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THE most sensational things that have been said about the Dead Sea Scrolls arise from the creative imagination of those who have said them and are without basis in the Scrolls themselves. As I propose to keep strictly to the evidence, I can promise nothing sensational in this study of the history of the Qumran sect so far as it can be pieced together from our various sources. But if fact is less exciting than fiction, it is at least truer. And truth is the goal of the scholar.

When the first find of the Scrolls from Cave I became known, there was a very wide divergence of view on many of the questions they raised, and particularly on questions relevant to the history

of the Qumran sect. Some scholars claimed to be able to define with precision on palaeographical grounds the date when the Scrolls were written,¹ while others objected that there were no known palaeographical standards on comparable material by which they could be judged.² The events in the history of the sect reflected in the Habakkuk Commentary were variously dated as far apart as the second century B.C. and the Middle Ages.³ While there is still much variety of view, it is within a greatly restricted range.

The finds of documents at Murabba‘at,⁴ apparently quite unconnected with the Qumran sect, included closely datable letters of Ben Kosiba, or Bar Cochba, written in the fourth decade of the second century A.D. These have now provided a palaeographical standard which was lacking earlier, since the only texts which were then known were either of uncertain date or inscribed on quite different materials, and they show that the Qumran Scrolls are older than the Murabba‘at texts. More important is the archaeological evidence which points to the year A.D. 68 as the date of the deposit of the Scrolls in the caves,⁵ and so sets the date of the copying of the manuscripts earlier than that, and therefore the date of the composition of the sectarian works still earlier—since there is no reason to suppose that we have the authors’ autographs—and the date of the events

¹ S. A. Birnbaum (J.T.V.I. lxxii (1950), 145) claimed that palaeography provided the decisive evidence for the dating, and he dated lQIs² 175-150 B.C., lQS 125-100 B.C., 1QpHab in the middle of the first century A.D. (B.A.S.O.R. No. 115, October 1949, 20 ff. and V.T. i, 1951, 91 ff.), while J. C. Trever (ibid. No. 113, February 1949, 19, 23) dated 1QIs² 125-100 B.C., lQS circa 75 B.C., 1QpHab 25 B.C. to A.D. 25. Cf. also Birnbaum, The Qumran Scrolls and Palaeography (B.A.S.O.R. Supplementary Studies, Nos. 13-14), 1952.
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referred to in the Scrolls yet earlier again. In any effort to examine the history of the sect, therefore, it is best to start at the end, and to ask first of all what is the evidence that the Scrolls were deposited in the caves in A.D. 68.

When the first Scrolls were found, some of them were in jars which were said to be of a type unknown hitherto,¹ and Father de Vaux, an archaeologist of great experience and of the highest renown, declared that they were pre-Roman and that they could not have been in use later than about 100 B.C.² Later, he undertook the excavation of the ruins in the neighbourhood of the cave, and found buried deep in the ground a jar of similar type alongside coins of the first century A.D.³ This not only provided unimpeachable evidence that the jars were still in use in the Roman period, but linked the finds in the caves securely with this building, which must have been used by the members of the Scrolls sect. One of the rooms in the building is believed to have been the scriptorium in which some at least of the Scrolls were copied. It contained tables which are believed to have been used for writing, and ink-wells with the dried remains of ink.⁴ Another room was a refectory, and it is probable that here the members of the sect gathered for their common meals.⁵

As for the building itself, Father de Vaux found evidence that it was occupied from the second century B.C. to the year A.D. 68, with a break of some years in the reign of Herod the Great after it was damaged by an earthquake, which is believed to have taken place in the year 31 B.C.⁶ The chief evidence for the dating is the coins which were found in the building, which run from the second century B.C. to the year A.D. 68.⁷ It is sometimes said that this is not very secure evidence, since we cannot suppose that every coin was placed where it was found immediately after

¹ Cf. R. de Vaux, Qumran Cave I ("Discoveries in the Judaean Desert", vol. i), 1955, p. 9.
³ Announced in Manchester Guardian, 7 April 1952, and Le Monde, 9 April 1952, where de Vaux retracted his earlier dating of the jars.
⁴ Cf. R. de Vaux, L'Archéologie et les manuscrits de la Mer Morte, pp. 23, 81.
⁵ Ibid. p. 9.
⁶ Ibid. chap. I.
⁷ Ibid. pp. 4, 14 f., 18 f., 26 ff., 32, 35 f.
it had been minted, and coins commonly continue to be current long after they have been minted. It is also said that a handful of coins taken from our pockets would reveal a wide variety of dates. While this is true, it is unlikely that any of our pockets would yield a range of two hundred years, and it is also more likely that the coins found in the building are the result of a gradual accumulation than that they formed a current "purse". The earliest Jewish coin is from the time of John Hyrcanus I, 135-104 B.C., and there are a few Seleucid coins which date from about the beginning of this period and some older Seleucid coins. It seems, therefore, most probable that the building was occupied from the second century B.C., and that the accumulation of the coins began at that time.

As for the other end of the period, the evidence seems even more convincing. There is evidence that the building was destroyed, but part was rebuilt on a different plan, and it is believed that this was for Roman military occupation for a few years. In the building that was destroyed a large number of Jewish coins dating from the first century of our era down to the year A.D. 68 were found, but none from a later date. In the reconstructed building Roman military coins were found, the earliest dating from the year A.D. 67-68. There is thus a clear distinction between the types of coins used in these two occupations, and the users of neither type of coins are likely to have used the other. It is most probable, therefore, that the destruction of the building took place in the year A.D. 68. It is then most probable that the destruction prior to the reconstruction was effected by the Roman soldiers, and that the deposit of the manuscripts in the caves by the members of the sect took place prior to this destruction. The period during which the sectaries occupied the building would thus be from the second century B.C. to A.D. 68, with a short break in the reign of Herod the Great. This would be long enough to allow for the composition and copying of the sectarian literature, and for the copying of many

---

2 Cf. de Vaux, op. cit. p. 15.
3 Ibid. pp. 14 ff.
5 Ibid. pp. 33 ff.
6 Ibid. pp. 28 ff.
7 Ibid. pp. 35 ff.
Biblical texts, as well as for the accumulation of so substantial a library as the caves yielded. The beginnings of the sect must then be placed not later than the middle of the second century B.C., and a substantial part of its history must have lain in the period preceding the beginning of the Christian era. There are still a few scholars who dispute this, but it is accepted by most of the scholars engaged on the Scrolls, though there are still important differences of detail between them.

