JEWISH SOURCES IN Gnostic LITERATURE

Jewish apocryphon, known from various patristic sources. The same group used a ‘Gospel of Eve’ and ‘many books in the name of Seth’ (Haer. 26:8, 1). The latter would certainly have included strictly Gnostic material (‘Talda豪门’ is mentioned in connection with them, ibid.) and a number of books in the name of Seth are now to be found in the Nag Hammadi Corpus. Non-Gnostic Jewish books in the name of Seth also circulated in late antiquity, though we have no way of knowing whether such were included in the Nicolaitan library. A book of ‘Noria’ is said to have been used among these same Gnostics (Haer. 26:1, 4-9), consisting of a fanciful retelling of the story of Noah’s ark, ‘Noria’ in this instance being Noah’s wife.  

Epiphanius records that books in the name of Seth and Allogenes (= Seth) were in use among the Sethians and the closely-related Archontics (Haer. 39:5, 1; 40:2, 2; 40:7, 4). These books were probably, in the main, Gnostic compositions, but it cannot be excluded that non-Gnostic Jewish Seth books were also in use. Books in the name of Moses were also to be found in these Gnostics’ libraries (Haer. 39:5, 1), and these may have included such Jewish apocryphal writings as the Testament of Moses, the Assumption of Moses, and the Adam-book now known as the Apocalypse of Moses, as well as others. The Ascension of Isaiah is listed by Epiphanius among the book used by the Archontics (Haer. 40:2, 2), and it is to be noted that this is not a Gnostic book.

One other book cited by name by Epiphanius as in use among the Sethian Gnostics (Haer. 39:5, 1) is an Apocalypse of Abraham. This document may have been the same apocryphon as the non-Gnostic Jewish

---

26 See e.g. Denis, Introduction, 37-38; Collins, Apocalypses, 36-37; cf. above pp. 415-8.  
27 See esp. Puech, ‘Fragments retrouvés,’ 273. The Audians also had a work called the Apocalypse of Abraham (gelyoneh) or Book of Abraham (Allogeneis), which told of the seduction of Eve by the archons (Puech ibid., 274); see now the discussion by Stroumsa, Another Seed, 58-60. This book, may, indeed, have been identical to one of the Allogenes books used by the Archontic (Sethian) Gnostics, according to Epiphanius, who uses the plural form Allogenes in his discussion: Haer. 40:2, 2 (Archontics); 39:5, 1 (Sethians). Allogenes (‘stranger’) is a Gnostic name for Seth. Cf. Pearson, ‘The Figure of Seth,’ 486. It should be noted that Epiphanius’ discussion of the Audians (Haer. 70) is clearly deficient; for example, one could not guess, from the information given by him, that the Audians were Gnostics.  
28 On the Paraphrase of Seth see the discussion of the Paraphrase of Shem, below, p. 475. On Baruch see below, p. 470, and n. 177.  
31 Cf. James, Lost Apocalypse, 16, on Ham. Barkóph may be the same as Barkóph, who with Barkabas is named as a Basilidian prophet by Eusebius (Hist. eccl. 4:7, 7). Barkabas is named as a prophet of the Niocolaitan Gnostics by Epiphanius (Haer. 26:2, 2).
apparently many in circulation in Gnostic groups in late antiquity) we have no way of knowing. That it might have had a Jewish colouration is not to be excluded as a possibility.\footnote{\textsuperscript{32}}

One Nag Hammadi trac\/\textit{tate} has a number of references to other books, some of which may be of Jewish origin or colouration. I refer to the treatise, \textit{On the Origin of the World}, wherein reference is made to the following titles: 1. 'The \textit{Archangelikê} of Moses the Prophet' (II, 102, 8-9); 2. 'The First Book of Noraia' (102, IO-I 1) = 'The First Logos of Noraia' (102, 24-25); 3. 'The Book of Solomon' (107, 3); 4. 'The Seventh Cosmos of Hieralaia the Prophet' (112, 23-25); 5. 'The Schemata of the \textit{Heirmarmê} of the Heaven Which is Beneath the Twelve' (107, 16-16); and 6. 'The Holy Book' (1 IO, 20; 122, 12-13).

The first-named book may have some connection with a magical text edited by Reitzenstein, an 'archangelic hymn which God gave to Moses on Mt. Sinai.'\footnote{\textsuperscript{33}} The second one recalls the 'Book of Noria' already cited in connection with the Nicolaitan Gnostics known to \textit{Epiphanius}.

It has also been suggested that a Noraia book may have been used as one of the sources for the \textit{Hypostasis of the Archons}, a document which not only displays a considerable Jewish colouration, but also stands in close relationship to \textit{Orig. World}. The \textit{Thought of Noraia} may also be cited in this connection, for this short \textit{trac\/\textit{tate}} may be based upon a previously-existing Noraia book; it also stands in a close relationship with \textit{Hyp. Arch.}\footnote{\textsuperscript{29}}

The third in our list has as its subject 'forty-nine androgynous demons' with their names and functions (IX, 106, 27-107, 3), and appears to have been one of a number of Solomon books associated with magic, astrology, and demonology circulating in late antiquity.\footnote{\textsuperscript{30}} The \textit{Testament of Solomon} comes readily to mind in this connection.\footnote{\textsuperscript{31}} As for the other books men-

\footnote{\textsuperscript{32}} See e.g. Porphyry, \textit{Vit. Plot.} 16; Clem. Alex., \textit{Strom.} I: 15, 69, 6. Cf. Giversen, \textit{Apocryphon Johannis}, 233. The colophon to \textit{Zostrianos} (\textit{NHC} VIII, 1: 132, 9) concludes with the phrase, 'Words of Zoroaster.'

\footnote{\textsuperscript{33}} The suggested content of the book referred to, i.e. the role of the angels in creating man, and the various passions ruled by the angels, is surely compatible with a Jewish provenience. Cf. e.g. Philo \textit{Fug.} 78-70 and \textit{T. Reuben} 2-3. Zoroaster was sometimes identified with the biblical Seth. Cf. Bouret, \textit{Hauptprobleme}, 378-82. For further discussion of \textit{Ap. John}, see below.


\footnote{\textsuperscript{30}} Above, p. 446.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{31}} \textit{On Hyp. Arch.} see discussion below. Cf. also \textit{Bohig, Schrift ohne Titel}, 32.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{32}} See Pearson, \textit{Nag Hammadi Codices IX} and X, 87-99, esp. 89.


\footnote{\textsuperscript{30}} See McCown, \textit{The Testament of Solomon}, and Conybear, 'Testament of Solomon'. On Solomonic books of magic in antiquity see e.g. McCown, \textit{Testament of Solomon}, 90-104; cf. also the list of pseudo-Solomonic works in J.E. 11, 446-S. See now also D. C. Duling in Charlesworth, \textit{Pseudepigrapha}, 935-87.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{33}} For discussion see Stroumsa, \textit{Another Seed}, 166-7. On the Manichaean \textit{Books of Giants}, an adaptation of the Enochic book of the same name, see below.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{40}} Cf. Dorese's interesting but speculative discussion, \textit{Secret Books}, 17-1.4.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{41}} The quotation from it in \textit{Orig. World} (II, 110,31-111,1) presents a typically Gnostic interpretation of the tree of knowledge in Paradise. The context of the second reference to this book (121,35-123,1) refers to three phoenices of Paradise, and 'the \textit{hydras} in Egypt.' \textit{Böhl} rightly emends the text at 122,18-19 to read \textit{nnhydr\!/ia}, translating the word as \textit{Wasserschlängen (Schriej ohne Titel, 94-95)}. The translation of Robinson, \textit{Nag Hammadi} has 'crocodiles.' Cf. also Tardieu, \textit{Trois mythes gnostiques}, 262-3. A possible allusion here to \textit{J. Enoc} 12:1 has been noticed by Dorese, \textit{Secret Books}, 172-4. See below, for discussion of the possible use of \textit{J. Enoc} in other Gnostic texts.


\footnote{\textsuperscript{43}} \textit{See Schmidt-MacDermot, Books of Jeu.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{44}} See also \textit{Pierpont Morgan Fragments}, 228-9; cf. Perkins, \textit{Gnostic Dialogue}, 139-40.

preserved in Hebrew (3 Enoch), revolving around the figure of ‘the Lesser YWHW’, i.e. Metatron. 46

We turn now to the Manichaean literature. As is well-known, Manichaeism is a form of Gnosticism which is programatically syncretistic. Mani presenting himself as the last of a series of heavenly emissaries going back to Adam, including other Old Testament patriarchs, Zoroaster, Buddha, Jesus, and Paul. 47 It has recently been established, as a result of the discovery and publication of the Cologne Mani Codex, 48 that Mani’s formative period was spent in a Jewish-Christian baptist sect with Gnostic proclivities, viz. that of Elchasai. 49 Moreover it is becoming increasingly clear that Mani’s Gnostic system shows massive influences from Sethian Gnosticism. 50 That Jewish and Jewish Gnostic books were utilized by Mani should not be surprising.

Indeed Manichaean sources do refer to such source material, circulating under the name of key Old Testament patriarchs. We read in a Coptic Manichaean homily that ‘all of the apostles have ... proclaimed this struggle in every one of their books, from Adam until now.’ 51 A Middle Persian fragment (M299) tells us that Vahman, a Holy Spirit figure, ‘proclaimed his greatness through the mouths of the primeval prophets, who are: Shem, Sem, Enosh, Nikotheos ... and Enoch.’ 52 Seth (called Sethel in Greek and Coptic sources) is an especially important figure for the Manichaeeans, 53 and a book called the ‘Prayer of Sethel’ is referred to in the

40 See e.g. 3 Enoch 12 et passim in Odeberg’s edition, and his remarks, pp. 188-91. Cf. Gruenewald, Apocalyptic, 191-208; Schollem, Jewish Gnosticism, 43-44, and Major Trends, 68-69. On 3 Enoch see now also Alexander, ‘Historical Setting,’ and id in Charlesworth, Pseudepigrapha 1, 223-315.

41 See e.g. Widengren, Mani and Manichaism, esp. 139-44.

42 See Henrichs-Koenen, ‘Mani Codex,’ Greek text and English translation: Cameron-Dewey, Mani Codex; cf. their bibliography, p. 6.


44 This point was already made by Widengren (Mani and Manichaism, 221) and has been greatly elaborated by Stroumsa. See Another Seed, 226-78.

45 Polotsky, Manichaic Homilien 14, lines 29-31, my translation. The text is fragmentary. On the OT patriarchs in Manichaean literature, and the use of Jewish apocrypha attributed to them, see Henrichs-Koenen, ‘Mani Codex,’ 107-108.

46 Asmussen, Manichaean Literature, 12. For Sem or Sem in this text we should read Seth. An apocryphal of Nikotheos was in use by the (Sethian) Gnostics known to Plotinus’ circle in Rome: Porphyry, Flit, 16. Nikotheos is named as a Gnostic prophet in the unattributed text of the Books of Enoch (ch. 7); see Schmidt-MacDermott, Books of Enoch, p. 235. He is also a highly regarded figure in Zosimus’ treatise on the letter Omega. See e.g. Festugière, Révelation 1, 263-74; Scott, Hermética, vol. 4, 104-44; Stroumsa, Another Seed, 217-26. The lore supposedly derived by Zosimus from this Nikotheos includes the interpretation of the letters of the name Adam, meaning the four cardinal directions (E.W.N.S.). Cf. 2 Enoch 30: 13.

47 Stroumsa, Another Seed, 226-39. The form of the name Sethel, found not only in Manichaean but also in Mandaean material (Seth), is probably based upon a Hebrew etymology attested in rabbinic, as well as Gnostic, sources: ‘to plant.’ See Stroumsa, 113-15.

48 See Henning, Ein manichaisches Henochbuch, Milik, Books of Enoch, 303; Bohlig (Books of Enoch, 37) thinks that this apocryphon is identical with the Book of Giants found at Qumran. Greenfield—Stone (The Enoch Pentateuch, p. 63) surmise that it is the same apocryphon that is quoted in the Mani Codex (on which see below).

49 Cameron-Dewey translation.


51 Asmussen, Manichaean Literature, 37.

52 See Henning, Ein manichaisches Henochbuch, Milik, Books of Enoch, 303; Bohlig (Books of Enoch, 37) thinks that this apocryphon is identical with the Book of Giants found at Qumran. Greenfield—Stone (The Enoch Pentateuch, p. 63) surmise that it is the same apocryphon that is quoted in the Mani Codex (on which see below).


55 Another Seed, 226-78.


57 Another Seed, 226-78.

58 So e.g. Henrichs, ‘Literary Criticism,’ 725; Stroumsa, Another Seed, 226-78.

59 Cf. discussion below of Apoc. Adam.

60 Cf. above, pp. 90-97.
the original Aramaic. The Book of Giants is an elaboration of the myth of the giants born to the ‘sons of God’ and the ‘daughters of men,’ according to Gen 6:4. Man’s own Book of Giants was written in Syriac, and fragments of this work are extant in Middle Persian, Sogdian, and Uyghur versions. It seems to have been simply a gnosticizing adaptation of the Jewish book now attested from Qumran. The Jewish Book of Giants circulated along with other Enoch literature, and is datable, in its original Aramaic version, to the second century s.c.e. The Aramaic fragments do not all as yet have been published, but Milik has produced a preliminary edition, with translation, and in that work discusses the relationship between the Qumran fragments and the Manichaean Book of Giants.

That Mani also knew the Enochic ‘Book of Watchers’ (= 1 Enoch 1-36), which together with the astronomical Enoch document (1 Enoch 72-82) may constitute the oldest extra-biblical religious Jewish literature known, is also quite probable. The Coptic Kephalaia contains passages, which, even if they reflect specifically Gnostic and Manichaean features, seem clearly to be based on 1 Enoch 6-10. This passage tells of the descent of the angels (Watchers) and their liaison with the daughters of men, resulting in the birth of the giants (cf. Gen 6:1-4).

The myth of the descent of the angels (1 Enoch 6-10; cf. Gen 6:1-4) was widely elaborated in Jewish literature of the Second Temple period, and served to answer the question of the origin of evil on the earth. This myth plays an important role, too, in Gnostic literature. In the particular case just now treated, we can see evidence of a direct reliance by the Manichaean author on the Enochic ‘Book of Watchers,’ as well as influences of already gnosticized versions of this myth, circulating presumably amongst Sethian Gnostics.

We turn now to a particularly important text of Sethian Gnosticism, the Apocryphon of John. This is one of many Gnostic texts which contain the myth of the creation of the world and men by the archons, a myth which, in turn, is ultimately derived in part from the Jewish myth of the fallen angels. One passage shows direct literary dependence upon 1 Enoch, as illustrated in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enoch</th>
<th>Ap. John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The angels desire the daughters of men, and resolve to take wives and beget offspring (6:2).</td>
<td>The Chief Archon makes a decision and sends his angels to the daughters of men in order to produce offspring (26, 16-20).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two hundred of them came down to Mt. Hermon. The names of their leaders are given (6:6-8).

See the apparatus criticus in Knibb’s edition of 1 Enoch. I have used here the forms of the names as they appear in the Aramaic fragments edited by Milik. On these four angels see also Yadin, Scroll of the War, 237-40.

For an important discussion of the Sethian Gnostic system, and the Gnostic texts which should be labelled as Sethian, see Schenke, ‘Gnostic Sethianism.’ The following Nag Hammadi tracts fall into the Sethian category, according to Schenke (p. 588): Ap. John; Hyp. Arch.; Gos. Eq.; Apoc. Adam; Steles Seth; Zost.; Melch; Norw. Marsanes; Allogenes; Tram. Prot.


The long version of Ap. John from NHC II is cited; the parallel passage in the BG version is 73, 18-75, 10. For Coptic text of Codex II (+ III and IV) see Krause, Drei Versionen: cf. Giversen, Apocryphon Johannis. For Coptic text of BG see Till-Schenke, Gnostische Schriften. For an English translation of the BG version see Feuerstein, Gnostic 1, 105-120. For 1 Enoch I have used Knibb’s edition.
The angels take wives, and teach them charms and spells. The women bear giants, who become predators on earth (7:1-6).

‘Aša’el teaches people metallurgy and other technological skills, and the people go astray (8:1-2).

Magic and astrology are introduced (8:3).

People cry out in their misery and destruction (8:4).

They create an Imitation Spirit (29, 23-26).

The angels take the likenesses of the husbands of the daughters of men, filling them with the Spirit of Darkness.

The angels teach people metallurgy and lead them astray (29, 30-30, 2).

People languish in mortality and ignorance, and the whole creation is enslaved (30, 2-7).

They take wives and beget children, and hardness of heart prevails until now, under the influence of the Imitation Spirit (30, 7-11).

The context in Ap. John is essentially a running commentary on Gen 1-6, organized as a dialogue between Jesus (‘the saviour’) and his disciple John, who serves as Jesus’ interlocutor. The passage before us is part of a response given by Jesus to a question (misplaced in the document as it stands) concerning the origin of the Imitation Spirit (27:31-32; cf. 26, 20, 27, 36). It is the introduction of this Imitation Spirit in our text which represents the most substantial deviation from the passage in 1 Enoch 6-8. Otherwise Ap. John follows 1 Enoch quite closely, and clearly is literally dependent upon it.

One other deviation from 1 Enoch is of interest here: In contrast to 1 Enoch 7, Ap. John has the angels assume the likeness of the husbands of the daughters of men in order to accomplish their purpose. This idea may derive from T’Reuben 5:5-7 or one of its sources. Thus, whereas 1 Enoch 6-8 is utilized in Ap. John, we note also the influence of other non-biblical Jewish material (including a two-spirits doctrine) in the elaboration of the myth. This passage stands as a well-defined unit in which no obvious Christian features are found, in spite of the Christian literary framework of Ap. John, which we shall discuss below.

Another Gnostic text from Nag Hammadi contains a possible use of the same material from 1 Enoch, viz. Orig. World (NHC II, 123, 4-15). While the motif of the seduction of the ‘daughters of men’ by the angels is absent from this passage, the descent of these angels is reflected, and their role in teaching men magic and other godlessness is stressed, as in 1 Enoch 7-8. One more example is found in Pistis Sophia, ch. 15. There one can easily see reflected 1 Enoch 7:1 and possibly 8:3, specifically in the clause, ‘those [mysteries] which the transgressing angels brought down, namely their magic.’

We have already noted, in passing, a possible connection between Orig. World and 2 Enoch. Another Nag Hammadi document, Zostrianos, shows some remarkable parallels with 2 Enoch, a Jewish apocalypse originating in the Egyptian diaspora, probably in the first century C.E. Indeed, Scopello has recently made the claim that Zost. is literarily dependent upon 2 Enoch. She shows this with special reference to two passages, both of which describe the heavenly ascent of the prophet Zostrianos in a manner similar to that of Enoch.
Scopello points to other correspondences between Zost. and 2 Enoch in the course of her argument, and makes a good case for the dependence of the former upon the latter. She also demonstrates that Zost. — a text which shows no Christian influence — has utilized a number of Jewish traditions, and concludes that attention to such influences in texts like Zost. can cast a new light upon the controversial problem of the existence of a Jewish gnosticism.

Another example of the possible use of 2 Enoch by a Gnostic author can be cited, viz. the first tractate of the Corpus Hermeticum: Poimandres. Poimandres has numerous features in common with 2 Enoch, both in structure and in specific content, and, timidly stated, ‘it is not out of the question that the author of the Poimandres was familiar with one or more apocryphases in the Enoch tradition of the sort represented by 2 Enoch.’ In fact, Scopello’s arguments regarding Zost. strengthens the case for a direct dependence of Poimandres upon 2 Enoch.

We have seen that actual literary dependence upon 1 Enoch 6-8 is surely to be found in Ap. John, probably in Pistis Sophia, and possibly in Orig. World. 1 Enoch 6-10 is surely utilized in the Manichaean Kephalaia. Thus, the Enochic ‘Book of Watchers’ can be seen to have enjoyed wide popularity in Gnostic circles. In addition, the Manichaean Book of Giants was seen to be an elaboration of a previously-existing Enochic Book of Giants. Moreover the very probable use of 2 Enoch in Zost. and Poimundres, and its possible use in Orig. World, is of great importance for the discussion of the date and provenience of that document.

Jewish and Jewish Gnostic Sources in Christian Gnostic Texts

We turn now to a consideration of some important Christian Gnostic texts, to see if we can detect in them the use of previously existing Jewish or Jewish Gnostic sources.

Behold, Zostrianos, you have heard all these things that the gods do not know and which are unattainable to the angels. (128, 15-18) Her citations from 2 Enoch are from Vaillant’s edition, corresponding to 2 Enoch 22: 10 (B) and 24:3 (A) in Charles, APOT. Cf. also 40:2-3 (in APOT). Andersen’s new translation (in Charlesworth, Pseudepigrapha) mainly follows Charles, APOT in its chapter-verses schema.

Not to my angels have I explained my secret and to you I explain it today. (ch. 11)”

We do not elaborate upon the oblique use of the myth of the fall of the angels in numerous Gnostic texts. On this see esp. Stroumsa, Another Seed, 43-111.
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THE TESTIMONY OF TRUTH

This document is a Christian Gnostic tract with homiletical characteristics, which defends a rigorously enigmatic doctrine and praxis, and contends against doctrines and groups regarded by the author as ‘heretical.’ What is of interest to us here is the apparent use of two ‘midrashim’ neither of which shows any Christian features. The first of these is a midrash on the serpent of Paradise, who was wiser than all the animals that were in Paradise (45, 30-46, 2; cf. Gen 3:1), and in typical midrashic fashion is associated with the ‘serpent’ traditions from Exod 4 and Num 21. The Paradise story is retold in such a way that the serpent is portrayed as the revealer of life and knowledge, whereas ‘God’ (i.e. the biblical Creator) is portrayed as a malevolent and ignorant demon. Despite the strong anti-Jewish tone of this piece, it is replete with specifically Jewish traditions of biblical interpretation, such as could hardly have been available to people not thoroughly acquainted with Jewish aggadah. It thus serves as a textbook example of a ‘Jewish Gnosticism’ in which traditional doctrines and values are turned upside-down in the interests of a higher gnosticism.

The other midrash occurs in Testim. Truth 69,32-70,24. The manuscript is quite fragmentary at that point, but the text has been restored. It concerns the association on the part of David and Solomon with demons. David, who ‘laid the foundation of Jerusalem,’ is said to have had demons dwelling with him, and Solomon is said to have built the temple with the aid of demons, which were afterwards imprisoned in jars. These details are derived from Jewish legends such as are reflected in rabbinic aggadah, and are elaborated in that curious apocryphon, the Testament of Solomon. The midrash contains nothing specifically Gnostic; it could easily be taken as a purely Jewish text.

MELCHIZEDEK

It is most regrettable that this interesting-and important tractate is so poorly preserved. As it stands, it is a Christian text, in which both Jesus Christ and Melchizedek play central roles. It is also, apparently, a Gnostic text
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which can be identified as a product of Sethian Gnosticism. What is of special interest to us here is the possibility that it is built up out of pre-Christian Jewish Melchizedek material. I have elsewhere set forth the theory of a three-stage development of the document: 1) a Jewish substratum, presenting Melchizedek as a priest of primal history and recipient of visions of the future, and an eschatological warrior-high-priest-messiah; 2) an overlay of Christian materials, introducing the figure of Jesus Christ and equating him with Melchizedek; and 3) Sethian Gnostic additions.

THE APOCRYPHON OF JOHN

This Sethian Gnostic document is one of the most important of all the Gnostic texts known, and contains a comprehensive Gnostic myth which very probably served as the basis for that developed by the Christian Gnostic teacher Valentinus, and further elaborated by his disciples. The extant form of Ap. John is an apocalypse, containing a revelation given by the risen Christ to his disciple John. Within the apocalyptic frame (evident at the beginning and at the end of the document) there are two main sections: a revelation discourse, and a commentary on Gen 1-6, roughly edited into a dialogue between Jesus and his interlocutor John. A number of sources seem to be reflected in the document, resulting in a good deal of confusion and even contradiction. The following outline of its content and main divisions is prepared on the basis of the version in Codex II, with the divisions in BG shown in parentheses:

Preamble and apocalyptic frame, 1:1-2,26 (19,6-22,17)
1. Revelation discourse A. Theosophy) 1 negative theology; the unknown God, 2,26-4,10 (22,17-26,6); 2) the heavenly world, 4,10-9,24 (26,6-36,15). B. Cosmogony 1) Fall of Sophia, 9,25-10,23 (36,15-39,4); 2) the cosmic world of darkness, 10,23-13,5 (39,4-44,9); 3) blasphemy of the Demiurge, 13,5-13 (44,9-18).

There are obvious relationships between Ap. John and some other important Gnostic texts, which in general can be accounted for by positing a basic Gnostic system which various groups and individual teachers have developed in different ways. The Sethian system posited by Schenke and others comes immediately to mind.

A fragment from the second part in our outline (II, 9) was discussed above (pp. 453-59). It was shown that this section which deals with the angels and the daughter of men is one of the most important of all the Gnostic system, see above n. 72.

II. Dialogue: Soteriology 1) repentance of Sophia, 13,13-14,13 (44,19-47,18); 2) anthropogony, 14,13-21,16 (47,18-55,18); 3) Adam in Paradise, 21,16-24,8 (55,18-62,3); 4) seduction of Eve: Cain and Abel, 24,8-34 (62,6-63,12); 5) Seth and his seed, 24,35-25,16 (63,12-64,12); two spirits: classes of men, 25,16-27,30 (64,12-71,2); 7) production of Heimarmene (Fate), 27,31-28,32 (71,2-72,12); 8) Noah and the Flood, 28,32-29,15 (72,12-73,18); 9) the angels and the daughters of men, 29,16-30,11 (73,18-75,10); 10) the triple descent of Pronoia, 30,11-31,25 (75,10-13).

Apocalyptic frame and title, 3,1-25,32,9 (75,14-77,5).

102 Cf. n. 72, above.
100 Pearson, Nag Hammadi Codices IX and X, 19-85.
101 Schenke (‘Jüdische Melchisedek-Gestalt’) also posits a Jewish substratum for Melch, but argues that the material was re-edited in Sethian Gnostic circles and finally christianized.
102 See n. 74, above, for reference to the standard editions. The document is extant in two basic recensions, a shorter one (BG and NHC III) and a longer one (NHC II and IV); there are also some minor differences to be observed among all four versions. Two of the extant versions are very fragmentary (III and IV); for our purposes they can safely be ignored. On the Sethian Gnostic system, see above n. 72.
104 Cf. Kragerud, ‘Formanalyse’; Fallon, Gnostic Apocalypses,’ 130-1
is a self-contained unit which, in the present literary arrangement of Ap. John, is organized around six of the ten questions (questions 4-9) put to the Gnostic Revealer (Christ) by his interlocutor. It has been referred to as a catechism, in which the ultimate fate of the human soul is tied to the operation of two spirits: the Spirit of Life and the Imitation Spirit. The two spirits are treated without any relation to the exegesis of Genesis, for the purpose of classifying mankind into two main groups, those who achieve salvation and those who do not:

Those on whom the Spirit of life will descend and (with whom) he will be with the power, they will be saved and become perfect and be worthy of the greatesses and be purified in that place from all wickedness and the involvements in evil. When the Spirit of life increases and the power comes and strengthens that soul, no one can lead it astray with works of evil. But those on whom the opposing spirit descends are drawn by him and they go astray. (NHC II, 23-28; 26, 15-22)

The resemblance of this doctrine to that of the Rule scroll from Qumran (1QS 3: 13ff) has been noted, and it has been argued that the entire passage must be understood from premises based not on Gnosticism but on sectarian Judaism. In other words, the passage in question is not Gnostic at all.

It should be pointed out, however, that this passage does, in fact, reflect a gnosticizing tendency. A closer look reveals that the passage posits three classes of men: the perfect, on whom the Spirit of Life has descended; ‘those who have not known to whom they belong’ (NHC II, 26, 33-34), and ‘those who did know but have turned away’ (II, 27, 22-23). The ‘perfect’ (= the Gnostics) are, of course, saved. Those in the second group are given another chance in another incarnation, and can thus be saved once they acquire gnosis. Those in the third group are ‘punished with eternal punishment’ (II, 27, 30). Moreover the entire passage has been placed by a redactor into the discussion of Seth and his race (II, 5 in our outline), as an anthropological excursus. Thus it is the race of Seth which is seen to constitute the ‘unmovable race’ (NHC II, 25, 23) of perfected and perfectible Gnostics.

Finally we must take up the issue whether, in fact, the basic mythology of the document, apart from its frame, should be regarded as a product of Jewish Gnosticism. In other words: can Ap. John be understood as a Christianizing redaction of pre-existing non-Christian Gnostic material, similar to the classic examples represented by the Sophia of Jesus Christ and Eugnostos. When one removes from Ap. John the apocalyptic framework at the beginning and the end, together with the dialogue features involving the ten questions put to ‘Christ’ by his interlocutor, one is left with material in which nothing basically ‘Christian’ remains, except for some easily-removed glosses. What is more, these vary in extent from one version to another. The conclusion is that the ‘Christian’ elements are altogether secondary, and that the basic material is a product of Jewish Gnosticism.

But why Jewish, if not Christian? Why not pagan? The answer to this is that the building-blocks of the mythological structure of Ap. John are the Jewish Bible and specifically Jewish traditions of interpretation thereof. The Jewish exegetical traditions appropriated in the Gnostic structure, moreover, derive not only from Greek-speaking diaspora Judaism, using the Septuagint as its text, but also from Aramaic-speaking Palestinian Judaism, using the Hebrew Bible as its text.

The theology of the ‘unknown God’ (I A, 1 in our outline) is developed out of a platonizing Jewish theology of divine transcendence, such as is richly documented in first-century diaspora Judaism. Philo of Alexandria

109 Hauschild, Gottes Geist, 223-35. In the preceding material in Ap. John (II, 2 and 3 in our outline), a ‘helper’ spirit also referred to as the ‘Epinoia of Light’ is sent by God to effect Adam’s (i.e., man’s) salvation. An ‘imitation Spirit’ is created by the evil archons for the purpose of obstructing salvation. These entities are developed out of an exegesis of key texts in Gen 2 and 3, and also tied exegetically to the two trees of Paradise: the ‘Thought of Light’ = the Tree of Knowledge, and the ‘Imitation Spirit’ = the Tree of (counterfeit) Life. See Ap. John II, 21, 16-22; 5, BG 35, 18-57, 12. The BG version is clearer.

110 Hausschild, Gottes Geist, 236; cf. 239-47. 111 So also Schenke, ‘Das literarische Problem,’ 61. 112 Cf. Kragerud, ‘Formanalyse,’ 35.

---

114 On the concept of ‘immovability’ see Pearson, ‘Jewish Elements in Gnosticism,’ 157-8; Strohma, Another Seed, 190-1; Williams, ‘Stability.’

115 Sophia of Jesus Christ ZZZ, 90, 14-119, 18 and BG 3; Eugnostos III, 70-190, 13. See esp. Krause, ‘Litterarische Verhältnisse,’ Parrott, Religious Syncretism'; Perkins, Gnostic Dialogue, 94-98. Eugnostos is an ‘epistle’ containing a discussion of the unknown God and the heavenly world, wherein one can easily detect a sophisticated Gnostic exegesis of key texts in Genesis. It shows no obvious Christian influences, and should be taken as a text of non-Christian (Jewish?) Gnosticism. Soph. Jes. Chr, is a composite document in which the text of Eugnostos has been utilized as a basis, and opened up into a revelation dialogue between Christ and his disciples.

116 E.g., the heavenly aeon Autogenes (‘self-begotten’) is identified by means of glosses as the pre-existent ‘Christ’ in I A, 2 (in our outline); this identification is made initially in the BG version at 30, 14-17, but is absent from the parallel passage in II, 6, 23-25. Sophia (II, 9, 25) is called ‘our sister Sophia’ in the BG version (36, 16). On the other hand, whereas the BG version has Epinoia, a manifestation of Sophia, teach Adam and Eve knowledge from the forbidden tree (60, 16-61, 12), in the other version it is Christ who does this (II, 23, 26-28). Such examples could be multiplied. See esp. Arai, ‘Christologie’; cf. Perkins, Gnostic Dialogue, 91-92. An analogy might be drawn between the ‘Christianizing’ of Ap. John, as argued here, and the controversial problem of the origins and literary development of Test. 12, Pair, on which see e.g. Becker, ‘Religious Syncretism’, and the studies cited in Collins, ‘Jewish Apocalypses,’ 57-58.

117 This is shown conclusively by Arai, ‘Christologie.’
where the concept of the Demiurge as an 'abortion' is traced to Jewish interpretation, both Alexandrian and Palestinian. For example, one can see reflected in it both the Alexandrian Jewish tradition that God created man's mortal nature to the angels (e.g. Philo, Fug. 68-70; cf. Plato, Timaeus 41A-42B) and the Palestinian tradition that God created man initially as a *golem* (e.g. Gen. Rabba 14:8).130

Finally, the role of Seth and his seed (II, 5) is developed out of Jewish traditions related to the birth and progeny of Seth. A number of recent studies have laid bare the essential points.131

Much of this material is found in other Gnostic texts, but it is clear that

118 MacRae, 'Jewish Background'; Dahl, 'Arrogant Archon,' 706-12.


120 Welburn, 'Identity of the Arclions.'

121 Dahl, 'Arrogant Archon.'


123 Klijn, *Seth*, 8:4-17; Stroumsa, *Another Seed* esp. 112-206; Pearson, 'The Figure of Seth.'

124 Another Seed. 80.

Ap. John is an exceedingly important document for the study of the Gnostic phenomenon and its history. The Jewish origins of its mythology are unquestionable, even if we cannot actually explain the Gnostic revolutionary hermeneutic as an organic development within Judaism.132

THE HYPOSTASIS OF THE ARCHONS

This tractate is also of prime importance for our consideration of Jewish Gnostic sources. It shares considerable material with Ap. John, and stands in an especially close relationship with Orig. World, though the latter is probably later, and represents a more advanced stage in the development of Gnostic religious syncretism.133 In its present form Hyp. Arch. is a Christian text, but it can easily be argued that its Christian features are attributable to a secondary Christianization of Jewish Gnostic material. They are primarily seen in the introduction, where the ‘great apostle’ (Paul) is quoted (Eph 6: 12), and in the concluding passage, where a number of allusions to the Johannine literature of the New Testament are to be found.134 Christian redaction is evident here and there in the body of the text as well. But before we proceed further with our discussion of this document, an outline of its content is in order:

Epistolary introduction (86, 20-27).
I. Commentary on Gen I-6. A. Introduction: 1) blasphemy of Samael (86, 27-3 1); 2) rebuke of the Demiurge and ensuing cosmogony (86,31-87,11).
B. Anthropogony: 1) appearance of the Image (87,11-23); 2) creation of man by the Archons (87,23-88,3); 3) vivification of man, naming the animals (88,3-24).
C. Adam in Paradise: 1) Adam placed in Paradise; prohibition against eating of the Tree of Knowledge (88,24-89,3); 2) creation of woman (89,3-17); 3) the Archons’ lust for Eve (89,17-31); 4) eating of the Tree, punishment of the Archons (89,3-19, 1, 11). D. Eve’s progeny: 1) Cain and Abel (91,11-30); 2) Seth and Norea (91,30-92,3).
II. Apocalypse of Norea. A. Setting: 1) Norea’s cry for help (92, 32-93,2); 2) appearance of Eleleth (93,2-17). B. Revelation dialogue: 1) inferiority of the Archons (93,18-32); 2) origin of the Archons: a) fall of Sophia (94,4-19, b) blasphemy and rebuke of Samael-Saklas (94,19-95,13), c) exaltation of Sabaoth (95,13-96,3), d) envy of Yaldabaoth and birth of his sons

132 See the introductory section of this article, above. Cf. also Stroumsa, Another Seed, 300.
133 NHC II, 86, 20-97, 2. Several editions of Hyp. Arch. have been published. The most recent are those of Layton and Barc. Bohig’s edition of Orig. World (Schrift ohne Titel) is still standard. For a perceptive study of biblical materials in Orig. World see Wintermute, ‘Gnostic Exegesis.’ See also Tardieu, Trois mythes gnostiques.
134 See Bullard, The Hypostasis of the Archons, 113-4.

As this outline shows, Hyp. Arch. is made up of two main parts, with some evident duplication of material. Part I consists essentially of a commentary on Gen 1-6. Part II consists of a revelation given to Norea by the angel Eleleth (one of the four luminaries encountered in Ap. John and other Sethian texts), in which Norea begins to speak in the first person as the putative mediator of Eleleth’s revelation (93,13). It is possible that the material in this second part of Hyp. Arch. is derived from a previously existing Apocryphon of Norea, which immediately reminds us of the references to books whose titles contain the name of this same figure, discussed above.135 Indeed, a plurality of books featuring the Gnostic heroine Norea seem to have been circulating in antiquity.136

The redaction of such sources as were used in Hyp. Arch. is quite thoroughgoing, and it is difficult precisely to recover them, although some scholars have tried to do so.137 For example, the transition from part I to part II is very skillfully done: the concluding narrative in the first part (I F) provides the occasion for the setting of the apocalypse in the second part. Moreover the main theme running through the entire work is the ‘reality’138 of the menacing Archons, from which the Gnostic is promised ultimate deliverance. Indeed the mythological deliverance of Norea is paradigmatic of the salvation of the Gnostic ‘children of light,’ her ‘offspring’ (97,13-14, 96,19).

There is widespread agreement that the material dealing with the exaltation of Saboath (II B, 2c in our outline) constitutes a distinct pericope within the larger revelation, and that this pericope and the parallel passage in Orig. World (NHC II, 103,32-106,18) derive from a common source.139

135 Pp. 446-5 S. Schenke suggests that an ‘apocalypse of Norea’ was a source used in common by Orig. World and Hyp. Arch.; see ‘Gnostic Sethianism,’ 596. However, there does not seem to be any specific correspondence between the material in Hyp. Arch. and the material said to be contained in the ‘Book of Norea’ in Orig. World (101, 26-102, 25). There are some features in common between the ‘Book of Nora’ described by Epiphanius (Haer. 26: 1,3-9) and the first part of Hyp. Arch. (i.e. item I E in our outline), but also some differences between them. The ‘apocalypse of Norea’ in part II, on the other hand, does not seem to be reflected in Epiphanius’ account.
137 The most complicated analysis is that of Barc, who posits three Jewish Gnostic sources and two redactions (one Jewish Gnostic and one Christian Gnostic). See Hypostase des archontes, 1-48.
138 Layton’s interpretation of the word hypostasis; see ‘Hypostasis of the Archons’ (1976), 44.
139 See esp. Fallon, Enthronement of Saboath.
This passage constitutes, in fact, a piece of Gnostic ‘Merkabah mysticism.’\textsuperscript{140} It has the following structure: \textsuperscript{141} 


The entire pericope is built upon themes derived from various Jewish traditions, both Alexandrian and Palestinian. The figure of Sabaoth represents, of course, the Jewish God, who is partially rehabilitated by splitting the wicked and ignorant Creator into two: Yaldabaoth, banished to Tartaros, and his son, Sabaoth, now ‘repentant’,\textsuperscript{142} singing praises to Sophia, and installed in the seventh heaven.\textsuperscript{143} Sabaoth’s assumption into heaven places him in the role of the apocalyptic seer, such as Enoch,\textsuperscript{144} and his enthronement reflects his ambiguous role, that of the apocalyptic seer (Enoch-Metatron is the best \textit{example})\textsuperscript{145} and that of the Jewish God, YHWH Sabaoth. As part of his enthronement, he is given the biblical name, ‘God of the powers’ (\textit{θεός τῶν δυναμεων}), which reflects the Hebrew etymology of the name Sabaoth (\textit{Σαβαώθ}).\textsuperscript{146} The ‘chariot of the Cherubim’ is a designation found in the Greek Bible (\textit{αρμα τῶν Χερουβίων}, cf. 1 Chr 28: 18; Sir 49:8).\textsuperscript{147} but it also reflects, to some extent, the early stage of the Jewish Merkabah speculation based on Ezekiel’s vision (Ezek 1).\textsuperscript{148} The infinite multitude of ministering angels reflects a widespread apocalyptic tradition (e.g. \textit{1 Enoch} 40.1),\textsuperscript{149} while the placement of Zoe at

\textsuperscript{140} Cf. Gruenwald, \textit{Apocalyptic}. 112-118. In the immediately preceding context in \textit{Hyp. Arch.} (II B 2) the Demiurge, Samael-Skak-Sylabatool (all three names occur, cf. n. 127 above) claims to be the sole God, and is rebuked by \textit{a bath qol} from heaven. (On the ‘blasphemy of the Demiurge,’ see my remarks on the relevant section of Ap. John, above, p. 463 and n. 129.) He then claims to be ‘God of the All,’ and is rebuked by Zöe (Eve, daughter of Sophia). She sends a fiery angel who binds him and throws him down to Tartaros, below the Abyss. The punish-


\textsuperscript{142} Stroumsa compares the repentance of Shemhazai, one of the fallen angels in the \textit{Midrash} of Shemhazai and Azazel, see Another Seed, 81.

