

2000

## Revelation Through Exegesis: A Study of the Use of Scripture at Qumran with Special Emphasis Given to the Sectarian Writings

Darrell MacLearn

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/dmin>



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#)

---

*George Fox  
Evangelical  
Seminary*

*A Graduate  
School*



## THESIS ACCEPTANCE CERTIFICATE

Title: Revelation through Exegesis: A Study of the Use of Scripture at Qumran with Special Emphasis Given to the Sectarian Writings

Presented by: Darrell MacLearn

We, the undersigned, certify that we have read this thesis and approve it as adequate in scope and quality for the degree of Master of Arts in Theological Studies.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Program Director

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Research Advisor

**GEORGE FOX EVANGELICAL SEMINARY**

**REVELATION THROUGH EXEGESIS**

**A STUDY OF THE USE OF SCRIPTURE AT QUMRAN  
WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS GIVEN TO THE SECTARIAN WRITINGS**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE DEPARTMENT OF MINISTRY  
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS IN THEOLOGICAL STUDIES**

**BY**

**Darrell MacLearn  
Spring 2000**

**Academic/project advisor: Dr. Steve Delamarter  
Second Reader: Professor Michael Vines**



## **CONTENTS**

GLOSSARY .....	vi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Background to the Scrolls	
Research Question	
Sectarian Literature	
Criteria for Selection	
Habakkuk Pesher (1QpHab)	
Rule of the Community (1QS)	
4Q Florilegium (4QFlor)	
Temple Scroll (11QTemp)	
Research Methodology	
2. QUMRAN REVELATION THROUGH EXEGESIS .....	11
Exegesis and Hermeneutics as Modern Distinctions	
Mediated Revelation	
3. EXCURSUS ON EXEGETICAL RULES OF EARLY JUDAISM .....	24
The 7 Rules of Hillel	
The 13 Rules of R. Ishmael	
The 32 Rules of R. Eliezer	
4. PESHER HABAKKUK (1QpHab) .....	29
Introduction to 1QpHab and the Pesharim	
Defining the Pesharim	

Exegesis in 1QpHab	
Citation and Atomization	
Variant Reading vs. Authorial Alteration	
Allegory	
Multiple Meanings	
5. COMMUNITY RULE (1QS) .....	52
Introduction to 1QS	
Importance of Scripture at Qumran	
Explicit and Implicit Use of Scripture in 1QS	
Uncovering the Hidden and Revealed	
6. 4Q FLORILEGIUM (4QFlor) .....	60
Introduction to 4Q Florilegium	
Exegesis in 4Qflor	
Gezerah Shawah	
Introductory Formulae	
7. TEMPLE SCROLL (11QTemp) .....	65
The Scroll as a Sectarian Work	
Dating the Scroll	
The Use of The Scroll at Qumran	
The New Moses	
Exegetical Methods in the Scroll	
Change From 3 <sup>rd</sup> Person to 1 <sup>st</sup> Person	
Harmonization	

Homogenization

Modifications and Additions

8. CONCLUSION .....	86
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	90

## GLOSSARY<sup>1</sup>

**Allegorical:** A symbolic method of interpretation which offers a different meaning of the text than what appears at first sight. Allegory is often associated with the explanation of the “hidden” or “real” meaning supposedly covered by the text itself.

**Apocalyptic:** Pertains to the genre of literature that divulges otherwise unknown secrets about the nature of God and the heavens and the end of days. Especially prominent is the concept of divine intervention and the dualistic idea of a cosmic/earthly conflict between evil angels, their agents of God, His Messiah, and holy angels. The term is also used to describe the imminent messianism that is often part of these texts.

**Apocrypha:** Pseudobiblical books composed by Jewish authors in the Second Temple period; these were not included in the Hebrew Bible. Most of these works survive only in translation; some were preserved in the Septuagint and others by various Christian sects.

**Cairo Genizah manuscripts:** A treasure of manuscripts of Second Temple, Rabbinic, and medieval texts discovered in the storage area of the Palestinian synagogue of the Jews of medieval Fustat (Old Cairo, Egypt), including letters, legal documents, and literary texts, many of which contain actual dates and datable historical references (see also *Genizah*).

**Codex (pl. codices):** A group of manuscript pages stitched together on one side to form a book. The codex came into wide use in early Christian times, largely replacing the *scroll*.

**Eschatology:** That branch of religious study, literature and belief having to do with aspects of the afterlife, as the Final Judgment, bodily resurrection, and the eternity of the soul. Eschatological doctrines refer to the end of days or the messianic era.

**Essenes:** A Jewish religious subgroup described by Josephus, Philo, and Pliny the Elder, noted for their communal way of life, their asceticism, their piety, and their ideas about fate and immortality.

**Exegesis:** There are many differing definitions of *exegesis* and it is often interchanged with the term *hermeneutics*. *Exegesis* generally refers to the work of ascertaining as far as possible the meaning that the writer intended. This involves scrutiny of the text, taking note of its linguistic elements, its genre, its historical background,

---

<sup>1</sup> Much of the content of this glossary has been extracted and adapted from Randall Price, *Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Eugene Oregon: Harvest House, 1996), 467-479 and Norman Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995), 401-408.



and so forth in order to interpret the text. It has also been referred to as the art of interpretation.<sup>2</sup>

**First Revolt:** The Jewish rebellion against Roman rule that began in C.E. 66 and reached its climax with the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish Temple in C.E. 70. The final action of the war was the capture of the Jewish fortress of Masada by the Romans, which occurred in C.E. 74.

**First Temple Period:** The Jerusalem Temple was first erected by Solomon circa 960 B.C.E., which was destroyed by the Babylonians in 586 B.C.E. This period in Israelite history is known as the *First Temple Period*.

**Genizah** (Hebrew: “storage room”): A designated place, often located in synagogues, for the storage of texts that have become worn out from use, but cannot be destroyed because of their holiness. The most famous medieval genizah was discovered in a synagogue in Fustat, or Old Cairo (see *Cairo Genizah manuscripts*).

**Halakhah** (adj. **halakhic**): Terms designating Jewish ritual and civil laws (e.g., Sabbath observance, tithing, contracts, etc.), as well as texts concerned with them (as opposed to *haggadic* texts, which are concerned with theological or devotional matters related to narrative texts).

**Hasmonean:** A period during the dynasty of the Maccabean descendants (152-153 B.C.E.).

**Hermeneutics:** This word is often confused with the term *exegesis*. *Hermeneutics* is an outflow of the exegetical process. Once the exegetical process has been completed the exegete then employs hermeneutical rules so as to interpret the text in light of his own time and cultural situation.<sup>3</sup>

**Judaeen Wilderness:** The low-lying steppeland of Judaea west of the Dead Sea and east of the central hill country.

**Khirbet:** (Arabic) A ruin or destroyed place; thus Khirbet Qumran = “ruin of Qumran.”

**Kittim:** A placename in the Aegean Islands, perhaps Kition in Cyprus, that, in Dead Sea Scrolls texts, serves as a code word probably referring to “Romans.”