By most scholars the sect of the Scrolls is identified with the Essenes, or held to be closely related to them. One of the Scrolls is called the Manual of Discipline. It tells us much about the


2 A few dispute this identification. In addition to those mentioned in the preceding note, cf. M. H. Gottstein, *V.T.* iv (1954), 141 ff., where anti-Essene traits are held to be in the Scrolls (cf. also B. Otzen, *S.Th.* vii (1953), 156 f.); C. Rabin, *Qumran Studies*, 1957, pp. 53 ff., where the sect is held to have been Pharisaic; A. M. Habermann, *Megilloth Midbar Yehuda*, 1959, pp. xv, 25 ff., where the sect is identified with the Sadducees (cf. R. North, *C.B.Q.* xvii (1955), 164 ff.). H. E. del Medico (*Le Mythe des Esséniens*, 1958) argues that there was no such sect as the Essenes, while K. H. Rengstorf (*Hirbet Qumran und die Bibliothék vom Toten Meer*, 1960) maintains that the Dead Sea Scrolls were part of the Temple Library.

of the members of the sect, about their organization and the way in which they conducted their affairs, and about the rules they observed for the admission of new members to their ranks. It was immediately observed that there was much similarity between what we read here and what Josephus, writing in the first century of our era, tells us about the Essenes. Moreover Pliny, also writing in the same century, says that the Essenes lived near the Dead Sea. Not all of the Essenes lived together, however, for we are told that there were groups of them scattered through the country. Further, Josephus mentions the Essenes as already existing about the middle of the second century B.C., and this well agrees with the archaeological evidence already noted.

Before we identify the Qumran sect with the Essenes, however, we must recognize that there are differences as well as similarities between what we learn of the sect from the Manual of Discipline and what we learn of the Essenes from the first-century writers. Moreover, there is another text which must be taken into account. At the end of last century there were found in the genizah of a Cairo synagogue two incomplete but overlapping manuscripts of a work variously referred to as the Zadokite Work or the Damaskusschrift. These were published by Schechter in 1910. The manuscripts were of the tenth

1 Antiq. XIII. v. 9 (171-3), XVIII. i. 5 (18-22); BJ. II. viii. 2-13 (119-64).
2 H.N. V. xv (73). Cf. also Philo, Quod omnis probus liber sit, xii f. (79-91).
3 Josephus, BJ. II. viii. 4 (124).
4 Antiq. XIII. v. 9 (171).
5 J. Strugnell (J.B.L. lxxvii (1958), 107) takes the identification of Qumranites and Essenes as proved.
century and of the eleventh or twelfth century of our era. The work records something of the history of the sect from which it came, and tells us something of the Teacher of Righteousness and his part in the ordering of the sect. As soon as the Habakkuk Commentary from Qumran was published it was believed that the Zadokite Work originated in the Qumran sect, and since fragments of the Zadokite Work have been found in more than one of the Qumran caves, this is now so probable that it is widely accepted. But the practices of the sect as indicated in the Zadokite Work are by no means identical with those reflected in the Manual of Discipline.

In the Manual of Discipline we are told that the members of the sect were divided into three categories, the priests, the Levites, and the lay members. That all of the members were not at Qumran is apparent, since we read that wherever there were ten members they could function as a group of the sect, under the leadership of a priest. We are told, moreover, that the members were divided into thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens. It is therefore clear that the total numbers were considerable. In the meetings of the sect, each member had his own appointed place, and in their deliberations each took part according to his position and none was allowed to interrupt another. The affairs of the sect were managed by a council of twelve members and three priests. It is disputed whether the three priests were included

1 For facsimiles of the manuscripts see S. Zeitlin, The Zadokite Fragments (J.Q.R. Monograph Series, vol. i), 1952.
4 Col. II, 19 ff.
5 Col. VI, 3.
6 Col. II, 21 f.
7 Col. VI, 8 ff.
8 Col. VIII, 1.
in the twelve or in addition to the twelve. In all things precedence was accorded to the priests, who must take their seats before the other members were allowed to do so. We read of an Inspector, or paqid, and an Overseer, or mebaqqer. It is not agreed by all scholars whether they are to be identified or whether they are separate officers, and in the latter case the relation between them is not clear. When anyone wished to join the sect, he was examined by the Inspector, who had power to admit him to the covenant if he was satisfied as to his suitability; but he did not immediately become a full member of the sect. After an unspecified period of probation his case was considered by "the Many", which appears to mean by a general meeting of the sect. Here a decision was taken as to whether he should be admitted to the second stage of probation, which lasted for a further year. If he was admitted, it is laid down that he should still not be permitted to touch the "purity of the Many". It seems likely that this means that he was not allowed to share in the lustrations of the members, though this is not certain and is not agreed by all. At the end of this year, his case was again considered, to see if he had adequate understanding of the Law and if his life conformed to the standards of the sect. If he was

1 Col. VI, 8 f. 2 Col. VI, 14. 3 Col. VI, 12, 20.


6 Col. VI, 14 f. 6 Col. VI, 15 f. 7 Col. VI, 16 f.

8 In col. V, 13 we read that evil men must not enter the water to touch the purity of the men of holiness, and this suggests that the "purity of the many" is the ritual purification by water (so Wernberg-Møller, The Manual of Discipline, 1957, p. 96, n. 52; T. H. Gaster, The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect, 1957, p. 107, n. 58; E. F. Sutcliffe, The Monks of Qumran, 1960, p. 161; A. Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Writings from Qumran, 1961, p. 83 n.)

9 Col. VI, 18 f.
approved, he was admitted to a final year of probation and his property was turned over to the sect, but was kept separate from the treasury of the sect.\(^1\) During this year he was not allowed to touch the food of the members.\(^2\) Some think the meaning is that during the previous year he was not allowed to touch the food and during this year he was not allowed to touch the drink of the members.\(^3\) By "touch" some think it is meant that he was not allowed to prepare the food or drink of the members,\(^4\) though it may perhaps mean that he was not allowed to sit at the common table with the members, but had his food separately. If at the end of this year he was approved by the members, he became fully incorporated in the sect and his property was added to its treasury.\(^5\) His initiation was a solemn occasion, when he acknowledged the gracious acts of God, made his confession, received the priestly blessing and entered into a solemn oath.\(^6\) He was then assigned his place in the fellowship.\(^7\)

Within the fellowship of the sect there was a rigid and stern discipline. Every year there was a review of all the members, when the covenant was renewed. Any member could then be raised to a higher position in the fellowship or demoted to a lower one.\(^8\) Any member who lied about his wealth might have his food ration reduced, and if he spoke impatiently, or did not treat one who ranked higher than he in the sect with due respect, he could be punished for a year.\(^9\) Many other offences are mentioned and the punishment laid down.\(^10\)

From all this it is clear that the members of the sect had many of the marks of a monastic community. It is laid down that they should eat together, and bless together, and take counsel together,\(^11\) that they should bring all their knowledge, their strength, and their wealth into the fellowship, and that they owed it the fullest

\(^1\) Col. VI, 19 ff.  \(^2\) Col. VI, 20 f.
\(^4\) Cf. E. F. Sutcliffe, Heythrop Journal, i (1960), 54. J. van der Ploeg (J.S.S. ii (1957), 169) thinks the meals had to be prepared under the supervision of priests, to ensure that all should be ritually pure.
\(^5\) Col. VI, 21 ff.
\(^6\) Col. I, 16 ff.  \(^7\) Col. VI, 22.
\(^8\) Col. V, 23 f.
\(^9\) Col. VI, 24 f.  \(^10\) Col. VII, 1 ff.
\(^11\) Col. VI, 2 f.
They were required to live in brotherhood and humility, and to show zeal for righteousness. Wherever there were ten members of the sect the continuous study of the Law, day and night through all the year, was laid down, and every member had to spend one-third of all the nights in this study. The considerable number of manuscripts of Biblical books represented in the finds in the caves finds its ready explanation in this devotion to the study of the Law—which doubtless means more than the Pentateuch, in view of the copies of other books of the Bible and commentaries on prophetic books and psalms found in the caves.

