

THE TEACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS AND THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS¹

By H. H. ROWLEY, M.A., B.LITT., D.D., THEOL.D., F.B.A.

PROFESSOR OF HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN THE UNIVERSITY
OF MANCHESTER

NEARLY fifty years ago Solomon Schechter published some fragments of a work which had been found in the famous Cairo Genizah.² These fragments were of two manuscripts of different dates, the one being commonly dated in the tenth century A.D., and the other in the eleventh or twelfth century. In part they duplicated one another, though there are variations in the text. Schechter called them *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, because they emanated from people who called themselves the Sons of Zadok.³ They contain references to a migration to Damascus of the sect from which the work came, and to a covenant entered into by members of the sect, who are therefore sometimes called the Covenanters of Damascus, and in continental works the fragments are usually called the *Damaskusschrift*. The work itself falls into two clearly defined parts, described by

¹ A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 13th February 1957. The following abbreviations are used in the notes below : *B.A.* = *The Biblical Archaeologist* ; *B.J.R.L.* = *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* ; *C.R.A.I.* = *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres* ; *E.Th.L.* = *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* ; *H.T.R.* = *Harvard Theological Review* ; *I.L.N.* = *Illustrated London News* ; *J.B.L.* = *Journal of Biblical Literature* ; *J.J.S.* = *Journal of Jewish Studies* ; *J.Q.R.* = *Jewish Quarterly Review* ; *J.T.S.* = *Journal of Theological Studies* ; *N.R.Th.* = *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* ; *N.T.S.* = *New Testament Studies* ; *P.E.Q.* = *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* ; *R.B.* = *Revue Biblique* ; *R.H.R.* = *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* ; *Th.L.Z.* = *Theologische Literaturzeitung* ; *T.T.* = *Theologisch Tijdschrift* ; *V.D.* = *Verbum Domini* ; *V.T.* = *Vetus Testamentum* ; *Z.R.G.G.* = *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte*. The literature on the Scrolls is so enormous that any full reference to the discussions on the various points is impossible. I have therefore kept the notes to the minimum, and apologize to the host of unmentioned scholars who could be cited for or against the views I have discussed.

² *Documents of Jewish Sectaries, I: Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (1910).

³ Cf. vi. 2 (p. III, lines 4 f.) : " the sons of Zadok are the elect of Israel, called by name, who shall arise at the end of the days ".

Dr. Rabin in his recent excellent edition of the fragments¹ as "The Admonition" and "The Laws". It therefore bore some resemblance in structure to the book of Deuteronomy, which contains a long historical survey expressed in terms of exhortation, followed by a code of laws.

This hitherto unknown work attracted much attention from scholars, who soon differed widely as to the date of the composition of the work and the particular group from which it came.² By most writers it was believed that the medieval manuscripts were copies of a much older work, and by some its composition was ascribed to the second century B.C.³ Writing in 1944, long before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, I expressed the view that its composition fell within the century and a half before the Christian era.⁴

The Zadokite Work tells us that God visited His people some 390 years after He had given them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, and caused a root to issue from Israel and Aaron.⁵ This root was the sect from which the Zadokite Work came. We read that after the sect had groped like blind men for twenty years God raised up for them a Teacher of Righteousness.⁶ It might seem at first sight that here we have a definite date, and some scholars accepted this as reliable evidence. They therefore dated the beginning of the sect in 196 B.C., and the rise of the Teacher of

¹ *The Zadokite Documents* (1954).

² Dates ranging from the second century B.C. to the eleventh century A.D. were proposed. For references to the advocates of the various dates cf. my *Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (1952), pp. 1 f. The sect from which the work came was variously identified with the Pharisees, the Zealots, the Dositheans, the Sadducees, the followers of John the Baptist, and the Karaites, while the affinities with the Essenes were also noted. For references to the relevant literature, cf. *ibid.* pp. 79 n., 56 n., 2 n., 46 n.

³ So E. Meyer, *Die Gemeinde des Neuen Bundes im Lande Damaskus* (1919), and *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, 4th edn. ii (1925), 47 ff.; H. Gressmann, in Bousset-Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums in späthellenistischem Zeitalter*, 3rd edn. (1926), p. 15; W. E. Barnes, *J.T.S.* xii (1910-11), 301 ff.; G. F. Moore, *H.T.R.* iv (1911), 330 ff.; B. D. Erdmans, *T.T.* xlv (1911), 282 ff.

⁴ Cf. *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* (1944), p. 72 (2nd edn. (1911), p. 74).

⁵ i. 5 (p. i, lines 5 ff.). I. Rabinowitz, *J.B.L.* lxxiii (1954), 11 ff., has advanced the view that the reference is to a period of 390 years before Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of Jerusalem. In a forthcoming paper in the volume in memory of A. Robert I examine this question and offer reasons for rejecting this view.

⁶ i. 6 f. (p. i, lines 9 ff.).

Righteousness in 176 B.C.¹ This, however, is much too simple. All our ancient Jewish sources are defective in their knowledge of the chronology of the post-exilic period,² and we cannot assume that here we have a reliable figure. If it should prove to be approximately accurate, it is more likely that this is an accident than that it rests on precise calculation.³ The 390 years should therefore be left out of account in any discussion of the date of the Teacher of Righteousness. On the other hand, the twenty years of groping is probably a reliable approximation, since the sect might be expected to know its own history, and since there is evidence that the Zadokite Work comes from a date within forty years of the death of the Teacher of Righteousness.

When the Dead Sea Scrolls were found in 1947, and came to the knowledge of scholars in 1948, attention was quickly drawn to the fact that the Teacher of Righteousness figures here also. In the Habakkuk Commentary, which was the first of the Scrolls to be published in full, there are several references to him and his enemies, and the view immediately gained ground that the Scrolls and the Zadokite Work emanated from one and the same sect. It may be added that some fragments of the Zadokite Work have now been found amongst the Qumran manuscripts,⁴ and it is certain, therefore, that this work was known to, and treasured by, the Qumran community. Since these new fragments are many centuries older than those found in Cairo, the view that those medieval fragments were copies of a much older work has found confirmation.

Much controversy raged at first about the problems of dating raised by the Scrolls, and there was the widest possible range of opinion, some scholars dating the placing of the Scrolls in the cave—only one cave was in question at first—in the beginning of

¹ Cf. Meyer, *Die Gemeinde des Neuen Bundes*, pp. 13 f.; R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, ii (1913), 792, 800.

² Cf. my *Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 62, 64, and G. Vermès, *Les manuscrits du Désert de Juda* (1953), p. 76 (Eng. trans. (1956), p. 72).

³ J. Teicher, *J.J.S.* iv, No. 2 (1953), 51, accuses me of wanting to eat my cake and have it because I find that it is approximately correct. I make it clear, however, that any approximation to accuracy which it may have is quite accidental, and I do not base myself on this figure in reaching my conclusions.

⁴ Some of these fragments have been published by M. Baillet in *R.B.* lxxiii (1956), 513 ff.

the first century B.C.,¹ while others dated the composition of some of the works here preserved as late as the Middle Ages.² We have to remember that there is no reason to suppose that the manuscripts which have now come to light were the original autographs of their authors, and hence several different dates must be borne in mind. There is the date of the life and work of the Teacher of Righteousness, the date of the composition of the works which refer to him, the date of the making of the particular copies that have been found, and the date of the deposit of these manuscripts in the caves.

So far as the last of these dates is concerned, there is now full assurance. All the manuscripts which come from the sect which was led by the Teacher of Righteousness were found in the neighbourhood of Qumran. In other areas some distance away, at Murabba'at and El Mird, other finds have been made, but there is nothing to connect any of these with the sect from which the Zadokite Work or the sectarian documents of Qumran came. The manuscripts which first came to light were sold in Jerusalem by dealers, who said they had come from one of the Qumran caves, where they had been stored in jars, and two jars were sold to Professor Sukenik, of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. These jars were declared by the experts to be unique.³ When the cave was later examined by archaeologists of international repute, they found some fragments of manuscripts buried beneath accumulations of dust and dirt which had long been undisturbed. Some of the fragments were of the same manuscripts that had been sold by the dealers. Moreover, they found fragments of jars which, when reconstructed, proved to be similar to those bought by Dr. Sukenik. There could therefore be no reasonable doubt that the manuscripts and the jars had indeed come from the cave.

¹ Cf. R. de Vaux, *R.B.* lvi (1949), 234, 586 ff. ; O. R. Sellers, *B.A.* xii (1949), 8 ; G. Lankester Harding, *I.L.N.*, 1 October (1949), p. 493.

² Cf. S. Zeitlin, *J.Q.R.*, xxxix (1948-49), 235 ff., 337 ff., xl (1949-50), 57 ff., 291 ff., 373 ff., xli (1950-51), 1 ff., 251 ff., 449, and *Crozer Quarterly*, xxvi (1950), 35 ff. ; P. R. Weis, *J.Q.R.*, xli (1950-51), 125 ff.

³ Cf. de Vaux, *R.B.* lvi (1949), 587 ff. Cf. Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, Eng. trans. p. 15 (French text, p. 21) : "The shape of the jars is without parallel among the Hellenistic types previously known."

