

ARTICLE V.

THE "ZADOKITE" DOCUMENT.¹

BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM HAYES WARD, D.D.,
NEW YORK CITY.

THIS interesting and puzzling Hebrew document, coming from the same treasure of manuscripts as the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus, might have escaped much notice but for the attention called to it by the Rev. G. Margoliouth, of the British Museum, in the *Athenaeum* of November 26, 1910. Mr. Margoliouth, who is a Hebrew scholar of distinction, claimed to have made the startling discovery that the personages mentioned are the leading ones in the first period of Christian history; that the "Anointed One" is John the Baptist; that the "Teacher of Righteousness" is Jesus; and that the "Man of Scoffing" is Paul. He thus makes this a document belonging to the first century, and representing the views of a Jewish-Christian sect who rejected the teachings of Paul, regarding him as a perverter of the true faith of Jesus, and who remained "zealous for the Law." Such a remarkable claim challenges attention to this Document; for if the claim be justified, it will provide us a source of the earliest Christian history of the utmost importance, giving us a view of the

¹Fragments of a Zadokite Work. Edited from Hebrew Manuscripts in the Cairo Genizah Collection now in the Possession of the University Library, Cambridge; and provided with an English Translation, Introduction, and Notes. (Documents of Jewish Sectaries. Volume I.) By S. Schechter, M.A., Litt.D. (Cantab.), President of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America in New York. 4to. Pp. lxiv, 20. With Two Facsimile Plates. Cambridge, England: The University Press.

position of those very early disciples who held fast to the Mosaic Law, and made of the new Way only a sect in Judaism. It is the purpose of this paper to study the new problem presented to us by Mr. Margoliouth. The question is, then, one of date, whether of the first century, or of a century before the Christian era. The difficulty of answering this question arises from the fact that no one belonging to the community is mentioned by name, and that only general terms are used; and the Hebrew language, lacking both mood and tense, often leaves it uncertain whether past or present time is referred to.

The clearer evidences of date are the following: There are many quotations from the Law and the Prophets, and also a few from the third collection called "the Psalms." These are taken from the later division of the Psalter, — Ps. xciv. 6 (p. 6, l. 16); xciv. 21 (p. 1, l. 20); cvi. 25 (p. 3, l. 8); and cvii. 40 (p. 1, l. 15). Also from Proverbs the author quotes xv. 8, 29 (p. '11, l. 21), and xvii. 15 (p. 1, l. 19). These are all, but are enough to prove that, at the time of writing, the later Hebrew books were at least familiar. That they were held to be canonical is rendered doubtful by p. 7, ll. 15–17, where the Torah and the Prophets are distinctly mentioned as such, but not the third division of the Hebrew Bible.

We also have definite quotations from the Book of Jubilees, mentioned by name, which is believed to have been composed not earlier than 125 B.C., and from the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs somewhat before 100 B.C. As they were now well known and had a certain authority, this evidence brings our Document down to a date somewhat later than 100 B.C., hardly earlier than 80.

There are no clear indications that allow us definitely to

fix the date of the Document more nearly than this. For further clues we must depend on our interpretation of the conditions described and the personages referred to not by name, but by such general terms as "Teacher" and "Anointed."

First, we may consider one personal name, that of Zadok, in which Dr. Schechter, to whom we are greatly indebted as editor, finds evidence that this is the pronouncement of a member of a sect which he calls Zadokite, and yet differing from the historical Sadducees as known from history.

Zadok is mentioned twice in this Document. The name appears first in p. 4, ll. 1-3, as follows: After an account of the falling away of Israel in the desert, and later under the kings, and the preservation of a righteous remnant, the author continues:—

"They who hold fast to him are for eternal life, and all glory of man is theirs; as God confirmed it to them through Ezekiel, the prophet, saying: 'The priests and the Levites and the sons of Zadok that kept the charge of his sanctuary when the children of Israel went astray from them, they shall bring unto me fat and blood.'"¹

The writer then proceeds in his usual way to apply the passage to his own day:—

"The 'priests' are the captivity of Israel who have gone forth out of the land of Judah and those who were joined with them [הַלְוִיִּים הַגֵּרִים for הַלְוִיִּים, "the Levites"]. And the 'sons of Zadok' are the chosen of Israel, called by name, who stand in the latter days."

The author applies to his own associates, who entered into the New Covenant at Damascus, the earlier language of Ezekiel. But there is no special emphasis put upon this more than upon other personages here quoted, to show that

¹Dr. Schechter's translations have not been literally followed where I preferred my own.

these believers regarded themselves as followers of Zadok more than of any other of the early saints. It is on this passage that the recognition of the sect as Zadokite rests, but what it says is that its *leaders*, the "chosen of Israel," the "called by name," not the whole sect, correspond to the "sons of Zadok," as the "priests and the Levites" correspond to the whole company who emigrated from the land of Judah.

The other passage in which a Zadok is mentioned is in p. 5, l. 5. David is excused for disobeying the law which forbade a king to take many wives, on the ground that the Book of the Law was hidden in the Ark, and was not opened "from the day of the death of Eleazar and Joshua, and the elders who served the Ashtaroth, and the Roll [הַסֵּפֶר לְמִנְיָהּ for גִּנְיָהּ] was concealed until Zadok stood up." Here the mention of Zadok is purely incidental, like that of Eleazar and Joshua.

