

Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts

F. F. BRUCE, M.A., D.D.
Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism and
Exegesis in the University of Manchester

[p.3]

CONTENTS

Preface	5
I The Qumran Commentaries	7
II The New Situation	20
III The Zadokite Work	32
IV Messianic Interpretation	41
V Servant of the Lord and Son of Man	56
VI The Interpretation of Daniel	67
VII Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts and the New Testament	75

[p.4]

ABBREVIATIONS

BASOR	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
DJD	<i>Discoveries in the Judaean Desert</i> I, ed. D. Barthelemy and J. T. Milik (Oxford, 1955).
JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
LXX	Septuagint (Greek version of Old Testament)
MT	Massoretic Text
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
PEQ	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
1Q	(Documents discovered in) Qumran Cave I
1QH	<i>Hymns of Thanksgiving</i>
1QIsa.A	Scroll of Isaiah i-lxvi
1QM	<i>Rule of War</i>
1QpHab.	Commentary on Habakkuk
1QpMic.	Commentary on Micah
1QS	<i>Rule of the Community</i>
1QSa	<i>Rule of the Congregation</i>
1Qsb	Collection of Benedictions
1Q 27	<i>Book of Mysteries</i>
4Q	(Documents discovered in) Qumran Cave IV
4QPIsa.	A Commentary on Isaiah x-xii
4QpNahum	Commentary on Nahum
4QPPs. 37	Commentary on Psalm xxxvii

<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
<i>SNTS</i>	<i>Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas</i>
<i>TB</i>	Babylonian Talmud
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
<i>Z</i>	Zadokite Work (also called Damascus Document)
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>

[p.5]

PREFACE

This monograph, now slightly revised, originally appeared in the series *Exegetica*, published by Messrs. Van Keulen of The Hague. When I was honoured with an invitation to contribute a monograph to that series, it seemed to me particularly appropriate to write on *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, because a few months previously I had lectured on this subject in the Free University of Amsterdam, the University of Utrecht and the University of Leiden. In expanding these lectures in this form, I have special pleasure in recalling the warm hospitality which I received in the Netherlands on that occasion, and in dedicating this short study to my Dutch colleagues and friends.

November 1959

F. F. B.

[p.6]

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Scripture quotations from the Revised Standard Version of the Bible (copyrighted 1946 and 1952 by the Division of Christian Education, National Council of Churches, U.S.A.) are used by permission.

[p.7]

CHAPTER I THE QUMRAN COMMENTARIES

I. THE MEANING OF 'PESHER'

Among the hundreds of documents found in the caves of Qumran during the past ten years there is one distinctive group which comprises commentaries on a variety of biblical texts. One of the first of the scrolls to be discovered and published belongs to this group, and it is still the most complete of those hitherto known—the commentary on the first two chapters of the Book of Habakkuk found in Cave I, succinctly referred to as I Q p Hab. From Cave I we also have fragmentary commentaries on Micah, Zephaniah and the Psalms; and from the other caves (especially from Cave IV) several more commentaries, of which one on the Psalms, one on Nahum and a few on Isaiah are particularly interesting.

The presence of such works in the library at Qumran is not surprising when we consider how devotedly the members of the Qumran community gave themselves to the study of the sacred scriptures. Evidence of their study and interpretation of these scriptures is not confined to the commentaries we have mentioned. The large number of copies of biblical books suggests the important part that these played in the studies of the sect, and sometimes these copies provide an indication of the way in which a text was interpreted. Most of the other books found in the

caves quote and apply biblical texts as they deal with the beliefs and practices of the sect. Their interpretation of these texts can be classified under several recognizable categories—allegorical, moral, and so forth. But the kind of interpretation found in the commentaries is introduced to the reader under the name *peshet*, and indeed the commentaries themselves have come to be referred to as *pesharim*. It is with this kind of interpretation that we are concerned in this chapter.

The Hebrew word *peshet* appears once only in the Old Testament: Ecclesiastes viii. 1, ‘who knows the interpretation of a thing?’ The context there implies that to know this kind of ‘interpretation’ is something that calls for wisdom. And this

[p.8]

is amply confirmed when we consider the thirty occurrences of the cognate word *peshar* in the Aramaic part of the Book of Daniel. There it is used of Daniel’s interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar’s two dreams and of the writing on the wall at Belshazzar’s feast; and also of the interpretation of Daniel’s first vision, supplied by one of the attendants at the heavenly judgment scene.

While the root *p-sh-r* is not found in the Hebrew part of Daniel, the same idea is conveyed there by such common roots as *byn*, *yd*^c, *škl* and *ngd*—in reference, for example, to the angelic reinterpretation of the seventy years of Jer. xxv. 11f. (xxix. 10) as seventy heptads of years (Dan. ix. 2, 24ff.).

The *peshet*, then, is an interpretation which passes the power of ordinary wisdom to attain; it is given by divine illumination. But it follows that the problem which requires interpretation of this order is no ordinary problem; it is, in fact, a divine mystery. This kind of mystery is denoted in the Qumran texts by the term *rāz*. This term of Iranian origin also appears in the Aramaic part of Daniel, with reference to Nebuchadnezzar’s two dreams. When Daniel enters the king’s presence to explain his dream of the great image, he says: ‘not because of any wisdom that I have more than all the living has this mystery (*rāz*) been revealed to me, but in order that the interpretation (*peshar*) may be made known to the king’ (Dan. ii. 30). And when Nebuchadnezzar enlists Daniel’s aid to explain his dream of the great tree, he says (Dan. iv. 9): ‘because I know that the spirit of the holy gods is in you and that no mystery (*rāz*) is difficult for you, here is the dream which I saw; tell me its interpretation (*peshar*).’

In the Greek versions of the Septuagint and Theodotion, this term *rāz*, wherever it occurs in Daniel, is represented by *mystērion*; and it is helpful to bear this in mind when we meet the word *mystērion* in the Greek New Testament.

In the Book of Daniel it is clear that the *rāz*, the mystery, is divinely communicated to one party, and the *peshet*, the interpretation, to another. Not until the mystery and the interpretation are brought together can the divine communication be understood. Nebuchadnezzar’s dreams and the writing which Belshazzar saw on the wall were divine communications to these monarchs, but they remained meaningless to them until Daniel supplied the interpretation which he in his turn received from God. Similarly, Daniel himself was anxious and alarmed by his

[p.9]

vision of judgment until the interpreting angel explained it to him (Dan. vii. 15f.). (Daniel's alarm was equally great after he received the interpretation, as he says in verse 28, but this time it was the alarm of what was known instead of what was unknown.)

This principle, that the divine purpose cannot be properly understood until the *peshet* has been revealed as well as the *rāz*, underlies the biblical exegesis in the Qumran commentaries. The *rāz* was communicated by God to the prophet, but the meaning of that communication remained sealed until its *peshet* was made known by God to His chosen interpreter. The chosen interpreter was the Teacher of Righteousness, the founder of the Qumran community.

We may compare, for example, the interpretation of Hab. ii. 1f. which is given in the Habakkuk commentary (1Qp Hab. vii. 1-5):

God commanded Habakkuk to write the things that were coming upon the last generation, but the fulfilment of the epoch He did not make known to him. And as for the words, so he may run who reads it, their interpretation (*peshet*) concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God made known all the mysteries (*rāzīm*) of the words of His servants the prophets.

The revelation, we may say, was divided into two parts, and not until the two parts are brought together is its meaning made plain. The revelation, moreover, had to do predominantly with the time of the end, the last generation; and the fact that the Teacher of Righteousness had now been raised up to interpret the words of the prophets was a token that the time of the end was imminent. This is confirmed at the beginning of the Zadokite Admonition, where the emergence of the faithful community is described (Z. i. 10-12):

God took note of their deeds, for they sought Him with a perfect heart, and He raised up for them a Teacher of Righteousness to lead them in the way of His heart, that He might make known to the last generations what He was about to do to the last generation—the congregation of deceivers.

We may, then, sum up the principles of biblical interpretation which we have thus far uncovered in the following propositions:

1. God revealed His purpose to His servants the prophets,

[p.10]

but His revelation (particularly with regard to the time when His purpose would be fulfilled) could not be understood until its meaning was imparted to the Teacher of Righteousness.

2. All the words of the prophets had reference to the time of the end.

3. The time of the end is at hand.

Thus, if Balaam spoke of the coming of a star 'out of Jacob' which would crush Israel's enemies (Num. xxiv. 17), if Moses spoke of a prophet like himself whom God would raise up (Deut. xviii. 15), if Isaiah described the invading Assyrian who would be brought low by no human sword (Isa. x. 27ff., xxxi. 8), if Micah foretold the desolation of Samaria (Mic. i. 6), if Nahum portrayed Nineveh as a den where 'the lion tore enough for his whelps and strangled prey for his lionesses' (Nah. ii. 11f.), if Habakkuk warned his fellow-Judaeans that their land

would be overrun by 'the Chaldeans, that bitter and hasty nation' (Hab. i. 6), if Ezekiel predicted the rise and fall of 'Gog, of the land of Magog' (Ezek. xxxviii. 1ff.)—these persons and events were understood to belong not to the time immediately following the prophetic pronouncements but to the time immediately following the rise and activity of the Teacher of Righteousness. Isaiah might speak of the Assyrians, Habakkuk of the Chaldeans, and Ezekiel of Gog; but these were simply different designations for the great Gentile power which would oppress the people of God at the end-time, and whose overthrow with divine aid would be followed by the dawn of the new age of righteousness and peace.

It will be easily realized that this principle of interpretation, if carried through to its logical conclusion, must deprive Old Testament prophecies of that relevance and coherence which can best be appreciated when they are studied in their historical setting. The references, express or implicit, to the Assyrians in Isaiah i-xxxiii are intelligible to the modern student in the light of Near Eastern history in the years 740-700 BC, and in turn they make a valuable contribution to our understanding of the history of these years. But if Isaiah was not speaking of the Assyrians whom he knew so well, but of the Seleucid or Roman armies of the last two centuries BC, then it is pointless to look in his oracles for any coherence or relevance in terms of the eighth century BC. Similarly, if Micah's warning that the city of Samaria would become 'a heap in the open country' looked forward not to its storming by the Assyrians in 721, BC, but to

[p.11]

the banishment of the unworthy priests of Jerusalem in the days of the Qumran community, it is useless to try to determine the sense of such a passage from its natural context.

All the prophecies, so to speak, were given in code, and no-one was able to break the code until the Teacher of Righteousness was given the key. But if, as he taught, the prophecies referred to his own days and the days immediately following, then it is in the context of these latter days that the prophecies appear coherent and relevant.

II. THE HABAKKUK COMMENTARY

Because the Habakkuk commentary is the most complete of those that have been recovered from the caves thus far, the points we have been making can best be explained from it.¹

1. *Atomization*

To the modern exegete the meaning of the Book of Habakkuk can most readily be grasped if it is viewed in the light of its historical setting towards the end of the seventh century BC, possibly in the reign of Jehoiakim (608-598 BC). We know on independent authority that Jehoiakim was guilty of oppression and violence (Jer. xxii. 13-17). Habakkuk cries out against the oppression and violence which are rampant in high places, and the answer he receives from God is that the Chaldeans are being raised up to execute the divine judgment on the unrighteous rulers of Judah. But later he has to renew his complaint, for the Chaldeans are guilty of even greater brutality and impiety than those against whom they executed the judgment of God. This time he is told that they too will disappear when they have served

¹ Cf. K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer* (1953); Osswald, 'Zur Hermeneutik des Habakuk-Kommentars', *ZAW* 68 (1956), p. 243-256.

God's purpose; divine righteousness will one day be manifestly vindicated on earth, but in the meantime the call is for patience and trust: 'the righteous shall live by his faith' (Hab. ii. 4).

Certain differences may be allowed on the details of the exegesis, but in general 'the oracle of God which Habakkuk the prophet saw' is coherent and intelligible when it is interpreted thus.

But in the Qumran commentary the two chapters are atomized:

[p.12]

each phrase is made to fit into a new historical situation regardless of its contextual meaning (as we understand it). Thus, Hab. i. 13 ('thou who art of purer eyes than to behold evil and canst not look on wrong, why dost thou look on faithless men, and art silent when the wicked swallows up the man more righteous than he?') is patently addressed by the prophet to God as part of his protest. But in the commentary it is not God, but the righteous remnant, that is 'of purer eyes than to behold evil', and it is not God, but a group of men called 'the house of Absalom', that is upbraided for looking on faithless men (without taking action against them) and for remaining silent when the righteous man is overwhelmed by the wicked. Again, in the previous verse, it is (according to the prophet) the Chaldeans who are ordained as a judgment and established for chastisement; in the commentary it is the righteous remnant. In order to make the biblical text applicable to a situation of his own day, the commentator simply disregards its original context, and even overrides the natural relationship of its component clauses. Here is what he says, construing verse 13 along with the second half of verse 12 in such a way as to extract a meaning foreign to the prophet's thought (1Q p Hab. v. 1-12):

Thou hast ordained him to execute judgment; and Thou, O Rock, hast established him to inflict chastisement, even him who is of purer eyes than to behold evil and cannot look on wrong. The interpretation of this saying is that God will not destroy His people by the hand of the nations, but into the hand of His elect will God commit the judgment of all the nations, and by the chastisement which they inflict those who have kept His commandments in the time of their distress will condemn all the wicked of His people. For this is what he means when he says: *of purer eyes than to behold evil.* The interpretation of this is that they did not commit unfaithfulness according to the lust of their eyes in the epoch of wickedness. *Why dost thou look on faithless men, and art silent when the wicked swallows up the man more righteous than he?* The interpretation of this concerns the house of Absalom and the men of their counsel, who were struck dumb when the Teacher of Righteousness was chastised, and did not go to his aid against the Man of Falsehood, who rejected the law in the midst of all their congregation.

2. Textual Variants

Along with this atomizing exegesis there goes at times an inter-

[p.13]

esting treatment of textual variants. Where one reading suits the commentator's purpose better than another, he will use it, although he may show in the course of his comment that he is aware of an alternative reading. He has been suspected of deliberately altering the text here and there in order to make the application more pointed, but the suspicion does not amount to proof.

In Hab. i. 5 MT reads: ‘Look among the nations, and see; wonder and be astounded.’ The Qumran commentary, however, probably read *bōgēdīm* (‘traitors’) instead of MT *baggōyīm* (‘among the nations’). We cannot be quite sure of this, for there is a lacuna in the manuscript in the place where the biblical text was quoted; but three times over in the *peshet* it is said that the reference is to ‘traitors’ (*bōgēdīm*)—those who allied themselves with the Man of Falsehood and disregarded the message of the Teacher of Righteousness, those who rejected the new covenant, and those who would act treacherously ‘at the end of the days’. But if the commentator did find *bōgēdīm* in his text, he probably used a manuscript which exhibited the same reading here as lay before the Septuagint translators when they rendered the opening words of the verse ‘Behold, you scoffers’ (cf. Acts xiii. 41; see p. 81).

In Hab. ii. Sa MT reads: ‘Moreover, wine is treacherous; the arrogant man is puffed up.’ But the Qumran commentator reads *hōn* (‘wealth’) for MT *hayyayin* (‘the wine’) and explains the passage thus (1Q p Hab. viii. 8-11):

Its interpretation concerns the Wicked Priest, who was called by the name of truth when first he arose, but when he ruled in Israel his heart was exalted and he forsook God, and dealt treacherously with the ordinances for the sake of wealth.

He links this interpretation with the verses immediately following, where the man who ‘heaps up what is not his own’ (Hab. ii. 6) is identified with the Wicked Priest, who

looted and amassed the wealth of the men of [v]iolence who rebelled against God, and took the wealth of nations, adding to himself iniquity and guilt, and acted in ab[om]inable ways, with every defiling impurity (1Q p Hab. viii. 11-13).

But, if the commentator had found the Massoretic reading in his text, it would have suited his interpretation equally well, for it is

[p.14]

plain from his comment on Hab. ii. 15f. that wine as well as wealth was a means of the Wicked Priest’s undoing, for he ‘walked in the ways of drunkenness to quench his thirst’.

This last passage provides further examples of the commentator’s use of variant readings. The MT of Hab. ii. 15f. may be rendered: ‘Woe to him who gives his neighbour to drink, adding thy fury thereto, and makes him drunk, that he may look on their nakedness! Thou art sated with contempt instead of glory. Drink thyself and be uncircumcised! The cup in the LORD’S right hand will come round to thee, and shame will come upon thy glory!’ This has been felt by many editors and translators to require some emendation; in RSV, for example, ‘adding thy fury thereto’ is conjecturally emended to ‘of the cup of his wrath’, and ‘be uncircumcised’ is replaced by ‘stagger’—a reading which finds support in the Greek and Syriac versions, and which now appears to have been found by the Qumran commentator in his biblical text (*hērār’ēl* for MT *hē’ārēl*). But a more curious variant is read by our commentator at the end of verse 15—*mō’ādēhem* (‘their sacred seasons’) in place of *mē’ōrēhem* (‘their nakedness’). This, then, is his treatment of the whole passage (1Q p Hab. xi. 2-15):

Woe to him who gives his neighbour to drink, adding his fury thereto, and also makes them drunk, in order to look on their sacred seasons! Its interpretation concerns the Wicked Priest, who pursued after the Teacher of Righteousness to swallow him up in his hot fury, even to his place of discovery and on the occasion of the sacred season of rest,

the day of atonement, he appeared among them to swallow them up and to make them stumble on the fast day, their sabbath of rest. *Thou art sated with shame instead of glory; drink thyself and stagger! The cup of the LORD'S' right hand will come round to thee, and shame will come upon thy glory!* Its interpretation concerns the priest whose shame was mightier than his glory, for he did not circumcise the foreskin of his heart but walked in the ways of drunkenness to quench his thirst. But the cup of [Gold's wrath will overwhelm him, to add to his [shame and] ignominy.

While the commentator found 'stagger' (*hērā'ēl*) in his text and not 'be uncircumcised' (*hērā'ēl*), as in MT, it is evident that he knew the latter reading, for his comment echoes it when he speaks of the priest who 'did not circumcise the foreskin of his heart'. It is also possible that he knew the reading 'their naked-

[p.15]

ness' (*mē'ōrēhem*) at the end of verse 15, for the phrase rendered 'to his place of discovery (or exile)' (*'abbēth gālūthō*)² is taken by others to mean 'desiring to strip him' (*'ābōth gallōtho*),³ and in any case it looks as though the reading 'their sacred seasons' (*mō'ādēhem*) was adopted simply because it fitted an incident to which the commentator believed the prophet was referring here. T. H. Gaster believes that the commentator's biblical text read *mō'ādēhem* ('their totterings'), which he revocalized to suit his purpose.⁴

3. Allegorization

Where the Qumran commentators felt that more was called for than the atomizing of the biblical text or the judicious selection of variant reading if an appropriate interpretation was to be extracted, allegorization might be resorted to. What, for example, was to be made of 'Lebanon' and 'the beasts' in Hab. ii. 17? The original reference is apparently to the cutting down of the cedars of Lebanon by the Chaldeans for military and other purposes, and the hunting of the animals that had their homes there. But no such literal interpretation was applicable to the situation which our commentator had in mind. Thus we read (1Q p Hab. xi. 17-xii. 5):

[For the violence done to Lebanon will overwhelm thee, and the destruction of beasts] will terrify thee.... The interpretation of this saying refers to the Wicked Priest, to repay him his recompense as he recompensed the poor. For Lebanon is the council of the community, and the beasts are the simple ones of Judah, the doers of the law.

It may be that 'Lebanon' was interpreted of the council of the community because of the white habit worn by the sectaries of Qumran, as T. H. Gaster suggests,⁵ but even so the exegesis is purely allegorical.

Even more remote from the text is the interpretation which the Micah *pesher* found in Cave I gives of Mic. i. 5b ('And what are the high places of Judah? are they not Jerusalem?'):

[Its interpretation con]cerns the Teacher of Righteousness: it is

[p.16]

² Cf. A. M. Habermann, *'Edah we-'Eduth* (1952), p. 27.

³ Cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (1952), p. 27.

⁴ T. H. Gaster, *The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect* (1957), p. 252, n. 42.

⁵ T. H. Gaster, *op. cit.*, p. 253, n. 45

he who [teaches the law to] his [council] and to all those who volunteer to be enrolled among the elect people [of God, practising the law] in the council of the community, who will be delivered from the day [of judgment] (*DJD* i, p. 78).