Soon the archaeologists excavated a nearby ruined site, and found buried deep in the ruins a jar similar to those which had come from the cave, and a room in which were tables and inkpots, still containing the remains of dried ink.¹ There could now be no possible doubt that the manuscripts had come from the people who used the building, which must have been a centre for the people of the sect. It is not correctly described as a monastery, though the term is often used for convenience. It was certainly the centre for the Qumran community, and it has yielded clear evidence as to the date when the sect ceased to use it. For it contains a large number of coins, ranging in date from the end of the second century B.C. to the year A.D. 68. Then the building was laid in ruins. But part of it was quickly rebuilt on a different plan and occupied. Here Roman coins covering a few years after A.D. 68 were found, and it is believed that the occupiers were now Roman soldiers.² It is therefore confidently believed that the sect of the Scrolls vanished from Qumran in A.D. 68, and hence that all the manuscripts must have been deposited in the caves by that date.³

This means that the various processes I have outlined must have reached their final termination by A.D. 68. Some of the manuscripts had been long in use before they were placed in the caves and abandoned. We are therefore carried back far before A.D. 68 for the copying of these manuscripts. We must then go back before that for the time of the composition of the sectarian texts, while the time of the life and work of the Teacher of Righteousness lies beyond that again. It is therefore as sure as anything can yet be that the Teacher of Righteousness lived before the beginning of the Christian era. Accordingly, of the many attempts to place him in a historical setting we may leave out of account all which date him later than this. We are still

¹ Cf. R. de Vaux, *C.R.A.I.* (1952), pp. 173 ff., and *R.B.* lxi (1954), 206 ff., lxiii (1956), 533 ff.; G. Lankester Harding, *I.L.N.*, 3 September (1955), p. 379.

² Cf. *R.B.* lxiii (1956), 565 ff.

³ Cf. de Vaux, *ibid.* p. 567: "La plupart de ces monnaies (of the level before the destruction) sont de la II^e année de la Révolte mais, dans chaque groupe, deux monnaies sont de la III^e année. Celle-ci a commencé au printemps de 68 ap. J.-C. Or nous avons conclu des données de Josèphe que Khirbet Qumran avait été pris par les Romains en juin 68: on ne peut souhaiter un meilleur accord de l'archéologie avec l'histoire."

left with three principal views. One locates him in the time of the struggle against Antiochus Epiphanes in the early part of the second century B.C.; a second locates him in the time of Alexander Jannaeus about a century later; a third locates him a little later, and places his death in the time of Aristobulus and Hyrcanus II, towards the middle of the first century B.C. Before we turn to examine these three views, we may see briefly what we are told in the texts about the Teacher of Righteousness and his times.

In the Zadokite Work we read that the Teacher was raised up to lead the sect and "to make known to the last generations what He (i.e. God) would do¹ to the last generation, the congregation of the evildoers".² It would therefore appear that the sect believed that it had come into existence at the climax of the ages. This is borne out by what we find elsewhere in this work, where it is said that the Sons of Zadok are "the elect of Israel . . . who shall arise at the end of the days".³ We learn little about the Teacher of Righteousness, save that he gave true teaching, and none of the details of his life are recorded. That he had died when the Zadokite Work was composed is clear, since there is a reference to the period from the day when the Teacher was gathered in until a Messiah should arise from Aaron and Israel.⁴ He is not called the Teacher of Righteousness here, but the Unique Teacher, which may be a scribal error for the Teacher of the Community.⁵ Some scholars think the expression "the

¹ The manuscript has "had done", but C. Rabin, *op. cit.* p. 5, conjectures that a letter has fallen out, and renders as above. So also A. Dupont-Sommer, *Evidences*, No. 59 (August-September 1956), p. 17.

² i. 8 (p. i, lines 11 f.).

³ vi. 2 (p. iii, lines 4 f.).

⁴ ix. 29 B (pp. xix, line 35, xx, line 1).

⁵ So S. M. Stern, *J.B.L.* lxxix (1950), 24; L. Rost, *Th.L.Z.* lxxviii (1953), 144; G. Molin, *Die Söhne des Lichtes* (1954), p. 57. Rabin, *op. cit.* p. 37, while recognizing this possibility, is cautious, and uncertain whether the Unique Teacher is the Teacher of Righteousness or another. T. H. Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures* (1956), pp. 72, 103, renders "the teacher of the community" but holds that he is distinct from the Teacher of Righteousness and a future prophetic teacher. L. Rost, *loc. cit.* cols. 143 ff., also differentiates the two teachers. R. H. Charles, *op. cit.* pp. 800 f. identifies the Unique Teacher with the Teacher of Righteousness, and so Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (1950), p. 78 (Eng. trans. by E. M. Rowley (1952), p. 63), and this view seems to me the more probable.

Messiah . . . from Aaron and Israel ” should be corrected to “ the Messiahs . . . ”, since we find the plural elsewhere.¹ This need not detain us here, especially since it is conjectural. More relevant to our purpose is it to note that in another passage we read that a period of forty years should elapse between the death of the Unique Teacher until all the men of war who returned with the Man of the Lie should be consumed.² It is therefore clear that the Zadokite Work was composed at some time during that forty years.

We are given little information about the Man of the Lie. Dr. Rabin notes that a comparable term in Arabic stands for Antichrist, and thinks the “ Man of Sin ” in 2 Thess. ii. 3 is a Greek rendering of the same term.³ The Man of the Lie in the Zadokite Work is a military figure, since he is accompanied by men of war. Elsewhere we meet the “ Man of Scorn ”,⁴ who “ caused the waters of untruth to drip to Israel ”,⁵ and a “ dripper of untruth ”,⁶ by which expression a false prophet may be meant. For the verb “ to drip ” is used in the Old Testament of prophesying. Amongst the enemies of the sect we find also reference to those who “ dripped lies ”.⁷

In one passage there is mention of the kings of the nations, and of the chief of the kings of Greece, who came to wreak vengeance upon those who rebelled.⁸ All this offers us very meagre information about the Teacher of Righteousness and his

¹ So J. T. Milik, *V.D.* xxix (1951), 152. The plural is found in the *Manual of Discipline*, col. IX, line 11, and this is commonly understood to mean the Messiah of Israel and the Messiah of Aaron, or the lay and priestly Messiahs (so G. Vermès, *Les manuscrits du désert de Juda* (1953), p. 118 (Eng. trans. (1956), p. 116); M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (1955), pp. 264 f.; T. H. Gaster, *op. cit.* p. 58; cf. Dupont-Sommer, *Nouveaux aperçus sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (1953), pp. 80 f.n. (Eng. trans. by R. D. Barnett (1954), p. 54 n.). W. S. la Sor, *V.T.* vi (1956), 425 ff. combats this view and holds that it means “ the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel ” where “ anointed ones ” is deliberately spelled without capital letters.

² ix. 39 B (col. XX, lines 14 f.).

³ *Op. cit.* p. 40.

⁴ i. 10 (p. i, line 14); in ix. 36 B (p. xx, line 11) the plural of this expression is found.

⁵ i. 10 (p. i, lines 14 f.).

⁶ ix. 22 A (p. viii, line 13).

⁷ viii. 1 (p. vi, line 1).

⁸ ix. 20 (pp. viii, lines 10 f., xix, lines 23 f.).

times. We are given no indication of the length of his leadership of the sect.¹

We may now turn to the Habakkuk Commentary found amongst the Dead Sea Scrolls, to see what more we can glean about this Teacher. Here the text “the wicked man encompasses the righteous” is followed by the comment that the righteous man is the Teacher of Righteousness.² Some words at the beginning of this comment are lost, and it is probable that they said that the wicked man is the Wicked Priest, to whom frequent reference is made elsewhere. From other references it is clear that he was a contemporary of the Teacher of Righteousness. We then read of those who acted treacherously with the Man of the Lie, and did not [. . .] the Teacher of Righteousness.³ The Man of the Lie figures again in the commentary later,⁴ where the House of Absalom is condemned because they kept silence when the Teacher of Righteousness was persecuted, and did not help him against the Man of the Lie.

Amongst the passages which refer to the conflict between the Wicked Priest and the Teacher of Righteousness there is one obscure and much disputed text which speaks of the persecution of the Teacher by the Wicked Priest,⁵ and of the retribution which came upon the Wicked Priest for the wrong done to the Teacher and his followers.⁶ God is said to have delivered the Priest into the hand of his enemies, afflicting him with a destroying scourge.⁷

Elsewhere we read that the Wicked Priest was “named according to the truth” when he first took office,⁸ but later

¹ Dupont-Sommer, *Evidences*, No. 59 (August-September 1956), p. 24, attributes to him a leadership of forty years. This is to make the total period from the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar to the coming of the Messiah tally with the four hundred and ninety years of Daniel—made up of the 390 years before the origin of the sect, *plus* the twenty years before the rise of the Teacher, *plus* these forty years of the leadership of the Teacher, *plus* the forty years after his death. This is very ingenious, but hardly convincing, since there is no reference to this period of 490 years anywhere in the literature of the sect, and no reference to the forty years of the Teacher’s leadership. A deduction based on an assumption is hardly securely based. ² Col. I, lines 12 f.