The Zadok mentioned by Ezekiel appears to be the Zadok who took the high priesthood from Abiathar at the coronation of Solomon, but may not have been so understood by the writer of our Document. Certainly it was not this Zadok whom he refers to in the second passage as living at the time when the Law was exposed from its hiding-place in the Ark. Who this latter Zadok was we have no means of knowing. It was Hilkiyah, grandson of another Zadok, who found the Law in the time of Josiah. I can find no evidence in these two passages that this was a Zadokite sect, nor a Sadducean sect.

The question next arises whether this was a sect opposed to the Pharisees. Dr. Schechter finds that they were as strict in their observance of the Law as the Pharisees, although not interpreting it always in the same way. The

evidence that they opposed the Pharisees he finds in the passages which are supposed to refer to the "fencing of the Law." Of these passages the main one is in p. 8, l. 12, and p. 19, l. 25. The writer has just spoken of those who walk in the way of the wicked, of whom God said (Deut. xxxii. 23), "Their wine is the poison of serpents and the cruel venom of asps" (R. V., but here understood as "the head of asps that is cruel"); and these words are individually explained, and the author continues: "But on all these things they meditated not who 'builded the wall and daubed it with untempered mortar' (Ezek. xiii. 10)." No further application is made of this, but the writer proceeds immediately to quote two different irrelevant passages from Deuteronomy, and six lines below (p. 8, l. 18, and p. 19, l. 31, of the duplicate codex B) he says that against "them who 'builded the wall' his wrath was kindled." Here we may fairly assume that the rest of the passage "and daubed it with untempered mortar" was in mind, and that the expression "builded the wall" has no special reference to the Pharisees. It is the "untempered mortar" which, Ezekiel says, makes the wall fall down in the storm.

In one other passage (p. 4, l. 19) there is mention of those who "build the wall." It is a passage whose meaning is not at all clear, and has no recognizable connection with what goes before or after it. Indeed the passage is probably corrupt, and there may be words lost. The sentence begins, "The builders of the wall, who walked after the command [w]." Dr. Schechter translates, "the commanding one," because it goes on after the author's fashion, to define the word w. "The w is he who prophesieth, — as it is said, 'They shall surely prophesy' [Micah ii. 6]. These are they who are caught by two, by fornication in taking two wives

while they are living," etc. Here, again, it is very hazardous to gather that there is any attack on the Pharisees for their fencing of the Law.

I confess that I fail to be satisfied that this Document presents here any satisfactory evidence either that it represents a special sect of Zadokites, or that the sect is hostile to the Pharisees, and yet more general historical conditions may relate them to a Jewish sect.

Dr. Schechter finds in the *מבקר*, or "Censor," an evidence of Roman influence, as no such office is known to Jewish religion. The word literally means not a censor or critic, but a searcher, a careful examiner or investigator. In Lev. xiii. 3 the priest "searches" for signs of leprosy. In Ezek. xxxiv. 11, 12, God "searches" out his faithful ones as a shepherd "searches" for his scattered sheep.

The office and duties of the "Searcher" are thus described by our author: "The Searcher who is over all the camps shall be from thirty years old and upwards until fifty years old" (p. 14, ll. 8, 9). The limit of his age is less than that of the judges, who might serve from twenty-five to sixty years of age. He is a superior official, and has large duties. He is "over all the camps"; he has the charge of admitting, excluding, and enrolling members (p. 15, ll. 8-15); in connection with the judges he receives the offerings of the people for the support of the poor (p. 14, ll. 13-16); he is particularly a student of the Law:—

"This is the usage of the searcher of the camp. He shall instruct the many in the deeds of God, and shall make them understand his mighty wonders, and shall narrate before them the happenings of eternity in their details [?], and shall have mercy with them, as a father with his children, and shall forgive all their rebellions. Like a shepherd with his flock he shall loose all the bonds of their wickedness [?] . . . oppressed and crushed in his congregation."

The words "a shepherd with his flock," Dr. Schechter compares with the same two words in Isa. xl. 11. It would be better to relate them to Ezek. xiii. 12, where they also occur with *בקר*. Indeed, it is probable that the designation of the office was suggested by this passage, with its figure of Yahve as the searcher after his lost and oppressed flock. In verses 11, 12, the word is three times used to designate this search. In another instructive passage (p. 13, ll. 5, 6) our author indicates the duties of the Searcher in a case of leprosy, as to which we have observed that the word is used (Lev. xiii. 3): "If there be a decision regarding the law of leprosy which a man will have, then shall come the priest and stand in the camp, and the Searcher shall instruct him in the explanation of the Law." We thus find that the Searcher is superior to the priest in his understanding of the Law.

From all this I do not find any special relation between his office and that of a Roman censor. His duty is much more that of a scribe, whether as enrolling the membership or as instructing them in their religious history and duties, or in enlightening the priests as to the meaning of the Law. Yet his position is more than that of a scribe; he is practically supreme, over priests, judges, and congregation. That learning in the Law was not a special privilege of priests or Levites we learn from p. 10, ll. 4-7:—

"And this is the usage of the judges of the Congregation: ten men selected from the Congregation according to the time; four from the tribe of Levi and Aaron, and six from Israel learned in the Book of the Hagu [meaning probably the Pentateuch] and in the foundations of the Covenant, from five and twenty years old even unto sixty years old."

It appears, then, that the Searcher might properly be a scribe from the Congregation, and not of the order of priests or Levites. Yet of course the priest might be a learned man,

for we have in p. 13, l. 2, the mention of "a priest learned in the book of the Hagu" (so also in p. 14, ll. 7, 8).

