

**The Sect of the Qumran Texts and its Leading Role in the Temple in Jerusalem During
Much of the First Century BCE: Toward a New Framework for Understanding**
Gregory L. Doudna

Roland de Vaux, the excavator of the site in the 1950s, argued that Qumran was the remains of a sect which was opposed to the Hasmonean high priests in control of the temple in Jerusalem. De Vaux never claimed he had an archaeological argument that the people at Qumran were opposed to the Hasmonean temple or its priests. He got that (so he supposed) from the texts in the caves associated with the site:

[T]he *Rule of the Community* ... Its members have separated themselves from Israel and its priesthood ... They have withdrawn to the desert and there lead a common life of work, prayer, and study of the sacred Law ... the Teacher of Righteousness was the founder, or at least the organizer of the community ... he had cut himself off from Judaism in its official forms, and had led his adherents into the desert ... (de Vaux 1973: 110, 115)

The archaeologists who advance de Vaux's interpretation today follow a similar template of logic:

- (a) the scrolls are associated with the site;
- (b) the scrolls depict a sect;
- therefore
- (c) the sect at Qumran was opposed to those in control of the temple in Jerusalem

But what if the sect of the scrolls was not alienated from the temple or its rulers in Jerusalem throughout the Hasmonean era as de Vaux assumed? How would that have affected the archaeological interpretation of Qumran?

~ ~ 1 ~ ~

The Community Rule (1QS and eleven other copies from Caves 4 and 5) is regarded as the classic text evoking sectarians separated from the temple in Jerusalem, forming a sectarian alternative to the priests in power in Jerusalem. But however deeply entrenched that reading of the Community Rule may be, it may all along have been fundamentally mistaken. In this essay I propose a different reading and a new framework for understanding the Qumran texts.

The best known of the Community Rule texts is 1QS (1Q *Serekh*). There is nothing in 1QS concerning the sobriquet-bearing figures of the Qumran *pescharim*. Nor is there anything in 1QS which is opposed to the temple. 1QS reads as rules of a religious order, a communally structured association of lay people ruled over by priests.

1QS might reflect in its origins something like a ruling regime sponsoring local party organizations in the countryside. The *yachad* groups of 1QS are subject to the control of priests at every turn. The priests get to eat first, decide things, they have the highest status, and so on. There is no reason internal to the *Serekh* texts to assume the priests of those texts to be other than priests of the temple in Jerusalem. The *yachad* groups of 1QS are not portrayed as a grassroots movement. Lay people are forbidden in 1QS from having meetings of over ten people unless a priest or party officer or commissar is present. That sounds like a rule that priests wrote, not lay people.

The formation of the 1QS *yachad* groups may correspond with what the Damascus Document calls the revival of Israel, likened to a dead plant coming back to life (CD 1.5-8; 1QS 8.5; 11.8). If that is the sense of that allusion, then according to the Damascus Document's chronological scheme the 1QS *yachad* groups started 'twenty years' before the Teacher of Righteousness arose.

So let us imagine that the 1QS *yachad* groups began before the Teacher of Righteousness and were sponsored by priests in power in Jerusalem—perhaps in the time of John Hyrcanus I (135-104 BCE) or Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 BCE), perhaps associated with John Hyrcanus's or Alexander Jannaeus's conquests and expansion of the Jerusalem state to areas which they turned into 'Israel' again, reviving Israel to its former status of old, as at least a possible context. The *yachad* groups might represent a means by which a ruling elite in Jerusalem, a priestly sect in power, extended its influence and control, and projected its practices and ideology, into the countryside and outlying areas.

And so by this reconstruction 1QS *does* describe a sect, but it would be an extension of the ruling sect in Jerusalem.

~ ~ 2 ~ ~

It has been presupposed in many scholarly discussions that the *Serekh* texts understand the *yachad* groups as a replacement for the temple. This has been assumed because in 1QS the *yachad* groups apply language and imagery of the temple to themselves. The idea is that the temple was regarded as replaced by the people of 1QS who, separated from the temple, saw their own community as a substitution for the physical temple and its priests. This interpretation was dismantled in a posthumously published article by Susan Haber of McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario. Here is Haber:

[Some scholars] argue that the *yahad*—as the community refers to itself in 1QS—regarded itself as a

temple, and perhaps even as a permanent replacement for the Jerusalem temple. Based on texts such as 1QS V, 5-7; VIII, 4-11; IX, 3-6; and CD III, 18-IV, 12, scholars point to the description of the community in terms of temple language, the references to the *yahad* as a 'priestly' community, the importance of atonement, and the use of cultic language to describe the worship of the community. Central to the community-as-temple argument is the observation that 1QS uses temple imagery metaphorically to refer to the community. This observation is correct ... As we shall see, however, a metaphorical reading of the temple imagery does not necessar[il]y lead to the conclusion that the community saw itself as a replacement for the Jerusalem temple. ... 1QS nowhere explicitly refers to the Jerusalem temple nor does it discuss the relationship of the community to the temple ... If we do not *a priori* assume that the community's rejection of the Jerusalem temple and cult underlies this passage, a different metaphorical reading emerges ... the community may simply be affirming its priestly status, as chosen by God. The language implies that the level of holiness usually reserved for the priesthood is transferred to this community as a whole ... With regard to temple language, our study suggests that the imagery was taken metaphorically and was very rich as a way of articulating the self-understanding of the community, but that it was not taken literally to mean that the community viewed itself as the replacement for the temple in Jerusalem ... (Haber 2008: 107-123)

That is the insight. It is correct on a very basic level. Going beyond Haber, not only is this argument gone for 1QS opposition to the temple, but it is time to recognize that *all* arguments undergirding that notion are immaterial.

Martin Goodman has argued that if the texts found at Qumran were not influenced anachronistically by later rabbinic and Christian modes of interpretation shaped by the destruction of the temple, but read in terms of their own content and contemporary external information, it would be perceived that the authors of the scrolls were 'as much committed to the Jerusalem cult as other Jews ... It was perfectly possible to interpret the sacrifices symbolically without thereby implying that the sacrifices should not also be carried out in practice, as Philo insisted in his attack on extreme allegorists' (Goodman 2010: 86).

Goodman and Haber distinguished participation in the temple from the distinct issue of criticism of priests and practices of priests *of* the temple. Goodman acknowledged there was criticism of the way the temple was run. Not every party could get its way at the same time on specific points of practice in the temple. But 'the notion that the Dead Sea sectarians cut themselves off from the Temple would seem to us bizarre if we only had the pagan evidence and archaeology as the background to our understanding of the scrolls ... such a reading [of

separation] is not required by a simple reading of the texts' (*ibid*: 88).

And yet in 1QS there is not even criticism of priests or priestly practices in the temple. There is nothing in 1QS which distinguishes its priests from the ones *running* the temple.

~ ~ 3 ~ ~

It has long been recognized that there seems to be a 490-year chronological scheme, so basic to other Qumran texts, underlying the Damascus Document as well: 390 plus 20 to the rise of the Teacher (CD 1.3-11), 40 for the Teacher, and then a final 40 after the death of the Teacher until the new age (CD 19.35-20.1; 20.13-15), giving 490 in total (e.g. Collins 2010: 92-94). This 490-year scheme (390 + 20 + 40 + 40 = 490), every element of which is attested in the Damascus Document except for the third one (the forty of the Teacher's career which is reconstructed), is based on the famous 'seventy weeks'/490-year prophecy found in Daniel 9, which was so pivotal to ancient calculations of the end of the age and the expected eschatological culmination.

The first number, the 390 years, is described in CD 1.5-8 as being the period from when God 'delivered them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon' to when God 'visited them and caused to sprout from Israel and from Aaron a plant root, in order to possess his land and to become fat with the good things of his soil'. It is widely acknowledged that this number, the 390 years, is of no historical usefulness since there is no reason to suppose the authors either knew or were constrained by what they might previously have supposed concerning the date of Nebuchadnezzar's conquest of Jerusalem (which we know to have been 587 BCE) or the dating of the Persian period (which we know to have been 538-323 BCE). This was well summarized by Michael Wise:

The year 587 [for Nebuchadnezzar] is a date modern scholars have deduced only because they have cuneiform writings to combine with the biblical clues. Ancient Jewish chronographers were less fortunate. Indeed, no one in the time of the scrolls was quite sure how long the Persian period had been ... Second Temple Jews calculated the length of the Persian period using the 490 years of Dan 9:24-27. Standard practice was first to decide when those 490 years had ended or shortly would end (i.e. when Daniel's prophecies would be fulfilled). Then one reckoned backwards from that very debatable standpoint ... Since, therefore, the author of the *Damascus Document* cannot be presumed to have posited the year 587 BCE for Nebuchadnezzar's siege of Jerusalem, the only proper methodology for understanding CD 1:3-11 is to turn the usual approach on its head. One must first determine when the Teacher lived, then work backwards from that point to calculate when the author believed Nebuchadnezzar was on the scene. (Wise 2003: 63-4)

In other words, the eschatologically-minded authors of the Damascus Document regarded counts which ended before their own time as erroneous by definition and in need of updating or recalculation (Adler 1996 [‘updating and reinterpreting Daniel’s vision of 70 weeks persisted in Judaism up to and even after the destruction of the temple in 70’]; Collins 2010: 93-94 [‘there is no reason to believe that the 390 years of CD 1 is any more reliable as a chronological indicator than Daniel’s 490 years ... the number cannot be pressed to yield even an approximate date’]).

Instead of assuming there was a single fixed chronological system in use in ancient texts such as those found at Qumran which was adhered to generation after generation, we should think instead in terms of a ‘moving front’ for their fixing of their end-dates, with periodic recalculations and reworking of the schemes as necessary to keep the end out ahead of the present, what Cana Werman calls ‘chronographic fluidity’ (2006: 250 fn 53). The authors of Daniel had a 490-year scheme that ended in the 160s BCE. Another scheme is reflected in 4Q390/Apocryphon of Jeremiah C, written at about the same time as Daniel in the context of the Hellenistic crisis, but which foresees that crisis continuing a long time and whose authors now calculated themselves to be only in the 7th of 10 jubilees of their 490-year count. The Damascus Document sets the end of its 490-year count forty years after the death of the Teacher of Righteousness which is in the very recent past of that text’s authors. The ‘Olivet Prophecy’ and book of Revelation of the New Testament end their 490-year counts of Daniel at the time of the First Revolt in the second half of the 1st century CE (Mk 13:14; Rev. 13:1-10; 17:5). All of these are different endings of Daniel’s 490 years, a ‘rolling front’ through time for when the eschatological transformation was anticipated to happen. A chronological scheme—a 490-year count—in a text in this era might by definition have been composed recently before the time of authorship of that text, with changing ways to count the 490 as schemes were updated in light of the latest developments.

In the case of the Damascus Document, the authors, reasoning that the true numbers must give a 490-year count coming out to ahead of their own time, used 390 years which they got from Ezek. 4:4-6 to fill in the first part of the period. Then they combined that 390 with more recent numbers to make the count come out right (which must obviously end at some point ahead of when they were writing). Michael Wise is right—the 390 years of CD 1.5-8 do not inform us of when the Teacher arose, but rather how long before their time the authors determined Nebuchadnezzar had lived (a question of no interest to us here).

But the more recent numbers of the Damascus Document scheme from the authors’ own time or recent memory—the 20 and the first 40—could be approximately correct. Those two numbers (the 20 and the first 40) are not necessarily the same in kind as the 390. The 390 is purely

schematic, a filler number, drawn from Ezek. 4:4-6. But the 20 and the 40 may be a mixture of part schematic and part allusion to recent time periods known to the authors as interpreted by the authors, in a sense that the 390 is not. Although the 20 and the 40 also give the appearance of being round numbers, they may reflect firsthand or secondhand knowledge of the authors.

The revival of Israel like a dead plant coming back to life of CD 1.5-8 is usually understood in terms of some sectarian phenomenon, which may not be entirely inaccurate, but another possibility, not necessarily in contradiction, is that the dead plant returning to life could allude to the conquests and expansions of Alexander Jannaeus viewed favorably by the authors of the Qumran texts—a reversal of the conquest of Nebuchadnezzar, Israel at last come ‘back to life’ as a serious and formidable entity on the map as it once had been in a golden age long ago. Compare this historian’s summary for a possible context within which an image of Israel coming back to life like a dead plant reviving could be evocative and understood:

By the death of Alexander Jannaeus [76 BCE] ... all of Palestine except for the territory of Ascalon and much of Transjordan were under Hasmonean control ... Jerusalem changed from a small hill-country town far from the main trade routes, whose chief distinction was a not very distinguished temple, to the capital city of one of the largest of the kingdoms which succeeded the Seleucid Empire. Alexander’s grandfather had been a village priest, low-level rebel leader and brigand; Alexander was an important king. Palestine had been a mosaic of Greek cities and little Hellenized semitic tribal and ethnic units, of which the Judaeans were only one, and possibly not the largest; now it was almost entirely ‘Jewish’ ... (Schwartz 1991: 16-17)

The rise of the Teacher twenty years after Israel revived back to life (CD 1.8-11) might then allude to the rise of a high priest who at some later stage was deposed from power and driven into exile and died.

In this picture, schematized according to the skeletal framework of the Damascus Document, the Teacher when he first emerges takes office as the lawgiver, the divinely inspired exegete, looked to for leadership by the already existing *yachad* groups scattered throughout the countryside and throughout the region. The total span or career of the Teacher lasts some forty years in the schematic reconstruction of the Damascus Document. This period—the schematic forty years of the Teacher—ends with the Teacher’s death.

~ ~ 4 ~ ~

To repeat, in this picture the Teacher of Righteousness of the Damascus Document rises to prominence at a time when the 1QS *yachad* groups are already in existence. That is, these groups recognize the leadership of the Teacher when he arose twenty years after Israel had

revived back to life again (CD 1.7-10). Was the Teacher of the Damascus Document originally a priest in the temple as most Qumran scholars today think, perhaps a high priest as Louis Ginzberg argued long ago in his landmark 1922 study of the Damascus Document, an idea which a number of scholars today also have regarded favorably? Again, there is no sound basis internal to the texts for the common notion that the *Serekh* or Community Rule texts are opposed to the temple or its priests. Instead, the *yachad* groups read well as an extension or projection of the sect of priests in control of the temple, and this precedes the rise of the Teacher of Righteousness.

When the Teacher, who is widely thought to have originally been a priest in the temple, who is spoken of in the texts in language and titles evocative of a high priest, who perhaps *was* a high priest—when this figure, this Teacher, arises he is revered and honored, his words regarded as inspired. If the *yachad* groups indeed reflect activity sponsored by priests of the temple, the Teacher as high priest would account for the *yachad* groups' acceptance of the Teacher's authority. The mystery as to how the Teacher attained prominence in the *yachad* groups which he did not himself found would receive a trivially simple answer: it is because the Teacher was the high priest, by acclamation the leading priest of the priests who controlled the *yachad* groups. Although this explanation of how the Teacher came to authority in the precursor groups alluded to at CD 1.7-10 draws on notions already current in Qumran scholarship, it appears not to have received scholarly consideration due to the blocking effect of the prior assumption that the *Serekh* texts reflect an adversarial stance toward the temple and its priests, even though there is no evidence whatsoever of such an adversarial stance in the 1QS and 4QS texts themselves.

~~ 5 ~~

There used to be an idea in Qumran scholarship that the Hasmonean high priests of the 2nd and 1st centuries BCE were not descended from Zadok, the biblical priest in the time of David. The idea was that the Hasmoneans (then called Maccabees) in the mid-2nd century BCE replaced the then-ruling Oniad line of high priests, believed to have been 'Zadokites'. In history the Oniad line of high priests in Jerusalem came to an end in the upheavals surrounding the Hellenistic crisis of the mid-2nd century BCE reflected in the book of Daniel.

1QS refers to the *yachad*'s priests as 'sons of Zadok'. The notion was that the priests of the Qumran sect of the 2nd and 1st centuries BCE, contemporary with and opposed to the Hasmoneans ruling in Jerusalem, were survivors of or a branch of the earlier Oniad high-priestly line, no longer in power but regarding themselves as legitimate, still in Judea, now the leaders of the Qumran sect. The idea was that the 'sons of Zadok' of the sect were opposed to the non-Zadokite Hasmoneans in power in Jerusalem who had usurped the Zadokite Oniads. Until

recently this scheme was taken for granted by most scholars and presented in standard popular introductions to the Dead Sea Scrolls.

But there never was any evidence for that construction—that the Hasmoneans did not understand themselves to have been descended from Zadok. No ancient text attests to that notion (there is no sign the Hasmoneans were criticized for not being descended from Zadok), and a number of studies in recent years, from Liver 1967 (the Hasmonean priestly course of Joarib was from Zadok), DeQueker 1986 (the Hasmoneans understood themselves to be Zadokites), Hjelm 2000 (the Hasmoneans identified themselves as Zadokites), Grabbe 2003 (all altar priests were assumed to have Zadok in their ancestry; Zadok was not a high-priestly line; 'sons of Zadok', 'sons of Aaron', and 'priests' are synonymous in Qumran sectarian texts), VanderKam 2004 (Hasmoneans as Zadokites very possible), Schofield and VanderKam 2005 (considerable reason to believe the Hasmoneans were Zadokites, no evidence to the contrary) and others have put an end to this idea. This means that when the Qumran Community Rule texts refer to their priests as sons of Zadok, there is no indication in that expression of a difference between those priests and priests of the temple in the era of the Hasmoneans.

~~ 6 ~~

And any assumption that the people of the Qumran texts practiced a different calendar than that of the 1st century BCE Hasmonean high priests, and therefore the Teacher could not have been a high priest of the 1st century BCE temple for that reason, or the priests of the Qumran texts could not have supported a high priest of the 1st century BCE for that reason, is no better founded than the non-Zadokite Hasmonean notion—since there is no independent knowledge of the calendar ideology of the priests of the temple in the era of the Hasmoneans, and therefore no basis for assuming that a regime of priests of the temple held views different than those of priests of the Qumran texts, as opposed to the same or compatible views.

1QpHab 11.4-8 has almost certainly been misunderstood in Qumran scholarship. In 1951 Shemaryahu Talmon proposed a reading of this pesher as indicating a calendar dispute between the Wicked Priest and the followers of the Teacher of Righteousness. As Talmon, followed by virtually every Qumran scholar since, read it, these lines give a picture of the Wicked Priest pursuing the Teacher of Righteousness to a place of exile, whereupon he (the Wicked Priest) attempts to disrupt the righteous when they are observing their holy fast day, the Day of Atonement. Obviously, the logic goes, if the Wicked Priest and the Teacher were following the same calendar, the Wicked Priest—the high priest—would be in Jerusalem in the temple on the Day of Atonement, not leading a military attack somewhere away from Jerusalem on that day. The conclusion, it is argued, is that the Wicked Priest was operating on a different calendar—

the pesher portrays an event occurring on the Day of Atonement of the calendar used by the sect of the Teacher, but this was not the Day of Atonement of the calendar of the Wicked Priest or the temple. This passage in Pesher Habakkuk and the interpretation of it just described have been pivotal in virtually every discussion of the Teacher of Righteousness in the more than half century since then. But that reading or interpretation of those lines is likely in error.

The two sentences in the pesher of 1QpHab 11.4-8 almost certainly allude to two distinct events in the world of the text, not one as commonly supposed. The first is a murderous pursuit by the Wicked Priest of the Teacher driving the Teacher to a place of exile. The second takes place in the temple in Jerusalem, where the Wicked Priest appears in glory on the Day of Atonement and casts the righteous (who also are in the temple in Jerusalem on this day) into disarray. The issue, from the point of view of the text, is a usurpation of the high priesthood by the Wicked Priest. The Wicked Priest drives the Teacher into exile, and then the Wicked Priest assumes the office of high priest now vacated by the Teacher. 1QpHab 11.4-8 therefore has nothing to do with a calendar dispute. Rather than being a calendar dispute, 1QpHab 11.4-8 is a legitimate high priest and usurpation dispute. The real significance of 1QpHab 11.4-8 has been lost by the mistaken reading. The real significance is a glimpse of a dramatic scene of the Wicked Priest appearing as high priest in the temple on the Day of Atonement, an allusion to a usurper who has driven out the Teacher, the legitimate high priest. It is an image of a usurper assuming the office of high priest formerly held by the Teacher—a traumatic and shocking event to the righteous in the world of the text.

~~7~~

It has been suggested that the 364-day calendar of many Qumran texts might have been used in the temple in the time of John Hyrcanus I and Alexander Jannaeus and sporadically at later times (Glessmer 1999: 273-74). But others such as Baumgarten (1987) and Stern (2000, 2010) have suspected the 364-day calendar of the Qumran texts did not involve repudiation of the lunar calendar in practice, but could have represented an ideal rather than intended to be practiced in real life. Helen Jacobus has published an analysis of 4Q318 Zodiology and Brontology showing that that text is extremely accurate in calculating the zodiac sign in which the moon is situated for most dates of the Hebrew calendar, even to the present day. Jacobus says that the lunar calendar (today's Hebrew calendar) was in use anciently and that 'it was harmonised with the 360-day year and the zodiacal arrangement in the text. The 4Q318 zodiac calendar would thereby integrate three cycles: the sun, the moon, and the stars (the zodiac) into a single, perpetual calendar' (Jacobus 2010: 374).

Sacha Stern suggests that scholarly studies of Qumran calendrical texts may have confused theoretical

discussions in texts with practice, and that apart from *Jubilees* (2nd century BCE) there is little actual evidence for Jewish calendar sectarianism in practice anciently. Josephus, for example, knows nothing of calendar disputes. Undercutting much of what has long been taken for granted in scholarly literature, Stern argues that 'the notion that the calendar was critical to Qumran sectarianism remains no more than a modern scholarly assumption' (Stern 2010: 249) and 'the 364-day calendar ... does not appear in Qumran sources as a polemical issue, nor does it appear to have played a particular role in forging the Qumran community's sectarian identity' (*ibid*: 250).

The calendar that is attached, for example, to 4Q259 S^e has nothing in it that warrants interpreting it as in contrast to a different calendar used by temple priests. The calendar of 4Q259 S^e reads perfectly well as a text of priests associated with or running the temple, and there is nothing in the text contrary to this. The calendrical texts among the Qumran finds have been read as in opposition to temple practice in the absence of knowledge of what calendrical practices and ideology in the temple actually were. Unless there is evidence to know otherwise, it should be considered that the calendrical texts among the Qumran finds may be *actual* glimpses into the world of priests of the temple in the era of the Hasmoneans concerning calendar issues, because these *may be their texts*—missed because of the blinding effect of a scholarly construction.

~~8~~

It is frequently supposed that the people of the Qumran texts opposed the Hasmoneans because the Hasmoneans combined the office of king and high priest. Texts such as the Temple Scroll are cited which envision a high priest superior to and distinct from the king. Other texts are cited which reflect a dual-messiah ideology of a separate king and high priest. CD 7.18-21 portrays a 'prince of the whole congregation' distinct from an 'Interpreter of the Law', corresponding to a distinction between a Davidic warrior messiah and a high priestly messiah in other texts. It has been argued that since the Hasmoneans combined the offices of king and high priest contrary to this, the people of the Qumran texts can only have opposed, and in no way could have supported, the Hasmonean rulers.

But this construction also evaporates when examined more closely. An article of Israel Knohl (2009) can be cited as the corrective here. Knohl notes the context of scholarly debate concerning the single- versus dual-messiah issue in the Qumran texts. Knohl notes that both views are represented in the Bible. On the one hand kings such as David exercise priestly prerogatives and there is Melchizedek of Genesis who is king and high priest. On the other hand the Torah separates king and high priest, and a dual messiah ideology can be seen reflected at Zech. 4:14. Knohl argues that just as in the Bible, so in the Qumran texts: both views are represented. Knohl cites

11QMelchizedek as combining in one figure the high priestly and royal messiah. Against a widespread scholarly notion that the figure of 11QMelchizedek is an angel, Knohl argues: the figure is human, an eschatological human figure. The figure sets people free. This figure is described with names of God, but this is like divine names associated with messianic figures in the Bible; it does not mean this figure *is* an angel or *is* God. Knohl cites 2.13 as showing the distinction: the figure ‘carries out the vengeance of God’s judgments’. Knohl argues that the figure of 11QMelchizedek combined both kingship and priesthood within a single person, and is identical to the figure of the Qumran *Self-Glorification Hymn* which has received so much discussion. Knohl argues that the figures of these texts are both royal and priestly, and that at least some authors of Qumran texts ‘saw the Community leader as the messianic king and high priest’ (Knohl 2009: 266).

Meanwhile, as other studies have shown, the *Self-Glorification Hymn*, in which a priestly figure speaks as if glorified in a heavenly setting, appears to speak with the same ‘I’ voice of the *Hodayot*, the voice of the Teacher (Abegg 1997; Wise 2000; Angel 2010). Kings and priests are combined in Aramaic Levi (3rd or 2nd century BCE), seven copies of which were found at Qumran (Stone 2006: 62-63).

These analyses remove the basis for the assumption that the *yachad* groups would have opposed the Hasmoneans over the issue of uniting king and high priest in one person, since some of their own texts have this. To this it may be added that there is not a single fragment among the finds at Qumran that attests opposition to or polemic against a figure on the grounds of combining king and priest. What some scholars have reified and perceived as a central issue, there is no evidence internal to the texts to indicate was an issue at all.

~~ 9 ~~

Nor is there any evidence within the Qumran texts that Davidic messianism functioned with anti-Hasmonean intent as sometimes supposed. The pro-Hasmonean text 1 Maccabees cites and praises the biblical promise to David of everlasting royal rule for his descendants (1 Macc. 2:57), part of what William Horbury characterizes as a general ‘presentation in 1 Maccabees of Hasmonaean achievements as Davidic’ (2003: 49). The Qumran texts portray a Davidic warrior figure—called the ‘Prince of the Congregation’ and the ‘Branch of David’—as a military commander, subordinate to the high priest who is the actual ruler of the nation (4Q285 5.1-5; 1QM 5.1; 1QSa 2.14-21; 1QSB 5.20-29). In these texts this Prince of the Congregation/Branch of David figure is not a king in the present age, although an eschatological military triumph and future kingship is envisioned—but that happens later, after this figure defeats Israel’s enemies (4Q161 8-10 iii 17-24; 4Q174 1.10-13; 4Q252 5 vi 1-4).

As brought out in a number of studies, priestly monarchism or supreme rule by the high priest was considered the traditional and legitimate form of Jewish government by the time of the Hasmonean era (Goodblatt 1994; van der Kooij 2007). David Goodblatt notes how belief in a restored Davidic kingship at the eschatological culmination could work very well within an ideology of high-priestly rule in the present age as long as the envisioned Davidic restoration remained future (Goodblatt 1994: 75-76). Compare the statement in 1 Macc. 14:40 that Simon Maccabaeus would serve as high priest temporarily until the rise of a True Prophet (‘the Jews and priests are happy that Simon should, pending the advent of a genuine prophet, be their ethnarch and high priest for life’). An ideology of an eschatological Davidic restoration could solidify Hasmonean rule in the present age by delegitimizing other claimants. In this ideology, Davidic royal rule would be restored once a commander of Judah of demonstrable Davidic ancestry defeated opposing empires and attained world-power status for Israel. Once those modest requirements were met the Davidic restoration would happen. However even then the Davidic king would continue to be under the authority of the high priest. This is how Davidic restoration is dealt with within the Qumran texts. In this way traditional dreams of Judah clans could be both embraced and channelled under the Hasmoneans.

There is no sign within the Qumran texts of criticism of a Hasmonean ruler on grounds of being non-Davidic. Psalms of Solomon 17 condemns Hasmonean usurpation of Davidic rule (a reading that PssSol 17 is alluding to Roman crushing of traditional national hopes of Davidic rule seems refuted by ‘they set up a monarchy’, or as Ward 1996 argues, ‘they exchanged their priestly turbans for a crown’, of 17.6, which seems to confirm the anti-Hasmonean reading). The Psalms of Solomon, which allude to Pompey in PssSol 2, 8, and 17 and are believed to have been written or collected in their final form late in the 1st century BCE, are traditionally thought to have come from 1st century BCE Pharisees, though that is debated. Josephus identifies popular opposition to Hasmonean rule as coming from the Pharisees (*Ant.* 13.288 and 13.296 compared with 13.401-2). One stream of Pharisees seems to turn up at the end of the 1st century BCE in the form of what Josephus calls a Fourth Philosophy of the Jews. Josephus says this philosophy was like the Pharisees in every other way except that they refused to ‘call any man master’—possibly this was the traditional or conservative form of Pharisee ideology. But the Qumran texts for many good reasons are considered to be opposed to the Pharisees of the 1st century BCE of Josephus and the rabbis. In this schematic, one could see the Qumran texts as reflecting pro-Hasmonean, pro-monarchic Hasmonean ideology, in contrast to Pharisee anti-monarchist resistance to Hasmonean rule. Such schematized ways of viewing history are problematic however; real history is invariably more messy and complicated than frameworks derived from literary texts which may themselves have been invented or shaped for other purposes, and in real life there is *realpolitik*.

associated with changing rhetorical justifications to meet political necessities. Most importantly and to the point here, the Psalms of Solomon is not a Qumran text, and no text that is among the Qumran finds reveals criticism of Hasmonean rulers on anti-David-usurpation or anti-monarchist grounds.

There may indeed be a progression in which Qumran texts during the earlier part of the Hasmonean era have a Davidic warrior commander figure who is limited to being a military commander who wins battles and is subordinate to the high priest as brought out by Casey Elledge (2007), and then development of that figure into a full-blown militant Davidic messianism in the Roman period. But in the Qumran texts the Davidic figure in the present age is under the authority of the high priest and is not king. When the Davidic figure does become king in the eschatological restoration, the Qumran texts still have him subject to the high priest. There is no evidence this ideology of the Qumran texts is distinguishable from the ideology of Hasmonean high priests. The perception that the Davidic figures in the Qumran texts represent criticism of the Hasmoneans is something scholars have read into the Qumran texts.

~ ~ 10 ~ ~

The images in the texts of the Teacher in exile, and the images of a high-priestly usurper and adversary—the notorious figure whom the texts call the Wicked Priest and other names—indicate that even though the Teacher may have *started out* prominent in the temple, *started out* as the leading priest of the priests who exercised authority in the *yachad* groups, something went *terribly awry*. For he may have *started out* in a prominent position in the temple, as the leader of the priestly sect controlling the temple, as high priest ... but he *ended up* in exile, out of power, with attempts on his life, having become the apparent inspiration for hymns of great pathos found in the Qumran Hymns or *Hodayot* texts (Douglas 1998, 1999; Wise 1999, 2010), and then he *died*, never having seen vindication or restoration to his former status. *Something had happened*—something had gone horribly wrong. What had happened was a usurpation, this usurpation being the occasion in the world of the texts when members of the sect *loyal to the former high priest which had been in power lost power, lost control of the temple*, and came to be out of power, the stance reflected in the Qumran texts at those texts' late end.

The usurper is regarded by these texts as an illegitimate high priest (because he had overthrown the legitimate high priest by force, had tried to kill the legitimate high priest and had driven him into exile, had expropriated wealth not belonging to him and so on, to which charges concerning defiling the temple also were raised). The authors of these texts expressed their deep displeasure with this figure in a series of bitter puns in Hebrew. In a disparaging pun on this figure's wrongful assumption of the high priestly office and claim to be the new legitimate 'high priest', they punned that as the 'Wicked Priest'.

Elsewhere they called him 'the Last Priest' in a disparaging pun on this figure's claim to be a 'priest of Aaron'. Still again in another text they gave him the sobriquet 'Manasseh', a wordplay on the name 'Hasmonean' while at the same time evoking all of the associations drawn from the famously wicked king Manasseh of old of the Bible, whom the biblical prophets blamed for Judah's downfall and punishment by Yahweh at the hands of foreign conquerors. And they refer to this detested figure having been 'called by the name of truth' at the time he took power, ironically using a technical term evoking the *yachad* sect. The authors of Peshier Habakkuk allude to this figure as having been acclaimed as a member of the same sect as the high priest just deposed. But the authors show by contrast how horrible this figure's actions were in practice, how wrong the acclamation had been.