Such allegorical interpretations are paralleled by some of those which we find in other Qumran documents which do not belong to the *peshet* category (see pp. 36f.).

4. Reinterpretation

One way or another, then, the Qumran commentators apply the writings of the prophets to a new situation—to the last generations (as they believed them to be) of the present age. Their procedure involved large-scale reinterpretation of the Old Testament writings. And it must be recognized that reinterpretation of a kind appears even within the Old Testament writings themselves. We have already mentioned the reinterpretation of the seventy years of Jer. xxv. 11f. (cf. xxix. 10) in terms of the seventy heptads of years of Dan. ix. 24ff.; we may also think of the reinterpretation of Balaam's 'ships from Kittim' (Num. xxiv. 24) to denote a Roman fleet in Dan. xi. 30. Indeed, Daniel's use of the term Kittim to denote Romans (possibly the first instance of its use in that sense) may be directly responsible for the common employment of Kittim as a designation of the Romans in the Qumran texts.

At the beginning of the Habakkuk *peshet* the divine warning, 'I am rousing the Chaldeans, that bitter and hasty nation, who march through the breadth of the earth, to seize habitations not their own' (Hab. i. 6), is explained as follows (1Q p Hab. ii. 12-14):

Its interpretation concerns the Kittim, w[h]o are swift and mighty in war, destroying f[ar-flung nations and bringing them] under the domination of the Kittim....

The description of the irresistible advance of these invaders which follows in the commentary strongly suggests that they are to be identified with the Romans (an identification supported by other evidence), although some scholars prefer to identify them with the Seleucid armies.

It is of some interest, however, that Habakkuk himself in this passage reinterprets, or at least echoes, the language of an earlier prophet. In earlier days God gave warning of the Assyrian

[p.17]

invasion of Judah in these terms: 'Because this people draw near with their mouth and honour me with their lips, while their hearts are far from me, and their fear of me is a commandment of men learned by rote; therefore, behold, I will again do marvellous things with this people, wonderful and marvellous; and the wisdom of their wise men shall perish, and the discernment of their discerning men shall be hid' (Isa. xxix. 13f.). And now that the Chaldean invasion is imminent, the warning of it given through Habakkuk is prefaced with the command: 'Look among the nations, and see; wonder and be astounded. For I am doing a work in your days that you would not believe if told' (Hab. i. 5).

But when the later Old Testament prophets echo or reapply the words of their predecessors, they mean that the message of God in an earlier crisis is relevant, *mutatis mutandis*, to a new crisis. It is doubtful, however, if the Qumran commentators thought in this way. Our commentator on Habakkuk, for example, does not appear to have said to himself: 'The words which were applicable on the eve of the Chaldean invasion in Habakkuk's day appear to be remarkably applicable also to the present day.' That is the sort of thing which many a

Christian preacher has thought and said in recent years when expounding the message of the prophets. But our commentator appears rather to have meant: 'This situation which has begun to develop in my own time is the situation which God had in view when He revealed His purpose to Habakkuk, and thanks to the further revelation given to the Teacher of Righteousness I can clearly recognize the individuals and the epochs to which Habakkuk's prophecy refers.' We may call his method one of reinterpretation, but he himself probably did not think of it in that way; to him his *peshet* was the true and proper interpretation of the prophet's words. And in this interpretation the Teacher of Righteousness was not only the divinely empowered exegete of those words; his career was the beginning of their fulfilment.

We have already summed up the principles of biblical interpretation in the Qumran commentaries in three propositions (pp. 9f.). We may now add four further propositions which set forth the methods by which these principles were put into operation

[p.18]

1. The biblical text is atomized so as to bring out its relevance to the situation of the commentator's day; it is in this situation, and not in the text, that logical coherence is to be looked for.
2. Variant readings are selected in such a way as will best serve the commentator's purpose.
3. Where a relation cannot otherwise be established between the text and the new situation, allegorization may be used to this end.
4. Biblical prophecies of varying date and reference are reinterpreted so as to apply to the end-time introduced by the ministry of the Teacher of Righteousness, and in some degree to the career of the Teacher himself.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

Instead of saying that the *peshet* is communicated to the interpreter, one may say that the mystery is revealed to him. Thus to the Teacher of Righteousness 'God made known all the mysteries of the words of His servants the prophets' (1Q p Hab. vii. 4f.). Daniel says to Nebuchadnezzar: 'there is a God in heaven who reveals mysteries' (Dan. ii. 28). In this latter case God communicated the mystery to the king in the form of a dream, in such a way that it remained a mystery to him; but He 'revealed' the mystery to Daniel in a night vision in such a way that he was able to make the interpretation known to the king. So repeatedly in the *Hymns of Thanksgiving* the speaker claims that God has revealed to him 'wonderful mysteries' (*rāzē pele'*) so that he is able to interpret them to others. For example:

These things I know by understanding from Thee;
For Thou hast uncovered my ears for wonderful mysteries
(1Q H i. 21).

Thou hast set me as a banner for the righteous elect,
And an interpreter blessed with knowledge in wonderful mysteries
(1Q H ii. 13).

For Thou hast made me know Thy wonderful mysteries,

And in Thy wonderful secret counsel Thou hast shown
strength with me;

[p.19]

For Thy glory's sake the wonder is manifest to many,
That Thy strength may be made known to all the living
(1Q H iv. 27-29).

From the context it appears that these wonderful mysteries, like those revealed in Daniel, have to do with God's purpose which is to be realized in the end-time. At present they are inscribed in heavenly records in God's presence (1Q H i. 23 f.; cf. 'the book of truth' in Dan. x. 21); when the time appointed comes, they will be unfolded in the form of earthly events.

Whether the speaker in these Hymns is the Teacher of Righteousness or not is a moot question. As members of the community believed, it was to him in the first instance that these revelations had been granted. But when he communicated them to his followers, then each member of the community could use such language as we have quoted with a considerable measure of truth. It may be safest at this stage to think of the speaker in the *Hymns* as a representative or spokesman of the community, without being more specific.

[p.20]

CHAPTER II THE NEW SITUATION

I. THE AVAILABLE EVIDENCE

When we come to define more clearly the new situation in terms of which the Qumran commentators interpret the prophetic writings, we find ourselves in some difficulty. That the situation in question was believed to be the end-time or the period immediately preceding it is clear; we may also agree that the end did not come then in the form in which it was expected. But where exactly in the historical record is the situation to be placed? The allusiveness and ambiguity of the language used by the commentators are such that we have to hesitate before identifying the persons and events to which they refer, and there are considerable differences between the various solutions to the problem which students of the text have propounded. Some scholars think the situation belongs to the reign of Antiochus IV and the Hasmonean revolt (175-163 BC);⁶ some associate it with the revolt against Rome in AD 66;⁷ others locate it at some point between these extreme dates.

One source of difficulty lies in the fact that leading personalities are denoted by descriptive titles rather than by personal names. We read much about the Teacher of Righteousness, the Wicked Priest, the Man of Falsehood, and the Seekers after Smooth Things; but there are many characters in the history of the Second Jewish Commonwealth who might be so described. Many a religious minority will venerate a Teacher of Righteousness, will complain of persecution by a Wicked Priest, and will disparage the more easy-going majority as Seekers after Smooth Things, followers of a Man of Falsehood. And where, by a rare chance, we do have people mentioned in the commentaries by their proper names, the document is

⁶ Cf. H. H. Rowley, *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (1952), pp. 62 ff.

⁷ Cf. C. Roth, *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (1958).

unfortunately so fragmentary that the context almost completely escapes us. The outstanding example of this is the commentary on Nahum from

[p.21]

Cave IV, which contains a reference to '[Deme]trius, king of Greece, who sought to enter Jerusalem by the aid of the Seekers after Smooth Things'.⁸ There were three Seleucid kings named Demetrius, and if more of the context had been preserved it might have been possible to say with certainty which Demetrius is intended here. As it is, we must be content with saying that one Demetrius is more probable than the other two. The first editor of the relevant part of the Nahum commentary, J. M. Allegro, thinks that the reference is to Demetrius III (98-88 BC), who invaded Judaea at the invitation of hostile Jewish subjects of Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 BC). On the other hand, H. H. Rowley argues that the reference is to Demetrius I (162-150 BC), who, at the instigation of the high priest Alcimus and his supporters, sent his general Nicanor to seize Jerusalem (1 Macc. vii. 26 ff).⁹ And, for the matter of that, Demetrius II (145-139/8 BC) might also be mentioned as a candidate, for he sent a force against Jonathan, brother of Judas Maccabaeus (1 Macc. xi. 63 ff.). My own view is that the identification with Demetrius III is the most probable, but it is not a matter on which one can make a dogmatic affirmation.

In the next line of the Nahum commentary there is a further personal reference; with reference apparently to Jerusalem the commentator says: '[Never has that city fallen] into the hand of the kings of Greece from Antiochus to the rise of the rulers of the Kittim; but hereafter it will be trodden down.' Whether the Antiochus referred to here is Antiochus III (223-187 BC), under whom Judaea passed from the rule of the Ptolemies to that of the Seleucids, or Antiochus IV (175-163 BC), under whom the Hasmonean rising took place, or (more probably) Antiochus VII (138-128 BC), whose demolition of the walls of Jerusalem about 130 BC was the last effective action by a Gentile ruler against the city until Pompey entered it in 63 BC, an interval is presupposed between him and 'the rise of the rulers of the Kittim'. The Kittim in that case can scarcely be Hellenists; they are more probably to be identified with the Romans, and the 'rulers of the Kittim' will be the successive Roman generals and governors

[p.22]

who dominated Palestine and the neighbouring lands from the time of Pompey onwards.

The original readers, of course, understood quite well who were referred to by these allusive terms; but we are not so much in the writers' confidence as they were.

The Kittim, who, as we have seen, are mentioned in the commentaries on Nahum and Habakkuk, are the last Gentile oppressors of the people of God. Their occupation of Judaea is presented as a token of divine judgment on the wicked rulers of that land for their oppression of the righteous. Among those wicked rulers is one who is frequently singled out as the Wicked Priest, and among those who are oppressed by him the outstanding figure is the Teacher of Righteousness of whom we have already heard. But, like other Gentile nations

⁸ The text of part of this Nahum commentary (4Q p Nahum) was published by J. M. Allegro in 'Further Light on the History of the Qumran Sect', *JBL* 75 (1956), pp. 89 ff.

⁹ Cf. H. H. Rowley, '4QpNahum and the Teacher of Righteousness', *JBL* 75 (1956), pp. 188 ff.; 'The Kittim and the Dead Sea Scrolls', *PEQ* 88 (1956), pp. 92 ff.

whom the God of Israel raised up in earlier times to execute His judgment upon His people—Isaiah’s Assyrians and Habakkuk’s Chaldeans, for example—the Kittim will exceed the terms of their commission and behave in such a bloodthirsty and tyrannous way that they themselves will incur His vengeance; and the executors of God’s vengeance on the Kittim will be those who have remained faithful to Him during the period of oppression. When, for instance, Habakkuk says (ii. 8), ‘Because you have plundered many nations, all the remnant of the peoples shall plunder you’, the commentator gives this explanation of his words (1Q p Hab. ix. 4-7):

Its interpretation concerns the last priests of Jerusalem, who piled up wealth and unjust gain from the plunder of the peoples; but in the latter days their wealth, with their plunder, will be given into the hand of the army of the Kittim, for it is they who are ‘the remnant of the peoples’.

And we have already quoted the comment on Hab. i. 12, to the effect that:

God will not destroy His people by the hand of the nations, but into the hand of His elect will God commit the judgment of all the nations (1Q p Hab. v. 3 f.).

How in fact God’s elect were expected to execute His judgment upon the nations, and upon the Kittim in particular, is described in detail in the Rule of War. Here we are told how the ‘sons of light’ are to take the field against the ‘sons of darkness’ of the ‘army of Belial’—an international force which

[p.23]

includes ‘the troop of Edom and Moab and the Ammonites, the army of the Philistines, the troops of the Kittim of Ashur, and in alliance with them the violators of the covenant.’ The ‘Kittim of Ashur’ are plainly the most powerful and numerous contingent in this force. They are apparently based on Syria, but ‘the king of the Kittim in Egypt’ is also involved in the fighting. There will be immense carnage, but by divine aid the ‘sons of light’ will be victorious at last. ‘Ashur shall fall, with none to help him, and the dominion of the Kittim shall pass away; so wickedness will be brought low, leaving no remnant, and nothing will survive of the [son]s of darkness’ (1QM i. 6 f.).

There are implications for biblical exegesis here at which we shall look later (see pp. 72 f.). But at the moment we are concerned with the Kittim. It is natural at first sight to identify the ‘Kittim of Ashur’ with the Seleucids and the ‘Kittim in Egypt’ with the Ptolemies; but the *Rule of War* presents features which suggest a date long after the Seleucids had ceased to count in Judaeian politics. The military organization which it describes appears to be based on a Roman model. The battle-formation prescribed for the sons of light resembles the Roman *triplex acies* of the first century BC rather than the *phalanx* of the Hellenistic monarchies; the weapons, trumpets and tactics to be used in the fighting are also of Roman inspiration.¹⁰ They bear a remarkable resemblance to those employed by Josephus when he assumed command of the insurgent forces in Galilee in AD 66.¹¹ But if the *Rule of War* is a product of the Roman period, it is unlikely that its author imagined that in the approaching time of the end he and

¹⁰ Cf. Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (1955), pp. 103-180. K. M. T. Atkinson, ‘The Historical Setting of the “War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness”’, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 40 (1957-8), pp. 272 ff., argues for a Hellenistic (Ptolemaic) setting c. 175 BC.

¹¹ Josephus, *Jewish War* ii. 577 ff.

his comrades would be called upon to engage in a deadly struggle with the Seleucid and Ptolemaic armies. The Kittim of this work must surely be the Romans—the Roman army of occupation in Syria and the forces based on Egypt. The reference to the ‘king of the Kittim’ need cause us no trouble; although the Romans acknowledged no king (*rex*), the Roman emperors were known in the eastern provinces by the Greek title *basileus*; and even before the triumph of Augustus, a king-maker like Antony who exercised more than royal power

[p.24]

in those provinces from 42 to 31 BC might well be called ‘king of the Kittim’.

If the Kittim are the Romans, and their coming was to be a divine judgment on the wicked rulers of Israel for their persecution of the Teacher of Righteousness and his associates, those wicked rulers must be identified with the priest-kings of the Hasmonean dynasty. This accords well with the prediction which we have quoted from the Habakkuk commentary, that the ill-gotten gain acquired by ‘the last priests of Jerusalem’ is to fall into the hands of ‘the army of the Kittim’. The Hasmonean rulers, particularly John Hyrcanus I (135-104 BC) and his two sons Aristobulus I (100-103 BC) and Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 BC) waged destructive war against their Gentile neighbours; Jannaeus especially was insatiable in his lust for conquest and loot. I have elsewhere summed up reasons for identifying him with the Wicked Priest of the Habakkuk commentary.¹² By the time the commentator wrote, the Wicked Priest had apparently died, his last days being made wretched by a disease which was brought on by his hard drinking.¹³ But his evil deeds lived after him, and the retribution which they incurred would fall upon his family and his supporters.

I have said that I think the Demetrius mentioned in the Nahum commentary is most probably to be identified with Demetrius III, who invaded Jannaeus’ territory at the instance of Jewish insurgents about 88 BC. Lower down in the same column of this commentary there is an account (unfortunately mutilated) of someone called ‘the Lion of Wrath’ (*kēphār he-chārōn*), who

took vengeance on the Seekers after Smooth Things, in that he proceeded to hang them up alive, [which was never done] in Israel before, for concerning one hung up alive on [the] tree the Scripture says....¹⁴

What the Scripture says is that ‘a hanged man is accursed by God’ (Deut. xxi. 23); but our scribe evidently could not bring himself to write these last ill-omened words. However, the hanging on a tree envisaged in Deuteronomy xxi. 22f. was the hanging of a dead body (cf. Josh. x. 26f.); what is meant in the

[p.25]

Nahum commentary is something much more dreadful, the hanging of men alive. Antiochus Epiphanes, to be sure, fastened faithful Jews to crosses ‘while they were still alive and breathing’ (Josephus, *Ant.* xii. 256), but he was a pagan. Until the time of Jannaeus, so far as

¹² F. F. Bruce, *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (1956), pp. 89 ff. [now online at http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/book_dss_bruce.html]; *The Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran Texts* (1957), pp. 18 ff. [http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/qumran_bruce.pdf].

¹³ Josephus, *Antiquities* xiii. 398; cf. 1Q p Hab. xi. 13 f., quoted on p. 14 above.

¹⁴ *JBL* 75 (1956). p. 91.

we know, the like had never been done ‘in Israel’—that is to say, by an Israelite. But Jannaeus did this very thing to eight hundred Jews who had rebelled against him.¹⁵ Whether the Wicked Priest is to be identified with Jannaeus or with an earlier Hasmonean ruler,¹⁶ there can be little doubt, I think, that Jannaeus is the Lion of Wrath. The men who were crucified by the Lion of Wrath, according to the Nahum commentary, are described as ‘Seekers after Smooth Things’. This designation appears in several places in the Qumran literature, and it is evident that the men of Qumran did not at all approve of them, but to ‘hang them up alive’ was condemned as a blasphemous outrage. The Seekers after Smooth Things were apparently members of a rival religious sect to that of Qumran, and one which commanded a greater degree of allegiance; on the whole I should be inclined to identify them with the Pharisees. We know that the Pharisees were in opposition to Jannaeus throughout the whole of his reign, and that they were subjected to persecution at his hands; indeed, the rabbinical traditions make repeated reference to the occasion ‘when King Jannaeus put the rabbis to death’.¹⁷ But they gained the upper hand during the brief reign of his widow and successor, Salome Alexandra (76-67 BC), and to this too some allusion may be preserved in the Qumran texts.¹⁸

Although the Teacher of Righteousness and his followers were persecuted by the Wicked Priest, there is no evidence in our documents that the Teacher suffered violent death at his hands, and certainly the Nahum commentary affords no ground for supposing that the Teacher was crucified.

With such data as can be obtained by piecing together the fragments of information which the Qumran documents provide, we must combine the archaeological evidence which has come

[p.26]

to light during the excavation of Khirbet Qumran, the headquarters of our community. This building appears to have been occupied by a religious community from the end of the second century BC to AD 68 or thereby. The occupation was interrupted, however, during the greater part (if not the whole) of Herod’s reign (37-4 BC). It may be that the headquarters were abandoned because of the damage done to them by earthquake in 31 BC; it is more likely, however, that they had already been left when the earthquake took place. Whether the community’s departure had anything to do with political changes in Judaea, such as the Parthian invasion and Hasmonean reinstatement of 40 BC, or the fighting which took place (not least in the district of Jericho) before Herod regained his kingdom, we cannot be sure.¹⁹ But the community centre was rebuilt and reoccupied towards the end of the first century BC. The second period of occupation came to an end when the building was violently destroyed by fire and sword. This destruction, viewed in conjunction with the evidence of the coin-record from Khirbet Qumran, was almost certainly the work of Roman soldiers of Vespasian’s army. In May of AD 68 Vespasian’s forces occupied Jericho, and from there the tenth legion marched against Jerusalem the following year, leaving a garrison in Jericho. The

¹⁵ Josephus, *Antiquities* xiii. 376 ff.; *Jewish War* i. 93 ff.

¹⁶ E.g., with Jonathan, according to J. T. Milik (*Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* [1959], pp. 68 ff.); with Simon, according to F. M. Cross (*The Ancient Library of Qumran* [1958], pp. 103 ff.).

¹⁷ Cf., e.g., TB *Sotah* 47a.

¹⁸ Salome Alexandra is mentioned, under her Hebrew name *Shēlōmsiyōn* (‘Peace of Lion’), in a fragmentary calendar from Cave IV at Qumran (J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* [1959], pp. 73, 145).

¹⁹ Cf. E. M. Laperrousaz, ‘Remarques sur les circonstances qui ont entouré la destruction des bâtiments de Qumran’, *VT* 7 (1957). pp. 337 ff.

community appears to have been dispersed, and its subsequent fortunes, while an interesting subject for research,²⁰ do not concern us at present.

II. The Historical Reconstruction

How then are we to reconstruct the new situation which forms the context for the Qumran interpretation of Scripture? The following outline, though subject to correction in the light of fresh evidence, may indicate our answer to this question.

