

# THE QUMRAN SECT AND CHRISTIAN ORIGINS<sup>1</sup>

BY H. H. ROWLEY, M.A., D.D., THEOL. D., LL.D., F.B.A.

EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN  
THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

OF all the questions raised by the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls the most controversial is that of the influence of the Qumran community on the Early Church, and the significance of the Scrolls for the understanding of Christian origins. That they are not without such significance most scholars would agree, but the nature of the significance can be established only by careful study of the evidence. Sometimes the evidence of the New Testament has been conjecturally read into the Scrolls to exaggerate the links, or the New Testament has been "qumranized" to eliminate patent differences. Already in 1951 one

<sup>1</sup> A lecture delivered in the Library series of public lectures. The following abbreviations are used in the footnotes below: *A.J.Th.* = *American Journal of Theology*; *A.Th.R.* = *Anglican Theological Review*; *B.A.* = *Biblical Archaeologist*; *Bi. Or.* = *Bibliotheca Orientalis*; *B.J.R.L.* = *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*; *B.W.* = *Biblical World*; *B.Z.N.W.* = *Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*; *C.B.Q.* = *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*; *Hastings' D.B.* = *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*; *D.T.T.* = *Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift*; *E.T.* = *Expository Times*; *E.Th.L.* = *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*; *H.T.R.* = *Harvard Theological Review*; *I.L.N.* = *Illustrated London News*; *J.B.L.* = *Journal of Biblical Literature*; *J.E.O.L.* = *Jaarbericht Ex Oriente Lux*; *J.J.S.* = *Journal of Jewish Studies*; *J.Q.R.* = *Jewish Quarterly Review*; *J.S.S.* = *Journal of Semitic Studies*; *J.T.S.* = *Journal of Theological Studies*; *M.G.W.J.* = *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*; *N.R.Th.* = *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*; *N.T.* = *Novum Testamentum*; *N.T.S.* = *New Testament Studies*; *O.T.S.* = *Oudtestamentische Studiën*; *P.E.Q.* = *Palestine Exploration Quarterly*; *R.B.* = *Revue Biblique*; *R.E.J.* = *Revue des Études juives*; *R.H.P.R.* = *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses*; *R.H.R.* = *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*; *R.Q.* = *Revue de Qumran*; *S.D.B.* = *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*; *S.E.Å.* = *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok*; *S.J.Th.* = *Scottish Journal of Theology*; *S.N.T.* = *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (ed. by K. Stendahl); *S.Th.* = *Studia Theologica*; *Th.L.Z.* = *Theologische Literaturzeitung*; *Th.Z.* = *Theologische Zeitschrift*; *T.W.N.T.* = *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*; *V.T.* = *Vetus Testamentum*; *Z.A.W.* = *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*; *Z.K.Th.* = *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*; *Z.N.W.* = *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*; *Z.R.G.G.* = *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte*.

writer in a French journal suffered himself to be so far carried away as to write: "Henceforth . . . we *know* that the Messiah of Galilee has contributed nothing, absolutely nothing, which was not long familiar to those who believed in the New Covenant",<sup>1</sup> i.e. to the members of the Qumran sect, who are referred to in one of the works which they treasured as those who entered into the New Covenant in the land of Damascus.<sup>2</sup> How true or false this sweeping judgement is we shall perhaps see better after we have looked at the evidence.

For our present purpose the pre-Christian origin of the Qumran sect will be accepted without discussion. While there are still a few writers who maintain that the Scrolls are of post-Christian origin,<sup>3</sup> the overwhelming majority hold them to be pre-Christian. They do not agree as to the precise period in which the work of the Teacher of Righteousness and the founding of the sect lay, and various dates in the second or first century B.C. are favoured.<sup>4</sup> The disagreements here are of little significance

<sup>1</sup> Étienne, in *Les Temps Modernes*, vi, no. 63 (January 1951), 1291 f. Cf. also P. Guth, *Le Figaro Littéraire*, 24 February 1951: "Entre 67 et 63 avant Jésus-Christ aurait été exécuté un premier Christ, presque semblable au second."

<sup>2</sup> *Zadokite Work* ix. 28 (p. viii, line 21, p. xix, lines 33 f.); cf. viii. 15 (p. vi, line 19). E. Lohmeyer, *Diatheke*, 1913, p. 116, records that the word "covenant" occurs thirty-five times in the *Zadokite Work*, and that this is greater than the number of occurrences in any book of the Old Testament.

<sup>3</sup> S. Zeitlin continues to maintain that the Scrolls are medieval texts written by illiterate authors. His articles will be found in many issues of the *Jewish Quarterly Review*. J. L. Teicher, in a series of articles in the *Journal of Jewish Studies*, has argued that the Scrolls come from Ebionite Christians, for whom Paul was the Wicked Priest. H. E. del Medico, in *The Riddle of the Scrolls*, Eng. trans. by H. Garner, 1958, has assigned the Scrolls to a succession of post-Christian dates. Cecil Roth, in *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1958, and in various articles, has maintained that the Scrolls were composed by Zealots and that the Teacher of Righteousness was Menahem ben Judah, who died in A.D. 66, or his kinsman, Eleazar ben Jair. G. R. Driver, who earlier favoured a later dating of the Scrolls (cf. *The Hebrew Scrolls from the Neighbourhood of Jericho and the Dead Sea*, 1951) has pushed back the date to the first century of our era, and now shares Dr. Roth's view of the Zealot origin of the sect (cf. *E.Th.L.* xxxiii (1957), 798 f.).

<sup>4</sup> For a discussion of this question by the present writer, cf. *B.J.R.L.* xl (1957-8), 114 f. Dates in the second century B.C., somewhat later than those proposed by the present writer, have been advanced by J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, Eng. trans. by J. Strugnell, 1959, F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumrân*, 1958, and E. F. Sutcliffe, *The Monks of Qumran*, 1960.

for the subject of the present lecture. If the Qumran sectaries already belonged to the Jewish world in which Jesus and His disciples lived, the precise date of the origin of the sect is not material to the study of the influence they may have exercised on the younger faith. Professor Barthélemy observes that through the Scrolls we can for the first time make ourselves contemporary with our Lord.<sup>1</sup> In the Gospels we see the Pharisees and the Sadducees through the eyes of Jesus and the Evangelists, but in the Scrolls we are able to enter into the life and thought of a third group of Jews through their own writings. This third group is identified with the Essenes by most of the scholars who have discussed the Scrolls,<sup>2</sup> though there are a few who dispute the identification.<sup>3</sup> The Essenes are described to us from the outside by writers of the first century of our era,<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Scripture*, xii, No. 20 (October 1960), 119.

<sup>2</sup> This identification has been advocated by none more vigorously than by A. Dupont-Sommer. For his latest statement of the case for this view, cf. *Les Écrits esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte* (1959), pp. 51 ff. Cf. also G. Vermès, "Essenes—Therapeutai—Qumran", *Durham University Journal*, June 1960, pp. 97 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. M. H. Gottstein, *V.T.* iv (1954), 141 ff., where anti-Essene traits are found in the Scrolls. Cf. also B. Otzen, *S.Th.* vii (1953), 156 f. C. Rabin has argued for the identification of the sect with a Pharisaic group (*Qumran Studies*, 1957, pp. 53 ff.); J. L. Teicher for the identification with the Ebionites (see above, p. 120, n. 3); A. M. Habermann for the identification with the Sadducees (*Megilloth Midbar Yehuda*, 1959, pp. xv, 25 ff.; cf. *Ha-aretz*, 5 March 1956, and the criticism of J. M. Grintz, *ibid.* 11 May 1956; cf. also R. North, *C.B.Q.* xvii (1955), 164 ff.); C. Roth and G. R. Driver for the identification with the Zealots (see above, p. 120, n. 3). Before the discovery of the Scrolls some of these identifications of the sect had been proposed on the basis of the *Zadokite Work*. Thus L. Ginzberg (*M.G.W.J.* lvii (1913), 289 ff.), W. Staerk (*Die jüdische Gemeinde des Neuen Bundes in Damaskus*, 1922, p. 97), J. Jeremias (*Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu*, 2nd edn., 1958, ii B, 131) and H. W. Beyer (in *T.W.N.T.* ii (1935), 614), had argued for the identification with the Pharisees; N. A. Dahl (*Das Volk Gottes*, 1941, p. 129) for the identification with an offshoot from the Pharisees; R. Leszynsky (*Die Sadduzäer*, 1912, pp. 142 ff.) for identification with the Sadducees; M.-J. Lagrange (*R.B.* xxi (1912), 335, and *Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ*, 1931, pp. 332 f.) for identification with the Zealots. H. E. del Medico maintains that there never was a sect of Essenes (*Le Mythe des Esséniens*, 1958). K. H. Rengstorf argues that the Scrolls were a part of the Temple library, and that Qumran belonged to the Temple authorities (*Hirbet Qumran und die Bibliothek vom Toten Meer*, 1960).

<sup>4</sup> For other ancient references to the Essenes, cf. H. Mosbech, *Essæismen*, 1916, pp. 29 ff.

by Philo,<sup>1</sup> Pliny<sup>2</sup> and Josephus;<sup>3</sup> but if the Qumran sectaries were really the same as the Essenes, we see them here from the inside. There are, indeed, some differences between the Essenes as described to us by these first century writers and the sect of the Scrolls as they are reflected in the texts we now have. It is on this ground that some deny that the sect is to be identified with the Essenes. Yet the similarities are so great that it is more probable that they should be identified, and the identification is often stated categorically.<sup>4</sup> The Essenes were a secret sect, whose teachings were not to be divulged outside the circle of its own members.<sup>5</sup> Some knowledge of its way of life and thought must have been known outside, or it could scarcely have attracted new members. That knowledge may not have been in all respects accurate, and this could account for some of the differences between what we read in the Scrolls and the accounts of the first century writers. More of the differences can probably be accounted for by the fact that in the Scrolls we see the sect at an earlier point in its life than that reflected in the first century writers.

The members of the sect cherished messianic expectations.<sup>6</sup> We know from the New Testament that such expectations were widespread, and in the second and first centuries B.C. a number of works were written in which such expectations are expressed. They are not always of a single pattern. In the New Testament we have no reference to any Messiah but the descendant of David. It is frequently stated that in the Scrolls we find the expectation of two Messiahs,<sup>7</sup> a Davidic and an Aaronic, and in the *Manual*

<sup>1</sup> *Quod omnis probus liber sit*, xii f. (75-91); cf. Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica*, VIII. 11.

<sup>2</sup> *Hist. Nat.* v. xv (73).

<sup>3</sup> *Antiq.* XIII. v. 9 (171-3), XVIII. i. 5 (18-22), *B.J.* II. viii. 2-13 (119-61).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. J. T. Milik, *R.B.* lxii (1955), 497 where it is said to be "absolument certaine".

<sup>5</sup> Josephus, *B.J.* II. viii. 7 (141); cf. *Manual of Discipline*, col. IX, line 17.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. A. S. van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân*, 1957; K. Schubert, *Biblische Zeitschrift*, N.F. ii (1957), 177 ff. Cf. also E. L. Ehrlich, *Z.A.W.* lxxvii (1956), 234 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. M. Burrows, *A.Th.R.* xxxiv (1952), 202 ff., and *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1955, pp. 264 f.; G. Vermès, *Discovery in the Judean Desert*, 1956, p. 116; A. S. van der Woude, in *La Secte de Qumrân et les origines du Christianisme* (Recherches Bibliques IV), 1959, pp. 121 ff.; J. Liver, *H.T.R.* lii (1959), 149 ff. N. Walker

of *Discipline* we find the expression "the messiahs of Aaron and Israel".<sup>1</sup> We must, however, beware of reading into the term Messiah all that the term means for us. It simply means "an

(*J.B.L.* lxxvi (1957), 58) suggests that the sectaries at first looked for two Messiahs and that the fusing of the civil and priestly offices into one by John Hyrcanus led them to look for only one Messiah. It is very doubtful if the Qumran sect approved of the Hasmonaeon assumption of the high priesthood, or would be influenced in this way (cf. M. Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1958, p. 298).