A word needs to be said as to the mention of Belial in this Document, inasmuch as Mr. Margoliouth has seen in what is said of him a reference to Paul. There can be no question that in every case he is, as usual in the late Hebrew writings, a name for Satan. In the days of Moses "Belial raised up Jannes and his brother" (p. 5, l. 18); again, we hear of "any man over whom the spirit of Belial shall have dominion" (p. 12, l. 2). Once more, wicked men are said to be devoted to "destruction by the hand of Belial." The remaining passage is in p. 4, ll. 13-15. After a period of revival, when God has pardoned his people,—

"Belial is let loose [משלוח] in Israel, as was spoken by the hand of Isalah the prophet, the son of Amoz, 'Fear and a net and a snare are upon thee, O inhabitant of the land.' Its explanation is, three nets of Belial," etc.

Here again Belial is certainly Satan, but in the word משלוח, which may also mean "one sent," "delegate," Mr. Margoliouth sees a play on the title of Paul as the *Apostle*. This appears unnatural and may be dismissed, although Mr. Margoliouth actually imagines Belial to be a human opposer of the truth, and identical with the "Man of Scoffing," also denounced.

After this quite too easy identification of the "Man of Scoffing" with Belial, who was "sent" (rather, "let loose"), and thus supposed to be Paul the *Apostle*, it is necessary for us to study who, in our Document, the "Man of Scoffing" is. He appears in p. 1, l. 14. The writer says that God "made known to succeeding generations what he had done in another generation, in the Congregation of treacherous men who departed out of the way." Then he defines more

closely what he means: "This is the time of which it is written, 'As a backsliding heifer so did Israel slide back'"; and he continues: "When there stood up the Man of Scoffing, who poured out to Israel the waters of lies, and made them to wander 'in a 'desert where there is no way,'" etc. Now this quotation about the "backsliding heifer" (taken from Hos. iv. 16) refers there to Israel's worship of idols in Bethel while Judah is urged to remain true to Yahve. The "Man of Scoffing" who has made Israel to drink waters of lies is clearly Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin. It was Jeroboam who, as the author says, "made the everlasting hills to bow down, and to depart from the paths of righteousness, and to remove the border which the forefathers had set up in their inheritance, that the curses of the Covenant might cling to them." This was peculiarly true of Jeroboam, the first king of the Northern Kingdom. There is no reason in referring this to Paul.

"Men of Scoffing" are mentioned in p. 20, l. 11, as living at a later time, but they have no relation to the "Man of Scoffing" of p. 1. The "Man of Lies" of p. 20, l. 15, belongs to a period just before the writer's time, and will be considered later in the study of the "Teacher of Righteousness."

Before entering on the discussion of the identity of the "Teacher of Righteousness" and the "Anointed One," it is necessary to gain an idea of the historical setting shown by the Document. We have already seen that the quotations from the Book of the Jubilees and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs show that our Document must be somewhat later than 100 B. C. and we are at liberty to find a date for it at any time for two or three centuries after that time.

The one definite statement of fact is, that the company of men who are addressed had escaped from the land of Judah, and had gone to Damascus, and had there entered into a solemn agreement to obey the Mosaic Law, and this was called the "New Covenant." Their names were regularly inscribed, and our author sets before them the constitution of their government, under a Searcher, judges and priests; and they are divided into four classes—priests, Levites, children of Israel, and proselytes. Their ritual observances were strict, much like that of the Hasideans.

The following are the passages which mention the establishment of the company, under the designation of the "New Covenant," at Damascus.

On p. 6, l. 5, it is said that "those who 'dugged' it ["The princes digged the well," etc., Num. xxi. 18] are the captivity of Israel, who went out from the land of Judah, and sojourned in the land of Damascus." Again, "All they who were brought into the Covenant (p. 6, l. 11) are to keep themselves separate and uncontaminated, and to observe the Sabbath and the feasts, "according to the command of them who entered into the New Covenant in the land of Damascus" (p. 6, l. 19). These words are repeated in p. 8, l. 21, of Text A and p. 19, l. 33, of Text B, "All the men who entered into the New Covenant in the land of Damascus." Once more, in p. 20, l. 12, it is said of some backsliders that they had "despised the Covenant and the pledge of faith which they had affirmed in the land of Damascus; and this is the New Covenant." Besides these passages in which Damascus is mentioned as the residence of the sect, and the reference, apparently, to a leader as the Star (Amos v. 26), "And the Star is he who explained [or sought] the Law, who came to Damascus" (p. 7, l. 19), there are a number

of passages in which the Covenant is mentioned: "All ye that entered into the Covenant," (p. 2, l. 2); "To those who walk in perfect holiness according to the instructions of the Covenant, God is faithful" (p. 7, l. 5); "All who entered into his Covenant, but did not lay hold of these statutes" (p. 8, l. 1); "Every man of them who hath entered into the Covenant" (p. 9, l. 3); the judges, "Learned in the Book of the Hagu, and in the foundations of the Covenant" (p. 10, l. 6); "Those who have entered into the Covenant" (p. 13, l. 14); they are to swear not by any name of God, "but only by the oath of the Covenant and the curses of the Covenant" (p. 15, l. 1); also p. 15, l. 3, "the curses of the Covenant"; p. 15, l. 5, "He who enters into the Covenant," and p. 15, l. 6, "Them that are numbered by the oath of the Covenant." Again we have mention of "those who entered into the Covenant (p. 20, l. 25). This Covenant is defined more exactly: "They entered into the Covenant of Repentance" (p. 19, l. 6). What are the pledges of the Covenant is in part given in a remarkable passage (p. 6, l. 19-p. 7, l. 6). After mention of duties, to observe the interpretation of the Law, to separate from the profane, from unjust wealth and robbery, to distinguish between the clean and the unclean, and to observe the Sabbath and feasts "according to the command of them who entered into the New Covenant in the land of Damascus," the author proceeds:—