\textsuperscript{143} His praise of Sophia seems to be derived from the Greek text of Prov 20:1 and 8:3 (\textit{υαλειέθαι}). \textit{See Fallon, Enthronement of Sabaoth}, 37.

\textsuperscript{144} \textit{Ibid.}, 35; cf. Gruenwald, Apocalyptic, 115.

\textsuperscript{145} Gruenwald, Apocalyptic, 115.

\textsuperscript{146} Fallon, \textit{Enthronement of Sabaoth}, 56.

\textsuperscript{147} \textit{Ibid.}, 57.

\textsuperscript{148} This is even clearer in the parallel in \textit{Orig. World}. Cf. Gruenwald, Apocalyptic, 114.

\textsuperscript{149} Fallon, \textit{Enthronement of Sabaoth}, 60.

\textsuperscript{150} The parallel in \textit{Orig. World} puts ‘Israel, the man who sees God’ (alias Jesus Christ), at Sabaoth’s right. The (false) etymology of the Hebrew name Israel, i.e. ‘man who sees God,’ is attested in \textit{Philo} (Post. 92; Abr. 57-59; etc.). Cf. Fallon, 106; Gruenwald, Apocalyptic, 115.

\textsuperscript{151} See Text. Abr. A12, wherein ‘angels of the right and of the left’ record, respectively, righteous deeds and sins. See Fallon \textit{ibid.}, 63.

\textsuperscript{152} See Abr 121: on either side of ‘He who IS’ (6\textit{Σω-ν}) are the two ‘powers’ (\textit{δυναμεοι}), the creative (\textit{δημιουρων}) whose name is God (\textit{Θεος}) and the royal (\textit{διακονων}) whose name is Lord (\textit{κυριος}). \textit{Bar. Hypothesis des Archontes}, 39-40. In \textit{Cher.} 27-28 \textit{Philo} says that the two powers symbolized by the Cherubim are called goodness (\textit{δικαιος}) and sovereignty (\textit{οικουμενα}).

\textsuperscript{153} The \textit{pargod} of Jewish mystical speculation. \textit{Cf. Fallon, Enthronement of Sabaoth}, 55; Gruenwald, Apocalyptic, 147, 204, 210-11; Scholens, Major Trends, 72.

\textsuperscript{154} Functionally, Zoe replaces the \textit{angels} \textit{interpres} of apocalyptic speculation, but there is also probably a reflex here of the word play on the Semitic name for Zoe: \textit{חנָה}, Eve; \textit{חנָה}, life, and \textit{חנָה}, Aram, to instruct; \textit{Fallon, Enthronement, 61}. Cf. Pearson, ‘Jewish Haggadic Traditions,’ 463-4.


\textsuperscript{156} See Pearson, ‘The Figure of Norea’; cf. now also Stroumsa, Another Seed, 78-91.

\textsuperscript{157} The text reads \textit{Noaba}, manifestly a corruption of Na’amah (Greek \textit{Ναομαι}); cf. Pearson, ‘The Figure of Norea,’ 149.

\textsuperscript{158} \textit{Ναομαι}, meaning ‘pleasing, lovely’ in Greek is \textit{Phaino}. The name Norea is a hybrid construction from Noama and Horaia. Pearson, ‘The Figure of Norea,’ 150.

\textsuperscript{159} See esp. Pirke de R. Eleazar 22; cf. Pearson, ‘The Figure of Norea,’ 150.

\textsuperscript{160} Other Gnostic text specifically identify her as the wife-sister of Seth (e.g. \textit{Iren. Adv. Haer.} 1:30, 9; Epiph. Haer. 39:5-2), a detail found also in at least one Jewish source: the \textit{Chronicles of Jerahmeel}, cf. Pearson, ‘The Figure of Norea,’ 149.
her birth: ‘And Eve became pregnant, and she bore [Norea]. And she said, he has begotten on [me a] virgin as an assistance for many generations of mankind. She is the virgin whom the Forces did not defile’ (91, 13-14).

‘He’ in the text refers to the supreme Father, not Adam. Seth, likewise, is said to have been born ‘through God’ (91, 33), in contrast to Cain, who is the product of the evil Archons (91, 12). Norea’s destiny to be an ‘assistance’ for mankind (Bon déia) recalls the role of Eve in Gen 2: 18, 20-22. Norea, indeed, emerges as a figure superior to Eve, not least in her chastity: a ‘virgin whom the Forces did not defile.’ The Gnostic portrayal of Norea thus stands in stark contrast to the reputation of Naamah in the Jewish haggadic traditions already referred to.

The story of Norea continues in the text in connection with the plan of the Archons to obliterate mankind in the Flood, and the command to Noah to build an ark (I E in our outline): ‘Then Orea came to him wanting to board the ark. And when he would not let her, she blew upon the ark and caused it to be consumed by fire. Again he made the ark, for a second time’ (92, 14-18).

This story of the burning of the ark is reported by Epiphanius, where our heroine is called Noria (Haer. 26: 1, 4-9), as a tradition current among the Nicolaitan Gnostics. According to this report Noria was Noah’s wife, and it is worth noting, in this connection, that there are some Jewish haggadic traditions in which Noah’s wife emerges as an evil woman, and tries to thwart the building of the ark. To be sure, the Gnostics regard the opposition to Noah in a positive light, which is altogether consistent with the revolutionary thrust of their hermeneutic.

Norea’s reputation as the ‘undefiled virgin’ is vindicated in the passage that follows (I F in our outline), wherein the Archons attempt to seduce the hapless Norea, as they claim they had done with her mother Eve: ‘You must render service to (i.e. sleep with) us, [as did] also your mother Eve…’ (92, 30-31). The outcome of this encounter, not explicitly stated in

162 Cf. Layton, ‘Hypostasis’, n. 84. This doctrine is derived from the Jewish (rabbinic) tradition that Cain was the son of Sammael; cf. Targum Ps. Jonathan on Gen 4: 1.
163 According to Barc, Hypostase des Archontes, 109, there is a play here on the traditional name of the wife of Seth, Azura (Jub. 4: 11), i.e. ‘she who assists.’ The MT of Gen 2: 2 has the word ייענה, which the LXX translates with the word Bon déia; this may, in fact, be the origin of the name Azura for the wife of Seth in Jubilees, i.e. another Eve. In Hyp. Arch. Norea also, is another Eve.
164 Cf. n. 158 above.
165 Cited above, p. 446.
166 Pearson, ‘The Figure of Norea’; cf. Stroumsa, Another Seed, 87-90.
167 There is an ambiguity in the story of the rape of Eve: on the one hand she turns into a tree in their clutches, yet on the other hand leaves a shadowy reflection of herself (i.e. her body) which the Archons defile (89, 25-30). On Eve’s becoming a tree cf. Pearson, ‘She Became a Tree’; cf. also Stroumsa, Another Seed, 54-60.
168 So Stroumsa, Another Seed, 60, n. 85.

our text, is that Norea is rescued from the clutches of the Archons by one (or all) of ‘the four holy helpers,’ about whom we read in the related text, the Thought of Norea. Our text does represent one of these ‘helpers,’ the light-angel Eleleth, as coming down in response to her cry for help (outline 11 A.1.1-2), and providing her with the revelation which constitutes the bulk of part II of Hyp. Arch.

In sum, the Gnostic myth of the encounter between Norea and the Archons is built upon Jewish traditions relating to the fall of the angels (Gen 6: 1-3), the story of the Fall (Gen 3), and the birth and progeny of Cain (Gen 4: 1).170

The salvation of Norea is paradigmatic of the salvation of all Gnostics, explicitly referred to in the text as her ‘offspring’ (96, 19). Norea is therefore presented in classic Gnostic fashion as a ‘saved saviour,’ akin to the figure of Sophia.171 It is also to be observed that Norea has virtually displaced Seth in this text, even if she is initially presented in juxtaposition with him. The usual ‘Sethian’ Gnostic emphasis upon Seth as the progenitor of Gnostic mankind has here been eclipsed by a ‘feminist’ perspective: Norea is progenetrix of Gnostic mankind. This, too, can be seen as an aspect of the Gnostic revolution.

While Ap. John and Hyp. Arch. are probably the most important examples of secondarily ‘Christianized’ products of Jewish Gnosticism, a number of other examples can be cited. They include: the Gospel of Mary (BG 1), sometimes regarded as a composite of two non-Christian documents; the Trimorphic Protennoia (NHC XIII, 1) which is closely related to the longer version of Ap. John; the Gospel of the Egyptians (NHC III, 2 and IV, 2), which displays a number of features in common with the Apocalypse of Adam and other Sethian texts; and the Book of Thomas the Contender (NHC II, 7), which may be a Christian redaction of a Hellenistic Jewish...
JEWISH SOURCES IN Gnostic Literature

pseudepigraphic epistle of the patriarch Jacob,\textsuperscript{176} Sources known from the church father Hippolytus might also be cited: the book Baruch (Ref. 5: 26, 1-27, 5),\textsuperscript{177} the Megalê Apophasis associated with Simon Magus (Ref. 6: 9, 4-18, 7),\textsuperscript{178} and the ‘Naassene Sermon’ (Ref. 6: 6, 3-9, 21).\textsuperscript{179}

**Jewish Gnostic Texts**

We turn, finally, to a consideration of documents which, in their entirety, have been regarded as Jewish Gnostic documents.

**THE APOCALYPSE OF ADAM**

This is one of the most important of all the extant Gnostic texts for the question of the existence of Jewish Gnostic literature. Its first editor, Böhlig,\textsuperscript{180} regards Apoc. Adam as a document of pre-Christian Sethian Gnosticism, with origins in a Jewish baptismal sect of the Syro-Palestinian area. Its most recent editor, MacRae, noting its close dependence upon Jewish apocalyptic traditions, suggests that it represents ‘a transitional stage in an evolution from Jewish to gnostic apocalyptic.’\textsuperscript{181} Formally, this document is both an apocalypse and a testament. It is an apocalypse in that it contains a revelation given by heavenly informants to Adam, who mediates the revelation to his son Seth. In general, it adheres closely to the apocalypse genre.\textsuperscript{182} It is a testament, with close formal connections with the Jewish testamentary literature, in that it is presented as a speech given by Adam to his son just before his death, ‘in the seven hundredth year’ (64, 4).\textsuperscript{183} Its lack of obviously Christian influence\textsuperscript{184} on the one hand, and its massive dependence upon Jewish traditions, on the other, make Apoc. Adam a primary test-case for the discussion of Jewish Gnosticism and Jewish Gnostic literature.

Its content can be outlined as follows:

**Introduction** (64, 1-5).

I. Setting: Adam’s testamentary speech to Seth. A. Adam relates his and Eve’s experiences with the Creator (64, 5-63, 23). B. Adam’s dream vision: three heavenly men and their addresses to him (65, 24-66, 8). C. Adam’s and Eve’s experiences (cont.) (66, 9-67, 14). D. Adam’s intention to reveal the heavenly revelation to Seth (67, 14-2 1).

II. The Revelation. A. The end of Adam’s generation (fragmentary material, 67, 22-28 + ). B. The Flood, first deliverance (69, 2-73, 29, p. 68 is blank). C. Destruction by fire, second deliverance (73, 30-76, 7). D. Third episode: end-time threat and redemption: 1) coming of the Illuminator (76, 8-77, 3); 2) the Powers’ wrath against the Illuminator (77, 4-18); 3) false and true views about the Illuminator: a) the Powers’ aporia (77, 18-27), b) the thirteen kingdoms (77, 27-82, 19), c) the generation without a king (82, 19-83, 4); 4) final struggle, repentance of the peoples (83, 4-84, 3); 5) condemnation of the peoples (84, 4-28); 6) final salvation of the Gnostics (85, 1-6). E. Revelations put on a high rock (85, 7-18).

First conclusion (85, 19-22). Second conclusion (85, 22-31). Title (85, 32).

The close parallels between Apoc. Adam and the Jewish Adam literature, especially the Life of Adam and Eve and the Apocalypse of Moses, have often been noted.\textsuperscript{185} These parallels are especially close in the first section, wherein Adam addresses Seth and gives him a biographical account of his and Eve’s adventures after the creation. The ‘slant,’ of course, is different. In Adam and Eve the two protoplasts have been banished from Paradise for their sin, and are duly repentant. In Apoc. Adam, on the other hand, Adam and Eve are by nature ‘higher than the god who had created us and the powers with him’ (64, 16-18). The Creator acts against Adam and Eve out of jealous wrath, in a manner reminiscent of the devil in Adam and Eve, banished from heaven because of his refusal to worship the newly created Adam (chs. 12-17).

The parallels extend also into the second part, which narrates the future history of mankind, focusing on the Gnostic seed of Seth, and organized around the three-fold pattern of flood, fire, and end-time. In Adam and Eve (49, 2-3) Eve reports what the archangel Michael had revealed to her and Adam concerning the coming flood and a subsequent judgment by fire. In

\textsuperscript{176} This work has heretofore been regarded as a purely Christian product of Syrian provenance; see Turner, Thomas the Contender; Perkins, Gnostic Dialogue, 100-107. However Schenke recently suggested that it is a Jewish pseudepigraph transformed into a dialogue between Christ and Judas Thomas. See Schenke, ‘The Book of Thomas.’

\textsuperscript{177} Foerster, Gri66i, 1. 48-58. Greek text: Vblker, Quellen, 27-33. On its Jewish character see e.g. Haenchen, ‘Das Buch Baruch’; Grant, Gnosticism, 19, 26; Kvideland, ‘Elohim’s Himmelfahrt.’

\textsuperscript{178} Foerster, Gri66i, 1, 251-60. Greek text: Volker, Quellen, 3-11. For a survey of recent scholarship see Rudolph, ‘Simon-Magus oder Gnosticus?’, esp. 302-10.

\textsuperscript{179} Foerster, Gri66i, 1, 261-62. Greek text: Volkier, Quellen, 1, 1-26. See also Frickel, ‘Naassener oder Valentinianer?’

\textsuperscript{180} Böhlig, Koptisch-Gnostische Apokalypsen, esp. p. 95; cf. Judische und Iransische’.\textsuperscript{181}


\textsuperscript{182} A disputed point; see below.

\textsuperscript{183} Cf. e.g. Perkins, ‘Apocalypse of Adam’; Pearson, ‘Figure of Seth,’ 492-4; Nickelsburg, ‘Some Related Traditions.’ The Armenian Adam books discussed by Stone (‘Armenian Adam Books’) should also be brought into the discussion.
Apoc. Adam the three angels’ revelation of the destructions by flood and fire (Sodom and Gomorrah!), as well as the end-time struggle, are part of the Creator’s attempt to destroy the Gnostic race. The reference at the end of Apoc. Adam to revelations written on rock (85, 10-14) recalls the tradition found at the end of Adam and Eve (ch. 50-5 1) that the revelations given by Adam and Eve were to be preserved by Seth on stone and clay to survive the coming judgments of flood and fire.186 These formal parallels, and others not treated here, lend a great deal of plausibility to the suggestion that Apoc. Adam and Adam and Eve share common sources.187

The essential point about Apoc. Adam, however, is that, from beginning to end, it is a Gnostic document in which numerous Jewish traditions, indeed the genre itself (apocalyptic testament), are thoroughly reinterpreted in the interests of a higher gnosis. With consummate irony the Gnostic author sets forth the ‘real truth’ concerning the heavenly origin of the spiritual ‘seed of Seth’ (the Gnostics) and the utterly folly of servitude to the Creator.188 It is a Jewish Gnostic document in the sense that its genre, and its building-blocks are derived from Judaism. But in its intentionality it is anti-Jewish in the extreme, a product of the Gnostic revolt against the Jewish religion and the Jewish God.

Some scholars have found traces of Christian influence in Apoc. Adam, especially in the section dealing with the career of the saviour (II D, 1-2 in our outline. E.g.: ‘Then they will punish the flesh of the man upon whom the holy spirit has come’ (77, 16-18). It is alleged that this is a veiled reference to Christ.189 But there is no need to see such a reference to Christ here, particularly in view of the fact that the entire context adheres to a pre-Christian Jewish literary pattern dealing with the earthly persecution and subsequent exaltation of the righteous man.190 The conclusion drawn by Perkins in this connection is apposite: ‘We see that from beginning to end Apoc. Adam invokes literary models developed in Jewish intertestamental writings. And it is equally clear that he uses them against their original intent: the God of Israel and those faithful to him are mocked; the Gnostics exalted.’191

The excursus on the various interpretations of the Illuminator’s coming (outline, II D 3) has given rise to a number of interesting comments on the religious syncretism of Apoc. Adam.192 Thirteen ‘kingdoms’ are listed, each with a different interpretation of the Illuminator, each of them ending with the clause, ‘and thus he came to the water.’ This passage has been utilized to prove the Christian provenance of the document.193 However the phrase, ‘he came to the water,’ does not necessarily refer to baptism. Rather, it may be a reference to the saviour’s descent.194 The opposite line of argument is that the first twelve kingdoms, to whom the saviour comes in various disguises, represent the twelve tribes of Israel, while the thirteenth kingdom represents the Christian church, with its reference to the logos which is said to have ‘received a mandate there’ (82, 13-15). The Gnostic community, on the other hand, is represented by the ‘generation without a king over it’ (82, 19-20), of those alone have true knowledge concerning the identity of the saviour, namely the earthly Seth, and who alone constitute the ‘seed’ who ‘receive his (i.e. the saviour’s) name upon the water’ (83, 4-6). Apoc. Adam, then, represents a strain of Sethian Gnosticism resistant and in reaction to the Christianizing of Sethian gnosis.195

In conclusion, no certainty can be achieved on the question of the date of Apoc. Adam. Typologically it is a ‘pre-Christian’ text inasmuch as it ad-

186 Cf. Pearson, ‘Figure of Seth,’ 492-5, 502-3; Stroumsa, Another Seed, 157-87.
187 See esp. Nicholas, ‘Some Related Traditions,’ 537: Apoc. Adam and Adam and Eve are dependent upon a previously existing apocalypse of Adam influenced by Enochic traditions. Hedrick has recently published an analysis (The Apocalypse of A & G) in which he isolates two main sources plus redaction. He dates the final redaction to the end of the first century C.E. The starting point for his source-analysis is the presence of what he takes to be two introductory sections at the beginning of the tractate (64, 6-7, 21), and two conclusions at the end (85, 19-3 1). These observations, in my mind, are ore cogent than his division of the body of the revelation proper into two sources (seep. 181), which in effect breaks up the triadic structure of the Gnostic history of salvation, based on the flood, fire, and end-time struggle, which is an essential feature of the revelation. I would, however, suggest that the n dealing with the ‘false and true views about the Illuminator’ (II D 3 in our outline) is a redactional excursus. Böhlmg (Koptisch-Gnostische Apokalypse,87,91-83,109) regards 77,27-83,4 as an excursus; MacRae sees this passage as an interpolation (in his introduction in Parrott, Nag Hammadi Codices V, 2-5 and VZ, 152). For a contrary view see Stroumsa, Another Seed, 129-57.
188 Superbly treated by Perkins, ‘Apocalypse of Adam.’
189 See Beltz, Adam-Apokalypse. Beltz regards Apoc. Adam — even with all of its ‘Jewish building blocks’ — as a late (third century) product with clear Christian influences. Cf. also Yamauchi, Pre-Christian Gnosticism, 107-115 (esp. 110), 217-38; and most recently, Shellrude, ‘Apocalypse of Adam.’ It is noteworthy that Schenke, on the other hand, has retracted his earlier objection to Böhlming’s view that Apoc. Adam is a pre-Christian document: ‘Gnostc Sethianism,’ 607.
190 This pattern has been delineated by Nickelsburg (Resurrection, 481-11) with reference to Wis 1-6 and other ancient Jewish literature. In Apoc. Adam this pattern is fully represented: (1) Earthly persecution: signs and wonders of the Illuminator (77, 1-3); conspiracy against him (77, 4-15); punishment of the Illuminator (77, 6-18). (2) Exaltation: the peoples acknowledge their sin (83,4-84,3); condemnation of the peoples (84, 4-28); exaltation of the elect (85, 1-18). Cf. Perkins, ‘Apocalypse of Adam,’ 590-1.
191 Ibid., 391.
193 Shellrude, ‘Apocalypse of Adam,’ 89-90, interprets the references to water to mean that the Gnostics’ opponents lay claim to the same saviour as the Gnostic community, and that baptism is associated with their acceptance of him. The conclusion is that the Gnostics’ opponents are orthodox Christians; the Gnostics themselves are Christian Gnostics opposed to water baptism.
194 So MacRae, in Parrott, Nag Hammadi Codices V, 2-5 and VZ, 179. This whole question turns on the interpretation of 83,4-85,18. See MacRae ibid., 190-5, and esp. Stroumsa, Another Seed, 153-6.
195 Stroumsa, Another Seed, 144-57. The Gospel of the Egyptians, with which Apoc. Adam shares much material (above, n. 175) represents that other side of Sethian gnosis.
heres to a very early type of Gnosticism, in which Jewish features are clearly displayed, and no positive Christian influence is clearly present. Nevertheless, it may be a comparatively late document (second or third century?) if the above interpretation of the ‘thirteenth kingdom’ is correct. Its possible, relationships with Mandaean and Manichaean forms of the Gnostic religion deserve further investigation.  

POIMANDRES

At first glance it may seem strange to discuss this fundamental work of the Graeco-Egyptian Hermetic religion (Corpus Hermeticum I) as a ‘Jewish Gnostic’ document. To be sure, it is widely understood as a Gnostic document, one of a number of Hermetic tractates so designated. Its title is the name given to the god who reveals himself in it, otherwise called ‘The Mind of the Absolute’ (ὁ πνεῦμα τῆς αὐτοτεθέας νοοῦ). The recipient of the revelation is unnamed but is traditionally identified as Hermes Trismegistus (cf. C.H. XIII, 15), the revealer-god par excellence in Graeco-Egyptian syncretism (the Egyptian Thoth).

In form, Poimandres is an apocalypse. Its content can be outlined as follows:

I. Introduction: Epiphany of Poimandres (ch. 1-3).
II. The Revelation. A. Cosmogony (4-11). B. Anthropology: 1) anthropogony: the ‘fall’ of Man (12-19); 2) ethics and the nature of man (20-23). C. Eschatology: individual ascent to God (24-26).
III. The prophet’s mission (27-29).
IV. Conclusion: hymns and prayers (30-32).

The structure of the document as a whole is very similar to that of 2 Enoch. Indeed, the parallels are so close that literary dependence of Poimandres upon 2 Enoch could easily be argued. The cosmogony and anthropogony are obviously dependent upon the Greek version of the book of Genesis, though of course they contain influences from disparate sources. Poimandres’ use of the book of Genesis has been demonstrated in detail by Dodd, who also notes numerous influences throughout this document from other portions of the Bible and calls attention to important resemblances to Philo of Alexandria and other Hellenistic-Jewish literature. To be sure, Dodd notes the heavy indebtedness of the document to contemporary Platonism and Stoicism (an indebtedness which is shared by Philo), and its (typically Gnostic) emphasis on gnosis as the basis of salvation. While he argues persuasively for its heavy indebtedness to Hellenistic Judaism, Dodd does not go so far as to call it a ‘Jewish’ document.

More recently this very step has been taken by Ludin Jansen, who argues that the Jewish emphasis in Poimandres is so pervasive that it must have been written by a Jew who had personally lived through the mystical experiences described in the ‘autobiographical’ sections of the text (I and II) in our outline. His conclusion is that Poimandres is a Jewish Gnostic text.

This judgment can easily be strengthened by the results of recent studies which have shown that the concluding chapters (IV in our outline) are fragments of Jewish liturgy, prayers and worship formulae actually utilized in the worship life of Hellenistic Jewish synagogues in the diaspora, including the shema, the kedusha, and the amida. It is therefore certain that the Hellenistic Jewish influences in the Poimandres are not only such as would be available to a pagan reader of the Septuagint and other Jewish II terature; in addition, actual participation in Jewish worship is indicated.

Yet Poimandres cannot adequately be defined, simply, as just another Jewish apocalypse. For one thing, it is a Gnostic text, in that it posits a dualism of heavenly light versus a natural world of darkness, distinguishes between a higher God and a lower Demiurge (a second ‘Mind’, ch. 9), and equates knowledge of the self with knowledge of God (ch. 18, 21, 27-28), presenting this gnosis as the very basis of ultimate salvation and ascent to God. To be sure, its dualism is not expressed in such radical terms as that of some of the Gnostic texts we have already treated, in which the Creator is presented as a vengeful and ignorant demon. In the final analysis, Poimandres represents a religious transition, from Judaism to a new religion: from the religion of Moses to that of Hermes the ‘Thrice-Greatest."

OTHER GNOSTIC TEXTS WITH JEWISH INFLUENCE

In concluding this section reference must be made to other Gnostic texts in which no Christian influence is present but which contain indications of Jewish background or influence. They are noted here for the sake of a complete presentation of the evidence.

The Paraphrase of Shem (NHC VII, 1, 49-11) is an apocalypse in which Shem is snatched up to heaven and receives a revelation from a heavenly
being called 'Derdakeas' (Aram. ידוקא, 'child') concerning the primary 'roots' of reality (Light, Darkness, Spirit) and the origin and fate of the world. 

The document uses and reinterprets biblical material, especially Genesis, and also shows a number of features of possible Iranian origin. It shows no traces of Christianity but a Christianized version of the same basic Gnostic system is preserved by Hippolytus in his discussion of the 'Sethian' Gnostics (Ref. 5: 19, 1-22, 1).

Zostrianos (NHC VIII.1) is an apocalypse in which the protagonist, Zostrianos, is guided on an otherworldly journey by an angelic informant and given knowledge concerning the various aeons of the heavenly world. Its possible dependence upon 2 Enoch has already been mentioned.

The Three Steles of Seth (NHC VII.5) is a 'revelation of Dositheos about the three steles of Seth' (118, 10-12), consists of praises sent up to each member of the Sethian divine triad, 'Geradamas' (the Son), 'Barbelo' (the Mother), and the supreme Father. Its Jewish features belong more to the traditional background than to the foreground, in which Platonist philosophical traditions predominate.

This last observation can be made with even greater emphasis regarding

**[206]** See esp. Fallon, *Gnostic Apocalypses,* 136-7; Wisse, *Redeemer Figure.* On 'Derdakeas' see Wisse, 133, n. 3; Stroumsa, *Another Seed,* 122.


**[208]** Hippolytus refers to a book called the *Paraphrase of Seth,* in which the whole Sethian system is said to be laid out (Ref. 5: 22, 1). The question naturally arises as to the exact nature of the relationship between the *Paraphrase of Seth* and Hippolytus' *Paraphrase of Sem,* and whether or not the former should be regarded as a Sethian Gnostic document. Its character as a Jewish sectarian document remains to be defined with greater precision than has thus far been achieved. See e.g. Foerster, *Gnosis* 1, 299-305; Bertrand, *Paraphrase de Sem*; Troger, *Gnosis und N. T.* 57-59. The phrase 'Jewish sectarian documents' is used by Segal, *Two Powers,* 253.


**[210]** Above, p. 455f. The prophetic exhortation found at the end (Fr. VIII 130, 14-13, 4) resembles that found at the end of *Poimandres* (ch. 27-29). Its dependence upon Jewish traditions is evident, but how far in the Sethian Gnostic background these traditions lie, i.e. to what extent it may be termed a Jewish Gnostic document, remains to be determined. Its heavy indebtedness to Middle Platonism is an important ingredient in the discussion. We know that considerable effort was put forth in the school of Plotinus in Rome to combat its doctrines. Amelius wrote a 40-volume refutation of it, according to Porphyry, *Vit. Plot.* 16.


**[212]** On the name Geradamas (or Pigeradamas) see Jackson, *Geradamas.* The praises are such as would be offered in an experience of intellectual ascent, but may also reflect actual (Sethian Gnostic) ritual practice. So Schenke, *Gnostic Sethianism,* 601-2. The occurrence of the name 'Dositheos' in this text has given rise to speculations about a possible Samaritan connection. See e.g. Beltz, *Samaritanerund Gnosis,* esp. 94-5. Schenke, who had earlier subscribed to this view, has had second thoughts. See *Gnostic Sethianism,* 592-3. On Dositheus and the Dositheians see Isser, *The Dositheans.*

Marsanes (NHC X) is a Sethian Gnostic apocalypse which reflects a situation of lively dialogue between Gnostics and Platonists such as is clearly represented in the school of Plotinus in third-century Rome. The putative author of the tractate, Marsanes, is mentioned by Epiphanius as one of the Gnostic prophets revered by the 'Archontic' (Sethian) Gnostics in Palestine (Hauk. 40:7, 6). He and Nicotheos are also held in high honour by the author of the untitled tractate in the Bruce Codex, another document of Sethian Gnosticism.

A Ilogenes (NHC XI, 3) is a Sethian Gnostic apocalypse featuring a revelation discourse in which 'Allogenès ( = Seth) records for his son 'Messos' the revelation he has received from a female heavenly being called 'Youel' (whose name is derived from esoteric Jewish sources). Again, in the case of A Ilogenes, as also of the Thought of Norea (NHC IX, 2), which has already been mentioned, it can be said that Jewish features are part of the Gnostic tradition which is utilized.

Eugnostos has been mentioned above in connection with our discussion of Ap. John. Its presentation of the unknown God and the heavenly world, based in large measure on speculative interpretations of Genesis, could easily belong to a 'Jewish Gnostic' document.

Hypsiphorne (NHC XI, 4) appears to be a Gnostic apocalypse, containing visions seen by a female figure called 'Hypsiphorne' ('high-minded'), but it is too badly preserved to allow any judgments on the question at issue here.

The Thunder, Perfect Mind (NHC VI, 2) is a revelation discourse presented by a female revealer in the first person, containing numerous self-predications of a deliberately paradoxical character (e.g.: 'I am the whore and the holy one; I am the wife and the virgin' — 13, 18-20). Quispel, in an extensive study, regards The Thunder as a pre-Christian (3rd-1st cent. B.C.E.), pre-Gnostic Jewish document in which the revealer is the biblical
Conclusions

From the evidence considered above it can easily be seen that the Gnostics utilized and created a great number of books. In addition to the books of the Old Testament — Torah (especially Genesis), Prophets, and Writings, both in Greek and in Hebrew — a large number of apocryphal Jewish books were used by them. We have taken special notice of the popularity of the Enoch literature in Gnostic circles, but pseudopigraphical writings attributed to other Old Testament patriarchs, especially Adam and Seth, were also heavily used. Indeed it can be observed that Jewish apocryphal texts, especially those featuring midrashic reworking of biblical traditions, served as models for the Gnostics’ own literary productions. The Apocalypse of Adam is an especially clear illustration of this. Even the Gnostic dialogue form, employed in a number of Christian Gnostic texts, can be regarded as a development of one feature of the Jewish apocalyptic in which the recipient of the revelation questions an angelus interpres concerning aspects of his heavenly journey or vision.226

222 Quispel, ‘Jewish Gnosis’, calls attention to the parallels between Thunder and a hymnic passage attributed to Eve in Orig. World (II, II.14, §15) and similar parallels between Thunder and a Mandaean text from the Book of Daminakht in the Right Ginz, wherein ‘Ewath, the Holy Spirit’ is quoted in a similar vein (ibid., p. 105; cf. Lidzbarski, Ginz, 207; MacRae, ‘The Thunder’, esp. 1-6). This leads Quispel to extended comments on the Jewish origins of Mandaean Gnosticism. His views on the Jewish background of Thunder have much to commend them, even if one cannot subscribe to all of his arguments.

223 Pearson, ‘The Thunder.’ The female revealer of Thunder is, in fact, remarkably reminiscent of the traditional portrayal of Simon’s Helen. Cf. the table of parallels ibid., 12-13. See further Rudolph, ‘Simon,’ 353-4, for discussion, with reference to other relevant literature. The Exegesis on the Soul (NHC 11.6) has also been brought into connection with Simonian Gnosis; cf. Rudolph, ‘Simon,’ 354-9.

224 Cf. Quispel’s discussion in ‘Jewish Gnosis.’ See esp. Rudolph’s numerous publications on Mandaeanism. e.g. Gnosis, 344-66; and his translation of the texts, with introduction, in Foerster, Gnosis2, 121-317.

225 See e.g. Cohm-Sherbok, ‘The Alphabet,’ a discussion of the relationship between certain secret Mandaean texts and the Jewish Sefer Yetsirah.


It must also be stressed that much of the Jewish traditional material so radically reworked by the Gnostic writers must have circulated orally. Basic ingredients of the Gnostic cosmogonic and anthropogonic mythology are based upon Jewish haggadic traditions which eventually came to be recorded in writing in various rabbinc midrash collections or in the haggadic portions of the Talmud. Gnostic literary production represents, in effect, an aspect of the general transition observable not only in Judaism but in the wider context of the Hellenistic-Roman world from ‘oral’ to ‘literary’ religious expression.227 What is especially interesting in this connection is that Gnostic texts frequently preserve exegetical traditions which are recorded only later within rabbinc Judaism in written form, sometimes much later.228

To be sure, one can observe in the Gnostic sources the presence of Gnostic themes, patterns, lines of argument, etc., which seem to be the focus of on-going discussion and lively debate in Gnostic intellectual circles. For example, the Gnostic pattern featuring the ‘blasphony’ or ‘vain claim’ of the Demiurge — itself based upon Jewish texts and exegetical traditions — occurs in a number of extant Gnostic texts. Yet the differences among them in details seem to preclude the literary dependence of one text upon another. What is found here is a common tradition, subject to refinement in this or that Gnostic book.229

Throughout our discussion of the Gnostic material we have noted the ambiguous relationship between the Gnostic texts and Judaism. Time and again we saw evidence of Jewish scriptures and traditions turned upside-down in a drastic reorientation of values and perceived religious truth. Indeed we began this essay with some general observations on the difficulty of appraising, historically, the actual relationship between the Gnostic religion and Judaism. But it must finally be borne in mind that ‘Judaism’ is not easy to define, at least not for the Second Temple period. To speak of any kind of ‘normative’ Judaism or Jewish orthodoxy before the end of the first century C.E. is anachronistic and contrary to the evidence. The plethora of Jewish sects and religious movements in pre-70 Judaism is a well-established fact, and is becoming even clearer as a result of new discoveries and new research.230 It is not, really, more difficult to conceive of groups of Jewish radicals, yes Jewish Gnostics, as a part of the religious maestrom of Judaism, than it is to recognize the historical fact that the Christian religion itself originated as a Jewish messianic sect. As an illustration, we may with Gruenwald cite a saying of R. Yohanan (P. T. San...
hedrin 10, 29c) to the effect that 'the people of Israel did not go into exile before they had become twenty-four sects of heretics.'

The Gothic historian Jordanes calls the Scandinavian peninsula ('Scandza') a 'factory of peoples' and a 'womb of nations' (officina gentium, vagina nationum — Getica 4, 25), referring to the hordes of tribes and peoples who came out of the north and spread all over Europe in the Migration Period. In an analogous sense we can speak of Judaism as a matrix religionum, producing not only a plethora of ephemeral sects and parties but also major world religions. Christianity and Islam are obvious cases, but the Gnostic religion, which in its Manichaean form actually became a world religion, can also be considered in this context.

Large gaps in our knowledge of the origin and early development of the Gnostic religion do remain, in the final analysis. Of the vast literary production of the ancient Gnostics, we have in our extant sources — now available as a result of chance discoveries — only the proverbial 'tip of the iceberg.'
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231 'Jewish-Gnostic Controversy,' 714.

232 'Rudolph, Gnosis-Weltreligion.'
Chapter Twelve

Qumran Sectarian Literature

Devorah Dimant

The Site and the Community

In the spring of 1947, the accidental uncovering of scrolls hidden in a cave near Jericho led to one of the most spectacular discoveries of the century, namely that of the oldest Hebrew literary manuscripts, now known as the Dead Sea Scrolls. Between 1948 and 1956, eleven caves with manuscripts (designated as caves 1-11) were discovered near the site known as Khirbet Qumran, on the north corner of the western shore of the Dead Sea. The findings aroused interest in the site of Qumran itself, and systematic excavations were conducted. At the same time an archaeological survey was made of the entire area between Qumran and Ein Feshkha, a site near a spring, three kilometers south of Qumran. Pottery and other remains found at Qumran, in the caves and near Ein Feshkha, point to the same period of settlement and to the same people. The main periods of occupation at Qumran correspond to the dates of the scrolls. Qumran was inhabited mainly between 150 B.C.E. and 68 C.E. The remains of a small Israelite settlement, dating from the 8th to the 6th centuries B.C.E., were resettled during the reign of Simon (142-134 B.C.E.). During this first major occupation period, extensive building took place and the settlement acquired its definitive shape: a large enclosure with a network of cisterns and water channels, workshops, a warehouse and an assembly hall. This period terminates with a great fire and an earthquake, possibly the earthquake of 31

1 The story of the discovery has been told many times. Cf. Milik, Ten Years, 11-19; Cross, Library, 3-20; Vermes, Qumran in Perspective, 9-24.
3 Cf. the summary of De Vaux, Archaeology, the head of the excavations. Another, more recent resume of the archaeological evidence was published by Laperrousaz, Qumran. He bases himself mainly on De Vaux’s work, but supplements it and differs from it in the interpretation of a number of details. Carbon 14 tests of organic remains indicate a span of time around the beginning of the Era. Cf. De Vaux, Archaeology, 50, 101.
4 Sometimes identified with the biblical City of Salt (Josh 15:61-62). Cf. Milik — Cross, ‘Chronique,’ 75; De Vaux, Archaeology, 922. Recently Bar-Adon suggested an identification with the biblical Sekakah, while the City of Salt he identifies with Ein Aturaba, south of Ein Ghweir. Both cities figure in the same list in Joshua 15; cf. Bar-Adon, ‘Hasmonean Fortresses,’ 352.
5 Cf. Milik, Ten Years, 51; De Vaux, Archaeology, 19; Cross, Library, 58, 122.
The majority of the manuscripts date from between the second century B.C.E. and the third quarter of the first century C.E. Scrolls older than the beginning of the Qumran settlement must have been brought there from outside. The close chronological correspondence between the archeology of the remains and the palaeography of the scrolls justifies the conclusion that the people who inhabited the site were identical with those who composed or copied the scrolls. Hence, data from the site and the scrolls were combined to reconstruct the life and history of the people involved.

