly aimed at stimulating discussion regarding the ideological character of each text. I do not regard the establishment of the historical or chronological sequence as my main aim (although I do have firm opinions about the time period reflected in *Jubilees* and the *Enoch* apocalypses), but rather view the chronological framework as merely a classificatory tool by which to organize the results of my initial inquiry into the degrees and types of sectarianism represented by these documents.

Survey of Previous Research

Since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, many attempts have been made to reconstruct the historical development of the so-called "Qumran movement." Most of the discussions were based on hints from the *Damascus Document* and the *pesharim*. At least two major hypotheses (of a Babylonian origin for the sect, and of the emergence of the sect through a Zadokite/Sadducean split) wove complex theories from too scant evidence.[4] At the same time, most scholars identified the Qumranites with the Essenes,[5] without sufficient attention to the

---

[3] Stark and Bainbridge, *The Future of Religion*, 49–60. The importance of separatism for defining a sect was already noted by Wilson, "An Analysis of Sect Development," 4. For a discussion of these two models and their application to the *Yaḥad*, the *Damascus Document* and to lesser degree also the *Temple Scroll* and MMT, see E. Regev, "Atonement and Sectarianism in Qumran: Defining a Sectarian Worldview in Moral and Halakhic Systems," in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (ed. D. J. Chalcraft; London: Equinox, 2007), 180–205.

[4] The influential theories of F. M. Cross and J. Murphy-O'Connor, among others, were critically surveyed in P. R. Davies, "The Prehistory of the Qumran Community," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (ed. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport; STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press and Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1992), 116–25; F. García Martínez and J. Trebolle Barrera, *The People of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (trans. W. G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 77–96; J. J. Collins, "The Origins of the Qumran Community: A Review of the Evidence," in *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer* (ed. M. P. Horgan and P. J. Kobelski; New York: Crossroad, 1989), 159–78.

[5] A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (trans. G. Vermes; Cleveland and New York: World, 1962), esp. 66–67; G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (rev. ed.; London: SCM Press, 1994), esp. 115–17; H. Stegemann, "The Qumran Essenes: Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March, 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1:83–166.

seemingly small differences between them. This state of research led to a more skeptical approach to the question of the origins and historical development of the "Qumran movement," under the leadership of Philip Davies, and with certain support by John Collins and Florentino García Martínez.[6] Readings of Qumran history have more recently been approached from deconstructionist perspectives by Charlotte Hempel and Maxine Grossman.[7]

A few years ago, however, Gabriele Boccaccini published his ambitious and complex monograph entitled *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Boccaccini adopts an *Überlieferungsgeschichte* approach that compares the Scrolls with what we know about the Essenes on the one hand, and the Aramaic documents in *1 Enoch* (and to a lesser degree, also *Jubilees*), on the other. He concludes that the Qumran movement originated from the circles of *1 Enoch*, and views the Essenes as more or less identical with the Enochic movement.[8] The strength of Boccaccini's analysis is in his detailed comparison of several components of the Enochic and Qumranic belief systems. His weakness, in my view, is his neglect of the social dynamics and behavioral aspects of these systems, such as laws and rituals.

Although I concur with Boccaccini's findings regarding the Enochic origins of the Qumranic ideas of cosmic dualism, angels, and eschatology, I cannot accept his identification of the Enochic movement with the Essenes. As will be shown below, the groups behind the Enochic documents, particularly the Animal Apocalypse, the Apocalypse of Weeks, and the Epistle of Enoch, are not sectarian organizations, but

---

[6] In addition to the studies cited in n. 4, see also P. R. Davies, "Redaction and Sectarianism in the Qumran Scrolls," in idem, *Sects and Scrolls: Essays on Qumran and Related Topics* (SFSHJ 134; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 151–61; F. García Martínez and A. S. van der Woude, "A 'Groningen' Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History," *RevQ* 14 (1990): 521–41.

[7] C. Hempel, "Community Origins in the *Damascus Document* in the Light of Recent Scholarship," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, and Reformulated Issues* (ed. D. W. Parry and E. Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 316–29; M. L. Grossman, *Reading for History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Study* (STDJ 45; Leiden: Brill, 2002).

[8] G. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998). See also R. T. Beckwith, "The Earliest Enoch Literature and its Calendar: Marks of their Origin, Date and Motivation," *RevQ* 10 (1981): 365–403; P. R. Davies, "A Comparison of Three Essene Sects," in idem, *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (BJS 94; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 107–34.

reform movements. They do not intend to separate themselves from the rest of the Jewish people, but rather aim to lead them. Moreover, the similarities that Boccaccini finds between *1 Enoch* and the beliefs and practices of the Essenes are too general—sacred books, angels, healing, providence, immortality of the soul, and sensitivity to the pitfalls of sexuality and wealth. The lack of mention of any of the famous Essene taboos and rituals in *1 Enoch* is ignored by Boccaccini.[9]

Boccaccini also compares the Essenes and the evidence from Qumran, mixing the literary evidence from the caves with the archaeological findings from the site of Kh. Qumran. Interpreting Philo's and Josephus' descriptions of the Essenes in a new fashion, he argues that the Essenes married and held private property, and consequently concludes that the Qumranites (apparently he is referring to the *Yaḥad*) were much more separatist than the Essenes.[10] I find unconvincing this interpretation of the evidence concerning the Essenes; hence, their identification with the Enochic movement seems forced. These disagreements notwithstanding, Boccaccini's attempt advances the discussion of the problem of Qumran origins. I find his "failure" as inspiring as his success. I think the main lesson is that it is not sufficient to approach the question of origin and development from the perspective of shared religious ideas; it is necessary to study the social stance of each document and group, as well as the practices and rules that govern it.

Appreciation for and criticism of Boccaccini's project as well as comparisons between the ideologies of *1 Enoch, Jubilees*, and the Qumran movement appear in the 2005 volume of the Enoch Seminar.[11] However, the contributors to this volume seem to continue to identify the Qumran movement with the Essenes without paying sufficient attention to the possible differences between them.

---

[9] Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 165–85. He concludes that "mainstream Enochic literature offers a much better setting for the ideology of the mainstream Essene movement…than the sectarian literature of Qumran" (178).

[10] Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 21–49.

[11] G. Boccaccini, ed., *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005). See especially the article by J. J. Collins, who seems to be bothered by this problem ("Enoch, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Essenes: Groups and Movements in Judaism in the Early Second Century BCE," 345–50). And see now *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees* (ed. G. Boccaccini and G. Ibba; Grand Rapids: Eerdman, 2009).

1 Enoch: *The Beginnings of the Presectarian Worldview*

The Aramaic documents found at Qumran and later preserved in *1 Enoch* have common ideological features: heavenly revelations, cosmic dualism, God's coming judgment of the wicked angels and corrupt humans, together with its eschatological consequences for the righteous ones.[12] They presuppose a state of evil in the world and explain it as the consequence of the acts of rebellious angels (especially in the Book of Watchers and the Animal Apocalypse), and, particularly in relation to the calendar,[13] of human transgression of God's orders.[14] A certain relief from the evil perpetrated by the wicked angels lies in angelic interference on behalf of the righteous.[15] But ultimate deliverance rests in esoteric divine wisdom, i.e., the knowledge that there is order in the world (especially in the heavenly world),[16] and in anticipation of the eschatological age, a day of judgment for both angels and humans.[17]

Most of these ideas are later attested in the *Instruction on the Two Spirits* (1QS 3–4), the *War Rule*, the *Hodayot, 11QMelchizedek*, and to a lesser degree the *Damascus Document*.[18] The notion that the forces of evil are intrinsic to the world is the most basic presupposition of the sectarian worldview. Since Enochic documents were found in the caves at Qumran, and since many of their basic ideas were adopted and developed in the Qumranic writings,[19] it is likely that the Qum-

---

[12] For the Aramaic fragments and their dates, see J. T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976). For the ideological unity of *1 Enoch* see G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Apocalyptic Construction of Reality in *1 Enoch*," in *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium* (ed. J. J. Collins and J. H. Charlesworth; JSPSup 9; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991), 51–64. See also *1 En.* 1:2–7; 5:4–9. *1 Enoch*'s mythic content is vast and cannot be introduced here in detail. The following discussion is confined to selected themes and general characteristics.

[13] *1 En.* 80:2–8 (see also 100:10–101:9).

[14] *1 En.* 1:10; 5:4–9.

[15] *1 En.* 10; 90:21–22; 100:4–5.

[16] Cf. the ascension of Enoch in chapters 14–19. See also 21:10; 22; 25–27.

[17] For the Book of Watchers, see 18:16; 19:1; 22:4, 11; 25:4; 27:3. For the Animal Apocalypse see 90:20–38.

[18] See M. J. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran* (JSPSup 11, Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 142–323. Davidson also discusses the connections between the Book of Watchers and the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*.

[19] Milik, *The Books of Enoch*; Davidson, *Angels at Qumran.*

ranites inherited their perception of cosmic tension and eschatology from Enochic circles.

However, these Enochic circles did not form a sectarian organization. Sectarianism is not only a perception, but also a mode of social behavior. Interestingly, none of the documents of *1 Enoch* (with the possible exception of the Astronomical Book) include instructions regarding particular social observances or religious restrictions. There is no call for separation or seclusion (as noted above, essential characteristics of a sectarian worldview) and no reference whatsoever to social institutions. *1 Enoch* is mainly occupied with myth (that is, a theoretical worldview), not with practice.

The social character of the Enochic movements is implicit in the Animal Apocalypse, the Apocalypse of Weeks and the Epistle of Enoch (which are later than the Astronomical Book and the Book of Watchers). In the Animal Apocalypse (*1 Enoch* 85–90), the author's group is symbolized by the lambs that open their eyes. These lambs cry out to the blind sheep, but the sheep do not listen (90:6–7): "A great horn sprouted on one of those sheep (now becoming a ram), and it looked at them, and their eyes were opened, and it cried out to the (other) sheep, and the rams (sic!) saw it, and they all ran to it" (90:9b–10). The fact that, later in the narrative, the sheep and ram clash with the ravens and other birds (that is with the Seleucids and other Gentiles) has led most interpreters to identify the ram with Judas Maccabeus.[20]

However, as M. Kister has already argued, this identification does not cohere with the lack of internal strife between the sheep, and especially with the fact that the ram is a religious or spiritual leader who opens the eyes of the rest of the sheep.[21] I would add that the lambs who open their eyes before the emergence of the ram are introduced, not as a sect, but as a reform movement that aims to awaken the whole Jewish nation. Moreover, the horned ram who experiences an angelic revelation is definitely a religious leader (although it would be hazardous to identify him with the Teacher of Righteousness). The Animal Apocalypse shares one major ideological trait with the *Yaḥad* and the

[20] J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 69; P. A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (SBLEJL 4; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 62–63, 78, 355–57, and bibliography. Translations from *1 Enoch* follow G. W. E. Nickelsburg, 1 *Enoch* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001).

[21] M. Kister, "Concerning the History of the Essenes," *Tarbiz* 56 (1986): 2–5 (Hebrew).

Damascus Covenanters: the claim that the bread (sacrifices) served on the table (altar) of the tower "was polluted and not pure" (89:72b). The Apocalypse also displays a strong eschatological tension. Nonetheless, the portrayal of the lambs is most suggestive of a reform movement. According to Bryan Wilson, a reform movement is a group that "recognizes the evil but assumes that it may be dealt with according to supernaturally given insights about the way in which social organization should be amended," that is, changing the world through the force of persuasion and without involving supernatural agencies, instead of deserting it.[22]

Similar conclusions should be drawn regarding the group represented in the Apocalypse of Weeks (*1 Enoch* 91–93).[23] In the seventh week, "there will arise a perverse generation, and many will be its deeds.… And at its conclusion, the chosen will be chosen, as witnesses of righteousness from the eternal plant of righteousness, to whom will be given sevenfold wisdom and knowledge"[24] (93:8–10). At this point, the transition to the eschatological age occurs:[25] "They will uproot the foundations of violence, and the structure of deceit in it, to execute judgment" (91:11). The social tension between the chosen righteous and their Jewish and non-Jewish enemies is extremely high. There is concealed stress between the emerging "eternal plant of righteousness" and the old regime. However, the author is not necessarily an advocate of the Maccabees or of traditional Judaism, resisting the Hellenistic reform.[26] The author's group does not regard itself as separated from

---

[22] B. R. Wilson, *Magic and the Millennium: A Sociological Study of Religious Movements of Protest among Tribal and Third-World Peoples* (London: Heinemann, 1973), 25. Although Wilson overstated the role of divine revelation or inspiration (the Pharisees were a reformist group, but did not argue for such revelation), in the case of *Enoch*, where angelic revelation is the governing paradigm, his assertion is apt.

[23] Its correct sequence is: 91:1–10, 18–19; 92:1–93:10; 91:11–17; 93:11–14. See Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 263–72 (following the Aramaic fragments); Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 414–15 and bibliography.

[24] The Ethiopic version is confirmed by the Aramaic fragment (Milik, *The Books of Enoch*, 265): תבחרון [בחירי]ן לשהדי קשט מן נ[צבת] קשט על[מ]א די שבעה [ב להון] חכמה ומדע תתיה[ב] פ[עמי]ן. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 448, interpreted the wisdom and knowledge mentioned in the context of the *Epistle of Enoch* as "a particular understanding of the divine law, other esoteric information about the cosmos, and the eschatological message of the coming judgment."

[25] J. C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 147, 149.

[26] My reading contrasts with the view common to most interpreters. See VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*, 145–49 and bibliography. Some have identified the sword of the eighth week with the Maccabean uprising. VanderKam

the rest of Israel.[27] The author also does not regard the "eternal plant of righteousness" as a sect or separatist group, but, again, as a reform movement that will lead Israel to the end of days. This movement is about to bring salvation to all Israel.

Social tension within Jewish society is also attested in the Epistle of Enoch (92–105).[28] Enoch calls upon his sons to love righteousness and to walk in it, although "certain men in a generation" will follow the path of violence (e.g., 94:1–4). The author speaks against the evil sinners and the rich and foresees their condemnation and destruction (94:5–11; 95:3); at the same time, he assures his readers that the righteous and wise will be rewarded at the End of Days (e.g., 104:1–2), and will eventually defeat the sinners.[29] There are also references to more specific debates about religious law and authority, covenant, the teachings of the wise, the commandment of the Most High, the words of truth, writing books, and mysteries.[30]

The author is interested in convincing others of the truth of his belief system, and is confident that the wise will acknowledge this truth and that all "sons of earth" will eventually "contemplate these words of the epistle."[31] The fact that the author appeals directly to

---

believes that this is rather part of the description of the end-times. He dates the apocalypse to the period before the decrees of Antiochus IV (167 BCE) and identifies the "perverse generation" with the Hellenizing faction.

[27] Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 108.

[28] The original extent of the Epistle is debated. I have followed the more common view in which chaps. 92–105 are seen to comprise one literary unit. The Aramaic fragments include chap. 104. See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 336–37, 426. Nickelsburg recognizes that the Epistle incorporates older traditions (especially the Apocalypse of Weeks) but regards it as the creation of a single author. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 110–12, 131–38 argues that *1 En.* 94:6–104:6 is a later interpolation. For discussion of the oppositions between the righteous and sinners, the poor and the well-to-do, and the theme of the Day of Judgment in the Epistle, see Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 94–103.

[29] *1 En.* 95:3; 96:1; 98:12. This forecast of reward and retribution is presented in the Apocalypse of Weeks as imminent (91:12). For a survey of the social tensions implied in this passage see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 426–27.

[30] *1 En.* 99:2; 99:10; 104:10–13. The author may be making reference to some kind of tendentious rewriting of the Torah, similar to the *Temple Scroll* and *Jubilees*, which puts forward (as divinely revealed) interpretations of the Torah that contradict the views of the author of *1 Enoch*, and therefore (from his point of view) represent the epitome of falsehood. See G. W. E. Nickelsburg, "The Epistle of Enoch and the Qumran Literature," *JJS* 33 (1982): 342. Nickelsburg (343) associates these books with the wisdom that will be given to the elect in the seventh week, according to the Apocalypse of Weeks (93:10).

[31] *1 En.* 100:6; 105:1; cf. 99:10.

sinners (99:10–16; 101) indicates, according to Nickelsburg, a certain openness towards outsiders.[32] Nickelsburg concludes that the author of the Epistle

> speaks for a group of Jews who make exclusive claims for their interpretation of the Torah, and who perceive as revealed wisdom the belief that the imminent judgment will separate them from those whose interpretation of the Law differs from theirs, as well as from the violent rich who oppress them. These exclusive claims notwithstanding, this is not a closed group who simply gather to comfort one another and to hurl curses at their enemies and opponents. The wise speak where they can be heard, and they testify to the truth in the hope that their message will be heeded and met with repentance.[33]

In other words, this is another example of a reform movement, not a separatist sect.

These two Enochic apocalypses (and to a certain extent also the Epistle), usually dated to the beginning of the Maccabean war, testify to a movement that shares with the later Qumranites views of cosmic and social tension, as well as the belief that the eschaton is immediate and that the movement and its special religious wisdom will lead Israel into the age of salvation. They also share with the Qumranites a degree of criticism of the Temple cult (perhaps the fact that the Second Temple is not mentioned in the Apocalypse of Weeks is not accidental, cf. *1 En.* 93:9). Other more general common theological themes (which cannot be discussed here at length) include moral impurity, revelation, and an activist struggle with the evil forces, both human and angelic, a theme later developed in the *War Rule*. However, unlike the Qumran sects, the movement(s) behind the Enoch apocalypses and the Epistle of Enoch did not call for withdrawal from the rest of the Jewish people, but rather aimed at a certain socioreligious activity or opposition that would lead Israel through the imminent and final struggle. All this shows, I think, that the Aramaic documents in *1 Enoch* are not strictly sectarian, but nonetheless provided the foundation for some of the major ideological traits of the Qumran sect.

---

[32] Nickelsburg, "The Epistle of Enoch," 344.

[33] Nickelsburg, "The Epistle of Enoch," 344–45. Dating the Epistle is very problematic. Nickelsburg argues for an early Hasmonean date (*1 Enoch 1,* 427–28). However, if its author also composed the Apocalypse of Weeks, the Epistle may be dated to the Maccabean period (before the rise of the Hasmonean state).

Jubilees *and the Presectarian Legal System*

Like *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees* classifies angels into just and evil, and also anticipates the Day of Judgment.[34] *Jubilees* is familiar with the Book of Watchers[35] and the Astronomical Book.[36] It is even possible that *Jubilees* is familiar with Enoch's apocalypses or Epistle, since *Jub.* 4:18–19 refers to Enoch's documentation of history and visions of the future until the Day of Judgment.[37] In *Jubilees*, however, the cosmic dualism of the Enochic literature is augmented by a social dualism of Israel vs. the Gentiles. The Gentiles are ruled by angels, and particularly by the angel Mastema, who misguides them.[38] *Jubilees* pays special attention to the iniquities of the Gentiles and to the problem of the Israelites' relationship with them. According to *Jubilees*, the Gentiles are impure and so are their idols.[39] *Jubilees* calls for a complete separation from the Gentiles. All Jewish–Gentile interaction is to be shunned, especially intermarriage, since contact with Gentiles would defile the holy essence of Israel.[40] Violation of the law of circumcision or the interdiction against marriage with a Gentile excludes the violator from the covenant with God.[41]

---

[34] On angels, see D. Dimant, "בני שמים: תורת המלאכים בספר היובלים לאור כתבי עדת קומראן" in *Tribute to Sara: Studies in Jewish Philosophy and Kabbala* (ed. M. Idel, D. Dimant, and S. Rosenberg; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1994), 109–10; J. C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 127–29. For the extermination of the wicked angels, see *Jub.* 5:10; 10:11. Cf. the times when there will be no Satan, in *Jub.* 23:29; 40:9; 50:5. On the eschatological New Creation, see *Jub.* 1:29; 5:12.

[35] *Jubilees* borrowed from the Enochic account the story of the angels of God who mated with women and sired giants. See *Jub.* 4:22; 5:1–11; 7:21–27; 10:1–14.

[36] *Jub.* 4:17–18. Cf. also *Jub.* 6:23–38.

[37] For *Jubilees*' dependence on *1 Enoch* see J. C. VanderKam, "Enoch Traditions in *Jubilees* and Other Second-Century Sources," in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1978* (2 vols.; SBLSP 13–14; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978), 1:229–51. VanderKam accounts for additional links between *Jubilees* and the Epistle of Enoch (e.g., *Jub.* 7:29 and *1 En.* 103:7–8) and points to the inclusion of other Enochic traditions in *Jubilees*, such as the portrait of Enoch as a dispenser of halakhah in *Jub.* 7:38–39; 21:10.

[38] *Jub.* 15:31–32; Dimant, "בני שמים," 108–9.

[39] *Jub.* 1:8–11; 11:16; 12:1–8, 12–14; 20:7–8; 21:3, 5; 22:18, 22; 31:1–2; 36:5; 48:5. See also the curse against the Philistines, who will be eradicated from the land at the Day of Judgment (24:28).

[40] *Jub.* 6:35; 9:14–15; 22:16; 25:1; 30.

[41] *Jub.* 15:34; 30:7–10, 15–16, 21–22. *Jubilees* 30 emphasizes the sin of intermarriage and the ensuing death penalty. On intermarriage as polluting the Temple, see *Jub.* 30:15; C. Werman, "*Jubilees* 30: Building a Paradigm for the Ban on Intermarriage," *HTR* 90 (1997): 1–22. The call for total separation from the Gentiles is one of the key

The call for complete severance of the relationship between Israel and the Gentiles is also evident in *Jubilees*' resistance to the foreign practice of nudity,[42] as well as in its polemic against the refusal of some Jews to adopt the Jewish ethnic mark of circumcision.[43] These two points are significant since they provide a specific chronological framework for *Jubilees*,[44] a framework that is generally lacking in *1 Enoch* and in most of the Qumranic writings. The breaking of the taboo on nudity is implied in the accounts of the Hellenistic reform in Jerusalem, specifically 2 Maccabees' description of the athletic performance in the gymnasium.[45] The failure to circumcise is attested in 1 Maccabees. The only known times when Jews failed to circumcise themselves during the Second Temple period are during the Hellenistic reform of 175 BCE and in the era of the decrees of Antiochus IV (167–164 BCE). 1 Maccabees 1:15 says that the Jewish Hellenistic reformers who built the gymnasium "underwent operations to disguise their circumcision."[46] A few years later, Antiochus IV decreed that circumcision was prohibited and was punishable by death. When Mattathias and his followers fled to the mountains and established their

---

points for categorizing *Jubilees* as a nonsectarian composition, aimed at winning the recognition of all Israel (see below).

[42] *Jub*. 3:31; 7:20.

[43] *Jub*. 15:33–34. *Jub*. 15:26 announces that anyone who is not circumcised on the eighth day does not belong to the people of God, but to "the people (meant for) destruction." The passage seems to refute the practice of postponing circumcision.

[44] J. C. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (HSM 14; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977), 217–29, dates *Jubilees* to around 152 BCE. Although he refers to the issues of nudity and circumcision, his main arguments are that Jacob's wars with the seven Amorite kings (*Jub*. 34:2–9) and with Esau and his sons and allies (*Jub*. 37–38:14) reflect the wars of Judas Maccabeus in 164–161 BCE.

[45] Cf. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 245–46; Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 81. For the wrestling performances in the gymnasium, see 1 Macc 1:14–15; 2 Macc 4:12–15. For the assumption that, as in the Greek gymnasium, the games in Jerusalem were performed in a state of nudity, see J. Goldstein, *I Maccabees* (AB 41; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1976), 200. Although Goldstein questioned this assumption elsewhere (*II Maccabees* [AB 41A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983], 230) because nudity is not mentioned explicitly in 2 Maccabees, it is supported by the reference to disguising one's circumcision (see below). R. Doran, "The Non-Dating of *Jubilees*: *Jub.* 34–38; 23:14–32 in Narrative Context," *JSJ* 20 (1989): 10–11, argues that *Jub*. 3:31 expresses the author's concern for purity and proper sexual relationships, rather than constituting a specific anti-gymnasium reference.

[46] 1 Macc 1:13–15 (translation following Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 198); and cf. *Ant*. 12.241. The necessity of covering the foreskin derives from the shame of performing in a state of nudity before the Gentiles. Translations of *Jubilees* follow volume 2 of J. C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text* (2 vols.; CSCO 510–511; Leuven: Peeters, 1989).

resistance movement, they forcibly circumcised the boys they found. Hence, we may conclude that some Jews had adhered to Antiochus's decree.[47] It is most probable that the polemic in *Jubilees* is reacting to some of these events.

Dating *Jubilees* to the Maccabean revolt also coheres with its abomination of the Gentiles. It should be noted that *Jubilees*' treatments of the relationship with the Gentiles, nudity, and circumcision reflect a debate within Jewish society in the Land of Israel on the hegemony of Jewish culture in relation to Hellenism. *Jubilees* (or at least one of its sources) was therefore written when Jewish religious identity was threatened.[48] I think that this cultural trait does not fit into the slightly later Hasmonean period, when the Jews cooperated with some Seleucids against other Seleucids, and the struggle with the Gentiles was involved, not merely with the survival of Judaism in a Gentile world, but also with military and political expansion.[49]

Unlike *1 Enoch, Jubilees* introduces not only religious ideas, but also modes of behavior or a legal system. It demands several capital punishments,[50] polemicizes against the lunar calendar in order to promote the Enochic 364–day calendar,[51] and even expresses criticism of the current Temple cult. In *Jub*. 23:21, the wicked party, which indulges in cheating and other moral sins and also denies the correct calendar,

---

[47] 1 Macc 1:48, 60–61; 2:46. Cf. S. Weitzman, "'Forced Circumcision' and the Shifting Role of Gentiles in Hasmonean Ideology," *HTR* 92 (1999): 37–60.

[48] For a similar view, see E. Schwartz, *Identität durch Abgrenzung* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1982). Admittedly, *Jubilees* has been dated by scholars to many different periods, ranging from early to late second century BCE. See the survey of J. C. VanderKam, "The Origins and Purposes of the *Book of Jubilees,*" in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* (ed. M. Albani, J. Frey, and A. Lange; TSAJ 65; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 4–16. I do not think that the Hasmoneans were later "hellenized," and therefore do not see the Hasmonean period as a background for traces of such a debate in *Jubilees*. For a sensible appreciation of the relationship between Hasmonean ideology and Hellenism, see E. S. Gruen, "Hellenism and the Hasmoneans," in *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 1–40.

[49] M. Stern, *Hasmonaean Judaea in the Hellenistic World: Chapters in Political History* (ed. D. R. Schwarz; Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 1995 [Hebrew]).

[50] *Jub*. 2:26–27; 4:22; 20:4; 30:9; 33:13; 41:26.

[51] *Jub*. 6:23–32. Cf. 23:19. The traditional lunar calendar is associated with the Gentiles, probably because the Greek/Hellenistic calendar was also lunar, and is considered much less accurate than the solar one, leading to the distortion of the correct dates of the festivals. Such a distortion actually means the desecration of holy time, which *Jubilees* comprehends as the act of polluting sacred time. For the defilement of time (Sabbath, festivals, calendar) see *Jub*. 2:25–26; 6:37.

is accused of defiling the "holy of holies" with the impure corruption of their contamination. In fact, *Jubilees* has a special concern for sacrifices, since almost every patriarch is depicted as sacrificing to God.[52] Moreover, *Jubilees* incorporates into its narrative several laws concerning sacrifices and priestly dues, which are attested in the *Temple Scroll* and MMT, but are for the most part opposed in Pharisaic or rabbinic *halakhah*.[53] For *Jubilees*, it should be emphasized, atonement is a major issue,[54] and the Temple and its cult are the initial means of

---

[52] *Jub*. 3:27; 4:25; 6:1–3; 7:3–5; 13:4, 8, 16; 14:11; 16:20–24; 22:4; 24:23; 32:4–6. See also the sacrificial rulings in *Jub*. 20:7–17; 49:16–21. The "priestly" outlook is also indicated by the tradition giving Levi a higher ranking than Judah (*Jub*. 3:12–17). Sensitivity to the sanctity of the Temple is also expressed in *Jub*. 1:10; 49:21.

[53] For partial presentation of the evidence in relation to the festivals, see J. C. VanderKam, "The Temple Scroll and the Book of Jubilees," in *Temple Scroll Studies* (ed. G. J. Brooke; JSPSup 7; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 211–36. *Jub*. 7:4 orders that the he-goat (*seʿir*) for atonement should be sacrificed first, as in the *Temple Scroll* (14:9–12; 23:10–13; 26:5–27:4), and in contrast to the plain text of Numbers 28–29 and rabbinic halakhah (*m. Zeb*. 10:2; *b. Zeb*. 89b). According to *Jub*. 32:15, the animal tithe is given to the priests, as in MMT B 63–64, whereas according to the rabbis (*m. Zeb*. 5:8), the owners get it. *Jub*. 7:36 orders that the fruits of the fourth year should be given to God's servants (namely, the priests), as in the *Temple Scroll* and MMT (MMT B 62–63; *Temple Scroll* 60:3–4; 4Q266 2 ii 6 [see J. M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)* (DJD 18; Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 144–45]), whereas the rabbis argued that it should be eaten by its owners (*m. Maʿas. Sh*. 5:1–5; *Sifre Numbers* 6 [*Siphre ad Numeros adjecto Siphre zutta* (ed. H. S. Horovitz; Leipzig: Gustav Frock, 1917; repr. Jerusalem: Wahrmann, 1966), 6]; *y. Peʾah*. 7:6, 20b–20c). *Jub*. 49:16, 20 specifies that the Passover sacrifice is to be eaten in the Temple, as does *Temple Scroll* 17:8–9, whereas according to the rabbis it may be eaten throughout the city of Jerusalem (*m. Zeb*. 5:8). Similar limitations in *Jub*. 7:36 and 32:14 apply to the fruits of the fourth year and the second tithe, also against the view of the rabbis (*m. Zeb*. 5:8). Both *Jub*. 32:10–11 and *Temple Scroll* 43:1–17 command that the second tithe be brought to the Temple every year. In *Jubilees*, a stress on the impurity of the Gentiles is similar to specific cultic laws in MMT involving the refusal to accept sacrifices from Gentiles, the exclusion of Ammonites and Moabites from the Temple, and perhaps also the prohibitions against bringing the offering/tithe of the wheat and grain of the Gentiles to the Temple and against the intermarriage of priests with Gentile women. See E. Regev, "Abominated Temple and a Holy Community: The Formation of the Concepts of Purity and Impurity in Qumran," *DSD* 10 (2003): 246–48. For the cosmological-philosophical perception that lies behind this cultic system see E. Regev, "On the Differences of Religious Outlook between Qumranic and Rabbinic Halakhah: Dynamic versus Static Sanctity," *Tarbiz* 72 (2002–2003): 113–32, 128–29 (Hebrew); idem, "Reconstructing Qumranic and Rabbinic Worldviews: Dynamic Holiness vs. Static Holiness," in *Rabbinic Perspectives: Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 7–9 January, 2003* (ed. S. D. Fraade, A. Shemesh, and R. A. Clements; STDJ 62; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 87–112.

[54] *Jub*. 1:23–24; 5:17–18; 16:22; 22:14; 23:26–31; 34:8; 41:23–24. In *Jub*. 6:1–4, the atoning force of sacrifices is underscored. Note that *Jubilees* specifies those sins that

accomplishing it. There are even several references to the new ideal Temple, which is to be built in the time of the New Creation.[55] In the eschatological age all the transgressions criticized by the author will be eliminated. It will be an age of purity when God "will create a holy spirit" for the people of Israel and will purify them forever, an idea that recalls the main theme in *11QMelchizedek*.[56]

Jubilees thus has several general perceptions in common with the Qumranites: cosmic dualism, calendar, and views and laws concerning the Temple cult (in common with MMT). Moreover, there are also more particular ideas that may point to Qumranic dependence on or continuity with the heritage of *Jubilees*. *Jubilees* 22:14 associates atonement with purification, as do the *Community Rule*, the *Hodayot* and several liturgies for ablution found in cave 4.[57] *Jubilees* views the people of Israel as being as holy as the angels in heaven—quite like the Qumranites, who portray themselves as associated with or equal to angels.[58] The discussion of a new and eternal Temple at the time of the New Creation (*Jub.* 4:26; cf. also *Jub.* 1:17) explains the crux of a similar reference in the *Temple Scroll* (29:9–10).[59] In both texts, purity, atonement, and sanctity are associated with the ideal Temple.

---

cannot be repented or atoned for, i.e., marriage with Gentiles and fornication with one's father's wife (*Jub.* 30:10; 33:13).

[55] The Garden of Eden is described as a Temple in *Jub.* 8:19. Adam acts as a priest offering incense in *Jub.* 3:27. *Jub.* 3:12 specifies that (like a sanctuary) Eden must not be defiled. For the concept of a new ideal Temple in the age of the New Creation, see *Jub.* 1:27, 29; 4:25–26. See T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, "Visions of the Temple in the *Book of Jubilees*," in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel—Community without Temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (ed. B. Ego, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer; WUNT 118; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 215–27. See p. 218 for the conclusion that God dwells only in Eden and in the future Temple.

[56] *Jub.* 1:23; 4:26; 50:5. On *11QMelchizedek*, see Davidson, *Angels at Qumran*, 255–64 and bibliography.

[57] 1QS 3:6–12; 1QH[a] 9[Sukenik 1]:32; 12[4]:37; 4Q284; 4Q414; and 4Q512, discussed in J. M. Baumgarten, "The Purification Liturgies," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. J. C. VanderKam and P. W. Flint; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999), 2:200–212.

[58] *Jub.* 2:17–18, 21. Cf. also *Jub.* 15:27. On Qumran, see: J. H. Charlesworth, "The Portrayal of the Righteous as an Angel," in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism* (ed. J. J. Collins and G. W. E. Nickelsburg; SBLSCS 12; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1980), 135–51; D. Dimant, "Men as Angels: The Self-Image of the Qumran Community," in *Religion and Politics in the Ancient Near East* (ed. A. Berlin; Bethesda, Md.: University Press of Maryland, 1996), 93–103.

[59] See the edition of E. Qimron, *The Temple Scroll: A Critical Edition with Extensive Reconstructions* (Judean Desert Studies; Beer Sheva: Ben Gurion University of the

In fact, a comparison of the two versions of this "new Temple" tradition leads to the conclusion that in this case the *Temple Scroll* may be dependent on *Jubilees*. In the *Temple Scroll* (29:8–10) God promises: "I shall sanctify my [Te]mple with my glory, for I shall make my glory reside over it until the day of creation, when I shall create my Temple, establishing it for myself for all days, according to the covenant which I made with Jacob in Bethel." But the *Temple Scroll* does not explain what "the covenant in Bethel" has to do with the eschatological and eternal Temple. This matter is elucidated in *Jubilees* 32, where Jacob inaugurates Levi into the priesthood at Bethel. In his vision, Jacob is handed seven tablets (*Jub.* 32:31), presumably containing sacrificial laws that may be identified with the reference to Jacob's covenant in the *Temple Scroll*. Jacob is then commanded not to build an eternal Temple at Bethel (*Jub.* 32:32). Hence, it seems that the *Temple Scroll* is actually dependent on the *Jubilees* tradition, which it introduces in abridged form.[60]

The character of the group behind the *Book of Jubilees* is exposed only in one passage, the so-called "*Jubilees* Apocalypse." The author condemns "that evil generation" for transgressing "the law and the covenant," "commandment, ordinance and every verdict," and particularly the calendar ("festival, month, Sabbath, jubilee"); but he also condemns them for moral transgressions ("injustice and cheating"). The people of Israel will be punished through internal strife and oppression by the Gentiles. The subsequent salvation will be due to the emergence of a new and just generation:

> In those days, the children will begin to study the laws, to seek out commands, and to return to the right way.... They will complete and live their entire lifetimes peacefully and joyfully. There will be neither a satan nor any evil one who will destroy, for their entire lifetime will be times of blessing and healing. (*Jub.* 23:26–29)

I do not think that the conflict described in *Jubilees* 23 relates to the Jewish Hellenizers and the Maccabees. There are no references to asso-

---

Negev Press; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), 44. Cf. also the fragmentary reference to "the creation until the [new] creation" in 4Q225 *Pseudo-Jubilees*[a] 1 7.

[60] For the Bethel traditions in *Jubilees*, the *Temple Scroll*, and other related documents, see E. Eshel, "*Jubilees* 32 and the Bethel Cult Traditions in Second Temple Literature," in *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone* (ed. E. G. Chazon, D. Satran, and R. A. Clements; JSJSup 89; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 21–36.

ciation with Gentiles or to intermarriage, such as occupy the writer's attention in so many other instances. Moreover, the "children" in this passage are a group that challenges the traditional mainstream elite, quite like the young lambs of the Animal Apocalypse of *1 Enoch* 90, as already shown by M. Kister.[61] The "children" in *Jubilees* represent a religious renewal movement. But this movement is not sectarian. It lacks the aspect of separation (whether claimed or practiced) that is essential for any sectarian movement.[62] It is portrayed as the true Israel, but without the claim that the "elders" will be cut off. No matter how sinful the elders are, the author does not regard them as doomed. The author implies that they will accept the teaching of the young ones, suggesting that the unity of the Jewish people will be preserved in times of reward and punishment. The us-vs.-them division does exist, but it is relatively limited. The misdeeds of the elders cause the punishment of the whole nation, including the young ones, while the enlightenment of the latter also affects the larger society, bringing eternal salvation. Thus, the author does not see his group as separated from the rest of Israel, but as a pioneering religious movement that faces opposition at its beginning.

Although traces of separation language can be found in *Jubilees* (impurity, sin, etc.), there is no call for social withdrawal. Rather, we find a strong inclination toward the reconciliation of all Israel, against the Gentiles.[63] In fact, the call for total abhorrence of and separation from non-Israelites on the one hand, and for sanctification of the People of Israel (as well as the anticipation that all Israel would embrace

---

[61] Kister, "Concerning The History of the Essenes," 6–7. Kister also thinks that "the evil generation" (*Jub.* 23:14) is identical with the "perverse generation" in the Apocalypse of Weeks (*1 En.* 93:9).

[62] See n. 3.

[63] For *Jubilees* as "not reflecting any significant break with the larger national body," but rather as an attempt to return to the "normative" position, which it represents, see O. S. Wintermute, "*Jubilees,*" *OTP* 2:44, 48. For *Jubilees*' audience as the Jewish nation as a whole, and its purpose as aiming for the conversion of Israel to the law, see Davies, *Behind the Essenes*, 117; Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*, 97–98. VanderKam, *Textual and Historical Studies*, 281, concluded that "*Jub.*'s concern is still for the entire nation of Israel, and its author and his party are still part of the national community which centered on the Temple in Jerusalem." He also regards the command in *Jub.* 49:21 that the Passover be celebrated not "in their cities," but in the Temple, as indicating a stance against withdrawal from the Temple (ibid., 281–82). Kister, however, defines the group behind *Jubilees* 23 as a "separatist, isolationist sect, similar to the Qumran sect" ("Concerning the History of the Essenes," i [English abstract]).

the author's message) on the other, flies in the face of any association of *Jubilees* with the sectarian worldview of the *Yaḥad*, which considers others Jews to be the people of Belial. The movement reflected in *Jubilees* is thus very different from the *Yaḥad*, which rejected every "otherness" within Israel and treated Jewish nonmembers as if they were Gentiles.[64]

The background for the emergence of the "children" may provide hints concerning the dating of the scene thus portrayed. Their victory is envisioned only after a national collective age of punishment, probably caused by the transgressions and iniquities of the elders. The dramatic descriptions of sword, captivity, plundering, and death caused by the cruel nations probably allude to the decrees of Antiochus IV and the consequent Maccabean wars. Interestingly, *Jubilees* portrays the young ones as emerging before that age of great distress and foresees their triumph after it. The author probably does not know how the war with the nations will end,[65] and he is unaware of Hasmonean independence, when movements like that behind *Jubilees* met with disappointment.

Until this point, I have argued that *Jubilees* introduces a reform movement that included many of the ideas also found at Qumran, but also that, its criticism of the religious situation in contemporary mainstream Judaism notwithstanding, it lacks a sectarian worldview entailing social separation from other Jews. Nonetheless, consider a situation where *Jubilees*' doctrine of religious reform was rejected by the Jewish leadership and by most of Jewish society, and the anticipated reform led by the "children" is not achieved. I think that an appreciation of the *Jubilees* belief system leads to the conclusion that under such circumstances a movement that adhered to the ideas in *Jubilee*s would withdraw and become a sect.

---

[64] For *Jubilees*' view of Israel and the Gentiles, see M. Himmelfarb, "*Jubilees* and Sectarianism," in Boccaccini, *Enoch and Qumran Origins*, 129–31. C. Werman, "The *Book of Jubilees* and the Qumran Community," in *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls 2* (ed. M. Bar-Asher and D. Dimant; Haifa: Haifa University Press; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2004), 37–58 (Hebrew), argues for a Qumranic-sectarian provenance for *Jubilees*. For the *Yaḥad*'s halakhic classification of other Jews as like Gentiles, see A. Shemesh, "The Origins of the Laws of Separatism: Qumranic Literature and Rabbinic Halacha," *RevQ* 18 (1997): 223–41.

[65] Admittedly, the author may purposely avoid mention of the Maccabees and their military and diplomatic achievements. Cf. also Daniel's lack of appreciation of the Maccabees (11:34).

In matters of cultic law and calendar (and to a certain extent, also of eschatology), the document that *Jubilees* most resembles is the *Temple Scroll*, although the genre and purpose of the two sources are very different. However, I would also like to show the close ideological relationship between *Jubilees* 23 and section C in MMT. In the homiletic section of MMT, the authors argue, "we have separated ourselves from the multitude of the people [and from all their impurity]" (C 7).[66] This impurity is probably moral, since the fragmentary continuation of this passage relates to moral sins: "and concerning…[the malice] and the treachery…and fornication [some] places were destroyed… [N]o] treachery or deceit or evil can be found in our hand" (C 4–6, 8–9). Similar accusations are ascribed to the "evil generation" in *Jub.* 23:14: (moral) impurity and contamination, sexual impurity (paralleling MMT's fornication) and detestable actions (paralleling MMT's malice, treachery and deceit). Further on, similar accusations are made against "the elders": "they have acted wickedly…everything they do is impure…all their ways are contamination" (*Jub.* 23:17); "cheating through wealth…they will defile the holy of holies with the impure corruption of their contamination" (23:21).

The notion of moral impurity is common to this section of MMT and the entire *Book of Jubilees*. Another possible parallel between the two texts is their use of threats of physical destruction. MMT recounts that "[some] places were destroyed," probably as a punishment following the sins of "[the malice] and the treachery…and fornication" (C 4–6). *Jubilees* 23:22–25 describes the dire consequences of the "elders'" transgressions and impure ways (that is, the sword, judgment and captivity). The common use of biblical motifs of destruction to specify punishments for these sins of moral impurity seems like more than a coincidence.

Last but not least, both MMT and *Jubilees* express eschatological expectations. The authors of MMT declare: "And we are aware that part of the blessings and curses have occurred that are written in the b[ook of Mos]es. And this is the End of Days, when they will return in Israel to the L[aw…]and not turn bac[k] and the wicked will act wickedly…" (C 20–22).[67] *Jubilees* 23:26–31 envisions that after the punishment at

[66] Unless otherwise noted, translations of MMT follow E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqṣat Maʿaśe Ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994).

[67] Translation of this passage follows that of F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden; Brill, 1997–1998), 2:803.

the hands of the nations, the "children" will take over, returning to the right way of the laws and commands; and an age of great peace, praise and happiness will begin. In both texts, there is hope for a religious reform that will lead to salvation. MMT's invocation of biblical curses and blessings (cf. Leviticus 26; Deuteronomy 28), probably in reference to the destruction from a previous war (most likely the Maccabean revolt), quickly shifts to the messianic age, much as *Jubilees* quickly moves from disaster to deliverance. Of course, in MMT, the sense of salvation is more imminent. The "End of Days" is no longer a future expectation, but the rubric for present existence. This difference may be explained, not only in light of the special rhetorical aim of MMT (i.e., persuading the addressee[s] to follow the authors' counsel), but also by the assumption that a few years separated the writing of *Jubilees* and MMT. In that interval, messianic expectations intensified, perhaps cultivated by the relative political relief when clashes between the Seleucids and the Maccabees headed by Jonathan ceased after 158 BCE (1 Macc 9:70–73).

I think these affinities show that there were close chronological and social links between *Jubilees* and MMT. One should also bear in mind that both documents have many features in common with the *Temple Scroll*. Simply put, I suggest that MMT was written by the members of a group that adhered to the ideology of *Jubilees*, or the descendants of such a group, and reflects a slight development of that ideology. Hence, according to the proposed dating of *Jubilees* around 160 BCE, MMT would be only slightly later than the period of the Maccabean revolt; this would support Qimron's and Eshel's presumptions that the text was sent to the Wicked Priest, identified with Jonathan.[68] A more complicated problem, however, is how to incorporate the *Temple Scroll* into this scheme.[69] The sections that resemble *Jubilees* and MMT (the sacrificial laws and the calendar) may be contemporary with either *Jubilees* or MMT, or rather, originate somewhere in between them, in

[68] E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, DJD 10.119–21; H. Eshel, "4QMMT and the History of the Hasmonean Period," in *Reading 4QMMT: New Perspectives on Qumran Law and History* (ed. J. Kampen and M. J. Bernstein; SBLSymS 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 53–65. See also H. Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 104–6.

[69] Cf. the literary-critical analysis of M. O. Wise, *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11* (Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990).

the early 150's, the period for which there is a vacuum in our knowledge in regard to the high priesthood and the Temple.

The Essenes as a Later Development of the Qumran Movement

The Essenes were undoubtedly a sect, separated from the larger society by many restrictions and taboos. From the earliest days of the study of the scrolls, the identification of the "Qumran community" with the Essenes was regarded as a consensus. However, if we reflect on previous research, it is unclear whether the Essenes are to be associated with the *Rule of the Community* or the *Damascus Document*;[70] were the forefathers of the Damascus Covenanters or the *Yaḥad*;[71] or even whether perhaps the Qumranic groups were only a part of the larger Essene movement.[72] There is also another less popular possibility: that is, that there is no relationship whatsoever between Qumran and the Essenes.[73]

A sweeping identification of the Essenes with the Qumran movement is difficult for two general reasons. First, almost all of our knowledge of the Essene way of life probably reflects the days of Philo and Josephus, the mid-first century CE; that is, 150–200 years later than the major documents from Qumran. Second, Philo and Josephus testify

---

[70] A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les écrits esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte* (Paris: Payot, 1959); G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (rev. ed.; London: SCM Press, 1994), 114–15;

[71] Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis*.

[72] E. P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE–66CE* (London: SCM Press; Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1992), 345.