The pious groups in Judaea which had viewed with horror the progressive conformity to the Hellenistic way of life among leading Jewish families in the earlier part of the second century BC were stirred to action when Antiochus IV made his direct

[p.27]

attack on Jewish religion in 168 BC. To many of them passive resistance and the ready acceptance of martyrdom seemed adequate to meet the situation, and they made common cause with the family of Mattathias the Hasmonean, who took up arms against the Seleucid forces and also against those Jews who were disposed to conformity or compromise with the Gentiles. But some at least of the pious party did not exaggerate the value of the Hasmonean alliance, for they realized that the Hasmoneans were fighting for different ends from those which they themselves had in view. Of these people we read in the book of Daniel (xi. 33-35):

Those among the people who are wise shall make many understand, though they shall fall by sword and flame, by captivity and plunder, for some days. When they fall, they shall receive a little help. And many shall join themselves to them with flattery; and some of those who are wise shall fall, to refine and to cleanse them and to make them white, until the time of the end, for it is yet for the time appointed.

To them the aid of the Hasmoneans was only 'a little help'. And when at last the Hasmoneans gained the upper hand, and proceeded to claim for their own family the vacant high-priesthood as well as supreme civil and military power, the alliance could no longer be maintained. The majority of the *chāsīdīm*, as the pious groups were called,²¹ appear to have formed themselves into the party of the Pharisees when they broke with the Hasmoneans early in the reign of John Hyrcanus I (135-104 BC). But the people in whom we are interested are probably to be distinguished from these. They regarded themselves as being in the succession of Daniel's *maśkīlīm* ('those among the people who are wise') and looked for the last days to develop along the lines sketched in Daniel's visions. But the time of the end, with the standing up of Michael the archangel and the resurrection of many 'who sleep in the dust of the earth' (Dan. xii. 2), did not come as soon as they originally expected—not even at the end of 1335 days (Dan. xii. 12). The establishment of the Hasmonean dynasty of priest-kings could not satisfy their puritan convictions or their belief that only the descendants of Zadok could be high priests of Israel by divine right. In spite of the

[p.28]

²⁰ Cf. O. Cullmann, 'Die neuentdeckten Qumran-Texte und das Judenchristentum der Pseudoklementinen', *Neutestamentliche Studien für R. Bultmann* (1954), pp. 35 ff.; 'The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research into the Beginnings of Christianity', *JBL* 74 (1955), pp. 213 ff.; H. J. Schoeps, *Urgemeinde, Judenchristentum, Gnosis* (1956), pp. 69 ff.

²¹ Called 'Hasidaeans' in 1 Mace. ii. 42, vii. 13; 2 Mace. xiv. 6.

independence which the Hasmoneans won for Judaea, their achievements could not be viewed as the bringing in of everlasting righteousness which was to come at the expiry of seventy heptads of years 'from the going forth of the word to restore and build Jerusalem' (Dan. ix. 240). What they ought to do they could not clearly discern, but they could neither support the Hasmoneans nor throw in their lot with the Pharisees. Towards the end of the second century BC, they found the answer to their uncertainties. A leader arose in whom they recognized a divinely-given guide to their perplexed minds. This leader, 'The Teacher of Righteousness', taught a new interpretation of the sacred scriptures which enabled them to appreciate clearly the part which they had to play in the accomplishment of God's purpose for the last days of the age in which they were living.

In order to play this part more effectively, away from the complications and contaminations of life in Judaea, they went out into the wilderness of Judaea, where the Teacher organised them into a closely knit community of 'volunteers for holiness'. They bound themselves by a 'new covenant' to devote themselves to the careful study and practice of the law until the hour struck for God to act. They found biblical authority for their action in the words of Isaiah xl. 3:

In the wilderness prepare the way of the LORD,
Make straight in the desert a highway for our God (1QS viii. 14).

Living here in camps, like a miniature Israel in the wilderness, they maintained the cadres of priests and Levites, and called themselves the community of 'Aaron and Israel'—i.e. priests and laymen. Other names which they gave themselves were 'the saints of the Most High', 'the men of the covenant', 'the poor of the flock', 'the sons of light' and 'the elect of God'. All these names show, in one way or another, how they looked upon themselves as the true spiritual Israel. Their hope was that, by steadfast devotion to the law of God, no matter what sufferings were incurred, they might not only maintain God's favour themselves but also win expiation for their erring fellow-countrymen. They were willing to be the instruments which God would use in the accomplishment of His purpose, and expected that when the Day of the Lord arrived they would be called upon to execute God's judgment on the wicked—both

[p.29]

on the ungodly rulers within Israel and on the pagan oppressors from without. But they were not allowed to carry on their chosen way of life without molestation. The Hasmonean rulers, of whose policy they so heartily disapproved, harried them in their wilderness retreat. A specially fierce opponent was the ruler who is designated 'the Wicked Priest' in the Qumran texts. Various incidents in the course of his persecuting activity are alluded to, but the language is not precise enough for us to reconstruct with confidence the various incidents and the persons who took part in them. One reference in the Habakkuk commentary seems to describe the Wicked Priest as bursting in upon the Teacher of Righteousness and his followers in their retreat (possibly the Qumran building) on an occasion when they were celebrating the solemn fast of the Day of Atonement, and throwing the assembly into confusion (see p. 14). 'The Qumran community, there is reason to believe, followed the calendar of the Book of Jubilees instead of that which regulated the temple services at Jerusalem;²² this may explain

²² Cf. A. Jaubert, 'Le calendrier de Jubilés et de la secte de Qumran', *VT* 3 (1953), pp. 250 ff.; 'Le calendrier de Jubilés et les jours liturgiques', *VT* 7 (1957), pp. 35 ff.

how the Wicked Priest was free to undertake this foray, for had it been the Day of Atonement according to the Jerusalem reckoning he would have been otherwise engaged.

Whether the Wicked Priest or the Teacher of Righteousness died first we cannot say. The Wicked Priest endured the pains of divine retribution in his own body before he died, and further judgments awaited his relatives and associates. The Teacher of Righteousness in due course was 'gathered in', as the Zadokite work phrases it (xix. 35-xx. 1, 14), but we are told nothing about the manner or circumstances of his death. It may be that at one time it had been expected that he would survive to see the advent of the new age; if so, his followers' expectation had to be revised when he died. The Zadokite work makes reference to the rise of a Teacher of Righteousness in the future (vi. 10f.), but it is not clear that this was to be the same Teacher, risen from the dead, and not rather another Teacher who would take up and complete his ministry (see pp. 36-38). It is possible, in fact, that the title 'The Teacher of Righteousness' was borne by a succession of leaders, and similarly the title 'The Wicked Priest' may have been given by the community to a succession

[p.30]

of men who, as it appeared from the Qumran viewpoint, illegally usurped the high-priesthood in Israel. But, even if this is so, our documents direct special attention to one 'Teacher of Righteousness' and one 'Wicked Priest' *par excellence*.

One passage in the Zadokite work (xx. 140 which mentions the Teacher's death has an interesting chronological note in connection with it:

From the day of the gathering in of the unique Teacher until the consuming of all the men of war who returned with the Man of Falsehood is about forty years.

The language is based on Deuteronomy ii. 14-26, where we are told that all the Israelites of military age who came out of Egypt at the Exodus died within thirty-eight years. The allusiveness of the terms used makes it difficult for us to be sure what incident is indicated in the Zadokite work. But the Man of Falsehood seems to have been the leader of a rival religious movement which 'led the simple astray' (1Qp Micah; *DJD* i, p. 78); and I have suggested elsewhere²³ that the reference may be to the Pharisees who followed Simeon ben Shetach. They were expelled from Judaea under Alexander Jannaeus (and with this we may link the mention of the 'Seekers after Smooth Things' in the Nahum commentary); but they returned when Jannaeus was succeeded by his widow, Salome Alexandra, in 76 BC. There are other allusions in the Qumran texts to a period of forty years closely associated with the time of the end;²⁴ it was perhaps felt that the present age of Israel's history should fittingly end, as it had begun, with a probationary period of this duration. Forty years from the Teacher's death would probably terminate about the beginning of Herod's reign, about the time when the community temporarily vacated its Qumran headquarters. (Was it by any chance a belief that a decisive epoch had been completed,

²³ *The Teacher of Righteousness in the Qumran Texts* (1957). pp. 25 f. Another (but less likely) suggestion is that the Man of Falsehood here is to be distinguished from the Preacher of Falsehood, and that while the latter may be the leader of a rival religious sect, the former is more likely to be Herod the Great, who certainly returned to Judaea with followers who were 'men of war' in the literal sense in 40 BC.

²⁴ Cf. the 40 years' warfare of 1QM and the 40 years after which the wicked shall be no more, according to 4QPs. 37, fragment A (*PEQ* 86 [1954], pp. 71 f.). But the eschatological period of 40 years was probably subject to reinterpretation as the hope of the community was deferred.

[p.31]

and not political or military developments in the region, that caused them to take this step?)

There is no clear evidence which could throw light on the relations between Herod and the Qumran community. On the other hand, if the Kittim of the Qumran texts are the Romans, there are abundant references to the Roman occupation. The Roman occupation of Judaea was viewed as a judgment on the Hasmoneans for their exploitation of the high-priestly power which they had no right to hold, and for their persecution of the righteous. This is the attitude of the Habakkuk commentary, which may actually have been composed very shortly before the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey in 63 BC. But the commentator knew very well how oppressive the Roman occupation would be, and could only console himself and his readers with the assurance that the Romans too would be visited by divine judgment when they had served their purpose. In the execution of this judgment on the Romans, as on the 'wicked' in general, the community expected to play a leading part. The leadership of the community would be accepted by Israel as a whole, and when wickedness had been put down the new age would be introduced. A worthy high priest, 'the Messiah of Aaron', would guide the national life and worship, and at his side a prince of the house of David, 'the Messiah of Israel', would direct military and other non-priestly activities.

No doubt the earlier expectations of the community were modified in the light of events, especially after their return to Qumran after Herod's death (4 BC), as the signal for God's intervention, so eagerly awaited, failed to appear. So far as our study of the literature thus far published indicates, it is their earlier experiences rather than their later ones that have given colour and direction to their exegesis. But their commentaries make it quite clear that they found in the prophetic writings not only a forecast of the denouement which they expected in the near future, but also details of the career of the Teacher of Righteousness and of the trials which he and his followers had to endure at the hands of an intolerant priesthood, as well as the punishment which came upon that priesthood in consequence.

[p.32]

CHAPTER III THE ZADOKITE WORK

I. THE ZADOKITE 'PESHER'

The Zadokite work is not a commentary, but it interprets biblical passages with reference to the history of the faithful community as wholeheartedly as any of the Qumran commentaries do, and with even less regard to context or coherence. It might be said that, after all, the Zadokite work is not a *peshet*, and that accordingly we need not expect to find its application of scripture following *peshet* principles. It is doubtful, however, if we should take this consideration too seriously; it may be that the Zadokite writer did think of his exegesis as being in the true *peshet* style.

In one place, at any rate, he expressly uses the term. Speaking of the 'epoch of lawlessness' he says (iv. 12-19):

Throughout all these years Belial will be let loose in Israel, as God spoke by Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz: 'Terror (*pachad*), and the pit (*pachath*), and the snare (*pach*)

are upon you, O inhabitant of the earth!’ (Isa. xxiv. 17). The interpretation (*peshet*) of this is the three nets of Belial.... with which he catches Israel by making them look like three kinds of righteousness. The first is fornication, the second is wealth, and the third is pollution of the sanctuary. He who escapes from the first is caught in the second, and he who is rescued from the second is caught in the third.

The context of Isaiah xxiv. 17 is a fearful cataclysm in which the world is dissolved on the day of judgment; our author reduces the scale of its warning note so as to make it refer to behaviour of the ruling parties in Israel which he thought particularly shocking, although this behaviour consisted for the most part of less strict applications of the law than those which were favoured in his community. When, for example, he charges them with fornication, it turns out that they thought the law permitted a man to marry two women at a time, or to marry his niece, whereas he regarded such practices as illicit.

[p.33]

As for the second of these two practices, it is noteworthy that the classic treatment of forbidden degrees in the Old Testament law (Lev. xviii. 6 ff.) does not prohibit marriage between uncle and niece. Some argued that if it had been the intention of the lawgiver to forbid such unions, he would have prohibited them as explicitly as he prohibits several others; therefore they were permissible. No, says the Zadokite author; a man is forbidden to marry his aunt (Lev. xviii. 12 f.), and therefore by analogy a woman is forbidden to marry her uncle.

The exegetical principles on which the taking of two wives is forbidden are still more interesting. Three passages from the Torah are involved: (i) ‘male and female he created them’ (Gen. i. 27); (ii) ‘two and two they went into the ark’ (Gen. vii. 9, 15); (iii) the ruler ‘shall not multiply wives for himself’ (Deut. xvii. 17).²⁵ Of these three the first was invoked by Jesus when He was asked if a man might divorce his wife. He admitted that because of men’s hardness of heart Moses had allowed divorce; ‘but’, He added, ‘from the beginning of creation “God made them male and female” ’ (Mark x. 6). And the very phrase ‘from the beginning of creation’ (Greek *ap’ archēs ktiseōs*) bears a remarkable resemblance to the language of the Zadokite writer when he says that ‘the basic principle of creation (*yēsod habbērī’āh*) is “male and female he created them”.’ But, while Jesus would no doubt have agreed that this scripture ruled out bigamy or polygamy, His use of it was intended to rule out divorce; and He combined with it not Genesis vii. 9, 15 or Deuteronomy xvii. 17 but Genesis ii. 24 (‘Therefore a man leaves his father and his mother and cleaves to his wife, and they become one flesh’).

When the Zadokite writer characterizes the men who thus break the marriage law, he does so by bringing together other biblical expressions. They are the ‘builders of the wall’, who ‘go after a commandment’; and, he adds, ‘the commandment in question is a preacher, as the scripture says: “they will preach with a continual drip” ’ (iv. 19 f.). The ‘builders of the wall’ are those people mentioned in Ezekiel xiii. 10ff., who cover up the cracks in a rickety wall with a plentiful coat of whitewash, in

[p.34]

²⁵ At this point the Zadokite author forestalls a possible objection by pointing out that King David did not know of this prohibition because the law-book was sealed and laid up in the ark, which remained unopened from the time of the elders who survived Joshua until the establishment of the Zadokite priesthood (cf. Deut. xxxi. 24 ff.).

the fond hope that this will keep it from collapsing when the winds of adversity blow. The reference in Hosea v. 11 to Ephraim's determination to 'go after a commandment' (*sāw*) presents a difficulty to interpreters, and it may be that we should follow the Greek and Syriac versions, which presuppose Hebrew show' ('vanity') instead of saw (cf. RSV, 'he was determined to go after vanity'). But our author follows a tradition which took the word saw to be a personal name or title, and interprets it of a certain preacher or prophet (*maṭṭīph*), probably the 'man of scoffing who prophesied (or "dripped", *hiṭṭīph*) to Israel waters of falsehood and led them astray in a trackless waste', mentioned near the beginning of his work (i. 14 f.). (The reference appears to be to a rival religious leader, probably, I think, a leader of the Pharisees.) Then he finds another prophetic reference to this preacher in Micah ii. 6, but the text which he follows is an inferior one. The Massoretic reading is 'al *taṭṭīphū yaṭṭīphu* |n ('Do not preach"—thus they preach'). But our author drops the negative and reads *hattēph yaṭṭīphu* |n, where *hattēph* is the absolute infinitive adding emphasis to the following imperfect—'they will certainly preach' or, as I have rendered it above (playing on the two meanings of the verb), 'they will preach with a continual drip'. The Greek and Latin versions reflect the absolute infinitive construction, but they do not drop the negative as our author does.

Plainly no-one could interpret the prophetic writings according to the canons accepted by our author unless he was acquainted with the new situation which these writings were believed to portray, and unless he was convinced that this situation had in fact that eschatological significance which made it a natural theme of sacred prophecy.

Another passage from Micah which the Zadokite author finds significant is Micah vii. 11, 'A day for the building of your walls! In that day the boundary shall be far extended.' He invokes this passage in support of the community's determination to remain aloof from the 'house of Judah'—the whole system of national life—throughout the epoch of wickedness: 'The wall' he says, 'is built; the boundary is far-flung' (iv. 12). This 'wall' is not the unstable structure which Ezekiel described; it is the fence which protects true godliness against the assaults or contamination of evil; and as for the 'boundary', our author clearly finds it more than a coincidence that word so translated can also mean

[p.35]

'statute' (*chōq*). The Zadokites saw a great difference between their own effective barrier against lawlessness and the useless facade which the rival party put up.

Why did the community make so much of the name of Zadok? Probably because they believed that the high-priesthood ought to have remained within the family of Zadok, instead of passing to the Hasmoneans and (after them) to a few wealthy priestly families which could afford to outbid rival candidates for the office. But they found biblical support for their espousal of the Zadokite cause in Ezekiel xliv. 15. Speaking of the faithful minority, our author says (iii. 18-iv. 4):

But God in His wonderful mysteries made propitiation for their iniquity and pardoned their rebellion, and He built for them a sure house in Israel, the like of which has not stood from former times until now. Those who adhere to it are enrolled for eternal life, and all mortal glory is theirs, as God assured them by Ezekiel the prophet, saying: 'The priests and the Levites and the sons of Zadok, who kept the charge of my sanctuary when the children of Israel went astray from me, they shall present to me the fat and the blood.'

The ‘priests’ are those Israelites who repented and went out of the land of Judah; the [‘Levites’ are those] who joined them, and the ‘sons of Zadok’ are the elect of Israel, those called by name, who will stand in the latter days.

Here ‘the priests, the Levites, the sons of Zadok’ are not understood as one group of people (as they are in Ezekiel’s text), but are divided, by means of the twice-inserted ‘and’, into three groups, each of which is given its own interpretation, so that the divine commendation is made to apply not to the Zadokite priests alone, but to all the community associated with them. Thus the community as a whole could apparently be called the sons of Zadok, whose survival meant that in the latter days there would be a worthy and legitimate body of men ready to resume the service of God, which had fallen into such incompetent hands during the epoch of wickedness. The present officials in Jerusalem had no status in the sight of God; during this period there was ‘neither king nor prince, neither judge nor any to reprove in righteousness’—so our author puts it, partly quoting and partly interpreting Hosea iii. 4 (‘For the children of Israel shall dwell many days without king or prince, without sacrifice or pillar, without ephod or teraphim’).

[p.36]

II. FIGURES OF THE LATTER DAYS

A notable example of allegorizing exegesis is seen in the use which our author makes of the ‘Song of the Well’ (Num. xxi. 17 f.) as a prophecy of the community and its leaders. This interpretation may have been suggested to him through the obvious appropriateness of pure water as a figure of sound doctrine (vi. 2-11):

God remembered His covenant with the forefathers, and He raised up from Aaron men of understanding and from Israel men of wisdom, and He made them hear Him, and they dug the well—‘the well which the princes dug, which the nobles of the people delved with the staff.’ The ‘well’ is the law. The diggers are those Israelites who repented and went out of the land of Judah and sojourned in the land of Damascus, all of whom God called ‘princes’ because they sought Him and their glory was never revoked by anyone’s authority. The ‘staff’ is the Expounder of the Law (*dōrēsh hattōrāh*), as Isaiah said who produces an instrument for its purpose’ (Isa. liv. 16). The ‘nobles of the people’ are those who have come to dig the well with the staves which the ‘staff’ established to walk therewith during the whole epoch of wickedness, and apart from these they will not attain their goal until the Teacher of Righteousness stands up in the latter days.

The above-quoted interpretation of Ezekiel xliv. 15 made mention of ‘those Israelites who repented and went out of the land of Judah’; this passage adds the information that when they did so, they went to ‘the land of Damascus’. It is possible that the community, or part of it, did actually migrate to Damascus at one stage in its career, perhaps at a time when continued residence in Judaea seemed impossible. On the other hand, it has been argued with considerable cogency that ‘Damascus’ is not to be understood literally—that it is simply a figurative way of describing the community’s Dead Sea retreat.²⁶ We must, I think, wait for further light before we can make a definite pronouncement one way or the other.

The word translated ‘staff’ (*mēchōgēq*) is ambiguous; it may also mean ‘lawgiver’ (as in Gen. xlix. 10, AV and RV), and there

²⁶ Cf. R. North, ‘The Damascus of Qumran Geography’, *PEQ* 87 (1955), pp. 34 ff.