<sup>1</sup> *Manual of Discipline*, col. IX, line 11. In *Deux Manuscrits hébreux de la Mer Morte*, 1951, p. 33, del Medico rendered by the singular without comment, but in *The Riddle of the Scrolls*, p. 227, he has the plural. G. Lambert (*Le Manuel de Discipline du Désert de Juda*, 1951, p. 83) thought the plural strange, and so K. Schubert (*Z.K.Th.* lxxiv (1952), 53). M. Black (*S.J.Th.* vi (1953), 6 n., and *S.E.Å.* xviii-xix (1955), 87 ff.) renders by the singular, taking the final letter of the first word as *yodh compaginis* instead of the plural ending. As normally understood the passage speaks of the coming of the Prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel. W. H. Brownlee (*The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline*, 1951, pp. 35 f.) thought the Prophet was the Messiah, and his priestly and lay followers were referred to as "the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel" (this is rejected by P. Wernberg-Møller, *The Manual of Discipline*, 1957, p. 135). In the *Zadokite Work* there are several references to "the Messiah of Aaron and Israel" (ix. 10 [p. xix, lines 10 f.], 21 [p. xx, line 1], xv. 4 [p. xii, lines 23 f.]). It has been supposed that the *Zadokite Work* originally had the plural in these cases, and that a late scribe changed it to the singular (so J. T. Milik, *Verbum Domini*, xxx (1952), 39 f.; cf. K. G. Kuhn, *S.N.T.*, p. 59), and J. Liver (*H.T.R.* lii (1959), 152) so far outruns the evidence as to say that it is now proved conclusively that the singular is either a scribal error or an emendation. L. H. Silberman (*V.T.* v (1955), 77 ff.) questions the view that two Messiahs were expected, and thinks the sect simply looked forward to the time when the legitimate line of Aaronic priests and Davidic kings would be restored, and thinks the function of the prophet was to indicate the right persons to anoint them. Before the discovery of the *Manual of Discipline* M.-J. Lagrange (*R.B.* xxiii (1914), 135) and F. F. Hvidberg (*Menigheden af den Nye Pagt i Damascus*, 1928, p. 281) had argued that the phrase in the *Zadokite Work* indicated that the Messiah would arise from the sect, and after the discovery of the *Manual* the present writer adopted this view and pointed out that the sect is described in its text as a "house of holiness for Israel . . . and a house of unity for Aaron" (col. IX, line 6), observing that "the sect itself therefore represents Israel and Aaron, and the title of the Messiah has reference to the character of the sect, and not his personal descent" (*The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1952, p. 41). This view is now adopted by W. S. LaSor (*V.T.* vi (1956), 425 ff.), who thinks that the proposed emendation of the text of the *Zadokite Work* is unnecessary. W. H. Brownlee (*S.N.T.*, p. 45) regards the emendation as very risky, and so M. Delcor (*Revue Thomiste*, lviii (1958), 762, 773). N. Wieder (*J.J.S.* vi (1955), 14 ff.) has argued that the Karaites believed in two Messiahs, and Delcor (*loc. cit.* p. 773) thinks it improbable that Karaite scribes would have altered the text to a singular.

anointed one",<sup>1</sup> and in the Old Testament it is never used for the expected Davidic leader. It is used of kings and priests, and even of Cyrus.<sup>2</sup> But by the beginning of the Christian era it had become a technical term for the deliverer whose advent was awaited. It was not unnatural that an anointed High Priest, alongside the kingly Messiah, should be thought of, and especially in such a sect as that of Qumran, in which the priests had the highest place. They could therefore speak of "the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel". One of the texts, to which we shall return, makes it plain that the Aaronic anointed one should have precedence over the Davidic.<sup>3</sup> Such a conception appears to be found also in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.<sup>4</sup> The *Zadokite Work*, which has been known since the beginning of this century and which is now generally recognized to have emanated from the Qumran sect, shows that there was an expectation that the Messiah would come within forty years of the death of the Teacher of Righteousness.<sup>5</sup> There are some who

<sup>1</sup> Silberman (loc. cit.) objected to the use of the term "Messiah" here, because of its misleading associations, and so LaSor (loc. cit.). <sup>2</sup> Isa. xlv. 1.

<sup>3</sup> See below, pp. 144 ff. Cf. J. Gnlika, "Die Erwartung des messianischen Hohenpriesters in den Schriften von Qumran und im Neuen Testament", *R.Q.* ii (1960), 395 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. G. R. Beasley-Murray, *J.T.S.* xlviii (1949), 5 ff. This view is accepted by B. Otzen (*S.Th.* vii (1954), 151 ff.), and A. S. van der Woude (*Die messianischen Vorstellungen*, pp. 194 f.). Cf. also J. Liver, *H.T.R.* lii (1959), 163 ff. It is rejected by A. J. B. Higgins (*V.T.* iii (1953), 330), who maintains that all that the passages indicate is the superiority of the priesthood to the kingship. E. J. Bickerman (*J.B.L.* lxix (1950), 252) declares "the doctrine of the Messiah from the tribe of Levi, allegedly professed by the author" to be "a figment, created by modern readers of the work".

<sup>5</sup> In ix. 21 (p. xx, line 1) there is a reference to the period from the day when the Unique Teacher was gathered in to the coming of the Messiah, while in ix. 39 (p. xx, lines 13 ff.) we are told that from the day when the Unique Teacher was gathered in until the consuming of all the men of war who returned with the Man of Falsehood would be about forty years. The Unique Teacher, or possibly the Teacher of the Community (cf. S. M. Stern, *J.B.L.* lxix (1950), 24; L. Rost, *Th.L.Z.* lxxviii (1953), 144; G. Molin, *Die Söhne des Lichtes*, 1954, p. 57), is generally identified with the Teacher of Righteousness (so R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii (1913), 800; G. Hölscher, *Z.N.W.* xxix (1929), 39; A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, Eng. trans. by E. Margaret Rowley, 1952, p. 63), and it is probable that the destruction of the men of war was associated with the coming of the Messiah (cf. the present writer's *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 2nd edn., 1947, p. 76). It should be noted that L. Rost (loc. cit. cols.

think that the Teacher of Righteousness was expected himself to rise from the dead and to be the Messiah,<sup>1</sup> though there is little clear evidence for this<sup>2</sup> and some evidence, to which we shall come, against it. Since the Teacher of Righteousness was a priest,<sup>3</sup> if such an expectation were held he would be thought of as an Aaronic Messiah. Already, before the discovery of the Qumran Scrolls, George Foot Moore, in discussing the *Zadokite Work*, had said that if the author had intended to identify

143 ff.) and T. H. Gaster (*The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect*, 1957, pp. 35 f.) differentiate the Unique Teacher from the Teacher of Righteousness, while C. Rabin (*The Zadokite Documents*, 2nd edn., 1958, p. 37 n.) does not commit himself.

<sup>1</sup> So A. Dupont-Sommer, op. cit. pp. 34 f., 44, *Les Écrits esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte*, 1959, p. 123 n.; cf. C. T. Fritsch, *The Qumrān Community*, 1956, p. 82). This view is rejected by J. van der Ploeg (*Bi. Or.* viii (1951), 12 f.), J. Bonsirven (*Études*, cclxviii (1951), 216), R. de Vaux (*La Vie Intellectuelle*, April 1951, p. 67), M. Delcor (*R.B.* lviii (1951), 521 ff.), R. Tamisier (*Scripture*, v (1952), 37 f.), M. Black (*S.E.Á.* xviii-xix (1955), 85 f.), G. Molin (*Die Söhne des Lichtes*, 1954, p. 148), and F. F. Bruce (*The Modern Churchman*, N.S. iv (1960-1), 51). Before the discovery of the Scrolls, in discussing the *Zadokite Work*, the view that the Teacher was expected to rise and be the Messiah had been advanced by S. Schechter (*Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, 1910, p. xiii; cf. G. Margoliouth (*Expositor*, 8th ser., ii (1911), 517)), and rejected by G. F. Moore (*H.T.R.* iv (1911), 342), J. A. Montgomery (*B.W.*, N.S. xxxviii (1911), 376), and J. B. Frey (*S.D.B.* i (1928), 397). J. D. Amusin (*The Manuscripts of the Dead Sea*, 1960, p. 251) thinks the Teacher was expected to return, and that this expectation later gave rise to the myth of the risen and returning Christ. This is surely rather much to hang on a single obscure and doubtful passage! (Amusin's book is in Russian and therefore inaccessible to me. I am indebted to the author for a copy and to Mr. Arie Rubinstein for access to its contents.)

<sup>2</sup> Cf. J. van der Ploeg, *The Excavations at Qumran*, Eng. trans. by K. Smyth, 1958, p. 203: "There is no mention in the Qumran writings of any resurrection of the Teacher or of his second coming as Judge. That he 'appeared' after his death to Jerusalem when Pompey took it in 63 B.C. is something that Dupont-Sommer invented." Cf. K. Smyth, *The Furrow*, April 1957, p. 222: "Dupont-Sommer reached this result by remoulding a few lines of the Habacuc Commentary nearer to his heart's desire, with the help of mis-translations, mis-readings of text, and the insertion of his own matter into lacunae." Cf. also J. Carmignac, *R.Q.* i (1958-9), 235 ff. On the rendering of the word "appeared" in *Habakkuk Commentary*, col. XI, line 7, cf. Carmignac *Le Docteur de Justice et Jésus-Christ*, 1957, pp. 38 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *P.E.Q.* lxxxvi (1954), 69 ff., where in a fragment of a commentary on Ps. xxxvii (col. II, line 15), published by J. M. Allegro, we find a reference to "the Priest, the Teacher of Ri[g]hteousness". Cf. also *Habakkuk Commentary*, col. II, line 8.

the Teacher of Righteousness with the coming Messiah, he would have expressed so singular and significant a belief unmistakably.<sup>1</sup>

It is already clear that the messianism of the Qumran sect was very different from that of the New Testament. For the Church Jesus was the Messiah, and it had no place for a second. The thought of his Messiahship was drawn from the Old Testament and not from Qumran. He was believed to be the Davidic Messiah, and it is hard to suppose that for Jesus or his followers any priestly Messiah was contemplated as having precedence over Him. No such idea appears anywhere in the New Testament.

It is true that in the Epistle to the Hebrews the work of Christ is interpreted in priestly terms. But the priest is not a second figure who stands beside and above Jesus. He is identified with Jesus. Nor is the priesthood of Jesus, as it is set forth in this Epistle, an Aaronic priesthood.<sup>2</sup> It is specifically dissociated from such a priesthood, and described as a priesthood after the order of Melchizedek. The Qumran sectaries called their priestly members Sons of Zadok,<sup>3</sup> and it is probable that by this name they indicated their rejection of any other High Priest than one of the family of Zadok, who was the Jerusalem priest of the time of David and Solomon. They did not offer

<sup>1</sup> *H.T.R.* iv (1911), 342.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. F. F. Bruce, *N.T.S.* ii (1955-6), 180 f.

<sup>3</sup> *Zadokite Work* vi. 2 (p. iv, line 3), *Manual of Discipline* col. V, line 2, *The Rule of the Congregation*, col. I, lines 2, 24, col. II, line 3 (Barthélemy and Milik, *Qumran Cave I*, 1955, p. 110), *Benedictions*, col. III, line 22 (*ibid.* p. 124). In the *Manual of Discipline*, col. IX, line 14, we find *bny hšdwk* (P. Wernberg-Møller, in *The Manual of Discipline*, 1957, p. 42, proposed to read here *hšdyk*, but in *R.Q.* ii (1960), 233, he withdraws this reading; cf. M. Martin, *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ii (1958), 443), where the use of the article is strange if the meaning is "sons of Zadok" (so rendered by W. H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline*, 1951, p. 36; K. Schubert, *Z.K.Th.* vol. lxxiv, 1952; H. Bardtke, *Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer*, 2nd edn., 1953, p. 102; P. Wernberg-Møller, *op. cit.* p. 27; E. F. Sutcliffe, *The Monks of Qumran*, 1960, p. 154). It has frequently been said, by the present writer among others, that the members of the sect called themselves the "sons of Zadok", but Wernberg-Møller shows (*V.T.* iii (1953), 311 ff.; cf. *The Manual of Discipline*, p. 90) that the "sons of Zadok" are conceived as the priestly members of the sect as opposed to the lay members (so also J. M. Grintz, *Ha-aretz*, 11 May 1956).



sacrifices in the Temple,<sup>1</sup> and it is probable that this was because they did not recognize the priesthood there as in the true line of succession from Zadok, and not because they rejected the Temple cultus in itself.<sup>2</sup> They looked for a rightful priest, and in their organization the priests were accorded the place of honour.<sup>3</sup> Jesus was not a priest, and did not function as such in the company of his disciples. When the Epistle to the Hebrews presents his work in priestly terms, his priesthood is exercised in a single act, and it takes place not in the Temple but on Calvary, where He offered Himself.