³ Col. II, lines 1f. There is a gap in the text, which I have not attempted to fill, since we have no means of knowing what it was. ⁴ Col. V, line 11.

⁵ Col. XI, lines 4 f.

⁶ Col. XII, lines 2 f.

⁷ Col. IX, lines 9 ff.

⁸ Col. VIII lines, 8 f.

forsook God and plundered for his own enrichment, taking also "the wealth of the peoples".¹ This is then caught up into a wider reference to "the last priests of Jerusalem" who "gathered wealth from the spoil of the peoples", but whose wealth should be given at the end of the days to the army of the Kittim.² There is also an allusion to the Priest as one who walked in the ways of drunkenness,³ and who wrought abominable works and defiled the sanctuary.⁴ In one passage there is mention of the "dripper of untruth",⁵ where the phrase is closely similar to that in the Zadokite Work, and this may once more indicate a false prophet.

In all this little is told us about the Teacher of Righteousness, with whom we are here principally concerned. These other figures are relevant to our inquiry only in so far as they may help us to discover the age in which the Teacher lived. Of the life and work of the Teacher, we know little save that he gave true and authoritative interpretation of the law to his followers and that he was opposed and persecuted by the Wicked Priest. Whether he was mortally persecuted depends on the interpretation of a doubtful passage, to which we shall return. One statement of the Habakkuk Commentary implies that he was a priest. This refers to those who do not believe the words of the priest, who by divine illumination interpreted the words of the prophets.⁶ The priest is not here called the Teacher of Righteousness, but it is virtually certain that he is to be identified with him.⁷ His function, like that of the Teacher of Righteousness, is to give true teaching, and since the Teacher figures so much in the rest of the Habakkuk Commentary it is likely that he, and not another interpreter of the Bible, is intended here. Moreover, while in this passage those who do not believe the priest are condemned, further on in the commentary we are told that those who are faithful to the Teacher of Righteousness should be saved.⁸

¹ Col. VIII, line 12.

³ Col. XI, lines 13 f.

⁵ Col. X, line 9.

² Col. IX, lines 5 ff.

⁴ Col. XII, lines 8 f.

⁶ Col. II, lines 6 ff.

⁷ In a fragment of a commentary on Psalm xxxvii, published by J. M. Allegro in *P.E.Q.* lxxxvi (1954), 69 ff., we find a reference to "the Priest, the Teacher of Ri[ghteousness]" (col. II, line 15).

⁸ Col. VIII, lines 2 f.

In the Habakkuk Commentary there are many references to the Kittim, and since these are of importance for the determination of the historical situation, we must traverse them here. They are said to be swift and powerful in battle,¹ dreaded of the nations they plundered,² cunning and deceitful,³ and without belief in the ordinances of [God].⁴ They come from afar, from the isles or coastlands,⁵ they despise fortresses,⁶ and their rulers come one after another to destroy the earth.⁷ Again we are told that they gather wealth and booty like the fish of the sea,⁸ and they sacrifice to their standards and worship their weapons.⁹ They are cruel and heartless, having no mercy on children.¹⁰ I have already noted that they are brought into association with the Wicked Priest, or with the last priests of Jerusalem, in that it is said that all the ill-gotten gains of the priests shall be handed over to them.¹¹

It is hard to escape the conclusion that the Kittim were active in Palestine in the days of the Teacher of Righteousness. They come into relation with the Wicked Priest, who was contemporary with the Teacher of Righteousness, and their intense cruelty does not seem to be something known to the writer by hearsay from abroad, but something which he had witnessed, and something that touched the sect as vitally as the treatment meted out to the Teacher of Righteousness. The Wicked Priest and the Kittim are alike the enemies and the persecutors of the sect, the one being the implacable foe of the Teacher of Righteousness, and the others the cruel tormentors of the members of the sect and their sympathisers. Yet the Wicked Priest is destined to be the victim of the Kittim. At one point of his career he was their tool; in the end all his ill-gotten wealth was destined to be poured into their lap.

In the Battle Scroll we find some further references to the Kittim. Here the Kittim of Assyria are linked with the troops of Edom, Moab, Ammon and Philistia¹² against the sons of Levi,

¹ Col. II, lines 12 f.

³ Col. III, lines 5 f.

⁵ Col. III, lines 10 f.

⁷ Col. IV, lines 12 f.

⁹ Col. VI, lines 3 f.

¹¹ Col. IX, lines 4 ff.

² Col. III, lines 4 f.

⁴ Col. II, lines 14 f.

⁶ Col. IV, lines 5 f.

⁸ Col. VI, lines 1 f.

¹⁰ Col. VI, lines 10 f.

¹² Col. I, lines 1 f.

Judah and Benjamin.¹ We learn of the Kittim in Egypt marching forth to fight against the kings of the north,² while elsewhere we find a reference to the king of the Kittim.³

In all this it is tantalizing to find no identifiable names of individuals. The house of Absalom might seem to offer us a personal name, though this is by no means sure. Some are of the opinion that it is an opprobrious term for someone who ignored the ties of natural kinship in an act which to the sect was as treacherous as Absalom's rebellion against his father. Even the term Kittim, as will be seen, is not of clearly defined significance. It is therefore both surprising and welcome that one of the latest texts to be published, a fragment of a Nahum Commentary,⁴ contains for the first time the actual names of historical characters. Here we meet a king of Greece, who sought to enter Jerusalem by the help of the seekers after smooth things.⁵ The name of the king is partly lost, but the termination survives and makes it almost certain that it must have been Demetrius. In the next line we find a reference to the kings of Greece from Antiochus to the rise of the rulers of the Kittim.⁶ Then we learn of one called the Young Lion of Wrath, who smites men down, and who is associated with the Seekers after Smooth things and hangs men alive.⁷ There is a reference to the wealth which the (priests) of Jerusalem amassed,⁸ and which is described as the prey of someone, apparently of the Young Lion of Wrath, though a short break in the text makes this uncertain.⁹ It is probable that the hanging alive means crucifixion, and while this is not absolutely certain I shall accept it here.¹⁰ It will be noted that I

¹ Col. I, line 2.

² Col. I, lines 3 f. The text is incomplete here, and Dupont-Sommer thinks it originally stated that *the king of the Kittim in Egypt would march against the kings of the north*. Cf. *Evidences*, No. 62 (January-February 1957), p. 35.

³ Col. XV, line 2.

⁴ Published by J. M. Allegro, *J.B.L.* lxxv (1956), 89 ff.

⁵ Line 2.

⁶ Line 3.

⁷ Lines 5 ff.

⁸ Line 11.

⁹ In line 6 the comment on "he filled with prey" says that this concerns "the Young Lion of Wrath". When therefore line 11 interprets the word "prey" to mean the wealth of the (priests) of Jerusalem, it would seem that this wealth is to be seized by the Young Lion of Wrath.

¹⁰ In *J.B.L.* lxxv (1956), 190 f., I argued that while it is not certain that the expression "hanged alive" means "crucified", it is probably that it has this

have not referred to the Teacher of Righteousness in connection with this text. That is for the simple and sufficient reason that he is not mentioned in it.

Some fragments of a Commentary on Psalm xxxvii contain references to a wicked person, who seems to have been the Wicked Priest, though again the text is broken, and only the final letter of the word for priest survives.¹ Apparently he is promised that he shall be delivered into the hands of the terrible ones of the Gentiles.² Elsewhere in this commentary there is mention of the wicked ones of Ephraim and Manasseh, who should put forth a hand against the priest and his associates.³ Here the latter are promised deliverance, after which their adversaries shall be given into the hands of the terrible ones of the Gentiles for judgement.⁴ The priest and his associates must here be the members of the sect of the Scrolls, though whether the priest is the Teacher of Righteousness cannot be known with certainty. It is rendered highly probable by a passage in another fragment of the same Commentary.⁵

Here, it would seem, is meagre material from which to reconstruct the life of the Teacher of Righteousness or to identify his age. A few things, however, are clear. He lived at a time of deep inner cleavage amongst the Jews, when one party made itself the ally and tool of a foreign power, and when that foreign power was active in Palestine and cruelly tormenting members of the sect and

meaning. N. Wieder, *J.J.S.* vii (1956), 71 f., says there is no ground for my caution, since he has found a passage in *Sifre* where it clearly means "crucify". I recognized that the verb *tālāh* alone may mean "crucify", but does not necessarily have this meaning. The Oxford Hebrew Lexicon recognizes the meaning in Biblical Hebrew "put to death by hanging", where there is no reason to think of crucifixion. Anyone who is put to death by hanging is hanged alive, whether he be crucified or not, and the addition of the word "alive" cannot therefore *prove* that crucifixion is intended. As I have not disputed that the meaning here may be "crucified", and that this is the probable meaning, my caution was not dictated by desire to evade this meaning, but simply by the desire to avoid claiming greater certainty for it than it has.

¹ This fragment has been published by J. M. Allegro, *J.B.L.*, loc. cit. p. 94. Cf. line 2 of this fragment.

² Lines 3 f.

³ In another fragment, published by Allegro, *ibid.* pp. 94 f. Cf. lines 3 f.

⁴ Line 5.