[73] A. I. Baumgarten, "The Rule of the Martian as Applied to Qumran," *Israel Oriental Studies* 14 (1994): 179–200; idem, "Who Cares and Why Does It Matter? Qumran and the Essenes, Once Again!" *DSD* 11 (2004): 174–90; M. Goodman, "A Note on the Qumran Sectarians, the Essenes and Josephus," *JJS* 46 (1995): 161–66; S. Talmon, "Qumran Studies: Past, Present, and Future," *JQR* 85 (1995): 11–14, 17–18. The following discussion owes a great debt to A. I. Baumgarten's emphasis that sect members would treat differences in regulations and practices much more seriously than outsiders. See his, *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (JSJSup 55; Leiden: Brill, 1997), esp. 55–57, 78–79, 92–93. Compare, for example, the split of the Amish from the Swiss Anabaptists in the 1690's due to the controversy over shunning transgressing members (*Meidung*) and the division between Amish congregations over the extent to which each strictly adheres to shunning. See E. Regev, "Comparing Sectarian Practice and Organization: The Qumran Sect in Light of the Regulations of the Shakers, Hutterites, Mennonites, and Amish," *Numen* 51 (2004): 146–81, esp. 161–62, 177–78.

to the presence of 4000 Essenes in Judaea, as well as in the cities,[74] and consistently claim that the Essenes held common property. It is obvious that the *Yaḥad* was a very small group, whose members met frequently together and probably lived in social isolation.[75] The group behind the *Damascus Document* (namely, the Damascus Covenanters), on the other hand, was probably larger and perhaps also urban; but unlike all the ancient reports on the Essenes, the Damascus Covenanters apparently did not have common property.[76]

Moreover, it is difficult to argue that the Essenes were the forefathers of the either the *Yaḥad* or the Damascus Covenanters, that is (as Stegemann and García Martínez argued), that the Essenes emerged during the Maccabean revolt or even before it. The examination of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* has shown that these documents reflect the thinking of groups or movements from which many of the later Qumranic ideas developed, but that nonetheless these movements were not sects in the full sense of the term. A comparison of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* with the Essenes as portrayed by Philo, Josephus, and Pliny results in a picture of very general similarities and numerous and fundamental dissimilarities between the Essenes and the groups behind the earlier documents, which seem quite remote from them in terms of social outlook.

There are numerous similarities in terms of beliefs, and especially in terms of practices and ritual, between the Essenes and the *Yaḥad* or the Damascus Covenanters: common property, tension in relation to the Temple, morality, self-restraint, companionship, a gradual admissions process, purity and avoidance of oil, and prayer.[77] However, within many of these similarities, a certain degree of difference is concealed.

---

[74] Essenes in the cities: Philo, *Hypothetica* 11.1, 8–10; *That Every Good Person is Free* 75; Josephus, *J.W.* 2.124; *Ant.* 18.20. References to Philo and Josephus follow the Loeb Classical Library editions: *Philo* (trans. F. H. Colson et al.; 10 vols. and 2 supplementary vols.; LCL; London: Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1932–1962); *Josephus* (trans. H. St. J. Thackeray et al.; 10 vols.; LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965).

[75] Cf. 1QS 6:8–23 (the meetings of the *rabbim*); 6:1–2; 8:12–15; 9:19–21 (withdrawal to the desert).

[76] On the Essenes, see *Hypoth.* 10.11; *Good Person* 86; *J.W.* 2.122; *Ant.* 18.20. Pliny asserts that they have "no money." See Pliny the Elder, *Natural History* 5.73. For rules concerning private property among the sectarians, see CD 16:14–20; 9:9–15; 13:14–16; 14:12–17.

[77] T. S. Beall, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (SNTSMS 58; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

Such, for example, is the case with the rules pertaining to defecation: an Essene digs a hole as needed, with his personal shovel, whereas the *Temple Scroll* and the *War Rule* mandate the building of permanent communal latrines.[78] There are also several quite striking parallels: interdictions against spitting in the midst of the assembly, against moving any vessel during the Sabbath, against preparation of food in the course of the Sabbath;[79] the role of the priests in the preparation of bread;[80] the priestly prayer/blessing before the meal;[81] and the exclusion of the novices from common meals and purification rites.[82]

These parallels pertain to both the *Community Rule* and the *Damascus Document*. Moreover, Philo's and Josephus' accounts combine conflicting characteristics of both Qumran-related branches. Philo's Essenes live in the villages, avoiding, like the *Yaḥad* in the desert, the iniquities of cities.[83] Josephus' Essenes live in cities,[84] probably like many of the Damascus Covenanters. Philo says that they served God, "not by offering sacrifices of animals, but by resolving to sanctify their minds"; quite similarly, the *Yaḥad* claims that prayers and moral behavior may substitute for sacrifices.[85] In the *Damascus Document*, withdrawal from the moral impurity of the Temple's treasury and dedications system stands side by side with the issue of conveying offerings to the Temple through a morally pure messenger.[86] This may be paralleled to Josephus' assertion that, barred from the Temple, the Essenes prepared their sacrifices by themselves, but nonetheless sent

---

[78] A. I. Baumgarten, "The Temple Scroll, Toilet Practices, and the Essenes," *Jewish History* 10 (1996): 9–20.

[79] J. M. Baumgarten, "The Disqualifications of Priests in 4Q Fragments of the Damascus Document, a Specimen of the Recovery of Pre-Rabbinic Halakha," in Trebolle Barrera and Vegas Montaner, *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 2:504–5.

[80] *Ant*. 18.22; 1QS 6:4–5, 20–21.

[81] *J.W*. 2.131; 1QS 6:4–6.

[82] *J.W*. 2.137–138 (discussed in Beall, *Josephus' Description of the Essenes*, 73–74); 1QS 6:13–23.

[83] Philo, *Good Person* 76, 78; 1QS 8:13.

[84] *J.W*. 2.124. Cities or towns (*ʿir*) are mentioned in CD 10:21 and 11:5–6, in relation to the limits on walking distances on the Sabbath. CD 12:19 refers to the "rule for the assembly of the cities of Israel"; namely, for the communities which dwell in the cities.

[85] Philo, *Good Person* 75; 1QS 9:4–5. According to the *Damascus Document*, punishments function as atoning sacrifices (4QD^{a} 11 1–3; 4QD^{e} 7 i 15–17).

[86] CD 6:4–16; 11:18–20. Cf. P. R. Davies, "The Ideology of the Temple in the *Damascus Document*," in idem, *Sects and Scrolls*, 45–60.

offerings to the Temple.[87] We are therefore left confused as to whether the Essenes portrayed by Philo and Josephus are the separatists of the *Yaḥad* or the less secluded Damascus Covenanters.

There are also some discrepancies between the reports of Philo and Josephus and the Qumran scrolls that may have been given inadequate consideration as "minor." The Essene abstinence from taking oaths, for example, is not attested in the Scrolls, which give regulations for the taking of oaths in front of judges in cases of lost property (CD 9:8–12), and speak of vows as a normative and even frequent practice (CD 16:1–7).[88] The Essene avoidance of holding slaves also does not correspond with the findings from Qumran; CD 11:12 prohibits "pressing" one's servant or maidservant (to work) on the Sabbath. In the *Community Rule* there is no mention of servants and one might be led to assume that neither the Essenes nor the *Yaḥad* held slaves, since they maintained common property. However, a recently discovered ostracon from Kh. Qumran that mentions the delivery of a slave named Ḥisdai from Ḥolon may attest to the dwellers' readiness to accept such slaves as property.[89]

Almost all scholars believe that like most of the Essenes, the *Yaḥad* members were celibates. This conclusion, however, cannot be proved and is based on the preliminary assumption that identifies the Essenes with the "Qumran community."[90] Actually, it may be refuted if

---

[87] *Ant*. 18.19. Cf. A. I. Baumgarten, "Josephus on Essene Sacrifice," *JJS* 45 (1994): 169–83. Indeed, indirect Essene involvement in the Temple is attested to in the references to Judas teaching near the Temple and the appointment of John in the public meeting on the Temple Mount (*J.W*. 1.78; 2.562, 567; *Ant*. 13.311; see Baumgarten, "The Rule of the Martian," 134–35).

[88] On oaths in the *Damascus Document*, see L. H. Schiffman, *Law, Custom, and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center for Jewish History, 1993), 204–11, 220–27 (Hebrew). Beall (*Josephus' Description*, 69–70) builds on the silence of the *Community Rule* in relation to oaths other than those of converts, thus creating a false parallelism with Philo and Josephus, while resolving the evidence from the *Damascus Document*'s different stages of development.

[89] For the Essene position, see Philo, *Hyp*. 11.4; *Good Person* 79; Josephus, *Ant*. 18.21. On CD 11:12, see Schiffman, *Law, Custom, and Messianism*, 125–26 (compare also Philo, *Laws* 2.66–68). For the ostracon, see F. M. Cross and E. Eshel, "Ostraca from Khirbet Qumran," *IEJ* 47 (1997): 17–28. This conclusion is reasonable even if one rejects their reading of "the *Yaḥad*" in line 5, and their suggestion that the ostracon attests to the acceptance of a new member and his property into the *Yaḥad*.

[90] E.g., R. De Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), 128–29; Stegemann, "The Qumran Essenes—Local Members," 89; Sanders, *Judaism*, 344; Baumgarten, "Rule of the Martian," 133; C. Hempel, "The Earthly Essene Nucleus of 1QSA," *DSD* 3 (1996): 266–74; G. Vermes "The Qumran Community, The Essenes, and Nascent Christianity," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty*

one does not take for granted that the Essenes were identical to the *Yaḥad*. Nowhere in the *Community Rule* or in any other document from Qumran is there any reference to celibacy or to exclusion of women from social life. Such a ruling would be extraordinary, and one should not deduce its existence from the *silence* of the *Community Rule* regarding women and family life. Moreover, husband and wife, girls and old women are mentioned in 4Q502 (called by Baillet a "Ritual of Marriage"), where the *Yaḥad* is mentioned several times and several terms characteristic of the *Yaḥad* are used.[91] A fuller consideration of the possibility that the *Yaḥad* included women and families cannot be contemplated here. For the present purpose, it is sufficient to indicate that celibacy cannot be viewed as a definitive parallel between the Qumran movement and the Essenes.[92]

A notable difference between the Essenes and the Qumranites is related to the Essene involvement in public affairs, mostly through public prophecies concerning Jewish rulers. Josephus notes that some Essenes, being versed in holy books, various forms of purification, and the words of the prophets, profess to have foreknowledge of the future.[93] Josephus also mentions several instances of Essene prophecies that were made in public. Judas predicted that Antigonus the Hasmonean would be killed at Strato's Tower (*J.W.* 1.78–80; *Ant.* 13.311–313). When Herod was still young, Menahem predicted that he would become the king of the Jews; later, once Herod was in power, he predicted that Herod would reign for twenty or thirty more years (*Ant.* 15.371–379). Simon correctly interpreted Archelaus' dream, and foresaw that his reign would soon

---

Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997 (ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Socety, 2000), 583–84. Cf. E. Schuller, "Women in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in Flint and VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years*, 2:117.

[91] M. Baillet, *Qumrân grotte 4.III (4Q482–4Q520)* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), 81–105; J. M. Baumgarten, "4Q502, Marriage or Golden Age Ritual," *JJS* 34 (1983): 125–35; idem, "The Qumran–Essene Restraints on Marriage," in *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The New York University Conference in Memory of Yigael Yadin* (ed. L. H. Schiffman; JSPSup 8; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 13–24.

[92] See E. Regev, "Chercher les femmes: Were the *yaḥad* Celibates?" *Dead Sea Discoveries* 15/2 (2008): 253–84.

[93] *J.W.* 2.159. Cf. also *Ant.* 15.379. For the general identification of these prophecies with the *pesharim*, see Beall, *Josephus' Description*, 110–11. However, the *pesharim* are not really predictive; they are mainly concerned with the End of Days, not with precise political events. See R. Gray, *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 105–7. Purification and the study of holy books or scripture are attributed elsewhere to the Essenes and are also characteristic of the *Yaḥad* (ibid., 83–92).

come to an end (*J.W.* 2.312–313; *Ant.* 17.345–348). In all these instances Josephus emphasizes the accuracy of the Essene foreknowledge.

I find it quite puzzling that distinguished members of a sect separated from normal social life, restricting its connections with other Jews, and specializing in a secret knowledge of the future, would be interested in such a public performance of prophecy. It seems to me that the purpose of these prophecies was to win public attention and admiration. One should bear in mind that predictions that were regarded as believable had great influence on the governing authorities and probably also on the masses. For example, when Jesus son of Ananias mourned the destruction of Jerusalem as early as 62 CE, he was arrested and flogged by the Roman governor Albinus.[94] There are many cases in which Roman authorities, rulers and emperors were very concerned about such prophecies.[95]

I therefore suggest that with these prophecies as well as with John's assumption of military leadership role during the Great Revolt, the Essenes strove for political recognition and the acquisition of social power. The Essenes' concern for the wider society, their large number, and the special attention paid to them by Josephus, Philo, and Pliny the Elder, all point to a movement that was socially significant, much more significant than either the *Yaḥad* or the Damascus Covenanters. I suggest that the Essenes were a branch that developed from both the *Yaḥad* and the *Damascus Covenanters*, and became larger and more successful than its precursors. If this was indeed the case, the *Yaḥad* and the Damascus Covenanters established a firm foundation for the subsequent development of a unique and rich religious culture and social system.

Conclusions

The authors of the *Damascus Document*, the *Community Rule*, the *War Rule* and the *Hodayot* were certainly influenced by the worldviews of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* concerning the presence of evil in the world, cosmic dualism, angelology, eschatology, a critical approach towards the

---

[94] *J.W.* 6.300–309; Gray, *Prophetic Figures*, 158–63.

[95] See the cases discussed in G. Anderson, *Sage, Saint and Sophist: Holy Men and their Associates in the Early Roman Empire* (London and New York: Routledge, 1994).

laws of Temple sacrifices, and the quest for atonement. I have also shown connections between *Jubilees* and the later MMT. However, given the accepted understanding of sect as a group in a state of tension with the world from which it aims to separate itself, it is quite apparent that the groups behind *1 Enoch* (as known to us from the Animal Apocalypse, the Apocalypse of Weeks, and the Epistle of Enoch) were not sects, but reform movements. Similarly, the social outlook of the *Community Rule,* the *Damascus Document* and the *Hodayot* is essentially different from that of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*.

The Essenes described by Philo and Josephus definitely constituted a sect (their social separation is stressed, especially in Josephus' *Jewish War*, and their social boundaries are also apparent in Philo's reports). Their worldview is therefore very different from those of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*. More than 200 years separates these two sets of evidence, and the characteristics they have in common are very general (predestination, eschatology, angelology). The available sources cannot affirm that the Essenes depended upon these earlier writings, although one should bear in mind that the nature of the evidence we have about the Essenes is descriptive, and very different from the direct literary evidence of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*. If the ideological origin of the Qumran movement stems from *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees*, the Essenes cannot be treated as the "parent movement" of the Qumranites. Rather, the evidence suggests that the Essenes were a later development of the Qumran movement.

The development of a trajectory of different reform movements and sects from the Maccabean revolt to the Great Revolt can be sketched only very generally. There may have been other variations and segmentations between the time of the "Enochic movement" and John the Essene that can or cannot be traced in these texts.[96] My present proposals may complicate matters, but approaching the texts with sensitivity to the social characteristics they reveal can contribute to the scholarly attempt to create order in the world of Second Temple sects and scrolls.[97]

---

[96] For the possible relationships between these groups and a sketch of the evolutions of some of them, see E. Regev, "The *Yaḥad* and the *Damascus Covenant*: Structure, Organization and Relationship," *RevQ* 21 (2003): 233–62.

[97] A much broader treatment of the issues discussed in this article is developed in chapters 5–7 of my book, *Sectarianism in Qumran: A Cross-Cultural Perspective* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007). See also my article "Jubilees, Qumran, and the Essenes," in Boccaccini and Ibba, *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah*, 426–40.

INNOVATIVE READINGS

EDUCATION AND WISDOM IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS IN LIGHT OF THEIR BACKGROUND IN ANTIQUITY

Bilhah Nitzan
Tel-Aviv University

I. *Introduction*

A primary aim of societies, nations, and cultures is to educate their members to live according to the community's ethical, sociological, and philosophical values. This educational aim is achieved by means of laws, historical stories, psalms or poetry, and other literary genres, frequently using indirect methods, and reflecting the connections of such values to religious belief and practice. Such is the case in the Bible and in postbiblical Jewish sources, and likewise in sources stemming from other ancient nations and societies.

Sapiential literature, which makes explicit its educational purpose, utilizes specific forms and content to instruct the reader. The sapiential writings discovered in Qumran enable us to study the methods of education used by the Qumran community.[1] On the one hand, the apocalyptic ideology and rigorous priestly system of Jewish law that characterized the Qumran community and caused their sectarian separation from the multitude of their contemporaries might have influenced their educational methods. On the other, their reliance on biblical literature might have bound them to more traditional methods of education. In light of the potential tension between these two inclinations, it is useful to investigate the Qumran writings, especially the sapiential ones, from the standpoint of their pedagogical methods, to clarify in what ways these reflect biblical values and conservative

[1] Among the earliest published Qumran writings we find copies of *Instruction* and *Mysteries* from cave 1 (1Q26 and 1Q27), edited by D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik (*Qumran Cave 1* [DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955], 101–2; 102–7); as well as the so-called "Wiles of the Wicked Woman" (4Q184), edited by J. M. Allegro (*Qumran Cave 4.I (4Q158–4Q186)* [DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968], 82–85). The remaining sapiential texts from cave 4 were published some thirty years later: T. Elgvin et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1* (DJD 20; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997); and J. Strugnell, D. Harrington and T. Elgvin, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2* (DJD 34; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999).

educational approaches, and in what ways they reflect particular approaches appropriate to the apocalyptic circles of Second Temple Jewry.[2] My article addresses this issue by examining, first, the pedagogical characteristics of sapiential literature; second, the theory and practice of education in ancient Jewish and other cultural contexts; and finally, what we can glean about the process and content of education in the Qumran community.

II. *The Pedagogical Characteristics of Sapiential Literature*

The aim of the wisdom literature of Israel and of other nations of antiquity was mainly didactic: namely, to instruct readers how to direct their lives honestly and wisely for their own benefit or the welfare of society, and to warn them against evil influences that might harm them. This purpose is apparent in Egyptian, Babylonian, and other ancient sapiential texts,[3] including the biblical books of Proverbs and Qoheleth (Ecclesiastes); the postbiblical books Ben Sira, the Wisdom of Solomon, and the *Book of Aḥiqar*; and some Qumran texts. Although the ultimate aim of such works is quite similar to that of legal literature, the approach taken is different in many respects from that of legal texts. The origin of sapiential texts is generally not seen to be divine, but human. Such literature distills the wisdom of sages, acquired through their own life experiences and through learning from others. It does not command its readers, but rather instructs and advises them, either directly through pithy maxims, or through lessons in how to draw good conclusions from human philosophy or cultural traditions. Such literature is generally not religious in the sense of having an interest in those aspects of cult that regulate the connections between deities and human beings; rather, it deals with everyday human relationships and concerns mostly secular areas such

[2] This issue has been considered by scholars since the publication of the text of *4QInstruction*. For the scholarly debate and the pedagogical intention of *4QInstruction*, see M. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (STDJ 50; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 6–29.

[3] See, for instance, "Instructions of Suruppak," in W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1960), 92–95; "Counsels of Wisdom," ibid., 96–106; S. Dening-Bolle, *Wisdom in Akkadian Literature: Expression, Instruction, Dialogue* (Leiden: Ex Oriente Lux, 1992), 124–33; M. Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature* (3 vols.; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), 1:58–80, 136–39, 184–92. For additional ancient Egyptian texts, see below, n. 5.

as economy, family, friendship, relations with authorities, etc. In these areas of life its instructions are mostly of an ethical nature. In those cases, by contrast, where teachings relate to cultic practices, their purpose is nevertheless the welfare of human beings.[4]

In terms of genres and styles, biblical and postbiblical wisdom literature is similar to that of other ancient peoples, such as the Egyptians and the Babylonians.[5] Nevertheless, cultural, political, and even religious differences between these ancient peoples are apparent in their wisdom writings—e.g., Jewish sapiential literature is monotheistic, while that of other nations is polytheistic.[6]

As wisdom compositions were written at different times, their authors developed traditional subjects in various directions so as to express the outlook of their own cultures for the education of their readers. Thus, the author of Qoheleth criticized certain approaches of the authors of the traditional wisdom in Proverbs.[7] Ben Sira, Qoheleth and the Wisdom of Solomon referred to certain subjects treated earlier in Proverbs, but from a new perspective, and also grappled with some new concepts that were familiar in their own times. These include, e.g., the Hellenistic approach to the science of wisdom achievable by human intelligence, as reflected in the Wisdom of Solomon (e.g., 7:17–21); the apocalyptic deterministic approach to time found in Qoheleth 3; and the apocalyptic philosophies of dualism (dealt with in Sir 33:10–15;

---

[4] See, e.g., Lambert, "Counsels of Wisdom," ll. 135–47; Prov 3:5–10; Sir 1:25–2:18; 15:11–16:23.

[5] Regarding stylistic features and terminology in ancient Egyptian and Hebrew wisdom literature, see N. Shupak, "The *Sitz im Leben* of the Book of Proverbs in the Light of a Comparison of Biblical and Egyptian Wisdom Literature," *RB* 94 (1987): 98–119; idem, *Where can Wisdom be Found? The Sage's Language in the Bible and in Ancient Egyptian Literature* (OBO 130; Fribourg: Fribourg University Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 32–51. For the genres and styles of Babylonian sapiential instructions, see the discussion by Dening-Bolle, *Wisdom in Akkadian Literature*, 124–33.

[6] See, e.g., the Babylonian text "Nisaba and Wheat," in Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature*, 168–75.

[7] See e.g., R. Gordis, "Introduction to Wisdom Literature," in *Sefer Ha-Shanah Li-Yehude Ameriqah 6* (ed. M. Rivolov; New York: Ha-Histadrut Ha-Ivrit ba-Ameriqah, 1942), 117–47 (esp. 125–32, 134–47); M. V. Fox, *Qohelet and His Contradictions* (JSOTSup 71; Sheffield: Almond, 1989), 121–50. In his discussion of justice and theodicy in wisdom literature (137–50), Fox asserts that the awareness of injustice is attested not only by the author of Qoheleth, but also by the author of Proverbs and other sages. The author of Qoheleth, however, "differs from most other sages in focusing on manifestations of injustice rather than on justice, a shift that diffracts his entire world-view" (p. 142).

39:15–35), and of determinism (rejected in Sir 15:11–20). The authors of the wisdom literature from Qumran also gave expression to their own philosophical and social outlooks concerning the education of the members of their circles.

This paper will investigate the educational methods that emerge from the literature of the Qumran community, within the context of the pedagogical aims expressed in Qumran wisdom literature, and in comparison to other educational frameworks. The analysis will educe both similarities to these frameworks, and also some significant differences, stemming from the apocalyptically-driven wisdom outlook of the Qumran sectarians.

III. *Education in Ancient Cultural Contexts*

Ancient sources inform us of the education of children and youth, the education of adults, and some of the institutions through which this latter, especially, was carried out. This section examines each of these aspects in turn, in Hebrew and other sources, to establish a broad framework for investigation of the Qumran texts.

The Hebrew scriptures speak of the education of children as a task imposed upon the parents, mainly on the father (see Gen 18:19; Exod 12:24–27; 13:8; Deut 4:9; 6:7, 20–25; 32:7, 46; cf. Ps 78:1–8).[8] According to Exodus and Deuteronomy, the content of that teaching consisted of the commandments of God and the traditional history of Israel. According to such directives in Proverbs as "Hear, my child, your father's instruction, and do not reject your mother's teaching" (Prov 1:8; cf. 4:1; 6:20; etc.), it would appear that the teaching of sapiential instructions for daily life also became a task of the parents.

In ancient sources, teaching directed at adults is often couched in the rhetoric of a father's appeal to his son. This rhetorical framework is known to us from ancient Egyptian and Babylonian wisdom texts, the influence of which on Hebrew texts has been elucidated by Nili

[8] See *Aḥiqar He-Ḥakham* (ed. A. Yellin; Jerusalem: D'fus Ha-Maʿarav, 1938), 31–37. For Egyptian letters and instructions written by kings to their sons see Gordis, "Introduction to Wisdom Literature," 141. For the texts see Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature*. For a letter from a father to his son concerning the art of the scribe, see below, at n. 14. For discussion of the education given by fathers to their sons, see J. L. Crenshaw, *Education in Ancient Israel: Across the Deadening Silence* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1998), 153–54; 161–63.

Shupak and others.[9] Similarly, in the Jewish sapiential books of Proverbs, Ben Sira, and *Aḥiqar*, and in some texts from Qumran, the appeal to one's adult student(s) as a son or sons is frequently found.[10]

Schools and Scribes

The existence of schools can be documented for ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia, through wisdom literature and archeological inscriptions.[11] The art of reading and writing was the basic subject of institutionalized education—mostly for the purpose of training professional scribes. Such schools also became centers for the preservation and study of holy writings as well as the production of wisdom literature. Inscriptions from antiquity demonstrate a range of levels of writing skills, from the simple recording of receipts, names, and calendars, to complex administrative and literary compositions.[12]

The ancient Egyptian schools were established to qualify scribes for administrative duties.[13] The training of scribes included the study of

---

[9] N. Shupak, "Selected Terms in the Biblical Wisdom Literature in Comparison to the Egyptian Wisdom Literature" (Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1984 [Hebrew]); idem, *Where Can Wisdom Be Found?* 31–51; idem, "The Father's Instruction in Ancient Egypt," in *Education and History* (ed. I. Etkes and R. Feldhay; Jerusalem: Zalman Shazar Center, 1999), 13–21 (Hebrew); J. L. Crenshaw, "Education in Ancient Israel," *JBL* 104 (1985): 607; idem, *Education in Ancient Israel*, 15–27; see also "Instructions of Suruppak"; Dening-Bolle, *Wisdom in Akkadian Literature*.

[10] The designation of the reader as "my son" appears 22 times in Proverbs and 24 times in Ben Sira; it is dominant in the *Book of Aḥiqar*, and it appears in some texts from Qumran: e.g., 4Q417 1 i 18, 25; 4Q418 69 ii 15 (all appeals to a son in the singular); 4Q525 2–3 ii 12; 10 3; CD 2:14 (all appeals are in the plural). Most of the texts from Qumran appeal to their readers using designations such as באי ברית, מבין, חכמים, ידעים, יודעי צדק. See B. Nitzan, "Typical Styles in the Wisdom Literature from Qumran," in *Zaphenath-Paneah: Linguistic Studies Presented to Elisha Qimron On the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. D. Sivan et al.; Beer-Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press, 2009), 319–46, esp. 321–25 (Hebrew).

[11] Crenshaw, *Education in Ancient Israel*, 85–86. L. L. Grabbe, *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period* (Library of Second Temple Studies 47; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 154 (and see the bibliography there). Grabbe is aware that scribes were trained in schools in ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia, but "if there were schools for others than scribes, they would have been for the wealthy and aristocratic, though these could probably afford to hire tutors."

[12] On literacy in ancient Israel, Egypt, Greece and Rome, see Crenshaw, *Education in Ancient Israel*, 29–49. On literacy in ancient Rome, see S. F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977).

[13] H. Brunner, *Altägyptische Erziehung* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1957); Crenshaw, "Education in Ancient Israel," 608–9; idem, *Education in Ancient Israel* 22–27; Shupak, "*Sitz im Leben*," 101–7.

reading and writing, oratory, and ethics, especially in regard to relationships between persons of variegated social status. The art of the scribe was regarded as an exclusive profession, which became a way to maintain the status quo. A satire by Kheti son of Duauf, written as a letter from a father to his son, who has been sent to study in such a school, contains a comparison of the scribal profession to other professions, intended to encourage the son to become a scribe. At the conclusion of the satire the author writes:

> See, there's no profession without a boss
> except for the scribe; He is the boss.
> Hence if you know writing
> it will do better for you…
> Look, I have set you on a god's path;
> A scribe's *Renenet* (good luck) is on his shoulder
> on the day of his birth;
> When he reaches the gate
> the people bow down before him;
> Look, no scribe is short of food
> and of riches of the palace…[14]

According to documents discovered in the archives of Mesopotamia, Egypt, Ugarit, Hatti, and Canaan, the administrative writings of the scribes included contracts and official letters, codes of laws, chronicles of kings, lists concerning the wealth and cult of temples, receipts and weights, etc.; their literary productivity included sapiential proverbs, mythical literature, and other literary genres.

Biblical and archaeological evidence shows similar school and scribal activity in ancient Canaan and Israel. Andre Lemaire has suggested, on the basis of several Canaanite inscriptions that contain different groups of alphabets, that there were schools for studying reading and writing in ancient Canaan.[15] The Hebrew Bible itself indicates a procedure of payment for professional teaching: "Why should fools have

---

[14] For the Egyptian origin of this text, see W. Helck, *Die Lehre des Dws'-Ḥtjj* (2 vols.; Kleine ägyptische Texte; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1970); For the English translation, see M. Lichtheim, *Ancient Egyptian Literature: A Book of Readings* (3 vols.; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973–80), 1:188–93, esp. 189, 191. For the Hebrew translation, see Shupak, "Father's Instruction," 20.

[15] A. Lemaire, *Les écoles et la formation de la Bible dans l'ancien Israël* (OBO 39; Fribourg: Fribourg University Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 32. See also Crenshaw, *Education in Ancient Israel*, 100–108.

a price in hand to buy wisdom, when they have no mind to learn?" (Prov 17:16).[16] Similarly, the Bible is a rich source of administrative writings from ancient Israel: e.g., the list of the seventy-seven officials and elders of Succoth written by a young man at the order of Gideon son of Joash (Judg 8:13–14); the lists of the twelve officials that Solomon placed over all Israel (1 Kgs 4:7–19); and so on. The Bible also contains allusions to the writings of the scribes of the kings, the scribe of a prophet, and other literary texts.[17]

The high social status of the scribes in Judaea during the Second Temple period is known from Ben-Sira's composition. Like the aforementioned Egyptian satire, Ben Sira compares the high status of a scribe with the status of those in other professions, as follows:

> All these rely on their hands,
> and all are skillful in their own work.
> Without them no city can be inhabited,
> and wherever they live, they will not go hungry.
> Yet they are not sought out for the council of the people,
> nor do they attain eminence in the public assembly.
> They do not sit in the judge's seat,
> nor do they understand the decisions of the courts;
> They cannot expound discipline or judgment,
> and they are not found among rulers. (38:31–33)[18]

Official administrative and other documents found at Wadi Daliyeh, Naḥal Ḥever, Naḥal Seʿelim, Wadi Murabaʿat, along with the literary scrolls from Masada and Qumran, provide concrete evidence of developed professional scribal activity in Judaea during the Second Temple period and following the destruction of the Temple.[19] An ostracon with alphabet letters found in the ruins of Khirbet Qumran, and four

---

[16] Compare also Prov 5:13–14, in which a man confesses: "I did not listen to the voice of my teachers or incline my ear to my instructors; soon I was in dire trouble amidst the assembled congregation." The English translation of v. 13 follows the NRSV, and that of v. 14 follows the NJPS.

[17] The biblical references on the roles of the scribes are given in Grabbe, *A History of the Jews and Judaism*, 152.

[18] The English translation follows the NRSV.

[19] See D. M. Gropp, "Daliyeh, Wadi: Written Material," *EDSS* 1:162–65; H. M. Cotton, "Ḥever, Naḥal: Written Material," *EDSS* 1:359–61; H. Eshel, "Murabaʿat: Wadi: Written Material," *EDSS* 1:583–86; S. Talmon, "Masada: Written Material," *EDSS* 1:520–25; H. M. Cotton, "Seʾelim, Naḥal: Written Material," *EDSS* 2:860–62; A. Yardeni, *Naḥal Seʾelim Documents* (Judean Desert Studies; Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1995 [Hebrew]).

ostraca with alphabet letters from Murabaʿat, demonstrate something of how the art of writing was also studied in Israel during this era.[20]

Emanuel Tov has shown that the Qumran scrolls exhibit a professional scribal practice and provide the ultimate evidence of Jewish scribal activity in the Second Temple Period.[21] Thus, we may suggest that the art of the scribes was studied in specific schools in Judaea.

The evidence for basic schools in Judaea during this period, whether for children or adults, is less direct. The authors of both Qoheleth and Ben Sira say that they were teachers of wisdom (see Qoh 12:9; Sir 51:23). However, their schools might have been for adult students. The study of wisdom or scripture by adults is mentioned in an apocryphal psalm appearing in the *Psalms Scroll* from Qumran:

> From the gates of the righteous is heard her voice,
> and from the assembly of the pious her song.
> When they eat with satiety she is cited,
> and when they drink in community together.
> Their meditation is on the Law of the Most High,
> their words on making known his might. (11QPs[a] 18:10–12)[22]

Although study by adults was common in the Qumran community (as we shall see later), this psalm seems to describe a more widespread Second Temple phenomenon. Such a social setting (of eating, drinking, and learning together) might have occurred among the upper classes of the towns, but not among farmers in villages, or among tradesman who were busy with their work or lived far from an urban center.

The existence of schools for children in Israel during the Second Temple period is referred to in a number of rabbinic texts.[23] Thus, for example, *b. Baba Batra* 21a mentions R. Joshua son of Gamla (63 CE), who amended the law of children's education as follows:

> שיהו מושיבין מלמדי תינוקות בכל מדינה ומדינה ובכל עיר ועיר ומכניסין אותן כבן שש כבן שבע.

---

[20] See J. Naveh, *Early History of the Alphabet: An Introduction to West Semitic Epigraphy and Paleography* (2d rev. ed.; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1987); Hebrew edition (1989), 1–6; G. W. Nebe, "Alphabets," in *EDSS* 1:18–20.

[21] E. Tov, "Scribal Practices," *EDSS* 2:827–30; idem, "Scribes," *EDSS* 2:830–31.

[22] For text and translation, see J. A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPs[a])* (DJD 4; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), 39, 64–65.

[23] On the development of Jewish schools, see M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* (London: SCM Press, 1974), 78–83.

> That teachers of school children be placed in every city-state and in every town and that [children] be brought there at the age of six or seven.[24]

The stated purpose of this law was to correct an earlier situation in which only those children whose fathers could send them to Jerusalem were educated in schools. This was a social reform to extend the education of children to the entire society, rather than confining professional education to the children of the rich. Thanks to this reform, the instruction of children became widespread in Judaea.[25]

IV. *Teaching and Study at Qumran*

According to Josephus and the scrolls from Qumran, there were two kinds of organized communities among the Essenes and the members of the *Yaḥad* (= the Qumran community): communities of celibate men, possibly those described in the *Rule of the Community*; and communities composed of families, called "camps" in the *Damascus Document*.[26] According to the *Damascus Document*, "those who enter the covenant for all of Israel as an eternal statute shall have their sons, who have reached (the age) for passing among those that are mustered, take the oath of the covenant" (CD 15:5–6).[27] From this law, one may deduce that the education of children and youth in the sectarian community was the primary duty of the father, as required by the Torah

---

[24] The English translation here and in the next note follows J. Neusner, *The Talmud of Babylonia: An Academic Commentary* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994–1999), 22A:83.

[25] The consequences of this reform are described in *b. Baba Batra* 21a, as follows: "Said Rabba: From the time of the ordinance of Joshua b. Gamla and onward, children are not sent from one town to another to go to school, but they can be required to go from one synagogue to another in the same town.… And said Rabba: The number of students for an elementary school teacher is twenty-five, and if there are fifty, we appoint two; if there are forty, an assistant, [all] at the expense of the locale." According to *b. Shabbat* 12a, the sages of the School of Shammai objected to teaching children on the Sabbath day, whereas the Hillelites allowed it. See V. Noam, "Beit Shammai and the Sectarian Halakha," *Jewish Studies* 41 (2002): 45–67, p. 64 (Hebrew).

[26] Josephus, *J.W.* 2.8.2 §121; 2.8.13 §§160–161; CD 7:4–9; 13:16–19; 14:12–17. See E. Qimron, "Celibacy in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Two Kinds of Sectarians," in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March, 1991* (ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; 2 vols.; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 1:287–94.

[27] See E. Qimron, "שבועת הבנים in the Damascus Covenant 15.1–2," *JQR* 81 (1990): 115–18.

for all Israel. However, this education was shaped by the *Yaḥad*'s particular outlook: that is, its goal was to prepare the next generation to observe the Law of Moses "with all (the) heart [and with all] (the) soul, to that which is found to be done during the en[tire tim]e of [evi]l" (CD 15:9–10).[28] This statement indicates a specific educational goal for the children and youth of the *Yaḥad*. According to the context of CD 15 and 1QS 5:7–10, the שבועת הברית ("oath of the covenant") was the initiation oath, to be taken by those who entered the *Yaḥad* during the annual ceremony held by the community in the presence of all its members. As these youths had been educated within the community, one may infer that they did not need to take an oath like those who entered the community from outside.

How were Children and Youth Educated?

Were there schools in the community, or a specific program for educating its children towards its goals? Such a program is found in *1QRule of the Congregation* (1QSa = 1Q28a). The statutes written in this composition were supposedly meant to be observed by the congregation of Israel in the final days, when all Israel would gather to take upon themselves the statutes of the *Yaḥad*. Lawrence Schiffman has asserted that the community already observed these laws during its present situation, known as "the time of evil."[29] The program of education for this time is thus recorded in the *Rule of the Congregation*:

> From his y[outh] [they shall edu]cate him in the *Book of Hagy*, and according to his age, instruct him in the precepts of the covenant, and he wi[ll receive ins]truction in its regulations; during ten years he will be counted among the small children. At the age of twenty y[ears, he will transfer to] those enrolled to enter the lot amongst his family and join the holy community. (1QSa 1:6–9)[30]

---

[28] The English translation follows (with minor modifications) that of J. M. Baumgarten and D. R. Schwartz, "The Damascus Document," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Vol. 2: Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck]; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 39.

[29] See L. H. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study of the Rule of the Congregation* (SBLMS 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).

[30] The English translation follows F. García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Translated: The Qumran Texts in English* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 126.

This program divides the education of children into two parts, each lasting for ten years. During the first ten years a child is too young to study the precepts of the covenant. This study is to be undertaken during the period of youth, namely, from the age of ten to twenty.[31] The *Damascus Document* suggests that the Overseer in the family camps had, among other responsibilities, that of teacher of the youth: והו[ואה] ייסר את בניהם [ ] וטפם [ברו]ח ע[נ]וה ובא[הבת חסד] ("He [the Overseer] shall instruct their sons […] and their children [in a spi]rit of hu[mi]lity and lov[ing-kindness]"; 4Q266 9 iii 6–7 par. CD 13:17–18).[32]

As implied by the *Rule of the Congregation*, during his youth a boy was considered capable of studying the *Book of Hagy*, the repository for the precepts of the covenant. There is no specific book among the Dead Sea Scrolls bearing this title; hence, its precise identity and contents remain a subject of scholarly speculation.[33] The title *HAGY* may allude to the precept והגית בו יומם ולילה, "you shall meditate on it day and night" (Josh 1:8; cf. Ps 1:2), referring to the "Book of the Law." However, the biblical Book of the Law is titled in the scrolls תורת משה ("the Law of Moses")[34] or תורה ("the Law"). According to the *Damascus Document*, knowledge of the *Book of Hagy* is a prerequisite for serving as one of the judges of the congregation: "A quorum of ten men chosen from the congregation according to the time, four from the tribe of Levi and Aaron and six from Israel, versed in the *Book of Hagy* and the foundations of the covenant" (CD 10:4–6). Another law stipulates that, among the minimum group of ten men, there should "not be absent a priest versed in the *Book of Hagy*" (CD 13:2). From

---

[31] See J. Licht, *The Rule Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea (1QS, 1QSa, 1QSb)* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965), 253, 256 (Hebrew).

[32] The English translation follows that of J. M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266–273)* (DJD 18; Oxford; Clarendon, 1996), 71. His suggestion that the word ובנותם ("and daughters") was written in the gap is uncertain. In a previous article I suggested that according to the context of CD 13:16–19, the Overseer had to teach those children whose fathers were not able to. However, it is not necessary to connect the Overseer's role in the judicial procedure of divorce with his role of educating the children of the community. יסר means to "teach," "instruct"—not necessarily by using punishments. Cf. Deut 4:36; Isa 28:26; Jer 17:23; 32:33; 35:13; Zeph 3:2, 7; Prov 1:8; 4:1; 8:33; 19:20; etc.

[33] See the discussion of C. Werman, "What is the *Book of Hagu*?" in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May, 2001* (ed. J. J. Collins, G. E. Sterling, and R. A. Clements; STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 125–40.

[34] See 1QS 5:8; 8:22; CD 15:2, 9, 12; 16:2, 5, 8; 4Q266 8 i 3; 11 6.

these precepts one may deduce that the *Book of Hagy* was an interpretation of the Torah of Moses, "according to everything which has been revealed from it to the Sons of Zadok, the priests…and according to the multitude of the men of their covenant" (see 1QS 5:8–9, etc.). This is the basis for Yadin's suggestion that the *Temple Scroll* might be the *Book of Hagy*.[35]

In the sapiential text *4QInstruction*, the *Book of Hagy* is not mentioned as such; however, a work entitled חזון ההגוי לספר זיכרון ("Vision of the Meditation on a Book of Memorial"; 4Q417 1 i 16),[36] is cited in the context of sapiential instructions given to an individual "understanding one" (מבין or בן מבין). It is stated there that this book was given as an inheritance to the man/*enosh* belonging to a spiritual people, but that no such meditation was given to those who had inherited a fleshly spirit. This statement, which reflects the deterministic-dualistic philosophical approach of apocalyptic circles, including the people of Qumran, makes it clear that only the chosen ones, who are inspired by the intellectual virtue of knowledge of the difference between good and evil, will inherit the aforementioned book. It is not clear if the writing titled חזון ההגוי לספר זיכרון is to be identified with the sapiential text *4QInstruction*, but we may suggest that the themes and ideology of *4QInstruction* are appropriate to that book, which is probably *not* to be considered identical with the *Book of Hagy*, and likely preceded it.[37]

4Q Instruction and Education at Qumran

As the forgoing discussion implies, *4QInstruction*, although it likely predated the Qumran sect, was important to the Qumranites and foundational to their own educational handbook (the *Book of Hagy*).[38]

---

[35] Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977 [Hebrew]; 1983 [English]), 1:300–302 (Hebrew).

[36] For this translation of the Hebrew phrase see Strugnell, Harrington, and Elgvin, DJD 34.155.

[37] Cana Werman has suggested that *4QInstruction* speaks here not of an actual book but of the intellectual activity of meditation on the *Book of Memorial*, which she interprets, drawing on 4Q417 1 i 15, as "the heavenly book of the predestined plan." She proposes that the *Book of Hagy* is the later written distillation of such meditation. See, "What is the *Book of Hagu*," 135–40, quotation on 136.

[38] See T. Elgvin, "Priestly Sages? The Milieus of Origin of *4QMysteries* and *4QInstruction*," in Collins, Sterling, and Clements, *Sapiential Perspectives*, esp. 77–79, on the various suggestions for its dating and audience.

The number of copies of the work found at Qumran testifies to its authority for the members of the *Yaḥad*,[39] so that investigation of its teaching can give us a fair idea of at least some of the content and aim of the more advanced educational program at Qumran.

The origin of the wisdom upon which *4QInstruction* instructs its readers to meditate is not the Book of the Law, nor the instruction of a father or a sage, but rather the wisdom of the רז נהיה, "the mystery that is to be." According to *4QInstruction*, the concept of the *raz nihyeh* is related to knowledge of the wondrous mysteries of God that he preordained for all the times: כול הנהיה בה למה היה ומה יהיה בו, "everything which is to come to pass [in the present], has come to pass [in the past] and will come to pass [in the future]" (4Q418 123 ii 2–3; cf. 4Q417 1 i 3–5, par.; 4Q418 43 2–3).[40] This wisdom may possibly be identified with the teaching of the נהיות עולם ("the happenings of eternity") which the Overseer and the *Maskil* were to teach the members of the *Yaḥad* (CD 13:8, cf. 2:10; 1QS 3:15), but in this text it is concerned specifically with everything that is to come to pass regarding the lives of individuals.

The benefit of meditation upon the *raz nihyeh* is in discerning the wisdom by which God laid down all the acts of creation, including those concerning human beings: וברז נהיה פרש את אושה ומעשיה (4Q417 1 i 8b–9a).[41] This mysterious wisdom underlying all of Creation is the foundation of the dualistic decree governing all human beings; the knowledge of it is therefore useful for distinguishing between "truth and iniquity, wisdom and foolishness, good and evil," as these are visited upon individuals (4Q417 1 i 6–8; cf. 1QS 4:2–14) "in all ages everlasting." Hence, meditation upon the everlasting deeds of God and the distinctions between the outcomes of his preordained dualistic secret plan (4Q417 1 i 11–13) is helpful for the individual, showing him "how he should walk, [p]erfec[t in all] his [ac]tions" (4Q417 1 i 12, cf. 1QS 9:19).[42] Indeed, the meditation upon the wondrous deeds of God in all the ages includes the knowledge of the outcomes for the future that one may deduce from the historical deeds of old (מעשי קדם, 4Q417

[39] See Strugnell, Harrington, and Elgvin, DJD 34:1–2.

[40] See T. Elgvin, "The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation," in *Qumran between the Old and New Testaments* (ed. F. H. Cryer and T. L. Thompson; JSOTSup 290; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 113–50.

[41] See Strugnell, Harrington, and Elgvin, DJD 34.158–59.

[42] See B. Nitzan, "The Ideological and Literary Unity of 4QInstruction and Its Authorship," *DSD* 12 (2005): 257–79.

1 i 3), such as "the iniquities of the sons of Sheth" (4Q417 1 i 15), the judgment of Korah (4Q423 5 1–4), and the punishment of Adam and Eve (4Q423 1–2 1–5).[43]

This focus on the *raz nihyeh* may be usefully contrasted with the subject matter of other texts found at Qumran. Meditation upon history is the main topic of the *Book of Mysteries* (1Q27; 4Q299–301);[44] however, this work concerns itself with universal mysteries rather than instructions to individuals for life within family and society.[45] The main instructions of *4QInstruction* are based on precepts of the Law, or on ethical values, interpreted in accordance with the preordained decrees of God for the life of each individual, regarding economic and social daily life. This predestinarian approach toward sapiential instructions for individuals is not found, for example, in *4QInstruction-like Composition B* (4Q424),[46] another sapiential text from Qumran; nor in Proverbs or Ben Sira, also geared towards individuals, which rely on traditional ethical values. As noted above, the idea of predestination was rejected by Ben Sira earlier in the Second Temple period; therefore, the deployment of this concept within *4QInstruction* may be considered an innovation within traditional Jewish wisdom.

An example of *4QInstruction*'s innovative stance may be seen in this teaching on the economic and social position of a needy individual. The "understanding one" is instructed as follows:

אביון אתה אל תתאו זולת נחלתכה ואל תתבלע בה פן תסיג גבולכה
....וברז [נ]היה דרוש מולדיו ואז תדע נחלתו ובצדק תתהלך כי יגיה אל
ת[אר]הו בכול דרכיכה.

---

[43] See the discussion of Werman, 'What is the Book of Hagu," 132–38.

[44] See L. H. Schiffman, "299–301. 4Qmysteries [a-b, c²]," in Elgvin et al., DJD 20.31–123.

[45] See also 4Q298 and 4Q413 (DJD 20.19–30; 169–71), but in these texts, the phrase *raz nihyeh* is not mentioned.