**Massorah** or “tradition”: The term as a rule refers to collections of early medieval textual traditions about the proper reading of the Hebrew Bible and to versions of it based on these traditions. The *Tiberian* Massoretic text is the one most widely

---

<sup>2</sup> See Daniel Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, no. 22 (Atlanta: Scholars 1975), 1-8 for more on the distinction between exegesis and hermeneutic.

<sup>3</sup> See Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine*, 1-8 for more on the distinction between exegesis and hermeneutic.

used today. This text was passed down through the generations made possible by the many Jewish rabbis and scholars who labored diligently to transmit a proper, precise text in the Massoretic tradition.

**Massoretes:** The group of scholars (scribes) from Tiberias, Israel who worked to establish and preserve the correct form of the consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible.

**Massoretic Text:** The traditional or received Hebrew text of the Bible, which has been considered authoritative by Jews from Mishnaic times until the present. The term derives from the Hebrew *mesorah*, “tradition” (see *Massorah*).

**Middot “Rules”:** The rabbis’ treatment of scripture was governed by certain rules or *middot*. Over time, Rabbinic tradition summarized these rules into groups that began with the 7 rules of Hillel. Following this was the formulation of the 13 rules of R. Ishmael, and the 32 rules of R. Eliezer. It is important to note that the 7 *middot* of Hillel were not invented by Hillel but constitute the formulation and codification of them during his time.

**Midrash** (pl. **Midrashim**; Hebrew, “expounding”): A method of Rabbinic biblical interpretation in which a passage of Scripture is quoted, and then a meaning or various meanings are drawn from the text. *Midrashists* employed a variety of rules (*middot*) and techniques, including allegories, word plays, and *gematria* (assigning numerical values to words) in order to determine the meaning of a text. Midrashim are divided into two categories: *halakhic* midrashim, which comment primarily on biblical laws, and *haggadic* midrashim, which expound mainly on theological or devotional aspects of the biblical text. The term can also designate a collection of such interpretations produced by the rabbis.

**Pesher**, (pl. **Pesharim**; Hebrew, “interpretation(s)”: The unique biblical interpretations and commentaries found at Qumran among the Dead Sea Scrolls. In the scrolls, *pesher* particularly refers to a method of interpreting prophetic texts referring specifically to the experiences of sectarians in the Second Temple period versus the time of the prophet.

**Pseudepigrapha:** Literally, referring to books written during the Hellenistic age in the name of an ancient Bible figure. More generally, the term is used to designate much of the religious literature of the various groups within Second Temple Judaism.

**Qumran:** A site on the western shore of the Dead Sea. Qumran itself holds the ruins of a building complex which served as the headquarters of the Dead Sea Sect (proposed by many to be the Essenes) in the Second Temple period.

**Raz** (Hebrew, “Mystery”): Referring to the mysteries hidden behind and within the texts of Prophetic Scriptures.

**Raz Peshar:** A process of interpreting the mysteries hidden within prophetic texts by divine guidance in order to reveal the hidden secrets of past events as being fulfilled in the present age.

**Revelation:** The process by which God communicates and *reveals* His divine will.

**Scroll:** A roll of parchment, papyrus, or other material containing written texts, with the sheets being sewn or otherwise fastened together one next to the other so as to facilitate the rolling up of the joined text. In biblical times, the Hebrew term *sefer* designated not a *codex* but a scroll, which preceded the codex throughout the Mediterranean world.

**Second Temple Period** (ca. 520 BCE to C.E. 70): The period from the rebuilding of the Jewish Temple at Jerusalem until the victory of the Romans over the Jews during the First Revolt.

**Sectarian:** Having the characteristics of a sect; i.e., a dissenting religious group adhering to a distinctive body of beliefs and practices.

**Septuagint:** The Greek translation of the Bible, produced in Egypt during the Hellenistic period.

**Teacher of Righteousness** (Hebrew, *Moreh Ha-Tzedeq*): The Sectarian leader who appears to have arisen soon after the founding of the Dead Sea Sect and whose enlightened insight interpreted for the community the prophetic texts concerning the end time.

***terminus a quo*:** A point of origin or a first limiting point in time.

***terminus ante quem*:** A final limiting point in time.

**Tetragrammaton:** The four-letter name of God, YHWH, found written in the ancient paleo-Hebrew script in some Dead Sea Scrolls. This was the name for God that was not uttered out of great reverence for God.

**Torah** (Hebrew, “the Law” or “the Teaching”): particularly designates the first five books of the Bible, otherwise known as the *Pentateuch* or Five Books of Moses (to whom they are traditionally attributed). Among the rabbis, the term became used more generally for the Jewish law, both oral and written.

**Wicked Priest:** A Hasmonean Priestly leader seen as the Qumran Sect’s arch-enemy.

**Yahad** (Hebrew, “Unity,” “Oneness”): A term appearing in several of the Dead Sea Scrolls that designates a particular pious group of purity-loving brethren who composed some of the scrolls.

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### Background to the Scrolls

In 1947, on the edge of the Dead Sea, at a place known as Khirbet Qumran, a corpus of scrolls was discovered. Today these scrolls make up part of a collection of writings known as the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>4</sup> These Dead Sea discoveries – written predominately in Hebrew, with some in Aramaic, and Greek, – contain a corpus of scrolls that have since been divided into three categories. Some of the manuscripts are biblical books, some are non-biblical books, also known as apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, and some are sectarian documents. Approximately eight hundred manuscripts have been discovered in the eleven caves of Qumran.<sup>5</sup> Some 223<sup>6</sup> or more of the total manuscripts are copies of biblical books. Copies of every book of the Old Testament, as we know it, have been found with the exception of the Book of Esther.<sup>7</sup>

The sheer number of biblical documents found at Qumran begins to give us a glimpse into the importance of the Scriptural writings for the community that lived there. Questions regarding the importance and the use of these biblical writings are what this thesis will attempt to answer. We will look at these questions, however, not from the

---

<sup>4</sup> Qumran is one region where finds known as the Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered. The Dead Sea Scrolls come from approximately 11 caves in the 'Ein Feshkha and Khirbet Qumran regions as well as from additional caves in Jericho, Ein-Gedi, Masada, Murabba'at, Nahal Hever, Nahal Se'elim, Nahal Mishmar, and Khirbet Mird.

<sup>5</sup> James C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Michigan: Eerdmans, 1994), 29.

<sup>6</sup> The number 223 comes from Randall Price's figures writing in 1996. In VanderKam's 1994 writing he shows the number at approximately 202 and gives the following breakdown: Genesis 15, Exodus 17, Leviticus 13, Numbers 8, Deuteronomy 29, Joshua 2, Judges 3, 1-2 Samuel 4, 1-2 Kings 3, Isaiah 21, Jeremiah 6, Ezekiel 6, Twelve Prophets 8, Psalms 36, Proverbs 2, Job 4, Song of Solomon 4, Ruth 4, Lamentations 4, Ecclesiastes 3, Esther 0, Daniel 8, Ezra 1, Nehemiah 0, and 1-2 Chronicles 1.