⁵ Published by J. M. Allegro, *P.E.Q.* lxxxvi (1954), 69 ff. Cf. col. II, line 15: "the Priest, the Teacher of Ri[ghteousness]".

those who were associated with them. Since it is certain, as I have already said, that the Teacher of Righteousness lived before the beginning of the Christian era, the choice of possible times is limited, and we may examine in turn the three principal views which have been put forward. Of the views which place the Teacher of Righteousness in post-Christian times nothing will be said here, since they seem to be definitely excluded by the evidence which is now available. At an earlier stage in the discussion of the Scrolls it was right for any hypothesis to be advanced which appeared consistent with what was then known, and the scholars who advanced views which are today seen to be untenable in the light of what we now know rendered a real service in guarding against the too ready acceptance of views without critical examination. The fact that the archaeological evidence now available puts some of these views definitely out of court is no reflection on the scholars who propounded them; on the other hand there is little point in examining them here, since the *terminus ante quem* for the deposit of the manuscripts in the caves is A.D. 68, and the period of the Teacher of Righteousness must be at least a century earlier.

Professor Dupont-Sommer has argued for the view that the Teacher of Righteousness lived in the middle of the first century B.C.¹ As he is the most powerful of the advocates for this view, it may suffice to examine his arguments. The Wicked Priest is identified with Aristobulus and Hyrcanus II.² Here it is fair to remember that some passages refer to the "last priests of Jerusalem". It is, nevertheless, a little surprising if the term "the Wicked Priest" is used alternately of two different people. The passages referring to the punishment suffered by the Wicked Priest are interpreted of Aristobulus,³ who died in prison of poison at the hands of Pompey's supporters.⁴

On this view the Teacher of Righteousness is held to have been martyred about 65-63 B.C.⁵ In the latter year Pompey

¹ Cf. *Observations sur le "Commentaire d'Habacuc" découvert près de la Mer Morte* (1950); *Aperçus préliminaires* (1950); *Nouveaux aperçus* (1953); and many articles. Cf. also K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer* (1953).

² Cf. *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 52 (Eng. trans., p. 40).

³ Cf. *Aperçus préliminaires*, pp. 46 f. (Eng. trans., p. 36 f.).

⁴ Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* xiv, vii. 4 (xiv. 124).

⁵ Dupont-Sommer earlier gave the date as between 67 and 63 B.C. Cf.

captured Jerusalem, and Dupont-Sommer interprets the obscure passage in the Habakkuk Commentary,¹ to which reference has already been made, to say that the martyred Teacher reappeared in the Temple on the Day of Atonement, when the city was captured.² The interpretation is very hazardous, and few other scholars can be found to accept this view of the passage.³ They find no reference to any reappearance of the Teacher, or to the capture of the city. By most it is believed that the text refers to the Wicked Priest's appearance in the Temple. Moreover, it is much disputed whether Pompey captured the city on the Day of Atonement, and those who have examined this question stand firmly against Dupont-Sommer.⁴

According to this theory the Kittim are to be identified with the Romans in the Habakkuk Commentary. But, be it observed, the Romans were not in Palestine during the ministry of the Teacher of Righteousness on this view. Nor is there the slightest evidence that Pompey harassed the religious enemies of Aristobulus and Hyrcanus.⁵ Although Pompey entered the Temple, our ancient authorities state specifically that he did not touch the Temple treasures.⁶ To the identification of the Kittim with the Romans we shall have to return. Here we may observe that Dupont-Sommer identified the Kittim of the Battle Scroll with the Seleucids and the Ptolemies.⁷ He held that the sect

Aperçus préliminaires, p. 47 (Eng. trans., p. 35). More recently he has modified it slightly to "vers 65-63". Cf. *Evidences*, No. 59 (August-September 1956), p. 16.

¹ Col. XI, lines 4 ff.

² Cf. *Aperçus préliminaires*, pp. 38 f. (Eng. trans., pp. 27 f.).

³ Cf. M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 153 ff.

⁴ Cf. P. R. Weis, *J.Q.R.*, xli (1950-51), 151 ff.; S. Zeitlin, *ibid.* pp. 153, 264; R. de Vaux, *La Vie Intellectuelle*, (April 1951), pp. 64 f.; M. B. Dagut, *Biblica*, xxxii (1951), 542 ff.; D. L. Drew, *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Fouad I University*, xiii, (May 1951), 93 ff.

⁵ Josephus records that 12,000 Jews were slain in the attack on Jerusalem, and that most of these were priests, the majority of them being slain by the opposite faction of the Jews (cf. *B.J.* i, vii. 5 (i. 150 f.), *Antiq.* xiv, iv. 4 (xiv. 69 f.)), but there is no reason to connect any of them with the sect of the Scrolls, who on Dupont-Sommer's hypothesis did not belong to the faction of either Aristobulus or Hyrcanus.

⁶ Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* xiv, iv. 4 (xiv. 72), *B.J.* i, vii. 6 (i. 152 f.); Cicero, *Pro Flacco*, xxviii. 67.

⁷ Cf. *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 98 (Eng. trans., pp. 79 f.).

came into existence in the Maccabaeian period, and that the Battle Scroll reflected the situation of that time.¹ This was because of the references to the Kittim of Assyria and the Kittim in Egypt, who marched against the kings of the north. We are familiar with the expression 'the king of the north' in the book of Daniel to signify the Seleucid king of Syria.² More recently, however, Dupont-Sommer has withdrawn this identification.³ When one of his critics objected that it was preferable to give the same interpretation to the term Kittim in the Battle Scroll and the Habakkuk Commentary, Dupont-Sommer rejected the objection as without weight.⁴ But when Dr. Yadin suggested that the Kittim of the Battle Scroll might also be the Romans,⁵ Dupont-Sommer pointed out that this made it possible to give the same interpretation to the term in the Battle Scroll and the Habakkuk Commentary, and that it would be an advantage to have a common interpretation.⁶ It may be said at once that if a common interpretation is given it cannot be the Roman. For in the Battle Scroll there is mention of the king of the Kittim.⁷ There was no king of the Romans in Republican times, and even in imperial times the Caesars did not use the term king. It is curious to note that Dupont-Sommer argued that the Kittim of the Habakkuk Commentary could not be the Greeks, but must be the Romans, since their rulers are not called kings there,⁸ but must be the Roman military commanders, who arose one after the other,⁹ yet now wishes to say that the Kittim of the Battle Scroll could be the Romans, though their head is here given the impossible title of king.

If the sect came into existence in the Maccabaeian period, we are faced with the statement of the Zadokite Work that after

¹ Ibid. p. 112 (Eng. trans., p. 91). ² Dan. xi.

³ Cf. *R.H.R.* cxlviii (1955), 42 f.; *Evidences*, No. 62 (January-February 1957), pp. 33 f.

⁴ Cf. I. Rabinowitz, *V.T.* iii (1953), 181 and Dupont-Sommer, *Semitica* v, (1955), 53.

⁵ Cf. *Ha-aretz*, 23 July, 1955, cited by Dupont-Sommer, *R.H.R.*, loc. cit. (I have not had access to this article.)

⁶ *R.H.R.* loc. cit. ⁷ Col. XV, line 2.

⁸ Cf. *Nouveaux aperçus*, pp. 38 f. (Eng. trans., p. 19).

⁹ Cf. *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 41 n. (Eng. trans., p. 30 n.); *Nouveaux aperçus*, pp. 38 f. (Eng. trans., pp. 18 f.).

twenty years of groping the Teacher of Righteousness arose to lead the sect. To place his martyrdom about a century later than this would be to credit him with an unduly long ministry. Dupont-Sommer has now moved from this position, however, and holds that the leadership of the Teacher of Righteousness, which came to an end *circa* 65-63 B.C., had lasted for about forty years.¹ If the twenty years of groping, which preceded the rise of the Teacher of Righteousness, is allowed for, the sect would have had its first beginning about 130 B.C. Yet Dupont-Sommer accepts the statement of Josephus,² that already in 146 B.C. the sect of the Essenes was in existence.³ The archaeological evidence suggests that the Qumran centre was established during the reign of John Hyrcanus,⁴ and Dupont-Sommer appears to accept this view.⁵ In that case it must have been established at the very beginning of the leadership of the Teacher of Righteousness, if not already before. It is highly improbable that during the period of groping in darkness, the sect was organized in the Qumran centre, and, as I shall show in a subsequent paper, it is unlikely that one of the first things the Teacher of Righteousness did was to found this centre.

Professor Goossens came to the support of Dupont-Sommer with the suggestion that the Teacher of Righteousness was Onias the Rain-bringer.⁶ In later Jewish sources this Onias is credited with the power to work miracles, but we have no evidence that he was the organizer of a sect. When Hyrcanus and Aristobulus were fighting one another, Onias was brought to the camp of Hyrcanus, and because he was unwilling to curse those on the other side, he was done to death by the soldiers of Hyrcanus.⁷ If these were really the circumstances of the death of the Teacher of Righteousness, it is hard to see why the punishment for the

¹ Cf. *Evidences*, No. 59 (August-September 1956), p. 24.

² Cf. *Antiq.* XIII. v. 9 (xiii. 171).

³ Cf. *Evidences*, No. 56 (April 1956), p. 12.

⁴ Cf. R. de Vaux, *R.B.* lxiii (1956), 566, 569; M. Burrows, *op. cit.* p. 65.

