

# THE COVENANTERS OF DAMASCUS AND THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS <sup>1</sup>

By HAROLD H. ROWLEY, M.A., D.D., THEOL.D., LL.D., F.B.A.  
PROFESSOR OF HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN THE UNIVERSITY  
OF MANCHESTER

**I**NNUMERABLE articles in the newspapers and journals of the whole world have been devoted to the discovery of manuscripts in Palestine in 1947,<sup>2</sup> and it is quite unnecessary for me to repeat the story here.<sup>3</sup> Amongst the manuscripts which have come to light there are Biblical and non-Biblical texts. There

<sup>1</sup> A lecture delivered in the John Rylands Library on Wednesday, the 13th of February, 1952. The following abbreviations are used in the footnotes below : *A.J.Th.* = *American Journal of Theology* ; *B.A.* = *Biblical Archaeologist* ; *B.A.S.O.R.* = *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* ; *Bi.Or.* = *Bibliotheca Orientalis* ; *B.W.* = *Biblical World* ; *C.A.H.* = *Cambridge Ancient History* ; *E.R.E.* = *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* ; *E.T.* = *Expository Times* ; *H.T.R.* = *Harvard Theological Review* ; *H.U.C.A.* = *Hebrew Union College Annual* ; *I.L.N.* = *Illustrated London News* ; *J.B.L.* = *Journal of Biblical Literature* ; *J.E.O.L.* = *Jaarbericht Ex Oriente Lux* ; *J.Q.R.* = *Jewish Quarterly Review* ; *J.T.S.* = *Journal of Theological Studies* ; *J.T.V.I.* = *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* ; *M.G.W.J.* = *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* ; *N.R.Th.* = *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* ; *O.L.Z.* = *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* ; *P.W.* = *Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll-Witte, Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertums-Wissenschaft* ; *P.E.Q.* = *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* ; *P.S.B.A.* = *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology* ; *R.B.* = *Revue Biblique* ; *R.E.J.* = *Revue des Études Juives* ; *R.H.R.* = *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* ; *R.Th.Ph.* = *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* ; *S.D.B.* = *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible* ; *Th.L.Z.* = *Theologische Literaturzeitung* ; *Th.R.* = *Theologische Rundschau* ; *T.S.K.* = *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* ; *T.T.* = *Theologisch Tijdschrift* ; *V.T.* = *Vetus Testamentum* ; *Z.A.W.* = *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* ; *Z.D.M.G.* = *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* ; *Z.N.W.* = *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* ; *Z.R.G.G.* = *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte*.

<sup>2</sup> For more recent discoveries, made early in 1952, cf. *Manchester Guardian* (7 April 1952), and *Le Monde* (9 April 1952).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte*, 1950 (English tr. by E. Margaret Rowley, 1952), for a fuller general account of the Scrolls than can be found gathered elsewhere in English. Some of Dupont-Sommer's views about the Scrolls have been criticized, and are not accepted in the present paper, while others are here adopted.

is a complete text of the book of Isaiah<sup>1</sup> and an incomplete text of the same book.<sup>2</sup> There is also a manuscript containing the first two chapters of the book of Habakkuk, together with a commentary on the text.<sup>3</sup> In addition there are fragments of the book of Daniel<sup>4</sup> and of several other books of the Old Testament, and amongst these are some fragments of the book of

<sup>1</sup> This has been published in full in facsimile and transcription, *The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary*, edited by M. Burrows, J. C. Trever, and W. H. Brownlee, 1950.

<sup>2</sup> This is in the hands of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and so far little of it has been published. Cf. E. L. Sukenik, *Megillôth Genûzôth*, vol. ii (1950), Plate XVII. A full edition of all the texts in the hands of the Hebrew University is in preparation, and this will contain superb plates of all the texts.

<sup>3</sup> This has been published in full in facsimile and transcription in the volume mentioned above in note 1. Translations of this text have been published by W. H. Brownlee, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 112 (Dec. 1948), pp. 8 ff.; A Dupont-Sommer, *R.H.R.* cxxxvii (1950), 129 ff.; J. van der Ploeg, *Bi.Or.* viii (1951), 5 ff.; H. E. del Medico, *Deux manuscrits hébreux de la Mer Morte* (1951), pp. 109 ff.; and M. Delcor, *Essai sur le Midrash d'Habucuc* (1951), pp. 20 ff. The question whether this is rightly to be called a commentary has been much discussed, and some have preferred the term Midrash. Actually it is neither like an ordinary Midrash, nor like the usual commentaries on Scripture books. It consists rather of an application of the Scripture text to contemporary events, and of an often forced interpretation of the text in terms of those events. Cf. G. Vermès, *Cahiers Sioniens*, v (1951), 341; R. Eisler, *The Modern Churchman*, xxxix (1949), 287. In the commentary the word *peshet* is used. This word is found in Biblical Hebrew only in Eccles. viii. 1, where many modern editors, following Ibn Ezra, hold that it is an Aramaism. The same word stands in the Aramaic part of the book of Daniel, where it is used sometimes of the interpretation of a dream, like the Hebrew word *pithrôn* (so Brown-Driver-Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (1906), p. 837b) or *pittârôn* (so Gesenius-Buhl, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*, 17th ed. (1921), p. 669b, and E. König, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*, 7th ed. (1936), p. 379b), but sometimes of the interpretation of the writing on the wall, in Dan. v. P. R. Weis, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xli (1950-51), 120 ff., argues that its use in the *Habakkuk Commentary* without reference to a dream is a reflection of Arabic influence through Karaite literature, but in view of the use of Dan. v it is not necessary to resort to such a view. The word seems to mean the interpretation of any mystery. Cf. G. Vermès, *Cahiers Sioniens*, v (1951), 340 f. In Accadian *paštru* and *pišru* are used of the interpretation of signs and omens. Cf. A. Deimel, *Akkadisch-Sumerisches Glossar* (1937), p. 360b.

<sup>4</sup> Three fragments of Daniel were taken to America with the scrolls in the hands of the Syrian Patriarch. Cf. G. E. Wright, *B.A.* xii (1949), 33. A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 23 (E. Tr., p. 17) says that the owners of seventeen fragments of Daniel are known, but there are certainly some others.

Leviticus written in the old character.<sup>1</sup> With none of these am I particularly concerned in this lecture, though it will be necessary to bear some of them in mind. My concern is more especially with the non-Biblical texts. These include the *Commentary on Habakkuk*<sup>2</sup> already mentioned, the *Manual of Discipline*,<sup>3</sup> the *War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*,<sup>4</sup> and the *Hymns of Praise*.<sup>5</sup> There is also an unopened scroll which is believed to contain the lost *Book of Lamech*.<sup>6</sup> Of the last of these little is yet known. The text of the *Habakkuk Commentary*

<sup>1</sup> On these cf. R. de Vaux, *R.B.* lvi (1949), 597 ff. ; W. F. Albright, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 118 (Apr. 1950), p. 6 ; S. A. Birnbaum, *ibid.* pp. 20 ff. ; S. Yeivin, *ibid.* pp. 28 ff. ; D. Diringer, *P.E.Q.* (1950), pp. 20 ff. ; S. A. Birnbaum, *V.T.* i (1951), 106 f. ; S. Mowinckel, *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift*, lii (1951), 252 ff.

<sup>2</sup> I. Rabinowitz, *B.A.* xiv (1951), 50 ff., thinks that fragments of a similar commentary on Ps. cvii were found in the cave. Some fragments of the *Book of Jubilees* were also found. Cf. R. de Vaux, *R.B.* lvi (1949), 597, 602 ff. J. T. Milik has suggested that another fragment is a part of the *Book of Enoch*. Cf. *Biblica*, xxxii (1951), 393 ff. Fragments of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* are also said to be among the finds. Cf. W. H. Brownlee, *B.A.* xiii (1950), 51 n.

<sup>3</sup> This has been published in full, in facsimile and transcription, in *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, vol. II, Fasc. 2 : *Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline*, edited by M. Burrows, J. C. Trever, and W. H. Brownlee, 1951. Translations of this text have been published by J. van der Ploeg, *Bi.Or.* viii (1951), 115 ff. ; W. H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline* (Supplementary Studies of *B.A.S.O.R.*, Nos. 10-12, 1951) ; H. E. del Medico, *Deux Manuscrits hébreux de la Mer Morte* (1951), pp. 31 ff. ; G. Lambert, *Le Manuel de Discipline du Désert de Juda* (1951) (reprinted from *N.R.Th.* lxxiii (1951), 938 ff.). On this text cf. also M. Burrows, *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, viii (1950), 156 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Parts of this text have been published in facsimile and transcription, in E. L. Sukenik, *Megillôth Genûzôth*, i (1948), Plates VIII and IX, and pp. 18 ff. ; ii (1950), Plate XI, and pp. 51 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Parts of this text have been published in facsimile and transcription, in E. L. Sukenik, *Megillôth Genûzôth*, i (1948), Plates X-XIII, and pp. 27 ff. ; ii (1950), Plates VII-X, and pp. 32 ff. Cf. M. Wallenstein, *Hymns of the Judean Scrolls* (1950), G. Lambert, *N.R.Th.* lxxi (1949), 621 ff., and G. Vermès, *Cahiers Sioniens*, No. 11 (Sept. 1950), pp. 178 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. J. C. Trever, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 115 (Oct. 1949), pp. 8 ff. ; O. Eissfeldt, *Th.L.Z.* lxxv (1950), cols. 23 ff. ; G. Lambert, *N.R.Th.* lxxii (1950), 493 ff. On the lost *Book of Lamech* cf. Th. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, ii (1890), 292 ; G. F. Moore, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, ii (1902), 4 ; E. Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, Div. II, iii (1890), 151 ; M. R. James, *The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament* (1920), p. xii. J. T. Milik suggests the possibility that the unopened scroll is the lost *Book of Noah*. Cf. *Biblica*, xxxii (1951), 400.

and of the *Manual of Discipline* has been published in full in facsimile and transcription, while of the other two texts only parts have been published.<sup>1</sup>

All of these texts are said to have come from a cave near the Dead Sea,<sup>2</sup> and although doubt has been cast on this by Professor Zeitlin<sup>3</sup> there seems little reason to doubt it. An accidental discovery by Bedouin<sup>4</sup> brought some of these finds to light, and from them they came into the hands of dealers, who sold some to St. Mark's Monastery and others to the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. It is possible that other texts are still in the hands of dealers, and certain that some of the fragments of Daniel are in various hands. Eighteen months after the first find the cave was excavated by archaeologists,<sup>5</sup> who found many of the smaller

<sup>1</sup> See references in the preceding notes. There is no space here to give references to the vast number of articles in various journals of the world where these texts have been discussed.

<sup>2</sup> The cave is situated at 'Ain Feshkha, close to Khirbet Qumrân which has been more recently excavated. For maps showing the precise spot where 'Ain Feshkha is located, cf. E. L. Sukenik, *Megillôth Genûzôth*, ii (1950), 16; O. Eissfeldt, *Forschungen und Fortschritte*, xxv (1949), 302; A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 7 (E. Tr. facing p. 9).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xl (1949-50), 57 ff., 291 ff., 373 ff.; xli (1950-51), 1 ff., 251 ff., and *Crozer Quarterly*, xxvi (1950), 35 ff. That there have been many discrepancies of detail in the accounts that have been given is undeniable, and it is well that they should be scrutinized and not accepted uncritically. Nevertheless, there seems to be no doubt whatever that the Scrolls came from the cave and that they are genuinely ancient documents, and not documents which had been deliberately placed there. Several scholars have replied to Professor Zeitlin's scepticism. Cf. I. Sonne, *J.B.L.* lxx (1951), 37 ff., E. L. Sukenik, *The Jewish Chronicle*, 26 Nov. 1950, and M. Burrows, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xlii (1951-52), 105 ff. To these Zeitlin replied in *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xlii. 133 ff.

<sup>4</sup> These Bedouin were of the Ta 'âmire tribe, on which cf. M. von Oppenheim, *Die Beduinen*, ii (1943), 74 ff. On the earlier activities of this tribe in searching caves and marketing their finds through Bethlehem dealers, as in the present case, cf. L.-H. Vincent, *R.B.* liv (1947), 269.

<sup>5</sup> G. Lankester Harding and R. de Vaux were the archaeologists. Their accounts will be found in *I.L.N.* (1 Oct. 1949), p. 493, and *P.E.Q.* (1949), pp. 112 ff. (Harding), and *R.B.* lvi (1949), 234 ff., 586 ff., and *La Vie Intellectuelle* (June 1949), pp. 583 ff. (de Vaux). The Belgian U.N.O. observer, Captain Ph. Lippens, who had a share in the arranging of this excavation, has published his account *apud* G. Lambert, *Revue Générale Belge* (1949-50), pp. 413 ff., and this stands in German translation by O. Eissfeldt, *Th.L.Z.* lxxv (1950), cols. 145 ff. Cf. also G. Lambert, *N.R.Th.* lxxii (1950), 53 ff. For further accounts of these excavations cf. O. R. Sellers, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 114 (Apr. 1949), pp. 5 ff., and

fragments, and who found in the cave fragments of some of the actual manuscripts which were sold by the dealers and which were said to have come from this cave.<sup>1</sup> In the cave fragments of some forty jars were found and the archaeologists who examined the cave, Lankester Harding and Father de Vaux, pronounced these jars to be late Hellenistic.<sup>2</sup> Professor Sukenik has published photographs of two jars<sup>3</sup> which came into his hands from the dealers and which are said to have come from the same cave, and they are of similar type and date.<sup>4</sup> Father de Vaux would date the pottery with great precision as coming from the end of the second century B.C., or at the very latest from the early part of the first century B.C.<sup>5</sup> There were in the cave some

*B.A.* xii (1949), 54 ff. ; G. E. Wright, *B.A.* xii (1949), 32 ff., 64 ff. ; G. Lambert, *Revue Générale Belge* (1949-50), pp. 405 ff. ; A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, pp. 11 ff. (E. Tr., pp. 9 ff.) ; P. Kahle, *Die hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle* (1951), pp. 10 ff., 53 ff.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. O. R. Sellers, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 114 (Apr. 1949), p. 7 ; R. de Vaux, *La Vie Intellectuelle* (June 1949), p. 588.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. R. de Vaux, *R.B.* lvi (1949), 234, 586 ff. ; G. L. Harding, *I.L.N.*, *loc. cit.* and *P.E.Q.* (1949), p. 113 ; Cf. also O. R. Sellers, *B.A.* xii (1949), 55 ; G. E. Wright, *ibid.* p. 64.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Megillôth Genûzôth*, ii (1950), Plate I, also p. 17. It may be noted that J. T. Milik has published photographs of some Egyptian jars dating from about 100 B.C. which are strikingly similar to the jars from 'Ain Feshkha. Cf. *Biblica*, xxxi (1950), 504 ff. and Plate facing p. 508.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. the reconstructed jar made from fragments found in the cave, published in *I.L.N.* (1 Oct. 1949), p. 495, with Sukenik's two jars.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *R.B.* lvi (1949), 595 (also p. 236), and lviii (1951), 439. W. F. Albright would date the pottery somewhat later than de Vaux, and would allow a date 'well down in the first century B.C.' Cf. *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 115 (Oct. 1949), p. 13 n. and his postscript to W. H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline* (1951), pp. 57 ff., and *The Old Testament and Modern Study* (edited by H. H. Rowley) (1951), p. 23. A. Parrot, in A. Lods, *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive* (1950), pp. 1031 f., is doubtful of the security of the dating of the jars. While the precision of the dating may be doubted, it may be agreed that only reasonable margins can be allowed, and the identification of the jars as late Hellenistic in type, on which the experts are agreed, cannot be disputed. Cf. de Vaux, *La Vie Intellectuelle* (Apr. 1951), p. 63, where it is agreed that a margin of some decades may be allowed, but added that this tolerance cannot be extended indefinitely. More recently, in view of the discoveries of 1952, when a similar jar was found sunk in the floor in a building which was excavated at Khirbet Qumrân, where also a number of coins of the first century A.D. were found, de Vaux has retracted his view that the Dead Sea Scrolls must have been deposited in the cave c. 100 B.C. Cf. *Manchester Guardian* (7 April 1952) and *Le Monde* (9 April 1952).

remains from the Roman period, including a lamp and some sherds.<sup>1</sup>

The forty jars the cave once contained were capable of holding between 150 and 200 scrolls,<sup>2</sup> and the number of fragments of texts found there provided evidence that there were once far more than the small number of scrolls which have recently come to light.