[p.37]

is an obvious play on these two meanings of the word in our author's interpretation of Numbers xxi. 18, where the 'staff' with which the well is dug, if not a giver of the law, is expressly called an Expounder of the Law. He is evidently distinguished from the Teacher of Righteousness who is to stand up in the latter days, when the epoch of wickedness has come to an end, but he could conceivably be the Teacher of Righteousness under whose guidance the community went out of 'the land of Judah' to prepare in the wilderness the way of the Lord.

There is another exegetical passage in which an Expounder of the Law appears. Here several prophetic scriptures are brought together and applied as follows (vii. 9-20):

But all the despisers [shall be visited with extinction] when God visits the earth to cause the recompense of the wicked to return upon them, when the word comes to pass which is written among the words of the prophet Isaiah the son of Amoz: 'There will come upon you and upon your father's house such days as have [not] come since the day that Ephraim departed from Judah' (Isa. vii. 17)—when the two houses of Israel separated, Ephraim became ruler over Judah—and all those who turned back were delivered to the sword, but those who held fast escaped to the land of the north, as He said: 'And I will exile Sakkuth your king, and Kaiwan your [star-god, your] images, from my tent to Damascus' (Amos v. 26 f.). The books of the law are meant by 'the booth (*sukkath*) of the king', as He said: 'And I will raise up the booth of David that is fallen' (Amos ix. ii). The 'king' denotes the assembly. The 'pedestals (*kannē*) of the images'... are the books of the prophets, whose words Israel despised. The 'star' is the Expounder of the Law who is to come to Damascus, as it is written: 'A star shall come forth out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel'—the 'sceptre' is the prince of all the congregation, and when he stands up he will 'break down all the sons of Sheth' (Num. xxiv. 17).

One feature of this passage is the frequent play on words. Thus, to the statement that 'Ephraim departed (*sār*) from Judah' is added the gloss that 'Ephraim became ruler (*sār*) over Judah'. *Sakkuth*, a name for the planet Saturn, is read by our author in his text of Amos v. 26, but it is expounded as though it were *sukkath* ('booth'), and linked with David's booth (*sukkath Dāwīd*) in Amos ix. 11. It is noteworthy that the Septuagint of Amos V. 26 (quoted by Stephen in Acts vii. 43) replaces 'Sakkuth

[p.39]

your king' (*sakkuth malkēkhem*) by 'the tent (or booth) of Moloch' (as though reading *sukkath mōlekh*). Similarly our author expounds *Kaiwan* (another name for Saturn) by *kannē* ('pedestals').

In the interpretation of the Song of the Well the 'Expounder of the Law' is apparently a leader of those who 'went out of the land of Judah and sojourned in the land of Damascus'; here he is described as one 'who is to come to Damascus'. It is more satisfactory to think of two separate 'Expounders of the Law'—an earlier one, possibly identical (as has been suggested above) with the Teacher of Righteousness who founded the community; and one who would arise later, possibly identical with the expected Teacher of Righteousness of the end-time, but at any rate (as we shall see reason to suggest) a priestly figure of considerable eschatological significance.

The 'prince of all the congregation' (*něšī' kol-hā'ēdāh*), who is to 'break down all the sons of Sheth'—or 'all the sons of tumult'—when he arises, is probably the royal warrior who will lead the sons of light to victory in the last great war against the forces of evil. More will be said about him in Chapter IV, where we shall consider, among other things, a document in which he appears along with the Expounder of the Law in the latter days (see pp. 52 f.).

Balaam's oracle about the star and sceptre was evidently a favourite with the community, to judge by the number of times that it is quoted in the Qumran literature (see pp. 50 ff.).

The last passage which we have quoted from the Zadokite work comes from part of the work where the two chief manuscripts (A and B) overlap. But although they overlap, they are by no means identical in wording. We have quoted the passage as it appears in manuscript A. But this is how it appears in B (xix. 5-9):

But all the despisers of the commandments and ordinances [shall be visited with extinction] when God visits the earth to cause the recompense of the wicked to return upon them, when the word comes to pass which is written by the prophet Zechariah: 'Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, against the man who stands next to me, says God; strike the shepherd, that the sheep may be scattered; I will turn my hand against the little ones' (Zech. xiii. 7). And those who 'gave heed' to him are 'the poor of the flock' (Zech. xi. 11).

[p.39]

The 'shepherd' seems to be one of the wicked rulers of Israel who misled the common people, according to the Zadokites' estimate. The 'poor of the flock',²⁷ on the other hand, are the Zadokite community. C. Rabin suggests that the 'shepherd' is taken by our author to be the Teacher of Righteousness; this is unlikely in the context, although we remember how Jesus quoted Zechariah xiii. 7 of Himself and His disciples an hour or two before His arrest in Gethsemane (Mark xiv. 27).

One last example of exegesis may be quoted, also from the part of the work for which both manuscripts are available. Concerning the unrepentant members of the nation, our author says (viii. 7-12 = xix. 19-24):

They did each man what was right in his own eyes, and chose each man the stubbornness of his own heart, and did not separate themselves from the people and their sin. They rebelled 'with a high hand' by walking in the way of the wicked, concerning whom God said: 'their wine is the poison of serpents, and the cruel venom (*rō'sh*) of asps' (Deut. xxxii. 33). The 'serpents' are the kings of the peoples, and 'their wine' is their ways, and the 'venom of asps' is the chief (*rō'sh*) of the kings of Greece, who comes to execute vengeance on them.

We notice first the play on words, for Hebrew *rō'sh* means both 'venom' and 'head' (or 'chief'). The language of Daniel viii. 21 ff. or x. 20 may have influenced the writer, but who is the 'chief of the kings of Greece' to whom he refers? Is he looking back to Alexander the Great, or Antiochus Epiphanes, or the more recent figure of Demetrius III? Or is he thinking of one of the Roman generals who imposed their dominion on the Hellenistic rulers? Again, the evidence is insufficient for a definite answer. But our author links the situation with the

²⁷ It is probably this passage that underlies Jesus' designation of His disciples as the 'little flock' (Luke xii. 32).

activity of the preacher of lies and his following, for he goes on immediately (viii. 12 f. = xix. 24-26):

No attention was paid to all these things by those who 'built the wall and daubed it with whitewash' (Ezek. xiii. 10 ff.), because the man who 'walks in the wind and raises storms and preaches falsehood' (Micah ii. 11) preached to them, and God's wrath was kindled against all his congregation.

[p.40]

By these, as I have suggested before, the party of the Pharisees may be meant; our author and other members of his community would certainly have thought the Pharisaic policy totally inadequate to the needs of the time. God loved the faithful remnant, who inherited His covenant with the fathers, but He hated and abhorred the builders of the wall.

And so it is with all who despise and abandon God's commandments and go on in the stubbornness of their hearts... All these men who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus and have lapsed into unfaithfulness and forsaken the well of living water' shall not be reckoned in the communion of the people or recorded in its register, from the day when the unique Teacher was 'gathered in' until a Messiah arises from Aaron and from Israel (xix. 32-xx. 1).

When our author speaks of 'entering the new covenant in the land of Damascus', his words may be more readily understood of the formation of the Qumran community, who by withdrawing from national life believed themselves to have become the people of the 'new covenant' foretold in Jeremiah xxxi. 31 ff. If subsequently, however, there was an actual migration from Qumran to Damascus, then we should have to infer that the 'new covenant' was reaffirmed literally 'in the land of Damascus' and that the Zadokite work was written during the Damascus sojourn. However that may be, it looks as if the death of the Teacher caused a defection on the part of some from the ranks of his followers; they had probably expected that the new age would dawn while he was still alive. Our author envisages something like a hiatus between the Teacher's death and the advent of the messianic age, and to the person or persons whose rise would coincide with the coming of that age we must now direct our attention.

[p.41]

CHAPTER IV

MESSIANIC INTERPRETATION

I. LAY AND PRIESTLY MESSIAHS

In some forms of Jewish expectation the final victory over the enemies of God and the establishment of His kingdom were closely associated with a Messiah. This word is derived from a Hebrew verbal adjective *māshīach*, which means 'anointed'; a Messiah is thus an 'Anointed One'—not simply in the sense that he was once anointed with oil, but with reference to a specially sacred status and authority which he continues to bear in consequence of that anointing. The Hebrew *māshīach* was represented in Greek by a verbal adjective *christos*, which has the same sense of 'anointed', and from which the form 'Christ' is derived. A Messiah, in the Old Testament sense of the term, is one who holds his office 'by divine right' or 'by the grace of God', as we should say nowadays. Thus even a Gentile ruler like

Cyrus the Persian could be hailed by the God of Israel as His 'Messiah' (Isa. xlv. 1), because he had been raised up in order to fulfil God's purpose, and by his military and political activity he was energetically promoting that purpose, however little he realized this himself.

In later Judaism the title Messiah came to be used with particular reference to the triumphant king of David's line who was expected to rise at some time in the future to be God's agent in putting down all wickedness and inaugurating an everlasting regime of universal righteousness and peace. It is in this sense that the title is generally understood, although it is seldom, if ever, used absolutely in this sense in the Old Testament writings.

In an interesting work which has come down to us from the early years of the Christian era—*The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*—a prominent part in the victory and restoration of the last days is accorded to a Messiah of the tribe of Levi, who stands alongside the Messiah of the house of David (who belonged, of course, to the tribe of Judah), and indeed overshadows him. In the Old Testament the chief priest is an anointed personage as well as the king, but until recently the idea of a priestly

[p.42]

Messiah who would arise in the end-time alongside a royal Messiah, as portrayed in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, was an isolated conception.²⁸ Now, however, it has been found in various Qumran texts, and this is the more striking because fragments of some of the Testaments, in an earlier recension than was formerly known, have been discovered among the Qumran manuscripts.

The Testaments purport to be the last words of Jacob's twelve sons, the ancestors of the twelve tribes of Israel, in which the fortunes of their descendants are outlined. In the Testament of Reuben (vi. 7-12), that patriarch addresses his sons thus:

For to Levi God gave the sovereignty.... Therefore I command you to hearken to Levi, because he shall know the law of the Lord, and shall give ordinances for judgment and shall sacrifice for all Israel until the consummation of the times, as the anointed high priest, of whom the Lord spoke. I adjure you by the God of heaven to practise truth each one with his neighbour and to entertain love each one for his brother. And draw near to Levi in humbleness of heart, that you may receive a blessing from his mouth. For he shall bless Israel and Judah because it is he whom the Lord has chosen to be king over all the nation. And bow down before his seed, for on your behalf it will die in wars visible and invisible and will be among you an eternal king.

Here quite plainly the kingship as well as the chief priesthood is exercised by the tribe of Levi, and it has generally been thought that this reflects the state of affairs under the Hasmonean dynasty, when these two offices were combined in the same person. But elsewhere in the Testaments the kingship is assigned to the tribe of Judah, although it is subordinate to the priesthood. Thus Judah says to his sons (*Testament of Judah* xxi. 1-5):

And now, my children, I command you, love Levi, that you may abide, and exalt not yourselves against him, lest you be utterly destroyed. For to me the Lord gave the kingdom, and to him the priesthood, and He set the kingdom beneath the priesthood. To

²⁸ Cf. G. R. Beasley-Murray, 'The Two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs', *JTS* 48 (1947), pp. 1 ff.

me He gave the things upon the earth; to him the things in the heavens. As the heaven is higher than the earth, so is the priesthood of God higher than the earthly king-

[p.43]

dom, unless it falls away through sin from the Lord and is dominated by the earthly kingdom. For the angel of the Lord said to me: 'The Lord chose him rather than thee, to draw near to Him, and to eat of His table and to offer Him the first-fruits of the choice things of the sons of Israel; but thou shalt be king of Jacob.'

The same idea is expressed in the form of a vision which Naphtali narrates to his sons (*Testament of Naphtali* v. 1-3):

In the fortieth year of my life, I saw a vision on the Mount of Olives, on the east of Jerusalem, that the sun and the moon were standing still. And behold, Isaac, my father's father, said to us: 'Run and lay hold of them, each one according to his strength; and to him who seizes them will the sun and moon belong.' And we all of us ran together, and Levi laid hold of the sun, and Judah outstripped the others and seized the moon, and they were both of them lifted up with them.

Here it is plain that the kingship is as much inferior to the priesthood as the moon is to the sun.

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs have come down to us in a Christian recension, and in that recension we meet statements from time to time which are evidently Christian additions or modifications. For example, when we are told in the *Testament of Levi* (viii. 14) that 'a king shall arise out of Judah and shall establish a new priesthood... for all Gentiles', it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that this owes as much to the Christian doctrine of the high-priesthood of Jesus as the reference, quoted above, to a Levitical kingship owes to the historical facts of the Hasmonean regime. But for the most part the picture we get is that of a future king of the tribe of Judah occupying a subordinate position to a priest of the tribe of Levi.²⁹

In both parts of the Zadokite work we have references to a Messiah (or Messiahs) 'of Aaron and Israel' whom the community expected to arise at the time of the end. In the Admonition, for example (*Z.* xix. 33 - xx. 1):

All the men who entered the new covenant in the land of Damascus and have lapsed into unfaithfulness and forsaken the 'well of living water' shall not be reckoned in the communion

[p.44]

of the people or recorded in its register, from the day when the unique Teacher was 'gathered in' until the rise of a Messiah from Aaron and from Israel.

Again, in the Zadokite Laws a rule of life is prescribed for those members of the community who live in camps throughout the epoch of wickedness, 'until the rise of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel' (*Z.* xii. 23-xiii. 1). It is probably a relevant point here that the community itself is said to have arisen 'from Israel and from Aaron'—i.e. from the laity and the

²⁹ Cf. *Testament of Simeon* vii. 2.

priesthood—so that it may have expected this Messiah (or these Messiahs) to come forth from its own ranks. These passages from the Zadokite work, taken by themselves, might be thought to point more naturally to one Messiah; but in the light of cognate references in other Qumran texts a strong case can be made out for understanding them to point to two Messiahs—a Messiah of Aaron and a Messiah of Israel (or, in T. H. Gaster's free translation, 'the priestly and the lay Messiah').

In the document from Cave I called *The Rule of the Congregation* the order of precedence is laid down for meetings and banquets in the age to come in the following terms (1Q Sa ii. 11-22):

This is the seating arrangement for the men of rank who are called to a convocation of the council of the community when [God] brings³⁰ the Messiah with them. The priest who is head of the whole congregation of Israel is to come first; then the heads of the priestly families of Aaronic descent, who are called to the convocation as men of rank, and they are to sit before him in order of dignity. Thereafter the Messiah of Israel is to take his seat, and the heads of the military contingents of Israel are to sit before him, each one in order of dignity and the position which he occupies in their camps and on the march. Then the heads of families of the congregation are to take their seats before them, together with the wise men of the holy congregation, each according to his dignity. If they gather at the communal table or to drink wine, then, when the communal table is set and the wine poured out for drinking, no one must begin to eat bread or to drink wine before the priest, for it is his province to bless the first mouthful of bread and wine and to stretch forth his hands first upon the bread. Afterwards the Messiah of Israel is to stretch forth his hands upon the bread, and after

[p.45]

that the whole congregation of the community shall pronounce a blessing, each according to his dignity. This is the rule for the procedure at every banquet where there are ten or more men present (*DJD* i, pp. 110 f., 117).

Here the Messiah of Israel, high as his rank undoubtedly is, occupies a position of inferiority to 'the priest' (who is presumably identical with 'the Messiah of Aaron', although he is not given this title in the *Rule of the Congregation*). Similarly in a collection of blessings from Cave 1 (1Q Sb; *DJD* i, pp. 118ff.), a general blessing for all the faithful is followed by special blessings, first for the high priest, then for the other priests, and thirdly for the 'prince of the congregation' (*něšī' hā'ēdāh*). And in the *Rule of War* the military leader of the sons of light in their conflict with the sons of darkness takes his instructions from the high priest, who is apparently, his superior.

The members of the community probably modelled their plans for the age to come on Ezekiel's programme for the new commonwealth (Ezek. xl-xlviii), in which the Davidic prince (*něšī'*) occupies the subordinate role of an ecclesiastical commissioner in relation to the priests, who exercise the real executive authority.

When a prince of the house of David did occupy the chief civil authority in Judaea for a short time after the return from the Babylonian exile, he and the new priest of the house of Zadok were jointly described as 'the two anointed who stand by the LORD Of the whole earth' (Zech. iv. 14). The interpreting angel who refers in these terms to Zerubbabel the governor

³⁰ Reading *hōlīkh* in place of *hōlīdh*, 'begets' (for which cf. Ps. ii. 7).

and Jeshua the chief priest does not indeed call them ‘Messiahs’ (*měshīchīm*), but uses a phrase which literally means ‘sons of oil’. Another oracle in the same book (Zech. vi. 12f.) hails Zerubbabel as the promised scion of David’s dynasty (cf. Jer. xxiii. S, xxxiii. 15)³¹ in these terms:

Behold, the man whose name is the Branch: for he shall grow up in his place, and he shall build the temple of the LORD. It is he who shall build the temple of the LORD, and shall bear

[p.46]

royal honour, and shall sit and rule upon his throne. And there shall be a priest by his throne, and peaceful understanding shall be between them both.

Here again we have the priesthood in close association with the civil power, although here there is no suggestion that the priesthood takes precedence.

It is interesting, too, to observe that during the Second Jewish Revolt (AD 132-135), while Ben-Kosebah was undoubtedly the dominant figure, his name—‘Simeon prince (*nāsī*) of Israel’—is associated on coins struck at that time with the name of ‘Eleazar the priest’. We know nothing certain about this Eleazar, and he does not appear to have played any prominent part in the revolt, but evidently it was regarded as proper for the civil and military leader to have a priest associated with him at the head of affairs.³²

II. PROPHET, PRIEST AND KING

A striking parallel to the passages in the Zadokite work which mention the rise of a Messiah from Aaron and from Israel is provided by the Rule of the Community, in a passage which enjoins that the original laws of the community are to be maintained without modification ‘until the coming of a prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel’ (1QS ix. 11). Here the word ‘Messiahs’ is plainly in the plural, and this supplies one of the strongest arguments for the view that the Zadokite work also points to two Messiahs in similar expressions. But in this passage the two Messiahs are linked with a prophet. The language in which the prophet is referred to reminds us of the statement of the author of 1 Maccabees, that when the Jerusalem temple was rededicated after its pollution by Antiochus Epiphanes, the stones of the defiled altar of burnt offering were stored ‘in a convenient place on the temple hill until there should come a prophet to tell what to do with them’ (iv. 46), or his later statement that ‘the Jews and their priests decided that Simon should be their leader and high priest for ever, until a trustworthy prophet should arise’ (xiv. 41).

In an age when the prophetic gift was no longer exercised in Israel, men felt that they had to be guided by such light as they

[p.47]

³¹ Not that Zerubbabel fulfilled Jeremiah’s prophecy; but the fact that after the return from captivity a prince of the house of David was governor of Judah showed at least that the promise of a ‘righteous Branch’ (*semach šaddīq*) to be raised up for David had not been revoked. Zerubbabel’s temporary elevation was a token that the Davidic Messiah would indeed come; and it is of some interest that both the New Testament genealogies of Jesus include Zerubbabel among His ancestors (Matt. i. 12 f.; Luke iii. 27).

³² Cf. L. E. Toombs, ‘Barcosiba and Qumran’, *NTS* 4 (1957-8). pp. 65 ff.

had; but they looked forward to a day when the prophetic gift would be revived in their midst, and all uncertainties would be cleared up. The expectation that a great prophet would arise at the time of the end to make God's will fully known to them took two principal forms: in one, the prophet would be a second Moses, in accordance with Moses' own promise that a prophet like himself would be raised up by God (Deut. xviii. 15ff.); in the other, the prophet would be Elijah, whose return to earth would prepare men for 'the great and terrible day of the LORD' (Mal. iv. 5f.). (They are combined in the 'two witnesses' of Rev. xi. 3ff.)

How does the Qumran conception of a prophet whose appearance would coincide with the rise of the two Messiahs relate itself to these two prophetic figures of common expectation?

The answer to this question is probably provided by a document from Cave IV which has been given the title 4Q *Testimonia*³³ This document brings together a few passages from the Old Testament which formed the basis for certain expectations relating to the end-time. Its importance justifies its reproduction at length.