⁵ Cf. *Evidences*, No. 59, August-September (1956), p. 16; also *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes*, Eng. trans. by R. D. Barnett, p. 169.

⁶ Cf. *La Nouvelle Clio*, i-ii (1949-50), 336 ff.; *Académie Royale de Belge: Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres*, 5th ser. xxxvi (1950), 440 ff. This view was approved by Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 47 n. (Eng. trans., p. 36 n.).

⁷ Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* XIV, ii. 1 (xiv. 22 ff.).

crime of Hyrcanus should fall on his enemy Aristobulus. Of the miracles with which Onias was credited none is referred to in any of the Dead Sea Scrolls. There is little point of contact between what we learn of the Teacher of Righteousness from the literature of the Qumran sect and what is recorded of this Onias in rabbinical sources. Dupont-Sommer links the reference to the House of Absalom with Absalom, the uncle of Aristobulus ;¹ but we are offered no reason why he should be blamed for not coming to the help of the Teacher of Righteousness.

It will be clear that the reasons for assigning the death of the Teacher of Righteousness to the time just before Pompey's capture of Jerusalem are of the slightest, and more is left without explanation than is explained. The strongest part of Dupont-Sommer's argument, however, lies in his identification of the Kittim with the Romans. That identification I have recently examined elsewhere, and I can only summarize the evidence here.²

It is beyond dispute that of itself the term Kittim could mean either the Romans or the Greeks.³ In Daniel it certainly means the Romans ;⁴ in 1 Maccabees it equally certainly means the Greeks.⁵ Much of what we are told in the Qumran texts would be true enough of either. Decisive importance is attached by Dupont-Sommer to the statement of the Habakkuk Commentary that the Kittim sacrificed to their " signs " and worshipped their arms.⁶ This is held to refer to the Roman cult of standards. For Roman sacrifice to standards we have the single witness of Josephus,⁷ who says that in A.D. 70, after the destruction of the Temple, the Roman soldiers sacrificed to their standards. For any evidence of such sacrifice in Republican times no evidence whatever is forthcoming, and H. J. Rose, writing without any axe to grind on the Scrolls and before their discovery, stated this quite explicitly.⁸ Dupont-Sommer is insistent that those who

¹ Cf. *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 48 (Eng. trans., p. 37).

² Cf. *P.E.Q.* lxxxviii (1956), 92 ff.

³ In this Dupont-Sommer and I are in full agreement. Cf. Dupont-Sommer, *Nouveaux aperçus*, pp. 34 f. Eng. trans., pp. 15 f.) and *B.J.R.L.* xxxv (1952-3), 133.

⁴ Dan. xi. 30.

⁵ 1 Macc. i. 1, viii. 5.

⁶ Habakkuk Commentary, col. VI, lines 4 f.

⁷ Cf. *B.J.* vi, vi. 1 (vi. 316).

⁸ Cf. *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (1949), p. 857 b.

disagree with him must produce evidence not alone of the veneration of standards, but of sacrifice to them by the people with whom the Kittim are identified.¹ Yet on his side he is not able to provide such evidence.² It is undoubted that standards were sacred in Republican Rome, as amongst other peoples, but it is not legitimate to antedate by more than a century our evidence for sacrifice to Roman standards.

On the other hand, it is known that sacrifice to standards and the worship of arms prevailed in the East in ancient times and that it continued in Syria in post-Christian times.³ It is more probable that a practice which is known to have prevailed in the lands ruled by the Seleucids before and after Seleucid times prevailed also under their rule than to suppose that it had died out and was reintroduced from Rome—the more so, as Classical scholars, writing before the discovery of the Scrolls and with no axe to grind here, have held that it was borrowed by Rome from the East.⁴ When we have evidence of the sacrifice to standards amongst the Romans, it is associated with Ruler worship,⁵ and Ruler Worship was not practised in Republican Rome, but was practised under the Seleucids.⁶ While, then, there is no direct evidence for sacrifice to standards and the worship of arms either in the time of Pompey or under the Seleucids, there is far greater probability in the case of the latter than in the case of the former, and the cast-iron case which Dupont-Sommer has claimed for the Roman identification of the Kittim on this ground does not survive examination.

We may now add that the Nahum Commentary carries us back quite certainly to the period before Pompey for the Wicked Priest. The reference to the attempt by Demetrius to enter

¹ Cf. *V.T.* v (1955), 115 f. n., and *Semitica*, v (1955), 54.

² For the examination of such claims made since the discovery of the Scrolls cf. *P.E.Q.* lxxxviii (1956), 100 ff. These claims, even if allowed, would not establish the practice of *sacrifice* to standards in Republican times, but only of veneration, which Dupont-Sommer recognizes to be insufficient.

³ On this cf. my paper in *P.E.Q.*, loc. cit. pp. 102 ff. ⁴ Cf. *ibid.* p. 104.

⁵ The emperor's effigy was on the standards sacrificed to in Jerusalem in A.D. 70. Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* xviii, iii. 1 (xviii. 55).

⁶ Cf. E. E. Bevan, *The House of Seleucus*, ii (1902), 154 n., 156 ff. For other references to discussions of Ruler Worship in the Hellenistic Kingdoms, cf. *P.E.Q.*, loc. cit. p. 102 n.

Jerusalem brings us at the latest to the time of Demetrius III. The following line mentions the period from Antiochus to the rise of the rulers of the Kittim. The Antiochus is thought to be Antiochus Epiphanes,¹ and if so it is improbable that this sentence covers a period from about a century before the time of Demetrius III down to the Roman appearance in Palestine after his reign. To this, however, we shall return. Here it will suffice to note that this is the latest period to which this text can refer. The Teacher of Righteousness is not referred to in this commentary, which mentions, it will be remembered, the crucifixions by the Young Lion of Wrath. It is improbable that this text deals with events before the rise of the Teacher of Righteousness,² and therefore likely that it deals with things that happened either during his leadership of the sect, or after his death. While there is a gap in the text, it seems probable that it stated that the wealth of the priests of Jerusalem should be the prey of the Young Lion of Wrath.³ This is against the view that the Young Lion is to be identified with the Wicked Priest, but favours the view that he was contemporary with him.⁴ It is therefore probable that a conflict, in which members of the sect were

¹ So J. M. Allegro, *J.B.L.* lxxv (1956), 93.

² C. Rabin, *J.J.S.* vii (1956), 11, suggests that this text deals with events of the distant past, before the time of the Teacher of Righteousness, on the ground that historical personal names are used and not cryptic names. As he follows Allegro in identifying the Young Lion of Wrath with Jannaeus, he suggests that the Teacher of Righteousness must be placed in a later age. The fact that the Qumran centre almost certainly dates from the end of the second century B.C. is against this view, since it is unlikely that the sect was organized in Qumran so long before the rise of the Teacher of Righteousness, when we learn from its own literature that its first gropings in darkness began twenty years before his rise.

³ Line 11.

⁴ A further consideration against the identification of the Young Lion of Wrath with the Wicked Priest is that the whole book of Nahum is directed against the Assyrians, and the section commented on here deals with Nineveh. The sect could easily transfer to the Kittim what is said of the Assyrians, just as in the Habakkuk Commentary they transfer to the Kittim what is said of the Chaldaean. It is not so likely that the Wicked Priest would be equated with the Assyrians. In the Habakkuk Commentary the righteous man becomes the Teacher of Righteousness and the wicked man the Wicked Priest, but wherever the context is unequivocally Chaldaean the interpretation turns to the foreign Kittim. This consideration therefore favours the probability that the Young Lion of Wrath is a foreign enemy.

involved, took place before the time of Pompey, during the reign of a Demetrius, and since there is a reference to crucifixions, it is likely that members of the sect and their sympathizers were amongst the crucified.¹ There is no reason to suppose that a second crisis for the sect, in many ways similar to the first, arose again under Aristobulus and Hyrcanus. Moreover, if the Kittim were the Greeks, as I have argued, the conditions reflected in the Habakkuk Commentary were certainly not those of the period immediately before Pompey's arrival in Jerusalem.

We may turn then to the second view, which makes Alexander Jannaeus the Wicked Priest. This Jewish king reigned in the first quarter of the first century B.C. Here it may be said at once that while on this view no known person can be identified with the Teacher of Righteousness, some of the things we are told about the Wicked Priest would excellently fit Jannaeus. The reference to crucifixions in the Nahum Commentary has recalled² the crucifixion of 800 of his enemies by Jannaeus,³ and the obscure reference to something that happened on the Day of Atonement, which Dupont-Sommer improbably connected with the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey, has been held⁴ to refer to the massacre of 6,000 persons by Jannaeus, which, according to Josephus,⁵ took place at the Feast of Tabernacles. The Wicked Priest is said to have profaned the sanctuary,⁶ and we know that Jannaeus aroused much opposition by his exercise of the priestly office when many thought he should not, and he was pelted by the mob with citrons.⁷

The advocates of this period for the Wicked Priest, and therefore for the Teacher of Righteousness, are not agreed,

¹ J. M. Allegro in a letter to *The Times* (20 March 1956), rightly says that the mention of the crucifixions in this text implies that these had some particular relevance for the history of the sect, though he holds in his article in *J.B.L.* lxxv (1956), 89 ff., that they were crucifixions of people unconnected with the sect, and with whom the members of the sect had no sympathy. This seems quite unnatural, and it is more reasonable to suppose that the relevance for the sect lay in the fact that their own members and sympathizers were amongst the crucified.