We know very little of the life of the Teacher of Righteousness. The references to him in the Scrolls indicate that he lived in stormy times and was opposed by one who is called the Wicked Priest, who persecuted him. The *Zadokite Work* speaks of his being "gathered in",<sup>4</sup> and this expression is used in the Old Testament for natural death.<sup>5</sup> There is an obscure passage in

<sup>1</sup> There are references to sacrifices in *Zadokite Work* xiii. 27, xiv. 1 (p. xi, lines 17-21), which probably dates from the time before the breach with the Temple was complete. But the later texts do not speak of such sacrifices being offered. On Josephus's statement about the Essenes and sacrifice see below, p. 131, n. 7. On the significance of the bones of animals found at Qumran, cf. R. de Vaux, *R.B.* lxiii (1956), 549 f., and J. van der Ploeg, *J.S.S.* ii (1957), 172 f.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. J. M. Baumgarten, *H.T.R.* xlvi (1953), 153 f.; J. Carmignac, *R.B.* lxiii (1956), 524 ff.; M. Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 258; K. Schubert, *The Dead Sea Community*, Eng. trans. by J. W. Doberstein, 1959, p. 56; E. F. Sutcliffe, *op. cit.*, pp. 82 f.; also cf. H. Mosbech, *Essæismen*, 1916, pp. 263 ff. O. Cullmann (*E.T.* lxxi (1959-60), 39) thinks it likely that the sectaries considered their separation from Jerusalem was only temporary, but says (pp. 39 f.); "Although in principle the specific rites of Qumran were not at all considered to be *opposed* to the bloody sacrifices, the long exclusive practice of their particular rites, baptism and the sacred meal, and the long abstention from sacrifices must sooner or later have given birth to the idea that sacrifices were not at all pleasing to God."

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Manual of Discipline*, cols. V, lines 2 f., IX, line 7.

<sup>4</sup> *Zadokite Work* ix. 21 (p. xx, line 1), ix. 39 (p. xx, line 14).

<sup>5</sup> For a careful study of the use of this expression, cf. B. Alfrink, *O.T.S.* v (1948), 118 ff. K. Schubert (*Z.K.Th.* lxxiv (1952), 25) holds that the language in the *Zadokite Work* implies the natural death of the Teacher, and so J. Carmignac (*Le Docteur de Justice et Jésus-Christ*, 1957, p. 55), J. Bourke (*Blackfriars*, xl (1959), 165), and M. Delcor (*Revue Thomiste*, lix (1959), 145). J. van der Ploeg (*The Excavations at Qumran*, p. 202) says: "That the Teacher was put to death is an assumption that still lacks confirmation from the texts."

the *Habakkuk Commentary* which is believed by many scholars to mean that he suffered martyrdom.<sup>1</sup> In another text there is a reference to an enemy of the sect, called the Lion of Wrath, who hung men alive.<sup>2</sup> It is probable that this refers to crucifixion, and it has therefore been held that the Teacher of Righteousness was crucified,<sup>3</sup> and thus suffered the same death as Jesus. If this were established beyond any doubt, it would have no special significance. Many others had been crucified before Jesus, and not a few had suffered this death as martyrs for their faith. In fact, the text that mentions the crucifixions does not mention the Teacher of Righteousness. How he died we have no means of knowing.

More important than the manner of his death is the significance attached to it by his followers. In the New Testament the death and resurrection of Jesus do not figure each in a single, obscure passage, but throughout the whole, and they are fundamental for the understanding of the entire theology of the Church from its earliest days. Whatever the Church derived from Qumran it did not derive this. Even if the Teacher of Righteousness was in fact crucified and was expected to rise from the dead, his death and resurrection did not dominate the thought and faith of the Qumran sect,<sup>4</sup> and no one could read the Scrolls and the

<sup>1</sup> *Habakkuk Commentary*, col. XI, line 5. Several writers have denied Dupont-Sommer's interpretation of this passage. Cf. E. Cavaignac, *R.H.R.* cxxxviii (1950), 156 f.; M. Delcor, *Essai sur le Midrash d'Habacuc*, 1951, p. 44; M. H. Segal, *J.B.L.* lxx (1951), 142; R. Tamisier, *Scripture*, v (1952-3), 38; K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakkuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer*, 1953, pp. 281 ff. For Dupont-Sommer's defence of his view, cf. *V.T.* i (1951), 200 f. C. T. Fritsch (op. cit. p. 81) accepts the view that the Teacher of Righteousness came to a violent end at the hands of the Wicked Priest.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. J. M. Allegro, *J.B.L.* lxxv (1956), 89 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Allegro, Letter to *The Times*, 20 March 1956 (cf. also *Time Magazine*, 6 February 1956) and *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1956, pp. 99 f. Allegro believes the Teacher of Righteousness was crucified by Alexander Jannaeus. E. Stauffer, on the other hand, identifies the Teacher with Jose ben Joezer, who was crucified in Maccabaeian times (*Z.R.G.G.* viii (1956), 250 ff.).

<sup>4</sup> There is a reference in the *Habakkuk Commentary* (col. VIII, lines 2 f.) to those who have faith in the Teacher of Righteousness, and this has been interpreted to mean that the Teacher was the object of saving faith (cf. Dupont-Sommer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 44; C. T. Fritsch, op. cit. p. 82). Again, it will be observed, much is being based on a single passage, which does not naturally bear the meaning placed on it. Cf. O. Cullmann, *S.N.T.*, p. 23: "this faith in

New Testament without being at once aware that they move in two different theological worlds.<sup>1</sup> By its Christology the New Testament stands in the sharpest contrast with the Scrolls.<sup>2</sup>

It has been conjectured, though without the slightest evidence, that Jesus lived for some years amongst the Qumran sectaries.<sup>3</sup> Professor F. C. Grant characterizes this as fantastic nonsense.<sup>4</sup>

the Teacher of Righteousness is not, as for Paul, faith in an *act of atonement* accomplished in the *death* of Christ for the forgiveness of sins. In fact, the concept of faith itself is different, containing nothing of the sense of opposition to the works of the law." The meaning here is nothing more than *fidelity* to the Teacher of Righteousness, and it is so rendered by K. Elliger, *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer*, 1953, p. 196: "ihrer Treue zu dem Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit" (cf. H. Bardtke, *op. cit.* p. 128). Cf. also J. van der Ploeg, *The Excavations at Qumran*, p. 202; E. F. Sutcliffe, *The Monks of Qumran*, p. 118. M. Burrows (*More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 121) says: "Faith in the teacher means confidence in his teaching, not in a work of atonement accomplished by his death"; K. G. Kuhn (*S.N.T.*, p. 78) observes: "In the Qumran texts we find no trace of such an ultimately redemptive significance of a historical person." Cf. also H. Kosmala, *Hebräer-Essener-Christen*, 1959, pp. 390 f.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Burrows, *op. cit.* pp. 66 f.: "No objective historian, whatever may be his personal belief about the resurrection of Jesus, can fail to see the decisive difference here in the beliefs of the two groups. What for the community of Qumran was at most a hope was for the Christians an accomplished fact, the guarantee of their hopes."

<sup>2</sup> Fritsch (*op. cit.* p. 82) says the Teacher of Righteousness must have been regarded as more than human. In this he is following Dupont-Sommer, who goes so far as to suppose that the Teacher was held to have been pre-existent as a divine being, and became incarnate (*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 34). This assumption is based on nothing more substantial than a reference to the Teacher's "body of flesh". Had the Teacher really been thought of as an incarnate divine being, we should have expected some clearer indication of this belief in the writings of the sect. Yet nowhere does it figure in any of their texts, or in any of the first century accounts of the Essenes. It is derived not from the literature of the sect, but from the New Testament, and then attributed to them. Cf. J. Carmignac, *Le Docteur de Justice et Jésus-Christ*, pp. 37 ff.

<sup>3</sup> See F. C. Grant, *Ancient Judaism and the New Testament*, 1960, p. 18, where an unnamed source for the suggestion is referred to. Cf. B. Hjerl-Hansen, *R.Q.* i (1958-9), 495 ff. The suggestion had already been rejected long ago by J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, 1900, pp. 395 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 19; cf. p. 133, where he speaks of "the preposterous inferences and hypotheses which many persons have advocated since the Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered—inferences which sometimes openly betray their propounders' unfamiliarity with ancient Judaism as well as with New Testament history and exegesis." Cf. also Cullmann, *S.N.T.*, p. 18: "That Jesus was . . . a member of the Essene Community is pure and groundless speculation."

The idea that Jesus derived his teaching from the sect is one that cannot survive the most superficial examination.<sup>1</sup> Professor Stauffer has argued that many of the teachings of Jesus were directed expressly against the sectaries,<sup>2</sup> and that their influence on the later writers of the New Testament was greater than on Jesus Himself.<sup>3</sup> For instance, in the New Testament we read: "Ye have heard that it was said 'You shall love your neighbour and hate your enemy'. But I say unto you 'Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you'."<sup>4</sup> It has often been pointed out by commentators that in the Old Testament we do not find the command to hate enemies.<sup>5</sup> In the Scrolls, however, we do find such a command.<sup>6</sup>

Whether Jesus had the Qumran community in mind or not when He uttered such sayings,<sup>7</sup> it is certain that his attitude on many questions was quite other than that of the sectaries.<sup>8</sup> The contrast between his attitude to Sabbath observance and theirs is particularly notable. Jesus was criticized by the Pharisees for what they regarded as his laxity. But the Scrolls teach a sabbatarianism that was much more strict than that of the Pharisees, and the members of the sect would have been shocked by the saying of Jesus "The sabbath was made for man, not man

<sup>1</sup> Cf. M. Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, pp. 88 f.; G. Graystone, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Originality of Christ*, 1956, p. 89. D. Flusser (*Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Scripta Hierosolymitana, IV], 1958, 215 f.) says: "The synoptic Gospels show few and comparatively unimportant parallels to the Sectarian writings. This seems to indicate that the Scrolls will not contribute much to the understanding of the personality of Jesus and of the religious world of his disciples."

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Die Botschaft Jesu damals und heute*, 1959, pp. 13 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 16.

<sup>4</sup> Matt. v. 43 f.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, i (1922), 353; E. Percy, *Die Botschaft Jesu*, 1953, p. 153; K. Schubert, *S.N.T.*, p. 120.

<sup>6</sup> *Manual of Discipline*, cols. I, line 10, IX, lines 21 f.; cf. col. X, lines 19 f. Cf. Morton Smith, *H.T.R.* xlv (1952), 71 ff. But cf. E. F. Sutcliffe, *R.Q.* ii (1960), 345 ff., where it is observed that there was to be no private hatred or revenge, and that the hatred enjoined in the Qumran texts was the hatred of wicked men, as in the Old Testament. There can be little doubt, however, that the enemies of the sect were regarded as wicked men.

<sup>7</sup> K. Schubert (*S.N.T.*, p. 121) says Matt. v. 43 f. is to be understood within the framework of Jesus's encounter with Essene concepts. J. D. Amusin (*op. cit.* pp. 253 f.) thinks this passage from Matthew and also 1 John ii. 9 ff. may have been directed against the Qumran sect.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Cullmann, *S.N.T.*, pp. 30 f.

for the sabbath".<sup>1</sup> When Jesus was watched to see if He would heal the man with a withered hand on the sabbath, He said "What man of you, if he has one sheep and it falls into a pit on the sabbath, will not lay hold of it and lift it out? Of how much more value is a man than a sheep!"<sup>2</sup> According to the teaching of the Qumran sect neither animal nor man should be so helped on the sabbath. In the *Zadokite Work* we read: "No one should help an animal to foal on the sabbath day. And if it should drop (its foal)<sup>3</sup> into a well or a pit, let not one raise it on the sabbath day . . . And if a man falls into a place of water or into some other place, let not one raise him<sup>4</sup> with a ladder or rope or instrument."<sup>5</sup>

In the *Zadokite Work* there are references to offerings on the altar,<sup>6</sup> but Philo tells us the Essenes did not offer sacrifices in the Temple,<sup>7</sup> and in the sectarian texts found at Qumran there are

<sup>1</sup> Mark ii. 27.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xii. 11 f.; cf. Luke xiv. 5. Amusin (op. cit. pp. 255 f.) thinks these passages were polemically directed against the Qumran sectaries.

<sup>3</sup> This follows the rendering of C. Rabin (*The Zadokite Documents*, p. 56) and Gaster (op. cit. p. 87), since the verb appears to be Hiph'il. R. H. Charles (*Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii. 827) renders "if it falls", and so Sutcliffe (op. cit. p. 144; cf. p. 120).

<sup>4</sup> This follows the rendering of Charles (loc. cit. p. 828) and Sutcliffe (op. cit. p. 144). Rabin (op. cit. p. 56) for "let not one raise him" renders "from which one cannot come up", and thus robs the sentence of its main verb, which he then conjecturally supplies as "let him bring him up". Gaster (op. cit. p. 87) does not render the negative, but emends it to yield the noun "darkness", i.e. "a place of darkness". But the context, which in a series of sayings has the negative with a verb, stating a prohibition, favours a similar construction here.

<sup>5</sup> *Zadokite work*, xiii. 22-6 (p. xi, lines 13-17).

<sup>6</sup> *Zadokite Work*, xiii. 27, xiv. 1 (p. xi, lines 17-21).