Two other settlements, probably connected with the inhabitants of Qumran, were discovered in the vicinity. One is an agricultural complex near the spring of Ein Feshkha, the other is Ein el Ghuweir, fifteen kilometers south of Qumran. In the small cemetery adjacent to Ein el Ghuweir, the same peculiar burial method was discovered, again containing skeletons of women and children. Consequently, the excavator concluded that the settlement belonged to the community of Qumran, i.e. to the Essenes. The peculiar character of Qumran, namely that it lacks buildings suitable for living, led the archaeologists to conclude that it served as a centre for communal life; the installations suit communal activities, and Qumran is assumed to have served only for such purpose, while the members of the community lived in the surrounding area in huts or caves.

With the absence of any self-designation in the scrolls, the first attempts to identify the community covered almost the whole range of Jewish sects known from classical sources. The explanation which thus far accounts best for most of the data, identifies Qumran as the centre of the Essene movement. The Essenes are well-known from a number of ancient accounts, the most reliable of which are the observations of Pliny the Elder, Philo and Josephus. The picture of the Essenes emerging from these sources is strikingly similar to what one gathers from the scrolls and the Qumran site:

a) Geographical information: Pliny describes the Essene settlement as located north of Ein-Gedi (Infra hos Engada). It suits the location of Qumran well.

b) Social and religious practices. Both sets of data speak of a community whose members share property, work and study, take meals together in a
ceremonial way and observe a strict state of ritual purity. Both have an elaborate procedure of admitting new members, and are strictly organized by ranks. They have a body of special teachings, most of which was kept secret. Religious ideas such as predestination, which Josephus ascribes to the Essenes, equally fit in with the ideology of the scrolls.  

c) Historical setting. Josephus introduced his account of the Essenes as one of the "three Jewish philosophies", while discussing the reign of Jonathan (160-142 B.C.E.; Ant. 13: 171). This corresponds to the beginning of the main period of occupation at Qumran and to the chronology established by the scrolls. Furthermore, most of the historical allusions contained in various sectarian works, fall within the Hasmonean Period.  
d) The Temple Scroll. Additional arguments in favour of identifying the Qumran community with the Essenes are provided by the Temple Scroll. The strict halakhic views of the scroll fit into our information about the Essenes. Specifically, the scroll prescribes the building of a sanitary installation outside the Temple-City, while Josephus tells of a similar installation serving the Essenes. Furthermore, Josephus states that the Essenes considered oil as rendering impure, which may be reflected in the Temple Scroll.  

The Qumran Library  

The body of documents found at Qumran restores to us some of the lost literary riches produced in Eretz-Israel during the Second Commonwealth Era. The collection contains literary documents of a most varied nature, most of them of religious character. Apart from the oldest biblical manuscripts in our possession, many fragments come from works previously unknown, while others yield the original Hebrew or Aramaic versions of apocryphal or pseudepigraphical works hitherto known only in translations. Yet among this varied literary debris, a group of documents is discernable, distinctive in style and ideology, relating to the life and beliefs of a community identical to the one settled at Qumran. It is with this literature that the present chapter is concerned, a literature to be designated hereafter as 'the sectarian literature'.  

The best-preserved and the most typical works in this category are the Rule of the Community, the Damascus Covenant, the Thanksgiving Psalms...
(Hodayot), the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness (War Scroll) and the biblical commentaries known as *Pesharim*.\(^{34}\)

Practically all the sectarian writings published to date are written in Hebrew, while the Aramaic is reserved for Apocryphal and narrative works.\(^{34}\) The Hebrew is a literary language, developed directly from later biblical Hebrew, but sharing many traits with the later Mishnaic Hebrew.\(^{35}\) The Aramaic used in the non-sectarian compositions is a literary dialect belonging to the Middle Aramaic, current in Eretz-Israel and the vicinity between 200 B.C.E. and 200 C.E.\(^{36}\) The languages spoken at Qumran were probably Mishnaic Hebrew\(^{37}\) and Aramaic.

The scrolls were copied on papyrus or leather, but the leather proved more durable and has survived. The scrolls exhibit the *scribal* conventions and techniques generally prevalent in the Jewry of the Second Common-wealth.\(^{38}\) The writing is in the square Hebrew script and occasionally in Palaeo-Hebrew. In some manuscripts Palaeo-Hebrew is employed to copy the Tetragrammaton YHWH.\(^{39}\) Some biblical manuscripts, all of Palestinian origin, are written in this script throughout.\(^{40}\)

Unlike medieval Hebrew manuscripts, the Qumran scrolls are not dated, and the Qumran manuscripts falls between the third century B.C.E. and the third quarter of the first century C.E.\(^{41}\) The majority of the manuscripts are assigned to 50 B.C.E. to 68 C.E.\(^{41}\) No sectarian writing survived in a copy earlier than the last quarter of the second century B.C.E.

This could be interpreted to mean that the literary activity of the sect belonged to the second phase of its existence. But the picture is more complex. Significantly, within the sectarian literature itself two categories can be discerned. The first group consists of works surviving in more than one copy, of which at least one dates to the beginning of the first century B.C.E. All of these works are composite and seem to have had a literary history. They include: the *Rule of the Community*, the Damascus Covenant, the War Scroll and the Thanksgiving Scroll. The second group consists mainly of the *Pesharim*. All of them reached us in single copies dating between 50 B.C.E. and 68 C.E. Furthermore, some *Pesharim* contain references to Roman times and in this case it may be inferred that they are autographs and belong to the latter phase of the sectarian history, in contradistinction to the first group.\(^{42}\)

Yet two considerations point to the possibility that the *Pesharim* in general originate from the early phase of the sect’s history. First, some of them may exhibit traces of a literary history.\(^{43}\) Secondly, their exegetical method and literary form are attested in older works. Furthermore; both the Damascus Covenant and the *Pesharim* are composite and seem to have had a literary history. They include: the *Rule of the Community*, the Damascus Covenant, the War Scroll and the Thanksgiving Scroll. The second group consists mainly of the *Pesharim*. All of them reached us in single copies dating between 50 B.C.E. and 68 C.E. Furthermore, some *Pesharim* contain references to Roman times and in this case it may be inferred that they are autographs and belong to the latter phase of the sectarian history, in contradistinction to the first group.\(^{42}\)

The Library of Qumran yielded several examples of ‘rules’, i.e. collections of various rules, regulations and religious instructions. They are, usually no
indicated by the term *serekh* (סְרֵךְ) meaning rule, order: and thus a *serekh* is a set of rules. There are two examples of rules concerned with the actual life and organisation of the sectarian community: The *Rule of the Community* and the second part of the Damascus *Covenant*. Two other examples deal with eschatological situations: the *War Scroll* lays down the rule for the final war, and the *Rule of the Congregation* discusses the future messianic banquet. Perhaps the work known as the *Benedictions* (*IQS*) which contains eschatological blessings also formed a kind of rule.

By its very nature, a rule presents an ideal pattern of behaviour. Yet the prescriptions of rules such as the *Rule of the Community* and the Damascus *Covenant* show close resemblance to Josephus' and Philo's descriptions of Essene practice. We may assume, then, that the rules largely reflect the actual practice of the groups behind them.

The literary genre of rule is unknown in Jewish literature outside Qumran, but it resembles the regulations of various societies in the Hellenistic world.

**THE DAMASCUS COVENANT**

The work currently known as the Damascus *Covenant* or the Zadokite Documents is the only sectarian document to have been known before the discoveries at Qumran. Found in the Geniza of the old Karaite synagogue at Cairo, it was published by Solomon Schechter as a Pharisaic sectarian document. But with the first publications of scrolls from Qumran, the numerous affinities of style and terminology between the Damascus *Covenant* and the scrolls suggested that they belonged to the same group. This was confirmed by the discovery of fragments of the Covenant in several Qumran caves. A copy of it may have come into the hands of the Karaites through an ancient discovery of manuscripts and may have been copied, and eventually preserved in the Geniza. Two important facts emerge from the state of the manuscripts: Manuscripts from cave 4 point to a different text, perhaps a different recension; although most of the copies are Herodian, the existence of one copy from 100-75 b.c.e. situates the composition of the work not later than 100 b.c.e.

The extant text from the Geniza falls into two distinct parts, each of a different character: a) leaves l-8 (MS.A) and 19-20 (MS.B). Usually labelled as the Admonition, it contains admonitions, moral addresses and historical teachings; b) leaves 9-16 contain halakhic legal prescriptions and sectarian regulations, partly constituting a Rule proper. Although of a distinct nature, the two parts are closely interrelated in ideas and style. The opening of the admonition is especially instructive in this respect:

And in the Epoch of Wrath, three hundred and ninety years (Ezek 4:5) after He had given them into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon (Jer 27:6), He visited them and He caused to grow forth from Israel and Aaron a root (Isa 60:2) of cultivation to possess His land (Ps 37:29) and to wax fat in the goodness of His soil. And they considered their trespass and they knew that they were guilty men. But they were like blind and like them they grope (their) way (Isa 59:10) for twenty years. And God considered their works, for with a perfect heart (1 Chr 29:9) did they seek Him; and He raised for them a Teacher of Righteousness (Hos 10:12) to lead them in the way of His heart (CD 1:5-12).

This passage takes up history from the point where God's punishment has lasted three hundred and ninety years. At the end of this period, God 'visited' Israel and caused a 'root of cultivation' to grow from Israel and Aaron. Thus the appearance of the group in question is described. Both 'visitation' and 'root' are biblical terms overlaid with eschatological significance. Hence, the entire event should be read in an eschatological context.
perspective. The initial impulse for the group’s appearance is understood in the framework of the divine, forordained plan for history. Yet the members of the sect have their own role to play; they recognize their sin and acknowledge it, thus actually going through confession and repentance: In a response, God raises the ‘Teacher of Righteousness’ to instruct them. In an allusion to Hos 10: 12, this leader’s appellation, as well as the circumstances of his appearance, show him to be the divine Elect, inspired and sent to the sect to impart special teachings about ‘God’s way’.

Thus the sect’s point of departure appears to have been a double awareness: on the one hand the recognition of their own sinfulness and the need to repent; on the other, the conviction that they possessed the true teaching and revelation through the Teacher of Righteousness. This explains why the sectaries call themselves both ‘the Repenters of Israel’ and ‘the comers into the New Covenant’. In this context, the special teachings of the sectaries enable them to recognize the true way, and to practise true repentance in fidelity to the Torah of Moses. From the few allusions in the Damascus Covenant it seems that these teachings concerned a wide range of subjects, ‘hidden things concerning which all of Israel err’ (CD 3: 14); the Sabbaths, the Appointed Times, His Will. The list may refer to the distinctive halakah developed among the sectaries and perhaps also to the special exegetical method they elaborated to interpret the Torah and the prophets. The allusion to the Appointed Times may refer to the solar calendar espoused by the sect, which set the festivals on dates different to those prescribed in the Torah. This sect’s point of departure appears to have been a double awareness: on the one hand the recognition of their own sinfulness and the need to repent; on the other, the conviction that they possessed the true teaching and revelation through the Teacher of Righteousness. This explains why the sectaries call themselves both ‘the Repenters of Israel’54 and ‘the comers into the New Covenant’. In this context, the special teachings of the sectaries enable them to recognize the true way, and to practise true repentance in fidelity to the Torah of Moses. From the few allusions in the Damascus Covenant it seems that these teachings concerned a wide range of subjects, ‘hidden things concerning which all of Israel err’ (CD 3: 14); the Sabbaths, the Appointed Times, His Will. The list may refer to the distinctive halakah developed among the sectaries and perhaps also to the special exegetical method they elaborated to interpret the Torah and the prophets.54 The allusion to the Appointed Times may refer to the solar calendar espoused by the sect, which set the festivals on dates different to those prescribed in the Torah.

All these teachings were divulged to the community in a divine revelation and thus render the community elect and just by its very nature. In order to preserve this character, a special way of life and thought was devised, consisting of strict segregation from the non-sectarian world. The members of the community were required ‘... to keep apart from the children of the Pit; to refrain from the unclean wealth of wickedness (acquired) by vowing and devoting...’ (CD 6: 14-15). The outside world is considered impure and full of iniquity.

In order to preserve their own purity and righteous way, the members instituted a communal life described in the Rule of the second part (CD 12-16). The members live in camps organized in units of thousands, hundreds, fifties and tens (13: 1-2, 20, 14:3), like the tribes of Israel in the desert (Exod 18:25).55 An official designated as the Overseer (אלוג) has special responsibilities: admitting new members, instructing them as well as the entire community, supervising income and expenses for the poor and performing judiciary functions.” The members of the community apparently work and have commercial contacts with non-sectaries, but these are strictly regulated by the Overseer (13: 14-16, 14:12-13). They marry and have children ‘according to the Law’ (19:3). The general assembly of the members convenes according to a fixed order: first the Priests, followed by the Levites, the Israelites and the proselytes (14:3-7). All members take a solemn oath to adhere to the law of Moses (15:5-16:2). A considerable part of the time was apparently devoted to study, whether of the Torah or other sectarian books, for in each smallest unit of ten people the presence of a learned priest is obligatory (13:2).57

As was stressed above, at the very heart of the sectarian thought lay the belief that Israel at large is still living in sin and error, and is caught in ‘the three nets of Belial’ (4: 15). This results in a total condemnation of non-sectarian Jews. Yet specific groups of adversaries are denounced; e.g., ‘those who search slippery things,’ led by ‘the Spouter of Lies’.58 In this connection too, the community’s attitude to the Second Temple should be seen: it is considered impure, defiled by its priests, and therefore members were not allowed to bring sacrifices there.59 But they were permitted to send them with offerings by someone else.60

The life and thought of the community described in the Damascus Covenant acquire a poignant intensity through their eschatological perspective. This is already implied in the description of the emergence of the sect (cf. above p. 491), and conforms to the pattern of the appearance of the Just and Elect at the dawn of the eschatological era, a pattern known from apocalyptic writings. It becomes clear that the just and perfect life to which the sect had converted formed part of the general divine plan of history. This is why the sect comes into being in ‘the Last Generation’ and in ‘a Period of Wickedness’ (1: 12, 6: 10, 14, 12:23, 17:7), both standing at the end of the historical sequence: the sect is destined to be the shoot from which the new eschatological world will spring. Hence the keen interest taken by the community in the historical circumstances surrounding its origins and existence. It accounts for the various interpretations of contemporary

55 The same form of organization recurs in the eschatological war, cf. below, p. 516.
57 In this connection a sectarian work named The Book of the Hago (הגו) is mentioned (CD 10:6-13:2: cf 1QS 1:7), which was subject to intensive study in the sect. Goshen-Gottstein, ‘Puzzle’ suggested to read המִלְל־כּוּב יִרְמָי, that it was the Bible, while Yadin, Temple Scroll 1.301 thought it refers to the Temple Scroll (below, p. 527). Cf. also Rabin, The Zadokite Documents, 50.
58 1:14, 15, 4: 19, 20, 8:13, 19:25.
60 Yadin, Temple Scroll 1, 105 suggests that CD 11: 17-18 concerns all sacrifices except those of the Shabbat proper.
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events in light of the biblical text, according to the pesher method (see below). It also explains the presence of unique chronological indications concerning the initial phase of the sect. The most crucial one is the statement cited above (CD 1:5), that 390 years elapsed from the subjugation to Nebuchadnezzar to the appearance of the sect (on which see below, pp. 543-5).

Other historical allusions speak of a migration of the community from the Land of Judaea to the Land of Damascus. While it is unclear exactly when this took place, it must belong to the early phase of the sect’s history, apparently during the lifetime of the Teacher of Righteousness (20: 12-14). This is certainly the case of the man named ‘the Searcher of the Torah (6:7).’ The combined internal and archaeological evidence shows that this migration did not take place during the main periods of occupation in Qumran, and must precede them. Therefore it is unlikely that Damascus is a symbolic name for Qumran. Nor is it convincing to interpret it as a designation for Babylon. A growing number of scholars see in ‘the Land of Damascus’ a symbolic designation for exile, but not for a specific one. In any case, if it does point to a specific location, no satisfactory identification has yet been suggested.

As for the literary structure of the Damascus Covenant, no clear agreement has yet emerged. The fact that the work consists of two parts of distinct

61 CD 4: 3, 6: 5, 6: 19, 8: 21, 19: 34, 20: 12.
62 As was suggested in the early years of research. Cf. e.g., Milik, Ten Years, 90. The main difficulty in this identification is the early date of the migration, as indicated by the data. Two considerations impose an early date: a) the oldest copy of CD, 4QDn, dates to the first third of the first century B.C.E.; b) the work has the earliest date of the Teacher of Righteousness (CD 10: 3-15). The combined evidence of both data, together with the assumption that the migration took place in the Teacher’s lifetime (CD, ibid.), imposes the conclusion that the migration took place at least a generation before the earliest manuscript, i.e., during the second half of the second century B.C.E. Significantly, CD does not mention the Kittim, i.e., the Romans, but only ‘the Kings of Greece’ (8: 10-12 [כטirmנינוק], probably the Seleucids. Cf. Cross, Library, 81-82; De Vaux, Archaeology, 112-13.
64 As proposed by Murphy-O’Connor, ‘The Essenes,’ p. 546 n. 294.
65 Another chronological datum is the statement that forty years elapsed from the death of the Teacher of Righteousness to the extermination of the followers of the Man of Lies (20:13). Though it is obviously patterned after the period of Israel’s wandering in the wilderness (Deut 2: 14), there is no reason to doubt its historical value. It may also represent the span of a generation following the biblical view. The number is important for fixing the date of composition of the Covenant, or at least that of the passage in question well after the death of the Teacher of Righteousness. This lapse of time should be taken into account in all reconstructions of the sect’s early history (cf. below, p. 545).
66 Cf. Rabin, The Zadokite Documents, x.
68 Cf. Milik, Ten Years, 39.
69 See e.g. Rabin, The Zadokite Documents, vii.
70 Cf. Carmignac, ‘Comparer entre les manuscripts’, 66. Murphy-O’Connor, ‘The Critique’, 203-5, argues that MS. B must be the later one because the variants of a cannot be explained by it. Cf. also Jeremias, Lecher der Gerechtigkeit, 112 n. 7. Iwry, ‘Migration’, 83 n. 10 sees in MS. B a later revised edition, because only in B the Yahad and the death of the Teacher are mentioned.
71 In connection with the messianic teaching two recensions were discerned: A (admonition) which mentions two Messiahs, and 4 (law) – B (19-20) with one Messiah. See e.g. Huppenbauer, ‘Zur Eschatologie’. Some scholars view MS. B as reflecting an earlier stage of the messianic teaching; cf. below p. 539.
72 The most significant divergences between the MSS. concern the pesherim: MS. A gives pesherim on Isa 7: 17 and on Amos, referring to past events. MS. B gives pesherim on Zech 13: 21 and on Ezekiel, alluding to eschatological events. In addition, MS. A includes a mention of Baruch and Gehazi (CD 8: 20-21), while B refers to the Messiah. B tends to give biblical quotations more fully and gives more developed stylistic forms.
73 Denis, ‘Evolution de Structures’ and Les Themes de Connaissance, gives the following division: 1) the three admonitions; 1: 4-6 + 7: 13-18 and 20: 15-27, reflecting the beginnings of the new religious movement; 2) 4: 6-7, 4: 20-27, 34: these passages reflect a more developed eschatological movement in Damascus; 3) 7: 2-8 (a: 19-20); the initial movement became an organized sect; 4) the Large Code, leaves 9-16, contains many elements of diverse periods.
based on independent sources. Even more questionable is the association of units of distinct literary character with specific historical situations. The literary analysis itself is not always convincing, nor are the historical reconstructions based on it. Especially puzzling is the disregard for the literary information to be gained from the Qumran fragments. The following overall picture of the ‘Geniza text with the Qumran fragments (in square brackets) clearly shows the unity of the work.

[Introduction (4Q frg.)]


The New Covenant: The sect, its significance and its contemporary role (3:12-4:12a).

74 Murphy O’Connor, taking up the work of Denis and of Stegemann (Die Entstehung). See ‘Missionary Document’; ‘The Literary Analysis’; ‘Analysis of CD XIX 33 ff.’; ‘The Critique’; ‘The Essenes’. He reconstructed the genesis of the Covenant as follows: 1) The Missionary Document (2:14-6:1) designed to convert to the Essene reform. This is the oldest source. 2) The Memorandum (6:2-8:3) devised to recall members of the community to a more faithful observance. 3) A criticism of the Rulers of Judaea (8:3-18). 4) A document aiming at meeting dissatisfaction (19:33-20:22b). See now also Davies, Covenant.

75 This connection, assumed to exist between a typical literary form and a Sitz im Leben (a methodological assumption basic to form-criticism), has recently been criticized. Cf. Knierim, ‘Form Criticism.’

76 Thus the theory that 2:14-6:1 is a missionary document is explained by the suggestion that the community saw itself as the Israelites in Kadesh during the wilderness period, and therefore introduced the list of sinners in CD 2:14-3:12. Cf. Murphy-O’Connor, ‘Missionary Document,’ 205. This is far-fetched. The mention of Kadesh alludes to the sinful generation of the wilderness which was doomed to perish in the wilderness because of its sins. Cf. Deut 9:23, Ps 106:23 and CD 20:14-15 (B). Therefore it is very unlikely that it served as a sect itself. It is rather the patriarchs in this list who serve as archetypes. The mention of the wilderness generation occurs in the framework of a general list of sinners, which has a long literary history behind it (see e.g. Sir 16:7-10).

77 Murphy-O’Connor’s main contention is that the sect came into being as a priestly group in Babylon and migrated to Judaea in the Maccabaean Revolt. The rest of the four stages are reconstructed from this point of departure. This contention is based on two questionable interpretations: a) The identification of the Land of Damascus as a symbolic designation of Babylon; b) The understanding of the sectaries’ self-designation as ‘those who returned from Exile’. Here, Murphy-O’Connor is greatly influenced by Iwry, ‘Migration.’ The evidence for such an understanding is null. Though from the linguistic point of view it is possible nothing in the context suggests it. By contrast, Rabin’s interpretation of as ‘those of Israel who repented’ perfectly suits the general climate of sectarian ideas. It is probably based on the biblical expression (Isa 59:20), an appellation figuring in CD itself (2CD 5:20-17). Expressions like ‘returning to the Law of Moses’ and ‘repenting one’s corrupted way’ (CD 15:7) clearly point to the true background of the appellation. Thus forms another sectarian sobriquet, based on a pesher to a prophetic text. Cf. below, p. 505. The arguments of Davies, Covenant for a diaspora origin do not convince.

78 The table is based on the reconstruction of Fitzmyer (‘Prolegomenon’, 18-19; Tools 90-92) who used all the available data on the Qumran fragments. For a detailed description of these fragments see above n. 50.

The Sins of Israel: The present rule of Belial over Israel: the sect’s adversaries and their sins (4:12b-6:2a).

Repentance of the Sect: The sense and principles of the New Covenant (6:2b-7:9a).


[Various Laws (4Q frg.)]

Practising the New Covenant: Rites and regulations of the sect (9:1-12:18).


[Concluding Ceremony of Acceptance: Liturgy for the feast of the renewal of the covenant (4Q frg.).]

The discernable structure is a complex one, embracing smaller units such as admonitions, history and law. In this respect, the framework manifests affinities to the structure of biblical covenant passages, such as Deut 26-27, 29-31; Neh 9-10, as well as a relationship with the Rule of the Community. Both the Covenant and the Rule illustrate the literary conventions of the Jewish post-biblical literature, especially of the apocalyptic works, in that they use complex forms, embracing various smaller forms, often modelled after biblical precedents. Such works may and do use various sources of distinct forms and periods, but they work them out into one overall framework which expresses the intention of the author. Thus the exaggerated search for distinct literary sources and corresponding historical situations may often distort the original intentions of the work and obscure more fundamental historical considerations.

THE RULE OF THE COMMUNITY

A second example of a Rule is offered by the work known as the Rule of the Community. Preserved almost intact, and prescribing regulations for the community in the present, it also gives the fullest picture now existing of the actual functioning of the sect. The best preserved manuscript from cave 1, 1QQS, was one of the first scrolls to be published. The fact that the work

79 Form-critical considerations militate against Milik’s suggestion to place the passage 18:1-17:12 at the beginning of the legal part of CD, unless there is evidence for it in the actual Qumran manuscripts. The passage in question fits well into its present context at the end of a list of laws. The same order of elements is attested by Deut 31:9-13.

80 Milik proposes to place this section after the penal code, but comparison with various passages in Deuteronomy shows that the ceremony follows the detailed laws, according to the scheme of the covenant; cf. Deut 27:31:9-13.

81 Cf. the comment of Koch, The Rediscovery, 23-28; Collins, Apocalypse, 22.
exists in twelve copies ranging from 100 B.C.E. to the Herodian period, shows its popularity and importance in Qumran. The manuscript dating points to a composition during the second half of the second century B.C.E. 82

As does the Covenant, the Rule also consists of distinct literary units of different character. A general introduction states the aims of the community (1: 1-15). It is followed by a description of the ‘Entrance into the Covenant’ (1: 16-3: 12; see further below, p. 500). After a summary of the sect’s main theological ideas, the ‘Treatise of the Two Spirits’ (3: 13-4: 26), there follows a loose combination of several sets of rules (5: 1-6: 23). It begins with another list of the sect’s aims and obligations, followed by various rules and admonitions to the individual members, mainly to avoid all contact with outsiders and to obey one’s superiors. More detailed rules are laid down in column 6. Next follows a penal code (6: 24-7: 25), a unit describing the ideal community (8: 1-9: 1), and finally a unit with instructions and guidance to the community (9: 12-26). The extant work concludes with psalm-like hymns (10: 1-11: 22).

The community organisation which emerges from this collection of regulations aims at a separation from ‘the men of iniquity’ in order to repent, to practice the Law of Moses properly (5: 8-10) and to prepare for the coming eschaton (8: 12-16). The members live a communal life, sharing property and work, assembling to discuss matters of the community, studying together and probably also praying together:

And this is the Rule for the members of the community who are willing to repent all evil and to hold fast to everything which He willed, to separate from the gathering of men of iniquity, to be a community (Yahad תַּחַת) in the Torah and in property; and to submit to the authority of the Sons of Zadok, the priests who guard the covenant and according to the majority of the community members who adhere to the Covenant... (1QS 5: 1-3).

The priests are given precedence in all ceremonial matters. They lead the ceremony of the entry into the covenant (see below, p. 500), bless first at the communal meal and they sit first in the council (1Q56: 5, 8). The same precedence is to be observed in the order of seating at the messianic banquet in 1QS9 (cf. below) as well as in the organisation of the eschatological war (1QM); a priest must also be present in a minimal group of ten (1QS 6: 3-4).

While the priests, the Levites and the elders sit first in the ‘Council of the Many’ (6: 8), it is the Overseer (6: 12, 14) who is in charge of the practical management (cf. above, p. 494). A number of functions are allocated to the general assembly (the Council of the Many — מְשַׁm

82 The following MSS. were recovered from Qumran caves:
1QS - Date: between 100 and 75 B.C.E. Contents: eleven leaves of almost the entire work. On the same manuscript, two other works were copied, 1QSa and 1QSb (cf. below). Cf. Milik and Barthélemy, DJD 1, 107-30. It was apparently copied from a defective copy, to judge from the blanks left and from the corrections by the scribe; cf. Cross, 'Introduction,' 4. Milik dates 1QS to the last quarter of the second century B.C.E. (Miliki-Šeđeq, 135). Photographs with transliterations were first published by John C. Trever, and were recently re-published.
5Q11 - Date: late writing. Contents: two fragments covering 1QS 2: 4-7, 12-14. (Milik, DJD 3. 180).
4QOS - Ten manuscripts from cave 4, still unpublished. Date: three copies dating from the first quarter of the first century B.C.E. to Cross, Library, 119. According to Milik (Ten Years, 133. 4), the oldest manuscript is 4Q5, a papyrus copy. A list of variants from 4Q copies was published by Milik in 'Review,' 4 11. 16 and was incorporated into the Hebrew edition of Licht.

only when the candidate is a full member. This is connected with the community’s withdrawal from the surrounding society: all money or property is considered ‘property of iniquity’ and should be shunned (IQS 9:8, 10:19; 1QH 10:22; CD 4:17, 6:15-16, 8:5,12:7).

Another central ceremony in the sectarian life is the so-called Entry into the covenant. The ceremony is described in the opening section of the Rule and it took place every year, perhaps at Pentecost as celebrated by the sect, i.e., on the fifteenth of the third month. As often in the Rule, the ceremony and its liturgy are arranged in a chiastic structure, of which the confession of the Israelites, the blessings and the curses form the central part.84 The ceremony itself was apparently modelled after the depiction of the Gerizim covenant (Deut 11:26-32; Josh 8:30-35). Two groups were arranged opposite to each other and some, perhaps the Priests and Levites, went through in procession. Likewise, liturgical elements were taken over from Deuteronomy, mainly the curses and blessings and the reiterated response of the participants (Amen, Amen; cf. Deut 27). Yet when comparing the biblical covenants (Lev 26:3-46; Deut 28; Josh 30-34) with the formulation of the Rule, the full measure of difference is apparent. While the biblical covenant implies a real choice and acceptance, and the curses and blessings function as threats and rewards, the covenant of the sectaries asserts and reinforces a situation predetermined by God from the beginning. The curses are addressed to the lot of Belial, the blessings to the lot of God. Therefore the real sanction is addressed not to the Sons of Darkness, who are damned in any case, but to those who did not persevere in the New Covenant. Not surprisingly, the language used is taken from the biblical threats to the Israelites betraying the covenant (Deut 29:19-20). As the ceremony in question contains a commitment to adhere to the New Covenant, it was identified with the oath taken by the members of the community and mentioned elsewhere. It is perhaps identical with ‘the formidable oath’ taken by the Essenes, according to Josephus.85

Among the literary units of the Rule, the section 3:13-4:26, called the

84 On the hymns see below p. 569f. The chiasm is illustrated in the following table:

| Instruction ‘to enter into the covenant’ (1:16-18) |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Priests and Levites bless God |
| Participants’ response: Amen (1:19-20) |
| Priests recite God’s deeds and pity, Levites recite Israel’s sins |
| Participants’ response: confession (1:21-2:1) |
| Priests bless God’s lot, Levites curse Belial’s lot |
| Participants’ response: Amen (2:1-10) |
| Priests and Levites curse the one who betrays the New Covenant, i.e., a sectarian who betrayed (2:11-17) |
| Participants’ response: Amen (2:18) |
| The Ceremony of entering into the covenant: |
| Passing in a procession according to the fixed order (2:19-25). |

85 See War 2:141; and cf. IQS 5:8; CD 8:15; 9:8; 9:12; 15:1; 6:7; 16:7.

‘Treatise of the Two Spirits’, forms a special case.86 Setting down the principles of the community’s ideology, it displays the major belief of the sect in dualism and predestination.87 Again it presents a unified chiastic structure, though consisting of distinct units.88 We shall return to the contents of this treatise in the section on the religious thought of the sect (below, pp. 533-6).

Though the homogenous overall nature of the Rule was recognized early, it was also evident that it is a composite work, consisting of many sections of independent character. This, in addition to the fact that copies of cave 4 attest to different recension(s), prompted studies on the literary structure of the Rule. These studies make clear that the Rule is of composite character, but there is no agreement as to its precise nature. While some saw it as a unified work,89 others regard it as a compilation of independent sources which they attribute to different historical periods.90 Thus Murphy-O’Connor sees the passage 8:1-10:8 as the oldest nucleus, while the introduction, the Entrance Ceremony and the Two Spirits’ Treatise (cols.1-4), as well as the final hymns (10:1-11), are seen as the latest parts, and the legislation in cols.5-6 as a later parallel to cols.8-9.91

However, apparent doublets are not necessarily the result of an editorial process reflecting different life-situations. It may well be a literary characteristic of the Rule, unobserved up to the present. The unit 9:12-26 was usually attached to unit 8:1-9:11. However, 9:12 has a new opening addressed to the Maskil, and 9:12-26 appears to parallel 3:13-4:26. Once this is noticed, other parallelisms become clear. A close examination of the various literary parts of the Rule again reveals a chiastic pattern:


87 Cf. references below, n. 242.

88 See the table presented by Licht, ‘Treatise’, 100.


90 Pouilly, La Règle. Leany, The Rule, 112-3, to a large extent follows Gilbert, and discerns the following sections: general introduction (1:1-15); entry into the community (1:16-3:12); doctrine of the community (3:13-4:20); purpose and way of life of the community (5:1-6:23); penal code (6:24-7:25); model of the pioneer community (8:1-9:26); closing hymn (10:1-11:3). The manifesto (8:1-9:26) would date back to 130 n.c.e, while the editing took place during the first century B.C.E.

91 Murphy-O’Connor, ‘La génése littéraire’, gives the following scheme: Stage one, pre-Qumran: the manifest (8:1-16a + 9:3t to 8a). Stage two, stage 1 a of Qumran: legislation (8:16b-19:8.20-9:20). Stage three, stage 1 b of Qumran: reformulation of legislation and aim (5:1-13a; 5.15b-7:25). Stage four, a few years later: additions and interpolations (1:4-10:1). His analysis is adopted with only slight changes by Pouilly, La Règle.
The Relationship between the Rule and the Covenant

The Rule and the Covenant are closely related both in themes and contents: they depict similar communities and ideologies. Yet differences of detail raised the question of the relationship between the two. Thus, e.g., the Overseer is mentioned in both documents, but in the Covenant he has greater responsibilities. For instance, the admitting of new members is the responsibility of the Many in the Rule (1QS 6:18-20), while in the Covenant it is the Overseer who takes this charge (CD 13:11-12; 15:7-11). Among his additional functions in the Covenant the Overseer is to instruct the congregation and the inexperienced priests and to allocate money to the needy (CD 13:5-6, 8-10; 14:12-16). Parallel to the increased responsibilities of the Overseer in the Covenant, there is an appreciable diminution of the role of the Many. While in the Rule they have various responsibilities, they are hardly mentioned in the Covenant. Now it was suggested that a transfer of authority from a community to a single person is more logical than the reverse, and that the Rule or its sources reflect an earlier stage in the history of the sect. Such a conclusion is at variance with other indications. Thus the Covenant mentions women and children, clearly indicating the existence of married couples in the sect. No such reference occurs in the Rule. The historical theories offered to reconcile this difference see the Covenant as reflecting an earlier stage of the sect when marriage was still practiced, while the Rule would envisage a celibate community which was installed at Qumran in a later stage.

Other important differences concern the Temple cult. While in the Covenant there are clear references to the participation of the sect in the Jerusalem Temple cult, none occur in the Rule. In fact, no mention is made in the Rule of the Temple. Again the question was asked how these data are related to each other. Does the Covenant indicate a stage when the sectaries still participated in the cult, in contrast to the Rule? An explanation which may be offered is that the omission by the Rule of the subjects in question is due to its choice of themes and literary character, and does not necessarily reflect a historical situation different from the one expressed by the Covenant.

Biblical Interpretation

The Qumran sect was no exception to contemporary Judaism at large in that it was centred around and drew upon the biblical tradition. In everyday life this was manifested by the strict observance of the Torah and the constant study and exposition of the Scriptures. It is this second aspect which will concern us now. The influence exercised by the biblical world on the sectarian literature may be discerned in three domains: the literary, the ideological and the exegetical. Literary influence is to be discerned in all those instances where use is made of biblical modes of expression, for literary purposes only, without implying a conscious attitude of interpretation towards scriptures invested with divine authority. Thus, there are numerous examples of borrowed biblical phraseology, style, literary forms and genres. Another category included is the anthro-

---

92 Murphy-O’Connor’s suggestions are often questionable not only on the literary level but also from a historical point of view. For the literary aspect, cf. the criticisms leveled by Puech, ‘Recension’, on Pouilly, La Règle, which are valid also for Murphy-O’Connor. Puech rightly criticizes the attribution of a situation-in-life to a literary phenomenon. From the historical point of view, two general observations may be made. In Murphy-O’Connor’s reconstruction, the Rule reflects four stages in the life of the community, which together lasted some fifty years. This seems too compressed a period for such a process. Secondly, part of the section alleged to be the oldest, i.e. 8:15-9:12, is omitted in the oldest manuscript of the Rule, 4Q55. Cf. Milik, ‘Review’, 416. Murphy-O’Connor dismisses this too lightly as a scribal omission.

93 Milik points to various redactional differences between the 4Q manuscripts and 1QS. In his opinion the primitive form of the Rule consisted of 6:1-9:11 and was perhaps composed by the Teacher of Righteousness around 150-145 B.C.E. Shortly after, subsequent copyists amplified it with long additions. The passage describing the entrance into the covenant belongs, in his opinion, to this second recension. Cf. Milik, ‘Milki-Sedeq’, 135.

94 Cf. Kruse, ‘Community Functionaries’. Wernberg-Møller, ‘Priests’. I am aware of the modern distinction made between exegesis and hermeneutic, but I am not convinced that it is helpful in the context of the present discussion. Cf. Patte, Jewish Hermeneutic, 2-3. Patte’s own application of this distinction to the review of the scrolls does not make a real difference as compared with other discussions. Consequently I am using both terms in the current sense to indicate a conscious attitude of interpretation towards scriptures invested with divine authority.

95 E.g., psalm style and form in the Hadayon (1QH), influence of biblical wisdom literature on the Covenant, and imitation of the Torah style in the Temple Scroll.
logical style, which makes use of biblical allusions, reminiscences and semi-citations as a literary feature. It should be distinguished from the anthological style with exegetical purpose. 97 Ideological influence of the Bible is to be seen in most of the sect’s presentations of its religious ideas; it is expressed in terminology and formulations (see below, pp. 533ff.). The influence in the exegetical field differs from the previous ones in that it implies a conscious exegetical attitude and activity, and is crystallized in hermeneutic rules, exegetical devices and corresponding literary forms and genres.

LITERARY FORMS OF BIBLICAL EXEGESIS

In reviewing Qumran materials pertaining to biblical exegesis, too often the main stress was put on the continuous pesharim. But the sectarian literature offers a variety of forms which merits a comprehensive investigation. What is offered here is a tentative list, with the purpose of suggesting a general context for the sectarian bibilical exegesis.

The designation pesharim was given to a group of biblical interpretations of a peculiar type. They have a fixed literary structure: a biblical quotation to be expounded, followed by the commentary which is often introduced as such by the word pesher. It consists of an identification of certain nouns in the text with the aid of various exegetical methods, and further elaborations on one or two details. 98 Thus the term pesher designates the isolated unit of interpretation, the interpretation itself, its technique and its literary form.

