

THE TWO ZADOKITE MESSIAHS.

PROF. H. L. STRACK, of Berlin, has courteously sent me a copy of an article on Prof. Schechter's *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, vol. i, which he published in *Reformation* (1911, No. 7); and as that article included a friendly but decisive challenge of the position which I took up with regard to the now famous 'Zadokite Document' in *The Athenaeum* for Nov. 26, 1910, it seems fitting that I should make an equally friendly and equally decisive reply.

So far as a final judgement on the origin, date, and historical bearing of the document is concerned, it is only right that students should take plenty of time for its consideration, and Prof. Strack himself promises a more elaborate contribution on the subject after a closer investigation of it ('nach genauerer Untersuchung'). The points for special examination are indeed very numerous, and the problem is at almost every step complicated with certain important matters relating to one set of religious ideas or another. But there is one point of vital difference between Prof. Strack's view and my own which seems to me of a comparatively simple character, and which may, therefore, be conveniently dealt with in a paper of fairly limited dimensions.

The question to answer is whether two different religious leaders are spoken of in the first eleven lines of the document or only one; and as in a matter of this kind the text itself must first of all be consulted, I will here reproduce the portion referred to in the original and add a translation. After a perusal of the text thus placed before him, the student will be in a position to appreciate the difference between my reading of the document on this important point and that of Prof. Strack, whose further argument concerning it I will then fully discuss.

HEBREW TEXT.

ועתה שמעו כל יודעי צדק ובינו במעשי | אל כי ריב לו עם כל בשר ומשפט
 יעשה בכל מנאציו | כי במועלם אשר עזבוהו הסתיר פניו מישראל וממקדשו |
 5 ויתנם לחרב ובזכרו ברית ראשנים השאיר שארית | לישראל ולא נתנם לבלה
 ובקץ חרון שנים שלש מאות | ותשעים לתיתו אותם ביד נבוכדנאצר מלך
 בבל | פקדם ויצמח מישראל ומאהרן שרש מטעת לירוש | את ארצו ולדשן
 בטוב אדמתו ויבינו בעונם וידעו כי | אנשים אשמים הם ויהיו כעורים |
 10 וכימנששים¹ דרך | שנים עשרים ויבן אֵל אֵל מעשיהם כי בלב שלם דרשוהו |
 יקם להם מורה צדק להדריכם בדרך לבו . . .

¹ So the MS.

P. 1, l. 1. 'And now hearken, all ye that know righteousness, and meditate upon the works of God. For he has a controversy with all flesh, and he will execute judgement on all who contemn him. For because of their treachery in that they have forsaken him, has he hidden his face from Israel and from his sanctuary, and given them over unto the sword. Yet remembering the covenant he made with their forefathers¹ has he left a remnant | to Israel, and gave them not over to complete destruction. And at the end of the wrath, [namely] three hundred and ninety years² after delivering them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babel, has he visited them, and he caused to sprout from Israel and Aaron a root of planting to possess his land, and to take pleasure in the good of his territory. And they meditated upon their sin, and they knew that they were guilty men, and like persons groping their way, |
 10 for twenty years. And God had regard to their works, for they sought him with a perfect heart. And he raised up for them a Teacher of Righteousness, in order to guide them in the way of his heart.'

In my *Athenaeum* article referred to I said that 'two Messiahs are clearly indicated in the text if read in its natural sense'. Proof for this seemed to me unnecessary. We have here a regular series of Imperfects with *waw* consecutive (ויצמח . . . ויבינו . . . וידעו . . . ויהיו . . . ויבן . . . ויקים). I regarded it, therefore, as self-evident that two different persons are introduced in these lines, a space of twenty years intervening between the beginnings of the two ministries. But Prof. Strack (following Prof. Schechter) thinks that the two are in reality only one; and if so, my initial conception of the problem would fall to the ground. Prof. Strack's own words are as follows:—'A comparison of l. 11 with l. 7 of p. 1 does, it is true, produce at first an impression of different personalities ("macht allerdings zuerst den Eindruck der Verschiedenheit"), but this impression cannot be maintained in view of other indications. If, therefore, the statement about the "twenty years" is correct, it is necessary to assume that twenty years after its "sprouting", which need not necessarily be taken in the sense of "being born", the root appeared as the "Teacher of Righteousness".'