~ ~ 11 ~ ~

The 'name of truth' said to have been applied to the Wicked Priest at 1QpHab 8.8-9, understood in its rich context of meaning in Qumran sectarian texts, is incongruous only if one holds the prior assumption that the sect is separate from the temple. If one does not assume that, then the allusion to the Wicked Priest having been 'called by the name of truth' reads as familiar allusion to a world of traitors and backsliders, parallel to the traitorous council of 1QpHab 5.8-12, the ruthless ones of the covenant of 1QpHab 2.5-6 and 4QpPs A 1-10 ii 14, iii 12, the wicked *yachad* of 4Q181 1 i 1-2, and perhaps 'the wicked one[s] of the *yachad*, the house of Peleg, the ones joined to Manasseh' which I have newly proposed to restore at 4QpNah 3-4 iv 1 (Doudna 2011: 277).

Note that Peshier Habakkuk is not necessarily saying the authors themselves had believed this Wicked Priest deserved or merited the name of truth. The sense of 'called by the name of truth' is that that was his reputation (among the sect, or the people at large), or possibly the expression is intended to represent a claim made by the Wicked Priest concerning himself. Isa. 44:5 seems to imply the expression 'called by the name of—' means 'one calls oneself X' or 'one is reputed to be X'. It suggests this expression in Peshier Habakkuk is not necessarily alluding to a past endorsement of the authors of Peshier Habakkuk of this figure when he came to power which the authors now regret. Instead it is an allusion to a general acclamation or reputation accorded to this figure and/or this figure's own claim, which it need not be assumed the authors of Peshier Habakkuk ever shared. Finally, in the expression *šm h'mt*, 'the name of truth', have the authors worked in another ironic pun or wordplay on the name *hšmn*, 'Hasmonean'?

~ ~ 12 ~ ~

These authors not only portray this figure's crimes, they allude to a horrible fate that comes to him. They portray this figure's regime and ill-gotten wealth of the temple falling violently to the *Kittim* in a horrific invasion and

massacre. They have him killed by the ruthless invaders, divine justice, divine payback for what he had done. In Peshar Habakkuk he is brought to divine judgment in a gentile court among the nations and killed (1QpHab 10.3-5). In Peshar Psalms A he is delivered 'into the hand of the dreadful ones of the nations to execute [vengeance] upon him' (4QpPs A 1-10 iv 8-10). In Peshar Nahum he is 'hanged up alive' (4QpNah 3-4 i 8-ii 1). All of this is in the context of an invasion of the *Kittim*, or Romans.

This last point, the detail about the invasion of the Kittim of Peshar Habakkuk and Peshar Nahum being Romans, is of the utmost significance for dating the world of these texts. As recognized by scholars today on the basis of details in the descriptions, the Kittim depicted so graphically in Peshar Habakkuk and appearing also in Peshar Nahum allude to Romans of the 1st century BCE—Romans of the era of the Republic and the civil wars with changes of rulers, in texts dated 1st century BCE in their time of composition. These are texts not later than the 1st century BCE, but at the same time the Romans also are not in Judea *until* the mid-1st century BCE. This is the context of Peshar Habakkuk and Peshar Nahum and related texts—*Roman invasion of Judea in the 1st century BCE*. This is the 'present' of the figures depicted as contemporary to the world of the authors of these texts. The surrealistic figures and images in these texts emerge from and reflect the world of the 1st century BCE, the era of Roman impact on Judea at a time when Hasmonean high priests still ruled (Wise 2003). This is not, however, the view held by most scholars. Most scholars today think the sobriquet-bearing figures of these 1st century BCE pesharim allude to events and figures from a century or so earlier than the time of the authors, from the mid-2nd century BCE.

It may seem odd that the great majority of scholars today can simultaneously fully acknowledge that the Kittim of Peshar Habakkuk and Peshar Nahum are contemporary 1st century BCE Romans, in texts written by authors of the mid- or later part of the 1st century BCE, yet hold that these texts nevertheless depict figures set in the mid-2nd century BCE, except when the Kittim appear who are acknowledged to be 1st century BCE. If this seems odd, perhaps it is because it is a little odd, if we step back and think about it. The prevailing scholarly notion is that the authors of these texts mixed up their centuries, their figures, and their stories in the pesharim, with the past put into the present and unmarked shifts back and forth between centuries. But the only reason for the scholarly insistence on reading the texts in this manner is because of a prior assumption that these texts are alluding to figures and contexts set in the mid-2nd century BCE, instead of figures and contexts from the authors' own time, as the texts themselves read. The texts themselves do not put their sobriquet-bearing figures a century or more earlier, or in the 2nd century BCE. There is no evidence, textual or otherwise, that the sobriquet-bearing figures of the pesharim were long past, or traditional figures, or had a long history of development, or an extensive oral history, or anything of this kind at the time

these texts were written. The ways the sobriquet-bearing figures are named evoke traditional language and ancient motifs (that is what gives nicknaming its power) but that is a distinct matter. The majority of Qumran scholars have read these 1st century BCE texts in terms of 2nd century BCE historical constructions without warrant from the texts themselves, for reasons extraneous to the texts.

It was not always so. Many in the first generation of Qumran text scholars—heavyweight names such as Dupont-Sommer, Burrows, van der Ploeg, Carmignac, Elliger, and others—thought the era of the sobriquet-bearing figures of the Qumran pesharim was the authors' own time, the time when the authors composed those texts, which is to say the 1st century BCE, because that is how the texts read. But somehow that was lost in the history of scholarship, for reasons that are hard at this date for anyone even to remember.

~ ~ 13 ~ ~

One reason which has been argued for holding to a notion of a distantly-past Teacher of Righteousness from the perspective of the authors of the pesharim is that the Teacher's depiction is so heavily stylized and motif-laden. If the Teacher is not a wholly invented figure set in the dim past, it is argued, accurate memory of this figure had certainly been lost and all that remained to these authors was an inherited or constructed tradition. In other words, it is argued, the motifs have overpowered any elements of historical details such that the figure has taken on a life of its own in the life of the community and in the world of texts. What such a figure might have been historically is either lost or irrelevant since the figure has become a literary figure, a figure drawn from composite stock types, whose function is to distinguish insiders from outsiders, friends from enemies, loyal from disloyal, truth from error and so on, in the authors' rhetorical and social worlds. I am paraphrasing but this is the sense of the objection: the Teacher is unlikely to have been drawn from a contemporary real-world figure because the portrayal is *so* motif-laden, so literary, so stylized, so unreal—so different from the kind of accurate details that the authors would have known and written if the figure were contemporary. The assumption is that a significant passage of time is necessary to account for a figure to be presented in texts in such a manner.

And yet the premise of this objection could hardly be more mistaken. All we have to do is observe our own present world, in which contemporary figures and religious and political leaders take on surreal and mythic statuses in the worlds of rhetoric, political campaigns, hagiographies, and popular acclaim. In our own time we have seen a ruling Ayatollah proclaim America 'the Great Satan'. We have seen the ruler of a Latin American nation address the United Nations, following an address by the American President, saying he could still 'smell sulfur' at the podium left behind by 'the devil'. The use of metaphors and images are attempts to speak *more* truth

about reality than a dry-fact journalistic description is perceived capable of doing. It has nothing to do with the figures not being contemporary. Even in the Qumran texts at issue, those who suppose the Teacher must be a dimly-remembered or imaginary figure from the text's past do not suppose by the same reasoning that the equally motif-laden Kittim must similarly be set in the text's dim past. In fact the phenomenon of nicknaming and the romanticizing and demonizing rhetoric of political discourse ancient and modern provide a spectrum within which the images of the pesharim can be compared.

~ ~ 14 ~ ~

The violent downfall and destruction of the regime of the wicked ruler who opposes the Teacher is associated with the forty years attributed to the era of the Teacher in the Damascus Document schematic, in the world of the texts. The Teacher, who started out as a leading priest of the temple, at some point becomes separated from the temple and driven into exile in this schematic forty years. If the death of the Teacher occurs at the end of the schematic forty years of the Teacher's era, and if the *yachad* groups started, say, in the era of Alexander Jannaeus twenty years before the rise of the Teacher, that would bring the Teacher's death down some sixty years (twenty plus forty) after the *yachad* groups began in the schematic, with a death of the Teacher perhaps somewhere in the time of Herod the Great (37-4 BCE).

What happens to the *yachad* groups under these circumstances in the world of the texts? Some defect from the Teacher and follow the Teacher's opponent, the figure the Qumran texts call the Wicked Priest and other names. (We see only one side's version of this dispute, remember. Texts representing the other side, the perspective of the Wicked Priest and his supporters—obviously they would not call him the Wicked Priest—have so far not been identified.) But what would happen to the groups who remained loyal to the Teacher after the Teacher lost power and was exiled? What would happen if the Teacher then died and there was no successor? Many of these groups might be more or less orphaned, rudderless, without leadership. And that is exactly the way the Damascus Document Manuscript B closes, with a picture of the Teacher dead, no replacement Teacher or leader, everyone on their own (CD 20.13-20). The B text of the Damascus Document found in the medieval Cairo Genizah alludes to the recent death of the Teacher and the new situation of the righteous ones being without their Teacher and lawgiver, like the scattered sheep of Zechariah that the B text quotes.

~ ~ 15 ~ ~

The texts do not reveal the circumstances in which the Teacher died, only that the Teacher's death was regarded as so pivotal that the authors of the Damascus Document updated their entire calculated end of the age chronology around the death of this figure.

In the schematic outlined, the death of the Teacher becomes situated perhaps sometime in the time of Herod, with the Damascus Document looking back on the Teacher's recent death. It is not clear that any of the pesharim know of the Teacher's death. Peshar Habakkuk can be read with the Teacher either living or not living in the text's present so is ambiguous, but Peshar Psalms A unambiguously portrays the Teacher as living and contemporary in the world of that text and its implied authors (4QpPs A 1-10 ii 18-20; iv 9). The portrayal of the Teacher as alive in the present of Peshar Psalms A could suggest, by analogy, that the likely contemporary text Peshar Habakkuk should be read similarly. But the Damascus Document, or at least the B text of the Damascus Document, does allude to the Teacher's death. That allusion in the Damascus Document is set in the very recent past, in the authors' personally known recent past, in the picture implied in the world of the text. The authors' 'present' in the Damascus Document B text is probably about year 450 or 460 or so into the 490, not too long after the death of the Teacher, somewhere in the final forty.

(Strictly speaking, it is not known for sure that the exemplar underlying the 'A' text of the Damascus Document of the medieval Cairo Genizah—the version in agreement with the copies found at Qumran—had the allusion to the death of the Teacher that the Cairo Genizah's 'B' text does, since that section in the 'B' text is missing in the 'A' text in the Cairo Genizah, and it has not turned up in any Qumran text either. But since the two medieval versions for the most part agree otherwise, the earlier copies of the Damascus Document found at Qumran presumably had the death of the Teacher. Nevertheless it remains curious that there is no clear allusion to the Teacher's death in any text fragment actually found at Qumran.)

~ ~ 16 ~ ~

But what would happen to the orphaned S and D groups in the world of the texts? With their leaders gone, a number of these S-groups may have come to terms at this time with living under Herod who agreed to let them practice their ways. These surviving groups, now existing independently, might then turn up as the idealized, glorified Essenes of the classical sources.

And so in this way there would be a direct IQS-Essene connection or continuity, but without any notion that the IQS or 4QS *Serekh* texts reflect opposition to the priests of the temple, for nothing in the *Serekh* texts calls for that notion. In the Damascus Document there *is* separation from the priests of the temple, an adversarial relationship, but that text postdates the Teacher and the Teacher's expulsion from the temple. But none of those developments are alluded to or assumed in the world of IQS, which is explained very simply if IQS is in fact from earlier, before those events. The key insight here is that when IQS 8.13 refers to separation from sinful men, or IQSa 1.2-3 refers to a separation from the 'path of the

people', or CD 8.16/19.29 refers to 'the ones who departed from the path of the people', or 11QMelch 2.24 refers to 'those who establish the covenant, who avoid walking on the path of the people', these all can be read as a sectarian orientation *held by priests of the temple* (and those who join with them). 1QS *extends* the ideology of priestly separateness to selected lay initiates, but nothing in 1QS requires reading that as meaning *rejection of the priests or the temple*.

~ ~ 17 ~ ~

In a series of insightful articles Joan Taylor has called into question some longstanding ways of reading the classical descriptions of the Essenes (2010, 2011a, 2011b, 2012b). Taylor argues that according to the classical descriptions Essenes took part in public office and rule in cities; otherwise they would not have been considered *haereseis*. 'Josephus does not imply that the Essenes—his prime example of Jewish excellence—avoided the Temple, Jerusalem, or the public life of Judaism ... nothing in Josephus implies Essene alienation from involvement with civic authority, and they are found within many Judaeon cities. This then raises the question of whether Josephus means to imply that all the schools (or orders) are largely subclasses of the body of priests, whom he defines as the holders of position in public life' (2010: 182). Taylor notes that the *Serekh* texts may 'be indicators of stages somewhat prior to that which Josephus and Philo represent in terms of the Essenes' (2011a: 19).

It can also be noted here that nothing in the classical sources suggests the Essenes were opposed to the Hasmonean high priests and kings. In Philo of Alexandria's early treatise 'Every Good Person is Free', written perhaps mid-20s CE (Taylor 2012b: 24)—before Philo's nephew married into the Herod family and before Philo and his brother became friendly with Agrippa I in the mid-30s to early 40s CE—Philo refers to the exemplary Essenes of Judea and how they are recognized by rulers for their virtue. Philo makes the point that even the worst rulers of the Jews recognized this—rulers who acted with 'the untameable savagery of wild animals, not avoiding any cruelty, slaughtering their subjects in herds', even 'butchering those still living into parts, and cutting off limbs' (trans. of Taylor, p. 36). Philo follows this with another kind of ruler who speaks deceitfully with quiet and gentle words, yet was just as bad in bringing about the same ruin to the nation—even rulers such as these, says Philo, could find no blame in the Essenes ('Every Good Person is Free', 89-91). Philo's cruel rulers evoke the sense of a speech Josephus attributes to a delegation in Rome from the Jewish nation following the death of Herod the Great, appealing to Caesar not to confirm Herod's son Archelaus as king of the Jews. The delegation tells Caesar that Herod was 'the most cruel tyrant that ever existed' (*War* 2.84 [Loeb ed., Thackeray]). The miseries Herod inflicted surpassed anything suffered before by the Jews ever since their return from the Babylonian exile (*War* 2.86). Herod 'had

brought together in his own person the most ruthless cruelties of all the various tyrants ... adding many new forms of his own natural invention ... outrages not even a beast could have done if it had possessed the power to rule over men' (*Ant.* 17.304-310 [Loeb ed., Marcus]). The portrayal of Herod of the Jewish delegation's speech to Caesar is echoed in Josephus's history. At *War* 1.655 Herod has dissident scholars burned alive. At *War* 1.660 Herod on his deathbed orders all of the leading men of the towns of Judea to be gathered in one place and slaughtered wholesale, out of spite (compare Philo's cruel ruler who slaughters his subjects in herds). Philo's detail about cutting limbs off living persons may allude to a practice of the Herod regime in which a person being interrogated or punished was progressively dismembered alive until there was nothing left to be buried (*War* 1.594). (This form of torment is not attributed to any Hasmonean ruler.)

Philo's contrast of the beast-like ruler to the kind of ruler who speaks with kind words but turns out just as bad corresponds to Josephus's portrayal of Herod's successor Archelaus. Following Herod's death Archelaus speaks kind words to the Jewish nation (*Ant.* 17.200). He promises he 'will make an effort to show himself kinder to them in every way than his father had been' (17.204). He speaks 'mildly and considerately', 'eager to please the multitude' (17.204-5). But when public demands from scholars of the law and unruly demonstrators got out of hand Archelaus sent in armed soldiers who massacred three thousand in the process of restoring order (17.218). The temple was 'filled with corpses' (17.237). The Jewish delegation in Rome pleaded with Caesar not to confirm Archelaus as king. They said they had at first gladly welcomed Archelaus as king, thinking anyone would be an improvement over Herod (17.311). They had tried to be reasonable with him. But first thing he does, Archelaus had three thousand Jews massacred in the temple, proving that a reign of Archelaus would be no improvement over that of his father (17.313).

Philo appears to be alluding to these negative portrayals of Herod and Archelaus in 'Every Good Person is Free'. Philo is making a point. This same Herod is said by Josephus to have given honors to the Essenes (*Ant.* 15.372, 378), and it is implied that Archelaus continued the honors and benefactions given to the Essenes by his father. And this is exactly who Philo is saying found no fault with the Essenes in 'Every Good Person is Free'—the very rulers he describes as so horrible. Philo casts his language in terms of kinds of horrible rulers that the Jews have had to endure throughout history. Yet though that is his way of speaking, the allusion is to Herod and Archelaus, the most recent ones. Philo is saying even the most savage beast-like ruler not only could find no wrong done by the exemplary Essenes, but 'became enfeebled' in the face of such goodness. This proved how virtuous the Essenes are (says Philo).

Philo discusses the Essenes again in a later work, 'Apology for the Jews', written c. 40s CE, after Philo

now has family and personal connections to Agrippa I (Herod's son) whom he regards favorably. Philo no longer alludes to the negative view toward Herod of his former treatise, but again he cites the Herods' relationship to the Essenes as evidence of the Essenes' goodness. Philo alludes to Herod the Great and Archelaus, and now perhaps Agrippa I as well, as giving honors to the Essenes and receiving back approval and honors from the Essenes in return (Philo, 'Apology to the Jews', 11.18; Taylor 2012b: 45-46). The respect given to the Essenes from the beast-like ruler of 'Every Good Person is Free' is parallel to the honors given to the Essenes from Herod alluded to in 'Apology for the Jews'. Philo is alluding to Herod differently between these two texts, but it is the same favorable treatment of the Essenes coming from the same Herod, in the world of Philo. And there is no reason derivative from Philo for supposing the Essenes were any less well regarded by the preceding Hasmoneans.

Philo does not characterize the Hasmoneans directly in 'Every Good Person is Free', but his rhetoric that all rulers respected the Essenes straightforwardly suggests that Philo understood the Essenes to have been favorably regarded by the preceding Hasmoneans as well. If one looks to Josephus's speech of the Jewish delegation before Caesar opposing Herod and Archelaus for how the young Philo might, by analogy (since he otherwise echoes the sense of that speech), have regarded the previous era of the Hasmoneans, one reads of the Jewish delegation contrasting a previous flourishing prosperity of Judea in the time of the Hasmoneans to a disastrous impoverishment of the nation done by Herod. Herod had reduced the nation 'to helpless poverty after taking it over in as flourishing a condition as few ever knew' (*Ant.* 17.307). It is not clear whether that was Philo's view. Philo could have understood one or more Hasmonean rulers as included among his stereotypical two kinds of evil rulers. In default of better information, we might suppose Philo's view of past rulers of the Jews, including the Hasmoneans, perhaps was a mixed bag, some better, some worse than others, with Herod regarded by many of young Philo's contemporaries as one of the worst in history. But the point is not what Philo thought of rulers of the Hasmonean era (if we could know); that would only tell us what Philo thought. The question is not what Philo thought, but what the Essenes thought of the Hasmoneans. And there is nothing in Philo or any other classical source that suggests that the Essenes were opposed to the Hasmonean high priests or kings.

That the Essenes seem to appear in large numbers in the time of Herod in the classical accounts reinforces the sense of those accounts that they are an ongoing phenomenon which previously existed, not newly-born. What changes at the time of Herod is not their newly coming into existence, but perhaps something else. According to Josephus Herod exempted the Essenes from an oath of allegiance (*Ant.* 15.371). It has been suggested that more could have been involved than this from Herod, such as exemption from taxes and receipt of other privileges; perhaps self-rule, even land grants (Murphy

2002: 420; Taylor 2012b: 128, 163-5, 241). With Herod, do the Essenes now become separated from participation in public life? It might be asked if before Herod the Essenes participated in the regimes of the Hasmonean high priests and kings, but with Herod they no longer fulfill those functions but are instead given self-governance and protection by Herod.

The Essenes were a Jewish legal philosophy or governing system and not marginal according to the analysis of Taylor (2012b: 49-57 ['legal interpretation is actually the *raison d'être* of these societies', p. 52; "'schools" or "societies" of Jewish law which had authority to establish rulings in courts and fix Temple procedures', p. 196]). Yet the Essenes seem missing from the 'Pharisee versus Sadducee' disputes described by Josephus's sources for the Hasmonean period. It is tempting to ask if Essenes could be included in some of the descriptions of 'Sadducees' in the Hasmonean era of Josephus, as has been separately suggested with respect to later rabbinical uses of the term 'Sadducee'. In this light one might compare the way in which one other of Josephus's three philosophies of the Jews, the Pharisees, becomes in the time of Herod, in Josephus's telling, two: one which Josephus continues to call Pharisees, and the other, an unnamed Fourth Philosophy (who also thought they were 'Pharisees'?) which 'agrees in all other respects with the opinions of the Pharisees, except that they have a passion for liberty that is almost unconquerable ... [they] avoid calling any man master' (*Ant.* 18.23-25). That is Josephus's version of two groups organizationally different (per the picture of Josephus) yet indistinguishable in philosophy except for a disagreement on one issue, perhaps explicable because the two philosophies had in fact been the same at an earlier stage. Did the Fourth Philosophy adherents regard themselves as of recent origin as Josephus portrays them? Or did they consider themselves to come from ancient origins with a line of predecessor figures going back to Moses, and in their view they were the true Pharisees, and it was the others who had departed from what was traditional and essential?

~ ~ 18 ~ ~

To set the Essene question into a larger context, studies of Lehmann, Yadin, Schiffman, Baumgarten, and Sussmann (and others) have identified 'Sadducean' legal traditions in texts such as the Temple Scroll, MMT, and the Damascus Document, such that it is now a fairly widespread view that the legal traditions of the Dead Sea Scrolls 'represent generally those of the much-maligned Sadducees, whose views are otherwise scarcely evident in the writings of Josephus, the New Testament, and early rabbinic Judaism, but nowhere directly transmitted' (Fraade 2012: 132). But another substantial set of arguments, drawing especially on parallels with 1QS, has convinced most scholars that the Qumran texts are to be identified with 'the Essenes'. While few have disputed that both Sadducees and Essenes are sects (in the classical sense of Josephus), they evoke significantly different

phenomena in the minds of scholars—the one sect associated with ruling Hasmonean high priests in power; the other sect removed from power and separated from the rest of society. The dilemma is that the two lines of textual argument just named each appear compelling if viewed in isolation, yet if considered together they appear contradictory. A satisfying resolution of these two lines of argument is one of the fundamental unresolved scholarly puzzles in understanding the Qumran texts (Shemesh 2012; Jassen 2012; Dimant 2012).

As for Pliny's Essenes of *Nat. Hist.* 5.73, analysis of that passage shows the sense is of a tribe of large numbers inhabiting a region, not a single site such as Qumran (e.g. Kraft 2009 ['Pliny does not refer to the Essenes as being at a specific settlement (town) but depicts them as a *'gens'* identified with an area to the (north-?) west of the Dead Sea distinct from Jericho and Engedi']; Mason 2011: 234 ['it is not clear that he intended anything more than to place them west of his enlarged Lake Asphaltites, therefore in Judea']; Taylor 2012b: 139, 245 [Pliny 'envisaged a region, not just one tiny site, where a large population lived']). The Pliny passage alludes to large numbers of this tribe of Essenes, evoking Josephus's and Philo's thousands of Essenes in multiple towns and villages. As for the region of Pliny's Essenes, might one think of the Plain of Jericho of the time of Herod and Archelaus, in some sense in continuity from the tremendous amount of priestly activity believed to have flourished around Jericho in the time of the Hasmoneans (Schwartz 1988 on the last point)? This would be within Pliny's sense of the west side of the Dead Sea, even if the Plain of Jericho is slightly north of the northern end of the Dead Sea (compare Bethsaida said to be to the east of Lake Gennasareth at *Nat. Hist.* 5.71).

The question that has to be asked is: did the Sadducees of Josephus of the era of the Hasmoneans have substantial numbers—in terms of party members or adherents—carrying out functions of regime and society that a ruling party might fulfill? Just as there was an issue in post-Saddam Iraq of 'de-Baathization', did Herod have his own issue of 'de-Sadduceeization' of his kingdom? On the one hand, there is this huge quantity of texts from exactly the era in which, according to the testimony of Josephus and his sources, the Sadducees were a ruling party, texts which through now hundreds of studies show themselves to be Sadducee in their legal system—and *no Essenes* in this period per Josephus with the exceptions of two individuals: Judah the Essene c. 100 BCE (who reads as possibly involved in machinations that put Alexander Jannaeus into power, if one reads between the lines), and Menahem the Essene who lived into the time of Herod. But the later rabbis seemed to think 'Menahem went out, and Shammai came in', perhaps a dim echo—if it is the same Menahem—that something did change around the time of Herod with the status of the Essenes. On the one hand there is a prominent Sadducee party in Josephus's history and all of the texts from that era found in our time which give the Sadducee legal system in detail (the Qumran texts)—and no Essene impact in organized

numbers is even mentioned in Josephus. Then there comes the watershed of Herod as king, and now there are *thousands* of Essenes (known to Josephus, Philo, the whole wide world) but *hardly any* Sadducees, *none* on the popular level, only a few elite secretive upper-class priestly families in Jerusalem—or at least this is the approximate impression. *Where did all the Essenes come from? Where did all the Sadducees go?* It is difficult to escape an inchoate sense that in some manner these Herod-era Essenes are successors of Hasmonean-era Sadducee activity. Yet no satisfying hypothesis seems at hand to make full sense of this.

~ ~ 19 ~ ~

And then there is the question of whether a distinct sect of Essenes existed. In what follows, John Reeves is not saying that there were no individuals who might have been called 'Essene'. Rather the question is whether a distinct Jewish sect or sociological entity existed by that name. Here is Reeves:

I think a pertinent question worth posing is whether in fact there was any such thing as an Essene sect ... There is not a single extant Palestinian or Syro-Mesopotamian Jewish writing authored in either Hebrew or Aramaic during the Achaemenid, Hellenistic, Roman, Byzantine, or Sassanian periods which mentions an Essene sect, categorizes a tradition or practice as Essene, or employs the label Essene in a recognizable way. A superficial perusal ... can leave an unwary reader with the mistaken impression that the primary sources for a scholastic reconstruction of Essene ideology are manifold and grounded on an extensive series of empirical observations and experiences. In actual fact, though, it is extremely improbable that any of the extant tradents who speak of a Jewish sect of Essenes, including our earliest authorities, Philo and Josephus, write on the basis of such knowledge. ... I would like to suggest that modern scholars have been unduly credulous about the actual existence of a Jewish Essene sect. Since the era of Hecataeus and Herodotus, a popular *Tendenz* in classical ethnography was the description of a number of elite or secretive castes of religious and/or intellectual functionaries supposedly flourishing among various barbarian peoples who inhabited the fringes of the Greco-Roman *oikoumene* ... members of these groups typically experience a marvelous longevity of life, they are dedicated to lives of piety and holiness, they are cultural repositories of priestly and philosophical wisdom, and they are adept in a number of useful arts, crafts, and technologies ... The Essenes and Philo's Therapeutae are clearly marketed by their publicists as the Jewish representatives of this ethnological trope ... there exist a number of conceptual and thematic similarities between the descriptions provided by classical sources of the Essenes, or barbarian utopian communities, and that of [the 9th century CE] Eldad ha-Dani of the people of Moses. Yet to my knowledge no responsible post-

Enlightenment thinker has ever seriously maintained that the latter group really existed, or sought to attribute any Jewish literature to their creative pens. Why then should the Essenes be so uncritically privileged? (Reeves 2005: 380-83)

Reeves should be listened to here. The picture Reeves evokes is that ‘Essenes’ may not have been a separate category sociologically, but rather a label fictitiously applied to some existing Jewish phenomena, ordinarily known under other names. That is where Reeves leaves off, but let me continue for a step or two further (hypothetically): let us suppose the fictitious description (in this picture), which in Philo’s telling is the one-sect ideal sect of the Jews, was secondarily added literarily to the two real sects of the Jews of the Hasmonean era, making three. In this view Josephus’s three-sect picture would consist of two real ones and one phantom one which through a literary process had become attached to the two that did exist, to make a literary presentation of three. There actually is an ancient body of contemporary literature which seems to agree with such a picture: the New Testament. In the Gospels and Acts of the New Testament the Pharisees and Sadducees are there, in distorted form, true, but they are there. But there are no Essenes, not in the Gospels, not in Acts, not in the letters of Paul. Of course it is possible to say the Essenes really are there by some other name. But if the Pharisees and Sadducees are there under those names, why aren’t the Essenes?

~~ 20 ~~

There have been suggestions of a Sadducee origin or identity of the Qumran texts:

- Robert North (1955; 1956: 93 [‘we must face honestly and reflectively the Sadducee-links of the Qumran documents, even while granting that the probabilities are far greater in favor of the Essenes’]).
- William LaSor (1956: 199-200 [‘the “Sadducees” were a complex sect of which we have previously had only a very restricted and unilateral view ... the Qumran writings may reflect elements of Sadduceism previously unknown to us’]).
- Manfred Lehmann (1993 [‘We should allow no one to take our Jewish patrimony away from us, as was attempted in the early stages of the Dead Sea Scrolls scholarship. Christian scholars had quickly jumped to the conclusion that the Scrolls were the product of a little known group, the Essenes. No authentic Jewish sources have ever mentioned this “sect,” which, according to Josephus, Philo and Pliny, existed alongside two other ... In my opinion, no Essenes, as so described, ever existed’]; 1994 [‘Some 25 years ago, I published the first claim that the Qumranites were Sadducees, not Essenes, based on their stringent observance of the mitzvot. Yigael Yadin, whom I consulted, was delighted with my identification. Schiffman today agrees with me’]; 1961: 115 [‘The political priority assigned in the Qumran literature to

the priestly Messiah can be understood if we see in the Qumran community a branch of the Sadducee sect’]; 1978: 579 [‘Contrary to popular notions that the Sadducees had no “oral law” ... it seems to me that the recently published Temple Scroll, which is the first available compendium of a large spectrum of sectarian Halakhoth, admirably fits under the heading of a *spr gyzrwt*’]).

- Robert Eisenman (1983: 19 [‘Our hypothesis is that the “Zadokite” monastery at Qumran is “Sadducean”, but not Sadducean according to the portraits in Josephus and the New Testament, which relate to a later period’]; 1994: 358 [‘one is able to build up an historical picture of two groups of Sadducees, one establishment ... and one opposition, stemming from the more normative Maccabean tradition, but destroyed and sent into opposition with the Herodian/Roman takeover’]).
- Yaakov Sussmann (1990: 69 [‘The Sadducees were not a monolithic sect. They also had divisions and arduous struggles. The extremists among them—those with pronounced religious, ethical, and spiritual leanings—that is, the Essenes ...’]).
- Lawrence Schiffman (1992: 42 [‘MMT ... shows beyond question that either the sect was not Essene, but was Sadducean, or that the Essene movement must be totally redefined as having emerged out of Sadducean beginnings’]; 1994: 89 [‘Josephus’ descriptions concern only the somewhat Hellenized Sadducees of the Roman period. Moreover, I am not claiming that the Dead Sea sect as we know it is Sadducean, only that its origins and the roots of its halakhic tradition lie in the Sadducean Zadokite priesthood’]).
- Edward Cook (1994: 116 [‘Some such compromise solution—that the Essenes were “break-away” Sadducees—seems likely to be the preferred option for a while in Qumran studies’]).
- Frank Cross (1995: 118 [the Righteous Teacher ‘won a following from remnants of the Hasidim, including, we believe, a radical wing of the Sadducean (Zadokite) party’]).
- Hyam Maccoby (2000: 140 [‘the reason why it contains no Pharisee documents ... is that it is the library of the High Priest who was a Sadducee ... this was a view that was put forward by K. Rengstorff in 1960 and is due for revival’]).
- Raphael Israeli (2008: 206 [‘It may even well be that the Essenes were the true holders of the orthodox Sadocee [*sic*] tradition, while those Sadocee Priests who lived in debauchery and hedonism attracted Flavius’ attention as a separate sect’]).