<sup>7</sup> Randall Price, *Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 77.

perspective of the biblical documents themselves, but through the study of the sectarian literature found at Qumran.

Sectarian literature, as will be noted later in detail, is a body of literature that is unique to the sect. If my personal library were to be discovered some two thousand years from now, one would discover a set of church manuals and other writings that are unique to the religious denomination with which I am affiliated. The story of my denomination, as well as the defining characteristics of who I am and what I believe, could be discovered through the “sectarian” literature that crowds my shelves. In the same light, the defining characteristics of the community at Qumran, as well as who they were and what they believed, can be discovered through the sectarian writings that crowded their shelves.

The sect that lived at Qumran, as we will discover, was formed around the study of Scripture. In their sectarian writings, we encounter a community of people who were committed to the disciplined study of God’s Word in an attempt to discover God’s plan for their lives. These writings attempt to map out a view of the world in which they live, as well as, what they believed God was doing in their specific historical setting.

### *Research Question*

In response to their historical settings, religious groups produce texts. The community of Qumran was no different. They produced a body of literature in response to the circumstances in which they found themselves. These ancient texts give us insight into the mind, heart and lifeblood of the group or individual(s) behind the text. In reviewing the sectarian materials from Qumran, we can discover a great deal about the worldview of this community. In this thesis, we are looking specifically at the

community of Qumran's beliefs about the Scripture through their sectarian literature. We want to know what the sectarian writings from Qumran reveal about the sect's view of Scripture. In their citations and allusion to Scripture, as well as in their discussions about the relevance of Scripture to their community, how do they express their beliefs about the Scripture and ultimately their view of God?

In order to answer this question we must first address several preliminary questions: 1) which of the works from Qumran are indeed sectarian 2) according to what criteria will we select certain documents for study, 3) by what methods will we analyze these texts?

### *Sectarian Literature*

Just how to categorize the texts from Qumran is a matter of some controversy. One approach divides them into two categories: biblical and non-biblical. The non-biblical can be further divided into two categories: sectarian and non-sectarian writings.<sup>8</sup> It would appear in reading the manuscripts from Qumran that certain of them are specifically intended for internal use within the life of the sect and would therefore be defined as sectarian in nature.<sup>9</sup> In these writings, we will discover that:

Some texts presuppose a particular kind of organization and share a distinctive set of doctrines, a unique theological vocabulary and a special perspective on history, things absent from other Qumran texts and other sorts of Judaism in general.... Perhaps 40 percent of the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls fall into this subgroup. These texts, it seems clear, were the central documents of the group or groups behind the Dead Sea Scrolls, and these are the ones we would designate as sectarian.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Michael Wise, Martin Abegg, Jr., and Edward Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1996), 13.

<sup>9</sup> Ben Zion Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983), 83.

<sup>10</sup> Wise, Abegg & Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 13.

Ben Zion Wacholder has further divided the sectarian literature into the following four genres: <sup>11</sup>

- a. *Peshers* – Biblical commentaries, so-called on account of the characteristic opening of their exegesis with the term *pisro* (its interpretation is). Some *peshers* fuse a number of biblical verses under a single theme, others present a line-by-line exegesis of entire biblical books.
- b. Legal lore – In addition to the rules of the sect, this also embraces paraphrases of biblical texts, calendars, and descriptions of the future Jerusalem and the sanctuary.
- c. Liturgical pieces.
- d. Histories of the group. <sup>12</sup>

Devorah Dimant breaks down the sectarian literature from Qumran in the following five genres adding a sixth for miscellaneous sectarian writings that do not seem to fall into a specific category or portray a clear sectarian character:

- a. Rules
- b. Biblical interpretations
- c. Eschatological Compositions
- d. Poetic and Liturgical Works
- e. Halakhah
- f. Varia <sup>13</sup>

One of the primary genres that is often left out of the sectarian designation is the *pesharim* and because of their unique nature, many authors discuss them separately from the sectarian manuscripts. For the purposes of this thesis, however, they will be included in the sectarian literature following Wacholder and Dimant's genre designations as noted above.

---

<sup>11</sup> It must be noted that the genre of these texts are not completely homogeneous. For example, the Rule of the Community (1QS) is mainly devoted to rules and regulations for the members of the sect. The conclusion of this document, however, contains a liturgical section.

<sup>12</sup> Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran*, 83.

<sup>13</sup> Devorah Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period 2*, ed. Michael E. Stone, *Compendia Rerum Iudicarum Ad Novum Testamentum*, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 483-550.

### *Criteria for Selection*

This brings us to the difficulty of trying to select and analyze sources for this study. The process of trying to select a small handful of primary sources for this thesis is not an easy one with the plethora of sources available today. As was noted above, approximately 40 percent of the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls are found to be sectarian in nature. Due to the limited scope of this thesis and the vastness of the sectarian literature, it becomes necessary to narrow the materials to those which would be a good representation of the literature and therefore pertinent to answer the question at hand.

The criterion therefore, by which documents were selected for use within this study, was as follows. Once the sectarian nature of the document was determined, then, the source had to contain enough usable material to get a clear picture of the community's view of Scripture. Following this, sources were selected to represent as many of the genres mentioned above as possible.<sup>14</sup> It is understood that one sample alone from a genre should in no way be made to represent all the rest. However, where there is agreement, from a broad range of genres, generalizations seem more possible.<sup>15</sup> Finally, the texts selected had to contain direct quotations of and/or allusions to Scripture, or they had to speak directly to the use and relevance of Scripture within the community.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> The use of multiple genres will avoid the limitations of focusing on a single way of using Scripture and thus skewing the discovery of the community's true view of Scripture.

<sup>15</sup> In Qumran research, it appears that the pesharim, due to its obvious exegetical nature, is often the sole focus of Qumran exegetical studies. This being the case, many other genres within the sectarian literature are often excluded, thus giving an incomplete view of the exegetical nature of the community.

<sup>16</sup> It is of interest to note that, with a few minor exceptions, all the scrolls found at Qumran are Jewish religious texts. In a way, the fact that all the documents are of a religious nature is surprising. There are no copies of works on secular or practical topics. As noted by Wise, Abegg and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 11, "The Jews in this period were an agricultural people. Wouldn't they want to read such secular books?" Why would they preserve a religious library and nothing else?



With the above criterion in mind the following is a listing of the primary sources which we have selected to be representative of the sectarian literature along with the rationale for each piece's inclusion within the context of this project.