[46] See S. Tanzer, "4Q424. 4QInstruction-like Composition B," in *Qumran Cave4. XXVI: Cryptic Texts* (ed. S. J. Pfann); and *Miscellanea, Part 1* (ed. P. Alexander et al., in consultation with J. C. VanderKam and M. Brady; DJD 36; Clarendon: Oxford, 2000), 333–46; G. Brin, "Studies in 4Q424 1–2," *RevQ* 18 (1997): 21–41; idem, "Studies in 4Q424 Fragment 3," *VT* 46 (1996): 271–95; idem, "The Relationship between 4Q424 and the Book of Ben-Sira," in *Fifty Years of Dead Sea Scrolls Research: Studies in Memory of Jacob Licht* (ed. G. Brin and B. Nitzan; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2001), 253–74 (Hebrew); B. Nitzan, "Instructions for the Individual in Sapiential Texts from Qumran," in *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls I* (ed. M. Bar-Asher and D. Dimant; Haifa: Haifa University Press; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2003), 95–109 (Hebrew).

> You are needy; do not desire something beyond your share/inheritance, and be not confused by it, lest you "displace your boundary." . . . And by the *raz* that is to come, study the origins thereof (i.e., of the mystery) and then you shall know what is allotted to it, and in righteousness shall you walk, for God will cause his c[ountenan]ce to shine upon all your ways. (4Q416 2 iii 8–10).[47]

This instruction to the needy person who wishes to improve his economic situation warns him against stumbling through deeds of injustice, in a fashion similar to teachings found in Prov 12:24; 16:8; Sir 27:1–2, 26–27. However, the instruction of *4QInstruction* differs from Proverbs as concerns the origins of one's economic inheritance and proper way of behavior. Proverbs applies the saying, "Do not remove the ancient landmark that your ancestors set up," (22:28) both to a person's economic inheritance and to inherited ethical teaching.[48] By contrast, *4QInstruction* roots both a person's economic portion and his mode of conduct in the preordained destiny allotted for him by God, which he is to study through meditation on the *raz nihyeh*.

Both traditional wisdom and *4QInstruction* are concerned with the existential lives of their readers. However, the latter instructs the needy "understanding one" always to take into consideration the End of Days, so as to prevent him from augmenting his misery. The meditation upon the *raz nihyeh* is aimed at comprehension of the dawn of salvation (4Q417 2 i 9–11). It is thereby helpful in preventing the needy person from engaging in activities that are not correctly appropriate to the end times, and which may therefore unnecessarily increase his toil in the present. Knowledge of the coming eschatological upheaval, which will cause those who now mourn to rejoice, is propitious for the needy person's actions and emotional well-being (4Q417 2 i 10–12; par. 4Q416 2 i 4–7a).

The precept of honoring one's parents is also interpreted in *4QInstruction* through meditation upon the *raz nihyeh*. Within this outlook, this precept is not merely an ethical obligation, as explained in Sir 3:1–16, but is the outcome of the unbreakable biological relationship between parents and children—"for they are the womb that was pregnant with you" (4Q416 2 iii 17). Therefore a person cannot ignore

---

[47] The English translation follows DJD 34:112–13.
[48] Cf. Deut 27:17 and Prov 22:22–23.

this precept under any circumstances, not even poverty.[49] Similarly, meditation upon the *raz nihyeh* leads to the concept of an unbreakable matrimonial connection between husband and wife, based on their becoming one flesh (Gen 2:18, 21–24; 3:16). Hence, the reason for preserving the integrity of a marriage is not merely domestic harmony, as in Prov 5:15–20; 18:22; 31:10–31, and Sir 9:1–9; 23:16–27; 25:1; 26:1–3, 13–22, 26; 36:27–31; 40:23; but rather the biological unification of husband and wife, which is seen within this framework as preordained destiny.

This deterministic outlook on daily living is consistent with the theological instruction that the *maskil* or overseer of the *Yaḥad* is to impart to the members of the Community. However, whereas the *Yaḥad*'s teachings are theoretical or philosophical (cf. 1QS 3:13–4:26; CD 2:2–13), the wisdom book of *4QInstruction* instructs its readers in how this predestinarian worldview is to guide their daily lives. These teachings are directed at adult individuals; even if the book in its origins *is* presectarian (see discussion above), its instruction would have been easily adapted to those of the family camps of the *Yaḥad*.

Wisdom and the Law at Qumran

Recommendations to study the Book of the Law are common in traditional Jewish wisdom writings, including the Qumran wisdom literature. Here, too, however, we will find a sectarian twist to the traditional materials.

The biblical wisdom books and the Book of Ben Sira connect the fear of the Lord with the study and observance of the Law; one who thus fears the Lord and learns the Law will be prevented from committing evil and faulty deeds (see Prov 14:26–27; 15:33; Sir 21:11; 32:13–18, 23–24; 33:1–2; cf. Ps 37:30–31).[50] The fear of the Lord and the study of the Law are also each presented as a means to attaining wisdom (cf. Prov 9:10; 28:4, 7; 29:18; Qoh 12:13; Sir 1:14–15, 26–27; 6:37).[51] This threefold connection between the fear of God, Law, and

[49] See J. J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 120.

[50] See P. R. Skehan and A. A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987), 398–99.

[51] Ibid., 144–46. The study of the Law and the fear of God are common paths towards attaining wisdom in the wisdom literature of Israel. See M. H. Segal, *Sefer Ben Sira Ha-Shalem* (3d ed.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1972), 22–25; G. von Rad,

wisdom leads, on occasion, to a quasi-identification of wisdom and Law, as in, e.g., Sir 19:20: כל חכמה יראת ה' וכל חכמה עשות תורה ("The whole of wisdom is the fear of the Lord, and in all wisdom there is the fulfillment of the Law").[52]

4Q525 *Beatitudes* is the most prominent composition from Qumran that involves the study of חכמה ("wisdom") and תורה ("Law") together as means of education.[53] The purpose of this text, like that of the books of Proverbs and Ben Sira, is to educate its readers ת[לדע] [חוכמה ומו[סר] "[to kno]w wisdom and disc[ipline]"(frg. 1 2; cf. frg. 2–3 ii 12). The didactic method of its extant opening fragments is a series of beatitudes on the subject of "the one who attains wisdom and walks in the Law of the Most High"—אשרי אדם השיג חכמה ויתהלך בתורת עליון (2–3 ii 3–4). Due to the absence of the beginning of this series, and the quasi-identification of wisdom and Law in the beatitude quoted, it is difficult to distinguish whether Law or wisdom is the primary object of the study. Judging from such extant beatitudes as אשרי תומכי חוקיה ("happy are they who cling to her statutes"; frg. 2–3 ii 1),[54] and בה יהגה תמיד ("he meditates on it continually"; ibid., l. 6), one may suggest that the studying of the Law is the means for attaining wisdom; or, put otherwise, the beatitudes educate the reader to meditate on the Law in order to attain wisdom.

Wisdom in Israel (London: SCM Press, 1942), 242–47. Von Rad explains that for Ben Sira the attainment of wisdom by studying and observing the Law is a theological idea, already latent in Prov 1:1–7. M. Hengel suggests that this idea became prominent in Ben Sira as a polemic against Hellenism and its wisdom (*Judaism and Hellenism*, 160–62).

[52] The second part of the maxim, as Segal notes, explains that the purpose of learning wisdom is training for observance of the Law (Segal, *Ben Sira*, 117); as he formulates it, exchanging the means and the purpose (22).

[53] E. Puech, "525. 4QBeatitudes," *Qumran Grotte 4.XVIII: Textes hébreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)* (DJD 25; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 115–78; idem, "The Collection of Beatitudes in Hebrew and in Greek (4Q525 1–4 and Mt 5, 3–12)," in *Early Christianity in Context: Monuments and Documents* (ed. F. Manns and E. Alliata; Jerusalem: Franciscan Press, 1993), 353–68. Except as otherwise noted, the English translation follows that of M. O. Wise, M. Abegg, and E. Cook with N. Gordon, in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader* (ed. D. W. Parry and E. Tov; 6 vols.; Leiden: Brill 2004), 4:247.

[54] The translation of this beatitude follows that of D. J. Harrington, *Wisdom Texts from Qumran* (London and New York: Routledge, 1996), 66, 68. Harrington suggests that in the Hebrew scriptures the word אשרי as used in beatitudes declares that someone is "happy" or "fortunate," and is to be distinguished from a benediction ("blessed are you"), the object of which is usually God. The *DSSR* translation reads "blessed" in these passages.

In this respect, the content of these beatitudes is similar to that of Proverbs and Ben Sira. Like its predecessors, this text educates its readers to ethical conduct; as is clear, for example, from instructions on how to converse with people (frg. 14 ii 18–28). Some of the beatitudes echo the language of ethical instruction found in the Psalms; e.g., אשרי[…בלב טהור ולוא רגל על לשונו] ("[happy…] with a clean heart and does not slander with his tongue"); אשרי דורשיה בבור כפים ולוא ישחרנה בלב מרמה ("happy are those who seek it with pure hands, and do not search for it with a deceitful heart"; frgs. 2–3 ii 1, 2–3; cf. Pss 15:2–3; 24:4).

However, the *Beatitudes* also echoes the phrasing and ideas of explicitly sectarian texts. One passage, for example, speaks about persisting in the study of the Law and the performance of its statutes even "in the face of [his] trial," "at the time of distress," and "[in the day of] terror" (frgs. 2–3 ii 4–6). Such language recalls passages in sectarian texts from Qumran that deal with the tribulations to be faced during the epoch of wickedness (cf. 1QS 1:17–18).[55] It may be, then, that in this same passage, the directive to "establish [one's] heart in its [the Torah's] ways"—יכן לדרכיה לבו (l. 4)—refers to sectarian education, to learning how to discern and perform God's will in the end times. In such passages, at least, we may suggest that the study of the Law for the attainment of wisdom is tantamount to studying the performance of its statutes according to the specific interpretation of the Community, within the apocalyptic framework of its outlook. Although *4QBeatitudes* is similar to traditional wisdom literature in much of its content, it yet reveals how that traditional content might be adapted to sectarian teaching.

This brief examination of *4QBeatitudes* again highlights the unique features of the teaching found in *4QInstruction*. Although some of the latter's sapiential instructions are rooted in biblical history and biblical law, these are uniformly viewed through the additional lens of determinism, which characterizes apocalyptic ideology. Thus it seems that the author of *4QInstruction* mediated the tension that might have been

---

[55] Trials (יסורים, נגועים) are mentioned in 1QH^{a} 17 (=9):10; 1QS 3:1; 4Q504 1–2 vi 7. Distress (מצרף) is mentioned in 1QS 1:17; 8:4; 4Q174 1–3 ii 1; 4Q171 1–2 ii 18; 4Q177 5–6 3. A "time of terror" (עת צוקה) is mentioned in 1QS 9:[26]. See Puech, DJD 25.124–25. The Hebrew phrase עת צוקה is used in Sir 37:4, but in a context of false friendship.

awakened between his received biblical legal and ethical tradition and the deterministic outlook of his own time, by merging these into a new sapiential conglomerate.[56] This kind of sweeping integration does not appear in other sapiential texts from Qumran.

V. *Conclusions*

The practices and the substance of education in antiquity have been studied on the basis of archeological inscriptions and ancient literature. Evidence from Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Israel demonstrates, on the one hand, the similarities between the cultural, social, and administrative requirements of education among different peoples and cultures and, on the other hand, the national and religious differences between them. Thus, the responsibility of the father for the education of his children was one factor common to these ancient cultures. A second common element was the institution of professional scribal classes, indispensible for the administration of kingdoms, temples and courts, and for cultural life in general; alongside the scribes flourished schools where the arts of reading and writing could be studied. Evidence indicates that such professional education was possible especially for rich families, and scribes had a high social status.

From the Second Temple period on, we have more information regarding the education of both children and adults in the Land of Israel. In addition to meeting administrative and cultural needs common to all organized societies, the education of children and adults in Israel was geared toward religious education, namely, knowledge of the תורה (the Law). The basic instruction in the historical traditions of Israel and the statutes of the Law was undertaken by the father. Further education in interpretation of the Law and in wisdom would have been taught by sages and professional teachers, not only to young people, but also to adults, as evidenced by Ben Sira, the author of Qoheleth, and writings from Qumran.

---

[56] This kind of integration makes difficult to recognize the origins of the text of *4QInstruction*, and whether it was written by one author or is a combination of sources composed of several redactional layers. See T. Elgvin, "Priestly Sages? The Milieus of Origin of *4QMysteries* and *4QInstruction*," in Collins, Sterling, and Clements, *Sapiential Perspectives*, 67–87. In this article Elgvin deals with the scholarly opinions on the origins of this text. See the bibliography mentioned there. For a new solution of this issue see Nitzan, "Ideological and Literary Unity," 257–79.

Didactic wisdom literature, such as the books of Proverbs, Ben Sira, Qoheleth, the Wisdom of Solomon, and the wisdom compositions from Qumran, are evidence for the content of Jewish education, particularly of the ethical and religious values that were common in Israel during the Second Temple period.[57] At the same time, a comparison of the wisdom compositions from Qumran with the traditional wisdom books demonstrates the unique ideology and approach to education shared by apocalyptic circles and the members of the *Yaḥad* during this period.

Qumran writings, especially the various communal rules (the *Rule of the Community*, the *Damascus Document*, the *Rule of the Congregation*), outline the educational procedures for the youth and adults of the Community. On the one hand the content of education at Qumran was similar to traditional Second Temple instruction in the Law and ethical values, as may be deduced from the text of *4QBeatitudes*. On the other hand, as we have seen especially in *4QInstruction*, the traditional values were adapted to an apocalyptic and deterministic theological framework that referred all past, present, and future events to the "mystery that is to be," according to which these events and their outcomes were preordained by God. The student of *4QInstruction* learned to negotiate the "small" challenges of everyday life with the big picture of God's cosmic purposes always in view. *4QInstruction* helped its readers towards a practical individual ethic for the end-times. Explicit connections of this "practical apocalyptic wisdom" with the Qumran communal ethos remain to be explored.

[57] For a broad comparative picture of the ethical values shared by Jews in the Land of Israel and the Diaspora during this period, see G. E. Sterling, "Was There a Common Ethic in Second Temple Judaism?" in Collins, Sterling, and Clements, *Sapiential Perspectives*, 171–94.

THE USE OF SCRIPTURE IN *1Q/4QMYSTERIES*

Torleif Elgvin
Evangelical Lutheran University College, Oslo

Scripture is used in a variety of ways in *1Q/4QMysteries* (1Q27/4Q299/4Q300, perhaps also 4Q301).[1] One often encounters a complex web of biblical allusions.[2] Biblical phraseology and even partial quotations of biblical verses are freely integrated into the running text (a technique known from works such as Qoheleth and *4QInstruction*). We encounter implicit exegesis combined with the strong spiritual self-consciousness of the writer(s) in question. Biblical expressions belong to the terminological thesaurus of this author or editor. He uses them according to his own liking, at times totally disregarding the original context. In some cases it is difficult to decide whether the reuse of biblical terms is deliberate or not. At times a specific biblical passage may be guiding the argument in a midrash-like style, while different and secondary texts are brought in for stylistic or other reasons.[3]

Poetic passages will be given particular attention in this paper, as they may demonstrate early liturgical usage of traditions later recurring in synagogue liturgy and Hekhalot texts. I include 4Q301 in this

---

[1] Thanks are due to George J. Brooke, Esther Eshel, and Ruth Clements for valuable feedback on this paper.

[2] J. A. Fitzmyer notes, "Such a *style anthologique* involves an implicit exegesis and is usually due to thorough acquaintance with and a reverent meditation upon the Old Testament"; see "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," *NTS* 7 (1960–61): 297–333, p. 299 (repr. in his *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* [London: Chapman, 1971], 3–58, p. 5). For this nonexplicit use of biblical tradition, see further P. Flint, "Scriptures in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Evidence from Qumran," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. S. M. Paul, R. Kraft, and L. H. Schiffman; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 269–304, esp. pp. 297–99; G. J. Brooke, "Biblical Interpretation in the Wisdom Texts from Qumran," in *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran and the Development of Sapiential Thought* (ed. C. Hempel, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger; BETL 159; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 201–20, pp. 207–8; and B. G. Wold, *Women, Men, and Angels. The Qumran Wisdom Document Musar leMevin and its Allusions to Genesis Creation Traditions* (WUNT 201; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 43–80.

[3] There is both incidental and explicit exegesis in *Mysteries*, cf. G. Barzilai, "Incidental Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Scrolls and Its Importance for the Study of the Second Temple Period," *DSD* 14 (2007): 1–24.

study, although I will conclude that it is a separate work based on similar sources.[4] I will first analyze the use of scripture in two relatively well-preserved passages, then discuss the recasting of biblical material in psalm-like passages, and finally survey the use of various biblical books in other passages.

I. *Midrashic Exegesis of Genesis and Isaiah*

1Q27 1 i 2–10 is the largest preserved passage in *Mysteries*, represented also in 4Q299 and 4Q300 (underlined text reflects 4Q300 3 2):[5]

2.] בעבור ידעו בין טוב לרע ובין שקר לא]מת
כי רזי פשע
3. [6]בכול] חכ[מ]תם ולוא ידעו רז נהיה ובקדמוניות לוא
התבוננו ולוא
4. ידעו מה אשר יבוא עליהמה ונפשמה לוא מלטו מרז נהיה
5. וזה לכם האות כי יהיה בהסגר מולדי עולה וגלה הרשע מפני הצדק
כגלות [ח]ושך מפנו
6. אור וכתום עשן וא[ינן]ו עוד כן יתם הרשע לעד והצדק יגלה כשמש
תכון
7. תבל וכול תומכי רזי פֿלאֿ איננה עוד ודעה תמלא תבל ואין שם לע[ד]
אולת
8. נכון הדבר לבוא ואמת המשא . . .

(2) [that they should discern between good and evil, falsehood and t]ruth. But only mysteries of evil did they (3) [*seek* and *support* in all] their wisdom. They did not know the mystery that will come, and did not consider deeds of ages past. They did not (4) know what would befall them, and did not save themselves from the mystery that will come.
(5) And this shall be to you the sign that it is going to happen: when the (astral) constellations of unrighteousness are closed,[7] wickedness will disappear before justice, as darkness disappears before (6) light—

---

[4] Cf. T. Elgvin, "4QMysteries[c]: A New Edition," in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* (ed. F. García Martínez, A. Steudel, and E. J. C. Tigchelaar; STDJ 61; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 75–85.

[5] Citations from 1Q27 and 4Q299–300 are based on, and partly improve, the critical editions of J. T. Milik, "27. 'Livre des mystères,'" in *Qumran Cave 1* (ed. D. Barthélemy, O. P. and J. T. Milik; DJD 1; Oxford: Clarendon, 1955), 102–7 (see p. 103 for this passage); and L. H. Schiffman, "B. Mysteries," in *Qumran Cave 4.XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1* (ed. T. Elgvin et al., DJD 20; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 31–123 (see p. 35). Translations of texts from *Mysteries* are my own. Italic font is used in the translation to indicate tentative restorations or translations.

[6] Two words, c. 10 letter spaces, are missing before the word כול, which is preserved in 4Q300. One option would be דרשו ותמכו.

[7] Or: "when those born of sin are locked up."

> just as smoke vanishes and no longer exists—so shall wickedness vanish forever. And justice will be revealed like the sun that regulates (7) the world. And all those who support "wonderful (?) mysteries" will be no more. Knowledge shall fill the world, and folly shall nevermore be there. (8) The thing is certain to come, and the oracle is true…

As the text continues, the unrighteousness of all peoples (cf. lines 2–3) is a supporting argument for the trustworthiness of the oracle—the judgment is certain to come.

Lines 2–3 interpret Genesis chapters 2–3 and 6 (reading ch. 6 with Enochic glasses). The phrase "that they should discern between g]ood and evil" refers to Genesis 2–3 (2:9, 17; 3:22). As this text understands Genesis, the Creator gave humankind the option of true discernment. But humanity in general (some present opponents are in particular view) only sought evil mysteries, a knowledge not sanctioned by God.

As "mysteries of evil" follows closely after the reference to knowing good and evil from Genesis 2–3, this term likely refers to the Enochic tradition of the Watchers bringing evil to humankind. In contexts dealing with the Watchers, 1QapGen 1:2 uses רז רשעא, and 4Q180Ages CreatA 1 7–10 has the phrase להנחיל רשעה, "inherit wickedness"; cf. the "eternal mysteries" of *1 En.* 9:6. "Mysteries of evil" of line 2 is probably identical with the "wonderful(?) mysteries" of line 7.[8] Our author regards (an early version of) the *Book of Watchers* either as some kind of Scripture, or as an interpretative key to Genesis. The opponents will be the objects of God's eschatological judgment (lines 3–4). I sense here a reading of Gen 6:1–5 together with the subsequent flood story as paradigm for the end-time judgment, similar to *1 Enoch* 10. A number of passages in *Mysteries* refer to the end-time judgment.[9] This feature supports my suggestion that this passage reads Genesis

---

[8] Milik reads רזי פלאֿ. Schiffman remarks, "Although the text of 1Q27 has פלא it is obvious from the context that it must be emended to בליעל or some synonym" (DJD 20.37). The reading פלאֿ is not self-evident. This word is cut through by a vertical fold, where the photograph is dark and almost impossible to read. The microfiche of PAM 40.527 shows a first letter which could be *bet, kaf, mem* or *pe*. Then follows a space for 1–2 letters, with dark-colored skin, before a *lame*d, with possible traces of a letter after the *lamed*. ב[לי]על is possible in the space available, but it is not possible to discern the head of a first *lamed* for such a reconstruction. E. Tigchelaar concludes from the physical evidence that this fragment is close to the beginning of the scroll: "Your Wisdom and Your Folly: The Case of 1–4QMysteries," in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Tradition* (ed. F. García Martínez; BETL 168; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 69–88, p. 73; idem, "Notes on the Readings of the DJD Editions of 1Q and 4QMysteries," *RevQ* 81 (2003): 99–107.

[9] 1Q27 1 i/4Q299 1 i; 4Q299 53; 4Q300 9 2; 4Q301 3 8.

2–6 in an eschatological light. Since *Mysteries* distinguishes between the we-group that has the right knowledge and those who choose evil mysteries, it portrays the we-group as having received the ability to discern between good and evil, perhaps as an eschatological gift of God to the elect ones, cf. *1 En.* 93:10.[10]

Tigchelaar and Lange ascribe *Mysteries* to the priestly Temple milieu (respectively in the pre-Maccabean period and around 150 BCE).[11] Most scholars assume a distance between the Zadokite Temple establishment and Enochic circles. If *Mysteries* indeed has its origins in Temple circles, we have here a Zadokite reference to the tradition of the fall of the angels.[12] Alternatively, the "mysteries of evil" and "wonderful mysteries" are Zadokite name-calling directed at the theology of Enochic circles.[13]

Kister has demonstrated that lines 3–4 closely follow a biblical text, Isa 47:9–14,[14] a prophetic word of judgment against ignorant Babylon, with its astrologers and soothsayers. Cf. Isa 47:11, 13, 14: ותבא עליך פתאם שואה לא תדעי…החזים…מאשר יבאו עליך…לא יצילו את נפשם מיד להבה; "a sudden catastrophe will befall you that you did not know…They predict…what is to befall you…and they will not save themselves from the burning fire." Further, both texts talk about

---

[10] On the revealed knowledge of the we-group in *Mysteries*, see A. Klostergaard Petersen, "Wisdom as Cognition: Creating the Others in the Book of Mysteries and 1 Cor 1–2," in Hempel, Lange, and Lichtenberger, *The Wisdom Texts from Qumran*, 405–32.

[11] Tigchelaar, "Your Wisdom and Your Folly," 75; A. Lange, "In Diskussion mit dem Tempel: Zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kohelet und Weisheitlichen Kreisen am Jerusalemer Tempel," in *Qohelet in the Context of Wisdom* (ed. A. Schoors; BETL 136; Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 113–59, p. 132. I have also advocated a pre-Maccabean dating: "Priestly Sages? The Milieus of Origin of 4QMysteries and 4QInstruction," in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May, 2001* (ed. J. J. Collins, G. E. Sterling, and R. A. Clements; STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 67–87.

[12] Scholars usually postulate a distance between the "Zadokite" Temple circles and the Enochic circles with their traditions about the Watchers. See, e.g., G. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

[13] Similar to Ben Sira's skepticism concerning those who seek lofty mysteries (3:21–23; 34:1–8). Cf. B. G. Wright, "'Fear the Lord and Honor the Priest': Ben Sira as Defender of the Jerusalem Priesthood," in *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research: Proceedings of the First International Ben Sira Conference, 28–31 July 1996, Soesterberg, Netherlands* (ed. P. C. Beentjes; BZAW 255; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997), 189–222.

[14] M. Kister, "Wisdom Literature and its Relation to Other Genres: From Ben Sira to *Mysteries*," in Collins, Sterling, and Clements, *Sapiential Perspectives*, 13–47.

a wisdom which is in vain (Isa 47:10). For Tigchelaar and Kister, the opponents configured in *Mysteries* are Gentile soothsayers.[15] However, one should not exclude the possibility that the biblical text is being reapplied here against Israelite opponents.

In its reading of Isaiah 47, *Mysteries* uses the exhortation of Isa 43:18 as a supporting text: אל תזכרו ראשנות וקדמוניות אל תתבננו, "Do not remember the former things and do not consider the deeds of ages past." The exhortation from Isaiah 43 is slightly rephrased by *Mysteries*, but dramatically recast in a reproof against the "they"-group, ובקדמוניות לוא תתבננו. The message is: the opponents have failed to consider God's acts in history.

Raz nihyeh, the "mystery to come," is used in *Mysteries* only here (where it appears twice). In this context *raz nihyeh* is a code word for God's coming judgment (cf. Isaiah 47), which is unknown to a group that considers itself wise. This represents a different use of *raz nihyeh* than that of *4QInstruction* (a feature not noted by previous scholarship), where the recurring *raz nihyeh* is a comprehensive term for God's plan from creation to the end of times.

כן יתם הרשע לעד (line 6) refers to the hope expressed in the biblical psalms that God will put an end to the ungodly; cf., in particular, Ps 104:35: יתמו חטאים מן הארץ ורשעים עוד אינם, "May sinners vanish from the earth and the wicked be no more"; and further, Pss 37:20; 101:8.[16] Kister remarks that the "wicked ones" of the biblical texts are replaced by רשע "wickedness" in *Mysteries*, 4Q215a, and the early *Ten Paḥdeka*-prayer.[17]

Line 7 rephrases Isa 11:9 and Hab 2:14. While Isaiah uses the verb מלא in *qal* (the world will be full of knowledge of the Lord) and

---

[15] Tigchelaar, "Your Wisdom and Your Folly," 75; Kister, "Wisdom Literature," 25–28.

[16] See similar expressions in *Aramaic Levi* 3:12: "And end lawlessness from the face of the earth"; *1 En.* 10:16, 22: "Destroy injustice from the face of the earth. And every iniquitous deed will end…And the earth shall be cleansed from all pollution"; 4Q215a (*4QTime of Righteousness*) 1 ii 4: "For the period of wickedness has been completed and all injustice will ha[ve an e]nd"; 1QS 3:25: "He has determined an end to the existence of evil." The passage from *Aramaic Levi* is only preserved in the later Greek ms. from Athos; see J. C. Greenfield, M. E. Stone, and E. Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 62–63. *1 En.* 10:16–22 should be dated to 200–170 BCE. On the relation between these texts, see T. Elgvin, "The Eschatological Hope of *4QTime of Righteousness*," in García Martínez, *Wisdom and Apocalypticism*, 89–102.

[17] Kister, "Wisdom Literature," 38–42.

Habakkuk in *nipʿal* (the world will be filled by knowledge of the Lord's glory), our text uses the *piʿel* form (knowledge shall fill the world). ארץ of the biblical text recurs as תבל in *Mysteries*, cf. the conflation of these two terms in 4Q369 *Prayer of Enosh* 1 ii 2: היאה צבי תבל ארצכה, "It is the glory of your earthly land."

Line 8, נכון הדבר לבוא ואמת המשא, uses language from Deut 13:15/17:4: והנה אמת נכון הדבר נעשתה התועבה הזאת בקרבך/בישראל, "if this (evil) thing really has happened among you/in Israel." The deuteronomic phrases are used in a sense radically different from the biblical passages, which deal with procedures for identifying idolatry in Israel. Another parallel, which better fits the context of a prediction, is Gen 41:32: "The matter has been firmly decided by God (כי נכון הדבר מעם האלהים), and God will do it soon." However, the combination of נכון הדבר with אמת, our author found only in Deuteronomy.

The "word/matter" (דבר) and "oracle" (משא) refer either to this passage in *Mysteries*, which is seen as a spirit-filled prophecy (so Kister), or to the judgment on Babylon and its soothsayers in Isaiah 47. The same ch. 13 of Deuteronomy (v. 2) uses אות to denote a sign promised by a false prophet, while other biblical texts use אות as a sign confirming *true* prophecy (Exod 3:12; 2 Kgs 19:29; 20:9; Jer 44:29). In *Mysteries*, the "sign" (l. 5) is the unfolding of the eschatological events. One wonders if the author "found" the word אות in his reading of Deuteronomy 13, but nevertheless chose to use it in a more positive prophetic sense?

This passage from *Mysteries* demonstrates sapiential, prophetic, and eschatological features. It is a reflection on the lack of true revelation among an ungodly "they"-group, Gentile and/or Israelite. The lack of true knowledge will lead to eschatological judgment. In a midrash-like style the author employs Genesis 2–6 and Isaiah 47 as base texts, while other texts from Isaiah, Psalms, and the Pentateuch are used as secondary supports. Deuteronomic phrases are deployed in a radically different sense, as fulfillments of prophetic pronouncements on the coming judgment. While the author in other cases uses biblical terms freely and out of context, recasting them for his own purposes, this section of *Mysteries* represents a conscious exegesis of the texts from Genesis and Isaiah. The oracle that truly will be fulfilled is the prophetic word against Babylon in Isaiah 47, and more precisely this text as reread in *Mysteries*. For the author, this biblical oracle has not been fulfilled and still awaits its implementation (cf. the postponement of the fulfilment of prophecy in 1QpHab 7:1–8). The writer may antici-

pate a judgment on the Seleucid Empire, the Babylon of his day. The coming judgment is characterized as *raz nihyeh*, while the antagonists falsely claim access to wisdom and רזי פלא. Since the Isaianic Book of Consolation is formative for this writer, he might have expected an Exodus from Babylon to Zion in his own days; cf. CD 1:7–8, and 4Q299 *Mysteries*[a] frgs. 10 and 13, which talk about Israel in contrast to and exalted over the nations. Such expectations would be feasible both in the pre-Maccabean and Hasmonean periods.[18]

Another passage that interprets the early chapters of Genesis is 4Q299 3a–b (underlined text reflects 4Q300 5):

2. מה נקרא ה[אדם עם דרכי]הו ומעש[יהו
3. וכול מעשה צדיק הטמ[אה ומה] נקרא לאד[ם כבשר אשר אינו]
4. חכם וצדיק כי לוא לאיש[בינ]ה ולו[א לאשה חכמה נכחדת כי]
5. אם חוכמת עורמת רוע ומ[חשבת שקר אשר עשו בראשונה וזה]
6. מעשה אשר לוא יעשה עוד כיא אם [ילך בתמים ויעשה את]
7. דבר עושו ומה הוא אשר יעשה ג[בר כיא אם ישמע ויעשה כי]
8. המרה את דבר עושו ימחה שמו מפי כול[

> 2. How should one describe[19] [*humankind* with]its[*ways*] and [its] deed[s?] 3. when every deed of the righteous also is defi[led?[20] And what] should one call manki[nd *but flesh* that is not] 4. wise and righteous? For [understandi]ng does not belong to a man, [and concealed wisdom not to a woman, only] 5. the wisdom of evil cunning and de[vices of falsehood as they did in the beginning. This is] 6. a deed he should not do any more, but [*he should walk blamelessly and follow*] 7. the command of his creator. For what is it that a m[an] should do[*but listen and obey*? For] 8. he who violates the command of his creator, erases his name[21] from the mouth of all [*the righteous*.

In line 4 one can likely restore אשה "wom]an" (*he* is preserved as the last letter of this word). Lines 2–8 of this large fragment contain

---

[18] *Pss. Sol.* 11, from the first half of the first century BCE, foresees and/or describes a similar Exodus from Babylon to the Land of Israel, as it was realized in the time of Alexander Yannai.

[19] Note the difference in lines 2–3 between מה נקרא האדם (describe) and מה נקרא לאדם (call).

[20] טמא *hotpaʿal*, cf. Deut 24:4. The *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (ed. F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998), 2:659 renders "judged [unclean," which would require a *puʿal.* This passage is not necessarily a priestly one, as claimed by Tigchelaar ("Your Wisdom and Your Folly," 77–78) and Lange ("In Diskussion mit dem Tempel," 133–34).

[21] Probably a *qal* imperfect, and not *nipʿal* (so DJD).

a sapiential reflection on the nature of humankind. Allusions to evil cunning, understanding and (violating) the command of the creator, suggest Genesis 2–3 as base text. As I read and restore this text, no human is totally pure; even the righteous one is not without faults. For the pessimistic anthropology of this text (and line 4 in particular),[22] cf. 1QH[a] 12:30: כי לוא לאנוש צדקה ולוא לבן אדם תום דרך, "justice does not belong to humankind nor perfection of way to a son of Adam." Our text could have served as source and inspiration for the anthropology of the *Hodayot*. Texts such as Ps 51:7; Job 4:17; 14:4; 15:14–16; Isa 6:5 (compare טמא שפתים with line 3, כול מעשה צדיק הטמ[אה) may have supported this understanding of humankind and Genesis 2–3. מעשה אשר לוא יעשה (line 6) is a biblical phrase, compare Gen 20:9 (in plural) and Isa 19:15. For עושו "his creator," cf., e.g., Isa 17:7; 44:2; Prov 14:31.

Lines 6–8 pertain to the commands of the Creator; those who violate these commands will erase their names from the mouths of the righteous; that is, they will cause their memories to be forgotten. Such a statement would be more easily applied to Israelite opponents than to Gentiles (*pace* Tigchelaar and Kister, who see *Mysteries* as a rhetorical piece against Gentile astrologers only). "Erase the name" is a biblical phrase (Deut 9:14; 25:6; 29:19; 2 Kgs 14:27; Pss 9:6; 109:13), but the qualification "from the mouth of all […" is not found in the Bible or elsewhere in Qumran literature.

The sapiential reflection breaks off in line 8, as a *vacat* and a call to attention in line 9 signal a new paragraph. The poetic unit in lines 9–12 deals with God's preordination of the ways of creation, and concludes with a psalm-like description of God:

> 9. Listen, you who support [mysteries of evil! From him are all] 10. eternal[mysteries,] the schemes of every creature and the pl[ans of every living being. He established] 11. every mystery and founded every plan, and causes everything[that comes into being.] 12. He is from eternity, the Lord is his name, ever[lasting is his *mercy*.

From line 13 the sapiential reflection picks up again, in the first person plural: God has opened the source of knowledge for the "we"-group.

[22] Different from its contemporary, Ben Sira, cf. Sir 15:14–17.

II. *Biblical Allusions in Psalm-like Passages*

Similar to *4QBarkiNafshi, Mysteries* recasts poetic and prophetic material from the Bible to create new poetic texts. Also, sapiential material can be reused in a poetic setting, as in 4Q299 5:

1. ....מאור]ות כוכבים לזכר]ון שמ[ו
2. ....גב]ורות רזי אור ודרכי חוש[ך
3. .... מא]בדון מועדי חום עם קצ[י קציר
4. ..מבוא יום]ומוצא לילה[
5. ....]ובית מולדים[

1. the lighten]ing stars for the re[mem]brance of [his] name[
2. migh]ty mysteries of light and the ways of dark[ness
3. from the a]byss,[23] the seasons of warmth and the period[s of ingathering
4. the coming in of day] and the going out of night[
5.]and the Zodiac sign[of

לזכר]ון שמ[ו (line 1), words referring to the heavenly Book of Memory (Mal 3:16), are reused in a poetic description of the heavenly lights and the changes of days and seasons. Line 2 borrows דרכי חושך, an ethical term from Prov 2:13, in its description of the turning of day and night .The order of the heavenly lights with the days and seasons (cf. Gen 1:14–18; 8:22) is praised as a remembrance of the Creator, in a fashion similar to Ps 19:1–7 and later sectarian psalms. The ways and phenomena of the firmament are praised as *mysteries* of creation, mysteries concerning which the "we"-group has received understanding.

The fragmentary lines of 4Q301 5 read "]the Temple of his kingdom[…wh]at is flesh that […]a great [li]ght. And honour[ed is he…] light, and his light […" In line 4, אור גדול from Isa 9:1–6 is connected to God's heavenly Temple. This represents a dramatic and conscious reuse of the biblical phrase. The vision of God's glory in the Temple in Isaiah 6 (cf. Isa 6:1 LXX "the house was full of his glory") may explain the reuse of Isaiah 9 in this passage, which recalls later Hekhalot writings. If the passage also has eschatological connotations, Zech 14:7 may belong to the background.

Psalm 99:3, גדול ונורא קדוש הוא, might provide the background for 4Q301 3, where all three epithets recur in lines 4–7: וגדו]ל הואה ברוב חמת[ו…ונורא הואה במזמת אפו…ונהדר[הואה ברום קו]דשו.

[23] Restore מא]בדון. The third preserved letter is *waw*, not *yod* (as read by DJD 20.45).

However, these epithets are common in psalms from the second Temple period.

The reflection in 4Q299 3a–b 9–16 (see discussion above, pp. 123–24) includes a poetic reference to the characteristics of God: הו[אה מק]דם עולם הואה שמו ולע[ולם ("He is from eternity, the Lord is his name, ever[lasting is his *mercy*," line 12). This line conflates phrases from Hab 1:12, אתה מקדם יהוה אלהי; Mic 5:1 (on the messianic prince), ומוצאתיו מקדם מימי עולם; Exod 15:3, יהוה שמו; Isa 42:8, אני יהוה הוא שמי. Cf. further the many deutero-Isaianic verses on YHWH as the only One who is from the beginning. As noted by Schiffman, הואה here serves as a substitute for the Tetragrammaton.[24]

1Q27 9–10 3, שמעו מלכי עמים, may allude to Pss. 2 and 110:5–6. For 4Q299 9 3, מ]לך נכבד והדר מלכותו מלא] הארץ כבודו, cf. Ps 145:12, להודיע…וכבוד הדר מלכותו, and Isa 6:3. All three texts refer to God's kingship and his glory, as do the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. This is a main theme in the psalm-like passages in *Mysteries* and especially in 4Q301; the writer consciously seeks out biblical passages that underline this subject.

III. *The Use of Various Biblical Books in* Mysteries

1) *Pentateuch*

I now turn to a short review of the use of specific biblical books in various fragments. For the Pentateuch, we have already noted the use of Genesis 2–6 in 1Q27 1 i and 4Q299 3.

In Gen 6:5; 8:21, man's לב [מחשבת] יצר is an evil inclination. In 4Q299 8 6, on the contrary, it is a positive factor: "discernment, the inclination of [ou]r heart. With great intelligence he opened our ear, so that we would h[ear." The "we"-group has received a positive inclination from God!

Two passages on the priestly service use biblical terminology. 1Q27 6 2–3, יכפר על שגגה, borrows from Lev 5:18. משפטים צדיקם, "right statutes" (Deut 4:8), recurs in 4Q299 55. Deuteronomy is no priestly document, but the use of this terminology in a priestly context is not unthinkable. Further, 4Q299 69 refers to the biblical rules of Yom Kippur.

---

[24] Schiffman, DJD 20.43.

For 4Q299 60 3, העמים] סגולה מכול [עם, cf. Exod 19:5; Deut 7:6; 14:2. 4Q299 60 4, וכול מלכי עמי]ם, is borrowed from Gen 17:16, where it refers to Sarah as ancestor of kings of peoples.

2) *Proverbs in 4Q301*

4Q301 1 likely represents the beginning of this scroll, which, according to Tigchelaar, probably preserves another recension of *Mysteries* (for him, the terminological overlaps suggest one and the same book). *Mysteries* is a composite work that includes material of various kinds (wisdom instructions, proverbial sentences, rhetoric contests, riddles, psalm-like passages, exegetical and historical reflections, eschatological outlooks, and priestly-halakhic passages). I therefore see it more as probable that 4Q301 is a separate work, collected from the same pool of texts in the same time and milieu.[25] It is noteworthy that the majority of the 4Q301 fragments are poetic or psalm-like in form. Frgs. 3–5 praise God, who is surrounded by angelic beings in the heavenly sanctuary in a fashion similar to later Hekhalot writings (frgs. 1 and 2 as well as the minor frgs. 7 and 10 are more didactic in nature). 4Q301:[26]

] Top Margin [

1. [שמעו בנים וא]בֽ֯יעה רוחי ולמיניכם אֹחלקה דברי אליכֽם֯[אשר]
2. [מבינים מ]של וחידה וחוקרי שורשי בינה עם תומכי ח֯[כמה]
3. [ומבינים ב]הֹולכי פותי ואנשי מחשבת שלכול עֹבודת מעשי֯[הם]
4. [הלכו עמים ו]הֹפרו קו֯[]קודק[וד כ]ל [ה]מֹולת עמים עם נמכֹר֯[לעם]

1. [Listen, sons, and I will sh]are out my spirit, and portion out my words to you according to your kinds, [you who 2. understand par]able and riddle, who search the roots of understanding together with those who support w[isdom. 3. You understand]both those who walk in simplicity and men of thought, as [the peoples walked] according to all the deeds of [their] works 4. [and] broke the line: yeah, the cre[st of al]l [the] tumult of the peoples, even a nation being sold[to another nation.

[25] Tigchelaar argues that 1Q27 1 i was located close to the beginning of the scroll. I have further argued that 4Q301 1 represents the opening passage of the 301 scroll; "4QMysteries^{c}: A New Edition." Thus, these sections preserve the beginnings of two related but different compositions.

[26] Text, translation, and restorations according to Elgvin, "4QMysteries^{c}: A New Edition." I have here suggested two new readings in line 4, הפרו and נמכר. I am indebted to Esther Eshel for the suggested reading עם נמכר in line 4, which recalls the reflection on peoples oppressing other peoples in 1Q27 1 i 9–12 and the fresh memory of the diadochean wars, as well as biblical references to selling enslaved people (Isa 52:3; Joel 4:6–8; Nah 3:4; Esth 7:4; Neh 5:8).

Line 1, "Listen, sons, and I will sh]are out my spirit, and portion out my words to you according to your kinds," clearly alludes to Prov 1:23, הנה אביעה לכם רוחי אודיעה דברי אתכם, which belongs to a speech by Lady Wisdom. The author introduces himself in the same way as does Lady Wisdom. Such an opening testifies to a self-conscious sapiential teacher, in a fashion similar to Ben Sira's self-presentation in ch. 1.[27] For a similar call to attention, see above on 4Q299 3 9.

3) *Daniel*

Schiffman and Lange assert that *Mysteries* refers to Daniel 9, and perhaps to the vision of Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 2 as well.[28] Lange therefore dates *Mysteries* to ca. 150 BCE. The text in question is 4Q300 1b 2,]כסלכמה כי חתום מכם[ח]תם החזון וברזי עד לא הבטתם ובבינה לא השכלתם; "]your folly, for sealed from you is the [s]eal of the vision, you have not gazed at eternal mysteries and have not grasped knowledge." This text *may* refer to Daniel, cf. Dan 9:24: "seventy weeks are decreed…to seal up vision and prophecy (לחתם חזון ונביא) and to anoint the most holy"; Dan 9:22: "I have now come to give you, Daniel, insight and understanding" (להשכילך בינה).

One cannot exclude the possibility that *Mysteries* plays with Daniel 2 and 9, and borrows the expression "seal a vision" from Daniel. But the line of dependence could be the other way around, from *Mysteries* to Daniel (I tend to date *Mysteries* earlier than Daniel 9); or, both could depend on a common source. Both books refer to magicians who do not have access to true divine wisdom. But the precise context is different in the passages in question. In contrast to Daniel 2 and 9, there is no eschatological scenario described in this *Mysteries* text. And in contrast to *Mysteries*, Dan 9:20–27 does not feature an antagonistic group who lack understanding.

4) *Allusions to Qoheleth?*

Both the DJD edition and Lange note parallels between *Mysteries* and Qoheleth.[29] At line 3 of 4Q299 3 (the second text discussed above, p. 123),

---

[27] For similar adjurations in the beginning of compositions, see CD 1:1; 4Q298 *Words of the Maskil* 1–2 i 1–3; 4Q413 *Exhortation* 1; 4Q303 *Meditation on Creation* A 1 1. See T. Elgvin, "4Q413–A Hymn and a Wisdom Instruction," in Paul, Kraft, and Schiffman, *Emanuel*, 205–14, p. 212.

[28] DJD 20.102; Lange, "In Diskussion mit dem Tempel," 132.

[29] DJD 20.42, 63; Lange, "In Diskussion mit dem Tempel," 125–26.

DJD refers to Qoh 8:14; at line 4, Qoh 9:1. It is difficult to see indisputable allusions to Qoheleth in these lines, the terms חכם and צדיק are common usage in sapiential writings such as Proverbs.

In terms of other possible parallels, for 4Q299 30 3, וש]ח בחושך, DJD refers to Qoh 6:4, which talks about the aborted fetus: it leaves in darkness, and its name is covered in darkness. However, this fragmentary line in 4Q299 may be interpreted in other ways as well. In 4Q299 64 3, DJD erroneously reads Qoheleth's key word הבל. The correct reading is תבל וֹכוֹל.

Lange has suggested that 1Q27 1 ii 3,]ל מה הוא היותר, quotes from Qoh 6:8, 11: כי־מה יותר לחכם…מה־יתר לאדם, "what advantage is that for a sage/for a man?" These texts are unique in their use of the same expression מה יותר ל-, cf. also Qoh 7:11 ויתר לראי השמש "it is an advantage for those who see the sun." In this case *Mysteries* may allude to Qoheleth, but the evidence is not conclusive. If *Mysteries* is dated to c. 200 BCE, there would be a time-gap of only fifty years between these two books, both written close to Temple circles. We do not know if Qoheleth was considered inspired or authoritative by circles in Yehud so soon after its composition. Whether *Mysteries* alludes to Qoheleth, or the author and/or his sources belong to the same linguistic (and social?) milieu, it is clear that this book differs dramatically from Qoheleth in worldview and eschatology.

Concluding Comments

In *Mysteries* we encounter neither a mystical search for the hidden meanings of a biblical verse, nor a pesher-like attitude (explaining what the scriptures *really* talk about). In many passages we encounter a self-conscious writer (or writers), who deliberately plays with biblical phrases, reusing them in new contexts. A number of pentateuchal phrases are conflated in the text. Among the prophets, Isaiah is the main source,[30] but Micah, Habakkuk, and Malachi also appear. The author(s) further digs his wells in both Davidic and Solomonic soil; Psalms and Proverbs are consciously used. Clear references to Qoheleth or Ben Sira cannot be shown, but dependence on Qoheleth is possible. Similar to the use of scripture in the writings of the *Yaḥad*, prophets

[30] In addition to passages already discussed, compare Isa 6:10 with 4Q299 8 6 "And how can a ma[n] understand who did not know and did not hear?"

and Psalms are not seen as inferior to the Torah: Alongside Genesis 1–6, 1Q27 also uses a chapter from Isaiah as an "inspired text," which is expounded in a midrash-like manner.[31] The same passage knows the Enochic tradition of the fall of the angels, either accepting it or polemicizing against Enochic circles.