However a greater number of scholars reject any notion of a Sadducee identity for the sect of the Qumran texts. The main reasons cited are differences in ideology or belief, principally, it is claimed, that Sadducees differed from the sect of the Qumran texts in not believing in fate, afterlife, and angels. For example here is James VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*:

From a historical perspective, one would expect Sadducees and Essenes to share some views because both had deep priestly roots. The Qumran group was founded and led by priests who called themselves sons of Zadok (the leading priest in the time of David and Solomon), while the term *Sadducee* seems to be derived from the name *Zadok*, and some influential priests are known to have been Sadducees. Both parties opposed what they understood to be the Pharisaic tendency to soften some laws and to modify the related penalties. That is, one reason why they shared some legal views is that both were strongly conservative on matters relating to the law. The nature of the data from the Mishnah (which was compiled about A.D. 200) hardly matches the amount and character of the earlier information from Josephus, Pliny, and others that has led so many to identify the Qumranites as Essenes. That Qumran views and those attributed to the Sadducees correspond for a few individual laws does not entail that the Qumran group was Sadducean in any sense in which that name is commonly employed today. After all, the Qumran manuscripts teach such prominent anti-Sadducean doctrines as the existence of multitudes of angels and the all-controlling power of fate. How could Sadducees develop such teachings, which are diametrically opposed to what ancient writers said about them? Also, the fact that an *early* document such as the Manual of Discipline (copied about 100 B.C.) enunciates thoroughly Essene, anti-Sadducee theology makes it most improbable that the Qumran residents arose from Sadducean origins. (VanderKam 2010: 94)

The evidence shows that the community of the Scrolls and the Sadducees took a similar, strict or severe approach to the Law of Moses. ... While it is important to recognize that the Scrolls community and the Sadducees took a similar stance on the law, they differed profoundly on theological matters. As we have seen, according to Josephus, the Sadducees denied what he calls fate or predeterminism of events; the Scrolls indicate that the community had adopted a determinist theology. The Sadducees denied a resurrection would occur, whereas resurrection is mentioned in the Scrolls. And the Sadducees are supposed to have denied there were angels or spirits; the Scrolls refer to many of them. So, in theology the Scrolls group(s) were not Sadducees, though they may well have been akin to them in legal approach ... legal matters were of utmost importance for the different Jewish groups and were an integral part of their ways of being Jewish. They did arrive at their separate views on some theological points, but their stances on legal matters more clearly set them off from one another. (VanderKam 2010: 155)

Of the three points of belief named as points of difference between the Sadducees and the Qumran texts—fate, afterlife, and angels—one can probably be eliminated immediately: the notion that Sadducees did not believe in angels. The sole claimed evidence for that notion in the entirety of ancient literature is Acts 23:8 ('for the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection nor angel nor

spirit but the Pharisees profess both'). That interpretation of Acts 23:8 has been fairly clearly shown to be a misunderstanding by Floyd Parker (2003), following earlier analyses of David Daube (1990) and Benedict Viviano and Justin Taylor (1992). Parker argues that the sense of Acts 23:8 is that Sadducees denied interventions in human affairs from angels or spirits (not a denial of the existence of angels or spirits), and that Acts 23:8 is alluding to this in explaining to the reader what the issue was of Acts 23:9.

Whether an eschatological resurrection from the dead is in the Qumran sectarian texts has been a subject of extensive scholarly discussion (e.g. Elledge 2006; Popović 2009; Collins 2009b; Hogeterp 2009). It is generally agreed that two non-sectarian texts among the Qumran finds do have a resurrection (4Q385-88, 391 Pseudo-Ezekiel and 4Q521 Messianic Apocalypse), and the Qumran texts include multiple copies of the book of Daniel which has belief in a resurrection. However there is not *much* resurrection belief in the non-sectarian texts, and there continues to be scholarly debate over whether there is *any* belief in a resurrection in the sectarian texts *at all*. Jonathan Klawans (2012) argues that the Qumran sectarian texts do not have a resurrection (in which a reconstituted body in some form is brought back to life after a delay), but rather assume an incorporeal immortal soul (separated from the body at death immediately), as at 1QH^a 11.20-23. In other words, the belief in the sectarian Qumran texts is of a present participation in the angelic celestial realm that upon death will continue, freed from the mortal shackles of the human body (hence a lack of fear or concern over death). In fact this is exactly what Josephus says was the Essene view of the afterlife. Josephus does not say the Essenes believed in a resurrection. The later Hippolytus says Essenes believed in a resurrection, but Klawans has an appendix arguing (against earlier arguments of Morton Smith) that Hippolytus has not preserved more fully a common source used by Josephus, but has added later embellishments to Josephus which cannot be considered reliable ('no one working on Hellenistic philosophy would rely on Hippolytus's accounts to suggest that Stoics or Heraclitus believed in bodily resurrection ... we should be wary of assuming, without clear confirming evidence, that Hippolytus is also necessarily correct on this score regarding the Essenes' [2012: 227-28]).

Klawans (exegeting Josephus) argues that the Sadducees denied both the beatific afterlife of the immortal soul of the Essenes, and the future resurrection of the Pharisees, but this does not mean the Sadducees rejected an afterlife altogether. Instead, Klawans says the Sadducees very likely believed in the traditional biblical view (of Job, of Ecclesiastes) of going to a shadowy Sheol or underworld after death. Why would the Sadducees deny what other Jews had come to believe (a happier state of an afterlife)? Klawans says one obvious answer—they were conservative with scripture which had Sheol and not a beatific afterlife—is probably not the full explanation. Klawans understands the Sadducee denial of rewards and

punishments in an afterlife to be part of the Sadducee belief in free choice as presented by Josephus; the two go together, arising out of a focus on living rightly, seeking justice and prospering in this life, with immortality through one's posterity or descendants, a this-worldly focus reflected in the wisdom literature (2012: 92-106).

There is also the matter of non-simultaneity of Josephus's Sadducee descriptions and the Qumran texts. Can Josephus's 1st century CE depictions of Sadducee beliefs be uncritically applied to the party of the same name of c. 100 BCE? In their introduction to *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*, Wise, Abegg, and Cook commented on the issue of anachronism:

The evidence suggests, then, that the Scrolls resemble the Sadducees in some way and the Essenes in others ... We have been using the Josephan categories of Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes as if these were distinct and different entities in the first century B.C.E., and indeed that is how Josephus presents them. But he was writing toward the end of the first century C.E., nearly two hundred years later, and the three parties he knew did not necessarily exist in the same form in the first century B.C.E. How much are today's Democrats and Republicans like the Whigs and Tories of two hundred years ago? (Wise, Abegg, and Cook 1996: 29-32)

At the very least there are major questions of anachronism when moving from Josephus to a time well before Josephus—questions which can be raised with respect to ancient accounts of sects' beliefs concerning fate and the afterlife.

~ ~ 21 ~ ~

There has been a scholarly view that the Sadducees of the Hasmonean era are condemned in Peshar Nahum when that text condemns 'Manasseh'. This is part of a belief, pervasive in the scholarship of the Qumran sectarian texts, that the geographical terms Judah, Ephraim, and Manasseh, when they appear in the sectarian texts, were used by the ancient authors as code-words for Essenes, Pharisees, and Sadducees respectively—Josephus's tripartite division of the three sects of the Jews. This notion really has no basis to it. There is no positive evidence for the notion, and there are numerous counterexamples: cases in which the geographic eponyms are used in sectarian texts which are inconsistent with the imagined system (e.g. the negative associations attached to most uses of Judah in the Damascus Document; the existence of wickedness in Peshar Habakkuk's Judah; the wicked ones of the covenant in Judah seeking to attack the righteous of Peshar Psalms A; the Damascus Document's wrath of the head of the kings of Greece upon Judah [from context] where there are seekers after smooth things and a Liar at work; elsewhere in the Damascus Document the righteous have gone from Judah [the sect left the sect?], and so on).

To be clear, the issue is not whether the ancient authors of the pesharim could quote terms or phrases from biblical passages, then allegorically interpret the quoted phrases, as in 'the prophet of old said "X"—interpreted, this means "Y"'. In such an expression 'X' is being allegorized. That is a well-known phenomenon, but that is not what we are talking about here. What we are concerned with here is the meaning of words used in 'Y'. The issue concerns the meanings of words used by the authors themselves in their own composition. What do the authors mean by 'Judah', 'Ephraim', or 'Manasseh' in their own writing? Did they write these words with intent to evoke usual and expected semantic fields of meaning that these words carry in biblical Hebrew? Or were the authors of these texts using these words cryptically, as ciphers or codes with transformed meanings in an esoteric system of their own, different from the usual meanings of these words in the biblical and non-sectarian texts at Qumran and in other Jewish texts of the era?

(By 'sectarian texts' among the Qumran finds is meant a certain kind of texts which have distinctive vocabulary and ideas in common. The phenomenon of 'sectarian texts' is recognized by virtually every scholar who works with the Qumran texts, even if the phenomenon is more of a clustering or spectrum phenomenon than a category with sharply-defined edges, and individual scholarly definitions and emphases can vary. The classic analyses of criteria characterizing the 'sectarian' texts are Newsom 1990 and Dimant 1995. I invented this acronym: 'HSDM + pesharim', for Hymns, Serekh, Damascus, and War Scroll with spinoffs thereof, and pesharim, which covers much of what have been considered the core 'sectarian' texts among the Qumran finds. The acronym is of course a wordplay on 'Hasidim'.)

Typically the counterexamples to the code-word theory are freely admitted by scholars upholding the theory but are characterized as exceptions, except that the exceptions outnumber the non-exceptions; it is completely arbitrary. Basic grammar and syntax are violated in support of the scheme, as in frequent claims that the expressions 'doers of the law in the house of Judah' (1QpHab 8.1), or 'the simple ones of Judah, the doers of the law' (1QpHab 12.4-5), demonstrate that 'Judah' is symbolic code for 'doers of the law'—instead of the alternative of reading with routine syntax in which the sense is those doers of the law are located *in* Judah, just as elsewhere in the text Jerusalem, towns, and the Wicked Priest are located *in* Judah, with Judah being a place or region, just as in biblical texts.

If it is supposed that 'Judah', 'Ephraim', and 'Manasseh' were being used as code for sects, why stop there? Why not say the following terms are codes for more sects: 'Gilead' (4QpPs A 13.5), 'half the tribe of Manasseh' (4QpPs A 13.5), 'Levi' (1QM 1.3), 'Benjamin' (1QM 1.3), 'Acco' (4QpIsa A 5-6.11), 'the land of the north' (CD 7.14), 'Damascus' (CD 7.9), 'the land of Damascus' (CD 19.34), 'Egypt' (1QM 1.4), 'Memphis' (4Q386 2.6), 'Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon' (CD 1.6), 'Zion'

(1QM 19.5), ‘the sea’ (4QpNah 5.2), ‘the islands of the sea’ (1QpHab 3.11), ‘the cities of Judah’ (1QM 19.5), ‘the cities of the east’ (4QpNah 3-4 ii 12), not to mention the ubiquitous ‘Jerusalem’? How is it known the ancient authors were not using those words as cryptic codes for religious sects too? Where does it end? Why did it start in the first place? Where are the controls, the ways of knowing when exegesis becomes eisegesis? In my opinion reading Ephraim, Manasseh, and Judah as code for sects in Qumran texts has been scholarly hallucination. But until my chapter critical of the notion in my 2001 study of Peshier Nahum it seems there had not been a published challenge to the scholarly enterprise of reading geographical terms in the Qumran sectarian texts as code for sects (Doudna 2001: 577-99).

Some readings cited in support of the three-sect codeword theory are textual mistakes. At 4QpPs A 1-10 i 24 instead of ‘wickedness at the hand of E[phra]im’ as some editions have it, read ‘<destruction of>] wickedness by the hand of the p[oor one]s’ on the basis of parallels at 1QM 11.8-9, 11-13, and compare 4QpPs A 1-10 iii 10-13 (Doudna 2001: 444 fn 506). At 4QpIsa A 8-10 iii 3, ‘by the hand of Israel’ as commonly reported is a mistaken reading; the correct reading is as Allegro published in DJD 5, ‘in the house of Israel’. ‘Manasseh’ as plural at 4QpNah 3-4 iii 9 (*hm mnšh*) is practically certainly an ancient scribal error (so Allegro, Dupont-Sommer, Vermes, Cook and García Martínez, who render *hm* as masc. sing. Copula ‘is’) (Doudna 2001: 519-22, 587-89). At 4QpNah 1-2 ii 7 ‘[...Car]mel’ of the editions is incorrect; the visible letters –*ml* end a verb of destruction, probably niphal [...*yg*]*ml*, ‘[...in]flicted upon its rulers’ (Doudna 2001: 96-103, 286-98). At 4QpNah 3-4 iii 5 instead of ‘they will join Israel (or, all Israel, or, the house of Israel)’ of most editions, the correct reading is ‘they will become joined to the G[od of Is]rael’ (Doudna 2001: 197-99).

In other cases there have been exegetical mistakes. ‘No more being attached to the house of Judah’ of CD 4.9-13 has often been claimed to mean the opportunity to join the sect is coming to an end. Rather the sense is, no one will any longer support the corrupt regime, in keeping with the rest of the text urging the righteous to become unattached from Judah, parallel language to 4QpNah 3-4 iii 5-8 (Doudna 2001: 583-86). At CD 7.10-14 when the text refers to Ephraim leaving Judah of old, the authors do not mean the Pharisees left the righteous sect, nor are they condemning anyone for leaving the righteous sect. Rather, the text is favorably comparing the current righteous who leave Judah (because Judah is so corrupt) with Ephraim of old who also departed from Judah and was spared God’s wrath on Judah. The authors are *urging* the righteous *to* leave Judah (or praising those who did), and in support of this, they cite the ancient example of Ephraim leaving Judah and how by doing so Ephraim was spared God’s wrath on Judah of old. The authors want their readers to heed this example, to do the same, to leave Judah and be spared God’s present wrath on Judah. On ‘*bhglwt* of the glory of Judah’ of 4QpNah 3-4 iii 4,

commonly interpreted as the triumph of the righteous sect, the sense is probably the downfall of Judah on the basis of biblical Hebrew parallels (Isa. 16:14; 17:4; 21:16; Hos. 9:11; compare 1 Sam. 4:21-22). But if the verb does have a positive meaning of ‘revealing’ the expression would be a circumlocution for God, nothing to do with Judah meaning the sect (Doudna 2001: 504-13, 587).

In most biblical and Qumran texts the geographical scheme for Israel is in any case two-part, not three-part: just Ephraim and Judah. This is the geographic scheme for Israel of Peshier Nahum, Peshier Hosea B, and the Damascus Document, just as earlier in Apocryphon of Joshua/4QTestimonia and throughout much of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea and the rest of the Bible—a two-part scheme of Israel, drawn from the southern kingdom called ‘Judah’ and the northern kingdom often called ‘Ephraim’.

In fact there is no use of Manasseh as a third geographical or ethnic term in any Qumran sectarian text with the sole exception of Peshier Psalms A in which wicked ones of Manasseh are named along with wicked ones of Ephraim, Judah, and Israel, that is, wicked ones from all Israel (4QpPs A 1-10 ii 14-16, 18-20; iii 12).

In Peshier Nahum, ‘Manasseh’ is a personal figure—not a group, tribe, or geographical region, not a code-word for a sect, but a personal figure. He rules, he has children, he has women, he has armies, he has ‘great men’ subordinates, he sends emissaries to surrounding nations. He is an accursed figure, accursed by being hung up alive. He has a regime, he has a kingdom, he reigns over Israel, using parallel language to that of the Wicked Priest of Peshier Habakkuk who rules over Israel. As the Wicked Priest is a personal figure in Peshier Habakkuk, so Manasseh is in Peshier Nahum: each wicked rulers, doomed rulers, in their respective texts, equivalents to each other. I consider one of the most important exegetical insights I was able to discern in Peshier Nahum in my 2001 study to be the identification, for the first time in the scholarship of this text, of a single figure running through lines 4QpNah 3-4 i 5, 8, 10-ii 1 and iii 9-iv 6. This figure is the doomed ruler of the text. The name given to this figure by the text is missing in the first of these columns due to the accident of destruction of part of the column, but the text’s name for this figure appears in the more fully-preserved later columns: ‘Manasseh’. This sobriquet has nothing to do with the biblical geographical region or tribe by that name. Instead this sobriquet is drawn from the personal name of wicked king Manasseh of Jerusalem of old whose sins are credited with having brought about Nebuchadnezzar’s conquest, in the world of the biblical texts.

There may be a certain elegance in Peshier Nahum having Israel as Judah and Ephraim, with a wicked king Manasseh as the ruler, but this is the structure of Peshier Nahum’s Israel: Ephraim and Judah (the two-part geography of Israel), and Manasseh its ruler in Jerusalem.

~ ~ 22 ~ ~

The geography or people evoked by ‘Ephraim’ in these texts is not limited to Samaria. Rather, ‘Ephraim’ in the two-part scheme evokes all of Israel to the north of or outside of Judah within the range of Jerusalem’s sphere of control. That is, ‘Ephraim’, as it is used in the Qumran texts in contrast to ‘Judah’—just as in the biblical prophets—usually includes Manasseh and all the other northern tribes of Israel and their peoples. As an example of this kind of language, it was common in America in the Cold War era to speak of the world as consisting of two superpowers, America and the Russians—except when this was expanded to the United States, Russia, *and China*. Similarly it is common to speak of Christianity as consisting of Catholics and Protestants—except when that is expanded to Catholics, Protestants, *and Orthodox*. Similarly, in the world of the biblical and Qumran texts, Israel is Judah and Ephraim—except when that is expanded to Judah, Ephraim, *and Manasseh*. These are not changes in actual meaning. These are rather different or expanded ways of speaking of the same thing. Needless to say, in these schematic ways of speaking there is a huge amount of imprecision and lack of nuance.

The wicked group in Pesher Nahum, the ‘Seekers-after-Smooth-Things’, alludes to 1st century BCE Pharisees of Josephus; this is recognized and correct. (This is based on the Pharisees being credited by Josephus’s sources as the main source of opposition to Alexander Jannaeus in the Demetrius III episode of 88 BCE [if there is any question that that is a correct exegesis of Josephus please see Doudna 2001: 658-62], correlated with the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things who function in the same role in the allusion to the same Demetrius III episode of 4QpNah 3-4 i 2-3, and this is in keeping with the wider anti-Pharisee *Tendenz* of the Qumran legal texts.)

But Pesher Nahum also, interestingly, attaches an Ephraimite—that is, ethnically non-Judean—provenance to this group. An expression which appears only in Pesher Nahum is ‘the leaders-astray of Ephraim’. At 4QpNah 3-4 ii 2-10 and iii 3-7 the ‘leaders-astray of Ephraim’ are identified as another name or epithet for the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, that is, the text appears to be using the two expressions interchangeably. There has been a debate in the history of scholarship over the grammatical meaning of *mt’y ’prym*, ‘the leaders-astray of Ephraim’. Is the expression an objective genitive (some deceivers victimizing Ephraim), or is it a partitive genitive (some deceivers from Ephraim, victimizing other people)? In my 2001 study of Pesher Nahum I mistakenly (in common with some other scholars) read the expression as an objective genitive. But that was in error; as correctly pointed out in Shani Tzoref’s study of Pesher Nahum the expression is a partitive genitive. The expression is saying the ones doing the leading astray, that is the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, are *of Ephraim* (Berrin [Tzoref] 2004: 196-99). If the expression is read in terms of routine Hebrew the sense evoked is ethnic or

geographic. Related to this may be 1QPesher Micah in which a phrase from Micah with Jacob and Samaria in it is interpreted in terms of the Liar’s activity, whereas the next phrase from the same passage in Micah which refers to Judah and Jerusalem is interpreted in terms of the Teacher of Righteousness’s activity. The author does not use these terms (Jacob, Samaria, Judah, Jerusalem) in the pesher. Nevertheless we might still ask why the author of 1QPesher Micah chose to make that particular alignment of interpretive correspondences from the text being interpreted. Is there a hint of a Samaritan or greater Ephraim provenance of the Liar or his congregation? Is there a hint of the Teacher’s group not as *being* Judah or *being* Jerusalem but rather as located there, or viewing their legitimate place as being there, or having come from there, or identified as people of there (in contrast to the Liar’s circles)? But the pesher author does not say.

At 4QpNah 3-4 ii 2 the text alludes to Jerusalem, characterizing Jerusalem as ‘the city of Ephraim, the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things’ (or possibly ‘the city of {the leaders-astray of} Ephraim, the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things’; see Doudna 2001 for argument that a phrase dropped out of the current text due to copyist error). The text is saying that Jerusalem is being run by Ephraimites. It is being run by Pharisees, but they are being called Ephraimites. That the city alluded to at 4QpNah 3-4 ii 2 is Jerusalem is correctly recognized by nearly all who have studied Pesher Nahum, because Jerusalem is the city of focus throughout the pesharim, part of a pan-Jerusalem focus of these texts. The focus on Jerusalem in the sectarian Qumran texts is difficult to overstate. (There is non-Jerusalem-centralized worship embedded in texts from earlier times prior to the sectarian texts. But those are from the past, inherited and reworked and reinterpreted by the sect. In the sect’s texts it is all Jerusalem, all the time, as the city of interest.) Other pesharim allude explicitly to the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things in Jerusalem: 4QpIsa C 22.10-11, ‘the congregation of the S[seekers-after-]Smooth-Things who are in Jerusalem’; 4QpIsa B 2.10, ‘the congregation of the Men of Scoffing who are in Jerusalem’. That the ‘city of Ephraim’ of 4QpNah 3-4 ii 2 is Jerusalem is therefore not in any question; the issue is how to understand Jerusalem being called ‘city of Ephraim’.

The characterization of a wicked regime which is centered in Jerusalem, the city of focus of the Qumran sectarian texts, as ‘the city of Ephraim’, suggests an image of non-Judeans ruling in Jerusalem, in the world of the text. The Seekers-after-Smooth-Things are being identified with the city, with Jerusalem, in keeping with idiom in biblical Hebrew in which polemic goes back and forth between the crimes of a city and the crimes of the rulers of the city (as at Ezek. 22:2-16). The equation of the group, the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, with the ‘city’ is idiom for saying this group is ruling the city. The ‘wicked of Ephraim and Manasseh’ of Pesher Psalms A, as well as the ‘wicked of the covenant of Judah’ of that text, could all be located in Jerusalem, with the sense being ethnic descriptors, in the world of that text as well.

Compare the similarity of language of 1 Chron. 9:3, ‘and in Jerusalem dwelt some of Judah, Benjamin, Ephraim, and Manasseh’. A city in which wicked ones of Ephraim rule might come to be termed a ‘city of Ephraim’, similar to the way neighborhoods of cities today can become nicknamed after ethnic groups or immigrant populations or gangs. Such nicknaming often emerges from people who feel displaced by more recently arrived outsiders.

Again, ‘Ephraim’ in the world of these texts is understood in the sense of the two-part (or three-part) schematic of Israel: ‘Ephraim’ means peoples of territories controlled from Jerusalem ‘outside Judah’, or ‘north of Judah’, part of ‘greater Israel’ understood from the point of view of the Jerusalem regime, perhaps corresponding to the ‘peoples’ within the sphere of Jerusalem’s ability to extract wealth but outside Judah possibly alluded to at 1QpHab 9.3-5. In this context ‘Ephraim’ is not limited to Samaria, and certainly does not mean Samaritans. (There is no Qumran text which uses the term ‘Ephraim’ or ‘Joseph’ to refer to Samaritans. 4Q372 ApocrJos^b alludes polemically to Samaritans and Mt. Gerizim at its lines 1.12-20 but that text calls the Samaritans ‘an enemy people’ settled there in contrast to the people of Joseph, Jacob, and Israel, echoing an anti-Samaritan view reflected in the Bible and Josephus in which the Samaritans are regarded as transplanted gentiles.)

It is true that ancient words such as ‘Kittim’ (for Seleucids or Romans) or ‘Babylon’ (for Rome in the book of Revelation) can take on meanings different from their long-obsolete original senses, and become reused in an allegorical sense toward updated polemical targets, peoples and empires. But there is no evidence this phenomenon is happening with the terms Judah, Ephraim, or Manasseh in the sectarian texts found at Qumran. Instead these terms remain very much in use as evocative geographic language in texts of the era, not significantly changed in sense from biblical Hebrew.

The three-sect code-word theory arose from the coincidence that one can count three geographical terms associated with biblical Israel (if one chooses to focus on counting three, instead of the more common two or twelve). There were also three religious philosophies or sects presented by Josephus in his depictions of Judaism to his Greek readers. For some reason it proved irresistible to match the three sects from the 1st century CE Josephus with the three geographical eponyms. But there is no reason to suppose such a notion would have occurred to any reader of these texts at the time these texts were written.

~~ 23 ~~

The following is a summary of the argument in my 2001 study that the text of Pesher Nahum corresponding to 4QpNah 3-4 ii 2 in the author’s composition originally read ‘the city of the *leaders-astroy* of Ephraim, the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things’, and that a copying scribe

mistakenly skipped over 4 letters in copying, resulting in the present text. The error proposed looked like this: *hw*’ yr mt ’ *prym* → *hw*’ *yr* *’prym* (*Its interpretation: this is the city of the leaders-astroy of Ephraim, the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things in the last days who in deceit and falsehood conduct themselves*’ → *this is the city of Ephraim, the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things in the last days who, etc.*). The proposed skip was caused by the similar appearance or sound of the *ayin-yod* sequences, with many examples confirming that *resh* was often not heard distinctly (Kutscher 1974: 529, 531; Doudna 2001: 134 fn 164). 4QpNah otherwise shows a relatively high incidence of common kinds of scribal errors similar to other pesharim such as 1QpHab. In many cases errors were corrected as a result of an ancient proofreading process (Tov 2004: 222 [‘upon completing the copying, and often while still in the process, scribes frequently intervened in the text’]). But just as with modern spell-checkers, if the error by accident forms a correctly-spelled different word or sequence the spell-checker misses it (does not recognize it as an error), and something analogous was at work with the results of ancient scribal proofreading. Scribal errors that happened by accident to read sensibly and were not caught in proofreading were a major mechanism of origin of ancient textual variants. In the present case, the error at 4QpNah 3-4 ii 2 would have been of this nature—it resulted in wording that was grammatical, read sensibly, and went uncorrected. I cited other cases in 4QpNah of skipped over letters in copying, e.g. the scribe visibly skipped over 4 letters in copying at 1-2 ii 7; visibly skipped over 3 letters in copying at 3-4 iii 11, and so on (listed with others at Doudna 2001: 472). This would be like the other cases, a skip over of 4 letters.

The conjecture of the longer earlier reading at 3-4 ii 2 is suggested by comparison with a unit of quotation and pesher with similar language at 1QpHab 10.5-13 (Doudna 2001: 465-66). In this 1QpHab unit, just as at 4QpNah 3-4 ii 1-2, there is a quotation dealing with a bloody city followed by a pesher which uses similar language to Pesher Nahum. The 1QpHab quotation has ‘building a *city* with blood’ and then the interpretation: ‘the Spouter of Lies who has *led astray* many—building a *city* of vanity by *blood* ... a congregation by *lies* ...’ Below is the conjectured original form of the lines of 4QpNah 3-4 ii 1-2, followed by the text of 4QpNah 3-4 ii 1-2 as it now stands:

Original composition (conjectured)

ALAS, *CITY OF BLOOD!* FILLED WITH DECEIT, FILLED WITH VIOLENCE!

Its interpretation: this is the city of the leaders-astroy of Ephraim, the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things in the last days who in deceit and lying conduct themselves.

4QpNah 3-4 ii 1-2

ALAS *CITY OF BLOOD!* FILLED [WITH DECEIT,] FIL[L]ED [WITH VIOLENCE!]

Its interpretation: this is the city of Ephraim—the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things in the last days who in deceit and lying conduct themselves.

The argument is that the association of ‘city of blood’ with ‘leading astray’ in 1QpHab 10.9-13 suggests the author of Peshar Nahum might similarly have been prompted to use ‘leading astray’ language, in this case ‘leaders-astray of Ephraim’. At 1QpHab 10.9-13 the Spouter of Lies builds a ‘city of vanity by bloodshed’ and ‘leads astray many’. That is, in Peshar Nahum a ‘city of blood’ is in the quotation and the author, in the same literary world as Peshar Habakkuk, would compose, ‘its interpretation is the city of the *leaders-astray of Ephraim*, the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things who ...’

But the present text of 4QpNah does not have a ‘leading astray’ expression in its pesher on ‘city of blood’, even though ‘leading-astray’ language is in the immediately surrounding context in Peshar Nahum and would read perfectly as having been in the text at 3-4 ii 2. A ‘leading astray’ expression seems to be missing in the pesher in 4QpNah; it should be there but it isn’t. The absence of a ‘leading astray’ expression that ought to be there becomes explained if in fact it was there in the original composition.

The conjecture would give a three-word construct sequence at the start of the pesher at 3-4 ii 2 as the text was originally composed: ‘*yr mt’y ’prym*, ‘the city of the leaders-astray of Ephraim’. Three-word construct expressions are not common in the pesharim compared to very common two-word construct expressions. But a three-word construct expression also starts the pesher of the very next unit: ‘its interpretation concerns *the dominion of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things* ...’ (4QpNah 3-4 ii 4). The three-word construct expression, ‘its interpretation: this is *the city of the leaders-astray of Ephraim*’, would be a parallelism to the first words of the next pesher, in the sense of back-to-back use of parallel three-word construct sequences.

In the proposed original wording, ‘the city of the leaders-astray of Ephraim, the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things’, it is not the city of Ephraim, but the leaders-astray of Ephraim who are identified as the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things. If this restoration is accepted, it further undermines the notion that ‘Ephraim’ was a sobriquet for the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things and that the geographical terms in the pesharim were coded references to the three Jewish sects.

~ ~ 24 ~ ~

The Damascus Document, like Peshar Psalms A, does not mention the Kittim, and this has caused some scholars to suppose the Damascus Document must therefore have received its final form before the Roman presence in Judea starting in the 1st century BCE. But a Roman conquest of Judea in the Damascus Document, no less than in Peshar Habakkuk and Peshar Nahum, is likely alluded to at CD 8.11-12 and 19.23-24, in which a figure called ‘the head of the kings of the Greeks’ comes to execute vengeance upon a Judean congregation against whom God’s wrath is kindled (CD 8.13). This

expression, ‘head of the kings of the Greeks’, has commonly been read as if it must allude to a Greek king before the Roman period. But that reading appears to be a misunderstanding.