### ***Habakkuk Pesher (1QpH) – Pesher / Biblical Interpretations***

From the *pesharim* we have chosen to examine the Habakkuk *Pesher* (1QpHab). The Habakkuk *Pesher* is one of the foundational pieces of literature within the study of the *pesharim*.<sup>17</sup> It was one of the first published<sup>18</sup> and is the most complete of all the *pesharim*. Written by the community for use within the sect, 1QpHab is clearly sectarian in nature and plainly shows the use of Scripture within the community. Dimant writes, “The *pesher of Habakkuk* provides the most comprehensive illustration of *pesher* patterns.”<sup>19</sup> And B. D. Chilton writes, “By reason of its relative completeness and the close attention it has attracted, 1QpHab is a suitable point of departure for understanding the *pesharim* generally.”<sup>20</sup> With good reason however, some have questioned whether or not 1QpHab should completely define the study of *pesharim*.<sup>21</sup> We agree with Moshe Bernstein: the Habakkuk *Pesher* should not be placed in the realm “possessing singularity or near-singularity.”<sup>22</sup> However, due to its completeness, its clearness, its obvious exegetical characteristics, as well as its acceptance within the scholarly community as a

---

<sup>17</sup> Moshe J. Bernstein, “Introductory Formulas for Citation and Re-citation of Biblical Verses in the Qumran Pesharim: Observation on a Pesher Technique,” in *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1, 1 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994), 31-32.

<sup>18</sup> There is debate over the dating of this document. These debates will be covered in further detail in chapter 4 of this thesis.

<sup>19</sup> D. Dimant, “Pesharim, Qumran,” *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 5, 248b.

<sup>20</sup> B. D. Chilton, “Commenting on the Old Testament (with particular reference to the *pesharim*, Philo, and the Mekhilta),” In *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture, Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*, ed. D. A. Carlson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 122.

<sup>21</sup> Moshe J. Bernstein, “Introductory Formulas,” 31-32.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 32.

sectarian document, it has been selected here to represent the *peshar* materials within the sectarian literature.

### ***Rule of the Community (1QS) - Legal Lore***

*The Rule of the Community* (1QS), preserved almost intact, gives the fullest picture now existing of the actual functioning of the sect. The fact that there are twelve extant copies indicates the document's popularity and importance in the life of the community.<sup>23</sup> This scroll consists of distinct literary units of differing genre. Dimant describes the structure of the document and the various genres employed:

A general introduction states the aims of the community (1.1-15). It is followed by a description of the 'Entrance into the Covenant' (1.16-3.12...). After a summary of the sect's main theological ideas, the 'treatise of the Two Spirits' (3.13-4.26), there follows a loose combination of several sets of rules (5.1-6.23). It begins with another list of the sect's aims and obligations, followed by various rules and admonitions to the individual members, mainly to avoid all contact with outsiders and to obey one's superiors. More detailed rules are laid down in column 6. Next follows a penal code (6.24-7.25), a unit describing the ideal community (8.1-9.11), and finally a unit with instructions and guidance to the community (9.12-26). The extant work concludes with psalm-like hymns (10.1-11.22).<sup>24</sup>

Since this document was of such great importance in the community and meets, quite adequately, the Scriptural requirements, we believe it is an invaluable document to give insight into the mindset the community had toward Scripture.

### ***4Q Florilegium (4QFlor) – Eschatological Composition***

Alongside the *pesharim* are a group of texts labeled *florilegia*. The distinctive characteristics of this genre is that texts are organized around a number of biblical passages that pertain to a single or a few themes. They differ from the *pesharim* in that they are more along the lines of a "thematic commentary" versus a "continuous or

---

<sup>23</sup> Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," 498.

running commentary.” 4QFlor is an eschatological composition which deals only with the community’s beliefs about the last epoch of history. This is noteworthy since, “though few sectarian writings escaped the touch of eschatology, a distinction should be made between compositions entirely devoted to it and other works dealing with it only in relationship to other subjects.”<sup>25</sup> 4QFlor is one of those texts that deal exclusively with the eschatological views of the community.

4QFlor gives a *peshet*-like interpretation of 2 Samuel 7:10-14, Psalm 2:1 and various other texts and is clearly sectarian in nature. The scroll deals directly with the text of Scripture and although this scroll is fragmentary, it is complete enough to give a clear view of the community’s use of Scripture and will therefore be included in this thesis.

### ***Temple Scroll (11QTemp) – Halakhah***

The Temple Scroll (11QTemp) is the longest of the Qumran documents.<sup>26</sup> It has been debated however, as to whether or not this document is in fact sectarian. Baruch Levine maintains that the scroll is not sectarian and that it contains no *halakot*. Halakhic texts are texts relating to Jewish rituals and civil laws, and therefore illustrate the sectarian nature of a work. Yigael Yadin, one of the most well-known scholars in the area of the study of the Temple Scroll, points out the weakness of Levine’s claims: Levine “makes this claim despite the striking similarity – which he too acknowledges – between the laws and language of the Temple Scroll and those of the Damascus

---

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” 483-550, 514.

<sup>26</sup> Due to the length of the Temple Scroll it will be difficult within the scope of this project and the time constraints put on this project to do an in-depth study of the scroll in its entirety. It is our opinion however, that the Temple Scroll, because of its completeness and the *halakah* that it contains, will be very useful in answering the question that this present work sets out to answer.

Document.” Yadin goes on to say, “Levine arrived at the far-reaching conclusion about the Damascus Document that it too is *not* sectarian.”<sup>27</sup> These debates and their relevance for this study will be discussed in further detail in Chapter 7. However, based on the support of the scholarly community for this document’s sectarianism, and the definition of sectarian literature within the context of this project, we will include it here as a sectarian document relevant to the sect’s view of Scripture. The *halakhah* of the sectarian community will show a direct correlation to the uniqueness of Scripture within the developments of the community’s laws and legal texts.<sup>28</sup>

### *Research Methodology*

We are analyzing 1QpHab, 1QS, 4QFlor and 11QTemp from the Qumran sectarian writings to discover more precisely what the sectarians believed about Scripture and how the Scripture impacted their world. The analysis of these sources begins with a thorough study of each primary source, with special attention being given to direct quotations and allusions to Scripture, as well as to discussions on the relevance of Scripture to the community. This analysis is combined with a review of the relevant secondary literature written on each primary source as well as materials written on the exegetical methods and use of Scripture within the community.

A plethora of materials have been written on the Dead Sea Scrolls and more specifically on the materials found at the site of Khirbet Qumran. The list of scholars in this field of research is not a small one.<sup>29</sup> It is our privilege today to be standing on the

---

<sup>27</sup> Yigael Yadin, “Is the Temple Scroll a Sectarian Document?” In *Humanizing America’s Iconic Book*, 6, ed. Gene M. Tucker and Douglas A. Knight, Society of Biblical Literature: Biblical Scholarship in North America, (Chico, California: Scholars, 1982), 153-169.

<sup>28</sup> Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” 526.

<sup>29</sup> Names familiar in the beginning and early progress of Qumran research are: A. Dupont-Sommer, Abbe J. Starcky, C.H. Hunzinger, Frank Cross Jr., J. Carmignac, J. Strugnell, J.D. Amusin, J.T.

shoulders of some of the finest scholars in the field of Qumran research. These scholars have established a firm foundation for our work.