"To raise their offerings according to their interpretation, to love every one his neighbor as himself, and to strengthen the hand of the poor and needy and the stranger, and to seek every one the peace of his neighbor. And no man shall be guilty of incest, but he shall separate himself from harlots according to the Law, to rebuke every one his brother according to the commandment; and not to hold a grudge from day to day; and to separate from all the impurities according to their laws; and no man shall defile his holy spirit, according as God did separate them. To all

those who walk in the perfection of holiness according to all the instructions, the Covenant of God stands fast, to preserve them for a thousand generations."

These precepts are based very largely on Lev. xix. 17, 19 :—

"Thou shalt not hate thy brother in thy heart. Thou shalt surely rebuke thy neighbor and not bear sin because of him. Thou shalt not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people; but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. I am Yahve."

These injunctions begin to have emphasis in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and are much developed in the New Testament. More than once in our Document the duty of not bearing a grudge is emphasized; but it is peculiar that here the injunction is, "not to bear a grudge from *day to day*," which is a parallel to that of Paul, "Let not the sun go down on your wrath" (Eph. iv. 26).

The impression I gain from these passages is, that at a time, perhaps a generation before the time of our author, a company of exiles had settled in Damascus, either on account of persecution or because of political changes. It would appear that in Damascus they had entered into a formal covenant to be true to the Mosaic law, as they interpreted its teachings, and that there had been serious defections from their number. This Covenant was of considerable length, contained high moral teachings as well as strict ritual observances, and was enforced by blessings and curses.

We know of two occasions in the first century B. C., at which there would be any special reason for such a withdrawal from Judah to Damascus; but we have no definite knowledge of any Jewish settlement in Damascus, although it is quite probable that there was. One occasion was the persecution of the Pharisees by Alexander Jannæus, when, we are told, many were exiled and slain. The other occa-

sion was under his daughter, Alexandra Salome, who brought back the Pharisees, while the Sadducees retired. In either case Damascus would be a likely retreat. Salome's son, says Josephus, made an unsuccessful attack on Damascus.

An account of the next time when there might have been an exodus from Judea to Damascus is given in the Book of Acts. The Christian sect had greatly multiplied when there arose a bitter persecution in which Stephen was stoned, and the believers in Jerusalem were scattered through all Palestine, and doubtless further. At any rate Saul of Tarsus, who was active in the persecution, went to Damascus with authority to arrest all the believers. This implies that Damascus was a chief seat of the body. Ananias was a leading man among them, and they were doubtless all "zealous for the Law," for the new convert Paul had not yet broken away from his Pharisaic teaching. It was while here and in the neighboring Arabia that he probably developed his broader faith, based on the fact that before his circumcision Abraham's faith "was counted to him for righteousness." Paul suffered much from "false brethren," who held him to be a renegade, and perhaps it was they from whom he fled at Damascus. Such a sect as our Document gives us might have arisen before the middle of the first century B. C., in which case it might either be Pharisaic or Sadducean, according as it arose from the persecution under Alexander Jannæus or that under Alexandra Salome; or in the latter half of the first century A. D., in which case it would be Jewish Christian, as Mr. Margoliouth supposes.

We now have to consider the reference to the "Anointed One," and the "Teacher of Righteousness."

An Anointed One (משיח or משיח) is first mentioned in p. 2, l. 12. It is there said, after a most general statement

that God knows all things past and future, that amid all perverse generations God always raises up a remnant to preserve a righteous seed: "and he made them know by the hand of his Anointed his Holy Spirit." Here there is evidently no definite historical reference. We simply learn that an Anointed One can always be found in time of need.

In p. 6, l. 1, the term Anointed appears again. The passage is a difficult one in which to find a definite reference of time and person. The author had spoken of the rebellion of the people, and the opposition of Jannes and Jambres to Moses and Aaron; and a new section begins:—

"And in the end of the desolation of the land there stood up those who removed the border and led Israel astray, and the land was wasted, because they had spoken rebellion against the commandments of God, by the hand of Moses and also by his Holy Anointed. And they prophesied lies to turn Israel back from following God; but he remembered the covenant with the forefathers."

It is not easy to tell here who the Holy Anointed one is, for it has no definite historical relation. There were various "desolations." In the clause "by the hand of Moses, *and also* by his Anointed," the emphasis of "and also" seems to exclude Aaron. It must be some priest like Ezra or Mattathiah, of Modin, father of the Maccabee brothers. From here the writer proceeds to apply the example and teaching to his own sect at Damascus, but here the Messiah belongs to an earlier time.

Again we have an "Anointed of Aaron and Israel" in p. 12, l. 23. It reads:—

"And this is the manner of the dwelling in the camps, to walk therein in the end of wickedness until there shall stand an Anointed of Aaron and Israel."

It is evident that an Anointed One was yet to appear; and inasmuch as these ordinances were to stand until his ap-

pearance, it would seem that he was to have power to revise the Law, as it had been revised by the authority of the priest Mattathiah, of Modin, who gave permission to bear arms and fight on the Sabbath day.