<sup>7</sup> *Quod omnis probus liber sit*, xii (75). In Whiston's translation of Josephus, *Antiq.* XVIII. i. 5 (19) we find a similar statement that the Essenes did not offer sacrifices, but the text is here uncertain. The Greek manuscripts, all of which are late, do not contain the negative and say that they sent offerings to the Temple and offered sacrifices with superiority of purificatory rites, for which reason they were excluded from the common court of the Temple and offered their sacrifices by themselves. The Greek *Epitoma*, which is attested at a date earlier than surviving manuscripts of the *Antiquities*, and the Latin rendering of the *Antiquities*, which was made in the sixth century, have the negative (cf. J. Thomas, *Le Mouvement baptiste en Palestine et Syrie*, 1935, pp. 12 f.n.; also Sutcliffe, op. cit. pp. 230 f.). The rendering of Whiston is accepted by Lightfoot (op. cit. pp. 369 f.), H. Mosbech (*Essæismen*, 1916, pp. 263 ff.), J. M. Baumgarten (*H.T.R.* xlvi (1953), 155), Burrows (*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1955, p. 285), and D. H. Wallace

no references to animal sacrifices.<sup>1</sup> This was probably, as has been already said, due to the fact that the Jerusalem priesthood was not recognized by the sectaries as legitimate,<sup>2</sup> and on this account they had nothing to do with the Temple or its sacrifices. Jesus and his disciples did not boycott the Temple, but visited it and He taught there. When He cleansed a leper He told him to go to the Temple and offer the prescribed sacrifice.<sup>3</sup> The Early Church did not keep away from the Temple,<sup>4</sup> and

(*Th.Z.* xii (1957), 334 ff.), and it is generally believed that the Essenes did not offer sacrifices. Cf. D. Flusser, *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1958, p. 235: "As the Qumran covenanters thought that the Temple was polluted, they could not take part in the Temple service of their time. This inability to offer real sacrifices engendered an ambivalent attitude to the sacrificial rites." Fritsch (op. cit., p. 108) says the Qumran community evidently believed that sacrifices were useless. This goes too far. Cf. J. Carmignac, *R.B.* lxxiii (1956), 530 f., where it is argued that the sect did not repudiate sacrifices on principle. It is hard to see how a sect which set so high a value on the Law could reject them on principle. Mlle A. Jaubert, *N.T.S.* vii (1960-1), 17, thinks the sectaries frequented the Temple and notes that one of the gates of the Temple bore their name. (Cf. M.-J. Lagrange, *Le Judasime avant Jésus-Christ*, 1931, pp. 318 f.) This does not necessarily mean that they offered sacrifices, and while the uncertain statement of Josephus cannot be pressed, the unambiguous statement of Philo should not be set aside. J. M. Allegro (*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 100) thinks the sect had its own altar at Qumran and there offered sacrifice, and that the Teacher of Righteousness was in the act of sacrificing when the Wicked Priest came to Qumran. But, as Burrows (*More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 366) says, this is quite incredible, since it would be a violation of the Law which the sect was pledged to obey. F. C. Conybeare (in Hastings' *D.B.* i, 769b) suggests that the passage in Josephus does not necessarily mean that they sent animal sacrifices to the Temple, even if the negative is omitted, but argues that the sacrifices they offered by themselves were the sacrifices of a devout and reverent mind, which Philo says they offered (*Quod omnis probus liber sit*, xii (75)).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 237: "The Manual of Discipline makes no reference at all to the temple or to sacrifice except in obviously figurative expressions." S. E. Johnson goes beyond the evidence when he roundly says that in the *Manual* the existing Temple cultus was repudiated (*S.N.T.*, p. 136). Cf. M. Delcor, *Revue Thomiste*, lviii (1958), 759. In the *War Scroll* there is a reference to the future offering of sacrifice (col. II, lines 5 f.). S. Holm-Nielson points out that in the *Hymns Scroll* there is a complete absence of references to the Temple and Temple worship (*Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran*, 1960, p. 309).

<sup>2</sup> To this it should be added that the objection of the Qumran sectaries to the official calendar (see below, pp. 147 ff.) meant that in their eyes the Jerusalem sacrifices at all the festivals were offered on the wrong days and were therefore invalid.

<sup>3</sup> Matt. viii. 4, Mark i. 44, Luke v. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Acts ii. 46, iii. 1 ff., v. 20 ff., 42.

when Paul made a vow he fulfilled it by sacrificing in the Temple.<sup>1</sup>

The members of the sect of the Scrolls had each his place in the meetings of the sect,<sup>2</sup> and every year there was a review of the conduct of all the members, leading to advancement to a higher place or relegation to a lower.<sup>3</sup> The disciples of Jesus were similarly interested in questions of precedence, and we read that as they walked in the way they argued with one another about their claims to the highest place.<sup>4</sup> That Jesus had nothing of the Qumran attitude to such a question is beyond doubt. He rebuked his disciples for even discussing it, and said: "If anyone would be first, he must be last of all and servant of all."<sup>5</sup>

On the subject of ritual ablutions, the attitude of Jesus stands in complete contrast to that of the sect. There are references in the Scrolls to purificatory waters, though it is recognized that no waters can purify the man who does not obey the laws of God and submit himself to the discipline of the sect.<sup>6</sup> From Josephus we learn that the Essenes bathed the whole body daily before partaking of food.<sup>7</sup> While this is not stated explicitly in the Scrolls, it is probable that the members of the sect followed this practice if the sect is to be identified with the Essenes, and likely that the statement in the *Manual of Discipline* that those who sought to enter the sect could not touch "the purity of the many" before the last year of their probation<sup>8</sup> is an allusion to it. The "purity of the many" is believed by many scholars to allude to the waters of purification in which the members daily bathed.<sup>9</sup> That Jesus and his disciples did not follow such a practice is clear from the fact that when the disciples were criticized for not

<sup>1</sup> Acts xxi. 26 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Manual of Discipline*, cols. V, lines 20 ff., VI, lines 4 f., 8 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Manual of Discipline*, col. II, lines 19 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Mark ix. 33 ff.; cf. Luke ix. 46 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Mark ix. 35.

<sup>6</sup> *Manual of Discipline*, col. V, lines 13 f.

<sup>7</sup> *B.J.* II. viii. 5 (129).

<sup>8</sup> *Manual of Discipline*, col. VII, lines 18 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Gaster (op. cit. p. 60) renders: "the formal state of purity enjoyed by the general membership of the community", and on p. 107, n. 58, brings this into association with the passage in Josephus. S. Lieberman thinks the meaning is the solid food of the community as opposed to liquids (*J.B.L.* lxxi (1952), 203).

even washing their hands before eating, Jesus defended them. Moreover, in the Johannine account of the Last Supper we read only of the washing of the disciples' feet by Jesus,<sup>2</sup> and not of the bathing of their body.

It has been argued that the Church owed much to the Qumran sectaries for its organization.<sup>3</sup> It would not be surprising for, the infant Church to learn from the experience of others in this matter. The services of the Early Church were modelled on those of the Synagogue, and since in the first days the Church was regarded by its Jerusalem members as a Jewish sect it would not be remarkable if its organization was modelled on that of another contemporary Jewish sect. It is possible that the community of goods in the Jerusalem church<sup>4</sup> was influenced by the community of goods at Qumran.<sup>5</sup> It does not seem to have lasted long in Jerusalem, or to have been practised in the churches established elsewhere, and it cannot be said to have belonged to the essential pattern of the Church.

While the sect of the Scrolls had its headquarters at Qumran, all its members were not concentrated there. There were smaller groups scattered throughout the land.<sup>6</sup> But wherever there was a company of sectaries they had at their head an officer, who presided at their meetings and without whose permission none was allowed to speak.<sup>7</sup> His title<sup>8</sup> may be rendered by the word

<sup>1</sup> Matt. xv. 1 ff., Mark vii. 1 ff.; cf. Luke xi. 37 ff.

<sup>2</sup> John xiii. 3 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. J. Schmitt, in *La Secte de Qumran* (Recherches Bibliques IV), 1959 pp. 216 ff. (p. 230: "Le judaïsme communautaire est, à n'en pas douter, le milieu d'où l'Église de Jérusalem tient les formes les plus marquantes de son organisation naissante"). The similarities between the Essenes and the Church had long been noted. F. C. Conybeare (loc. cit. p. 770b) gives an account of them, and concludes that "the most we can say is that the Christians copied many features of their organization and propagandist activity from the Essenes". Cf. also J. B. Lightfoot (op. cit. pp. 395 ff.), who recognizes Essene influence in the Church before the close of the Apostolic age.

<sup>4</sup> Acts iv. 32 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. S. Segert, "Die Gütergemeinschaft der Essäer", in *Studia Antiqua Antonio Salač septuagenario oblata*, 1955, pp. 66 ff.

<sup>6</sup> *Manual of Discipline*, col. VI, lines 3, 6; cf. Josephus, *B.J.* II. viii. 4 (124-6).

<sup>7</sup> *Manual of Discipline*, col. VI, lines 8 ff.

<sup>8</sup> *m<sup>e</sup>bhakkēr*. Cf. *Zadokite Work* x. 10 f., 13 (p. ix, lines 18 f., 22), xv. 7, xvi. 1 (p. xiii, lines 6 f.), xvi. 7 f. (p. xiii, lines 13, 16), xviii. 2 (p. xiv, line 13), xix. 8, 10, 12 (p. xv, lines 8, 11, 14), *Manual of Discipline*, col. VI, lines 12, 20.



Inspector. There is a reference to an "Inspector who is over all the camps",<sup>1</sup> who would seem to have been the head of the whole sect. For the admission of new members an Overseer<sup>2</sup> acted in the first instance.<sup>3</sup> Whether he is the same as the Inspector is not clear,<sup>4</sup> or, if they were different persons, what the relation of the one to the other was. It had been held that the office of bishop in the Early Church corresponded to that of Inspector in the Qumran sect.<sup>5</sup> This has been disputed,<sup>6</sup> and the single use of the term *episkopoi*, or bishops, in the book of Acts would suggest that the office was not quite the same as that of Inspector amongst the Qumran sectaries. For Paul called the elders of the church at Ephesus to meet him at Miletus,<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Zadokite Work*, xvii. 6 (p. xiv, line 9).

<sup>2</sup> *paqidh*.

<sup>3</sup> *Manual of Discipline*, col. VI, line 14.

<sup>4</sup> F. M. Cross (*Ancient Library of Qumrân*, p. 176 n.) identifies them, and so J. van der Ploeg (*The Excavations at Qumran*, p. 135; cf. *Bi. Or.* ix (1952), 131b), W. H. Brownlee (*The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline*, 1951, p. 25) and P. Wernberg Møller (*The Manual of Discipline*, 1957, p. 107), while J. T. Milik holds the identification to be probable (*Ten Years of Discovery*, p. 100). On the other hand, G. Lambert (*N.R.Th.* lxxiii (1951), 944) appears to differentiate them.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. I. Lévi, *R.E.J.* lxi (1911), 195; K. Kohler, *A. J. Th.* xv (1911), 416; A. Büchler, *J.Q.R.*, N.S. iii (1912-13), 464; W. Staerk, *Die jüdische Gemeinde des Neuen Bundes im Damaskus*, 1922, p. 68; G. Hölscher, *Z.N.W.* xxviii (1929), 39; J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu*, 2nd edn., 1958, ii B, 132 ff.; J. Daniélou, *R.H.P.R.* xxxv (1955), 111, and *Les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte et les origines du Christianisme*, 1957, pp. 36 f.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. K. G. Goetz, *Z.N.W.* xxx (1931), 89 ff.; H. W. Beyer, in *T.W.N.T.* ii (1935), 614 f. Bo Reicke (*S.N.T.*, p. 154) says: "There is little reason to assume that the church got its episcopal office from the Essenes and their *mebaqqer*" (cf. *Symbolae Biblicae Upsalienses*, No. 6, 1946, p. 16 n.); cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Modern Churchman*, N.S. iv (1960-1), 53: "The *mebaqqer* or superintendent of one of the branches of the Qumran community has little in common with the Christian *episkopos* but the meaning of the title." M. Delcor (*Revue Thomiste*, lix (1959), 136) distinguishes the *m'bhakkēr* from the *episkopos* on the ground that the former was accompanied by a priest and was therefore himself a layman. It is very doubtful if this is correct, since it is unlikely that a sect which gave its leadership into the hands of priests would have put the examination of converts in lay hands. Moreover the *episkopos* was not a priest in the sense in which the priestly members of the sect were, i.e. a descendant of Aaron. Cf. R. P. C. Hanson (*A Guide to the Scrolls*, 1958, p. 67): "There is no evidence that the early Christians divided their members into 'laymen' and 'clergy or ministers' at all." Cf. also F. Nötscher, in *Die Kirche und ihre Ämter und Stände* Festgabe für Cardinal Frings, 1960, pp. 315 ff. <sup>7</sup> Acts xx. 17.

and in addressing them he called them bishops.<sup>1</sup> This would suggest that in the church at Ephesus there were several bishops, and not a single person with the authority of the Qumran Inspector. Similarly, Paul's letter to the Philippians is addressed to the members of the church with its bishops and deacons.<sup>2</sup> That the office of bishop later developed into something more comparable with the inspectorship of the Qumran sect<sup>3</sup> is not evidence that the Church took this over from the sect, but would suggest that it developed in the life and experience of the Church. The term *episkopos* closely corresponds in meaning with the Qumran term Overseer, and it may well be that the Church owed something to Qumran for the adoption of the term, though the total organization of the Church was very different from that of the sect.