There are three types of Pesharim: a) Continuous Pesharim. This term designates commentaries on entire biblical books, mostly the prophets. 99 b) Thematic Pesharim. These are characterized by the assembling of various biblical texts and their interpretations around certain themes. Typical of this type are the texts known as 4Q Florilegium and the Pesher on Melchizedek. c) Isolated Pesharim. These consist of a citation of only one or two verses with an interpretation using pesher methods and terminology, interwoven into larger compositions of a different literary genre. Several examples of this type occur in the Covenant and the Rule. Thus, for instance, CD 19:5-13 has a pesher on Zech 13:7, and CD 7: 14-19 contains a pesher on Amos 5:26-27. In 1QS 8:13-15 we find a pesher on Isa 40:3. Interestingly, the Covenant contains pesharim on Pentateuchal texts: CD 6:3-11 on Num 21:18, and CD 7:19-21 on Num 24:17. 100

Apart from the pesharim three additional forms of biblical exegesis can be distinguished in the literature of the sect. a) The various appellations given to historical figures and groups should be considered as a special literary form. Each one actually constitutes a cryptogram for an entire pesher. This is obvious almost in all the extant examples: the designation ‘The Teacher of Righteousness’ stands for a pesher on Hos 10:12 and context; ‘The Spouter of Lies’ is a sobriquet based on Micah 2:11; while ‘The Searchers of Slippery Things’ is anchored in Isa 30:10 and context. The name Kittim applied to the Romans is based on Num 24:24 and Dan 11:30. b) Anthological style. In this form the exegesis is not introduced explicitly by a conscious citation and interpretation, but is implied by the way the biblical text is interwoven into the general style. 101 c) Halakhic exegesis should be kept as a distinct category due to its special relation to the biblical text as a source of halakhah, in which specific literary forms and procedures are implied. The Temple Scroll now offers an interesting case of the rewritten Bible style, serving as a form of halakhic exegesis (see below, pp. 526-30).

THE CHARACTER OF THE PESHER

Hermeneutical principles and techniques play an important role in the Pesharim due to their specific purpose: to read historical and eschatological events into the biblical prophecies. Since there is a gap between the literal sense and the desired sense, a series of hermeneutical devices 102 were employed in order to extract the latter from the former. 103

97 The definition of the anthological style usually referred to is that of Robert, ‘Attaches littéraires’, cf. also Bloch, ‘Midrash’, both stressing the exegetical function of the anthological style. But Wright, ‘Midrash’, 121-31, rightly points out the existence of a non-midrashic anthological style, namely a style using the biblical phrases for literary aims.


99 This name, in contradistinction to the thematic Pesharim, was suggested by Carmignac, ‘Melchisedeq’, 360-3. Though most of the known Pesharim comment on one prophet, a Pesher like 4QPss, which is interspersed with quotations from other prophets, should warn us from a hasty judgement that this is always the case (see p.513ff.).

100 The same verse is interpreted in a messianic sense also in 1QM 11:6 and 4QTest 9-13.

101 For material and examples cf. Carmignac, ‘Pottes de serviteur’; ‘Les citations dans la Guerre’; Elliger, Studien, 78-117; Fitzmyer, ‘Quotations’. Recently Gabrion, ‘L’interprétation’ discussed some problems involved, but he does not attempt to attain a clear distinction between the various anthological styles.

102 They may not, perhaps, be called hermeneutical rules in the precise sense, for they do not appear to have a definitive binding formulation, but hermeneutical principles undoubtedly were at work at Qumran.

103 The main exegetical devices may be summarized as follows (cf. Horgan, Pesharim, 244-6):

1. The use of synonyms for the words in the lemma. Cf. e.g., 1QHab 5:6-8 (_mov / עניב; 4QPnah 3-4 14-6 (ueil / עלות). )

2. Use of the same roots as in the lemma, in the same or different grammatical form (very current).

3. Play on words in the lemma. E.g.: 1QPhab 8:6-13 (עבש; 4QPs 9:10IV 13-16 (עבש).

4. The use of a different textual tradition; e.g., 1QHab 9:13. The Massoretic text for Hab 1:11 reads ודעון ‘and a guilty one’, the text cited by the pesher reads ודעון and he makes,'
It is significant that many of the hermeneutical rules employed by the rabbinic *midrash* occur also in the *Pesharim*. A particularly close similarity in structure and methods exists between the *pesher* and the rabbinical *midrash* of the *petira* type. The latter interprets a biblical verse with a general and undefined meaning by attributing specific motifs and circumstances to it. The decisive difference between the *pesher* and the *petira* is in the contents: the *petira* always deals with moral lessons, while the subject of the *pesher* is historical-eschatological. In light of such an affinity between the *pesher* and rabbinic *midrashim*, it was rightly concluded that both drew upon a common Jewish heritage, each adapting it to its own purposes.

Concurrently, it was noticed that the *pesher* shows affinities to another type of Jewish and non-Jewish interpretation, namely the interpretation of dreams. The same attitude is apparent in both: the dream, or the prophecy, is seen as a divinely-sent cryptogram, to be deciphered by applying a variety of exegetical methods. There is also a considerable resemblance between the methods themselves. Thus symbolism, atomization and *paronomasia* were widely used in the interpretation of dreams. Hence the striking similarities between the *Pesharim* and the interpretation of dreams in the book of *Daniel*.

The wide spectrum of elements converging in the *Pesharim* produced a lively debate as to their character and origin. Some saw them as a targum, others as a type of rabbinic *midrash*. A third group of scholars and the interpretation has (םַעְנֵלֶים) *their guilt*.

5. Changing the order of the letters or words in the *lemma*; e.g., 1QpHab: 1-5: 6; 4QipHos 2:2-3.

6. Referring back to an earlier *lemma* or anticipating a following *lemma*. (1QpHab: 5-9: 12—13 the rebuke of the Teacher of Righteousness*, probably referring to בֶּנְדִיָּהוּ, *to reprove*, of Hab 1: 12. Partially parallel lists of hermeneutical devices employed in the *pesharim* are offered also by Brownlee, *Biblical Interpretation*; Fishbane, *Qumran Pesher*; Solomovic, *Exegesis*; Rabinowitz, *Pesharim/Pittiron*; Patte, *Jewish Hermeneutic*, 300-2; Brooke, *4QFlorilegium*.

104 Thus, e.g., *Notarikon* and *Gemara* are used in CD: 7:13-8:1; 1QpHab: 5:11; 4:4-13; *Zechar* LeDuvor and *Asmakhah* are used in CD: 10: 19-11:6 and 1QpHab: 8:13-13. Cf. Solomovic, *ibid.*; Patte, *ibid.* Brooke, *4QFlorilegium*, 450-9; offers the following list of exegetical procedures: *Gazer Showa*, deliberate editing of the biblical text; *Paronomasia*; *Binyun Av*; *Samakun* and double meaning. Cf. also Brooke, *Amos-Numbers Midrash*.

105 Silverman, *The Riddle*.


107 Cf. *Finkel, Dreams*; Rabinowitz, *Pesharim/Pittiron*; Fishbane, *Qumran Pesher*.


110 Cf. e.g., Wieder, *The Habakkuk Scroll*.

111 Cf. most recently, Brooke, *Qumran-Pesher*, 501-503. Unfortunately Brooke arrives at the conclusion that the *pesher* is a type of *midrash* by applying the too vague definition of *midrash*.
events emerge. The central personality is that of the Teacher of Righteousness, the apparent leader of the sect (1: 13; 2: 2; 5: 9-12; 7: 4-5; 8: 3; 9: 9-12; 11: 4-8) and known from the Damascus Covenant (CD 1: 11; 20: 1, 28, 32). He is the inspired interpreter of Scriptures. He has two adversaries: the Man of Lies and the Wicked Priest. The Man of Lies (2: 1-2; 5: 11) is probably identical with the Spouter of Lies (10: 9-13 and perhaps with the Man of Scorn in CD 1: 14. This person is the leader of a group designated as the Traitors (2: 1, 3, 5) who do not accept the inspired teachings of the Teacher of Righteousness and betray the covenant of God. As such he is usually identified with the religious opponent of the Teacher who heads ‘the Searchers of Slippery Things’ (דִּירֵשׁ הָחֵלַקְתּוֹת 1 QH 2: 15, 32; CD 1: 18; 4 Qp Nah 3-4 II 2; 4 QpS 23 II 10).

That the Spouter of Lies was the leader of a rival congregation is implied by another passage, where he is accused of ‘building through bloodshed his city of vanity and erecting through falsehood a congregation’ (1 Qp Hab 10: 10). Undoubtedly we have here the typology of two opponents, heads of two congregations: the Man of Lies heads a ‘congregation of falsehood,’ while the Teacher of Righteousness leads the ‘congregation of His elect’ (1 Qp Ps 1-10 II 5; 1-10 III 5), symbolized by the eschatological Jerusalem (4 Qp Ps). Thus both congregations are symbolized by cities. It was also observed that the Teacher of Righteousness, as the inspired interpreter of the Prophets, may stand for the true prophet, while the Man of Lies is the opposite figure of the false prophet.

It appears that the controversy between the Teacher of Righteousness and the Man of Lies concerns religious matters, perhaps different approaches to the interpretation of Scripture and halakah. A different case is presented by the relationship between the Teacher of Righteousness and the other adversary, the Wicked Priest (1 Qp Hab 8: 8-13; 8: 16-9: 2; 11: 4-8, 12-15; 12: 2-6, 7-10). This person ... was called by the Name of Truth at the beginning of his rule; but while he ruled over Israel his heart became haughty and he abandoned God and became a traitor to the Laws because of wealth; and he robbed and amassed the wealth of the men of iniquity who had rebelled against God; and the wealth of the people he took, as to increase the guilt of transgression upon himself. And he committed abominable acts with every kind of defiling impurity. (1 Qp Hab 8: 8-13)

From this description emerges a ruler of Israel who at the beginning of his rule was probably acceptable for the sect, but in the course of time changed his ways and consequently was condemned by the community. In another context he is described as a persecutor of the Teacher of Righteousness.

---

117 The book of Daniel presents a special case: due to its subject matter and ideology it has special affinities with the Pesharim.

118 Could it be another example of a thematicpesher, with the title preserved? It is difficult to tell. 1 have discussed this document in ‘Pesher on the Periods’.

119 For a convenient edition assembling all the continuous Pesharim see Horgan, Pesharim. See also Elliger, Studien and Brownlee, Peshar Habakkuk.


121 Cf. Betz, Offenbarung, 88-89.
to the Pharisees, is strikingly reminiscent of the three Jewish parties described by Josephus: the Sadducees, the Pharisees and the Essenes. It was, therefore, inferred that the same three are alluded to by this typology: Judah is the sect, Ephraim the Pharisees and Manasseh the Sadducees. Thus references to the government of ‘the Searchers of Slippery Things’ may refer to the reign of the last Hasmonaean, Salome Alexandra (76-67 B.C.E.) and Hyrcanus II with Aristobulus II (67-63 B.C.E.). In all probability also the conquest of Pompey is referred to, from which the Sadducees are said to suffer heavily (4QpNah 3-4 IV 1-8).

One of the results of the safe identification of ‘the Searchers of Smooth Things’ is that the leader of this group, the Man of Lies, mentioned in the Damascus Covenant and the Habakkuk Peshar, cannot be identified as one of the Hasmonaean Kings, but should be seen as a Pharisaic leader.

The Pesharim on Psalms

This Pesharim is one of the two extant continuous Peshurim on a non-prophetic text. Its surviving fragments contain peshurim on Psalms 37, 45, 60. They preserved the remains of four columns written in a ‘semi-formal’ hand. The Pesharim under discussion is concerned with the same figures familiar from other Peshurim: the Teacher of Righteousness, the Wicked Priest and the Man of Lies. The Teacher of Righteousness is clearly called ‘the Priest’ (I-10 III 15; cf. II 18). He is also referred to as the ‘Interpreter of Knowledge’ (1-10 127). The Wicked Priest is still persecuting the Teacher of Righteousness, actually seeking his death (I-10 IV 8). The Man of Lies figures again as an opponent of the Teacher who would not listen to his teaching but would ‘lead many astray with deceitful words, for they chose empty words (דָּשַׁם) and did not listen to the Interpreter of Knowledge’ (1-10 I 27). The controversy between the Teacher of Righteousness and his followers, and the Man of Lies and his men, is read into the Psalm’s dichotomy between the poor and the wicked and the Righteousness and his followers, and the Man of Lies and his men, is read into the Psalm’s dichotomy between the poor and the just and the wicked and evil will be annihilated. In the War Scroll the same number is used for the duration of the eschatological war (1QM 2:6-14, see below). Our Pesharim may allude to this last event, for it goes on to describe the peace awaiting the Just thereafter (I-10 II 9-10). In this context the expression ‘the Nets of Belial’ (ib.10-1), in which Israel is caught, recurs. These are the traps mentioned in CD 4: 14-18 as consisting of fornication, riches and the defilement of the Temple. They express the sway which Belial, the lord of the evil forces, has over Israel and the consequent sin and wickedness which rule Israel. As for the members of the community themselves, they are saved from these nets and will ‘inherit the earth’ (I-10 II 9-11). The Congregation of the Poor (율ָּדים אֲבוֹתֵיהֶם ib. 10), namely the sect, is therefore waiting for the destruction of the Wicked and for the moment when it will rule Jerusalem. The Peshar implies that the events are near at hand.

Other continuous Peshurim

The rest of the extant Peshurim are relatively small; most of them are Peshurim on Isaiah.

4QpIsa 4 (= Q161) covers Isa 10:21-22, 24-34; 11:1-5. Fragments 5-6 interpret the Assyrian march described in Isa 10:28-32, which the Peshar applies to someone who is ascending from ‘the Plain of Acre in order to fight with …’ (2-6 II 27). It was suggested that this is an allusion to events connected with Acre-Polemais during the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (Jos. Ant. 13:324-364; War 1:86-87). More specifically, it is the march of Ptolemy Lathyrus from Acre to Judaea, which was stopped by his mother Cleopatra. Thus the halting of Ptolemy could have been seen as miraculous just as was the dispersion of the Assyrian army, referred to by Isaiah. 4QpIsa 4 (= Q163) covers scattered parts of Isaiah. The interesting feature of this Peshar is that while commenting on its major text, Isaiah, it occasionally cites and interprets other prophets. Thus Zach 11:11 is quoted while commenting on Isa 30: I-5 (21 7-8) and Hos 6:9 is cited in 23 II 14. In this respect there is similarity to thematic Pesharim. Several times the

Pesher seems to skip verses; thus in 4:6-7, 11-8, Isa 9: 12 seems to have been omitted.

4QPsr (= 4Q164), dating from the early Hasmonaean period, deals with Isa 54: 11-12. This Pesher is interesting in that it applies to the sect the description of the New Jerusalem in Isa 54, identifying the precious stones in the future city with various groups within the sect. This identification is a natural outgrowth of the sectarian beliefs. The sect saw itself as ‘a holy house’ and the opponent group of the ‘Searchers of slippery things’ as ‘a city of iniquity’. The Pesher also refers to a group of twelve, either the ‘City of iniquity’.

One of the Pesherim on Hosea, 4QMic, 4QZeph, 4QPsalms. One of the Pesherim on Hosea contains a mention of ‘the Lion of Wrath’ and of ‘the last priest and king’. 4QPsr on Psalms contains a mention of ‘the Lion of Wrath’ and of ‘the last priest (ibid. 4QPsr 2:2-3).

Eschatological Compositions

Though few sectarian writings escaped the touch of eschatology, a distinction should be made between compositions entirely devoted to it, and other works dealing with it only in relationship to other subjects. Here we are concerned with the first category.

THE WAR SCROLL

This work, also known as the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness, 4Q94 (Q4M), is extant in one better preserved manuscript from Cave 4 and six fragments from Cave 4; their dates of writing range from the first half of the first century b.c.e. to the beginning of the first century c.e. 4Q94 (Q4M). The War Scroll is a description of the final eschatological war between the forces of Light, commanded by the archangel Michael, and the forces of Darkness, headed by Belial. The camp of the forces of Light includes the sectarian community and a host of good angels, while in the opposite camp we find first of all the Kittim, the people ruling the world, and further some minor nations and those ‘acting wickedly against the Covenant’ (הָעַטְרֵיהַ כְּלֵי בְּרִית), namely apostate Jews (1Q1M 1:2). Such is the sectarian version of the final eschatological war as depicted in biblical prophecy.

The main purpose is apparently to supply the members of the sect with a detailed set of regulations for the day destined ‘from of old for a battle of annihilation of the Sons of Darkness’ (1: 10). The result of this war is pre-ordained; God himself will intervene on the side of the Sons of Light. Yet this intervention will take place only after a series of real battles, in which the Sons of Darkness will alternately be defeated and victorious. The war will have to be fought according to all the rules of war practiced by the nations, but also in accordance with the Law of Moses. The fact that angels participate in the battle obliges the Sons of Light to observe all the biblical


4Q MSS. (formerly Q4M*), now fully published by Baillet, DJD 7, 12-72.


4Q94 (Q4M), Date: middle of the first century a.d. Contents: 1-2:3. 4Q493 (Q4M), Date: first half of the first century a.d. It may be the most ancient MS, and may stem from a different recension. The contents do not correspond to any of the known sections of 4Q94, but evidently are of the same work.


laws of purity. This, and the general self-image of the sectarianists, brought about an effort to model the whole army of the Sons of Light after the organization of Israel’s camp during the wandering in the wilderness. Thus the men are organized by tribes, camps, families; thousands, hundreds, fifties and tens.\footnote{Cf. Exod 18. Compare CD 13: 1-2, and above p. 492.}

In the first column of the scroll there is a description of how the community will become the divine instrument for establishing an ideal world. Column 2 specifies arrangements for the regular temple service at the time when most of the men will be fighting. Then follows a detailed depiction of the weapons and tactics. Column 7 deals with purity regulations, while columns 8-9 take up the description of tactics. In columns 10-19 we find various prayers, hymns and exhortations to be recited on various occasions. In column 13 there is a malversation of Belial and his lot, which states the dualistic theology of the sect. It is sharper than other statements in the sectarian writings, but lacks the radical determinism found in the Treatise of the Two Spirits.\footnote{See pp. 533-4. On the peculiar apocalyptic character of the War Scroll see above, pp. 426-7.}

The dating of the work is connected with its literary character. Early commentators were impressed by the unified plan of the work, and ascribed it to one author. In view of the military details the composition was seen as a military manual adapted from a similar Roman work, dating from the time of Herod the Great (37-4 b.c.e.).\footnote{The theory was proposed by Yadin, The Scroll of the War, and was accepted by Milik, Ten Years, 39, 122; Dupont-Sommer, Les Écrits, 182-3.} This conclusion was later criticized and an earlier date was proposed, on the basis of historical considerations\footnote{It was pointed out that knowledge of Roman tactics could have penetrated Eretz-Israel before the time of Herod. Segal suggested that the optimist and militarist atmosphere of the composition suits the period of John Hyrcanus (134-104 B.C.E.). Cf. Segal, ‘The Qumran War Scroll’, Van der Ploeg, Le Rouleau, 19. Cf. also Atkinson, ‘The Historical Setting,’ showing that the military descriptions in QM are Hellenistic and not Roman.} and of linguistic affinities with the Rule of the Community and the Thanksgiving Psalms.\footnote{Cf. Milik, Ten Years, 39; Hunzinger, ‘Fragmente’, 1:47-51. Baillet, ‘Le volume VII’, 79. All of them agree that some of the 4Q MSS, above all 4Q491 (=4QM4), reflect a different recension of the work. But Hunzinger’s judgement is that it is older than the recension of 1QM is doubted by Baillet, ibid., and Carmignac, La Règle, 270-2. Among the additional passages found in 4Q491 and not in 1QM is a hymn placed in the mouth of the archangel Michael (4Q491 II 8-18). It shares elements with 1QM and a work designated as Beqati-Mithama, known in several copies from cave 4. The affinities with copy 4Q8 186 are especially numerous. Cf. Baillet, ‘Le volume VII’, 79-80; idem, DJD, 7, 26-27.} An early date is now also ascribed by the oldest MS., 4Q493, and by the composite structure of the work which implies a literary history.\footnote{Today there is no generally accepted view on the literary structure. Inner divergencies and duplications were noticed, among them the obvious parallel in the description of the eschatological war in 1:15-19 and 7:9-11:9.\footnote{Von der Osten-Sacken, Gott und Belial, 42-115. Van der Ploeg, Le Rouleau, 1-25, noticed other inconsistencies. Thus, e.g., certain passages predict a swift victory over the Kittim in one day (4QM 7:9-11; 11:13; 14:4-14; 16:1:18; 11:11) while in col. 2a war of forty years is predicted. There are also divergencies in the description of the trumpets (cols. 8, 9, 16, 17, 18).} These facts led to various literary explanations. It was proposed to see the War Scroll as a compilation of three distinct books.\footnote{This was significantly expanded in Seitz, Das Apokalypsebuch, 1960 \textit{et passim}.} According to another theory, a primitive work of the second half of the second century b.c.e. was considerably enlarged by a later redactor who turned it into a ‘Rule’.\footnote{According to another theory, a primitive work of the second half of the second century b.c.e. was considerably enlarged by a later redactor who turned it into a ‘Rule’.\footnote{Milik, DJD, 1, 118-30.}} Finally, the theory is offered that two works of composite character were assembled together with independent additional material.\footnote{This was significantly expanded in Seitz, Das Apokalypsebuch, 1960 \textit{et passim}.}

Though not all the results of these analyses are agreed upon,\footnote{This was significantly expanded in Seitz, Das Apokalypsebuch, 1960 \textit{et passim}.} they establish with certainty that the War Scroll is a composite work. Considering the existence of an early copy, its composition should be assigned, along with the Damascus Covenant and the Rule of the Community, to the early phase of the sect’s life, namely the second half of the second century b.c.e.\footnote{This was significantly expanded in Seitz, Das Apokalypsebuch, 1960 \textit{et passim}.}

THE RULE OF THE CONGREGATION

Two smaller works of a ‘rule’-type originally belonged to the 1 QS scroll: one (1Q50) describes the eschatological community, while the other (1 Q51) is a collection of benedictions (see below, p. 524). The work under discussion, 1QM, gives eschatological legislation on two subjects. First, the duties of every citizen of the future Congregation of all Israel. These are graded by age, the main point being that at thirty, one must join the army for full service and undertake responsibilities of command. The second subject is the formal assembly of the leading elite in the messianic age. It shall be called together as needed, and include civil and military leaders, notables, as well as priests, who shall preside the sessions. The future festive banquet takes place according to a fixed order: the high priest is the first...
and the most important, while ‘the Messiah of Israel’ is mentioned afterwards, in a position clearly less prominent. This indicates a doctrine of two Messiahs, one a priest and the other of the Davidic line (cf. below, pp. 539-41).

4Q Testimonia

The work was copied in a MS. dated to 100–75 B.C.E. and was preserved almost intact. It contains a collection of scriptural texts pertaining to the messianic teachings of the sect, and a quotation from the sectarian work the Psalms of Joshua, yet unpublished. Though the citations are not accompanied by a commentary, the ideas behind the collection are implied in their selection and order. Thus it is evident that each quotation represents a messianic figure, in the following order: 1) ‘a prophet like Moses’; 2) the Star of Jacob and the Sceptre of Israel, referring to the priestly and the Davidic Messiahs; 3) a quotation concerning the priesthood, which may refer again to the priestly Messiah; 4) ‘the son of Belial’, presented by a quotation from the Psalms of Joshua. It is likely that this evil figure represents an early Jewish version of the idea of the Anti-christ, i.e. the wicked opponent of the Messiah at the threshold of the End of Days. In addition, this last figure seems to portray a historical figure, perhaps the Wicked Priest of the Pesharim.

4Q Florilegium

Two fragmentary columns of this work have survived in a manuscript copied by ‘an old Herodian hand.’ The work gives a pesher-like interpretation of the Qumran Sectarian Literature.

162 4Q175: Text: Allegro, DJD 5, 60; Strugnell, ‘Notes en marge,’ 225-9; cf. Cross, Library, 247-8; Milik, Ten Years, 61–64, 124-5.

163 Cf. Cross, Library, 114; Milik, Ten Years, 124, dates it back to 100 B.C.E.

164 Deut 5:28-29; 18:18-19; Num 24:15-17; Deut 33:8-11; Josh 6:26. Collections of proof-texts, Testimonia, are known also from New Testament times. Cf. Milik, Ten Years, 125. For a review of the Testimonia question in relationship to 4QTest see Fitzmyer, 4QTestimonia.


166 Thus Cross, Library, 147. ‘The Star of Jacob’ of Num 24:24 is interpreted as the priestly Messiah. Cf. CD 7:18-19 where it is understood of ‘the Searcher of the Law’, (the Teacher of Righteousness?); the sceptre is understood of the Messiah of David as is clear from 4QPatr l-5. In CD 5:23-4, it is referred to as ‘the Prince of the congregation’, who equals the Messiah of David and is as refers to 4QFlor 1:11 as referring to three temples.

167 Cf. Milik, Ten Years, 125; on the idea of the Antichrist in Qumran sources cf. Flusser, ‘The Hubris’.

168 Thus Cross, Library, 147-52, who identifies him with Simon the Maccabee. Milik, Ten Years, 63-64 sees here a reference to Matthias and his sons Jonathan and Simon. Both identifications depend on the authors’ identifications of the Wicked Priest. Cf. above, on 1QPeshab, p. 509f.


170 Strugnell, ‘Notes en marge,’ 177,220.

The Pesher on 2 Sam 7:10-14 is divided into two parts: a citation of 2 Sam 7:10-11a, with interpretation (4QFlor 1:1-7); and second, a citation of 2 Sam 7:11b-14a, with interpretation (4QFlor 1:7-13). In each unit the author adds additional citations to support and clarify his exposition.

The first section understands 2 Sam 7:10-11 as referring to three temples. The first one to be mentioned, the eschatological Temple inferred from 2 Sam 7:10a, is not preserved in the fragment, but is implied by the citing of Exod 15:17-18 which is the locus classicus for the eschatological Temple to be built by God himself. Significantly, in the Pesher it is referred to as ‘the House’ (בֵּית הַלּוֹוֹת, 1:2-3) and not as ‘temple’ (טָבִיבֵי), thus playing on ‘the House’ in the biblical verse. This temple is further described by a citation of Deut 23:3-4, from which it is inferred that no Ammonite, Moabite or bastard could approach it.

A second temple, named the ‘Temple of Israel’ (מַלְכִּי-אָדָם), is inferred from 2 Sam 7:10b. The text is understood as alluding to the Temple of Israel desolated by foreigners because of Israel’s sins; it is an evident reference to the First Temple, the only one desolated by foreigners at the author’s time.

A third temple is called a Temple of Men (מַלְכִּי-אָדָם), obviously inferred from 2 Sam 7:11a. This temple, then, should be understood as distinct from both the eschatological Temple of God and the Temple of Israel, destroyed in the past. It is a temple belonging to, or consisting of Men. It is described as a temple in which instead of real offerings, Works of Art were performed in a positio clearly less prominent. This indicates a doctrine of two Messiahs, one a priest and the other of the Davidic line (cf. below, pp. 539-41).

The same verse from Exodus is interpreted as pertaining to the eschatological temple in 11QTemp 29:8-10. In the present Pesher the exegetical connection between 2 Sam 7:10 and Exod 15:17-18 is based on the similarity in wording in both passages.

Deut 23:3-4 actually refers to ‘the congregation of YHWH’, not the sanctuary. This means that the Pesher identifies the congregation with the future Temple. Moreover, the Pesher excludes from the list foreigners and proselytes, who are not included in Deut 23 but inferred from Ezek 44:6-9, which depicts the future Temple. See Baumgarten, Studies, 77-78. But note Lam 1:10; Neh 13:1.

Obviously the verb וַיְדֹאֲשֵׁה means ‘desolate’ here, which would suit the context perfectly. Flusser’s proposition to interpret it as ‘desecrated’ is against the common biblical usage and is influenced by his interpretation of this temple as the Second Temple. Cf. idem, ‘Two Notes’, 102 n. 9; cf. also Ben-Yashar, ‘Midad-Adam’.

The Pesher is obviously interpreting מַלְכִּי-אָדָם, probably in connection with Jer 51:5, which speaks of the First Temple.

171 The same verse from Exodus is interpreted as pertaining to the eschatological temple in 11QTemp 29:8-10. In the present Pesher the exegetical connection between 2 Sam 7:10 and Exod 15:17-18 is based on the similarity in wording in both passages.

172 Deut 23:3-4 actually refers to ‘the congregation of YHWH’, not the sanctuary. This means that the Pesher identifies the congregation with the future Temple. Moreover, the Pesher excludes from the list foreigners and proselytes, who are not included in Deut 23 but inferred from Ezek 44:6-9, which depicts the future Temple. See Baumgarten, Studies, 77-78. But note Lam 1:10; Neh 13:1.

173 Obviously the verb וַיְדֹאֲשֵׁה means ‘desolate’ here, which would suit the context perfectly. Flusser’s proposition to interpret it as ‘desecrated’ is against the common biblical usage and is influenced by his interpretation of this temple as the Second Temple. Cf. idem, ‘Two Notes’, 102 n. 9; cf. also Ben-Yashar, ‘Midad-Adam’.

The Pesher is obviously interpreting מַלְכִּי-אָדָם, probably in connection with Jer 51:5, which speaks of the First Temple.

174 Obviouly the verb מָשְׁנַר means ‘desolate’ here, which would suit the context perfectly. Flusser’s proposition to interpret it as ‘desecrated’ is against the common biblical usage and is influenced by his interpretation of this temple as the Second Temple. Cf. idem, ‘Two Notes’, 102 n. 9; cf. also Ben-Yashar, ‘Midad-Adam’.

175 The Pesher is obviously interpreting מַלְכִּי-אָדָם, probably in connection with Jer 51:5, which speaks of the First Temple.

176 The Pesher is obviously interpreting מַלְכִּי-אָדָם, probably in connection with Jer 51:5, which speaks of the First Temple.

177 The Pesher is obviously interpreting מַלְכִּי-אָדָם, probably in connection with Jer 51:5, which speaks of the First Temple.
of Torah (מָלֵךְ-סֶדֶק) are offered. 177 Now deeds or works of the Torah are part of the sectarian’s ideals, who see themselves as ‘the Doers of the Torah’. 178 Hence, the Temple of Israel being the Temple of Solomon, and the Second Temple of the Maccabees being defiled and not worth mentioning, the Temple of Men appears to be none other than the sect itself. 179

This interpretation is supported by many other details of the sectarian ideology. We may refer to the designation of prayer as a sacrifice (CD 11: 20-21; 1 QS 9:4-5), indeed to the whole sectarian way of life as sacrificial (1Q5 1QS). It also explains the symbols of ‘the House’ and ‘Jerusalem’ as applied to the sect, which both imply the Temple. Especially interesting is the self-designation of the sect as ‘the New Jerusalem’ (as in 4QpIsa, cf. above, p. 514) which expresses the concept of the temple-city. This is especially significant in light of the halakhah of the Temple Scroll which considers all of Jerusalem as a temple-city and requires a corresponding state of purity. 180

In a sense, for the sect, the Temple and Jerusalem are one and the same. 181 Yet it should be emphasized that the sect’s identity with a temple does not necessarily imply that it replaces the actual temple service. Rather, it may indicate the priestly life of the sectarians, like servants in the sanctuary. 182

The second section of the Florilegium expounds 2 Sam 7: 14 as referring to the Plant of David, a messianic figure in the eschatological age. This is undoubtedly the Davidic Messiah referred to as ‘the Messiah of Justice, the Plant of David’ in 4QPatr 3-4. He is mentioned together with ‘the Searcher of the Torah’ (4QFlor 1: 1), who is referred to in CD 6: 7 as a historical figure, but in CD 7: 18-19 appears in an eschatological context. That means

177 Both the terms מָלֵךְ-סֶדֶק and מִלְכִּי-סֶדֶק (‘and this is the Torah of Men’). Thus Flusser, ibid.; Ben-Yashar, ibid. Therefore it is preferable to preserve this reading and not read מִלְכִי-סֶדֶק as suggested by Strugnell ibid and adopted by Brooke, 4QFlor, 138.

178 מִלְכִי-סֶדֶק. 1Q5 1QS 7:11, 8:1; cf. CD 4:8, 6:4, 14:4QpIsa 1-1011. 15, 23; as observed by Baumgarten, Studies, 82-83; Klinzing, ‘Die Umdeutung der Kultus, 83-4. 179 As it is understood by many scholars. Thus, e.g., Görtner, The Temple, 34-5; cf. also Klinzing, ‘Die Umdeutung des Kultus, 83-4. Schwartz, ibid., identifies it with the Temple of Solomon, but in the foreground interpretation it is the Temple of Israel which is seen as referring to the Temple of Solomon. Ben Yashar ibid. sees the Temple of Men as the Second Temple. This is unacceptable because of the negative attitude of the sect towards that temple. 180 Cf. Yadin, Temple Scroll 1, 215-63.

181 In my contribution, ‘Jerusalem and the Temple.’ I have argued that the concept of the Temple-city in the halakhic interpretation of the sect can best account for the employment of one symbol, ‘the House’, for the Tabernacle, the historical Jerusalem and the eschatological Jerusalem, in the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85-90).

182 Cf. The Angelic Liturgy, below pp. 524f. and 565f. Some passages show that the sectaries did not break with the Temple completely (cf. CD 6: 11-16, 20) and hoped for a restoration of the Temple in the eschatological era (1QM 2:1-6; 1IQ Temp 29:8-10).
Another point of interest is the chronological system implied in the Pesher. The mention of the tenth Jubilee, obviously the one destined for eschatological events, implies a system of ten Jubilees, which equals the seventy weeks’ calculation \((49 \times 10 = 490 = 70 \times 7)\), and therefore is another form of the system widely used in the Second Commonwealth era.  

The figure of Melchizedek as a supernatural redeemer and eschatological judge has striking affinities with the Epistle to the Hebrews (5: 1-10; 6:20; 7: 1-3), where Jesus is presented as a high priest ‘in the order of Melchizedek.’  

It is also suggested that the figure of Melchizedek influenced the title ‘Son of Man’ applied to Jesus in the New Testament.

Poetic and Liturgical Works

Among the manuscripts of Qumran, the fragments of liturgical works form an important part. This may be explained by the prominent role assigned to prayer at Qumran. Being prevented from bringing sacrifices to the Second Temple, the sectaries may have developed ‘offering of lips,’ namely prayer (IQS 9:4-5; CD 11:20-21). This situation would account for the variety of liturgical compositions.

Yet it is not always possible to decide precisely which purpose such compositions served, whether for actual recitation in ceremonies, for private or public prayers, or for meditation. Nor is it always easy to conclude whether the work in question is sectarian or not. Some compositions, as the Thanksgiving Psalms, evince the characteristic sectarian features of style and thought, but this is not true of compositions like the apocryphal psalms contained in the Psalms Scroll (11 QPs). Here, only strictly sectarian works will be discussed.

THE THANKSGIVING PSALMS

Collections of the sect’s Thanksgiving Psalms, psalm-like hymns also called Hodayot, survived in one larger manuscript (1QH) and in several other manuscripts. Their dating ranges from 100 to 1 B.C.E.

The first editors of the Hodayot were struck by their resemblance to the biblical Psalms, especially those of the type termed individual thanksgiving psalms. But it was soon realized that the similarity is partial and does not apply to all the hymns. At the same time these hymns do contain elements taken from other biblical forms. This eclecticism is typical of post-biblical literature in general. Hence the parallels to the Hodayot should be looked for in hymnic and psalmic compositions found in the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament. Some scholars are not even prepared to see real poetry in the Hodayot but call them ‘rhythmic prose.’

The Hodayot are divided into two groups: a type of hymn using the first person singular, and another using the first person plural. The first type of Hodayot are characterized by a strong personal tone and by many biographical details taken from the life of the speaker. Themes recurring in this connection are: the solitude of the speaker, his life in exile and persecution by his enemies, the grace of God in saving him and in electing him for a special knowledge, a knowledge that he transmits to a group of his followers. Similarities to what we know of the Teacher of Righteousness from other writings led to the attribution of these Hodayot to his own hand, but this rests on hypothesis. It was assumed that the second type of Hodayot refer to the community as a whole.
A related question concerns the Sitz-im-Leben in which the Hodayot came into being. Some suggested a liturgical function, but others thought that they are more suited for edification and reflection.

Though expressing themselves in a peculiar form of their own, the Hodayot produce a review of most of the sectarian ideas found in other works: dualism, predestination, election and grace, to mention a few. Peculiar to the Hodayot is the view that man is constituted of a duality of flesh and spirit; the flesh is base by nature, for it is susceptible to sin, while the spirit is capable of purification and repentance. This teaching is placed in the context of the general dualism and predestination of the sect: God has created everything according to a pre-ordained plan which divides the world into two camps, Good and Evil, so that repentance from sin is the lot only of those who belong to the camp Light. A special place is given to eschatological ideas. One Hodaya describes the future purification of the world in a great conflagration, and another describes the eschatological role of the sect as a small plant which will grow into a large tree.

THE BenedictionS

The fragments of this composition, 1QS, originally belong to the 1QS scroll. They produced liturgical blessings pronounced by the instructor (Maskil) and are addressed to the Fears of God, i.e. the entire community (1-2), to the Sons of Zadok, the Priests (3-4), and to the Prince of the Congregation (5:20-29). We do not know on what occasion these blessings were pronounced, but as the Prince of the Congregation appears in an eschatological context in the companion piece, the Rule of the Congregation (1QS), we may assume that the Benedictions were equally intended for an eschatological ceremony. Some blessings appear to be addressing the priestly Messiah. Likewise, the prominent function of Isa 11:1-5 in the blessing for the Prince of the Congregation suggests that the Messiah of Israel, i.e. of David, is intended. (See further below, pp. 539-41).

THE ANGELIC LiturgY

This work, 4QShirShabb, is extant in at least four manuscripts from cave 4, dating between 50 B.C.E. and 50 C.E. Linguistic peculiarities of the work define it as a sectarian composition. It has many affinities with prayers found in the War Scroll and with a liturgical work yet unpublished, 4QBerakhot. Only one fragment has been provisionally published.

The work consists of liturgies composed by a Maskil for every Shabbat offering of the year, according to the Essene calendar. Perhaps these songs were connected with the sacrifices in the actual Temple. The participation of angels seems invoked, and in general the liturgy in the heavenly Temple corresponds to the liturgy on earth.

The work seems to reflect a conception of seven heavens, with seven chief princes of angels, seven princes of second rank, seven tongues and seven words. It has obvious affinities with the rabbinc Merkabah traditions, which are concerned with speculations about the heavens, angels, and the ascension of the visionary to see the Merkabah, i.e. the Throne of God.

Interestingly, a copy of the same work was found in the excavation at Masada. The presence of this specifically sectarian writing may indicate that sectarianists were engaged in the defense of the Zealot fortress.

Halakah

As occurs in other groups of sectarian writings, the halakhic material also exhibits both affinities with Jewish literature outside the sect and a peculiar sectarian character of its own. While substantive parallels exist, e.g. with halukkah preserved in rabbinc tradition, the sectarian halukkah cannot be identified with it, nor with any other known halakhic tradition.