We cannot doubt that the Messiah was mentioned in p. 14, l. 19, a much mutilated passage, where we can only gather that "[at the coming of the Anointed] of Aaron and Israel he shall make atonement for our sins."

In p. 19, l. 10, the Messiah is mentioned in another eschatological passage, peculiar to Text B. Once more judgment is threatened against the misdoers, based on Zech. xi. 7-11. The author continues:—

"And 'they who observe' it are 'the poor of the flock.' These shall be delivered in the end of the visitation; and those who are left shall be delivered to the sword at the coming of the Anointed of Aaron and Israel."

This passage simply gives us the expected future coming of the Messiah to close up the "visitation," to deliver the righteous and destroy the wicked.

The "Anointed One" of p. 20, l. 1, is mentioned simply as yet to appear. This passage will be considered in treating of the "Teacher." The Messiah in all this is either a priest long dead, or one yet to appear.

There remains to be considered perhaps the most important of the personages mentioned in our Document, the "Teacher of Righteousness," also called the "Only Teacher" or simply "Teacher," or the "Only One." He appears early in the Document (p. 1, l. 11). It is said that on account of their sins God had given his people over to the sword, but had yet left a remnant. The author continues:—

"At the end of the wrath, 390 years after he had given them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, he visited them; and there sprang up from Israel and from Aaron a root of

a plant to possess his country, and to flourish in the goodness of his land. And they recognized their sin, and knew that they were guilty men. And they were like blind men, and like those who grope in the way, for twenty years. And God perceived their works, that with a perfect heart they sought him, and he raised up for them a Teacher of Righteousness to lead them in the way of his heart."

The date here given (390), a round number, after Ezek. iv. 5, would take us from the capture of Jerusalem (586 B.C.) to 196 B.C. It was in 197 B.C. that Palestine came under the Syrian rule. This certainly was not the "end of the wrath," for thirty years later (in 167 B. C.), Antiochus Epiphanes set up the "Abomination of Desolation" to profane the Temple. Now followed twenty years of revolt, until Jonathan Maccabeus fought against Apollonius and became ruler of Jerusalem in peace. But it is impossible to reckon less than 440 ($390+30+20$) years instead of 390, although the twenty years of blindness and groping might be supposed to correspond to the twenty years of revolt. It is not easy to discover who the Teacher of Righteousness was, who was raised up after "the end of the wickedness." The most likely candidate is Mattathiah, priest of Modin, father of the Maccabee brothers, who first called the Jews to the pure Mosaic Law, when they were reverting to idolatry, and who raised the banner of rebellion carried after his death by his sons; but that was thirty years after the completion of the 390 years. I notice that Dr. E. N. Adler, in the *Athenaeum* of February 4, 1911, reckons the 390 years as beginning after "the end of the wrath," that is, from the return to Jerusalem after the exile, which brings the date of the reform down to the time of John Hyrcanus, perhaps 128 B. C. I cannot so translate the text; neither does it seem easy to make John Hyrcanus a "Teacher of Righteousness."

Perhaps the fact that during most of the reign of this Anointed Priest-king he favored the Sadducees against the Pharisees might support his claim to be a Teacher of Righteousness. It would seem to me Mattathiah has a better claim.

In p. 3, l. 8, Moses is the Teacher. It is said of the children of Israel in the desert that "they did not hearken to the voice of Him who made them, the command of their Teacher" (or teachers).

In Text B, p. 20, l. 1, the Teacher appears as the "only Teacher." The author had spoken of those of the Captivity whom God had favored because he remembered his ancient covenant, while he hates and will punish the evil-doers, and he continues to apply this example to his own times:—

"So with all the men who entered into the New Covenant in the Land of Damascus, should they turn [or, and they turned, etc., as historical] to evil, and depart from the well of living waters. They shall not be reckoned in the assembly of the people, and in its register they shall not be registered, from the day that the *Only Teacher* was gathered in, until there shall stand up the Messiah from Aaron and Israel."

We here learn that the "Only Teacher" was greatly honored by those who had entered into the New Covenant in the land of Damascus, and that he had been "gathered in," i. e. was dead. Whether this "Only Teacher" had led them from Judah to the land of Damascus is not clear, but it is suggested that he died in Damascus.

We have further light on the "Only Teacher" in p. 20, l. 14. Again punishment is threatened against those faithless to the New Covenant entered into in Damascus, who shall have no part in the House of the Law. It continues:—

"And from the day when the Only Teacher was gathered in until the completion [death] of all the men of war who followed,

who walked with the Man of Lies, was [is? will be?] about forty years. And at that end the anger of God shall burn against Israel," etc.

It is not clear whether the "forty years" is here historical or prophetic. The number of years (forty), with the mention of the "men of war," is a reminiscence of the forty years in the desert, while the men of war perished who came out of Egypt with Moses. We cannot then gain any historical conclusion from the "forty years." But we do learn that the activity of the "Man of Lies" was subsequent to the passing away of the "Only Teacher." The term "Man of Lies" reminds one of the "Man of Sin," the "Son of Perdition," the "Lawless One" of 2 Thess. ii. 3, 8, but Paul is speaking of an expected Antichrist.

In p. 20, l. 28, mention is made of those who "shall hear the voice of the Teacher and confess before God, We have sinned," etc. This gives no help in identifying the Teacher.