The expression seems to be a variant of well-known ‘king of kings’ language used throughout the ancient near east by empires and kingdoms proclaiming their dominion over other peoples. In this light the expression ‘head of the kings of the Greeks’ would read very well as an allusion to, e.g., the ruler of the eastern Roman empire, Mark Antony, in the period when the Roman empire was divided and Octavian ruled the western part, and Mark Antony the eastern, or Greek-world, part (42-30 BCE). The wording ‘the head of the kings of the Greeks’ in the Damascus Document was generated by wordplay from similar-sounding words in a line quoted from Deuteronomy in the text (that accounts for the choice of words), but at the same time reads well as a striking image of a Roman ruler over the eastern kingdoms. The Hebrew ‘head’ in the expression appears to be the equivalent of Latin *imperator*. The ‘head of the kings of the Greeks’ does not mean the figure is Greek; it means he has power over them. Compare 2 Sam. 22:44, David is head of the heathen, and Lam. 1:5, Jerusalem’s enemies are her head. Compare similarly 1QpHab 4.1, the Kittim ‘sneer at kings’; 1 Macc. 8:12-13, the Romans have ‘subdued kings far and near’; and Rev. 17:18, Babylon (Rome) is ‘the great city ... which has dominion over the kings of the earth’. Julius Caesar was called ‘lord of the world’. Josephus refers to the Romans as ‘lords of the inhabited world’. The Roman historian Appian wrote that Mark Antony ‘set up kings here and there as he pleased’ (*Civil Wars* 5.75). The ‘head of the kings of the Greeks’ of the Damascus Document has exactly the same meaning as ‘king of kings’ except that Roman rulers were not kings so are called in these texts ‘rulers’ or in this case ‘head’. At 1QpHab 9.7 the Kittim are ‘the preeminent of the peoples’ (with a wordplay on ‘rest of the peoples’ of the quotation). The Kittim, the Romans, were the unrivaled power of the eastern Mediterranean world, the preeminent of the peoples, head over the kings of the Greeks. And again, the word choice in the CD passage was both generated by and constrained by the needs of a wordplay ‘head’ from ‘venom’ spelled the same in Hebrew, ‘Greeks’ from ‘wine’ very similar in Hebrew, from Deut. 32:33).

Furthermore, the conqueror of the Damascus Document so strikingly corresponds to the conquering figure of Peshar Nahum, the Lion of Wrath, that the question is raised whether these two figures—of the Damascus Document and Peshar Nahum—are the same figure. In the Damascus Document the head of the kings of the Greeks ‘comes upon Israel to execute vengeance’ (CD 8.11-12) against them, against a congregation upon whom ‘God’s wrath has been kindled’ (8.13), a congregation given up to *the sword*, which ‘sought smooth things’ (1.17-18).

In Peshar Nahum the Lion of Wrath ‘[comes ... to execute ven]geance against the *Seekers-after-Smooth-*

Things' (4QpNah 3-4 i 6-7), a *congregation* (ii 5; iii 5, 7) given up to *the sword* and violently destroyed (ii 4-6; iii 6-8). It is the same language, the same themes, the same conquest. The allusions are contemporary and the texts are contemporary. The contexts of the Damascus Document, Peshier Nahum, Peshier Habakkuk, and Peshier Psalms A, their settings, their conquests, the worlds of their implied authors, their dates of composition, are all from the same era, second half of the 1st century BCE, all representing variant depictions of the same context in the worlds of these texts.

There is therefore no reason to suppose the Damascus Document, any more than 4QPesher Psalms A, must be earlier than Peshier Habakkuk or Peshier Nahum simply because of the absence of the word 'Kittim'. Nor is there any sound reason calling for dating the production of the final form of the Damascus Document, in the form in which it appears in the finds at Qumran and in the Cairo Genizah, earlier than the second half of the 1st century BCE. The Damascus Document is contemporary to the pesharim which echo the same themes and figures, because the sobriquet-bearing figures in these texts all read as contemporary to each other and to the texts' authors. The second half of the 1st century BCE is both the time these texts were produced and the era of the allusions of these texts.

~ ~ 25 ~ ~

CD 6.3-11 is often read as contrasting the Teacher of Righteousness of the past (by a different name) to another Teacher figure to come, but that reading is doubtful. The text is likely speaking of the same figure in different ways on analogy with the repetitive structure of CD 4.2-4. This figure gave rules by which to guide the righteous during the present wicked age. The sense is another version of CD 1.7-11 in which the righteous are portrayed as having stumbled blindly until the Teacher showed them right instructions by which to live. The Teacher 'in the last days' of 6.10-11 refers to the authors' own time, the contemporary present (Steudel 1993). The problem is 6.3-11 *sounds* as if one figure gave rules to guide the righteous until the rise of a second figure who necessarily is distinct from and follows the first, but who is referred to by the same name by which the earlier figure is known in other texts. Rather than that otherwise-unattested construction, it is better to read the text as expressing a slightly confusing but nevertheless discernible sense in which the same figure is spoken of doing the same thing and given different names for variation (Interpreter of the Law, Ruler, Teacher of Righteousness). All becomes clear if the imperfect verb commonly rendered 'will not obtain' or 'will not attain' of lines 10-11 is read as a continuous past tense ('did not obtain' or 'did not attain') referring to the same era of blind stumbling of column 1 before the Teacher gave the rules by which to live during the present era of wickedness. The text is not referring to a doubled second Teacher figure still to come; the text is not referring to an earlier figure before the rise of the Teacher; nor is the text

preserving the future sense of a past oracle which was subsequently believed to be fulfilled. Only a reading of the imperfect *yqtl* form of 'not obtain' as future instead of as a continuous past tense in line 10 stands in the way of this analysis being more clear. It can also be noted that nearly all of the words of CD 6.8-11 are in lacunas in the Qumran D fragments which survive, leaving only the medieval text as the basis for these lines.

~ ~ 26 ~ ~

There is another 'Lion of Wrath' passage in 4QPesher Hosea B which reads at 2.2-4 (the biblical quotation is in capitals; conjectural reconstructions are in superscript):

4QpHos B 2.2-4

2 [_____ into the hand of] the
Lion of Wrath. (Hos. 5:14a) FOR I AM [LIKE A
YOUNG LION TO EPHRAIM AND LIKE A LION
TO THE HOUSE]

3 [OF JUDAH. <vacat> Its interpretation concerns the Lion of Wrath, the one
who comes to destroy the assembly]ly of the Last Priest, which he
stretches forth his hand to smite in Ephraim

4 [and in the house of Judah. For because of the violence they did against his chosen
ones God delivers them into] his [ha]nd.

The way these lines have usually been read, the 'Last Priest' of line 3 is the inflictor of violence, and therefore must be the same figure as the Lion of Wrath by a different name. But apart from a lack of positive basis for certainty that the Last Priest is the smiter of line 3 (due to the preceding lacuna), there are several reasons which argue the opposite, that the Last Priest is not the grammatical subject of 'stretches forth his hand to smite' of line 3. First, a wraparound quotation from Hos. 5.14b-15 at lines 5-6 gives c. 78 letter-spaces lengths for the lines of this column, and an estimated 36 +/- 3 spaces for the lacuna at the start of line 3 (Doudna 2001, 2002; Vielhauer 2001). This suggests the grammatical subject of the verb of line 3 was three or four words earlier in the line than the visible 'Last Priest' expression.

From this starting point the rest of the analysis falls into place. The Last Priest of Peshier Hosea B becomes the thematic equivalent of the Wicked Priest and wicked last priests of Peshier Habakkuk and Peshier Psalms A. In these other texts these wicked and last priests are doomed; by analogy the Last Priest of Peshier Hosea B also is wicked and doomed. In Peshier Nahum it is most commonly the associates, warriors, and subordinates of Manasseh who get the language of doom, more than Manasseh personally. Similarly in Peshier Hosea B it may be those associated with the Last Priest, rather than the Last Priest himself, who receive the violence. As for the agent of violence against the doomed regime of the Last Priest of Peshier Hosea B, a named figure is visible, available, and indicated in the immediate context to fulfil this function: the Lion of Wrath. This analysis is confirmed by a striking correspondence between Peshier Hosea B and Peshier Nahum: if the Lion of Wrath figures of the two texts, Peshier Hosea B and Peshier Nahum,

correspond, then the Last Priest of 4QpHos B 2.3 corresponds to *the doomed Israelite figure whose regime is a victim of the Lion of Wrath of 4QpNah 3 4 i 5*, by the basic parallel structure at those lines in the two texts including use of the identical verb: <*Lion of Wrath*><*smites*><*regime of*><*wicked Israelite ruler*> (Doudna 2001: 557-73; 2002; 2005; compare Berrin 2004: 122-24). Finally, correcting a common mistake including in my own previous renderings, Marie-France Dion has correctly pointed out that the *bet* prefixed to ‘Ephraim’ at the end of 4QpHos B 2.3 is spatial, indicating where the smiting is taking place (similarly at 4QpNah 3-4 ii 1), rather than indicating a direct object of the smiting as has usually been rendered (Dion 2011: 411-12).

~~ 27 ~~

In 37 BCE Roman armies sent by Mark Antony invaded Judea, put Jerusalem under siege, and breached the walls. According to Josephus the Romans massacred men, women, and children: ‘no quarter was given to infancy, to age, or to helpless womanhood’ (*War* 1.352). (Compare 1QpHab 6.10: ‘the Kittim destroy many by the sword—youths, grown men, aged, women and children—not even pity on babies’.) The last Hasmonean king, Antigonus Mattathias (40-37 BCE), surrendered to the Roman commander, Sosius. Three years earlier, Antigonus with the help of a Parthian army had invaded Judea and had overthrown Hyrcanus II. Revered and aged, Hyrcanus II, the oldest son of Alexander Jannaeus, had been the high priest of the Jewish nation for over three decades (76-67, 63-40 BCE), with a reputation internationally and domestically for moderation and a non-assertive personality—not known to have sought anyone’s execution or to have sought vengeance, at least according to the reports that have come down in history.

In the aftermath of his overthrow of Hyrcanus II in 40 BCE, Antigonus had had the aged Hyrcanus II brought to him bound in chains, and had responded to the humiliated high priest in prostration before him by lacerating or cutting off Hyrcanus’s ears with his own teeth, says Josephus (*War* 1.270). Josephus explains that this action had a reason behind it: it was to disqualify Hyrcanus from ever serving as high priest in the temple again, due to a stricture well represented in Qumran legal texts against priests serving who had physical disabilities. At *War* 1.229 Josephus tells of an incident in c. 43 BCE in which Hyrcanus, trying to keep a threatening army led by Herod from entering Jerusalem, ‘sent orders forbidding [Herod] to intrude aliens upon the country-folk during their period of purification’. Presumably this would have been a document from Hyrcanus framed in the language of a legal ruling or citation and justified on that basis. Was the problem between Hyrcanus and Herod a ‘halakhic dispute’? Perhaps so, but behind minutiae in legal rulings there can be unseen or non-obvious issues at stake. In this light we might consider ‘the law’ that the Teacher of Righteousness sent to the Wicked Priest to which the Wicked Priest is said to have responded by trying to kill the Teacher, of 4QpPs A 1-10 iv 8-9.

When Antigonus’s forces arrived at Jerusalem and Antigonus was threatening to take power, what would be Hyrcanus’s reaction? One thing a high priest such as Hyrcanus might do would be to issue a legal ruling explaining in halakhic language points a, b, c, that—by coincidence—might have the effect of preventing Antigonus’s forces from entering Jerusalem, or Antigonus from serving as a high priest, etc. This intent might not be spelled out in the legal document, though it would be clear to everyone anciently, including most pointedly Antigonus himself. How would someone in Antigonus’s position react in that case?

The reaction of the Wicked Priest to the law sent from the Teacher is: he rejects the law sent, and he tries to kill the sender, the Teacher. (But in the texts he does not kill the Teacher, despite his intent.) The reaction of the Wicked Priest implies something significant was at stake in the world of the text with this ‘law’.

Josephus does not say Antigonus’s cutting off Hyrcanus’s ears was a response to a legal ruling Hyrcanus had sent. But an hypothesized reconstruction might be: (a) Antigonus threatens to violently take power in Jerusalem. (b) Just as he did with Herod earlier, Hyrcanus issues a legal ruling which forbids e.g. Antigonus’s people from entering Jerusalem, Antigonus’s people from serving in the temple, etc. for reasons a, b, c. (c) Antigonus rejects the legal ruling and responds by mutilating Hyrcanus in a manner that disqualifies Hyrcanus from ever being high priest in the temple, or issuing further rulings in the name of the temple, again.

Hyrcanus was taken into exile by the Parthians and Antigonus became king in Jerusalem and assumed the high priesthood in the temple. That was in 40 BCE. Three years later in 37 BCE Antigonus was defeated and a prisoner, his regime in flames. Sosius sent Antigonus to Mark Antony—head of the eastern Roman empire—who was then in Antioch. Mark Antony executed Antigonus. The Roman historian Dio Cassius says Antigonus was scourged and crucified, or maybe the sense is he was put up on a cross for scourging as part of the execution (*Roman History* 5.49.22). Strabo followed by Josephus says Antigonus was beheaded. All accounts agree that the death was shocking and purposely so, intended to be ignominious in the eyes of all, so that any sympathy for Antigonus would be discredited and ended.

~~ 28 ~~

What has long been overlooked is that a Qumran text, widely acknowledged to have been authored at about this very time, speaks directly of a Jewish ruler being ‘hung up alive’—just like Dio Cassius’s account of the fate of Antigonus Mattathias. This is found at 4QpNah 3-4 i 8-ii 1, which is a pesher unit consisting of a biblical quotation followed by its interpretation. The text introduces this unit with the words: ‘concerning the one hanged up alive on a stake it is proclaimed:’, or ‘to the one hanged up alive on a stake he (i.e. God) proclaims:’. This is how the

text of Peshar Nahum *visibly introduces this particular unit*. A quotation from Nah. 2:14 then follows (destruction of an Assyrian ruler and his regime) and then the peshar or interpretation, which refers to a doomed ruler of Israel and the fall of his regime. Elsewhere this same ruler of Israel (from identical language) is said explicitly to have a *malkut*, ‘kingdom’ (3-4 iv 3). This doomed ruler of 3-4 i 8-ii 1 is a Jewish king in the world of the text, and the text presents him as ‘hung up alive’ and accursed.

The authors of Peshar Nahum compare this Jewish ruler’s fate to that of earlier rebels against Alexander Jannaeus of 88 BCE, alluded to in the past tense at 4QpNah 3-4 i 2-3 and again explicitly in the past, in line 8. The earlier rebels of 88 BCE had invited in a foreign army under the Seleucid king Demetrius III for the purpose of overthrowing Alexander Jannaeus. That rebellion had been unsuccessful, and in a story made famous by Josephus, the defeated rebels, whom the authors of Peshar Nahum regard as wicked, had been crucified by the hundreds *en masse* by Alexander Jannaeus, an event which Josephus says reverberated with horror and reprisals throughout Jewish society for decades after—but that is Josephus speaking, not the Qumran texts. The Qumran texts show only support for Alexander Jannaeus and for the crucifixions of his enemies. In the same way (in the world of the text), in what the text sees as a repeat of history, Antigonus Mattathias had treacherously invited in a foreign army—this time the Parthians—for the purpose of again attempting to forcibly overthrow the legitimate high priest, Alexander’s son, Hyrcanus II. Unlike the previous rebels Antigonus had succeeded. He had become the new ruler, a wicked ruler from the point of view of Peshar Nahum. But in what the authors of Peshar Nahum see as ironic justice, just as the rebels *before* of the text’s *past* had been *accursed by being hung up alive*, the treacherous Antigonus and other members of his regime of the text’s *present* *also are hung up alive, become accursed* in the same way, a replication of the same issues and the same outcome.

I believe the past crucifixions of Alexander Jannaeus are the reference of the italicized words below:

4QpNah 3-4 i 6-8

6 ... Its interpretation concerns the Lion
of Wrath
7 [the one coming upon Israel in the last days to execute ven]geance upon
the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things, whom he hangs up as
living men
8 [to be a horror and a curse as it was with *the traitors*] *against Israel before*.

I have reconstructed lacunas above, but the expression ‘in Israel before’ or ‘against Israel before’ is visible and is not reconstructed. That expression, ‘in or against Israel before’, refers back to the past event which the text has just introduced into the immediately preceding context in lines 2-3 a few lines earlier in the same column: the allusion to the wicked rebels against Alexander Jannaeus.

Those *past* crucifixions (i.e. the ones of Alexander Jannaeus), which are set in the text’s *past* (by means of a perfect verb and a Greek-Kittim temporal sequence in lines 2-3), are evoked by the text as background or comparison for the text’s actual focus which is the downfall of the *present* wicked ruler and his regime, which is set in the text’s *present*.

Note clearly that Peshar Nahum situates its ‘Demetrius’ of the Alexander Jannaeus episode in the text’s past, in contrast to nearly all of the rest of the text which is set in the text’s present. This is made clear in that Demetrius is given a perfect verb, one of only two perfect verbs used in a peshar in the entirety of the five surviving columns of Peshar Nahum. (The other is the amassing of wealth by the priests of Jerusalem of 3-4 i 11, preparatory to saying they lose that wealth expressed with an imperfect verb.) The perfect verb given to Demetrius in line 2, unlike every other unit and actor in the same column which receive imperfect verbs, signifies that Demetrius is in the past with respect to the text’s present, the implied authors’ present which is the actual authors’ present. By contrast, the Lion of Wrath, who functions in the text as other language for the Kittim conquest, receives imperfect verbs (lines 5 and 7), just as the Kittim receive an imperfect verb (line 3), and just as every surviving peshar of the entire text is expressed with an imperfect verb with the sole exception of four consecutive verbless peshers at 3-4 iii 9-iv 1.

The reason Demetrius in Peshar Nahum receives the highly atypical perfect or *qtl* form verb at 3-4 i 2 is because Demetrius, like Antiochus and the other Greek kings of line 3, is in the text’s *past*, is intended by the text to be understood as set in the past, unlike the Lion of Wrath and the Kittim who do *not* receive perfect or *qtl* form verbs because *they* are in the text’s *present*. The reference to something ‘in or against Israel before’ of line 8 is also explicitly set in the past. That expression reads naturally as a second allusion to the *very same past* Demetrius episode of lines 2-3, the same allusion to Demetrius III which we know historically from Josephus involved crucifixions, just as the allusion to something in the past at line 8 suggests.

Peshar Nahum does not understand its ‘Demetrius’ of its past to be contemporary with its present Lion of Wrath, any more than the text understands its past era of Greek kings to be contemporary with its present era of the Kittim. The Lion of Wrath of Peshar Nahum is not Alexander Jannaeus as so often claimed. Alexander Jannaeus does not appear in Peshar Nahum directly as a figure, although the Demetrius III episode and the crucifixions carried out by Alexander Jannaeus in its aftermath are alluded to by the Peshar Nahum authors writing from the perspective of a later point in time.

The Lion of Wrath of Peshar Nahum is later than Alexander Jannaeus. The Lion of Wrath is a figure in the Roman period, a figure contemporary to the authors and the present of the text. The very word *hhrwn*, ‘wrath’, in

the Lion of Wrath's name, is used in the Bible only—without exception—of divine wrath. The presence of this word in the sobriquet of the Lion of Wrath evokes this figure's function as a deliverer of divine wrath. The Lion of Wrath is the text's current hanger-up-of-men-alive, of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things and the defeated Jewish ruler. The defeated ruler who is hung up alive is the text's 'Manasseh', the doomed ruler, the doomed king, in the world of the text. The Lion of Wrath functions as a figure carrying out the conquest envisioned by the text, the conquest which is the most basic theme of Peshet Nahum, a Kittim conquest, the same Kittim conquest of Peshet Habakkuk.

There is no reason internal to the texts to be surprised at or to resist reading an image of a Jewish ruler, a Jewish king, being hung up alive in Peshet Nahum. It is simply Peshet Nahum's version of the Wicked Priest of Peshet Habakkuk who is brought to judgment, tortured and killed, and the Wicked Priest of Peshet Psalms A who is killed by gentiles. It is all variants on the same theme of the ruler's death at the hands of gentiles, and all of these figures of these texts described in this way are the same figure, set in the contemporary present of the implied authors in each of these texts, in texts which are themselves contemporary to each other.

~ ~ 29 ~ ~

The lack of mention by Josephus of the torture of Antigonus Mattathias on a cross as part of his execution in Antioch by the head of the eastern Roman empire, Mark Antony, as recounted by Dio Cassius, presumably is because Josephus's source did not have it. Martin Hengel comments on both the ubiquity of Roman crucifixions in reality and a simultaneous absence of mention of crucifixions in the writings of Julius Caesar, Lucretius, Virgil, and many other Roman as well as Greek authors in antiquity. Hengel attributes this reticence to literary tastes of elites who regarded crucifixions as disgusting and preferred not to speak of them (Hengel 1977: 38-47 ['What would we know about the crucifixions in Palestine without Josephus? Tacitus ... does not say a word about them']). In this light it would not be surprising if other members of Antigonus Mattathias's regime also were hung up on also ended up on crosses when Antigonus was punished, although the sources do not say. As an analogy, many Christian accounts speak of the crucifixion of Jesus in a manner which, if taken in isolation, would give the impression of a single crucifixion. But of course the original story speaks of three. The other two of the story are not considered as important and therefore often disappear into nonexistence in the retelling. Does the Lion of Wrath's hanging up alive of the Seekers-after-Smooth-Things allude to Herod's torture and execution of members of the sanhedrin who were supporters of Antigonus Mattathias (*Ant.* 14.175; 15.5-10)?

~ ~ 30 ~ ~

It is sometimes claimed that there are multiple Wicked Priests in Peshet Habakkuk because there are three conflicting methods of death of the Wicked Priest in that text—by God, by disease, and by torture. Since three methods of death are believed inconsistent for single figures in texts (other than Rasputin), the logic goes, the text has multiple Wicked Priests. But that is a misunderstanding. A first response is this may fail to appreciate how singularly focused a literary text might be in making sure that a single hated figure is really, really good and dead, even if that means having him killed off in five different ways, or as Francis Watson puts it, 'supposed inconsistencies over the circumstances of the Wicked Priest's death (ix.1-2, 10-12; x.3-5) may simply be intended to make the Wicked Priest's final sufferings as comprehensive as possible' (2004: 106-7 fn 76).

But that is not the most important point here, which is that there is in fact no death of the Wicked Priest by disease in the text, i.e. it's not there, and once that means of death is removed there is no remaining contradiction between the other two. The sense at 1QpHab 9.1-2 is something like 'horrible bodily injuries' rather than 'diseases', indicated by the parallelism with the expression of the same sentence, 'vengeance upon his putrid flesh'; an image of a figure being tortured, and compare 2 Chron. 24:25. At 1QpHab 9.10-11 the sense is punishments inflicted by angels of destruction evoking torture (compare 1QS 4.11-13 and association with 'annihilation in fire'), not 'diseases' as rendered in some translations (Doudna 2001: 621-22).

And at 1QpHab 9.4 the 'last priests of Jerusalem' is another way of alluding to the regime of the Wicked Priest, not a successive series of high priests following one after another as has sometimes been misunderstood. There are not multiple Wicked Priests in Peshet Habakkuk any more than there are multiple Kittims in Peshet Habakkuk. These texts are highly redundant. They say the same things over and over in slightly different ways. There is no reason to assume it was more complicated than that.

~ ~ 31 ~ ~

Again, the doomed ruler hung up alive of Peshet Nahum is Peshet Nahum's variant on the violent death of the Wicked Priest of Peshet Habakkuk and of Peshet Psalms A. It is the same figure, called by various names and depicted in various ways in these texts. All of this is set in the context of a Kittim invasion, in these texts from the latter half of the 1st century BCE. It is a doomed ruler of Israel portrayed in a context of a Roman invasion, contemporary to the time of these texts' writing, *killed by gentiles ... defeated Jewish ruler ... Romans ... hung up alive ... killed by gentiles ... second half of the 1st century BCE ... Roman invasion ... Jewish ruler ... Roman*

invasion ... executed ... Roman invasion ... who could this figure alluded to in these texts possibly be?

In what may come to be regarded as one of the more unusual, indeed astonishing, oversights in the history of Qumran scholarship, so far as is known it seems no previous scholar has proposed that Antigonus Mattathias, the last Hasmonean king of Israel, tortured and executed by the Romans in 37 BCE, might be the figure underlying the Wicked Priest of Peshier Habakkuk or the doomed ruler of Peshier Nahum. The actual allusion of the figure of these texts, Antigonus Mattathias, remained unseen even though it was always in open view, as obvious as it could be. And in wondering how Antigonus Mattathias was missed in the history of scholarship I include myself, for I too missed this in my 2001 study of Peshier Nahum.

~ ~ 32 ~ ~

According to Josephus, Antigonus Mattathias, the son of Aristobulus II, perhaps a teenager at the time, was sent to Rome along with his family at the time of his father's loss of power in 63 BCE (*Ant.* 14.70). The rest of Antigonus's adult life was spent in Rome, then back in Judea with his father involved in a revolt which failed (*Ant.* 14.96), then in Ashkelon living with his mother and siblings (*Ant.* 14.97, 126), and finally and most importantly, in Chalcis or territory controlled by it when his sister married first the son of Ptolemy the ruler of Iturea and then Ptolemy executed the son and married her himself (*Ant.* 14.126). The Itureans leaned pro-Parthian and anti-Roman in this era (Overman 2009: 287-88). The plan of Antigonus to be king in Jerusalem is said to have begun with a deal between Antigonus and the Parthians brokered by the new king of Iturea, Lysanias the son of Ptolemy. Antigonus promised five hundred women to the Parthians and money, and in return received Parthian support in destroying Antigonus's archenemy Herod and installing him, Antigonus, as king in Jerusalem (*Ant.* 14.230).

In 40 BCE a Parthian army entered Jerusalem with Antigonus Mattathias and made him king. Leading up to this, Josephus refers to a large number of Jews from Mount Carmel (greater Ephraim) who had come to Jerusalem and fought on behalf of Antigonus from inside the city and the temple (*Ant.* 14.334). Iturea or Chalcis, Antigonus's home base and source of connections, was considered biblically part of Manasseh or at least some of its territory was (1 Chron. 5:18-23; McNamara 2011: 183). This background could be a context for the somewhat unusual introduction of 'Manasseh' into the text of Peshier Psalms A, as prompted by an allusion to the Manassite provenance of Antigonus Mattathias and perhaps other elements of Antigonus's regime. Perhaps this is in the background to the allusion to 'the wicked ones of Ephraim and Manasseh' of Peshier Psalms A who join the wicked ones of the covenant of Judah in persecuting the righteous. Perhaps all of these allusions are set in Jerusalem (as in the language of 1 Chron. 9:3). Peshier Nahum could be saying the same thing in a different way in referring to Jerusalem as 'the city of Ephraim'. It could even be that 'Manasseh' came first in

the sequence of the authors' compositions in both Peshier Psalms A and Peshier Nahum (used in different ways), and then those uses of 'Manasseh' secondarily brought 'Ephraim' into those two texts for reasons of elegance and symmetry.

Culturally Antigonus Mattathias came from a very different background than Hyrcanus II, with most of Antigonus's adult life spent in pagan surroundings. Whether Antigonus's differences in background resulted in significant changes in temple practices in Jerusalem when he took over as high priest, or small changes deemed significant by others, or no changes, is unknown and on one level perhaps not too important; the important point is how Antigonus's regime was perceived from the point of view of supporters of the ousted former high priest, and how that might turn up in the world of texts written from the perspective of the side that had lost.

If there is any substance to Josephus's account of a sanhedrin bringing charges against Herod but Hyrcanus II acting to spare Herod to the sanhedrin's dismay, that could be a context not only for Pharisee support for Antigonus but for a direct Pharisee alliance in Antigonus's regime, given the common cause against the same enemy (*Ant.* 14.165-175). Pharisee *animus* toward Herod in the years leading up to Antigonus's ousting of Herod and Hyrcanus II seems explicit in Josephus: Josephus alludes to opposition to Herod from 'Pollion the Pharisee' and 'Samaias' in the story of the thwarted attempt to condemn Herod (*Ant.* 14.172-176; 15.1-10). The figures Pollion and Samaias are generally understood to be Abtalion and Shemayah of the later rabbis, teachers of the famous Hillel and Shammai. Josephus says Herod executed the entire sanhedrin under Antigonus with only the exceptions of Pollion and Samaias themselves after he came to power, implying that Herod regarded the sanhedrin under Antigonus as having been supporters of Antigonus and a continuation of the earlier sanhedrin of the time of Hyrcanus II which was at odds with Herod and Hyrcanus II. The Talmud refers to Herod killing the sages (Baba Bathra 3b-4b). Antigonus Mattathias could very well have had an arrangement with the Pharisees for the administration of cities and towns, replacing those formerly aligned with Hyrcanus II who did not change over to support Antigonus. The stories of Herod's execution the sages/sanhedrin of the time of Antigonus could be an indirect clue that there was a Pharisee-Antigonus convergence of interests and rule in the brief regime of the last Hasmonean king.

~ ~ 33 ~ ~

One Qumran text, 4Q448b, directly praises Alexander Jannaeus by name. This is the reading of most scholars (especially Eshel, Eshel, and Yardeni 1992; Puech 1996 [on the syntax]; and Eshel and Eshel 2000) although several (Main 1998; Lemaire 2000) have argued (without claim of certainty in Lemaire's case) that it is anti-Jannaeus based on a parallel in Zech. 13:7 ('rise up, o sword, *against*'). But that the text is favorable to Jannaeus is clear. The text appears to have the same sense

in its first line of two words as in other stand-alone uses of the Qal form of the verb in the Psalms (7:7; 44:24; 59:4): 'Awaken O God' or 'Rise up O God', in contexts of appealing for divine deliverance from enemies. Then the text gives two items in series beginning with 'concerning'. Each of the two listed items names a subject and then gives a benediction at the end. King Jonathan was Alexander Jannaeus's name on his coins. The full text:

Awaken Holy One!

Concerning Jonathan the king and all the congregation of your people Israel who are in the four winds of heaven. Let there be peace on all of them.

And concerning your kingdom. May your name be blessed.

That the 'Awaken O God' is on behalf of Jonathan and the congregation of Israel and not 'rise up *against* Jonathan the king, *but* all the congregation of your people, etc.', is illustrated from a parallel verb structure at Dan. 12:1, where Michael the archangel is 'one standing *on behalf of* your people' (not standing *against* your people). If the sense in 4Q448b were negative, a followup curse would be expected toward Jonathan but there is none. Not only is there no hint of a negative wish toward king Jonathan elsewhere in this text, there is nothing negative toward Alexander Jannaeus in any Qumran text. From the standpoint of *the texts*, there is no reason why it would occur to anyone to expect king Jonathan to be condemned.

Even more interesting, as brought out by Eshel and Eshel (2000), is that this blessing on king Jonathan is juxtaposed next to Psalm 154 of column 'a' of 4Q448 which has a superscription in its ancient Syriac translation identifying that psalm as written to celebrate the deliverance of the Jewish king Hezekiah from the Assyrian invader Sennacherib. The blessing on king Jonathan of column 'b' reads as asking God to 'awake' on behalf of the threatened Jewish king just as God delivered Hezekiah anciently. This is consistent with the 'c' column which also mentions Jonathan by name in a context of military and war, again with no hint of a negative view toward king Jonathan.

Eshel and Eshel brought out another point in their discussion: 4Q161 Peshier Isaiah A interprets a passage from Isa. 10:24-34 which is usually read as depicting Hezekiah's deliverance from Sennacherib, the very theme anciently attributed to Psalm 154. In Peshier Isaiah A the Isa. 10:24-34 passage is interpreted in terms of an attack from an invader coming south from 'Acco' (Ptolemais) almost to Jerusalem ('even up to the boundary of Jerusalem'). Joseph Amusin proposes that the text alludes to an event in Alexander Jannaeus's first year as king (Amusin 1974). In 103 BCE Ptolemy IX Lathyrus came down from Ptolemais and defeated the army of Alexander Jannaeus in a battle in the Jordan valley. The way was

open for Ptolemy Lathyrus to proceed to conquer Jerusalem, but he was ordered back by his mother, Cleopatra III. Alexander Jannaeus and the vulnerable Jewish state were spared, just as Hezekiah's Jerusalem of old had been miraculously spared.