In order to answer the questions presented in this thesis, the literature of these scholars has been reviewed. The review of this literature will be found in the following chapters as it is relevant to the nature of the discussion at hand.

---

Millik, John Allegro, K.G. Kuhn, P. Skehan, R. deVaux, William Hugh Brownlee, John C. Trever, E.L. Sukenik, and Yigal Yadin. These scholars, along with others, were instrumental in initial publications and development of the texts. Other names associated with the later development of Qumran research include: Ben Zion Wacholder, George Brooke, Geza Vermes, Hershal Shanks, Joseph Fitzmeyer, Lawrence Shiffman, M. Burrows, Maurya P. Horgan, Michael Wise, Norman Golb, Theodore Gaster, F. F. Bruce, Hartmut Stegemann, James VanderKam and Timothy Lim. See the bibliography at the end of this work for more on the literature of each of these scholars as it relates to this current project.

## CHAPTER 2

### ***QUMRAN REVELATION THROUGH EXEGESIS***

#### Exegesis and Hermeneutics as Modern Distinctions

An investigation of the ways in which Scripture was used at Qumran involves more than a simple look at a few documents from Qumran. One must begin with a broader understanding of the work of exegesis and hermeneutics in Judaism in the first centuries B.C.E. and C.E.<sup>30</sup> We are following Daniel Patte's distinction between exegesis and hermeneutics. Patte claims that:

The only conscious use of Scripture was hermeneutical. Even the *middot* of classical Judaism (sometimes called exegetical rules) are according to our definition nothing else than hermeneutical rules: they are describing the 'legitimate' way to prolong the discourse of Scripture by a new discourse. Yet our assumption is that these hermeneutical rules as well as the other hermeneutical interpretations are based upon implicit exegeses, that is, on understandings of the 'significance' and 'signification' of the biblical text.<sup>31</sup>

George Brooke, following Patte, states, "For the early Jew there was no difference between exegesis and hermeneutic, that is, no difference between his encounter with the text as object *per se*, and as it related to himself as subject. Such is to say that the text presented itself to the early Jew as immediately relevant."<sup>32</sup>

Exegesis is the work of ascertaining as far as possible the meaning that the writer intended. This involves a scrutiny of the text, taking note of its linguistic elements, and its genre, its historical background, and so forth. Hermeneutics is an outflow of this

---

<sup>30</sup> For a detailed discussion of this matter, see Daniel Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic In Palestine*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 22, (Missoula, Montana: Scholars, 1975). See also George J. Brooke, *Exegesis At Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 29 (England: JSOT, 1985).

<sup>31</sup> Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 6.

exegetical process. Once the exegetical process has been completed, the exegete then employs hermeneutical rules to interpret the text in light of his own time and cultural situation. Therefore, Patte notes:

Hermeneutic is a second step in the process of interpretation. It is possible only on the basis of an understanding of the “significance” and “signification” of the text. These are apprehended by means of an exegesis –either an explicit exegesis (in contemporary times) or an implicit exegesis (in former times). Any exegesis is dependent upon the culture of the “exegetes” who have to comply with the demand of their culture.<sup>33</sup>

With this in mind, it must be noted that the distinction between exegesis and hermeneutic is probably a modern one, and not one that would have been in the minds of the authors of the Qumran Scrolls. At best, there may have been what Patte refers to as “implicit exegesis”<sup>34</sup> leading toward a hermeneutical use of the text. It is for this reason, that the terms exegesis and hermeneutics have been combined in this thesis. For simplicity, the word exegesis has been chosen as the word to represent the process of ascertaining an interpretation of a text that is immediately relevant to the interpreter and his community.

### Mediated Revelation

This brings us to the question at hand: What was the self-understanding at Qumran with reference to revelation? The sectarian writers believed they wrote the Truth. But, what did they believe was the source of their Truth? And by what process was this Truth revealed to them? Later Jewish writers would come to believe that the Truth they wrote came to them via an unbroken chain of oral transmission which reached

---

<sup>32</sup> Brooke, *Exegesis At Qumran*, 3.

<sup>33</sup> Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 3.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

all the way back to Moses on Mt. Sinai.<sup>35</sup> Did the authors of the Qumran sectarian literature understand themselves to be recipients of unmediated revelation? Did they claim direct, personal inspiration by God for themselves or for their Teacher of Righteousness or, did they believe that Truth had come to them through a process of inspired exegesis of the Holy Scriptures?

Our thesis is that the community of Qumran used exegetical rules and methods to discover God's revelation. In other words, revelation came through a divine encounter with the text not a mystical, unmediated encounter with the Divine. As will be seen in subsequent chapters the study of Scripture at Qumran is quite clear. In fact, the founding principles upon which the community of Qumran was established can be seen in their insistence upon the continual study of Scripture. A passage from the *Manual of Discipline* will suffice at this point:

Everyone who enters into the council of the community shall enter into the Covenant of God in the presence of all the volunteers and he shall obligate himself by a binding oath to return to the Law of Moses according to everything which he prescribed, with all his heart and all his soul, following the priests, the keepers of the Covenant and the seekers of his will, and to the multitude of the men of their covenant they who volunteer together for this truth and to walk in his will. And he shall undertake by the Covenant to separate himself from all men of iniquity that walk in the ways of wickedness. For they are not reckoned in His Covenant, for they have not sought nor searched in his laws to know the hidden things in which they have erred, incurring guilt, and the manifest things they have done high-handedly.<sup>36</sup>

Patte believes that this passage shows that the community at Qumran separated themselves from the rest of Judaism based on a different attitude toward Scripture. The "men of iniquity" were those who had not "sought nor searched in his laws." Patte notes

---

<sup>35</sup> Herbert Danby, ed. "Aboth," in *The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes* (Oxford: University Press, 1933), 446-447.



the use of the Hebrew words “בִּקֵּשׁ and דָּרַשׁ were both used with the meaning ‘to consult’, ‘to inquire of’ God (Exodus 33:7) or His Word (Amos 8:12). This consultation of the precepts of God was to be done ‘in order to know the hidden things’. The Covenanters were not therefore merely rejecting people who neglected the study of Scripture, but those who were not practicing the same approach toward interpreting Scripture as theirs.”<sup>37</sup>

The Scripture, more specifically the Torah, was to be studied by the whole of the community. The *Zadokite documents* refer to the community as a “house of the Torah.”<sup>38</sup> Following Joshua 1:8, and Psalm 1:2, the community ruled that where there were ten members of the sect, there was to be a man studying Torah day and night. Joshua 1:8, and Psalm 1:2 read respectively, “This book of the law shall not depart out of your mouth, but you shall meditate on it day and night, that you may be careful to do according to all that is written in it; for then you shall make your way prosperous, and then you shall have good success” and, “But his delight in the law of the Lord, and on his law he meditates day and night,”<sup>39</sup> 1QS 6.6 states:

In any place where there happen to be ten such men, there is not to be absent from them one who will be available at all times, day and night, to interpret the law, each of them doing so in turn.