And [the LORD] spoke to Moses, saying: 'You have heard the sound of the words of this people, which they have spoken to you; they have rightly said all that they have spoken. Oh that they had such a mind as this, to fear me and to keep all my commandments always, that it might go well with them and with their children for ever! A prophet will I raise up for them from among their brethren—one like you—and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak to them all that I command him. And whosoever will not give heed to my words which he shall speak in my name, I myself will require it of him' (Ex. xx. 21, Samaritan text; cf. Deut. v. 28 f.; xviii. 18 f., MT).

And he took up his discourse and said: 'The oracle of Balaam the son of Beor, the oracle of the man whose eye is opened, the oracle of him who hears the words of God, and knows the knowledge of the Most High, who sees the vision of the Almighty, falling down, but having his eyes uncovered:

[p.48]

I see him, but not now;
I behold him, but not nigh:
a star shall come forth out of Jacob,
and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel;
it shall crush the forehead of Moab,
and break down all the sons of Sheth' (Num. xxiv. 15-17).

And of Levi he said:

'Give to Levi thy Thummim,
and thy Urim to thy godly one,
whom thou didst test at Massah,
with whom thou didst strive at the waters of Meribah;
who said to his father and mother,
"I do not know you";
he disowned his brothers,
and ignored his children.

³³ Published by J. M. Allegro in *JBL* 75 (1956), pp. 182 ff. (in an article 'Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature', pp. 174 ff.); cf. translation by T. H. Gaster, *op. cit.*, pp. 353 ff.

For he observed thy word,
and kept thy covenant.
They shall make thy judgment clear to Jacob,
thy law to Israel;
they shall put incense before thee,
and whole burnt offering upon thy altar.
Bless, O LORD, his substance,
and accept the work of his hands;
crush the loins of his adversaries,
and may those who hate him rise no more'
(Deut. xxxiii. 8-11).

At the time when Joshua finished praising and giving thanks in his praises, he said: 'Cursed be the man who builds this city; at the cost of his first-born shall he lay its foundation, and at the cost of his youngest son shall he set up its gates' (Josh. vi. 26). And behold, an accursed man, one of the sons of Belial, shall stand up, to be a very sna[re of the f]owler to his people, and destruction to all his neighbours. And he shall stand up... [so that] they too may be instruments of violence. And they shall build again the... [and s]et up a wall and towers for it, to make a stronghold of wickedness... in Israel, and a horrible thing in Ephraim and Judah,... [and they shall work pollution in the land, and great contempt among the sons of... [and shall shed blood like water on the rampart of the daughter of Zion, and in the boundary of Jerusalem.

[p.49]

The fourth paragraph of this interesting document is related to another work found in Cave IV, tentatively entitled the Psalms of Joshua. Joshua's ban on the rebuilding of Jericho is here applied to some activity of which the writer disapproved—probably the fortification of Jerusalem by a Hasmonean ruler. The whole document is evidently a compilation of biblical proof-texts or 'testimonies'—a category of literature with which we are familiar in early Christianity. Its first three paragraphs constitute a collection of texts relating not to the Christian Messiah but, it appears, to three figures who played an important part in the theology of Qumran. And it can hardly be doubted that they are the same three as are named in the *Rule of the Community*—'a prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.'

1. The Coming Prophet

The prophet, at any rate, is common to both documents. And the testimony compilation identifies him with the prophet of whom Moses spoke. Like the priest and the king, the prophet in Israel was also in his own way a mediator between God and men, although he was not (so far as we know) installed in his office by anointing, as they were. Elijah, it is true, was commanded to anoint Elisha as his successor in the prophetic ministry (1 Kings xix. 16), but that was an exceptional instance. Yet the prophets could be described collectively as God's 'anointed ones' (*mēshīchīm*), because they acted under His commission, even if no oil had been poured on their heads. Thus, in God's charge regarding the patriarchs in Psalm cv. 15

— Touch not my anointed ones,
do my prophets no harm! —

the parallelism shows that 'anointed ones' and 'prophets' are synonymous terms. And in some of the Qumran documents the term 'anointed ones' is used with the manifest sense of 'prophets'.

We gather from the Gospels that the expectation of a second Moses was cherished in some Jewish circles in Palestine in the early decades of the first century AD. This is specially evident in the Fourth Gospel (to whose affinities with the Qumran literature considerable attention has been directed of late). According to John i. 19ff., a deputation from Jerusalem interviewed John the Baptist and asked him first if he claimed to be the Messiah,

[p.50]

and then if he claimed to be the coming Elijah. When he answered 'No' to both these questions, they said: 'Are you the prophet?' John did not have to ask: 'Which prophet?' He knew at once that they meant the prophet of whom Moses spoke in Deuteronomy xviii. 15ff., and again he answered 'No'.

Later in the same Gospel, we are told that when Jesus fed the multitude with loaves and fishes by the Sea of Galilee, they remembered how their forefathers had eaten manna in the wilderness in the days of Moses, and concluded that Jesus must be the second Moses: 'This is indeed the prophet who is to come into the world!' (John vi. 14). And again, when Jesus in the temple court in Jerusalem proclaimed, 'If any one is thirsty, let him come to me and drink', many people who heard Him said: 'This is really the prophet'—for they remembered how Moses had brought water from the rock for their forefathers to drink (John vii. 37ff.).

The Samaritans' messianic hope was chiefly fixed on the appearing of this prophet, whom they called the *Taheb*, or 'restorer'; 'when he comes', the woman of Sychar told Jesus, 'he will show us all things' (John iv. 25). The Ebionites similarly interpreted Jesus' messianic role as that of a second Moses, who came to renovate the Torah and purify it from such corrupt accretions as the sacrificial cultus.

We are ill-informed about the details of the ministry which the men of Qumran expected the prophet like Moses to fulfil when he arose. But this much is evident, that they looked for him to appear in the end-time and declare the will of God.

2. The Coming King

The second testimony in the compilation from Cave IV reproduces Balaam's prophecy about the star out of Jacob. This prophecy was plainly a favourite with the Qumran community. We have noticed the use made of it in the Zadokite Admonition (see pp. 37 f.), where the star and sceptre are dissociated in the interpretation, the star being identified with the 'Expounder of the Law'³⁴ and the sceptre with a military conqueror called the 'prince of all the congregation'. It appears again in the *Rule*

[p.51]

of War, in the course of a hymn of praise to God, where the conquest foretold by Balaam is identified with the coming victory over the Kittim and other sons of darkness (1QM xi. 4-6):

³⁴ *In the Testament of Levi* xviii. 3 it is said of the new priest whom the Lord will raise up: 'his star shall arise in heaven as of a king, righting up the light of knowledge as the sun the day, and he shall be magnified in the world.' This suggests that the Expounder of the Law' of Z. vii. 18 is also the great priest of the end-time.

Thine is the warfare; from thee is the strength; it is not our own. It is not by our might or the power of our hands that valiant deeds have been wrought, but by thy might and the strength of thy great valour, even as thou hast declared it to us from of old, saying:
'A star shall come forth out of Jacob,
and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel;
it shall crush the forehead of Moab,
and break down all the sons of Sheth...?'

In the *Rule of War* the predicted conqueror is no doubt to be interpreted of the mighty man (*gibbōr*) who leads the sons of light to battle against the enemy, and who is addressed as follows in the paean of triumph (1QM xii. 10-13):

Arise, O mighty man,
And lead thy captivity captive, thou man of glory!
Gather thy plunder, O thou who doest valiantly!
Set thy hand on the necks of thy foes,
And thy foot on the heaps of the slain!
Smite through the nations, thine adversaries,
And let thy sword devour the flesh of guilty men!
Fill thy land with glory,
And thy heritage with blessing;
Let there be a multitude of cattle in thy camps,
Silver and gold and precious stones in thy palaces!

We know that in other Jewish traditions the star of Balaam's oracle was understood to refer to the Davidic Messiah—a more appropriate interpretation than the interpreters themselves may have realized, for the original reference of the oracle is probably to King David himself. It was on the basis of this oracle, for example, that Simeon Ben-Kosebah received the new patronymic Bar-Kokheba ('the son of the star') when Rabbi Aqiba hailed him as the true Messiah in AD 132. And it may be to this oracle, too, that allusion is made in Revelation xxii. 16, where Jesus designates Himself as the Davidic Messiah in these terms: 'I am the root and the offspring of David, the bright morning star.'

Was this how the oracle was understood at Qumran? Is the

[p.52]

mighty man of the *Rule of War* the Messiah of Israel mentioned in other Qumran texts? In the light of other published texts from Qumran this seems very probable. When J. M. Allegro first published the text of the testimony compilation, he published along with it three other documents from Cave IV, each of which makes significant mention of the coming prince of the house of David. In one of these, provisionally entitled 4Q *Patriarchal Blessings*, Jacob's blessing on his son Judah (Gen. xlix. 10) is expounded as follows:³⁵

There shall [not] cease a ruler from the tribe of Judah: when dominion comes for Israel [there shall never] be cut off an enthroned one therein for David—for the ruler's staff is the covenant of the kingship, and the feet are the [fa]milies of Israel—until the coming of the rightful Messiah, the shoot of David, for to him and to his seed has been given the covenant of kingship over his people for everlasting generations....

³⁵ *JBL* 75. pp. 174-6.

The passage which immediately follows is badly mutilated, but it plainly brings this expectation of the Davidic Messiah into relation with the Torah and the ‘men of the community’. Here the enigmatic Shiloh of Genesis xlix. to is straightforwardly interpreted as ‘the rightful Messiah’ (literally, ‘the Messiah of righteousness’, *mēshīach haṣṣedeq*).³⁶

The next extract comes from a document provisionally entitled 4Q *Florilegium*, which appears to be an anthology of biblical passages describing the future restoration of the house of David. Here again the Davidic Messiah is brought into relation with the life and thought of the Qumran community.

*The LORD [de]clares to you that he will build you a house; and I will raise up your seed after you, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom [for eve]r. I [will] b[e] his father, and he shall be my son (2 Sam. vii. 11-14). He is the shoot of David, who is to stand up with the Expounder of the Law... in Zi[on in the l]ast days, as it is written: And I will raise up the booth of David that is fallen (Amos ix. ii). That is David’s fallen booth, [but hereafter he will stand up to save Israel.*³⁷

[p.53]

The ‘Expounder of the Law’ with whom the Davidic Messiah is to stand up is most probably the priestly Messiah of the end time. For if ‘the lips of a priest should guard knowledge, and men should seek instruction (torah) from his mouth’ (Mal. ii. 7), this priest in particular should be the Expounder of the Law *par excellence*. This extract presents an interesting parallel to the interpretation of Balaam’s star-oracle in the Zadokite Admonition (see p. 37), where the star from Jacob is ‘the Expounder of the Law who is to come to Damascus’, while the sceptre from Israel is ‘the prince of all the congregation, who, when he stands up, will “break down all the sons of Sheth” (or tumult)’. But, from a further reference to the Expounder of the Law in the Zadokite *Admonition*—in its exposition of the ‘Song of the Well’ (see p. 36)—it appears that the Expounder of the Law has already arisen. It may be that the title was borne by a succession of priestly teachers (of whom the great Teacher of Righteousness was the first), but the last of the succession was to be a specially significant eschatological figure.³⁸

The third of these extracts comes from a fragmentary *peshet* on part of the Book of Isaiah, of which the comments on the closing verses of chapter x and the opening verses of xi are partially extant (see p. 72). The commentary on Isaiah x. 28-34 relates these verses to ‘the war of the Kittim’ and describes someone as going up to battle in the latter days from the plain of Acco (Ptolemais) as far as the boundary of Jerusalem; but whether this warrior is the leader of the sons of light or of their enemies is not clear. If the original force of the prophet’s words were any guide, the reference would certainly be to a hostile invader like the Assyrian, but we know that the Qumran commentators were apt to ignore the original force of the words on

³⁶ On the Targumic use of this title (Aram, *mēshīchā dē-šidqā*) cf. G. Dalman, *The Words of Jesus* (1902), pp. 293 f.; S. Mowinkel, *He That Cometh* (1956), p. 292.

³⁷ *JBL* 75, pp. 176 f. For 2 Sam. vii. 14 (which does not appear to be applied to the Messiah in rabbinical literature), cf. Heb. i. 5b; for Amos ix. 11 cf. Acts xv. 15 ff.; see pp. 83 f.

³⁸ The great Teacher of Righteousness was a priest (1Qp Hab. ii. 8; 4QP Ps. 37. ii. 15). When he first arose, his followers no doubt hailed him as the fulfilment of the promised ‘rain (*yōreh*, *mōreh*) of righteousness’ of Hos. x. 12 and Joel ii. 23; when, however, his death left the realization of all that the prophets had spoken still incomplete, a later Teacher of Righteousness was looked for who would bring to fruition the work which the first Teacher had begun.

which they commented. The text of the commentary is more continuous, however, when we come to the portrayal of the 'shoot from the stump of Jesse' in Isaiah xi. 1-5.

[p.54]

[Its interpretation concerns the shoot] of David, who is to stand up in the lat[ter days]... and God will uphold him with the... law... [th]rone of glory, a crown of ho[liness] and garments of many-coloured material... in his hand, and over all the G[entile]s shall he bear rule, and Magog... [and al]l the peoples shall his sword judge. And as for the words, *He shall not [judge by what his eyes see], or decide by what his ears hear*, their interpretation is that... [a]s they teach him, so shall he judge, according to their mouth... [And] there shall go forth one of the priests of high rank, and in his hand garm[ents]...³⁹

It is a pity that we have no further information about this priest of high rank, for it would be interesting to know if he is to take the same precedence over the 'shoot of David' as 'the priest' takes elsewhere over the Messiah of Israel. J. M. Allegro may be right in thinking that at the point where the quotation breaks off the commentator is about to describe the Davidic Messiah's coronation at the hands of the priest. In any case, the testimony compilation and other documents at which we have looked have helped to fill in details of the commentary's expectation of a Messiah from Israel.⁴⁰

3. The Coming Priest

We come now to the Messiah of Aaron. If the quotations of Moses' prediction of a coming prophet and Balaam's oracle of the conquering star illuminate the reference in the *Rule of the Community* to the rise of a prophet and the Messiah of Israel, the third quotation in the testimony compilation—Moses' blessing of the tribe of Levi—is to be brought into close relation with the Messiah of Aaron. From all that has been said already, it appears that he is to be the real head of the state when the new age dawns; even the Davidic Messiah is to take instructions from him. The organization of the community of Qumran in the days of its exile, in which special honour was paid to the priesthood, was modelled on their conception of what the national organization ought to be. During their period of exile, the 'epoch of Belial', an unworthy priesthood held office in

[p.55]

Jerusalem, but this state of affairs would not endure for ever. Just as the prophets foretold the re-establishment of the royal house of David, they also foretold the re-establishment of the Levitical priesthood, more particularly the Zadokite line (cf. Jer. xxxiii. 17 ff.; Ezek. xliv. 15 f.).

The dawn of the new age would be marked, in Qumran expectation, by the appearance of a worthy prophet, a worthy priest and a worthy king. Was the Teacher of Righteousness who was to stand up in the latter days identified with one of the three? It is natural for us to think so, but in that case the question arises whether he was identified with the prophet or with the priest. Some features of his predicted activity might seem to link him with the prophet. But if we equate him (as we have tentatively done) with the coming Expounder of the Law, it may

³⁹ *JBL* 75. pp. 180-2.

⁴⁰ There may be a reference to the Davidic Messiah in 1QH iii. io, where we have the announcement of a man-child described as a *pele' yo | `e | s* ('wonder of a counsellor'), who comes to birth from the community, pictured as a woman in travail (cf. Rev. xii. 1 ff.). In Isa. ix. 6 (ix. 5 in Hebrew Bible) *pele' yo | `e | s* is a designation of a coming Davidic king.

be better to think of him as the great priest of the new age. To be sure, when we consider how eschatological expectations can fluctuate and oscillate today among members of apocalyptic groups, it is unwise to try to impose too great precision on the eschatological expectations of the Qumran community. So far as we can judge, however, the Teacher of Righteousness who founded the community cannot be thought of as having messianic significance in its developed eschatology.

[p.56]

CHAPTER V SERVANT OF THE LORD AND SON OF MAN

1. THE SERVANT OF THE LORD IN QUMRAN THOUGHT

Not long after the publication of the complete Isaiah manuscript found in Cave I at Qumran (1Q Isa. A), considerable interest was aroused in a peculiar reading at lii. 14. Here the Massoretic text reads *kēn mishchath mē'īsh mar'ēhū*, ('his appearance was so marred, beyond human semblance'), where *mishchath* is commonly taken as the construct state of *mishchāth*, from the root *sh-ch-th* ('destroy', 'spoil').⁴¹ The form *mishchāth* by itself could also, of course, be taken as the construct state of *mishchah* ('anointing'), from the root *m-sh-ch*; but this would not suit the context of Isa. lii. 14. However, in 1Q Isa. A the text was quite evidently *m-sh-ch-t-y*, which must presumably be read *māshachtī* ('I have anointed'). It is hardly a matter for serious contention that the prophet actually meant: 'As many were astonished at him—so did I anoint his face more than man's, and his form beyond that of the sons of men—so shall he sprinkle many nations...'⁴² But it is arguable that the peculiar reading reflects an attempt by some members of the Qumran community to impose a messianic interpretation on the figure of the Servant. This was the burden of two papers on 'The Servant of the Lord in the Qumran Scrolls', contributed by W. H. Brownlee to the *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, Nos. 132 (December 1953, pp. 8ff.) and 135 (October 1954, pp. 33ff.). He compared the construction and the sense of Psalm xlv. 7, where a king who is identified with the Davidic Messiah in the Targum and in the New Testament is assured: 'God, your God, has anointed you with the oil of gladness above your fellows.'⁴³ Brownlee may well be right in dis-

[p.57]

cerning a messianic intention in the peculiar reading of Isa. lii. 14—although others would explain it differently; thus A. Guillaume, in the *Revue Biblique* 59 (1952), p. 186, appeals to an Arabic root in support of the rendering: 'I had so altered his appearance from (other) men's.' But it is unnecessary to look to Arabic for the meaning of a Hebrew word when its ordinary Hebrew sense is quite intelligible.

⁴¹ Perhaps the word should be revocalized *moshchāth*, the Hoph'al participle of the verb *shāchath* ('mar', 'destroy').

⁴² But D. Barthélemy, one of the first scholars to draw public attention to this peculiar reading, thought its claims to be regarded as original should receive serious consideration; cf. pp. 546 ff. of his article 'Le grand rouleau d'Isaïe trouvé près de la Mer Morte', *RB* 57 (1950), pp. 530ff.

⁴³ Cf. also the construction in IQS iv. 20 (quoted on p. 58): 'And then God will purify by His truth all the deeds of a man (*geber*), and will cleanse (him) for Himself more than the sons of man (*wē-zāqaq lō mibbēnē 'īsh*'); see, however, p. 58, n. 4.

If the interpretation which Brownlee puts upon the peculiar reading *māshachtī* is right, then we have in this manuscript a more unobtrusive instance of what we find in the Targum of Jonathan, where the Servant is expressly identified with the Messiah in Isa. lii. 13, 'Behold my Servant Messiah will prosper.' Indeed an apparent messianic identification of the Servant is found earlier still, if it is the Servant of the four great songs who says in Isa. Ixi. 1: 'The Spirit of the Lord Yahweh is upon me, because Yahweh has anointed me to bring good tidings to the afflicted'—and the same idea is implied, though the verb *māshach* is not used, when the Servant is introduced by God in Isaiah xlii. i, 'I have put my spirit upon him' (cf. Isa. ix. 2, where similar language is used of the coming 'shoot from the stump of Jesse').

But when the Targum identifies the Servant with the Messiah, it is plain that the Davidic Messiah is intended. If, however, a messianic identification of the Servant is implied in the text of 1Q Isa. A, which Messiah is intended? Probably the priestly Messiah, in view of the words which follow: 'so shall he sprinkle many nations' (Isa. li. 1). Sprinkling with a view to purification is a priestly act. I agree with Brownlee in retaining the meaning 'sprinkle' for the verb *yazzeḥ* here, and I am also inclined to agree with him when he says that, according to his view of the Qumran interpretation, 'the anointing of the Servant would indicate his consecration for the priestly office so that he could "sprinkle" others' (*BASOR* 132, p. 10).