The interesting point which receives surprisingly little comment is that this reading of Peshier Isaiah A is another *positive* reading of Alexander Jannaeus. Eshel and Eshel 2000 suggested that 4Q448 reflects Ptolemy IX Lathyrus in 103 BCE as well. *Most* Qumran scholars read 4Q448 as favorable to Alexander Jannaeus; *many* read Peshier Isaiah A in accord with the Ptolemy IX Lathyrus allusion which is favorable to Alexander Jannaeus; and *all* read Peshier Nahum as negative toward Alexander Jannaeus's enemies. All three of these descriptions are mainstream scholarship, *in spite of* nearly all of these same scholars regarding the Qumran sect *as hostile to Alexander Jannaeus*, even though there is no text that says that. Much energy is then expended attempting to explain the anomaly of pro-Alexander Jannaeus texts found among the texts of what is believed to be an anti-Jannaeus sect.

But there is a mistaken premise in these discussions: the assumption that the people of the Qumran texts were opposed to Alexander Jannaeus. There is another possibility, which to the present day seems incapable of percolating into mainstream scholarly consciousness: 4Q448 is favorable to Alexander Jannaeus because the people of the Qumran texts were favorable to Alexander Jannaeus. Here are about the only two voices at the time who got this interpretive point right:

This text [4Q448] completely disproves the Essene theory of Qumran origins at least as classically conceived ... Qumran has to be considered *pro-Maccabean*, i.e. *pro* Alexander Jannaeus or Jonathan and not *anti* ... In traditional theories of Qumran origins, i.e. the Essene theory and its variations, Alexander Jannaeus is often considered perhaps the most likely candidate for the role of Wicked Priest referred to in these *peshtarim*—either him or one of his equally zealous Maccabean predecessors ... It was the aim of *Maccabees*, *Zadokites*, *Christians* and *Qumran* to gainsay this approach. The Paean to King Jonathan now vindicates this position, and supports the opposite ... this group *cannot* have been anti-Maccabean; if anything it was pro-Maccabean ... The first lines of this splendid little poem prove this proposition as nothing else can ... (Robert Eisenman, in Eisenman and Wise 1992: 273-76)

The idea that the Qumran group—Essenes or some other persuasion—originated in the second century B.C.E. out of opposition to the Hasmonean takeover of the high-priesthood is crumbling. The newly released scrolls offer this interpretation no support. Not only is there no evidence that the Dead Sea group objected to the Hasmonean high-priesthood as such. The newly available texts actually show the opposite: they held some of the Hasmoneans in high regard ... *In Praise of*

King Jonathan undermines the idea that the Teacher and his followers were on principle opposed to the Hasmoneans ... If the Teacher's group could side with Alexander Jannaeus, then clearly they need not have disapproved of any Hasmonean ruler on principle. This new chain of evidence makes it very unlikely that the group originated in a dispute concerning the high-priestly succession in the mid-second century B.C.E. (Wise, Abegg, and Cook 1996: 26-27)

~ ~ 34 ~ ~

4Q175 Testimonia 21-30 portraying an 'accursed man'/'man of Belial' interpreted from a passage of the book of Joshua which alludes to a wicked figure whose sons will be destroyed is sometimes supposed to have been written against John Hyrcanus I (ruled 135-104 BCE), but there is no basis for confidence in that supposition, because the entire passage (including the interpretation of the passage from Joshua) is quoted from the Apocryphon of Joshua (4Q379 and several other copies), which is an older text. Carol Newsom's comment remains reasonable that the Apocryphon of Joshua 'belongs to the type of literature represented by Jubilees and was probably written by a scribe belonging to that intellectual and scribal circle' (Newsom 1996: 37). That explains why the language of 4QTestimonia has nothing to do with the sobriquets of the later sectarian texts. The referent of the accursed man of Belial in 4QTestimonia is from the time of composition of Apocryphon of Joshua which could be before the time of John Hyrcanus I. The compiler of 4QTestimonia chose to select in sequence without additional comment four blocks of quotations from biblical and parabiblical texts including the Apocryphon of Joshua. In a sense 4QTestimonia is like a thematic pesharim text in which only the quotations appear without any of the peshers. The compiler of quotations of 4QTestimonia gives no information why those particular passages were selected or the points intended to be understood from their selection and sequencing. If the passages were intended to be read aloud and then orally interpreted (which is one possibility), or were notes in preparation for an author's fuller intended composition later (another possibility), how does one presume to reconstruct the content of an ancient unwritten oral interpretation of an even more ancient text—or construct the sense of what an ancient author had in mind to write later—in the absence of evidence?

The scribe of 4QTestimonia (4Q175) has long been identified as the same scribe who copied several other Qumran texts including the famous 1QS. Eibert Tigchelaar concluded that this scribe exercised markedly lower scribal standards, compared to this scribe's other texts, in the one-sheet, four copied quotations of 4QTestimonia, and that 'the lack of care for a consistent orthography and the undisciplined script ... suggest that this single sheet was written for private use' (Tigchelaar 2003: 451). Mladen Popović comments, '4QTestimonia and other one-page lists, or rather scraps, such as 4QList

of False Prophets ar (4Q339) and 4QList of Netinim (4Q340), may represent personal scholarly notes. The badly damaged 4QGenealogical List? (4Q338) may perhaps be another example of such a note. It was written on the verso of 4QEn^a (4Q201)' (Popović 2012: 577). Therefore the compiler of the quotations listed in 4QTestimonia may have been the scribe of 4QTestimonia.

Rather than blindly conjecture that inside the mind of this scribe there was an interpretation of the quotation from the Apocryphon of Joshua directed against John Hyrcanus I who had sons who died unnaturally and then regard that conjecture as fact (i.e. this reconstruction of the inner thoughts of the scribe), one could as easily imagine the inner thoughts of the scribe interpreting the quotation in some other way, perhaps with reference to some figure or figures who had no sons who died in unusual ways. It is overly subjective to insist on certainty concerning the content of an ancient scribe's inner thoughts about a text for which no written exposition of the scribe survives. And yet modern arguments that the scribe of 4Q175 interpreted the quotation from ApocrJosh as directed against John Hyrcanus I rely upon claims of knowledge of the inner thoughts of the scribe as the foundation of that argument.

Of course the source text, Apocryphon of Joshua, itself is a peshar or interpretation of Joshua (so to speak; it is actually in the form of a prophecy for the last days spoken by the biblical Joshua), but as noted, Apocryphon of Joshua may be from before the time of John Hyrcanus I. As brought to attention by Russell Gmirkin there are striking parallels in language between ApocrJosh/4QTest and I Maccabees 1:33-37 with reference to stories of the Hellenistic crisis of the 160s BCE, suggesting an earlier focus of interest of Apocryphon of Joshua and perhaps the most plausible context for the allusions.

Armin Lange (2003) notes that 4QTestimonia quotes Apocryphon of Joshua with other biblical texts as if Apocryphon of Joshua is scripture, and Lange suggests this implies some length of time Apocryphon of Joshua was in existence before it was quoted as if it was scripture by the scribe of 4QTestimonia c. 100-75 BCE. Lange further argues that Apocryphon of Joshua is quoted in and therefore predates another Qumran text, 4Q460 Narrative Work and Prayer, which because of its free use of the tetragrammaton is itself early (mid-2nd century BCE according to Lange).

(Three textual observations on the Apocryphon of Joshua passage quoted in 4QTestimonia very quickly. First, the city at issue in the passage is Jerusalem, not Jericho [Dimant 2005: 126]. Second, the argument of H. Eshel [1996, 2008] that the passage was secondarily inserted into an earlier text of ApocrJosh after original composition by the scribe of 4QTest, instead of the reverse, is not plausible [Dimant 2005: 130-33]. And third, a contribution of my own, it is possible that existing editions of this text have erred on a restoration

affecting meaning. As the editions and discussions have it, the 4QTest/AprocrJosh passage: '[and they] will she[d] blood like water on the ramparts of the daughters of Zion, and in the precincts of Jerusalem'. But based on analogy with Ps. 79:1-3, that restoration should probably be instead, '[and they] will she[d] their [blood] like water on the ramparts of the daughters of Zion, etc.', that is, '[...dm]m' rather than '[...d]m' at 4QTest 29. The visible final *mem* is not the final letter of 'blood' but is the masc. pl. possessive suffix attached to 'blood'. The antecedent of 'their blood' presumably would be the 'sons of Jacob' of the preceding line. The point is significant because it suggests the ones doing the shedding of blood are not Jewish figures but rather, 'the nations'. A c. 13-15 spaces lacuna in the preceding line, 4QTest 28, might have a sense on analogy with Ps. 79:1-3 something like this: '[and they/the nations will come and] they [will com]mit a profanation in the land', making explicit the agent carrying out the bloodshed with which the passage closes.

If however the Apocryphon of Joshua is from as late as the time of John Hyrcanus I, it likely would be *pro*-John Hyrcanus I, not *anti*-, based on the following line of argument: the Apocryphon of Joshua is similar to and perhaps from the same literary context as the Apocryphon of Joseph (three copies among the Qumran finds). As argued by Magnar Kartveit (2009: 140-71) in agreement with earlier work of Eileen Schuller (1990), the Apocryphon of Joseph has an apparent allusion to the temple at Mount Gerizim considered negatively, which the text considers to be an abomination done by gentile non-Josephites transplanted to Samaria. But the temple at Mount Gerizim was destroyed by John Hyrcanus I and his sons 107 BCE. Therefore these texts, the Apocryphon of Joseph and by analogy the Apocryphon of Joshua (also Sirach and Jubilees on similar grounds) not only precede 107 BCE, but as suggested long ago by R.H. Charles and others for Jubilees, become well understood as *pro*-Hasmonean texts in being anti-Gerizim, anti-Samaritan, pre-conquest of Gerizim, which ultimately resulted in John Hyrcanus I attacking what these texts present as the abomination of the temple at Mount Gerizim. The texts become part of a *pro*-Hasmonean literature designed to discredit the enemies or targets of conquest of the Hasmonians in Jerusalem. ('To sum up, 4Q372 [Apocryphon of Joseph^b] can best be described as a polemical text about the Samaritans who are dwelling in Joseph's land in the 2nd century B.C.E. ... Their criticism of the temple in Jerusalem amounts to blasphemy' [Kartveit, p. 171].) It is not necessary to resolve here the exact dating of the Apocryphon of Joshua. The important point is that no anti-John Hyrcanus I text has been demonstrated among the Qumran finds.

~ ~ 35 ~ ~

4Q390, along with fragments from 4Q385a and 4Q387-389 analyzed by Devorah Dimant in DJD 30 as belonging to the same text and named Apocryphon of Jeremiah C (Dimant 2001; Reynolds 2012), have been cited as being anti-Hasmonean based on this text's negative portrayal of

Israel being ruled by the Angels of Mastemot or Angels of Destruction seventy years after the Hellenistic crisis of the mid-160s BCE (e.g. Eshel 2008: 22-27). In this interpretation this text is written near the end of this seventy years and regards the early Hasmonean rulers negatively. But that dating and interpretation of the Apocryphon of Jeremiah C appears to be in error (I thank Russell Gmirkin for contributing to the analysis of this section).

4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C appears to have been written in the time of the Hellenistic crisis and foresees the crisis as extending a long time. Unlike Daniel written in the midst of the Hellenistic crisis which sees the eschatological culmination happening right then, the authors of Apocryphon of Jeremiah C, writing at about the same time or soon after, place themselves in the seventh of ten jubilees chronologically (4Q390 1.7-8). Whereas the authors of Daniel saw themselves in the final week of their 490 years, the authors of Apocryphon of Jeremiah C rewrote the chronological scheme to indicate a long time of continuation of the issues of the Hellenistic crisis. The authors of Apocryphon of Jeremiah C are aware of resistance to the Seleucids, the existence of a remnant, and a 'contending' or a civil war underway, i.e. they are aware of the Maccabean revolt. At the same time the authors foresee only darkness ahead. They foresee Israel ruled by the Angels of Mastemot for seventy years, which seems to reflect an anticipation of foreign dominion for seventy years, perhaps to be followed by something else for another seventy-year period after that (to get to the 490).

As with texts which contain *ex eventu* prophecy up to a certain point and then at the point of the authors' present the text shifts to genuine prophecy which becomes non-specific and historically inaccurate, so with Apocryphon of Jeremiah C. The authors foresee seventy years of contending (4Q390 2.6) which start from the beginning of the Hellenistic crisis, during which time Israel is delivered into the rule of the Angels of Mastemot (4Q390 2.6). This is written from the standpoint of authors at the time of the Hellenistic crisis. There are no identifiable historical allusions later than the 160s-150s BCE in the fragments of Apocryphon of Jeremiah C which could confirm a later date of authorship. The Hellenistic crisis is the overwhelming issue of the text and there is a lack of identifiable historical allusions after that time.

The Apocalypse of Weeks of 1 En. 93.3-10, 91.12-17 has seven weeks of world history until the apostate generation which is the author's present, and foresees three weeks still to come followed by the age of peace. Although the chronology is different, there is an analogy to the '7 + 3' structure for past to future of the 10-jubilees schematic of Apocryphon of Jeremiah C, with the authorial present in the 7th jubilee of 10 total. The phenomenon of texts foreseeing a difficult victory taking an extended length of time has parallels, e.g. 1QM has 7 years of victorious local war followed by a longer period of 33 years required to defeat the rest of the nations of the

world (that was anticipated to take a little longer). The Apocryphon of Jeremiah C is written before the Maccabees achieved victory, which happened in history sooner than the text expected.

The dating of Apocryphon of Jeremiah C will have been at a time when the authors had knowledge of the Maccabee resistance, but before their victory and at a time when victory was not expected any time soon, a little after the final composition of Daniel but not much after. A time following some defeat or setback of the revolt could be a context for Apocryphon of Jeremiah C, for example just after Judas Maccabaeus was killed in battle with Bacchides (1 Macc. 9:11-22). 4Q387 3.4-8 has this:

[] three priests who will not walk in the ways of [the] former [priests]. By the name of the God of Israel they will be called. And in their days will be brought down the pride of those who act wickedly against the covenant and the slaves of foreign things. And Israel will be rent asunder in th[at] generation, each m[a]n fighting against his neighbour over the Torah and over the covenant.

This is followed in the text by what may be an allusion to a famine of hearing the word of the Lord. These lines appear to allude to the Maccabean revolt having some success—bringing down the pride of those who act wickedly against the covenant—yet without foreseeing lasting victory, but instead continued civil war ravaging the land. The sense seems to correspond to 4Q390 2.6-7: ‘and [t]he[y] will be[gi]n to contend among themselves for seventy years from the day of the violation of the [oath and the] covenant which they will have violated. And I shall deliver them [into the hand of the An]gels of Mastemot, and they will rule over them.’ This is followed by more description of Israel’s sins. Again the allusion appears to be to the Maccabean revolt and civil war without knowledge of the Maccabees’ victory. Instead the authors foresee civil war and foreign dominion (the rule of the Angels of Mastemot or Destruction) lasting seventy years.

If the ‘three priests’ of 4Q387 3.4 are good priests, they could be the three Maccabee brothers portrayed in 1 Maccabees as leaders of the revolt, Judas, Jonathan, and Simon (1 Macc. 5:16-55; 9:19), although the three priests, if they are good, could also be some different leaders of the resistance. Some propose reading these three priests as three Hasmonian rulers in consecutive sequence after the Maccabees had achieved power, but the text does not require that reading and that reading is counterindicated by the text anticipating Israel to be ruled by the Angels of Mastemot for seventy years, which in other texts seems to function as other language for foreign dominion. There is nothing about these three priests in the text which dates them to a time later than the time of the Hellenistic crisis.

It also may not be textually certain that the ‘three priests’ are the ones doing the resistance or fighting against the wicked of the next lines. The ones doing the resistance may be a different group named in the lacuna of lines 3-4 preceding the words ‘three priests’, with the true subject group being contrasted in some way to the ‘three priests’ which become visible after the lacuna. In this case the preceding righteous group term would be the actual subject of the verbs, e.g. ‘[<And then><righteous ones><will rise up after><the wicked ones>] the three priests, who will not walk in the ways of [the] former [priests]. By the name of the God of Israel they will be called, and in their days will be brought down the pride of those who act wickedly against the covenant ...’, etc. This hypothetical righteous group in the lacuna before the visible ‘three priests’ would then follow temporally and be in contrast to the three wicked former priests. In this case the ‘three priests’ might be the three hellenizing high priests Jason (c. 175-171 BCE), Menelaus (c. 171-162 BCE), and Alcimus (c. 162-159 BCE). These three priests would be wicked in the view of the text, set in contrast to a naming of righteous ones, perhaps something like ‘the ones who do righteousness’ of 4Q388a 1 ii 9 and Dan. 12:3, or some other righteous group term used in Daniel.

A broken reference in a different fragment to ‘three who will rule’ appears at 4Q388a 7 ii 8, using the verb *ymlk[w]*, ‘reign, rule as a king’. The use of this verb seems to argue against an identification of these ‘three who will reign’ as the three hellenizing high priests Jason, Menelaus, and Alcimus as some scholars have suggested, since those high priests were not kings. If the setting is in the Hellenistic crisis the three who ‘reign’ might allude to the three Seleucid kings of the Hellenistic crisis: Antiochus IV (175-164 BCE), Antiochus V (164-161 BCE), and Demetrius I (161-150 BCE). Or is the allusion possibly to the triumvirate of three simultaneous co-rulers of Egypt in the years 169-164 BCE: Ptolemy VIII Physcon, Ptolemy VI Philometor, and Cleopatra II? Egypt is named in the immediately preceding lines. A third possibility is that these lines are set in the earlier time of Jeremiah, not the Hellenistic crisis, with allusions to Jeremiah 44 and Egypt, and the three who reign allude to some figures or rulers of the 500s BCE.

The Apocryphon of Jeremiah C, in other words, was written with knowledge of the Maccabean resistance and civil war, but without knowledge that it would be successful or with an expectation of a quick victory. Compare Dimant’s comment that ‘since the *Animal Apocalypse* is usually dated to 164-163 BCE, its affinity to the *Apocryphon* [of Jeremiah C] from Qumran furnishes an additional argument in support of a second century BCE *terminus ad quem* for the composition of the Qumran *Apocryphon* ... their agreement on numerous points suggests that they shared the same ideology and may have stemmed from the same milieu’ (Dimant 2001: 110). The Apocryphon of Jeremiah C becomes part of a cluster of texts from the era of the Hellenistic crisis with which it shares similarities.

By contrast, the view of a Qumran text whose authors *did* have retrospective knowledge of the early Hasmonean era may be seen in Peshar Nahum. The view of the authors of that text is not that Israel was ruled by the Angels of Mastomot or under foreign dominion during that era. Rather, the view is that Jerusalem was free and unconquered 'from the time of Antiochus until the standing of the rulers of the Kittim', that is, from the Hellenistic crisis until the arrival of the Romans, schematically understood (4QpNah 3-4 i 3). Although 4Q383-391 and the texts represented therein have uncertainties concerning the relationships of fragments to one another which are a subject of continuing discussion, it is clear that the Hellenistic crisis of the 160s BCE is not only alluded to in these fragments but is of overwhelming importance. The interpretation that the time of composition was well into or toward the end of the seventy years of 4Q390 2.6-7 which the text anticipates as a continuation of the Hellenistic crisis is without evidence and counterindicated. Rather, the authors' present is closer to the beginning of that seventy years due to its anticipation of foreign dominion and civil war continuing for seventy years, which was not the case historically. The text knows of the Maccabean resistance but does not know of the Maccabees' lasting success. This dates the context of composition to some time after the Maccabee revolt began but before its success was assured. The fragments identified as belonging to Apocryphon of Jeremiah C have nothing anti-Hasmonean in them because they were written before the Hasmoneans ruled and know nothing of Hasmonean rule. And what these texts know of the Maccabean revolt is not necessarily unfavorable.

~ ~ 36 ~ ~

The absence of Hanukkah in the Qumran texts has also sometimes been cited as evidence of opposition to the Hasmoneans, but that too is unwarranted. There is no direct evidence that either the authors of the Qumran texts or the Hasmonean high priests celebrated Hanukkah in terms of historical records, but there is no clear reason to suppose the authors of the Qumran texts were not celebrating Hanukkah if the Hasmonean rulers were. Hanukkah is not a Mosaic festival and hence would not be expected to be in the Qumran calendrical texts, which do not otherwise show interest in observances of days not attributed to legislation from Moses. Perhaps the notion that the authors of the Qumran texts were opposed to Hanukkah simply because their texts do not speak of it has been a misunderstanding, equivalent to arguing that the Hasmonean high priests were opposed to Hanukkah because Josephus never mentions them observing it. In any case there is nothing in the Qumran texts which opposes Hanukkah or the memory of the Maccabees.

Michael Daise (2005) has argued that 1QS 1.13-15 in fact may allude negatively to Hanukkah when it instructs the righteous to not 'be delayed from any of their sacred feasts', based on an argument that 2 Maccabees presents

Hanukkah as a delayed Feast of Tabernacles. James VanderKam noted in response that '2 Maccabees is the only source that associates the two holidays [Hanukkah and Feast of Tabernacles], so we do not have a good way of gauging the extent of the tradition' (2005: 167). To VanderKam's comment can be added that it has long been thought, going back to R.H. Charles and Abraham Geiger, that 2 Maccabees is anti-Hasmonean and pro-Pharisee. This means that if Daise's argument is partly correct, it may be a Pharisee position or practice which is opposed at 1QS 1.13-15, not a Hasmonean practice. Presumably so long as the Feast of Tabernacles was kept at the right time, 1QS 1.13-15 would represent no objection to Hanukkah, provided Hanukkah was not regarded as a Feast of Tabernacles or caused a delay of the Feast of Tabernacles.

The absence of 1 and 2 Maccabees among the Qumran finds also is sometimes claimed to be indicative of anti-Hasmonean sentiments, but this too seems to be a misunderstanding. The absence of these two texts is well understood for generic reasons, not for reasons of opposition to the contents of the texts. As Sidnie White Crawford expresses it in describing the Qumran finds, 'There are no texts of an openly historical character, such as First or Second Maccabees. No works from pagan or Christian literature were discovered. Personal legal or business documents are almost entirely absent ...' (2011b: 268). Just because historical and legal documents are absent as genres of texts in the caves of Qumran, it is not warranted to assume that the collectors of the Qumran texts were opposed to the contents of histories or the contents of legal documents. Since the absences of 1 and 2 Maccabees are well understood as special cases or instances of this larger observation, there is no basis for invoking anti-Hasmonean sentiment as an additional explanation for these texts' absence. And again, there is nothing in the Qumran texts which do exist which is opposed to the memory of the Maccabees.

~ ~ 37 ~ ~

There has been a notion that Hyrcanus II was pro-Pharisee, whereas the Qumran texts are anti-Pharisee. But a close reading of Josephus shows no evidence that Hyrcanus II favored the Pharisees, as distinguished from relating to the Pharisees as rivals to the Hasmonean family fortunes. Jean Le Moyne's 1972 *Les sadducéens* saw no Hyrcanus II/Pharisee alignment. Nor did Anthony Saldarini in his 2001 *Pharisees, Scribes, and Sadducees in Palestinian Society*. Günter Stemberger considered an equation of Hyrcanus II's followers with Pharisees to be very questionable (1995: 113). James VanderKam notes that 'the sources say nothing' about Pharisees exercising influence on Hyrcanus II (2004: 338), and so on. Hyrcanus II's sectarian orientation is now generally understood to have been Sadducee: e.g. 'it is known that the Hasmonean rulers, with the exception of Queen Alexandra, who leaned toward the Pharisees, belonged to the Sadducee sect' (Bar-Nathan 2002: 186).

~~ 38 ~~

Hyrchanus II became high priest in 76 BCE upon the death of his father, Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 BCE). According to Josephus, the Pharisees, whom Alexander had persecuted, exercised influence and control over Jannaeus's widow and successor, Queen Alexandra Salome. Hyrchanus II was the rightful heir of Jannaeus and logically should have become king. But (as the story goes in Josephus) Alexandra Salome, the queen, did not permit this. Instead she let the Pharisees rule. The picture is that Alexandra retained nominal royal authority for herself but *de facto* civil rule was in the hands of the Pharisees. In this picture Hyrchanus II does not have civil power; the Pharisees do. He was confirmed in the high priesthood so he controls the temple, but he does not have civil power. Nine years later in c. 67 BCE Queen Alexandra just before she died made Hyrchanus II king whereupon Hyrchanus was immediately challenged and overthrown by his younger brother Aristobulus II. As Josephus tells it, the two brothers publicly embraced in the temple and Aristobulus II took over as king and high priest (67-63 BCE). But later Hyrchanus II became frightened and fled to Arabia and civil war broke out. The Arabian king tried unsuccessfully to restore Hyrchanus II to power.

In 63 BCE the Romans arrived to Jerusalem. Both brothers had journeyed to Damascus to appeal to Pompey to be recognized as king, plus a third party representing 'the nation'. 'The nation' is probably other language for the Pharisees, in the literary scheme of Josephus's source (*Ant.* 13.288, 296, 376, 402; 14.41). This third party ('the nation', the Pharisees) was opposed to either Hasmonean being king (*Ant.* 14.41, 46; Diodorus of Sicily 40.2). Pompey responded by deciding to invade the Hasmonean kingdom. Both Hasmonean brothers cooperated with Pompey's journey to Jerusalem. Aristobulus surrendered the fortresses to the Romans. In Jerusalem, supporters of Hyrchanus II assisted Pompey in gaining control of Jerusalem over a failed resistance from members of the regime of Aristobulus II who disobeyed Aristobulus's order to surrender the city. Pompey removed Aristobulus II from being king and 'liberated' the territories which Alexander Jannaeus had earlier put under Jewish rule and which the Hasmoneans, most recently Aristobulus II, were charged with oppressing. Pompey reorganized the region and abolished the monarchy in Judea altogether. Aristobulus II and his family were exiled to Rome. Pompey put Hyrchanus II back in as high priest (63-40 BCE).

~~ 39 ~~

Hyrchanus II was aligned with the Romans, just as Hasmoneans going back to Judas Maccabaeus had been. A question is raised: would the priests of the Qumran texts have supported a high priest who was as cooperative with Rome as was Hyrchanus II? There is a perception in some circles that the texts are anti-Roman and therefore the people of these texts could hardly have favorably regarded the pro-Roman Hyrchanus II. The notion is that

the people of the Qumran texts were like the later zealots who revolted violently against the Romans. It is supposed that there was an uncompromising anti-Roman ideology in the scrolls which stands in sharp contrast to the collaborating pro-Roman high priest Hyrchanus II of history.

Here again there appear to be some serious misunderstandings. First of all, the text cluster perceived as being anti-Roman above all among the Qumran finds is the War Scroll (1QM), which portrays a war against the Kittim in the context of a grandiose vision of becoming the next world power. And the Kittim in Peshet Habakkuk and Peshet Nahum are certainly Romans.

But the Kittim of the War Scroll texts do not refer to the Romans but to the earlier Seleucids (Eshel 2001). Several lines of argument converge on situating the War Scroll in the era of Alexander Jannaeus (if not earlier), before the Romans were in Judea, before there was any reason to be hostile to Rome. The term 'king of the Kittim' in the War Scroll is notable. In Peshet Habakkuk and Peshet Nahum the Kittim (Romans) of those texts have 'rulers' but not 'kings', consistent with the Roman commanders and *imperators* of the Republic and the civil wars. In Peshet Nahum the '*rulers* of the Kittim' (Romans) follow and are distinct from the earlier '*kings* of the Greeks' (Seleucids). In 1QM 1.2 the Kittim are 'the Kittim of Asshur' or Syria, i.e. the Seleucids. (There is no second body of Kittim of Egypt or in Egypt at 1QM 1.4 as sometimes misunderstood; that is the *king* of the Kittim who is in Egypt.)

The reason the War Scroll was thought by some scholars to be dated as late as the Roman period, and therefore anti-Roman, was because of Yigael Yadin's early work showing that the weaponry and tactics of the War Scroll are Roman. Hence, Yadin reasoned, the text was produced in the Roman period. Gmirkin (1996) is the corrective on this: the weaponry and tactics in the War Scroll *are* Roman but they are Roman tactics and weaponry which predate the reforms of Marius of 104 BCE; the War Scroll draws on a Roman military manual from before 104 BCE. Of course it could be argued that later Jews in Judea used an old and obsolete Roman military manual in the composition of an imaginary text. But in the absence of a positive indication calling for a later dating, Gmirkin's analysis establishes significant weight in favor of an earlier, pre-Roman period dating of the War Scroll. Therefore the context of the War Scroll may be from the era of the rise of Alexander Jannaeus, the era of the rise of the parallel *Serekh yachad* groups, the revival of Israel back to life, complete with the exuberant and grandiose hopes of the War Scroll in the world of texts—the same context of 4Q448 and 4QPeshet Isaiah A. These lines of analysis argue that although the weapons and tactics of the War Scroll are Roman, the 'king of the Kittim' of the War Scroll whose defeat is envisioned is Seleucid, not Roman. The War Scroll envisions a Jewish army using then-current Roman tactics and weapons at a time when Rome was an ally of and

perhaps sending assistance to the Hasmoneans, to defeat the *Seleucids* then in power.

The War Scroll assumes a favorable stance toward and identifies with the Jewish state and high priest, the national army, and its commanders which are successful in defeating foreign powers. The close relationships between the *Serekh* (Community Rule) texts, the Rule of the Congregation (1QSa), and the War Scroll, which is also a *serekh* or rule text, have been developed elsewhere (e.g. Schiffman 1989) and become very sensible arising out of this common context. And finally, it has been argued that the battle of Ptolemy IX Lathyrus and Alexander Jannaeus reflects Jewish armies having adopted Roman weaponry and tactics (Bar-Kochva 1999 [‘a partial adoption of Roman weaponry and tactics by specially trained units of some 8,000 elite troops. Organized in centuries, these units bore shields that were a Jewish version of the ‘door-like’ legionary scutum’]). The significance of this last point is the study of Gmirkin 1996 establishing that the War Scroll reflects pre-104 BCE Roman military weaponry and tactics. Far from being an anti-Roman text, the War Scroll emerges from a context in which the Romans are helping the Jews defeat the Kittim of that text (the Seleucids). The ‘Kittim’ of the War Scroll, the eschatological enemy, therefore are the power that was then at issue, the Seleucids. After the Romans arrived in Syria and Judea, the authors of the Qumran texts applied the appellation ‘Kittim’ to the Romans, in Peshar Habakkuk and Peshar Nahum. But the War Scroll texts become situated in the pre-Roman era of Alexander Jannaeus and are anti-Seleucid, not anti-Roman.

The key point is that once the War Scroll is removed from being anti-Roman, it raises the question whether there are anti-Roman texts among the Qumran texts during the time Hyrcanus II was high priest, that is prior to the time of Herod. This may sound surprising; it is easy to romanticize and identify with the later Jewish zealots and freedom fighters and anachronistically project that back into texts that actually exist. But in the texts that exist is such a theme there during the time Hyrcanus II was high priest? What may be perceived as dissonant or missing in Hyrcanus II with respect to how the people of the scrolls would have regarded him—his lack of violent revolt against Rome—is no less missing in the texts themselves.

~ ~ 40 ~ ~

There are not many Qumran texts which can be identified as carrying specific allusions to the Romans. There is the biblical book of Daniel with its historical allusion at 11:30 to a Roman intervention in Egypt of 168 BCE, assuming Qumran’s Daniel copies read the same as later Daniel mss. And there are Roman allusions in Peshar Habakkuk, Peshar Nahum, Peshar Hosea B (the ‘Lion of Wrath’), and the Damascus Document (the ‘head of the kings of the Greeks’). There is also 4Q333 with the name of Aemilius Scaurus, one of Pompey’s generals in Judea

(60s BCE). In other fragments there is an uncertain restoration of Gabinius, proconsul of Syria (50s BCE), and names of figures in relationship with the Romans (a certain reading of Peitholaus [c. 50s BCE]; a likely reading of Aristobulus II [67-49 BCE]).