Allusions to a book do not necessarily mean that it seen as authoritative. But the same technique is used to interpret texts from Psalms and Proverbs as we see in use with texts from the Torah and the prophets. So among the Ketubim, at least these two collections (with the borders of Psalms probably still fluid) are seen as authoritative works at this time, perhaps around 200 BCE.

Mysteries is a composite work, to a much greater degree than Qoheleth or *4QInstruction*. The book contains wisdom instructions and wisdom sayings, rhetorical dialogues, eschatological sections, psalm-like passages, and references to the priestly service, as well as reflections on creation and the ways of humankind. It is hard to conceive a unity of argument in the book as a whole. It is rather an edited collection of originally independent materials.[32] The fact that the book contains two different sapiential reflections on the opening chapters of Genesis supports this conclusion.

The polemic against חרטמים suggests a contrast between Gentile magicians and true Israelite sages, but Israelite opponents are also in view. Kister suggests that Moses and Aaron are the fictitious sages opposing Egyptian magicians, and sees both *Mysteries* and 4Q*Instruction* as sectarian compositions.[33] In contrast, Tigchelaar and myself see the references to (a tumult of) Gentile nations, oppressors, and the opposition between the people of Israel and the Gentiles, as reflecting the pre-Maccabean period and the Seleucid–Ptolemaic wars.

Differences both in theology and terminology suggest that *Mysteries* is either earlier than *4QInstruction* or independent of it: we encounter

---

[31] Different both from Pharisaic and Sadducean practice; cf. S. J. Pfann, "Historical Implications of the Early Second Century Dating of the 4Q249–250 Cryptic A Corpus," in *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone* (ed. E. G. Chazon, D. Satran, R. A. Clements; JSJSup 89; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 171–86.

[32] Tigchelaar is open to both options; see "Your Wisdom and Your Folly," 77.

[33] Kister, "Wisdom Literature," 27–32, 45–47. Kister has advocated a dating of the *Yaḥad* early in the second century: "Concerning the History of the Essenes: A Study of the Animal Apocalypse, the *Book of Jubilees* and the *Damascus Covenant*," *Tarbiz* 56 (1986–1987): 1–18 (Hebrew).

a different use of *raz* and *raz nihyeh*;[34] and the book is more nationalistic and envisions no *ecclesia* within Israel. On the other hand there are a number of thematic and terminological similarities between these two texts.[35] *4QInstruction* seems to be dependent on either *Mysteries* or some of its sources.[36]

The Hekhalot-style praises of 4Q301 may root this tradition in the pre-Maccabean Temple, the likely milieu of origin of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* and hymns such as 11QPs[a]Creat.[37] A location of *Mysteries* in the pre-Maccabean Temple would enable us to see how liturgical traditions with terminological and thematic parallels find their way into the writings of the *Yaḥad*, synagogue liturgy, and Hekhalot meditation.[38] Levitical Temple singers could provide the milieu of origin of these texts with such a wide *Wirkungsgeschichte*.[39]

---

[34] Tichelaar has noted that in its use of *raz*, *Instruction* demonstrates a systematization which is not apparent in *Mysteries*; "Your Wisdom and Your Folly," 79.

[35] Lange, Tigchelaar, and the present writer have commented upon these parallels. Compare further 4Q299 6 ii 5 מה אב לבנים מאיש]לעבדים "How much more is a father to his children than a man[to his servants?" with 4Q416 2 iii 16 כי כאל לאיש כן אביהו וכאדנים לגבר כן אמו "for as God is to a person so is his father, and as ruling angels are to a man so is his mother."

[36] *Pace* Lange, who dates *4QInstruction* around 200 BCE, and *Mysteries* half a century later: "In Diskussion mit dem Tempel," 130–34.

[37] 11QPs[a]Creat combines Isa 6:3 with Ezekiel's merkabah vision in a manner typical of later Hekhalot exegesis: see E. G. Chazon, "The Use of the Bible as a Key to Meaning in Psalms from Qumran," in Paul, Kraft, and Schiffman, *Emanuel*, 85–96, pp. 90–94.

[38] T. Elgvin, "Qumran and the Roots of the Rosh Hashanah Liturgy," in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19–23 January 2000* (ed. E. G. Chazon; STDJ 48; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 49–67; cf. Kister, "Wisdom Literature," 36–43. Based solely on the text of *1QMysteries*, David Flusser early suggested a link between *Mysteries* and later synagogal liturgy: "The *Book of Mysteries* and a Synagogal Prayer," in *Knesset Ezra: Literature and Life in the Synagogue. Studies Presented to Ezra Fleischer* (ed. S. Elizur et al.; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 1994) 3–20 (Hebrew).

[39] T. Elgvin, "Temple Mysticism and the Temple of Men," forthcoming in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Text and Context* (ed. C. Hempel; STDJ; Leiden: Brill).

"MEMORY AND MANUSCRIPT":[1] BOOKS, SCROLLS, AND THE TRADITION OF THE QUMRAN TEXTS

Lawrence H. Schiffman
New York University

Long before the modern discussion of orality and literacy, the talmudic rabbis discussed the role of these factors in the transmission of the Jewish tradition. They argued that Jewish tradition was made up of components originally composed or revealed in written form, and also of material that had originated orally and been transmitted by memory and not by manuscript. Some of this material the rabbis saw as originating in a divine oral revelation.[2] Although the Pharisees before them had been aware of an oral body of tradition, they did not make a claim of divine revelation, only of authority via oral transmission.[3] When the rabbis prescribed that what in their view had been revealed in writing was to be passed down in writing, and what had been revealed orally was to be transmitted orally, they essentially asserted that to some extent the medium was closely connected to the message. Mode of transmission was an essential aspect of accuracy, in their view.[4]

---

[1] The title acknowledges the significant work of B. Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity; with, Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity* (trans. E. J. Sharpe; The Biblical Resource Series; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998; the two works were originally published in Swedish in 1961 and 1964).

[2] L. H. Schiffman, *From Text to Tradition: A History of Second Temple and Rabbinic Judaism* (Hoboken, N.J.: Ktav, 1991), 179–81; E. E. Urbach, *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs* (trans. I. Abrahams; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1987), 286–314; M. S. Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism, 200 BCE–400 CE* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, 71–189; J. Neusner, "Foreword," in Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, xxv–xlvi.

[3] J. Neusner, "Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before A.D. 70: The Problem of Oral Transmission," *JJS* 22 (1971): 1–18; contra J. M. Baumgarten, "The Unwritten Law in the Pre-Rabbinic Period," in idem, *Studies in Qumran Law* (SJLA 24; Leiden: Brill, 1977), 13–35.

[4] Y. Elman, "Orality and Redaction in the Babylonian Talmud," *Oral Tradition* 14 (1999): 52–99.

This approach is in marked contrast to that found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and also with that attributed to the Sadducees in our sources. Regarding the Qumran corpus, we seem to be dealing with a group that places authority in written texts, rather than in both written and oral traditions. To the sectarians of Qumran, there was a written text that transmitted God's revealed word, and it was accompanied by exegetical teachings; but whether in the halakhic sphere or the aggadic—to borrow the rabbinic terms—these interpretations were closely based on the written word, and they themselves were always written, even if they may have emerged from discussion—an oral activity to be sure. While the sectarians recognized the נסתר, the hidden teachings derived from their interpretation, and while this category has a degree of commonality with the rabbinic oral law in that they are both supplements to the written Torah, the *nistar* knows no oral authority. Authority derives from inspired sectarian interpretation, not from some chain of tradition. Indeed, the sect asserts that the link of tradition was broken, and they alone have recovered the true teachings. They reject the Pharisaic view of the "traditions of the elders."[5]

That the sect subscribes to a written culture is clear not only from their collection of so many books, but also from the mention of detailed record-keeping. There were to be lists of members in accord with rank, lists of property brought into the sect, lists of military units, and even dockets of reproof offered before the *mevaqqer*, an official of the sect.[6]

Given the role of text and manuscript as the only medium for memory among the sectarians, it seems appropriate to dedicate a study to the mentions of scroll, book, and text in the Qumran documents themselves. But such a study requires context, so I will begin with the background set by the Hebrew Bible, then proceed to the Scrolls

---

[5] Cf. L. H. Schiffman, "Pharisees and Sadducees in Pesher Naḥum," in *Minḥah le-Naḥum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of his 70th Birthday* (ed. M. Brettler and M. Fishbane; JSOTSup 154; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 272–90.

[6] L. H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (SJLA 16; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 65–68. Cf. E. Eshel, "477: 4QRebukes Reported by the Overseer," in S. J. Pfann et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (DJD 36; Oxford: Clarendon, 2000), 474–83 and pl. xxxii. The nonliterary materials found among the fragments of Cave 4, in fact, originated in the Bar Kokhba caves, so they are not relevant here. See H. M. Cotton and A. Yardeni, *Aramaic, Hebrew and Greek Documentary Texts from Naḥal Ḥever and Other Sites: With an Appendix Containing Alleged Qumran Texts (The Seiyâl Collection II)* (DJD 27; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 283.

corpus, and then compare this corpus with the New Testament and rabbinic literature. Finally, I will draw conclusions about the role of scrolls and books in the ancient Dead Sea sect, and also in the "Scrolls" culture of today's academic and wider communities.

I. *The Biblical Period*

The scroll was, of course, the only form of book in use in biblical Israel.[7] Other materials were not adequate for such long texts. It was even possible to have a scroll with writing on both sides (Ezek 2:9). The purpose of writing a scroll (Jer 36:6; Ps 40:8) was for it to be read, as designated by the root קרא (Jer 36:21). To be read, it had to be spread out, פרש (Ezek 2:9).

It appears that in biblical Hebrew there was no real difference between a מגילה ("scroll") and a מגילת ספר (lit. "scroll of a book") (Jer 36:2, 4, Ezek 2:9, Ps 40:8).[8] Jeremiah tells us about a "scroll of a book" that was to contain his prophecies. Ezekiel 2:9 and 3:3 use this phrase to refer to a scroll containing words of lamentation, to be eaten and internalized by the prophet. The flying scroll of Zech 5:1–2 was 20 cubits long and 10 wide, clearly not a real scroll, and it contained as well a symbolic divine message. From Jeremiah 36 we learn that a scroll had 3–4 columns on a sheet, was cut with a knife, and that the writing material was flammable.

From the point of view of content, the only actual textual material associated in the text of the Hebrew Bible with a *megillah* as opposed to a *sefer*, which will be discussed below, is the text of Jeremiah's prophecy, which had to be copied twice, once before and once after

---

[7] E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 39–40; cf. E. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 202, who discusses the possibility that biblical texts were originally written on papyrus. Cf. M. Haran, "Book-Scrolls at the Beginning of the Second Temple Period: The Transition from Papyrus to Skins," *HUCA* 54 (1983): 111–22. However, I consider this to be extremely unlikely. Cf. Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 31–32. Examples for the Hebrew biblical period were gathered with the aid of C. Dohmen, F. L. Hossfeld and E. Reuter, "Seper," *TDOT* 10:326–41.

[8] Cf. A. Hurvitz, "The Origins and Development of the Expression מגילת ספר: A Study in the History of Writing-Related Terminology in Biblical Times," in *Texts, Temples, and Traditions: A Tribute to Menahem Haran* (ed. M. V. Fox et al.; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996), 37–46, who argues that this expression reflects a late linguistic layer in the Bible.

its burning (Jer 36:1–8, 27–32). This is also the only case of a מגילת ספר in the Hebrew Bible for which we can identify the contents.

The closest word by which to translate the biblical Hebrew *sefer* is "document," not "book"; as we shall see, *sefer* had a wider use that atrophied in postbiblical Hebrew. In several passages, *sefer* refers to a letter (e.g., 2 Sam 11:14–15; 2 Kgs 5:5–7); in the plural it may designate letters, or perhaps multiple copies of the same letter (e.g., 2 Kgs 19:14; 20:12). A letter is written (כתב) and is to be read (קרא). Usually such letters were written by kings. *Sefer* can also describe legal documents, including a divorce document (Deut 24:1, 3; Isa 50:1; Jer 3:8) or a contract of purchase (Jer 32:10–16). We have to assume that this usage was common in speech beyond its few occurrences in the Bible. Quite common, in what we might call footnote style, is reference to what must have been annalistic chronicles of the kings of Judah and Israel (e.g., 1 Kgs 11:29; 14:11). These are only two of the books mentioned in the Bible that no longer survive today.[9] In this regard, *sefer* in a few passages describes a text with historical accounts of military events (Exod 17:14; Num 21:14; Josh 10:13; 2 Sam 1:18). It also can be used at the head of a genealogy (Gen 5:1), in the sense of "document," here included in a longer text.

When we come to the prophetic books, we can see the process by which oral prophetic messages are redacted into a *sefer*. In Isa 30:8 the prophet is directed to write his message on a tablet and a *sefer* to preserve it for the future. As mentioned above, the prophecies of Jeremiah were assembled by his scribe Baruch in a *megillat sefer* (Jer 36:4). Jeremiah himself, we should note, quotes from a written version of the book of Micah (Jer 26:18; cf. Mic 3:12), but the term *sefer* is not mentioned. Daniel 9:2 in turn quotes "the word of the Lord . . . to Jeremiah the prophet" (cf. Jer 25:12; 29:10), found in one of the *sefarim*, which was apparently a specific, or protocanonical, collection.

Sefer, of course, is most prominently used in regard to the legal corpora of ancient Israel. The *Sefer ha-Torah* or *Sefer ha-Berit* is prominent in Deuteronomy, and the latter term occurs in Exodus as well. These terms, then, appear in later Deuteronomistic material. In the case of Deuteronomy, we are again dealing with oral material put into writing. A copy of the law is to be written in a *sefer*, according to Deut 17:18. Note also 2 Kgs 22:8, 11: ספר התורה, vs. 22:13: על דברי הספר

[9] C. F. Kraft, "Books Referred to," *ABD* 1:453–54.

את דברי הברית הזאת הכתובים על הספר הזה...ככל הכתוב, and 23:3: הזה. These terms, especially in light of their use of the definite article ה-, indicate that from Deuteronomy on, the book *par excellence* was Moses' book of the law, whatever that might have been construed to contain.

We should note that the Bible perhaps also bears witness to heavenly books, as in Ps 136:16. Several passages speak of a "Book of Life," i.e., a list of those to be spared judgment or punishment. Also mentioned is a ספר זכרון, a "Book of Remembrance" (Mal 3:16 and cf. Ps 56:9).[10]

To sum up, then, in the biblical period we see that the word *sefer* denotes a document of any kind; it is used for legal instruments and annals, but comes as well to be the standard designation for books of Torah and of the prophets, including the use of the term *sefarim* in Daniel for a collection of such books. Heavenly books and a Book of Life, drawn from ancient mythology, are occasionally mentioned. The term *megillah* denotes the particular physical form of a *sefer*; but since this was actually the only form in use, it apparently was not necessary to mention it in every context. We could not know from the Bible that the Torah must be written on a scroll or on a number of scrolls.

II. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*

With this background, we can look at the corpus of the Dead Sea Scrolls.[11] We turn first to the term "scroll" itself, so prominent in our vision of the Qumran sect. Here we have only three passages to examine. *4QHalakha B* (264a), a miscellany of halakhic material with parallels elsewhere in the Qumran corpus, refers to a prohibition against proofreading a scroll on the Sabbath:

...אל יגיה איש מגל]ת ספר ל[קרא] בכתבו ביום [השבת]...אך] יקראו
[ו]למדו בם.

Let no one proofread a scrol]l of a book to re[ad] its text on the [Sabbath] day, (but) they may read [and] study in them (1 4–5).

[10] In Dan 1:4, 17 *sefer* = writing, script.

[11] Cf. the brief treatment of this issue in Dohmen, Hossfeld and Reuter, "Seper," 340–41.

It seems that the writer is concerned that proofreading might lead to correction on the Sabbath, hence to violation of the prohibition of writing, which, by the way, is not mentioned in the Sabbath Code in CD. Yet study from scrolls is otherwise permitted.[12] Note the use here of the phrase *megillat sefer*, which, we have noted above, has biblical precedents. Here we have a series of book terms: the document is called a מגלת ספר; its text is a כתב. Reading is קרא, but correction is יגה. Intensive study is למד.

Very similar is the only other usage of מגלה in Hebrew Dead Sea texts. *4QWays of Righteousness*[b] (4Q421), in a fragmentary passage, refers to]מג[לת ספר לקרא, "a scroll of a book to read (4Q421 8 2)." Here again the word "scroll" is partly restored—an apt metaphor for our field—and it is accompanied by both the noun ספר and the root קרא.[13]

Beyond this, we find the mention of a scroll only once more in the Qumran corpus. In the Aramaic *4QProto-Esther*[a] (4Q550) the text refers to the books of the king being read:

> ספ[רי אב[ו]הי [א]תקריו קדימוהי ובין ספריא אשתכח(ת) מגלה ח[דא…
>
> The books of his fa[t]her were [re]ad before him and among the books was found o[ne] scroll…(lines 4-5)[14]

Here again, the scroll is a type of book, the action is קרא, reading. שכח (= Hebrew מצא) is used for locating the correct book. Note that this document is described as sealed with the seven seals of King Darius.

Two almost identical Hebrew usages and one presectarian Aramaic text do not testify to the significance of scrolls among the sectarians. Our view of their culture was not theirs.

What about the use of the term *sefer*, a book or document?[15] We will first investigate its use in the Dead Sea texts to refer to books that are

---

[12] J. M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XXV: Halakhic Texts* (DJD 35; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 54–55.

[13] T. Elgvin, "421. 4QWays of Righteousness[b]," in *Qumran Cave 4.XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1* (ed. T. Elgvin et al.; DJD 20; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 194. The note is incorrect in stating that the phrase is not found elsewhere in Qumran literature.

[14] The use of *megillah* here need not indicate that the other books were in some other form or that this particular book had some distinctive significance. We cannot know why megillah is used here because the text breaks off abruptly.

[15] A difficult usage, ספורות, has been translated as referring to scribal arts in 4Q418 148 ii 7: "and in the scribal craft of m[en." Cf. Ps 71:15; and J. Strugnell, D. J.

part of the later Pharisaic–rabbinic canon of the Hebrew Bible. Following is a list of the occurrences of *sefer* wherein individual books or groups of books are designated by this noun:

Torah: CD 5:7, 7:15; 4Q267 5 iii 5; 4Q273 2 1; 6Q9 21 3; 11Q19 56:4
ḥumashim(?): 1Q30 1 4
Sefer Moshe: 2Q25 1 3, 4Q249 verso 1, 4Q397 14–21 10 = 4Q398 14–17 2, 4Q398 11–13 4

Prophets (*Neviʾim*): CD 7:17 = (?)4Q266 3 iii 18; 4Q397 14–21 10
Isaiah: 4Q174 1–2 i 15; 4Q176 102 4; 4Q265 1 3;
Jeremiah: 4Q182 1 4
Ezekiel: 4Q174 1–2 i 16; 4Q177 7 3
Zechariah: 4Q163 8–10 8
Uncertain prophet: 4Q177 5–6 5
Daniel the prophet: 4Q174 1–3 ii 3

Psalms: 4Q491 17 4

Sefer ha-Torah ha-Shenit: 4Q177 1–4 14

As the table above shows, the word *sefer* is used with about equal frequency to designate the Torah and prophetic books. Several texts refer explicitly to the Torah, that is, the Five Books of Moses. This same collection, clearly identical in scope and content to our Torah, is in one passage apparently termed חומשים, "Pentateuch." Several passages refer to the Torah as the "Book of Moses." The reference to a "Second Torah," difficult as it is, presumes that the locution ספר תורה refers to the Torah as we know it, and thus "second Torah" designates "another Torah."

The collective term, "books of the prophets" occurs several times, while certain individual prophetic books are referred to explicitly, as demonstrated in the list above. Of the Writings, only the Psalms are referred to as a *sefer*, recalling the New Testament's treatment of Torah, Prophets, and Psalms (Luke 24:44; cf. 20:42). MMT C 10[16] can be read as referring to "books of David," probably also a designation for the Psalms.

Harrington, "418. 4QInstruction[d] (*Musar LeMevin*[d]), in *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2* (ed. J. Strugnell et al.; DJD 34; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 374–76, esp. the n. to line 7. The context here would set the scribal arts among the "sciences" of the ancient Jewish wisdom tradition.

[16] Cf. E. Qimron, and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqṣat Maʿaśê ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 59 n. 10.

In addition, the term *sefer* is used of other books which appear to be authoritative for the writers of these texts. Quite common is the unidentifiable "Book of Hagi (Hagu)." This book is referred to in several sectarian compositions: CD 10:16; 13:2; 14:8 (rest.); 1QSa 1:7; 4Q249a 1 5; 4Q266 8 iii 5; 4Q270 6 iv 17. Most scholars see it as a designation for the "Torah of Moses," although some see it as containing some sectarian regulations.[17] A possible reference to that same book is in *4QInstruction*, 4Q417 1 i 16, which refers to "the vision of the *haguy* (ההגוי) for a Book (*Sefer*) of Memorial." This "Book of Memorial (Remembrance)" is based on the allusion in Mal 3:16 to a ספר זכרון.[18] From the context it appears that Malachi's "Book of Remembrance" is understood here as the "Book of Haguy," which is engraved and passed down to humanity, being of heavenly origin.[19] This passage in *4QInstruction* refers twice to the "Book of Remembrance" (lines 15 and 16). A similar phrase occurs in CD 20:19 where the phrase appears to denote a record of human actions, as in Malachi itself. Probably similar is the "Book of Life" (ספר החיים) of 4Q381 31 8 and *4QDibre ha-Me'orot* (4Q504) 1–2 vi 14.[20]

Among the nonbiblical Hebrew texts, there is only one actual book referred to that we can be more or less sure is an existing apocryphal book. This is the *Sefer Maḥleqot ha-'Ittim*, mentioned in CD 16:3 and generally taken to be the *Book of Jubilees*. No other identifiable text besides this and the biblical books is referred to explicitly as ספר, with the possible exception of the *War Scroll*, on which see below. The words usually used with the term ספר are קרא, "to read," בין "to understand/explain the contents of a book," כתב, "to write," כתוב, "that which is written," usually referring to a biblical text, and למד, "to teach or learn." Essentially, then, the use of *sefer* and its accom-

---

[17] Cf. S. D. Fraade, "Hagu, Book of," *EDSS* 1:327.

[18] See A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 70–79, 83–85.

[19] Cf. C. Werman, "What is the Book of Hagu?" in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 20–22 May, 2001* (ed. J. J. Collins, G. E. Sterling, and R. A. Clements; STDJ 51; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 125–40. She sees the "vision of the *haguy*" as a meditation on history, and sees the Book of Hagu as including "what was learned from the meditations on creation and history" (p. 140).

[20] E. G. Chazon, "A Liturgical Document from Qumran and Its Implications: 'Words of the Luminaries' (4QDibHam)" (Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1991), 293–94 (Hebrew).

panying semantic field is limited to our canonical books, the *Book of Jubilees, Sefer he-Hagi/u*, and maybe the *War Scroll*, among the Qumran Hebrew texts. This may have implications for the issue of canon at Qumran.

It appears, however, that in the Aramaic texts, the heritage of earlier religious and intellectual trends, the use of ספר may be broader. I have covered this phenomenon in great detail in my recent article, "Pseudepigrapha in the Pseudepigrapha."[21] Here, I will provide a few examples of the use of *sefer* in the Aramaic literature from Qumran.

In 4QEnoch^{c} 1 vi 9, the title of the Book of the Watchers is "the Book of the Words of Truth and Rebuke of the Watchers." 4Q529 1 6 (*Words of Michael*) refers to "the Books of the Great One, the Master of the Universe," in which something is "written." While the Book of the Watchers *is* an actual book, the second case is an example of the quotation of fictional pseudepigraphal books in (actual) pseudepigrapha, in order to create the picture of a chain of written transmission or to support the authority of the work in which these allusions are embedded. There are other references to "the book," associated with wisdom (4Q213 1 i 9; 1–2 ii 8; 4Q214a 2–3 ii 5; 4Q541 7 4 [Apoc Levi^{b}]). We should also recall that Enoch is described as a scribe (ספר פרשא) in three passages (4Q203 8 4; 4Q206 2 2; 4Q530 2 ii + 6–12 14). "Three books" are referred to in *4QNoah* ar 1:5.

If, so far, we have not found that the term *sefer* is used explicitly for sectarian writings, it will be useful for us to look carefully at a unique sectarian term, *serekh*. I dealt with this word at length in *Halakhah at Qumran*,[22] and I only want to survey here the evidence that pertains to סרך as a term for a literary composition. Such uses as list, rule, or military unit need not be reviewed.

The usual usage of *serekh* in the Dead Sea Scrolls is in the introduction to a set of regulations. Here it refers to "a series of decrees or statements arranged in a small collection."[23] Examples are CD 10:4, סרך לשופטי העדה, "the rule collection for the judges of the congregation;" 12:22, סרך מושב בני ישראל על המשפטים האלה, "the regulations

[21] L. H. Schiffman, "Pseudepigrapha in the Pseudepigrapha: Mythical Books in Second Temple Literature," *RevQ* 21 (2004): 429–38.

[22] Schiffman, *Halakhah at Qumran*, 60–68.

[23] J. Licht, *The Rule Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea: 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSb* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1965), 66 (Hebrew).

for the council of the children of Israel;" סרך הנדות, "the rules for menstruants" (4Q284 1 6).

These collections emerged from sectarian study sessions and denote mini-codes or collections that found their way, through the complex redactional and recensional history that we recognize, into the sectarian texts as we know them. This term is not limited to legal or administrative issues, as illustrated by its use in 4Q180 1 4 (*Ages of Creation*) where it refers to a list of generations.

There are several passages in which ספר סרך, "the Book of the *Serekh*" has been read or restored. The title of 1QS is restored by some as ספר סרך היחד.[24] Indeed, the designation ספר סרך היחד, "The Book of the Rule of the Community," appears fully in 4Q255 1 1 (4QpapS[a]). *Sefer serekh* may also be restored in 1QM 1:1. In addition, some other text is referred to as ס]פר סרך עתו, "the Book of the *Serekh* of its Time" (1QM 15:5).[25] Thus, we have a few examples of the use of *sefer serekh* apparently to describe the compilation of these סרכים, themselves mini-collections, into a text of the character familiar to us since the publication of the entire Qumran corpus, including additional manuscripts of previously published texts—4QS, 4QM, 4QH, 4QD, and others. I take the one use of *sefer* for a sectarian composition as a whole, *Sefer Serekh ha-Milḥamah* (restored), to actually express this meaning, rather than the biblical sense of "document."

Also related to our topic is the use of כתב, "text." This Aramaic-type noun appears in the Hebrew scrolls a few times. The end of the *Copper Scroll* (3Q15 12:11) refers to the second copy of the text as משנא הכתב הזה. I have already mentioned 4Q264a 1 4 where *ketav* is a text to be read. 4Q509 (*Festival Prayers*) 97–98 i 9 may reflect usage of this noun as well. The term is more common in Aramaic contexts. It appears in the title כתב מלי דנוח [פרשגן] "[a copy] of the text of the Words of Noah" (1Q20 5:29). The same usage occurs in 4Q543 1a–c 1. As a noun it also means "text" in 4Q197 (Tobit) 5:10 and in 4Q Enoch[c] (204) 6:19. *Ketav* can also refer to handwriting, as in 4Q203 (En Giants[a])

---

[24] Cf. E. Qimron and J. H. Charlesworth, "Rule of the Community (1QS)," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations, Vol. 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck]; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 6–7, 58–59.

[25] Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness* (trans. B. and C. Rabin; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962), restores ככת]וב בספר המלחמ]ה in 1QM 15:6, but admits that סרך would be as likely a restoration as ספר (p. 332).

8 4, where the handwriting of Enoch is mentioned. A manuscript that will not deteriorate is described as כתב די לא יבלא in *4QAramaic C* (536) 1 ii 12. כתבי means "my writings," i.e., compositions, in 4Q542 1 ii 12.

What overall impression can we form of this Qumran material when it is compared with the data we gathered from the Hebrew Bible? Basically, in the Qumran texts *sefer* has, to all intents and purposes, become virtually a term for a biblical book. Only in a few cases can it be used for books not part of the scriptural collection. In those usages it refers to collections of *serakhim* that comprise sectarian, not scriptural, compositions.

מגילה, counter to general expectations, is an insignificant term that must denote, following biblical usage, the usual *form* of "book," really the only form in use—that is, a roll of sheets of animal skin. To the sectarians, their compositions are "books" or *serakhim*, rule collections, not "scrolls." They therefore saw themselves as continuators of the Israelite literary tradition. Memory was inscribed in manuscripts, but not consciously in "scrolls."

III. *The New Testament*

The New Testament evidence accords much more closely with what we have observed at Qumran than with the evidence of the Hebrew Bible.[26] New Testament passages use *biblos* and *biblion*, the noun and what was originally its diminutive, to refer to the Books of Moses, Isaiah, Psalms; and in one case (Acts 7:42) to the more generic "Prophets," where the specific passage is from Jeremiah (19:13). Matthew 1:1 uses *biblos* as it is employed in LXX Gen 5:1, to refer to the genealogical section of his work. *Biblia*, the plural of *biblion*, becomes the regular collective term for biblical books.[27]

Biblion itself functions as the usual equivalent of the biblical Hebrew *sefer*, as it does also in the LXX and Josephus. *Biblion* can, therefore, refer to a scroll, or just to a book or a text. In other words, it can be equivalent of *sefer, megillat sefer*, or *ketav*. Such a usage may be seen

[26] New Testament evidence was gathered with the help of G. Schrenk, "Biblos, Biblion," *TDNT* 1:615–20.
[27] Ibid., 617–18.

in Heb 10:5–7, quoting Ps 40 (39):7–9, which itself refers to the Torah of God as a *megillat sefer*. Also certainly a scroll is the reference to the "Book (*biblion*) of the Prophet Isaiah" read publicly by Jesus in Luke 4:17. The term may actually designate a papyrus roll in 2 Tim 4:13. *Biblion* designates the law/the Torah throughout the LXX, and so *biblion*/*biblia* refers to the books of the Torah in the New Testament numerous times. In John 20:30 the author uses the term *biblion* for his own book but this seems to have no technical, that is, canonical, significance.

In Revelation, *biblion* is used in a number of ways. Revelation 6:14 makes clear that this author conceives of the form of a book as a scroll. In 1:11 and 19 the author refers to his own writing as a book, the book that records the things revealed to him. This book is *not* sealed (22:10, cf. CD 5:2), as opposed to the book of Dan 12:4, 9, because the end is now near and is soon to be made known.

Revelation 5:1–9 refers to a book with seven seals. This book, translated by the RSV as "scroll," was written on both sides. Despite some arguments to the contrary, this passage does refer to a scroll and not to a codex. This text is based on the similar two-sided scroll imagery of Ezek 2:9–10. The notion of a sealed book derives from Isa 29:11 and Dan 12:4 (cf. 8:6), although the *seven* seals may derive from the Roman legal practice of having a will sealed by seven witnesses (cf. *1 En.* 89:71). In any case, the book tells of the divine secrets of the unfolding of the end times, and with this direction and goal in mind, it is given to the community. To open the sealed document is to initiate the chain of events, as in the case of opening a will.

In Rev 10:8–10, also as in Ezekiel (3:2), a scroll, or "little scroll," is eaten. In this scene, it is clear that the writer (= the prophet) is to internalize God's teachings, in order to prophesy to other peoples and nations (v. 11).

The New Testament (predominantly Revelation) also has references to the "Book of Life." This term appears seven times in Revelation. The Book of Life is a list of names written before the foundation of the earth and is the book of the Slain Lamb, i.e., Jesus, (Rev 13:8, 17:8). According to 20:10 this is one of the last two books to be opened at the Final Judgment. The righteous are those written in this book (21:27, cf. 3:5). Others will be severely punished (20:15). While these ideas are based on the Hebrew Bible, they certainly represent further development of the concept of a Book of Life, which can also be seen

in Second Temple literature and in rabbinic thought.[28] This book is also referred to in Phil 4:3.

It seems that in the New Testament the "book" functions to refer to the writings of the canonical Hebrew Bible, as well as to apocalyptic works and the Book of Life. For the most part these apocalyptic references are to the Book of Revelation itself, by its own author. The use of "books" in the NT is therefore similar to the usage of this term in the scrolls. Scrolls here are the normal form of books, and so explicit mentions of the word "scroll" occur only in repetitions of passages from the Hebrew Bible (albeit based on the Greek translation of the LXX) that use this term. No terminological equivalents of סרך seem to be found.[29]

Of course, the early Christian writers (predominantly Paul) introduced their own innovative rule-related genre, the "epistle" (*epistolē*). The epistles are essentially compilations of subunits that were once sent to various Christian communities, by either Paul or his followers, composed in the form of personal letters. Later epistles were composed to imitate the style of the earlier compilations. Like *serakhim*, they address both theological and practical questions. The *serekh* and the epistle served to meet similar needs of their respective communities, i.e., the transmission of the teachings of the sect, yet their literary forms and origins are very different. In addition, early Christians developed the genre of the Gospel, which in a very explicit way preserved in writing the orally transmitted memories of the teaching and death of Jesus.[30]

Both the sectarians and the early Christians shared a common heritage in the scroll/book of Hebrew Bible times. Each group, however, created its own kind of literature. Each literary form was appropriate to the particular kind of teaching that was central to the respective religious communities. Both communities used writing to preserve memory, but in very different ways. Our investigation, by the way, confirms that the Christian transition from papyrus (or animal skin)

---

[28] Cf. M. Rist, "Life, Book of," *IDB* 3:130.

[29] Cf., however, the so-called "household codes" preserved in Col 3:18–4:1 and Eph 5:21–6:9, which are lists of rules very similar to *serakhim*. However, unlike the *serakhim*, these appear to be unitary compositions.

[30] Note that *evangelion* is not a literary term in the New Testament itself, denoting only the content of oral teaching (G. Friedrich, "εὐαγγέλιον," *TDNT* 2:735).

roll to codex, as the means of transmitting texts, did not take place until after the composition of the New Testament texts.

IV. *The Rabbinic Corpus*

Although the rabbinic corpus is too vast for detailed treatment, some remarks about rabbinic usage are in order.[31] Here we can see continued evolution in the use of the terms we have been studying.

Often, rabbinic sources use מגילה to refer to a part of a *sefer*, that is, of a biblical book, or to a pamphlet-like text in scroll form. So we find *megillah* used for small texts like a book of spices (*b. Yoma* 38a), or the record of pedigree of a priest (*m. Yebam.* 4:13).[32] But we also find it used to designate a scroll containing a part of the Pentateuch, as in the debate over the revelation of the Torah: was it given as a complete Torah (תורה חתומה), lit. "sealed," or מגילה, מגילה, part after part (*b. Giṭ.* 60a). *Megillah* is also the term for a scroll of one of the Five Books of Moses, in opposition to *sefer*, the entire book (scroll) of the Pentateuch. Rabbinic texts assume without question that biblical "books" must be written in the form of a scroll, according to specific scribal halakhot and professional practices. This is shown, for example, in *b. ʿAbod. Zar.* 18a where Rabbi Ḥanina ben Tradyon, to be burnt by the Romans, is first wrapped (כרך) in a *sefer torah*, itself, of course, a flammable item. The late tractate *Sefer Torah* 1:5 specifically states that a Torah may not be written on a פנקס; this probably denotes a codex, though it could still refer to wax tablets, as in earlier rabbinic texts.[33]

Quantitatively, the most frequent usage of *megillah* occurs in relation to מגילת אסתר, the scroll par excellence. Here *megillah* denotes a small book, as is the case with the expression חמש מגילות, "the five scrolls." *B. Megillah* 19a specifically says that the *megillah*—Esther—is termed both a "book" (ספר) and a "letter" (איגרת). But *megillah* is also used in this passage to refer to a scroll containing a collection of the Writings (*ketubim*, the third division of the rabbinic biblical collection), from which it is prohibited to read the Book of Esther on Purim.

---

[31] References here were gathered with the help of B. Ansbacher and C. Roth, "Books," *EncJud* 4:1220–29.

[32] Cf. ספר יוחסין in *b. Pesaḥ.* 62b.

[33] Cf. S. Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962), 203–8.

The main rabbinic use of *sefer*, of course, is to denote a biblical book. In *m. Yad.* 3:5 *sefer* appears to be the term for one of the books of the Torah, but generally it denotes an entire Torah scroll. The Pentateuch was specifically termed a ספר תורה, language based on biblical usages—ספר התורה הזאת and ספר התורה הזה. The biblical canon is referred to by the plural formulation כ"ד ספרים (e.g., *Exod. Rab.* 41:5), following the usage of *sefarim* in Daniel. *Sefarim* may also refer to a group of biblical scrolls. Rabbinic texts continue to preserve the biblical meaning of *sefer*, i.e., "document," as in *m. ʿEd.* 1:12, ספר כתובה, the specific formulation of the marriage document. *Sefer* is also used for individual noncanonical books, as in "the Book of Wisdom," ספר החכמה (*y. Soṭah* 9:16 [24c]) or the "Book of Adam," ספרו של אדם הראשון (*Gen. Rab.* 24:2), a book that supposedly foretold all the names of the future generations. Rabbinic texts also refer to books *not* accepted by rabbinic law using the collective terms, ספרי מינים (*b. Sanh.* 100b, *Sifre Num.* 16), heretical books. The move toward a consciousness of canonical, i.e., authorized, and noncanonical, unauthorized books is seen in the Mishnah's formulation, ספרים חיצוניים, literally "external books" (*m. Sanh.* 10:1); i.e., those outside of the canon. The public and perhaps even private reading of the latter books was prohibited by rabbinic halakhah, not necessarily because these books contained unacceptable teachings but simply because they stood outside the canon. We should note that apocalyptic books as such are not discussed in rabbinic texts. Further, the Book of Ben Sira, as is well known, is the only noncanonical (apocryphal) book quoted by the rabbis as a *sefer* with the use of *ktv* (Hebrew *katav*, Aramaic *ketiv*) in the quotation formula.

While *serekh* does not appear as a designation for a written text in rabbinic literature, the noun *ketav* does. This term seems to have a wider usage. It can designate the act of writing or even the script, as in כתב אשורי, "the Assyrian script," or כתב עברי, "the paleo-Hebrew script." The term תורה שבכתב, "the written law," designates that which is literally "in writing." *B. Megillah* 18b, שלא מן הכתב, refers to "what is not in a written text," a usage of כתב similar to what we encountered at Qumran. דברים ככתבן, taking "the words as they are written," or "as in their text" (e.g., *b. Pesaḥ* 21b), refers to the literal, Sadducean interpretation of certain Torah commandments. כתב יד is a signature, literally "the writing of a hand" (*m. Ketub.* 2:3). ככת(ו)בו can also refer to the form of a written text (כתיב) as opposed to the way the text is read (קרי) (e.g., *t. Meg.* 3[4]:40).

The plural, כתבים, can refer to government documents in later midrashim (*Num. Rab.* 23:1). Most important, however, is that the plural כתבי הקודש, "holy scriptures," refers regularly to those canonical books of the rabbinic and Masoretic canon (e.g., *m. Yad.* 4:5).

Rabbinic literature shares uses of *sefer* with the Dead Sea Scrolls, but its use of *megillah* is quite different, especially because of Esther and the Purim holiday, both absent at Qumran.[34] Self-consciousness about scrolls, books and scribal practices in rabbinic circles clearly results from the fact that other patterns were in use in the surrounding world, e.g., the use of papyrus rolls in Egypt and the spread of the codex among early Christians. Indeed, much of the literature found at Qumran, while probably designated ספרים by the rabbis, was actually condemned and forbidden in rabbinic literature. So the description of these books as *sefarim* does not carry the positive and authoritative message that it does, for example, in the Qumran Aramaic texts. Further, for the rabbis, written texts were not the only form of memory; oral tradition took a place of centrality along with the authority of the written text.

Conclusion

The starting point of our investigation of the uses of *megillah*, *sefer*, and *ketav*, as well as *serekh*, was the realization that one of the greatest curiosities of the field of Qumran studies is that, while the scrolls make numerous references to books, there is virtually no mention of "scrolls." Almost all uses of *sefer* in the Hebrew scrolls refer to what to us are biblical books, and the sectarian compositions seem to have been designated *serekh* or *sefer serekh*, a collection of *serakhim*. Never is one of their texts termed simply a "book." The Dead Sea sectarians saw themselves as passing on the books of the Bible, but they seem to have distinguished their own books from those of what we call the canon, which for them may have also included *Jubilees* or even the *Aramaic Levi Document*. The tradents—scribes, teachers or just plain sectarians—saw themselves as passing on ancient books, authored by ancient Israelite figures. They apparently saw their own compositions

[34] S. Talmon, "Was the Book of Esther Known at Qumran?" *DSD* 2 (1995): 249–67; S. White Crawford, "Has *Esther* Been Found at Qumran? *4QProto-Esther* and the *Esther* Corpus," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 307–25.

as different, a point also clear from the fact that these texts are built on elements of what we call the Bible—interpreted, rewritten, or just pilfered for the language. But almost nothing like this was done with the sectarian texts. This is true despite the common methods of preparation and transmission of biblical and extrabiblical materials. The medium—the scroll—was the same, but the message was distinguished.

The earlier tradition of those who produced the Aramaic literature in the sect's library was different, as was that of the author of *Jubilees* (composed in Hebrew before the rise of the Qumran sect). Here, existing books outside of the biblical canon, as well as references in those books to antediluvian, fictitious books were the norm.[35] In these books we find an openness not only to the authority of "nonbiblical" texts, but also to a library of fictitious pseudepigrapha that was the basis of a claim of continuity of tradition, an argument not made by the Qumran sect itself.

What we have said so far refers to ancient history. But then there is the modern "construct" of the Dead Sea Scrolls. We use a term for these texts for which there is no hint in the texts. This term reflects not the ancient historical memory of the ancient Jews, but rather the ever-developing sense of that memory for contemporary scholars and lay people.

It seems fair to assert that our designation of these texts plays on two contradictory elements of our conceptions of them. On the one hand, for some, the reduction of these "books," to "scrolls," "documents," and "texts," serves to demote them and push them back into the recesses of Jewish historical memory, creating an ancient sectarian library where in ancient times, in the view of the collectors, these books constituted the heritage of the survivors of ancient Israel.[36] This tendency makes it possible for many, even scholars of ancient Judaism and Christianity, to treat the new texts as irrelevant to the background and history of these two faiths. On the other hand, a contradictory tendency, often observed in the popular Dead Sea Scrolls imagination, sees these scrolls as ancient and mysterious, as a hidden revelation traversing two millennia to somehow rescue us from ignorance; in

[35] Cf. Schiffman, "Pseudepigrapha in the Pseudepigrapha," 429–38.

[36] Adapted from the title of M. A. Elliott's study, *The Survivors of Israel: A Reconstruction of the Theology of Pre-Christian Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).

the best case, academic and historical, and in other, confused cases, religious.

But to the Dead Sea Scrolls sect, as we still must call it, the term scroll, as in the New Testament and some strata of rabbinic material, refers only to the physical form of the material, not to its status, canonicity, or contents. Our Dead Sea Scrolls are really books and texts—but think of how much more exciting it is to speak of scrolls. Who would want to give that up?

THE WOOD-OFFERING: THE CONVOLUTED EVOLUTION OF A HALAKHAH IN QUMRAN AND RABBINIC LAW*

Cana Werman
Ben-Gurion University

The precise nature and date of the practice of bringing wood to the Temple are elusive.[1] First mentioned in Neh 10:35, the practice is attested in Josephus, Qumran, *Megillat Taʿanit*, and in Tannaitic and Amoraic literature. The present paper reconsiders this ritual, examining its development in two Qumran texts and in rabbinic halakhah, each of which, for reasons of its own, altered what I view as a popular custom. A tripartite discussion is therefore necessary: of Qumran literature, of rabbinic literature, and of the relationship between the testimony found in these corpora and actual practice during the Second Temple period. However, any attempt to establish Second Temple practice must recognize that the almost total absence of direct witnesses to the performance of ritual activity during the Second Temple period fosters reliance on the very literature, which, I seek to argue here, opposed popular custom. I therefore proceed with due caution, hoping to avoid the pitfalls of presupposition and circular reasoning.

No references to the bringing of wood to the Temple appear in preexilic literature. The first attestation of this custom comes from the early Second Temple period. Nehemiah 10:35 relates that the priests, the Levites, and the people cast lots על קרבן העצים...להביא לבית אלהינו לבית אבתינו לעתים מזמנים שנה בשנה לבער על מזבח ה' אלהינו ככתוב בתורה ("for the wood-offering, to bring it into the house of our

* This research is supported by the Israel Science Foundation (Grant #733/03). It develops one aspect of my presentation at the Tenth Orion Center symposium. I would like to thank Dena Ordan for translating the article.

[1] This topic has been treated by distinguished scholars. See J. N. Epstein, "Zeman ʿAṣei ha-Kohanim," in his *Studies in Talmudic Literature and Semitic Languages* (ed. E. Z. Melamed; trans. Z. Epstein; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1983), 1–5 (Hebrew); C. Albeck, *Shisha Sidrei Mishnah: Seder Moʾed* (Jerusalem: Bialik Institute; Tel-Aviv: Dvir, 1952), 497; S. Lieberman, *Tosefta ki-fshutah* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1993), 2:848–50, 5:1111–15; S. Safrai, *Pilgrimage at the Time of the Second Temple* (Jerusalem: Akademon, 1985), 220–24 (Hebrew).

God, [according] to our fathers' houses, at times appointed, year by year, to burn upon the altar of the Lord our God, as it is written in the Law").[2] Nehemiah's testimony implies that the people obligated themselves to bring wood "at times appointed" according to clans.[3]

The somewhat obscure phrasing, as well as the context of the verse, makes the nature of this obligation difficult to determine. It appears between two ordinances: following the statement of an obligation to contribute one-third shekel annually—"for the showbread, and for the continual meal-offering and for the continual burnt-offering, of the sabbaths, of the new moons, for the appointed seasons, and for the holy things, and for the sin-offerings to make atonement for Israel, and for all the work of the house of our God"—in verse 34; and preceding an injunction—"to bring the first-fruits of our land, and the first-fruits of all fruit of all manner of trees, year by year, unto the house of the Lord"—in verse 36. This placement lends itself to two possible interpretations of the wood-offering. One is that, like the one-third shekel, the wood was brought to the Temple to facilitate the carrying out of the sacrificial rites in the Temple, namely, to supply wood for the altar. Another feasible explanation is that the wood was not supplied for the burning of sacrifices, but rather was an offering in and of itself, an independent gift (consistent with the opening of the verse: קרבן העצים), meant to be burnt separately upon the altar. In that case, the wood shares the status of the first-fruits mentioned in verse 36, and the bringing of wood "to burn upon the altar of the Lord" therefore parallels the bringing of the first-fruits (as expressed in the concluding verse of Nehemiah: "and for the wood-offering, at times appointed, and for the first-fruits" [13:31]). Thus understood, the bringing of the wood constitutes an addition that embellishes the daily rites and does not relate to the ongoing financing of the cult.