There is nothing in the Manual of Discipline about women, but in a related fragment there is mention of women and children. Moreover among the graves which have been excavated in the Qumran area there are some graves of women. The Zadokite Work, however, implies the marriage of members, since it says that wives and children must walk according to the ordinances of the Law. It recognizes four categories, priests, Levites, children of Israel, and proselytes. Here there is no contradiction of the Manual, which mentions but three categories, since the proselytes are probably the same as those not yet admitted to full membership but undergoing their probation.

The rules for the admission of new members are much simpler in the Zadokite Work than in the Manual of Discipline. There

1 Col. I, 11 f. 2 Col. V, 1 ff. 3 Col. VI, 6 ff.
6 P. vii, 6 ff. 7 P. xiv, 3 ff.
is no indication of the length of probation, but simply the provision that those who wished to join the sect were examined by the Overseer as to their works, their understanding, their might, their strength, and their wealth,\(^1\) and that if they proved satisfactory they took the oath of the covenant\(^2\) and became enrolled in the membership. There is no reference to any submission of their case to the vote of the community. Nor is there any mention of the handing over of their property to the sect. Instead it is laid down that the members of the sect should pay two days’ wages every month into the common fund for the relief of the poor and needy.\(^3\) No common meal is mentioned or envisaged.

There is a reference to ritual ablution, where it is laid down that none should cleanse himself in the waters of a vessel, and that even a pool containing but little water was forbidden to the sectaries, if an unclean person had touched it.\(^4\)

According to the Zadokite Work the sect was organized in “camps”.\(^5\) It would therefore seem to have had a military, or quasi-military, character. Of this there is no indication in the Manual of Discipline.

In the Zadokite Work the legitimacy of the Temple is recognized,\(^6\) but only the legitimacy of priests who conformed to the standards of the sect.\(^7\) In the Manual of Discipline there is no reference to the Temple or to sacrifice, except in a figurative sense.\(^8\) Similarly the Hymns Scroll has no reference to the Temple or its ritual.\(^9\)

---

1. P. xiii, 11 ff. As in the Manual of Discipline the organization was by thousands and hundreds and fifties and tens (p. xiii, 1 f.).
2. P. xv, 1 ff.  
3. P. xiv, 12 ff.  
4. P. x, 11 ff.  
5. P. xiv, 3 ff.
9. L. Arnaldich (*Est. Bib.* xi (1952), 363 n.) observes: “En ningún texto de los manuscritos del Mar Muerto se habla ce la subida a Jerusalén con ocasión de ciertas festividades, ni se hace mención de los sacrificios en el Templo. Es muy posible que los sectarios no acudieran al Templo para no contaminarse al contacto
When we turn to Josephus's account of the Essenes, we read that they despise riches and have all things in common, and that their affairs are managed by stewards.¹ They are of great piety and worship daily before sunrise.² They labour until the fifth hour, when they assemble and clothe themselves with white and bathe in cold water and then go to their refectory where they eat a simple meal in quiet reverence, and then return to their labours until the evening when they eat after the same manner.³

According to Josephus, those who wished to join the sect had to go through three stages of probation, each lasting a year. After the first year, they were allowed to partake of the waters of purification, but not until the expiry of two further years were they to touch the food of the sect, and then only after the most solemn of oaths.⁴ As to women, Josephus says that the Essenes despise wedlock, while not condemning it absolutely,⁵ but that there is an order of Essenes who marry, though not out of desire for pleasure, but for the sake of posterity.⁶

On the question of sacrifices Josephus's evidence is not certain, because a vital negative is missing from the Greek manuscripts,⁷ which are late, though it is in the Greek Epitoma⁸ and in the Latin manuscripts.⁹ What he most probably wrote was that the Essenes sent gifts to the Temple, but did not offer sacrifices.¹⁰


¹ B.J. II. viii. 3 (122 f.). ² B.J. II. viii. 5 (128).
³ B.J. II. viii. 5 (129 ff.). ⁴ B.J. II. viii. 7 (137 ff.).
⁵ B.J. II. viii. 2 (120 f.). ⁶ B.J. II. viii. 13 (160 f.).
Philo, writing also in the first century of our era but before Josephus, says the Essenes lived holy lives, avoided the cities, and did not offer animal sacrifices. He says that in their services they sat in rows according to their ages, and lived in communities with a single treasury and had all things in common.\(^1\)

It will be seen that though there is much similarity between these accounts, there are also real differences, and these have led some scholars to deny that the sect of the Scrolls were Essenes at all. If all of these descriptions were contemporary, we should be forced to conclude that they referred to at least three different sects. But since there is reason to believe that the Zadokite Work and the Manual of Discipline emanated from the same sect, it is clear that there was some development in their practice, and if the sect existed for two centuries both of these texts may be much earlier than the first-century writers who tell us about the Essenes, and the descriptions of those writers be of the life and practice of the same sect at a later age.

One of the chief reasons which have led some scholars to deny that the Qumran sect can have been the Essenes is that Josephus describes them as a pacific brotherhood, who carried no arms save for self-defence when on a journey,\(^2\) while Philo says they were unconcerned with weapons or with war.\(^3\) Yet the Qumran community clearly set great store by the War Scroll,\(^4\) which told of the war by which the nations of the earth should be overcome by the true people of God and prescribed the rules for the conduct of war. Before we conclude that this difference rules out any possibility of the identification of the sect of the Scrolls with the Essenes, we must note that Josephus provides some evidence that

---

\(^1\) *Quod omnis probus liber sit*, xii (75 ff.).

\(^2\) B.J. II. viii. 4 (124 f.).

\(^3\) *Quod omnis probus liber sit*, xii (78).

the Essenes were not quite so pacific during the Roman War of A.D. 66-70. He tells us that an Essene named John became a
general in the Jewish Army, and that the Romans subjected the
Essenes to terrible tortures which they endured with the greatest
fortitude. There would be little reason to torture the Essenes
if they were pacifists of no possible danger to Rome, but it would
be more understandable if the Essenes were the people who had
long cherished the War Scroll and dreamed of the day of triumph
over other nations and now thought the day of their dreams had
come, and so allied themselves with the fanatical Zealots. This
would explain why the Romans should destroy the Qumran
centre. It would also explain the fact that at Masada, where the
Zealots made their last stand against the Romans, a fragment of
one of the texts found in the Qumran caves has been found.