But there is clearer and more interesting evidence than this for the Qumran interpretation of the Servant of the Lord. The priestly Messiah would be a representative of the whole righteous community. And the community itself is viewed as fulfilling the role of the Servant. The members of the community

[p.58]

believed that by their painstaking study and practice of the law of God, and by their patient endurance of the wrongs heaped upon them by the ungodly, they would not only secure their own acceptance in God's sight but would also accumulate a store of supererogatory merit sufficient to make propitiation for their erring fellow-countrymen (although not, apparently, for the wicked rulers in Israel who led them astray). This seems to be the sense of the following passages from the *Rule of the Community*:

For it is through the spirit of God's true counsel with regard to man's ways that all his iniquities will be expiated, so that he may look upon the light of life; and it is through the spirit of holiness, in unity with God's truth, that he will be cleansed from all his iniquities. It is through an upright and humble spirit that his sin will be expiated, and through his self-submission to all God's ordinances that his flesh will be cleansed, so that he may have water of purification (*mē niddāḥ*) sprinkled on him and be sanctified by means of cleansing water. He will direct his steps to walk perfectly in all God's ways, as He has commanded for His appointed seasons, and he will turn aside neither to the right hand nor to the left, nor will he transgress any of God's words. Then will he be acceptable in God's sight by means of pleasing expiation-offerings, and it shall be to him a covenant of eternal unity (1QS iii. 6-12).

And then God will purify by His truth all the deeds of a man, and will cleanse (him) for Himself more than the sons of men,⁴⁴ so as to destroy every evil spirit from the midst of his flesh and cleanse him by the spirit of holiness from all his wicked deeds. He will

⁴⁴ It may be that the preposition *min* in *mibbēnē 'īsh* should be taken in the partitive, not in the comparative sense; the meaning will then be: 'And then God will purify by His truth all the deeds of man, and will cleanse for Himself some of mankind.'

sprinkle the spirit of truth upon him like water of purification (*mê niddāh*) from every false abomination... (1QS iv. 20-21).

Let every one circumcise in the community the foreskin of his [evil] inclination and his hard neck, to lay a foundation of truth for Israel, for an eternal covenant-community, to make propitiation for all who volunteer for holiness in Aaron and for the house of truth in Israel and those who join them for a communal life for controversy and judgment, to condemn all transgressors of the law (1QS v. 6-7).

[p.59]

When these things [the details of the Rule] are done in Israel according to all the prescriptions, to establish a holy spirit for eternal truth, to make propitiation for the guilt of rebellion and for sinful faithlessness, and to obtain favour for the land apart from the flesh of burnt-offerings and the fat of sacrifice, then the oblation of the lips according to right judgment shall be as a sweet savour of righteousness, and the perfectness of one's ways as an acceptable freewill offering (1QS ix. 3-5).

The lustral terminology of these passages echoes the prescription for the water of purification (*mê niddāh*) in Numbers xix and the promise of God in Ezekiel xxxvi. 25ff., 'I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean from all your uncleannesses, and from all your idols I will cleanse you. A new heart I will give you, and a new spirit I will put within you; and I will take out of your flesh the heart of stone and give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes and be careful to observe my ordinances.' The community's ceremonial purifications with water were not a substitute for righteous living but an outward and visible sign of inward and personal holiness. While the community could not take part in the sacrificial ritual in the temple at Jerusalem, and indeed would not because of the uncleanness conveyed to the holy place by unworthy priests, they believed that the offering of God-fearing lives and undefiled lips was an acceptable sacrifice to God.⁴⁵ We are reminded of Josephus' remark about the Essenes, that they did not bring sacrifices to the temple because they had distinctive (or superior) purificatory rites of their own.⁴⁶ And the sacrifice of obedience and praise which the men of Qumran presented to God was believed to be an acceptable offering to Him not only on their own behalf but on behalf of the whole land. This is indicated, for example, in the title of the *Rule of the Congregation* (1Q Sa. i. 1-3):

This is the Rule for the whole congregation of Israel in the latter days, when they gather themselves [together to walk according to the decision of the sons of Zadok, the priests, and the men who are joined in covenant with them—those who turned aside from walking in the way of the people. They are the men of God's counsel who kept His covenant in the midst of wickedness, so as to make propiti[ation for the lan]d?⁴⁷

[p.60]

Something similar appears in the *Rule of the Community*, where the inner council of the community is described as:

⁴⁵ Cf. Hos. xiv. 2; Heb. xiii. 15.

⁴⁶ Josephus, *Antiquities* xviii. 19.

⁴⁷ *DJD* i, pp. 109, 111.

an eternal planting, a holy house for Israel, a most holy foundation for Aaron; true witnesses in judgment, the elect ones of God's favour, to make propitiation for the land and to requite the wicked with their recompense.... They will be objects of God's favour, so as to make propitiation for the land and to execute judgment upon wickedness, that perversity may be no more (1QS viii. 5-7, 10).

With this we may compare what is said about the Servant of the Lord in the Targum of Jonathan: 'He will make entreaty for our trespasses and for his sake our iniquities will be forgiven; ...by his instruction peace will flourish upon us, and when we follow his words our trespasses will be forgiven us. All we like sheep had been scattered, each in his own way we had gone astray, and it was the Lord's good pleasure to forgive all our trespasses for his sake' (Isa. liii. 4-6). There the speakers are the people of Israel, and the one for whose sake they have received forgiveness is the Messiah; but in the Qumran texts it is for the sake of the righteous community that this forgiveness is bestowed. And the Servant's suffering is not minimized almost to the point of disappearing completely, as it is in the Targum.⁴⁸

When the community speaks through one of its spokesmen in the *Hymns of Thanksgiving*, further allusions to the portrayal of the Servant may be recognized. The spokesman claims repeatedly to be the servant of the Lord, endowed with the spirit of holiness and knowledge:

I, Thy servant, have learned,
through the spirit which Thou hast placed within me,
[that all Thy judgments are true]
and all Thy ways are righteous (1Q H xiii. 18-19).

But as for me, Thy servant, Thou hast graced me
with the spirit of knowledge [and truth (1Q H xiv. 25)].

Thou hast shed [Thy] holy spirit
upon Thy servant (1Q H xvii. 26).

[p.61]

Such passages are reminiscent of Isaiah xlii. 1 ('Behold my servant... I have put my spirit upon him'); but of course God has many other servants than the Servant of the Songs, and similar language could be used of them. But there are other passages in the *Hymns of Thanksgiving* which seem to echo the Servant Songs even more strikingly:

For Thou knowest me from (or better than) my father,
And from the womb [hast Thou set me apart];
[Yea, from the body of] my mother hast Thou dealt
bountifully with me,
And from the breast of her who conceived me have
Thy tender mercies been upon me.
In thy bosom of my nurse [hast Thou sustained me],
And from my youth hast Thou illuminated me in the
understanding of Thy judgments;
With Thy truth hast Thou supported me firmly,
And in Thy holy spirit hast Thou made me rejoice
(1Q H ix. 29-32).

⁴⁸ Only in Isa. liii. 12 does the Targum suggest any suffering for the Servant, and even there the words 'he delivered up his soul to death' may imply no more than exposure to the risk of death, as in battle.

The poet's affirmation that God has called him and set him apart from birth to be the recipient and communicator of His truth is reminiscent of the Servant's similar claim in Isaiah xlix. 1, although other biblical parallels also come to mind—notably God's call to Jeremiah (Jer. i. 5). But here are two passages from the Hymns which appear to be direct echoes of the third Servant Song (Isa. 1. 4-9):

My tongue is as that of those who are taught by Thee
(1Q H vii. 10).

I could not raise my voice
[with the tongue of those who are taught [by Thee],
to revive the spirit of the stumbling,
or to sustain with a word him that is weary (1Q H viii. 35 f.).

In this last passage the speaker describes an occasion on which he was unable to discharge his proper ministry—a ministry which might be expressed exactly in the words of Isaiah 1. 4, 'The Lord Yahweh has given me the tongue of those who are taught, that I may know how to sustain with a word him that is weary.'

In another passage in the *Hymns* language is used by the

[p.62]

speaker which may echo the Servant's description in Isaiah liii. 3 as one 'despised and rejected by men; a man of sorrows, and acquainted with diseases':

[My] dwelling-place is with diseases,
and my resting-place among those that are stricken;
and I am as a man forsaken (1Q H viii. 26 f.).

The word here translated 'stricken' is that used in Isaiah liii. 4, 'yet we esteemed him stricken (*nāgūa'*)', where a reference to the plague of leprosy has frequently been diagnosed.

The conclusion to which all this appears to lead is that the Qumran community felt itself called upon to fulfil the ministry of the Servant of the Lord, who by obedience and suffering makes atonement for the sins of many and turns them to righteousness. When we consider how the statement of Isaiah liii. 10, that the Servant will 'make many to be accounted righteous', is echoed in Daniel xii. 3, where those who are wise' (the persecuted *maskīlīm*) are described as men 'who turn many to righteousness', we may find further significance in the fact that the members of the community called themselves *maskīlīm*, claiming no doubt to be in the succession of Daniel's *maskīlīm* (a claim which in all likelihood was historically justified).

If, however, the whole community had its mission prescribed in terms of the mission of the Servant, it is not difficult to understand how some smaller body, or even an individual, acting or speaking in the name of the community, could be referred to in similar terms. In one place, as we have seen, the propitiatory language is used of the inner council of fifteen men (1Q S viii. 5ff.). And, whether the *Hymns of Thanksgiving* were written by the Teacher of Righteousness or not, the writer of each hymn is evidently a representative of the community, and as such he uses in the first person language proper to the experiences of the Servant. In

the same way, if it be established that one or another of the 'messianic' figures expected by the community is also viewed as an embodiment of the Servant, this also is quite natural, for each of the messianic figures would be regarded as a representative of the community, and indeed of the people as a whole. We have already considered the possibility that the Qumran interpreters recognized a reference to the priestly Messiah in Isaiah lii. 14f.; M. Black similarly finds an allusion to

[p.63]

the priestly Messiah as a sacrificial victim in the *Testament of Levi* xviii. 2ff.,⁴⁹ while elsewhere he sees hints of a belief that the 'prophet like unto Moses' would also meet a martyr's death.⁵⁰

II. THE SON OF MAN IN QUMRAN THOUGHT

In some of the passages which have been quoted from the Qumran literature to illustrate the community's expiatory function, that function is evidently conjoined with the execution of judgment on the ungodly. And in Chapter I we considered the interpretation which the Habakkuk commentary gives of Habakkuk i. 12b ('Thou hast ordained him to execute judgment; and thou, O Rock, hast established him to inflict chastisement'):

The interpretation of this saying is that God will not destroy His people by the hand of the nations, but into the hand of His elect will God commit the judgment of all nations, and by the chastisement which they inflict those who have kept His commandments in the time of their distress will condemn all the wicked of His people (1 Q p Hab. v. 3-6).

While the word 'His elect' (*bhyrw*) might be singular ('His elect one', *bēhīro* |) or plural ('His elect ones', *bēhīra* |*w*) so far as the spelling goes, the context indicates that it is to be read as a plural, for it is evidently in synonymous parallelism with 'those who have kept His commandments in the time of their distress', i.e. the followers of the Teacher of Righteousness who maintained their faithfulness in spite of persecution. They are not only 'to make propitiation for all who volunteer for holiness in Aaron and for the house of truth in Israel and those who join them for a communal life', but also 'to condemn all transgressors of the law' (1Q S v. 6f.); just as the inner council of the community is not only 'to make propitiation for the land' but also 'to execute judgment upon wickedness, that perversity may be no more' (1Q S viii. 10). And it is not only the Gentile oppressors of Israel but also the wicked men of Israel itself who are to be judged by God's elect, according to the Habakkuk commentary. Presumably, then, the beneficiaries of the com-

[p.64]

munity's atoning work will be the rank and file of the people of Israel who were led astray by their wicked rulers.

But if the community expected to be the executors of the divine judgment at the end of the age, it looks as if they must have identified themselves not only with the Servant of the Lord

⁴⁹ M. Black, 'The Messiah in the Testament of Levi XVIII', *Expository Times* 60 (1948-9), pp. 321 f.

⁵⁰ M. Black, 'Servant of the Lord and Son of Man', *Scottish Journal of Theology* 6 (1953), pp. 1 ff. The fact that the Isaianic Servant has occasionally been identified with Moses himself is suggestive in this regard, although the identification is untenable.

but also with the 'one like a son of man' whom Daniel saw in his vision of judgment approaching the Ancient of Days to receive universal and eternal authority from Him (Dan. vii. 13f.). In the interpretation (Aram. *pěshar*) of the vision this 'one like a son of man' has as his counterpart 'the saints of the Most High', to whom judgment and royal dominion are given (Dan. vii. 18, 22, 27). And 'the saints of the Most High' appears to have been a name assumed by the members of our community (Z. xx. 8; cf. 'saints of the covenant', 1Q M x. 10).

We may recall that in the Enoch literature, which is related to the Qumran literature,⁵¹ the Son of Man is referred to as the Elect One and the Righteous One, and he is associated with a body of people who are called 'the elect', 'the righteous', and 'the holy'.⁵² If suffering is not predicated of the Son of Man in Enoch, it is certainly predicated of the righteous community associated with him. And it is not only to suffering that the righteous are called, but to the execution of judgment as well.

In those days downcast in countenance shall the kings of the
earth have become,
And the strong who possess the land because of the works of
their hands;
For on the day of their anguish and affliction they shall not
(be able to) save themselves,
And I will give them over into the hands of mine elect:
As straw in the fire so shall they burn before the face of the
holy:
As lead in the water shall they sink before the face of the
righteous,
And no trace of them shall any more be found
(1 Enoch xlvi. 8 f.).

[p.65]

It is well known that when Jesus in the Gospels speaks of Himself as the Son of Man, He does not only designate Himself as the Son of Man who is to come on the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory, to reward every man according to his works (Mark xiii. 26, xiv. 62; Matt. xvi. 27, xxv. 31ff.), but also (and even more characteristically) as the Son of Man who forgives sins, who must suffer many things and be treated with contempt, and who came not to receive service but to give it, and to give His life a ransom for many (Mark ii. 10, ix. 12, x. 45). And it is commonly maintained (and, I believe, rightly) that in His teaching the figures of the Isaianic Servant and the Danielic Son of Man are fused.⁵³ The manner in which Jesus interpreted these and other Old Testament figures, and fulfilled them in His own person and ministry, has given Christianity its distinctive stamp. But it now seems clear that in the century or two preceding AD 70 Jesus and His followers were not the only teachers in Israel to proclaim that the appointed time had fully come and to envisage its consummation in terms which involved a unitive exegesis of Isaiah xl ff. and the visions of Daniel. Nor should this surprise us, for there is good reason to hold that Daniel's visions are in part dependent on the

⁵¹ But so far as can be learned at the time of writing, no fragments of the 'Similitudes of Enoch' (1 Enoch xxxvii-lxxi) have been identified at Qumran.

⁵² Cf. M. Black, 'The "Son of Man" in the Old Biblical Literature', *Expository Times* 60 (1948-9). pp. 11 ff.; T. W. Manson, 'The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 32 (1949-50), pp. 171 ff.

⁵³ Cf. T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus* (1935). pp. 227 ff.; *The Servant-Messiah* (1953). pp. 64, 72 f.

Servant Songs of Isaiah, and (more particularly) that Daniel's 'one like a son of man' was from the first intended to be identical with the Isaianic Servant.⁵⁴

So our community solemnly dedicated itself to the fulfilment of the role of the Servant who would 'deal wisely' (*yaškīl*, Isa. lii. 13) and 'make many to be accounted righteous' (*yašdīq... la|rabbim*, Isa. liii. 10), of the 'wise' (*maškīlīm*, from the same verb as *yaškīl* in Isa. lii. 13) who would 'turn many to righteousness' (*mašdīqe | ha|rabbīm*, Dan. xii. 3), of the Son of Man who would wield world-wide dominion (Dan. vii. 13f.) and of the saints who would judge the earth (Dan. vii. 18ff.; cf. 1 Cor. vi. 2). The oscillation between corporate and individual interpretation that can be traced in the Qumran documents is matched by the oscillation between a community and its individual representative in the biblical texts themselves.

[p.66]

When we consider the twofold responsibility of expiation and judgment to which these 'sons of the covenant' had bound themselves, we may appreciate better the strictness of the discipline under which they lived. Only by perfect obedience to the law of God, cost what it might, could they accomplish their high destiny. No-one was obliged to enter the covenant-community; those who applied for admission were made fully aware of the conditions which membership in it imposed.

⁵⁴ Cf. C. F. D. Moule, 'From Defendant to Judge—and Deliverer', *SNTS Bulletin* 3 (1952). pp. 40 ff.; M. Black, 'Servant of the Lord and Son of Man', *Scottish Journal of Theology* 6 (1953). pp. 1 ff.

[p.67]

CHAPTER VI THE INTERPRETATION OF DANIEL

We have seen in the foregoing chapters a number of interesting points of contact between the Qumran texts and the book of Daniel. The exegesis of Scripture in terms of *rāz* ('mystery') and *peshet* ('interpretation') which characterizes the Qumran commentaries is paralleled by the unfolding of divine secrets in Daniel. The Qumran community appears to have set itself to the fulfilment of the roles which in Daniel's visions are assigned to 'one like a son of man', to the 'saints of the Most High', to 'those among the people who are wise'; and the last two corporate expressions are adopted as community-designations. That the members of the Qumran community stood in direct succession to those *maškīlīm* who witnessed a good confession for the God of Israel in the period of apostasy and persecution under the Seleucids is extremely probable; and it is tempting to suppose that it was among the spiritual ancestors of the community that the book of Daniel was 'unsealed' in the days when the persecution was fiercest (Dan. xii. 4, 9). We can well believe that nowhere more than within the Qumran community was the prediction fulfilled that when the book was unsealed at the time of the end many would 'diligently peruse'⁵⁵ it and knowledge would be increased (Dan. xii. 4b). When members of the community read the words, 'none of the wicked shall understand, but the *maškīlīm* shall understand' (Dan. xii. 10), they would naturally think of themselves, as those to whom the mysteries of the divine purpose were made plain.

Further light on the relation between the Qumran community and the book of Daniel may be expected when all the fragments of this book found in various caves are published. We may look also for further light on the literary history of the Daniel narratives; our appetite for this has already been whetted by the publication of the *Prayer of Nabonidus* with its suggestive affinity with the canonical account of Nebuchadnezzar's madness in Daniel iv, and of other fragments of a Daniel cycle.⁵⁶

[p.68]

For the present, however, we have to consider some further instances of the Qumran interpretation of the book of Daniel.

I. THE SEVENTY HEPTADS

At the beginning of the *Zadokite Admonition* we are told how God visited His people 'in the epoch of wrath, 390 years after He had given them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar' and raised up a godly community in their midst. But the members of this community 'were like blind men, and like men that grope for a way, for 20 years', until he raised up 'a Teacher of righteousness to lead them in the way of His heart' (Z. i. 5ff.). After the Teacher's death a further period of 40 years had to elapse 'until the consuming of all the men of war who returned with the Man of Falsehood' (Z. xx. 14f.)

The period of 390 years is probably derived from Ezekiel iv. 4f., where Ezekiel is commanded to bear the iniquity of the house of Israel symbolically for 390 days, each day to represent a year. But the *Zadokite* author apparently incorporates this figure into a more

⁵⁵ So Jerome (*pertransibunt*).

⁵⁶ Cf. J. T. Milik, ' "Prière de Nabonide" et autres écrits d'un cycle de Daniel', *RB* 63 (1956), pp. 407 ff.

comprehensive scheme, based on Daniel's prophecy of the seventy heptads (490 years). If we add to the 390 years the 20 years of groping and the 40 years which follow the Teacher's death, we have a total of 450 years, and if the Teacher's ministry be estimated at 40 years, we have a total of 490 years. The figures given are schematic rather than material on which a chronologer could build with confidence, and in any case it cannot be proved that the Zadokite author had Daniel's seventy heptads in mind; but in view of the manifold attempts to interpret the seventy heptads made during the last two centuries of the Second Jewish Commonwealth, it is antecedently likely that the men of Qumran had their interpretation too, and that the Zadokite author gives us some idea of what it was.