An ancient halakhah found in the *Talmud Yerushalmi* and in the *scholium* to *Megillat Taʿanit* (MS Parma) is relevant to the attempt to elucidate the meaning of the obligation to bring wood to the Temple, as stated in Nehemiah. This halakhah reads as follows: להן כל אינש די יהוי עלוי אעין ובכורין, האומר הרי עלי עצים למזבח וגזירין למערכה אסור בספד ובתענית ומלעשות מלאכה בו ביום ("But everyone who

[2] Unless otherwise noted, all English citations of the Bible are taken from the 1917 JPS translation: www.machon-mamre.org.

[3] As my translation suggests. The verse is explained this way in the LXX and the Vulgate. See Epstein, "Zeman," 1 n. 1. (There is an error in Epstein's citation.)

made a vow [to bring] wood and first fruits [to the Temple]—[that is] one who says 'I take it upon myself [to bring] wood for the altar and logs for the pile'—is prohibited regarding lamenting and fasting and [similarly] from working on that day" (*y. Pesaḥ.* 30c).[4] The halakhah opens in Aramaic and finishes in Hebrew, starts with wood and first-fruits and concludes with wood alone. From the language of the Aramaic opening, it appears that the wood-offering and the first-fruits have parity: each is brought at the donor's initiative, and the assumption of this initiative releases the donor from the obligation to fast or to eulogize the dead.[5] I suggest that this early halakhah reflects the situation in early postexilic times, when people brought both wood and first-fruits offerings at will. Nehemiah's legislation, as reflected in Neh 10:34–36, sought to direct this popular custom towards Temple needs. The bringing of first-fruits continued as before; the folk tradition of bringing wood ostensibly also continued, but was now incorporated into the public funding of the Temple cult.

Such an understanding of Nehemiah's actions as an attempt to channel a popular custom into a means of funding the public cult explains the ambiguous wording of Neh 10:35. The term קרבן עצים used by Nehemiah alludes to the wood-offering's independent status, and even though wood should logically belong to the items funded from the one-third shekel, it is not included on that list. By this means, Nehemiah preserved the status of the wood-offering as independent and semi-voluntary, according to the ancient custom. On the other hand, in transforming sporadic donations of wood into an institutionalized, fixed practice that would enable regular sacrificial offerings "as it is written in the Law," he required that the wood be brought "at times appointed," according to clans. Hints of Nehemiah's success appear in attestations to a custom of bringing wood on fixed dates in sectarian

---

[4] For the text, see *Talmud Yerushalmi* (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language, 2001), 516; all parenthetical page numbers in future references to the Yerushalmi are to this edition); *y. Meg.* 70c (p. 743); *y. Hag.* 78a (p. 789); according to a Genizah fragment cited in V. Noam, *Megillat Taʿanit: Versions, Interpretation, History, with a Critical Edition* (Between Bible and Mishnah: The David and Jemima Jeselsohn Library; Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2003), 378 (Hebrew). I consulted B. Bokser's translation: *Yerushalmi Pesaḥim* (The Talmud of the Land of Israel 13; compl. and ed. L. H. Schiffman; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 148.

[5] This equivalence is surprising because first-fruits are a pentateuchal obligation, whereas the bringing of wood by individuals is voluntary. Perhaps for this reason the Hebrew section of the halakhah, which is certainly later, relates only to wood (האומר הרי עלי עצים למזבח וגזירין למערכה).

literature of the second century BCE, as well as in Josephus, *Megillat Taʿanit*, and rabbinic writings. The question remains, however, in what manner and on what dates was this offering brought?

Second Temple literature links the wood-offering to a specific date. *Megillat Taʿanit*, a nationalistic Hasmonean work, cites the fifteenth of Av as a day on which it is forbidden to fast (among the other dates so mentioned in the *Megillah*), as well as to make a eulogy at a funeral, *because* this is the day of עצי כהנים (as Epstein notes, this expression is short for עצי כהנים והעם):[6] בחמשה עשר באב זמן אעי כהניא ודלא למספד בהון ("on the fifteenth of Av falls the time for the wood of the priests, and it is forbidden to eulogize [on them]"). Because of the nature of the dates mentioned in *Megillat Taʿanit*, we cannot necessarily conclude that wood was actually brought to the Temple on that day during the late Second Temple period; perhaps the occasion celebrated the bringing of wood on that day in the past. Such an interpretation creates parity between the Wood Festival and the other festivals in *Megillat Taʿanit*, which commemorate joyous events in the past rather than contemporary ones.

Verification of the actual carrying out of this practice shortly before the destruction of the Temple comes from another Second Temple period source. In an aside to his description of what sparked the First Revolt, Josephus states: "The eighth day was the feast of wood-carrying, when it was customary for all to bring wood for the altar, in order that there might be an unfailing supply of fuel for the flames, which are kept always burning" (*J.W.* 2.425). From the context, it appears that the feast as described by Josephus took place either on the Fourteenth of Av or on the day following. Both Josephus and *Megillat Taʿanit* shed light on a statement by Rabban Simeon ben Gamliel: לא היו ימים טובים לישראל כחמישה עשר באב וכיום הכיפורים שבהם בני ירושלים יוצאין בכלי לבן שאולים ובנות ירושלים יוצאות וחולות בכרמים ("There were no days better for Israelites than the Fifteenth of Av and the Day of Atonement. For on these days the Jerusalemites go out in borrowed white clothes and the Jerusalemite girls go out and dance in the vineyards"—*m. Taʿan.* 4:8).[7] The better manuscripts of the Mishnah testify that it was the Jerusalemites who wore white—in the more com-

[6] Epstein, "Zeman," 4.

[7] P. Mandel, "'There Were No Happier Days for Israel than the Fifteenth of Av and the Day of Atonement': On the Final Mishnah of Tractate *Taʿanit* and Its Transmission," *Teʿudah* 11 (1996): 168 (Hebrew).

mon version the girls wear white—and Second Temple sources indicate that this was the convention among those entering the Temple.[8] As Mandel notes, the custom of bringing wood witnessed by *Megillat Taʿanit* and Josephus provides the best explanation for the mass visit by the people to the Temple on the fifteenth of Av.[9]

Thus, Second Temple sources testify both to the bringing of wood to the Temple in mid-Av and to the mass nature of this activity: "the priests" (*Megillat Taʿanit*), or the "priests and the people" (according to Epstein's reconstruction of *Megillat Taʿanit*), or "all" (Josephus). Based on the evidence from these witnesses alone it is necessary to qualify the success of Nehemiah's measures. In the later Second Temple period, the people apparently brought wood to facilitate the routine carrying out of the cult, not "at times appointed," but once a year; not by clan, but en masse. Yet, consideration of Qumranic and rabbinic literature elicits a more complex picture of reality.

The Wood Festival in the Qumran Documents

Two documents found at Qumran, 4Q365 and the *Temple Scroll*, contain an injunction to bring wood to the Temple. Separate consideration of each text and its halakhah is the first step, to be followed by a comparison of the two texts and by an attempt to determine the reality to which they respond.

The briefer version of the command is found in 4Q365, frg. 23:[10]

(4) וידבר יהוה אל משה לאמור צו את בני ישראל לאמור בבואכמה אל הארץ אשר
(5) אנוכי נותן לכמה לנחלה וישבתם עליה לבטח תקריבו עצים לעולה ולכול מלאכ[ת]

[8] Ibid., 170 n. 94.

[9] Rabban Simeon ben Gamliel's main message was: "These two festivals were thus intimately connected with the Temple in Jerusalem and expressed the love and admiration of the masses for the Temple service" (Mandel, "There Were No Happier Days," 168).

[10] Text and translation from E. Tov and S. White, "Reworked Pentateuch," in *Qumran Cave 4.VIII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 1* (ed. H. Attridge et al.; DJD 13; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 187–352, p. 291. 4Q365 is one of the witnesses to the text of a work entitled *Reworked Pentateuch* by the editors. This work contains various biblical pericopes, generally organized according to the biblical sequence, interlaced with short

(6) [הב]ית אשר תבנו לי בארץ לערוך אותם על מזבח העולה [תח]ת
העו[ו]לו[ות][11] לבער]
(7) [איש]ם לפסחים ולשלמים ולתודות ולנדבות ולעולות דבר יום [ביומו]
(8) [ ]מים ולד[ל]תות ולכול מלאכת הבית יקרי[בו אותם]
(9) [ ]אחר מ]ועד היצהר יקריבו את העצים שנים [שנים משבטיכם ליום]
(10) [האחד ויהיו המקריבים] ביום הריש[ו]ן לוי [ ]
(11) [ ]ראו]בן ושמעון [וב]יום הרב[יעי]

(4) The Lord spoke to Moses, saying, command the children of Israel, saying, "When you come to the land which
(5) I am about to give you as an inheritance, and where you shall dwell securely, bring wood for the sacrifices and for all the wo[r]k of
(6) [the H]ouse which you will build for me in the land, arranging it on the altar of sacrifice, un[der] the offer]ings [to combust]
(7) [their fire] for Passover sacrifices and for peace-offerings and for thanksgiving offerings and for the free-will offerings and for da[ily] whole burnt-offerings [ ]
(8) [ ] and for the doors and for all the work of the House the[y] will br[ing it]
(9) [after] the [fe]stival of new oil let them bring the wood, two [by two from their tribes on each]
(10) [day and those who bring] on the fir[st] day, Levi [ ]
(11) [Reu]ben and Simeon [and on t]he four[rth] day [[12]

This passage presents the obligation to bring wood, following the Festival of Oil (line 9), as a divinely ordained command addressed to Moses.[13] The *Temple Scroll* fixes the Festival of Oil in the third week

---

interpolations intended either to harmonize the passages with other pentateuchal verses or to fill lacunae in the biblical text. The passage cited here, which follows the command to celebrate Sukkot, based mostly on Leviticus 23, is unusual. As opposed to the other additions, it is independent and also longer. For that reason the editors debated whether it should be ascribed to a different manuscript, 4Q365a, which is close in nature to the *Temple Scroll*. See the discussion, ibid., 293–95, and n. 13 below.

[11] The editors propose the following reconstruction: לערוך אותם על מזבח העולה את העגל[י]ם[ו]. Examination of the photographs of the text shows that the reading suggested here is preferable. As to the first word: The last letter is clear; the remnant of the preceding letter does not fit *aleph*, however, but rather appears to be the top stroke of the left side of a *ḥet*. I therefore propose reading חת[ת] and not את[ו]. In the following word the initial letter *he* has been well preserved. The following two letters are barely visible; the surviving three dots indicate that these letters touched the top of the line. This is followed by the top stroke of the letter *lamed*. These three dots perhaps represent the two ends of the letter *ʿayin* and the top stroke of a *vav*, suggesting a possible reading of והעולות, which also fits the context: the wood is arranged on the altar under the sacrifices. The editors did not suggest a reconstruction for the lacuna that follows; I suggest ם[לבער איש], which refers to wood.

[12] Translated by the author.

[13] This feature alone suffices to demonstrate that these lines could not belong to 4Q365a. 4Q365a is a copy of the *Temple Scroll* or a work belonging to the same genre.

of the sixth month; therefore the Festival of Wood falls at the end of the sixth month. On each day of the festival two tribes bring wood to the Temple; accordingly, the festival lasted six days.

Lines 4 to 8 explain the use to which the wood was put. The brief statement that the wood would be for the "sacrifices" and "for all the wo[r]k of[the H]ouse" in line 5 is amplified in the continuation. Lines 6 to 7 explain that the wood designated for "the sacrifices" was to be placed beneath *any* of the Temple sacrifices, thereby enabling a number of offerings to be burnt—paschal offerings, peace-offerings, thanksgiving-offerings and the daily *tamid*. "For all the wo[r]k of [the H]ouse" is repeated and expanded in line 8. The mention of "doors" in line 8 indicates that the missing beginning of the line listed Temple items that could be repaired with the wood. In brief, 4Q365 instructs the twelve tribes of Israel to see to a regular supply of wood for the Temple, wood to be used both for the sacrificial cult and for upkeep of the Temple. Representatives of the tribes bring the wood to the Temple after the Festival of Oil, over a six-day period at the end of the sixth month.

The author's choice of the root ק.ר.ב (line 5: תקריבו; line 8: יקריבו) is noteworthy. The closest biblical analogy to the charge found in 4Q365 is the description of the donations made by the tribal chieftains at the dedication of the Tabernacle. Here too, the leading root is ק.ר.ב: ויקריבו נשיאי ישראל ראשי בית אבתם הם נשיאי המטת הם העמדים על הפקדים. ויביאו את קרבנם לפני ה' שש עגלות צב ושני עשר בקר עגלה על שני הנשאים ושור לאחד ויקריבו אותם לפני המשכן ("Then *brought-near* the exalted-leaders of Israel, the heads of their Fathers' House—they are the leaders of the tribes, they are those who stand over the counting—they brought their *near-offering* before the presence of YHWH: six litter wagons and twelve cattle, a wagon for (every) two leaders and an ox for (each) one. When they had *brought-them-near* to the Dwelling…" (Num 7:2–3).[14] The use of the root ק.ר.ב perhaps reflects the desire of the author of 4Q365 to link the Festival of Wood and the dedication of the Tabernacle. Another possibility is that the author is alluding to his understanding of Nehemiah's "wood-offering" / קרבן עצים as referring not to an offering burnt on

In this genre the entire composition is given to Moses at one time; there is no need for a separate opening noting that this commandment was explicitly addressed to Moses.

[14] Translation: E. Fox, *The Five Book of Moses* (New York: Schocken, 1997); my emphases.

the altar, but rather to the bringing of, i.e., donating, wood for fuel for the burnt-offerings and for Temple renovations. To my mind, 4Q365's phrase לכול מלאכת הבית (line 8) also alludes to Nehemiah. It echoes Neh 10:34, where the concluding phrase כל מלאכת בית אלהינו signifies that the one-third shekel is to be used to underwrite the routine sacrifices and grain-offerings as well as any other cultic needs. By utilizing this phrase related to Nehemiah's one-third-shekel donation in the context of a description of the wood-offering, 4Q365 creates a correspondence between the wood and the rest of the items funded by the one-third shekel; that is, the wood is also for the ongoing maintenance of the Temple cult.

The original length of this fragment remains undetermined. Perhaps it concluded with a list of the names of the tribes, or went on to detail the amount of wood to be donated by each tribe. Because the text portrays a year's supply of wood being brought to the Temple storehouse, it seems unlikely that it encompassed a directive to bring special sacrifices for the Wood Festival itself. To sum up: in its clarification of the verse from Nehemiah, 4Q365 excludes the above-noted possibility that the verse refers to an offering of wood merely to embellish the cult. Nehemiah's עתים מזמנים are interpreted as six consecutive days in late summer, and the obligation undertaken in Nehemiah becomes a divine, meta-temporal law. Moreover, as distinct from Nehemiah, the requirement to bring wood rests on the entire people; not on representatives of families, but of tribes.[15]

The Festival of Wood is treated at greater length in the *Temple Scroll*, col. 23. As in 4Q365, God is the speaker. The text, based partially on Qimron's reconstruction, reads as follows:[16]

(3) [ואחר מועד היצהר יקריבו] למזב[ח]
(4) [את העצי]ם שנים [עשר מטות בני ישראל והיו המקריבים]

[15] In other words, the author reworked a postexilic directive (from a time when the basic unit was families) into a text describing presettlement times (when the basic unit was tribes). I would like to thank Ruth Clements for her help in formulating this conclusion.

[16] The reading of the text is according to E. Qimron, *The Damascus Document Reconsidered* (ed. M. Broshi; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 1992). A discussion of my proposed reconstruction (23:3–6; 24:1–6) has been published elsewhere. See C. Werman, "Appointed Times of Atonement in the *Temple Scroll*," in *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls 4* (ed. M. Bar-Asher and D. Dimant; Haifa: Haifa University Press; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 2006), 107–115 (Hebrew).

(5) [ביום הראשון] מטות [לוי] ויהודה וב[יום השני בנימין ובני]
(6) [יוסף וביום השלישי ראובן ו]שמ[עון וביום הרביעי ישששכר]
(7) [וזבולון וביום החמישי גד ו]אשר וביו[ם הששי דן] ונפתלי
(8) [ויקריבו על] העצים עולה ליה[וה ויביאו מטה]
(9) [לוי ומטה יהודה ביום הראשון ש]עירי עזים שנ[ים לחטאת לכפר]
(10) [בהמה על בני ישראל ומנחת]מה ונסכמה כמ[שפט ויעשו עולה]
(11) [כול מטה ומטה] פר אחד איל אחד כב[ש אחד בן שנתו]
(12) [תמימים לכול מ]טה ומטה שנים עשר בני יעקו[ב]
(13) [ויעשום ברוב]ע הים על המזבח אחר עולת הת[מיד ונסכה]

(3) [and after the Festival of Oil they shall bring]
(4) the twel[ve tribes of Israel are to bring woo]d to the alt[ar. Those contributing]
(5) [On the first day] are to be the tribes of [Levi] and Judah; on [the second day Benjamin and the sons of]
(6) [Joseph; on the third day Reuben and] Sim[eon; on the fourth day Issachar]
(7) [and Zebulun; on the fifth day Gad and] Asher; on the six[th day Dan] and Naphtali
(8) [On] the wood [they are to offer] a burnt-offering to the Lor[d and the tribe]
(9) [of Levi and the tribe of Judah will bring on the first day tw]o goats [for a sin offering to atone]
(10) [through them for the people of Israel and the requisite grain-offer] ing and drink offering, following the us[ual regulations.]
(11) [Each tribe shall bring] as a burn[t offering] one bull, one ram and [one yearling la]mb;
(12) [without blemish, for each and every tr]ibe of the twelve sons of Jaco[b]
(13) [and they shall sacrifice them at the fourth of the da]y on the altar after the per[petual] burnt-offering [and its drink-offering.][17]

The first lines of the passage contain two directives. The first (lines 3 to 7) calls on the twelve tribes to bring wood to the altar (it is impossible to determine whether the author used the root ק.ר.ב. or ב.ו.א.). The second injunction, beginning on line 8, outlines the purpose for which the wood was to be brought. Qimron's proposed reconstruction ויקריבו על] העצים עולה ליה[וה] is based on the directive relating to the Festival of Wine: ויקריבו על היין הזה ביום ההוא [עולה] לה'. If correct, this reconstruction suggests that the wood was used on the same day that it was brought and served as fuel for the sacrifices that the tribal representatives were commanded to bring (end of line 8 through

[17] Translation based on M. O. Wise, M. Abegg, and E. Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999), 466–67.

line 12). Both the use of the definite article (העצים)—and the absence of any detail regarding a secondary division of the amount of wood to be brought—suggest that all the wood brought (lines 3 to 7) served the purpose stated (starting with line 8), namely, as fuel for burning the meat of the sacrificial offering or its fat.

The sacrifices offered on the wood are one bull, one ram, and one yearling lamb brought by each tribe (23:11–12). On the first day, the representatives of Levi and Judah also bring goats for sin-offerings (23:9). As Yadin notes, the author of the scroll here creates a ritual resembling that of the Day of Atonement, when two sin offerings are made, one for the priests and the other for the people.[18] A further connection to the Day of Atonement arises from the fact that the מזרק (bowl), the utensil used by the priest to sprinkle sacrificial blood, appears only in the passage treating the Day of Atonement and in the continuation of our passage (23:14–24:3):

23:(14) ויקרב הכוהן הגדול את עולת [הלויים]
(15) לראישונה ואחריה יקטיר את עולת מטה יהודה וכא[שר הוא]
(16) מקטיר ושחטו לפניו את שעיר העזים לראישונה והעלה את
(17) דמו למזבח <u>במזרק</u>;
24:(1) [ושחטו את שעיר העיזים השני]
(2) [והעלה למזבח ב]<u>מזרק</u> את [דמו ועשה בדמו כאשר לדם השעיר
(3) [הראשון וכיפר על] בני ישר[אל

23:(14) The high priest is to o[ff]er the [Levites'] burnt offering
(15) first, then the burnt offering of the tribe of Judah. W[hen he]
(16) is ready to begin making offerings, the male goat shall be slaughtered in his presence as the first thing. He is to raise
(17) its blood to the altar in a *bowl;*
24:(1) [and they shall slaughter the second male goat]
(2) [and bring] its [blood to the altar in] a *bowl* [and he shall do with its blood as he did to the blood of the first
(3) male goat and atone for [the children of Is]rael[19]

In col. 23 and the opening of col. 24 the author sets out guidelines for the sin-offering of two male goats. The following lines detail how the burnt-offerings—the bull, ram, and lamb—are sacrificed. The author also provides instructions regarding the order in which the portions

[18] Y. Yadin, ed., *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1977–1983), 1:126–28.
[19] Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*, 467; my emphases.

of the burnt-offerings are to be placed on the altar. As I have shown elsewhere,[20] this additional detail is not found in the Bible and has a parallel only in the *Aramaic Levi Document*, where Isaac instructs Levi concerning the sacrificial rites (8:2–4).[21]

This affinity between the *Temple Scroll* and the *Aramaic Levi Document* sheds further light on the role assigned by the *Temple Scroll* to the Festival of Wood. The chapter in *ALD* where Levi is taught how to offer burnt-offerings also contains instructions regarding the type of wood suitable for use on the altar and specifies the amounts of wood, grain-offering, and incense required for each animal. *Jubilees* 21, a reworking of the cultic halakhot of *ALD*,[22] adds another directive: old wood, that is, wood that has been cut down long ago, should not be used on the altar. "Do not place (there) old wood, for its aroma has left—because there is no longer an aroma upon it as at first" (21:13). Accordingly, *Jubilees* held that there was an expiration date on the stored wood, after which the cut wood was considered old and was prohibited for cultic use.

Thus both *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll* reworked the cultic instructions found in *ALD, Jubilees* adding an injunction against the use of old wood; the *Temple Scroll* mandating celebration of a Festival of Wood. Given the fact that *Jubilees* and the *Temple Scroll* are reworking the same older tradition, I suggest that we understand the *Temple Scroll*'s Wood Festival as marking the expiration date for the stored wood and the point from which it cannot be used on the altar. This date falls sometime in the sixth month, in the late summer, at which time fresh supplies of wood probably reached the Temple storehouses. In other words, whereas *Jubilees* issues a general prohibition against using old wood, the *Temple Scroll* provides a cut-off date, the Festival of Wood, after which time use of the wood brought to the Temple a year earlier was proscribed. Such an understanding transforms the Festival of Wood in the *Temple Scroll* into a worthy link in the chain

---

[20] Werman, "Appointed Times," 111–15.

[21] J. C. Greenfield, M. E. Stone, and E. Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document* (SVTP 19; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 82 (hereafter *ALD*).

[22] See C. Werman, "The Story of the Flood in the *Book of Jubilees*," *Tarbiz* 64 (1995): 183–202 (Hebrew); idem, "Qumran and the Book of Noah," in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the [Second] International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12–14 January, 1997* (ed. E. G. Chazon and M. E. Stone; STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 171–81.

of first-fruit festivals that precede it, the Festivals of First-Fruits of Wheat, Wine, and Oil. On each of these festivals use of the new crop was initiated and from that point onward, only new produce was permissible for use in the Temple.[23] No statement attributing this significance to the Festival of Wood is found in the lines preserved; however, it may have appeared in the unpreserved first lines of col. 25, which continue the treatment of the Festival of Wood.

Comparison of the passages treating the Festival of Wood in the *Temple Scroll* and in 4Q365 elicits differences. In 4Q365 the festival marks the date in the late summer when the annual supply of wood was brought to the Temple, evidently without any accompanying Temple ceremony. In contrast, the material preserved in the *Temple Scroll* delineates a Temple ceremony, where the wood brought by the representatives of the tribes is used on the festival itself to burn the fat from the male goats offered as sin-offerings and the flesh of the burnt-offerings; this account includes no instructions regarding a year's supply of wood for the Temple.[24] Nonetheless, there are some similarities between the two texts. If my premise regarding the content of the first lines of col. 25 is correct, then, like the author of 4Q365, the author of the *Temple Scroll* assumed that the priests and/or the leaders of the people brought freshly cut wood to the Temple during the summer. Thus both texts stress the requirement to renew the wood supply annually and evidently seek to avoid the burning of wood that has been stored for long periods.

A second shared feature is the fashioning of the festival ritual. In both texts, specified representatives of the people, as opposed to Nehemiah's chance representation by families, come to the Temple. Both texts also portray an organized, sequential festival, which begins after the Festival of Oil, in contrast to Nehemiah's unspecified עתים מזמנים. They portray the wood supply for the altar as a support for the bibli-

---

[23] See C. Werman, "The First-Fruit Festivals according to the *Temple Scroll*," *ZAPHENATH-PANEAH: Linguistic Studies Presented to Elisha Qimron On the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. D. Sivan, D. Talshir, and C. Cohen; Beer-Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press, 2009), 177–95 (Hebrew). The attention paid to the type of wood and its freshness naturally results from the priestly desire to endow the sacrificial offerings with a pleasant odor. Another possible consideration stems from the wine poured straight into the fire according to priestly halakhah. After having that amount of liquid poured on it, only high quality wood would continue to burn.

[24] This was noted by Y. Nahmias, "New Festivals in the Festival Calendar of the *Temple Scroll*" (M.A. thesis, Tel-Aviv University, 2003), 88 (Hebrew).

cally appointed sacrifices, not as an independent sacrifice. Moreover, both the *Temple Scroll* and 4Q365 share the view that the Festival of Wood is divinely ordained. From their perspective, Nehemiah and his generation were not instituting a new tradition, but were obligating themselves to fulfill a divine Sinaitic commandment. Both texts would have identified the expression ככתוב בתורה, which concludes Neh 10:35, as indicating a Sinaitic directive mandating the wood-offering: that is, the obligation to bring the wood is itself written in the Torah, not only the general commandment to burn wood under the sacrifices ("to bring it into the house of our God…to burn upon the altar of the Lord our God, as it is written in the Law").

This claim to Sinaitic authority is understandable against the background of the sect's polemic against its opponents. The Qumran community, whose worldview did not admit patriarchal custom (in keeping with priestly halakhah in general),[25] was unwilling to acknowledge that the yearly bringing of wood was a custom fixed in Nehemiah's day; therefore, at Qumran, the bringing of wood became a heavenly law. Folk traditions, even when sanctioned by community leaders, were either to be opposed or attributed to the divine law. In this respect Qumran literature provides a window onto a phenomenon better known from the late First Temple period: i.e., the process whereby a folk custom is reshaped and transformed into biblical law. Evident in the Bible itself, such a process is exemplified by the acceptance and incorporation into the Holiness Code of folk traditions that the Priestly source ignored.[26] Qumran literature reluctantly changed a current, extrabiblical tradition to serve its halakhic outlook, which demanded the use of particularly fresh wood, and made this requirement part of the divine word.[27]

---

[25] C. Werman, "Oral Torah vs. Written Torah(s): Competing Claims to Authority," in *Rabbinic Perspectives: Rabbinic Literature and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 7–9 January, 2003* (ed. S. D. Fraade, A. Shemesh and R. A. Clements; STDJ 62; Leiden: Brill 2006), 175–97.

[26] See I. Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence: The Priestly Torah and the Holiness School* (trans. J. Feldman and P. Rodman; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995).

[27] Jacob Milgrom views 4Q365 as a version of the Bible and as indicative of the continued functioning of the Holiness School, which sought to incorporate a folk tradition into the Torah as late as the fourth century BCE; i.e., after Nehemiah's day. See J. Milgrom, "Qumran Biblical Hermeneutics: The Case of the Wood Offering," *RevQ* 16 (1994): 449–56. If Milgrom is correct, then the Festival of Oil mentioned in 4Q365 should have been included in his presumed biblical version. I find it less complicated

Lastly, I turn to the matter of how the Qumran texts point to the historical circumstances of the Second Temple period. I first address the question of the dating of the Wood Festival. I understand the *Temple Scroll* as mirroring a reality in which wood was brought to the Temple on several festive occasions during the year. The fact that the scroll assigns six days to the festival appears to indicate that the writer was familiar with a Wood Festival that fell on more than one date. That 4Q365 assigns six days to the festival may be attributed to its need to explain עתים מזמנים in the verse from Nehemiah. However, the *Temple Scroll*, which does not invoke this verse, nevertheless refrains from establishing a one-day festival comparable to the other first-fruit festivals in the *Scroll*. The number of sacrifices listed in the *Temple Scroll*, thirty-eight—two male goats for a sin-offering and thirty-six burnt offerings, three for each tribe—does not require that this festival be spread out over six days. Indeed, during the Festival of Wine, for example, forty-six sacrifices (twelve rams as burnt-offerings, the ten usual festival sacrifices, and twenty-four thanksgiving sacrifices) are offered on a single day.

At the same time, the *Temple Scroll* substantiates what arises from Rabban Simeon ben Gamliel's statement in *m. Taʿanit* (4:8) and Josephus' indirect testimony: namely, that the most important date for the bringing of wood was the fifteenth of Av. Cautiously, I suggest that the *Temple Scroll* is responding to the state of affairs described by Rabban Simeon ben Gamliel: לא היו ימים טובים לישראל כחמישה עשר באב וכיום הכיפורים שבהם בני ירושלים יוצאין בכלי לבן שאולים ובנות ירושלים יוצאות וחולות בכרמים. The *Temple Scroll* and Rabban Simeon ben Gamliel both stress the uniqueness of the Wood Festival and of the Day of Atonement as compared to other festivals. However, for Rabban Simeon ben Gamliel the common denominator is great joy and the mass presence of people dressed in white at the Temple, whereas in the *Temple Scroll* the successive offering of sacrifices, the bringing of sin-offerings, and the sprinkling of blood from a bowl are the particular characteristics of these occasions. In brief, gravity and not levity was to be the order of the day.

---

to view 4Q365 as a sectarian text with an authority base similar to that of *Jubilees,* the *Temple Scroll*, and other writings. On this authority base, see A. Shemesh and C. Werman, "Halakha at Qumran: Genre and Authority," *DSD* 10 (2003): 104–29.

The texts from Qumran also provide insight into the uses to which the wood was put. As noted earlier, 4Q365 attempts to eliminate the interpretation that קרבן העצים denotes the burning of the wood as an independent sacrifice in order to magnify the fire on the altar. The reworking of the verses from Nehemiah in a fashion that unequivocally establishes the meaning of the root ק.ר.ב, and the purpose for which the wood was brought, implies a polemic against those who claimed that the wood was brought not to provide an annual supply, but to embellish the fire on the altar. Such an inference suggests that the author of 4Q365 was perhaps familiar with a reality in which the donors placed a portion of the wood on the altar as an independent offering, and his statements come to oppose this practice.

As I understand it, the underlying picture presented by Qumran literature is of an environment in which families and individuals brought wood to the Temple on fixed dates over the course of the year, the most important of which was the fifteenth of Av. It remains difficult to determine precisely to what use the wood was put; we cannot exclude the possibility that some of the wood was placed on the altar on the days when it was brought, to intensify and enhance the fire.

The Wood Festival in Rabbinic Literature

The expression זמן עצי כהניא found in *Megillat Taʿanit* also appears in *m. Taʿan.* 4:5: זמן עצי כהנים והעם בתשעה. This Mishnah lists nine dates over the course of the year, mainly during the summer months (one in Tammuz, five in Av, and one in Elul), in which illustrious families, familiar from the genealogical lists in Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles, bring wood to the Temple:[28]

> זמן עצי כהנים והעם בתשעה. באחד בניסן—בני ארח בן יהודה; בעשרים בתמוז—בני דוד בן יהודה; בחמישה באב—בני פרעש בן יהודה; בשבעה בו—בני יונדב בן רכב; בעשרה בו—בני סנאה בן בנימין; בחמשה עשר בו—בני זתואל בן יהודה, ועמהם כהנים ולוים וכל מי שטעה שבטו ובני גונבי עלי ובני קוצעי קציעות; בעשרים בו—בני פחת מואב בן יהודה; בעשרים באלול—בני עדין בן יהודה; באחד בטבת שבו בני פרעש שנייה. באחד בטבת לא היה בו מעמד, שהיה בו הלל, וקרבן מוסף וקרבן עצים.
>
> The time of the wood of the priests and people [comes on] nine [occasions in the year]: On the first of Nisan [is the time of] the family of

[28] According to MS Parma; MS Kaufman has a similar reading.

> Araḥ b. Judah [Ezra 2:5; Neh 7:10]; on the twentieth of Tammuz [is the time of] the family of David b. Judah; on the fifth of Av [is the time of] the family of Parosh b. Judah [Ezra 2:3; Neh 7:8]; on the seventh of that month [is the time of] the family of Yonadab b. Rekhab [Neh 3:14: Malchijah ben Rekhab]; on the tenth of that month [is the time of] the family of Senaah b. Benjamin [Ezra 2:35; Neh 7:38]; on the fifteenth of that month [is the time of] the family of Zattuel b. Judah [or Zattu; Ezra 2:8; Neh 7:13]; and with them [comes the offering of] priests, Levites, and whoever is in error as to his tribe, and the pestle smugglers, and the fig pressers. On the twentieth of that same month [is the time of] the family of Paḥat Moab b. Judah [Ezra 2:6; Neh 8:11]; on the twentieth of Elul [is the offering of] the family of Adin b. Judah. On the first of Tebet the family of Parosh returned a second time. On the first of Tebet there was no *maʿamad*, for there was *Hallel* on that day, as well as an additional offering and a wood-offering.[29]

The status quo described by the Mishnah reflects the obligation attested in Nehemiah, to bring wood "into the house of our God, [according] to our fathers' houses, at times appointed, year by year." It also is in agreement with the Second Temple literary testimony that attributes prominence to the fifteenth of Av, as seen from the fact that on that date, as opposed to the other eight occasions, additional groups join the family whose assigned day it was.[30]

Yet, the Tosefta (*Taʿanit* 3:5) takes a different tack, one that obscures the clear Mishnaic testimony:

> מה ראו זמן עצי כהנים והעם לימנות, שכשעלו בני הגולה לא מצאו עצים בלשכה עמדו אילו והתנדבו עצים משל עצמן ומסרום לציבור, וכך התנו עמהן נביאים שאפי' לשכה מלאה עצים, ואפי' עצים משל ציבור יהוא אלו מתנדבין עצים בזמן הזה, וכל שעה שירצו, שנ' "והגרלות הפלנו על קרבן העצים הכהנים הלוים והעם להביא לבית אלהינו לבית אבתינו לעתים מזמנים" וגו' ואו' "כי עזרא הכין לבבו לדרוש את תורת ה' ולעשת וללמד בישראל חק ומשפט."
>
> Why did they set aside [special times for] the wood of priests and the people? For when the exiles came up, they found no wood in the wood-chamber. These in particular went and contributed wood of their own,

---

[29] J. Neusner's translation, slightly revised: J. Neusner, *The Mishnah: A New Translation* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), 314–15).

[30] Ostensibly, there is a word missing after בתשעה in the phrase זמן עצי כהנים והעם בתשעה. This difficult reading has led some scholars to propose that the Mishnah at some point read זמן עצי כהנים בתשעה באב. For discussion of this Mishnah and the dates it mentions, see Epstein, "Zeman," 3; Safrai, *Pilgrimage*, 222; and J. Heinemann, "The Meaning of Some Mishnayot in the Order *Moʿed*," *Tarbiz* 29 (1960): 29–31 (Hebrew).

> handing it over to the public. On that account prophets stipulated with them, that even if the wood-chamber is loaded with wood, even if wood should be contributed by the public, these should have the privilege of contributing wood at this time, and at any occasion on which they wanted, as it is said, *We have likewise cast lots, the priests, the Levites, and the people, for the wood-offering, to bring it into the house of our God, [according] to our fathers' houses, at times appointed, year by year*…(Neh 10:35). And it says, *For Ezra had set his heart to study the law of the Lord and to do it, and to teach his statutes and ordinances in Israel* (Ezra 7:10).[31]

This Tosefta relates to our Mishnah[32] by asking why specific families were given fixed times for bringing wood (in Lieberman's words: "Every person who brings a wood-offering [as a personal sacrifice], it is a festive day for him").[33] In its answer, the Tosefta points to the prophets Ezra and Nehemiah as the source for the Mishnaic halakhah. It indicates that the families appointed in the Mishnah acquired the privilege of bringing wood on fixed dates because of a noble deed they had performed during the *Shivat Zion* period (in the Tosefta's words: שכשעלו בני הגולה). Because there was no wood in the Temple storehouse at that time, the families in question "went and contributed wood of their own, handing it over to the public." On that account, prophets, i.e., Ezra and Nehemiah, stipulated that the members of these families "should have the privilege of contributing wood at this time, and at any occasion on which they wanted," even if there was no need for wood at that time, and even if the "wood should be contributed by the public."

A comparison with Nehemiah is instructive for arriving at an understanding of the Tosefta. In contrast to the Tosefta, Nehemiah recounts nothing of the generosity of the clans prior to their acceptance of the obligation; nor is the obligation presented as a privilege granted to specific clans because of their beneficence. Moreover, in describing what took place in Ezra and Nehemiah's day according to the portrait depicted in the Mishnah, the story in the Tosefta is

---

[31] J. Neusner translation, slightly revised. Unless otherwise noted, all translations of the Tosefta are cited from: J. Neusner (ed.), *The Tosefta: Second Division, Moed* (New York: Ktav, 1981).

[32] That the Tosefta is interpreting the Mishnah is evident from the continuation in halakhah 6 which speaks of אותן ימים, namely, the occasions mentioned in the Mishnah, and by the fact that halakhah 7 explains two terms that appear in the Mishnah: גונבי עלי and קוצעי קציעות.

[33] Lieberman, *Tosefta ki-fshutah*, 5:1111.

somewhat anachronistic: in Nehemiah the entire population, according to clans, obligates itself to bring wood, whereas according to the Tosefta, this obligation was only undertaken by the families specifically listed in the Mishnah.[34]

Closer examination of the Tosefta shows that the explanation it offers for the Mishnah is the result of a contradiction it attempts to resolve. Alluded to in the course of the Tosefta, this contradiction lies in the picture evoked by the Mishnah, wherein individual families donate wood, which opposes the rabbinic principle that the public cult must be funded only from public funds, namely, from the half-shekel.[35] It is the Tosefta's awareness of this contradiction that motivates its rewriting of the biblical account. The description of the families' actions—"These in particular went and contributed wood of their own, *handing it over to the public*"—implies awareness on the part of the donor families in Nehemiah's day that the public cult had to be funded from public money. Consequently, the donation was not made directly to the Temple, but rather to the public, and it was the public that brought the wood to the Temple. The Tosefta states that the clans are permitted to continue their practice "even if the wood chamber was filled with wood donated by the public," because so "the prophets had stipulated with them."[36] The statement, "the prophets had stipulated with them," makes the anachronism in the Tosefta understandable. In

---

[34] Note that the Tosefta solves another difficulty found in Nehemiah, that is, why the wood is not funded from the one-third shekel. According to the Tosefta, the wood brought by the families is simply in addition to that funded by the one-third shekel; the bringing of the wood is a privilege granted only to particular individuals.

[35] This halakhah is a fundamental principle of *m. Šeqalim*, esp. 4:1–4. It is also found in *Sifre Num.* 142 (see *Siphre ad Numeros adjecto Siphre zutta* [ed. H. S. Horovitz; Leipzig: Gustav Frock, 1917; repr. Jerusalem: Wahrmann, 1966], 188). For a brief survey of the different scholarly opinions, see Noam, *Megillat Taʿanit*, 172–73.

[36] This wording התנו עמהן נביאים appears only once more in Tannaitic literature, also in *t. Taʿanit* (2:1). This halakhah, which treats the division of the priestly families into watches, addresses the question of the status of the watch of Jehoiarib. Based on Ezra 2:36, the halakhah states that the priests were divided into four families: Jedaiah, Harim, Pashḥur, and Immer. Surprised at the absence of a fifth family, that of Jehoiarib, the Tosefta concludes that even though Jehoiarib had the status of a family, it is counted not as an independent family but as one of the twenty-four watches, for "so the prophets stipulated with them, that even if Jehoiarib should come up from exile, not one of them would be removed on his account, but he would be made subordinate to him." The prophetic stipulation ostensibly solves the contradiction between the early Second Temple period reality that emerges from the time of Ezra, when the family of Jehoiarib was a branch of the house of Jedaiah (from which the high priests were chosen until Antiochus Epiphanes' accession), and the situation in the late Second Temple period, when Jehoiarib was the most prominent family because its

facing the discomfiting situation described in the Mishnah, wherein illustrious families are said to have brought wood privately, in seeming contradiction to rabbinic halakhah, the Tosefta claims that the roots of this practice lie in the ancient past, when the prophets released these families from the obligation to obey the rabbinic principle.

The Tosefta can be understood as further reducing the contradiction between the biblical account and the rabbinic principle by restricting the agreement between the prophets Ezra and Nehemiah and the donor families to their own generation. The manuscript editions of the Tosefta read as follows: יהוא אלו מתנדבין עצים בזמן הזה, וכל שעה שירצו. The question is how to understand בזמן הזה. Does this expression allude to the prophets' day, in which case וכל שעה שירצו refers to future generations? Or, does בזמן הזה refer to the dates enumerated in the Mishnah, in which case וכל שעה שירצו refers to additional days during the year? Lieberman, who opts for the first understanding of בזמן הזה as referring to the period of the prophets,[37] emends the following text according to MS Erfurt: בזמן הזה, בכל שעה שירצו. Thus, according to this reading, כל שעה שירצו is also restricted to the period of the prophets, and the practice of bringing wood is sanctioned only for the prophets' day.

From a linguistic perspective the suggested emendation is not essential. Evidently, Lieberman proposed it because the following halakhah (3:6) can be interpreted (as he does) as evidence that for most of the Second Temple period the families in question did *not* bring wood to the Temple, and that the dates cited in the Mishnah simply reflect commemoration of an ancestral practice:

> אותן ימים אסורין בהספד ובתענית, בין משחרב הבית ועד שלא חרב הבית. ר' יוסה אומ' משחרב הבית מותרין, מפני שאבל הוא להם. אמ' ר' לעזר בי ר' צדוק אני הייתי מבני סנואה בן בנימן וחל תשעה באב להיות בשבת ודחינוהו לאחר שבת והיינו מתענין ולא משלימין.
>
> Those days it is prohibited to conduct the rite of mourning or to have a fast, whether this is after the destruction of the Temple or before the destruction of the Temple. R. Yosa says, "After the destruction of the Temple it is permitted [to lament or to fast], because it is an expression of mourning for them." Said R. Eleazar b. R. Ṣadoq, "I was among the

members, the Hasmoneans, were in power. In this instance the contradiction resolved by the prophetic stipulation is a political, not halakhic, one.

[37] This appears to be correct, because whenever the phrase בזמן הזה appears elsewhere in the Tosefta it refers to a period of time, not to a specific calendar date.

> descendants of Sanaʾah of the tribe of Benjamin. One time the Ninth of Av coincided with the day after the Sabbath, and we observed the fast but did not complete it.

This Tosefta deals with the commemoration of "those days" of the wood-offering through their auxiliary prohibitions of fasting and eulogies. The suggestion that these prohibitions be continued *after* the destruction implies that, even *before* the destruction, no wood was actually brought on these days; they were observed as days of rejoicing, commemorated through these auxiliary practices. The Tosefta inserts R. Eleazar ben R. Ṣadoq's testimony to the effect that his family continued to celebrate the day of the wood-offering even after the destruction, when the ninth of Av had become a day of mourning. Rabbi Yosa, in a minority opinion, holds that wood was brought before the destruction; consequently, the families can eulogize or fast on those days after the destruction, because this constitutes an expression of mourning.[38]

The explanation proposed above for the phrase אותן ימים אסורין בהספד ובתענית, בין משחרב הבית ועד שלא חרב הבית is not the only one possible. Perhaps the Tosefta maintained that the clans continued to celebrate the days of the Wood Festival after the destruction, even though the actual bringing of wood no longer took place. In that case, Rabbi Yosa, who opposes the leading opinion in the Tosefta, is arguing that it is not possible that these joyous days did not become days of mourning. However in halakhah 5 the redactor of the Tosefta grapples with the contradiction between the requirement that public sacrifices receive public funding and the custom described in Nehemiah, and rewrites the biblical account in order to blur the incongruity. Accordingly we might suggest that halakhah 6 was shaped by the redactor's desire to deny the existence of a custom created in the early Second Temple period. Consequently, the *tanna qamma*'s opinion is that the custom of bringing wood was cancelled during the Second Temple period; the celebrations were simply commemorative and did not reflect a current practice of wood-bringing.

I submit that the next two halakhot in *t. Taʿanit* (3:7–8) also seek to obscure the lack of consistency between the ancient custom and the halakhah barring individuals from making donations to the public

[38] On the Amoraic development of Rabbi Yosa's opinion, see A. Schremer, "The Concluding Passage of *Megilat Taʿanit* and the Nullification of Its Halakhic Significance during the Talmudic Period," *Zion* 65 (2000): 436–37 (Hebrew).

sacrificial cult. Halakhah 7 explains the names of two of the groups mentioned in the Mishnah, גונבי עלי וקוצעי קציעות.

> מהו בני גונבי עלי ובני קוצעי קציעות? שבשעה שהושיבו מלכי יון פרדדיאות על הדרכי' שלא לעלות לירושלם כדרך שהושיב ירבעם בן נבט, כל מי שהוא כשר וירא חטא באותו הדור מה היה עושה, הוא מביא את הביכורים, ועושין כמין סלים ומחפן בקציעות, ונוטל את הסל ואת הבכורים ומחפן כמין קציעות[39] ומניחן בסלים ונוטל את הסל ואת העלי על כתיפו ועולה, כשהגיע לאותו משמר, אמרו לו לאן אתה הולך, אמ' להם לעשות שתי קציעות הללו, שני כפין של דבילה, במכתש הלז שבפניו, בעלי זה שעל כתפי, כיון שעבר מאותו משמר, מעטרן ומעלן לירושלם
>
> What was the matter having to do with the Pestle-Smugglers and the Fig-Pressers? Now when the Greek kings set up border guards on the roads, so that people could not go up to Jerusalem, just as Jeroboam the son of Nebat did,[40] then, whoever was a suitable person and sin-fearing of that generation—what did he do? He would take up his first fruits and make a kind of basket and cover them with a kind of dried figs, and he would put them in a basket and take the basket and a pestle on his shoulder and go up. Now when he would come to that guard, [the guard] would say to him, "Where are you going?" He said to him, "To make these two rings of dried figs into cakes of pressed figs in that press over there, with this pestle which is on my shoulder. Once he got by that guard, he would prepare a wreath for them and bring them up to Jerusalem.

According to the Tosefta, the names of the groups mentioned in the Mishnah echo their brave deeds during a period of religious persecution. The pestle-smugglers and the fig-pressers risked their lives to bring first-fruits under the guise of preparing pressed figs with a pestle.