In the three post-Daniel literary ‘sectarian’ texts just named (1QpHab, 4QpNah, CD), the Romans/‘head of the kings of the Greeks’ are an invincible power which destroys a wicked regime in Jerusalem (very different from earlier times when the Maccabees and Hasmonean rulers had treaties with Rome and Rome promised to assist them in their wars against the Seleucids). In these texts the Kittim/Romans are seen as acting as God’s agents just as the biblical texts regarded the Assyrian and Babylonian conquerors of old as God’s agents in punishing wicked regimes in Jerusalem. In the Damascus Document the figure carrying out divine punishment on the wicked regime is described neutrally without condemnation. In Peshar Habakkuk the Kittim/Romans are depicted as terrifying and horrible but, except for 5.4 (‘by means of his chosen ones God will judge all the nations’) there is little destruction or condemnation of the Kittim until the end in the form of a generic statement of divine judgment against idolatrous nations.

Peshar Nahum has stronger words regarding destruction of gentile powers in its earliest surviving column, 4QpNah 1-2 ii, which parallels the ending of Peshar Habakkuk. The word ‘Kittim’ is not attested or reasonably reconstructed in this column of 4QPeshar Nahum (contrary to most editions), but the surviving text does appear to reflect themes of ultimate destruction of the wicked ‘nations’ parallel to the ending of Peshar Habakkuk (Doudna 2001: 77-106, 267-314). In addition to this, a never-published note in the papers of the original editor of 4QPeshar Nahum, John Allegro, has the intriguing suggestion that there may be a pun on ‘wicked Rome’, *rwm’ ršy’h*, in the expression ‘height of wickedness’, *rwm rš’h*, at the column’s line 6 (Doudna 2001: 254).

So the theme of generic destruction of gentile powers in the end is present in these two pesharim. But there seems to be no sign that the text’s authors are acting to bring about the envisioned divine outcome. In the world of these texts Roman power will eventually be overthrown and replaced like all idolatrous gentile kingdoms after they have served their temporary purposes in the divine plan on earth. There is no *apology* for Roman power in these texts apart from a fatalistic acceptance of their divine role in destroying the text authors’ enemies. At the same time there are glimpses of rhetorical targeting of Rome in the first surviving column of Peshar Nahum and the final column of Peshar Habakkuk, though it seems curiously indirect, eschatological, and generic.

By the present analysis Peshar Habakkuk and Peshar Nahum, as well as Peshar Hosea B in parallel with the first two, and the Damascus Document, allude to the defeat of Antigonus Mattathias at the hands of the

Romans in 37 BCE. That is after Hyrcanus II is no longer high priest in Jerusalem. These texts are not evidence of anti-Roman sentiment in Qumran texts at the time Hyrcanus II was high priest, since they were composed after Hyrcanus II was high priest. It is not clear whether there are texts among the Qumran finds which testify to anti-Roman sentiment when Hyrcanus II was high priest. A conceivable case might possibly be 4QPesher Isaiah A, if it was situated c. 43 BCE in the context of Hyrcanus II's favoured general Malichus's intent to war against Cassius and become king, but this is uncertain (*War* 1.218-237; *Ant.* 14.271-296). Can the texts found at Qumran be distinguished from the kinds of texts priests loyal to Hyrcanus II would have produced?

~~ 41 ~~

Just as there is no anti-John Hyrcanus I and no anti-Alexander Jannaeus text among the Qumran finds, there is no anti-Hyrcanus II text either. In the one Qumran text in which Hyrcanus II appears by the name 'Hyrcanus', the fragmentary annal-like 4Q332 (formerly numbered 4Q322) at 2.6, he is termed by the title by which Josephus seems to suggest Hyrcanus II was addressed as an honorific much of his life: 'king' (even though he was not king). As noted correctly in the Vermes editions of the Dead Sea Scrolls in English following an accurate reading of Wacholder and Abegg (1991), the text reads 'Hyrcanus kin[g of ...]'. This noun phrase is attached to a 3rd masculine singular verb whose only visible letter is a final *bet* which could be 'returned'—all else is lost in lacunas. The reading is not, as published in the *editio princeps* DJD 36 edition of Fitzmyer, 'Hyrcanus rebelled' (*mr[d]*), with what some have argued are negative connotations attached to Hyrcanus II on the basis of that verb. Apart from 'king' (*ml[k]*) being the better reading, 'Hyrcanus rebelled' would be unusual in having an anomalous subject-verb (S-V) word order, instead of expected verb-subject (V-S) as appears to be the case in every other instance in this and related texts where this point can be checked (e.g. 1.4 and 2.4). The expression 'Hyrcanus king of (Israel presumably)' is either favorable or neutral to Hyrcanus II, but is certainly not negative.

~~ 42 ~~

During the later years of Hyrcanus II's high priesthood he was revered and influential throughout the eastern Mediterranean world and in the diaspora as the nation's most highly respected religious leader or lawgiver. Throughout Hyrcanus II's ups and downs as high priest during these turbulent decades he would have been the leading priest of the *yachad* groups, regarded as the moral authority, teacher, and lawgiver within the *yachad* groups scattered throughout the countryside, with all the respect and honor that the office of high priest meant. When Hyrcanus was deposed in 40 BCE he was taken from Judea in chains with the Parthians returning home, but there his situation improved.

When Hyrcanus was brought there, the Parthian king Phraates treated him very leniently because he had

learned of his distinguished and noble lineage. For this reason he released him from his bonds and permitted him to settle in Babylon, where there was a great number of Jews. These men honored Hyrcanus as their high priest and king, as did all of the Jewish nation occupying the region as far as the Euphrates. (*Ant.* 15.14-15)

According to this account significant numbers of Jews ('all of the Jewish nation occupying the region as far as the Euphrates') regarded the aged Hyrcanus II, mutilated and in exile though he may be, as their legitimate high priest. Perhaps they addressed him by titles reflecting this. Perhaps some in Judea did as well. Perhaps some wrote texts. Perhaps some of those texts have been found at Qumran.

~~ 43 ~~

Following the collapse of Antigonus's regime in 37 BCE and Herod's installation as king by Rome, Herod invited Hyrcanus II to return from exile to Judea, and Hyrcanus returned. As Josephus tells it, at first Herod outwardly honored Hyrcanus, but it was all a trap. Herod, after he had finished executing other Hasmonean potential threats, treacherously charged Hyrcanus with treason. There was a trial, and in 30 BCE, Hyrcanus II, now over eighty years old according to Josephus, was convicted and executed, an ignoble end to what Josephus portrays as a man of varied fortunes, betrayed by malevolent persons in whom he had too naively trusted. This is Josephus's epitaph of Hyrcanus II:

This, then, was the way in which Hyrcanus was fated to end his life after experiencing a lifetime of diverse and varied fortunes. At the very beginning of the reign of his mother Alexandra he was appointed high priest of the Jewish nation and held this office for nine years. After taking the throne on the death of his mother he held it for three months, but was driven from it by his brother Aristobulus. When it was restored to him later by Pompey, he received all his honours back and continued to enjoy them for forty years more. But he was deprived of them a second time by Antigonus, mutilated in body, and taken prisoner by the Parthians. From their country he returned to his own land some time later because of the hopes held out to him by Herod, but none of these was fulfilled in accordance with his expectations, after he had experienced much suffering in his lifetime. But what was most painful of all, as we have said before, was that in his old age he came to an unworthy end. For he seems to have been mild and moderate in all things and to have ruled by leaving most things for his administrators to do, since he was not interested in general affairs nor clever enough to govern a kingdom. That Antipater and Herod advanced so far was due to his mildness, and what he experienced at their hands in the end was neither just nor an act of piety. (*Ant.* 15.179-182)

Here is more of Hyrcanus II's ancient reputation:

Hyrkanus because of his mild character did not choose either then or at any other time to take part in public affairs or start a revolution, and he submitted to Fortune and appeared to be pleased with whatever she brought about ... Not even in his youth did he give a sign of boldness or recklessness. (*Ant.* 15.165, 177)

Gmirkin (2006: 40-71, 259-63) has argued that Diodorus of Sicily preserves an account of the Jewish high priesthood from Theophanes who accompanied Pompey to Syria and Judea in the 60s BCE. Gmirkin's analysis is convincing in light of the context of Theophanes' portrayal of and *apologia* for Pompey's actions in Judea (*contra* Grabbe 2008; response from Gmirkin 2013). This account, arguably a contemporary description of Hyrcanus II, reads:

Authority over the people [of the Jews] is regularly invested in whichever priest is regarded as superior by his colleagues in wisdom and virtue. They call this man the high priest and believe that he acts as a messenger to them of God's commandments. It is he, they say, who in their assemblies and gatherings announces what is ordained, and the Jews are so docile in such matters that straightway they fall to the ground and do reverence to the high priest when he expounds the commandments to them. (Diodorus Siculus, *Library* 40.3.5c-6a)

Compare this outsider's report of *emic* (insider) views of Hyrcanus II as high priest, with the *emic* (insider) portrayals of the Teacher of Righteousness in the world of the texts, who also is regarded as superior in wisdom and virtue. The *etic* (outsider) views of Hyrcanus II would be the historians' accounts Josephus gives in his history. It is important to compare *emic* (of the high priest Hyrcanus II) with *emic* (of the Teacher) views, for a true basis for analysis.

Perhaps a high priest in the temple in Jerusalem for over three decades might be remembered by fellow priests (who perhaps had assisted him in administration, speechwriting, liturgical compositions, and legal decisions) in terms something like the way the Teacher is remembered in the Damascus Document. Compare this from Yonder Gillihan's study of the Qumran Rule texts and civic associations:

A commonly cited analogy between the Covenanters and other voluntary associations is the veneration of a founding figure ... But the analogy has significant flaws ... Unlike founders of philosophical schools and voluntary associations, the Covenanters do not regard the Teacher as having created something new. Rather, as a divinely appointed agent acting on behalf of the entire people of Israel, he restored his generation's adherence to the Torah of Moses ... we may compare the depiction of the Teacher with portrayals of reformers, innovators, and restorers in Greek *politeiai*, such as the Aristotelian *Constitution of Athens*. Not one of these are described as having founded the *polis* or its

constitution. Instead, they are contributors to a centuries-long process by which democratic Athens attained its final constitutional form. Their reforms are described as appropriate for their age; nevertheless many of their innovations underwent further change through the reforms of later figures. Here we find another analogy to the Teacher: his establishment of an interim constitution for the Covenanters is not depicted as eternal in all of its details. Instead the statutes provide guidance 'for the age of evil,' before the restoration of Israel at the End of Days ... It thus seems that, like the Athenian statesmen, the Teacher's accomplishment is that he established exactly what his people needed at the time, a *foundation* of eternal truths, but not the final constitution of Israel. (Gillihan 2012: 157-9)

The figure the Qumran texts call the Teacher of Righteousness appears to read, very simply and with due allowance for imagination in the world of texts, as an *emic* or insiders' portrayal of the figure who was the contemporary high priest during the decades of the most intensive era of composition and scribal copying activity of the Qumran texts. When the priests of the texts, the priests writing the texts, extol their leading priest, this figure is Hyrcanus II. When Hyrcanus II lost his high priestly position through violence at the time of the Parthian invasion, the texts portray the one who overthrew him as the Wicked Priest. The priests of the texts at Qumran were priests for whom Hyrcanus II was *their* high priest, with all of the deep significance and honor that would have meant in the world of imagination and texts.

~~ 44 ~~

An analysis of an identification of the ancient authors' Teacher of Righteousness should not be affected by notions of what we today, far removed chronologically and culturally, might prefer or choose to admire. Yet despite the formal acceptance of this statement that every historian and scholar will grant, at the same time there is a romanticizing impulse in how the Teacher figure has been viewed to which scholars studying the Qumran materials have not been immune. Romanticized images of the Teacher, images of modern scholarly creation, may bring about cognitive dissonance when encountering a figure in history which practically by definition is going to be 'not what we expected'. There may even be an attachment on a certain emotional level to a romanticized view of an ethereal Teacher who remains invisible, outside of history, forever unknowable even by name.

~~ 45 ~~

Somewhere around this time, toward the end of the 1st century BCE, the lights go out completely in the texts in the caves at Qumran. It has long been noted that there is not a single name, event, ruler, battle, or allusion to anything later than the 1st century BCE in any of the texts found in the Qumran caves, nor indeed is any text known

to have been composed later than the 1st century BCE among the finds. Most scholars acknowledge this, but suppose that through seven decades of the 1st century CE until the First Revolt (66-70 CE), the inhabitants at Qumran chose not to write or collect a single new text in seventy years but copied hundreds of old texts from the previous century in contrast to not one from their own. Then (the theory goes) at the time of the First Jewish Revolt of 66-70 CE the residents of Qumran hid or abandoned these texts they had been copying and collecting entirely from the previous century. This makes no sense, yet without exaggeration this is what mainstream Qumran scholarship thinks happened. For reasons I discussed in 2006 in the Galor *et al.* Brown University Qumran archaeology conference volume it makes much better sense that all of the literary text deposits at Qumran were completed by the end of the 1st century BCE. There never was a First Revolt mass deposit or abandonment of texts at Qumran. That has been a chimera all this time which created the 1st century CE palaeographic dates for Qumran texts on the basis of itself and through which the rest of the relevant evidence has been filtered and interpreted.

~ ~ 46 ~ ~

In my 2006 article, I argued that most if not all of the cylindrical ‘scroll jars’ found in the buildings of Qumran of the same kind used with the scroll deposits in the caves were from the late 1st century BCE, and that none of the scrolls in the caves of Qumran can definitely be dated later than the end of the 1st century BCE. In light of the importance of these issues I would like to address two questions which have been raised concerning that article. First, it has been objected that my analysis disregards radiocarbon datings which have indicated 1st century CE Qumran text activity, specifically of 4Q266 Damascus Document^a and 4Q171 Peshier Psalms A. Both of those texts have been dated palaeographically to the 1st century BCE by Ada Yardeni, and 4Q266 D^a is widely considered the earliest copy of the Damascus Document. In my experience those who raise these two radiocarbon dates as evidence of 1st century CE Qumran text activity do not themselves believe these two texts actually were 1st century CE, yet nevertheless perceive these radiocarbon dates as evidence that others, but not these ones, were. Apart from the illogic, in a group of twenty or so radiocarbon dates from a common context such as the Qumran texts, it is difficult to determine whether outliers represent real information at the edges or are simply part of variation from statistics, in the absence of corroboration.

Ada Yardeni’s palaeographic date estimate for 4Q266 D^a is ‘to the first half or to the middle of the first century BCE’ (Baumgarten 1996: 26-30). In the case of 4Q171 Peshier Psalms A, Yardeni described that text as written by a scribe who ‘was one of the most prolific copyists active in Qumran in the late first century BCE’ (Yardeni 2007: 288-89). (Later, Yardeni characterized this scribe’s texts as typical of writing ‘generally to the first half of the

Herodian period, that is, the late first century BCE to the beginning of the first century CE’ [p. 298].) Two other texts identified by Yardeni as written by this same scribe have been radiocarbon dated (4Q267 D^b, MasapocrJosh). Both gave radiocarbon dates unambiguously 1st century BCE. No other text written by this scribe dated 1st century CE. 1QPeshier Habakkuk which is probably contemporary also radiocarbon dated 1st century BCE. (As George Brooke has put it, 4QpPs A and 1QpHab are ‘two texts of the same genre, in the same language, with the same formulae and the same vocabulary, probably from the same community, in the same place, at roughly the same time’ [1994: 345].) In light of this information it does not seem sound to uncritically assume an actual true date of 1st century CE for these two texts, 4Q266 D^a and 4Q171 Peshier Psalms A, on the basis of existing information.

There may however be more to these radiocarbon dates than simply a matter of correct interpretation of statistics. As brought out in a series of scientific papers by a collaboration involving radiocarbon labs in The Netherlands and Denmark, there is a possibility of a sample contamination issue in the 1994 Tucson radiocarbon datings of Dead Sea texts (Rasmussen *et al.* 2001; Rasmussen *et al.* 2003a [response to Carmi 2002]; Rasmussen *et al.* 2009). Two of our coauthors in the first two of these publications, original scroll editors Frank M. Cross and John Strugnell, reported that texts worked on in the Scrollery in the Palestine Archaeological Museum, now the Rockefeller Museum, in the 1950s involved use of castor oil in cleaning the fragments. Both reported the extent of use was significant. Cross recounted his concern when Qumran texts were being dated at Zurich that radiocarbon dates could be affected, and that he had communicated this concern to Magen Broshi. Meanwhile, the sample preparation protocol used on the Dead Sea texts (called ‘AAA’ in radiocarbon lab jargon, for acid-alkali-acid)—otherwise standard procedure and normally adequate—was subsequently proven not to be effective in removing castor oil, if such was present in the text sample to begin with. In this circumstance the lab would measure a radiocarbon age slightly offset toward modern from the text’s true date. (That is, the lab’s measurement of the age of the carbon would be accurate, but the carbon would not be entirely from the thing desired to be dated.) And castor oil, if present, cannot be seen in the samples under a microscope, which was the only means used to check most of the Qumran text samples for the presence of contamination.

Misunderstandings surround this issue. Some assume that the pretreatment or cleaning carried out by the Zurich and Tucson labs would have removed castor oil if it were present. For most contaminants that is correct, but it is not correct for castor oil. It is not correct in theory (i.e. in prediction of what would happen based on chemistry), and it has been proven incorrect experimentally, i.e. it has been proven that ‘AAA’ used to clean and prepare the text samples for radiocarbon dating is not capable of fully removing castor oil if it is present (Rasmussen *et al.*

2001). Some have assumed that the margin of error in reporting of the radiocarbon dates already includes allowance for contamination; that also is not correct. A third point has been raised by Magen Broshi, Curator of the Shrine of the Book at the Israel Museum from 1964 to 1994. Broshi has stated that no castor oil was used on texts in the Israel Museum's history (e.g. 1QIsa^a, 1QapGen, 1QH^a, 1QpHab, 11QT^a). Broshi also stated that no samples given for radiocarbon datings from texts in the Rockefeller Museum were contaminated with castor oil either:

This suspicion seems to be absolutely superfluous ... samples were taken from margins never touched by castor oil. Even if there were traces of oil they would have been eliminated by the pre-treatment. (Broshi 2004: 135).

In *all* cases the samples for dating were taken from the margins of each parchment/papyrus, where there was no writing and hence no intentional smearing with castor oil (Magen Broshi, personal communication 2002). The radiocarbon experts were aware of a possible problem, took care to do just this in collecting the samples. (Carmi 2002: 213)

Professors Cross and Strugnell, who were there, did not share Broshi's assessment that the concerns over castor oil on texts in the Rockefeller Museum were superfluous. Broshi's assurance of no potential exposure to contamination of the Rockefeller Museum text samples is unconvincing in light of testimony that the castor oil was used for cleaning and softening of entire fragments after taking pieces out of a humidifier, with the castor oil applied with a paintbrush to clean the marl clay off the parchment and make the pieces supple. This was necessary to enable the fragments to lay flat so they could be photographed and then placed in glass display cases. There is no known testimony or reason to suppose the margins were left untouched in the cleaning of fragments and the treatments to make the fragments supple. Since Broshi was not present in the Rockefeller Museum, his unsubstantiated statement carries no independent weight. On the separate issue of Broshi's additional claim that the pretreatment would have removed castor oil if it were present (see above), Broshi claimed to support that with a footnote to Carmi 2002. However Carmi's article nowhere makes or supports that claim. Nor did Broshi provide any other support for that claim.

Here is Joseph Fitzmyer:

I spent a year in the Scrollery, as they called it, in what was then called the Palestine Archaeological Museum. During the course of that year some of the fragments were cleaned with castor oil. That was something that was applied to some of those fragments in modern times, during the year 1957-58. (transcript of public oral comment of Fitzmyer, 12/16/92, Wise *et al.* 1994: 448)

Here is a diary entry from Edmund Wilson, the famous writer, dated April 14-17, 1954:

Working on Scrolls, Rockefeller Museum: fragments of leather scrolls (a few of parchment) like bits of autumn leaves under glass, ranging from dark brown to a rare, almost paperlike paleness. They put them in a humidifier (bell glasses and sponges), then go over them with a paintbrush dipped in castor oil or alcohol. When text too much effaced, they treated them with infrared rays and took reduced photographs of them, which they studied through a magnifying glass.—Only three were on it, Milik, Cross, Allegro, in a room by themselves; enormous concordances of the Septuagint. (Wilson 1986: 235)

The castor oil was applied to enable the fragments to be spread out flat without cracking: 'Reed (1972) noted the use of castor oil applied either "neat" (undiluted) or with an organic solvent to increase the flexibility of parchment documents' (Caldararo 1995: 29). And here is Hershel Shanks reporting from Professor Cross. Because of the insights this gives concerning the procedures in the Rockefeller Museum it is worth quoting at length.

Cross has described the Cave 4 fragments as they came into scholarly hands. 'Many fragments are so brittle or friable that they can scarcely be touched with a camel's hair brush. Most are warped, crinkled or shrunken, crusted with soil chemicals, blackened by moisture and age ... Often a fragment will exhibit an area of acute decay and shrinkage ... The bad spot may draw the entire fragment into a crinkled or scalloped ball, so that the fragment is almost impossible to flatten. The script in such an area of decay may be shrunk to half or less the size of that in good areas. Often such decomposition in sheets of leather has caused splitting and fragmentation.' Cross recalls one dark, illegible fragment encrusted with yellow crystals that appeared to be dried urine. With castor oil and a camel's-hair brush he carefully cleaned the fragment, slowly removing the encrustation. Gradually, the Hebrew letters began to appear. It turned out to be a fragment from the biblical book of Samuel ... After initial cleaning, the fragments were photographed, often repeatedly in various stages of reconstruction, by a remarkable Arab photographer named Najib Albina, who worked for the Palestine Archaeological Museum. Using infrared film, Albina was often able to bring out features that could not be seen with the naked eye. Even in the case of the legible scrolls, Albina's photographs were far easier to read than the fragments themselves, to which scholars would turn only to clarify a questionable reading or an illegible passage ... During the 1956 Sinai campaign, Jordanian authorities feared that the museum and its scrolls might fall into Israeli hands. As a precaution, the scroll fragments were packed up in boxes, shipped to Amman, and stored in the basement of the Ottoman Bank, where dampness had a devastating effect on some of the more fragile scrolls. When they were returned to Jerusalem after the

war, many had mildewed and almost all had to be re-cleaned ... (Shanks 1999: 43-45)

Of the 18 Dead Sea texts dated by Tucson in the 1994 series, 13 had been worked on in the Rockefeller Museum in the 1950s (4Q22, 4Q171, 4Q208, 4Q249, 4Q258, 4Q266, 4Q267, 4Q317, 4Q342, 4Q344, 4Q345, 4Q521, XHev/Se 8a Kefar Baru [= Milik's 'Kefar Bebayou']). The reason I think the issue of contamination affecting radiocarbon datings of texts which had been worked on in the Scrollery at the Rockefeller Museum may not be simply hypothetical is based on analysis of two specific cases among these thirteen. The first is the Kefar Baru document. The Kefar Baru document is the only one of three internally dated documentary texts dated at Tucson which had been worked on in the Rockefeller Museum. The Kefar Baru document was published in 1957 by Józef Milik, who used and taught his colleagues in the Scrollery to use castor oil on the texts. The radiocarbon age measured at Tucson on the Kefar Baru document is visibly offset toward modern from its true date (the true date is known from a date formula on the document):

Kefar Baru (= Milik 'Kefar Bebayou') pap Contract ar
At 68% confidence: 237-340 CE
At 95% confidence: 140-390 CE
True date: 135 CE

(The radiocarbon dates I am quoting are from calibrations I published in Doudna 1998 which in most cases moved dates a few calendar years younger than originally reported, though the differences are minor. In the original publication of the Tucson radiocarbon dates the calibration then in use also had the entire 2-sigma range offset toward modern outside of the true date [144-370 CE at 95% confidence]. The original lab publications of the Zurich and Tucson datings are Bonani *et al.* 1992 and Jull *et al.* 1995 respectively.)

The other two documentary texts dated at Tucson gave radiocarbon dates in agreement with the true dates (both well within the 2-sigma 95% confidence ranges, just off one end of 1-sigma 68% confidence). Two out of the three internally dated documents at Tucson dated accurately, but one of the three was significantly offset toward modern, the one worked on by Milik the castor oil user in the Rockefeller Museum. It could be coincidence. It is hard to say for sure. But it looks consistent with a possible castor oil effect. Here are the radiocarbon dates on the other two documentary texts dated at Tucson for comparison:

5/6Hev 21 pap Purchase of a Date Crop gr
At 95% confidence: 80-389 CE
At 68% confidence: 132-324 CE
True date: 130 CE

5/6Hev 19 pap Deed of Gift gr
At 95% confidence: 84-322 CE
At 68% confidence: 131-240 CE
True date: 128 CE

(Remember that in reading a radiocarbon date the true date should be regarded as equally possible throughout the entire confidence range reported, not more likely in the middle.)

The second case is 4Q171 Peshar Psalms A, written by the prolific scribe previously noted, whose scribal work has now been radiocarbon dated three times, according to Ada Yardeni's identifications of texts produced by this scribe (Yardeni 2007):

4Q171 Peshar Psalms A (dated at Tucson)
At 68% confidence: 29-81 CE
At 95% confidence: 3-126 CE
True date: ?

Same scribe, MasapocrJosh (dated at Zurich)
At 68% confidence: 166-49 BCE
At 95% confidence: 196-2 BCE
True date: ?

Same scribe, 4Q267 Damascus Document^b (dated at Tucson)
At 68% confidence: 168-51 BCE
At 95% confidence: 198-3 BCE
True date: ?

The radiocarbon date of 4Q171 is offset toward modern from the other two. These texts, identified as written by the same scribe by Ada Yardeni, should yield contemporary radiocarbon dates. I asked Yardeni if she still retained confidence that the scribes of 4Q171 and 4Q267 were identical. Yardeni's reply (quoted with permission):

I still believe these manuscripts were written by the same hand, perhaps with a time interval between the various manuscripts in which some changes may have occurred, deliberately or not. However, so far there is no real scientific method which can enable the identification of scribes on the basis of their hands. Therefore, I cannot prove scientifically my identification of the scribe, which took into account only a limited number of parameters and was based on my drawings of the letters, concluding that the common features of the script attested in these manuscripts indicate a common hand. In my book [*The Book of Hebrew Script*] I offered a method which could perhaps help in palaeographic analysis of handwritings and I hope that this method will some day be programmed for a computer, and solve questions of this kind. In any case, the number of common features of these manuscripts is large enough to indicate they were copied by one and the same person. (Ada Yardeni, email, 1/27/13)

But the radiocarbon date of 4Q171 Peshar Psalms A is inconsistent with the radiocarbon dates of the other two texts of Yardeni's prolific scribe (4Q267, MasapocrJosh). The measurements are too far apart to be explained in terms of statistical variation of two datings of

contemporary texts. Either there is an error in the scribe identification, or there is a problem in the radiocarbon date on 4Q171. Unless these texts actually are decades apart in their true dates, this appears to be a second case consistent with a possible castor oil effect. 4Q171 Peshar Psalms A was worked on in the Scroller by John Allegro, who also wrote of the use of castor oil. On the other hand, in light of the close agreement of the radiocarbon dates on the two other texts of the 'prolific scribe', the presumption would be that the radiocarbon date of 4Q267 is uncontaminated and clean.

A third text from the same group of thirteen dated at Tucson, 4Q258 Community Rule^d, for sure had a contamination problem. The lab measured a 2nd-3rd century CE date on this one, which because it was unexpected was redated from a second sample cut from a different part of the same text and the late date not replicated, confirming contamination. The unusual dating of 4Q258 has been thought to be due to glue (unrelated to castor oil) because the lab reported they saw visible glue on this sample as well as five other samples, prior to pretreatment. The Tucson lab took extra measures to remove the glue until it was no longer visible under a microscope. Yet despite the Tucson lab believing all the glue had been removed—they did not report any glue remaining, and it is difficult to believe they would have knowingly dated a sample with visible glue remaining—the radiocarbon date still came out unusual. The nature of the contaminant, though it is assumed to be residual glue even though they thought they had gotten it all, is not confirmed. The dates on the two samples from this text:

First sample 4Q258 Community Rule^d

At 68% confidence: 133-237 CE

At 95% confidence: 129-255 CE

True date: ?

Second sample 4Q258 Community Rule^d

At 68% confidence: 36 BCE-81 CE

At 95% confidence: 50 BCE-130 CE

True date: ?

A fourth case out of the group of thirteen of possible interest might be 4Q521 Messianic Apocalypse. This text, written in a 'formal Hasmonian' script, was given a palaeographic date estimate of between 100 and 80 BCE ('dans le premier quart de 1er s., entre 100 et 80' [Puech 1992: 480]). The radiocarbon date:

4Q521 Messianic Apocalypse

At 68% confidence: 39 BCE-66 CE

At 95% confidence: 49 BCE-116 CE

True date: ?

Is the palaeographic date estimate of 4Q521 offset toward ancient from the text's true date? Or is the radiocarbon date offset toward modern from the true date?

Finally, a fifth among the group of thirteen, the previously mentioned 4Q266 D^a, commonly cited by Qumran text scholars as the earliest copy of the Damascus Document, is characterized by Yardeni as 'a semi-cursive hand ... should be dated to the first half or to the middle of the first century BCE' (Baumgarten 1996: 26-30). Its radiocarbon date:

4Q266 Damascus Document^a

At 68% confidence: 4-82 CE

At 95% confidence: 44 BCE-129 CE

True date: ?

Is the palaeographic date estimate of 4Q266 offset toward ancient from this text's true date? Is the radiocarbon date offset toward modern from the true date?

Out of the thirteen Rockefeller Museum texts dated at Tucson, two raise questions of possible contamination affecting their datings for reasons explained (Kefar Baru, 4Q171). In the absence of a better explanation, the hypothesis that needs to be excluded is that those two datings illustrate a castor oil contamination effect. A third case, while it was clearly contaminated, cannot clearly be attributed to castor oil (4Q258). The fourth and fifth cases among the thirteen in themselves would be ambiguous if evaluated individually, yet in light of the existence of the stronger cases could be additional, if weaker, signals of datings offset toward modern consistent with a possible castor oil effect (4Q266, 4Q521).

On the one hand there is no hard evidence any dates among the thirteen Rockefeller Museum texts dated at Tucson were contaminated, except for the one that was rechecked and found to be contaminated (4Q258). Since none of the others were rechecked, there was no possibility to have such evidence come to light in the other cases. In the absence of hard evidence, I have presented an indirect argument from appearances and inferences, which may ultimately be confirmed or disconfirmed. On the other hand, with the exception of 4Q267 D^b for the reason noted, there is no evidence that other texts among the thirteen were not contaminated, since no test or check was done capable of identifying the presence of castor oil in the samples, no procedure was used capable of removing it if it was present, and the datings were not corroborated in any other way. It is not even excluded that castor oil, and not glue, was the cause of the contamination of 4Q258, because that was not checked either. In the worst case, the situation with the Qumran text radiocarbon dates at present could be one in which the greater number of dates are accurate within reported confidence levels and error margins (these would be the dates on samples which were uncontaminated to begin with), but among the Rockefeller Museum texts may be 'salted' an unknown incidence of radiocarbon dates affected by contamination giving dates slightly offset toward modern. It bears repeating that the issue of contamination is entirely distinct from evaluation of the statistical nature of radiocarbon dates.