Much of the discussion that has gathered round these texts has been concerned with questions of dating. Here three separate questions arise. When were the non-Biblical texts composed? When were the various manuscripts, Biblical and non-Biblical, copied? When were the manuscripts deposited in the cave? For the first of these we need to examine the contents of the manuscripts, to see what indications of date they contain. For the second palaeographical considerations are important. For the third the archaeological evidence is relevant. Unfortunately none of the evidence is as clear as we should like to see it, and conclusions that go far beyond the evidence have been drawn.

The archaeologists would make the date of the jars regulative for the whole discussion. De Vaux has maintained that the jars were made to hold these particular manuscripts at the time of the hiding in the cave, and therefore none of the texts could have been copied later than the end of the second century B.C., or the beginning of the first century.<sup>3</sup> The composition of the non-Biblical works would also be placed before this date. This conclusion clearly goes beyond the evidence. There is no proof whatever that the jars were made at the time of the hiding, or that they were made specifically to hold these particular

<sup>1</sup> Cf. O. R. Sellers, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 114 (Apr. 1949), p. 8; G. E. Wright, *B.A.* xii (1949), 32; G. L. Harding, *I.L.N.* (1 Oct. 1949), p. 493.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. R. de Vaux, *R.B.* lvi (1949), 593; G. L. Harding, *loc. cit.* W. F. Albright thinks there were 200 or more manuscripts originally. Cf. *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 115 (Oct. 1950), p. 13.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *R.B.* lvi (1949), 595. So also J. Leveen, Letter to *The Times*, 26 August 1949. Since this lecture was delivered de Vaux has withdrawn this view, and has recognized that jars of this type continued in use until the first century A.D. Cf. *Manchester Guardian* (7 April 1952) and *Le Monde* (9 April 1952).

manuscripts.<sup>1</sup> The Roman lamp and sherds are held to have been left by persons who entered the cave at a later date, and in this connection may writers have referred to Origen.<sup>2</sup> At the beginning of the third century of the Christian era we know that a Greek manuscript was found in a jar in or near Jericho,<sup>3</sup> and it is assumed that it was found in this cave and that Origen himself visited it. Actually in the texts that tell us of this there is no mention of a cave or of Origen's personal sight of the jar in which the text was found,<sup>4</sup> and there is no reason whatever to suppose that Origen visited the cave. Nor is there any evidence that the lamp and sherds come from a time subsequent to the deposit of the jars in the cave, and there are scholars of eminence who believe that these give important evidence of the date of the deposit.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. M. Burrows, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 122 (Apr. 1951), p. 5: 'The ceramic evidence cannot tell us how old the manuscripts were when they were placed in the jars, nor how old the jars were when the manuscripts were placed in them'. Cf. also G. R. Driver, *The Hebrew Scrolls* (1951), pp. 23 f.

<sup>2</sup> E. L. Sukenik, *Megillôth Genûzôth*, i (1948), 15; G. E. Wright, *B.A.* xii (1949), 32, 64 f.; F. M. Cross, *ibid.* p. 38; R. J. Tournay, *R.B.* lvi (1949), 205; G. L. Harding, *I.L.N.*, *loc. cit.*; O. R. Sellers, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 114 (Apr. 1950), p. 9; W. F. Albright, *ibid.* No. 115 (Oct. 1950), p. 12; F. Nötscher, *Palästina-hefte*, No. 40-42, v (1950), 10.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* vi. 16, and Origen's own words, in Mercati, *Studia e Testi*, v (1901), 29. Translations of the passages are given in P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (1947), pp. 160 ff. Both of these accounts agree in mentioning the finding of texts in a jar, but Eusebius says it was in Jericho and Origen near Jericho, but neither mentions a cave. Cf. G. R. Driver, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xl (1949-50), 367 f.; *The Hebrew Scrolls* (1951), pp. 24 f.

<sup>4</sup> Neither account says that Origen visited the spot in or near Jericho where the texts were found. W. Baumgartner, *Th.R.*, N.F. xix (1951), 112, is doubtful of the suggestion that Origen visited the cave. Certainly if a large number of Hebrew as well as some Greek manuscripts had been found in the cave in Origen's time, we should have expected some reference to this fact, and especially if Origen himself had visited it. B. J. Roberts observes that it is doubtful if so essentially Jewish a sect as the Sect of the Scrolls would have been interested in Greek texts, such as the *Sexta*, to which Origen and Eusebius refer. Cf. *Z.A.W.* (N.F. xxi), lii (1949-50), 227.

<sup>5</sup> R. de Vaux maintains with insistence that these Roman remains date the violation of the cave. Cf. *La Vie Intellectuelle* (Apr. 1951), p. 63. P. Kahle, on the other hand, thinks they indicate the date of the original deposit. Cf. *V.T.* i (1951), 41. Cf. also S. Zeitlin, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xl (1949-50), 73 f., where it is held that we may legitimately assume that someone brought the manuscripts into the cave in the Roman period. Yet actually Zeitlin does not think the Scrolls

Birnbaum would make the palaeographical evidence regulative of the entire discussion.<sup>1</sup> He brushes aside all study of the contents of the texts as subjective, and claims that palaeography is an exact science which enables him to date every text with precision.<sup>2</sup> The paucity of material available for this purpose is frankly acknowledged by others.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, the *Nash Papyrus* must figure largely in any discussion of the palaeography.<sup>4</sup> Yet were written until long after the Roman period, and believes that all the things the archaeologists found in the cave had been but recently placed there. In view of the 1952 finds, de Vaux has now agreed that the Roman remains date the deposit and not a subsequent entry into the cave. Cf. *Manchester Guardian* (7 April 1952) and *Le Monde* (9 April 1952).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *J.T.V.I.* lxxxii (1950), 145, where the archaeological evidence and the study of the contents are depreciated, and it is held that the decisive evidence is the palaeographical. Cf. also *J.B.L.* lxx (1951), 227 ff.

<sup>2</sup> For Birnbaum's studies of the palaeography cf. *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 113 (Feb. 1949), pp. 33 ff.; No. 115 (Oct. 1949), pp. 20 ff.; *P.E.Q.* (1949), pp. 140 ff.; *J.B.L.* lxxviii (1949), 161 ff.; *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 118 (Apr. 1950), pp. 20 ff.; *V.T.* i (1951), 91 ff. Amongst the many other palaeographical studies of the manuscripts cf. J. C. Trever, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 111 (Oct. 1948), pp. 3 ff., No. 113 (Feb. 1949), pp. 6 ff., and *J.J.S.* ii, No. 4 (1951), 195 ff. (cf. J. L. Teicher, *ibid.* pp. 200 ff.); O. Eissfeldt, *Th.L.Z.* lxxiv (1949), cols. 226 ff.; E. R. Lacheman, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xl (1949-50), 15 ff. (cf. W. F. Albright, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 115 (Oct. 1949), pp. 10 ff., and E. R. Lacheman, *ibid.* pp. 17 f.); S. Yeivin, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 118 (Apr. 1950), pp. 28 ff.; J. van der Ploeg, *J.E.O.L.*, No. 11 (1949-50), pp. 48 ff.; M. Burrows, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 122 (Apr. 1951), pp. 4 ff.; B. Kanael, *Bulletin of the Israel Exploration Society*, xvi (1951), 46 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. G. Vermès, *Cahiers Sioniens*, No. 11 (Sept. 1950), p. 178: 'L'argument paléographique n'était pas, ne pouvait pas être apodictique à cause du nombre très restreint des documents susceptibles de fournir des termes de comparaison'. Cf. M. Burrows, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 122 (Apr. 1951), p. 4: 'Its adequacy is limited by the fact that the amount of definitely datable materials for comparison is not as abundant as might be wished. No contemporary Hebrew manuscripts are extant. The available specimens of Hebrew writing which can be considered contemporary with the Dead Sea Scrolls consist almost entirely of brief inscriptions on graffiti, and they cannot be dated precisely. Under these circumstances palaeography can establish only a general range of possibilities, with some elasticity at both ends.' J. Schirrmann, *Semitica*, ii (1949), 42, thinks that all we can say on palaeographical grounds is that the manuscripts are ancient and not medieval. Cf. also G. R. Driver, *The Hebrew Scrolls* (1951), pp. 30 ff. (p. 31 n.: 'Attempts to fix dates so closely on grounds of script alone betray a naïve and exaggerated view of the possibilities of palaeography; this deals not in years or even often in decades but most commonly in centuries').

<sup>4</sup> In the Cambridge University Library. Trever, *B.A.* xi (1948), 47, wrongly stated that this was in the 'Manchester Library', and this has led some to locate it in the John Rylands Library. More recently *B.A.* (Sept. 1951) has published



the *Nash Papyrus* is itself of disputed date. That Papyrus was first published at the beginning of this century. It contains the text of the Decalogue and of some verses from Deuteronomy vi. When it first came to light it was dated in the first or second century A.D.,<sup>1</sup> and was even dated so late as the sixth century A.D.<sup>2</sup> Shortly before the late war, however, Albright dated it in the second century B.C.,<sup>3</sup> though he has more recently assigned it to the first century B.C.<sup>4</sup> No particular date for the *Nash Papyrus* can be taken as fixed and final, and still less can it be used to give a fixed and final date for any other text whose date is determined in relation to it. Further, the dates for our texts assigned by Birnbaum with so much precision differ from these assigned by others on palaeographical grounds, and based on the same evidence as his own dates.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, he would assign a photograph of Solomon Schechter studying Genizah material at 'the Bodleian Library at Cambridge'. It is improbable that Oxford University will consent to this removal of its Library to Cambridge.

<sup>1</sup> F. C. Burkitt, *J.Q.R.* xv (1903), 392 ff., xvi (1904), 559 ff., assigned it to the first century A.D.; Cardinal E. Tisserant, *Initiation Biblique*, edited by A. Robert and A. Tricot (1939), p. 76 (2nd ed., 1948, p. 82) to c. A.D. 100; R. H. Charles, *The Decalogue* (1923), pp. xiii ff., to the end of the first century A.D. or the beginning of the second; S. A. Cook, *P.S.B.A.* xxv (1903), 34 ff., and *E.T.* xiv (1902-03), 200 ff., to the second century A.D., and similarly I. Lévi, *R.E.J.* xlvi (1903), 212 ff., X, *R.B.* (N.S. i), xiii (1904), 242 ff., and E. R. Lacheman, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xl (1949-50), 31.

<sup>2</sup> G. Margoliouth, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, viii (1904), 304b, 312b, assigned it to the sixth or seventh century A.D.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *J.B.L.* lvi (1937), 145 ff. Similarly S. A. Birnbaum, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 115 (Oct. 1949), p. 22, ascribes it to about the beginning of the second century B.C.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 113 (Feb. 1949), p. 18 n.: 'in the late Maccabaeen period, but well before Herod's accession in 37 B.C. (plus or minus, of course)'; p. 23 n.: 'somewhere about 50 B.C.'. Cf. also *ibid.* No. 115 (Oct. 1949), p. 19: 'not later than the first half of the first century B.C.'. Similarly M. Noth, *Die Welt des Alten Testaments* (1940), p. 208, dates it in the pre-Herodian period, while J. C. Trever, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 113 (Feb. 1949), p. 19, ascribes it to the period 50-35 B.C. S. Mowinckel, *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift*, lii (1951), 253, assigns it to the second half of the first century B.C.

<sup>5</sup> Birnbaum puts the *terminus ad quem* for all the manuscripts in the middle of the first century B.C. and dates the St. Mark's *Isaiah Scroll* 175-150 B.C., the *Manual of Discipline* 125-100 B.C., and the *Habakkuk Commentary* c. 50 B.C. J. C. Trever assigns the manuscripts to about half a century later, placing the *Isaiah Scroll* 125-100 B.C., the *Manual of Discipline* c. 75 B.C., and the *Habakkuk Commentary* and the *Lamech Scroll* between 25 B.C. and A.D. 25. P. Kahle dates

some of the texts to a later date than de Vaux puts as the date of the deposit in the cave. The archaeological and palaeographical assurance, therefore, lead to divergent conclusions.

It should further be noted that the complete *Isaiah Scroll* shows evidence of having been used for a long time. The marks of handling over a long period are evident,<sup>1</sup> and the scroll has had to be repaired.<sup>2</sup> There have been additions by other hands than the original copyist's.<sup>3</sup> One of these additions shows some development in the writing of the alphabet.<sup>4</sup> As is well known some of the letters of the Hebrew alphabet have a different form for final and for initial or medial use. In the *Isaiah Scroll* we find no final form for the letter *Pé* save in this single addition, which may therefore be from a later hand. Professor Kahle would date this addition not earlier than the second century A.D.,<sup>5</sup> partly on the basis of this letter, though as he dates the *Nash Papyrus*, which also has this final letter, before this<sup>6</sup> we do not need to

the *Habakkuk Commentary* before A.D. 70, but the *Isaiah Scroll* not before the second century A.D. Cf. *V.T.* i (1951), 38 ff. E. R. Lacheman holds that the manuscripts are of medieval origin. It should be plain that palaeography is not the exact science that Birnbaum claims, unless he also wishes to claim that he is the only person who understands this science. S. Zeitlin, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xlii (1951-52), 150, has drawn attention to the extreme speed with which J. C. Trever claims to have mastered this science. According to Trever's own confession, when he first saw the scrolls on Thursday 19 February 1948, the script looked strange to his inexperienced eyes. Cf. *B.A.* xi (1948), 47. Yet by the following Tuesday he claims to have been able to tell by a passing glance in the library of the Syrian monastery that a manuscript was an eighteenth-century Ashkenazic manuscript with characteristic German palaeography. Cf. *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xlii (1951-52), 123.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the photograph in E. L. Sukenik, *Megillôth Genûzôth*, ii (1950), Plate XV.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. J. C. Trever, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 111 (Oct. 1948), pp. 5, 7.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, vol. I: *The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary* (1950), Plates XXVIII, XXX-XXXIII.

<sup>4</sup> Isa. xxxiv. 17-xxxv. 2 has been added in a different hand in a space which had been left blank. Cf. *ibid.* Plate XXVIII. Why the space was left blank can only be conjectured, but it would seem that the copyist knew of the missing verses, but had not their text before him. Possibly the manuscript from which he copied was mutilated or illegible.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Th.L.Z.* lxxv (1950), col. 539; *V.T.* i (1951), 40; *Die hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle* (1951), p. 58.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *ibid.* p. 6, where the *Nash Papyrus* is dated before the Destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70. S. Zeitlin, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xl (1949-50), 64 f. n., holds that the final letters came into vogue in the second half of the second century A.D.

come down so late on this ground.<sup>1</sup> We must, however, allow for a long period of use of the manuscript, and a period of about a century has been suggested.<sup>2</sup> It may have been even longer than this, since we have no means of knowing how frequently the manuscript was used.

Attention has been drawn to the ruling and the paragraphing<sup>3</sup> of the Isaiah manuscript, but no conclusive results can be based on these. Similarly the ink<sup>4</sup> has been analysed without yielding much help. Some of the linen found in the cave has been

On the other hand, J. Leveen, in a Letter to *The Times*, 7 May 1951, argues that the fluid use of *Mêm* in the *Isaiah Scroll* enables us to date the manuscript well before the fall of Jerusalem. His argument is that in the Massoretic text we have a single instance of final *Mêm* in the middle of a word (Isa. ix. 6), and a single instance of a medial *Mêm* at the end of a word (Neh. ii. 13), while according to Rabbinical tradition the Severus Codex of the Torah, which Titus carried to Rome, had five words ending in a medial *Mêm*. In the *Isaiah Scroll* there are many cases of medial *Mêm* at the end of a word and of final *Mêm* in the middle of a word. Zeitlin, *loc. cit.* discounts the traditions on which Leveen relies as untrustworthy.