In Daniel ix. 1 ff. we are told of Daniel's distress because Jeremiah's prophecy that Jerusalem's desolations would come to an end in 70 years from the capture of the city in 587 BC appeared not to have been fulfilled. Daniel gives himself to prayer and confession, and is then informed by the angel Gabriel that the 70 years are to be reinterpreted as 70 heptads of years. These 70 heptads are sub-divided into three parts. The first part consists of seven heptads (49 years) 'from the going forth of the

[p.69]

word to restore and build Jerusalem to the coming of an anointed one, a prince' (Dan. ix. 25). That seems clear enough: 49 years after the promulgation of the divine decree for Jerusalem's restoration (Jer. xxx. 18, xxxi. 38 ff.)—which probably enough coincided with the beginning of the city's desolations in 587 BC—came Cyrus' edict for the building of the temple, which involved the restoration of the Zadokite priesthood, in the person of Jeshua the son of Jehozadak.⁵⁷

The second subdivision consists of 62 heptads, covering the rebuilding of Jerusalem and lasting until 'an anointed one shall be cut off, and shall have nothing; and the people of the prince who is to come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary' (Dan. ix. 26). Most interpreters nowadays regard this period as running from the edict of Cyrus to the deposition or assassination of Onias III, the last legitimate high priest of the Zadokite line, a few years before the outbreak of the Seleucid persecution. That the actual interval from 538 BC to 171 BC (the date of the murder of Onias) is considerably less than 434 years (or 62 heptads) is not of great importance when we are dealing with schematic numbers; if we follow those traditional Christian interpretations which identify the anointed one of Daniel ix. 26 with Jesus, then the period involved is considerably in excess of 434.⁵⁸ But it is noteworthy that in one of the earliest samples of Christian exegesis of the prophecy, 'an anointed one, a prince' (*māshīach nāgīd*) is not interpreted of the Christian Messiah (although that was soon to become the standard Christian interpretation) but of the line of Jewish high priests from Jeshua to Alexander Jannaeus.⁵⁹ This was evidently a Jewish interpretation taken over into Christianity, and I suggest that in its original form this Jewish interpretation identified the 'anointed one' with the Zadokite

⁵⁷ For 'prince' (*nāgīd*) of a high priest cf. Daniel xi. 22. The 'word' of Daniel ix. 25 is identified by some with the prediction of the 70 years in Jer. xxv. 12 (605/4 BC) or xxix. 10 (597 BC); by others—e.g. E. J. Young, *The Messianic Prophecies of Daniel*, *Exegetica* I, 6 (19-54). pp. 52 ff.—with Cyrus' edict, which gave effect to 'the word of the LORD by the mouth of Jeremiah' (2 Chron. xxxvi. 22; Ezra i. 1).

⁵⁸ For the symbolical character of the seventy heptads cf. E. J. Young, *op. cit.*, p. 48 (he gives a detailed exposition of Dan. ix. 24-27 in terms of the fulfilment of the passage by Jesus).

⁵⁹ Cf. Eusebius, *Demonstratio Evangelica* viii. 2. 58; he does not name his authority for this interpretation, but it was probably Hippolytus. See A. Ehrhardt, *The Apostolic Succession in the First Two Centuries of the Church* (1953). pp. 54 ff.

[p.70]

high-priesthood of post-exilic times from Jeshua to Onias III.⁶⁰ Both the restoration of the Zadokite line under Cyrus and its cessation under Antiochus IV were regarded as fateful epochs.

The third subdivision, the final heptad, was to witness the climax of apostasy, the culminating perfidy of the persecuting Gentile king, the appalling profanation of the sanctuary and desolation of the holy city—to be followed by the establishment of everlasting righteousness.

But it was very plain to the *maskilim*, and to other pious Jews, that this desired consummation had not been attained by the cleansing and dedication of the temple in December, 164 BC, or with the establishment of national independence under the Hasmonean dynasty of priest-kings some twenty years later. The deferment of their hope led to reinterpretations of the seventieth heptad, several of which have left traces in Jewish and Christian literature. First this heptad appears to have been identified with the seven years' interregnum in the high-priesthood between Alcimus and Jonathan (160-153 BC),⁶¹ then the chronology of the post-exilic period was recast so as to make the last heptad begin with the accession of Alexander Jannaeus in 103 BC;⁶² later still, when Alexander's reign proved to last much longer than seven years, the last heptad seems to have been expanded to cover the whole period of the Hasmonean (and even post-Hasmonean) high-priesthood. Such an expansion evidently underlies the attempt made in the *Testament of Levi* xvi. i-xvii. 11 to fit the profanation of the priesthood into a framework of seventy or seven heptads (although the text has come down to us in a confused state).

How exactly the Qumran community interpreted Daniel's threefold division of the seventy heptads we are not told, but it

[p.71]

is highly probable that the interpretation of the middle division of 62 heptads as covering the period of the Zadokite high-priestly rule in the post-exilic age would make a strong appeal to them. The Zadokite Admonition will then give us an alternative method of dividing up the epoch of the seventy heptads, in such a way as to fit Ezekiel's 390 years into it.

II. DANIEL AND THE 'RULE OF WAR'

The occupation of Judaea by the Kittim (whom I take to be the Romans) provided a setting in which the community might well expect the concluding stages of Daniel's last vision to be enacted in real life. One form which this expectation took has been preserved in that fascinating document, the *Rule of War*.

⁶⁰ The identification was perhaps later extended to include the high-priesthood of Jannaeus in the interests of a reinterpretation which brought the Romans within the range of the prophecy.

⁶¹ Cf. Josephus, *Antiquities* xx. 237 ('the city continued seven years without a high priest').

⁶² Cf. Josephus, *Antiquities* xiii. 301, where Aristobulus I becomes king '481 years and 3 months after the people's deliverance from the Babylonian captivity'. Since Aristobulus reigned a year, Jannaeus acceded to the chief power in the 483rd year, i.e. towards the end of the 69th heptad. It is this calculation that is responsible for Josephus' inflated chronology of the post-exilic period. The calculation is not due to Josephus himself but to one of his sources; his own interpretation of the seventy heptads apparently involved the identification of Vespasian as the 'prince who is to come' of Dan. ix. 26 (cf. *Jewish War* vi. 312 f.).

Towards the end of Daniel xi most commentators feel that the clear picture of the career of Antiochus IV which has been discernible from verse 21 onwards gives place to something which cannot be fitted into what we know of the later years of his reign. This is true in general from verse 36, and more particularly from verse 40 onwards, where the angel's prediction concerning the 'wilful king' continues thus:

At the time of the end the king of the south shall attack him; but the king of the north shall rush upon him like a whirlwind, with chariots and horsemen, and with many ships; and he shall come into countries and shall overflow and pass through. He shall come into the glorious land. And tens of thousands shall fall, but these shall be delivered out of his hand: Edom and Moab and the main part of the Ammonites. He shall stretch out his hand against the countries, and the land of Egypt shall not escape. He shall become ruler of the treasures of gold and of silver, and all the precious things of Egypt; and the Libyans and Ethiopians shall follow in his train. But tidings from the east and the north shall alarm him, and he shall go forth with great fury to exterminate and utterly destroy many. And he shall pitch his palatial tents between the sea and the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end, with none to help him.

At that time shall arise Michael, the great prince who has charge of your people. And there shall be a time of trouble, such as never has been since there was a nation till that time; but at that time your people shall be delivered, every one whose name shall be found written in the book. And many of those

[p.72]

who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And those who are wise shall shine like the brightness of the firmament; and those who turn many to righteousness, like the stars for ever and ever (Dan. xi. 40-xii. 3).

The picture of the invader from the north 'overflowing and passing through' at the head of his confederate force, which includes African contingents from Libya and Ethiopia, until he meets his doom in the place where he has pitched his royal tent, between Jerusalem and the Mediterranean, has features which are apparently drawn from Isaiah's description of the Assyrian invasion (Isa. viii. 7 f., x. 5 ff., xxxi. 8 f.) and Ezekiel's description of Gog's invasion (Ezek. xxxviii. 1 ff.). But to the author of the *Rule of War* and the Qumran commentators, these earlier oracles, like the passage quoted from Daniel's last vision, were predictions of the overthrow of the invading Kittim. This is clear, for instance, in the fragmentary *peshet* on Isaiah x. 28-xi. 4 found in Cave IV (see p. 53), where the Assyrian campaign portrayed so vividly in these verses is interpreted as the 'war of the Kittim', in which Israel's leader will be the victorious 'shoot of David'. In this document 'Magog' is one of the nations subjugated by him.⁶³

In the *Rule of War*, a plan of action is drawn up for the time of trouble foretold in Daniel's vision. The sons of light are to take the field against the sons of darkness, the army of Belial. This army consists mainly of the 'troop of the Kittim of Assyria' (the Roman forces in the province of Syria, as I judge); among other contingents are the 'violators of the covenant' (Jews who have abandoned the law of God), and the nations mentioned in Daniel xi. 41 (Edom, Moab and Ammon), together with Philistia. The 'king of the Kittim in Egypt' is also

⁶³ 4QpIsa.A; cf. *JBL* 75, pp. 177 ff.; T. H. Gaster, *op. cit.*, pp. 344 ff.

to be attacked by the sons of light as he goes forth to do battle against the 'kings of the north'. This may be a reference to the leader of the Roman forces in Egypt (some such person as Julius Caesar or Mark Antony); at any rate, our author is patently adapting to his purpose the language of Daniel xi. 40 ff., and his treatise has not unfittingly been called a midrash on this section of the book of Daniel.⁶⁴

[p.73]

The sons of light are further described as returning from their exile in the 'wilderness of the peoples' and receiving the aid of 'the sons of Levi and the sons of Judah and the sons of Benjamin' in their struggle against the forces of Belial and the violators of the covenant. This suggests that, as the end of the epoch of wickedness is now at hand, the faithful community is at last permitted to reunite with their brethren in the 'house of Judah'—i.e. the inhabitants of Judaea, with the exception of the apostate leaders and those who have deliberately embraced their cause. The overthrow of the Kittim will evidently take six years to accomplish. Three times the sons of light will inflict defeat on them; three times the army of Belial will rally; but on the seventh occasion God will intervene through the agency of Michael, and the empire of the Kittim will come to an end (see p. 23).

These six years of fighting are followed by a sabbatical year, during which no military adventures will be undertaken. To judge by the care with which the sacrificial duties of the priests are prescribed, a worthy priesthood has apparently been installed in Jerusalem by this time, in place of the apostate priests of the epoch of wickedness, and pure sacrifices can be offered once again.

The six years of fighting against the Kittim, followed by the seventh year of rest, may represent a reinterpretation of Daniel's seventieth heptad; but here these seven years are worked into a schema of 40 years. When the sabbatical year is over, the remaining 33 years (apart from sabbatical years) are to be devoted to fighting against more remote enemies, mostly ancestral opponents of Israel. This fighting is carried out by sections of the national manpower in rotation, who deal with those enemies, a few or one at a time, until all are destroyed.

The treatise contains detailed instructions for the conduct of a holy war after the ancient pattern: the sons of light are to organize themselves according to the pattern of the Israelite men of war in the days of the wilderness wanderings under Moses, arranged by tribes, with the priests and Levites performing their proper functions. But along with this repristination of the holy war goes an up-to-date familiarity with the contemporary tactics and weapons based (as Y. Yadin assures us)⁶⁵ on Roman military manuals of the middle of the first century BC.

With the extermination of all the sons of darkness the new

[p.74]

age is launched; in other words, to use Daniel's language, transgression is finished, sin is brought to an end, iniquity is expiated, everlasting righteousness is brought in, vision and prophet are confirmed, and the most holy place is anointed. This language is echoed in the

⁶⁴ 1QM i. 1 ff.

⁶⁵ See p. 23, n. 5.

fragmentary document from Cave I which has been entitled the *Book of Mysteries* (DJD i, p. 103):

They knew not the mystery that is to be, and the former things they understood not; they knew not what was to come upon them, nor could they deliver themselves from the mystery that is to be. And this will be a sign for you that it will come to pass: when the children of iniquity are shut up, evil will be banished from the presence of righteousness as darkness is banished before light; and as smoke disappears and is no more, so will evil disappear for ever and righteousness will be revealed like the sun to regulate the world; and all who restrain the wonderful mysteries⁶⁶ will be no more. Knowledge will fill the world⁶⁷ and folly will never again be there. The word will assuredly come to pass; the oracle is true (1Q 27, i. 3-8).

⁶⁶ For the restrainers (*tōmēkhīm*) cf. the restraining power of 2 Thes. ii. 6 f. There is a verbal similarity between the fragmentary mention of 'mysteries of rebellion' (*rāzē pēsha*) in the second line of this *Book of Mysteries* and the 'mystery of lawlessness' in 2 Thes. ii. 7.

⁶⁷ Cf. Isa. xi. 9; Jer. xxxi. 34; Hab. ii. 14; Dan. xii. 4.

[p.75]

CHAPTER VII BIBLICAL EXEGESIS IN THE QUMRAN TEXTS AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

I. 'THIS IS THAT'

After John was arrested, Jesus came into Galilee, proclaiming God's good news: "The appointed time has arrived", He said, "the kingdom of God has drawn near; repent, and believe in the good news" (Mark i. 14 f.).

In these words Jesus announced that the days were at hand when, as foretold in the book of Daniel, the God of heaven would set up a kingdom which would never be destroyed, but would endure for ever (Dan. ii. 44). C. H. Dodd has called attention to a 'most striking' allusion in this summary of Jesus' first Galilaean proclamation to the language of Daniel vii. 22: 'the time came when the saints received the kingdom.'⁶⁸

This note of fulfilment is repeatedly struck throughout the New Testament. Paul speaks of himself and his fellow-Christians as those 'upon whom the end of the ages has come' (1 Cor. x. 11). To the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews God has spoken his definitive word 'in these last days' by His Son, who 'has appeared once for all at the end of the age to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself' (Heb. i. 2, ix. 26). And Peter, writing in AD 63 about the salvation which is 'ready to be revealed in the last time' as the outcome of his readers' faith (1 Pet. i. 5, 9), goes on to say:

The prophets who prophesied of the grace that was to be yours searched and inquired about this salvation; they inquired what person or time was indicated by the Spirit of Christ within them when predicting the sufferings of Christ and the subsequent glory. It was revealed to them that they were serving not themselves but you, in the things which have now been announced to you by those who preached the good news to you through the Holy Spirit sent from heaven, things into which angels long to look (1 Pet. i. 10-12).

[p.76]

Peter does not use the terms 'mystery' and 'interpretation'; but what he says here is strikingly similar to the doctrine of the Qumran commentaries, according to which the prophets recorded the mysteries (*rāzīm*) of God, while the Teacher of Righteousness and his followers had the interpretation (*peshet*) of these things revealed to them. To quote again the interpretation of Habakkuk ii. 1:

God commanded Habakkuk to write the things that were coming upon the last generation, but the fulfilment of the epoch He did not make known to him. And as for the words, so he may run who reads it, their interpretation concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God made known all the mysteries of the words of His servants the prophets (1Q p H. vii. 1-5).

⁶⁸ C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (1952), pp. 67 ff.

Peter's claim is, in effect, that things which had been concealed from the prophets—things vitally affecting the interpretation of the words which the prophets spoke—had been revealed to himself and to his fellow-apostles. The prophets might 'search and enquire' in an endeavour to find out what person or time was indicated by the words which they uttered under inspiration; Peter and his associates had no such need; they knew. We may compare the confidence with which Peter begins to address the crowd which had gathered in Jerusalem in wonder at the strange events which marked the first Christian Pentecost: 'This is that which was spoken by the prophet' (Acts ii. 16). These words '*This is that*' are a major theme of the New Testament. A new situation has come about which at once explains and fulfils the ancient prophecies.

If Peter and the other apostles had been asked whence they had learned this interpretation of the prophetic scriptures, they would have acknowledged that they had received it from Jesus. In this respect Jesus was to the early Church what the Teacher of Righteousness was to the Qumran community—although He was more than that. The apostles remembered how their Master had said to them on one occasion, 'To you has been given the mystery of the kingdom of God; but to those who are outside all these things take the form of riddles, so that they see without perceiving, and hear without understanding; otherwise, they would turn and be forgiven' (Mark iv. 11 f.). This key which He put into their hands enabled them to unlock the Old Testament writings and understand how all that was written came

[p.77]

true in Him; as He said Himself on another occasion, 'everything written about me in the law of Moses and the prophets and the psalms must be fulfilled' (Luke xxiv. 44). The Qumran commentators might see the career of the Teacher of Righteousness sketched in advance in the sacred writings, but the early Christians found in these writings a more comprehensive witness to Jesus. Peter may be quoted again: 'To him all the prophets bear witness that every one who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name' (Acts x. 43). This goes farther than the Qumran comment on the words of Habakkuk ii. 4, 'the righteous shall live by his faith':

Their interpretation concerns all the doers of the law in the house of Judah, whom God will save from the house of judgment because of their toil and their faith in the Teacher of Righteousness (1 Q p Hab. viii. 1-3).

For the Qumran commentators did not claim that the Teacher of Righteousness was the one to whom all prophetic scripture pointed forward, although his career was foretold there. They believed that all prophetic scripture was concerned with the fulfilment of God's purpose in the end-time, and that the key to the understanding of this purpose had been granted to their Teacher; but the early Christians believed that Jesus was the very embodiment and fulfilment of God's purpose, the one in whom all the promises of God found their 'Yes' (2 Cor. i. 20). The New Testament interpretation of the Old Testament is not only eschatological but Christological.

In his important study *According to the Scriptures* (1952), C. H. Dodd finds that the New Testament use of the Old Testament is based on certain fairly well-defined areas of the Old Testament, displays a few clearly recognized patterns of fulfilment, and exhibits 'the rudiments of an original, coherent and flexible method of exegesis' which paid attention to the original context and was based on the historical intention of the scriptures quoted. This

exegesis involves a view of history akin to that of the Old Testament prophets: history is seen as subject to the sovereignty of God, whose 'impact upon human society reveals itself negatively as judgment upon human action, positively as power of renewal, or redemption. This twofold rhythm of the pattern of history finds characteristic expression in terms of death and resurrection.' This exegesis, this 'piece of genuinely creative

[p.78]

Thinking', cannot be the work of the great New Testament theologians, Paul or John or the writer to the Hebrews, for they all 'received' it. The creative mind to which it must be traced back can only be the mind of Jesus.⁶⁹

What Dodd says about the basic part played in this exegesis by the historical intention of the scriptures quoted is borne out especially by passages like Stephen's defence in Acts vii, Paul's synagogue address in Acts xiii. 16 ff., and the review of the 'faith of the elders' in Hebrews xi. There the interaction of God's revelation and men's response in the process of Old Testament history is rehearsed from a viewpoint which is not paralleled in the Qumran texts. The nearest approach is the section in the Zadokite Admonition which traces the successive outpourings of divine judgment against 'thoughts of guilty inclination and eyes of fornication' (Z. ii. 16 ff.) from the fall of the 'watchers of heaven' down to the writer's own day. But there is little evidence of a historical viewpoint in the actual use made of Old Testament quotations in the Admonition. Again, the New Testament tendency to present a coherent Christian exegesis of self-contained sense-units of Old Testament scripture is a safeguard against an atomizing interpretation.

The new situation which made the Old Testament writings plain to the early Christians was the situation introduced by the advent and ministry of Jesus. As they viewed it, the situation was the perfect outworking of a pattern of divine activity which could be traced recurrently in Old Testament times. The repeated instances of this pattern in those earlier times were now understood as adumbrations of its definitive unfolding which they themselves had witnessed. So, for example, the redemption accomplished by Christ was a new Exodus (cf. Luke ix. 31); His death was a new passover sacrifice (1 Cor. v. 7); the Christian Church, thus brought into being, was a new Israel (Gal. vi. 16), described (in language previously applied to the old Israel) as 'a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people' (1 Pet. ii. 9). Yet the new Israel was vitally related to the old Israel; as Isaiah in the eighth century BC had seen the national hope to be bound up with the survival of a faithful remnant, so in this new situation the believing community constituted 'a remnant, chosen by grace' (Rom. xi. 5). And if this remnant, consisting of Abraham's spiritual offspring, includes

[p.79]

Gentiles as well as Jews, that conforms to a principle exemplified earlier within Israel's national history, according to which those who were formerly not the people of God become His people, and those who had formerly not experienced His mercy ultimately receive it in abundance (Hosea ii. 23; cf. Rom. ix. 25 f.; 1 Pet. ii. 10). We may compare Paul's allegorizing use of the story of Isaac and Ishmael in Galatians iv. 21 ff., where the Church corresponds to the offspring of the freewoman, while the Jews who have remained under the law correspond to the offspring of the slavegirl. The new Israel, gathered in by faith from Jews and Gentiles

⁶⁹ C. H. Dodd, *op. cit.*, pp. 108 ff., *et passim*

alike, is heir to the promise given to Abraham; the rest of Abraham's physical descendants through Isaac are given the same place as Ishmael and his descendants.