The general members of the community are to keep awake for a third of all the nights of the year reading book(s), studying the Law and worshipping together.

---

<sup>36</sup> 1QS 5.7-12. Unless otherwise noted, this and all subsequent translations of the Dead Sea Scrolls are dependent upon the work of Wise, Abegg and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*.

<sup>37</sup> Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 215.

<sup>38</sup> CD 20:10, 13.

<sup>39</sup> This and all subsequent citations of Bible texts are taken from the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible.

The Teacher of Righteousness, the founder of the sect,<sup>40</sup> was primarily an expounder of God's Word. He is described in the Habakkuk *Pesher* as "the priest in (whose heart) God has put (the ability) to interpret all the words of His servants the prophets through whom God has foretold everything that is to come upon His people and (His land)."<sup>41</sup> He is also characterized in this document as "The Teacher of Righteousness to whom God made known all the mysterious revelations of his servants the prophets."<sup>42</sup> Patte refers to him as "the *inspired* interpreter of the Prophets' writings."<sup>43</sup> He explains this by stating, "he was inspired in the sense that he had the gift of 'explaining' these records, especially the mysteries, the secrets contained in them."<sup>44</sup> It is evident from the above discussion, and it will be seen in the subsequent chapters, that the Teacher of Righteousness' "inspiration" was through a divine encounter with the text as a gift from the Holy Spirit.<sup>45</sup> The *Hodayot* repeatedly mentions the author receiving the gift of the Holy Spirit. The author of the *Hodayot* is generally identified as the Teacher of Righteousness. Wise, Abegg, and Cook note in their comments on the *Hodayot*:

The author speaks of himself in the first person and recounts an agonizing history of persecution at the hands of those opposed to his ministry. In addition, the writer describes having received an

---

<sup>40</sup> It must be noted that this title, *Teacher of Righteousness*, has been considered by some to refer to a position or function rather than to a specific individual. See Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 216, 20 who is following *inter alia* G. W. Buchanan, "The Priestly Teacher of Righteousness", *Revue de Qumran*, 6, (1969), 553-558. It is agreed however, that the first who fulfilled this function was without any doubt considered as the Teacher of Righteousness *par excellence* and had a considerable role in the organization of the community. Several Qumran texts can be attributed to him, namely, some of the *Hodayot*. cf., M. Mansoor, *The Thanksgiving Hymns* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1961), 45ff., and the bibliography therein. Patte also notes that the *Zadokite Document* (1.1ff.) does not seem to refer to the Teacher of Righteousness as the founder of the sect.

<sup>41</sup> 1QpHab col. 2.8-10.

<sup>42</sup> 1QpHab col. 7.4-5, *Ibid.*, 119.

<sup>43</sup> Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 217.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>45</sup> For more on the work of the Holy Spirit at Qumran see F. F. Bruce, "Holy Spirit in the Qumran Text", in *The Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society* (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 49-55.

empowering spirit granting him special insight into God's will (1QH 4.26), opening his ears to wonderful divine mysteries (9.21), using him as a channel of God's works (12.8), and fashioning him as a mouthpiece for God's words (16.16). Indeed, in col. 26, he claims that no one compares with him, because his office is among the heavenly beings (see 4Q427 frag. 7, col. 1, 11. 11-12). These are bold affirmations for any leader, reminiscent of those of various claimants of both ancient and more recent history.<sup>46</sup>

1QH 13.18-19 reads, "So, for mine own part, through the Spirit thou hast planted within me, I, Thy servant, am come to know that [all Thy judgments are truth,]...." And 1QH 14.25 states, "So hast Thou graced me, Thy servant, with the spirit of knowledge and truth, that I should cherish the paths of righteousness and abhor all froward ways."<sup>47</sup>

Did this "inspiration" come through the study of the text, or, did it come in the same way as the revelation of the prophetic words themselves? The Teacher of Righteousness believed himself to be inspired by the Spirit in his interpretation of the Scriptures and this inspiration was unlike that of the prophets. There is no explicit reference in the Dead Sea Scrolls to any kind of visionary experiences. For the Teacher of Righteousness and the community at Qumran the Scriptures played a much more central role in the revelation and uncovering of the "hidden things" and the "mysteries". "Revelation occurred in an *inspired search of Scripture*."<sup>48</sup>

M. P. Miller states, "If *peshet* is the revelation of prophetic mysteries, these mysteries are exegetically discerned. They are the product of a meditative study on biblical texts."<sup>49</sup> And it is through this meditative study that the Teacher of Righteousness, along with other authors of Qumran sectarian literature, were *inspired* to

---

<sup>46</sup> Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*, 84-85.

<sup>47</sup> Translation taken from Theodor Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1976), 195.

<sup>48</sup> Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 218. Italics added for emphasis.

<sup>49</sup> M. P. Miller quoted in Brooke, *Exegesis At Qumran*, 5.

write and give their interpretations of Scripture and make use of the Scriptures for the formation and continuation of their sect.

“The correct interpretation of Scripture was the focal point of the Community, and its belief that it had been entrusted with the correct teaching and meaning of Scripture was the basis of the Covenanters’ faith, the stabilizing factor of their rigidly disciplined daily lives.”<sup>50</sup> This can be seen in the *Manual of Discipline*. 1QS 8.1,2,4,5 reads as follows:

In the deliberative council of the community there shall be twelve layman and three priests schooled to perfection in all that has been revealed of the entire law. Their duty shall be to set the standard for the practice of truth, righteousness and justice, and for the exercise of charity and humility in human relations... So long as these men exist in Israel, the deliberative council of the community will rest securely on a basis of truth.<sup>51</sup>

In addition, from the *Manual of Discipline*, 1QS 8.14, we read of the Scriptural foundation for the community. “Prepare in the wilderness the way... make straight in the desert a highway for our God.”<sup>52</sup> Isaiah 40:3 is a text that could be said to be the ‘bumper sticker’ of the community. In 1QS 8.14 a parenthetical note is given following the quotation of Isaiah 40:3. The note reads, “The reference is to the study of the Law which God commanded through Moses to the end that, as occasion arises, all things may be done in accordance with what is revealed therein and with what the prophets also have revealed through God’s Holy Spirit.”<sup>53</sup>

W. H. Brownlee comments, “In this case, the interpretation of Isa. 40:3 lay at the roots of the Essene way of life and was not merely an afterthought for vindicating their

---

<sup>50</sup> John Trever, “The Qumran Covenanters and Their Use of Scripture,” *Personalist* 39 (1958): 127-138, 129.

<sup>51</sup> 1QS 8.1,2,4,5. Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scripture*, 60.