It also must be emphasized that the problem is not with the radiocarbon method, or with the reporting of confidence levels or error margins, but with sample contamination. The solution is not to assume greater margins of error on all dates, or to conclude radiocarbon dating is not useful, but rather to solve the sample contamination problem (Rasmussen *et al.* 2009). The bottom line is that the existence of texts produced as late as the 1st century CE among the Qumran finds has not been confirmed on the basis of existing radiocarbon information. However, if such texts do exist, in the absence of other conclusive evidence radiocarbon dating remains the best means of finding out. In a recent article Emanuel Tov discussed radiocarbon dating and the castor oil issue and commented: ‘this discussion is important, since C-14 examinations are very significant for scroll research. A[mir] Masic [of the University of Turin] has developed a new technique to identify such oil ... C-14 examinations should be continued as a useful tool for dating in spite of the uncertainty regarding the contamination of castor oil’ (Tov 2011b: 8, 24).

The Tucson lab struggled in some cases with inadequate amount of sample to carry out procedures they would have liked to have done. I remember their expressions of frustration over this point at the time. That said, it remains that the protocol used by the Zurich lab appears to have been superior to that which was done at Tucson, notably Zurich’s use of ultrasound battering on all samples, partly effective in mechanically dislodging castor oil if present, which was not reported done on most Tucson samples; and split-sample dating with different preparation procedures as a way to diagnose the presence of contamination, not done at Tucson. Yet in light of what is now known, neither lab’s protocol was fully sufficient in retrospect. I am told that the situation with the Dead Sea Scrolls is indeed an unusual case. The contamination issue combined with the fragility of the sample material which easily dissolves in solvents creates special challenges. Nevertheless my understanding is that solutions, real solutions, are well within the existing capabilities of the top tier of radiocarbon labs in the world, in building upon the lessons learned from the first two series, and I hope this will be done.

~~ 47 ~~

The other main objection which has been raised to my 2006 article on the dating of the scroll deposits is a statement of Kenneth Atkinson in a review of the Brown University conference volume that ‘[Rachel Bar-Nathan’s] finding that most of the pottery from the scroll caves, with the exception of isolated Cave 1 vessels, dates to the first century C.E. (277), poses a significant challenge to Doudna’s thesis and his interpretation of her findings’ (Atkinson 2008). Notwithstanding my immense respect for Bar-Nathan on every other aspect of her work, this point of Bar-Nathan is not supported by her own pottery publication and relies upon an idiosyncratic interpretation that virtually no other archaeologist accepts. Let me explain. The vast bulk of the pottery in

the scroll-bearing caves around Qumran consists of the scroll jars themselves and the bowls used as their lids. At Jericho all of these—without exception—are dated late 1st century BCE, in the time of Herod, in Bar-Nathan’s Jericho volume (2002). According to Bar-Nathan none of the jars of the cylindrical types associated with the scrolls or the bowls used as their lids were found at Jericho in the 1st century CE. At Qumran most if not all of the cylindrical scroll jars, and most if not all of the bowl lids, also are dated to the late 1st century BCE according to very conventional current datings of de Vaux’s finds at Qumran, in agreement with Bar-Nathan’s finds at Jericho. Bar-Nathan however gives a confusing and conflicting assessment of the scroll jar datings found in Qumran’s buildings. In the Brown University conference volume Bar-Nathan says, ‘several [scroll jars] were found at Qumran in contexts associated by de Vaux with Periods Ib and II ... According to de Vaux, cylindrical jars were found in Period Ib and II contexts at Qumran. However, the revised chronology of Period Ib dates these cylindrical jars [at Qumran] to the post 31 B.C.E. phase (i.e., between 31 and ca. 9/8 B.C.E.). ... The cylindrical type [at Jericho] develops during the period of Herod the Great, i.e., sometime between 31 and 4 B.C.E.’ (Bar-Nathan 2006b: 275). That seems straightforward: the scroll jars are in use at Qumran in the time of Herod the Great.

But then a few sentences later Bar-Nathan changes that, switches all of the Qumran scroll jars in the buildings later, without explanation, entirely out of the reign of Herod the Great into the 1st century CE: ‘As mentioned above, comparison with the jars of Jericho and Qumran indicate that the ovoid shape ... is characteristic of the period of the Hasmoneans and Herod the Great whereas the cylindrical shape ... appears first at Jericho during Herod’s reign and at Qumran and Masada in the first century C.E.’ (*ibid.*: 275). A few sentences later, citing an analogy with Masada far to the south she has all of the scroll jars found in the Qumran caves dated to the 8-year period 66-74 CE: ‘The great similarity between the jars of Masada dating to the period of the Great Revolt (66-73/4 C.E.) and in particular those of the Qumran caves permits us to narrow the date of the Qumran scroll jars to the years of the Great Revolt, that is between 66-68 and 74 C.E.’ (*ibid.*: 275). In the next sentence Bar-Nathan claims that the rest of the pottery in the scroll-bearing caves other than the scroll jars also is 1st century CE: ‘Analysis of pottery from the Qumran caves shows that it, too, does not antedate the first century C.E.’. In her conclusion section, she restates this and now adds that the scroll jars in the caves are not necessarily connected with the site of Qumran: ‘The pottery evidence indicates that the use of the caves around Qumran does not predate the time of Herod the Great. In fact, except for isolated vessels in Cave 1, most of the pottery from the caves dates to the first century C.E.; more specifically, to the days of the Great Revolt, between 66 and 73/4 C.E. ... there is no necessary link between the jars found in the caves and those found at the site’ (*ibid.*: 277).

In her Masada volume Bar-Nathan elaborates further: speaking of Qumran, she says, ‘on the basis of the pottery, the cave [*sic*] is dated 66-73/74 C.E., whereas according to Humbert (2003), the site was destroyed and its population dispersed ca. 60 C.E. It therefore seems that there is no correlation between the pottery in the caves and the Qumran settlement’ (Bar-Nathan 2006a: 71). In other words Bar-Nathan sees *all* of the cave scroll jar activity around Qumran as within the years 66-74 CE and *none* of it related to the makers and users of the numerous and identical scroll jars from decades earlier found at the buildings of Qumran. That is the specific basis for Bar-Nathan’s characterization that nearly all of the pottery in the scroll-bearing caves is 1st century CE. It happens that with the scroll jars in Cave 1 were found two lamps of a type dated by Bar-Nathan exclusively to the time of Herod the Great—late 1st century BCE—at both Jericho and Qumran (‘at Jericho, J-LP3 is found in contexts dated to Herod’s reign’ [2002: 111]). To me, these lamps in Cave 1 date the scroll deposit activity in Cave 1 to the time of Herod. As Robert Donceel, who worked on the de Vaux excavation materials, noted in the conclusion of a study he carried out showing that those two Cave 1 lamps were manufactured from the same workshop as other lamps of the same kind found at Qumran, all dated late 1st century BCE: ‘If these observations reinforce the hypothesis, dictated otherwise by simple likelihood, of a relationship between the site and the nearby caves, they nevertheless attest that this relationship was at a time well before the events which resulted in the capture of the site by the Romans and then Jerusalem and the destruction of the temple’ (Donceel 1998: 104 [my trans.]). Since the scrolls and pottery in Cave 1 are similar in kind to those of the other scroll-bearing caves, what is indicated for one cave suggests the era of the scroll deposits of all of the caves. The only basis for considering Bar-Nathan’s dating of most of the pottery in the scroll-bearing caves to 66-74 CE a serious objection to my 2006 analysis is if one accepts the thesis that the scroll jars in the Qumran caves should be dated contemporary to uses at Masada, instead of contemporary to uses at Qumran. Finally, as concerns the Masada scroll jars, Bar-Nathan’s reason for dating the Qumran cave jars so late, David Stacey, coauthor of the present volume, has informed me that in his opinion all of the fragments of scroll jars at Masada cited by Bar-Nathan as from Zealot/First Revolt contexts originated in the stores of Herod the Great at that site and are either residual or evidence of reuse.

~~ 48 ~~

In addition, I have been involved in the publication of radiocarbon datings on ten linen wrappings associated with scrolls and/or the jars used with the scroll deposits from four of the scroll-bearing caves at Qumran, from Caves 1, 4, 8, and 11. Every single one of these ten radiocarbon dates is significantly earlier than a radiocarbon dating (20 BCE-70 CE at 68% confidence) on a charred linen sample from locus 96 at the site of Qumran that may have been burnt in the fire of c. 68 CE.

Nine out of the ten from the caves had more of their possibility ranges in the 1st century BCE than the 1st century CE, and the tenth one was almost evenly divided being only slightly more in the 1st century CE side (Rasmussen *et al.* 2006a). The sheer number and consistency of these datings also appear suggestive to me of a focus on the late 1st century BCE as the era of the text deposits in the caves.

~~ 49 ~~

A large number of Qumran texts have been reported dated to the 1st century CE on the basis of palaeographic analysis and comparisons with script charts prepared by Frank Cross in 1961, and supported and illustrated in Ada Yardeni’s beautiful book, *The Book of Hebrew Script* (Yardeni 2010). But the validity of these 1st century CE dates of scribal copying claimed for many Qumran texts is subject to question. I quote from my discussion in the 2006 Galor *et al.* Brown University conference volume:

Many today think that some Qumran texts have been independently dated to as late as the first century C.E. by paleography. But, in fact, those who defined the absolute datings of the formal scribal hands of the Qumran texts ... did so based on the assumption that the Qumran cave texts ended c. 70 C.E., which was assumed to be an external checkpoint, an independent archaeological fact. That is how Qumran texts came to be as late as the first century C.E. paleographically. It is one hundred percent circular reasoning, as the following brief historical sketch will make clear ... However, external data has not cooperated with this construction, which is derived from the First Revolt premise. In 1961, Cross reported that semicursive hands from as late as the first century C.E. are entirely missing from the Qumran texts (they never existed in the Qumran texts to begin with) [Cross 1961: 188]. And in 1997, Yardeni argued that a tiny handful of first century C.E. true cursive hands among the 4Q texts have nothing to do with Qumran (that is, those 4Q texts indeed are first century C.E., but they are not from Qumran) [Cotton and Yardeni 1997]. Today the chronologically floating formal hands are all that remain among the Qumran finds which are still generally believed to run as late as the first century C.E. ... The first century C.E. dating of the Qumran text deposits is a classic example of a mistaken scholarly paradigm filtering subsequent perception of data (archaeological, paleographic, and radiocarbon), creating illusions of independent corroboration ... (Doudna 2006: 152-54)

It appears that actual scribal writing in formal hands in Judea of the 1st century CE prior to the First Revolt is what Cross labeled in his script charts ‘post-Herodian’. Some may be unaware that to some extent this has already begun to be recognized. Cross illustrated ‘post-Herodian’ c. 75-100 CE in his script charts with a line of letters from 5/6HevPs, a Psalms scroll from Nahal Hever. This Psalms scroll from Nahal Hever was characterized

by Cross as later than the latest Qumran texts. Since Cross assumed that the scribal hands of the Qumran texts came to an end c. 70 CE, Cross determined the Psalms scroll from Nahal Hever was c. 75-100 CE, and that the writing of that text was illustrative of the writing of Judean scribes c. 75-100 CE (Cross 1961: 139, Fig. 2, line 9; 1998: Pl. 10, line 9). The Nahal Hever Psalms scroll is the only example Cross gives in his script charts for c. 75-100 CE. Ada Yardeni, meanwhile, has a discussion of the Nahal Hever Psalms scribe's writing and describes it as 'from the early 2nd century [CE]' (Yardeni 2010: 144-47, and Fig. 170).

But the Nahal Hever Psalms scroll has been convincingly argued to predate the First Revolt (Bouzard 2003), and the Nahal Hever Psalms scroll is dated in DJD 38 by its editor, Peter Flint, to c. 50-68 CE (Flint 2000: 143). The Nahal Hever Psalms scroll appears to be an actual example of 1st century CE writing in a formal hand prior to the First Revolt—writing which Cross considered typologically more developed than all of the scribal hands of the Qumran texts. Bouzard argued for dating the other biblical manuscripts from Nahal Hever/Wadi Seiyal to pre-First Revolt as well (Bouzard 2003: 333-35), and these earlier datings are also reflected in DJD 38 for several other Nahal Hever biblical texts published by Peter Flint. In this light the Nahal Hever biblical texts become actual 1st century CE pre-First Revolt scribal writing in the Herodian formal sequence.

A disappearance of the 1st century CE from the Qumran textual horizon might have less repercussions on the current palaeographic dating system than it may seem. Essentially all palaeographic datings with BCE dates could remain the same. 'Early Herodian' formal, usually considered c. 30 BCE-20 CE, might become for Qumran texts, say c. 50 BCE—?, with little change there. That leaves only the statistically fewer Qumran texts in developed 'middle Herodian' and 'late Herodian' formal scribal hands. In those cases it can be considered those could be from the time of Herod, such that that is the only significant change, a change that affects a relatively small percentage of the total texts and does not necessitate larger repercussions in principle.

There is no reason to suppose all scribes in Judea phased out one style of their way of writing, say 'early Herodian', before changing simultaneously in lockstep unison to adopting another kind of writing, say 'late Herodian'. That is a rather mystical view of how palaeographical development likely worked. Rather than smooth development of the formal hands in all scribes simultaneously we should think rather in terms of pluralism, punctuated equilibrium, and contemporary differences in master scribes and their apprentices.

There is no reason why 'early Herodian' and 'late Herodian' cannot have been contemporary. Historical linguists know that language change happens more rapidly in cities, and that rural areas are more conservative with language change, with rural children

continuing to grow up using older forms abandoned in urban settings. Although palaeography is not the same, there may nevertheless be an analogy, in which new typological developments need not immediately displace older ones. All that needs to be supposed is that the school of writing called 'late Herodian' was not something that appeared in a brief blip mysteriously affecting every scribe in Judea for the same brief 2-3 decade period just before the First Revolt, as some Qumran scholars have seemed to think. Rather, 'late Herodian' might have begun at some point in the time of Herod, say in some progressive state-of-the-art scribal workshop in Jerusalem under a new master's training. In this scenario this new 'late Herodian' writing, which actually begins in the reign of Herod, does not displace the 'early Herodian' writing of other scribes, but occurs simultaneously with 'early Herodian'.

All of the 'late Herodian' Qumran texts, by this analysis, would be from the time of Herod, and no other classes of palaeographic datings need in principle be affected. If this were the true dating of the Qumran 'late Herodian' texts, it would be predicted that radiocarbon dates on this class of texts would not average later than the time of Herod. In fact only one Qumran text characterized as 'late Herodian' has been radiocarbon dated to the present day, and that radiocarbon date range centers in the 1st century BCE very compatible with the time of Herod. This was XJoshua, published by James Charlesworth in DJD 38, 'an example of the late Herodian formal bookhand (40 BCE-68 CE, most likely near the end of the range)' (2000: 234). The radiocarbon date of this text was reported at 68% confidence as 86 BCE-49 CE, and at 95% confidence as 165 BCE-76 CE. While this lone radiocarbon date in itself does not exclude a true date of c. 50-68 CE for XJoshua out at one end of the 2-sigma range, five or ten radiocarbon dates such as this on 'late Herodian' Qumran texts, if they came in the same, instead of just this one on this class of text, would be a very different matter.

An example of 'first century A.D.' writing (according to Cross) turned up on a Locus 89 bowl at Qumran in an archaeological context that de Vaux reported was Period Ib (late 1st century BCE), decades before such writing supposedly existed in Cross's system. At first Cross and Milik argued de Vaux's archaeological dating must be in error, because of their palaeographic dating. But in 1961 Cross reported that de Vaux had talked to him and had explained the basis for the 1st century BCE archaeological dating of the Locus 89 pottery, and that de Vaux's explanation had sounded reasonable. This caused a perplexed but honest Cross to say that if the Locus 89 bowls really were from Period Ib, then the actual dates for typological developments in the Herodian formal hands might be systematically a little earlier than he had published for them (Cross 1961: 190 fn 9). To grasp the significance of this, Cross was not saying the palaeographic dating of that particular item might be in error or need to be adjusted. Cross was saying the palaeographic dating of all—all—1st century CE scribal

hands in the Herodian formal series could be systematically affected, potential cause for modification of *all* 1st century CE palaeographic datings of Qumran texts to a little earlier. Few today question de Vaux's correctness on the archaeological dating of the Locus 89 bowls to 1st century BCE (although it is now generally agreed that de Vaux's Period Ib goes to the end of the 1st century BCE, about two or three decades later than de Vaux thought it ended). The dating of the Qumran Locus 89 bowls to the late 1st century BCE is adhered to by, for example, Jodi Magness (2004: 44 fn 10), as well as David Stacey in the present volume. If there ever was any question on the dating of the Locus 89 bowls, the publication in 2002 of the pottery from Hasmonean Jericho by Rachel Bar-Nathan would seem to have settled that question: Bar-Nathan reported that the exact kind of bowls found in large quantity at Qumran's Locus 89 were also found in large numbers at Jericho, and all were 1st century BCE. Because of the importance of the point, here is Bar-Nathan quoted in full:

J-BL5 [the bowl type of Qumran Locus 89] first appeared in Jericho in the later stages of the Hasmonean palace complex and continued into the Herodian I period [c. 31-15 BCE], especially in Building FB1. J-BL5 may have developed toward the second quarter of the first century B.C.E.; however, no example was found in the early stages of the Hasmonean palace complex at Jericho. Of particular interest is the resemblance of the Jericho bowls, especially those from the Twin Palaces and Building FB1, to examples from Qumran (Locus 89) where 708 bowls were recovered. It could well be that this kind of bowl was produced by pottery workshops of the Jericho and Dead Sea region. In view of the absence of this bowl from first-century C.E. contexts at Jericho, the dating of the material from Qumran Period II might have to be revised. (Bar-Nathan 2002: 89)

Despite this, the analysis of Cross in his 1961 footnote remains as ignored today as when he wrote it in 1961. The question is: will Qumran text scholars—now that the palaeographic datings of Qumran texts have been set into print and frozen for all time (so to speak)—follow the counsel of Cross in his last words below? Here are the words of the late Professor Cross in 1961, words which call for response from scholars who intend to continue to recommend uncritical reliance on the 1st century CE palaeographic datings of Qumran texts.

A graffito on a bowl from locus 86/89, reading 'l'zr, has already been a subject of some dispute although the piece is unpublished. According to de Vaux, the piece comes from the destruction of Qumran at the end of Period Ia [*sic*]; Milik has argued both on archaeological grounds and on palaeographical that the bowl belongs to Period II (ca. A.D. 1—68). The writer, unlike de Vaux and Milik, was not present when the deposit was excavated, but for palaeographical reasons has sided with Milik (*ALQ*, p. 48, n. 21). In the summer of 1958, however, Père de Vaux kindly reviewed the

archaeological data and went over the pottery associated with the inscribed bowl with the writer. De Vaux's case is strong, and it appears that the graffito, despite its Herodian tendencies (inverted-'v' 'alef; large-based *lamed*; large 'ayn, lying on its right leg; curved *zayn*, with distinct suggestion of extension of the head to the right; and broad *resh*), must be placed tentatively at the end of Period Ib (ca. 31 B.C.), rather than in the first century of the Christian era. A final decision on the context of the graffito must await full publication of the excavations at Hirbet Qumran. Meanwhile, the possibility should be borne in mind that the minimal dates in our absolute chronology for shifts of certain letter forms (notably *zayn*) to full-blown Herodian styles may be slightly low. (Cross 1961: 190 fn 9)

In short, the 1st century BCE dating of the Locus 89 bowl at Qumran is not in any serious question, and the archaeologists' dating of the bowl to the late 1st century BCE has been corroborated by the finds at Jericho. Yet the implications of Cross's reasonable statement above have never been taken seriously. There is no non-circular argument calling for dating the literary texts found in the caves of Qumran later than the end of the 1st century BCE.

~~ 50 ~~

Another line of analysis concerns a comparison of the character of the biblical texts at the Judean desert sites. Emanuel Tov describes the biblical texts found at Qumran: 'the Qumran proto-Masoretic texts are less similar to the medieval tradition than those found at Masada' (Tov 2004: 321). Tov has repeated this descriptive observation many times, e.g.: 'the texts of the three sites [Naḥal Hever, Murabba'at, Masada] are nearly identical to the consonantal text of the Masoretic text, even more so than the "protomasoretic" texts of Qumran' (Tov 1997: 218 [my trans.]); 'all the proto-Masoretic texts from Qumran (57) are somewhat removed from the medieval text, while those from the other find-sites in the Jordan Desert are identical to the medieval text' (Tov 2011a: 9). In the last article of Tov just cited, Tov discusses sympathetically the suspicions of the editor of 4QGen^b in DJD 12, James Davila, that an apparent Qumran exception, 4QGen^b, is actually from Murabba'at and was mistakenly identified as from Qumran (Davila 1994).

Earlier, Shemaryahu Talmon had reported the same observation ('the Masada biblical fragments witness to the existence of a stabilized proto-masoretic textual tradition. ... In contrast, the textual fluidity, which can be observed in the Qumran scrolls and fragments of biblical books and bible-related works, which stem from the last centuries B.C.E., proves that these manuscripts were not subjected to such a stabilizing process' [Talmon 1999: 25]).

Ian Young has built on these observations and strengthened their validity with tables of data based on counts of variants of biblical texts from Dead Sea sites compared to the medieval Leningrad Codex (the oldest surviving complete Masoretic codex) which he used as a standard for the counts (Young 2002, 2005, 2013). Both Tov and Young agree on the facts: a significant difference between the character of the biblical manuscripts at the sites, with the MT-like Qumran texts being less in agreement with MT than those found at Masada and Nahal Hever and the other Dead Sea sites. To be clear, Young in his studies actually does bring out several additional cases among Qumran texts, notably 4QDeut^a and a couple of others, which he found did agree exactly with medieval MT, not noted by Tov, but Young notes that the suspicion that 4QGen^b is not from Qumran could raise questions concerning the several other cases of exact MT-agreement he found in 4Q biblical texts, given that those texts are unverified archaeologically or from photographs as having come from Qumran's Cave 4 (Young 2005: 84-85, 91). Tov meanwhile found that 4QGen^b is the only exception in 57 Qumran MT-class biblical texts with enough preserved to do analysis, out of 127 total (Tov 2011a: 9-10). Tov and Young are in full agreement that the Qumran MT texts differ in character from the consistently exact-MT biblical texts found at the other Dead Sea sites (about 25 biblical texts total at the other Dead Sea sites, without exception exact-MT). In the cases of Masada and now Nahal Hever, those biblical texts are pre-First Revolt. (As previously noted, the Nahal Hever biblical texts are now also believed to be pre-First Revolt [Flint 2000; Bouzard 2003].)

From this agreement on the data Tov and Young then differ in interpretation of the meaning of this data. For Tov, the ending of the Qumran texts at the First Revolt is a given verity (presumably in his view established on other grounds). The difference in the character of the biblical texts reflected at Qumran from those of all of the other Dead Sea sites is therefore necessarily to be explained within the conventional dating presuppositions. Tov explains the differences in the biblical texts found at Qumran and Masada as due to differences in collecting groups which were 'not chronological, but socio-religious' (Tov 2010: 174-80 ['the Masada texts (copied between 50 BCE and 30 CE) are not later than the Qumran texts ... The difference between the sites is therefore not chronological, but socio-religious ... During the same period, we thus find a stable text tradition at Masada and the other sites (M) and textual fluidity at Qumran (M-like and other texts)']).

Young drew a different conclusion. In Young's view the most straightforward interpretation of the data is that the latest text deposits in the caves of Qumran are simply earlier than the First Revolt (Young 2005: 82-83, 118 ['In hindsight, the biblical text was developing toward the stabilized MT exemplified by codex L. Hence the proportion of words to variants gives some idea of each manuscript's relationship to the ultimate outcome. ... Whereas the "normal" Qumran scroll has many variants,

and, more often than not, fewer than 20 words per variant, the scrolls from sites other than Qumran have either no variants, or a much higher proportion of words to variants than almost any Qumran scrolls ... it is hard to understand the Qumran biblical corpus as nearly contemporary with the Masada scrolls']).

In his 3rd edition of *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, Tov argues against notions and terminology of an intentional stabilization of the biblical text ('The Myth of the Stabilization of the Text of the Hebrew Scripture', Tov 2012: 174-180, also 29-31). Tov gives a different explanatory model for the existence of stabilized biblical texts essentially involving a pre-First Revolt choice in the temple to use a master copy and corrected copies which were internally uniform but involved no suppression of other text traditions, combined with an historical accident of surviving texts in the aftermath of the First Revolt. On the one hand Tov has frequently argued that the Qumran texts are in many ways representative of practices of Jewish society at large, and Tov with some other scholars has supposed a connection between the non-biblical texts at Masada and texts of Qumran. Yet on the other hand Tov is forced to simultaneously suppose, in stark contrast, that the only biblical texts that were brought to Masada came from the one source from which, according to Tov's model, the scribes of the Qumran texts throughout the 1st century CE systematically refused to obtain or to copy their biblical manuscripts—the temple. These anomalies in Tov's reconstruction are a result of the starting premise, the assumption that the production of biblical texts at Qumran went as late as the First Revolt (Tov 2012: 30 fn 13 ['All the texts copied from the beginning of the 1st century CE until 65 CE from Qumran are of a varied nature, with only a few very M-like texts, while the texts from the same period from Judean Desert sites other than Qumran only reflect M']).

But if one considers a different model, in which the true watershed with respect to stabilized biblical texts was the time of Herod (instead of the later First Revolt or post-First Revolt), this would account for the same evidence while removing the anomalies. In this model a decision was made in the temple to produce 'carefully corrected' copies from MT master copies from the time of Herod forward, while the Qumran text deposits concluded at about the same time. In this reconstruction the temple would not suppress extra-temple copying of LXX Greek texts (which would continue to be copied and have a life of their own), nor would any active suppression of non-MT texts need to be supposed, but non-MT Hebrew biblical texts would fall out of use through attrition among Jews associated with the temple. In fact the sole obstacle to such a model is the prevailing perception of the dating of the Qumran texts which, as argued above, is probably mistaken.

~ ~ 51 ~ ~

There is a striking observation: in contrast to many allusions to Hasmonean figures, there has seemed to be in

the Qumran texts no identifiable allusion to Herod as a personal figure, with name, sobriquet, or description—at least it is not easy to find a published argument for such an allusion from any scholar. There are arguments that the time of Herod is in the background of certain texts, such as: the Davidic warrior messiah texts (Atkinson 1999); the Self-Glorification Hymn and 4Q246 Apocryphon of Daniel (Knohl 2000); the Temple Scroll (Thiering 1989); MMT (Knohl 2002); the anti-polygamy and anti-niece marriage polemic of the Damascus Document (Eisenman 1983, 1986); and in the present analysis I suggest that Herod's regime may be in the background of the final form of the Damascus Document. However in none of these cases does there seem to be an explicit claim of a direct allusion to the figure of Herod, as distinguished from contexts in the time of Herod.

But the figure of Herod the Great looms so large, so towering, of such overwhelming significance in the history of this era, that the apparent complete silence of the Qumran texts in alluding to Herod as a figure is astonishing. Contrast this situation with the Testament of Moses (Assumption of Moses), a text which alludes to Herod directly as an object of polemic; is widely regarded as having been written c. 4 BCE-48 CE and as argued well by Atkinson, more specifically c. 4 BCE-6 CE (2004: 137-41); a text which Jodi Magness has suggested *alludes specifically to knowledge of text deposits in jars in the caves of Qumran* (Magness 2002a: 87-88), but which *is not among the Qumran finds*. So there are texts capable of speaking of the figure of Herod. *They just aren't among the Qumran finds*—or so it has seemed.

Yet among the Qumran finds there are texts which appear to have been produced in the time of Herod. To begin with there are the pesharim which according to the present analysis allude to the Roman conquest and death of Antigonus Mattathias of 37 BCE (1QpHab, 4QpNah, 4QpPs A, 4QpHos B). To those can probably be added the other pesharim which imply a stance of being out of power, though whether they would precede or postdate the downfall of Antigonus would require separate analysis.

The Damascus Document becomes another, since its image of its conqueror destroying the Teacher's archenemy's regime also correlates to the Roman conquest of 37 BCE. In addition, the Damascus 'B' text found in the Cairo Genizah appears to allude to the death of Hyrcanus II in 30 BCE. This would date the Damascus 'A' text and the D texts at Qumran to c. 30 BCE as well, if the assumption is correct that the 'B' text with its Zechariah smitten-shepherd quotation is a contemporary variant of the 'A' text (or vice versa) and is not an intentionally modified later edition of 'A'.

The palaeographic date estimate previously mentioned for 4Q266 D^a, considered the earliest copy of the Damascus Document, 'to the first half or to the middle of the first century BCE' (Baumgarten 1996: 26-30

[Yardeni]), can hardly be considered an objection to a proposal of a c. 30 BCE date of final composition of the Damascus Document in the form it was found at Qumran, since palaeographic date estimation is not an exact science and the 1st century BCE provides few exemplars on which to base datings to specific decades. It can be presumed that publication of ancient texts occurred upon completion of composition, with recopying occurring quickly for ancient texts that 'went viral', such that the copy, 4Q266 D^a, need not be presumed to postdate the time of composition by much.

As previously discussed, 4Q266 D^a was radiocarbon dated, with the Tucson lab reporting at 95% confidence that the date of this scribal copy is later than c. 45 BCE (45 BCE-120 CE at 95% confidence), which if it were not for the issue of sample contamination of the earlier discussion would be highly relevant here. But for reasons discussed earlier, in the absence of corroboration or further investigation that radiocarbon date should not be given any weight at present in establishing the true date of 4Q266, due to the sample contamination uncertainty issue.

On internal grounds, the Qumran texts seem to have ended as late as but not later than the time of Herod. The allusions which go into the early part of the reign of Herod establish the texts go that late. But the absence of allusions after that, the drop to flat-line zero, suggests the texts do not go much later than the date of the latest allusion.

~ ~ 52 ~ ~

Attempting to reconstruct the reason for the end of the text deposits at Qumran can be hazardous. The texts themselves do not tell us; they simply go silent at a certain point. It could be a logical fallacy to conclude that the activities of priests or synagogues of the sect associated with the Teacher ceased, simply because the sect no longer used the site or caves of Qumran. It could be that they and their activities continued, just no longer with their texts going to Qumran. At some point the lights went out at Qumran for the people associated with the text deposits. Was this because the lights were going out everywhere for these people (persecution or extermination)? Or was it some reason more site-specific, such as a change in ownership or control of the site or region, or an end of economic viability of the site?

Was the end of the text deposits related to the impact of Herod taking control of Jericho and Qumran? That is, priests centered at Jericho might have experienced at some point an end to their way of life and their ability to continue functioning at Jericho and its satellite Qumran. With the advent of Herod there were significant changes in the priesthood and changes in the temple according to Josephus and rabbinic tradition, and ultimately a new temple. Was the end of the Qumran texts simply one by-product in the mix of these far-reaching changes?

And there have been suggestions on archaeological grounds that a change in inhabitants at Qumran took place toward the end of the 1st century BCE ('It is therefore entirely possible that a different kind of group occupied Qumran in Period II [post-c. 4 BCE]' [Davies, Brooke, and Callaway 2002: 179]). If there was a disruption or discontinuity in the people making use of Qumran toward the end of the 1st century BCE, could that be related to the end of the scrolls in the caves?

In the present volume David Stacey argues that Qumran went out of use as a site of habitation and industrial activity following the reign of Archelaus (4 BCE-6 CE), in the context of a general impoverishment of the region, essentially becoming a 'ghost site' in the early decades of the 1st century CE, visited only by nomads and shepherds. Could that be an explanation for the end of the scroll deposits?

~~ 53 ~~

It is tempting to ask if the death of the Teacher is related to the end of the texts at Qumran. This question is raised on grounds internal to the texts, namely the lack of allusion anywhere in the sectarian texts to a successor figure after the Teacher. Although there might be several hypothetical ways to account for the lack of a successor figure to the Teacher in the texts, the least complicated explanations would seem to be either that a new leader never was appointed or emerged (why?), or that there was a succession but the text deposits concluded soon enough after the death of the Teacher that no texts with the succession were included in the texts that went into the caves. This internal argument from the texts agrees externally with the present analysis concerning Hyrcanus II, in that it seems that either around the time of the death of Hyrcanus II or not too long after, the text activity represented in the texts of the caves of Qumran seems to come to an end.