The affairs of the sect were managed by a council of twelve members and three priests.<sup>4</sup> It has been held that this means twelve men of whom three should be priests,<sup>5</sup> in accordance with the sect's conceding of special influence and authority to the priests. We should more naturally understand the reference to mean that the three priests were in addition to the twelve,<sup>6</sup> but we need not press that. On the view that they were within the

<sup>1</sup> Acts xx. 28. R.S.V. conceals the use of the word *episkopoi* here by rendering "guardians".

<sup>2</sup> Phil. i. 1. The references to bishops in 1 Tim. iii. 2, Titus i. 7, do not give any indication how many bishops there were in a single church.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Beyer (loc. cit. p. 615): The *m<sup>e</sup>bhakkē* "hat seine Entsprechung tatsächlich mehr im Bischof des 3 Jhdts als in dem, was wir von den *ἐπίσκοποι* des Urchristentums wissen".

<sup>4</sup> *Manual of Discipline*, col. VIII, line 1.

<sup>5</sup> C. T. Fritsch (op. cit. p. 120) states this as if it were not open to question (cf. p. 63). Bo Reicke (*S.N.T.* p. 151) says that "perhaps the inclusion of the three priests is to be preferred".

<sup>6</sup> Cf. J. T. Milik (*Ten Years of Discovery*, p. 100), who thinks the twelve laymen represented the twelve tribes of Israel and the three priests the families of Levi's three sons, Gershon, Kohath and Merari. Dupont-Sommer (*Les Écrits esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte*, 1959, p. 105 n.) inclines to follow this view, and holds that the interpretation of fifteen men is more natural (cf., *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes*, Eng. Trans. by R. D. Barnett, 1954, pp. 81 f., where the inclusion of the three within the twelve was favoured). So R. P. C. Hanson, *A Guide to the Scrolls*, 1958, 66 ("not even the arithmetic corresponds in this alleged resemblance") and E. F. Sutcliffe, *J.S.S.* iv (1959), 134.

twelve, this has been thought to have provided the model for Jesus,<sup>1</sup> who chose twelve disciples, of whom three seem to have formed an inner circle. For the choice of twelve disciples there is no need to look to Qumran for inspiration. The Old Testament is a sure source for the ideas of Jesus, while the sect of Qumran is at best less sure. The twelve tribes of Israel almost certainly supplied the inspiration for both. Indeed, we find Jesus in the Gospels promising the disciples that they should sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.<sup>2</sup> Moreover, the special position of Peter, James and John<sup>3</sup> cannot well be traced to Qumran. For in the organization of the sect the three, whether within or without the twelve, were priests, and this was fundamental to the whole spirit of the sect. Peter, James and John were not priests. The members of the sect were divided into three categories, according to the *Manual of Discipline*.<sup>4</sup> These were priests, Levites, and lay members. According to the *Zadokite Work* there were four categories, priests, Levites, children of Israel, and proselytes.<sup>5</sup> Here there is no necessary contradiction,<sup>6</sup> since the *Manual of Discipline* tells us of the long probation of those who joined the sect, who stood outside the full membership of the sect.<sup>7</sup> It is probable that these correspond to the proselytes of the other text.<sup>8</sup> In the Early Church we find nothing of this, and there is no evidence that priests or Levites had any special status within the Church.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. C. T. Fritsch, *op. cit.* p. 120. Bo Reicke (*S.N.T.*, pp. 151 f.) notes a parallel, but adds that "we cannot say that Jesus is directly dependent on the Qumran sect in this matter". Cf. J. van der Ploeg, *The Excavations at Qumran*, p. 135.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xix. 28, Luke xxii. 30.

<sup>3</sup> O. Cullmann (*S.N.T.*, p. 21) thinks the three priests may have had their parallel in the three pillars of Gal. ii. 9 f.: James, Cephas and John. Cf. S. E. Johnson, *ibid.* p. 134; Bo Reicke, *ibid.* p. 151; J. van der Ploeg, *loc. cit.*

<sup>4</sup> *Manual of Discipline*, col. II, lines 19 ff.

<sup>5</sup> *Zadokite work*, xvii. 1 ff. (p. xiv, lines 3 ff.).

<sup>6</sup> M. Burrows (*O.T.S.* viii (1950), 184) says the *Zadokite Work* adds a fourth class to the threefold classification of the *Manual*.

<sup>7</sup> *Manual of Discipline*, col. VI, lines 13 ff.

<sup>8</sup> Nowhere does the Qumran community show any interest in the making of converts from the Gentiles, and the proselytes of the *Zadokite Work* were almost certainly Jewish converts to the sect, just like the postulants of the *Manual*.

<sup>9</sup> We are told in Acts vi. 7 that many priests accepted the Christian faith, but there is no evidence that they had any special status.

In estimating the relations between the Church and the sect, similarities and differences must alike be taken into account.

Again, in the organization of the sect the twelve men and three priests would seem to have a permanent place as the supreme council of the community.<sup>1</sup> In the Church the twelve disciples did not form part of the enduring pattern of the organization. When Judas was replaced by Matthias,<sup>2</sup> it was not with the idea of maintaining a constant council of twelve living members. As Professor Manson has pointed out, when James was martyred by Herod Agrippa,<sup>3</sup> his place was not filled. This, as Professor Manson says, was because his place was not vacant.<sup>4</sup> Judas had forfeited his place by his misconduct and not by his death. The twelve disciples had been promised that they should judge the twelve tribes of Israel<sup>5</sup> and the Early Church took this literally and believed that James would be raised from the dead to take his place. But this could not apply to Judas, and therefore his place was filled. It was filled by one who had companied with the disciples throughout the ministry of Jesus, from the time of John the Baptist's baptism. That this was regarded as an essential qualification would imply that no permanent body of twelve living men was in mind.

The admission of new members to the sect is provided for in the *Zadokite Work* and in the *Manual of Discipline*, and is described by Josephus in his account of the Essenes. The *Zadokite Work* probably comes from a time early in the history of the sect, and the *Manual of Discipline* from a later time.<sup>6</sup> The procedure was simpler as described in the *Zadokite Work*,

<sup>1</sup> E. F. Sutcliffe (*J.S.S.* iv (1959), 134 ff.) disputes this and holds that they were the first fifteen men of the Qumran community.

<sup>2</sup> Acts. i. 23 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Acts xii. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Ethics and the Gospel*, 1960, p. 74. Cf. S. E. Johnson (*S.N.T.*, p. 134): "A more likely supposition is that the Twelve are the community's council for the coming Messianic Age, when they will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

<sup>5</sup> Matt. xix. 28, Luke xxii. 30.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. the present writer's paper "Some Traces of the History of the Qumran Sect", *Th.Z.* xiii (1957), 530 ff. (cf. *B.J.R.L.* xxxv (1952-3), 144 f.); cf. too P. Wernberg-Møller, *D.T.T.* xvi (1953), 115; B. Otzen, *S.Th.* vii (1953), 141; J. O. Teglbyærg, *D.T.T.* xviii (1955), 246 f.; J. van der Ploeg, *J.E.O.L.* xiv (1955-6), 104; K. Smyth, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1956, p. 7; R. P. C. Hanson, *A Guide to the Scrolls*, 1958, pp. 63 f.; and H. A. Butler, *R.Q.* ii (1960), 532 ff.

while that in the *Manual of Discipline* is closer to that described by Josephus. The *Zadokite Work* tells us that the candidate for membership was examined by the inspector as to his works, his understanding, his might, his strength, and his wealth, and if the Inspector was satisfied he was enrolled in the membership.<sup>1</sup> According to the *Manual of Discipline*, a candidate was examined by the Overseer, and if he was satisfied, the candidate was admitted to the covenant, but was not yet admitted to the fellowship.<sup>2</sup> He underwent an unspecified period of probation, after which he was considered by "the many"—which may mean by a general meeting of the members—and a decision was taken as to whether he should be allowed to enter on a further year of probation. During this year he was still not permitted to touch "the purity of the many".<sup>3</sup> It is probably meant that he was not allowed to perform daily ablutions in the water used by the members of the sect.<sup>4</sup> At the end of this year, he was again considered by "the many" as to his understanding of the Law and his way of life.<sup>5</sup> If he was still regarded as satisfactory, his property was turned over to the sect, but was kept separate from the treasury of the sect during a final probationary period of a year.<sup>6</sup> During this year he was not allowed to touch the food of the members.<sup>7</sup> This may mean that he was not allowed to sit at the same table as the full members, though it has been argued that it means that he was not allowed to prepare the food for the members.<sup>8</sup> At the end of this year, his case was again

<sup>1</sup> *Zadokite Work*, xvi. 4 f. (p. xiii, lines 11 f.).

<sup>2</sup> *Manual of Discipline*, col. VI, lines 14 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Manual of Discipline*, col. VI, line 16.

<sup>4</sup> W. H. Brownlee (*The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline*, 1951, p. 25) brings this into connection with Josephus's phrase "the purer kind of holy water" (*B.J.* II. viii. 7 [138]), but allows that here it might include, in addition to the lustrations, the sectarian meals. Cf. *supra* p. 133, n. 9.

<sup>5</sup> *Manual of Discipline*, col. VI, line 18.

<sup>6</sup> *Manual of Discipline*, col. VI, lines 19 ff.

<sup>7</sup> *Manual of Discipline*, col. VI, line 20. S. Lieberman (*J.B.L.* lxxi (1952), 203) thinks the word *mashkeh*, which is here used, referred to drink only. Cf. also E. F. Sutcliffe, *Heythrop Journal*, i (1960), 53 f. Others think the word, like *mishteh*, stood for the whole meal. So M. Burrows, *O.T.S.* viii (1950), 163 f.; T. H. Gaster, *op. cit.* p. 61; A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les Écrits esséniens*, p. 102.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. E. F. Sutcliffe, *loc. cit.* pp. 62 f.

considered, and if he won the approval of the members he became a full member of the sect and his property was incorporated in that of the sect.<sup>1</sup> According to Josephus in his account of the Essenes, the preliminary period, which is undefined in the *Manual of Discipline*, lasted for a year, like the others.<sup>2</sup> During this year the candidate was subjected to the same mode of life as the members, though he was not admitted to the sect.<sup>3</sup> If he was found satisfactory at the end of this time he was allowed to share the waters of purification used by the sect, but had two more years of probation before he was admitted to full membership.<sup>4</sup>

It is hard to suppose that Jesus or the first disciples copied any of this. For it would have taken three years for anyone to be fully enrolled amongst the disciples or in the Church—assuming that the initial period of probation was a year, as Josephus says. This means that none of the twelve disciples would have completed his probation during the ministry of Jesus,<sup>5</sup> and so none would have been eligible for membership of the supposed council corresponding to the council of the Qumran sectaries. Nor is there any evidence that the Early Church required a period of three years of probation before admission to its membership.

This very important difference between the Church and Qumran becomes even clearer when we turn to the question of baptism. It has been maintained that Christian baptism was derived from the Qumran sect through the baptism of John, who is sometimes thought to have been a member of the sect.<sup>6</sup> Of

<sup>1</sup> *Manual of Discipline*, col. VI, line 22.

<sup>2</sup> *B.J.* II. viii. 7 (137).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *B.J.* II. viii. 7 (138).

<sup>5</sup> The ministry of Jesus is usually thought to have lasted three years, but a one-year ministry (a common view in the 2nd and 3rd centuries) or a two-year ministry (cf. E. F. Sutcliffe, *A Two-Year Public Ministry*, 1938) has been proposed; on this question, cf. G. Ogg, *The Chronology of the Public Ministry of Jesus*, 1940.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. G. L. Harding, *I.L.N.*, 3 September 1955, p. 379 ("John the Baptist was almost certainly an Essene, and must have studied and worked in this building"); J. M. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1956, pp. 163 ff.; C. T. Fritsch, *op. cit.* pp. 112 ff.; A. Powell Davies, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1957, pp. 142 f.; W. H. Brownlee, *S.N.T.*, pp. 33 ff. (cf. p. 57: "It was John the Essene who proclaimed the coming Messianic Age in the wilderness"). J. Daniélou (*op. cit.* p. 15) says: "les découvertes des manuscrits ont confirmé de

none of this is there any evidence, and the whole character and significance of John's baptism were so different from anything that is known from Qumran that it is in the highest degree improbable.<sup>1</sup> All that we are concerned with here, however, is to see how far Christian baptism reflects anything of which we have knowledge in the faith and practice of the Qumran sect.<sup>2</sup>

Josephus tells us that the Essenes bathed the whole body daily before eating.<sup>3</sup> This is not what we mean by baptism, and there is no evidence that this practice was taken over by Jesus or the Church. In the Qumran texts it is probable that the references to "the purity of the many" are to these daily ablutions.<sup>4</sup> By baptism we mean a water rite of initiation, and only a rite of initiation. There is no reference either in the Scrolls or in Josephus to a special water rite of initiation amongst the Qumran sectaries or the Essenes.<sup>5</sup> It is likely that the first of the daily ablutions after admission to the appropriate stage of probation would have a special character for the candidate for membership of the sect, just as the first Communion has a special character for Christians. But there is a fundamental difference

façon qui semble indubitable les contacts de Jean avec les moines de Qumrân." Cf. K. Schubert, *The Dead Sea Community*, Eng. Trans. by J. W. Doberstein, 1959, p. 126, and A. S. Geysler, *N.T.* i (1956), 70 ff. (p. 71: "we can now assume with comparative certainty that John was brought up by Essenes"). M. Delcor (*Revue Thomiste*, lviii (1958), 766) thinks it probable that as a child John came under their influence, and so J. A. T. Robinson, *H.T.R.* 1 (1957), 175 ff. On the other hand G. Molin (*Die Söhne des Lichtes*, 1954, p. 170) thinks this is questionable, and W. Eiss (*Qumran und die Anfänge der christlichen Gemeinde*, 1959, p. 14) thinks it very improbable. G. Graystone (*The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Originality of Christ*, 1956, p. 113; cf. pp. 93 ff.) thinks it is improbable that the Baptist ever visited Qumran. The suggestion that John may have been an Essene is no new one. It was already rejected by J. B. Lightfoot (op. cit. pp. 398 ff.).