² So J. M. Allegro, *J.B.L.*, loc. cit. p. 92.

³ Cf. *Antiq.* XIII, xiv. 2 (xiii. 380), *B.J.* 1. iv. 6 (i. 97).

⁴ So M. Delcor, *Essai sur le Midrash d'Habacuc* (1951), pp. 65 f.

⁵ *Antiq.* XIII, xiii. 5 (xiii. 372).

⁶ Habakkuk Commentary, col. XII, lines 8 f. ⁷ *Antiq.* XIII, xiii. 5 (xiii. 372).

however, on certain fundamental issues. On the one hand the Kittim are identified with the Seleucids and the sect associated with the Pharisees,¹ or, on the other hand, the Kittim are identified with the Romans and the sect differentiated from the Pharisees and linked with the Essenes.² It is necessary, then, to look at the difficulties encountered by each of these views. But first we must look at the internal and external relations of Jannaeus. He was bitterly opposed by the Pharisees, and at one point in his reign these enemies of his invited the help of the Seleucid monarch, Demetrius III, against him.³ Demetrius marched against Jannaeus, who suffered a defeat; whereupon some of his Jewish foes repented of their action and went over to the king, and Demetrius, finding his support melting away, withdrew to the north. Jannaeus then seized 800 of his foes and crucified them with a callousness that rivalled Nero's later treatment of the early Christians.⁴

If the Kittim were the Seleucids and the sect the Pharisees, the conditions reflected in the Scrolls would be far from met. For the Seleucids acted against Jannaeus, and therefore, on this view, against the Wicked Priest. Their allies were the Pharisees, and therefore, on this view, the members of the sect. Yet in the Nahum Commentary Demetrius is said to have sought to enter Jerusalem with the help of the seekers after smooth things. It is not likely that this description was intended to refer to members of the sect. The condemnation of the Wicked Priest and of the Kittim in the Habakkuk Commentary is much more naturally understood if the Kittim and the Priest were associated in their hostility to the sect than if they stood opposed to one another, and it is wholly improbable that the sect entered into any alliance with the Kittim. In the Battle Scroll the Kittim figure amongst the foreign foes of the sect, to be overthrown as the first of the foreign powers to be successively conquered. While we must beware of assuming that the Battle Scroll and the Habakkuk

¹ So Delcor, *op. cit.* pp. 56 ff.

² So J. M. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls* (1956); also F. F. Bruce, *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (1956).

³ Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* XIII, xiii. 5, xiv. 1 f. (xiii. 376 ff.), *B.J.* I, iv. 4 ff. (i. 92 ff.).

⁴ Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* XIII, xiv. 2 (xiii. 380), *B.J.* I, iv. 6 (i. 97).

Commentary reflect the same period, it must be recognized that in both the Kittim incur the same fierce hatred.

On the other hand, against the theory that the Wicked Priest was Jannaeus and the Kittim the Romans, while the sect is to be identified with the Essenes, it must be observed that we have no evidence whatever of either the Romans or Jannaeus persecuting the Essenes in that age. It is hard to suppose that the references to the bitter cruelty of the Kittim were merely based on reports coming from abroad. On the other hand, if the composition of the texts is placed after the coming of the Romans into Palestine, when their authors might have had some experience of them at close quarters, it could hardly have been thought that Jannaeus, the supposed Wicked Priest, would be delivered into the hands of the terrible ones of the Gentiles, since by that time history would have demonstrated otherwise. It has been suggested that Jannaeus was the Young Lion of Wrath who hung men alive,¹ and that while this is a reference to his crucifixion of 800 of his foes, no mention would have been made of this in the Nahum Commentary if he had not also crucified the Teacher of Righteousness, who is nowhere mentioned in the commentary.² This is wholly without cogency. For surely if the Teacher of Righteousness had been crucified this would have merited direct mention, and not have been left to be inferred from the mention of the crucifixion of people with whom he was in no way associated. It seems to me legitimate to suppose that the mention of the hanging men alive by the Young Lion of Wrath involved members of the sect and their sympathizers, and therefore that it was not an allusion to the crucifixion of Pharisees. It is similarly legitimate to suppose that the cruel persecution of men by the Kittim would not have been mentioned if the sect had not suffered at their hands, and this means that we are definitely not in the days of Jannaeus with the Romans as the Kittim. In any case there is not the slightest reason to suppose that the Teacher of Righteousness was crucified by Alexander Jannaeus or by anyone else. There is not the faintest allusion to his crucifixion, either in the Nahum Commentary or in any other text.

¹ Cf. J. M. Allegro, *J.B.L.* lxxv (1956), 92. ² Cf. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 98 f., and letter to *The Times* (20 March 1956).

Yet another form of the Jannaeus view is that the sect was associated with the Pharisees and Sadducees in opposition to Jannaeus, though at the same time opposed to them on other issues.¹ Here the Kittim are once more identified with the Romans, and the difficulties of this view for the period of Jannaeus have been sufficiently indicated. There is no reason arising from the text of the Scrolls to suggest that the members of the sect had anything to do with the seekers after smooth things who invoked foreign aid against Jannaeus, and their hostility to the Wicked Priest, to the seekers after smooth things who were on the side of Demetrius, and to the Kittim is uniformly expressed in all the texts where they are mentioned.

Millar Burrows has observed that "the very existence of so many different theories connected with Alexander Jannaeus should arouse suspicion as to the validity of any association between him and the Habakkuk Commentary".² The fundamental difficulty under which this view in all its forms labours is that the Kittim can be equated with neither the Seleucids nor the Romans in any satisfactory way. The Kittim of the Battle Scroll, who had a king, could not be the Romans, and no ingenuity can get round this difficulty. Yet it is equally impossible to equate them with the Seleucids in the first century B.C. For to the author of the Battle Scroll the Kittim were the most hated of foes, and so if he represented the sect by composing this work in that age, the members of the sect should have been solidly behind Jannaeus in his war with Demetrius. Yet it is impossible to think of them rallying behind the Wicked Priest. The age of Jannaeus does not provide the setting for the dream of a Holy War against either Seleucids or Romans. To transfer the composition of the work to the end of the first century B.C., after the Romans had appeared on the scene, does not ease the situation. For the Seleucids had then disappeared, and the Romans still had no king.

An equally fundamental difficulty, which is important against both the Jannaeus theory and the Aristobulus-Hyrcaeus II theory, is that the situation does not explain the particular ideas and teachings of the sect. It would be easy to see how a sect

¹ Cf. Segal, loc. cit. p. 143.

² Cf. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 177.

which attached great importance to the Zadokite priesthood should oppose the Hasmonaean assumption of that priesthood. It is not easy to see why a sect should arise in the time of Hyrcanus I or Jannaeus on this issue, so many decades after the Hasmonaean had assumed the priesthood.

Moreover, there is no evidence that Jannaeus or Aristobulus and Hyrcanus II promoted idolatry or profaned the Temple, whereas the sect condemned those who did these things. The sect attached great importance to the keeping of the sabbath, but there is no reason to suppose that this was a special current issue in the first century. The sect attached much importance to the correct calendar, but again this was no new or flaming issue in the first century, so far as we know. All of these things had been living issues in the second century, and any group which had once taken a stand on them might be expected to continue to do so; but a sect which came into existence at the end of the second century or the beginning of the first century entirely on issues which had been burning issues half a century or more earlier, but which were no longer burning issues, would be one which came belatedly into existence. What it is incumbent on the advocates for the Jannaeus view or the Aristobulus-Hyrcanus II view to show is why the sect came into existence at the precise point when they assume it came into being, and how its teaching and practice can be related to the particular situation of that time.

We may therefore turn to the third of the views I mentioned at the beginning, that the Teacher of Righteousness and the Wicked Priest belonged to the second century B.C., and to the critical period of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes which provoked the Maccabaeen rising. For this view I argued some years ago,¹ and all the additional information we now have seems to accord with it.

¹ Cf. *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 61 ff.; *B.J.R.L.* xxxv (1952-53), 137 ff.; *E.Th.L.* xxviii (1952), 269 ff. This view has been held by a number of other scholars including Bo Reicke, *Studia Theologica*, ii (1949-50), 45 ff. (though abandoned in *Handskrifterna från Qumran* (1952)), J. Trinquet, *V.T.* i (1951), 287 ff., E. Dhorme, *C.R.A.I.* (1951), pp. 199 f., E. Stauffer, *Th.L.Z.* lxxvi (1951), 667 ff., G. Lambert, *N.R.Th.* lxxiv (1952), 259 ff., I. Rabinowitz, *J.B.L.* lxxi (1952), 19 ff. and *V.T.* iii (1953), 175 ff., H. Bardtke, *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer* (1952), pp. 143 ff., A. Michel, *Le Maître de Justice* (1954), J. C. G. Greig, *N.T.S.* ii (1955), 119 ff. In *Z.R.G.G.* viii (1956), 250 ff., E.