<sup>1</sup> The present writer is doubtful how far we can press this argument based on final letters. If it is pressed then the whole basis of the argument that makes any of the Scrolls younger than the *Nash Papyrus* is demolished. For all the final letters are used properly in that text. The *Habakkuk Commentary* uses the final *Pê*, and also the final *Kaph* and *Šādhê*, and according to the table given by Trever in *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 113 (Feb. 1949), pp. 20 f., final *Kaph* and *Pê* are found in the fragment of the *Lamech Scroll* so far unrolled, though neither final *Mêm* nor final *Šādhê* occurs there. If there was a period of the fluid use of the final and medial forms, it might be due to the particular scribe's preference, or even caprice, as to which was employed. O. H. Lehmann, *P.E.Q.* (1951), p. 35, suggests the possibility of a deliberate archaistic non-use of final letters. This does not seem convincing, since none of the Scrolls is without any final letters.

<sup>2</sup> Even advocates of the second century B.C. date for the original preparation of this manuscript have been willing to allow that some of these additions may have been made a century later. Thus J. C. Trever dates the *Isaiah Scroll* 125-100 B.C., and the additions between 25 B.C. and A.D. 25. Cf. *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 113 (Feb. 1949), p. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. G. R. Driver, Letters to *The Times*, 23 and 30 August, 22 September 1949, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xl (1949-50), 129, *Hibbert Journal*, xlix (1950-51), 18, and *The Hebrew Scrolls* (1951), pp. 28 ff., 43 ff.; E. R. Lacheman, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xl (1949-50), 34 ff.; J. Leveen, Letter to *The Times*, 5 September 1949.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. G. R. Driver, Letter to *The Times*, 22 September 1949, *J.Q.R.*, *loc. cit.* pp. 134, 359, and *The Hebrew Scrolls*, p. 28; H. J. Plenderleith, *J.T.V.I.* lxxxii (1950), 146 f.; G. Lambert, *N.R.Th.* lxxii (1950), 505; S. A. Birnbaum, *V.T.* i (1951), 97 f.

examined,<sup>1</sup> but while it is not without interest it does not help in the dating of the deposit. Some of the linen has been subjected to the radiocarbon test,<sup>2</sup> but this is not very helpful. It is claimed that it yields a date not more than two hundred years before or after A.D. 33.<sup>3</sup> It is doubtful how secure this date is, since only a single test appears to have been made,<sup>4</sup> but even if it is secure the range of 400 years is of more use to exclude certain dates than to establish any date for the deposit in the cave. The radiocarbon test, the palaeographical evidence and the archaeological evidence would all appear to rule out the view that some of the non-Biblical works found amongst the Scrolls were first composed in the Middle Ages.<sup>5</sup>

It seems to me desirable that every aspect of the Scrolls should be studied with the utmost care and with complete

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Louisa Bellinger, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 118 (Apr. 1950), pp. 10 f; G. M. Crowfoot, *P.E.Q.* (1951), pp. 5 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Manchester Guardian*, 30 January 1951; O. R. Sellers, *B.A.* xiv (1951), 29. On the radiocarbon method of dating, cf. A. Bauchau, *N.R.Th.* lxxiii (1950), 515 ff.; D. Collier, *B.A.* xiv (1951), 25 ff.; W. G. Guindon, *C.B.Q.* xiii (1951), 268 ff.; F. E. Zeuner, *The Listener*, 28 June 1951, pp. 1053 f.

<sup>3</sup> It was at first inaccurately stated that this meant that the linen comes from the period 167 B.C. to A.D. 233. Since there was no year 0, it should be from 168 B.C., as Sellers has since noted. Cf. *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 123 (Oct. 1951), p. 25.

<sup>4</sup> G. E. Wright, *B.A.* xiv (1951) 31 ff., cites a case where three tests were made on a single piece of wood, where the dates yielded were within a range of 270 years on either side from 746 B.C., 698 B.C., and 289 B.C. It is clear that at least one of these tests was quite unreliable, and since but one test was made in the case of the linen of the Scrolls, we have no means of knowing whether this was similarly unreliable.

<sup>5</sup> While it has been said that palaeography is not an exact science that can define the age of manuscripts of the centuries immediately before and after the beginning of the Christian era with precision, it is hard to think that the Dead Sea Scrolls are of anything like so recent a date as the manuscripts of the *Zadokite Work*, which will be discussed below. These are dated in the tenth century in one case, and the eleventh or twelfth century in the other. Again, while the date of the deposit cannot be determined with security from the age of the jars, since the jars could be older than some or all of the manuscripts that were placed in them, it would be very surprising if manuscripts which were copies of works first written in the Middle Ages should all be hidden in jars which belonged to a collection of similar jars, all more than a thousand years old. Further, while the radiocarbon test cannot be implicitly trusted, it would be surprising if it erred by so great a margin as the medieval theory would require. And since the cumulative force of all three of these surprises would add enormously to their surprising character, it may be said that the medieval theory is highly improbable.

independence.<sup>1</sup> No one line of approach can give the answers to all the questions I have posed, and no scholar should brush all others but himself aside. We must distinguish between evidence and opinion, and while all opinions cannot be reconciled in any final view of the Scrolls, all evidence must somehow be accommodated in such a view. This means that the internal evidence of the contents of the non-Biblical texts must be studied as much as any other aspect of the Scrolls,<sup>2</sup> and it is to this that I want particularly to direct my attention.

Ever since the Scrolls first became known, their affinity with another work has been remarked. Early in the present century Solomon Schechter published some fragments now in the Cambridge University Library, which were found in the Cairo Genizah, under the title *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*.<sup>3</sup> These

<sup>1</sup> While it is clear from the preceding note that the present writer does not accept the view of S. Zeitlin or P. R. Weis, he recognizes the service they have rendered in challenging the easy acceptance of the views that were first advanced after scanty and partial study. Both have drawn attention to the many links between the Scrolls and the Karaites, and it is well that these links should be studied, whatever conclusions may be ultimately adopted. Similarly G. R. Driver has rightly entered a *caveat* against the over-confident assurances of palaeographers and archaeologists who have drawn conclusions going far beyond the evidence they have produced. Those who have studied the internal contents of the documents have offered the most widely divergent theories of the historical background out of which they came, by concentrating on the elements that seemed to support their views and by ignoring elements that did not. Here, once more, the critic may render a real service to scholarship; but so too may the propounders of the various theories, who have at least shown that many known situations can fit some of the features. From the bewildering variety of views stable conclusions may be reached, but they can only be stable if they are able to accommodate all the known conditions and to integrate into a single view all the evidence we have.

<sup>2</sup> G. Pidoux, *R.Th.Ph.*, 3rd series, i (1951) 204, maintains that the only method which can yield secure results is that of internal study, while S. A. Birnbaum, *J.T.V.I.* lxxxii (1950), 145, would dismiss this method.

<sup>3</sup> *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, vol. I: *Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (1910). The most convenient edition of the Hebrew text is that of L. Rost, *Die Damaskusschrift* (1933). The most accessible English translation is that of R. H. Charles, in *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, ii (1913), 786 ff. (first published separately in 1912). Many other translations have been published including French translations by I. Lévi, *R.E.J.* lxi (1911), 172 ff., and M.-J. Lagrange, *R.B.* (N.S. ix), xxi (1912), 215 ff.; and German translations by F. M. Th. Böhl, *T.T.* xlvi (1912), 5 ff., W. Staerk, *Die jüdische Gemeinde des Neuen Bundes in Damaskus* (1922), pp. 15 ff., and P. Riessler, *Altjüdisches Schrifttum*

fragments are of two manuscripts,<sup>1</sup> which are held to come from the tenth century and from the eleventh or twelfth century of our era. In part the two manuscripts overlap, but where they do so the text is not identical, and it is clear that either one or both of these copyists, or some earlier copyists, felt free to modify the text. The later of the two manuscripts is manifestly not the author's autograph, and there is no reason to suppose that the earlier one is such an autograph. How much earlier than the tenth century the composition of the work is to be placed, however, is a question which has been much disputed. It has been ascribed to dates so far apart as the second century B.C.<sup>2</sup> and the eleventh century A.D.,<sup>3</sup> with a great variety of dates in between.<sup>4</sup>

*ausserhalb der Bibel* (1928), pp. 920 ff. ; Danish translation by F. F. Hvidberg, *Menigheden af den Nye Pagt i Damascus* (1928), pp. 37 ff. While the present lecture has been in the press, S. Zeitlin has published facsimiles of the MSS. of this text, together with an Introduction. Cf. *The Zadokite Fragments* (1952).

<sup>1</sup> Manuscript A consists of eight leaves, and is numbered T.-S. 10 K 6 ; Manuscript B consists of a single leaf and is numbered T.-S. 16 311.

<sup>2</sup> So Ed. Meyer, *Die Gemeinde des Neuen Bundes im Lande Damaskus* (1919), and *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, ii, 4th ed. (1925), 47 ff. ; H. Gressmann, in W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums in späthellenistischem Zeitalter*, 3rd ed., edited by H. Gressmann (1926), p. 15 ; P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (1947), pp. 11 f. ; W. E. Barnes, *J.T.S.* xii (1910-11), 301 ff. ; G. F. Moore, *H.T.R.* iv (1911), 330 ff. (but cf. *Judaism*, i (1927), 204) ; B. D. Eerdmans, *T.T.* xlv (1911), 282 ff. While refraining from committing himself to any date, P. Volz inclined to the pre-Maccabean date of Ed. Meyer. Cf. *Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* (1934), p. 15. I. Lévi, *R.E.J.* lxiii (1912), 4, dated it after 165 B.C., though finding it to reflect the Maccabean period. The present writer, in *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 2nd ed. (1947), p. 74, dated it 'somewhere in the last century and a half before the Christian era'.

<sup>3</sup> So A. Marmorstein, *T.T.* lii (1918), 92 ff.

<sup>4</sup> J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu*, ii B (1937), 116, N. A. Dahl, *Das Volk Gottes* (1941), p. 305a, and earlier H. Gressmann, *Z.D.M.G.* lxvi (1912), 499 f. (for Gressmann's later view, cf. above, note 2) all date it in the first century B.C. or the first century A.D. ; R. H. Pfeiffer, *History of New Testament Times* (1949), p. 57, dates it between 100 B.C. and A.D. 70 ; F. M. Th. Böhl, *loc. cit.* pp. 1 ff., dates it in the first century A.D. ; J. A. Montgomery, *B.W.* xxxviii (1911), 373 ff., I. Lévi, *R.E.J.* lxi (1911), 161 ff., lxiii (1912), 1 ff., and H. Preisker, *T.S.K.* xcvi-xcix (1926), 295 ff., date it before A.D. 70 ; F. F. Hvidberg, *op. cit.* p. 289, assigns it to a date between 63 B.C. and A.D. 70 ; J. Gutmann, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, v (1930), col. 753, assigns it to a date within the century preceding the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70 ; R. Leszynsky, *Die Sadduzäer* (1912),

This text tells how 390 years after Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of the Temple there was the sprouting of a root from Aaron and Israel, by which appears to be meant the origin of the sect from which the text came.<sup>1</sup> The disloyalty of the nation to the law of God is described, and the sect is declared to have sought to give renewed loyalty and obedience. After a further period of twenty years we find there is a figure who is called the Teacher of Righteousness, who is apparently the leader of the sect.<sup>2</sup> There are references to his death, which is called his 'gathering in'.<sup>3</sup> After his death another leader, called the Star,<sup>4</sup> is found leading the sect, which now migrates to Damascus.<sup>5</sup> We are told that forty years after the gathering in of the Teacher of Righteousness the Messiah should arise from Aaron and Israel,<sup>6</sup> and it is

pp. 142 ff., contents himself with assigning it to the time before the destruction of the Temple; J. Schousboe, *La Secte juive de l'Alliance Nouvelle au pays de Damas et le Christianisme naissant* (1942), assigns it to c. A.D. 70; G. Margoliouth, *Expositor*, 8th series, ii (1911), 499 ff., iii (1912), 213 ff., and *Bibliotheca Sacra*, lxxix (1912), 421 ff., assigns it to the period immediately following A.D. 70; R. Eisler, in *Occident and Orient* (Gaster Anniversary Volume, 1936), pp. 110 ff., dates it between A.D. 70 and A.D. 135; M.-J. Lagrange, *R.B.* (N.S. ix), xxi (1912), 213 ff., 321 ff. (N.S. xi), xxiii (1914), 133 ff., and R. J. Tournay, *ibid.*, lvi (1949), 233, assign it to the end of the second century A.D.; S. Landauer, *Th.L.Z.* xxxvii (1912), cols. 261 ff., assigns it to the period of the Mishnah; W. Bousset, *Th.R.* xviii (1915), 51 ff., assigns it to c. the seventh century A.D.; A. Büchler, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. iii (1912-13), 429 ff., F. Perles, *O.L.Z.* xvi (1913), cols. 417 ff., and S. Zeitlin, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xxxix (1948-49), 180, assign it to the seventh or eighth century A.D.; D. S. Margoliouth, *Expositor*, 8th series, vi (1913), 157 ff., assigns it to the tenth century A.D.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. i. 5 (p. I, lines 5 f.). The references to the *Zadokite Work* will be given by chapter and verse, as in the edition of Charles, and also by page and line of the Hebrew text.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. i. 6 f. (p. I, lines 8 ff.).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. ix. 39 (p. XX, lines 13 f.).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. ix. 8 (p. VII, line 19). It is probable that the Star is to be distinguished from the Teacher of Righteousness, though a few writers have maintained that they should be identified. So S. Schechter in the *editio princeps*, p. xiii, and J. B. Frey, in *S.D.B.* i (1928), col. 399.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. vi. 1, viii. 6 (pp. IV, lines 2 f., VI, line 5).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. ix. 39 (p. XX, lines 13 ff.). S. Schechter, *loc. cit.* identified the Teacher of Righteousness with the expected Messiah. A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (1950), p. 56 (E. Tr., p. 44), takes the same view. This view was rejected by G. F. Moore, *H.T.R.* iv (1911), 342; J. A. Montgomery, *B.W.*, N.S. xxxviii (1911), 376; J. B. Frey, *loc. cit.* Since Dupont-Sommer advocated this view anew it has been declared improbable by J. van der Ploeg, *Bi.Or.* viii (1951), 13, and rejected by J. Bonsirven,

clear that this period of forty years had not yet expired, though it seems probable that its close was not far off. If we could rely on the figures of this chronology all of these events could be located in the second century B.C.<sup>1</sup> It is impossible to rely on it, however.<sup>2</sup> From no other ancient Jewish source do we have accurate chronology of the Persian period, and little reliance can be placed on this.<sup>3</sup> It is probable that the figure 390 was derived from Ezek. iv. 5,<sup>4</sup> though it is here reckoned from a different point. It is schematic rather than scientific.<sup>5</sup>

*Études*, cclxviii (1951), 216, and R. de Vaux, *La Vie Intellectuelle* (Apr. 1951), p. 67. G. F. Moore, *loc. cit.* could find no evidence of any belief in the resurrection in the *Zadokite Work*. On the other hand G. Margoliouth thought that the sect expected two Messiahs, both of whom were dead and expected to rise again. Cf. *J.T.S.* xii (1910-11), 446 ff., and *Expositor*, 8th series, ii (1911), 510 ff. L. Ginzberg, *M.G.W.J.* (N.F. xxii), lviii (1914), 160, held that some passages in the *Zadokite Work* favoured the identification of the Teacher of Righteousness and the Messiah, while other passages did not.

<sup>1</sup> Three hundred and ninety years after Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of the Temple would carry us to 196 B.C. Ed. Meyer, *Die Gemeinde des Neuen Bundes im Lande Damaskus* (1919), pp. 13 f., treats this chronology seriously. Cf. R. H. Pfeiffer, *History of New Testament Times* (1949), p. 57: 'If we assume on the part of the author a chronological accuracy unparalleled in ancient Jewish literature for the period 586 B.C. to 175 B.C., we may date the schism and the journey to Damascus soon after 176 B.C.'

<sup>2</sup> So R. Leszynsky, *Die Sadduzäer* (1912), p. 166; F. F. Hvidberg, *Z.A.W.* (N.F. x), li (1933), 309.