<sup>1</sup> On this question, cf. the present writer's essay on "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Sect" in *New Testament Essays: Studies in memory of T. W. Manson*, 1959, pp. 218 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. O. Betz, *R.Q.* i (1958-9), 213 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *B.J.* II. viii. 5 (129).

<sup>4</sup> See above, p. 133.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. E. F. Sutcliffe, *Heythrop Journal*, i (1960), 179 ff. (p. 188: 'There is no mention of any rite performed by one for another nor of any ablution forming part of a ceremony of initiation. Such a meaning cannot legitimately be read into the statement that admission to the two years of probation after the year of postulanship carried with it the right to share the purer waters of purification, as this implies continual use and not a single act').

between baptism and the first Communion. The one is an unrepeatable act of initiation, while the other is the first of a repeatable series of experiences. The daily ablutions of the sect were not administered rites, but washings of the body which each performed for himself. We have no evidence that the first of these ablutions was different in this respect from the rest. Christian baptism was an administered rite, as also was the baptism of John,<sup>1</sup> and we have no evidence that either was followed by similar daily rites. Both were rites of initiation and only of initiation.

A further notable difference that is relevant to our discussion of the organization of the sect and of the Church is in the timing of the experience. If it were established that the form of the first Essene ablution coincided with the form of Christian baptism, we should still have to note that the former did not take place until the end of the second period of probation, according to the *Manual of Discipline*, or the end of the first, according to Josephus—i.e. until after at least a year, and perhaps two years. In the New Testament we read that on the day of Pentecost three thousand people were converted by the preaching of Peter, and they were baptized the same day.<sup>2</sup> When Philip fell in with the Ethiopian eunuch and joined him in his chariot, they stopped when they came to water, and the eunuch was immediately baptized.<sup>3</sup> Again, when Paul converted the Philippian gaoler, he baptized him the same night.<sup>4</sup>

Yet even if the first Essene ablution could rightly be regarded as identical with Christian baptism in its form and its timing, we should still have to ask how far the two accorded in significance.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. John i. 25 f., where we are told that John baptized, or Mark i. 9, Matt. iii. 13, where we are told that Jesus was baptized by John. Whether John plunged a man under the water, or whether the person baptized plunged himself, we do not know; but in either case it was an administered rite, and in this respect comparable with Jewish proselyte baptism (cf. T. B. *Yebamoth*, 47 ab), as distinct from ordinary Jewish lustrations or the daily ablutions of the sect. Nowhere in the Scrolls or in the first century accounts of the Essenes is there any reference to an administered rite of baptism. Cf. J. Daniélou, *R.H.P.R.* xxxv (1955), 106: "En effet, dans l'essénisme, il s'agit de participation aux bains rituels de la communauté et non d'un rite spécial d'initiation."

<sup>2</sup> Acts ii. 41.

<sup>3</sup> Acts viii. 36 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Acts xvi. 33.



Christian baptism betokens a relation to Christ, whereas we have no knowledge of anything comparable with this in the sect of the Scrolls. The Teacher of Righteousness is unmentioned in any reference to Essene ablutions, and there is no reason to suppose that the first ablution, or any ablution, betokened any relation to him. While there is little reason to trace the form of Christian baptism to the Qumran sect, there is even less to look there for the origin of its significance.

In his account of the Essenes Josephus has given us a picture of their daily meals,<sup>1</sup> of which the members partook in solemn silence, and this has been held to be the source of the Christian Eucharist.<sup>2</sup> The *Manual of Discipline* tells us that only when one had been admitted to full membership of the Qumran sect could he be allowed to touch the "drink" of the members.<sup>3</sup> This is probably an allusion to the daily meals of the Qumran community.<sup>4</sup> It may be allowed that during the period when the members of the Jerusalem church had all things common its members shared a daily table. But this is not to be identified with the Eucharist without more ado; nor if it were could the Eucharist then be traced back to Qumran. During the ministry of Jesus, our Lord and his disciples doubtless ate together. But the Last Supper is not merely one of such meals. It had a special character, and the Eucharist of the Church does not commemorate the daily meals of Jesus and his disciples or even the last of a series. It commemorates the character of that meal in itself, without reference to any that had preceded it, and its character derived from its association with the imminent death of Jesus. We have no knowledge of any such commemorative character of the meals of the sect. Nowhere in Josephus or in the Scrolls is the Teacher of Righteousness mentioned in connection with the meals. So far as we know, they did not betoken any relationship

<sup>1</sup> *B.J.* II. viii. 5 f. (129-33).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. A. Powell Davies, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1957, p. 130: "The early Christian sacrament was the Essenic sacrament with, perhaps, some Christian adaptations". Cf. also D. Howlett, *The Essenes and Christianity*, 1957, p. 147.

<sup>3</sup> *Manual of Discipline*, col. VI, line 20.

<sup>4</sup> See above, p. 139, n. 7.

between the members and him, or commemorate any incident of his life or the moment of his death. In this they differ *toto coelo* from the Christian sacrament.

One writer on the Scrolls has observed that the presiding priest at the sacred meals of the sect may have said: "This is my body", and that the wine that was drunk may have been thought of as the blood of the Messiah. He then concludes that the sacred meal of the sect was almost identical with the Christian sacrament.<sup>1</sup> Such nonsense is an insult to the intelligence of his readers. If the account of the meals of the sect is imaginatively reconstructed from the New Testament, it is not surprising that similarities are found, since they are first unwarrantably imposed without a shred of evidence. It should be clear to any ordinary intelligence that we can only discuss the relation of the Scrolls to the New Testament if we let each literature speak for itself, and refrain from tampering with the evidence to make it say what we wish to find.<sup>2</sup>

The daily meals of the sect are more naturally understood in terms of the communal meals of monastic orders,<sup>3</sup> which no members of such orders would confuse with the sacrament. They are sacred meals in the sense that the members are conscious that they belong to a religious order, and they are eaten with a solemnity and a quiet which is appropriate to the presence of the God whose blessing is invoked.

Reference has already been made to a passage which indicates that in the messianic expectation of the sect the Aaronic anointed one should have precedence over the Davidic. This passage<sup>4</sup> describes what is often called the messianic banquet. It says that in the days of the Messiah, he should come with the priests and members of the sect and they should sit down in the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. A. Powell Davies, *op. cit.* p. 130.

<sup>2</sup> It is curious that Powell Davies should say "there is no certainty that the accounts of the Lord's Supper in the New Testament have not been edited to accord with the practice of a later time" (*ibid.*). There is complete certainty that he has edited his account of the meal of the Qumran sect to accord with his own theory.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. J. van der Ploeg, *J.S.S.* ii (1957), 163 ff., and *The Excavations at Qumran*, p. 213; E. F. Sutcliffe, *Heythrop Journal*, i (1960), 48 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *The Rule of the Congregation*, col. II, lines 11 ff.

order of their dignity. No one should eat until the priest had first blessed the food, and then the priest should eat first, and after him the Messiah of Israel, followed by the rest of the company, each in the order of his dignity. The text continues by saying that in accordance with this rule the members of the sect should act at every meal, when at least ten are assembled.<sup>1</sup> It is clear, therefore, that this is not really a description of any special messianic banquet.<sup>2</sup> It is a description of the regular meals of the sect, and the Messiah takes no special part in it. If he should be present, he should occupy the second place, but beyond that the meal is conceived as an ordinary meal, and no sacramental significance is given to it.

This passage is important in another connection, to which reference has also been made. It says: "If God should cause the Messiah to be born<sup>3</sup> in their time", his place should be as defined.<sup>4</sup> It is clear that he is the lay Messiah, since he is called the Messiah of Israel and yields precedence to the priest. The one who presides at the meal is simply called the priest. It has been said already that this passage is often held to contemplate two Messiahs,<sup>5</sup> a lay and a priestly, and it well illustrates the

<sup>1</sup> *The Rule of the Congregation*, col. II, lines 21 f.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. M. Burrows, *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 101; T. H. Gaster, op. cit. p. 29; also J. van der Ploeg, *The Excavations at Qumran*, p. 213: "The text of the Two Column Document as a whole does not give the impression that it means to describe a sacred or 'Messianic' banquet." J. D. Amusin (op. cit. pp. 241 f.), while finding a messianic colouring in this text, is cautious about any possible connection with the significance of the Last Supper.

<sup>3</sup> D. Barthélemy (*Qumran Cave I*, 1955, p. 117), adopting a suggestion of J. T. Milik's, emends the text to read "brings" instead of "causes to be born", and this is adopted by F. M. Cross (*The Ancient Library of Qumrân*, p. 64). R. Gordis (*V.T.* vii (1957), 191 ff.) argues against Milik's emendation. T. H. Gaster (op. cit. p. 260) similarly rejects this "daring but unfortunate conjecture", and proposes a different emendation, to yield the sense "when the Messiah is present". Cross (loc. cit.) says this is to be rejected categorically. Y. Yadin (*J.B.L.* lxxviii (1959), 240 f.) proposes yet another emendation, to yield the sense "on the occasion of their meeting". The reading of the MS. is beyond question, and it should probably be understood, with Burrows (op. cit., p. 303) in the same way as Ps. ii. 7, where it refers to the adoption and establishment of the King as God's son. Similarly A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les Ecrits esséniens*, p. 123 n. Cf. also E. F. Sutcliffe, *R.Q.* ii (1960), 541 ff.

<sup>4</sup> *The Rule of the Congregation*, col. II, lines 11 f.

<sup>5</sup> See above, p. 124.

danger of the use of the word Messiah, instead of "anointed one". For while it is clear that the lay Messiah is here the coming expected one who should restore the kingdom,<sup>1</sup> it is equally clear that the priest is just the person who happens to be the head of the community at that time. Though he was an anointed one, no reference is made to that here, and we have no business to import the term Messiah, with all that it signifies to us, into this passage.<sup>2</sup> If the priestly Messiah, who should take precedence of the Davidic Messiah in the messianic age, had really been thought of as the risen Teacher of Righteousness, it would be nothing short of astonishing for him to be introduced without the slightest reference to this remarkable expectation. What those who suppose the sect cherished this hope need to do is not merely to press a doubtful interpretation of a passage in another text, but to explain the complete absence of any allusion to it here.

Philo tells us that the Essenes were a pacific sect.<sup>3</sup> But there is no reason to suppose that they conceived the Davidic Messiah in any other than the conquering terms that characterized the popular expectation in the time of Jesus. They cherished the text described as the *War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, which kept alive dreams of the day when the nations of the world should be successively destroyed in battle. Jesus discouraged any reference to Himself as the Messiah, because He conceived his messiahship in quite other terms. It was not by killing but by dying that He purposed to save his people. The Qumran sect seem to have abandoned their pacific way of life in the war with Rome and to have joined the rebels<sup>4</sup> in the belief that the long dreamed of time for the establishment of the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the text published by J. M. Allegro in *J.B.L.* lxxv (1956), 174 f., where there is a reference to the rightful Messiah of the house of David.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. M. Black, in *Studia Patristica*, ed. by K. Aland and F. L. Cross, i (1957), 447: "The fact that the High Priest takes precedence of the Messiah of Israel may mean very little; presumably he would do so in any Temple rite or priestly function, but this does not mean that we are to regard the High Priest as in the strict sense a 'Messianic' figure."

<sup>3</sup> *Quod omnis probus liber sit*, xii (78).