The debate on the origin of the sectarian halukkah dates from the publication of the Damascus Covenant (cf. above, p. 490), which on leaves 9-12 gives a varied collection of halakhot. Initially, these were identified either as Pharisaic or Sadducean. But further research showed that the picture is more complex. Comparisons between the Covenant and Pharisaic traditions showed that different solutions are given to halakhic problems. Comparative study of the sectarian halukkah and other halakhic

205 The reference is to a article discussing the relationship between the sectarians and the Essenes, with particular attention to the use of the term "halukkah" in both communities.
206 For reviews of the religious ideas in Hodayot cf. Licht, 'The Doctrine'; Merill, Qumran.
207 See below, pp. 537 and 539 and footnotes.
208 Cf. Milik, DJD 1, 118-30.
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traditions is necessary, but it serves to emphasize the specific identity of the sect.213

An analysis of the sectarian halukhah in the Covenant and in the Rule recently indicated that the sect divided the biblical laws into two categories: niggel (revealed) and nistur (hidden). The first type would consist of laws of which the interpretation is clear to everyone, while the other category is correctly understood only by the sectaries who derived it, according to this analysis, by means of a particular, divinely inspired exegesis.214

While the relationship between the halukhah of the Pharisees and the sectaries is complex, there are striking similarities between them. As we have seen above (p. 499) the graded process of admission to the sect was structured by the stratified system of purity rules. The three grades of admission correspond to three degrees of purity, the highest being that of the full members. A similar admission procedure is known of the Pharisaic Huburoth, fraternities for practising religious commandments such as the purity rules. There too, three grades of admission seem to have required corresponding, increasingly strict purity rules. In particular the distinction between the purity of food and that of liquids, the latter being more strictly guarded because it is more susceptible to contamination, sheds light on the sect’s distinction between the ‘Purities of the Many’ and the ‘Drink of the Many.’215 As such, both communities attest to the wider usage of the Second Commonwealth era to practice purity rules in various degrees.216 Yet there are also considerable differences, one of them being the fact that the sect separated itself from the rest of Israel. We are then, dealing with similarities, perhaps springing from common sources, but not with identity.217

THE TEMPLE SCROLL

With the recent publication of the Temple Scroll (11QT), the halakhic material from Qumran has been considerably augmented. This is the longest sectarian work yet published, and it is entirely devoted to halakhic matters.

212 Cf. Rabinovitch, ibid.
213 Jackson, Essays, 21.
214 Schiffman, The Halakhah, 75-76, who further suggests that the biblical text was the only source for the sectarian halukhah. See also his Sectarian Law, 2 1-1-7.
217 As argued by Rabin, Qumran Studies. Cf. the criticism on the book by Baumgarten, Studies. 3-12.

The scroll, fully edited with commentary by Yadin, is written on nineteen sheets of thin parchment, preserving sixty-seven columns. In its present state, the scroll measures 7.94 meters, but according to Yadin its original length was 8.75 meters. This is, then, the longest scroll yet known. It was copied by two scribes: one copied columns 1-5, the other, all the rest. The script of both is Herodian and Yadin assigns the manuscript to the first half of the first century C.E. But fragments of other copies of the work exist, according to Yadin, and one of them is assigned by him to the last quarter of the second century B.C.E. Yadin, therefore, thinks that the work was composed in its essential parts during the reign of John Hyrcanus (135-104 B.C.E.), or at the beginning of the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 B.C.E.). Yadin sees some of the scroll’s halakhot, for instance the Law of the King and Temple regulations, as particularly suitable for the period in question.

The language used by the scroll is the Hebrew literary style also found in the other scrolls, though it lacks their distinctive religious vocabulary. Yet this may be due to the different purpose and contents of the present work; it ostensibly imitates biblical style. Nonetheless, the scroll unmistakably betrays its Second Commonwealth origin: there is the typical use of the composite verb, characteristic of Mishnaic Hebrew, the use of words rare in the Bible but current in Mishnaic Hebrew, and the use of technical terms known from rabbinic parlance.222

Yadin suggests that the scroll should be identified with the sectarian composition Sefer Hahago, mentioned in other works, which he asserts is identical with the Book of the Torah alluded to elsewhere.223

The scroll is written in the first person and the speaker is God himself, addressing Moses, as is indicated in 45:5, 'The Sons of Aaron your brother'. The opening of the work is lost, so we do not know how it was introduced, but the composition is evidently conceived as a Torah given to Moses by God. This is achieved not only by the literary setting (God addressing Moses), but also by a thoroughgoing rewriting of large passages from the Pentateuch.224 While doing so, the author was undoubtedly convinced that

221 Cf. Qimron, 'The Language'.
222 Yadin, Temple Scroll I, 29-34.
223 Cf. Yadin, Temple Scroll I, 301-304. See above, n. 57. The Book of Torah is mentioned in CD 5:2; 4QPrPs 1-10 iv 2.8-9; 4Q171-1 iv 13-14.
224 Other methods employed include: a) altering the order of the biblical words; b) inserting additional sectarian halakhot; c) adding entire sections; d) interpreting the biblical text by emendations and glosses; e) conflating biblical laws of similar nature.
he was writing the truly divine Torah as revealed to him through tradition and divine inspiration.

The scroll contains the following subjects: the covenant between God and Israel, according to Exod 34: 10-16 and Deut 7: lff. (col. 2); the Temple, its structure, the sacrifices and offerings, the festivals (cols. 3-45); the Temple city and related purity regulations (cols. 45-52); the Law of the King (cols. 56-59); various prescriptions (cols. 53-56, 60-67). From this survey it is clear that the scroll’s main preoccupations are with the Temple and its service, and with the King’s Law.

In general the halakhah of the scroll is stricter than that of the Pharisees. Some of it is clearly polemical, such as the halakhah concerning the Temple and the Temple-city which stands in contrast to the practice in the contemporaneous Hasmonaean Temple as known from various sources. The scroll combines various biblical passages, among them Ezekiel 40-48, on the ideal Temple.

The basic principle is that the Temple-city is equivalent to the camp of Israel in the wilderness, and correspondingly the biblical purity laws concerning the camp and the Tabernacle are strictly applied. In contradiction to Pharisaic halakhah, the entire area of Jerusalem is considered as a Temple-city. Consequently, a three-day purification rite is required before admission, and all bearers of impurity are excluded from the city. Sexual intercourse is forbidden in the city (cf. CD 12: 1), as is defecation; women were apparently not permitted to live in the city. All of this is reminiscent of the sanctity of the camp of the Sons of Light in the eschatological war described in the War Scroll. Indeed, the similarities to the camp rules of the War Scroll form another indication of the sectarian origin of the Temple Scroll.

Among the peculiar halukhot implied by the strict observance of levitical purity is the one prescribing a place for defecation outside Jerusalem, undoubtedly inspired by Deut 23: 13-14. In another halakhah, burial in Jerusalem or other cities is strictly forbidden and a central cemetery for each of four cities should be allocated (11QTemp 48: 1-14). Special attention was paid to food and drink brought into the city, wine and oil being mentioned in particular. Only pure food and drink is allowed in, to be carried only in skins of pure animals which were sacrificed in the Temple (11QTemp 47: 7-18).

A prominent place in the scroll is allocated to the various festivals and their respective sacrifices. The peculiar feature of the festivals is that they are clearly reckoned according to the solar calendar of 364 days (cf. 11QTemp 64: 6-13). The scroll changes the order of the words in the respective verse (Deut 21: 22), indicating that death should occur by hanging, while the rabbinic halakhah prescribes that the convict be strangled before being hanged. This difference made Yadin suggest that the author of the Pesher on Nahum describes the hanging of the Pharisees by Jannaeus is not criticizing him but, on the contrary, saw a justified punishment in it for the Pharisees’ treachery (cf. p. 511).

In conclusion it may be reiterated that the halakhah of the sect as set below, p. 530). The sequence of festivals began with the waving of the Omer on the 26th day of the first month. On Shavuot, i.e. the 15th day of the third month, the offering of the New Wheat is celebrated. Two additional festivals are celebrated: the offering of the New Wine on the third day of the fifth month, and the New Oil festival on the 22nd of the sixth month. Each celebration is accompanied by a sacrificial meal in the Temple, where the corresponding first fruits are consumed.

A section with many innovations is the one dealing with the king. In addition to a rewritten version of Deut 17: 14-20, there are entirely new additions, as, for instance, the prescription that the king should consult an advisory council. The rules concerning the king’s wife bear the widest applications. She cannot be a foreigner, but must be of the king’s family. More strikingly, she is to be his only wife; he cannot remarry until she dies. In effect, polygamy and divorce are forbidden.

Interestingly, the king is absolutely subordinated to the high priest in all matters relating to optional war. Here the halakhah of the scroll again rallying itself to other sectarian scrolls where the future Messiah of Israel is clearly subordinate to the priestly Messiah (cf. p. 539f.).

The prominence of the king’s law and its original additions led some scholars to suggest that it represents a Hebrew sectarian version of a tractate on kingship, a literary genre well-known in Hellenistic times, especially in Egypt.

Another detail which intrigued scholars is the prescription for execution by hanging (11QTemp 64: 6-13). The scroll changes the order of the words in the respective verse (Deut 21: 22), indicating that death should occur by hanging, while the rabbinic halakhah prescribes that the convict be strangled before being hanged. This difference made Yadin suggest that the author of the Pesher on Nahum describes the hanging of the Pharisees by Jannaeus is not criticizing him but, on the contrary, saw a justified punishment in it for the Pharisees’ treachery (cf. p. 511).

In conclusion it may be reiterated that the halakhah of the sect as set

226 The new data of the Temple Scroll shed light on various prescriptions for offerings of oil and wheat preserved in a fragmentary state in 4Qhalakhah 5 (published by Baillet, DJD, 3, 300). Other related halakhic fragments named ‘ordonnances’: 4Q513, published by Baillet in DJD 7, 287-298; cf. also 4Q159 in DJD 5. In 4Q513 13 4, the expression אִלָּא צַבָּא עַשָּׁרָה is mentioned, which is to be associated with וַיָּקָםָה בַּלַּכָּא in CD 12: 16 (cf. above n. 25). The Temple Scroll also confirms that a reference to the New Oil festival is included in a small fragment mentioned by Milik, ‘Le travai’; cf. Baumgarten, Studies, 131-42.

227 Such a halakhic prescription may explain the size of the Qumran cemetery, which may have served the entire area. Cf. above, p. 484.

228 The verse adduced in support of this is Deut 17: 17-17, the same verse used by CD 4:20-21 to forbid polygamy in general. Another matrimonial halakhah imposed on the king and shared by the Covenant is the prohibition to marry the daughter of one’s brother or sister; 11QTemp 66:15-17 and CD 5:7-11. This prohibition was in force also among the Samaritans, Karaites, Falashas, Christians and Muslims, but not in rabbinic halakhah.

forth in the Temple Scroll is of a peculiar distinct character. The conception of Jerusalem as a Temple-city, the extreme purity rules involved in it, the deviating solar calendar and other details all confirm the close connection between the sect’s exclusive character and its halakhah. This exclusiveness gains additional severity from the divine inspiration claimed by the author of the scroll.

THE SCROLLS AND JUBILEES

The book of Jubilees shows affinity both with the sect’s severe halakhah and with its claim of divine inspiration (cf. above, p. 99-101). Therefore it is of particular interest to compare the halakhah of Jubilees with that of the Temple Scroll and the Damascus Covenant. Three main areas of affinity may be delineated: Sabbath, calendar and festivals, and general religious ideas.

As for Sabbath laws, both Jubilees and the Damascus Covenant permit only food prepared before the Sabbath to be eaten (CD 10:22-11:2; Jub. 2:29, 50:8), and both forbid fasting on the Sabbath (CD 11:4-5; Jub. 50:12).

Calendar and festivals: it was recognized long ago that the solar calendar advocated by Jubilees and 1 Enoch must also have served the sectaries, but with the publication of the Temple Scroll many more details became evident. Thus the sacrifice of Passover is to be offered before the Tamid and in the Temple court, and not after the Tamid in the city, as the rabbinic halakhah ordains (11QTemp 17:6-9; Jub. 49:16-20). The festival of Shavuot is considered a festival of offering, and not only of new wheat (11QTemp 19:9; Jub. 6:21). Also, the second tithe is attached to the festival offerings (11QTemp 33:4-10; Jub. 32:10ff).

General religious climate: in this context the violent rejection by Jubilees of any sexual contact between Israelites and foreigners should be mentioned (Jub. 30:11). It coincides with the prohibition to the king to marry a foreign woman in 11QTemp 57:15-19. Further parallels are: the idea that God will build the eschatological Temple himself (11QTemp 29%10; cf. Jub. 1:15-17, 26-29, and 1 Enoch 90:29) and the prominence of Levi reflected in the order of sacrifices in the Temple Scroll (11QTemp 23:10; cf. 1QM 1:2) and in the position of Levi as a priest in Jubilees (ch. 31).

In conclusion it may be said that though Jubilees and the Qumran scrolls share the same tradition in respect to many halakhot, yet they differ in various details and therefore cannot be simply identified. In consequence the question of the nature and the origin of sect’s halakhah remains open.

Varia

Up to this point the major compositions of distinctive sectarian character were reviewed. But there are many fragments of interest which do not fall into a specific category, nor is their sectarian character always evident. A few of them are reviewed now.

THE COPPER SCROLL

This document, 3Q 15, consists of a list of real or imaginary treasures hidden in various locations. The list is engraved on copper plates found in Cave 3. It describes some sixty-four caches of gold, silver, aromatics and manuscripts. The enormous amounts recorded led Milik to assume that they are imaginary. Others thought that the scroll may have referred to the sectarian treasures hidden during the Jewish Revolt.

HOROSCOPES

This is a curious document (4Q186), written in Hebrew, but from left to right instead of the reverse. It is written in a mixture of archaic and square Hebrew letters and also Greek ones. It appears to associate physical characteristics with specific psychological qualities, and to relate both to the position of the planets at the moment of one’s birth. Of special interest is the allocation of portions of Light and Darkness to each person, which seems to decide on his place in the camp of Light or Darkness.

THE NEW JERUSALEM

This name designates an Aramaic work found in several copies. It seems to describe the New Jerusalem and the Temple along the line of Ezekiel 40-48, giving the general plan of the city, the gates and towers, the disposition of a house and the interior of a house. Some fragments clearly

235 1Q22 and 1Q15 were published by Milik. DJD 1, 134-5; 3, 184-93, with variants from the MSS of 4Q. Among others, Milik cites a sentence indicating that a seer, who describes Jerusalem, is accompanied by a divine messenger, just as in Ezekiel’s description of the future Temple. 2Q24 was published by Baillet, DJD 3, 85-89, which dated it to the beginning of the first century C.E. A fragment of another MS., 11QJehNouar is being published by Jongeling. See his ‘Publication provisoire’. The fragment shows many affinities with 2Q24. There are additional 4Q MSS. still unpublished, assigned to Strugnell and Milik. Cf. Jongeling, ‘Note Additionelle’.
236 Discussed in detail by Licht, ‘An Ideal Town’.
The Religious Thought of the Sect

INTRODUCTION

The sect’s literary corpus attests to an overall unity of thought, terminology and style. Yet it also manifests a variety of manners of exposition, and of nuances in detail and formulation. This situation led to two different evaluations. One saw the sectarian literary corpus as reflecting a unified system of thought. Consequently, the aim of the analysis was a synthesis of the thought expressed in the various writings. More recently, scholars tend to detect various layers and stages of development in the sectarian literature, and the analysis aims at disentangling them.

Yet two general considerations should be taken into account. The sectarian documents, while attesting to a variety of literary forms, genres and purposes, to a large extent employ a poetic, repetitive style. Therefore, nuances may be due to various literary conditions, and not necessarily reflect different concepts or ideas. Secondly, all the major sectarian writings, the War Scroll, the Hodayot, the Rule, the Covenant and the Temple Scroll, stem from a relatively short span of time, namely between 170 and 100 B.C.E. This means that most of them were composed within the span of one or two generations. This seems to be too short a period to allow a far-reaching inner development of ideas, and even if divergencies exist, they should be seen as various components of basically one system which originated in a relatively short span of time (cf. p. 546 on the history of the sect). In light of these considerations it is preferable to pursue the first approach, and to see the sect’s thought as one homogenous system, though variously reflected by the different documents. The following survey outlines some central topics which are basic to the understanding of the documents.

237Yadin, Temple Scroll, 1, 167-9 notes the similarity of ‘the Houses of Steps’ (בֵּית הָעַלֶּכֶת) mentioned in 5Q 15 II 2 2-5 to the houses made to facilitate entry into the Temple mentioned in 11QTemp 42-7-8.
238E.g. Burrows, More Light, 277-362.
239See investigations such as those of Starcky, ‘Les quatre étapes’; Von der Osten-Sacken, Gott und Belial, and Murphy-O’Connor (above, footnotes 74, 91).
240This, of course, is tenable only if the origins of the sect are dated to around 170 a.c.e. But it is possible that the origins are earlier (cf. below p. 545), which would give a larger span of time for composition and literary development.
also their good or evil character. Significantly these notions concern the human domain only: nature is governed by laws proper to it. Although both sets of laws, in nature and in humanity, bear the same mark of rigorous predestination, yet the laws governing humanity are of special character. They prescribe the existence of two spirits, the Spirit of Truth or Light, and the Spirit of Evil or Darkness. Each spirit stands for an entire domain, in outside reality as well as in man’s heart; there is a camp of truthful spirits and angels headed by the Angel of Light, and there is a camp of evil angels, commanded by Belial, the Angel of Evil. Between the two camps lies eternal strife, which also divides humanity: all men are engaged in the struggle, either as ‘Sons of Light’ or as ‘Sons of Darkness’.

In this context, there is a special significance in the term ‘lot’ or ‘part’ (רָבָּא). It is especially prominent in the War Scroll, where it signifies the ‘part’ of each spirit or angel. Thus, the lot of Belial includes the evil spirits but also the Sons of Darkness. Interestingly, the community is God’s own lot, and not that of the Angel of Light (cf. 1QM 13:13, 15:1, 17:7; 1QS 2:2). This is a sectarian adaptation of the idea in Deut 32:8-9 that Israel is the part of God, while the nations are governed by angels.

In this way the position of the governing angels acquires a special significance: it gives supernatural expression to the strife between the two camps. The dualistic idea that the camps of good and evil are headed by two corresponding angels, the Angel of Light and Belial, is probably of Iranian origin (see below, p. 546f.), but at the same time use was made of biblical ideas and terminology. The name Belial (בֶּלְיָאָל) is used in biblical parlance as an adjective meaning ‘base’, ‘wicked’ (e.g., Deut 13:14; Prov 6:12). Later it is used as a proper name for the figure of Satan, who was meanwhile much more developed than the one known from the biblical texts (e.g., Zech 3:1; Job 1-2). A cosmic leader of the forces of Evil is known also in pseudographic works such as Jubilees, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and the Ascension of Isaiah. His opponent, the Angel of Light, shares many functions attributed to Michael, the Angel of Israel, as he is described in Daniel 10:21, 12:1; 1 Enoch 20:5 and in rabbinic

245 Cf. Isa 45:7. Shaked, ‘Qumran and Iran’, 433-4 warns that the common use of the phrase dualism is misleading, for it implies a rigid opposition of two equal forces of good and evil. He stresses that such equality does not exist in any of the religions, including Zoroastrianism. This is true also in Qumran. For a typology of dualism cf. Gammie, ‘Spatial and Ethical Dualism.’


251 As implied e.g. by Gammie, ‘Spatial and Ethical Dualism’, who enumerates the different type of dualism. Often this is the same dualism reflected in different domains.

252 Significantly, all the major components of Qumran dualism are found together in Zoroastrianism; cf. Shaked, ‘Qumran and Iran’. So it is difficult to argue that Iranian influence operates on only one segment such as reflected in the Treatise of the Two Spirits, as claimed by von der Osten-Sacken, Gott und Belial, 239-40. He discerns three stages of Qumran dualism: a) the earliest, cosmic dualism as expressed in 1QM 44 that the final, psychological dualism in the Two Spirits Treatise. Both from material and literary considerations, this reconstruction is questionable.

dualistic conceptions and terminology very close to what is found in Qumran writings. 254

PREDESTINATION AND ELECTION

It has already been stated that the dualism of the sect operates the so-called ‘double predestination’, i.e. the predetermination of man’s life and of its good or evil character. How does it function? The sectarians solved this question by applying predestination both to human history and to personal biography.

As for history, the central idea effecting the belief in predestination is that of the periods (מְעָרֵדָה) of history. It is well-known from the apocalyptic writings, but the few allusions in the scrolls suffice to conclude that the sectarians espoused the same teaching. 255 It conceives history as a sequence of ‘periods’, i.e. of units of time which are fixed in duration, in character and in their place in the sequence. The entire sequence and its components are preordained in the divine plan before creation. History is but the unfolding of this preordained sequence.

In addition, the sequence of periods is enigmatic and mysterious, and therefore is designated by the term ‘the mysteries of God’ (_HP רְדֵי גוֹ�). 256 Only the knowledge of these mysteries enables a true understanding of the historical process, its direction and its approaching End. The sectarians thought that this divine knowledge was divulged to the prophets, and that by true interpretation, equally inspired, the ‘mysteries’ of history could be revealed again. This was the function performed by the Teacher of Righteousness. The knowledge he imparted to the sect unveiled to its members the fact that they are living in the final generation, on the threshold of the Eschatological Era. Such a frame of mind clearly accounts for the utmost importance attributed by the sectarians to the proper understanding of the contemporary events and of the related biblical interpretation (cf. above, pp. 507-8). Though only referred to by allusions, undoubtedly the dualistic principle operated also in the sequence of the periods. 257

What is the sense of the personal biography in such an ideology? Can there be any place for freedom of choice, for moral responsibility? This presents a major difficulty for the understanding of the sectarian way of thought; especially so in light of the fact that the community did prescribe confession and repentance, did admit new members and consequently did allow for the possibility of a passage between the two camps. We have to go to other texts for an answer. The Treatise of the Two Spirits, usually taken as a paradigm of the sect’s thought, is set forth from the perspective of the divine plan of creation and history. But other sections, chiefly in the Hodayot, take their point of departure in the human situation. The Hodayot depict man as weak and base by nature, inclined to sin and treachery and void of knowledge; he was made out of dust and water, and born out of a woman’s womb (IQH:21-22, 4:29-3). This situation is decreed by the eternal and just Creator. Human nature was created in another duality: that of flesh and spirit. The flesh is feeble and liable to sin, while the spirit is often that part which is capable of receiving God’s grace (IQH:3:21). Undoubtedly this teaching draws on biblical formulations (e.g., 1Kgs.8:46; 2Chr.6:36; Job 15:14, 25:4), but it goes beyond the biblical tradition in its consequent distinction between spirit and flesh.

The total dependence of man on God, inherent in the fundamental laws of creation, implies that man’s salvation, if possible, depends on God too. So it is expressed in the Hodayot and elsewhere. Yet such salvation demands a corresponding attitude of man. In fact, by truly repenting and by following God’s true ways, i.e. the Law of Moses (IQH:10:30), man distinguishes himself as one who merits and is capable of receiving the divine grace. 258 At this point, the sect’s doctrine of election comes in. Though the first initiative may come from God, it is the elect who has to show his willingness and merit. Only then is true purification effected by the Holy Spirit (IQH 16:12) from the impurity of sin (IQH:4:37,14:24), comparable to the effect of purifying water (IQS:4:21) on the body in ritual baptism (cf. above, p. 499). In this way the elect becomes an expression of the action of the Holy Spirit, thus bridging the gulf between the divine and the human. 259

The string of ideas, sin — repentance — divine grace — salvation, is not exclusive to the Hodayot. It is also found in the Damascus Covenant, embedded in the history of Israel and the sect’s beginnings, which indicates that this cluster of ideas formed a basic component of the sectarian thought from its earliest phase. In fact, it conforms with the dualistic character of the sectarian ideology in that it integrates the various dichotomies: Creator 258 Cf. Garnet, Salvation and Atonement, 112-1 17.

259 The close connection between election and divine grace is another area of close resemblance between Qumran and early Christianity. Compare e.g. IQS:11:7-9; IQH:9:31-3, 15:14-15 with Gal 1:15; Eph 1:11. The dependence of man on God is equally stressed by both communities: compare IQS:11:16-17; IQH:14:13, 16:12 with Rom 3:22-24,11:5; Eph 2:8; 2 Tim 1:9.
and creatures; sin and purification: flesh and spirit. How, then, should this complex be reconciled with the double predestination? The answer must be that the elect too are part of the preordained plan of history, as stated in the Covenant:

For God has not chosen them (i.e. the wicked) from the days of eternity, and before they were established He knew their works and abhorred the generations when they arose, and He hid His face from the land, from their arising until their being consumed ... And in all of them (i.e. the epochs) He raised for Himself men called by name in order to leave a remnant for the land and to fill the face of the universe of their seed. (CD 2:7-12)

In this way, the predestination advocated in respect to individual lives, also operates in respect to general human history. Both the wicked and the elect are known by God ‘of old’, i.e. before the beginning of history; His divine predilection for the just as well as His hatred of the wicked are preordained.

The question remains what role is left for man. Man himself is incapable of deciphering that mystery, which embraces *both* his personal biography and history at large. His lot is to search all his life, by his own action, and by divine illuminating grace, in order to discover to which part he belongs, Light or Darkness. Thus, the emphasis is shifted from freedom of action to the mystery of knowledge. The freedom given to man is not to choose where to go but to discover where he is. This can be done only with the aid of divinely-inspired knowledge of the true meaning of the world, of man and of history. This is why the starting point of man is ignorance, while the final election is marked by a gift of knowledge.260

**ESCHATOLOGY AND MESSIANISM**

As it is, we do not possess a systematic presentation of the sect’s eschatological teaching. It is expressed in various connections, and more fully in respect to some particular aspects. We do not know how all these elements fit into one picture and therefore the presentation remains fragmentary. However one of the fundamental characteristics of all of the sect’s writings is the peculiar eschatological tension,261 created by the special place in history the sect ascribed to itself. The theoretical means by which this place is defined, is the teaching of the periods (cf. above, p. 536). Through it, the sect established its own special role on the threshold of the eschaton, which determines all its activities. The radical break with the past by repentance is at the same time a return to a purified, idealized past; the strict practice of the Law of Moses implies an uncompromising separation from the present wickedness and evil. Yet by these very elements, the sect announces the approaching End, and initiates the beginning of the eschatological process.262

This particular position of the sect is described with the image of a young, tender plant, which is hardly noticed in the present, but which in the future will grow into a large tree which will cover the earth (cf. Isa 60:21; Ezek 3 1). In sectarian parlance the plant refers to the group of the elect and the just, now few and hidden but destined to rule the world in the future.263

Not surprisingly, the decisive eschatological events and the appearance of the messianic protagonists take place within the community itself.264 The role of these messianic figures is not always clear, and some of the texts, like the *Hodayot*, lack reference to the Messiah altogether, even though they contain elaborate eschatological depictions.265

Even in the case of explicit messianic references there is some uncertainty. The Covenant contains references to ‘the Messiah of Aaron and (of) Israel’ (CD 12:23, 14: 19, 19: 10 (B), 20: 1 (B)). Initially, it was concluded that the Covenant espoused one Messiah, of Aaron and Israel simultaneously: an idea not known from other sources. But already Ginzberg argued that linguistically the expression may be understood as referring to two Messiahs, one from Aaron and one from David, an idea which is well-known from other Jewish sources such as the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*.266 When the Rule was first published, with its explicit reference to ‘the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel’ (1 QS 9: 1 1), this explanation gained much support. It was asserted that the expression

Mashtana haMeyusharim sheEyn.267


262 A similar picture of history emerges from the *Animal Apocalypse* (1 Enoch 85-90). Cf. Dimant, ‘History according to the Animal Apocalypse’.


264 As stressed by Huppenbauer, ‘Zur Eschatologie’.

265 The *Hodayot* (IQH 3:7-18) describes the birth of ‘a man’ with terminology suggesting the Messiah of David (cf., e.g., 1QH 3: 10 alluding to Isa 9:5). Cf. Van der Woude, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen*, 144-56. References to a future Davidic Messiah depicted in biblical terms are found also in a copy of the work known as ‘The Words of the Luminaries’, 4QDibHam (= 4Q504) 12 IV 5-8, dated to 150 B.C.E. There exist two other copies of this work, 4QDibHam* (= 4Q505) and 4QDibHam* (= 4Q506). Cf. Baillie in *DJD* 7, 137-75. See also below p. 567.

of the Covenant can be understood in the plural, and consequently the Rule and the Covenant concur in the teaching of two Messiahs. Apart from the Pseudepigrapha this teaching is also found in other sectarian works.

The role of the Messiahs is less clear. The references in CD and 1QS indicate that they will appear at the End of Days. In fact, they seem to inaugurate the eschaton itself. The priestly Messiah plays a central role both in the great eschatological war and in the festive messianic banquet (cf. above, p. 517-8). By contrast, the role of the royal Messiah is less clear; he is hardly mentioned in the War Scroll, although in 1QS 5:27-28 it is implied that he is to lead the battle against the nations.

The Balaam oracle (Num 24: 17) served as a major prooftext for the teaching of the two Messiahs. The verse is cited in three different texts: CD 7: 18-21 (A), 1QM 11:6-7 and 4QTest 9-13. The most explicit is the Covenant, which applies ‘the Star’ and ‘the Scepter’ mentioned in the verse to ‘the Searcher of the Torah who came to Damascus’ and to ‘the Prince of the Congregation’, respectively. In combination with other evidence it is clear that the Covenant interprets ‘the Scepter’ as referring to the Davidic Messiah. The identification of ‘the Star’ with the priestly Messiah is less unequivocal. While 4Q Testimonia refers to the ‘Searcher of the Torah’ as an eschatological figure, the Covenant speaks of him as a historical person.

As for the origin of the doctrine of the two Messiahs, one can point to the visions of Zechariah (4: 14). Yet its central place in the scrolls and related works such as Jubilees and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs shows that it was cherished by certain circles in particular. Perhaps this preference is due to the priestly tendencies of the sect and related documents. It may also reflect the criticism levelled by the sect against the contemporary temple priests, and its vision of a blameless priesthood.

Together with the figures of the two Messiahs, a third figure is sometimes mentioned, namely the eschatological prophet. In accordance with Mal 3: 22-24, he is introduced before the other messianic figures, thus in fact announcing their coming; but his exact function remains unclear.

As has been mentioned, both the Messiahs of Aaron and of Israel figure in the dramatic eschatological war. This war might be prompted by a large invasion of the Kittim as a measure of punishment, and further consists of three periods in which Belial and his camp are victorious, another three round won by the Sons of Light, and a seventh period in which the war is decided in favour of the latter by God’s own intervention. At this stage the sectaries themselves would come to rule in Jerusalem.

The relationship between these events and the various saviour figures and functions is not clear. Thus Melchizedek is attributed a role of executing vengeance on the Sons of Darkness and saving others from the hand of Belial (above, p. 521). His role may be connected with the final purification of the world by a great conflagration, an idea known from Persian sources and also may relate to the concept of the punishment of the wicked in eternal fire.

For the sectarians the eschatological upheavals seem to culminate in a beatific state of eternal peace, length of days and sovereignty over the land.
while the wicked will be damned to eternal fire. This final bliss is expected as an existence before God in the company of the angels, sharing angelic wisdom, which again stresses the importance of divine knowledge for the sect. It is not clear if this partnership with the angels will take place in a normal state of existence or after the resurrection, as might be expected. At least from one passage of the Hodayot (1QH11:9-14) it seems that a passage from the sinful state of the flesh into a purified existence is implied. Josephus states that the Essenes believed in the immortality of the soul, and Hippolytus adds that they believed in the resurrection. However, nowhere in the scrolls is there a clear formulation of these beliefs, and some passages in 1QH (6:29-34, 11:12) interpreted to this effect may be otherwise explained.

The History of the Sect

The history of the sect must be reconstructed on the basis of two sets of data: on the one hand the historical allusions in the scrolls, and on the other, the accounts of the Essenes, assuming their identity with the sect. The presentation is best served if we first start solely from the sectarian scrolls.

According to the Damascus Covenant, the birth of the sect occurred ‘390 years’ after the deliverance of Israel into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar (cf. above, p. 491). A group of men, ‘a root’, sprang from ‘Aaron and Israel’ and searched for twenty years. Then they received a guide from God: the Teacher of Righteousness. A part of the congregation in question rebelled against the Teacher and followed the ‘Spouter of Lies’, who led the dissenters astray in matters of doctrine and morals. A violent conflict ensued. Perhaps in the wake of this conflict the Teacher and his followers went to ‘the land of Damascus’, where they established ‘the New Covenant’. The history of the sect must be reconstructed on the basis of two sets of data: on the one hand the historical allusions in the scrolls, and on the other, the accounts of the Essenes, assuming their identity with the sect. The presentation is best served if we first start solely from the sectarian scrolls.

The opponents of the sect are named as Ephraim and Manasseh (cf. above, p. 501) because they invited ‘Demetrius, King of Greece’ to come to Jerusalem. Scaurus, the first Roman governor of Syria, are mentioned. It is now agreed among most scholars that the Wicked Priest is to be identified with Jonathan the Maccabee and that the sect’s opponents, Ephraim and Manasseh, should be identified with the Pharisees and the Sadducees. Most of the other events alluded to by the Pesharim fall into the Hasmonean Period, from the reign of Alexander Jannaeus to the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey (63 B.C.E.). Significantly, no later event is alluded to in the Qumran writings. Assuming the identity of the group in question with the inhabitants of Qumran, this means that most of the sectarian literature originated in the early period of the sect, between 150 and 50 B.C.E.

If we accept the identification of the sect with the Essenes, further references in Josephus to the Essenes provide information about the sect’s later history. Thus Josephus states that the Essenes were favoured by Herod, who dispensed them from the obligatory oath of allegiance, because of the prophecy of the Essene Menachem foretelling that Herod would become king (Ant. 15:371-378). Essenes also participated in the Jewish Revolt and even supplied one of the commanders, John the Essene (War 2:567). The copy of a sectarian work found at Masada corroborates this evidence (cf. above, p. 525).

While the first active period of the sect is generally agreed to have fallen under the Hasmonean rule, the issue of its origin is less clear. Most scholars agree upon the following elements. First, the number 390 in CD 1:5f. should be calculated from the destruction of the First Temple (586 B.C.E.), which together with the twenty years of searching yields the date 176 B.C.E. as the beginning of the sect. Assuming that the reckoning is

278 1QS 2:4-7, 1QH 13:17, 15:16, 18:30; 1QS 3:52; 1QM 1:9-4 Q P" 1-10 II 4-12. On the punishment of the wicked see preceding note.

279 1QS 4:22; 1QH 13:21-22, 6:13, 11:6-14; 4Q181 1-3-6. For 4Q181 cf. the text in DJD 5, 79-80 with the corrections and notes of Strugnell. In general see Kühn, Enderwartung, 66-72; Lichtenberger, Studien zum Menschenbild, 224.

280 Cf. above, p. 538. On knowledge at Qumran cf. Denis, Les Thèmes de Connaissance; Nösscher, Theologische Terminologie, 38-78: Romanik, ‘Thème de la Sagesse.’ For the partnership of the angels in the camp of the Sons of Light during the eschatological war see 1QM 7:6, 12:4, 8. Compare also 1QS 2:8; 1QS 3:6; 4:24-26. Note also the text 11QBer where a blessing is apparently addressed to the sect, and where it is stressed that the angels are participating. For text cf. Van der Woude, ‘Segenssprüche,’ 253.

281 Cf. Brandenburger, Fleisch und Geist, 104-5.


283 Cf. Kühn, Enderwartung, 78-88; Nickelsburg, Resurrection, 146-56; Lichtenberger, Studien zum Menschenbild, 219-224.

284 Cf. Cross, Library, 197-206; Milik, Ten Years, 44-98; Stegemann, Die Entstehung; Vermes, Qumran in Perspective, 137-162; idem, ‘The Essenes and History’.

285 The Wicked Priest is distinct from the Man of Lies, for they have different spheres of action and characterization. Cf. Stegemann, Die Entstehung, 46.
symbolic and consequently schematic and imprecise, scholars inferred that it alludes to a date around 171-170 b.c.e., which marks the murder of Onias III and the beginning of the hellenization crisis. Therefore they saw the years 170-150 b.c.e. as the matrix for the sect’s coming into existence. This, in turn, is associated with the alleged Zadokite origin of the Teacher of Righteousness and other leaders, and the sect is seen as schismatic group contesting the legitimacy of the Hasmonaean high priesthood.285

All these assumptions may be questioned. First, the chronological data of the covenant may be differently interpreted. As the number 390 is probably connected with the reckoning of the seventy years’ period (cf. Dan 9), the starting point for the calculation may be chosen at 605 b.c.e., the ascension of Nebuchadnezzar to the throne.286 This yields the date 215 b.c.e. as the sect’s beginning and 195 b.c.e. as the first appearance of the Teacher of Righteousness. According to this calculation the beginnings of the sect date back to a different historical context, namely the wars between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies on the control over Eretz-Israel.

Interestingly, such a dating is corroborated by a composition known as the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85-90) which was composed in the time of the Maccabean revolt. This composition is closely related to the sectarian literature in many respects and, in my opinion, to be considered an early sectarian work.287 The Apocalypse, too, calculates the last period of history in terms of seventy (year-)weeks, the end of which designates the beginning of the eschaton. The seventy weeks’ period is further divided into four sections comprising twelve, twenty-three, twenty-three and twelve weeks; i.e. periods of eighty-four, 161, 161 and eighty-four years. The appearance of the group of elect, corresponding to the sect, takes place at the beginning of the fourth section. Taking this chronological scheme at face-value,288 and here, too, starting the count in 605 b.c.e., i.e. before the destruction of the First Temple as is clear from 1 Enoch 55:57-58,289 the following dates emerge: 605, 521, 360 and 199 b.c.e. Each of these dates indicates a significant political event,290 but here it will suffice to state that the year 199 b.c.e. coincides with the appearance of the group of just. The date marks major events in Eretz-Israel. Politically, Judaea passed from the hands of the Ptolemies into those of the Seleucids, after the victory of Antiochus III in the Battle of Panium (200 b.c.e.291 which ended the Fifth Syrian War. Internally, the year 200 b.c.e. saw the death of the high priest Simon II, the last of the prestigious Zadokite high priests. The office of his son Onias III is already marked by internal strife.

This evidence, when added to the calculation of the 390 years, may point to the same circumstances surrounding the passage of Eretz-Israel into the hands of the Seleucids as the crucial date for the sect’s emergence. If we assume that the Animal Apocalypse refers to the appearance of the Teacher of Righteousness, this event can be assigned to a date between 199 and 195 b.c.e. This would allow nearly forty years of activity until 152 b.c.e., the appointment of Jonathan, the Hasmonaean leader, as high priest. The events alluded to in the Peshar on Habakkuk (above, p. 509) would according to this argument, belong to the last days of the Teacher of Righteousness.

If these suggestions are correct, two important conclusions follow. First, the theory that the sect came into being in reaction to the Hasmonaeans’ rise to the high priesthood is invalidated; as is the view that the Teacher of Righteousness was himself of Zadokite lineage and had a claim to this office.292 Secondly, it is unlikely that the hellenizing crisis presented the wrongly, that the author of the Apocalypse places himself at the end of the period of the seventy weeks.

285 Cross, Library, 132-134; Milik, Ten Years, 59; Stegemann, Die Entstehung, 210-220, 242. The beginning of the Teacher’s office is associated with the hellenizing crisis which was prompted by the ascension of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175 b.c.e.) and the death of the high priest Onias III (171 b.c.e.).