Such an application of Old Testament scripture, extending to Gentiles equal privileges within the Abrahamic covenant, would have been unacceptable to the Qumran sect. Again, while the New Testament refers to the Church as the new Jerusalem (Rev. xxi. 2, 10 ff.; cf. Gal. iv. 26; Heb. xii. 22), the new Jerusalem envisaged at Qumran was rather a restored and purified form of the existing Jerusalem. The New Testament speaks of a new temple, a 'spiritual house' where spiritual sacrifices are offered up by a holy priesthood (1 Pet. ii. 5). But temple and priesthood alike are identical with the Church, and the sacrifices are offered on no material altar. The words of Hosea xiv. 2, about the praise of the lips being an acceptable substitute for animal sacrifice, are echoed both in the New Testament (Heb. xiii. 15) and in the Qumran literature (1 Q S ix. 4); but while the Christians had entered a new order which rendered the old cultus for ever obsolete, the Qumran community considered the substitution of the offering of the lips as a temporary necessity. During the 'epoch of wickedness' they were debarred from taking part in the sacrificial ritual at Jerusalem because they repudiated the official priesthood as apostate and because of their acceptance of a different calendar from that which regulated the Jerusalem festivals; yet they looked forward to the day when, as the true Israel, they would return to Jerusalem and introduce a pure sacrificial worship in the renovated temple (cf. 1Q M ii. 5). The cadres of priests and Levites were accordingly kept intact in the Qumran community, the miniature Israel, so that the divinely appointed ritual might be resumed without delay when the coming holy war gave Jerusalem into their hands.

[p.80]

Just as the Qumran commentators at times chose that form of the biblical text which lent itself best to their interpretation, so in the New Testament we note the same sort of thing time after time. For example, the LXX text of Psalm xl. 6, 'a body hast thou prepared for me', lends itself better to the thought of our Lord's incarnation in Hebrews x. 5 ff. than the MT 'ears hast thou dug for me' would have done—although the MT would have lent itself equally well to the insistence on our Lord's obedience in that context of Hebrews (cf. the words of the Servant in Isa. 1. 4 f.). Similarly, the reading 'thou hast bestowed gifts on men' in Psalm lxviii. 18 (attested in the Targum and Peshitta) is preferred by Paul in Ephesians iv. 8 because it is more in keeping with the thought of the triumphant Christ conferring largesse on His Church below—but if Paul had known only the MT and LXX reading, 'thou hast received gifts among men', that could easily have been understood of Christ's receiving those gifts from the Father that He might give them to His people. Furthermore, just as the enemies of the righteous in various Old Testament passages are identified in the Qumran commentaries with the persecutors of the Teacher of Righteousness, so in the New Testament those who oppose God and His Messiah (PS. ii. 2) are identified with 'Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the peoples of Israel' (Acts iv. 27), while the righteous man's treacherous friend and table-companion is identified with Judas Iscariot (John xiii. 18, quoting Ps. xli. 9; Acts i. 20a, quoting Ps. lxix. 25; Acts i. 20b, quoting Ps. cix. 8; cf. John xvii. 12). In connection with Judas, we may be reminded of Qumran methods of quotation in Matthew xxvii. 9 f., where the purchase of the potter's field with the thirty pieces of silver is viewed as the fulfilment of a prophecy in which Zechariah xi. 12 f. is conflated with two passages from Jeremiah (xviii. 2 f. and xxxii. 6-15)—the whole being described as 'what had been spoken by the prophet Jeremiah'. We may discern, too, in Matthew's narrative a knowledge and use of two

alternative readings in Zechariah xi. 13—‘*o|sa|r* (‘treasury’) and *yo|se|r* (‘potter’).⁷⁰ It is possible that the conflated quotation was derived by the Evangelist from a primitive collection of Christian ‘testimonies’.

[p.81]

II. THE CHRISTIAN ‘PESHER’

Christians in the apostolic age did not, so far as we know, compose commentaries on Old Testament books after the fashion of the Qumran *pesharim*. But if they had done so, we can judge how they would have set about the task, and a very interesting and remarkably consistent work they would have produced.

The early Christian interpretation of the Old Testament involved the exegesis of several continuous passages. Among these C. H. Dodd lists the first two chapters of Habakkuk as a subordinate and supplementary source of ‘testimonies’.⁷¹ We have seen how the Habakkuk *peshar* from Qumran interprets the prophet’s message in terms of a later situation. If such a continuous *peshar* had come down to us from the early decades of Christianity, the quotation of Habakkuk i. 5 in the kerygmatic context of Acts xiii. 41 suggests that we might have been faced with something like this:

Behold, you scoffers, and wonder, and perish; for I do a deed in your days, a deed you will never believe, if one declares it to you. Its interpretation concerns those who despise the Messiah and the message of salvation which he has brought; they will not believe it to be the work of God when it is told them plainly by one whom the Messiah has sent; but they will be struck with amazement when the judgment of God overtakes them, and they will utterly perish because they would not receive his words.

While the Qumran commentator tries to find a contemporary application for each detail in the oracle, the Christian preacher is more concerned to emphasize the permanent principle which it enshrines and to find it specially applicable to those Jews who do not acknowledge Jesus as Messiah.

The Christian *peshar* of Habakkuk i. 5 is implied rather than expressed in Acts xiii. 41. But another passage from the same prophecy is specially dwelt upon both by Paul and by the writer to the Hebrews—namely, Habakkuk ii. 3 f. In the original context Habakkuk receives in a vision the assurance that God’s righteousness will yet be vindicated. The fulfilment of the vision may be long postponed, but its ultimate arrival is sure. The

[p.82]

oppressor whose unrestrained violence seems to flout God’s righteousness will go on in his impious course until destruction overtakes him, but the righteous man will be saved through his steadfast and loyal trust in God.

The Qumran commentator grasps the permanent principle here well enough. ‘The last time’, he comments, ‘will be long delayed, longer than all that the prophets have spoken, for the mysteries of God are marvellous.’ But the men of truth will continue to keep the law and

⁷⁰ For a detailed comparison of Matthew’s methods of Old Testament quotation with those found in the Qumran texts, cf. K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew* (1954). pp. 97 ff.

⁷¹ C. H. Dodd, *op. cit.*, p. 107; cf. pp. 49 ff., 87.

serve the right until the time decreed by God in the mysteries of His wisdom, and then ‘God will save them from the house of judgment because of their toil and their faith in the Teacher of Righteousness’ (1Q p Hab. viii. 1-3).

This insistence on faith in the Teacher has a striking parallel in Paul’s interpretation of the same words in terms of faith in Jesus (Rom. i. 17; Gal. iii. 11). If Paul’s interpretation were recast in *peshet* idiom, it might be put thus:

The righteous shall live by his faith. Its interpretation concerns the man who has faith in Jesus, for his faith is reckoned to him for righteousness, and he will receive the life of the age to come.

The faith in the Teacher of Righteousness mentioned by the Qumran commentator probably consists of acceptance of his teaching, while the faith in Jesus of which Paul speaks involves more than this. And the Qumran commentator, who ascribes saving efficacy to the ‘toil’ (*‘āmāl*) of the doers of the law in the house of Judah, would not have known what to make of Paul’s statement that ‘to one who does not work but trusts him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is reckoned as righteousness’ (Rom. iv. 5). Justification by faith is not an unknown idea in Qumran literature, but justification of the ungodly would have been unthinkable.

The whole passage—Habakkuk ii. 3 f.—is quoted in Hebrews x. 37 f. (with inversion of verses 3 and 4); its application might be rendered as follows in *peshet* idiom:

For still the vision awaits its time; it hastens to the end—it will not lie. If it seem slow, wait for it; it will surely come, it will not delay. Its interpretation concerns those who look for the return of the Messiah; the appointed time is very near, and the faithful ones wait in hope for him to come.

[p.83]

Behold, he whose soul is not upright in him shall fail. Its interpretation concerns the apostates, who no longer wait for the Messiah; and because they draw back, God is displeased with them and they are on the way to perdition.

But the righteous shall live by his faith. Its interpretation concerns those who wait in hope, who do not draw back like the apostates, for they are righteous, and because they are strong in faith they will save their souls.

Here the *peshet* is largely provided by the modification in the LXX text, which is specially appropriate to the Christian writer’s argument at this point.

Sometimes we are more impressed by the contrast than by the similarity between the Qumranic and early Christian methods of quotation and interpretation. An outstanding instance of such a contrast is provided by the use made of Amos v. 25 ff. in the Zadokite Admonition (see p. 37) and in Acts vii. 42 ff. While the Zadokite author puts an arbitrary interpretation on certain phrases picked out from the Old Testament passage, Stephen’s use of it in his defence against the Jews (even if he does follow the LXX in its deviations from the MT) shows a grasp of the real principle involved. The conclusion which Stephen draws from the words of Amos is that Israel’s national idolatry, which began in the wilderness with the worship of the golden calf, found its climax under the monarchy with the worship of the planetary powers, for which the nation lost its freedom and suffered deportation. And by this

interpretation Stephen places himself in the true spiritual succession of Amos and his fellow-prophets.⁷² The 'forty years' of Amos v. 25 are not mentioned by the Zadokite author in this context; but elsewhere in his work he envisages a period of forty years at the end-time (see p. 30) which balances the forty years of wandering at the beginning of Israel's history. We may compare the implication of Psalm xcv. 10 ('forty years long was I grieved with this generation') as quoted in Hebrews iii. 9 f., where the Christian writer thinks apparently of a period of forty years beginning with the 'gathering in' of another 'Unique Teacher'.

With this passage from Amos the Zadokite author conjoins the passage at the end of the same book about David's fallen booth (Amos ix. 11); he identifies this booth with the 'booth of the king' which he finds in his reading of Amos v. 26, and interprets

[p.84]

both of 'the books of the law' (p, 37), The natural explanation of David's fallen booth is given in the document 4Q *Florilegium* (see pp. 52 f.), where its restoration is the work of the expected shoot of David'. And this interpretation of the passage in terms of the Davidic Messiah underlies the application which it is given by James the Just in Acts xv. 15 ff.

The *prima facie* sense of Amos ix. 11 f. is that the fallen fortunes of the royal house of David will be restored and that it will rule over all the territory which had been included in David's empire. But instead of envisaging this consummation in terms of military conquest, James sees the restoration of David's house in the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus, the Son of David, and in the reconstitution of His followers as the new Israel, while he sees the extension of its rule in the expansion of the Christian Church to include Gentiles as well as Jews. To be sure, the LXX text which James quotes lends itself better to his application than the MT would, but even the MT predicts that the house of David is to gain possession of all the nations which are called by the name of the God of Israel.⁷³

III. MESSIANIC TESTIMONIES

In fact, most of the Qumran 'testimonies' relating to the Davidic Messiah which we reviewed in Chapter IV are applied to Jesus in the New Testament or in early Christian literature. Paul so applies the words of Isaiah xi. 1 ff. (see pp. 53 f.) in Romans xv. 12; the writer to the Hebrews so applies 2 Samuel vii. 14 (see pp. 52 f.) in Hebrews i. 5b; Justin Martyr so applies Genesis xlix. 10 ff. (see pp. 36, 52) in his *First Apology* (chs. 32, 54) and in the *Dialogue with Trypho* (ch. 120), and Numbers xxiv. 17 (see pp. 37 f. 50 ff.) in the *Dialogue with Trypho* (ch. 106).

But the military language of some of these 'testimonies' relating to the Davidic Messiah has been strangely changed in significance when their fulfilment is sought in Jesus! The holy war is now a conflict waged in the realm of the spirit. and the conquest of the sons of tumult is effected by the power of divine love. Even in the fulfilment of His people's hopes, Jesus touches nothing that He does not transform.

But it was not only the promise of the Davidic Messiah that the early Christians saw fulfilled in Him; to them He also fulfill-

⁷² Cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts* (1954). pp. 153 ff.

⁷³ Cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, p. 310.

[p.85]

ed the promise of a prophet like unto Moses. The other eschatological prophet—the returning Elijah of Malachi iv. 5 f.—was at one time thought by some people to have come in Jesus (cf. Mark viii. 28), but the early Christians quickly accepted the interpretation that John the Baptist, and not Jesus, was the expected Elijah (cf. Luke i. 17); and so well they might, for Jesus Himself had suggested this identification to them (Matt. xi. 14; Mark ix. 13). But the heavenly voice which three of the disciples heard on the mount of transfiguration (Mark ix. 7) identified Jesus not only with the Messiah (‘This is my Son’) and with the Servant (‘the Beloved’) but also with the prophet foretold by Moses (‘listen to him’; cf. Deut. xviii. 15). And in the early chapters of Acts both Peter (Acts iii. 22 f.) and Stephen (Acts vii. 37) quote the words of Moses as pointing forward to Jesus. Peter adds that not only Moses, but ‘all the prophets who have spoken, from Samuel and those who came afterwards, also proclaimed these days’ (Acts iii. 24)—words which could equally well have been spoken by the Qumran interpreters to express their own understanding of these matters. Later on, in one stream of Christian tradition—that represented by the Ebionites—it was pre-eminently as the new prophet, the second Moses, that the person of Jesus was evaluated, together with His ministry.⁷⁴

The ‘testimonies’ which spoke of the rise of a great Levitical priest at the end-time were naturally not adduced in reference to Jesus in the New Testament. A prince of the house of David, the victorious Lion of the tribe of Judah, could not be identified with the ‘Messiah of Aaron’. The New Testament does not attempt to establish a Levitical descent for our Lord through His mother, although this attempt was made at a later date.⁷⁵ The New Testament writer who does establish the doctrine of the priestly ministry of Jesus on an Old Testament basis does not

[p.86]

look to the Levitical writings for that basis but to Psalm cx. 4, where a Davidic ruler is hailed by God as ‘a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek’. Melchizedek reigned in Jerusalem in earlier days, as priest of ‘El ‘Elyon (‘God Most High’); when David captured Jerusalem about 1000 BC he became heir to the ancient dynasty of priest-kings of which Melchizedek was the most illustrious member. This priestly element in the Davidic kingship is not stressed in the Old Testament—we recall, however, that David, unlike the Levitical priests, ‘sat before the LORD’ (2 Sam. vii. 18)—but it has ample justice done to it in the ministry of ‘great David’s greater Son’, who, having ‘offered for all time a single sacrifice for sins, sat down at the right hand of God, then to wait until his enemies should be made a stool for his feet’ (Heb. x. 12 f., echoing Ps. cx. 1).⁷⁶

⁷⁴ Cf. H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* (1949). pp. 87 ff.

⁷⁵ Hippolytus (on Gen. xlix. 8) says that Christ was descended from the tribe of Levi as well as from Judah (an inference which he apparently draws from the Testament of Simeon vii. 2); he interprets Moses’ blessing of Levi (Deut. xxxiii. 8 ff.) with reference to Christ; cf. M. Brière, L. Mariès and B. C. Mercier, *Hippolyte de Rome sur les Bénédictiones d’Isaac, de Jacob et de Moïse in Patrologia Orientalis* 27 (1954). pp. 72. 144 ff.; cf. also L. Mariès, ‘Le Messie issu de Lévi chez Hippolyte de Rome’, *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 39-40 (1951-2), *Mélanges Lebreton*, pp. 381 ff. For a recent attempt to establish Jesus’ priestly lineage through His mother, whose kinswoman Elizabeth was ‘of the daughters of Aaron’ (Luke i. 5), cf. J. L. Teicher in *Journal of Jewish Studies* 2 (1950), pp. 134 ff.

⁷⁶ Cf. Y. Yadin, ‘The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews’ *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 4 (1957), pp. 36 ff.

The early Christians, then, like the men of Qumran, recognized that the Old Testament writings pointed forward to the emergence of a great prophet, a great priest and a great king at the end-time; but whereas the men of Qumran thought of three distinct personages, the early Christians looked to their Lord as the one in whom all three figures were realized and transcended.

Moreover, they saw that Jesus fulfilled this triple role in terms of the Servant of the Lord of Isaiah xlii-liii—in whose portrayal we find a blending of prophetic, royal and priestly traits. Jesus Himself accepted the character and mission of the Servant as determinative of His messianic function. The heavenly voice which He heard at His baptism (Mark i. ii) acclaimed Him as the Messiah of David's line—'Thou art my Son' (cf. Ps. ii. 7) —but at the same time indicated that His Messiahship was to be realized by His acceptance and fulfilment of the programme laid down for the Servant—'my beloved; in thee I am well pleased' (cf. Isa. xlii. I). Nor would He be deflected from this path by any proposal that He should achieve His messianic destiny by more traditional and less exacting means: the Son of Man must suffer many things and be set at naught, must serve others instead of receiving service, must give His life a ransom for many, and thus attain triumph and glory ('Mark ix. 12, x. 45; Luke xxiv. 26). But so often when Jesus speaks of Himself as fulfilling the role of the Servant, He refers to Himself as the Son of Man, deriving

[p.87]

this title from Daniel vii. 13. The Son of Man, it appears, accomplishes atonement as well as judgment; and we have suggested already that the identification of the Son of Man with the Servant of the Lord rests securely upon the original intention of the Old Testament scriptures where these figures are presented (see p. 65).

The Qumran interpretation of these figures is primarily corporate, although they may be understood in a secondary sense of certain representative individuals. The New Testament interpretation of them is primarily an individual one: Jesus in His own person is Servant and Son of Man. But the New Testament attests a secondary interpretation in which the people of Christ are associated with their Lord in this twofold role. Thus Paul at Pisidian Antioch (Acts xiii. 47) can claim that he and his fellow-apostles, in bringing the gospel to the Gentiles, are fulfilling the command which the Lord has laid upon them:

I have set you to be a light for the Gentiles,
to bring my salvation to the ends of the earth.

But this is a quotation from the second Servant Song, where God addresses these words to the obedient Servant (Isa. xlix. 6). And when Paul tells the Corinthian Christians that 'the saints will judge the world' (1 Cor. vi. 2), he echoes Daniel vii. 22, where 'the saints of the Most High' receive judgment and sovereignty. But whether their ministry be one of blessing or one of judgment ('to one a fragrance from death to death, to the other a fragrance from life to life', as Paul puts it in 2 Cor. ii. 16), the followers of Christ can discharge it only in close association with their Master.

We have already noted a number of examples of the New Testament use of the book of Daniel, as we earlier looked at the use made of it in the Qumran literature. Its influence throughout the New Testament is deep and pervasive, not least in the teaching of Jesus

Himself. There is no overt allusion to the seventy heptads of Daniel ix. 24 ff. in the New Testament, although the period of three and a half years variously mentioned in Revelation xi. 2 f., xii. 6, xiii. 5 probably represents a fresh interpretation of the ‘half of the week’ in Daniel ix. 27. The book of Revelation, of course, might be expected to reflect the contents of Daniel in a special degree, since it belongs to the

[p.88]

same literary genre. But in our Lord’s eschatological discourse in Mark xiii we recognize several leading motifs of Daniel’s visions—the abomination of desolation (verse 14), the great distress (verse 19) and the deliverance of the elect (verses 20, 27) as well as the coming of the Son of Man (verse 26). And in one version of the parable of the vineyard (Luke xx. 17 f.), the stone which pulverizes the great image in Daniel ii. 34 f. is identified with the stone which the builders of Psalm cxviii. 22 rejected and with the stone of stumbling of Isaiah viii. 14 f. on which many will fall and be broken—and all together are interpreted not only of the kingdom of God (which is the explanation of the stone given in Daniel ii. 44 f.) but of the Messiah. Jesus is the embodiment of the divine kingdom—the *autobasileia*, as Origen so finely puts it.

Here, then, is the key to that distinctive interpretation of the Old Testament which we find in the New Testament. Jesus has fulfilled the ancient promises, and in fulfilling them He has given them a new meaning, in which their original meaning is not set aside but caught up into something more comprehensive and far-reaching than was foreseen before He came. In His own perfect way He has accomplished a ministry which involves the finishing of transgression, putting an end to sin, atoning for iniquity, bringing in everlasting righteousness, and setting the seal on vision and prophecy; and has thus vindicated His right to be hailed as the Lord’s Anointed, the Holy One of God. And as we learn to interpret ‘in all the scriptures the things concerning himself’ (Luke xxiv. 27), we can best understand what He meant when He said of those scriptures: ‘It is they that bear witness to me’ (John v. 39).

© 1959, 1960 F.F. Bruce. Reproduced by permission.

Prepared for the Web in February 2006 by Robert I. Bradshaw.

<http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/>