I therefore subscribe to the widely accepted view that the
sect of the Scrolls and the Essenes were one and the same sect,
but that we see them in our various sources at different stages of
their development, and that we can use the Scrolls and our
writers of the first century of our era to discuss their history,
provided we remember that they are not contemporary sources,
and provided, too, that we remember that the Scrolls give us
inside information while the first-century writers gave outside
information, and that since the Scrolls sect forbade the free dis­
closure of its affairs to outsiders the first-century writers give us
less authoritative information. At the same time, something of
the life and faith of the sect must have become known outside its
fellowship, or it could hardly have looked to recruit new members.

In the Zadokite Work we read that 390 years after the Jews
were delivered into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar God raised up
a shoot from Israel and Aaron, and after twenty years of groping
gave them the Teacher of Righteousness to be their leader. I
have already said that the Teacher of Righteousness figures also
in other texts found in the Qumran caves, and especially in the
Habakkuk Commentary. From that Commentary we learn that

---

1 B.J. II. xx. 4 (567). 2 B.J. II. viii. 10 (152 f.).
4 Cf. Josephus, B.J. II. viii. 7 (141); also Manual of Discipline, col. 1X, 17 ff.
5 P. i, 5 ff. 6 P. i, 9 ff.
he lived in a period of much tension, when foreign foes, called Kittim, were violently active in the land,1 and when internal enemies of the Teacher of Righteousness, under the leadership of a Wicked Priest, persecuted him until he was finally done to death.2 The Zadokite Work speaks of the period from his death to the coming of the Messiah,3 and it would therefore seem to find some dispensational significance in his death. There is also a reference to a period of forty years between the death of the Teacher and the consuming of the men of war.4 It is probable that this elimination of the men of war was thought of as inaugurating the messianic age, which was thus expected forty years after the Teacher's death. It is in any case apparent that the Teacher had not yet been dead forty years when the Zadokite Work was composed.

If we reckon 390 years from the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, we are brought to the year 196 B.C. for the origin of the sect and the beginning of the twenty years of groping. When the Zadokite Work first came to light Eduard Meyer held it to be an exact figure, and dated the origin of the sect precisely in 196 B.C.5 It is very improbable that we should treat this as a

1 They come from afar, from the isles or coastlands of the sea, and devour nations like vultures (col. III, 10 f.); they are swift and powerful in battle (col. II, 12 f.), despise fortresses (col. IV, 5 f.), and are merciless to young and old alike (col. VI, 10 f.); they gather wealth like the fish of the sea (col. VI, 1 f.), are cunning and deceitful (col. III, 5 f.), and are dreaded of all men (col. III, 4 f.); they have no belief in the ordinances of God (col. II, 14 f.), but sacrifice to their standards and worship their weapons (col. VI, 3 f.).

2 The Wicked Priest was "called by the name of truth" at first (col. VIII, 8 f.), but then forsook God and plundered and took the wealth of the peoples (col. VIII, 10 ff.). This is then taken up into a more inclusive reference to the last priests of Jerusalem, who gather wealth from the spoil of the peoples, but whose wealth should be given into the hand of the army of the Kittim at the end of the days (col. IX, 5 ff.), clearly suggesting that the Kittim are active in Palestine in the days of the last priests of Jerusalem, who are associated with the Wicked Priest. The Wicked Priest walked in the ways of drunkenness (col. XI, 13 f.), and wrought abominable works and defiled the sanctuary (col. XII, 2 f.); he persecuted the Teacher of Righteousness to destroy him in the place of his exile (col. XI, 4 f.), but received the due retribution for his misdeeds (col. XII, 2 f.) when he was given into the hand of his enemies to destroy him because of the iniquity done to the Teacher of Righteousness (col. IX, 9 ff.).

3 Col. XIX, 35; XX, 1. 4 Col. XXI, 14 f.

reliable chronological calculation, since ancient Jewish writers show little exact knowledge of the whole Persian period. In the Seder 'Olam Rabba the Persian period is said to have lasted for thirty-four years. We should attach no evidential value at all to this 390 years, and if we find it to be approximately correct, it must be on other grounds and any approximation to the facts must be purely fortuitous. R. H. Charles, who thought the date was approximately correct, did not base himself on the calculation from the time of Nebuchadnezzar, but thought the figure was schematic, like the seventy weeks of the book of Daniel, and believed it was derived from Ezek. iv. 5. It seems best, therefore, in discussing the origin of the sect, to leave this figure aside.

That we must come to the second century B.C. for the beginnings of the sect seems clear, if the archaeological evidence that the Qumran centre was occupied by the sect in the latter part of the second century and Josephus's evidence that the Essenes already existed about the middle of that century are to be relied on. A number of writers think the Teacher of Righteousness lived about the middle of that century and make him contemporary with Jonathan, the brother and successor of Judas the Maccabee, or with Simon, another brother and the successor of Jonathan. There are, however, two objections to this. One is the difficulty of suggesting anyone for the part of the Teacher of Righteousness. The Wicked Priest is identified by these scholars with Jonathan or Simon, but the Teacher has to be left without identification. The other objection is that no foreign foes were violently active in Palestine in the time of Jonathan or Simon. Most scholars identify the Kittim with the Romans. But the Romans had not appeared in Palestine at that time. It

---

1 Cf. R. Leszynsky, Die Sadduzäer, 1912, p. 166.
2 So H. H. Rowley, The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls, 1952, p. 64.
3 A.P. ii (1913), 800.
6 Cf. G. R. Driver, ibid. 143.
is improbable that the references to the Kittim in the Commentary and the references to the Wicked Priest are to things widely separated in time,¹ as some have thought, and if the Teacher of Righteousness is located in the second century it is altogether probable that the Kittim who were active in his time were the Macedonians, and especially those of the Seleucid Kingdom.² In itself the term Kittim could refer to either the Macedonians or the Romans. In 1 Maccabees i. 1 it clearly means the Macedonians, and in Daniel xi. 30 it equally clearly means the Romans.

The sect called itself or its priestly members the Sons of Zadok, and the most probable explanation of this is that it was loyal to the high priestly house of Zadok, which it regarded as the only true high priestly house. This would explain why it did not recognize the priesthood of the Temple and did not offer sacrifices despite its regard for the Temple and its deep regard for the Law which prescribed the sacrifices.⁸ The sectaries could not, therefore, recognize the priesthood of the Hasmonaeans. But we know that this was a live issue earlier in the century, in the time of Antiochus IV. When Antiochus came to the throne Onias III was the High Priest. But Onias was displaced by the king in favour of Jason,⁴ and later Jason was displaced by Menelaus,⁵ who was not even of the priestly tribe, but a Benjamite.⁶ The son of Onias, also called Onias, fled to Egypt and there founded the temple of Leontopolis.⁷ That the question of the legitimate priestly line was held to be a vital one is apparent from the fact that when Alcimus became the High Priest, some of the