<sup>4</sup> Mlle A. Jaubert thinks the Zealots were an offshoot from the Essenes (*N.T.S.* vii (1960-1), 12). Hippolytus (*Ref. omn. haer.* ix. 26) reckoned the Zealots among the Essenes.

kingdom had come. It was during the war with Rome that the Qumran centre was destroyed, and Josephus tells us the Romans persecuted the Essenes with the utmost cruelty,<sup>1</sup> while they bore themselves with superhuman fortitude. One of the Essenes became a commander in the rebel forces.<sup>2</sup> All this stands in the strongest contrast to our Lord's conception of the way the kingdom would be established.

The Copper Scroll, which records the places where vast quantities of treasure were hidden, is probably an inventory of Temple treasure, as Dr. Rabin first suggested.<sup>3</sup> By some it has been thought to record mere folklore,<sup>4</sup> but it seems improbable that copper would be used for such a purpose. If it is an inventory of Temple treasure, it is likely that it was prepared by the rebels who had charge of the Temple. There were two copies of this inventory,<sup>5</sup> one deposited in one of the Qumran caves and one deposited elsewhere. Doubtless both were prepared in the same place, and there is no reason to think that was at Qumran,<sup>6</sup> where texts on quite different materials were copied. Jerusalem would be the most natural place, since it was from there that the treasure was distributed. But the deposit of one of the copies in one of the Qumran caves would strengthen the suggestion that in the time of the war against Rome the Zealots regarded the Essenes as their trusted allies. Their conception of the messianic age was thus very different from that of Jesus, and He can scarcely be supposed to have derived his from them.

The Qumran sect did not use the current official calendar, but used one which ensured that the festivals should fall on the same

<sup>1</sup> *B.J.* II. viii. 10 (152 f.).

<sup>2</sup> *B.J.* II. xx 4 (567).

<sup>3</sup> *The Jewish Chronicle*, 15 June 1956, p. 19. So also K. G. Kuhn, *Th.L.Z.* lxxxix (1956), 541 ff. Y. Yadin (*The Message of the Scrolls*, 1957, p. 159) says it is not excluded that the Copper Scroll is a list of the treasures of the sect, and this is the view of Dupont-Sommer (*Les Écrits esséniens*, pp. 400 ff.).

<sup>4</sup> So J. T. Milik, *B.A.* xix (1956), 63, *R.B.* lxvi (1959), 322, and *Ten Years of Discovery*, pp. 42 f.; J. Jeremias, *E.T.* lxxi (1959-60), 228. This view is rejected by A. Dupont-Sommer, *Les Écrits essenienis*, pp. 397 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. J. M. Allegro, *The Treasure of the Copper Scroll*, 1960, p. 55 (col. XII, line 11).

<sup>6</sup> So Allegro, *op. cit.* p. 125.

day of the week every year.<sup>1</sup> It was a fifty-two week calendar, and not a luni-solar calendar like the official Jewish calendar. It had no place for intercalary months every few years, giving years of variable length. This calendar was the calendar of the book of *Jubilees*, to which there is a reference in the *Zadokite Work*,<sup>2</sup> and fragments of which have been found amongst the Scrolls. Mlle Jaubert has very acutely argued that Jesus and his disciples followed this calendar, and has attempted by this means to resolve the vexed question of the relation of the Synoptic dating of the Last Supper and the Johannine dating.<sup>3</sup> According to the Synoptics the Last Supper was a Passover meal, while according to the Fourth Gospel it took place before the Passover. Mlle Jaubert holds that Jesus celebrated the Passover on the sectarian date, and that it took place on Tuesday, when the Qumran Passover would fall, and adduces some patristic evidence for this date.<sup>4</sup> This would allow more time for all the events that have to be fitted in between the Supper and the Crucifixion, which then took place before the official Passover day, to which the Fourth Gospel refers. It would also explain why there is no reference to a Passover lamb in any of the accounts of the Last Supper. While this is a very attractive view, it is not wholly without difficulties.<sup>5</sup> Nowhere does Jesus show the slightest

<sup>1</sup> Cf. D. Barthélemy, *R.B.* lix (1952), 199 ff.; A. Jaubert, *V.T.* iii (1953), 250 ff., vii (1957), 35 ff., *R.H.R.* cxlvi (1954), 140 ff., *La Date de la Cène*, 1957, and *La Secte de Qumran* (Recherches Bibliques, IV), 1959, 113 ff. Cf. also J. Morgenstern, *V.T.* v (1955), 34 ff.; J. Obermann, *J.B.L.* lxxv (1956), 285 ff.; J. B. Segal, *V.T.* vii (1957), 250 ff.; E. R. Leach, *V.T.* vii (1957), 392 ff.; J.-P. Audet, *Sciences Ecclésiastiques*, x (1958), 361 ff.; S. Talmon, *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Scripta Hierosolymitana, IV), 1958, pp. 162 ff.; E. Vogt, *Biblica*, xl (1959), 102 ff.; E. Kutsch, *V.T.* xi (1961), 39 ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Zadokite Work*, xx. 1 (p. xvi, lines 2 ff.).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *R.H.R.* cxlvi (1954), 140 ff., *La Date de la Cène*, 1957, and *N.T.S.* vii (1960-1), 1 ff.

<sup>4</sup> E. Vogt has shown that both calendar dates of Passover could fall in the same week (*Biblica*, xxxix (1958), 72 ff.).

<sup>5</sup> It has been rejected by J. Blinzler (*Z.N.W.* xlix (1958), 238 ff.), P. Benoit (*R.B.* lxxv (1958), 590 ff.), and J. Jeremias (*J.T.S.* N.S. x (1959), 131 ff.). On the other hand it has been accepted by many writers, including E. Vogt (*Biblica*, xxxvi (1955), 408 ff.), P. W. Skehan (*C.B.Q.* xx (1958), 192 ff.), H. Haag (*S.D.B.* vi (Fasc. 34, 1960), 1146 f.), and, with some reservations, by R. F. McDonald (*American Ecclesiastical Review*, cxi (1959), 79 ff., 168 ff.) and J. A. Walther (*J.B.L.* lxxvii (1958), 116 ff.). M. Black (*New Testament Essays : Studies in*

interest in calendar questions,<sup>1</sup> and since He is reported to have visited the Temple at some of the festivals, He would appear to have observed them on the official dates.<sup>2</sup> Probably the reasons which have been already suggested for the Qumran sect's avoidance of the Temple were reinforced by the non-use of the calendar to which they attached such great importance. Mlle Jaubert has shown that this calendar was not invented by the author of *Jubilees*, but that there is evidence in the Old Testament that it was accepted by some of the sacred authors.<sup>3</sup> It is therefore possible that others, besides the Qumran sect, clung to this calendar, though if Jesus and his disciples did in fact follow it, they could well have been influenced by the Qumran sect in so doing. It would be curious, however, for them to be so influenced in a matter which plays no part in the teaching of Jesus, when in so many ways the teaching and practice of Jesus and the Early Church show such striking differences from those of the sect.

Similarities of phrase and idea between the Scrolls and the New Testament have been noted by many writers.<sup>4</sup> Professor Stauffer finds that they are closer in the case of the Evangelists and other New Testament writers than they are in the case of the teaching of Jesus Himself.<sup>5</sup> Wherever they are found they can

*Memory of T. W. Manson*, 1959, 19 ff.) also somewhat cautiously accepts it. Cf. also C. U. Wolf, *The Christian Century*, 18 March 1959, pp. 325 ff. Mlle Jaubert has replied to Blinzler's arguments in *N.T.S.* vii (1960-1), 1 ff. M. Delcor (*Revue Thomiste*, lviii (1958), 778 f.) expresses grave objections to Mlle Jaubert's view, but the objections expressed are fully answered by her in the article cited. Further criticisms of her view are offered by M. Zerwick (*Biblica*, xxxix (1958), 508 ff.) and E. Kutsch (*V.T.* xi (1961), 39 ff.).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. K. Schubert, *The Dead Sea Community*, 1959, p. 142.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery*, 1959, pp. 112 f.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. A. Jaubert, *La Date de la Cène*, pp. 31 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Before the discovery of the Scrolls Bo Reicke had collected a large number of parallels between the *Zadokite Work* and the New Testament. Cf. "The Jewish 'Damascus Documents' and the New Testament" (*Symbolae Biblicae Upsalienses*, No. 6), 1946.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Die Botschaft Jesu damals und heute*, 1959, p. 16: "Die Qumranisierung der Jesustradition wächst mit dem zeitlichen Abstand der Traditionsträger von Jesus." M. Burrows (*More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 103) observes that "few parallels have been found for sayings of Jesus outside of the Sermon on the Mount", while K. Schubert (*S.N.T.*, p. 273) notes that even in the Sermon on

be examined dispassionately. It has always been recognized that the uniqueness of the New Testament does not lie in the originality of the individual sayings of Jesus. Innumerable parallels to the Golden Rule have been found, not only in Jewish literature but in the literature of the world, without our being in any way troubled. The uniqueness of Jesus lies rather in the example which He Himself set and in the spring of power He offers his followers to enable them to follow his example.<sup>1</sup> His own eager love for men and readiness to sacrifice his life for them are set before the eyes of the Christian, who by the transmuting touch of his personality on them and by the power of his redeeming death are lifted into his spirit and given power to follow Him. And however many parallels of phrase are found in the Scrolls and the New Testament, they do not touch this profound and fundamental aspect of the uniqueness of Christ.

We must always remember that Jesus and his disciples lived in the Jewish world of a particular time, and moved in the realm of ideas of their age. The Qumran community belonged to that age, and doubtless influenced that realm of ideas, and if there are links of word and thought it was because Jesus and his followers were alive to the world in which they lived.<sup>2</sup> As one writer has

the Mount "it is remarkable that the Essene parallels are found almost exclusively in Mt. 5". J. Coppens (*Les Documents du Désert de Juda et les Origines du Christianisme*, 1953, p. 26) observes that the contacts of the Scrolls with Apostolic preaching are greater than with the teaching of Jesus. Cf. also G. Graystone, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Originality of Christ*, 1956, p. 28. J. B. Lightfoot (op. cit. p. 407) had already recognized that Essene influences came into Christianity before the close of the Apostolic age, and detected them in the Roman Christian community to which Paul wrote. O. Cullmann (*Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann* [B.Z.N.W. 21], 1954, 35 ff.) has argued that Essenes joined the Jewish Christians after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 (cf. H. J. Schoeps, *Z.R.G.G.* vi (1954), 1 ff.).

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the present writer's "The Chinese Sages and the Golden Rule" (*B.J.R.L.* xxiv (1940), 321 ff.), p. 350.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. R. E. Brown (*S.N.T.*, p. 206): "The ideas of Qumran must have been fairly widespread in certain Jewish circles in the early first century A.D."; M. Burrows (*More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 54): "If the Dead Sea Scrolls are at all typical of the language and thinking of Palestine at the time when Christianity came into being, the disciples of Jesus and Jesus himself would naturally use these forms of expression and ways of thinking whenever they could, as a means of communication". Cf. also C. G. Howie (*The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Living Church*, 1958, p. 99): "The Church and Essenism developed in



said, they show the contemporary character of the language of the New Testament;<sup>1</sup> or, as another puts it, "in any given age new ideas and new modes of expression pass into currency and become common property".<sup>2</sup> Nor must we forget that the Old Testament was precious to both the Qumran community and Jesus and his disciples. It formed "a common reservoir of terminology and ideas", to use the words of Professor Albright, for Jews of every sect and for Christians.<sup>3</sup> Light and darkness are figures for the good and the bad in the *War Scroll*, and in the Fourth Gospel we find the same figures.<sup>4</sup> But before we trace the one directly to the other, we should recognize that the Old Testament is the source of these figures.<sup>5</sup> There the wicked are spoken of as walking in darkness and the righteous in light.<sup>6</sup> Moreover, as has been said, there is difference as well as similarity here between the Scrolls and the New Testament.<sup>7</sup> In the thought of the Qumran sect the battle between light and darkness was to be waged with carnal weapons, whereas to Jesus and his followers it was to be waged with spiritual weapons.

In the Scrolls we find teaching about the two ways, the way of the righteous directed by the spirit of truth and the way of the wicked directed by the spirit of perversity.<sup>8</sup> In the early Christian writings, the *Epistle of Barnabas* and the *Didache*, we find the same age and came out of the same general background. Facing similar problems in like circumstances the two movements could not have been absolutely dissimilar in doctrine."

<sup>1</sup> Cf. R. E. Murphy, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Bible*, 1956, pp. 77 f.

<sup>2</sup> E. F. Sutcliffe, *The Monks of Qumran*, p. 118.

<sup>3</sup> *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology* (C. H. Dodd, *Festschrift*), ed. by W. D. Davies and D. Daube, 1956, p. 169.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. F. Nötscher, *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumrantexte*, 1956, pp. 92 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. H. M. Teeple, *N.T.* iv (1960-1), 18; Nötscher, *op. cit.* p. 129. C. G. Howie (*op. cit.* p. 89) says: "Since therefore the light-darkness motif is found both in the Qumran literature and in the New Testament, it is safe to assume that it began in its present form with the Essenes." This is to ignore the common source of both in the Old Testament.