<sup>52</sup> 1QS 8.14. Ibid., 61

strange exclusiveness.”<sup>54</sup> It is commonly agreed among scholars that this community was devoted to the continual study of and meditation upon Scripture. Not only was this the foundation of the community, but it was the sustaining life of the community. It has been suggested by John Trever, “take away the assurance of the Covenanters concerning the correctness of their understanding of God’s work and will, and their faith would be shattered.... Unless Scripture could provide a solution, they had no further basis for faith!”<sup>55</sup> It was the assurance that they were “rightly dividing the Word of Truth” that kept them faithful to a rigid life of study and solitude in the Judean Wilderness. They were committed to this rigid life of study in order that they may “live up to the election as the holy and faithful people of the last generation.”<sup>56</sup> It is for this reason that the community “searched” the Scriptures.

But what was it that they were searching for? 1QS 5.7-12 states that the community “searched” the Scriptures to know the “hidden things”:

Everyone who enters into the council of the community shall enter into the Covenant of God in the presence of all the volunteers and he shall obligate himself by a binding oath to return to the Law of Moses according to everything which he prescribed, with all his heart and all his soul, following the priests, the keepers of the Covenant and the seekers of his will, and to the multitude of the men of their covenant they who volunteer together for this truth and to walk in his will. And he shall undertake by the Covenant to separate himself from all men of iniquity that walk in the ways of wickedness. For they are not reckoned in His Covenant, for they have not *sought* nor *searched* in his laws *to know the hidden things* in which they have erred, incurring guilt, and the manifest things they have done high-handedly.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Ibid.

<sup>54</sup> W. H. Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), 84.

<sup>55</sup> Trever, “The Qumran Covenanters and Their Use of Scripture,” 130-131.

<sup>56</sup> Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*. See also on this G. R. Driver, *The Judaean Scrolls, The Problem and a Solution*, (New York, Schocken, 1965), 564ff.

<sup>57</sup> 1QS 5.7-12. Italics added for emphasis.

According to the community at Qumran, revelations were given to the prophets and hidden in the prophetic text until the “appointed time” for their unveiling.<sup>61</sup>

It seems, then, that for the community at Qumran, revelation came through exegesis. In the prophetic writings we read of a different method of “inspiration” or “revelation” from what we see at Qumran. The prophets receive an unmediated divine revelation. The mysteries that were made known to the prophets came through “the Word of the Lord” which was then shared with the prophet’s audience. A standard formula in the prophetic writings is, “The word of the Lord came to me” or “The word of the Lord that came to . . . .” Most of the prophetic books claim to present “the word of the Lord” through the prophet. For example, in the book of Ezekiel the phrase “The word of the Lord came to me” is repeated over 50 times.<sup>62</sup> It may not always be clear how these “words” were acquired, but in many cases the prophet received visions. For example, Amos, Obadiah and Nahum all received the word of the Lord through visions, as did Isaiah and Ezekiel.<sup>63</sup>

Two prophetic books more closely associated with Qumran are Daniel and Habakkuk. The *peshar* method of Habakkuk is said to be closely related to the dream interpretation of Daniel.<sup>64</sup> We would contend, however, that the writers of the *pesharim* as well as the other authors of the Qumran documents, the Teacher of Righteousness included, did not receive their “revelations” in this same visionary manner. Daniel

---

<sup>61</sup> Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 220.

<sup>62</sup> The phrase appears approximately 80 times in the prophetic writings. These numbers were acquired through a quick phrase search in *Bible Works* Computer software program version 3.5, Michael S. Bushell, Lotus Development Corp, 1966.

<sup>63</sup> See the 5 vision reports of Amos 7-8, “This is what the Sovereign Lord *showed* me,” Obadiah 1:1, “The *vision* of Obadiah,” Nahum 1:1, “The book of the *vision* of Nahum the Elkoshite,” Isaiah 1:1, “The *vision* of Isaiah son of Amoz, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah.” See also Ezekiel 11:24 and 43:3 for examples of Ezekiel’s visions.

interpreted mysteries (ר) from visions that came directly from God. Daniel 2:19-23 reads as follows:

Then the mystery was revealed to Daniel in a vision of the night, and Daniel blessed the God of heaven. 20 Daniel said: "Blessed be the name of God from age to age, for wisdom and power are his. 21 He changes times and seasons, deposes kings and sets up kings; he gives wisdom to the wise and knowledge to those who have understanding. 22 He reveals deep and hidden things; he knows what is in the darkness, and light dwells with him. 23 To you, O God of my ancestors, I give thanks and praise, for you have given me wisdom and power, and have now revealed to me what we asked of you, for you have revealed to us what the king ordered."<sup>65</sup>

Daniel 8:1 reads, "In the third year of the reign of King Belshazzar a vision appeared to me, Daniel, after the one that had appeared to me at first."<sup>66</sup> The prophets receive "the word of the Lord," the mysteries (ר) described in the *pesharim*, through visionary encounters with God. The community at Qumran received the "revelation" of the mystery, in the case of the *pesharim*, and the hidden things, in the case of the Torah materials, through a divine encounter with a text. We assert that the community at Qumran believed that it was the diligent searching of Scripture that put the Teacher of Righteousness into a position to hear "the word of the Lord" through the text. Patte writes:

The Qumran community had the conviction that the "Presence" of God was bound to the community. It is not surprising therefore to find Scripture used as a mere language: the community itself was the locus of revelation. This is not to say that Scripture had an insignificant role: it provided the framework in which the "Presence" manifested itself. Yet precisely to fulfill this function, Scripture had to stay in the background. To put it in terms of the sectarian's explicit understanding of Scripture, to use Scripture (to study it) was to "prepare the way of (the Lord)" (1QS 8.15). The

---

<sup>64</sup> Debates on this issue are discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.

<sup>65</sup> Daniel 2:19-23.

<sup>66</sup> Daniel 8:1.

“Presence” of the Lord pushed into the background this preparation for His coming.<sup>67</sup>

The question of how revelation was acquired at Qumran, mediated or non-mediated, could be answered with the statement: “revelation through exegesis.” In the preceding material, we have focused on the acquisition of revelation to show that the community of Qumran had a firm belief that they were the community of the “New Covenant,”<sup>68</sup> living up to the election as the holy and faithful people of the last generation. This belief was, in their view, not of man, but was “revealed” to them by God through the correct handling of the Scriptures themselves.

In the following chapters we turn our attention to four sectarian documents, from differing genres, that will illustrate the exegetical practices of the community. It is only through the “correct handling of the text” that accurate “revelation” would be possible in the mind of this community. And again, it was the improper handling of the text that separated them and sent them into the wilderness to spend their lives studying and “searching” the Law of God and the Prophets. The “men of iniquity” have erred in their “searching” of the “hidden things” in God’s Laws and have therefore incurred guilt, excluding them from God’s covenant. The community at Qumran felt they could no longer be a part of this improper way of handling Scripture and therefore, separated themselves and gave themselves over to a life committed to the searching and knowing of the Law and the Prophets. “For they are not reckoned in His Covenant, for they have not *sought* nor *searched* in his laws *to know* the hidden things in which they have erred, incurring guilt, and the manifest things they have done high-handedly.”<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 279

<sup>68</sup> The “New Covenant” is how the community at Qumran viewed themselves. This term is used throughout their writings.