¹ Literally: the first ones.

² On the strength of a confused statement of Talmudical chronology found in *Abodah Zarah* fol. 9^a Prof. Strack considers that by the 390 years after the conquest of Nebuchadnezzar the year 47 B. C. is meant. On the correct reckoning it would be 197 B. C. (587-390). That we have here to deal with an erroneous piece of chronology is only too likely, the more so as similar instances can be cited. But Rabbinic chronology having been faulty to the extent of 150 years (197-47), why not that of the sect of the document faultier still if the clear impressions derived from the persons and events mentioned in the document should be found to demand it. But the entire subject of the chronology of the document requires further investigation.

It is clear that Prof. Strack himself—and how can he help it?—realizes that in its natural meaning the document would be taken to refer to two different persons in ll. 7 and 11 respectively. Only he considers that other parts of it prove such a construction to be erroneous. It will, therefore, be best to collect in this place all the references to the ‘Messiah’ and the ‘Teacher of Righteousness’ found in both the fragments published by Prof. Schechter, so as to place the student in a position to decide for himself whether the indications they contain force us to abandon the natural meaning of ll. 7 and 11 of p. 1, and to regard the ‘root of planting’ as one and the same person with the ‘Teacher of Righteousness’. In the notes which will accompany the phrases cited, some matters will incidentally be touched upon which have a bearing on the interpretation of the document in general.

1. There is first of all on p. 2, ll. 12–13 (fr. A) what may be fairly called the *locus classicus* of the document, and which had best be taken by itself:—**וידועם ביד משיחו רוח קדשו והוא אמת ובפרש שמו שמוחהם**: ‘And he made them know his Holy Spirit through his Messiah, and he is true. And in the explanation of his Name are their names. And those he hated has he caused to go astray.’ (In the sentence: ‘And in the explanation of his name are their names’, I see an allusion to the great similarity of meaning between the name of *Boῦθός*, founder of the Boethusian section of the Sadducees and **ישוע**, Jesus, *vide Athenaeum*, but this only by the way.)

Now is there anything in this passage which obliges us to accept the forced and unnatural construction put by Prof. Strack on ll. 7 and 11 of p. 2?—Clearly not! For the Messiah here spoken of may, in full accord with the usual sense of such sentences, be identical with the ‘Teacher of Righteousness’ of l. 11, regarded as a separate personality. It is clear that the gift of the Holy Spirit could not have been bestowed during the ministry of the ‘root of planting’, for the people were after its appearance still ‘like blind men . . . groping their way’. That ministry was essentially a negative one. They learnt to know ‘that they were guilty men’, but they could not find the way they wished to go. Then came the positive ministry of the ‘Teacher’, who guided them on the way which they had been seeking (compare Acts xix 1–5; also St John i 8–9).

2. We may next conveniently put together the passages in which the title ‘Teacher’ (**מורה**, but also **יורה**) is used in conformity with p. 1, l. 11.

On p. 6, ll. 10–11 (fr. A) is the sentence:—**והלהם לא ישנו עד עמד**: ‘And beside them none shall attain to it [i.e. to a certain religious way of life] until there arise he who teaches righteousness at the end of the days.’—Here we have a clear reference

to the expected reappearance of the 'Teacher' at the end of the dispensation then present.

At the close of p. 19 and the beginning of p. 20 (fr. B) is the very significant sentence:—*ובכתבו לא יכתבו מיום האסף מורה היחיד עד עמוד משיח*: 'And in his writing shall they [i.e. certain refractory people] not be written from the day when there was gathered in [i.e. died] the unique [or only] Teacher until there shall arise the Messiah from Aaron and Israel.' (Specially to be noted is the epithet *היחיד*, which—as Mrs Lewis of Cambridge has pointed out to me—is the exact equivalent of *μονογενής*, the Old Syriac rendering of *μονογενής* in St John i 14; Pesh. similarly *ܡܘܢܘܓܝܢܝܫ*. But as this touches too closely on the question of identification of the persons referred to, it cannot be discussed in the present paper.)—The reference to the Messiah from Aaron and Israel will be noted again under (4).