Halakhah 8 of the Tosefta concerns another group not mentioned in the Mishnah: the sons of סלמי הנתוצתי, about whom it recounts a similar story. According to the Tosefta, the sons of Salmai the Netotzathite concealed their wood-offering as a ladder, which they then dismantled in order to bring the wood to the Temple:

> מהו אומר בני סלמאי הנטופתי (Ms. Erfuhrt: הנתוצתי)? שעה שהושיבו מלכי יון פרסדדיאות על הדרכים שלא לעלות לירושלם, כדרך שהושיב

---

[39] On the corruption of the text here, see Lieberman, *Tosefta ki-fshutah* 5:1114. MS Vienna reads: היה מביא את ביכוריו ונותנן לתוך הסל ומחפה אותן קציעות ונוטל את הסל ואת העלי וכו'.

[40] The tradition that Jeroboam ben Nebat placed guards on the roads appears in *Seder Olam Rabbah* 22. The author of this unit in the Tosefta was familiar with the tradition and compares it to a similar instance of religious persecution under Greek rule.

ירבעם בן נבט, כל מי שהוא ירא חטא וכשר באותו הדור היה נוטל שני גזירי עצים ועושה אותן כמין סולם, ומניחן על כתיפו ועולה, כשהגיע לאותו משמר, אמרו לו לאן אתה הולך, ליטול שני גוזלות משובך הלז שבפני, בסולם זה שעל כתפי, כיון שעבר מאותו משמר, מפרקן ומעלן לירושלם.

What is the matter having to do with the sons of Salmai the Netotzathite? Now when the Greek kings set up guards on the roads so that the people should not go up to Jerusalem, just as Jeroboam the son of Nebat did, then whoever was a suitable and sin-fearing person of that generation would take two pieces of wood and make them into a kind of ladder and put it on his shoulder and go up. And when he came to that guard, [the guard] said to him, "Where are you going?" "To fetch two pigeons from that dovecot over there, with this ladder on my shoulder." Once he got by that guard, he would dismantle [the pieces of wood of the ladder] and bring them up to Jerusalem.

There is a discrepancy between the stories in the Tosefta and the account in the Mishnah. The Tosefta frames both the story of the wood-offering (halakhah 8) and that of the first-fruits (halakhah 7) in the context of martyrdom. Moreover, the names that appear in the Mishnah—גונבי עלי and קוצעי קציעות—are associated in the Tosefta with the first-fruits, not the wood-offering; a different group, בני סלמי הנתוצתי, is linked to the wood-offering. Perhaps it was not the Tosefta that first portrayed the pestle-smugglers and fig-pressers as bringing first-fruits. The Tosefta might reflect here a source in which the ancient halakhah cited earlier, להן כל אינש די יהוי עלוי אעין ובכורין, was developed and justified in light of brave deeds during times of persecution. The ancient affinity between first-fruits and the wood-offering, as illustrated by this halakhah, may explain the seemingly unexplainable situation where two groups are related in the Mishnah to the wood-offering and in the Tosefta to the first-fruits.

The important point for our discussion is the fact that the groups mentioned in the Mishnah become in the Tosefta bringers of first-fruits who endangered themselves under Greek rule. According to the Tosefta, these groups have no past or present connection to the bringing of wood; they belong to circles that celebrate the bringing of first-fruits in dangerous times. This description of the pestle-smugglers and fig-pressers has implications for the grouping of "priests, Levites, and whoever is in error as to his tribe," mentioned earlier in the Mishnah. These, too, are transformed from joyous bringers of wood in the present into groups commemorating unusual deeds in the past. More importantly, the Tosefta chooses to add another name which appears to denote a family, but actually refers to individuals ("whoever was a suitable and sin-fearing person of that generation") who risked their

lives to serve the public by bringing wood to the Temple; and therefore, for them as well, the fifteenth of Av was a day of rejoicing.

The stories found in halakhot 7–8 of the Tosefta create a new common denominator between the groups mentioned in the Mishnah, but in so doing depart from the Mishnah's original meaning. According to the plain sense of the Mishnah, all the groups enumerated bring wood to the Temple. According to the Tosefta, all the groups in the Mishnah engaged in commendable, praiseworthy acts, as summarized by the ending of halakhah 8 in the Tosefta: "Now because they were prepared to give up their lives for the Torah and for the commandments, therefore they found for themselves a good name and a good memorial forever. And concerning them Scripture says, *The memory of a righteous person is for a blessing* [Prov 10:17]. But concerning Jeroboam son of Nebat and his allies, Scripture says, *But the name of the wicked will rot* [Prov 10:17]." However, according to the Tosefta there are two subgroups. Most of the names mentioned in the Mishnah belong to families from the period of *Shivat Zion* who donated wood. The remaining groups are public servants from the period of Greek persecution who risked their lives to fulfill the tasks of bringing first-fruits and wood to the Temple. This transformation in the Tosefta blurs the distinction between custom and halakhah, in order to establish that there was no divergence from halakhah in either the past or the present. By juxtaposing halakhot 7 and 8 to halakhot 5 and 6 the Tosefta heightens the uncertainty as to whether the families mentioned in the Mishnah brought wood during the Temple period or whether, they—like the pestle-smugglers and the fig-pressers and the sons of Salmai the Netotzathite—simply celebrated their past deeds. [41]

Yet, in one place, the Tosefta assumes that wood *was* brought to the Temple:

> זמן עצי הכוהנים והעם בתשעה[42] וטעונין לינה. והיו מתעסקין בהן[43] כדרך שמתעסקין בביכורין.
>
> The appointed times [for bringing the] wood-offering of the priests and the people are on nine, and [those who bring the wood-offering are]

[41] See Appendix A below on the Yerushalmi's reworking of the Tosefta.

[42] As noted, the text of the printed editions of the Tosefta, בתשעה באב, may be an addition meant to solve the obscurity of this difficult reading and is understandable given the centrality of Av in the list of dates on which there were festive occasions, five out of the nine.

[43] According to Lieberman, *Tosefta ki-fshutah*, 2:849–50.

> required to spend the night [in Jerusalem]. They [the inhabitants of Jerusalem] would treat them [those that brought the wood-offering] in the same manner as they treat [those who brought] the first-fruits. (*t. Bikk.* 2:9)

This Tosefta is meaningless if the families came empty-handed. If no wood was brought and placed on the altar, there would be no need for the donors to stay overnight in Jerusalem after bringing the offering.[44] There are other allusions in rabbinic literature to the bringing of the wood to the Temple: the halakhah that on the days of the wood-offering there were no *maʿamadot* (*m. Taʿan.* 4:4; *t. Taʿan.* 3:4) indicates the existence of some sort of Temple ritual associated with the wood-offering. Thus, *t. Taʿan.* 3:5–8 denies a reality to which 3:4 attests in close proximity. Since the Tosefta's interpretation of the Mishnah was shown to be biased and the product of a halakhic difficulty created by individuals bringing public offerings, it can be dismissed as unreliable.

Accordingly, the evidence from *m. Taʿanit* cited in the opening of the current section appears to reliably document the state of affairs during the Second Temple period, in which prominent families, each on its appointed date, brought wood-offerings to the Temple. The primary date for these offerings was the fifteenth of Av, when the family to whom this day belonged—that of Zattu ben Judah—was accompanied by additional groups. Although the donations were intended for the Temple storehouse, perhaps a portion of the wood was festively burned on the altar on those days. The obligation put in place by Nehemiah was accepted and maintained by the people, even though the huge sums collected through the donation of the half-shekel might have made that obligation superfluous in the late Second Temple period.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I submit that we must recognize that the people of the Second Temple period obeyed neither the Qumran priests nor

---

[44] *Sifre Deuteronomy* contains a midrash demanding an overnight stay in Jerusalem for those bringing the wood-offering: "*And thou shalt turn in the morning, and go unto thy tents* (16:7): Hence we learn that this requires an overnight stay (in Jerusalem). Now this applies only to animal sacrifices; whence do we learn that it applies also to fowls, meal-offerings, wine, incense, and wood? From the expression, *And thou shalt turn*—any time you turn (from the Temple), it must be from the morning onward" (*Piska* 134; trans. R. Hammer, *Sifre: A Tannaitic Commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy* [Yale Judaica Series 24; New Haven: Yale University Press], 176–77). The verse in Deuteronomy refers to the paschal sacrifice; the midrash broadens its scope by specifying additional offerings that require an overnight stay in Jerusalem.

the Pharisees and rabbinic halakhah. A critical reading of rabbinic literature and careful consideration of Qumran literature indicates the complexity of the reality of the age and the convoluted nature of the halakhic response to that complexity. Because of its content and origin, the custom of bringing wood to the Temple, an ancient folk custom practiced during the Second Temple period, was looked on with disfavor by the halakhic decision-makers, both contemporary and later. Denying its folk origins and making it a Sinaitic injunction, the Qumranites accepted its existence but reshaped it to fit their cultic requirements. Rabbinic literature denied the implementation of the custom and simultaneously portrayed it as a prophetic stipulation.

Appendix A. The Tosefta and the Yerushalmi

Tosefta Taʿanit 3:5–8 (ed. Lieberman, pp. 338–340)	*Yerushalmi Taʿanit* 68b (p. 730)
1. מה ראו זמן עצי כהנים והעם לימנות, שכשעלו בני הגולה לא מצאו עצים בלשכה עמדו אילו והתנדבו עצים משל עצמן ומסרום לציבור, וכך התנו עמהן נביאים שאפי' לשכה מלאה עצים, ואפי' עצים משל ציבור, יהוא אלו מתנדבין עצים בזמן הזה וכל שעה שירצו, שנ' "והגורלות הפלנו על קרבן העצים הכהנים והלוים והעם להביא אל בית ה' אלהינו לבית אבותינו לעתים מזומנים" וגו' ואו' "כי עזרא הכין לבבו" וגו'. (ג 5)	1. מה ראה זמן עצי כהנים והעם להימנות. אלא שבשעה שעלו יש' מן הגולה לא מצאו עצים בלישכה. ועמדו אילו ונתנדבו עצים משלעצמן ומסרום לציבור וקרבו מהן קרבנות ציבור. והתנו עמהן הנביאים שביניהן שאפילו לשכה מליאה עצים [שיהיו מביאין מעצמן]. ועמדו אילו ונתנדבו עצים משלעצמן. שלא יהא קרבן מתקרב אלא משלהן תחילה.
	2. אמ' ר' אחא דר' יוסה היא. דר' יוסי אמ' אף הרוצה מתנדב שומר חנם. ר' יוסי בשם ר' אילא דברי הכל היא מה פליגין בגופו של קרבן. אבל במכשירי קרבן כל עמא מודיי שהוא משתנה [מן] קרבן יחיד (מ)[ל]קרבן ציבור.
3. אותן ימים אסורין בהספד ובתענית, בין משחרב הבית ובין עד שלא חרב הבית, ר' יוסה אומ' משחרב הבית מותרין, מפני שאבל הוא להם. אמ' ר' לעזר בי ר' צדוק אני הייתי מבני סנואה בן בנימן וחל תשעה באב להיות בשבת ודחינוהו לאחר שבת והיינו מתענין ולא משלימין. (ג 6)	3. מתנית' פליג' על ר' יוסי. אותן הימים נוהגין בהן בשעת קרבן ושלא בשעת קרבן. ר' יוסה או'. אינן נוהגין אלא בשעת קרבן. ועוד מן הדא דתני. אמ' ר' לעזר בי' ר' יוסי אנו היינו מבני סנאה בן בנימן. וחל תשעה באב להיות בשבת. ודחינו אותו למוצאי שבת. והיו מתענין ולא משלימין.

(*cont.*)

Tosefta Taʿanit 3:5–8 (ed. Lieberman, pp. 338–340)	*Yerushalmi Taʿanit* 68b (p. 730)
4. מהו בני גונבי עלי ובני קוצעי קציעות, שבשעה שהושיבו מלכי יון פרדדיאות על הדרכי' שלא לעלות לירושלם כדרך שהושיב ירבעם בן נבט, כל מי שהוא כשר וירא חטא באותו הדור מה היה עושה, הוא מביא את הביכורים, ועושין כמין סלים ומחפן בקציעות, ונוטל את הסל ואת הבכורים ומחפן כמין קציעות[45] ומניחן בסלים ונוטל את הסל ואת העלי על כתיפו ועולה, כשהגיע לאותו משמר, אמרו לו לאן אתה הולך, אמ' להם לעשות שתי קציעות הללו, שני כפין של דבילה, במכתש הלז שלפני, בעלי זה שעל כתפי, כיון שעבר מאותו משמר, מעטרן ומעלן לירושלם. (ג 7)	4. מהו בני גונבי עלי ובני קוצעי קציעות. אלא בשעה שהושיב ירבעם בן נבט פרסדאות על הדרכים לא היו מניחין את ישראל לעלות לירושלם. כל מי שהיה כשר וירא חט באותו הדור היה מביא את בכוריו ונותנן לתוך הסל ומחפה אותן קציעות ונוטל את העלי ונותן את הסל על כתיפו ונוטל את העלי בידו. וכיון שהיה מגיע באותו המשמר היו אומ' לו. לאיכן אתה הולך. והוא או' לו. איני הולך אלא לעשות מעט קציעות הללו כפות אחד שלדבילה בעלי הזה שבידי. וכיון שהיה עובר את אותו המשמר היה מעטרן ומעלה אותן לירושלם.
5. מהו אומר בני סלמאי הנתוצתי, בשעה שהושיבו מלכי יון פרסדדיאות על הדרכים שלא לעלות לירושלם, כדרך שהושיב ירבעם בן נבט, כל מי שהוא ירא חטא וכשר באותו הדור היה נוטל שני גזירי עצים ועושה אותן כמין סולם, ומניחן על כתיפו ועולה, כשהגיע לאותו משמר, אמרו לו לאן אתה הולך, ליטול שני גוזלות משובך הלז שבפני, בסולם זה שעל כתפי, כיון שעבר מאותו משמר, מפרקן ומעלן לירושלם. לפי שמסרו עצמן על התורה ועל המצות, לפיכך נמצא להם שם טוב וזכר טוב בעולם ועליהם הוא אומר "זכר צדיק לברכה" ועל ירבעם בן נבט וחביריו הוא אומר "ושם רשעים ירקב." (ג 8)	5. מהו או' בני סלמיי הנתיצתי. אלא כל מי שהיה מתנדב עצים וגזירים למערכה היה מביא עצים ועושה אותן כמין שלבין ועושה אותן כמין סולם ונותנן על כתיפיו. וכיון שהיה מגיע לאותו המשמר היה או' לו. לאיכן אתה הולך. והוא או' לו. איני הולך אלא להביא שני גוזלות הללו מן השובך זה שלפניי בסולם הזה שעל כתיפיי. וכיון שהיה עובר את אותו המשמר היה מפרקן ומעלה אותן לירושלם. על ידי שנתנו את נפשם למצות זכו לקנות שם טוב בעולם. ועליהם הוא או' "זיכר צדיק לברכה."

[45] For the reading found in MS Vienna, see n. 39.

Above, I considered the message that emerges from the Tosefta. The corresponding passage in the Yerushalmi, which has close affinities to the Tosefta, takes a much more decisive tone. The redactor's intention was evidently to establish as the majority opinion that the custom of voluntarily bringing wood during the Second Temple period was restricted to ancient times.

The opening of the Talmudic *sugya* is straightforward: the prophetic agreement with the families stipulates that even if the storehouse is well-stocked with wood, the wood that they bring will be offered first. The stipulation has no temporal reference; the expression בזמן הזה וכל שעה שירצו is missing from the Yerushalmi. It appears, then, that this is a permanent stipulation. Yet, in the continuation, the redactor indicates that the Mishnah, as interpreted by the Yerushalmi, represents a minority opinion, that of Rabbi Yosa, who, according to *m. Šeqal.* 4:1 does not insist on a clear distinction between private and public funding for the public sacrificial cult (in the language of the Yerushalmi: אף הרוצה מתנדב שומר חנם). In *m. Šeqalim*, R. Yosa teaches that it is permissible for someone to volunteer to guard a field during the sabbatical year from which produce will be taken for the public sacrifices, even though this act makes him the owner of the crop. According to the redactor of our *sugya*, just as Rabbi Yosa does not insist on maintaining the boundary between public and private in *m. Šeqalim*, so too here, he does not so insist. By contrast, in the redactor's view, most of the rabbis thought that the families were not allowed to bring wood.

The suggestion put forth by Rabbi Yosé b. Rabbi Ila, that the Mishnah reflects the majority opinion, holding that it *is* permissible for individuals to donate sacrifice-related things, is rejected on the basis of a quotation from a Tannaitic source similar to the Tosefta, in which R. Yosa is shown to disagree with the *tanna qamma*: אותן הימים נוהגין בהן בשעת קרבן ושלא בשעת קרבן. ר' יוסה או'. אינן נוהגין אלא בשעת קרבן. This Tannaitic source, whose interpretation I have questioned above,[46] is given an unequivocal explanation in the Yerushalmi as rejecting Rabbi Yosé b. Rabbi Ila's suggestion. The disagreement revolves around whether or not wood was brought during the time of the Temple. The *tanna qamma* holds that the dates of the wood-offering are still celebrated after the destruction of the Temple (אותן הימים נוהגין בהן בשעת קרבן ושלא בשעת קרבן), implying, that even

[46] See pp. 169–70.

before the destruction wood was not brought to the Temple. Rabbi Yosa holds that these dates are not celebrated after the destruction, namely, he maintains that wood was offered before the destruction and that the destruction of the Temple ended the custom and its celebration. The redactor prefaces Rabbi Eleazar b. Rabbi Yosé's attestation to the continued keeping of the festival even after the destruction with the words ועוד מן הדא דתני, namely, that this comes to support the *tanna qamma*'s view.

Another difference between the Tosefta and the Yerushalmi lies in the historical placement of the events. In the Yerushalmi, the story of the persecution is set in the time of Jeroboam ben Nebat. The features that identify the prophets as belonging to the Second Temple period disappear and the Yerushalmi cites no prooftexts. Nor does it identify the group that came from exile as בני הגולה, a designation applicable only during the Second Temple period. Thus, the tradition of the wood-offering in all its variants belongs to the very distant past.

According to the Yerushalmi, the majority opinion is that the wood-offering was not brought during the Second Temple period. Perhaps that is why an alternative tradition, assigning the importance of the fifteenth of Av to a reason other than the bringing of wood, developed during the Amoraic generation.[47] The Yerushalmi goes far afield and submits that the wood cut on that date was of special quality:

> ר' יעקב בר אחא בשם ר' יסא: שבו]היינו, טו באב[זמן קיצה יפה לעצים, שכל עצים שהם נקצצין בו אינן עושין מאכולות כהיא דתנינן תמן כל עץ שנמצא בו תולעת פסול מעל גבי המזבח [מידות ב 5].
>
> R. Yaakov b. Aha in the name of R. Yassa: That day [i.e., the fifteenth of Av] is a good time for cutting trees, for all the trees being cut on that day are not eaten [by worm]. As the one that was taught there [*m. Middot* 2:5]: Any tree with a worm found in it is not allowed on the altar. (*Yerushalmi Taʿanit* 68c [p. 738])

According to the Bavli, the fifteenth of Av is the last date for the cutting of trees:

> רבה ורב יוסף דאמרי תרוויהו, יום שפסקו מלכרות עצים למערכת. דתניא ר' אליעזר הגדול אומר מטו באב ואילך תשש כוחה של חמה ולא היו כורתין עצים למערכה לפי שאינן יבשין. אמר רב מנשיא וקרו ליה תבר מגל.
>
> Rabbah and R. Joseph both said: It is the day on which [every year] they discontinued felling trees for the altar. It has been taught: R. Eliezer

[47] Mandel, "There Were No Happier Days," 170 n. 92.

the elder says: From the fifteenth of Av onwards the strength of the sun grows less and they no longer fell trees for the altar because they are not sufficiently dry. R. Menashya said: And they called it the day of the breaking of the Axe. (*b. Taʿanit* 30b)[48]

Appendix B. The Scholium to Megillat Taʿanit

A comparison of the two versions of the *scholium* to *Megillat Taʿanit* with the Tosefta and the Yerushalmi indicates the secondary nature of the *scholium*. The following synopsis allows us to compare MS Oxford of the *scholium* with the Tosefta and the Yerushalmi.[49]

Tosefta *Taʿanit* 3:5–8	*Yerushalmi* *Taʿanit* 68b	*Scholium* (MS Oxford)
מה ראו זמן עצי כהנים והעם לימנות.	מה ראה זמן עצי כהנים והעם להימנות.	וזהו ששנינו: זמן עצי הכהנים. וזהו שאו': בחמישה עשר בו בני זתוא בן יהודה ועמהם בני הכהנים ולוים וגרים ונתינים ועבדים משוחררים וכל מי שטעה בשבטו ובני גונבי עלי ובני קוצעי קציעות.
(א) שכשעלו בני הגולה לא מצאו עצים בלשכה עמדו אילו והתנדבו עצים משל עצמן ומסרום לציבור, וכך התנו עמהן נביאים שאפי' לשכה מלאה עצים, ואפי' עצים משל ציבור יהוא אלו מתנדבין עצים בזמן הזה, וכל שעה שירצו, שנ' "והגרלות הפלנו על קרבן העצים הכהנים הלוים והעם להביא לבית אלהינו לבית אבתינו לעתים מזמנים" וגו' ואו' "כי עזרא הכין לבבו" וגו' אותן ימים אסורין בהספד ובתענית, בין משחרב הבית ועד שלא חרב הבית. (ג 5–6a)	(א) אלא שבשעה שעלו יש' מן הגולה ולא מצאו עצים בלישכה ועמדו אילו ונתנדבו עצים משלעצמן ומסרום לציבור וקרבו מהן קרבנות ציבור. והתנו עמהן הנביאים שביניהן שאפילו לשכה מליאה עצים [שיהיו מביאין מעצמן] ועמדו אילו ונתנדבו עצים משלעצמן שלא יהא קרבן מתקרב אלא משלהן תחילה.	(ב-ג) מה הם גונבי עלי? גונבים העלי (ב) והביכורים (ב) בימי ירבעם בן נבט, שהושיב משמרות שלא יעלו ישראל לרגל, והם היו מעטרין סליהם בתאנים (ב) ועלי עץ (ג) על כתפיהם. מצאו משמרות ואמרו להם: לאן אתם הולכין? אמרו להם למקום פלוני לעשות צמוקין במכתשת שלפנינו ובעלי שעל כתפינו. הגיעו לירושלים, הורידום והניחום לפני המזבח, הסלים לביכורים והגוזלות (ג) לקיץ המזבח…

[48] The translation of the Bavli is according to I. Epstein, *The Babylonian Talmud, Seder Moed* (London: Soncino, 1938), 163–64.

[49] For a comparison of all the sources, see Noam, *Megillat Taʿanit*, 221.

(*cont.*)

Tosefta *Taʿanit* 3:5–8	*Yerushalmi* *Taʿanit* 68b	*Scholium* (MS Oxford)
(ב) מהו בני גונבי עלי ובני קוצעי קציעות שבשעה שהושיבו מלכי יון פרדדיאות על הדרכים שלא לעלות לירושלם כדרך שהושיב ירבעם בן נבט, כל מי שהוא כשר וירא חטא באותו הדור מה היה עושה, הוא מביא את הביכורים, ועושין כמין סלים ומחפן בקציעות ונוטל את הסל ואת הבכורים ומחפן כמין קציעות ומניחן בסלים ונוטל את הסל ואת העלי על כתיפו ועולה, הגיע לאותו משמר, אמרו לו לאן אתה הולך, אמ' להם לעשות שתי קציעות הללו, שתי כפין של דבילה, במכתש הלז שבפניו בעלי זה שעל כתפי, כיון שעבר מאותו משמר, מעטרן ומעלן לירושלם. (ג 7)	(ב) מהו בני גונבי עלי ובני קוצעי קציעות אלא בשעה שהושיב ירבעם בן נבט פרסדאות על הדרכים לא היו מניחין את ישראל לעלות לירושלם. כל מי שהיה כשר וירא חט באותו הדור היה מביא את בכוריו ונותנן לתוך הסל ומחפה אותן קציעות ונוטל את העלי ונותנן את הסל על כתיפו ונוטל את העלי בידו. וכיון שהיה מגיע באותו המשמר היו אומ' לו לאיכן אתה הולך. והוא או' לו איני הולך אלא לעשות מעט קציעות הללו כפות אחד שלדבילה בעלי הזה שבידי. וכיון שהיה עובר את אותו המשמר היה מעטרן ומעלה אותן לירושלם.	(א) בני זתוא בן יהודה למה נכתבו? כשעלו בני הגולה לא היה להם עצים בלשכה. התנדבו בני זתוא עצים ומסרום לציבור. התקינו שאע"פ שהלשכה מלאה עצים, יתנדבו עצים למערכה כל זמן שירצו.
(ג) מהו אומר בני סלמאי הנתוצתי, שעה שהושיבו מלכי יון פרסדדיאות על הדרכים שלא לעלות לירושלם, כדרך שהושיב ירבעם בן נבט, כל מי שהוא ירא חטא וכשר באותו הדור היה נוטל שני גזירי עצים ועושה אותן כמין סולם, ומניחן על כתיפו ועולה, כשהגיע לאותו משמר, אמרו לו לאן אתה הולך, ליטול שני גוזלות משובך הלז שבפני, בסולם זה שעל כתפי, כיון שעבר מאותו משמר, מפרקן ומעלן לירושלם. לפי שמסרו עצמן על התורה ועל המצות, לפיכך נמצא להם שם טוב וזכר טוב בעולם ועליהם הוא אומר "זכר צדיק לברכה" ועל ירבעם בן נבט וחביריו הוא אומר "ושם רשעים ירקב." (ג 8)	(ג) מהו בני סלמיי הנתיצתי אלא כל מי שהיה מנדב עצים וגזירים למערכה היה מביא עצים ועושה אותן כמין שלבין ועושה אותן כמין סולם ונותנן על כתיפיו. וכיון שהיה מגיע לאותו המשמר היה או' לו. לאיכן אתה הולך. והוא או' לו איני הולך אלא להביא שני גוזלות הללו מן השובך זה שלפניי בסולם הזה שעל כתיפיי. וכיון שהיה עובר את אותו המשמר היה מפרקן ומעלה אותן לירושלם. על ידי שנתנו את נפשם למצות זכו לקנות שם טוב בעולם. ועליהם הוא או' "זיכר צדיק לברכה."	

As the table shows, MS Oxford of the *scholium* opens by citing the Mishnah and then focuses on the fifteenth of Av. It first explains גונבי עלי וקוצעי קציעות and בני סלמאי הנתוצתי, using a mixture of motifs taken from the two stories of risk-taking in the Yerushalmi and in the Tosefta: the first-fruits, the figs, and the pestle (the story of the prohibition against bringing first-fruits) are integrated with the branches and the dovecot (the prohibition against bringing wood). Combining the Mishnaic note that the sons of Zattu ben Judah brought wood on the fifteenth of Av with the Toseftan story regarding the generosity of בני הגולה when they returned to Palestine, it subsequently reworks the explanation for bringing wood. Again, the text does not speak of the priests and the people; the sons of Zattu are the ones who donated the wood to the public. MS Oxford is, then, an attempt to mediate between the testimony of *Megillat Taʿanit* and the testimony of the Mishnah, with the help of the Tosefta.

MS Parma differs greatly from MS Oxford. Parma knows a version of *m. Taʿan.* 4:5 listing the nine dates for the wood-offerings, in which the ninth of Av appears: זמן עצי כהנים והעם בתשעה באב.[50] The thrust of this version of the *scholium* is to explain how the testimony of the Mishnah fits with the testimony of *Megillat Taʿanit* that the fifteenth of Av was the day of the wood-offering:

> מפני כשעלתה גולה בראשונה התקינו להם את יום תשעה באב שיהו מביאין בו קרבן עצים. אמרו חכמים כשיעלו למחר הגליות יהו אף הם צריכין התקינו להם את יום חמשה עשר באב שיהו מביאין בו קרבן עצים.
>
> When the first exiles returned, they established the ninth of Av for bringing the wood-offering. The Sages said: "When other exiles will return, they too will need to bring an offering." For them they established the day of the fifthteenth of Av for bringing the wood-offering.

This version augments the above-cited halakhah, which releases those bringing first-fruits or wood from the obligation to eulogize the dead:

> וכל המתנדב קרבן למקדש אפי' עצים פטור מן ההספד באותו יום לכך הוא אומ': ואנש דילהוין עלוהי אעין או ביכורין.
>
> Anyone who donates an offering to the Temple, even wood, is exempt from eulogies on that day. Therefore it is said: everyone who made a vow [to bring] wood and first fruits [to the Temple].

---

[50] See n. 30 above.

REASSESSING OLD PERSPECTIVES

FURTHER REFLECTIONS ON A DIVINE AND ANGELIC HUMANITY IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis
Westminster Theological Centre, Cheltenham

In my book *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*,[1] I have argued for a rethinking of some established interpretative judgements on the Dead Sea Scrolls from the caves behind Khirbet Qumran. I have tried to show that, all too often, the cosmological framework within which certain texts are interpreted, especially those having to do with liturgical matters, is anachronistic. In this paper I summarise briefly the principal theses of that book and present some further evidence that supports and clarifies the thrust of my argument.

The book sets out two interlocking theses. First, in the Bible, and throughout late Second Temple Judaisms, the *place* of Israelite worship—the Jerusalem Temple and its rivals—is conceived of as a microcosm of the universe and a restoration of Eden. In the Jerusalem Temple the roofed sanctuary is heaven, outside this sanctuary there is the earth—represented, in particular, by the altar of burnt offerings—and the once chaotic waters are present in the "sea" (1 Kgs 7:23), the large bronze laver in which priests were to wash (Exod 30:17–21; 2 Chr 4:6). The construction of this sacred space completes or recapitulates the perfect order of creation; it neutralizes and protects against encroaching chaos. The peoples of the ancient Near East took it for granted that temples functioned in this fashion. In the last few decades a plethora of studies have demonstrated the central significance of the temple-as-microcosm and restored-Eden motifs for the Hebrew Bible. Broadly speaking, their presence in the biblical record is not now contested, although an older generation dismissed their relevance for the pure "revealed" religion of Israel.[2]

---

[1] C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002).

[2] See, for example, the dismissal of their significance for Israelite religion in R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* (trans. J. McHugh; London: Darton, Longmann & Todd, 1961 [1958]), 328–29. Some remain sceptical (e.g., M. Cogan,

This way of understanding sacred space was then, I contend, taken more or less for granted by the writers of the Qumran Scrolls,[3] as it was for all Jews of the period. This means that as historians and interpreters of texts from that time, we now have a choice. If ancient Jewish writers did *not* have their own version of a wider ancient Near Eastern temple cosmology, then modern interpreters of the scrolls have been right all along to treat their cosmology as essentially dualistic, with heaven and earth clearly, and sometimes sharply, separated realms. If, on the other hand, as I contend, they took for granted some presuppositions of ancient Near Eastern temple cosmology, we should understand their texts to presume a holistic interpenetration of heaven and earth, divine (and also angelic) life and earthly, especially human, existence. Furthermore, the thrust of my argument, especially its second part, will be convincing only if we commit ourselves to an exercise in historical imagination, entering sympathetically the world of biblical and Jewish temple cosmology.[4]

Secondly, then, within this temple theology, there is a particular view of human identity that modern scholars perhaps have difficulty accepting because it has little direct contact with modern anthropologies.[5] The purpose of entry into the pristine world of the Temple—of access to the heavenly world that the inner sanctuary offers—is *transformation*. Worship makes possible not just proximity to God, but also conformity to his character, nature and modes of action. The liturgical anthropol-

---

1 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary [AB 10; New York: Doubleday, 2001], esp. 271–73).

[3] The identification of the Temple with creation is clearly assumed in 11QT 29:9 and, I argue, is also present in 4Q392, 1QH[a] (col. 12), 4Q408 (and therefore 1Q29 + 4Q376), the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (4Q400–407, 11Q17), and the *War Scroll* (1QM), The cosmogonic characterization of the priest in 4Q451 frag. 9 attests the temple-as-microcosm idea. (See Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 232–36, 240–43, 243–48, 252–394, 395–474, for discussion of each of these texts.) The complex cosmological symbolism of the Temple is also presumed in the distinctive Qumran use of the otherwise unattested word אורתום ("perfect light") that has to do with both the Urim and Thummim, the oracles worn by the high priest, and the primal light of God's creation (see *All the Glory of Adam*, chapter 7).

[4] At least one critical review of *All the Glory of Adam*—that by J. J. Collins ("Review: C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls*," *JSJ* 34 [2003]: 73–79)—has little to say about the temple theology part of the argument. It is noteworthy that in none of Collins' own not inconsiderable studies, as far as I can tell, does he consider the possible significance of temple symbolism for Jewish cosmology.

[5] Indeed, for reasons which are not entirely clear to me, I sometimes encounter a visceral hostility to this anthropology.

ogy of the temple tradition is essentially a matter of *deification*. This way of thinking has largely been lost in the Christian west; it is fundamental to Eastern theology, and, at least in the mystical tradition, was, I think, basic to Jewish theology in antiquity. As various recent studies have shown, the belief that the truly human receive some kind of angelic or divine transformation is rather widely attested in Second Temple literature.[6]

In the biblical material this theology is grounded in the opening statement in Gen 1:26–27 that God made humanity *betsalmo*. It is now widely recognised that the use of *tselem* here means that humanity is more than just a concrete, physical likeness of God. In biblical texts a *tselem* is usually a cult statue, an idol of a god (Num 33:52; 1 Sam 6:5; 2 Kgs 11:18; Ezek 7:20; 16:17; 23:24; Amos 5:26; Dan 2:31, 32, 34). So one point of Gen 1:26–27 is to say that humanity is created to function as the Creator God's statue, his living, breathing idol. This provides a profound theological critique of idolatry: humanity should not locate divine presence in a tree, the sun, moon, stars or something that humanity makes with its own hands—a statue to be worshipped—because it is humanity itself which is the supreme locus of divine presence. *Idolatry means emptying our transcendence into that which cannot bear divine immanence*. In the ancient world idols *are* the gods and goddesses. At least, that is, once a statue has been ritually identified as the deity through the proper rituals (of "the opening of the mouth," and "the washing of the mouth"), and provided it is properly cared for—housed in an appropriate sanctuary, fed daily meals of the finest quality, daily dressed (and undressed) in glorious gold- and jewel-encrusted garments and sung songs of worship—the god is present to serve its worshipers. The service provided by the gods in their statues is all-encompassing: it means cosmic and ecological stability, national, social, political, military and personal welfare.

Only with this background in mind is the full force of Gen 1:26–27 understood: humanity is created to be, *ontologically and functionally* (in being and action), divine. Humanity is to provide cosmic stability and the rest of creation should look to humanity with reverence, fear, and perhaps, worship. In fact, here is the origin of a widely-attested tradition that the angels worshipped Adam when he was first created;

---

[6] See the review of secondary literature in Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 1–32.

they treat Adam as the creator's cult statue, the way his identity as God's "*tselem*-bearer" suggests he should be treated.[7]

Reading Genesis 1 within this world of thought, Mayer Gruber has now suggested that the puzzling *bet* in Genesis 1:26–27 ("Let us make *ʾadam betsalmenu* and God created the *ʾadam betsalmo, betselem* of God he created him.…) is a *bet pretii*.[8] This gives us an English translation: "And God said, 'Let us make man in the place of our image.… And God created the *ʾadam* in the place of his statue, in the stead of God's idol he created him.…" That is, the creation of humanity is meant to forestall any attempt to represent and to worship God through a cult statue. Again, according to Genesis 1, idolatry is a tragedy—it entails a denial of humanity's vocation and privilege to bear God's presence and to act on his behalf.

It is this theological anthropology that is the conceptual bedrock of the material in the scrolls I have discussed. I use the word "angelomorphic" a good deal to refer to instances where it seems that some human beings—the righteous—are ascribed angelic qualities, epithets and titles. But as my book's title indicates, it is ultimately a particular *anthropology* that interests me. Because the sacred space and time experienced in worship entails a repristination of the cosmos and a return to the conditions in Eden before the Fall, the worshippers recover the original divine Glory intended for Adam (and Eve). This means we have here to do with a particular kind of *liturgical* anthropology that belongs within an overarching metanarrative according to which Israel recovers the original identity of humanity that was lost following the catastrophes of Genesis 3–11. Just as humanity was originally created to be God's physical presence and to do what God does, so Israel, reconstituted through proper worship, is to do what God does and *be* what he is.

Once these conceptual coordinates are properly grasped, individual points of interpretation that otherwise seem arbitrary or tendentious make sense. For example, in my discussion of 4QDibHam I suggest that because Adam is clearly (in 4Q504 8 [recto]) created to embody God's own Glory; when it says in 4Q504 1–2 iii 2–4 that God created Israel "for his Glory," this should probably be taken not simply as a comment on God's action—i.e., that the act of creating Israel is a glo-

---

[7] For witnesses to this tradition see Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 99 nn. 34 and 35. To the references there should probably be added Philo, *On the Creation* 82–83.

[8] M. Gruber, "God, Image of," *The Encyclopaedia of Judaism* (ed. J. Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 1757–62, p. 1761. See BDB, 90.

rious one—but also as a statement about Israel's own *identity*—Israel bears God's Glory and reflects it to the rest of the world.[9] And this takes place in particular in and through performance of the liturgy, for which 4QDibHam provides specific content.

The two fullest extant explorations of this liturgical anthropology amongst the Dead Sea Scrolls are the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* and the *War Scroll* (discussed below). In the former case, the established scholarly view that this "angelic liturgy" encapsulates a dualistic cosmology, wherein the human community may only view from a distance the worship of the angels, is fraught with exegetical difficulties. A close examination of the *Songs*' language suggests, rather, that *much* (though not all) of what has been taken to refer to *supra*human angels actually refers to the human worshippers, especially the priests *in the heavenly, angelic, or divine mode* that they acquire in the liturgical space and time of the true temple. When it says that this liturgy takes place in the "exalted heights" (מרומי רום: 4Q400 1 i 20; 4Q401 2 4), it should not surprise us that this means in fact the heavenly heights that are experienced in the cultic space. The righteous are expected to live in the heights (Isa 33:16) and because the temple is built as a microcosm, comprising both the earth and *the heights* (רמים: Ps 78:69), this expectation is naturally fulfilled in the place of the true Zion with its locus of divine encounter. There are *dualities* in the *Sabbath Songs*; between humanity in its state of mortality (4Q400 frag. 2) and its newly God-given state of exaltation; between the priesthood and the laity; and (probably) between the inner sanctuary that is equated with heaven and the outer reaches of sacred space that are equated with earth.[10] But there are not the hard, absolute *dualisms* that older commentators have imagined.

The true-humanity-as-God's-idol theology is, I estimate, rather widely attested in ancient Judaism.[11] It can be found in parts of Exodus, Isaiah,

---

[9] Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 92–94.

[10] These distinctions probably explain the fact that, apart from the one first person plural ("we") in *Song* 2, most of the songs speak of specific (groups of) liturgical participants in the third person plural ("they").

[11] For what follows see Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 98–103; idem, "The Cosmology of P and Theological Anthropology in the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira," in *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture* (ed. C. A. Evans; 2 vols.; LSTS 50–51; SSEJC 9–10; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2004), 1:69–113; idem, "Alexander the Great's Worship of the High Priest," in *Early Jewish and Christian Monotheism* (ed. L. T. Stuckenbruck and W. S. North; JSNTSup 263; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2004), 71–102; idem, "The Image of God and the Biblical Roots

Ezekiel and Daniel.[12] It was known to Josephus, Philo and, according to the author of Acts 17 (vv. 26–29), Paul was known to start his preaching to Gentiles by outlining this basic Jewish critique of idolatry. In some texts this theological anthropology is combined with biblical temple cosmology so that it is the priest, dressed in gold- and jewel-encrusted garments and officiating in the temple-as-microcosm, who is Israel's true Adam, fulfilling humanity's vocation to be God's cult statue. This, I have argued, is the way Aaron is imagined in Exodus 25–31,[13] and certainly this is the way that the Exodus material is read in Ben Sira (esp. ch. 50), Josephus (*Ant.* 11.326–338) and Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* (chs. 25–26).[14]

Did the Dead Sea Scroll community know and agree with this humanity-as-God's-idol theology? In *All the Glory of Adam* I suggest that the tradition according to which Adam is worshipped by the angels is attested in the first fragment of 4Q381 (*4QNon-Canonical Psalms B*). Unfortunately, the text is badly damaged at the key point and we cannot be sure that that text *does* record the angels worshipping Adam in the manner described elsewhere. The *War Scroll* indicates, however, that the writers of the scrolls took this theology for granted.

---

of Christian Sacramentality," in *The Gestures of God: Explorations in Sacramentality* (ed. G. Rowell and C. Hall; Biblical Roots; London: Continuum, 2004), 73–89; idem, "God's Image, His Cosmic Temple, and the High Priest: Towards an Historical and Theological Account of the Incarnation," in *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology* (ed. T. D. Alexander and S. Gathercole; Carlisle: Paternoster, 2004), 81–99; idem, "Humanity and the Idols of the Gods in Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities*," in *Idolatry: False Worship in the Bible, Judaism and Christianity* (ed. S. C. Barton; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2007), 58–72.

[12] For Ezekiel see J. Kutsko, *Between Heaven and Earth: Divine Presence and Absence in the Book of Ezekiel* (Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California San Diego 7; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000). For Exodus and Isaiah see G. Y. Glazov, *The Bridling of the Tongue and the Opening of the Mouth in Biblical Prophecy* (JSOTSup 311; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001). For Daniel see C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, "Religious Experience and the Apocalypses," in *Experientia, Volume 1: Inquiry into Religious Experience in Early Judaism and Christianity* (ed. F. Flannery, C. Shantz, and R. A. Werline; SBLSymS 40; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 125–44 (pp. 135–37).

[13] See Fletcher-Louis, "The Image of God and the Biblical Roots of Christian Sacramentality"; and Fletcher-Louis, "God's Image."

[14] See also Philo, *On Dreams* 1.208–215.

The War Scroll *from Qumran*

It is usually considered that the *War Scroll* (1QM) contains several clear dualisms, including an absolute qualitative difference between God (and his angels) and humanity. Whilst the scroll contains an imaginative and highly stylised account of the future battle between the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness, the prominent role of angels (including, for example, Michael, Gabriel, Raphael and Uriel [9:15–16]) has led some to conclude that in this vision of Israel's holy war human combatants are passive bystanders, lacking a military Messiah, and that all responsibility for the defeat of the enemy is in the hands of God and his supernatural agents.[15]

However, recent work has shown that this dualistic reading of the scroll is overdrawn. The royal Messiah is expected to lead the combatants on the battlefield (5:1; 11:1–7; 12:10–12), and the human fighters—"the perfect of way" (1QM 14:7), "the poor ones" (11:9)—not the angels, are responsible for the shedding of the enemies' blood. And I have argued that rather than a fantastical vision of a war conducted by (suprahuman) angels, the scroll contains a thoroughgoing meditation on Israel's own responsibility to act as God's agent in the company of the angelic forces of creation.[16]

The *War Scroll* can be divided into two halves: columns 1–9 contain instructions for the timing of the war's phases, for the dress and military arrangements of the forces and for the conduct of various stratagems. Columns 10–19 comprise material which commentators have found harder to assess. This part of the *Scroll* is usually judged to be composite and lacking in thematic structure. I have tried to show that whilst the second half of the *Scroll* is theologically dense and highly allusive in its use of scripture, it is a conceptual unity and it contains a developing argument that gives a theological account of, and justification for, Israel's cultically-centred war machine.

Briefly, I read these later columns like this: In column 10, a priest is to address the troops and to remind them that as the true Israel, God's chosen people, they are peculiarly like God, and that they have a privileged position in coming history which is grounded in their

---

[15] For a recent example of this view see L. L Grabbe, *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh* (London: Routledge, 2000), 274.

[16] For what follows see Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 395–475.

privileged position as the true Adam in the cosmos. That position is nurtured in their cult, which is finely tuned to the order of the cosmos and the activity of the Creator-Redeemer. In two ways this energises the combatants in the field of conflict. On the one hand, the true Israel, from its centre in the temple-as-microcosm, acts in accordance with the structure of creation so that in the end all of creation becomes filled with the Glory of the Creator that first fills the sanctuary (see esp. column 12 and its reuse of Isaiah 6). In the process the *Endzeit* is a return to the *Urzeit*; the land becomes a new Eden (12:7–16); Israel recovers the "form of Adam" (*tabnit adam*) (10:14), ruling forever throughout the world (12:15–16); the nation's daughters are decked in "ornaments of Glory" (12:15)—the attire that Adam and Eve would have worn had they been obedient to their vocation. In column 17 the forces of the enemy that would drag Israel back to pre-Creation *tohuwabohu* are overcome by God's everlasting light (cf. Gen 1:2–3).

On the other hand, by virtue of its priestly service, Israel acts in imitation of and in the power of God himself. For example, the nation acts "in [his] truthful works" and "in his mighty deeds" (14:12–13) because in the liturgical calendar, it celebrates and reenacts his great works of creation. In the *tamid* offerings (14:13–14), Israel marks the separation of darkness and light that God originally established at the evening and morning in Gen 1:3–5. Whilst the priesthood reenacts that primal moment of divine creativity in the tending of the Temple lampstand, the nation's warriors—the Sons of *Light*—bring about the ultimate separation of light and darkness by vanquishing the enemy—the Sons of *Darkness*.[17] Their action is God's action and so we are told in column 11 that, like the divinely-empowered David of old, the future royal Messiah and his troops will strike the enemy by the hand of God. On the face of it, they will strike with their own hands and weapons, but this, in fact, is God's own hand since they are his agents. The first five lines of column 12 describe how when the troops go to war they are mustered and directed by the priesthood from the sanctuary that manifests the heavenly abode on earth. The priests do not themselves get their hands dirty with the blood of the slain. But their liturgy—their cursing of God's enemies, their blessing of the elect that is described

[17] I take it that already in Exodus (27:20–21; 30:7–8) the priest acts in imitation of God when he tends the menorah at the evening and morning sacrifices.

in column 13, and their completion of the nation's sacrificial duties—provides a sacramental power (what the *Scroll* calls a "help" 12:7; 13:8, cf. 17:6) for the nation's soldiers in the theatre of conflict.

In all this there is a strong sociological dualism between the lot of God—the Sons of Light—on the one side, and the lot of Belial—the Sons of Darkness—on the other. But there is no wooden, inflexible dualism between God (with his angels) and humanity. Neither is there a flat and rigid dualism between heaven and earth, in which angels are confined to the world above and earthly actors watch passively here below. The world of the *War Scroll* is holistic. This is possible because the Temple and its worship bind together heaven and earth; bringing heaven down to earth and raising up the righteous to the heavenly heights. The *Scroll* is only properly understood once the reader has a proper appreciation of the text's worldview, in which temple-as-microcosm and humanity's vocation to bear the divine being and activity is appreciated.

At various points in columns 12–19 the righteous are described in language that is customarily taken only to refer to God and his angels. In 12:1–5, through a subtle evocation of Mal 2:5–7, the priests are called a "host of angels"; the people are a "congregation of holy ones" (12:7) who embody the glory which Isaiah saw filling the earth in Isa 6:3 (1QM 12:7–10).[18] And the royal Messiah is a star—the heavenly body predicted in Num 24:17 (1QM 11:6).