In p. 20, l. 32, the "Only One" is mentioned. It is said of those who "obey the voice of the Teacher" (p. 20, l. 28) : "They shall be instructed in the former judgments wherein the sons of the men of the *Only One* were judged, and they shall hearken to the voice of the *Teacher of Righteousness*." Here we gather, as we know before, that the Only Teacher was no longer living, that he had associates, men of the "Only One," and that they had "sons," or followers.

An important passage (p. 6, ll. 10, 11) seems to identify the Teacher with the Anointed One. We read:—

"And 'the princes of the people' are those who came to 'dig the well' by the laws which the lawgiver enacted to walk therein in all the end of the wickedness; and apart from them they shall not swerve until the appearance of the Teacher of Righteousness in the latter days."

Here the Teacher of Righteousness is to appear in the

latter days precisely as in p. 12, l. 23, it is said that the Anointed One is to appear in the end of the wickedness.

Now to gather up the conclusions as to the personages thus discussed, Belial is, and can be, nothing but Satan. He is not St. Paul, the Apostle (תלמוד). Neither is Paul the "Man of Scoffing," who is Jeroboam, while the "men of scoffing" who lived at the writer's time refer to a class and not to any single man. This is not the case, however, with the "Man of Lies," who flourished after the death of the "Only Teacher," who might be Paul if the Only Teacher were Jesus or John the Baptist, or who might have been an opponent of an earlier time. The Messiah is not Jesus, nor can he be John. He is in every case either some anointed priest or the Messiah expected to appear in the last days to restore all things, but always a priest of Aaron, or priest-king, such as was John Hyrcanus and his successor. Most important for our discussion is the "Teacher of Righteousness," or the "Only Teacher." When spoken of as living at an earlier period he is Moses, or Mattathiah, or possibly John Hyrcanus. But there was also a greatly honored teacher of their own ranks, who had died early in the history of the sect, before the activity of the "Man of Sin." This might find a fair parallel in the careers of Jesus and Paul, but there is here nothing conclusive, although one might gather that the Teacher died in Damascus, and so was neither John nor Jesus. The Teacher had died and was to reappear, precisely as the Messiah was to appear.

As none of these personages thus discussed give us any clear light, we may turn to a few other possible indications.

It is, I think, notable that none of the references to the "end of the days," or "end of the desolation," appear to refer to the profanation of the temple by Pompey, or earlier by

Alexander, or later under Titus. Twice the defiling of the sanctuary is mentioned, but in both cases it means the defiling of it by hostile and disobedient Jews in that they do not obey the Law. In p. 4, ll. 15-18, it is said that the three nets of Belial are harlotry, wealth, and the defiling of the sanctuary. In p. 20, l. 23, it is said of the sect that "they rested upon God at the end of the offense of Israel, when they [the remnant people, I take it] had defiled the sanctuary." There is no cursing of the Gentiles, but only of Jews. This seems to indicate a conflict between two classes, or sects; and it would seem to be on this account, because of the success of their opponents whose misinterpretation and conduct had defiled the sanctuary, so that it could not be properly used for worship, that they had fled to Damascus. For this conclusion the crucial passage is p. 6. Apparently in large numbers they had gone under their chosen leaders, leaving Judea and the Holy City and the sanctuary to their enemies, determined elsewhere to be free to obey strictly the Mosaic Law, and not to swerve from it as they had interpreted it, until there should arise (p. 6, l. 11) a "Teacher of Righteousness in the last days." The writer proceeds:—

"And all who were brought into the Covenant were not to enter into the sanctuary to kindle its altar, but were to close [its] door, as God said: 'Oh, that there were one among you that would shut the doors, that ye might not kindle fire on my altar in vain' [R.V. translation of a slightly variant text, Mal. i. 10], if they will not observe to do according to the interpretation of the Law at the end of the wickedness, to separate from the children of destruction," etc.

The meaning is, that if the sanctuary is defiled by disobedience, the true believers are bidden to forsake it. Indeed, the prophet goes on to say that God has no pleasure in such

impure offerings, but that everywhere, from the rising to the setting of the sun, one can offer to God incense and pure offerings. This was their justification for leaving Jerusalem and carrying a purer worship to Damascus, where they might even have built a temple as in Egypt.

We then seem left to the character of their teachings to decide whether, if the Document had its origin in the first century B.C., their exodus from Judea to Damascus took place at the time of one or of the other persecution. In the one case they would be Pharisees, in the other Sadducees. Inasmuch as we have learned that the name Zadok, mentioned twice, does not prove that this is a Zadokite, or Sadducean, document, and, further, inasmuch as we do not find any condemnation of the custom of the Pharisees to "build a wall" about the law, the field is open to either explanation. Are the teachings, then, of this Document Sadducean or are they Pharisaic?

I am convinced by considerations I have heard presented by Professor Ginsburg, of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York, that they much more nearly approximate the teachings of the Pharisees than of the Sadducees. The strenuousness with which they held to their very strict interpretation of the Law, is Pharisaic. They made much of their פירוש, "interpretation," of the Law. Nearly two pages are given to enforcing exceeding strictness in the observance of the Sabbath, and it has actually "hedged the Law." If we can trust our authorities, which are, to be sure, Pharisaic, their carefulness does not characterize the Sadducees.