Of this period we have considerable knowledge. Palestine had recently been transferred from the control of the Ptolemies to that of the Seleucids, who are called the kings of the north in the book of Daniel.¹ There was growing tension between the stricter parties of the Jews and their Seleucid masters, and at the same time there were hellenizing Jews, including members of the priesthood, who were on the side of the Seleucids against the orthodox Jews, and against Onias, the High Priest.² These could well be called the seekers after smooth things. Onias was expelled from the High Priesthood, and replaced first by his brother Jason, and then by Menelaus, who was not even of the legitimate high priestly line.³ The followers and supporters of Onias might naturally call themselves the Zadokites, or supporters of the true line of Zadok. Onias was ultimately killed by the Seleucid king as the result of the intrigue of Menelaus, who is a suitable candidate for the title of Wicked Priest.⁴ The rapacity of Menelaus is attested in our ancient sources,⁵ and the prediction

Stauffer presents the suggestion that the Teacher of Righteousness is to be identified with Jose ben Joezer of Zeredah, of the Maccabean period.

¹ Dan. xi.

² Cf. 1 Macc. i. 11 ff., 2 Macc. iii. 1 ff., iv. 1 ff.

³ He was first succeeded by his brother Jason (2 Macc. iv. 7), and then by Menelaus (2 Macc. iv. 23 f.). Josephus says that Menelaus was also the brother of Onias (*Antiq.* xii, v. 1 (xii. 238)). Some writers have preferred this account. For a discussion of the question, cf. my paper in *Studia Orientalia Ioanni Pedersen dicata* (1953), pp. 303 ff.

⁴ Cf. 2 Macc. iv. 32 ff. The statement in the Habakkuk Commentary that he was "named according to the truth" when he first took office has been held to be a difficulty against this view, and it has been held to favour the Jannaeus view, since Jannaeus is said by Josephus to have been superior in age and character to his brothers before he attained the throne (*B.J.* i, iv. 1 (i. 85)). This would not be naturally expressed by saying that he was "named according to the truth". On the other hand Delcor, *Essai sur le Midrash d'Habacuc*, p. 64, when arguing for the identification with Alexander Jannaeus, holds the reference to be to his Jewish name of Jonathan. Cf. also M. Burrows, *op. cit.* p. 175. If the reference is to the personal name of the King—and this would seem to be a natural understanding of the expression—this explanation would apply to Menelaus, who probably affected the Greek name of Menelaus, just as Jason affected a Greek name. Josephus says that the real name of Menelaus was Onias, and this may well be true, though the statement of Josephus that he was the brother of the other Onias is probably wrong. For two brothers to be named Onias would be surprising, but if Menelaus was not the brother of the High Priest Onias, there would be no difficulty about his bearing the same name.

⁵ Cf. 2 Macc. iv. 24, 27.

that the wealth of the priests would be handed over to the Kittim found its fulfilment in the plunder of the Temple by Antiochus Epiphanes, who robbed the Temple of no less than 1,800 talents.¹ While, therefore, in that age the Seleucids and the priests were allied against the stricter Jews, there was no security for the priests against their foreign masters. Moreover, Menelaus came to an evil end at the hands of those masters,² as the Scrolls predict that the Wicked Priest would suffer at the hands of the aliens.

The Kittim would be the Greeks on this view. I have already said that the term could in itself stand for either Greeks or Romans, but that the reference to the king of the Kittim in the Battle Scroll shows that it cannot mean the Romans there. In the period of which we are thinking, the Greeks were to be found in Egypt, in the Ptolemaic kingdom, and in Syria, in the Seleucid kingdom. It would then be natural for the sect to dream of victory first over the Kittim of Assyria, i.e. Syria, and then over those in Egypt. The Battle Scroll indicates that the Philistines, Edomites, Moabites and Ammonites were allied to the Kittim of Assyria, and it is not without significance to note that when Judas the Maccabee led the Jews against the Seleucids, he immediately turned to attack the Philistines, the Edomites, and the region east of the Jordan—i.e. the territory of the Moabites and Ammonites.³

An objection to the view I am now presenting has been raised on the ground that the Kittim are said to have come from the isles or coastlands, and that while this would be relevant to the Romans it would not be relevant to the Seleucids.⁴ But Josephus records that the army of Antiochus Epiphanes included mercenaries from the islands,⁵ while in 1 Maccabees we learn that in the year following the death of Antiochus an army was collected for Antiochus Eupator, in which were men from other kingdoms and from the isles of the sea,⁶ while shortly after Demetrius I raised an army against the Jews from the isles of the Gentiles.⁷ The

¹ Cf. 1 Macc. i. 20 ff., 2 Macc. v. 15 f., 21, also Josephus, *Antiq.* XII, v. 4 (xii. 249 ff.), and *Contra Ap.* ii. 7 (83 ff.).

² 2 Macc. xiii. 3 ff.

³ 1 Macc. v. 3 ff.

⁴ Cf. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 41 (Eng. trans., p. 29) and *Nouveaux aperçus*, pp. 35 f. (Eng. trans., pp. 16 f.); C. Detaye, *E.Th.L.* xxx (1954), 324.

⁵ Cf. *Antiq.* XII, xii. 2 (xii. 293).

⁶ 1 Macc. vi. 28.

⁷ 1 Macc. xi. 38. Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* XIII, iv. 9 (xiii. 129).

objection therefore falls completely to the ground. Similarly, as I have already said, the reference to sacrifice to standards and the worship of arms fits the Seleucids better than it does Republican Rome.

In the period of which we are thinking, Antiochus Epiphanes bitterly persecuted the loyal Jews, with the backing of his hellenizing Jewish supporters. He proscribed the practices of Judaism, and death was the penalty for possessing copies of its sacred books.¹ Circumcision was forbidden, and those who circumcised their children were crucified, with their babes hung around their necks.² This provides a far more suitable background for the references to the cruelty of the Kittim, even to the fruit of the womb, and to the crucifixions by the Young Lion of Wrath than the other view I have mentioned. For instead of hearsay evidence about the Kittim from abroad and the execution of rebels, with whom the sect is believed to have had no connection, we have here the crucifixion of members of the sect and their sympathizers for their loyalty to the principles of their faith. These are martyrs for their faith, as the executed Pharisees were not. The Young Lion of Wrath would be Antiochus Epiphanes, or—less probably—one of his agents.

Again, the only contemporary persons who have their known personal names in the Scrolls are Antiochus and Demetrius. So far as I know, no one has suggested identifying the former with anyone but Antiochus Epiphanes. It would be more natural for him to be named here if he were the great antagonist of the sect and its Teacher than if he had lived almost a century earlier. The Demetrius who is mentioned in the next line is more likely to have been Demetrius I, who was already on the throne within two years of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, than Demetrius III in the following century. For Demetrius I certainly sought to get possession of Jerusalem with the help of the seekers after smooth things, and the boastful threat of his general, Nicanor, against the Temple, with its sequel in his defeat and death and the nailing of his arm to the wall by Judas, need not be enlarged upon.³

¹ 1 Macc. i. 56 f.

² Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.* XII, v. 4 (xii. 256).

³ 1 Macc. vii. 26 ff.

The House of Absalom would, on this view, be the Tobiad family, which, though akin to the High Priest, put its own interests above the ties of kinship, and gave Onias no support against his enemies, with whom they were in league.¹ Such conduct would well deserve the opprobrious designation as the house of Absalom, recalling Absalom's treachery against his own father. Moreover, the sect condemned marriage with a niece.² This is not specifically forbidden in the Law, but the sect, like the later Karaites, extended by analogy the Law's prohibition of the marriage of a woman and her nephew to the marriage of a man with his niece. Some later Pharisees commended such a marriage.³ Josephus records the marriage of the head of the Tobiad house with his niece, under circumstances which were anything but creditable to him.⁴ If the Tobiad house were the house of Absalom, we could well understand how our sect would seize on this discreditable incident in the recent history of the family and would condemn it with the utmost strength.⁵

We may next observe that many of the special teachings of the sect can be understood in terms of the situation of this period. Their condemnation of idolatry⁶ and the reference to the polluting of the sanctuary⁷ have no particular relevance in the time of Alexander Jannaeus or in that of Aristobulus and Hyrcanus. But in the days when Antiochus profaned the Temple, and set up a heathen altar within the sacred precincts,⁸ this would be a very living issue. The strong insistence on the keeping of the Sabbath would equally be explained.⁹ For we know that in the Maccabaeian period some of the devotees of the Law allowed themselves to be slaughtered on the Sabbath day without resistance.¹⁰ Since Judas laid it down that his followers were to

¹ Cf. A. Büchler, *Die Tobiaden und die Oniaden* (1899).

² Cf. *Zadokite Work*, vii. 9 f. (p. v, lines 7 ff.).

³ Cf. S. Krauss, in *Studies in Jewish Literature* (Kaufmann Kohler Festschrift) (1913), p. 165.

⁴ Cf. *Antiq.* XII, iv. 6 (xii. 186 ff.).

⁵ Bo Reicke first drew attention to this. Cf. *Studia Theologica*, ii (1949-50), 55.

⁶ Cf. *Zadokite Work* ix. 34 (p. xx, line 9) and *Manual of Discipline*, col. II, lines 11, 17.