<sup>3</sup> G. Hölscher, *Z.N.W.* xxviii (1929), 42, quotes the reckoning given in *Seder 'Olām Rabbā*, where the Exile is reckoned at seventy years, the Persian period at thirty-four years, the Greek period at 180 years, and the Hasmonaeon period at 103 years. The total here is therefore 387 years from the destruction of Jerusalem to the death of Antigonus. A further example of the inaccuracy of chronological knowledge, this time coming from the very period in which the acceptance of the figures of the *Zadokite Work* as reliable would place it, is the passage referring to the Seventy Weeks in Dan. ix. Interpreters have made brave attempts to treat these figures as precise, but it is hard to find any two who agree in their conclusions on this basis.

<sup>4</sup> So R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii (1913), 800, and earlier R. Leszynsky, *R.E.J.* lxii (1911), 193.

<sup>5</sup> F. F. Hvidberg, *Z.A.W.* (N.F. x), li (1933), 309 ff., argued that the period is based on the figures in the book of Genesis for the period from the birth of Shem to the birth of Abraham. S. Zeitlin, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xxxix (1948-49), 238 f., and P. R. Weis, *ibid.* xli (1950-51), 142, hold that the figure is based on a Talmudic tradition which assigns 420 years to the duration of the Second Temple. If to this a further seventy years are added for the length of the exile, we reach a total of 490 years, from the destruction of the first Temple to that of the second.



There are references to the enemies of the sect. Amongst them figures one who is called the Man of Scorn,<sup>1</sup> and the Prophet of Untruth.<sup>2</sup> These appear to be one and the same person. There is also a reference to the chief of the Kings of Javan<sup>3</sup> who appears to be allied to the enemies of the sect.

We learn something of the organization of the sect, though we have no means of knowing whether this organization was due to the Star and dated from about the time of the migration to Damascus, or whether it had been the same in the time of the Teacher of Righteousness or from the beginning. There are four categories of members: priests, Levites, Israelites and proselytes.<sup>4</sup> It is improbable that the last class means proselytes from the Gentiles, since the sect avoided any dealings with Gentiles,<sup>5</sup> and it is more probable that the reference is to converts from amongst the Jews to the sect which regarded itself as the true Israel. They were therefore persons who had not yet entered into the full membership of the sect.<sup>6</sup> The members were organized in camps,<sup>7</sup> and at the head of each camp there was

A. Baraita is then quoted in support of the tradition that Hillel became Nasi 100 years before the destruction of the Temple, and the period of the *Zadokite Work* is held to carry us to Hillel's installation as Nasi. Both of these are very ingenious interpretations. They both agree in finding the figure to be schematic rather than accurate chronology.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. i. 10 (p. I, line 14). In ix. 36 (p. XX, line 11) we have the plural of this expression.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. ix. 22 (p. VIII, line 13). Cf. also i. 10 (p. I, lines 14 f.) and viii. 1 (p. VI, line 1). In ix. 39 (p. XX, line 15) we find the expression Man of Untruth.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. ix. 20 (pp. VIII, line 11, XIX, lines 23 f.). In the use of the word 'chief' it is probable that we should see a *double entendre*. The word occurs in a comment on the phrase 'the poison of asps', where the word 'poison' is identical with the word 'chief' in the comment.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. xvii. 1 ff. (p. XIV, lines 3 ff.).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. xiv. 7 ff. (p. XII, lines 6 ff.).

<sup>6</sup> In the *Manual of Discipline*, Col. II, lines 20 ff., we find three classes referred to, priests, Levites, and all the people. But while there is no reference to the proselytes here, it is to be observed that there is reference to a fourth category, the novices. Indeed, the opening columns of the facsimile edition of the text deal with the concluding stages of their novitiate, and further on we read more of the admission of new members to a probationary period (cf. col. VI, lines 14 ff.). It is further to be noted that the novices were Israelites who wished to enter the sect, and not Gentiles. It is these who are probably referred to as the proselytes in the *Zadokite Work*.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. xvii. 1 (p. XIV, line 3).

an Inspector,<sup>1</sup> who has been compared by some writers with the Christian bishop.<sup>2</sup> They were strict in the observance of the Sabbath,<sup>3</sup> and they appear to have been in disagreement with their contemporaries in the matter of the calendar.<sup>4</sup> There is a reference to the book of *Jubilees* in the *Zadokite Work*,<sup>5</sup> and the sect appears to have accepted the calendar which was approved by that book.<sup>6</sup> The members are called the Sons of Zadok,<sup>7</sup> and this appears to mean that they were loyal to the high priestly house of Zadok.<sup>8</sup> There is a reference to the polygamy of David,<sup>9</sup> which is excused on the ground that the Law was unknown to him, since this was before the restoration of the law by Zadok.<sup>10</sup> On the question of marriage the sect condemned marriage with a second wife while the first wife was living.<sup>11</sup> It was therefore against polygamy.<sup>12</sup> It also objected to marriage with a niece,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. x. 10 ff., xv. 7, xvi. 1 ff., xix. 8 ff. (pp. IX, lines 16 ff., XIII, lines 4 ff. 7 ff., XV, lines 7 ff.).

<sup>2</sup> So J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu*, ii B (1937), 132 ff.; B. Reicke, *Symbolae Biblicae Upsalienses*, No. 6 (1946), p. 16 n. Earlier I. Lévi, *R.E.J.* lxi (1911), 195, compared him with the Epimelētēs of the Essenes, the Bishop of the Church, and the Censor of the Romans. Cf. also W. Staerk, *Die jüdische Gemeinde des Neuen Bundes in Damaskus* (1922), p. 68. Against this, K. G. Goetz, *Z.N.W.* xxx (1931), 89 ff., raised objection. Cf. H. W. Beyer, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, ed. by R. Kittel, ii (1935), 614 f.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. xiii. 1 ff., 13 ff. (pp. X, lines 14 ff., XI, lines 4 ff.). On the attitude to the Sabbath of the sect, cf. M. H. Segal, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. ii (1911-12), 136 f.; G. Margoliouth, *E.T.* xxiv (1912-13), 553 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. v. 1, viii. 15, xx. 1 (pp. III, lines 12 ff., VI, lines 18 f., XVI, lines 2 f.).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. xx. 1 (p. XVI, lines 3 f.).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. S. Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, pp. xvi, xix f.; G. Margoliouth, *E.T.* xxiii (1911-12), 362 ff.; A. Büchler, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. iii (1912-13), 435 f.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. vi. 2 (p. IV, line 3). I. Lévi, *R.E.J.* lxxv (1913), 24 ff., called attention to another fragment from the Cairo Genizah on which a reference to 'the Community of the Sons of Zadok' stood. Cf. also M.-J. Lagrange, *R.B.* (N.S. xi), xxiii (1914), 135 f.

<sup>8</sup> H. J. Schoeps, *Z.R.G.G.* iii (1951), 336, thinks it probable that the Teacher of Righteousness was named Zadok, and gave his name to his followers.

<sup>9</sup> vii. 4 f. (p. V, lines 1 ff.).

<sup>10</sup> vii. 6 (p. V, lines 4 f.).

<sup>11</sup> vii. 1 ff. (p. IV, lines 19 ff.).

<sup>12</sup> S. Schechter, *op. cit.* p. xxxvi, thinks divorce was equally condemned by the sect, but the reference to David immediately following would seem to limit the thought to polygamy. Cf. R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii (1913), 810. M. H. Segal, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. ii (1911-12), 138, thinks the text of xvi. 9 (p. XIII, line 17) once had reference to divorce, and permitted it only when the

though this is not explicitly prohibited in the Pentateuch.<sup>1</sup> This objection was based on the principle of analogy.<sup>2</sup> Since the marriage of a man with his aunt is prohibited, they held that the marriage of a woman with her uncle was equally illegitimate.

It must here suffice to mention one other significant, but cryptic, reference in the text. The sect held in special esteem a book which is called the *Book of Hagu*.<sup>3</sup> Nothing was known of this book, and little may yet be known. But to this we must return.

In the literature which was devoted to this text between 1910 and the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, much attention was given to the identification of the sect. The Pharisees,<sup>4</sup> the Sadducees,<sup>5</sup> the Zealots,<sup>6</sup> the Dositheans,<sup>7</sup> the followers of John

Censor allowed it. On the marriage rules of the sect, cf. also A. Büchler, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. iii (1912-13), 433 ff.; G. Margoliouth, *E.T.* xxv (1913-14), 560 ff.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. vii. 9 ff. (p. V, lines 7 ff.).

<sup>2</sup> They based this analogy on Lev. xviii. 13. It may be noted that the book of *Jubilees*, with which the *Zadokite Work* shows acquaintance, and which it follows in the matter of the calendar, is here in disagreement. Cf. *Jub.* iv. 15 ff., viii. 5 f., where marriage with a niece is recorded with no sign of disapproval.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. xi. 2, xv. 5 (pp. X, line 6, XI, line 2).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. L. Ginzberg, *M.G.W.J.* (N.F. xxi), lvii (1913), 289 ff., 676, and I. Teil, *Eine unbekante jüdische Sekte* (1922), p. 375 (this volume contains a reprint of a long series of articles in the *Monatsschrift*, together with an additional chapter; references are here given to the *Monatsschrift*, save for the final chapter, since the present writer had brief access to the book only after his work was almost completed); W. Staerk, *op. cit.* p. 97; J. Quiring, in *From the Pyramids to Paul* (G. L. Robinson Festschrift) (1935), p. 199; H. W. Beyer, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, ed. by R. Kittel, ii (1935), 614. It was rejected by R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii (1913), 791; M.-J. Lagrange, *R.B.* (N.S. ix), xxi (1912), 337, and *Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ* (1931), p. 332. N. A. Dahl, *Das Volk Gottes* (1941), p. 129, holds that the sect was an offshoot of the Pharisees.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. R. Leszynsky, *Die Sadduzäer* (1912) pp. 142 ff. (cf. the review by F. Perles, *O.L.Z.* xvi (1913), cols. 417 ff.). This view was rejected by B. Revel, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. vii (1916-17), 429 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. M.-J. Lagrange, *R.B.* (N.S. ix), xxi (1912), 345, and *Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ* (1931), pp. 332 f.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. S. Schechter, *op. cit.* pp. xxi f.; J. Schousboe, *La Secte juive de l'Alliance Nouvelle au pays de Damas* (1942), pp. 52 ff. This view is rejected by I. Lévi, *R.E.J.* lxiii (1912), 10 ff.; S. Poznanski, *Jewish Review*, ii (1911-12), 277 f.; L. Ginzberg, *M.G.W.J.* lvii (1913), 395 ff. On the Dositheans cf. J. A. Montgomery, *The Samaritans* (1907), pp. 252 ff.; G. F. Moore, *H.T.R.* iv (1911), 360 ff.

the Baptist,<sup>1</sup> and the Ebionite Christians<sup>2</sup> all had their advocates, and while the last two seem quite out of the question, the others had all some measure of appropriateness. Moreover, the connections with the Essenes were noted, though the *Zadokite Work* was not claimed to be Essene.<sup>3</sup> Yet all of these were in some measure inappropriate, for our sect does not wholly agree with what is known of any of these parties. It is for this reason that they have been called the Zadokites.<sup>4</sup> In Hebrew this name is identical with the Sadducees, but it is most improbable that they were the Sadducees of the New Testament. By using the term Zadokites we avoid prejudicing their relation to any of the parties mentioned, while being free to recognize their affinities with any or all of them.<sup>5</sup>

The advocates of the very late dating of the *Zadokite Work*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. R. Eisler, in *Occident and Orient* (Easter Anniversary Volume) (1936), pp. 110 ff.; J. Schousboe, *op. cit.* Schousboe identified the Man of Scorn with Jesus. G. Margoliouth had earlier found references to John the Baptist in the *Zadokite Work*, but in a different way, holding him to be the predecessor of the Teacher of Righteousness, and not treated as set against Jesus. Cf. *Expositor*, 8th series, iii (1912), 220 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. G. Margoliouth, *The Athenaeum* (26 Nov. 1910), pp. 657 ff.; *J.T.S.* xii (1910-11), 446 ff.; *Expositor*, 8th series, ii (1911), 499 ff., iii (1912), 213 ff.; *E.T.* xxiii (1911-12), 362 ff., xxiv (1912-13), 553 ff., xxv (1913-14), 560 ff.; *Jewish Review*, ii (1911-12), 361 ff.; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, lxix (1912), 421 ff.; *International Journal of Apocrypha*, x (1914), 36 f. This view was rejected by K. Kohler, *A.J.Th.* xv (1911), 404 f.; M.-J. Lagrange, *R.B.* (N.S. ix), xxi (1912), 335; G. F. Moore, *H.T.R.* ix (1911), 370 ff.; S. Poznanski, *Jewish Review*, ii (1911-12), 443 ff.; J. B. Frey, *S.D.B.* i (1928), col. 402.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. M.-J. Lagrange, *R.B.* (N.S. ix), xxi (1912), 344; I. Lévi, *R.E.J.* lxi (1911), 9 f.; J. Bonsirven, *Le Judaïsme palestinien*, i (1936), 67. None of these scholars accepted the Essene view. On the Essenes cf. among many other works, W. Bauer, in *P.W.*, Supplement, iv (1924), cols. 386 ff.; H. Mosbech, *Essæismen : et Bidrag til Senjødedomens Religionshistorie* (1916); J. W. Lightley, *Jewish Sects and Parties in the Time of Jesus* (1925), pp. 268 ff.; L. Marchal, in *S.D.B.* ii (1934), cols. 1109 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. S. Schechter, *op. cit.* p. xviii; R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii (1913), 790.

<sup>5</sup> None of the other proposed identifications is wholly satisfactory, yet almost every one can provide some points of connection. It is probable that during the period 200 B.C. to A.D. 100 there were many Jewish groups, differing from one another in various respects, yet all developed from the group known as the Hasidim of Maccabean days. Cf. H. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 3rd ed., iv (1864), 482 ff.; K. Kohler, *A.J.Th.* xv (1911), 435; J. Bonsirven, *Le Judaïsme palestinien*, i (1934), 68.

based themselves on the affinities between the members of the sect and the *Ḳaraites*.<sup>1</sup> The early *Ḳaraites* were called by the name which we may represent by Sadducees or by Zadokites,<sup>2</sup> but later *Ḳaraites* resented and rejected any connection with these people.<sup>3</sup> It is clear that the name was then understood to mean Sadducees,<sup>4</sup> though it is possible that the reference was really to the sect of which we have knowledge through the *Zadokite Work*, and that there was confusion owing to the same name being used for the two groups.<sup>5</sup> It should be remembered that the *Zadokite Work* was found in a genizah in which much *Ḳaraite* material was found.<sup>6</sup>

The discussion of the *Zadokite Work* is all reopened, however, by the finding of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The *Manual of Discipline* is clearly the Manual of the same sect from which we have the *Zadokite Work*. Here we find that a long period of initiation precedes full membership of the sect,<sup>7</sup> and that apart from those who are still in that period, there are three classes of members of the sect.<sup>8</sup> The opening columns of this text do not stand in the American edition, but are now in the hands of Father de Vaux,<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> On the *Ḳaraites* cf. A. de Harkavy, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, vii (1904), 438 ff. ; K. Kohler, *ibid.* pp. 446 f. ; S. Poznanski, in Hastings's *E.R.E.* vii (1914), 662 ff. ; I. Markon, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, ix (1932), cols. 923 ff. ; J. Heller, *ibid.* cols. 945 ff. ; L. Nemoy, *Jewish Universal Encyclopedia*, vi (1942), 314 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. S. Poznanski, *R.E.J.* xlv (1902), 162 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *ibid.* p. 171 ; J. Mann, *Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature*, ii (1935), 295.