Once more, we know that the Sadducees did not believe in angels and spirits. This is not true of the writer of this Document. He refers to Satan several times as Belial;

and once "the angel of Mastema," that is, of Satan, is mentioned. And again (p. 2, ll. 4, 5) he says that there is with God "might and power and great wrath, with flames of fire; therein are all the angels of destruction for those who depart out of the way and despise the statute." Here the "angels of destruction," with the "flames of fire," represent the beliefs of the Pharisees rather than of the Sadducees. Once more, the sect represented by this Document held the characteristic doctrine of predestination, as remarked by Dr. Ginsburg. The writer says of the unfaithful Jews:—

"For before the world was God chose them not, and ere they were established he knew their deeds, and he contemned the generations of blood and hid his face from the land to exterminate them till they were consumed. And he knew the years of their continuance, and the number and the account of their ends; and all the happenings of the ages, and those that shall be, unto whatever shall come in their ends to all eternity" (p. 5, ll. 7-10).

Here is a well-developed doctrine of predestination.

All these points seem to forbid us to regard this as a Sadducean document. While it does not wholly agree with the rabbinic interpretation, it yet substantially agrees with the Pharisaic spirit; and this would tend to put the date in the time of Alexander Jannæus, perhaps 80 B. C., if it belongs to this century.

It may be mentioned, as bearing on the date of our Document, that the sect appears hostile to the ruling dynasty in Judea, and to have conscientiously abandoned the temple. It is said (p. 4, l. 11) that "in the completion of the end, for the number of these years, no one was to ally himself any longer to the house of Judah, but every one was to stand 'on his own net' [or place]." As these refugees were largely priests and Levites, this can hardly mean anything else than that they were to feel free to separate them-

selves from the party left in Judea. This implies a time of bitter alienation and persecution.

Another evidence that the Document was written before the overthrow of the Maccabean dynasty of priest-kings, is the fact that when it was composed the Messiah was expected still to come from the tribe of Levi, as had John Hyrcanus and Alexander Jannæus. The overthrow of that dynasty discredited such an anticipation, and before the dawn of the next century a Davidic Messiah was expected. Accordingly Jesus as Messiah was shown to be Davidic. But the Messiah of our Document is always the "Messiah of Aaron and Israel." The fact that the Messiah is Aaronic and not Davidic would fix the date in the first century B. C.

What now are the indications that would suggest a date in the first century A. D., as Mr. Margoliouth believes, and which would identify the characters with John Baptist, Jesus, and Paul ?

I confess that I find none of much value. There is no reference to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, with its loss of the temple. The fact that the sect had its seat in Damascus is of some weight, for we know from the early history of Paul that there was a considerable Christian following there, which proves a larger Jewish settlement. The Jews who did not accept Jesus as the Messiah or Teacher would doubtless be very bitter against the Hebrew Christians. And Paul has occasion to speak severely of certain "false brethren," from whom he suffered persecution. It is as likely to have been to escape them as to escape the Jews that he was let down in a basket from the wall. At the time of the persecution when Stephen was stoned, the Christians scattered everywhere, and very likely some went to Damascus. But such an exodus is no more likely to have

occurred then than when the Sadducees were dispossessed of power in the time of Alexander Jannæus, perhaps 80 B. C., if it belongs to this century.

The anticipation of a coming Messiah is Christian, but it was the general expectation of Jews as well, and has no distinctive value. Dr. Schechter and Dr. Adler make much of the fact that the Messiah of our Document is of Aaron and Levi, and not of David and Judah. They are right; but the point is not that a Levite Messiah is a Jewish idea, while the Christian Messiah is Davidic. The Jews did at first expect a Davidic Messiah, but during the reign of John Hyrcanus and Alexander Jannæus they changed to expecting that the Messiah should come from Aaron. Such is the teaching of the Jubilees and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. On the disgraceful fall of this priestly kingdom and the profanation of the Temple by Pompey, they gave up the hope of an Aaronic Messiah and reverted to a Davidic one. The fact that it is a Davidic Messiah that is expected puts the date early in the first century B. C., and not in the first century A. D. Yet we do not know how much of legend has attached itself to the infancy story of Jesus, nor how much of it grew out of the attempt to make the story fit certain prophetic passages. It is curious that the same story which in both Matthew and Luke makes Jesus of the seed of David also makes Mary the kinswoman of the wife of the priest Zacharias, father of John the Baptist.

Possibly to the Christian reader the first impression that this is a Christian document comes from the emphasis on the New Covenant, which has seemed a peculiarly Christian designation. A number of covenants of the people with Yahve are mentioned, the last being under King Zedekiah, but none of them is called a *New Covenant*. But in Jer.

xxx. 31 the expression occurs once where God promises to make "a new covenant" with his people, not like the old covenant which they had broken, but a permanent one in their hearts. Probably it was this prophecy which gave occasion for the term adopted by the sect at Damascus. The adoption of it might have been original with the Christian believers, but we may equally suppose an earlier sect to have assumed it, and that it was taken up by the members of the sect at Damascus who became Christians. Yet hitherto we have known no New Covenant people but Christians, and the use of this term would suggest a Christian sect.