⁷ Cf. *Zadokite Work*, ix. 47 (p. xx, line 24).

⁸ Cf. 1 Macc. i. 54 ff. For the complicity of Menelaus in the profaning of the sanctuary, cf. 2 Macc. iv. 39, v. 15 ff.

⁹ Cf. *Zadokite Work*, v. 1 f. (p. iii, lines 12 ff.), viii. 15 (p. xi, lines 4 ff.).

¹⁰ Cf. 1 Macc. ii. 32 ff.

defend themselves on the Sabbath day, it is clear that this issue must have been discussed. Again, we know that the sect was interested in questions of the calendar,¹ and once more this was a live issue in the time of which we are thinking. The book of Daniel tells us that the Little Horn, or Antiochus Epiphanes, sought to change times,² and the book of Jubilees, which may be dated with great probability in the middle of the second century B.C., shows that calendar issues were living issues at that time.³ The calendar favoured by the sect appears to have been the same as that favoured by the author of the book of Jubilees.⁴

The death of the Teacher of Righteousness was clearly regarded by the sect as marking a turning point of time, since its members believed that forty years after his death all the men of war who were ranged against them should be destroyed.⁵ It is likely that the War against the Sons of Darkness was thought of as lasting for forty years, and probably the same period was in mind. In the book of Daniel we find a reference to the cutting off of an Anointed One,⁶ and this has commonly been interpreted in terms of the death of Onias, the rightful High Priest. Great significance is attached to this death in the book of Daniel, which made it one of the critical points in the schematic period of seventy weeks of years which should precede the establishment of the great enduring kingdom. If the Teacher of Righteousness is rightly to be identified with Onias, the widespread significance attached to his death finds confirmation here. It is true that the basis of calculation is different in the book of Daniel and in the Zadokite Work, but one has only to study the apocalyptic works

¹ Cf. *Zadokite Work*, v. 1 f. (p. iii, lines 12 ff.), viii. 15 (p. vi, lines 18 f.), xx. 1 (p. xvi, lines 2 f.), and *Manual of Discipline*, col. I, lines 14 f.

² Dan. vii. 25.

³ Cf. *Jubilees* vi. 17 ff., xvi. 20 ff., xxiii. 19, xxxiv. 18 ff., xlix. 1 ff.

⁴ Cf. A. Jaubert, *V.T.* iii (1953), 250 ff., vii (1957), 35 ff.; also J. Morgenstern, *V.T.* v (1955), 34 ff., and J. Obermann, *J.B.L.* lxxv (1956), 285 ff.

⁵ In *Zadokite Work*, ix. 29 B (pp. xix, line 35, xx, line 1) the period from the death of the Teacher to the coming of the Messiah is mentioned, but without specifying its duration. In ix. 39 B (p. xx, lines 13 ff.) the period from the death of the Teacher to the destruction of all the men of war who were with the Man of the Lie is specified as forty years. It is probable that both the references are to the same period and that the coming of the Messiah was expected to signalize the destruction of all the enemies of the sect.

⁶ Dan. ix. 26.

of the last two centuries before the Christian era and of the early Christian centuries to realize how the basis of calculation was being continually varied to accommodate it to an ever changing situation.

The chronology of the sect also falls into line on this view. If the twenty years of groping is put before the rise of Onias, and he is identified with the Teacher of Righteousness, then the migration of the sect to Damascus would fall within the forty years following his death in 171 B.C.¹ There are some who think that Qumran is meant by Damascus.² I am not persuaded that this is so, though it is certain that if the sect did withdraw to Damascus they returned later, and perhaps after a very short stay, and settled in the wilderness of Judaea at Qumran, where fragments of the Zadokite Work have been found. The difference between this view and the view that Qumran is Damascus is not of serious chronological significance therefore. If the migration to Damascus fell a little before 131 B.C., and the return a few years later, we should be very near to the date assigned to the building of the Qumran centre by the archaeologists. The earliest coins found at Qumran date from the reign of John Hyrcanus, 134-104 B.C. While the earliest coins might have been minted either shortly before, or shortly after, the establishment of the centre, it is not without significance that we are very close to the date to which we should be brought on my view.³

There is nothing in the Scrolls to indicate that the Teacher of Righteousness was ever in Qumran. The migration to Damascus was under the leadership of one who is called the Star, who appears to have been a different person from the Teacher of Righteousness. Since he was an organizer, he cannot have preceded the Teacher of Righteousness since the sect groped in darkness until the latter's rise. He is therefore likely to have

¹ Since the Zadokite Work was clearly written within forty years of the death of the Teacher of Righteousness, but already looks back on the migration.

² So R. North, *P.E.Q.* lxxxv (1955), 34 ff.; cf. also I. Rabinowitz, *J.B.L.* lxxiii (1954), 11 ff.

³ It has been noted above that the view of de Vaux is that the centre was founded either during the reign of Hyrcanus I or during that of Jannaeus.

been a later organizer.¹ This accords with the view I have presented, but gives rise to difficulties on the other views, which place the Teacher of Righteousness in the first century B.C. For then the founding of the Qumran centre must be placed long before the death of the Teacher of Righteousness, and therefore either during the period of his leadership or before. To suppose that it was before his time is very difficult, since it was but groping in darkness then. To suppose that it was under his leadership that the sect had withdrawn from Jerusalem to the desert decades before his persecution and death yields a less natural course of development than the one I have outlined. During the time of the Teacher of Righteousness whose leadership of the sect may have been of short duration, there was bitter conflict within the nation and without, in which the Teacher and the members of the sect were involved. Within a decade or two of the Teacher's death the members withdrew from the conflict to Damascus and a life of contemplation. All that we know of the organization of the sect, whether from the Zadokite Work or the Manual of Discipline or the first century A.D. accounts of the Essenes accords with this. If Damascus is other than Qumran, then the return from Damascus to Qumran would leave the sect still withdrawn from the bitter conflict with their fellow Jews, living a life of contemplation and study, while cherishing their faith and their hope of triumph in the future. If the fight against the Wicked Priest had been carried on from organized headquarters in Qumran, we should have expected not only the Teacher of Righteousness to be persecuted and martyred, but the headquarters to be destroyed. This is precisely what happened in A.D. 68. Then the sect appears to have been allied with the Zealots who fought the Romans, and in consequence the Qumran centre was destroyed. But if the withdrawal to Damascus and the subsequent founding of the Qumran centre marked the withdrawal from further open conflict with the authorities, their molestation in Qumran would not be expected. For on my view the sect was once allied with the Maccabees against the hellenizers and the Seleucids. The migration to Damascus took place under

¹ Here I am in agreement with Dupont-Sommer. Cf. *Aperçus préliminaires*, pp. 74 f. (Eng. trans., p. 60).

Jonathan or Simon, former allies of the sect, and while such defenders of the law and of the Zadokite priesthood as the members of the sect could not be expected to approve of the Hasmonaean assumption of the priesthood, the bitterness of their opposition would be altogether less than it had been to the idolatry and hellenism of the time of Antiochus. Hence peaceful withdrawal, instead of passionate battle, as in the days of Antiochus, would be understandable.

It remains only to add that the great significance attached to the life and death of the Teacher of Righteousness seems to have been but a temporary feature in the life of the sect. He is mentioned in some of the commentaries and in the Zadokite Work. The references to him are allusive, and must have been intelligible to the first readers of these works, though they are so obscure to us. Hence all these works were probably written within a very few years of his death. The Zadokite Work was written within forty years of his death, and it is probable that all the works that mention him fell within that period. He is not mentioned in the Manual of Discipline, and so far as we know no mention of his life or death figured in any of the rites of the sect. The most usual view is that the sect developed into the Essenes, of whom we have accounts in the writings of some authors of the first century of our era. Nowhere does the Teacher of Righteousness figure in those accounts. He belongs to the history of of the sect, but not to its faith.

The close links of the sectarian writings with I Enoch, Jubilees, and the sources of the Testaments, which I have examined elsewhere,¹ and the common background in a time of idolatry, apocalyptic hopes, and disputes about the calendar and the sabbath, strongly suggest that all spring from the critical conflicts of the Maccabaeon age. This view at least has the merit of attributing the rise of the sect to the period when current issues and conflicts occupied its thought.

I therefore adhere to the view of the Teacher of Righteousness to which I subscribed some years ago, and find the fuller study of the problems involved and the fuller evidence which is now in our hands confirms it. All the issues which specially interested the

¹ Cf. *Jewish Apocalyptic and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (1957).

sect were live issues in the period of which Antiochus Epiphanes and Onias are the focal figures on either side, and far more of the references in the Scrolls have relevance in that age than in any other. ¹

¹ While this lecture has been in the press C. Roth and G. R. Driver have advocated the view that the Teacher of Righteousness is to be identified with Menahem, who lived in the first century A.D., and died in A.D. 66. This view was earlier presented by H. E. del Medico, who has now published a further book (*L'Enigme des manuscrits de la Mer Morte*) in its defence—also since this lecture went to press. All of these were too late to be examined here, but the present writer is still persuaded that any post-Christian date for the Teacher of Righteousness is excluded for the reasons stated in the lecture.