<sup>4</sup> Their enemies stigmatized them as the 'sect of Zadok and Boethus'. Cf. J. Mann, *ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> The *Ḳaraite* writer *Ḳirḳisānī* tells us that the Zadokites were founded by Zadok and Boethus, who were the disciples of Antigonus of Soko. Cf. the passage cited by L. Nemoy, in *H.U.C.A.* vii (1930), 326. The successor of Antigonus, according to *Pirḳe Aboth*, i. 4, seems to have been one of the victims of Alcimus in the Maccabaeon period (cf. R. T. Herford, *Pirḳe Aboth*, 2nd ed. (1930), p. 25). Zadok and Boethus may therefore have belonged to the same time. On the other hand since the *Zadokite Work* makes particular reference to the Zadok who became High Priest in the time of Solomon, the 'Sons of Zadok' from whom it emanated would seem to have been a group which owned loyalty to the Zadokite priesthood.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. J. Mann, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xii (1921-22), p. 123 ff. ; P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (1947), p. 56 n.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *Manual of Discipline*, col. VI, lines 14 ff.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. col. II, lines 20 f.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. R. de Vaux, *R.B.* lvii (1950), 427.

who has stated that there is here a reference to the *Book of Hagu*. We do not yet know whether the *Manual of Discipline* is the *Book of Hagu*, or whether that is a still unrecovered work.<sup>1</sup> In any case this reference constitutes a most significant link between the sect of the Scrolls and the sect of the *Zadokite Work*. In the *Manual of Discipline* we find the officer whom we have called the Inspector,<sup>2</sup> who was charged with great authority over the members. It would appear that the members had all things in common.<sup>3</sup> They handed over their goods to the sect, and ate together.<sup>4</sup> They entered the sect with a solemn oath and were subject to their own tribunals.<sup>5</sup> The members of the sect are called the sons of Zadok here,<sup>6</sup> as in the *Zadokite Work*.

The Teacher of Righteousness figures much in the *Habakkuk Commentary*,<sup>7</sup> where he is described as a priest.<sup>8</sup> Over against him stands a Wicked Priest, who is bitterly condemned.<sup>9</sup> We also find the Prophet of Untruth,<sup>10</sup> or the Man of Untruth,<sup>11</sup> who may be the same person who is referred to in the *Zadokite Work*, where we also found the name Man of Scorn. We find reference to the defiling of the sanctuary,<sup>12</sup> by which the Temple appears to

<sup>1</sup> W. H. Brownlee, *B.A.* xiii (1950), 54, conjectures that the *Manual of Discipline* is the *Book of Hagu*, while S. Zeitlin, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xli (1950-51), 263, doubts if there ever was such a book as the *Book of Hagu*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Manual of Discipline*, col. VI, lines 10 ff., 19 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. col. V, line 3 to col. VII, line 7. Cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 64 (E. Tr., p. 50).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. col. VI, line 2.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. cols. V to VII. Cf. also *Zadokite Work*, x. 10 ff., xi. 1 ff. (pp. IX, lines 16 ff., X, lines 3 ff.).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. col. V, line 2.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. cols. I, line 13, II, line 2, V, line 10, VII, line 4, VIII, line 3, IX, lines 9 f., XI, line 5.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. col. II, lines 7ff. Here the word Teacher does not stand in the text as it has survived, and may not have stood there originally, though it is clear that a priestly teacher is referred to. Cf. the reconstructions of the passage in W. H. Brownlee, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 112 (Dec. 1948), p. 10; A. Dupont-Sommer, *R.H.R.* cxxxvii (1950), 132; J. van der Ploeg, *Bi.Or.* viii (1951), 5; H. E. del Medico, *Deux Manuscrits hébreux de la Mer Morte* (1951), p. 110; M. Delcor, *Essai sur le Midrash d'Habacuc* (1951), p. 22. Brownlee renders 'when they hear all the Cov(enant which) the last generation (will hear) from the mouth of the priest whom He has given unto the Ch(ildren of Israel for a teach)er to give the meaning of all the words of His servants the prophets' (the bracketed words being conjecturally restored).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. cols. VIII, line 9, IX, line 9, XI, line 4, XII, lines 2, 8.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. col. X, line 9.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. cols. II, lines 1 f., V, line 11.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. col. XII, lines 8 f.

be meant. Foreign foes are mentioned also under the name Kittim.<sup>1</sup> Elsewhere this name is used for the Greeks or for the Macedonian kingdoms of the period that followed Alexander,<sup>2</sup> and later for the Romans.<sup>3</sup> These Kittim appear to be supported by the Wicked Priest,<sup>4</sup> on whom retribution is promised,<sup>5</sup> while a wider judgment is promised, to be effected by the Elect of God.<sup>6</sup> The House of Absalom is condemned for their failure to come to the help of the Teacher of Righteousness,<sup>7</sup> who appears to have suffered persecution and probably martyrdom.<sup>8</sup>

In the text which has been called the *War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, we find the two groups of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness set over against one another.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. cols. II, lines 12, 14, III, lines 4, 9, IV, lines 5, 10, VI, lines 1, 10, IX, line 7.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. 1 Macc. i. 1, viii. 5; probably also in *Jubilees*, xxiv. 28 f. Cf. R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii (1913), 50.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Num. xxiv. 24 in the Targum of Onkelos, where Kittim is rendered *Romans*, and in the Vulgate, where it is rendered by *Italia*; Ezek. xxvii. 6, in the Vulgate, where Kittim is rendered by *Italia* (the Targum of Jonathan here having *Apuleia*); Dan. xi. 30, in the Septuagint and the Vulgate, where Kittim is rendered by *Romans*; 1 Chron. i. 7, in the Targum, where Kittim is rendered by *Italia*. Cf. also H. E. del Medico, *Deux manuscrits hébreux de la Mer Morte* (1951), p. 69, on other uses of Kittim in the Talmud.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. col. IX, lines 4 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. cols, IX, lines 9 ff., XII, lines 2 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. col. V, line 4. Here the Wicked Priest is not specified, and the retribution is more general. Whether the Elect is to be read as a singular or as a defectively written plural is not agreed. W. H. Brownlee, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 112 (Dec. 1948), p. 34, J. van der Ploeg, *Bi.Or.* viii (1951), 13a (cf. also pp. 10 f.), and H. Yalon, *Kirjath Sepher*, No. 2-3, xxvii (June 1951), 175b, all regard it as a defectively written plural.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. col. V, lines 9 ff.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. col. XI, line 5. Several scholars deny that the Teacher of Righteousness was martyred. So J. Coppens, *t H. Land*, iv (1951), 66 f.; G. Lambert and G. Vermès, *N.R.Th.* lxxiii (1951), 390 f.; E. Cavaignac, *R.H.R.* cxxxviii (1950), 156 f.; M. Delcor, *Essai sur le Midrash d'Habacuc* (1951), p. 44 (cf. *R.B.* lviii (1951), 525). Against this A. Dupont-Sommer, *V.T.* i (1951), 200 f., argues for the view that he was martyred. The main issue here is as to the interpretation of the word *lbl'w*. This is most naturally rendered *to swallow him up*, in accordance with Dupont-Sommer's view. In the *Zadokite Work*, i. 15 (p. I, line 20) we find the expression taken from Ps. xciv. 21 'they gather themselves together against the soul of the righteous', where we could equally well render 'they attack the life of the righteous'. The words that follow in the Psalm imply that it is a mortal attack, and it is most naturally so taken here.

<sup>9</sup> Parts only of this text have yet been published, but the name given to the text by E. L. Sukenik is an indication of its character, setting forth the manner of the struggle between the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness.

Some have thought the text apocalyptic or have held that the war was a ritual combat,<sup>1</sup> but it would appear to be a real war that provided the background of this text.<sup>2</sup> The text itself would seem to be what Dupont-Sommer describes as a Rule of War for the sect. The members of the sect were the Sons of Light and their enemies were the Sons of Darkness. Both of these groups are referred to in the *Zadokite Work*<sup>3</sup> and also in the *Manual of Discipline*,<sup>4</sup> though they are not given these names in the former. The Sons of Darkness are equated with the Kittim of Assyria, and with the Edomites, Philistines and Ammonites,<sup>5</sup> while the Sons of Light were faithful Jews, from Aaron and Israel.<sup>6</sup> The members of the sect are referred to in more than one of the texts as consisting of Aaron and Israel,<sup>7</sup> and in the *Zadokite Work*, as has been said, the Messiah of Aaron and Israel was expected.<sup>8</sup> This is therefore the Messiah who should arise from this sect and who should be its leader.<sup>9</sup> In the *Manual of Discipline* there

<sup>1</sup> Cf. W. Vischer, *Études Théologiques et Religieuses*, xxiv (1949), 30; I. L. Seeligmann, *Bi.Or.* vi (1949), 4b; G. Vermès, *Cahiers Sioniens*, No. 11 (Sept. 1950), pp. 190 f.

<sup>2</sup> The references to the Kittim of Assyria and the Kittim of Egypt would seem to imply an actual historical situation as the background of the text, though it is probable that the text was apocalyptic in the sense that an apocalyptic situation was believed to be about to develop. This is precisely what we find in the book of Daniel.

<sup>3</sup> The actual terms are not found in the *Zadokite Work*, though the two opposed groups are frequently referred to. Cf. i. 13 ff., viii. 1 f., ix. 36 ff. (pp. I, lines 19 ff., V, lines 20 f., VI, line 1, XX, lines 10 ff.) for references to the opponents of the Teacher of Righteousness.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. cols. I, line 9, III, lines 13, 25, for 'the Sons of Light', and col. I, line 10, for 'the Sons of Darkness'. In other passages the two opposed groups are referred to, but without the use of these terms, and in col. III, lines 19 ff., we have the contrast between light and darkness, but without reference to the Sons of Light and of Darkness.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. E. L. Sukenik, *Megillôth Genûzôth*, i (1948), 19.

<sup>6</sup> The Sons of Light are defined as from the tribes of Levi, Judah, and Benjamin. Cf. E. L. Sukenik, *ibid.* They are also defined as consisting of Aaron and Israel. Cf. *ibid.* It would therefore seem that Aaron stands for the Levitical and priestly members of the sect, and Israel for the lay members, and not for persons from the northern tribes.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *The War of the Sons of Light*, according to Sukenik, *loc. cit.*; *Manual of Discipline*, cols. V, line 6, IX, line 6.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. ix. 10 B, 29, xv, 4, xviii. 8 (?) (pp. XIX, lines 10 f., XX, line 1, XII, lines 23 f., XIV, line 19).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. M.-J. Lagrange, *R.B.* (N.S. xi), xxiii (1914), 135; F. F. Hvidberg, *Menigheden af den Nye Pagt i Damascus* (1928), p. 281.



is a reference to the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel, in the plural.<sup>1</sup>

On the banners of the Sons of Light as they went into battle religious mottoes were inscribed.<sup>2</sup> In the battle itself the ritual blowing of trumpets and the raising of the ritual cry that should make the foe to tremble, had an important place.<sup>3</sup> When victory was achieved the army was instructed to return singing hymns of praise.<sup>4</sup> The text gives an example of such a hymn.<sup>5</sup> This is similar to the hymns in the scroll that is called *Hymns of Praise*, save that they are not specifically battle songs. This scroll is doubtless also from the same sect, who would need psalms for use on other occasions. These psalms are mosaics of Biblical phrases,<sup>6</sup> and it has been suggested that at least one of them was composed by the Teacher of Righteousness.<sup>7</sup>

It is impossible here to examine all the links of word and phrase that bind these texts together, and show that the *Zadokite Work* and the non-Biblical texts amongst the Dead Sea Scrolls issued from the same sect, though not necessarily at the same stage of its history. One of the characteristic words is 'Covenant'. This word is found no less than thirty-five times in the *Zadokite Work*, and this is more frequently than in any book of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. col. IX, line 11. H. E. del Medico, *Deux Manuscrits hébreux de la Mer Morte* (1951), p. 33, renders by the singular, while H. Lambert, *Le Manuel de Discipline du Désert de Juda* (1951), p. 83, observes that the plural is strange.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. E. L. Sukenik, *Megillôth Genûzôth*, i (1948), 19.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *ibid.* J.-G. Février, *Semitica*, iii (1950), 53 ff., has argued that this scroll shows knowledge of the tactics of the Hellenistic armies of the second century B.C.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. E. L. Sukenik, *op. cit.* Plate IX, line 1.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. E. L. Sukenik, *Megillôth Genûzôth*, ii (1950), Plate XI.

<sup>6</sup> Widely different judgments have been expressed on these psalms. R. T. O'Callaghan, *Scripture*, iv (1949), 44, says they may be compared for their depth of religious sentiment and devoutness of expression with the most beautiful of the world's literature. On the other hand, A. R. Johnson, in *The Old Testament and Modern Study*, ed. by H. H. Rowley (1951), p. 165, says they do not appear to be of any great literary merit. Similarly S. Zeitlin, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xli (1950-51), 43; G. R. Driver, *Hibbert Journal*, xlix (1950-51), 13 (cf. *The Hebrew Scrolls* (1951), pp. 17 ff.).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. E. L. Sukenik, *Megillôth Genûzôth*, ii (1950), 32; A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 86 (E. Tr., p. 70). Cf. also M. H. Segal, *J.B.L.* lxx (1951), 135 n.; J.-M. P. Bauchet, *Scripture*, iv (1951), 277.

the Old Testament.<sup>1</sup> The members of the sect were bound together by a covenant, or by the New Covenant.<sup>2</sup> They refer to themselves in the *Habakkuk Commentary*<sup>3</sup> and in the *Manual of Discipline*<sup>4</sup> as a community, and the word that is used here is nowhere used in this sense in the Old Testament.<sup>5</sup> This word does not stand in the *Zadokite Work*, but it has been conjectured that we should restore it by a very slight emendation.<sup>6</sup> In the *Zadokite Work* we find the expression which had been rendered 'Unique Teacher',<sup>7</sup> where the reference is to the Teacher of Righteousness. It has been suggested that we should read *yaḥadh* = *community* instead of *yāḥīdh* = *unique*, and so should render the phrase 'Teacher of the Community'.<sup>8</sup> The word *serekh*, which means *rule* or *habit*, is also characteristic of these texts.<sup>9</sup> It is found in the *Zadokite Work*,<sup>10</sup> in the *Manual of Discipline*,<sup>11</sup> and in the *War of the Sons of Light*.<sup>12</sup> In view of these

<sup>1</sup> Cf. E. Lohmeyer, *Diatheke* (1913), p. 116.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Zadokite Work*, ii. 1, viii. 11, 15, ix. 12, 28, 37, xi. 2 (pp. II, line 2, VI, lines 11, 19, VIII, lines 1, 21, X, line 6, XIX, lines 13 f., 33 f., XX, line 12); *Habakkuk Commentary*, col. II, lines 3 f.; *Manual of Discipline*, cols. I, lines 8, 16, 18, 20, 24, II, lines 10, 12, 13, 16, 18, IV, line 22, V, lines 5, 8, 9, 10, 20, 22, VI, lines 15, 19, VIII, lines 9, 10.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. col. XII, line 4.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. cols. I, lines 1, 12, 16, II, lines 22, 24, III, lines 2, 6, 7, 12, V, lines 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 16, 21, 22, VI, lines 3, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, VII, lines 2, 6, 17, 18, 20, 22, 23, 24, VIII, lines 1, 5, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, 22, IX, lines 2, 7, 10, 19, XI, line 8.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. M. H. Segal, *J.B.L.* lxx (1951), 132 n.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. S. M. Stern, *J.B.L.* lxxix (1950), 24.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. ix. 29 (p. XX, line 1), and ix. 39 (p. XX, line 14). The word for Teacher is not quite identical in these passages.

<sup>8</sup> Similarly in ix. 53 (p. XX, line 32) we should perhaps read 'Men of the community', substituting *yaḥadh* again for *yāḥīdh*, where Charles thought this word was misplaced and moved it to yield the meaning 'Unique Teacher of Righteousness'. Cf. *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii (1913), 822. The phrase 'men of the community' is found in the *Manual of Discipline*, cols. V, lines 1, 15 f., VI, line 21, VII, line 20, VIII, lines 11, 16, IX, lines 6 f., 10, 19.