¹ Cf. Driver, ibid.: "passing arbitrarily from the Maccabaean to the Roman period would make the whole story unintelligible."
⁴ 2 Macc. iv. 7 ff.
⁵ 2 Macc. iv. 23 ff.
⁶ 2 Macc. iv. 23 and 2 Macc. iii. 4. Josephus, however, says that Menelaus was the brother of Onias, and therefore an Aaronite (Antiq. XII. v. 1 (238)). On this question, cf. H. H. Rowley, Studia Orientalia Ioanni Pedersen dicata, 1953, pp. 303 ff.
⁷ Cf. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. iii. 1, 3 (62 ff., 72 ff.); B.J. I. i. 1 (33), VII. x. 2 (421).
Hasidim who had fought with Judas against the king’s forces welcomed him because he was of the seed of Aaron,1 though when he turned against them they paid dearly for their trust in him.2 It seems probable that the Teacher of Righteousness was Onias III.3 He was done to death at the instigation of Menelaus,4 and it is generally believed that his death is referred to in Daniel ix. 26,5 where it marks one of the great divisions of the seventy

1 A. Bouché-Leclercq (Histoire des Séleucides, ii (1913), 311) says Alcimus was not an Aaronite, but presents no evidence for this view.
2 1 Macc. vii. 12 ff.
4 2 Macc. iv. 32 ff. Menelaus fits what we are told of the Wicked Priest more closely than any other. The statement in the Habakkuk Commentary that the Wicked Priest was “named according to the truth” when he first took office (col. VIII, 9) has been raised as an objection (cf. M. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, 1955, p. 165). But in favour of the identification of the Wicked Priest with Alexander Jannaeus it has been argued that the reference is to his name Yannai, which is a late form of Jonathan (cf. M. Delcor, Essai sur le Midrash d’Habacuc, 1951, p. 64; M. Burrows, op. cit. p. 175; F. F. Bruce, Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 2nd edn, 1961, p. 101), while the same argument has been advanced in favour of Jonathan, the brother of Judas Maccabeus (cf. E. F. Sutcliffe, The Monks of Qumran, 1960, pp. ix f.). But both of these bore these names not only when they first took office, but throughout their lives. On the other hand Josephus tells us that the real name of Menelaus was Onias, but that he changed this for the Greek name Menelaus (Antiq. XII. v. 1 (238)). Since Onias was the name of the true High Priest, who had been removed from office by Antiochus, this would be an honoured name among the followers of Onias III, and especially if he were the Teacher of Righteousness who led the sect from which the Habakkuk Commentary came, and since Menelaus exchanged it for a Greek name at a time when the Greeks or Macedonians were the bitter enemies of the faithful Jews, the reference to his name as “according to the truth” when he first took office would be reasonably explained (on Menelaus, cf. H. H. Rowley, Studia Orientalia Ioanni Pedersen dicata, 1953, pp. 303 ff.).
5 This has long been accepted by writers of quite different schools: M. Stuart, Commentary on the Book of Daniel, 1850, p. 289; F. Hitzig, Das Buch Daniel, 1850,
weeks, and is therefore given dispensational significance. Matthew Black says that "to all other theories it may be objected that the Founder of a movement so famous and influential as that of the Hasidim must have left some trace in our known historical records, and in no single case except that of Onias can this be reasonably claimed." 1

At this time foreign foes were certainly violently active in Palestine in the persons of Antiochus and his representatives. 2 The Temple was desecrated and made a temple of Zeus, 3 and the practices of the Jewish faith were proscribed. 4 Many of the Jews, including the puppet priests and their followers, joined the king's servants and shared in the persecution of the loyal Jews until the revolt broke out under Mattathias and his sons. 5 At no time during the two centuries that preceded the beginning of the Christian era was any foreign foe so violently active in Palestine as in this period, or so supported by the Jewish religious leaders, and at no other time did any foreign enemy proscribe the practices of the Jewish faith and instigate a religious persecution of such a character. If we seek in the second century B.C. a situation which could be reflected in the Habakkuk Commentary, none seems so promising as this.

The Zadokite Work refers to the pollution of the sanctuary, 6 and at no time was the sanctuary so polluted as in the time of Antiochus, when the puppet priests of Jerusalem supported him. The condemnation of idolatry 7 could find its best setting in the


2 The Books of Maccabees recount the oppression to which the loyal Jews were subjected and the story of the revolt to which they led.

3 1 Macc. i. 54 ff.; 2 Macc. vi. 1 ff.

4 1 Macc. i. 44 ff., 56 ff.; 2 Macc. vi. 7 ff.

5 Cf. 1 Macc. i. 11 ff.; 2 Macc. iii. 4 ff.

6 Cf. CD, p. xx, 23.

7 Cf. CD, p. xx, 23 f., where Charles (A.P. ii (1913), 822) renders "and returned again to molten images". The text is very indistinct, however, and it
open idolatry of that time, when the heathen king’s image, referred to in the book of Daniel and in 1 Maccabees as the abomination of desolation, was erected in the Temple. The emphasis on the strict observance of the sabbath, which we find in the Zadokite Work, is most relevantly understood in the setting of the Maccabaean age, when we know that this was a live issue. In the Zadokite Work marriage with a niece is condemned, and Josephus records how Joseph, of the Tobiad house, the rival of Onias, married his own niece. The Qumran sect’s insistence on the solar calendar suggests that it arose from a time when this was a live issue. Antiochus is said in the book of Daniel to have changed times and the law, and the book of Jubilees, which most probably comes from the middle of the second century B.C. shows the same insistence on the solar calendar which we find in

has been differently read by different editors; cf. Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 359: “they turned to God. And he smote”; Rabin, The Zadokite Documents, p. 40: “they returned unto God. And let him appease”; F. F. Hvidberg, Menigheden af den Nye Pakt i Damascus, 1928, p. 54: “og vendte om til Gud...”; Sutcliffe, The Monks of Qumran, p. 141: “they returned to God...”; Maier, Die Texte vom Toten Meer, i. 69: “und kehrten um zu Gott...”; Caster, The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect, p. 82: “and returned to God, but through those wrangles”; A. G. Lamadrid, Los descubrimientos de Qumran, 1956, p. 329: “que se volvieron después hacia la corriente”; Dupont-Sommer, The Essene Writings from Qumran, p. 141: “and were converted to God. But”; Cothenet, Les Textes de Qumran, ii. 180: “ils sont retournés à nouveau vers la [voie]”; Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English, p. 107: “but returned again to the way.” The rendering of Charles seems more relevant than any of these others. The context refers to the house of Peleg who departed from the holy city and relied upon God when Israel sinned and polluted the sanctuary. To continue “they returned to God” or “they were converted” would be very surprising, since there is no suggestion that their loyalty was in doubt, while nothing anywhere in the Scrolls suggests that the disloyal enemies of the sect repented.


2 CD, pp. iii, 12 ff., xi, 14 ff.

Cf. 1 Macc. ii. 32 ff. Since Judas laid it down that self-defence on the sabbath was permissible, it is clear that the issue must have been discussed. Moreover, the fact that Antiochus forbade the observance of the sabbath (1 Macc. i. 45; 2 Macc. vi. 6) is evidence that it was a live issue.