All this follows a striking example of the true-humanity-as-God's-idol theology in the first half of the *Scroll*, to which I now turn. The first half of the *War Scroll*, with its detailed instructions for the attire, accoutrements and strategies of Israel's soldiers, contains an apparently puzzling theme. Columns 3–6 describe how the trumpets which the commanders use to communicate with the troops, the standards of the whole army and its subdivisions, and the javelins thrown by the skirmishers, are all to be inscribed with various slogans and declarations: "summoned of God," "princes of God," "rule of God," "from God a hand of war against all flesh of deceit," "truth of God," "righteousness of God," "Glory of God," "clans of God," "hosts of God," "strife of God,"

---

[18] Contrary to what one reviewer has reported (M. Goff, "Review: Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in The Dead Sea Scrolls*," *JBL* 122 (2003): 165, 172–75, p. 174) I nowhere argue that in the *War Scroll*, *'elim* refers to heavenly humans. I claim this is a *possibility* in parts of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, but I see no convincing evidence for it in 1QM.

"victory of God," and so on. This theme raises a number of questions. Why, given that there is no obvious precedent for this practice in the Hebrew Bible, is it expounded at such length in the *War Scroll*?[19] Some of the inscriptions—particularly those on the banners of the military divisions which record the names of the twelve tribes and smaller tribal divisions of combat—obviously perform an important practical purpose in communicating the position of individual fighting units on the battlefield. Some of the slogans stimulate the right *esprit de corps*, instilling in the troops a triumphalistic enthusiasm in the way they celebrate God's action and wrath in their military endeavour. But other inscriptions are less straightforwardly a matter of practical military organisation. Neither, it seems, are they obviously designed to motivate by directing combatants to trust in the god who fights for them. The "great standard which is at the head of the whole people" has written on it the words "people of God" and the names "Israel" and "Aaron," and the names of the twelve tribes of Israel (3:13). Whilst a principal standard at the head of the army would play an important role in maintaining the cohesion and direction of the fighting, it is hard to see what practical purpose such an inscription can have, since it is not carried by a particular unit within the army but names the whole army. It is hardly designed, as if it were a ship's ensign, to identify the army to an oncoming opponent (who would need unusually good eyesight and linguistic competence to read the identifying label). How does it motivate Israel's own fighters by directing their attention to their god and his power?

The inscription on the great standard is all the more remarkable when the *War Scroll* is read in the context of contemporary Roman military conventions.[20] The Roman army attached great significance to

---

[19] Y. Yadin (*The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962], 39) rightly points to Num 2:2; 17:17–18 [Eng. 17:2–3] as the basis for the inscribed-banners motif. But the *War Scroll* has developed the theme far beyond the brief references in those biblical texts to the use of inscribed staffs for organizational purposes. Only a limited comparison can be made with the slogan of battle given by Judas Maccabaeus in 2 Macc 8:23: "he appointed Eleazar to read aloud from the holy book and gave the watchword, 'the Help of God.'" The language of 1QM 3–6 has developed well beyond this brief slogan and in 2 Maccabees the rallying cry is not written on the instruments of war.

[20] There is agreement among the commentators that the *War Scroll*'s military environment is Roman, not Greek, and that to some extent, the *Scroll* models Israel's military conduct on that of the Roman army. The date of the scroll, however, is harder to establish. Most date it, on the basis of its knowledge of the Roman army, to the period after Pompey's conquest of Palestine.

its standards (*signa*, σημεία). The most prominent of these, the *aquilae*, the "eagles" who represented the god Jupiter Optimus Maximus, were carried, like the *War Scroll*'s great standard (*haʾot haggedolah*), at the head of the army.[21] Along with lower-ranking *signa* (*vexilla*), which accompanied the smaller units of soldiers, these standards played a vital religious role in Roman warfare. They were the armies' *numina*, the divine powers which accompanied the forces and gave them their victories.[22] Besides the image of the eagle and other zodiacal signs (some of which were associated with the *dies natalis* of the individual legion), the *signa* would be adorned with images of the emperor and, presumably, with words that made explicit the dedication.[23] On festival days (Pliny, *Nat. Hist*. 13.4.23), perhaps in particular on the legion's birthday or in commemoration of its famous victories, the standards were washed, anointed and adorned in the manner in which the images of the gods were worshipped.[24] After a victory the standards would be set up on a conquered sanctuary and worshipped (as Josephus says was done in the Jerusalem Temple in 70 CE; *J.W*. 6.316). When not in use on the field of combat, the standards and their associated images were stored in a specially-built sanctuary (*sacellum*) in the *praetorium* of the army's camp or fortress.[25]

For the Jews this was all blatant idolatry. The practice is explicitly attacked in the *Habakkuk Pesher* (1QpHab 6:4). Presumably, this is the kind of religious activity that the *War Scroll* has in mind when it speaks of the other nations as creatures of vanity (*ḥebel*) (6:7; 9:9; 14:12), with impure cultic practices (13:4–5; 17:1–3), whom God's wrath will

---

[21] Before the reform of the Roman army by Gaius Marius (104 BCE) the eagle was one of four zoomorphic symbols on Roman military standards; the others being the horse, the boar and the minotaur (see Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 10.5).

[22] See e.g., esp. Tacitus, *Ann*. 2.17.2.

[23] For the words of dedication to the emperor on military equipment see Philo, *Legatio Ad Gaium* 299–300.

[24] For the decorating of the standards with roses at annual festivals see A. S. Hoey, "*Rosaliae Signorum*," *HTR* 30 (1937): 15–35.

[25] Before the Romans, similar practices had been adopted in Egypt and in Mesopotamia. For the Assyrian evidence, see recently S. W. Holloway, *Aššur is King! Aššur is King! Religion in the Exercise of Power in the Neo-Assyrian Empire* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 10; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 160–77. For the Egyptians see Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca* 1.86.4–5; Plutarch, *Is. Os.* 72 (379F–380A); and R. O. Faulkner, "Egyptian Military Standards," *JEA* 27 (1941): 12–18. The fact that this practice was well known to Jews in the third century BCE (see Artapanus in Eusebius, *Praep. Evang*. 9.27.35) means that the image-of-God-in-Israel polemic of 1QM 3–6 could very well be much older than the *War Scroll* itself.

destroy "like the fire of his outburst against the idols (*'elilim*) of Egypt" (14:1). On more than one occasion the presence of the Roman army's *signa* on Israel's holy land and, especially, inside the holy city in close proximity to its Temple, was the cause of religious offence and political disturbance.[26] So, if Roman veneration of its military accoutrements was so well known, is not the author of the *War Scroll* itself risking idolatry by having in Israel's army, standards apparently dedicated to the people of God, Israel, Aaron, and the twelve tribes?[27] The *War Scroll*, of course, avoids the use of zoomorphic images on its military equipment. It does not have any adornment or sacrifices offered to its standards and has such slogans as "battle *of God*" (4:12), "truth *of God*," (4:6) "greatness *of God*" (4:8) on those standards; all of which is in accord with Israel's monotheistic desire to ascribe to its creator and redeemer the responsibility for its salvation. However, the words on the great standard itself do not at first appear to direct attention to Israel's god. Quite the reverse; they direct attention to God's people, giving them pride of place at the front of the army where otherwise the images of pagan gods would appear.

However, this striking feature of the battle preparations now makes perfect sense. These earlier columns present a subtle but deliberate and polemical subversion of Roman military religion claiming that *Israel* is the image of the one true God, his idol. This claim is entirely in accord with the theology of columns 10–19 where Israel is portrayed as peculiarly like the one creator God, whose action and presence in eschatological history manifest God's action and presence. *Israel* is the one who will cleanse the earth of its defilement, returning the world to its pre-lapsarian Edenic state (col. 12, esp. lines 7–16);[28] not the manmade images of the emperor and the Roman gods. And so, Israel is the one who will *rightfully* be clothed, as was Adam, with God's Glory (12:13, 15; 19:7), receiving the worshipful prostration of the nations, who will submit to its divine rule (12:14–16; 19:6–8). Whereas the Roman *signa* are washed, anointed with oil and garlanded, it is God's chosen people, his "anointed" (11:8), who are to be washed after battle (14:2–3) and

---

[26] See Josephus, *J.W.* 2.169–174 = *Ant.* 18.55–59; *Ant.* 18.120–22; and Philo, *Legatio Ad Gaium* 299–300.

[27] Yadin (*War Scroll*, 64) senses the problem but does not fully address it.

[28] For the restoration of Eden and the recapitulation of creation in col. 12 see Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 435–42.

are decked out with garments of Glory (12:15). In fact, already now, Israel proceeds to war, claiming for itself the "Glory of God" (4:6, 8). The slogans on the military paraphernalia *broadcast* Israel's claim to be God's real presence on the battlefield. So, for example, in 4:11–13, "when they draw near for battle they shall write on their standards (both) 'battle of God,' 'vengeance of God,' 'strife of God,' 'requital of God,' 'power of God,' 'retribution of God,' 'might of God,' 'destruction by God of all the nations of vanity,' *and* the whole list of their [i.e., the Israelite combatants'] names." The human soldiers embody the character of God—his "truth," "righteousness," "greatness" (4:6, 7)—and, as an extension of his personality, manifest his action—the "judgement of God," the "right hand of God" (4:6, 7), the "mighty hand of God" (3:8), and the "wrath of God in an outburst towards Belial and against all the men of his lot" (4:1–2). Accordingly, we also find on the standards inscriptions which ascribe to the army overtly angelic language: they are the "camps of God" (cf. Gen 32:3 and 4Q400 2 2) and the "hosts of God" (4:9, 10).[29]

Whilst the people of God take the place of the divine images on the Roman standards, there is not, it should be stressed, a complete symmetry between the Jewish and the Roman religious use of the standards. In the Roman army the standards had a numinal power *in themselves*. They provided security and, at times of distress, could be clung to for safety.[30] By contrast Israel's standards are *signs* (*'otot*), which point away from themselves. They point, of course, to Israel's creator and redeemer, but *also* to the image of that god, Israel herself.

So the *War Scroll* espouses a thoroughgoing image-of-God-in-humanity theology. In order to cleanse the world of idolatrous man-made images and gods who are no gods, God intends to use his true image, Adam-in-Israel, to fill creation with his Glory. The destruction of idolatrous humanity by the "sword of God" (15:3; 19:11) in Israel's hand is a necessary and appropriate means to that end; *appropriate* because in so acting, Israel demonstrates that it is the nation that truly embodies God's truth, righteousness, greatness, and peace. Through its description of the names of the nation, its tribes and its individual

[29] For the human community as God's angelic host at Qumran see 4Q511 35 4 ("His righteous people, his host and servants, the angels of his Glory"); Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam*, 162–68; and see 423–49 on 1QM 12.

[30] See e.g., Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.39.

fighters on the standards, columns 3–6 anticipate in a symbolic gesture the theology that is worked out in the later columns of the *Scroll* (10–19).[31] In turn, this part of the *War Scroll* provides vital evidence that the Qumran community took for granted a particular theological anthropology which only very recently has come to our attention in biblical and other postbiblical literature.

[31] Entirely consistent with this image-of-God-in-humanity theology is the fact that in 7:4–5 all those in whom the image of God is marred—the lame, the blind, the crippled and any man "in whose flesh there is a permanent blemish" or "a man stricken by some uncleanness in his flesh"—are excluded from fighting. All the fighters shall be "perfect in spirit and flesh."

THE POLEMIC AGAINST THE *ṬEVUL YOM*: A REEXAMINATION

Martha Himmelfarb
Princeton University

With the publication of the legal texts from among the Dead Sea Scrolls over the course of the last decades, there has been an explosion of scholarly interest in the history of halakhah. Texts such as the *Temple Scroll*, 4QMMT, and 4QD have opened up the possibility of bridging the gap of many centuries between the Torah and the Mishnah.[1] The dominant view of the studies of the last decades has been that the Scrolls reflect a priestly legal tradition that is often in disagreement with the halakhah of the rabbis.[2] Scholars who hold this view use rabbinic literature to illumine the legal texts among the Scrolls, arguing that the concerns of rabbinic literature permit us to see the significance of language and concepts in the Scrolls that might otherwise be missed. Further, these scholars argue that by confirming the reports about the position of the Sadducees in rabbinic accounts of disputes between Pharisees and Sadducees, the Scrolls also permit us to identify as Pharisaic, aspects of tannaitic halakhah that stand in opposition to the position of the Scrolls.

There can be no denying the many important insights into the Scrolls that arise from comparison to rabbinic literature, but such an approach inevitably involves the danger of reading later ideas back into earlier texts. Here I would like to discuss one instance in which I believe that the lens of rabbinic literature has been distorting. This instance is the detection in the Scrolls of a polemic against the rabbinic concept of

---

[1] For a useful history of the discussion, see L. H. Schiffman, "Halakhah and Sectarianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context* (ed. T. H. Lim; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 123–42.

[2] See, e.g., the influential programmatic essay of Y. Sussman, "The History of the Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Preliminary Talmudic Observations on *Miqṣat Maʿaśe Ha-Torah* (4QMMT)," *Tarbiz* 59 (1989–1990): 11–76 (Hebrew; an English translation without extensive annotation appears as "Appendix I," in *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqṣat Maʿaśe ha-Torah*, [ed. E. Qimron and J. Strugnell; DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994], 179–200). The literature on this topic is considerable. See, for example, the articles of L. H. Schiffman and J. M. Baumgarten cited below.

the *ṭevul yom*, as the rabbis call a person who has laundered his clothes and bathed but still awaits the coming of evening to complete a process of purification mandated by the Torah. The Mishnah devotes an entire tractate to the implications of this liminal status, during which, according to the rabbis, some actions forbidden to a person in a state of impurity are permitted, since the state of impurity has been partially remedied (*m. Neg.* 14:2–3; see below).

The claim that the concept of the *ṭevul yom* was a point of dispute between the Essenes and the Pharisees goes back twenty-five years to Joseph M. Baumgarten, who made his argument on the basis of the *Temple Scroll* alone.[3] The claim was developed in greater detail by Lawrence Schiffman in an article in the first volume of *Dead Sea Discoveries* in 1994.[4] In this article Schiffman collected all of the passages relevant to the concept of the *ṭevul yom* from the *Temple Scroll* and from two texts that had only recently become available, 4QD and 4QMMT. While he noted that no rabbinic text identifies the *ṭevul yom* as a Pharisaic concept, he argued that opposition to the concept in the Scrolls demonstrates that the idea goes back to the Pharisees as the pre-70 predecessors of the Tannaim.[5]

Here I would like to reexamine the passages Schiffman considers and suggest a different way of looking at them that understands them not as a polemic against the position of the Pharisees, but rather as a response to ambiguities and difficulties in the laws of the Torah.[6] Let me begin with some observations about the place of sundown as the final element in purification in the Torah. The types of impurity that the priestly source of the Torah designates as lasting until evening are, with a single exception, mild types of impurity that last for no more than a twenty-four-hour period. One group of such impurities is produced by contact with the carcass of a forbidden insect or animal

---

[3] J. M. Baumgarten, "The Pharisaic-Sadducean Controversies about Purity and the Qumran Texts," *JJS* 31 (1980): 156–61.

[4] L. H. Schiffman, "Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Case of *Ṭevul Yom*," *DSD* 1 (1994): 285–99. Schiffman was unable to make use of the DJD editions of 4QMMT and 4QD, which did not appear until 1994 (the same year as Schiffman's article) and 1996, respectively.

[5] "Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah," 299. While Schiffman is admirably careful on this point, Baumgarten, "Pharisaic-Sadducean Controversies," attributes the concept of *ṭevul yom* to the Pharisees without qualification (158).

[6] Below I discuss all of the passages Schiffman considers in "Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah," with the exception of a passage from 4QOrdinances^{c} col. i, which Schiffman thinks may be relevant, but which does not mention waiting until evening (298).

(Lev 11:24, 25, 27, 28, 31), eating a permitted animal that dies of itself, or contact with its carcass (Lev 11:39–40). The Torah requires the arrival of evening before the one who has had such contact returns to a state of purity. So, too, one who enters a house that has been shut because it is afflicted with *ṣaraʿat* becomes impure until evening (Lev 14:46). Several other states of short-lived impurity are produced by contact with someone in a state of more severe impurity, or with objects with which the person with the more severe impurity has had contact. Thus, for example, anyone who touches the bed of a menstruant (Lev 15:21), or of a man (Lev 15:5) or a woman (Lev 15:26–27) with abnormal genital flow, becomes impure. Like the impurity caused by contact with an animal carcass, this type of impurity is removed by laundering, bathing, and the arrival of evening. The impurity of seminal emission, too, whether in the context of sexual intercourse or not, for both the man who emits the semen and his female partner if there is one, lasts until both man and woman have bathed and evening has arrived; any garment or leather that has come in contact with the semen becomes pure after laundering and the arrival of evening (Lev 15:16–18). Finally, the Holiness Code decrees that that one who eats an animal unfit for consumption because it died on its own or was killed by other animals is impure until evening (Lev 17:15).

The Torah also decrees that impurity disappears only at evening for those who incur the short-lived impurity caused by various stages in the manufacture of the ashes of the red cow; these ashes form part of the waters sprinkled on a person during the process of purification from corpse impurity. The priest in charge of the sacrifice of the cow (Num 19:7), the person who burns the cow (Num 19:8), and the person who gathers the ashes (Num 19:10) all become impure and must launder, bathe, and wait until evening to return to a state of purity.[7] The person who sprinkles the waters on those impure from contact with a corpse also becomes impure, as does anyone who touches the waters, and the impurity lasts until evening (Num 19:21), although here the text is not as clear as it might be, a point to which I shall return.

---

[7] The text does not mention bathing as a requirement for the one who gathers the ashes (Num 19:10), but presumably it assumes such a requirement, since laundering typically goes together with bathing. J. Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16* (AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 667–68, argues that where P mentions laundering, it assumes bathing as well.

For only one type of impurity that lasts more than a single day does the Torah legislate an evening terminus. This is the impurity caused by contact with a corpse, the type of impurity removed by sprinkling with water mixed with the ashes of the red cow: "The pure person shall sprinkle upon the impure on the third day and on the seventh day; thus on the seventh day he shall cleanse him, and he shall wash his clothes and bathe himself in water, and at evening he shall be pure" (Num 19:19).[8] Perhaps it is the association of corpse impurity with the burning of the red cow that leads the Torah to state explicitly that corpse impurity disappears only at evening. Otherwise it is hard to see why the end-time should be specified for corpse impurity but not for other types of longer-lasting impurity. Of the longer-lasting types of impurity, corpse impurity is more easily remedied than most, but less easily remedied than menstrual impurity, which requires nothing other than a seven-day waiting period (Lev 15:19) and presumably bathing, though bathing is not explicit in the text of the Torah.[9] Purification from corpse impurity is more complicated since it requires sprinkling, presumably by a priest, on the third and seventh days. But it is less demanding than purification from childbirth (Lev 12:6–8), skin eruptions (Lev 14:1–32), and abnormal genital flow (Lev 15:13–15, 28–29), because it does not require a sacrifice of its own; one red cow, after all, served to supply ashes for many, many people contaminated by corpse impurity. Nor does it require as extended a period of purification as childbirth, or as complex a set of rituals as purification from skin eruptions.

In contrast to the types of impurity for which it decrees that purity is restored only at evening, the Torah offers no indication of the time of day when purity is restored after childbirth, skin eruptions, abnormal genital flow, or menstruation. Had the Torah not mentioned waiting until evening for purification from corpse impurity, it would have been reasonable to conclude that the requirement to wait until evening applies only to types of impurity that last twenty-four hours at most. But the laws of corpse impurity make matters more complicated. Especially since the process of purification from corpse impurity lies somewhere between the extremes in the continuum of complexity and length of such processes, the mention of waiting until evening raises the ques-

[8] I use the RSV translation, but I substitute "pure" for RSV's "clean" and "impure" for RSV's "unclean."

[9] Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16*, 934–35.

tion of whether that requirement is implicit in all of the processes of purification in the Torah.

The Temple Scroll

With this problem in mind, I turn to the passages from the Scrolls relevant to the *ṭevul yom*. I begin with the *Temple Scroll*, which follows the dictates of the Torah in noting three types of impurity that require waiting until the evening: the impurity of seminal emission (Lev 15:16–18); the impurity of contact with a corpse (Num 19:11); and the impurity of contact with carcasses of swarming things (Lev 11:39). Like other texts from among the Scrolls, the *Temple Scroll* finds the Torah's attitude toward impurity too relaxed. Its purity laws seek to remedy this problem. One distinctive aspect of its approach, inspired by the rigorous rules for exclusion from the wilderness camp in Num 5:2, is the provision of places of confinement outside the city of the sanctuary for men with genital discharges or skin eruptions (*TS* 46:16–18), and outside ordinary cities for people with skin eruptions, menstruants, and parturients (*TS* 48:14–17). But the *Temple Scroll* elaborates the Torah's rules in other ways as well, with the goal of intensifying the consequences of impurity.

For the Torah, as we have seen, seminal emission belongs among the least severe forms of impurity. The *Temple Scroll* works out its view of the consequences of seminal emission in relation to nocturnal emission rather than sexual relations. In place of the Torah's brief period of impurity—from the moment of the emission until evening as long as bathing and laundering have occurred—it decrees a three-day period and specifies not only bathing, but also laundering for both the first and third days (*TS* 45:7–9). Like the Torah, the *Temple Scroll* says explicitly that the state of purity returns only at evening (*TS* 45:9–10). The rule for sexual relations insists on the three-day period but otherwise provides little detail (*TS* 45:11–12); it does not mention waiting until evening.

The language in which the *Temple Scroll* refers to the arrival of evening—"after the sun has set"—is different from that of the P source, which consistently uses the phrase, "until evening."[10] The *Temple Scroll* takes this language from the Holiness Code's summary of the constraints

[10] Lev 11:24, 25, 27, 28, 31, 32, 39, 40; 14:46; 15:5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 27; Num 19:7, 8, 10, 21, 22.

on a priest's right to eat holy food as a consequence of various types of impurity delineated by P: a priest who incurs one of the short-lived impurities "shall be impure *until the evening*, and he shall not eat of the holy things unless he has washed his body in water and the *sun has set*. Then he becomes pure, and *afterward* he may eat of the holy things. . . ." (Lev 22:4–7; quotation, 6–7).[11] Thus the Holiness Code clarifies P's somewhat ambiguous terminology, leaving no doubt about the moment when impurity comes to an end.[12] This clarity must have appealed to the authors of the *Temple Scroll*.

Though even the rabbis would prohibit the *ṭevul yom* from entering the Temple,[13] Schiffman argues that the strong language that accompanies the *Temple Scroll*'s requirement of waiting for evening in the case of a man with a nocturnal emission—"They shall not enter my Temple with their unclean impurity (בנדת טמאתמה) and defile it" (*TS* 45:9–10)—points to a polemic against the concept of the *ṭevul yom*.[14] He takes the emphatic phrase, "with their unclean impurity," as an attack on those who hold the rabbis' view that the man is no longer in a state of complete impurity as he awaits evening. But the *Temple Scroll* has just dramatically altered the Torah's rules by requiring a three-day period of purification from seminal emission; thus it seems to me that those who prefer the Torah's single day of purification to the *Temple Scroll*'s lengthier and more elaborate process are more likely targets of the *Temple Scroll*'s ire.

The *Temple Scroll* also found the Torah's remedy for corpse impurity insufficient. Thus it decrees washing the house and its utensils (*TS* 49:11–16), as well as laundering and bathing, on the first day (*TS* 49:16–17), a day for which the Torah prescribes no rituals at all. It also elaborates the Torah's ritual for the third day by requiring laundering and bathing in addition to sprinkling (*TS* 49:18). On both the third and seventh days, the utensils of the house are to be included in

---

[11] Translation and italics mine. Betsy Halpern-Amaru points out to me that Deut 16:6 mentions evening and sunset in its instruction about the time of the slaughter of the paschal sacrifice, but there the time in question is "at evening," not "until evening."

[12] So too Milgrom, *Leviticus 17–22* (AB 3A; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 1855; he also suggests that H is consciously invoking P's terminology elsewhere in this passage (1854–55).

[13] *Sifre Deuteronomy* 256, cited by Schiffman, "Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah," 292.

[14] Schiffman, "Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah," 293. All translations from the *Temple Scroll*, 4QD, and 4QMMT are mine.

the laundering (*TS* 49:18–20). Like the Torah, the *Temple Scroll* notes that after undergoing purification from corpse impurity, one becomes pure only at evening, but it mentions this twice (*TS* 49:20, 50:4); the context of the second mention is unfortunately unclear because it is fragmentary.

The *Temple Scroll* also insists on the necessity of the arrival of evening for purification in two special cases that immediately follow its treatment of those who have had contact with a corpse in a house. The first, contact with a corpse or parts of a corpse lying in a field (*TS* 50:4–9; "pure at evening," 50:8–9), is included in the Torah's discussion of purification from corpse impurity (Num 19:16–19), and so the insistence on waiting until evening is not an innovation of the *Temple Scroll*. The second special case, a woman carrying a dead fetus (*TS* 50:10–19), does not appear in the Torah. This case is connected to the *Temple Scroll*'s larger anxiety about graves, which the Torah includes in a list of the possible sources of corpse impurity in the field (Num 19:16). Immediately preceding the discussion of the impurity of a corpse in a house, the *Temple Scroll* warns, "You shall not do as the Gentiles do. They bury their dead everywhere. They even bury them within their houses" (*TS* 48:11–12). The text goes on to decree setting aside places reserved for burial, one for every four cities (*TS* 48:12–14). For the *Temple Scroll*, the woman carrying a dead fetus within her is impure "like a grave" (*TS* 50:11); any house she enters becomes impure as if it had a corpse in it (*TS* 50:11–12), and anyone who has contact with the house is impure until evening (*TS* 50:12). Anyone who enters a house with the woman contracts an impurity that, to judge by the mode of removal, appears to be equivalent to standard corpse impurity (*TS* 50:12–15) and disappears only at evening (*TS* 50:15–16).

As in its treatment of the laws of seminal emission, the overarching concern of the *Temple Scroll* in its treatment of the laws of corpse impurity is to offer a more adequate response to impurity than, in its view, the Torah does. While waiting until evening plays an important part in the *Temple Scroll*'s expanded laws of corpse impurity, on this point these laws simply follow the Torah. The only possible exception is the woman with the dead fetus, a case that does not appear in the Torah. Still, the Torah does require waiting for evening at the end of the process of purification from contact with a grave, and the *Temple Scroll* clearly understands the woman as a type of grave. In the *Temple Scroll*'s insistence that only after sundown is it permitted for the person who has undergone purification from corpse impurity to touch "all

their pure things" (כול טהרתמה) (*TS* 49.21), Schiffman finds a rejection of the view later held by the rabbis that the *ṭevul yom* may touch any nonsacral food without rendering it impure.[15] But in contrast to the heated rhetoric of the *Temple Scroll*'s prohibition on entering the Temple after seminal emission, there is no hint of polemic in the language of the *Temple Scroll* here. Without other reasons to assume that a dispute about the concept of the *ṭevul yom* lies in the background, this passage could easily be read as a straightforward statement of the rules governing purification from corpse impurity.

The *Temple Scroll* contains one last set of laws that involve waiting until evening, i.e., the laws for purification from contact with animal carcasses (*TS* 50:20–51:5); again, the Torah, too, requires waiting for evening after such contact (Lev 11:39–40). For this type of impurity as well, the *Temple Scroll* goes beyond the laws of the Torah or makes explicit what is only implicit in the Torah: purification requires not only laundering, as the Torah indicates (Lev 11:40), but also bathing (*TS* 51:3–5). Here, too, Schiffman detects polemic in the language of the *Temple Scroll*: "Anyone who carries some of their bones or their carcass, whether hide, flesh, or nail, shall launder his clothes and bathe in water. When the sun sets, afterward he will be pure" (*TS* 51:4–5). In Schiffman's view, "afterward" is emphatic, implicitly rejecting the possibility of the partial purity of the *ṭevul yom*.[16] I would suggest instead that this passage shows the *Temple Scroll*'s debt to the formulation of the Holiness Code as quoted above (Lev 22:6–7), which specifies that P's "until evening" means *after* sundown;[17] in other words, the language *is* emphatic, but it is the Holiness Code's emphasis, intended to clarify P's ambiguous language. Thus there is no need to invoke the existence of the concept of the *ṭevul yom* to explain the *Temple Scroll*'s language.

We shall see shortly that 4QD and 4QMMT go beyond the Torah by applying the requirement to wait until evening to types of impurity to which the Torah does not apply it. The *Temple Scroll*, on the other hand, makes the Torah's laws of purity more demanding in a variety of ways, but it does not go beyond the Torah in requiring the arrival of evening for the return of a state of purity.

---

[15] Schiffman, "Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah," 293–94.

[16] Schiffman, "Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah," 295.

[17] Schiffman points out that the rabbis use the passage from Leviticus 22 to demonstrate the existence of the category of the *ṭevul yom* ("Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah," 295–96); their reading is hardly straightforward, however.

4QD

There is nothing sectarian in the rhetoric of the purity laws of 4QD, although I have argued elsewhere that the rules governing sexual relations, which involve a quite radical intensification of the laws of the Torah, presuppose a sectarian context in which sexual relations are valued only for purposes of procreation.[18] Thus, for example, 4QD conflates the impurity of seminal emission with the impurity of abnormal male genital flow, which would introduce an eight-day period of purification following sexual relations. As this example suggests, the purity laws of 4QD, like those of the *Temple Scroll*, read the purity laws of the Torah as a system; but the exegetical character of 4QD is more evident than that of the *Temple Scroll*, which presents itself as an alternate Torah.

The only passage in 4QD that preserves an allusion to the necessity of waiting for evening for purification is the discussion of the woman with abnormal genital flow, or in rabbinic terminology, the *zavah*. Here, then, 4QD takes the step of applying the requirement to wait to a type of impurity beyond those to which the Torah applies it: "She shall not eat anything sanctified, nor shall she [enter] the sanctuary until sunset on the eighth day" (4Q266 6 ii 3–4). The phrase, "until sunset," עד בו השמש, integrates the vocabulary of the Holiness Code's clause, ובא השמש (Lev 22:7), with the form of P's recurrent phrase, עד הערב.

4QD's approach to the purity laws as a system is very much in evidence in this passage. "She shall not eat anything sanctified, nor shall she enter the sanctuary until sunset on the eight day" is a paraphrase of the rule that appears in relation to the woman after childbirth (Lev 12:4), the only passage in P to specify the consequences of being in a state of impurity—lack of access to holy things. The passage in 4QD makes explicit what is surely implicit in the Torah, i.e., that the same prohibitions apply to other types of impurity. But perhaps with the Holiness Code's rule for priests in mind (Lev 22:4–7), 4QD sharpens the Torah's prohibition on *touching* holy things by replacing "touch" with "eat," since the primary form of touching holy things, especially for a woman, is eating.

---

[18] M. Himmelfarb, "The Purity Laws of 4QD: Exegesis and Sectarianism," in *Things Revealed: Studies in Early Jewish and Christian Literature in Honor of Michael E. Stone* (ed. E. G. Chazon, D. Satran, and R. A. Clements; JSJSup 89; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 155–69.

To turn to the point relevant for us, 4QD specifies the time at which the *zavah* returns to a state of purity as sunset on the eighth day. This is a significant innovation in relation to the text of the Torah. The Torah says that the *zavah* counts seven days from the time of the cessation of the flow "and afterwards she is pure" (Lev 15:28). On the eighth day she brings her sacrifice (Lev 15:29–30). 4QD is clearly troubled by two pieces of information that fit together only imperfectly. On the one hand, the *zavah* "is pure" on the seventh day. On the other, since she must bring a sacrifice on the eighth day, the process is not yet complete on the seventh day, and therefore, perhaps her state of purity on the seventh day is not complete either. In light of the desire it shares with the *Temple Scroll* to intensify the Torah's laws of impurity, it is not surprising that 4QD prefers the more stringent possibility, that purity is restored only on the eighth day. But even when the question has been resolved in favor of the eighth day, another question remains. Does the state of purity return with the offering of the sacrifice, or, as for those forms of impurity for which the time of termination is specified, must the *zavah* await evening? Once again 4QD gives the stringent answer to the question.

I see no reason why 4QD would have confined this type of reasoning about the duration of the period of impurity to the *zavah* when it would also have been relevant to the woman after childbirth, the *zav*, those suffering from skin eruptions, and perhaps also the menstruant, though her process of purification according to the Torah does not involve stages. No such requirements are preserved in 4QD, but its purity laws are quite fragmentary, and it is certainly possible that the complete text included them.

I have suggested that 4QD can be read as responding to questions raised by the text of the Torah. But does 4QD betray awareness of an opposing position? In *m. Neg.* (14:3), the rabbis discuss the status of a person undergoing purification from skin eruptions, a process even more complex than the procedure for a *zav* or *zavah*, at several moments in this process. They consider him to have achieved the status of *ṭevul yom* after immersion on the seventh day and a further level of purity after sundown on the seventh day. Full purity, however, is restored only after he offers his sacrifice on the eighth day. The passage goes on to note that there are also three stages in the return to purity of a woman after childbirth. While the rabbis never offer a staged view of the return to purity of the *zav* or *zavah*, it is certainly fair to say that the perspective of *m. Negaʿim*, with stages of purity and a return

to full purity immediately after sacrifice without awaiting sundown, stands in contrast to 4QD's prescription for the *zavah*, in which purity returns not in stages, but all at once after sundown on the last day of the process.[19] Still, this does not mean that 4QD's rule for the *zavah* is a polemic against a point of view like that of *m*. *Negaʿim*; indeed, there is nothing in 4QD's straightforward presentation of its rule to suggest polemic. If 4QD had opponents in view, it is perhaps more likely that they are people who concluded on the basis of the language of the Torah that the *zav* and *zavah* returned to a state of purity on the seventh day before offering sacrifice on the eighth day.

4QMMT

4QMMT is usually read as a polemic against the views of others, most often the priestly establishment in Jerusalem at a time when it was under Pharisaic influence; though this understanding of 4QMMT is by no means unproblematic, as Steven D. Fraade has recently argued.[20] 4QMMT contains two passages relevant to the discussion of *ṭevul yom*; one treats skin eruptions, the other the ritual of the red cow. As we shall see, the passage about skin eruptions does have a polemical tone, but the polemic has nothing to do with a disagreement about the status of a *ṭevul yom*, and the practice being criticized is unlikely to have been that of the priestly establishment. In the passage about the red cow, on the other hand, the moment of the return of purity is indeed the central topic. I shall argue, however, that the concern of the passage is not polemic, but rather exegesis.

In the case of skin eruptions, 4QMMT introduces a requirement of waiting for evening that does not appear in the Torah, just as 4QD introduces such a requirement for the *zavah*. The passage in 4QMMT begins by complaining of failure to observe the Torah's rule that those undergoing purification from skin eruptions must stay outside their houses for seven days after shaving, laundering, and bathing (Lev 14:8): "It is written that from the time he shaves and launders, he should dwell

[19] Schiffman, "Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah," 297–98, notes points of contact between the views of the rabbis and this passage in 4QD, but characterizes 4QD as "much more extreme" in its requirement of awaiting sunset on the eighth day.

[20] "To Whom It May Concern: 4QMMT and Its Addressee(s)," *RevQ* 19 (2000): 507–26.

outside [his tent seven da]ys. But now while their impurity is still with them, [those with skin eruptions] enter a house with communal pure food (טהרת קודש)" (B66–68). While the continuation of the passage is fragmentary, it appears to require that anyone who violates this rule bring a purification offering and to label him a slanderer and a blasphemer (B69–70). Finally, it permits one undergoing purification from skin eruptions to eat sanctified food (קו[ד]שים) only after sundown on the eighth day, the day on which he would bring his sacrifice according to the Torah (B71–72); the relationship between sanctified food and pure food in this passage is never clarified in the extant text.

4QMMT is clearly in disagreement with the position of *m*. *Negaʿim*, which permits the consumption of sanctified food (קדשים) at any time on the eighth day after the offering of the sacrifice (and of the second tithe and heave offering even earlier in the process of purification); indeed, Schiffman sees the earlier text as engaged in a polemic against contemporaries who follow the practice later delineated by the Mishnah.[21] The emphasis of the passage in 4QMMT is not on waiting for sundown on the eighth day, however, but rather on the evils of entering one's home during the seven-day period after the first stage of purification. This emphasis strongly suggests that 4QMMT is worried not about adherents of views like those of *m*. *Negaʿim*, but rather about people who violate the explicit command of the Torah to remain outside one's tent for seven days (Lev 14:8), a requirement that rabbinic law, too, embraces (*m*. *Neg*. 14:2).[22]

Finally I turn to 4QMMT's treatment of the sacrifice of the red cow:

> And also concerning the purity of the cow of the purification offering: the one who slaughters it and the one who burns it and the one who gathers its ashes and the one who sprinkles the [waters for] purification—for all of them, the sun must set for them to be pure so that a pure person will sprinkle the impure person (Num 19:19). For the sons of Aaron should be[(B 13–17)

This passage undoubtedly places emphasis on waiting for sunset for purification. But is it a polemic, as Schiffman and Baumgarten suggest,

---

[21] Schiffman, "Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah," 290–91.

[22] *M*. *Neg*. 14:2 requires that the person at this stage of purification remain outside his house, though he may go inside the city wall; and it explicitly prohibits sexual relations, a prohibition that is perhaps implicit in the Torah's requirement of remaining outside the house.

against the insistence of *m. Parah* 3:7 that the burning of the red cow should be accomplished only by a priest in the state of a *ṭevul yom*?[23] Here is the relevant portion of the Mishnah:

> The elders of Israel used to go early on foot to the Mount of Olives, where there was a ritual bath. They would render impure the priest who was going to burn the cow because of the Sadducees, so that they would not say, it was done only by those on whom the sun had set.

It is astonishing that this passage not only permits, but apparently requires—retrospectively—that the priest who burned the cow be a *ṭevul yom*.[24] It is worth noting that while the passage from the Mishnah mentions the Sadducees, it does not refer to the protagonists as Pharisees, but rather as the elders of Israel. But the real problem with reading 4QMMT in light of this passage is that the Mishnah is concerned with the status of the one who burns the cow. 4QMMT includes the one who burns the cow in its list, but its focus is on the one who does the sprinkling: "For all of them, the sun must set for them to be pure *so that a pure person will sprinkle the impure person*."

If 4QMMT is not engaged in a polemic against the Pharisees, why the need for this emphasis? For three of the four roles listed by 4QMMT, the Torah is quite clear that purity returns only at evening. In insisting that the slaughterer, the burner, and the gatherer do not become pure until evening, 4QMMT is simply restating what the Torah says (Num 19:7, 8, 10)—if you assume, as 4QMMT apparently does, that the priest who throws the cedarwood, hyssop, and scarlet stuff into the burning cow (Num 19:6) is to be identified with the one who slaughters the cow. The requirement to await evening for the return of purity is not as clear for the sprinkler, however. Indeed, the Torah's formulation of the requirements for the sprinkler's purification is somewhat confusing: "The one who sprinkles the waters for impurity shall launder his clothes and the one who touches the waters for impurity shall be impure until evening" (Num 19:21).[25] The language of the passage appears to suggest a distinction between "the one who sprinkles the waters" and "the one who touches the waters." But if they are distinct people, it is not clear

---

[23] Schiffman, "Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakhah," 287–90; J. M. Baumgarten, "The Red Cow Purification Rites in Qumran Texts," *JJS* 46 (1995): 112.

[24] M. Kister, "Studies in *Miqṣat Maʿaśe Ha-Torah* and Related Texts: Law, Theology, Language and Calendar," *Tarbiz* 68 (1999): 317–371 (Hebrew), comments on the remarkable character of this requirement (pp. 330–31).

[25] I follow RSV in translating מי־הנדה as, "waters for impurity."

who the one who touches them might be; the only plausible candidate, the person undergoing purification from contact with a corpse, has already been accounted for (Num 19:19). Thus 4QMMT's equation of the sprinkler with "the one who touches the waters," an identification implicit in its inclusion of the sprinkler in a list of those who must await evening to be restored to purity, is quite reasonable.[26]

The motive provided by 4QMMT for its concern about sunset—"*so that a pure person will sprinkle the impure person*"—shows that its real concern is for the sprinkler rather than for the participants in the production of the ashes. The Mishnah presumably exaggerates in claiming that from the time of Moses only seven or nine red cows had ever been sacrificed (*m. Parah* 3:5), but the sacrifice of a red cow was clearly a rare event, and the tasks of slaughtering the cow, burning it, and gathering its ashes would not be performed very often. Thus, the return to a state of purity of the one who slaughtered the cow, the one who burned it, and the one who gathered the ashes, though surely of importance to these men themselves, especially since they were probably priests who needed to reincorporate themselves into the ongoing Temple ritual, was irrelevant for the proper conduct of the red cow ritual in its own right.

Sprinkling to remove corpse impurity, on the other hand, must have been performed frequently. Here the requirement to await evening for purification would have had a real impact: no one could perform more than a single sprinkling in one day. In other words, although the language of the Torah decrees the moment at which the sprinkler becomes pure again *after* sprinkling, it has implications for the beginning of the process, for it prohibits anyone from sprinkling more than one impure person per day: "so that a pure person will sprinkle the impure person."[27] The same concern may also be reflected in the Torah's emphasis on the purity of the sprinkler as he sprinkles the person in a state of corpse impurity (Num 19:19). 4QMMT's concern with the moment when the sprinkler returns to a state of purity is similarly directed at assuring that the sprinkler begins the activity in a state of

[26] 4QMMT does not seem concerned that the Torah neglects to mention bathing together with laundering for this person, just as for the one who gathers the ashes (Num 19:10).

[27] I would like to thank Ruth Clements for this point.

purity. In other words, rather than polemic, 4QMMT appears to be engaging in careful exegesis of the text of the Torah.[28]

Conclusions

I have argued that the Scrolls' treatment of the requirement to wait until evening for purity to be restored can be explained by reference to two factors: the Torah's sometimes ambiguous language and less than completely consistent system of treating impurity; and the Scrolls' desire to intensify the purity laws of the Torah. Not only is there no need to invoke a polemic against the rabbinic idea of the *ṭevul yom*, first indisputably attested only centuries later,[29] to make sense of the Scrolls' language and rules, but even in those case in which the Scrolls do appear to be engaged in a polemic, there are other more plausible candidates for their targets.

Finally, I would like to make two related points about the implications of my argument about the *ṭevul yom*. First, I would suggest greater caution about invoking the dichotomy "priestly halakhah" / "halakhah of the sages." In the case of the *ṭevul yom*, I hope I have shown that there is no reason to assume that the Scrolls are reacting against a Pharisaic version of the position that later appears in rabbinic literature. Surely not every point at which the rabbis hold a different position from that of the Scrolls reflects the position of the Pharisees. Frequently, the points of contact between the Scrolls and the rabbis, whether similarities or differences, reflect the contours of the Torah's laws. Nor is it

---

[28] Baumgarten, "The Red Cow Purification Rites," 118–19, argues that another aspect of the Scrolls' polemic against the rabbinic procedures for the red cow is their insistence that the sprinkler be an adult priest, not a young boy. The material Baumgarten considers (4Q277 and 4Q271 [4QD]; *m. Par.* 3:2–3; *Epistle of Barnabas* 8.1) deserves further consideration, though, as Baumgarten himself notes, the rabbinic texts that make young boys responsible for the preparation of the ashes never mention the boys as sprinklers, the very task the Scrolls prohibit them from performing.

[29] A. Solomon, "The Prohibition Against *Ṭevul Yom* and Defilement of the Daily Whole Offering in the Jerusalem Temple in CD 11:21–12:1: A New Understanding," *DSD* 4 (1997): 1–20, argues that CD's *ṭame' kavus* is the equivalent of the rabbis' *ṭevul yom* (12–17). While Solomon makes a persuasive case that CD's term refers to someone at the same stage in the process of purification as the *ṭevul yom*, the very limited evidence gives no indication that the status of the *ṭame' kavus* stands between pure and impure. According to CD he is simply impure. Solomon reads the passage in CD as a polemic against the Pharisees' understanding of the privileges of the *ṭevul yom* (16), but it might better be understood as criticism of lax popular practice, as I suggested above for the rules about skin eruptions in 4QMMT.

surprising that the positions of the rabbis would correspond to some of the positions of their predecessors now known to us from the Scrolls and react against others. The position the rabbis embrace in relation to the burning of the red cow, which so clearly contradicts the plain sense of the Torah, may actually reflect their desire to differentiate themselves from their predecessors at a time when the sacrifice of the red cow was safely in the past. Indeed, it may be that the concept of the *ṭevul yom* is possible only *after* the destruction of the Temple.

But there is another reason for caution about this dichotomy. Although I did not highlight this point in my discussion here, the contents of the texts I have discussed certainly raise reservations about the idea of a unified priestly halakhah. It is true that as far as we can tell from what has been preserved, the laws of the *Temple Scroll*, 4QD, and 4QMMT are consistent with each other concerning the requirement of waiting for evening for the return of purity. The same cannot be said of other aspects of their purity laws, however. For example, the *Temple Scroll* decrees three days of purification for seminal emission; 4QD, on the other hand, appears to treat seminal emission as equivalent to abnormal male genital flow. The *Temple Scroll* confines those in particular states of impurity to special places; 4QD does not appear to know of such places. Thus, while the lens of rabbinic literature has helped to illumine many aspect of the legal material of the Scrolls, it seems to me that it has also encouraged us to move too quickly to a picture of two relatively unified, opposing streams of halakhah in the centuries before the destruction of the Temple.[30]

[30] I would like to thank Steven Fraade, Ian Werrett, and Ruth Clements for their helpful comments on this paper, and the participants in the Orion Symposium, especially Moshe Bernstein and Lawrence Schiffman, for helping me to clarify its argument.

QUMRAN AND THE GENEALOGY OF WESTERN MYSTICISM

Philip S. Alexander
Centre for Jewish Studies, University of Manchester

Mysticism at Qumran: The State of the Question

Scholars have shown a marked reluctance to recognize the existence of mysticism at Qumran.[1] This reluctance extends both to Scrolls experts and to historians of Jewish mysticism. Almost as soon as the first reports of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* appeared, the possibility of links between this work and the later Hekhalot literature was raised.[2] Since then a number of more detailed studies by Schiffman, Baumgarten, Davila and others have vastly multiplied the parallels with the Hekhalot texts,[3] but there are still few accounts of Jewish mysticism which take

---

[1] This essay provides an overview of a position I have worked out at greater length in *The Mystical Texts: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Related Manuscripts* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 7; London: T&T Clark International, 2005), to which the reader is referred for detailed documentation. The present article, however, is not just a summary of the book. The necessity of compressing and simplifying the case has led me, to some extent, to rethink and clarify my argument. A number of points (e.g., the anthropology behind Qumran mysticism, and the doctrine of predestination, which seems to be all over the relevant texts) now strike me as more important than I realised when I wrote the book. My purpose is to open a debate on what happens if we take certain Scrolls seriously as mysticism, and read them into the western mystical tradition.

[2] John Strugnell already hinted at the possibility in the first publication of fragments of *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, "The Angelic Liturgy at Qumrân: 4Q Serek Šîrôt `Ôlat Haššabbāt," in *Congress Volume: Oxford, 1959* (VTSup 7; Leiden; Brill, 1960), 318–45. I noted some parallels in the introduction to my translation of *3 Enoch* in *OTP* 1:249–50.