286 According to several sources, it is this date which serves as a starting point for the calculation of the seventy year period of Israel’s ‘subjugation to Nebuchadnezzar’ (Jer 25:1; 29:10). Thus Ezra 1:1; 2 Chr 36:21-22; Dan 1:1, 10:3 and 1 Enoch 59. The reckoning from the destruction of the First Temple is adopted by Zech 1:12.

287 The affinity between the Apocalypse and the sectarian scrolls was noticed already by Smend, ‘The Dead Sea Sect’, 358. Beckwith, ‘The Prehistory of the Pharisees’, 6, 36, thinks that it is ‘proto-Essenic’. For a discussion of the affinity between the apocalypse and the scrolls, see Dimant, ‘Jerusalem and the Temple.’

288 In my opinion, the various chronological schemes figuring in the apocalyptic writings cannot be lightly dismissed as inaccurate and symbolic, as is asserted concerning the 390 years in CD, cf., e.g., Milik, Ten Years, 38; Cross, Library, 133.

289 Beckwith, ‘The Significance of the Calendar’, pushes the beginning of the seventy years’ period to the ascension of Manasseh, i.e. 251 b.c.e. He arrives at this date by assuming,
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indirect incentive to the emergence of the sect. Such a theory is not only problematic on internal grounds, since there are no real polemics against the hellenizers in the scrolls; it is also hard to be reconciled with the fact that certain pseudopigraphical works earlier than the sect’s emergence contain ideas central to the sectarian ideology, as is the case with the ‘Astronomical Book’ (1 Enoch 72-82) which espouses the solar calendar.293 This situation points to the early existence of circles cherishing ideas which were later adopted by the sect. It may also explain the various parallels between the sectarian literature and pseudopigraphical works such as Jubilees and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Thus the sect should be viewed as the heir to a more ancient tradition. This would account for the fact that the sect’s literature exhibits a well-developed system of thought which cannot have been created in the course of one generation, but rather must draw upon a tradition long established in Eretz-Israel.294

In this connection, the Iranian influence apparent in the sectarian literature is particularly interesting. This concerns the type of dualism, the concept of ‘spirit’ and the prominent role of knowledge.295 There are no indications that this influence came through Hellenistic channels;296 on the other hand it is historically plausible to assume direct contact of the Jews with the Persians during the Babylonian exile and the Persian rule.

If, then, the sectarian movement is a phenomenon proper to Judaea, in what context should it be understood? In the past it was usually associated with the Assidaeans mentioned in 1 Macc 2:42, 7:12-13. However our precise knowledge of that group is limited to those few verses.297 It is here proposed to adopt a less restrictive frame of reference. The sectarian doctrine seems to have emerged from a wider trend existing in Judaism in at least the third and second centuries B.C.E. This trend is not directly connected with the hellenizing movement and the events which took place in Judaea between 170 and 150 B.C.E., but apparently has its roots in much earlier circumstances.298 The one certain conclusion that follows from these considerations is that the problem of the origins of the sectarian doctrines should be separated from the question of the historical and political circumstances which led to the actual creation of the sect.

The problems involved in the later history of the sect, e.g. its influence on other groups, are no less complex than those of its beginnings. Especially striking are the numerous similarities between the Qumran community and that of the first Christians, who were active concurrently around the middle of the first century C.E. The main elements to be mentioned are the communal organization, baptism, the strong eschatological awareness, the conception of the community as sacral, and other theological concepts such as predestination, dualism in various aspects, selection by grace, and the New Covenant; all of this underlined by a close similarity and sometimes identity of the characteristic vocabulary. Whether we should speak here of direct influence or of a more complex relationship remains to be discussed.299

293 Thus Hengel, Helissen 1, 230; Michaud, ‘Un mythè Zervante’. Hengel stresses in particular the Hellenistic influence on material circumstances (methods of construction, languages, etc.); cf. idem, ‘Qumran und der Hellenismus’, 359-60. However this influence does not necessarily imply influence in the religious domain.

295 For criticism on the current theories about the Haadim, cf. Davies, ‘Haadim’.

296 For a general theory dating the origin of Jewish parties to the Restoration time, cf. Smith, Palestine Politics.

297 Cf. above notes 254 and 259. For general surveys see Flusser, ‘Dead Sea Sect’; Cross, Library, 197-243; La Sor, Dead Sea Scrolls, 142-264; Vermes, ‘Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls’. For discussion of particular details see Braun, Qumran und das Neue Testament I-2; Stendahl ed., The Scrolls and the New Testament; Murphy-O’Connor, Paul and Qumran; Black ed., The Scrolls and Christianity; Charlesworth ed.. John and Qumran. See also the bibliographies in Braun ib. and Fitzmyer, Tools, 124-30.

298 For a general theory dating the origin of Jewish parties to the Restoration time, cf. Smith, Palestine Politics.

299 Cf. above notes 254 and 259. For general surveys see Flusser, ‘Dead Sea Sect’; Cross, Library, 197-243; La Sor, Dead Sea Scrolls, 142-264; Vermes, ‘Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls’. For discussion of particular details see Braun, Qumran und das Neue Testament I-2; Stendahl ed., The Scrolls and the New Testament; Murphy-O’Connor, Paul and Qumran; Black ed., The Scrolls and Christianity; Charlesworth ed.. John and Qumran. See also the bibliographies in Braun ib. and Fitzmyer, Tools, 124-30.
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Though the number of publications in this domain is enormous, there are few overall up-to-date reviews. MILLER, Ten Years and CROSS, Library remain classical and readable presentations of the state of research in the sixties. They retain their value because both authors are working on the scrolls and draw on yet unpublished material, although later publications, especially of the Temple Scroll, have necessitated a new approach. Two more recent reviews should be noted. VERMES, Qumran in Perspective offers a concise, very clear introduction to the major issues involved, with a good selective bibliography. The recent fascicle of the Supplement to the Dictionary of the Bible, dedicated to Qumran, represents some of the best French scholarship in the field, and offers a comprehensive review of the state of research. Especially valuable is the contribution of SIMON on the Bible at Qumran.
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Chapter Thirteen

Psalms, Hymns and Prayers

David Flusser

In the literary documents that are discussed in this volume, material of hymnic and liturgical nature is found scattered throughout. These psalms, hymns and prayers are the object of the present survey. The special interest they offer is that we can learn about various types of Jewish piety in the Second Temple period, including that of Hellenistic mystical circles, the Essenes and early synagogal liturgy.

The question, however, is to what extent these texts reflect actual liturgical practice. The majority are prayers put into the mouths of biblical persons who figure in these apocryphal works and it is clear that at least in their present form the primary purpose was not liturgical. Rather, such prayers and hymns were composed by the authors as parts of their literary output. Even in the case of purely hymnic compositions such as the Thanksgiving Scroll from Qumran, it is unlikely that they once formed part of a liturgy and they may rather have been written for studying. However in other cases, e.g. the apocryphal psalms from Qumran and Psalm 151 in the Septuagint, it is very probable that they were written for recitation before a congregation. There are also prayers in the Dead Sea scrolls with clear indications when they were to be said. Thus there is a basic difference between hymns and prayers contained in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha and many prayers from Qumran. While the first are literary compositions, at least some of the prayers and psalms from Qumran were actual liturgical texts. Even so, merely ‘liturgical’ prayers or hymns may often serve as witnesses for liturgical forms in Judaism, because they may imitate current liturgical patterns.

We are thus confronted with a problem of presentation. When the emphasis is on certain types of prayer, we may collect material from the whole range of documents. However when we focus on the prayers and hymns as they are contained in the sources, we have to deal with a variety of genres in each document. Our method will shift between the two viewpoints, according to the interest of the material itself.

Magnificat and Benedictus

A good example of this complex situation is provided by the two hymns included in the Gospel of Luke, namely the Magnificat (Luke 1:46-55)
and the Benedictus (Luke 1:68-79). 1 The Magnificat is a hymn recited by Mary, or according to other texts by Elisabeth the mother of John the Baptist, and the Benedictus is the song of Zechariah, the father of John the Baptist. Both became part of Christian liturgy. In the ‘Nativity Gospel’ (Luke chapters 1-2) other poetical passages are incorporated as well, 2 but many scholars believe that the Magnificat and the Benedictus are pre-Lukan and that their origin is to be found in circles attached to John the Baptist. They may originally have been written in Hebrew and only later translated into Greek; one opinion is that they are an elaboration of two Maccabean Hebrew psalms. 3 Indeed, even in their present form they are an expression of Jewish national feeling. In the Magnificat nothing is explicitly said about the birth of a child, and in the Benedictus only the second part (Luke 1:76-79) hints at John the Baptist as a prophet who will prepare the way of the Lord. There are scholars who assume that this second part was added, and that the first part (Luke 1:68-75) may simply be an ancient Jewish psalm of salvation. In any case the beginning of the Benedictus (‘Blessed be the God of Israel’) resembles the synagogal benedictions: it begins with the same word יְהֹוָה (Blessed). Moreover, there are important parallels in prayers from Qumran: 4 two prayers in the War Scroll (1QM 3:2 and 14:4) begin with the same word. 5 The first part of the Benedictus is an important witness for the development of the Eighteen Benedictions.

The Greek Additions to Esther and Daniel

While some of the psalms, hymns and prayers in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha were originally written in Hebrew (or in Aramaic), others were composed in Greek. Such is the case with the Prayers of Mordecai and Esther in the additions to the Greek Book of Esther. 6 These prayers are a literary fiction. They were evidently composed, along with the other additions to the book, in order to form an integral part of the Greek version. One of their aims was apologetical: since in the Hebrew Book of Esther

1 See especially Schirrmann, Lukasevangelium, 70-80, 84-94; Schneider, Lukas, 54-56, 59-60.
3 See Winter, ‘Magnificat and Benedictus’.
5 The beginning of the Benedictus, though very similar to 1 Sam 25:32, is not taken from there because there it is not a beginning of a prayer. See also Schirrmann, Lukasevangelium, 86 n. 28. It seems to me that there are striking similarities between the content of the Benedictus and the Magnificat, and 1QM 14:3-9 and 1QM 18:6-8. On the Qumran background of the Magnificat and the Benedictus see Flusser, ‘The Magnificat’.
6 See especially Moore, Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah, 30-34.

God is not directly mentioned, the Hellenistic Jewish author of the two prayers tried to correct this omission and had the two Jewish heroes of the book address God. Moreover, from the Hebrew text it is not clear why Mordecai declined to bow down before Haman, nor is it clear how Esther could marry a gentile or why Mordecai even forbade her to disclose her Jewishness to others. Thus in order to explain Mordecai’s behaviour, the author of the Greek additions to Esther has Mordecai say: ‘You know all things; you know, Lord that it was not because of insolence or arrogance or vanity that I did this; that I did not bow down before arrogant Haman; for I would have been quite willing to kiss the soles of his feet for Israel’s sake. But I did it in order that I might not put the glory of a man above the glory of God, nor will I bow down to anyone except you who are Lord, nor will I do this out of arrogance.’

Likewise Esther says in her apocryphal prayer that she loathes the bed of the uncircumcised and of all foreigners, and that she has not eaten forbidden meats nor drunk the wine of libations. ‘From the day I arrived here until now, your maidservant has not delighted in anything except you, Lord, the God of Abraham.’ 8 Thus the pious apologetical purpose of the two prayers is patent. At the same time they are an expression of a deep piety of Hellenistic Judaism. The exact time at which the prayers were written is not known.

One of the Greek additions to the Book of Daniel is ‘The Prayer of Azariah and the Hymn of the Three Young Men’. 9 It contains the prayer and hymn uttered by Azariah and his two companions, Hananiah and Mishael, after they had been thrown into the fiery furnace for their refusal to worship a golden image set up by King Nebuchadnezzar. The first to quote these songs is Justin Martyr (d. 165 c.E.). 10 Their exact dating depends on whether they were compositions independent of the canonical Book of Daniel and whether the Greek texts are originals or translations or adaptations from a Hebrew original. The terminus ad quem of the songs seems to be c. 100 B.C.E. 11

The main emphasis of the Prayer of Azariah is on the fact that God has acted justly in all he has brought upon the Jews, because they did not observe his commandments. As this emphasis does not fit the situation – the three martyrs did obey God’s commandments – some scholars think that the prayer originally had nothing to do with the Book of Daniel and was inserted only later into the Greek translation of the book. As the main

8 Addition C, 29.
9 Cf. above, pp. 149-52. Moore, Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah, 39-76. The additions to Daniel are preserved in the Septuagint and in the Greek version ascribed to Theodotion.
10 Apologia 1:46.
11 The versions of the Septuagint and Theodotion are virtually identical; see Moore, Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah, 30-34.
motif of the prayer is very common in ancient Judaism, especially in ‘apotropaic’ prayers recited in a situation of danger; it could have been composed to be recited by Azariah. But even so, it is very probable that the prayer was once independent of the Book of Daniel. Danielic fragments from the Dead Sea scrolls show that our Book of Daniel was not the only book dealing with Daniel and his fellows (see below).

A similar situation is that of the Hymn of the Three Young Men, but here a somewhat free translation from a Hebrew original is far more probable. It seems that it is a single composition though it can be divided into two parts: an ode (verses 29-34) and a psalm (verses 35-68). Both parts are antiphonal and the refrains are very similar. A constant refrain appears also in Psalm 136; another refrain is repeated in the Psalms Scroll from Qumran Cave 11 (columns 16-17). This refrain is added to each verse of 1IQPs145, but does not appear in the Massoretic text and ancient versions and was probably added to the psalm for liturgical purposes. Thus the use of refrains in the Hymn of the Three Young Men is in accordance with the liturgical practice of the Second Temple period. Of particular importance for the history of Jewish liturgical poetry is the ode. So we read: ‘Blessed is the holy name of your glory ... forever ... blessed are you in the temple of your sacred glory ... forever ... blessed are you on the throne of the glory of your kingship.’ This is an expansion of the doxology recited in the Temple of Jerusalem: ‘Blessed be the name of your glory forever.’ and the apoplectic prayer can serve as a kind of explanation of this famous Jewish doxology. Though the place of the doxology was the Temple of Jerusalem, it seems that in the first part of the hymn the author referred to the heavenly temple where God is enthroned upon the cherubim. If so, the Hymn is evidently the oldest datable reference to the heavenly temple of God.

The Prayer of Nabonidus

A proof of the existence of ‘Danielic’ literature independent of and even anterior to the extant book of Daniel is a fragment from Qumran, the so-called ‘Prayer of Nabonidus’. The Qumran document, written in Aramaic, describes the healing of the last ruler of Babylon, Nabonidus (555-539 B.C.E.), by a Jewish exorcist. The name of the exorcist is not preserved, but it is probable that this was Daniel himself. The plot of the fragment is parallel to (but not identical with) the content of chapter 4 of

the Book of Daniel and thus it can be assumed that there the less famous Nabonidus was changed to Nebuchadnezzar. This also fits in with the compulsory worship of the image of gold on the plain of Dura mentioned in Daniel 3. It was the same Nabonidus, and not Nebuchadnezzar, who introduced a religious reform, abolishing the worship of Marduk and promoting the worship of Sin, the moongod. Thus it is probably that the legend reflected in chapter 3 of the Book of Daniel, also reflects events under Nabonidus. Consequently the fragment of the Prayer of Nabonidus elucidates a more ancient stage of some of the stories in the first part of the Book of Daniel and makes the historical element in Daniel more tangible. Unfortunately the prayer itself is no longer preserved and so the fragment from Qumran does not contribute to the history of Jewish prayers in the period of the Second Temple.

The Prayer of Manasseh

The ‘Prayer of Manasseh’ is an independent prayer, written to give an idea of the penitence of the wicked king Manasseh and it is most probably a Jewish and not a Christian composition. According to 2 Chr 33: 12-13 when Manasseh was in distress ‘he humbled himself greatly before the God of his fathers. He prayed to him and God received his entreaty and heard his supplication ...’ The extant prayer is apocryphal; its task is to offer the wording of the prayer mentioned in 2 Chronicles. Its content is Manasseh’s repentance and his request for God’s mercy. A Syriac version is included in the Syriac Didascalia, a work of which the Greek text was probably written in Syria in the third century C.E. The Greek text of the prayer is included in the Apostolic Constitutions 2:22,12-14, whence, probably, it entered some manuscripts of the Septuagint, among the Odes appended to the Book of Psalms. The Prayer of Manasseh was probably composed in Greek; if it was a translation from the Hebrew, the Greek translator approached the original in a free manner.

Prayers in the Book of Tobit

One of the most important sources for the history of Jewish prayer is the Book of Tobit. The book is preserved in two Greek versions; it remains difficult to decide on the connection between these two translations, until the Aramaic and Hebrew fragments of this book found at Qumran are published. Then it will also be possible to decide whether the book of Tobit

12 Moore, Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah, 66. The words correspond verbally to הנאום מברוך, see in Q430 2513. See Newsom, Angelic Liturgy, 372.
13 See Flusser, Sanktus und Gloria’, 139 and n. 2 there.
16 In the manuscript of the Latin translation only the last words of the prayer are preserved. See Tidner, Didascalia Apostolorum, 37-8.
17 See Funk, Didascalia, M-89.
was originally written in Hebrew or in Aramaic. The date of the book is probably the fifth to fourth century b.c.e. One of the significant features is that the language of the Aramaic fragments largely resembles an imperial Aramaic earlier than that of Daniel. As the prayers in Tobit are ancient and more or less datable, they indicate how Jews prayed in a distant period for which such sure evidence is otherwise lacking.

Like most of the prayers in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, the prayers in the Book of Tobit are not independent compositions but serve to express the feelings of the personages of the book. The first two are the parallel prayers of the blind father Tobit’s prayer (3:2-6) and of the unhappy Sarah, daughter of Raguel (3: 11-15). As is common in such prayers, in both of them the captivity of Israel is mentioned. Typical are the words of Tobit’s prayer about the sins committed by the previous generation:

For they disobey'd thy commandments and thou gavest us under plunder, captivity and death; thou madest us a byword of reproach in all the nations among which we have been dispersed. And now thy many judgments are true in exacting penalty from me for my sins and for those of my fathers, because we did not keep thy commandments. For we did not walk in truth before thee (Tobit 3:3-5).

Tobit’s prayer on his wedding night (8:5-8) throws light on the history of later Jewish nuptial liturgy, especially in the mention of Adam and Eve. The prayer opens with standard phrases from Jewish liturgy: ‘Blessed art thou, God of our fathers’.

The prayer in Tobit, chapter 13, is not particularly relevant to the Book of Tobit. It is the earliest witness of a special type of psalms which we shall now examine.

Eschatological Psalms

The eschatological psalms of the Second Temple period constitute a specific genre. They sprang from Israel’s longing for deliverance from the foreign yoke and from the eschatological hopes connected with Jerusalem. The earliest evidence for this type of psalms is the hymn in Tobit 13, which according to one of the two Greek versions Tobit himself wrote. It contains numerous echoes of biblical passages. Its main content is an eschatological vision of the new Jerusalem. God will ‘again show mercy and will gather us from all the nations among whom you have been scattered.’ That Jerusalem will be built with precious stones is an echo of Isa 54: 1 1-12 (cf. Rev 21: 18-2 1). Tobit’s hymn fits his views about the future given in the last chapter of the book (14:4-7).

The last part of the apocryphal Book of Baruch (4:5-5:9) contains a prayer which is near in spirit to Tobit’s long prayer. This psalm of encouragement is addressed first to the exiled children of Israel and then to their mother Jerusalem; it is probable that its original language was Hebrew. The captivity is seen as a punishment for Israel’s sins, but God will deliver it from the power of its enemies and the sons of Jerusalem will be gathered there, rejoicing in God’s glory. He will display his splendour to every nation. There is a clear connection between Baruch 4:36-5:9 and the eleventh of the Psalms of Solomon (composed in the middle of the first cent. b.c.e.; there is a possibility that both have a common source. If so, the prayer in the Book of Baruch was composed in Hebrew between the first half of the second and the first half of the first centuries B.C.E.

Another representative of the genre of eschatological psalms is the eleventh of the Psalms of Solomon just mentioned. Its author sees in spirit the future return of the dispersed Jews and the final grandeur of Jerusalem: ‘Stand on the height, 0 Jerusalem, and behold thy children, from the East and the West, gathered together by the Lord; from the North they come in the gladness of their God, from the isles afar off God has gathered them. . . Put on, 0 Jerusalem, thy glorious garments, make ready thy holy robe . . .’ (11:3-8).

An eschatological psalm is also to be found in the book of Ben Sira. The mention of God’s future judgement and his vengeance on the wicked nation (35:17-20) induces the author of this Hebrew work to include a prayer for the deliverance and restoration of Israel (36: 1-17). May God cause the fear of him to come upon all the nations, ‘and let them see thy might. . . and let them know thee, as we have known that there is no God but thee;’ may God destroy the adversary and wipe out the enemy. Ben Sira prays that God’s eschatological promises may be quickly fulfilled, and says: ‘Gather all the tribes of Jacob and give them their inheritance as at the beginning . . . Have mercy on the city of thy holiness, Jerusalem, the place of thy rest. Fill Zion with thy splendour and thy temple with thy glory . . . and fulfill the prophecies spoken in thy name. Reward those who wait for thee and let thy prophets be found trustworthy . . . and all who are on the earth will know that thou art the eternal God’ (36: 1-17). Here, as in the other examples, we find the main motifs of the genre: the deliverance of Israel from their foes, the gathering of the dispersed and the future glory of Jerusalem and its Temple.

Our last example of the genre of eschatological prayers from the Second Temple period is found in the Psalms Scroll from Qumran, col. 22: 1-15,

---

20 Ginz, Chapters, 66 n. 46.
21 Or this item see Flusser-Safrai, ‘In His Image, After His Likeness’.
22 See Moore, Daniel, Ester and Jeremiah, 250, 305-16.
23 The book of Baruch also contains a prayer for the exiled community (2:6-3:8); see below, p. 571.
24 See below, p. 573-4.
25 Ben Sira likewise includes a prayer for self-control (2 1:27-23:6). There is a similar prayer in Pss. Sol.16:10-11.
where a prayer appears which its editor named ‘Apostrophe to Zion’ (11QPs*Zion). The Hebrew hymn is not to God but to Zion itself. The main statement is: ‘Great is thy hope, 0 Zion: peace and thy longed-for salvation will come;’ in other words, the well-known motifs of the genre appear. The hymn speaks of the generation of saints which will inhabit Jerusalem and walk in her splendid squares. All enemies of Zion will be cut off; violence will be purged from her midst; the hope of Zion will not perish. The poet even says in verse 17: ‘Accept (i.e. Zion) the vision bespoken of thee and the dreams prophets sought for thee.’ This is a clear reminiscence of Sir 36: 14-15, especially in its Hebrew wording; thus the eschatological prayer in Ben Sira may be an ancestor of the ‘Apostrophe to Zion’.

An interesting detail is that the group among whom the ‘Apostrophe to Zion’ was composed is characterized as ‘those who yearn for the day of thy salvation’ (verse 4): ‘How much they have hoped for thy salvation, the pure ones have mourned for thee’ (verse 9). These are evidently the same pious circles which we meet in Luke, chapter 2, including Simeon who ‘was righteous and devout, looking for the consolation of Israel’ (Luke 2:25) and the prophetess Anna who ‘did not depart from the Temple worshipping with fasting and prayer night and day,’ and when she saw the infant Jesus, ‘spoke of him to all who were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem’ (Luke 2:36-38).

The Qumran Psalms Scroll and the Syriac Psalms

The Psalms Scroll in its present form contains forty-one biblical psalms and four apocryphal psalms which were already known from other sources. In addition to these, three hitherto unknown hymnic compositions are found, which the editor of the scroll named the ‘Apostrophe to Zion’ (dealt with above), the ‘Hymn to the Creator’ (a sapiential hymn of which only nine verses have been preserved) and the ‘Plea for Deliverance’ which we shall treat below. Finally, the Psalms Scroll contains a prose section known as ‘David’s Compositions’. On palaeographical grounds the manuscript has to be assigned to the first half of the first century c.e. This date corresponds to the time when those circles lived in which Essenism crystallized. This impression is reinforced by the additions to Ben Sira which may be an ancestor of the ‘Apostrophe to Zion’.

One of the four apocryphal psalms was already known from Ben Sira (5:1-13-30), both in the original Hebrew and in the Greek version. It is not a prayer but a poem in which the author tells how he acquired wisdom and sought to impart it to others. In the Psalms Scroll the poem is included as a Davideic composition, which provides a definite proof that it was not part of the original book of Ben Sira, which ended with chapter 50. The other additions to Ben Sira are not contained in the Psalms Scroll. Sir 5:1-12 is a thanksgiving hymn which in the Greek version begins with ‘I will give thanks to thee’ (Hebrew ‘Al Meshucot’, an opening known from most of the Essenine Hodayot. The other addition is preserved only in Hebrew and has the same structure as the biblical Psalm 136 (‘The Great Hallel’). As this hymn shows interesting affinities with Jewish synagogue prayers, especially with the Eighteen Benedictions, it is a pity that the time of its composition is unknown.

The three remaining apocryphal psalms were already known from a Syriac translation and one of the three also from the Septuagint as Psalm 151. These three Syriac psalms appear together with two more psalms not available in the Psalms Scroll as ‘filler’ material in a Book of Discipline written by the Nestorian bishop Eliajud of Al-Anbar (died c. 940). Moreover, all five psalms are preserved in three Syriac biblical manuscripts. Syriac psalm I differs from the Qumran text and fits the Greek version from which it apparently was translated, while the other four Syriac psalms were evidently translated from the Hebrew. This evidence makes it probable that the Hebrew originals of all the five Syriac psalms stem from the Qumran library, while Syriac psalm I which was already known from the Greek Psalter, was translated into Syriac from there and not from its Hebrew original. Interestingly, we learn from an ancient letter that around the year 786, Hebrew manuscripts were discovered in the vicinity of Jericho various circles. Some may have been composed within the broader movement in which Essenism crystallized. This impression is reinforced by the sectarian calendar reflected in ‘David’s Compositions’.

30 11QPs*Sirach. ‘It is now quite clear that the canticle is totally independent of Sirach. If Jesus, son of Sira, of Jerusalem, had penned the canticle it would hardly be found in 11QPs, which claims Davidic authorship’ (Sanders, Psalms Scroll, 83).
31 Cf. below p. 567. In the Geniza MS. the two parts of the first verse are interchanged.
32 They have been given the following indications (see Van der Woude, pp. 31-32): Syriac psalm I or Psalm 151 = Septuagint Psalm 151 = 11QPs*28:3-14 Syriac psalm II or Psalm 154 = 11QPs*18:1-16 Syriac psalm III or Psalm 155 = 11QPs*24:3-17 Syriac psalm IV or Psalm 152 Syriac psalm V or Psalm 153. See Sanders, Psalms Scroll, 33 and Van der Woude, Syrischen Psalmen. The last work contains an introduction and a German translation of these five non-canonical psalms based upon a new critical edition by Baars, ‘Apocryphal Psalms’.
and among them were more than 200 Davidic psalms. It is feasible to assume that the Hebrew originals of the Syriac psalms belonged to this find, although that does not necessarily mean that they were composed at Qumran. Syriac psalms I, III, IV and V will be discussed in the following sections as representing two specific literary genres which are also evidenced by other documents.

Syriac psalm II is a sort of sapiential hymn. It is surely not strictly Essene, as it speaks of the ‘assembly of the pious’ (line 12), a Hebrew designation which does occur in the biblical Ps 149: 1, but never in strictly Essene writings. The hymn was composed in this particular congregation and it praises Wisdom: ‘From the gates of the righteous is heard her voice, and from the assembly of the pious her song. When they eat with satiety she is cited, and when they drink in community together, their meditation is the Law of the Most High.’ We see that there was a more or less rigid and separatist community which studied the Torah at common meals and imparted wisdom to the simple folk who are far from its gates. The psalm may perhaps be called proto-Essene, or Hasidic.

Apotropaic Prayers

Syriac psalm III represents a distinct type of prayer which still exists today. One scholar saw in this psalm an overall individuelles Danklied with a Klagelied, but it is more precise to define its genre as an ‘apotropaic’ prayer. Other texts in this genre are: a prayer in the Psalms Scroll, col. 19; a prayer from the Aramaic Testament of Levi which is put into the mouth of Levi the son of Jacob; and four rabbinic prayers. The biblical Psalm 51 is a remote ancestor of this genre. It is natural that an apotropaic prayer, like other types of prayer, should not be exempt from other motifs; conversely, prayers of another kind can contain apotropaic sentences as well. The main objectives of this type of prayer are: understanding (Torah); protection against sin; forgiveness, purification, and removal from sin; salvation from troubles; resistance to temptation and deliverance from Satan.

Thus Syriac psalm III (Psalms Scroll, col. 24) is such an individual prayer for forgiveness, mercy and purity. It ends by saying that God fulfilled the psalmist’s request. The most purely apotropaic passage is in lines 8-14. Of special interest is line 11b: ‘Do not bring me into difficulties insur-

A potropaic prayer is one that is said in order to ward off evil. These prayers were often recited in times of trouble or when someone was about to undertake a difficult task. They were meant to protect the speaker from harm and to bring them safety and security.

The other apotropaic prayer in the Psalms Scroll is what its editor called the ‘Plea for Deliverance’ (column 19:1-18). It is one of the three apocryphal psalms of the Scroll which are not preserved in any translation. Like the other apotropaic psalm, the ‘Plea for Deliverance’ is not typically Essene. We meet Satan and the evil inclination of rabbinic literature and prayer, rather than Belial and the spirit of wickedness of Qumran. The typically apotropaic passage which has parallels in similar texts is found in the lines 13-16. Of special importance are also lines 9-11: ‘I belonged to death in (or: through) my sins and my iniquities had sold me to Hades, but thou didst save me, 0 Lord.’ In the Epistle to the Romans (6:23) Paul says that ‘the wages of sin is death’ and that man, being carnal, is ‘sold under sin’ (7:14), and he asks: ‘Who will save me from this body of death?’ (7:24). We see that Paul used specific Jewish concepts to serve his theology of the Law.

Autobiographical Poetry

As stated, the composition from the Psalms Scroll known as the Syriac psalm I is also contained in the Septuagint Psalter as Ps 15 1. The superscription reads: ‘A Hallelujah of David the Son of Jesse.’ However the composition itself is not a prayer to God or a hymn, but a poetical narrative; the speaker is David himself and the content is 1 Sam 16: 1-13, his election and anointing by the prophet Samuel. David also mentions his skill as a musician: ‘My hands have made an instrument and my fingers a lyre’ (vs. 2). Verse 3 is preserved only in the Hebrew version and its interpretation is difficult. Some scholars think that the verse says with beauty and simplicity that mute nature appreciates David’s masterful music in praise of God. If this interpretation is correct, then this is a very early description of David as a counterpart of the Greek musician Orpheus as we know him from Jewish and early Christian art. The last two verses

38 See Sanders, Psalms Scroll, 70. Especially interesting are lines 10-11: ‘A man who glorifies the Most High shall be conduced as one who brings a meal offering, as one who offers he-goats and bullocks, as one who fattens the altar with many burnt offerings, as a sweetsmelling fragrance from the hand of the righteous,’ Sanders rightly compares these words with IQS 9:4-5, but see also Sir 32:135:1-3.
39 See Sanders, Psalms Scroll, 73.
40 See Flusser, ‘Apopropaic Prayers’.
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of the Greek translation of Ps 151 speak of the Goliath episode, but they are in reality an epitome of another apocryphal psalm, in which David speaks of his clash with the Philistine. This psalm has a superscription which is naturally lacking in the Greek translation: 'The beginning of David’s power after the prophet of God had anointed him.' Thus the Greek Psalm 151 is an amalgamation of the psalm mentioned earlier (called Ps 151A) which dealt only with David’s musicianship and anointing, and the composition which follows (Ps 151B). Unfortunately only the beginning of this second composition is preserved, at the end of column 28 of the Psalms Scroll.41

As in Syriac psalm I (Psalms 151 A/B), the speaker in Syriac psalms IV and V is the young David, this time on the occasion of the events described in 1 Sam 17:34-37. There David himself tells how he watched the sheep for his father and killed a lion and a bear. In Syriac psalm IV, David, struggling with the lion and the bear, prays to God to rescue him from the danger and send a deliverer. Syriac psalm V is a thanksgiving psalm said by David after God sent an angel who shut the jaws of the two wild beasts and thus saved David’s life. This legendary aspect goes beyond the biblical text, which states that David himself killed the animals.

Thus we know of four non-biblical, pseudo-Davidic psalms, all of them most probably written in Hebrew. All have events in the life of the young David as their theme. As we have observed, these psalms were probably once together in the library of Qumran. Thus it is not unlikely that these psalms were composed as parts of a pseudepigraphic autobiographical sequence. Liturgical purposes seem absent. As it is, we do not know whether this sequence contained more psalms, and whether it covered David’s youth only or also the rest of his life. There is no doubt that the sequence was partly inspired by the secondary superscriptions of some of the biblical psalms.42 Thus we are able to recognize in ancient Judaism a special autobiographical poetical genre. The natural place of such autobiographical poetry is in a book which narrates the pertinent deeds and events. This is so in the Hebrew Bible, e.g. Moses’ song at the Reed Sea; the song of Deborah; the song of Hannah, and other psalms in the Book of Samuel; so also in the Book of Tobit, in the additions to the Greek books of Esther and Daniel, in the prayer of Manasseh, in the Aramaic prayer of Nabonidus and in the psalm of encouragement in the apocryphal book of Baruch.

Another hymn which is related to this genre is the Greek prayer for wisdom in the Wisdom of Solomon (9:1-18; see 1 Kings 3:6-9).43 Personified Wisdom is defined here as the companion of God’s throne and the petition for Divine Wisdom is the central theme of the prayer. Solomon prays for wisdom, because he needs it, being chosen by God as a king of his people: ‘Send her (the Wisdom) forth from the holy heavens and dispatch her from your majestic throne, so she may labour at my side and I may learn your pleasure . . . So shall my works be acceptable, and I shall judge your people justly, and be worthy of my father’s throne.’ The end of the prayer (9: 13-18) expresses the idea that man cannot know the counsel of God because his perishable body weights down the soul. This concept of the body is Platonic: man is able to reach understanding only if God grants him wisdom and sends his holy spirit from on high. However the ideas expressed in this last part of the prayer are not only Platonic, but are also influenced by the Essene understanding of man.44 The closest parallel to this passage is in the Thanksgiving Scroll (1QH4:29-33).

Mystical Prayers

An important question is the role played in ancient Jewish liturgy by mysticism. A prominent witness is the Greek Testament of Job45 but the problem is that we do not know in what circles this book originated and what liturgical reality it may reflect. Music plays a prominent role in the book, as when Job says (chapter 14): ‘And I used to have six harps and a ten-stringed lyre. And I would arise daily . . . and I would take the lyre and play for them (the servants) and they would chant. And by means of the harp I would remind them of God so that they may glorify the Lord. And if my maidservants ever began murmuring, I would take the harp . . . and I would make them stop murmuring in contempt.’ Chapter 25 contains a poem with a refrain about the cruel lot of Job’s wife, contrasting her prior wealth with her present misery. Parallel in content is Eliphas’ ’royal lament’ over Job’s disaster (chapter 3 1:5-8 and chapter 32). This time the refrain is: ‘Where is now the splendour of your throne?’ As an answer to this mourning-song, Job utters a mystical hymn (chapter 33) and speaks about his throne and the splendour of its majesty among the holy ones, in a supra-terrestrial realm. Chapter 43 contains a song of condemnation of Elihu: Elihus receives the spirit and recites the hymn in which Elihu is described as belonging to darkness and not to light, because ‘he loved the beauty of the serpent and the scales of the dragon.’ The Testament of Job mentions other prayers (40: 14; 49:3;50:3) which are not given in the book. It seems, however, that these indications are only literary fiction, as in the case of the mention of a great lamentation after Job’s death in 53: 1, which is followed only by a short poetical lament (53:2-4).

41 See Sanders, Psalms Scroll, 60-61.
42 On this problem and related questions see now the important study of Bayer, ‘The Titles of the Psalms’.
44 See Flusser, ‘Dead Sea Sect’, 257-60.
The book contains interesting references to other mystical religious songs. After the happy ending to Job’s suffering, his daughters receive wondrous sashes with which they gird themselves. Thereupon they are given a new heart, so that they no longer think of earthly things and are able to chant verses in the angelic language ‘according to the hymnic style of the angels’: the author affirms that these hymns are recorded in other collections (chapters 48-57). Before he died, Job took a lyre and gave it to his daughter Hemera, and gave a censer to Kassia and gave a kettle-drum’ to his third daughter, ‘so that they might praise those who had come for his soul,’ and indeed ‘the daughters praised and glorified God in the exalted dialect’ (53:3-7).

It is not very probable that the songs contained in the Testament of Job were actually used as liturgical poetry in the Jewish Hellenistic circles in which the book originated, although this possibility cannot be completely excluded. In any case, it is likely that the work in some way reflects the liturgy, including pneumatic songs, of a Jewish mystical group living probably in Egypt in the second century c.E.60

Another work, possibly written at the same period in similar circles, is the Greek legend of Joseph and Asenath.47 The book tells the story of Joseph’s marriage with the Egyptian Asenath, who is depicted as a prototype of the virtuous proselyte. As in the Testament of Job, the atmosphere is impregnated with the supernatural and miraculous. The book contains two poetical prayers; in the first (8: 10-1 1) Joseph blesses Asenath. The second (chapters 12-13) is uttered by Asenath after she has repented, renounced her paganism and destroyed her idols. Both prayers begin with a praise of God as Creator. In the second prayer Asenath, after the praise of God, confesses that she has sinned as an idolatress and prays God for forgiveness and salvation. The content and structure of this prayer resemble the Prayer of Manasseh (above p. 555). These literary compositions may in some way reflect actual prayers of the Jewish Hellenistic group in which the book was written.

In the first prayer (8: 10), it is said that God has called all things ‘from darkness into light and from death into life’ (cf. also 15: 13). A parallel to these words exists in the Easter Homily of the Christian bishop Melito of Sardis (chapter 68).48 In other parts of this sermon Melito is also dependent on the Jewish liturgy of the night of Passover. These complex connections pave the way for the assumption that the two prayers in Joseph and Asenath indirectly reflect some liturgical reality.

A further document reflecting ancient Jewish mysticism is the Apocalypse of Abraham,60 a book which is preserved in a Slavonic translation from the Greek; it is probable that the original language of the book was Hebrew. It was evidently written in the same period as Joseph and Asenath and the Easter Homily, i.e. in the second century c.E. The traces of mysticism are even stronger than in the Testament of Job; there are clear affinities with the mystical school which is represented by the so-called Hekhalot literature.50 The book even offers the song taught to Abraham by the angel who guides him on his way to heaven, and this song (17: 8-18) is the very hymn sung by the angels who mount guard before the Throne. This hymn already has the numerous character of the later Merkabah hymns.51

Another important document contributing to the history of Jewish mystical liturgy is the Angelic Liturgy62 in manuscripts from Qumran cave 4 which can be dated paleographically to the late Hasmoncean or early Herodian period (c. 75-25 B.C.E.) It describes the Sabbath praise-offerings of the angels in the heavenly sanctuaries. The recitation of the Angelic Liturgy appears to have been a vehicle for the liturgical communion of the Qumran community with the angels. The songs of the angels are only referred to, but never quoted. These descriptions are clearly dependent upon the Book of Ezekiel. Although there is no direct genetic relationship between the Angelic Liturgy from Qumran and the Hekhalot hymns of later Merkabah mysticism, significant affinities of content and style are evident.50 In the body of the composition very little if any characteristic sectarian terminology is used, but even if there was a prehistory of the Angelic Liturgy outside Qumran, the composition appears to have been used by the Qumran community. The liturgical Sitz im Leben of this composition is

46 Schaller, Die Testament Hiobs, 309-11, suggested that the author belonged to the sect of the Therapeutae, without sufficient proof.
47 See above, p. 65-7 1; Philonenko, Joseph et Asenath.
48 ‘It is he that delivered us form slavery to liberty, from darkness to light, from death to life, from tyranny to eternal royalty’. This is parallel to the introduction to the Hallel in the Passover Haggadah. See Hall, ‘Melito’, On Joseph and Asenath, Melito and the Passover Haggadah see Pines, ‘From Darkness into Great Light’. On the same question see also Flusser, ‘Some Notes on Easter’.