4 CD, p. v, 7 ff.

5 Antiq. XII. iv. 6 (186 ff.).

6 CD, pp. iii, 12 ff., vi, 18 f., xvi, 2 f.; Manual of Discipline, col. I, 14 f.

7 Dan. vii. 25.

the Scrolls,¹ and this book is referred to in the Zadokite Work.² All of these things tie in with what were certainly current issues in the period to which I have ascribed the origin of the sect.

Again, we know from the book of Daniel that hopes of the establishment of the universal kingdom of God through the saints of the Most High were entertained in that age,³ which would provide the background for the War Scroll and for the military, or quasi-military, organization of the sect as reflected in the Zadokite Work. The War Scroll describes the war against the Kittim of Assyria and the Kittim in Egypt,⁴ which should last seven years and then be followed by thirty-three years of war against other nations, but it says little about any fighting except against the Kittim. Allied with the Kittim were the Edomites and Moabites and Ammonites and Philistines,⁵ and it is to be noted that when the standard was raised against Antiochus by the Maccabees, Judas turned to attack the Philistines, the Edomites, and the region east of the Jordan,⁶ i.e. the territory of the Ammonites and Moabites. If the sect existed in the time of Antiochus, it is likely to have shared in the rebellion against the king and his persecuting laws, and the War Scroll reflects the spirit and the hopes of that period better than any other until we come to the first century A.D., towards the time of the conflict with Rome.⁷ But when independence was secured, and the


² CD, p. xvi, 3 f.

³ Dan. vii. 27.

⁴ Col. I, 2, 4.

⁵ Col. I, 2 f.

⁶ 1 Macc. v. 3 ff.

⁷ C. Roth, who himself holds the Zealot view of the Qumran sect (see below, p. 231), is in agreement with the present writer in holding that no period between the time of Antiochus IV and the Jewish War could satisfy the conditions
fighting against the Seleucids died down, the sect would inevitably live in peace, even though it still cherished the War Scroll and dreamed of the day when its hopes would be realized. It is unlikely to have been satisfied with the priesthood of Jonathan and Simon, but it would have little reason to turn its arms against them, since the utmost it could achieve would be to weaken them in their dealings with Seleucid rulers and would-be rulers and imperil the independence, which must have been as dear to the members of the sect as to their fellow-countrymen. They would therefore become a dissident group, neither actively supporting nor militarily opposing the Hasmonaeans, and this would explain their withdrawal to the wilderness. And since they cherished the War Scroll, when a new Maccabaean rebellion, this time against Rome and under the leadership of the Zealots, broke out, it is understandable that they should throw in their lot with the rebels, only to experience less success than under the Maccabees.

I have said that the Zadokite Work was composed within forty years of the death of the Teacher of Righteousness. That it is older than the Manual of Discipline seems on every ground likely. Some have thought that the Manual of Discipline was composed by the Teacher of Righteousness himself, in which case it would have been the older work. Yet all we learn of the sect in the Manual of Discipline seems to stand nearer to the first implied by the Scrolls (The Dead Sea Scrolls: a new historical approach, 1965, pp. 37, 77).


2 Dupont-Somer (The Essene Writings from Qumran, pp. 71 f.) thinks that basically it may derive from the Teacher of Righteousness, but that it underwent alteration or adaption after his death. Cf. A. R. C. Leaney, The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning, pp. 115 f.

3 In CD, p. x, 6, there is a reference to the book of Hagu, and in 1QSa, col. I, 7 (cf. p. 212 n. 4) the same work is referred to as the Book of Hagû. Some have thought the Manual of Discipline was this Book, in which case it would certainly be the older work. But there is no evidence for this, and evidence against it will be given below.
century accounts of the Essenes than what we read in the Zadokite Work. No communal meal appears to be contemplated in the Zadokite Work, as it does in the Manual and in the first-century writers. It is unlikely that it was first established, then abandoned, and then restored. Along with this goes the community of goods. In the Zadokite Work we do not find this, but only a contribution from the earnings of each member for the common purse, whereas in the Manual and in the first-century accounts we do. Similarly, the simpler rules for the admission of new members reflected in the Zadokite Work are not so close to those reflected in Josephus as those of the Manual of Discipline.

It has been noted that the Zadokite Work implies married members. This would be easier before communal establishments were set up than after, and since some women’s graves have been found at Qumran, it is probable that celibacy was not observed until after the settlement there. Father Barthélemy, the editor of the Fragment related to the Manual of Discipline, found in the caves, in which reference is made to marriage, thinks this is older than the Manual of Discipline itself. He also notes that this fragment has a more military flavour, and thinks it reflects the Maccabaean conflict. It is therefore closer to the organization reflected in the Zadokite Work than what we find in the Manual and in the first-century writers.

Josephus tells us of the daily ablutions of the members of the sect. Within the building at Qumran vessels or cisterns were found, in which it is thought that these ritual ablutions took place, and I have said that many scholars think the reference to the “purity of the Many” in the Manual of Discipline is a reference to these ablutions. The Zadokite Work refers to ablutions

1 *Qumran Cave I*, p. 108.
3 This is less certain than some writers suppose. The cisterns could well be for the storage of water, and the steps down into the cistern are in no way proof that they were used to enter the cistern to bathe (cf. *New Testament Essays in memory of T. W. Manson*, 1959, p. 219; R. de Vaux, op. cit. pp. 98 f.).
4 It has been said above that some dispute this. Apart from this the only reference to ablutions in any of the Qumran Scrolls is in 1QS, col. III, 9, where there is mention of lustrations as cleansing bodily impurity. It will be seen how tenuous is the argument of some scholars that the Qumran sect was the source of
in a pool, which must be uncontaminated by contact with an unclean person.\(^1\) Before the members of the sect lived in monastic conditions this could well be understood, and bathing in a vessel could be forbidden. But in Qumran running water would not always be available, and outsiders could not have access to the cisterns within the centre, so that circumstances could have determined the modification of the rule.

The closer determination of the rules of the Sect for the conduct of its business and for the study of the Law would seem to set the Manual later than the Zadokite Work. It would seem to come from a time after the settlement at Qumran, whereas the Zadokite Work, coming from within forty years of the death of the Teacher of Righteousness, would be before that settlement. If the Settlement at Qumran is placed in the last third of the second century B.C.,\(^2\) and the composition of the Zadokite Work is placed earlier than this, and the death of the Teacher of Righteousness not more than forty years before this, we are carried back very closely to the period I have suggested for the activity of the Teacher.

One other question closely related to our subject calls for some examination. In the Zadokite Work we read of a migration of the sect to Damascus.\(^3\) It has been argued that Damascus is a symbolic name and that it really means Qumran.\(^4\) This does not

John's baptism and therefore of Christian baptism. For there is no suggestion of an initiatory rite of baptism either here or in the rules for the admission of new members. Moreover, though there is later testimony to the ritual ablutions of the Essenes, there is no reference in any ancient writer to an initiatory rite of baptism, but only to daily ablutions (cf. *New Testament Essays in memory of T. W. Manson*, pp. 218 ff.).