<sup>6</sup> Prov. iv. 19; Ps. xcvi. 11. Cf. also Isa. ii. 5, l. 10, lix. 9; Ps. lvi. 13 (Heb. 14).

<sup>7</sup> H. Bardtke (*Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meer: Die Sekte von Qumrān*, 1958, p. 210) says: "Der Dualismus zwischen Licht und Finsternis begegnet uns im Johannesevangelium in einer ganz anderen Form."

<sup>8</sup> *Manual of Discipline*, col. III, lines 13 ff.

find a similar thought of the two ways.<sup>1</sup> While these early Christian writings may owe much, directly or indirectly, to the Qumran sect,<sup>2</sup> we should remember that the same thought is already found in Psalm i.

We have already noted the Gospel passage in which the twelve disciples are promised that they shall sit on twelve thrones to judge the twelve tribes of Israel. In the Habakkuk Commentary we read that "in the hands of his elect God will put the judgement of all the nations."<sup>3</sup> Here again, it is probable that both are based on the thought of Daniel vii, which promised the everlasting dominion to the saints of the Most High,<sup>4</sup> though we should not forget that the Qumran sectaries looked for physical triumph over their foes, while the New Testament passage does not.

Reference has already been made to the fact that the Qumran community referred to themselves as those who had entered into the new covenant.<sup>5</sup> This immediately recalls our Lord's reference at the Last Supper to the new covenant.<sup>6</sup> Here again it is unnecessary to derive the one from the other, since both derive from Jeremiah xxxi. 31. Moreover, there is a great difference between the Scrolls and the New Testament here. Sutcliffe says: "The Christian covenant was in reality new and brought with it the abrogation of the levitical, but not the moral, precepts of the Old Law. The covenant of the brotherhood was not a new one but a renewal of the obligation to observe the old and indeed in its strictest interpretation."<sup>7</sup>

A more interesting link between the Scrolls and the New Testament is to be found in the injunction in the *Zadokite Work*

<sup>1</sup> *Ep. Barnabas*, xviii-xx, *Didache*, i-v.

<sup>2</sup> On the Scrolls and the Epistle of Barnabas, cf. L. W. Barnard, *S.J.Th.* xiii (1960), 45 ff.; on the Scrolls and the *Didache* and the *Shepherd of Hermas*, cf. J.-P. Audet, *R.B.* lix (1952), 219 ff., lx (1953), 41 ff. Cf. also J. D. Amusin, *op. cit.* p. 248.

<sup>3</sup> *Habakkuk Commentary*, col. V, line 4.

<sup>4</sup> Dan. vii. 27.

<sup>5</sup> *Zadokite Work*, viii. 15 (p. vi, line 19), ix. 28 (pp. viii, line 21, xix. 33 f.), viii. 37 (p. xx, line 12).

<sup>6</sup> Matt. xxvi. 28, Mark xiv. 24 (in both the best manuscripts omit "new"); Luke xxii. 20 (the whole verse is omitted by some manuscripts; 1 Cor. xi. 25).

<sup>7</sup> *The Monks of Qumran*, p. 120. Cf. D. Flusser, *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Scripta Hierosolymitana, IV), 1958, pp. 236 ff.

that none may bring a charge against a fellow-member unless he has previously reproved him before witnesses.<sup>1</sup> In Matthew xviii. 15 ff. Jesus gave similar teaching, saying that one who is wronged should first speak in private to the one who wronged him, and then before witnesses, and only finally bring the matter to the church.

It is impossible for us here to examine all the links of this kind that have been found. Some writers have directed attention to the special closeness of those links between the Fourth Gospel and the Scrolls,<sup>2</sup> while others have examined the Pauline links,<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Zadokite Work*, x. 2 (p. ix, line 3).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. W. Grossouw, *Studia Catholica*, xxvi (1951), 295 ff.; Lucetta Mowry, *B.A.* xvii (1954), 78 ff.; F. M. Braun, *R.B.* lxii (1955), 5 ff.; W. F. Albright, loc. cit. pp. 153 ff.; R. E. Brown, *S.N.T.*, pp. 183 ff. (cf. p. 195: "in no other literature do we have so close a terminological and ideological parallel to Johannine usage"; p. 205: "there remains a tremendous chasm of thought between Qumran and Christianity"); A. R. C. Leaney, *A Guide to the Scrolls*, 1958, pp. 95 ff.; G. Baumbach, *Qumrân und das Johannes-Evangelium*, 1958. W. H. Brownlee (*S.N.T.*, p. 46) goes so far as to say: "one may almost say that in John's portrayal of Jesus we have the Essene Christ", while O. Cullmann (ibid. p. 22) says the Fourth Gospel "belongs to an ideological atmosphere most clearly related to that of the new texts", and K. G. Kuhn (*Z.K.Th.* xlvii (1950), 210) says: "wir bekommen in diesen neuen Texten den Mutterboden des Johannes-evangeliums zu fassen." Cf. however, the more cautious assessment of H. M. Teeple, *N.T.* iv (1960-1), 6 ff. (esp. p. 25, where he says almost all the parallels between the Scrolls and the Fourth Gospel could have been suggested by the Septuagint). On the attitude to the Temple in the Fourth Gospel and the Scrolls, cf. O. Cullmann, *N.T.S.* v (1958-9), 157 ff. On the influence of the Qumran sect in the Gospel of Matthew, cf. K. Stendahl, *The School of St. Matthew*, 1954; S. E. Johnson, *Z.A.W.* lxvi (1954), 115 ff.; B. Gärtner, *S.Th.* viii (1955), 1 ff.; S. Lassalle, *Bulletin du Cercle Ernest Renan*, No. 71, April 1960, pp. 1 ff. Cf. also W. D. Davies (*H.T.R.* xlvi (1953), 113 ff.) on Matt. xi. 25-30 and the Scrolls. On the Scrolls and the Gospel of Luke, cf. W. Grossouw, *Studia Catholica*, xxvii (1952), 5 ff. On the Scrolls and Acts cf. S. E. Johnson, *Z.A.W.* lxvi (1954), 106 ff. On the Scrolls and the Gospel of Matthew and the Epistle of James, cf. Leaney, op. cit. pp. 91 ff., and on the links with the Gospel of Luke and Acts, ibid. 109 ff. On the general question of Qumran exegesis and New Testament exegesis of the Old Testament, cf. G. Vermès, *Cahiers Sioniens*, v (1951), 337 ff.; cf. also F. F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, 1960, and J. van der Ploeg, *Bijbelverklaring te Qumrân*, 1960.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. W. D. Davies, *S.N.T.*, pp. 157 ff., where the author argues that "the Scrolls and the Pauline Epistles share these terms [i.e. flesh and spirit], but it is not their sectarian connotation that is determinative of Pauline usage" (p. 182). On flesh and spirit, cf. further D. Flusser, *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Scripta Hierosolymitana, IV), 1958, pp. 252 ff. Cf. also W. Grossouw, *Studia Catholica*,

or the links to be found in the Epistle to the Hebrews.<sup>1</sup> Professor F. C. Grant declares that the contacts and parallels between the New Testament and the Scrolls are comparatively insignificant when set against the innumerable contacts and parallels between the New Testament and other literature of the Hellenistic age.<sup>2</sup> This does not mean that the parallels with the Scrolls are to be ignored or depreciated. Quite the reverse. Christ is not to be exalted by the depreciation of others, and it is as wrong to use the Scrolls simply as a foil for the teaching of the New Testament as it is to use them simply as a quarry for passages to attack the originality of the New Testament. We may gladly recognize all that is fine and good in the thought of the Qumran sectaries, with their deep religious interest and the purity of their lives. Their devotion to the Old Testament and their austere life of obedience to the will of God as they understood it is worthy of all admiration. The Scrolls are therefore to be recognized as of importance for the understanding of the background of Christianity and for the light they shed on currents of Judaism in the period in which Christianity came into being.<sup>3</sup> It should be clear that they do not justify the extreme statement of the French writer which was quoted at the beginning of this lecture,<sup>4</sup> and

xxvii (1952), 1 ff.; S. E. Johnson, *H.T.R.* xlviii (1955), 157 ff.; J. Daniélou, op. cit. pp. 94 ff.; K. Schubert, *The Dead Sea Community*, pp. 155 ff.; A. R. C. Leaney, op. cit. pp. 104 ff.; R. E. Murphy, *Sacra Pagina*, ii (1959), 60 ff.; and W. Grundmann, *R.Q.* ii (1960), 237 ff.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Y. Yadin, *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Scripta Hierosolymitana, IV), 1958, pp. 36 ff. Cf. also J. Daniélou, op. cit. pp. 106 ff.; C. Spicq, *R.Q.* i (1958-9), 365 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Ancient Judaism and the New Testament*, p. 20; cf. also p. 21: "the few and superficial resemblances between the New Testament and the Dead Sea Scrolls do not prove the dependence of Christianity upon the Essenes". See also F. C. Grant, *The Gospels: their Origin and Growth*, 1957, p. 75.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. L. Cerfaux, *La Secte de Qumrân* (Recherches Bibliques, IV), 1959, pp. 238 f.: "Les documents de la Mer Morte nous rendront d'immenses services . . . Nous aidant à préciser le vocabulaire chrétien, ils exerceront une influence bienfaisante sur notre exégèse". Cf. also J. D. Barthélemy, *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie*, vi (1959), 249 ff.

<sup>4</sup> The views of some Russian authors, recorded by Amusin (op. cit. pp. 234 ff.) but not otherwise available to the present writer, may be noted. R. Y. Vipper (*Rome and Christianity*, 1954) thinks the Essenes were the precursors of Christianity, and the Essenes and the Christians were but as grandparents and grand-

anyone who reads the Fourth Gospel, or indeed any part of the New Testament, and who then reads the Scrolls in any of the translations that have been published, will be quickly aware that there is a world of difference between them.<sup>1</sup> One of the translators, Professor T. H. Gaster, has said with the fullest justification that in the Scrolls "there is no trace of any of the cardinal theological concepts . . . which make Christianity a distinctive faith."<sup>2</sup> They do not offer the single and sufficient explanation of Christian origins. They do bring their contribution to the understanding of the soil in which Christianity was planted.<sup>3</sup> Scholars have long recognized that Judaism was not a decadent and moribund faith in the time of Jesus, and that Pharisaism is not truly reflected in the New Testament. There we see Pharisaism at its worst, and as it is sometimes condemned in

children. A. P. Kazhdan (*Religion and Atheism in the Ancient World*, 1957) is more cautious, and says we cannot derive Christianity from Essenism, but thinks the latter exerted a considerable influence on the formation of Christianity and on the growth of the Christian myth, while S. I. Kovalev (in the *Annual of the Museum of the History of Religion and Atheism*, 1958) is yet more cautious, and says we have no reason to regard the Essenes as direct precursors of Christianity either in matters of ideology or organization. Y. A. Lenzman (*The Rise of Christianity*, 1958) says the *Manual of Discipline* has nothing in common with early Christianity, but thinks the figure of the Teacher of Righteousness provided the most important element of the legend of Jesus. K. B. Starkova (in the Preface to her translation of the *Manual of Discipline*, 1959) says that in the light of the Qumran texts we can understand more clearly the birth of Christianity and the rise of Christian literature.

<sup>1</sup> O. Cullmann (*S.N.T.*, pp. 31 f.) says: "Is it not significant that Josephus and Philo can both describe the Essenes in detail without once mentioning the Teacher of Righteousness? . . . Would it be possible to describe primitive Christianity without naming Christ? To ask the question is to have answered it." Cf. also K. Schubert, *The Dead Sea Community*, p. 144: "the milieu of Jesus and the milieu of the Qumrân texts do belong in the same broad framework of the messianic movement, but Jesus himself clearly dissociated himself in many things from his Qumrân Essene predecessors and contemporaries."

<sup>2</sup> *The Scriptures of the Dead Sea Sect*, p. 22.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. K. G. Kuhn, *S.N.T.*, p. 87: "The abiding significance of the Qumran texts for the New Testament is that they show to what extent the primitive church, however conscious of its integrity and newness, drew upon the Essenes in matters of practices and cult, organization and constitution." It may be added that the study of the limit of such borrowing is no less important than the study of its extent. Cf. W. Eiss, *Qumran und die Anfänge der christlichen Gemeinde*, 1959, p. 22.

Jewish sources.<sup>1</sup> But Pharisaism at its best was deeply religious, and the Christian debt to it is one which should never be forgotten. Now through the Scrolls we have knowledge of another contemporary group, which in its different way preserved amongst the Jews a deep religious devotion, and helped to create the climate in which the Christian faith could be born. In many ways God prepared for the coming of his Son.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. J. Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth*, Eng. Trans. by H. Danby, 1925, pp. 213 ff., 227, 321.