<sup>9</sup> This word is not found in Biblical Hebrew, but is found in the Talmud. It is found also in a Genizah Aramaic fragment of the *Testament of Levi*. Cf. Charles and Cowley, *J.Q.R.* xix (1906-07), 574, line 4.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. ix. 1, x. 1, xv. 1, 4, xvi. 1, xvii. 1 (pp. vii, line 6, X, line 4, XII, lines 19, 22, XIII, line 7, XIV, line 2).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. cols. I, line 16, II, lines 20, 21, V, lines 1, 23, VI, lines 8, 22.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. E. L. Sukenik, *Megillôth Genûzôth*, i (1948), Plate VIII, line 14.

and all the other verbal links that could be enumerated, it is impossible to escape the conclusion that the *Zadokite Work* which was found in the Cairo Genizah and the Dead Sea Scrolls came originally from a single sect.

In addition, therefore, to the problems of dating which I posed above, we have some new problems. How are these texts to be related to one another, and how can we explain the finding of the one in an ancient Genizah in Egypt and the others in a cave near the Dead Sea? We may first return to the problems of dating on internal grounds. The *Zadokite Work* was written after the migration of the sect to Damascus, and there would seem to be no background of warfare, though the organization was in camps. It would seem, therefore, as though the warfare was earlier than this, and as though the military organization of that conflict had left its mark permanently on the vocabulary of the sect for its divisions. Amongst the enemies in that war were the Kittim of Assyria. There are also references to the Kittim of Egypt.<sup>1</sup> Here we seem to be quite certainly in the pre-Roman period, and the Kittim of Assyria are the Seleucids and the Kittim of Egypt the Ptolemies.<sup>2</sup> Since it is the former and not the latter who are associated with the Wicked Priest, we seem to be definitely in the second century B.C., after Palestine had come under Seleucid rule. The mottoes on the banners<sup>3</sup> remind us of those of Judas Maccabaeus,<sup>4</sup> and the singing of hymns on the return from victory finds also its parallel in that period.<sup>5</sup> Both may well have been found in other periods, however.

The period of the Maccabean wars, however, seems excellently to fit the general conditions. Within the second century

<sup>1</sup> Cf. E. L. Sukenik, *Megillôth Genûzôth*, i. (1948), p. 18 n.

<sup>2</sup> S. Zeitlin objects that we nowhere else find Syria referred to as Asshur during the Second Commonwealth. Cf. *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xxxix (1948-49), 338, xli (1950-51), 266. The Seleucid rulers still claimed to possess Babylonia, where the founder of the dynasty first established his rule, and Antiochus III and Antiochus IV both exerted themselves to restore effective control there. It would therefore be appropriate to call them the Kittim of Assyria. Moreover, as S. A. Birnbaum has pointed out, the fact that we have references to the *Kittim* of Assyria and the *Kittim* of Egypt implies that the same kind of people are intended in both countries. Cf. *J.B.L.* lxx (1951), 228.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. E. L. Sukenik, *Megillôth Genûzôth*, i (1948), 19.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. 2 Macc. viii. 23, xiii. 15.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. 1 Macc. iv. 24.

B.C. there is no other period that is so appropriate. We know that at that time the question of the Zadokite priesthood was to the fore. The high priest Onias was replaced by his brother Jason in the high priestly office,<sup>1</sup> and later Menelaus, who seems to have been not even of the tribe of Levi,<sup>2</sup> was installed in the office.<sup>3</sup> That this scandalized some of the faithful is certain. For we find that some of the supporters of Judas Maccabaeus withdrew their support as soon as Alcimus came to Jerusalem,<sup>4</sup> on the ground that one of the line of the true high priests was to be trusted.<sup>5</sup> That he turned out not to deserve their trust does not affect the ground of their trust, or diminish its evidence that this was a live issue at that time. It is true that later on, after the Hasmonaeans had occupied the High Priesthood, this became a

<sup>1</sup> Cf. 2 Macc. iv. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. 2 Macc. iv. 23, iii. 4, from which it would appear that he was of the tribe of Benjamin. But according to Josephus, *Antiq.*, XII, v. 1 (xii. 238) he was the brother of Onias and Jason. Many scholars have preferred to follow Josephus. So Humphrey Prideaux, *The Old and New Testament Connected* (1845 ed.), ii. 150; S. Zeitlin, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xli (1950-51), 258. R. Marcus, *Josephus* (Loeb edition), vii (1943), 121 n., thinks Josephus is here confused. With this cf. E. Schürer, *History of the Jewish People* (English Tr.), I. i (1890), 204 n.; Ed. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, ii (1925), 133. Amongst those who have followed 2 Maccabees here cf. E. R. Bevan, *The House of Seleucus*, ii (1902), 170; H. P. Smith, *Old Testament History* (1911), p. 444; Oesterley and Robinson, *History of Israel*, ii (1932), 220 n.; L. Finkelstein, *H.T.R.* xxxv (1942), 321; M. Grandclaoudon, *La Sainte Bible* (ed. by L. Pirot and A. Clamer), 2nd part, viii (1951), 173. The account of 2 Maccabees is suspected by the scholars mentioned above on the ground that it says that Menelaus's brother Simon was a Benjamite, and held the office of *προστάρης* of the Temple, whereas it is thought that this office could not be held by one who was not a priest or a Levite. Actually, as E. R. Bevan, *C.A.H.* viii (1930), 500, notes, no one knows what the functions of the *προστάρης* were. Some scholars have maintained that the original text of 2 Maccabees did not assign Simon to the tribe of Benjamin but to the tribe of Bilgah, which is then held to have been a priestly family. So H. Bévénat, *Die beiden Makkabäerbücher* (1931), p. 181; E. Bickermann, *Der Gott der Makkabäer* (1937), p. 66; F.-M. Abel, in *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, i (1946), 52 ff. (cf. *Les Livres des Maccabées* (1949) (in *Études Bibliques*), p. 316, and *Les Livres des Maccabées* (1948) (in *La Sainte Bible de Jérusalem*) p. 115). This view is rejected by L. Finkelstein, *H.T.R.* xxxvi (1943), 33 f.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. 2 Macc. iv. 24.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. 1 Macc. vii. 10 ff.

<sup>5</sup> A. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire des Séleucides*, i (1913), 311, states that Alcimus was not of the house of Aaron, but presents no evidence in support of this.

live issue in some quarters once more, but it is hard to find evidence of a conflict then that would answer to the conditions of our texts. Some have connected the conflict with the divisions between Pharisees and Sadducees at the end of the century,<sup>1</sup> but no foreign power, answering to the Kittim, was involved in that conflict in the way indicated here. Others have transferred the scene to the middle of the first century B.C.,<sup>2</sup> when the Romans were active and when the Kittim could be equated with them. Here great weight is put on a passage in the *Habakkuk Commentary* which is held to be a reference to Pompey's capture of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. M. H. Segal, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. iii (1912-13), 301 ff.; *The Jerusalem Post* (26 May and 2 June 1950) (seen only in reprint); *J.B.L.* lxx (1951), 131 ff. Cf. also *Tarbiz*, xxii (1950-51), 136 ff.; *Eretz Israel*, i (1949-50), 39 ff. Cf. also M. Delcor, *Essai sur le Midrash d'Habacuc* (1951), pp. 56 ff., and *R.B.* lviii (1951), 538 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. especially A. Dupont-Sommer, *Observations sur le Commentaire d'Habacuc* (1950), pp. 5 ff.; *La Nouvelle Clio*, i-ii (1949-50), 330 ff.; *Aperçus préliminaires*, pp. 38 ff. (E. Tr. pp. 27 ff.). R. J. Tournay, *R.B.* lvi (1949), 232, had earlier suggested the Herodian age as the background for the texts, and J. Daniélou, *Études*, cclxv (May 1950), 183, the conquests of Pompey. Of the scholars who have followed the view of Dupont-Sommer, so far as the background of the texts is concerned, we may note R. Goossens, *La Nouvelle Clio*, i-ii (1949-50), 336 ff., 652, 662 ff.; H. Grégoire, *ibid.* pp. 354 ff.; Marcel Simon, *Revue Historique* (Oct.-Dec. 1950), pp. 218 ff.; P. Kahle, *Th.L.Z.* lxxv (1950), 539 f., and *V.T.* i (1951), 43 f.; G. Widengren, *Svenska Dagbladet* (1 Sept. 1951); and E. Cavaignac, *R.H.R.* cxxxviii (1950), 152 ff. Cf. also H. J. Schoeps, *Z.R.G.G.* iii (1951), 325 ff.; R. Dussaud, *Syria*, xxviii (1951), 138 ff. Dupont-Sommer drew from his view corollaries with reference to the origin of Christianity which have been much discussed, and which have brought upon him the strongest attacks, and which have perhaps caused the interpretations on which he relied for his dating of the background of the scrolls to be rejected with so much vigour. Going beyond Dupont-Sommer in the presentation of these views, Étiemble, *Les Temps Modernes*, No. 63, vi (Jan. 1951), 1291 f., declares that 'the Messiah of Galilee' did nothing whatever but copy the martyred Teacher of Righteousness of our sect. Amongst the writers who have strongly criticized Dupont-Sommer we may note J. van der Ploeg, *Bi.Or.* viii (1951), 11 ff.; G. Vermès, *Cahiers Sioniens*, v (1951), 58 ff.; G. Lambert and G. Vermès, *N.R.Th.* lxxiii (1951), 385 ff.; R. de Vaux, *La Vie Intellectuelle* (Apr. 1951), pp. 60 ff., and *R.B.* lviii (1951), 437 ff.; J. Coppens, *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, xxvi (1950), 580 ff., *t H. Land*, iv (1951), 65 ff., and *apud* G. Vermès, *La Communauté de la Nouvelle Alliance* (1951), p. 17; J. Bonsirven, *Études*, cclxviii (1951), 213 ff.; M. Delcor, *Essai sur le Midrash d'Habacuc* (1951), pp. 39 ff., and *R.B.* lviii (1951), 521 ff.; M. B. Dagut, *Biblica*, xxxii (1951), 542 ff.; S. Talmon, *ibid.* pp. 549 ff.

Jerusalem on the Day of Atonement.<sup>1</sup> Since it is by no means certain that Pompey did in fact capture the city on the Day of Atonement,<sup>2</sup> and since the passage in the *Habakkuk Commentary* does not mention the capture of the city by the Kittim,<sup>3</sup> this is not very convincing. Moreover, this view requires a different interpretation for the Kittim in the *Habakkuk Commentary* and the *War of the Sons of Light*,<sup>4</sup> and places the Teacher of Righteousness long after the rise of the sect,<sup>5</sup> whereas the *Zadokite Work* places him twenty years after the rise of the sect.<sup>6</sup>

If we revert to the Maccabaeen period, Onias can be identified with the Teacher of Righteousness.<sup>7</sup> He was in the line of Zadok, but was displaced from office by the Seleucid monarch,<sup>8</sup> who could well be described as the chief of the kings of Javan,<sup>9</sup> or Greece, and later he was killed at the instigation of Menelaus

<sup>1</sup> Cf. col. XI, lines 4 ff. Cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, pp. 38 ff. (E. Tr., pp. 27 ff.).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. P. R. Weis, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xli (1950-51), 151 ff.; S. Zeitlin, *ibid.* pp. 153, 264; R. de Vaux, *La Vie Intellectuelle* (Apr. 1951), pp. 64 f. H. Prideaux, *The Old and New Testament Connected* (1845 ed.), ii. 412 n., maintained that the city was taken on the 9th of Tammuz, and so Zeitlin, *loc. cit.*, and *The First Book of Maccabees* (1950), pp. 255 f. L. Herzfeld, *M.G.W.J.* iv (1855), 111 ff., and E. Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, Div. I, i (1890), 322 f., held that Josephus misunderstood his Gentile source, which used the term 'Fast Day' instead of the 'Sabbath'. To this conclusion M. B. Dagut has come after a re-examination of the question. Cf. *Biblica*, xxxii (1951), 542 ff. Cf. also D. L. Drew, *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Fouad I University*, xiii (May 1951), 83 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. J. Coppens, *'t H. Land*, iv (1951), 68; R. de Vaux, *La Vie Intellectuelle* (Apr. 1951), pp. 64 f., and *R.B.* lviii (1951), 439 ff.; H. H. Rowley, *E.T.* lxiii (1951-52), 62a.

<sup>4</sup> Dupont-Sommer identifies the Kittim of Assyria and of Egypt in the *War of the Sons of Light* with the Seleucids and Ptolemies. Cf. *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 98 (E. Tr., p. 79). In the *Habakkuk Commentary*, however, he identifies the Kittim with the Romans. Cf. *ibid.* p. 40 (E. Tr., pp. 28 f.). Cf. also I. L. Seeligmann, *Bi.Or.* vi (1949), 6, and M. H. Segal, *J.B.L.* lxx (1951), 133. For a criticism of this view cf. R. de Vaux, *R.B.* lviii (1951), 442 f.

<sup>5</sup> Dupont-Sommer assigns the rise of the sect to the Maccabaeen period. Cf. *Aperçus préliminaires*, pp. 112 ff. (E. Tr., pp. 91 ff.). The period of the Teacher of Righteousness is put in the middle of the first century B.C. Cf. *ibid.* pp. 46 f., 75 (E. Tr., pp. 34 f., 60).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. i. 6 (p. I, lines 8 ff.).

<sup>7</sup> So B. Reicke, *Studia Theologica*, ii (1949-50), 62.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. 2 Macc. iv. 7 ff., 32 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *Zadokite Work*, ix. 20 (pp. VIII, line 11, XIX, lines 23 f.).

who had wrongfully taken his office.<sup>1</sup> Here Kittim and the Wicked Priest are associated as they are in our texts.<sup>2</sup>

The House of Absalom may be identified with the Tobiad house.<sup>3</sup> Joseph, of the Tobiad house, had secured from the Egyptian court the tax-farming rights for Palestine before the change-over to Seleucid rule.<sup>4</sup> These rights had hitherto belonged to the High Priest, but from that time on the financial power in Jerusalem had been divorced from the religious

<sup>1</sup> Cf. 2 Macc. iv. 23 ff.

<sup>2</sup> A difficulty which has been raised against this view of the background of the *Habakkuk Commentary* arises from its reference to the Kittim as sacrificing to their signs (col. VI, lines 4 f.). Dupont-Sommer has maintained that this must refer to the Roman cult of *signa*, and that it proves that the Kittim of this text cannot be the Seleucids (*Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 42 (E. Tr., p. 31); so also M. H. Segal, *J.B.L.* lxx (1951), 133 f.). To this it may be replied (1) that the Roman cult of *signa* is not known to have been practised before the establishment of the empire (cf. H. J. Rose, *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (1949), p. 857b), the first attestation of it standing in Josephus, *Antiq.*, XVIII, iii. 1 (xviii. 55), as noted by G. Vermès (*La Communauté de la Nouvelle Alliance* (1951), p. 12; *Cahiers Sioniens*, v (1951), 68 f.), whereas Dupont-Sommer places the composition of the *Habakkuk Commentary* in the Republican period; (2) since we are ignorant of the standards of the Seleucids we cannot affirm that the banners of Antiochus IV did not bear an image of the monarch, to be identified with Zeus whose incarnation he professed to be (cf. M. Delcor, *Essai sur le Midrash d'Habacuc* (1951), p. 42 n., where the cult is said to have been current amongst the Assyrians, Persians and Egyptians, and hence probably adopted by the Hellenistic armies); (3) in Ps. lxxiv. 4, which is held by so cautious a scholar as J. Calès (*Le Livre des Psaumes*, ii (1936), 18 f.) to have been adapted in the Maccabaeian age, we find a reference to enemy *signs* being placed in the Temple, where the reference may be to the images of the King and of Zeus which were placed in the Temple by Antiochus (cf. Jerome, in Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, xxv (1845), col. 569), and where the word 'ôth is used precisely as in the reference in the *Habakkuk Commentary* (cf. E. Stauffer, *Th.L.Z.* lxxvi (1951), cols. 667 ff.). While this lecture has been in the press Professor R. Goossens has called my attention to Cicero, *In Catilinam*, I, ix. 24, II, vi. 13, which speak of Catiline's setting up a shrine in his home for the worship of his eagle. While this has no reference to the worship of *signa* by armies, and only makes the charge that Cataline has privately worshipped his standards in his home, it is possible that the cult of *signa* goes back to Republican times.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. A. Büchler, *Die Tobiaden und die Oniaden* (1899), for a study of the rivalry and conflict between the house of the Tobiads and the Oniads.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Büchler, *ibid.* pp. 74 ff.; E. R. Bevan, *Jerusalem under the High Priests* (1920 ed.), pp. 45 ff. These accounts rest on Josephus, *Antiq.*, XII, iv. 1 ff. (xii. 154 ff.), on which cf. M. Holleaux, *Études d'Épigraphie et d'Histoire grecques*, iii (1942), 337 ff.

leadership. When later the religious power was taken from the house of Zadok<sup>1</sup> the Tobiad house gave no support, but was probably on the other side. Yet Joseph was related to the High Priest, Onias,<sup>2</sup> giving to the situation the character of family disloyalty that could well bring down upon the Tobiad house the opprobrious name of House of Absalom from the supporters of Onias.