[3] L. H. Schiffman, "Merkavah Speculations at Qumrân: The 4QSerek Shirot `Olat ha-Shabbat," in *Mystics, Philosophers, and Politicians: Essays in Jewish Intellectual History in Honor of Alexander Altmann* (ed. J. Reinharz and D. Swetschinski; Duke Monographs in Medieval and Renaissance Studies 5; Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1982), 15–47; idem, "Hekhalot Literature and Qumran Writings," in *Early Jewish Mysticism: Proceedings of the First International Conference on the History of Jewish Mysticism* (= *Jerusalem Studies in the History of Jewish Thought* 6/1–2) (ed. J. Dan; The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1987), 121–38 (Hebrew); J. M. Baumgarten, "The Qumran Sabbath Shirot and Rabbinic Merkabah Traditions," *RevQ* 3 (1988): 199–213; J. R. Davila, "The Hodayot Hymnist and the Four who Entered Paradise," *RevQ* 17 (1996): 457–78; idem, "4QMess ar (4Q534) and Merkavah Mysticism," *DSD* 5 (1998): 367–81; idem, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Merkavah Mysticism," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls*

serious note of this parallelism or attempt to integrate the Scrolls into the history of the Jewish mystical tradition. The attitude of Scholem set the tone. When he first wrote his agenda-setting monograph *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* the Scrolls had not, of course, been discovered, but his scholarly career continued long after many texts had become widely known, including the passages from the *Sabbath Songs* first published by John Strugnell in 1960.[4] His response to these ground-breaking finds was surprisingly muted. In *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* he makes some passing remarks about the "gnostic" colouring of some of the Dead Sea texts. This comment is highly significant, since it hints that the Scrolls possibly *should* be included in the genealogy of Jewish mysticism, which Scholem construed as fundamentally a form of Jewish Gnosticism. And in the additional notes to the second edition of this work he drew attention to the stylistic parallels between the numinous hymnology of the Hekhalot treatises and the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*.[5] But he never followed up these insights, possibly with good reason; for if he had, they would arguably have problematised, if not subverted, his grand paradigm of Jewish mysticism.[6] It is interesting to note that at the Berlin conference which convened to assess *Major Trends* fifty years after its publication, and to discover where it needed to be supplemented and corrected, no one, apparently, mentioned the Dead Sea Scrolls.[7]

There have, indeed, been some notable exceptions to this neglect of the Scrolls in the history of Jewish mysticism. Here one should single out Johann Maier's pioneering 1964 monograph *Vom Kultus zur Gno-*

---

in their Historical Context (ed. T. H. Lim; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 249–64; idem, *Liturgical Works* (Eerdmans Commentaries on the Dead Sea Scrolls; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), *passim*. See also the useful overview of the state of play in the mid-nineties by E. Hamacher, "Die Sabbatopferlieder im Streit um Ursprung und Anfänge der Jüdischen Mystik," *JSJ* 27 (1996): 119–54.

[4] Strugnell, "Angelic Liturgy." The first edition of *Major Trends* was published in 1941 (New York; Schocken). For the present article I have used the 1967 edition (3d ed.; New York: Schocken).

[5] G. G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (2d ed.; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965), 3–4, 29–30, 128.

[6] On the Scholemian paradigm of Jewish mysticism, see P. S. Alexander, "Mysticism," in *The Oxford Handbook of Jewish Studies* (ed. M. D. Goodman; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 705–32.

[7] *Gershom Scholem's "Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism" 50 Years After: Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on the History of Jewish Mysticism* (ed. P. Schäfer and J. Dan; Tübingen: Mohr, 1993). I participated in the conference, and do not recall any references to the Scrolls in the unpublished discussion.

sis: Studien zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte der jüdischen Gnosis; Ithamar Gruenwald's *Apocalyptic and Merkabah Mysticism* (1980); and the essays Gruenwald collected in the volume *From Apocalypticism to Gnosticism* (1988), though he put greater stress on the apocalyptic antecedents of Hekhalot mysticism than on texts like *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*.[8] More recently Rachel Elior has argued for the beginnings of Jewish mysticism in the Second Temple period and drawn on the Scrolls and on apocalyptic to make her case.[9] But these are the exceptions that prove the rule, and they have by no means said the last word on this matter, nor met with widespread agreement.

A similar picture emerges when we turn specifically to the world of Dead Sea Scrolls studies. When Bilhah Nitzan published her seminal article on "Harmonic and Mystical Characteristics in Poetic and Liturgical Writings from Qumran" in 1994, she was immediately criticised for her use of the term "mystical" by Eliot Wolfson, a noted authority on later Jewish mysticism, in an article in the same volume.[10] Wolfson's criticisms seem to have had an effect, and to have made other Scrolls experts wary of talking about mysticism at Qumran. Thus Esther Chazon, in a valuable essay on "Human and Angelic Prayer in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," published in 2003, in which she developes Nitzan's ideas, still feels it necessary to issue a *caveat* about using the term "mysticism" in relation to Qumran, with a reference to Wolfson's strictures.[11] The fact is that the category of mysticism does

---

[8] J. Maier, *Vom Kultus zur Gnosis: Studien zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte der "jüdischen Gnosis"* (Salzburg: O. Muller, 1964); I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (AGJU 14; Leiden: Brill, 1980); idem, *From Apocalypticism to Gnosticism: Studies in Apocalypticism, Merkavah Mysticism, and Gnosticism* (BEATAJ 14; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1988). The study of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* has been hampered by a tendency to classify the text as "apocalyptic," or to assimilate it to apocalyptic. Though its descriptions of heaven clearly have parallels in the apocalyptic literature it is *liturgy*, not apocalyptic, and that makes a world of difference.

[9] R. Elior, *The Three Temples: On the Emergence of Jewish Mysticism* (trans. D. Louvish; Oxford: Littman Library of Jewish Civilization, 2004).

[10] B. Nitzan, "Harmonic and Mystical Characteristics in Poetic and Liturgical Writings from Qumran," *JQR* 85 (1994): 163–83; E. R. Wolfson, "Mysticism and the Poetic-Liturgical Compositions from Qumran: A Response to Bilhah Nitzan," *JQR* 85 (1994): 185–202.

[11] E. G. Chazon, "Human and Angelic Prayer in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 19–23 January, 2000* (ed. E. G. Chazon, in collaboration with R. A. Clements and A. Pinnick; STDJ 48; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 35–48. Her disavowal of the term "mysticism" is on p. 36.

not come readily to the minds of most scholars of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The study of the Scrolls has been dominated by philological and literary approaches, and mysticism is a term that belongs essentially to the phenomenology or history of religion. It is noticeable that philologists and literary historians tend to be more suspicious of the term than do historians of religion. Yet there is much to be gained in understanding and contextualizing various aspects of the spiritual life of the Dead Sea community if we can identify mysticism there. A range of analogies and parallels is at once opened up, and a body of highly sophisticated theory and analysis can be invoked, to enhance our perceptions of what may be happening at Qumran. Philology and literary history are the bedrock of any analysis of the Scrolls, but they will only take us so far. There comes a point beyond which we can advance only by adopting a more history-of-religions approach.

The Qumran Mystical Corpus

In this short paper I will set out two linked theses. The first is that the evidence that has accumulated for the existence of mysticism in the Qumran community is now substantial and compelling. The second is that the type of mysticism attested at Qumran, for which one could cautiously borrow the later Christian term *angelikos bios*,[12] somehow fed into not only later Jewish but also later Christian mysticism, and this puts Qumran firmly into the genealogy of the western mystical tradition. If I am correct, then Qumran has to be integrated into the history of western mysticism.

There are two ways in which we can identify mysticism at Qumran. The first is indicatively. We can attempt to show that certain Dead Sea texts contain such close parallels in thought, terminology and *praxis* to

[12] On the concept of the *angelikos bios* see K. S. Frank, *ANGELIKOS BIOS: Begriffsanalytische und begriffsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum "angelgleichen Leben" im frühen Mönchtum* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1964); D. E. Linge, "Leading the Life of Angels: Ascetic Practice and Reflection in the Writings of Evagrius of Pontus," *JAAR* 68 (2000): 537–68; N. Ricklefs, "An Angelic Community: The Significance of Beliefs about Angels in the First Four Centuries of Christianity" (Ph.D. diss., Macquarie University [Sydney], 2002). By the *angelikos bios* type of mysticism I mean a mysticism in which the angels are seen as exemplars of the supreme relationship to God to which a creature can attain. The mystic's aim is, through a process of elevation and transformation known in some later Christian texts as *theosis*, to join the choirs of angels, and so to share in their nearness to God.

other texts universally deemed mystical as to be plausibly placed in the same category. This approach works very well, since, as we have noted, it has been shown that there are quite remarkable parallels between Dead Sea texts like the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* and the later Hekhalot literature, which, along with the *Sefer Yetzirah*, was identified by Scholem as the foundation of the Jewish mystical tradition. If the Hekhalot texts are mystical, then why should we deny that *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* is mystical as well? This argument is in itself quite strong but it leaves hanging in the air what we mean by mysticism. This brings us to our second way of identifying mysticism at Qumran. Can we find anything at Qumran which would conform to an acceptable abstract definition of mysticism? The definition of mysticism is, of course, hugely contested, and it is this that has frightened many scholars off from using it as a descriptive or analytical category. This is neither the time nor the place to get involved in the deep philosophical debates on this question, and for our present purposes, I would suggest, it is actually quite unnecessary. It is perfectly possible for us to come up with a working definition of mysticism that is relatively uncontroversial and that is adequate to serve our immediate needs.

Three elements are essential to that definition. (a) The first is that mysticism arises from religious *experience*, the experience of a transcendent divine presence which stands behind the visible, material world. It is the experience that is important. Mysticism is simply a convenient label by which the phenomenon is known. This transcendent presence will be named and described in various ways in the different concrete traditions (in the great monotheisms it is identified with God). The sense that this presence is there is very widespread in human experience, and is not confined to the conventionally religious. One of the most subtle analyses of this experience remains Rudolf Otto's *Idea of the Holy*.[13] (b) Second, the mystic, having become aware of a transcendent presence, is filled with a desire for a closer relationship with it. He or she feels acutely a sense of alienation or separation from this ultimate reality. This desire is commonly described in intensely emotional language, such as "longing," or "yearning," or "love." It is sometimes said that the nature of the theological culture to which the mystic belongs will determine

[13] R. Otto, *The Idea of the Holy: An Inquiry into the Non-Rational Factor in the Idea of the Divine and its Relation to the Rational* (trans. J. W. Harvey; revised with additions; London: Oxford University Press, 1926).

exactly how they conceive of this relationship being consummated. In theistic systems, which are conscious of an unbridgeable ontological gap between the Creator and the created, this consummation will be described as *communion*; in pantheistic systems, it will be described as *union*. However, in actual fact the language of union in the strictest sense is common also in the theisms. (c) Third, mysticism always demands a *via mystica*, a way by which the mystic sets out to attempt union/communion with the divine. *Praxis* lies at the heart of mysticism: without it there is no mysticism in any strict sense of the term, only theosophy, or mystical *theology*, a point often missed by historians of mysticism. This mystical *praxis* involves a bewildering variety of ways and means, ranging from the magical and theurgical at one end of the spectrum, with a stress largely on mechanistic practices, to the purely noetic and contemplative at the other, with an emphasis on the exercise of the intellect. There is, however, a broad agreement within the various traditions that there is no instant gratification, no shortcut to the ultimate reality (in this respect drug-induced ecstasy is the antithesis of real mysticism): the *via mystica* demands perseverance and discipline; it is long and hard, and there are many stages along the way.[14]

If we apply both our indicative and abstract criteria it is not difficult to isolate a corpus of texts at Qumran that seem to point to the existence of mysticism within the Dead Sea sect. These texts fall into two groups. The first consists of descriptions of the heavenly Temple and the angelic liturgies. The most important work here, and indeed the key document of the whole Qumran mystical corpus, is the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (4Q400–407; 11Q17; Mas1k). But many of the central themes of the *Sabbath Songs* are found in other Scrolls as well: *4QBlessings* (4Q286–290); *4QWords of the Luminaries* (4Q504–506); *4QDaily Prayers* (4Q503); *4QApocryphon of Moses*^{c}? (4Q408); *4QPseudo-Ezekiel* (4Q385); *4QMysteries*^{c} (4Q301); *4QSongs of the Sage* (4Q510–511); *11QMelchizedek* (11Q13); the *Hodayot* (1QH^{a}); the *Community Rule* (1QS); the *Rule of the Congregation* (1QSa); the *Rule of Blessings* (1QSb); and the *War Rule* (1QM). The second group consists of texts which describe ascents to heaven. The most important work here is the so-called *Self-Glorification Hymn* (4Q491c; 4Q471b; 4Q427 7 i 6–18;

[14] There is a third test for identifying mysticism in a text. Does a mystical reading of it work? Does it throw light on the text's darker places, and bring the reader to a deeper understanding of it? I leave it to others to decide whether my mystical reading of *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* is convincing.

1QH[a] 26:6–14),[15] in which someone, apparently within the community (possibly the *Maskil*), boasts of having ascended to heaven, and exhorts his congregation to join with the angels in the performance of the celestial liturgy. The inspiration for this ascent appears to lie in ascents performed by great heroes in the past, notably Enoch and Levi; so the Qumran accounts of these can also be added to the mystical corpus (for Enoch, see 4Q202 6:1–4; 4Q204 6:1–30; cf. *1 En.* 14:8–23; and for Levi, 4Q213a 1 ii 15–18; 4Q213b 1–6; cf. Cairo *Testament of Levi*, Bodleian *col.* a 11–13; *T. Levi* 2:5–5:7; 8:1–19).[16] The range of texts is impressive: it includes both sectarian and nonsectarian compositions, from almost every stage of the Qumran community's history. The ideas with which we are dealing here were clearly widespread and deeply ingrained in the community's belief and practice.

The Nature of the Unio Mystica *at Qumran*

If we try to read these texts from the standpoint of mysticism, what emerges? The transcendent reality towards which Qumran mysticism is directed is, not surprisingly, identified as the God of Israel, but the closest relationship to God which the texts envisage the mystic attaining is that enjoyed by the angels in heaven, who perpetually offer to him worship and adoration in the celestial Temple. In terms of mysticism the descriptions of the celestial Temple and the angelic liturgies function as metaphors for the supreme relationship to God which humans can achieve. The Qumran mystics long to join the angels in their liturgy, to form with them one worshipping community (*yaḥad*). The following are three of the many passages where this thought is expressed or implied:

(a) 1QH[a] 11:22–24: "The depraved spirit you have purified from great offence so that he can take up a position (להתיצב במעמד) with the host of the holy ones, and can enter into union (לבוא ביחד) with the congregation of the sons of heaven. You cast eternal destiny for man with the spirits of knowledge, so that he praises your name in the community of jubilation (ביחד רנה)."

---

[15] The line numbers given for the *Hodayot* texts cited in this paper are based on their official publication in *1QHodayot[a]* (ed. H. Stegemann, with E. Schuller and C. Newsom; DJD 40; Oxford: Clarendon, 2008).

[16] For a detailed discussion of these texts see Alexander, *Mystical Texts*, 13–92.

(b) 1QH[a] 19:13–17: "For the sake of your glory, you have purified man from offence, so that he can make himself holy for you from every impure abomination and guilt of unfaithfulness, to be in union (להיחד) wi[th] the sons of your truth in the lot of your holy ones, to raise the worms of the dead from the dust, to an everlasting community, and from a depraved spirit, to knowledge (בינה) [of you], so that he can take up a position in your presence (להתיצב במעמד לפניכה) with the perpetual host and the spirits […], to renew him with everything that exists, and with those who know (ידעים), in a community of jubilation (ביחד רנה)."

(c) 4Q427 7 i 13–18: The speaker in the *Self-Glorification Hymn* (possibly the *Maskil*) exhorts his community: "Make melody, beloved ones (ידידים), sing to the King of [glory, rejoice in the asse]mbly of God, exult in the tent of salvation, praise in the [holy] residence, [e]xalt together (יחד) in the eternal host, ascribe greatness to our God and glory to our King; [sanc]tify his name with strong lips and powerful tongue, raise your voices in unison (הרימו לבד קולכמה) [at a]ll times, cause the shout to be heard, rejoice with everlasting happiness, and unceasingly bow down in the united assembly (ביחד קהל)."

The constant reappearance of the term *yaḥad* in this context is striking. It points to reflection and theorizing about the nature of the experience involved. The mystics strive for *yiḥud* ("union") with a transcendent reality; in this case, however, the union is not with God, but with the angels who worship God in purity and perfection. From a comparative perspective this is highly suggestive. The *yiḥud* with the angels cannot be an end in itself. The human mystic desires this union only so that he can enjoy the same close and privileged relationship to God that the angels enjoy. The angels represent the ultimate perfection in nearness to God. *Union* with the angels is the mystic's way of achieving the supreme *communion* with God. The implication of this is clear. There is no absorption into God in Qumran mysticism: the gulf between the Creator and his creatures is not crossed. A superficial reading of the texts might suggest that there is a constant blurring of the boundaries between God and the highest angels. For example, one of the ubiquitous titles of the angels is "Gods" (*ʾElohim*), but closer analysis shows that there is no real confusion in the minds of the writers. They explicitly stress that the angels are God's creatures, and they are constantly shown in a relationship of worship, adoration and total submission to God the King (4Q402 4 12; Mas1k 1:2; 4Q403 1 i 35; 4Q402 3 ii 12; 11Q17 19–20 6–7; Mas1k 1:9). What the angels

know they know only because God graciously grants them illumination. Thinking of this relationship in ontological terms did not come as readily to the Qumran writers as it would to us, or, possibly, to the ancient Greek philosophers, but they make it perfectly clear that they hold to an absolute qualitative difference between God and the angels, a difference that cannot under any circumstances be erased. Indeed it is arguable that it is *because* they espouse this view so completely that they sense no problem in speaking of angels as "Gods." It would never have crossed their minds that anyone could have been misled by such language, which in any case has an exegetical basis (see, e.g., Ps 82:1), into blurring the distinction between the Creator and his creatures.[17]

This qualitative difference comes out in the reluctance of the texts to describe God. In *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* much time is spent envisioning in the most vivid and concrete terms the angels and the celestial Temple, but the climactic vision of the King on his throne seems to have been extremely brief. The passage is missing from the surviving manuscripts, but reconstruction suggests that it cannot have been long, and may have contained no more than a fleeting reference to "the Great Glory," as in *1 En.* 14:20 and *T. Levi* 5:1.[18] This refusal to dwell on the appearance of God is certainly deliberate: the ultimate mystery is beyond words; the adoration of the highest angels takes place in silence (4Q405 20 ii to 21–22 8, 12). The *Songs* seem to have concluded with a description, not of God but of the robes of the celestial high priests (11Q17 21–22 6–9; 4Q405 23 ii 1–11). A strategy of displacement or substitution may be involved here. If the supreme mystery is ineffable, then it is hard to focus on it: the mind finds it difficult to dwell on a void. Instead it is directed to an enumeration of the garments and accoutrements of the beings closest to the supreme mystery, the heavenly high priests. From a contemplative point of view this description may have functioned like the enumeration of the limbs of God in the later *Shiʿur Qomah*, as a way of holding the mind at the climax of the ecstasy. This

[17] See Alexander, *Mystical Texts*, 104–6, and further K. P. Sullivan, *Wrestling with Angels: A Study of the Relationship between Angels and Humans in Ancient Jewish Literature and the New Testament* (AGJU 55; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 14–16, and *passim*.

[18] It should have come in Song 12, where the *merkabah* is described (4Q405 20 ii to 21–22 6–14; 11Q17 16–18 9–15 + 11Q17 19–20 2–10 + 4Q405 23 i 1–14). See Alexander, *Mystical Texts*, 40–42.

would be particularly appropriate if the high priestly garments were seen as containing symbols of the ultimate mystery.[19]

It is probable that the *yiḥud* with the angels involves some sort of transformation, but the nature of this transformation is unclear because the anthropology that lies behind it is not fully spelled out. The texts presuppose that humans possess both a material body and a spirit. It is very tempting to read this on the analogy of later gnostic and neoplatonic thinking as implying that the ascent involves the pure spirit escaping from the shackles of the evil body into an immaterial world. But such a starkly dualist interpretation should probably be resisted as not doing justice to the subtlety of the texts. It is true that the material body is spoken of in derogatory language as "formed from the dust" (1QH^a 11:22); as "dust" and "worms of the dead" (1QH^a 19:15); as "the assembly of unfaithful flesh" and "the assembly of worms" (1QS 11:9–10); as "a creature of clay" (1QH^a 11:24–25); but the spirit is also spoken of negatively as "depraved" and "sinful" (1QH^a 11:22; 19:15; 1QS 11:9). The language of "raising" and "transformation" and "purification" (1QH^a 11:22; 19:13–17) seems to be applied to both. The texts are filled with a sense of unworthiness, of the continuing burden imposed upon the mystic by the world, the flesh and the devil. The final transformation will only be achieved at the *eschaton*, but it clearly can be anticipated in moments of ecstasy now. The final transformation seems to envisage transformed humanity as still embodied, though the eschatological body will be purified and no longer, presumably, subject to the ills which our bodies suffer now, and will no longer act as a drag on our union with the spiritual world (see, e.g., 1QSb 3:25–26; 4:24–26; 1QM 12:1–2, 7–9). Though we share the element of "spirit" with the angels, they at the *eschaton* will remain pure spirits, while we will remain embodied spirits. Angels and humans will, therefore, still constitute two distinct orders in the hierarchy of being. If this is the case, then we should be somewhat careful how we apply to Qumran mysticism the later Christian concepts of angelification or *theosis*. The *yiḥud* with the angels involves sharing in their closeness to God, but it

[19] Note how Josephus sees the high priestly robes as full of cosmic symbolism (*Ant*. 3.184–187). See further C. H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 222–51.

does not necessarily involve the obliteration of the ontological distinction between angels and humanity.[20]

The most pervasive term in our texts that seems to describe the condition resulting from the union with the angels is "knowledge" (*daʿat*). The angels are constantly designated as "spirits of knowledge" (*ruḥot daʿat*: 1QH[a] 11:23–24), "those who know" (*yodeʿim*: 1QH[a] 7:17; 19:17), and the like, and the union of the mystic with the angels means participation in their "knowledge." But what is the object of this knowledge? It is tempting to jump to the conclusion that this must be God, but that would probably be a mistake. Nowhere is God specified as the object of this knowledge; and, if we are correct in arguing that the Qumran mystics regarded God as ultimately ineffable, then it is highly unlikely that he would be that object. The problem is not solved by noting that the Hebrew verb *yadaʿ* does not have the same exclusively intellectual focus as its Greek counterpart γιγνώσκω, but can also be used to cover more personal interrelationships.[21] The fact is, the word *does* seem to be used in our texts in an intellectual sense. The knowledge referred to appears to be knowledge of the ultimate purposes of God and of one's part in them, of what 1Q27 (*Mysteries*) 1 i 3 calls the *raz nihyeh*, "the mystery that is coming to pass." It is knowledge of personal election, of being predestined to stand among God's holy ones before his face.[22] *Daʿat* is, therefore, somewhat analogous to the gnostic concept of *gnosis*, which denotes not knowledge of God in himself, but of the true nature of the world and of one's place in it, and of one's destiny to return to the world of the *pleroma*. The Qumranic vision of heaven as a place of "knowledge" implies, as in Gnosticism, the converse idea that this world, or this age, is characterised by ignorance or lack of knowledge.

How was the union with the angels attained at Qumran? The Qumran mystical texts have little to say on the surface about mystical *praxis*. This is not as surprising as might at first sight appear because the primary mechanism of the ascent seems to have been quite simply incantation—the recitation of texts. We have the texts, but as with other ancient

---

[20] I am not sure that in *Mystical Texts* I have done justice to the nuances of the language on this point, and I may have spoken too simplistically of transformation into angels (see especially pp. 107–8).

[21] *HALOT* (2001) 1:390–92; and *TDOT* 5:448–81. It would be a mistake, however, to restrict the Greek γιγνώσκω to purely intellectual forms of knowing. Its range is actually very similar to *yadaʿ*.

[22] It is possible that *binah* was used for knowledge of God: see 4Q400 1 i 6; 4Q405 23 ii 13; 1QH[a] 19:15.

prayers and liturgies few rubrics survive to explain how they should be performed. Information on this was held in the collective memory of the worshipping community and passed on orally. The key text is the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. The communal chanting of these numinous hymns on successive Sabbaths was apparently deemed sufficient to carry the earthly worshippers up to the courts of the celestial Temple, through the nave and into the sanctuary, and to set them before the throne of God. *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* implies a communal "ascent."[23] The community on earth aligns its worship with the worship of the angels in heaven. In solemn, highly charged, rhythmic and repetitive speech it pictures to itself the angels performing the celestial liturgy, and finds itself transported into heaven to join them. The *Songs*, as has often been noted, are descriptive, but it is a fundamental mistake to see them as purely literary. Unlike the similar descriptions of the heavenly world in apocalyptic, they are liturgical. That is to say they are meant to be performed, and it is this performance that makes them active and transformative. Through communal chanting the descriptions are appropriated and internalized, engendering an altered state of consciousness in which the worshippers on earth feel they have become one with the angels in heaven. The Qumran community was logocentric, and had a strong belief in the power of speech. For them speech was highly performative: note their frequent use of blessing and cursing. There is surely no problem in accepting that in such a community a suitable text in the right setting would on its own have been sufficient to induce such powerful effects.

Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice implies a communal ascent: if one makes the ascent then one does so in a group. Group dynamics could, of course, make it easier to alter individual states of consciousness. The *Self-Glorification Hymn*, however, seems to imply that some individuals within the community, like Enoch and Levi and other great spiritual heroes of the past, had made the ascent on their own. Such individual ascent was probably the exception, rather than the rule; and, as I have suggested, the subject of the *Self-Glorification Hymn* is not just anyone,

[23] The texts do not employ the language of "ascent," but this is probably less significant than some have supposed. I use ascent here in connection with the mystical *yiḥud* at Qumran as a useful shorthand. I am fully aware that the term does not actually occur. From a mystical perspective this is not really an issue, for although the tradition often speaks of the *unio mystica* in terms of ascent, such language is by no means universal, and where it does occur it is always metaphorical. It does not imply a crude, spatial "up" and "down." See further Alexander, *Mystical Texts*, 118–19.

but the *Maskil*. Individual ascent could only be achieved by exceptional people. It is very tempting to integrate the *Self-Glorification Hymn* with the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*. It is reasonable to assume that the liturgy of the *Songs* would have been led by the *Maskil*, and his leadership would be all the more meaningful, and persuasive, if he himself had already made the ascent: he would then be supremely qualified to act as a mystagogue to bring his congregation into the heavenly courts. Indeed it would be easy to see the *Self-Glorification Hymn* as a sort of introit to the *Sabbath Songs* in which the *Maskil*, having recited his credentials to lead the congregation, then exhorts them to follow his example of uniting with the angels in their worship of God.

Qumran and the Genealogy of Western Mysticism

If there was genuine mysticism in the Qumran community in the late Second Temple period, what significance, if any, does this have for the history of western mysticism? First, let us consider the question from the standpoint of Jewish mysticism. The importance here is at once obvious. It means that we can antedate the origins of Jewish mysticism by around three hundred years.[24] Scholem, as I remarked earlier, initially took some notice of the Qumran evidence, and even of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*, but he effectively ignored it when shaping his great paradigm of Jewish mysticism—and with some reason, because arguably it severely challenges his views. For Scholem, mysticism within Judaism stands in dialectical tension with halakhah; it was partly for this reason that he traced the origins of Jewish mysticism back to around 200 CE, when, he believed, the earliest forms of the Hekhalot tradition emerged. The date is highly significant: it corresponds, of course, to the publication of the Mishnah. Mysticism, for Scholem, emerged as a kind of protest against the rigidities imposed by halakhic Judaism. But what if, in fact, Jewish mysticism originated three hundred

[24] There seems to be a growing tendency to go back to a late dating for the Hekhalot literature: see, e.g., R. S. Boustan, *From Martyr to Mystic: Rabbinic Martyrology and the Making of Merkavah Mysticism* (TSAJ 112; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005). A late amoraic or even early gaonic dating for the treatises as we now have them is perfectly possible (long ago I argued this strongly for *3 Enoch*), but it would be a mistake to swing all the way back to Graetz's view that the *ideas* contained in these texts only arose in the early Middle Ages. *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* proves conclusively that they did not.

years earlier, and not, as Scholem maintained, in a rabbinic milieu? The short answer might seem to be that the dialectical tension which Scholem posited between law and mysticism can still apply, except that we move the "mystical revolt" back to Second Temple times; but this answer is not as easy as it first seems. We actually know very little about Jewish law in the Second Temple period, and whether or not there was anything equivalent then to rabbinic halakhah, with which specifically Scholem set up the tension, remains a moot point. Unease about *maʿaseh merkabah* is clearly expressed in rabbinic halakhic texts, but is hard to document in Second Temple legal literature. Moreover, a whole new way of construing the tension emerges, which does not depend on the highly dubious essentialising of a fundamental opposition between "Law" and "Mysticism."[25]

It seems eminently reasonable to postulate with Johann Maier[26] that the Qumranic type of Jewish mysticism did not actually originate at Qumran, but in priestly circles in Jerusalem. It was part of a movement in late Second Temple Judaism to "spiritualize" the cult by seeing it as efficacious, not in and of itself, but as a sacramental reenactment of the celestial liturgy performed by the angels. That doctrine, of course, would have been particularly relevant at Qumran: having cut themselves off from the Jerusalem cult, on the grounds that it was hopelessly flawed and corrupt, they were thus not totally bereft of a Temple. They could still join the angels in the heavenly sanctuary. But the doctrine itself did not evolve at Qumran specifically to meet the liturgical needs of a community with no earthly Temple. The Qumranites adapted it for that purpose. In other words this form of mysticism in Judaism was an invention of Temple-based *priests*.

This tradition must have been carried forward by priests in the post-70 period. There has been a great deal of discussion in recent years as to what happened to the priests after 70. The view that as a class they probably maintained some coherence for centuries after the destruction of the Temple, and passed on their distinctive traditions,

[25] It is really surprising how easily Scholem seems to have fallen into this trap, and how easily he led others, like Erwin Goodenough, astray (though Goodenough was already inclined this way before he read Scholem). The binary opposition is at least problematised, if not refuted outright, by the fact that later Jewish mystics, such as Joseph Karo, seem to have found it easy to reconcile a consuming interest in and meticulous observance of halakhah with a profoundly mystical spirituality.

[26] In his *Vom Kultus zur Gnosis*.

has much to commend it.[27] Their power base within the community became the synagogue, which does not seem to have been in any sense a rabbinic institution in late antiquity. The priesthood, in various ways, probably continued to contest the rabbis' claims to the leadership of Jewish life right down to the early Middle Ages. The priestly orientation of Qaraite groups, such as the *ʿAvelei Tziyyon*, and their strong antirabbinism, is very striking.[28] For these priestly circles the doctrine of the celestial Temple and its angelic liturgy could have functioned in much the same way as it functioned for the Qumran community: as, to borrow Carol Newsom's useful phrase, "a virtual Temple." Rabbinic uneasiness about this doctrine could, therefore, be construed as related to the fact that it was *priestly*; that is to say, that it emanated from a structure of power and personal authority that was *not rabbinic*. We do not need to postulate, as Scholem did, a kind of dialectical or self-correcting movement *within* the rabbinic tradition.

When we compare Qumran mysticism with later Hekhalot mysticism, a number of very interesting points emerge. There can be little doubt that these two systems are broadly of the same type: there are too many correspondences in thought and language for this not to be the case. But there are also some striking differences: the theurgy and magic of the Hekhalot literature are much more pronounced. In comparison with Qumran, the Hekhalot texts have a plethora of angelic names (I mean here *proper* names, not *generic* names for classes of angels such as *ʾElohim* and *ʾElim*). Further, the Qumran texts, as Dale Allison observed, do not actually give us the texts of the hymns and blessings

---

[27] Steven Fine has reviewed the debate and expressed scepticism about any continuing role for the priests as a class in post-70 Judaism, in "Between Liturgy and Social History: Priestly Power in Late Antique Palestinian Synagogues," *JJS* 56 (2005): 1–10. He prefers to see the post-70 interest in priestly matters as little more than romantic nostalgia for the lost Temple. But he underestimates the evidence for the survival of distinctively priestly traditions, unparalleled at least in extant rabbinic sources, e.g., the "priestly" *piyyutim* (see now M. D. Swartz and J. Yahalom, *Avodah: An Anthology of Ancient Poetry for Yom Kippur* [University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005], 14–15 and *passim*). He also does not give sufficient weight to the fact that sacerdotal authority was fundamentally different from rabbinic authority, and that the presence of priests in the Jewish communities of late antiquity was always going to be a potential basis for challenges to rabbinic hegemony.

[28] See Y. Erder, *The Karaite Mourners of Zion and the Qumran Scrolls: On the History of an Alternative to Rabbinic Judaism* (Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad, 2004 [Hebrew]).

which the angels recite in the celestial sanctuary.[29] But most significant, in my view, is the fact that, read against *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice, an antipriestly tendency emerges in the later Hekhalot texts*. This suggests that what we have in our extant Hekhalot literature is a *rabbinic reworking of the priestly doctrine*. This comes out in the astonishing democratisation of the celestial Temple in the Hekhalot literature. No restrictions in principle seem to be placed on who can enter the celestial Holy of Holies: the vision of the *merkabah*, the celestial Ark of the Covenant, can be enjoyed, apparently, by anyone who knows how to make the ascent. As *Hekhalot Rabbati* puts it, knowing the secret of the ascent is like "having a ladder in one's house: one can go up and down it at will" (*Hekhalot Rabbati* 13:2, *Synopse* §199)!

The rabbinic redaction of the priestly doctrine may also have been responsible for introducing into the tradition the so-called *Sar Torah* motif. This discordant element in the Hekhalot literature has long puzzled scholars. Its generally rabbinic complexion is obvious: instead of ascending to heaven to contemplate the Throne of Glory, the adept conjures down from heaven the angelic guardian of the Torah, who helps him master halakhah and initiates him into the secrets of Torah. This tradition is missing from Qumran, and its absence confirms, as some had already suspected, that it is late. It is part of a rabbinic redaction of the priestly doctrine. Scholem, therefore, may have been right that the Hekhalot texts *are* rabbinic, at least to the extent that *the Hekhalot traditions as we now have them have undergone a rabbinic editing*. That alternative forms of the Hekhalot traditions were known in late antique Judaism may be indirectly inferred from Nag Hammadi treatises such as *The Hypostasis of the Archons* and the *Untitled Work on the Origin of the World*, which contain some remarkable parallels to Hekhalot literature, but do not seem to presuppose the Hekhalot tradition in precisely the form in which we now have it. The tendency of the rabbis to rabbinize early Jewish traditions which they found problematic is well-documented. It is manifested, for example, in their

[29] D. C. Allison, "The Silence of the Angels: Reflections on the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice," *RevQ* 13 (1988): 189–97. All sorts of suggestions have been made as to why the texts of the angelic songs are missing: they are too holy to record or sing; they are in an unintelligible angelic language; the angelic hymns were recorded in other texts now lost; and so forth. One possibility, that the angels' "singing" is wordless and silent (see above), would have appealed to Dionysius the Areopagite! See P. S. Alexander, "The Qumran *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* and the *Celestial Hierarchy* of Dionysius the Areopagite: A Comparative Approach," *RevQ* 22 (2006): 349–72.

handling of messianism, magic, and certain types of divination such as dream interpretation.[30] A similar strategy could, I would suggest, have been applied to priestly mysticism.

There is one other point at issue in the study of Hekhalot mysticism to which the Scrolls make a contribution. Scholem revolutionized the study of the Hekhalot literature by rejecting Graetz's gaonic dating and carrying it back, in part, to the tannaitic era. This meant that the growth of Hekhalot literature overlapped with that of the Talmud; it was, therefore, logical to look to this literature to fill out the *merkabah* teachings alluded to in the Mishnah, the Tosefta, the Yerushalmi and the Bavli.[31] Urbach, in a famous essay, challenged this view: he argued that the Hekhalot literature is indeed post-Talmudic, and originated in attempts by post-Talmudic scholars to make sense of the cryptic references in the Talmud.[32] David Halperin developed the argument further in his doctoral dissertation.[33] This position is not only intrinsically problematic, since it seems to demand an implausibly absolute caesura in the tradition, but also, in my view, decisively disproved by the Qumran evidence, which shows that the central tenets of Hekhalot mysticism were known much earlier. Scholem was right to carry the tradition back: the problem was that he did not go back far enough.

I would suggest, then, that when the Qumran evidence is integrated into the history of Jewish mysticism it forces a major revision of the Scholemian paradigm. But I would go further. There are good grounds for arguing that the Qumranic type of mysticism belongs not only to the genealogy of Jewish mysticism, but to that of Christian mysticism as well. The standard histories of early Christian mysticism say little about any Jewish background. In his influential monograph, *The Origins of*

---

[30] See P. S. Alexander, "Bavli Berakhot 55a–57b: The Talmudic Dreambook in Context," *JJS* 46 (1995): 230–48; idem, "The King Messiah in Rabbinic Judaism," in *King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (ed. J. Day; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 456–73; idem, "The Talmudic Concept of Conjuring (*ʾAḥizat ʿEinayim*) and the Problem of the Definition of Magic (*Kishuf*)," in *Creation and Recreation in Jewish Thought: Festschrift in Honour of Joseph Dan on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (ed. R. Elior and P. Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 7–26.

[31] See especially *m. Ḥagigah* 2:1; *t. Ḥagigah* 2:1–7; *y. Ḥagigah* 2:1 (77a–b); *b. Ḥagigah* 11a–16a.

[32] E. E. Urbach, "The Traditions about Mysticism in the Period of the Tanna'im," in *Studies in the Kabbalah and History of Religions Presented to Gershom Scholem on his Seventieth Birthday* (ed. R. J. Z. Werblowsky and C. Wirzubski; Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 1968), Hebrew section, 1–28.

[33] D. J. Halperin, *The Merkabah in Rabbinic Literature* (New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society, 1980).

the Christian Mystical Tradition, Andrew Louth, undeniably a leading authority on the subject, nowhere seems to mention Judaism. To be sure, he has a chapter on Philo, but Philo gets into the act as a Middle Platonist, not as a Jew![34] Bernard McGinn in his magisterial history of Christian mysticism protests about this, and significantly has an opening chapter entitled "The Jewish Matrix," but there he deals largely with Second Temple period Jewish *apocalyptic*.[35] He misses the crucial significance of *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*.

The fact is, however, that the old Jewish priestly doctrine of the celestial liturgy, which we have discovered flourishing already in the Second Temple period, was taken up in Christian tradition, and there contributed powerfully to the development of an influential *angelikos bios* strand of Christian mysticism. The doctrine seems to have entered Christianity at its very inception. This is shown by the polemical use of it in Hebrews 8 and 9, and by the throne vision in Revelation 4–5, which lights up when we read it intertextually specifically with *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice*.[36] Some New Testament scholars have argued that in the phrase θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων in Col 2:18 the genitive should be construed as subjective rather than objective. In other words the reference is not to humans worshipping angels, but to the worship which the angels offer to God.[37] And a case has been made that the verb ἐμβατεύων there alludes to entry into the celestial Temple.[38] In other words, the old Jewish priestly doctrine of the angelic liturgies had already passed into Christianity in the first century.

Over the next few centuries this doctrine served a number of purposes. The angels became the exemplars of the way of life to which the Christian mystic should aspire: their constant praise of God, their

---

[34] A. Louth, *The Origins of the Christian Mystical Tradition: From Plato to Denys* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1981). In his later *Denys the Areopagite* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1989), he does say a little about the Jewish background.

[35] B. McGinn, *The Presence of God: A History of Western Christian Mysticism, Vol. 1: The Foundations of Mysticism* (London: SCM Press, 1991), 12–22. From his footnotes it seems that McGinn is following Gruenwald, which would explain his emphasis on apocalyptic.

[36] See, e.g., D. C. Allison, "4Q403 Fragm. 1, Col. I. 38–46 and the *Revelation to John*," *RevQ* 12 (1986): 409–14.

[37] For a survey see L. T. Stuckenbruck, *Angel Veneration and Christology: A Study in Early Judaism and in the Apocalypse of John* (WUNT 2.70; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1995), 111–19.

[38] See F. W. Danker, *Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2000), 321b, *sub* ἐμβατεύω for a summary of the evidence.

asceticism and celibacy (Matt 22:20, "neither marrying nor giving in marriage"), their closeness to God, represented the redeemed state into which righteous humans would be transformed at the *eschaton*, but which they could anticipate in moments of ecstasy even now.[39] There is constant reference in early Christian texts to individuals or congregations of worshippers on earth joining the angels in heaven in the worship of God—just as at Qumran. We find the idea used polemically in an interesting way. Early Christians deployed the doctrine of the celestial Temple to *delegitimize* the terrestrial cult, by arguing that, if one could enter the true Temple in heaven, why bother with its pale shadow on earth? This argument would not have been countenanced for one moment by Second Temple Jewish priests, who saw the idea, rather, as *validating* the terrestrial cult in terms of an *imitatio angelorum*. However, later in the history of the Church when the notion of a separate, ordained "Levitical" priesthood came to the fore, the concept of the celestial liturgy was once again invoked to justify it. It may have been at this time that the *Sanctus* was introduced into the Eucharist. But this clerical argument was, intriguingly, turned on its head by reviving once again the early Christian anti-Jewish use of the doctrine: why, protested the monks and solitaries, should we have to go to Church to receive the sacrament from ordained priests, when we can commune with the angels in our monasteries and cells in the desert![40]

This early Christian angelic mysticism was gathered up, in many ways, and powerfully unified in the *Angelic Hierarchy* of Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite—one of the pivotal works of Christian mysticism.[41] Because of his pseudepigraphic stance Denys is very careful to conceal

---

[39] One important way of living the *angelikos bios*, which does not involve ecstasy, was through preserving one's virginity. For the link between virginity and the angels see Methodius of Olympus, *Symposium* 3.6 and 6.5.

[40] This appears to be an underlying theme of the Syriac *Liber Graduum*: see particularly VI, XXI, XXII, XXV, XXVIII, XXX. R. A. Kitchen and M. E. G. Parmentier, *The Book of Steps: The Syriac Liber Graduum* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications, 2004), offer a useful translation of this fascinating work.

[41] Text: R. Roques, G. Heil and M. de Gandillac, *Denys l'Aréopagite: La Hiérarchie Céleste* (Sources Chrétiennes 38; Paris: Cerf, 1958); translation: C. Luibhéid, *Pseudo-Dionysius: The Complete Works* (Classics of Western Spirituality; New York: Paulist Press, 1987). For Denys's place in western Christian mysticism, see McGinn, *Foundations of Mysticism*, 157–85. See further P. Rorem, "The Uplifting Spirituality of Pseudo-Dionysius," in *Christian Spirituality: Origins to the Twelfth Century* (ed. B. McGinn and J. Meyendorff; London: SCM Press, 1989), 132–51; idem, *Pseudo-Dionysius: A Commentary on the Texts and an Introduction to their Influence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

his indebtedness to writers who lived after the first century CE. However, his dependence on Neoplatonism, and perhaps specifically on Proclus, is clear, and antecedents to his doctrine of the celestial hierarchy in patristic thought have long been recognized.[42] What he might ultimately have owed to Jewish sources has not been properly considered; but the hypothesis that in his *Angelic Hierarchy* he Neoplatonized an *angelikos bios* tradition which early Christianity inherited from Judaism, in much the same way as Philo Middle-Platonized preexisting Jewish tradition, is surely worth exploring.[43] Denys's mystical theology is notoriously opaque, but it seems perfectly clear that he holds that the contemplation of the angels in their nine orders, grouped into three triads, is an essential stage in the lifting up of the soul to union with God. Denys's near contemporary Gregory the Great had similar thoughts, and in *Homily* 34 of his *Forty Homilies on the Gospels*,[44] it is even more clear that the angelic hierarchy represents a "ladder of ascent," stations on the *via mystica* of the soul's journey into God. On the surface, the language of these sixth-century Christian writers is a world away from that of Second Temple Palestinian Judaism, but the underlying ideas

---

[42] For important antecedents in Cyril of Jerusalem, John Chrysostom, and Gregory of Nyssa, see Louth, *Denys the Areopagite*, 36–37.

[43] I would strongly counsel against essentializing Judaism and Hellenism in this context, or attempting to set Hebraic and Greek modes of thinking in diametrical opposition to one another. Two points should be borne in mind: (1) The Platonic, and especially the late Platonic, interest in *daimones* makes it actually rather easy to Platonize the old Jewish doctrine of angels. It should be remembered that both the Second Temple period Jewish *angels* and the Platonic *daimones* may already have shared a common background in Persian thought. (2) The possibility of Christian, or even Jewish, influence on late Neoplatonism should not be ruled out. The philosophical programme of Neoplatonists like Amelius and Iamblichus was clearly to create a synthesis of Plato and oriental wisdom, as contained in writings such as the *Chaldean Oracles*. Note how Polymnia Athanassiadi, in passing, describes this process as interpreting Plato along the lines of the *Oracles* and not vice versa (P. Athanassiadi and M. Frede [eds.], *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1999], 156)! By the time Denys was writing, late paganism, Christianity, and Judaism had converged remarkably at many points. Anyone reading the following passage without any attribution might be at a loss to decide whether its author was Jewish, Christian or pagan: "This oracle gives knowledge of the three orders of angels: those who perpetually stand before God; those who are separated from him and who are sent forth with a view to certain messages and ministrations; those who perpetually bear his throne…and perpetually sing." It was, in fact, written by the Neoplatonist Porphyry (Louth, *Denys the Areopagite*, 37).

[44] Text: *Patrologia Latina* (ed. J.-P. Migne; 221 vols.; Paris: Garniere, 1844–1864), 76:1246–59; partial English translation in: S. Chase, *Angelic Spirituality: Mediaeval Perspectives on the Ways of Angels* (Classics of Western Spirituality; New York: Paulist Press, 2002), 95–106.

they expound are demonstrably not so remote from those we find in *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* at Qumran.[45]

Under the constraints of space, this essay has had, perforce, to be programmatic and to summarize complex arguments, which are addressed somewhat more fully in my *Mystical Texts*, but I hope that, short though it is, I have been able to say enough to make at least a *prima facie* case that there was indeed mysticism at Qumran, and that the Qumran evidence now needs to be integrated into the history of western mysticism.

[45] For example, Denys's description of God's relationship to the world in terms of "procession" and "return," and his analysis of the act of ascent into the three stages of "purification, illumination and union," have clear Neoplatonic antecedents, but the underlying ideas here surely cannot be claimed as exclusively Neoplatonic. I would suggest that they can be found, dressed up in somewhat different language, in the *Sabbath Songs*. See Alexander, "The Qumran *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* and the *Celestial Hierarchy* of Dionysius the Areopagite," for a detailed comparison of the similarities and differences between these two compositions.

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

Bible

Apocrypha

New Testament

Pseudepigrapha

Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Texts

Philo and Josephus

Rabbinic Writings

Greco–Roman, Early Christian, and Other Ancient Sources