\(^1\) P. x, 10 f. Here again there is no suggestion of an initiatory rite.
\(^2\) Cf. above, p. 206.
\(^3\) P. vi, 5.
seem to me likely and I think those scholars who interpret it to mean the city of Damascus are right.\textsuperscript{1} This means that the migration to Damascus took place within forty years of the death of the Teacher. In the period which I have suggested for the Teacher of Righteousness, Damascus belonged to the realm of Antiochus, and it would be out of the question for those who fled from the king's persecution to expect to find refuge in Damascus. In that age, as is shown by what has been said of the son of Onias III, Egypt offered a more promising refuge than Damascus.\textsuperscript{2} But if the Teacher of Righteousness died in 171 B.C. many changes of conditions took place within the next forty years. Jewish independence was secured and Jonathan and Simon had led the Jewish nation. They had furthered their interests less by fighting than by playing the Syrian leaders off one against the other. For this was a period of constant struggle for the control of the Seleucid realm. Antiochus IV had himself not been the legitimate heir,\textsuperscript{3} and the book of Daniel tells us of three of the horns of the fourth beast falling before the Little Horn, or Antiochus.\textsuperscript{4} The Habakkuk Commentary tells us that the rulers of the Kittim were falling one before another.\textsuperscript{5} When Antiochus died, his son and successor lasted for but a short time, and was followed by his brother, Demetrius I. Then followed a confused period in which Pretenders and Upstarts, Alexander Balas and Tryphon, contended for power with members of the Seleucid line.\textsuperscript{6} The Jewish leaders sold their support first to one and then to another. There would be no difficulty in the migration of a Jewish sect to Damascus at a time when its \textit{de facto} rulers were hostile to the Jewish leaders and therefore willing to give refuge

\begin{itemize}
  \item[1] G. R. Driver (\textit{The Judaean Scrolls}, pp. 303 ff.) strongly maintains this view.
  \item[2] This consideration rules out the date suggested for the composition of CD by J. Quiring in \textit{From the Pyramids to Paul} (G. L. Robinson Festschrift), 1935, p. 199, where it is ascribed to a date shortly after 172 B.C.
  \item[3] The legitimate heir was Demetrius, who was a hostage in Rome and who afterwards became Demetrius I.
  \item[5] Col. IV, 11 f.
\end{itemize}
to a dissident group.¹ Such a sect as that of the Scrolls, passionately devoted to the true Zadokite line of High Priests, could not have been content with Jonathan or Simon, and is unlikely to have given them support. At the same time it is unlikely to have been tempted to give any support to the alien leaders. It would therefore have developed that peaceful character which it continued to have to the time of the Roman War. Here in Damascus it seems to have found a new leader who gave it the simple organization reflected in the Zadokite Work.²

We are not told why they migrated to Damascus or why they returned. But the fact that fragments of the Zadokite Work, which tells of the migration, have been found in the Qumran caves implies that they did return from Damascus and came to Qumran. It may be that some change in the situation at Damascus or in Jerusalem caused them to return. At a time when there was not tension between the Hasmonaeans and the Seleucids a body that was not politically active, but marked only by deep religious loyalty to the Law, could have returned and settled at Qumran, as well as in smaller groups throughout the country, without menace to anyone and without being interfered with by the government. In any case, the archaeological evidence clearly suggests that the sect did return from Damascus, and did settle at Qumran at some time in the period of John Hyrcanus I.

I have not referred to the view that the Teacher of Righteousness suffered persecution and martyrdom in the first century B.C. in the time of Alexander Jannaeus³ or

² P. vii, 18 f., called the Star.
³ This view was held by L. Ginzberg long before the finding of the Dead Sea Scrolls, when only the Zadokite Work was known (cf. Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte, 1922, pp. 375 ff.). Since the discovery of the Scrolls it has been put forward in a variety of different forms by many authors, including M. H. Segal, J.B.L. lxii (1951), 131 ff.; M. Delcor, Essai sur le Midrash d'Habacuc, 1951, pp. 56 ff., and R.B. lviii (1951), 538 ff.; W. H. Brownlee, B.A.S.O.R. No. 126, April 1952, 10 ff.; J. M. Allegro, The Dead Sea Scrolls, 1956, pp. 99 ff.; F. F. Bruce, Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 2nd edn. 1961, pp. 100 ff. This view was at one time held by de Vaux (cf. R.B. lvii (1950), 428 ff.), but later retracted (see below, p. 229, n. 2). It was examined and rejected by the present writer in E.Th.L. xxviii (1952), 261 ff., and B.J.R.L. xl (1957-8), 133 ff. Millar Burrows (The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 177) said: “The very existence of so many different
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later. 1 Father de Vaux says that the archaeological evidence would rule out this view, 2 though he himself does not go back so far as I do, but locates the Teacher of Righteousness in the time of Jonathan or Simon, but without suggesting any probable identification for him. Dupont-Sommer, who himself has been the doughiest champion of the view that the Teacher of Righteousness belonged to the middle of the first century B.C., and suffered martyrdom later than the time of Alexander Jannaeus, argued for the origin of the sect in the troubles of the Maccabean period, and held that the Essenes developed from the loyal Jews of that age. 3 But if the Teacher of Righteousness did not suffer martyrdom until more than a century after that time, it is hard to suppose that the sect groped in darkness for a mere twenty years before he arose to lead them. And while the 390 years of the Zadokite Work could be a schematic and unreliable figure, it is less likely that the twenty years of groping is as unreliable. The sect is likely to have been better informed of its own history, which was far more recent than the time of Nebuchadnezzar.

theories connected with Alexander Jannaeus should arouse suspicion as to the validity of any association between him and the Habakkuk Commentary. " The absence of any suggestion of an identification for the Teacher of Righteousness is a fatal weakness for this view.

1 A. Dupont-Sommer has been the proponent of the view that the Teacher of Righteousness lived in the middle of the first century B.C., and he identified the Wicked Priest with Aristobulus and Hyrcanus II, holding that the Teacher of Righteousness was martyred c. 65-63 B.C. (C.R.A.I., 1950, 196 ff.; Observations sur le Commentaire d'Habacuc, 1950, pp. 5 ff.; La Nouvelle Clio, i-ii (1949-50), 330 ff.; and many other publications). R. Goossens supported the view with the suggestion that the Teacher of Righteousness was Onias the Rainbringer (La Nouvelle Clio, i-ii (1949-50), 336 ff., and Académie Royale de Belgique: Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres, 5th ser. xxxvi (1950), 440 ff.), and this was cautiously approved by Dupont-Sommer (cf. The Dead Sea Scrolls, Eng. trans. by E. Margaret Rowley 1952, p. 36 n.). Other scholars who have followed Dupont-Sommer include H. Grégoire, La Nouvelle Clio, i-ii (1949-50), 354 ff.; M. Simon, Revue historique, cciv (1950), 218 ff. (cf. also K. Elliger, Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer, 1953, pp. 270 ff.). For a long list of critics of this view, cf. H. H. Rowley, The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls, 1952, pp. 20 f. n. The hypothesis was examined and rejected in E.Th.L., loc. cit. pp. 265 ff., and B.J.R.L. xl (1957-8), 126 ff. In The Essene Writings from Qumran Dupont-Sommer limits the identification of the Wicked Priest to Hyrcanus II (pp. 351 ff.) and offers no identification of the Teacher of Righteousness (pp. 358 ff.).