When Onias was put to death the event caused very profound concern to the faithful. We know from the book of Daniel, where this event has long been thought to be referred to in ix. 26,<sup>3</sup> that the death of Onias was believed to be a major critical point in world history. It was therefore thought of in terms comparable with the esteem given to the Teacher of Righteousness in our texts.

The Wicked Priest is said to have defiled the sanctuary and wrought abominations in Jerusalem,<sup>4</sup> and to have delivered wealth into the hands of the Kittim.<sup>5</sup> Menelaus is said in 2 Maccabees to have consented to many sacrileges that were committed in the city and to have led Antiochus into the sanctuary when that monarch removed the sacred vessels.<sup>6</sup> The Man of Scorn, or Prophet of Untruth,<sup>7</sup> could be identified with Antiochus Epiphanes. From the book of Daniel we know that he had a

<sup>1</sup> Cf. 2 Macc. iv. 7 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.*, XII, iv. 2 (xii. 160).

<sup>3</sup> This view has long been current amongst writers of various schools. Cf. Moses Stuart, *Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (1850), p. 289; F. Hitzig, *Das Buch Daniel* (1850), p. 162; A. A. Bevan, *Short Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (1892), p. 157; J. D. Prince, *Critical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (1899), p. 160; K. Marti, *Das Buch Daniel* (1901), p. 70; M.-J. Lagrange, *R.B.* (N.S. i), xiii (1904), 512; S. R. Driver, *The Book of Daniel* (1922 ed.), p. 140; J. A. Montgomery, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (1929), p. 246; H. W. Obbink, *Daniël* (1932), p. 123; F. Nötscher, *Daniel* (1948), p. 48b. J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu*, ii B (1937), 42, thinks the text refers to the displacement of Onias by Jason.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Habakkuk Commentary*, col XII, lines 7 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *ibid.* col. IX, lines 6 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. 2 Macc. iv. 39, v. 15 ff.

<sup>7</sup> In the *Zadokite Work*, i. 10 (p. I, lines 14 f.), the Man of Scorn is identified with the Prophet of Untruth. It is not clear here whether he is a foreign figure or an Israelite, but if he is to be identified with the Man of Untruth of the *Habakkuk Commentary*, he is most probably a foreign potentate, since he had rejected the Law among all peoples (col. V, lines 11 f.). A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 50 n. (E. Tr., p. 38 n.) thinks the Prophet, or Man, of Untruth in the *Habakkuk Commentary* is to be identified with the Wicked Priest,



mouth speaking great things and that he exalted himself even against God.<sup>1</sup>

I have already noted that the sect of the Scrolls condemned polygamy and also marriage with a niece. It happens that Joseph, the Tobiad leader, married his niece under the most dishonourable and scandalous conditions,<sup>2</sup> and since he already had a wife who had borne him seven sons,<sup>3</sup> and who seems still to have been alive, we have a concrete case in the setting of that age, to connect with the *Zadokite Work's* castigation of those who did such things.

The expectation of the coming of the Messiah fits well into the apocalyptic hopes that are known to have been current in the second century B.C. It has been thought by some that the Teacher of Righteousness was expected to rise from the dead as the Messiah of Aaron and Israel.<sup>4</sup> Others find no evidence of this in the texts,<sup>5</sup> and I am of their number. The Messiah of Aaron and Israel does not mean a Messiah of priestly stock,<sup>6</sup> but but this seems most improbable. In Dupont-Sommer's view the Wicked Priest is to be identified with Aristobulus and Hyrcanus, sometimes the one and sometimes the other being in mind. It is hard to see how either of these can be said to have rejected the Law among all peoples. It therefore seems more probable that the Wicked Priest is to be differentiated from the Man of Scorn or Prophet of Untruth, and that in the latter a non-Israelite person is to be found.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Dan. vii. 8, 20, 25, xi. 36. The Little Horn is to be identified with Antiochus Epiphanes.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.*, XII, iv. 6 (xii. 186 ff.). B. Reicke, *Studia Theologica*, ii (1949-50), 55, called attention to this.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Josephus, *Antiq.*, XII, iv. 6 (xii. 186).

<sup>4</sup> So A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 56 (E. Tr., p. 44).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. J. van der Ploeg, *Bi.Or.* viii (1951), 13; J. Bonsirven, *Études*, cclxviii (1951), 216; R. de Vaux, *La Vie Intellectuelle* (Apr. 1951), p. 67. Among scholars who had rejected this identification before the finding of the Dead Sea Scrolls, cf. G. F. Moore, *H.T.R.* iv (1911), 342; J. A. Montgomery, *B.W.*, N.S. xxxviii (1911), 376; J. B. Frey, *S.D.B.* i (1928), col. 399. L. Ginzberg finds some passages of the *Zadokite Work* to favour the identifying of the Teacher of Righteousness and the Messiah, and others to favour their differentiation. Cf. *M.G.W.J.* (N.F. xxii), lviii (1914), 160.

<sup>6</sup> R. H. Charles held that the reference was to the sons of Mariamne and Herod, who were of priestly descent from Aaron on their mother's side, and of Israel on their father's. Cf. *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii (1913), 795 f. It is hard to see how Herod, who was himself an Idumaeen and the son of a Nabataean mother, could have given Israelite descent to his children, or how a woman could give an acceptable Aaronic descent to her children. Cf. my *Relevance of Apocalyptic* (2nd ed. 1947), p. 75.

a Messiah who should arise from and lead the sect—which consisted of Aaron and Israel, of priestly and levitical members on the one side, and of laity on the other.<sup>1</sup>

If Onias were the Teacher of Righteousness, the beginnings of the sect would have to be put before the change from Ptolemaic to Seleucid rule, when the issue of Hellenism was already very much alive. There were people at that time known as the Ḥasidim who were scandalized at the trends and who sought to show resolute loyalty to the Law. To such people Onias would be a leader and a hero during his High Priesthood, and the intrigues against him, and his removal from office and subsequent martyrdom, would only deepen their devotion to him. The outbreak of the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, after the death of Onias, and the revolt under the leadership of Judas Maccabaeus, would give the setting for the *War of the Sons of Light*. Apparently the Teacher of Righteousness played no part in that War or Ritual of War, and this may well be because he was no longer alive.

Within forty years of the death of the Teacher of Righteousness the migration to Damascus took place, and probably this was near the end of that period. The end of that period would fall in 131 B.C. This would mean that the *Zadokite Work* was composed before that date, though probably not much before it, and perhaps not very long after the migration to Damascus. By this time the Hasmonaeans had usurped the High Priesthood, and this would inevitably rouse the opposition of our sect, who may well have found it expedient to withdraw to Damascus. At that time the affairs of the Seleucid kingdom were subject to constant kaleidoscopic changes as one ruler or upstart followed another, and there was frequent internal strife and conflict. Indeed Jonathan and Simon extended their influence and power rather by playing one of these rivals off against another than by renewing the fighting which had marked the struggle of Judas. It may well have been,

<sup>1</sup> Cf. above. A. Vincent, *Ecclesia*, No. 27 (June 1951), p. 75, holds that the meaning is that the Messiah would be of Levite descent and of northern Israelite descent. This is most improbable. For the Children of Light are said in the *War of the Sons of Light* to consist of members of the tribes of Levi, Judah and Benjamin. It is therefore almost certain that Israel must stand for the non-priestly elements of the sect, and Levi for the priestly and Levitical members.

therefore, that at a time when Jerusalem and Damascus represented rival factions the refugees from Palestine could go to Damascus.<sup>1</sup>

The Star who reorganized the sect would stand between the death of Onias and the migration, and it may have been he who gave the sect the *Manual of Discipline* and who gave the communal character to its organization. At whatever time it had that communal character it would create a communal library. If the members brought all their goods to hand over to the sect, any books they had would be brought also. It is doubtful if private libraries were large or numerous at that time, but the fact that the possession of copies of the Scriptures was made an offence by Antiochus<sup>2</sup> shows that some copies were in private hands. If the sect valued books, as it clearly did since the cave of 'Ain Feshkha seems once to have contained nearly two hundred scrolls—a very large library in those times—then it would add to such books as came to it in this way. Some of the Biblical texts could well be older than the first formation of the sect, therefore, and the Leviticus Fragments in the archaic script seem certainly to belong to this class. Other Biblical texts could have been copied for the sect or by its own members, and since texts were *composed* by members of the sect there is no reason why Biblical and other texts could not have been *copied* by them.

<sup>1</sup> M. H. Segal, *Jerusalem Post* (26 May and 2 June 1950), and *J.B.L.* lxx (1951), 143 f., emphasizes the necessity to find a time when the administration of Damascus was different from the administration of Jerusalem. Were the *Zadokite Work* composed shortly after 172 B.C., as maintained by J. Quiring (in *From the Pyramids to Paul*, G. L. Robinson Festschrift, 1935, p. 199) and the migration to Damascus to have taken place before that date, this consideration would provide an important difficulty. But at a time shortly before 131 B.C. it would not. On Segal's view the members of the sect were allied with the Seleucid rulers of Damascus in their conflict with Alexander Jannaeus at the end of the century, while the Kittim were the Romans. This seems improbable, since (a) the Kittim would seem to be allied with the Wicked Priest and to be destructively and oppressively active in Palestine, and (b) while it is true that the Jewish enemies of Alexander Jannaeus appealed to the Seleucids for help against him (cf. Josephus, *Antiq.*, XIII, xiii. 5 (xiii, 376)), and later were shocked at the result of their policy (cf. Josephus, *Wars*, I, iv. 5 (i. 95)), the *Habakkuk Commentary* tells us of their assurance that judgment would be executed through the Elect of God.

<sup>2</sup> I Macc. i. 57 ff.

A modern library is housed on shelves, and when a library is created shelving for many years is provided. A library of scrolls could be more appropriately housed in jars, and a quantity of jars may well have been made for the library of the sect when it was first started. De Vaux objects that we have no evidence of a library being housed in jars,<sup>1</sup> and if they had been then we should have expected varieties of jars rather than a number of jars all alike.<sup>2</sup> This is not very cogent. We know beyond a peradventure that the scrolls were placed in jars when they were put in the cave. By what logic or evidence can we be assured that our sect first thought of jars for the storing of their manuscripts when they came to hide them? What evidence have we that the scrolls were kept in some different containers before being placed in the cave? And why, if so, were the same containers not used? And what would be more suitable for keeping scrolls in than jars? It is true that a library that had a long life and that grew rapidly would need added equipment. But we are not to think of growth at the rate of a modern library. The library that was deposited in the cave seems to have reached a maximum number of 200 texts. Of these a reasonable proportion might be expected to be provided for from the establishment of the library. At a later date some additional jars might be needed. Here it may not be without significance that more than one pattern of jar has been found in the cave.<sup>3</sup> Pottery cannot be precisely dated by style within a few years,<sup>4</sup> and late Hellenistic pottery did not cease to be made everywhere on a given date by decree, so that we must allow for the possibility that some decades separated the date of the making of some of the jars from the date of the making of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *La Vie Intellectuelle* (Apr. 1951), pp. 63 ff., and *R.B.* lviii (1951), 439. P. Kahle, however, says the practice is well-known. Cf. *V.T.* i (1951), 41. Cf. also J. van der Ploeg, *J.E.O.L.*, No. 11 (1949-50), p. 42; J. T. Milik, *Biblica*, xxxi (1950), 504 ff.; R. Goossens, *La Nouvelle Clio*, i-ii (1949-50), 661 f.; G. R. Driver, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xl (1949-50), 370 n.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *La Vie Intellectuelle*, *loc. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Sukenik, *Megillôth Genûzôth*, ii (1950), Plate I. Cf. G. E. Wright, *B.A.* xii (1949), 64, and R. de Vaux, *R.B.* lvi (1949), 589. O. R. Sellers, *B.A.* xii (1949), 55, says some of the jars had two handles, some three, some four, while some were without handles.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires* (1950), pp. 21, 43 (E. Tr., pp. 15, 32).

others,<sup>1</sup> though it may be agreed that there are limits to the elasticity that may be supposed. Jars that were used for storing books in would last for a long time, since breakage under these conditions would not be excessive.<sup>2</sup> Hence while the jars may be late Hellenistic, and most of them may date from the second century B.C. and others perhaps from the first, some of the manuscripts that were kept in them could be of later origin or copied later.<sup>3</sup>

In the Maccabean age there seems to have been a revival of Hebrew. Aramaic had become the popular tongue, and the stories of the book of Daniel were composed in that language. The latter portions of the book of Daniel were written in Hebrew, but the author wrote poorer Hebrew than Aramaic. It is probable that many of his contemporaries were less familiar with Hebrew than with Aramaic, and the manuscript of Isaiah that has been published in facsimile by the American Schools may have been written to help such readers.<sup>4</sup> It contains a number of variations from the Massoretic text, and while some of these may preserve superior readings, and some agree with the Septuagint and may go back to the manuscript copied, there are other variants which appear to be indications of carelessness on the part of the scribe.<sup>5</sup> The sect clearly attached great importance to the Scriptures, and it is improbable that a text which was intended for official use would have been copied carelessly. A copy which was intended to be used to facilitate the use of the Hebrew language might have been copied more carelessly. It is well known that many of the forms found in this manuscript have unusual endings,<sup>6</sup> and appear to have been read with an additional final vowel that is not represented either consonantly or by vowels in

<sup>1</sup> Cf. W. F. Albright, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 115 (Oct. 1949), p. 13 n.; A. Parrot, in A. Lods, *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive* (1950), pp. 1031 f.

<sup>2</sup> We are not to think of a library under modern conditions, with a constant stream of readers.

<sup>3</sup> It has been noted above that de Vaux now allows that the jars may be later than he had at first thought, and recognizes that the most recent evidence shows that similar jars were in use in the first century A.D.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. P. Kahle, *V.T.* i (1951), 42 f.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. H. M. Orlinsky, *J.B.L.* lxxix (1950), 151: 'There can be no doubt that the scribe . . . was not a particularly careful one', p. 165; 'In addition to faulty copying and spelling, faulty memory was at work'.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. M. Burrows, *J.B.L.* lxxviii (1949), 195 ff.

the Massoretic text. It has been remarked that this vowel persisted in Samaritan.<sup>1</sup> It may well be that it was written consonantly in this manuscript precisely to help readers who were not familiar with the Hebrew language. When the language was a living language it was not written and was not needed, and when the effort to revive Hebrew as a spoken tongue failed and Aramaic regained its position as the spoken language, while Hebrew became the language of the learned only, it was no longer needed. Later the Massoretic vowel system was created, but that was designed to preserve the sacred text with the utmost precision, rather than to teach people how to read and speak the language.<sup>2</sup> If this suggestion is right, then the probability of this Isaiah manuscript dating from the second century B.C., to which period it is dated palaeographically by several scholars,<sup>3</sup> would be high.

We have then to allow a long period for the use of this manuscript and for the additions that have been made to it. We have also to remember that the non-Biblical texts were not composed until some time after the Maccabaeen struggle, in some cases at least, and that we have no reason to presume that we have author's autographs, and hence we may have to come down well below the end of the second century B.C. and perhaps into the Christian era, for the copying of some of these texts. It has been suggested that in one of the manuscripts there are the beginnings of a system of vocalization,<sup>4</sup> in which case we should have to come down to the post-Christian period for its present form.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. P. Kahle, *Die hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle* (1951), pp. 41 f.; H. Yalon, *Kirjath Sepher*, xxvii, No. 2-3 (June 1951), p. 171b.