50 Schalten, Major Trends, 61 already saw that the attributes of God in this hymn are in some cases identical with those used in Greek and early Christian prayers. This (and other indications) makes it difficult to assume that the book was not composed in Greek, but in Hebrew. Philonenko, Die Apokalypse Abrahams, 417 saw this difficulty and therefore was prepared to consider the beginning of the hymn (17:8-10) as a later Greek interpolation.
52 Above p. 524-5; Strugnell, ‘The Angelic Liturgy’. Meanwhile all the texts have been published, with introduction and commentary, by Newsom, Angelic Liturgy.
53 Abstract from Newsom, Angelic Liturgy.
unclear, as the text does not contain actual liturgical prayers. It is possible that the text was recited on Sabbaths by the Instructor (*Maskil*), who is mentioned at the beginning of the various units.

**Qumran Liturgical Texts**

Our discussion of hymns of mystical quality brought us to the liturgy of the Qumran sect, and to a possible function in it of the *Maskil*.54 We shall now deal with the other hymnic and liturgical texts from the Qumran caves, which in part document actual liturgical practices of a specific, socially well-defined group.55

The *Canticles of the Instructor* are an indication that the *Maskil* did have some liturgical function, although we can not define it precisely.56 In this collection of canticles, which has been preserved in fragments from two copies, the Instructor speaks in the first person.57 Like the *Angelic Liturgy*, these poems begin with the words ‘To the Instructor, a song’ (cf. Ps 45: 1). Thus the canticles show an affinity with the *Angelic Liturgy*, an affinity also expressed in the angelology which figures prominently in both collections. But in content and wording they are sometimes closer to the *Thanksgiving Scroll*.

We now turn to the hymns in the *Thanksgiving Scroll*. As in the *Canticles of the Instructor*, their author speaks in the first person, and these hymns are markedly expressive of the religious and theological approach of a leader of the sect. This in itself makes it difficult to assume that such personal prayers could have been written for liturgical purposes, since that would require the speaker to be presented as a biblical person, as in the Davidic compositions from Qumran. Thus its seems probable that both the *Thanksgiving Scroll* and the *Canticles of the Instructor* were composed for study rather than for use as prayer. It is very unlikely that the two compositions were written by the same author: as far as we can judge from the fragments, the dualistic anthropology of flesh and spirit and the specific theology of election which are typical for the *Thanksgiving Scroll* and the concluding psalm of the *Manual of Discipline* are absent from the *Canticles of the Instructor*.58

Some of the hymns in the *Thanksgiving Scroll* open with the word ‘Blessed be’ (*ברוך ב-ו*),59 which opens many prayers from the period of the

---

54 For other duties of this functionary, see 1QS 13:9-12 (above, p. 501-2); CD 12:21.
55 Most of the important liturgical fragments are now published by Baillet in DJD 7, but see also the other volumes of this series.
57 DJD 7, 215-62.
58 On these concepts see Flusser, ‘Dead Sea Sect’, 252-63 See also Flusser, ‘The Sect of the Judaean Desert’.
59 The words ‘Blessed be you God of Gods’ appear in the *Canticles of the Instructor* (Baillet, DJD 7,229).

---

Second Temple and many rabbinic prayers and benedictions. However, the regular opening of the thanksgiving hymns is ‘I thank you’ (*תִּודה*). This was also the opening of the thanksgiving hymn of Jesus (Matt 11:25-27; Luke 10:21-22).60 Not only the opening of Jesus’ hymn but also the free rhythm of the poem and its content show affinity with the Essene thanksgiving hymns. Furthermore, the high self-awareness expressed in Jesus’ hymn resembles the Essene hymns; both Jesus and the author of the *Thanksgiving Scroll* proclaim that they reveal to the simple divine things hidden from others. Thus it seems evident that Jesus knew the Essene thanksgiving hymns and used their form in order to express his own place in the divine economy, though he introduced into his own hymn the motif of his divine sonship, which is naturally absent from the *Thanksgiving Scroll*.

In Cave 4 at Qumran, fragments of three copies of a collection of prayers were found of which the editor assumed that it was named *The Words of Luminaries*.61 It is a work of great importance for the history of Jewish liturgy. The oldest manuscript dates from the early Hasmonean period (about 150 B.C.E.) and the collection itself is evidently pre-Essene. These hymns are not personal but community prayers to be recited on specific days of the week; Wednesday and Sabbath are indicated in the fragments.

The theme of these prayers is a plea for God’s mercy on his people. Israel has sinned in the past and was rightly punished for its sins. ‘Do not remember against us the sins of our forefathers!’ God will also remember the election of Israel and his mighty deeds in its favour, and forgive them and gather the dispersed. Naturally, these prayers also contain reminiscences from biblical history, from the creation of Adam to the catastrophe at the end of the First Temple. An exception to this pattern is the prayer for the Sabbath, a day destined for joy; the pertinent fragment is a hymnic praise of God. With this exception, the prayers of this collection belong to the genre represented by biblical prayers such as Dan 9:3-19,62 which can be termed *Tahanunim* (supplications) according to the word which appears in Dan 9:3, 17. The liturgical use of such supplications is convincingly proved by the evidence in the Qumran fragments showing that they were said on specific days of the week.63

There are more Qumran texts which carry indications as to their actual liturgical use. In Cave 1, fragments of another collection of liturgical
prayers were discovered.64 In the first of them, the beginning of what is named ‘a prayer of the Day of Atonement’ is preserved. It is very probable that two other fragments also belong to the liturgy of the Day of Atonement.65 Especially interesting is the third fragment, which describes events from the creation of the luminaries until Moses.66 It resembles the content of poetical introductions to the so-called Avodah which forms part of the synagogal liturgy of the Day of Atonement.67

As already said, most of the liturgical fragments are from Cave 4 of Qumran. Many are too small to allow conclusions to be drawn about the character of the scrolls they represent.68 It was suggested by their editor that 4Q502 preserves fragments of the ritual of marriage, but that is by no means sure. The fragments of 4Q503 contain the remainder of short evening and morning benedictions for all the days of the month. They are introduced by indications as to when the community pronounces the pertinent benediction; the benedictions themselves are phrased in the plural; e.g. ‘We, the sons of your covenant’ or ‘We, your holy people.’ Introductory indications appear also in the fragments of 4Q512, in the so-called Ritual of Purification.69 There the introductions specify the kinds of purification which call for specific prayers; these prayers are naturally phrased in the first person singular.

Another document deserves to be mentioned in this connection, although it was not discovered at Qumran. In the Cairo Geniza, four pages from a medieval manuscript were found which contain a fragment from a collection of non-biblical psalms, termed the Songs of David. Apparently these psalms were composed in the Second Temple period and probably were once brought from Qumran.70

The psalms are expressly designed to be recited day after day and were consequently destined for actual liturgical use. This may be the collection mentioned in the prose list of ‘David’s Compositions’ in the Psalms Scroll, where we read that David composed ‘songs to sing before the altar every day, all the days of the year.’72 As in the case of the non-biblical psalms from the Psalms Scroll, the Songs of David are attributed to David himself. Here he appears as a prophet, a universal messianic king who is to teach all the inhabitants of the earth, so that they may return to God’s way, serve him truly and no longer adore the idols.73 This combination of universalism and Jewish messianism is an important witness for the development of Jewish religious thought.

Specific expressions reveal a relationship to the Essene literature, but these Davidic psalms are not strictly sectarian. They were apparently composed in the same circles as the Davidic psalms from the Psalms Scroll, as is attested by similarities in terminology and phrasing.74 More precisely, the Songs of David contain somewhat more sectarian terminology and concepts than the non-biblical psalms from the Psalms Scroll or the Words of Luminaries, and consequently seem nearer to the sect than the latter.

The importance of the Songs of David for the history of Jewish worship is undeniable. Not only do they attest actual liturgical practices of circles close to Esseneism, they also contain liturgical phrases which reappear in rabbinic prayers.75

Some other liturgical texts may be mentioned, of a more formalized nature. The liturgy of the annual solemn renewal of the Essene covenant is described in the Manual of Discipline 1: 16-2: 18, although the full wording of the ceremony is not given.76 Those who enter into the covenant make a confession (1QS 1:24-2: 1) which has biblical roots and resembles the confession of the high priest on the Day of Atonement (M. Yoma 3:8) and the confession in the Damascus Covenant 20: 27-30.77 The benediction of the priests (1QS 2:2-4) is a poetical enlargement of the priestly blessing in Num 6: 25 and in this respect resembles the blessings in 1QS.78 Curses follow, against ‘all the men of the lot of Belial’, and against those who enter the covenant but in their heart resolve not to change their wicked ways (1QS 2:11-18). The latter curse owes its vocabulary to Deut 29: 17ff., but enlarges it and deepens its meaning.79 At the end of the Manual of Disci-

64 Barthélemey-Milik, DJD 1, 152-5. Fragments of the same work were found in Qumran Cave 4 (4Q507, 4Q508, 4Q509). See Baillet, DJD 7, 175-215.
65 See Grin., Chapters, 155-8.
66 The editor wrongly saw the fragment as being eschatological, speaking about the Dead Sea sect! In the last line of the fragment mention is made of רכש השם יראתנים (the faithful shepherd, Moses, a meek man). Moses is described as a meek man in Num 12: 3 and ‘the faithful shepherd’ is a current attribute of Moses in rabbinic literature. Here it appears for the first time.
67 See Elbogen, Der jüdische Gottesdienst, 216-7, 277-8.
68 See DJD 7, 73-262.
69 The language of the fragment of the lamentation in 4Q501 recalls the style of the Thanksgiving Scroll, while the content resembles the Psalms of Solomon.
70 Baillet, DJD 7, 262-86.
71 Flusser-Safrai, ‘A Fragment’. Language and style of the fragment also point to a date of composition before 70 C.E.
72 Sanders, Psalms Scroll, 92.
73 See the translation of one of the universalistic passages from the Songs of David (2: 8-19) in Flusser, ‘Paganism’, 1097. It resembles so much to Tob 14: 6 (Sinaiticus version) that dependence or a common source is probable. Another parallel is 1QH 6: 11-13.
74 Especially with Syriac psalm III (11 QPq 155); Sanders, Psalms Scroll, 70-7 1.
75 E.g., the verses in leaves 2:20 and 4: 11-12 are relevant for the history of the Kaddish.
77 Cf. also Jubilees 1:22.
78 It is probable that the early Christian community used a similar curse against those who tried to join it dishonestly. This becomes evident from Peter’s words to Simon Magus (Acts 8: 2:1-23): ‘You have neither part nor lot in this matter...’, The words ‘gall of bitterness’ in Acts 8:23 are taken from Deut 29: 17f! See also Betz, Offenbarung, 170-6.
In the War Scroll (1QM 9:17-16:1; 16:13-17:9:18:6-19:8), when considering them, we must bear in mind that they are designed only for the eschatological war, not immediate use. Yet I venture to suggest that some of these liturgical pieces are not just the product of eschatological ‘science fiction’, but are based upon actual prayers and hymns which the author of the War Scroll adapted to the eschatological setting and to his own theology. One of the significant features of these prayers is the frequent appeal to God’s promises for the future as well as his mighty deeds in the past. God is asked to grant victory as in the days of Pharaoh (1QM 11:9-10); he has delivered Goliath into the hand of David (1QM 11:2-3); and he preserved for himself Eleazar and Ithamar for an eternal covenant (1QM 17:2-3). This return to the past is a constant motif in similar prayers for deliverance. Indeed, together with other features it constitutes another genre of Jewish prayers.

Prayers in Distress (Tahanunim)

Jews of all ages have said prayers in times of distress. The basic pattern is a combination of two elements: supplications for God’s help and the remembrance of his saving deeds in the past. So, in Mishnah Taanith 2:4-5, a litany is quoted which was to be recited on fast days, and in which God is asked to help because it was he who answered Abraham in distress, Israel at the Red Sea, Joshua at Gilgal, Samuel, Elijah on Mount Carmel, Jonah, David and his son Solomon. The prayer for the deliverance and restoration of Israel in Ben Sira 36:1-17 asks God to fulfill the prophecies spoken in his name, and begins with the election of Israel. In the Book of Judith, the heroine prays God to help her (chapter 9) in the following words: ‘0 Lord

peline (10:1-11:15), we find religious poetry which in spirit is similar to the Thanksgiving Scroll, but is not a prayer properly speaking, because God is not addressed in it.

The scroll from Qumran Cave 1 containing the Manual of Discipline adds two more texts at the end. The second of them is a collection of blessings (1QS), to be pronounced by the Instructor on a specific solemn occasion, which cannot be precisely identified because of the fragmentary condition of the scroll. We do know that it will occur in the eschatological future, because, for instance, one of these benedictions is in honour of the Prince, a title of the Essene Davidic Messiah. The benedictions of this work are again another poetical elaboration of the priestly blessing in Num 6:25.

Of special interest are the prayers and other liturgical pieces contained in the War Scroll (1Q10M 9:17-16:1; 16:13-17:9:18:6-19:8). When considering them, we must bear in mind that they are designed only for the eschatological war, not immediate use. Yet I venture to suggest that some of these liturgical pieces are not just the product of eschatological ‘science fiction’, but are based upon actual prayers and hymns which the author of the War Scroll adapted to the eschatological setting and to his own theology. One of the significant features of these prayers is the frequent appeal to God’s promises for the future as well as his mighty deeds in the past. God is asked to grant victory as in the days of Pharaoh (1QM 11:9-10); he has delivered Goliath into the hand of David (1QM 11:2-3); and he preserved for himself Eleazar and Ithamar for an eternal covenant (1QM 17:2-3). This return to the past is a constant motif in similar prayers for deliverance. Indeed, together with other features it constitutes another genre of Jewish prayers.

Prayers in Distress (Tahanunim)

Jews of all ages have said prayers in times of distress. The basic pattern is a combination of two elements: supplications for God’s help and the remembrance of his saving deeds in the past. So, in Mishnah Taanith 2:4-5, a litany is quoted which was to be recited on fast days, and in which God is asked to help because it was he who answered Abraham in distress, Israel at the Red Sea, Joshua at Gilgal, Samuel, Elijah on Mount Carmel, Jonah, David and his son Solomon. The prayer for the deliverance and restoration of Israel in Ben Sira 36:1-17 asks God to fulfill the prophecies spoken in his name, and begins with the election of Israel. In the Book of Judith, the heroine prays to God to help her (chapter 9) in the following words: ‘0 Lord

See above, p. 524; DJD 1, 118-30 and Lichi, The Rule Scroll, 273-89.

80 It is also very probable that the blessing by which the high priest was to be blessed, was destined for the future priestly Messiah.

81 For the characteristic patterns of the prayers in the Essene War Scroll see Flusser, ‘The Magnificat’. 82 In Judith 16:1-17 there is also a song of praise which Judith and all the people sing after the victory. It is modelled on the pattern of Old Testament poetry. In its first part (Jdt 16:2-12) Judith speaks of herself in the third person, as Deborah did (Judg 5). The second part of Judith’s song (16:13-17) is marked by a new beginning: ‘I will sing to my God a new song.’ It is a general hymn of praise; nothing can resist God; the foundations of the earth shall be shaken and in God’s presence the rocks shall melt like wax, ‘but to those who fear thee, thou wilt continue to show mercy.’ Every sacrifice is for God a very little thing, ‘but he who fears the Lord shall be great for ever.’ At the end of the song Judith proclaims that the Lord Almighty will take vengeance on all enemies of Israel ‘in the day of judgement’. Thus the song ends with an eschatological outlook (cf. Isa 35:18-20, a passage which precedes the prayer for deliverance of Israel). Griniz, Sefar Yehudith, rightly argues that the Book of Judith was written in the Persian period, as was the Book of Tobit; which indicates the antiquity of these prayers. 83 On the Tahanun see Elbogen, Ojegiisch Gottesdienst, 73-81; Ydth, ‘Tahanan’. 84 Neh 1:4-11, 9:6-37; Dan 9:3-19; cf. Ezra 9:6-15. On Dan 9:3-19 see Hartmann-Di Lella, Daniel. On pp. 245-6 and 248-9 these authors argue that this prayer is an insertion into the basic stratum of chap. 9 of Daniel. The assumption that the prayer is older than the chapter itself is strengthened by the similarity with the Qumran Words of the Luminaries. See also Delcor, Daniel, 185-6. 85 Cf. Jer 32: 15-23. See Moore, Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah, 257-8, 283-94.
by a priest named Eleazar. Both contain the three motifs: the plea for God’s help, the petition for forgiveness of Israel’s sins and the enumeration of God’s saving deeds in the past. We also find, as is usual in such prayers, an apostrophe to God as the Creator of the universe.

An important witness for Jewish prayers in distress in the Hasmonaean period is 1 and 2 Maccabees. In one of the prayers in the First Book of Maccabees68 (7:40-42), Judas prays that God may crush Nicanor’s army as once the angel struck down the army of the Assyrians in the time of Sennacherib. Another prayer of Judas Maccabaeus before a battle (1 Macc 4:30-33), which begins with the usual ‘Blessed are you’, also mentions mighty deeds of God in the past, namely those in the days of David. It is significant that in the same book (2:49-68) Matthias in his last words asks his sons to remember the deeds of the fathers, mentioning Abraham, Joseph, ‘Phineas our father’, Joshua, Caleb, Elijah, Hananiah, Azariah and Mishael and Daniel. All this fits the genre of which we have spoken.

Of the prayers in the Second Book of the Maccabees,87 two are found in the letters prefacing the book. In the first, from the year 124 B.C.E., written at Jerusalem to the Jews in Egypt, there is a prayer (2 Macc 1:2-5) which is reflected in a Jewish prayer still said today.88 This is the oldest non-biblical Jewish prayer which can be dated precisely. The second opening letter was written by Judas Maccabaeus89 to the Jews in Egypt before the purification of the Temple in the year 164 B.C.E. It contains an interesting prayer ascribed to the priests in the time of Nehemiah (2 Macc 1:24-29) and also a benediction connected with the death of Antiochus: ‘Blessed for all things be our God who gave the impious doers for a prey.’ This is a common form of Jewish benedictions.90

The Second Book of the Maccabees itself also gives prayers of the Maccabean warriors,91 which reflect Jewish prayers of the time. This is an additional indication that the book is not purely Hellenistic, but is also rooted in Palestinian Judaism. Most of these prayers are pleas for deliverance and, as befits the genre, include historical reminiscences. In 2 Macc 8:14-15, the Jews pray to be saved, ‘if not for their own sake, yet for the sake of the covenants made with their fathers, and because he (God) had called upon them his holy and glorious name.’ Then Judas Maccabaeus exhorts them not to fear the enemy and tells them of the times when help came to their ancestors (2 Macc 8:18-20). He also mentions the rescue in the time of Sennacherib, an event which is equally mentioned in Judas’ prayer before the battle with Nicanor (15:21-24), beseeching God to send a good angel to save Israel (cf. 11:6). In another prayer (12:15) the fall of Jericho is recalled. According to 2 Macc 15:8-9, Judas exhorted his men to keep in mind the former times when help came from heaven, encouraging them from the Law and the prophets. In another prayer (14:34-36) the priests begged that the Temple that had recently been purified should remain undefiled for ever. And after the victory over Nicanor, the people ‘blessed the Lord who had manifested himself, saying, “Blessed is he who has kept his own place undefiled”’ (2 Macc 15:34). This is the language of Jewish benedictions.

Psalms of Solomon

This work was written in Jerusalem in the middle of the first century B.C.E. It was originally written in Hebrew, but only a Greek translation has been preserved.92 Nothing but the title indicates the authorship of Solomon. The aim of the Psalms of Solomon is didactic, polemical and theological. It is difficult to assume that they were written for liturgical purposes or later became part of any liturgy. The eighteen psalms reflect the dramatic events of Jewish history in that period and criticize the various Jewish groups. A prominent theme is criticism of those who cause social evil. The author is influenced by the contemporary apocalyptic trend. This is surely the main reason why, after the manner of apocalyptics, he does not name persons and political parties. He apparently laments Pompey’s conquest of Jerusalem in 63 B.C.E. (psalms 1 and 2; and see psalm 17) and describes his violent death in Egypt (psalm 2), without naming him or the Romans. Some idea of the political and religious involvement of the author may be deduced from the way he speaks of those who love the assemblies of the pious who fled to the desert (psalm 17:18-20). This is the party of the Hasidim, which is already mentioned in 1 Macc 2:42 (cf. Ps 149:1); the author of the Psalms of Solomon was evidently one of the later adherents of this party. This explains why he denounces the Hasmonaean dynasty as illegal, and why his religious opinions resemble the teaching of the Pharisees, especially on the resurrection of the body and on the question of

---

68 Others are: 1 Macc 3:50-53; 4:30-33; 7:36-38, 40-42.
70 See Flusser, ‘Sanktus und Gloria’, 143. (The date of the letter is 124 B.C.E and not 143 as indicated there.)
71 I have shown elsewhere that this letter is authentic. See Flusser, ‘Jerusalem’, 277-80.
72 Another benediction is pronounced by one of the heroes of the Biblical Antiquities (26:6) after seeing a miracle: ‘Blessed be God who has done such great wonders (virates, ἀγαθά) for the sons of man.’ This seems to have been a Jewish benediction said after a supernatural phenomenon had occurred. It is reflected in Matt 9:8 after the healing of a paralytic: ‘When the crowds saw it, they were afraid, and they glorified God, who had given such authority to men.’ The original wording of the benediction is changed here under the influence of Matt 9:6 and parallels. A very similar benediction is pronounced by Jews when they see a non-Jewish king: ‘Blessed be you, o Lord our Lord, King of the universe, who has given his glory to flesh and blood.’ See B. T. Berakhot 58a.
73 2 Macc 8:14-15, 18-20 (Judas’ exhortation); 12:15; 14:35-36; 15:9 (Judas’ encouragement); 15:21-24; 15:34.
74 See Holm-Nielsen, Die Psalmen Salomos.
free will. The Psalms of Solomon are important evidence for the Jewish eschatological hopes of the time. The main substance of the seventeenth psalm and of part of the eighteenth is the coming of the Davidic Messiah, who is described as a mighty and righteous earthly king.

Prayers in Biblical Antiquities

The prayers in the Book of Biblical Antiquities are mostly literary compositions integrated into the narrative, which presents the ‘legends of the Jews’ from the creation until Saul’s death. The prayers in the book, like the speeches, often serve to express the religious position of its author and to bring in historical events omitted earlier in the narrative. This didactic purpose is evident for instance in Joshua’s prayer (21:2-6), which begins by stressing God’s presence (21:2), then mentions the incident with Achan about which nothing has been said before, and for the rest consists of theology and prophecy. While the author does not mention the song at the Red Sea in Exod 15, the Song of Deborah in Judg 5 inspired him to give his own version (chapter 32); a historical retrospect, combined with other motifs, mostly didactic. A long passage in it is devoted to Abraham (32:2-4); among other things the author gives his own aggadic version of the sacrifice of Isaac, which he omitted before. Israel’s history in retrospect ends at 32:11 and only then does the author return to the Song of Deborah, but even this part contains historical reminiscences, together with interesting religious information. After Deborah’s death, the author gives a short poetical lament uttered by the people (33:6). This is his own composition, as is the lamentation of Jephthah’s daughter (40:5-7). The latter is probably influenced (directly or indirectly) by Greek tragedy. The central motif of the lamentation is an identification of the virgin’s violent death with her marriage which was never to occur. In the case of Hannah’s song (1 Sam 2:1-10), the paraphrase in the Biblical Antiquities (51:3-6) is also a poetical song. But even here it is didactic: Hannah quotes what Asaph says about her son in Ps 99:6! Another poetical psalm is sung by David after being anointed by Samuel (59:4). The theme of this psalm is the same as the apocryphal Psalm 15 1, of which we have spoken before, but there is no specific similarity between the two. Moreover, the mention of the sacrifice of Abel again shows the didactic purpose which is typical of most of the prayers in the Biblical Antiquities.

Only one poetical composition in this book seems important for the history of Jewish prayer, namely the other Davidic composition contained in the book (chapter 60). It is a psalm of David, supposedly said to bring about the departure of the evil spirit from Saul. It begins with the statement that ‘there were darkness and silence before the world was’, followed by an unusual description of creation in which God is not expressly mentioned. The psalm ends this description by addressing the evil spirit of Saul: ‘And after that was the tribe of your spirits created.’ The unclear Latin wording of the beginning of verse 3 possibly hints at the concept that the spirits were created on the second day of creation. Therefore, all that is said about the creation is an aetiological preamble to the exorcism which follows. At the end of this exorcism, David evidently refers to his future son Solomon, who is to subdue the evil spirits; a very familiar item. One of the characteristics of the Biblical Antiquities is the importance of magic: the author betrays an ambivalent attitude to it and he evidently distinguishes, so to speak, between black and white magic. Thus it is no wonder that David’s song before Saul is built on the pattern of a real exorcism. There is a striking similarity in content with a Babylonian cosmological incantation against toothache, which proceeds from the creation of the world to the creation of the worm which causes toothache, and then continues with the exorcism. Other Babylonian incantations likewise contain cosmological material, as do incantations from outside the ancient Near East. From these observations we conclude that David’s psalm before Saul reflects a type of ancient Jewish charm which is otherwise unknown to us. It is even possible that this kind of charm ultimately stems from non-Jewish circles. A further investigation might possibly show to what extent the supposed incantation against evil spirits was already Judaized before it was adapted to the biblical frame in the Biblical Antiquities.

Prayers in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch

Prayers put into the mouths of the protagonists, as an organic part of the work, are also found in 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch. Between these non-epical,

---

58 In rabbinic literature ‘black magic’ (which is prohibited) is named ‘the ways of the Amorites’. See Urbach, Sages I, 101. The author of the Biblical Antiquities understands this concept literally: black magic is performed by the Amorites.
59 Prichard, ANET, 100-101. See also p. 671 (100d).
60 Very like the psalm in LAB 60 and even more like the Babylonian incantation is the so-called Wessobrunner Gebet, from the beginning of the ninth century. Furthermore, two old German Merseburg charms in a manuscript from the tenth century begin with an aetiological mythological scene. See W. Braune-K. Helm, Althochdeutsches Lesebuch, 16. Auflage bearbeitet von E. A. Ebbinghaus, Tübingen 1979, pp. 85-86, 89. For a translation see H. Mette, Alteste deutsche Dichtung und Prosa, Leipzig 1979, 84-6, 156-7.
apocalyptic works which were written in Hebrew around the year 100 C.E., there is a literary connection.\(^{101}\) In the Syriac text of 2 Baruch three such prayers bear the superscription ‘Baruch’s prayer’ (21:1-26; 28:1-20; 54:1-14), but it is probable that these superscriptions are not original.\(^{102}\) In 4 Ezra 5:20 only the Syriac translation bears such a superscription, while in 8:20 the superscription is ‘The beginning of the words of Ezra’s prayer before he was taken up,’ which appears also in other translations. It is likely, however, that this superscription is secondary as well. The so-called confession of Ezra (8:20-36) which follows, was evidently used for Christian prayer in the Apostolic Constitutions 7:7-5-6.\(^{104}\) The possibility cannot be excluded that the ‘Confession of Ezra’ stems from an originally independent Jewish prayer or that the confession itself was once accepted in unknown Jewish circles, but this seems to me very improbable. The hymnic part of this prayer (8:20-25) much resembles the Prayer of Manasseh (verses 1-7).

The complaint of Ezra (3:4-36) contains in verses 4-27 a survey of history from Adam to the Babylonian exile. This survey has a similar structure to Stephen’s speech in Acts 7:2-53. The main content of another prayer, namely 4 Ezra 6:38-59, is a poetic description of the days of creation. Similar descriptions appear also in other Jewish hymns from the time of the Second Temple, e.g. in the Biblical Antiquities chap. 60, in Ben Sira 42:15-43:15 and in the Qumran Thanksgiving Scroll 1:10-20.

**Epilogue**

In none of the Jewish writings from the Second Temple period do we find any quotations of the synagogue prayers transmitted by rabbinc tradition, with the single exception of the little prayer in 2 Macc 1:2-5. This is remarkable, because ancestors of other rabbinical prayers did exist at that time. Two of them, the Tahanunim and the apotropaic prayers, are clearly represented in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha and the Dead Sea Scrolls. This situation cannot be fully explained by the fact that part of the sources are sectarian or at least not in the line of later rabbinic Judaism. It is not difficult to show that the Essene Thanksgiving Scroll betrays knowledge of the Eighteen Benedictions,\(^ {105}\) and it seems likely that while the Essenes knew the ‘proto-rabbinic’ liturgy, they rejected it because of their opposition to the Pharisees. However such a position is unthinkable for the circles in which 2 Baruch, 4 Ezra and the Biblical Antiquities originated, since these were not far from the Pharisees and must have appreciated their prayers. We are left with the conclusion that the authors of such works did not find occasion to quote the common prayers. A factor which undoubtedly encouraged this reticence is that the synagogue prayers were oral,\(^ {106}\) and that it was considered forbidden to write them down.\(^ {107}\)

Meanwhile, the prayers and psalms contained in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and in another way the actual Essene prayers, elucidate the religious life and thought of ancient Judaism. Especially important is the light they shed on the origin of the two types of informal rabbinic prayers we mentioned. Beyond the scope of this volume is the significance of these texts for the development of early synagogue poetry (piyyut). It is important to study the language and poetical style of these psalms, hymns and prayers, especially of those preserved in Hebrew, not only to enrich our knowledge of the various levels of post-biblical poetical Hebrew, but also to deepen our understanding of the various types of synagogue poetry and of private prayers.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**


On the Prayer of Manasseh: OSSWALD, ‘Gebet Manasses.’


When prayers are parts of documents treated elsewhere in this volume, see the corresponding bibliographies.
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102 See Bogart, *Apocalypse de Baruch* 2, 48.
103 See Myers, *Z and ZZ Esdras*, 144.
104 See Myers, id., 118, who also notes that Clemens of Alexandria (*Stromata* 3:16) cites *2 Esdras* 5:35. See also Schreiner, *Das 4. Buch Ezra*, 294 n. 25.
105 See Talmon, ‘The Order of Prayer’. More material can be found, such as the psalm in Sir 51:12 already referred to, which contains material pertinent to the history of the Eighteen Benedictions.
107 See the incident with R. Yishmael and the rule cited in connection with it, *T. Shabbath* 13:4; *P.T. Shabbath* 16:15c; B.T. *Shabbath* 115b. The synagogue liturgical texts will be discussed in the volume on rabbinic literature.
The aim of the present study is to consider the form and function of the letter in the context of Jewish literary activity in the period c. 200 B.C.E. – c. 200 C.E. Our first task is to collect all the surviving letters and to establish a corpus of texts on which to base our analysis.

**The Corpus**

The evidence may be conveniently surveyed as follows:

**Manuscript Letters.** Around 28 letters (some very fragmentary) in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek were found at Murabbaat, Nahal Hever and Masada in the Judaean Desert. One letter is an ostracon, one is written on wood, the rest are on papyrus. The two Masada texts are pre-73 C.E., the others all belong to the period of the Bar Kokhba War (132-135 C.E.), and even include dispatches from Bar Kokhba himself.

1 Maccabees quotes 11 letters. These fall into three rough groups: first,
letters sent by Jews either to other Jews or to Gentiles (e.g. 12:6-18, Jonathan’s letter to the Spartans seeking an alliance); second, letters from various Seleucid kings to the Jews (e.g. 10:18-20, Alexander Balas’ letter to Jonathan appointing him High Priest); third, letters from other foreign rulers to the Jews (e.g. 15:16-21, the encyclical of the Roman consul Lucius announcing a treaty of friendship between the Romans and the Jews).2

2 Macabees contains 3 letters from Antiochus Epiphanes, one from Lysias, and one from the Roman ambassadors Quintus Memmius and Titus Manius. The work is prefaced by two important letters from the Jewish authorities in Jerusalem relating to the celebration of the festival of Hanukkah.3

3 Macabees has 2 letters ascribed to Ptolemy IV Philopator (221-204 B.C.E.), both addressed to his generals.4

In his extensive writings Josephus cites some 37 letters both ‘from Jews and non-Jews. 13 of these are derived from the Bible, or from texts already known to us (such as Aristeas and 1 Macabees). These duplicates are not without interest since they provide us with evidence of how Josephus used his sources. The remaining letters are taken from literary works no longer extant, or from archives which Josephus explored for himself.5


The Epistle of Aristeas quotes a letter from Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285-246 B.C.E.) to Eleazar the Jewish high priest, with Eleazar’s reply.7 Despite its title, Aristeas itself is not a letter: it is not in epistolary form, nor was it recognized as a letter by the earliest writers who refer to it.8 The Greek Esther contains 2 decrees of Artaxerxes in epistolary form.9 Daniel


8 Josephus, Ant. 12.100 calls it a βίος τοῦ Φαίδρου, Epiphanios, De Mensus ru et Ponderibus 9, αὐτοπροσέλεξαι. Eusebius, Praeparatio Evangelica 9:38 gives it the title, Προαγάλυπται Επιστολή τοῦ Φαίδρου Ναζαρετικού. On the literary genre of Aristeas see further above, p. 78.

9 Addition B 1-7 (= 3:13-8), and Addition E 1-24 (= 8:12a-x). The Aramaic letter in Tut-gum

quotes two Aramaic royal encyclicals, one attributed to Darius, the other to Nebuchadnezzar.10

The end of the Syriac Apocryphon of Baruch claims to give the text of a ‘letter which Baruch son of Neriah sent to the nine and a half tribes which are across the river Euphrates’.11

The Greek Paralipomena Ieremiae contains a letter allegedly sent by Baruch to Jeremiah, along with Jeremiah’s reply.12

Certain of the Pseudepigrapha were referred to as ‘letters’ in antiquity, though they are not in epistolary form. This was true of the Epistle of Jeremiah, 1 Baruch, and the ‘Epistle of Enoch’.13

Rabbinic Texts. Several letters and fragments of letters have been preserved in rabbinic literature: 3 Aramaic letters attributed to Rabban Gamaliel;14 2 Hebrew letters supposedly sent jointly by Rabban Shimon b. Gamaliel and Yohanan b. Zakkai (both of whom flourished at the time of the First Jewish War against Rome, 66-74 C.E.);15 a Hebrew letter from the Jews of Jerusalem to the Jews of Alexandria requesting the return of Judah b. Tabbai (first half of first century B.C.E.) to become Nasi;16 the opening of

Sheni to Est 8:13 (Lagarde, p. 265). 300) has many similarities to Greek Addition E and is probably ultimately derived from it. For a late rendering of Addition E into Hebrew see Jellinek, Beth haMidrash 5, 14-15.


11 2 Baruch 78-87.


13 The Epistle of Jeremiah opens: ‘A copy of an epistle which Jeremiah sent to those who were to be led captives into Babylon.’ 1 Baruch is entitled in certain text-witnesses: ‘The Epistle of Baruch’, or ‘The Second Epistle of Baruch’. Certain Greek texts refer to 1 Enoch 91-108 as ‘The Epistle of Enoch’ (cf. 1 Enoch 100:6 in Greek); see Milik, Books of Enoch, 47. According to the colophon of the Greek Esther the whole of that book is a letter. We noted earlier the tradition that Aristeas is a letter, though it is not in letter form (see note 8 above). Note further the traditional New Testament classification of ‘To the Hebrews’ as a letter, though it does not have a normal epistolary opening; see Kümmel, Introduction, sect. 25.2.

14 P. T. Sanhedrin 18d: P. T. Maaser Shen 50c; T. Sanhedrin 2:6; B.T. Sanhedrin 1a. Cf. Dallman, Aramaicke Dialektpoken, 3. From the reference to his deposition in B.T. Sanhedrin 1a it appears that the Babli took Gamaliel here to be Gamaliel II who flourished 90-110 (cf. B. B. Berakhoth 27b-28a for the story of his deposition). However the accuracy of attribution of these letters must be in grave doubt. The first two of them are closely parallel to the two Hebrew letters attributed jointly to Shimon ben Gamaliel and Yohanan ben Zakkai in Midrash Tannaim (see note 15 below). The third is parallel to an Aramaic letter attributed to Shimon b. Gamaliel in B. T. Sanhedrin 1a. Whether or not the attributions are accurate, letters such as these were undoubtedly sent out by the religious authorities in Jerusalem, and it is very probable that the letters before us accurately reflect those letters’ general formulae and style. Note further the reference in P. T. Megillah 71a, 6-9 to the two letters found by Mar Usha.

15 Midrash Tannaim to Deut 26:23 (2 p. 176). See n. 14 above.

16 P. T. Hagigah 77d. The historical background and the text of this letter are very uncertain.

P. T. Sanhedrin 23c tells more or less the same story as P. T. Hagigah 77d, but in B. T. Sanhedrin 107b (a passage cut by the censor), and in B. T. Sanhedrin 47a, what appears to be the same letter is said to have been sent by Shimon ben Shetah to Joshua ben Perahiah (both contemporaries of Judah b. Tabbai).
a letter from Judah ha-Nasi (died c. 220 c.e.) to the Emperor Antoninus;\(^{17}\) a reference to a letter from Judah ha-Nasi to R. Hananiah the nephew of R. Joshua which apparently began, ‘To the holiness of Hananiah’.\(^{18}\)

The New Testament. For the sake of completeness we should note here the New Testament letters, though they will not figure much in the ensuing discussion. These may be divided into three groups: the 14 letters by or attributed to Paul, the 7 so-called ‘Catholic Epistles’, the letters to the seven churches of Asia Minor contained in Revelation, and the two letters quoted in Acts.\(^{19}\)

If we exclude the New Testament epistles and the duplicates in Josephus, then our corpus of texts numbers around 90 separate items. In no sense is it a unified body of material. It contains letters of diverse and often uncertain date, in very different languages — Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek. It includes both forged and genuine letters, letters written by Jews and by non-Jews, independent letters existing in manuscript and letters quoted in works of literature.

The existing manuscript letters are undoubtedly of primary importance for our purposes, but our analysis would be very thin if it were to be based solely on them: they are too few in number to admit of any substantial conclusions, and they are clearly not entirely representative of the uses to which Jews put letter-form at the turn of the eras. So we must bring in the other evidence as well, with all the problems it entails. Though some letters are almost certainly forgeries, or obviously pseudepigraphic, we have included them in our list, simply because it is not practicable at this stage to become involved in detailed decisions as to authenticity. Besides, even non-genuine letters, if properly handled, can be made to testify to the uses of letter-form, or to epistolary conventions. Reluctance to pre-empt the question of authenticity also dictates the inclusion of the letters by non-Jews. We must base our corpus on the broadest possible criteria. Some of these letters could be Jewish forgeries, and the simple fact that they are quoted in Jewish sources is sufficient to qualify them for admission to the body of evidence.