For the Christian reader this conclusion would also be at least supported by the substance of the pledge of the New Covenant. While its members were, like the Jewish Christians, "zealous of the Law," they were, like the Christians, despisers of the "wealth of wickedness." As in the Christian Scriptures, the greed for wealth is repeatedly condemned. They were pledged "to love every one his neighbor *as himself*, and to strengthen the hand of the poor and the needy and the stranger, and to seek every one the peace of his neighbor." Further they promised "to admonish every one his neighbor according to the Law, and not to bear a grudge from day to day," and "to walk in all these things in the perfection of holiness." The repeated mention of "the perfection of holiness" as their aim reminds one of the use of the word "perfect" by Saint Paul: "We speak wisdom among them that are perfect" (1 Cor. ii. 6); "Let us, as many as be perfect, be thus minded" (Phil. iii. 14). May not this use of the word as applied to faithful Christians have come from an earlier sect? Of course the requirement to love one's neighbor as one's self appears once in the Mosaic Law, but the emphasis on it here is much like that

put upon it by Jesus. The command not to bear a grudge is also Mosaic, but the requirement not to maintain a grudge from one day to another is like that of Paul, "Let not the sun go down upon your wrath," and that of Jesus not to stop to offer a sacrifice before making peace with an offended neighbor. Yet while these injunctions seem so Christian they find their parallels in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs; as shown by Mr. Charles.

Another matter in which our Document reminds us of the early Christians is the emphasis put on the care of their poor. Not every Lord's day, but once a month, they were to take a collection for those in need. This was given to the Searcher and the judges, and from it they were to give to the poor and the aged, and the homeless, to the captive prisoner and to the helpless virgin. There were thus none left as paupers and beggars, and, as in the early church, none had need.

While these points suggest relationship, there are differences of quite as radical a nature. They did not know the Lord's day, which was a very early institution. We have observed that they took their collection monthly, not weekly. Also their officers (the Searcher and Judges) are not of the early church. They were to swear by the curses of the Covenant, while Christians were forbidden to swear at all. If this is a Christian document, it is remarkable that there is no reference to the manner of the tragical death of either John Baptist or Jesus. We have simply the mildest reference to the death of their Teacher.

To my mind, the balance of evidence leads to the conclusion that the Document is not Christian, but is from a Pharisaic source, of perhaps 80 B.C., when the Pharisees fled from the domination of the Sadducees under Alexander Jannæus.

If we can conclude that this Document represents a branch of the Pharisees dispossessed of power by the Sadducees, we gain a higher respect for that sect. While strenuous for the observance of the Law, when circumstances allowed, they could yet, when needful, shut the gates of the sanctuary and no longer offer sacrifices there. While less is said than we might expect of a future life, it is through them that we discover the steady development of the ethical sense, as appears in the emphasis put in their New Covenant on love of one's neighbor as one's self, on bearing no grudge from one day to another, on reproving a neighbor who has gone astray, and on the condemnation of unjust wealth as well as of all impurity. It was from a better class of Pharisees, such as St. Paul, that the early Christians were recruited, with their belief in the resurrection of the dead, and they were strict in their adherence to the Mosaic Law. Jesus never condemned the Pharisees for obedience to the Law, but said, "These things ought ye have done," and not left undone the weightier matters of justice and mercy.

As an appendix, I add a few textual notes.

In p. 1, l. 15, *שהו נבעות* להשה נבהות עולם rests on Hab. iii. 6, *שהו נבעות*, rather than on Isa. ii. 17, after Schechter, who had recognized that *נבהות* must be amended *נבעות*.

In p. 1, l. 19, *ויבחרו בטוב הצואר*, "and they chose the good of the neck," makes no easy sense. For *הצואר*, perhaps we should read *היצר*, which is used elsewhere for the imaginations of the heart.

In p. 2, l. 13, Dr. Schechter takes *שמו* to be by dittography, and to be omitted. It can be read, "In the interpretation of his name are their names," as does Mr. Margoliouth, but the meaning is not clear. May it not be read, "in the exposition

[of the Law, that is, their exposition] they *set* their names," referring to their signing the Covenant, as in p. 4, ll. 4, 5?

In p. 3, l. 7, where Schechter recognizes that a word is omitted, I would suggest to insert **במאן** after p. 5, l. 11, so as to read, "They defiled their spirit" (cf. p. 7, l. 4).

In p. 4, l. 6, I should without question adopt **שומרים** for **שונים**, an alternative emendation very doubtfully suggested by Dr. Schechter, and base it on p. 4, l. 1, **שמרו את משמרת**.

In p. 4, l. 12, for **מצודו** I would prefer **מעמדו**, although we might expect the preposition **ב**, instead of **על** (cf. p. 4, l. 11).

In p. 5, l. 5, I prefer to retain the text **יעלו**, for which Dr. Schechter would read **יעלימו**, and read, "they praised," instead of "they concealed the deeds of David." I take it that there David is excused, not blamed (cf. 1 Kings xv. 8).

In the mutilated passage p. 12, l. 3, Dr. Schechter does not supply the missing letters, but prefers to change **תהל** to **קהל**, "congregation." I would retain **תהל** and fill the blank thus: **ב** **סרך מושב** **(המתנת לה) חהלך** **כו**; and I would compare p. 13, l. 20; 14, l. 3, and p. 6, l. 10 (see also p. 7, ll. 6, 8). It would then read: "This is the custom of the settlement of the camps, to walk in it." i.e. in the **סרך החורה** (p. 7, l. 6), "in the end of the wickedness, until the appearance of the Anointed of Aaron and Israel." This corresponds to p. 6, l. 10, which says, "To walk in them to all the end of the wickedness, and they shall not swerve from them until the appearance of the Teacher of Righteousness in the last days."

In p. 13, l. 1, it is said that at least ten men shall be required for an organized congregation. I take it that the words "By thousands and hundreds and fifties and tens" are a free quotation from Ex. xviii. 21, 25, which is given as authority to organize under tens at least.