<sup>2</sup> For the view of Kahle that Massoretic Hebrew was not the Hebrew of Palestine of the Biblical period, and that it differed from the earlier post-Biblical Hebrew, cf. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (1947), pp. 85 ff., where earlier systems of vocalization are also discussed. Cf. also A. Sperber, *J.B.L.* lxii (1943), 137 ff., for a criticism of the current Hebrew grammars on the ground that they are based on an artificial medieval schematization, and Kahle, *op. cit.* p. 109 n., for a criticism of Sperber.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. S. A. Birnbaum, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 113 (Feb. 1949), pp. 33 ff., No. 115 (Oct. 1949), pp. 20 ff.; and *V.T.* i (1951), 91 ff.; J. C. Trever, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 113 (Feb. 1949), p. 19; W. F. Albright, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xl (1949-50), 45, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 111 (Oct. 1948), p. 2, and No. 118 (Apr. 1950), p. 6; W. R. Taylor, *University of Toronto Quarterly*, xix (1949-50), 331.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. O. H. Lehmann, *P.E.Q.* (1951), pp. 51 ff.

The strongest links of belief and practice that have been adduced would connect the sect of the Scrolls with the Essenes.<sup>1</sup> Yet there are differences between them and the Essenes<sup>2</sup> as they appear in the writings of Philo<sup>3</sup> and Josephus.<sup>4</sup> It may well be, however, that here we see them, or a group out of which the Essenes developed, in an earlier stage. From the passionate devotees of the national faith of the Maccabaeon era there developed more than one of the Jewish sects and parties.<sup>5</sup> The beginnings of Pharisaism are to be sought there, and probably also the beginnings of Essenism and of other groups. If the sect of the Scrolls was reorganized under the Star, there is no reason to suppose that it knew no change after that time. If it did become the sect of the Essenes, then its members would seem to have returned from Damascus.<sup>6</sup> If it was from persecution that

<sup>1</sup> A. Dupont Sommer has maintained that the Essenes were the sect of the Scrolls. Cf. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions* (1950), pp. 196 ff.; *Observations sur le Commentaire d'Habacuc* (1950), pp. 5 ff.; *La Nouvelle Clio*, i-ii (1949-50), 330 ff.; *Aperçus préliminaires*, pp. 36, 105 ff. (E. Tr., pp. 26, 85 ff.). Others before him had noted similarities between our sect and the Essenes. Cf. E. L. Sukenik, *Megillôth Genûzôth*, i (1948), 16; M. Burrows, *B.A.* xi (1948), 58; F. M. Cross, *B.A.* xii (1949), 39 n. Cf. also K. Schubert, in *Alttestamentliche Studien* (Festschrift Nötscher) (1950), pp. 232 f., and W. H. Brownlee, *B.A.* xiii (1950), 56 ff. While Dupont-Sommer has secured some following this view has been rejected by W. Baumgartner, *Th.R.*, N.F. xvii (1948-49), 337; W. Vischer, *Études Théologiques et Religieuses*, xxiv (1949), 34; M. Burrows, *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, viii (1950), 167 (cf. *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xlii (1951-52), 132). G. Lambert, *Le Manuel de Discipline du Desert de Juda* (1951), p. 4 n., holds that it is still premature to attempt to identify the sect.

<sup>2</sup> These are freely recognized by those who favour the Essene view, but it is thought that our sect might be a special variety of Essenes. The Essenes, as described to us in texts of the first century A.D., were celibate, but since some Essenes did not abstain from marriage it is supposed that our sect consisted of marrying Essenes. By most writers on the Essenes foreign influence on the sect is maintained. It is hard to think of the sect of the Scrolls as consciously admitting foreign influence. But here again it must be remembered that our evidence on the Essenes is of the first century A.D.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Quod omnis probus liber sit*, 75 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Antiq.*, XVIII, i. 5 (xviii. 18 ff.); *Wars*, II, viii, 2 ff. (ii. 119 ff.).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. J. Bonsirven, *Le Judaïsme palestinien*, i (1936), 68: 'Aux siècles, qui ont précédé l'ère chrétienne, le Judaïsme fut travaillé par un grand mouvement de fermentation religieuse'. Cf. too H. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 3rd ed., iv (1864), 482 ff.; L. Finkelstein, *The Pharisees*, i (1938), 77; J. Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth* (1925), p. 202.

<sup>6</sup> In the time of Pliny the Essenes had settlements in the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea. Cf. *Hist. Nat.* V, xvii (V, xv. 73 in Loeb edition).

they fled, then they might reasonably be expected to return when the danger from which they fled had passed. They were an intensely Jewish sect, who would not live amongst Gentiles from choice. And if they returned then they would not finally hide their books in a cave, never to recover them, until the sect finally ceased to exist in Palestine.<sup>1</sup> This would not be until some time

<sup>1</sup> A few scholars have revived earlier views which were put forward on the basis of the *Zadokite Work*, and have identified the sect of the Scrolls with groups that came into existence in the post-Christian era. Thus J. L. Teicher, *J.J.S.*, ii, No. 2 (1951), 91 ff. (= *Z.R.G.G.* iii (1951), 193 ff.), No. 3 (1951), pp. 115 ff., has claimed that the sect consisted of Ebionite Christians, since in the *Habakkuk Commentary*, col. XII, lines 2 ff., they refer to themselves as 'ebhyônîm, or poor. He then identifies Jesus with the Teacher of Righteousness and Paul with the Prophet of Untruth. As W. Baumgartner says, we should have expected a more definitely Christian character for our texts if this view were right. Cf. *Th.R.*, N.F. xix (1951), 142. Moreover, it is hard to see how Paul could be said to have beguiled many in order to rebuild his town of vanity in blood (*Habakkuk Commentary*, col. X, lines 9 ff.), or with whom the Wicked Priest, who with his associates is said to have amassed great wealth by plundering the people (*ibid.* col. IX, lines 4 ff.), could be identified. Since Teicher says (*J.J.S.*, *loc. cit.* p. 129) that this refers to the money Paul collected from Gentile Christians for the Jerusalem church, he would appear either to identify Paul with the Wicked Priest, though he was not even of the tribe of Levi, or to hold him to have been intimately associated with some contemporary Priest to whom he handed over this money. A different view is presented by R. Eisler, who finds the Teacher of Righteousness to be John the Baptist. Cf. Letter to *The Times*, 8 September 1949, and *The Modern Churchman*, xxxix (1949), 284 ff. It is an insuperable difficulty for this view that Eisler finds himself compelled to find John the Baptist referred to as the High Priest, and then to find a reference to a giant, who is equated with Simon of Peraea, referred to by Josephus, *Antiq.*, XVII, x. 6 (xvii. 273 ff.), who rose as Messiah in 4 B.C., and who is held to be promised messianic authority in the text. If John the Baptist was mixed up in this affair he was rather young, while whether he is held to be involved in it or not, since the text was not written until after the death of the Teacher of Righteousness, the sect would scarcely be likely to remember in its writings a promise which experience had proved to be so false. Again H. E. del Medico, *Deux Manuscrits hébreux de la Mer Morte* (1951), identifies the sect with extremists who first came into existence under Judas of Galilee about the beginning of the Christian era, and who took their name from a certain Rabbi Zadok of that time, but who first became organized as a sect after A.D. 80 (pp. 63 f., 92 f.). He identifies the Teacher of Righteousness with Menahem, and the Wicked Priest with Ananias; also the House of Absalom with Menahem's officers, the chief of whom was named Absalom (pp. 133 ff.). It may be noted that Eisler identified the Man of Untruth with Menahem (cf. *Occident and Orient* (Gaster Anniversary Volume), 1936, p. 124). S. Talmon, *Biblica*, xxxii (1951), 549 ff., assigns the rise of the sect to about the same period, but offers a very different setting and rests his case



well on in the Christian era, and the Roman lamp and sherds may be the evidence of the date of the deposit and not of a subsequent entry.<sup>1</sup> In that case a copy of the *Zadokite Work* may have been amongst the texts deposited in the cave, as Kahle supposes.<sup>2</sup>

Why then is it that the only copies of this text that we have are of so much later date and come from Egypt? Professor Eissfeldt drew attention,<sup>3</sup> soon after the discovery of the Scrolls was known, to a story which is found in a letter of Timotheus to Sergius,<sup>4</sup> the Metropolitan of Elam. This tells of the accidental discovery of a cave in the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea containing a number of manuscripts shortly before A.D. 800. From other writers during the next century and more<sup>5</sup> we find references to a so-called 'Cave Sect',<sup>6</sup> that was given this name, because their works were found in a cave.<sup>7</sup> It may well be, therefore, that this is the discovery referred to by Timotheus. Our information about the 'Cave Sect' comes principally from Karaite sources, and is meagre enough. The Karaite writer Kirkiṣānī speaks of the Cave Sect and of the Zadokites in close succession.<sup>8</sup> It may be that the one name was given because of

wholly on the single consideration of the calendar. He recalls Rabban Gamaliel's treatment of Rabbi Joshua when he attempted to disregard the official calendar as evidence of concern on this question at that time. It is hard to find the terms used of the Wicked Priest in our texts relevant to Gamaliel, or to see why the Kittim, however they are identified, could be involved. The framing of a general theory about the Scrolls on a single consideration like this is greatly to be deprecated.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 44 (E. Tr., p. 32); P. Kahle, *V.T.* i (1951), 41, and *Die hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle* (1951), p. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *V.T.* i (1951), 46.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Th.L.Z.* lxxiv (1949), cols. 597 ff. Cf. also G. Lambert, *N.R.Th.* lxxii (1950), 199 ff.; R. de Vaux, *R.B.* lvii (1950), 417 ff.; F. V. Filson, *B.A.* xiii (1950), 96 f.; P. Kahle, *V.T.* i (1951), 44 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. O. Braun, *Oriens Christianus*, i (1901), 299 f., where the text is published.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. R. de Vaux, *R.B.* lvii (1950), 421 ff., where attention was first called to these passages.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. L. Nemoy, *H.U.C.A.* vii (1930), 326 f., 363 f.; S. Poznanski, *R.E.J.* l (1905), pp. 13 ff. Cf. also de Vaux, *loc. cit.* pp. 427 f., 422, for citations from later writers al-Bīrūnī (cf. also Poznanski, *loc. cit.* pp. 16 f.) and Shahrastānī (cf. Poznanski, *loc. cit.* pp. 15 f.).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. L. Nemoy, *loc. cit.* pp. 326 f.

<sup>8</sup> He places the Cave Sect between the Zadokites and the disciples of Jesus, while Shahrastānī places them four centuries before Arius.

the place where their writings were discovered and the other because of the contents of the texts, and that this sect called itself the sons of Zadok like the sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls. *Ḳirḳi-sānī* and others appear to have confused the sons of Zadok with the Sadducees,<sup>1</sup> but what is recorded of the Zadokites and of the Cave Sect is curiously related to what we know of the sect of the Scrolls. The Zadokites are said to have forbidden marriage with a niece,<sup>2</sup> while the Cave Sect is said to have had calendar peculiarities and to have indulged in fanciful interpretation of Scripture.<sup>3</sup>

If it were the 'Ain Feshkha cave that was found about A.D. 800 and many of the manuscripts that were in the cave were removed, and fell into *Ḳaraite* hands, then the fact that only a few of the manuscripts the cave once contained were there in 1947 would be explained, and also the fact that many of the broken pieces of the jars found by the archaeologists were ancient breakages.<sup>4</sup> The texts that were removed and later received by the *Ḳaraites* would account for the connections between the sect of the Scrolls and the *Ḳaraites* and would explain why the *Ḳaraites* were called Zadokites. We should also understand why the Zadokite Work came to be copied so late in the tenth and eleventh or twelfth centuries, and how these copies came to be found in the Cairo Genizah. The many links with the *Ḳaraites* that have been found would be fully explained, and also the differences. For there are differences also between our sect and the *Ḳaraites*<sup>5</sup> that make it most improbable that they were written by *Ḳaraites* and

<sup>1</sup> He tells us that the Zadokites were founded by Zadok and Boethus, who were disciples of Antigonus of Soko. Cf. *H.U.C.A.* vii (1930), 326. He appears to have the Sadducees of the New Testament in mind, since otherwise the Sadducees would not figure in his work. Just as he differentiates the Cave Sect from the Zadokites, and the 'Ananites from the *Ḳaraites* ('Anan being the Founder of the *Ḳaraites*), because in each case two names were current for the sect concerned, so here he appears to confuse the Zadokites and the Sadducees because a single name was used for both.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *H.U.C.A.*, *loc. cit.*

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *ibid.* p. 363.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. O. R. Sellers, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 114 (Apr. 1949), p. 8; G. L. Harding, *P.E.Q.* (1949), p. 114; R. de Vaux, *La Vie Intellectuelle* (June 1949), p. 586.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. B. Revel, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. iii (1912-13), 352 ff., L. Ginzberg, *M.G.W.J.* (N.F. xxi), lvii (1913), 161, 404 ff., and especially p. 418.

reflect Karaite teaching, as some have maintained.<sup>1</sup> Such a view is impossible to harmonize with the archaeological and palaeographical evidence, for our documents from the cave must be far older than the beginnings of Karaism.<sup>2</sup> The direction of the influence must be from the sect of the Scrolls to the Karaites and not from the Karaites to the sect, and if the cave referred to by Timotheus were the cave of 'Ain Feshkha this would be fully explained.

The answers I would give to the three questions I put at the beginning of my lecture, therefore, are as follows: (1) The non-Biblical texts from the 'Ain Feshkha Cave and also the Zadokite Work were probably composed at various dates in the second century B.C. They emanated from a sect which took its rise before the Maccabaeon age, and which took an active part in the conflict of that time, championing the faith of Israel and the Zadokite priesthood, but which later was persecuted and forced to migrate for a time to Damascus. (2) The manuscripts, Biblical and non-Biblical, which were found at 'Ain Feshkha, were copied at various dates ranging over a long period. Some, such as the Leviticus Fragments, are probably older than the foundation of the sect. Some, and especially the St. Mark's Isaiah manuscript, may have been copied during the second century B.C. for the use of the sect. Others, including copies of the non-Biblical works which were only composed in the second century B.C., are probably of later origin, and may have been written any time down to the date of the deposit in the cave. (3) The date of the deposit of the manuscripts in the cave cannot be defined with any precision. If they were deposited by Essenes, never to be recovered, this is unlikely to have been done until the

<sup>1</sup> So S. Zeitlin, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xxxix (1948-49), 235 ff., 337 ff., xl (1949-50), 57 ff., 291 ff., 373 ff., xli (1950-51), 1 ff., 251 ff., 449, xlii (1951-52), 133 ff., and *Crozer Quarterly*, xxvi (1950), 35 ff.; P. R. Weis, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xli (1950-51), 125 ff.

<sup>2</sup> The Founder of Karaism was 'Anan, who flourished in the eighth century A.D. As to how far he had predecessors cf. L. Nemoy, in *Semitic Studies in Memory of Immanuel Löw* (1947), pp. 239 ff., and *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xl (1949-50), 307 ff. The Karaites claimed that they were conserving the ancient doctrines, and if they had secured possession of ancient documents from the Cave and been influenced by their teaching this could be easily understood.

Essenes finally disappeared from Palestine. Since the Essenes were still near the Dead Sea in the time of Pliny this cannot have been before A.D. 70, and it is unlikely to have been before the time of the rising of Bar-Cochba in the second century A.D. This would allow for the long use of the Isaiah Scroll and for its repair and marginal additions, though it is possible that a much shorter time would suffice for this. If the manuscripts had formed the library of the sect for a long time before the hiding in the cave the jars could have been used for storing them and could therefore have been older than the date of the deposit.

These answers are only tentative answers, since we do not yet have access to all the material from the cave, but they seem to accommodate all the evidence so far known.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Much literature on the Dead Sea Scrolls has been published while this lecture has been in the press. It has not been possible to embody references to it here, save in one or two cases. Many titles will be found in the Bibliography which stands in the writer's book *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, though complete access to all the vast and growing literature on the subject cannot be had by any one person.