On p. 20, ll. 13–15 (fr. B) we read:—*ומיום האסף יורה¹ היחיד עד תם כל*: 'And from the day when there was gathered in [i.e. died] the unique Teacher until all the men of war who walked with the man of lies were destroyed there were about forty years.' (On my interpretation of the 'forty years' see the *Athenaeum*; the expressions used are, of course, adapted in the well-known allusive style, from Deut. ii 14–16. The rebels here spoken of—in my opinion, the followers of the Apostle Paul—are compared to the rebellious Israelites who were doomed to die in the desert prior to the entry of the people into Canaan.)

The last extant mention of the 'Teacher' is found in l. 32 of p. 20 (fr. B):—*והחיסרו במשפטים הראשונים אשר נשפטו בני אנשי היחיד והאוינו*: 'And they shall be chastised by the first judgement in which the sons of the men of the unique one were judged, and they will listen to the voice of the Teacher of Righteousness.' (This sentence requires elucidation, but the mere literal rendering is sufficient for our present purpose; but it is, in connexion with all the four passages, important to note how frequently *διδάσκαλος*, = *מורה*, is used of our Lord in the Gospels, and that in the disputed passage in Josephus, *Ant.* XVIII ch. iii 3, the same term is found.)

The question must now be asked whether there is anything in these four passages to make it necessary for us to take the series of Imperfects with *waw* consecutive in ll. 1–11 of p. 1 in any but their natural sense, and the confident answer may at once be given that there is absolutely nothing in them to point in such a direction. On the contrary, the passage at the end of p. 19 and the beginning of p. 20 may legitimately be taken to look the other way, the 'Teacher' being apparently regarded as distinct from the 'Messiah from Aaron and Israel'.

¹ The dots over the second ' merely mean that it is to be deleted.

3. The designation 'Messiah', without indication of descent, occurs only twice, once on p. 2, l. 12, given under (1), and the second time in a passage beginning at the close of p. 5 (fr. A), where certain persons living at the 'end of the destruction of the land' (which I take to mean the final Roman conquest under Titus, A.D. 70) are accused of 'speaking rebellion against the commandments of God given by the hand of Moses and also against God's Holy Messiah; and there is clearly as little in this passage as in that found on p. 2, ll. 12-13, to suggest the necessity for taking ll. 7 and 11 of p. 1 in the sense adopted by Prof. Strack.

4. Lastly, we have four passages in which a Messiah with specified descent from Aaron and Israel is spoken of.

At the end of p. 12 (fr. A) is the phrase עַד עֲמוּד מְשֹׁחַ אַהֲרֹן וְיִשְׂרָאֵל: 'Until there arise the anointed one from Aaron and Israel.' The same phrase (with perhaps מְשִׁיחַ for מְשֹׁחַ) clearly stood on p. 14, l. 19 (fr. A), where (in consequence of mutilation) the words אַהֲרֹן וְיִשְׂרָאֵל alone remain. On p. 19, l. 10 (fr. B), we have בְּבֹא מְשִׁיחַ אַהֲרֹן וְיִשְׂרָאֵל: 'When comes the Messiah from Aaron and Israel.' The fourth passage (end of p. 19 and beginning of p. 20) has already been given under (2).

In all the four instances the reference is to the appearance of the Messiah from Aaron and Israel at a future time; but it must be regarded as certain that what is meant is the reappearance of the 'root of planting' (manifestly a Messianic phrase, reminding one strongly of the idea of צֶמַח in the Old Testament; and see especially Isaiah xi 1), also stated to be descended from Israel and Aaron. (On the idea of this double descent see *The Athenaeum*.)

But is there anything in these passages demanding our rejection of the natural sense of ll. 7 and 11 in p. 1?—Clearly not! On the contrary, it seems perfectly legitimate to argue that there is in the document an intentional distinction between the Messiah descending from Aaron and Israel and the Messiah, whose descent is not specified, the former having at his first coming awakened men to a knowledge of their guilt, and the latter having imparted to his followers the positive element by bestowing on them the gift of the Holy Spirit. In the language of the New Testament, Elias had to come first, and after him came the Messiah *par excellence*. The coming of both was, as is well known, the general expectation; and from the Zadokite document, now brought to light by Prof. Schechter, we learn that both were by the sect in question expected to reappear in the latter days.

G. MARGOLIOUTH.