Hyrcanus II's last act of his life was an attempt to get to somewhere unnamed at the Dead Sea as part of an escape from Herod in 30 BCE, according to an account related by Josephus (*Ant.* 15.168). But Hyrcanus's planned expedition to the Dead Sea was discovered and he was executed. Following Herod's execution of Hyrcanus II Josephus says Herod attempted to exterminate the remaining family and partisans of Hyrcanus II. As Josephus puts it, 'None was left alive of the family of Hyrcanus, and the kingdom was wholly in Herod's power' (*Ant.* 15.266). It is not clear how Herod's execution of Hyrcanus II would have affected priests who had been loyal to Hyrcanus II for decades, i.e. priests who collected, lived by, and in some cases wrote the Qumran texts according to the present analysis. But if the present analysis is correct it would be surprising if the text deposits at Qumran were not significantly affected.

~~ 54 ~~

As for why the texts were not later retrieved after having been put in the caves of Qumran, whether this was late 1st century BCE or any other time the question and the answer may be the same: it may be because, as David Stacey brings out in the present study and as Joan Taylor has argued (2012a, 2012b: 272-303), they were permanent disposals, in continuity with the later *genizot* and burials of texts. In this interpretation the Qumran texts were not retrieved from the caves because there never was an intention to retrieve them by the ones who deposited them. That some of the scrolls subsequently were retrieved against the intent of the depositors would be attributable to chance, while the failure to retrieve so many others is well explained if the locations of these text disposals were not publicized by those who knew.

In Taylor's analysis the inlying caves were a staging area for preparation of scrolls for burials in the outlying caves. (Taylor's use of the term 'burial' of scrolls in the outlying caves derives from Crowfoot 1955, who noted that medieval *genizot* texts were buried in cemeteries, whereas at the time of the Qumran texts Jews were burying in rock-hewn tombs or ossuaries above-ground. Crowfoot suggested that permanent disposals of texts in jars in sealed caves would be an analogous form of burials for texts. The term 'burial' of scrolls as used here is synonymous with 'deposits' of scrolls in jars in the caves.) Taylor suggests the preparations of the scrolls for burial in the outlying caves may have involved procedures similar to those used in Egyptian mummification. Taylor suggests that hot bitumen and bitumen-impregnated linen was used to seal the jars with scrolls inside, such that the jar lids were not simply set loosely on top. In this way the jars would have been made into true sealed airtight ancient time capsules, with the scrolls inside preserved indefinitely within the limits of what ancient technology would allow (Taylor 2012b: 284-85).

Taylor joins others who have noted that Testament of Moses 1.16-18 and Jer. 32:14 allude to burials of scrolls in jars. Taylor notes that the medieval term *genizah* actually applied to a temporary holding place for texts awaiting burial, as distinguished from the permanent burial itself. At Qumran the loose texts in the inlying caves (Cave 4 mainly, but also Caves 5, 6, 7, 8) would correspond to the later medieval *genizah* proper, being loose and not yet buried. By contrast, the scrolls in jars in the outlying caves at Qumran (Caves 1, 2, 3, 11) represent the completed process, scrolls which had received permanent burials.

The use of the bitumen required heating and was labor-intensive (Taylor 2012b: 283). Bitumen involved fire and smelly smoke and would not be done inside buildings or inside caves. Therefore Taylor reasons it most likely was done on the marl terrace above Cave 4 adjoining Qumran. Taylor cites the results of a 1996 probe on the marl terrace that reported 'isolated bitumen deposits' (Taylor

2012b: 295). Taylor gives a picture of a scroll burial industry at Qumran which had been interrupted and never resumed. That would account for the large number of scrolls still in the inlying caves abandoned to the elements, left unpreserved, not in jars, not given their intended burials in the outlying caves.

It is difficult to distinguish an interrupted permanent disposal (with no intent to recover the texts) from an interrupted hiding (with intent to recover the texts), in terms of appearances. Would the material remains look differently either way? In either case there is the question of why, if the intended procedure for all of the scrolls was not fulfilled—preservation in sealed jars—did those who abandoned the project never return to complete their work? Were the scroll depositors killed, or deported or fled from Judea? That would be one way to explain it, but it may not necessarily be the only possibility. It could be that the ones who did the uncompleted deposits were alive and nearby, but deterred from re-accessing the site to complete the job, for example: suppose the Copper Scroll was part of the scroll deposits (and not a later deposit in Cave 3), thereby associating knowledge of the whereabouts of wealth with the ones doing the scroll deposits. In this case it might be impossible for the depositors to return to the site to complete the scroll deposits without risking arrest and interrogation concerning the wealth, and disclosure to the wrong people where the wealth was. Or maybe it was as simple as it would not be possible to return to complete the scroll deposits if someone else was now occupying and controlling the site—and it was not more complicated than that.

One might ask the same kinds of questions about the hoard of silver coins ending c. 8 BCE found in three buried vessels at Qumran's Locus 120. Why was that buried hoard never recovered? Could the failure to recover the Locus 120 hoard and the failure to complete the scroll deposits even have the same explanation? Was the interruption in the scroll deposits related to the upheavals surrounding the death of Herod c. 4 BCE?

Whether it was the impact of Herod's control of the region, the death of Hyrcanus II, an end of economic viability or use of the site of Qumran, or some other reason or some combination of the preceding, the texts in the caves of Qumran seem to have ended toward the end of the 1st century BCE. And this dating agrees with the lamp datings found in association with the scroll deposits of Cave 1, lamp datings which may all along have been a 'smoking gun' indication of the true date of the era of the scroll deposit activity at Qumran. But the ones who could tell the details of what happened in that era are long dead, and all that survives are the mute remains discovered in our time.

~~ 55 ~~

In his important study Yonder Gillihan (2012) argues that 1QS is patterned on Greco-Roman civic associations.

Gillihan's interpretation of all of his findings in terms of a sect opposed to the temple cult leads him to suppose the sect of the Qumran texts spent all its energy mimicking a legitimate temple association, instead of considering that maybe 1QS was one. Gillihan sees the *Serekh yachad* association as preparing its members solely for future rule of Israel in a restored state, instead of in keeping with Greco-Roman association parallels which included existing civic bodies. But never mind that; despite the interpretive filter the stunning power of the raw data and judicious analyses compiled by Gillihan comes through:

Associations are frequently formed by state initiative ... In antiquity it was especially common for the state to sponsor local cultic associations. ... (p. 71)

[T]he usage of Council in S (עצה; סוד) resembles conventions of Greek and Latin political discourse, in which councils (βουλαῖ; *collegia*) of officials conduct the most important affairs of the cities. In many cases the councils oversaw the public cult—a role analogous to that of the *Yahad* within the sect. The identification of a cultic council as the leading body of a group that thought of itself in state-like terms is hardly surprising: in *poleis* organized around a temple cult, like Jerusalem, the bouleutic council was involved in cultic matters as well as civic administration. ... (p. 284)

Obviously the best analogy for *Yahad's* activity is the 'college' of priests and associated officials responsible for the cult of the Jerusalem temple ... (p. 290)

The conventions of Greek and Latin political discourse show that the *Yahad's* self-designation would have sounded like regular ways of describing the authoritative bodies within a state. ... I am inclined to view יחד and עצה היחד [as] Hebrew equivalents of terminology conventional to Greek and Latin political discourse. ... (Pp. 291-93)

The Covenant Renewal Ceremony [1QS 1:16-3:12] ... allowed members of the *Yahad* to participate in a national rite that all Jews observed ... analogous to a common phenomenon among Greco-Roman associations: numerous groups observed their own versions of public festivals. This was especially true among the cultic associations ... most associations' festivals complemented their participation in the public festivals. ... (Pp. 294-95)

In the Spartan, Athenian, and Magnesian states, leaders met regularly for commensality, deliberation, and cultic duties. While prayer, deliberation, and eating together doubtless were combined—especially at the state *sussitia*—major cultic and judicial work took place at meetings and festivals devoted to these purposes. Analogies with the common life of the *Yahad* are immediately apparent. ... (p. 350)

Earlier, Matthias Klinghardt (1994), going beyond work of Moshe Weinfeld (1986), argued that 1QS reflected a

Jewish version of a Hellenistic association, that this is what synagogues were, and that the temple in Jerusalem, like the pagan temples, likely had such associations or synagogues. Klinghardt suggested statutes of such priestly associations attached to the temple could be reflected in the Qumran texts. Klinghardt's synthesis was fundamental and brilliant. But because most scholars believed the Qumran sect's opposition to the temple was firmly established, Klinghardt's argument made surprisingly little impact on scholarly thinking. Here is Klinghardt:

The closest parallels to the Manual of Discipline in regard to genre and contents are statutes of *Hellenistic associations*. The similarities between those statutes and IQS make it most likely that the group to which IQS applies was such a religious association, rather than a cenobitic 'sect' ... It is very unlikely that the initiate had to submit *all* his possessions to the *yachad* ... The especially numerous instances of this ideal relating to philosophers sharing possessions make clear that it is realized as communal property of an association. ... [T]he repetition of many single regulations and the clearly recognizable sections beginning with 'these are the regulations' *etc.* disprove the literary integrity of IQS; the same is true for CD ... [M]any of the statutes of associations show the same literary non-uniformity, which results from changes that have been made through the years. ... The organizational features of the Essenes, such as their initiation ceremony with a probationary period, their assemblies and communal meals, the judgments and disciplinary regulations, are paralleled not only in the *yachad* of IQS, but by many pagan associations as well ... What Philo's *Therapeutae* and Josephus' *Essenes* have in common is not a particular sectarian character, but the typical characteristics of religious associations, which most probably were synagogue communities ... We know from countless Greek, Roman, and even Palmyrenian references that religious associations often were attached to temples and were entrusted with service and maintenance of the cult. ... Since it is, therefore, not very probable that there ever existed a monastic group at Qumran, and since there is no need to postulate one in order to explain IQS, my idea tends to support Professor Golb's suggestion of an origin of these writings elsewhere. ... (Klinghardt 1994: 252-69)

~ ~ 56 ~ ~

Going back still earlier, Karl Rengstorf of the University of Münster published a monograph in 1960 in which he cited comparative evidence showing the temple was the long-standing center of religious text collection and scribal activity throughout the ancient near east. Among other things Rengstorf cited 2 Macc. 2:13-15 which refers to a library of biblical and religious books of Nehemiah said to have been restored by Judas Maccabaeus, in a letter purporting to be from the Jewish leaders in Jerusalem who said they had that library and offered to produce and send copies of any books the letter's

recipients lacked. Rengstorf cited rabbinic references to book correctors paid from the temple treasury (b. *Ketub.* 106a). He argued that the temple library in Jerusalem with its scribes, archivists, and priests was the obvious place to consider as the source of the texts represented in the finds of Qumran. Norman Golb summarized the reception to Rengstorf's publication: 'With the exception of the appearance of one or two German articles ... in the 1960s ... by 1970 [Rengstorf's view] was virtually forgotten. He did not again return to the subject, and many years later, shortly before his death, confided to a younger colleague in Germany that, because the reaction was not what he had hoped for or expected, he had ended up despairing ...' (Golb 1995: 162).

Most scholars today suppose that many if not most of the Qumran texts were imported, and it remains to be proven that not all were (e.g. Crawford, 'the general consensus today, many if not most of the Qumran manuscripts ... were imported from elsewhere' [2011a: 129]; Tov, 'Undoubtedly, at least some leather scrolls were produced locally, as will be provable in the future by way of DNA analysis of scrolls in comparison with that of local animals ... but at present this assumption cannot be ascertained' [2004: 14-15]). In 1980 Norman Golb had argued that all Qumran texts were brought to the site and none produced at the site:

The great number of scroll remnants points to an origin in a large center of learning in Palestine such as only Jerusalem is known to have been before 70 A.D. ... no manuscript fragments written on parchment or papyrus (but only some ostraca) have been found in the settlement, not even at the site of the room considered to be the scriptorium ... de Vaux shows some sensitivity to this problem, but appears satisfied with the following formula in dismissing it: '... It is natural that in the ruins of Khirbet Qumran, exposed as they were to the weather, texts written on skin or papyrus should have failed to survive.' This statement fails to take into account the fact that in similar ruins at Masadah just such parchments and papyri were found in the excavations of 1963-1965. (Golb 1980: 10-12)

For some reason however the vast majority of scholars have balked at going from 'most' texts imported to Golb's 'all' texts imported, although it is not quite clear why, since it would seem the data at Qumran would be no less well explained on the latter hypothesis. In other words, if it is not disputed that 'most' were imported, a mechanism is in place to account for all of the scrolls' presence at the site (importation), removing any necessity to invoke on-site production as an additional explanation. Similarly, the leather tabs and strings used to tie scrolls found in Caves 4 and 8 could have arrived to the site by means of being attached to imported scrolls arriving to the site, one tab per scroll, or if there was on-site manufacture of leather tabs and strings, it could be as part of an industry of burials of imported scrolls, in neither case requiring an additional supposition that some scrolls were produced on-site. Proposals that the furniture in

Locus 30 was used for spreading out unrolled scrolls for reading or repair or manufacture, while possible, are generally regarded as too ambiguous for certainty (e.g. Tov 2004: 15, ‘the reliability of the evidence pertaining to the existence of such a scriptorium is questionable’). The inkwells found at Qumran prove the existence of literacy and writing at the site but do not establish what kind of writing the inkwells were used for. A clue to what kind of writing might have been associated with the two inkwells de Vaux found in Locus 30 from c. mid-1st century CE (and perhaps also the one de Vaux found immediately adjacent to Locus 30 attributed to Locus 36) might be the seal stamp with a name in Greek (‘Josephus’) found by de Vaux in Locus 30. The seal stamp could suggest the Locus 30 inkwells were used for writing of letters, or business or bureaucratic reports (in Greek?), rather than production of literary texts on scrolls (none of the scrolls in the caves have a ‘Josephus’ or any other named stamp on them). Dozens of ostraca have been found in and around the buildings of Qumran but in not a single case has an identical scribal hand or the content of writing found in the buildings been matched to a scroll in the caves. In the absence of evidence otherwise, inkwells found in the buildings at Qumran might be presumed to have been used for the writing that was found in the buildings, as well as other bureaucratic or commercial correspondence possibly suggested by the seal stamp, without necessity to suppose that some scrolls in the caves were produced on-site as an additional explanation. And as David Stacey notes in the present volume, Sirach 38:24-34 says the life of the scribe is inconsistent with making pottery and other kinds of manual industries carried out at Qumran. For all of these reasons, on-site production of the scrolls found in the caves not only, as Tov says, ‘cannot be ascertained’ at present—that is, it has not been shown to have happened—but the currently known evidence seems to weigh against the possibility as a conjecture.

The notion that Qumran texts were imported to the site from somewhere else therefore is hardly an unusual idea. Yet somehow Rengstorf’s proposal that this ‘somewhere else’ might be the source overwhelmingly indicated from all known ancient near eastern parallels for the exact kind of texts found at Qumran (i.e. the temple) failed to convince nearly any of the key scholars working on the Qumran texts.

One of the problems in the reception of Rengstorf’s argument was that Rengstorf proposed a scenario that most scholars did not find too convincing: temple ownership of Qumran as an agricultural estate in continuity from centuries earlier. And yet logically Rengstorf’s argument for the temple connection itself may be valid independently of his specific proposal to account for that connection; the two arguments should be distinguished. Also, Rengstorf argued against an Essene connection with the *Serekh* texts, since he assumed, in common with those who disagreed with him, that there was an irreconcilable conflict between accepting an Essene identification with the scrolls and a temple origin

of the same texts. (But there is no reason to suppose the Essenes of the classical descriptions were opposed to the temple.)

Another point, a more subtle one, shared by both sides of this debate in the history of scholarship—e.g. Rengstorf and Golb on the one hand (Golb holding to a Jerusalem but not temple origin for the texts), as well as Shanks (1999: 140-41 [‘Jerusalem was obviously the place ... where a library of this magnitude would be maintained’]); Hutchesson (1999 [the scrolls came from Sadducean partisans of Aristobulus II from Jerusalem]); Hirschfeld (2004: 242-43 [the scrolls came from Sadducean priests of Jerusalem at the First Revolt]); Magen and Peleg (2006: 111-12 [the scrolls came from refugees from Jerusalem at the First Revolt])—and mainstream Qumran scholars on the other hand, is that *both* sides assumed that a temple or Jerusalem origin of the texts of Qumran means the texts in the caves *would be the actual holdings from the temple* (or other Jerusalem origins), transported from Jerusalem and hidden in the caves in a crisis, in advance of an invasion, in response to a war, a *genizah* disposal, etc.

But that is not the only possibility. One could suppose priests at Jericho supportive of the temple, part of the temple (during their courses of service in Jerusalem), acquiring copies of texts from the temple library, with the master copies remaining in the temple. One could suppose groups of priests and synagogues throughout the region obtaining copies of all sorts of texts from the temple library as well as from each other and disposing of copies at Qumran when they became unusable. The texts would originate from the temple in the sense that they might be copies which had been produced from master copies there, like a bookshop producing print-on-demand books. Texts when old or discarded would end up in the caves of Qumran, but these would not be master copies, holdings of the temple, or autographs or author’s originals—only copies. One could even imagine dozens of far-flung temple-affiliated associations composing, copying, studying, duplicating, and exchanging texts, loosely coordinated and archived by the librarians of the temple, perhaps regionally facilitated by priests associated with the temple. But none of these alternatives (and further permutations that can no doubt be imagined) seem to have been considered because of the prior blocking assumption—that the people associated with the texts found at Qumran were estranged from the temple and its priests for an extended period of time spanning many generations. Once the extreme fragility of that assumption is recognized, once that assumption is then thoroughly deconstructed, all sorts of blocks to understanding can be removed, opening new possibilities for better understanding.

~ ~ 57 ~ ~

A sect can be in power and control the temple. Sects can be understood as socially organized groups with distinctive interpretations of native customs that seek to

gain political power over against rival groups within the same ‘big tradition’, such that the leadership of the Jewish state and temple can be sectarian and in power at the same time (Pasto 2002: 182-83). Jutta Jokiranta suggests ancient Jewish sects might be understood in terms of ‘a teacher with a following or a tradition of practice among families and elites’ (2010: 221). Earlier, Jokiranta noted that ‘the use of the term “sect”—if insisted—of a group behind the Scrolls should be free of presuppositions such as that this group had a very marginal position ... or that it protested against the Temple establishment ... These views, if held on to, should always be result of a thorough study of texts, not a given set of ideas inherent in the concept used’ (Jokiranta 2001: 239). After discussing and rejecting terms such as group, movement, party, faction, cult, school, and denomination, Lester Grabbe concludes ‘the one word that works for all the groups considered here and also carries religious implications is “sect”, a neutral designation meant to characterize pre70 Jewish groups ... The group most difficult to characterize is ... the Sadducees. Yet even here the little knowledge we have about them is that they are a religious group and not just a social class. They can also be labeled a sect’ (Grabbe 2007: 127-29).

On the free will versus fate issue again by which Josephus contrasts the Jewish sects from each other, at least one scholar, E.P. Sanders (2000: 29-30), sees that as more or less a non-issue (‘probably they all believed in both’). Chad Stauber notes, ‘When modern scholars speak of free will and determinism in ancient Jewish texts, they should be aware that “choice” and “freedom” already presuppose a semantic range that was not present in the early Semitic linguistic framework until well after the Hellenistic infiltration of the Levant’ (Stauber 2011: 348). Stauber criticizes ‘reading into the text covert notions of agency as we translate the Hebrew words into our modern languages’ (*ibid*: 348). If Stauber’s analysis is correct, it could be that Josephus’s depictions of the sects’ views toward fate and free will may have been anachronistic from the beginning. It is less clear than it may seem what is meant when Josephus says that the Essenes believed in ‘fate’, or that the high priest Hyrcanus II relied upon ‘Fortune’, whereas the Sadducees ‘do away with Fate altogether’ and believe in ‘free choice of good or evil’. What does it mean, for example, that Hyrcanus II is singled out by Josephus as ‘submitting to Fortune and appearing to be pleased with whatever she brought about’ (*Ant.* 15.165), so evocative of the belief in ‘fate’ by which Josephus characterizes the Essenes? As for the Sadducees, Jonathan Klawans attempts to get behind the caricatures and comments, ‘what Josephus likely means when he says that Sadducees denied fate is something along what we find in Sirach 15: God has not destined anyone to sin, and each individual chooses to be righteous or wicked. The Sadducean view is unlikely to have involved a denial of divine election’ (Klawans 2007: 274-75). Is this clearly outside the views of the collectors of the Qumran texts (Sirach is a Qumran text)?

~ ~ 58 ~ ~

On 4QMMT, it is difficult to tell whether that text is written from a stance out of power or from a stance that is in power addressed to fellow leaders of the authorial voice’s own party and explaining points of difference with an opposing party. Although the addressee is often thought to be a political ruler, several studies have challenged that assumption (e.g. García Martínez 1996). The text perhaps could be understood on analogy with the letter of James of Acts 15, which seems so similar in tone, ‘we-you-they’, and content (legal rulings); the addressees in that case are friendly outlying groups and the letter issues from an authoritative figure speaking as ‘we’. There is no basis for assuming MMT caused the formation of the sect; it is clear the priests underlying the authorial voice, the ‘we’, already exist, as brought out by Charlotte Hempel (2010). I am not aware that it has yet been suggested that the authorial voice might be a *serving high priest* (explaining to friendly priests or groups his or his party’s rulings that are opposed by a significant party of priests who are however not in power)—but *why not*? One hypothesis would be that MMT issued at some point from Hyrcanus II, whether before or after he lost power as high priest. On the other hand, Annette Steudel has raised intriguing arguments that MMT may be part of the same text as 4Q448, the prayer for king Jonathan (Steudel 2006); if that line of argument is correct MMT might derive from the start of the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, reinforcing the leading role of Sadducees in the temple under the new king against Pharisees in opposition. In any case, Hanne von Weissenberg emphasizes that the multiple copies of MMT testify to ‘a continuous, real, and acute concern for the purity of the Temple cult’ (Weissenberg 2009: 24).

~ ~ 59 ~ ~

Whereas there is no evidence that the priests of the Qumran texts were opposed to any Hasmonean ruler before the last one (and that because they were loyal to the previous one), so much about the texts makes much better sense if considered as coming from priests associated with the temple and the high priest, as the literature of a sect of priests which controlled the temple during the era of the Hasmoneans, a sect of priests loyal to a high priest. Let us only begin to count the ways ...

- The Netzer excavations of the Hasmonean estate at Jericho which turned up the same kind of pottery interpreted as distinctive of the sect at Qumran when found at Qumran, as reported by Bar-Nathan (‘the finds from Qumran [Period Ib] ... are, in fact, identical to those exposed in the Hasmonean Palace Complex at Jericho ... we shall not discuss whether this similarity indicates a similar sect in both sites ...’ [2002: 5, 197-8]).
- David Stacey’s argument in the present volume that Qumran was an extension of the Hasmonean palace complex in Jericho. As Humbert puts it, ‘Most people

[at Qumran] came from and went to Jericho: the idea that Qumran and its extension towards Feshkha was linked economically with Jericho is increasingly accepted' (Humbert 2006: 23).

- The close proximity of the scrolls found at Qumran to Jericho, which is thought to have been a center for priestly and material support, a staging area, for priests serving their courses in Jerusalem during the era of the Hasmoneans (Schwartz 1988); perhaps the scrolls found at Qumran also were part of Qumran's economic relationship to Jericho.

- The high priest appears in a number of Qumran texts such as 1QSa. According to the 'sect versus temple' construction the high priest in these texts must be fictitious or utopian, or alternatively a 'shadow' high priest peculiar to the sect. Another reading might be that the high priest intended in the world of these texts was the high priest usually understood when such language is encountered in texts, the one of the temple. Martin Abegg has identified 1QSB as the full text of blessings recited at the annual Festival of the Renewal of the Covenant of 1QS, and has identified the fifth of six recited blessings of 1QSB as addressed to the high priest (Abegg 2003: 15-16). That analysis appears to reinforce the notion that 1QS, to which 1QSB was attached in the physical scroll, is favorable to the temple. It suggests that 1QS's priests are understood to be priests of the temple, since *these priests are blessing the high priest*.

- Several texts deal with the Urim and Thummim, the oracle-giving lighted stones on the high priest's breastplate, as well as other high-priestly themes of interest (Fletcher-Louis 2002: 222-51).

- The extensive focus on priestly qualifications and rules in the texts.

- Calendars for temple course service.

- Liturgical texts among the finds reflect temple practice and vicarious participation in temple practice in synagogues (Daniel Falk: 'Every element of the Yahad's daily liturgy can be related to practices which had come to be associated with the daily Temple services, among the priestly service, the Temple singers, and the popular prayers of the people ... the origin[s] of institutional prayer ... seem to lie in the attraction of prayer to the Temple cult, rather than the need to provide a replacement for the sacrificial system' [Falk 1998: 254]).

- An emerging awareness that the Qumran texts reflect Jewish mysticism originating from priestly circles close to the temple in Jerusalem. The constructed voice of the Teacher among the texts of Qumran, it turns out, evokes both high priest and mystic at the same time, combining mystical and liturgical associations with the temple. Abegg (2003) notes an expression of the high priestly

blessing at 1QSB 4.27, 'to illumine the face of many', and its echo in the voice of 1QH^a 12.27, 'by me you have illumined the face of many'.

- The Copper Scroll—whose published palaeographic dating of Cross of 25-75 CE in DJD 3 (Cross 1962: 217) can no longer uncritically be relied upon in light of 'Vulgar semiformal', the script of the Copper Scroll, characterized by Cross as having arisen secondarily out of Herodian forms which only began in the Herodian period (Cross 1961: 173-74; 1962: 217 fn 1), *having turned up on Alexander Jannaeus coins well before the Herodian period* (Naveh 1968)¹—is an ancient list of wealth in the form of offerings dedicated to the temple or other kinds of temple wealth (Lehmann 1964; McCarter 1994; Wolters 1998; Lefkovits 2000). The Copper Scroll was found in one of the scroll-bearing caves, Qumran Cave 3. Qumran scholars traditionally have explained this in one of two ways. First, by arguing that the labor-intensive dry list, without story or literary trapping, pounded into metal and in genre an economic text or inventory list (David Wilmot dissertation [Wise 2002]), was fictitious. The other explanation is that the Copper Scroll's find spot in Cave 3 is a coincidence, i.e. the Copper Scroll was produced and hidden by persons unrelated to the other texts in Cave 3. If after sober consideration neither of these two explanations sounds very convincing, what are the implications?

- The last of the items listed in the Copper Scroll, described in its lines 12.10-13, is said to be another copy of the text which gives details concerning the hiding places. This mysterious copy has been the subject of scholarly fascination and even novels. I would like to suggest openly what I have privately suspected, that the Copper Scroll itself may be that copy. The original is what is missing; the copy has been found and is the Copper Scroll. The copy's hiding place is said to be in what sounds like a cave which has *qbryn*, 'burials'. Identification of the deposits of texts in the caves of Qumran as burials of sacred texts appears to explain that element of the description of the location of the copy: Cave 3 had 'burials' of sacred texts, and that is where the copy, the Copper Scroll, was anciently hidden (compare Crowfoot 1955 ['burial in caves was the custom of the country, and so this concealment may only be the equivalent of the correct cemetery burial of the contents of a *Genizah*'] and Taylor 2012b: 303 [Qumran was in part 'a scroll burial center ... burials for scriptures']). That the details promised in the copy

¹ Naveh (1968: 21-23): 'The [coins'] inscription is in the Jewish (so-called square Hebrew) script and in the Aramaic language. It consists of מלכה אלכסנדרוס, and the word שנה followed by the numerals כ and, more often, כה. These are dated coins of the 20th and 25th years of Alexander Jannaeus, corresponding to 83 and 78 B.C. respectively ... the legend is written in the "vulgar semiformal" in Cross's terminology ... The closest parallels to these letters are to be found on ossuaries. As the latter are generally attributed to the Herodian period and as the earliest known vulgar semiformal examples do not antedate this period, the palaeographical significance of this dated Hasmonean inscription is quite obvious.'

described at lines 12.10-13 are nothing other than the contents of the text of the Copper Scroll itself has been known (Mandel 1993), but until now no one has proposed that the Copper Scroll is the copy of itself it is describing. The hiding place of the copy is described as 'north of Kochlit'. Cave 3 is north of Qumran. Kochlit is the most common toponym in the Copper Scroll (five times) and on this analysis becomes Qumran. A possible context for a scattering and sequestration of wealth associated with the temple could be related to the upheavals surrounding the death of Herod. As Josephus tells it there was insurrection against the Romans in which at least two high priests were alleged to have been involved (*Ant.* 17.164, 207-208, 379). There was advance warning of Roman arrival in force and Josephus speaks prominently of concerns over Roman appropriation of Jewish national wealth stored in the fortresses (*Ant.* 17.206-298). There can be no objection from palaeographic dating to this context since Cross was improperly dogmatic on the range claimed (see the previous footnote). (Of course other contexts are also possible.)

- Designs in linen scroll wrappers found in 1949 in Cave 1 (Crowfoot 1955) have long been suggested to reflect a relationship with the temple.
- One of the main employers of scribes throughout the Second Temple period was the temple (Grabbe 2000: 151-52). Temple scribes are referred to in a decree of Antiochus III of c. 200 BCE (*Ant.* 12.142). On the one hand, the major source of religious text scribal activity (the temple); on the other hand a mother lode of religious, priestly, and temple-oriented texts (Qumran). Perhaps there is a connection.
- And to return again to IQS, there is no basis internal to that text to suppose the priests of IQS are other than priests who support the temple, priests loyal to the high priest of the temple.

And so the debates among Qumran archaeologists over who built Qumran in the time of Alexander Jannaeus in territory controlled by Alexander Jannaeus—was it Alexander Jannaeus, or was it the *sect*?—become

resolved with this answer: both are correct. For the Qumran sect *was* the sect of the Hasmonean priests in Jerusalem and Jericho, and the site of Qumran was an extension of that sect's activity from nearby Jericho and the temple in Jerusalem.

~~ 60 ~~

In conclusion, this is a picture very different from scholarly constructions that have been taken for granted for so long with respect to understanding the sect of the Qumran texts. It is a picture in which the Teacher is not in the distant past to the authors of the Qumran sectarian texts but is instead a living contemporary, or recently deceased contemporary, at the late end of the Qumran texts. It is a picture in which the Community Rule texts (S) precede the final form of the Damascus Document (D), a necessary and clear resolution within the constraints of this reconstruction to that particular issue in Qumran scholarship, in agreement with analysis of D as 'rewritten S' of a study group at Göttingen (Kratz 2011; Steudel 2012). It is a picture in which the Damascus Document in its final form was produced in the second half of the 1st century BCE, contemporary with the latest of the pesharim. It is a picture which focuses on the 1st century BCE as the center of interest and activity of the sect of the Qumran texts, and it is a picture in which the 1st century CE disappears from the Qumran textual horizon. It is a picture which dismantles the romanticized notion of a parallel history of a Qumran sect, running alongside known history, constructed solely from the texts themselves, invisible to external history. Instead, in this picture the Qumran texts become the literary remains of a sect organized and led by priests associated with the temple during the greater part of the 1st century BCE, texts from the inner world of this sect, texts from *inside the 1st century BCE temple*, and the invisibility and anonymity of the shadowy parallel sect and its shadowy leader whose name must remain forever unknown of the common scholarly construction vanishes. And finally, as ironic as this may sound, it is a picture in which it may legitimately be said that what scholars have referred to as 'the Qumran sect' controlled the temple in Jerusalem during the greater part of the 1st century BCE.