We must recognize that we face serious problems over using many of the letters which we have collected to illustrate the purely formal aspects of the letter. First, we must reckon with the fact that we do not always have the letters in their original languages. 2 Macc 1:1-10 was originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic, but only a Greek version survives. The Greek correspond-
The Problem of Authenticity

The papyrus letters from Judaea are unquestionably genuine. The Epistle of Jeremiah, the letters in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch, Paralipomena Ieremiae, and the Greek Additions to Esther, as well as the correspondence between Solomon, Hiram and Pharaoh in Eupolemos and Josephus (Ant. 8:50-54; cf. Ag. Ap. 1: 11), are just as certainly fabrications. As to the authenticity of the remaining letters in the corpus, especially those in 1 and 2 Maccabees and Josephus, Ant. 12-14, the situation is far from clear. Some of them cause grave misgivings, but it seems well nigh impossible to produce an argument which will prove conclusively that any of them are not authentic.

Two tests of authenticity have been applied. First, the letters have been examined minutely for inappropriate epistolary formulae. The study of the large body of Greek papyri from Egypt indicates that the conventions of Greek letters changed over the years, and that certain formulæ were in vogue only at certain periods of time. Thus the opening expression χαιρεων Χαιρεων apparently emerged first in the late Ptolemaic period: the earliest instances of it are dated to around 160 b.c.e. The opening formula χαιρεων Χαιρεων comes into vogue about one hundred years later and is first attested in a papyrus of 57/56 b.c.e. Now, it could be argued that the presence of χαιρεων Χαιρεων in the two letters of Ptolemy IV Philopator (221-204 B.C.E.) and in 3 Macc 3: 12 and 7: 1, and even more so in the letter B opens, ‘The great king Artaxerxes...’ It is tempting to dismiss the superscription as simply mistaken, but two points should be borne in mind: (1) if the superscription is removed the work is bereft of any setting and becomes an incomplete fragment; (2) it is wrong to be too dogmatic as to what constitutes letter-form in a given context.

Two tests of authenticity have been applied. First, the letters have been examined minutely for inappropriate epistolary formulae. The study of the large body of Greek papyri from Egypt indicates that the conventions of Greek letters changed over the years, and that certain formulæ were in vogue only at certain periods of time. Thus the opening expression χαιρεων Χαιρεων apparently emerged first in the late Ptolemaic period: the earliest instances of it are dated to around 160 b.c.e. The opening formula χαιρεων Χαιρεων comes into vogue about one hundred years later and is first attested in a papyrus of 57/56 b.c.e. Now, it could be argued that the presence of χαιρεων Χαιρεων in the two letters of Ptolemy IV Philopator (221-204 B.C.E.) and in 3 Macc 3: 12 and 7: 1, and even more so in the letter B opens, ‘The great king Artaxerxes...’ It is tempting to dismiss the superscription as simply mistaken, but two points should be borne in mind: (1) if the superscription is removed the work is bereft of any setting and becomes an incomplete fragment; (2) it is wrong to be too dogmatic as to what constitutes letter-form in a given context.

Two tests of authenticity have been applied. First, the letters have been examined minutely for inappropriate epistolary formulae. The study of the large body of Greek papyri from Egypt indicates that the conventions of Greek letters changed over the years, and that certain formulæ were in vogue only at certain periods of time. Thus the opening expression χαιρεων Χαιρεων apparently emerged first in the late Ptolemaic period: the earliest instances of it are dated to around 160 b.c.e. The opening formula χαιρεων Χαιρεων comes into vogue about one hundred years later and is first attested in a papyrus of 57/56 b.c.e. Now, it could be argued that the presence of χαιρεων Χαιρεων in the two letters of Ptolemy IV Philopator (221-204 B.C.E.) and in 3 Macc 3: 12 and 7: 1, and even more so in the letter B opens, ‘The great king Artaxerxes...’ It is tempting to dismiss the superscription as simply mistaken, but two points should be borne in mind: (1) if the superscription is removed the work is bereft of any setting and becomes an incomplete fragment; (2) it is wrong to be too dogmatic as to what constitutes letter-form in a given context.

The Epistle of Jeremiah was known to have corresponded with the exiles in Babylon (see Jer 29: lff, where a letter from him to pass off his letter-form does not enter deeply into the Epistle of Jeremiah: the work barely sustains even the second person address to the readers; after the opening verses (l-7) the second person is used. As an alternative the author could, perhaps, have employed the testament form, such as we find in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, which also allows direct address to the readers. It is interesting to note that Baruch’s letter is, in fact, represented as his last will and testament (78:5; 84: 1).26

23 See Josephus, Life 217-218; 226-227; 229; 235; 263.
24 See, e.g. the letters of Plato, Isocrates and Epicurus.
25 New Testament letters such as Romans could be described fundamentally as sermons in the form of letters. Col 4: 16 and 1 Thess 5: 27 speak of reading letters to the assembled church. It is possible that the letters to the churches in Rev 2-3 were also intended for public reading.
26 On the testament form see above, p. 329. Like the letter of Baruch, the Epistle of Jeremiah has also certain sermonic characteristics. However, its literary form is much more problematic. The superscription speaks of a letter, yet the work is not in any obvious epistolary form. It is tempting to dismiss the superscription as simply mistaken, but two points should be borne in mind: (1) if the superscription is removed the work is bereft of any setting and becomes an incomplete fragment; (2) it is wrong to be too dogmatic as to what constitutes letter-form in a given context. The superscription seems to have been employed as the opening of the letter; it is just possible that this is how the author thought Jeremiah would have written. Though Eupolemos was happy to have Solomon, Hiram and Pharaoh corresponding in the Greek letters, he allowed them to address his readers in the second person (Eupolemos, 6: 1) and to use the hortatory ‘we’ (82: 3-9; 83: 3-4; 84: 1; 86: 1) and to use the hortatory ‘we’ (82: 3-9; 83: 3-4; 84: 1; 86: 1) and to use the hortatory ‘we’ (82: 3-9; 83: 3-4; 84: 1; 86: 1) and to use the hortatory ‘we’ (82: 3-9; 83: 3-4; 84: 1; 86: 1).26
27 For χαιρεων Χαιρεων, see Exler, Form, 32, 60, 64; for χαιρεων Χαιρεων, see Exler, Form, 32, 46, with the correction of Chan-Hie Kim, The Familiar Letter, 15. Exler’s cautious remarks (Form, 106-107) on the development of these two formulæ should be carefully noted.
of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285-246 B.C.E.) in Ep. Arist. 35-40, is decidedly suspicious. So, too, if χαίρε τε καὶ γνωρίζω first emerged in the mid-first century B.C.E., then its use in the letter of Antiochus Epiphanes in 2 Macc 9: 19-27 might cast doubt on that letter’s authenticity. However, this line of argument must lack the power of final conviction, simply because it is always at the mercy of some chance find which may upset the established chronology as to the currency of the formulae. Moreover, we must be especially careful in using this approach on translated letters. For example, it would clearly be dangerous to impugn the claim of the second Hanukkah letter (2 Macc 1:18) on the grounds that it contains the formula χαίρε τε καὶ γνωρίζω for if, as has been suggested, the extant Greek text is a translation of a lost Hebrew or Aramaic original, then the formula would only point to the date of the translation, not of the original. As we noted earlier, epistolary conventions can become distorted in translation. Rather than render Semitic formulae literally, a translator may simply substitute the corresponding Greek formulae of his own day.28

Second, the letters can be examined for historical inaccuracy. The second Hanukkah letter once again illustrates this approach. It states (1: 14-18) that Antiochus Epiphanes died before the rededication of the Temple. This agrees with the account in 2 Macc 9-10, but contradicts 1 Macc 4-6, which puts Antiochus’ death after the rededication. Most scholars accept the chronology of 1 Maccabees at this point.29 But it follows, then, that the letter is guilty of a gross historical error, which would be unlikely in an official document written so close to the events. This seems to be a convincing case. Nevertheless, we must still use caution. The categories ‘genuine’ and ‘false’ cannot be defined in any absolute way. We must allow for gradations between them. Thus it would be possible for an author to take a genuine document and rewrite it, or interpolate it, or adapt it in order to make it fit his purpose or his theme. It is also possible that a perfectly genuine document could have been corrupted accidently in copying. In either case the result would be a text containing both what is ‘genuine’ and what is ‘false’. In view of the possibly mixed character of some of our letters it is premature to condemn a whole document as false on the basis of one false element detected in it.30

Given that some of the letters are not genuine, what could have been the motivation for forging them?31 There are two rather different cases to be considered here: first, that of the single, independent forgery; and second, that of the forged letter incorporated into a narrative text. The second case naturally raises the further question of why narrative writers cited whole letters in their works. This question is important in its own right, whether or not the documents involved are genuine, but it has also a bearing on the question of authenticity, in that the motives for including whole documents could also be motives for forging them. An author may incorporate an entire document in his narrative for a variety of reasons. (1) He may be following a certain literary model, or source. The Chronicler (who was at work towards the end of the fourth century B.C.E.) took over intact from his Ezra-source a number of letters, and somewhat later Daniel and the Greek Esther also include letters. These early texts may have established a precedent. 1 and 2 Maccabees could be following this tradition. (2) Documents may be quoted to impart to a text ‘the ring of truth’, to persuade the reader that the account offered to him is reliable. ‘Archaeologists’ such as Josephus, Berossus and Manetho had a concern for documentation. This was partly due to the fact that they were interested in the distant past and so had to rely on written sources (rather than on eyewitness accounts),32 and partly related to their apologetic aims. All were concerned with nationalistic propaganda and so strove to be persuasive. Josephus, for example, assembled the documents in Ant. 14 with the aim of making public ‘all the honours given to our nation and the alliances made with them by the Romans and their emperors, in order that the other nations may not fail to recognize that both the kings of Asia and of Europe have held us in high esteem and admired our bravery and loyalty’ (Ant. 14: 186). (3) Finally, letters may be included in a text for purely literary reasons: like speeches and dialogue they can be used to vary the pace and texture of a narrative. In the Greek Esther the two letters from Artaxerxes serve to clarify the dramatic structure of the work by emphasizing the theme of the Jewish reversal of fortunes. The two letters from Ptolemy Philopator in 3 Maccabees are used to similar effect.

Among the independent forged letters we must include not only the Epistle of Jeremiah or the ‘Letter of Baruch’ (which, though now attached to the end of the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch, was apparently meant to circulate separately: see 78: 1 and 86: 1-87: 1), but also a number of the fabrications now contained in narrative texts, since it was wrong to assume that every forgery which may be detected in, say, 1 Maccabees was invented by the author of that work. Some of the forgeries may have existed already as independent documents and may have been taken over in all good faith. It would be possible even for official archives to contain false documents. Among the letters which had, or may have had, an independent existence we can distinguish two main groups. First, there are

28 Cf. n. 20 above.
29 See Schürer, History I, 161 note 61.
30 Normally scholars do not rely on a single argument to prove a document not genuine. The letters in Aristea and 3 Maccabees would fall by the arguments which impugn the historical reliability of the works as a whole.
31 The motives for forging letters are basically no different from those for forging other documents. In general see, Speyer, Die literarische Fälschung, and Brox, Falsche Verfasserangaben.
those like the Epistle of Jeremiah and Sym. Apoc. Baruch 78-87 which contain religious teaching and are attributed to important religious authorities in the distant past. The motive here is obvious: the author hopes to gain a reader’s ear for his ideas by putting them forward in the name of a respected sage, rather than in his own name. Second, there are letters ascribed to persons of political power (Seleucid kings, Roman consuls and so forth) in the more recent past. These texts normally grant privileges, make concessions, or express friendship to the recipients. It is not hard to imagine that such texts could have been fabricated with an eye to tangible, political advantage. At least some of the letters in favour of the Jews cited by Josephus in Ant. 12-14 belong to this category. As Josephus himself hints (Ant. 14: 187), the authenticity of these documents had already been questioned in antiquity.

Analysis of the Bar-Kokhba and Masada Letters

The following three papyrus letters, all found in Judaea and dating to the period of the Bar Kokhba War (132-135 CE), will serve to illustrate the general style of Jewish letters in the early second century CE. They are in Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek, respectively.

From the administrators of Beth Mashikho, from Yeshua and from Eleazar, to Yeshua ben Galgula, Chief of the Camp, peace! Be it known to you that the cow which Joseph ben Ariston took from Jacob ben Judah, who dwells in Beth Mashikho, belongs to him by purchase. (5) Were it not for the fact that the Gentiles are close to us, I would have gone up and satisfied you about this matter of which I have written to you (to all the House of Israel)/Yeshua ben Eleazar has written it./Eleazar ben Joseph has written it. (10) Jacob ben Judah, for himself./Saul ben Eleazar, witness./Joseph bar Joseph, witness;/Jacob ben Joseph testifies.33

Shimon to Judah bar Manasseh, to Qiryat Arabayah. I have sent to you two asses, so that you may send with them two men to Jonathan bar Baayan and Masabala, that they may gather and send to the camp, to you, palm-branches and citrons. And you, send others from your place to bring you myrtles and willows. Prepare them and send them to the camp... (5)... Be well!34

Soumaios to Jonathes (son of) Baianos and to Masabala, greeting! Since I have sent to you A[ggrippa, make][hast][e] to send me/[h]al/[s] and citrons, and furnish [them]/for the celebration of the (10) Jews: and do not do otherwise. Nor (this) has been written in Greek because [an][impluse has not been] found to w[ri][te] (15) in Hebrew. Di[s]patch him speedily on account of the feast. And do not do otherwise. (20) Soumaios./ Farewell!35

Out of our whole corpus only the Bar Kokhba and Masada letters provide first-rate evidence for the analysis of epistolary practice since they alone exist in their physically original form. Though they are in three languages these letters may be treated as a group, since they exhibit very much the same forms and conventions throughout. The typical letter falls into three parts: (a) an opening; (b) a body; and (c) a close. These are not simply convenient heads under which to discuss the various features of the letter: they indicate real structural elements. Ancient letter-writers recognized these divisions and employed various devices to demarcate them, and an analysis of the letter in terms of information theory also clearly indicates the existence of these three parts. The beginning and the ending of the letters are highly stereotyped: they are largely predictable and carry a light information load. The middle of the letter, on the other hand, is much less formalized: it contains the substance of the communication and is as varied as the messages people wish to convey.

The opening normally contains two elements occurring in the following order: (1) a parties’ formula which states the names of the sender and of the recipient; and (2) a salutation. In the Aramaic and Greek letters the parties’ formula is ‘X (the sender) to Y (the recipient)’.36 In the Hebrew letters, on the other hand, it is ‘From X to Y’.37 It is striking that there should be this difference between the Aramaic and the Hebrew letters, given that both emanated from the same narrow circle at the same period of time. It could

---

33 Mur 42 (Hebrew). See Milik, DJD 2, 156, with plate XLV. Further, Yadin, Bar Kokhba, 134-6. The translation given above tries to reproduce faithfully the ambiguities of the original. The precise circumstances of the letter are far from clear. As Milik rightly notes, the document is, in fact, mixed in form: it is in part a certificate of purchase, and in part a letter. On the sense of in lines 8-9, see note 48 below.

34/5/6 Heb 15 (Aramaic). See Kutscher, ‘Language of Hebrew and Aramaic Letters’, 129-33. Further, Yadin, Bar Kokhba, 128-30. Yadin appears to read the difficult words at the end of line four and beginning of line five as: 'ספנインド. (the request is made) since the army is big’.


36 E.g., 5/6 Heb 8: ‘Soumaios bar Kosiba to Jonathan bar Baayan’; 5/6/6 Heb 3: ‘Soumaios to Jonathan son of Baianos and to Masabala’.

37 E.g., Mur 43: ‘Soumaios, from Shimon ben Kosibah to Yeshua ben Galgula’.
Transition from the opening to the body of the letter is marked in several of the Aramaic texts by the particle ו/ר. This is di rectitutium and indicates the beginning of direct speech. The opening of the letter is implicitly in the third person, whereas the address is directly to the recipient in the second. In two Hebrew letters the particle she- serves the same purpose.

The close of the letter comprises two elements: (1) a wish for the well-being of the recipient (what is called the formula valetudinis in the analysis of Greek letters42), and (2) a signature. Some letters do not have a formal

42 No formal close: 5/6 Hev 1 (Aramaic); only a formula valetudinis: 5/6 Hev 4 (Aramaic); 5/6 Hev 8 (Aramaic).

43 In the Greek papyri (5/6 Hev 3 and 6) it is signature followed by formula valetudinis; so, too, in the Hebrew letter Mur 46; but in the Hebrew letters Mur 42 and 48 the order is reversed.

44 This feature is clearer in the Greek letters 5/6 Hev 3 and 6, but see also Mur 46 (Hebrew).

45 “Peace and prosperity I send you.”

46 “Much peace and prosperity I send you.”

47 For signatures in the Greek papyri from Egypt, see Turner, Greek Papyri, 82-83. Cf. Paul’s “signature” in 1 Cor 16:21; Col 4:18; 2 Thess 3:17. In a letter written by a professional scribe the signature was a means of authentication. The use of an amanuensis did not necessarily mean that the sender of the letter was illiterate. Paul used an amanuensis (Rom 16:22), as did Rabban Gamaliel, Rabban Shimon b. Gamaliel, Yohanan b. Zakkai and Judah ha-Nasi – all of them well-educated men.

48 It would be natural to translate the תְּלֵימוּנַת as ‘So-and-so’ or what was written in the letter) or ‘was the scribe’. The signature would then be that of the amanuensis and not that of the sender. This interpretation certainly suits 5/6 Hev 8 (Aramaic), where the name in the signature is different from that of the parties’ formula in the opening. However, it does not fit the Hebrew letters Mur 42 and 46. Two things are noteworthy in the two latter texts: (1) the names in the signatures are the same as the names of the senders; and (2) the handwriting of the signatures is different from that in the main body of the letter. So in these two cases the nickname cannot have its obvious sense: it must mean something like ‘sent it’, or ‘issued it’. Cf. Milik’s translation of the formula: ‘sent it’. This recalls the expression יאדוים יאדוים, which occurs at the end of Ps 125 and 128, and is reminiscent of Paul’s words towards the close of Galatians (6:16). ‘Peace and mercy upon all who walk according to this rule, and upon the Israel of God.’

The parties’ formula normally gives only the bare names of the sender and the recipient, but in the Aramaic letter 5/6 Hev 1 a title is attached to the name of the sender: ‘Shimon bar Kosibah President over Israel, to Jonathan and Masabalah’; and in 5/6 Hev 6 (Greek) a defining epithet follows the name of the recipient: ‘Annanos to Jonathas, the brother’. The salutation is brief and mirrors the spoken greeting; in Aramaic it is כניעב, in Hebrew ו/ר, and in Greek χαιρετον. From the fact that Aramaic letters 5/6 Hev 8 and 15 do not have a salutation we may deduce that it was not regarded as obligatory. However, it is not clear under what circumstances it could be omitted. 5/6 Hev 4 (Aramaic) has a curious opening: ‘A letter of Shimon bar Kosibah. Greetings to Jonathan bar Baayah’. 5/6 Hev 15 (Aramaic) introduces a third element into the opening, viz., an indication of the destination in the form of a prepositional phrase following the name of the recipient: ‘Shimon to Judah bar Manasseh, to Qiryat Arabaya’.38

38 ‘Brother’ is used as address between social equals in the Aramaic letters of the Persian period: see e.g. Cowley, Aramaic Papyri, no 20 lines 1 and 11; further Fitzmyer, ‘Padua Aramaic Papyrus Letters’, 17. It seems, however, that the term means something more here: like the early Christians, the followers of Bar Kokhba were organised as a fellowship and called each other ‘brother’; see Lifshitz, ‘Greek Documents’, 60-61; Lifshitz, ‘Papyrus greca’, 256-8.


40 It is just possible, however, that the formula is to be taken with the following wish: ‘Peace and prosperity I send you’: To Qiryat Arabaya I have sent you ...

41 For the rectitutium see Dan 2:25; 5:7; 5:6; 6:14; 1QGenAp 4:19-20; 20:10; 20:27; 22:22; Cf. the use of en rectitutium in Greek, e.g. Luke 1:25; John 1:20; Rom 3:8. See Blass-Debrunner, Grammar, sect. 470 (1) and Bauer, Lesicon, 593b. ‘Introducing orutio recta is rare and may developed by analogy with ἰ δια τινης in Aramaic. However, רוא is found before orutio recta in biblical Hebrew; see Gesenius-Kautzsch, Hebrew Grammar, sect. 157c; further Segal, Mishnaic Hebrew, sect. 431.

42 Koskenniemi, Idee und Phasologie, 130-9. close, while some have only one of the elements.42 When both elements occur together their order is flexible.43 In several cases the distinction between the body and the close of the letter is indicated by the visual device of separating the elements of the close from the rest of the letter by a space.

In Aramaic the concluding formula valetudinis is ריוו in both cases with an echo of the opening salutation.44 Mur 42 (Hebrew) has the more elaborate formula, ‘Peace be (to you) and to all the House of Israel’.45 The Greek letters employ the verb ἀνακελεῖν in the concluding formula valetudinis: 5/6 Hev 3 has simply ἀνακελεῖτο ‘Be well’, but 5/6 Hev 4, ἀνακελεῖτο ἐκείνῳ ‘Be well, brother’. The signatures of the Aramaic letters are those of the senders, and they consist simply of their names.47 At the end of the Hebrew and Aramaic letters we find the formula, ‘So-and-so son of So-and-so in the name of...’. It is not entirely clear whether this indicates the name of the scribe or of the sender.48
It is interesting that the structure and conventions of the Bar Kokhba letters, whether they be in Hebrew, Aramaic or Greek, are so similar. Too much should not, perhaps, be made of this, since Semitic and Greek letters were in any case basically very similar, and the similarity is heightened in the present instance by the fact that all the letters are simple communications. However, it is not unlikely that in the narrow circle of the followers of Bar Kokhba a common letter-form would have emerged which would have been employed whatever the language of communication. The concluding formula valetudinis, ‘Be well’, in the Hebrew and Aramaic letters is instructive in this respect. There are no precise parallels to this closing imperative in earlier Hebrew-Aramaic epistolography;\(^\text{49}\) it probably reflects the very common Greek ending \(\text{ἐπιστολῶν ἐστίν ἐπιστολή} \) (which we encountered in 5/6 Hev 3 and 6). If this is so, then it would appear that the convergence of letter-forms was towards Greek practice.

**Analysis of the Remaining Letters**

The analysis of the extant manuscript letters puts us in a good position to discuss the remaining letters in the corpus. As we noted earlier, there is a problem over how the Gamaliel letters in *P.T. Sanhedrin 18d* are supposed to open. They are introduced thus in the text: ‘It happened once that Rabban Gamaliel and the Elders were sitting on a step on the Temple Mount, and Yohanan the scribe was sitting before them. Rabban Gamaliel said to him: Write to our brethren in the south ... may your peace be multiplied’. The question is, how are we to punctuate here? Dalman would make a break after ‘write’ and begin the quotation of the letter with, ‘To our brethren is the south’. This is problematic on two counts: (1) it results in a defective letter-opening which fails to declare the name of the sender; and (2) none of the nearly contemporary Bar Kokhba letters begins in this way. The analogy of the Bar Kokhba texts would suggest an opening, ‘Gamaliel (\(\text{גמאליקא} \)) to our brethren in the south ... It is interesting that the parties’ formula ‘from X to Y’, which we noted earlier as being confined to the Bar Kokhba letters in Hebrew, occurs also in the Hebrew letters from Shimon b. Gamaliel and Yohanan b. Zakkai, and from the Jews in Jerusalem to the Jews in Alexandria. The pattern is, however, broken by the occurrence of ‘From X to Y’ in the Aramaic letter from Judah ha-Nasi to Antoninus. In the Hebrew letters of Shimon b. Gamaliel and Yohanan b. Zakkai, we find the simple salutation \(\text{שלום עליכם שמעון} \) the Aramaic Gamaliel letters, however, have \(\text{מידך ישמעל שמעון} \) ‘may your peace be multiplied’, probably in imitation of the use of this formula in the letters in Dan 3:31 and 6:20. On two occasions the verb \(\text{ידע} \) ‘to know’, serves to mark the transition from the opening to the body of the letter: thus we find in the Gamaliel letters, ‘I inform you that ...’, and in the letters of Shimon b. Gamaliel and Yohanan b. Zakkai, ‘יריע הנהל ענומת ...’ These phrases are stereotyped and largely redundant, but they can function as transition-markers to indicate the divisions of the letter.\(^\text{51}\)

The original language of the letter of Baruch in *Syr. Apoc. Baruch 78-87* was probably Hebrew or Aramaic. The exact wording of its opening and its close is in some doubt. According to one form of the text (Codex Ambrosianus) the opening runs: ‘Thus says Baruch the son of Neriah to the brethren carried into captivity: mercy and peace be with you’. The other form of the text (found in all the other manuscripts) shortens the salutation simply to ‘mercy and peace’.\(^\text{52}\) The parties’ formula, ‘Thus says X to Y’, is not common. It has probably been lifted straight out of the beginning of Jeremiah’s letter to the exiles, Jer 29:4, ‘Thus says the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, to all the exiles whom I sent into exile from Jerusalem to Babylon’. The salutation ‘Mercy and peace’ \(\text{חֶסֶד וּלְפָנֵי} \) (rahme ‘aph shlama) is also unusual. A similar expression occurs in Tobit 7:12, though in a non-epistolary context. It recalls the New Testament greeting, ‘Grace to you and peace’ (1 Thess 1:1; cf. also 1 Tim 1:2). There are two forms of the ending: Codex Ambrosianus, ‘And bear me in mind by means of this letter, as I bear you in mind in it, and at all times’; the remaining manuscripts, ‘And bear me in mind by means of this letter, as I bear you in mind in it, and at all times’. An allusion to this is found in Apoc. Baruch, 5:7, 8. At the second reading the expression ‘at all times’ \(\text{בְּכָלָּלֶה} \) (b’khulē bhan) recalls the use of \(\text{בְּכָלָּלֶה} \) in salutations in the Aramaic letters of the Persian period: e.g., ‘The welfare of

---

\(^{49}\) Perhaps the nearest we get to it is the formula found in the Hermopolis papyri: \(\text{_salve} \) For your peace/welfare (or, to greet you) I have sent this letter: see Bresciani and Kamil: *Le lettere aramaiche*, nos. 1, 12-13; 2, 17; 3, 13: 5, 9; 6, 10; 7, 4.

\(^{50}\) A similar problem arises in Ezra 4:17 and 5:7. It is important to note that the issue here is how to punctuate the text of the Talmud. This is a problem whether or not the letters are genuine. Even if they are fictitious it is reasonable to assume that they reflect genuine contemporary epistolary conventions. On the problem of the authenticity of the Gamaliel letters see above note 14.

\(^{51}\) For the use of phrases with \(\text{ידיע} \) as transition-markers see also Mur 42; 5/6 Hev 14; Ezra 3: 14; 4: 12, 15; 5, 8. For similar phenomenon in Greek letters see White, *Body of the Greek Letter* 2-5.

\(^{52}\) There may be more to this simple change than meets the eye; see Bogaert, *Apocalypse de Baruch*, I 67-81.

\(^{53}\) So Bogaert, but we might also translate: ‘... in it and at all times. Fare well.’
my lord may all the gods seek abundantly at all times.\textsuperscript{54}

It is reasonably certain that the first of the two Hanukkah letters in 2 Macc 1:1-10 had a Semitic original, though opinion is divided as to whether it was in Hebrew or Aramaic. The opening runs: ‘To the brethren, the Jews in Egypt, greeting (χαιρεῖν).’ The brethren, the Jews in Jerusalem and in the country of Judaea, good peace (εἰρήνη, εἰρηνεύομαι). The double greeting χαιρεῖν and εἰρηνεύομαι is unusual: the χαιρεῖν may be eliminated as a secondary attempt by the translator to conform the letter to Greek usage. When it is removed a parties’ formula of the ‘To Y, X’ type emerges.\textsuperscript{55} The balance of epistles, ‘brothers ... brothers’ is a stylistic trick easily paralleled in Aramaic correspondence of the Persian period.\textsuperscript{56} Torrey retroverts εἰρηνεύομαι literally into Aramaic as סלמה and its salutations is a common transition-marker in Aramaic letters in the Persian period, and it is also found in Hebrew letter style.\textsuperscript{58} The date in verse 10 is to be attached to the end of the first letter and not, as Torrey supposes, to the beginning of the second. In Aramaic letters of the Persian period a date is not common, but when it does occur it is usually at the end of the letter. In one text it was put on the outside of the letter along with the external address.\textsuperscript{59}

On balance it is unlikely that the second Hanukkah letter in 2 Macc 1:10-2:28 had a Semitic original, though Torrey confidently offers a retroversion of it into Aramaic. Its parties’ formula is of the ‘X to Y’ type, and its salutations is χαιρεῖν καὶ εὐρήνευομαι which is good Greek letter-style (see above).\textsuperscript{60}

\textsuperscript{54} See Kraeling, Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri, no. 13,1 (note 38 above); Strasbourg Library Ostracoon (=Répertoire d’épitaphe sémitiques no. 1300): σαλῳ ἀνὴρ ἡμῖν ὑπὲρ ᾿εσσά, ‘Greetings, my brother, at all times’.

\textsuperscript{55} This formula is attested e.g. in Cowley, Aramaic Papyri, no. 40,1 (獎状). Τοῦ μου ἀδελφοῦ Ἑβραίου, ‘To my brother Piltai, your brother Hoshai (ah)’; Bresciani and Kamil, ‘Le lettere aramaiche’, no. 3, 1: Αἱ ἀδελφοί σου Ἀραμαΐα, ‘To my Lord Psam, your servant Makkibian’.

\textsuperscript{56} E.g. Bresciani and Kamil, ‘Le lettere aramaiche’, no. 1, 1: ‘To my sister Rayah, from your brother Makkibian: see also Cowley, Aramaic Papyri, no. 40, 1 (quoted in note 55 above).

\textsuperscript{57} Torrey, ‘The Letters’, 141.


\textsuperscript{59} Date at the end of the letter: Cowley, Aramaic Papyri, nos. 30, 30:42, 14; Kraeling, Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri, no. 13, 8. Date on the outside: Cowley, Aramaic Papyri, no. 26, 28.

\textsuperscript{60} Torrey’s Aramaic version ἡ χαιρετήσει αὐτοῦ δηλαδη καταφέρεται a formula unknown in Aramaic letters. If there was an Aramaic original we should perhaps think in terms of a variation of the formula found in one of the Elephantini papyri εἰρήνη καὶ χαίρετε ἴδων. May you be happy and prosperous at all times: see Cowley, Aramaic Papyri, no. 30, 3. Cf. Cowley, Aramaic Papyri, no 70, 2: τὰ ἀνὴρ ἡμῖν ἀφοίτητος ἱερωτευμένον ζωὴν, ‘Living and prosperous my lord may my lord be exceedingly’.

The vast majority of the quoted Greek letters in the corpus conform to the simple type we encountered in the Bar Kokhba Greek papyri (5/6 Hev 3 and 6). The opening is X to Y χαιρεῖν (see e.g. 1 Macc 12:8-18; 13:36-40);\textsuperscript{61} and several end with the formula valetudinis ἐπισκεπτόμεθα/ἐπισκεπτόμεθα (see e.g. 2 Macc 11:21; 3 Macc 7:9; Ep. Arist. 40). There are, however, two new elements: (1) a number of the letters (all of them in 2 Maccabees; see 11:21, 33, 37) carry the date at the very end; and (2) several of them prolong the opening salutation to include a formula valetudinis. This takes the form of a wish for the good health of the recipient, and sometimes conjoined with it an assurance as to the well-being of the sender. The wish for the recipient’s health is expressed in two ways: either (a) as an infinitive attached by xai to the opening salutation χαιρεῖν; or (b) as an independent sentence following directly after the χαιρεῖν. The well-being of the sender is always announced in a separate sentence. In both the wish for the recipient’s welfare and the reassurance as to the well-being of the sender the verbs ἰατρεύομαι and ἱερωτεύομαι are used. As we noted earlier, this is standard Greek practice.\textsuperscript{62}

\section*{BIBLIOGRAPHY}

Modem study of epistemology began among classical scholars whose interest in the subject had been aroused by the great papyrus finds in Egypt, and it was the classicists who first outlined methods for the analysis of the ancient letter. For a survey of classical work in the field see Dziatko, ‘Brief; syzkuris, ‘Epistolographie’; and Schneider, ‘Brief’.

The two outstanding monographs are EXLER, FORM and KOSENNIEMI, IDEE und Phraseologie.

DEISSMANN, Light from the East clearly demonstrated the importance of the papyrus letters for the study of the New Testament epistles, but New Testament scholars were rather slow to develop his insights. Until recently ROLLER’S Das Formular was the only substantial monograph on the formal aspects of the New Testament letters. In the 1970’s however, the situation changed with the publication of a number of dissertations in the United

\textsuperscript{61} The most notable exception is the letter of Antiochus in 2 Macc 9: 19. This opens with an expansion of the formula, ‘To Y (= the recipient) χαιρεῖν, X (=the sender)’; see Chan-Hie Kim, Familiar Letter, 17.

\textsuperscript{62} The following are examples of an opening formula valetudinis in the letters of our corpus.


(2) 2 Macc 1: 10: χαιρεῖν καὶ εὐρήνευομαι.

(3) 3 Macc 3: 12- 13: χαιρεῖν καὶ εὐρήνευομαι καὶ ἐπισκεπτόμεθα λατρευτζομαι.


See also 2 Macc 9: 19-20; 3 Macc 7: 1; Ep. Arist. 41. See further note 27 above.

With attention focused on Greek letters, Semitic epistolography was largely neglected. Two pioneering studies of some merit were BEER, 'Briefliteratur', and MARTY, 'Contribution'. FITZMYER, 'Aramaic Epistolography', undoubtedly marked a turning-point. Since its publication in 1974 there has been a spate of articles on Hebrew and Aramaic letter-form. The following particularly deserve mention: ALEXANDER, 'Aramaic Epistolography'; PARDEE, 'Hebrew Epistolography'; id., 'Letters from Tel Arad'; id., *Handbook*; PORTEN, 'Archive of Jedaniah'; DION, 'Les types épistolaires'. PORTEN, 'Aramaic Papyri and Parchments' offers a long-overdue re-examination of the purely physical aspects of ancient letter-writing, while COURROY, 'BRK et les formules égyptiennes' provides a wealth of background material to the various proskynesis formulae.

Much has been written on the letters quoted in works such as 1 and 2 Macc and Josephus, Ant., particularly on the question of their authenticity. The following will serve to introduce the subject: WILIECH, *Urkundenforschung*; MOMIGLIANO, *Prime Linee*; BICKERMANN, 'Ein jüdischer Festbrief'; TORBEN, 'The Letters'.

**Abbreviations**

Abbreviations in source references in general follow the system of the Journal of Biblical Literature. For rabbinical literature see index of sources. For Philo, the abbreviations given in the Loeb edition, vol. 10 p. xxxv f. are used. Book, chapter and paragraph in classical sources are distinguished by semi-colon and comma.

References to modern literature in notes and bibliographies are by author and short title. Full bibliographical details are given in the accumulative bibliography below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJSL</td>
<td>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature (Formerly Hebraica) 1-12. Chicago 1884-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJSR</td>
<td>Association for Jewish Studies Review 1-5. Cambridge MA 1976-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFO</td>
<td>Archiv für Orientforschung. 1923ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnBib</td>
<td>Analecta Biblica. 1952ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANET</td>
<td>Ancient Near Eastern Texts (Pritchard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANRW</td>
<td>Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt (Haase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APOT</td>
<td>Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T. 1-2 (Charles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARW</td>
<td>Archiv für Religionswissenschaft 1-39. Leipzig 1898-1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASTI</td>
<td>Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute. 1962ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Biblical Archaeologist. 1938ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>Berlin Gnostic codex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJPES</td>
<td>Bulletin of the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society. 1933ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZAW</td>
<td>Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBQ</td>
<td>Catholic Biblical Quarterly. 1939ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compendia</td>
<td>Compendia Rerum Judaicarum ad Novum Testamentum. Section I: S. Safrai — M. Stern (eds.). The Jewish People in the First Century 1-2 (1973-76). Section II, see above p. II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRAI</td>
<td>Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. 1835ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSEL</td>
<td>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum 1-70. Vienna 1866-1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCO</td>
<td>Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium. Louvain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. 1 (1955) D. Barthelemy — J. T. Milik, Qumran Cave 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. 2 (1961) P. Benoît et al., Les grottes de Murabbaat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. 3 (1962) M. Baillet et al., Les petites grottes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. 4 (1965) Sanders, Psalms Scroll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>Vol. 5 (1968) J. M. Allegro, Qumran Cave 4/I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. 6 (1972) J. T. Milik, Qumran grotte 4/II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vol. 7 (1982) M. Baillet, Qumran grotte 4/III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ (Berlin)</td>
<td>Encyclopædia Judaica 1-10. Berlin 1928-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ET</td>
<td>English Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETL</td>
<td>Ephemera Theologicae Lovanienses. Louvain 1929ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRBS</td>
<td>Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies. Durham 1958ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>History of Religions. Chicago 196ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTR</td>
<td>Harvard Theological Review. 1908ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUCA</td>
<td>Hebrew Union College Annual. Cincinnati 1924ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBL</td>
<td>Journal of Biblical Literature. 188ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>Jewish Encyclopedia I.-12. New York 1901-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGWJ</td>
<td>Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums 1-83. Breslau 1851-1939 n.F. neue Folge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHC</td>
<td>Nag Hammadi Codices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHL</td>
<td>Nag Hammadi Library in English (Robinson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nor TT</td>
<td>Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift. 1900ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRT</td>
<td>Nouvelle Revue Théologique 1-94. Louvain 1869-1972 n.s. New Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift. 1946ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLZ</td>
<td>Orientalische Literatur-Zeitung. 1898ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEQ</td>
<td>Palestine Exploration Quarterly. 1869ff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGM</td>
<td>Papyri graecae magicae (Preisendanz)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Patrologia Graeca (Migne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Patrologia Latina (Migne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAC</td>
<td>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum. 1950ff.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABBREVIATIONS

REJ Revue des Etudes Juives. 1880ff.
RGG Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. 3rd rev. ed. 1-6. Tübingen 1957-65
RHR Revue d’Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses. 192 ff.
RSPT Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques. 1907ff.
RSR Revue des Sciences Religieuses. 191Off.
SBLSP Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SBLTT Society of Biblical Literature. Texts and Translations
SPA Sitzungsberichte der Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil.-Hist. Klasse
TDNT Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. (Reference may also be made to the original German edition, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament)
TLZ Theologische Literaturzeitung. Leipzig 1866ff.
TQ Theologische Quartalschrift. Tübingen 18 19ff.
TR Theologische Rundschau. 1897ff.
TTZ Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift. 1889ff.
v c Vigiliae Christianiae. 1947ff.

YCS Yale Classical Studies. 1928ff.
ZÄS Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde. 1863ff.
ZAW Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Berlin 1881ff.
ZDMG Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft. 1846ff.
ZNW Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. Berlin 1901ff.
ZRGG Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte. 1948ff.
ZTK Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche. Tübingen 189 1 ff.