2 L'Archéologie et les manuscrits de la Mer Morte, p. 90.

3 So in The Dead Sea Scrolls, Eng. trans., pp. 85 ff.
More recently Dupont-Sommer has abandoned the view that the sect took its rise in the Maccabaean period in favour of the view that the Teacher of Righteousness began his career as leader of the sect in about 104 or 103 B.C. and led it for forty years until his martyrdom in 65-63 B.C. The twenty years of groping would then carry us back to about 125 B.C. As Dupont-Sommer also accepts the statement of Josephus that the Essenes were already in existence in 146 B.C., it is difficult to follow the supposed development. For they would already have been in existence more than twenty years before they began to grope. Moreover, the archaeological evidence places the occupation of the Qumran centre in the reign of John Hyrcanus, in what would have been the period of groping before the rise of the Teacher. Dupont-Sommer therefore, while broadly accepting the archaeological evidence, simply states that the centre was not occupied until the first century B.C., in the teeth of that evidence. Further there is no evidence for the assumed forty years of the Teacher's leadership of the sect.

Again, there is nothing in the conditions of this period to account for the teachings of the sect to which I have referred. There was no pollution of the sanctuary comparable with that to which I have referred, and no idolatry comparable with the erection of the image of Antiochus in the Temple. The opposition to marriage with a niece finds no comparable occasion to bring it to the fore, and the insistence on the strictest observance of the sabbath cannot be connected with any known discussion comparable with that of the Maccabaean age. Nor can the calendar issue be linked with any contemporary controversy such as that of which we have evidence for the second century B.C. Finally, the raising of the Zadokite issue would be somewhat belated. For if it was first raised in the time of John Hyrcanus, before the rise of the Teacher of Righteousness, or even later in the supposed time of the Teacher, by people who had accepted the high priesthood of non-Zadokite priests for the best part of a century without

1 So in *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, Eng. trans., p. 353 n.
2 Ibid. p. 41.
3 So in *The Essene Writings from Qumran*, Eng. trans., pp. 61 ff.
4 Ibid. p. 65.
protest, they must have been very slow off the mark. If the issue had been taken up by the sect when it first became a living one, as it is known to have been in the Maccabaean age, then it would naturally continue to alienate them from the worship of the Temple. There are, therefore, considerations other than the archaeological, which Father de Vaux considers alone sufficient, to render this view difficult to accept.

Similarly, I have not referred to the view that the sect of the Scrolls is to be identified with the Zealots and the Teacher of Righteousness identified with Menahem.\(^1\) This seems to be even more ruled out by the archaeological evidence.\(^2\) Moreover, Professor Driver, who has argued with great learning for this view,\(^3\) concedes that the sect took its origin from the Maccabaean troubles.\(^4\) He holds that it went into Egypt in the Maccabaean age, and did not return until around the beginning of the Christian era, when it became the sect of the Zealots. But he holds that some of the members could not abandon the pacific character they had come to have and split off from the militant group. This means that he finds a somewhat similar development of character in the sect to that which the holders of the Essene view find. But the twenty years of the groping referred to in the Zadokite Work he commences with the year A.D. 46,\(^5\) and ends with the death of Menahem, whom he identifies with the Teacher of Righteousness. Here, once more, I find it hard to think that a sect which had existed in Egypt for more than a century and a half, and which had renewed itself as a militant sect around the beginning of the Christian era, should have supposed that it was in the year A.D. 46

\(^1\) This view was advanced by H. E. del Medico, *Deux manuscrits hébreux de la Mer Morte*, 1951, and *The Riddle of the Scrolls*, Eng. trans. by H. Garner 1958. In a different form it was presented by C. Roth, *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1958, reissued with additions as *The Dead Sea Scrolls: a new historical approach*, 1965.

\(^2\) It was examined on other grounds in *Von Ugarit nach Qumran* (Eissfeldt Festschrift), 1958, pp. 184 ff., and *V.T. ix* (1959), 379 ff. (cf. the reply by C. Roth, *V.T.* x (1960), 65 ff., and the rejoinder, ibid. pp. 227 ff.).

\(^3\) *The Judaean Scrolls*, 1965. In earlier works Driver had ascribed the origin of the Scrolls to the seventh or eighth century A.D. (*Hibbert Journal*, xlx, 1950-51, 20) or to the period A.D. 200-500 (*The Hebrew Scrolls*, 1951, p. 17).

\(^4\) *The Judaean Scrolls*, pp. 228 ff.

\(^5\) Ibid. p. 315.
that it took its first rise, or should have equated the twenty years of groping before the rise of the Teacher of Righteousness with the twenty years of his leadership.¹

On every ground the view that I have presented seems to be in closer agreement with the archaeological evidence and with what we are told in the Scrolls themselves, and in the Zadokite Work. Taking its origin early in the second century B.C., and then led and taught by the legitimate Zadokite High Priest, whose deep loyalty to the Jewish faith and practice it shared, but separating itself when a priesthood it could not recognize as legitimate occupied the Temple, migrating for a time to Damascus and then returning to settle at Qumran, having first a simple organization and later a more strict rule, cherishing the memory of its first militant days and then passing through a period of pious passivity until the old militancy flared up again in the days of the Roman War, only to lead to the destruction of its centre and the decline of the sect—here we have a story which accords with the statement that the Essenes existed in the middle of the second century B.C. and which also agrees with the archaeological evidence from Qumran and with what we learn of the Essenes from the first-century writers. For its piety and its austerity of life the sect commands respect. Its undoing was the renewed militancy to which it was led when it tragically misread the signs of the times. Our debt to its library is indeed great, and the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls is one of the most remarkable of modern times. It does not bring us our first knowledge of the Teacher of Righteousness or our first knowledge of the Essenes, but it significantly adds to our knowledge of Jewish religious life in the intertestamental period, and sheds welcome additional light on the background of the New Testament.

¹ Menahem is said to have commenced his leadership in A.D. 46, but to have gone into hiding and left the sect to all intents leaderless for twenty years, but to have emerged to become the real leader in the year of his death, A.D. 66. The composition of the Manual of Discipline is ascribed to the period of the groping (p. 599), though the strict rules of the Manual do not suggest this in any way. For a long and critical review of Professor Driver's book, particularly from the archaeological point of view, cf. R. de Vaux, New Blackfriars, xliv (1966), 396-410. An even longer review by the same scholar has appeared in the R.B. lxiii (1966), pp. 212-35.