<sup>69</sup> IQS 5.7-12. Italics added for emphasis.



But prior to looking at the four documents from Qumran, it is important to insert an excursus on the exegetical rules found in early Judaism, focusing on the *middot* due to their common association with Qumran.

## CHAPTER 3

### **EXCURSUS ON EXEGETICAL RULES**

From the modern perspective, the year C.E. 70 is a decisive turning point in Jewish history. Before C.E. 70 the focus was upon the Temple and the Pharisees. Following C.E. 70 and the destruction of the Temple, the focus was upon the rabbis. The introduction of the term ‘Rabbi’ suggests the consciousness of a new era.<sup>70</sup> It is from this period following the destruction of the Temple that we acquire what is known as the ‘Rabbinic Literature.’ This literature arose mostly out of an attempt to adapt the Torah to changing conditions. With the destruction of the Temple, Jewish communities were forced to change the way they looked at life. “This updating of the Torah occurs in the ‘oral Torah’ whose development is particularly connected with biblical exegesis, be it by direct deduction of new regulations and ideas from the text or by secondary justification of a statement of tradition through a particular biblical reference.”<sup>71</sup>

The rabbis’ exegetical process was governed by certain rules known today as the *middot*. These rules were developed over time and were eventually summarized into three groups: the 7 rules of Hillel, 13 rules of R. Ishmael, and the 32 rules of R. Eliezer (ben Yose ha-Gelili).<sup>72</sup> It is debated as to whether or not these rules actually began with Hillel or were simply formalized in his time. It is evident, as we will see in the following chapters however, that there was a definite methodology of interpreting Scripture prior to the formal crystallization of these rules.

---

<sup>70</sup> H. L. Strack, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, ed. Markus Bockmuehl (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress, 1996), 1-7.

<sup>71</sup> *Ibid.*, 15.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*

It is not our intent here to explain each of these rules in depth. They are listed here with a definition. As we will see, some of these rules appear to have been used at Qumran. We will discuss these in greater detail in the following chapters.<sup>73</sup>

### The 7 Rules of Hillel

1. *Qal wa-homer*: This is an argument from the lighter (less significant) to the weightier (more significant) and vice versa.
2. *Gezerah shawah*: Lit., 'equal ordinance' or 'statute'. This is an argument from analogy. Strictly speaking this is only used if two given Torah statements make use of identical (and possibly unique) expressions. Moreover, these expressions which form the basis for the analogy should not be required for the understanding of the statement; in this way it can be assumed that Scripture itself already used them with a view to the intended analogy.
3. *Binyan ab mi-katub ehad*: Lit., 'founding of a family from a single Scripture text'. By means of this exegetical norm, a specific stipulation found in only one of a group of topically related biblical passages is applied to them all. Thus the main passage bestows on all the others a common character which combines them into a family.
4. *Binyan ab mi-shne ketubim*: This is the expression for the same kind of derivation based on two biblical passages. Thus, for example, the regulations that a slave must be released when his owner puts out his eye or tooth (Exod 21:26,27) are generalized: for any irreplaceable loss a slave must be compensated by being freed.
5. *Kelal u-ferat u-ferat u-kelal*: 'The general and the particular, the particular and the general', i.e. the qualification of the general by the particular, and the particular by the general. The thirteen rules of Ishmael divide this rule into eight (nos. 4-11).
6. *Ke-yose bo be-maqom aher*: 'Something similar to this in another passage'. This rule is similar to the argument by analogy, but it is less strictly limited.
7. *Dabar ha-lamed me-'inyano*: The 'argument from the context' of a biblical statement. This principle frequently leads not to a natural exegesis of context but to often farfetched expositions based on the accidental proximity of two terms.

---

<sup>73</sup> The following lists of *middot* have been abbreviated from Strack, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, 15–30. For more on the *middot* and Rabbinical hermeneutics see the bibliography in Strack, 15, 16-17, 20, 22.

### The 13 Rules of R. Ishmael

The thirteen rules (*middot*) of R. Ishmael are essentially an expanded version of Hillel's seven *middot*. The breakdown is as follows: R. Ishmael (I) # 1 = Hillel (H) # 1; I # 2 = H # 2; I # 3 = H # 3 and # 4; I # 4 – 11 are formed by a partition of H # 5; I # 12 = H # 7. H # 6 is left out of R. Ishmael's list. I # 13 is new: 'Two verses of Scripture contradict each other until the third verse comes and decides between them.'

### The 32 Rules of R. Eliezer

These rules are named after Eliezer ben Yose ha-Gelili who flourished a generation after Bar Kokhba (ca. 150 C.E.).<sup>74</sup> The list of rules is as follows:

1. *Rubbui*: 'increase, inclusion' where the Bible uses the words *af* and *gam* ('also') i.e. Gen 1:1 'God created heaven and earth'. 'Heaven' includes sun, moon, stars and constellations; and 'earth' includes trees, grass, and the Garden of Eden.
2. *Mi'ut*: 'restriction, exclusion, reduction' indicated by the words *akh*, *raq* ('only' and 'from, out of').
3. *Ribbui ahar ribbui*: 'inclusion after inclusion' through a combination of two of the particles cited for no. 1.
4. *Mi'ut ahar mi'ut*: a combination of two restrictive or exclusive particles. 'An exclusion after an exclusion signifies an inclusion.'
5. *Qal wa-homer meforash*: An explicit argument from the lesser to the greater, and vice versa (Cf. Hillel No. 1)
6. *Qal wa-homer satum*: An implicit argument from the lesser to the greater, and vice versa.
7. *Gezerah shawah*: Cf. Hillel no. 2.
8. *Binyan ab*: Cf. Hillel No 3.
9. *Derekh qesarah*: An abbreviated or elliptical expression.
10. *Repetition* is used for interpretation.

---

<sup>74</sup> This is approximately 100 years after the heyday at Qumran.

11. *Related material which is separated* (by *sof pasuq* or another disjunctive accent).
12. Something is adduced for comparison and thereby is itself seen in a new light (cf. Hillel No. 7).
13. If a general principle is followed by an action (*ma'aseh*), then the latter is the particular instance of the former (cf. Hillel No. 5).
14. The more significant is compared with the lesser in order to achieve better understanding.
15. = Ishmael 13.
16. An expression which is unique to its passage.
17. A circumstance not clearly expressed in the main passage is mentioned elsewhere. This is especially used to supplement a Pentateuchal reference with a non-Pentateuchal one.
18. One particular instance is mentioned in a category of events although the whole category is intended.
19. A statement is made in relation to one object, but it is also valid for another.
20. Something is inappropriately said about an object but must properly be applied to another.
21. Something is compared with two things and only the good properties of both are applied.
22. A sentence which must be supplemented from its parallel.
23. A sentence serves to supplement its parallel
24. Something is contained in a general statement and is then isolated in order to say something about itself.
25. Something is contained in a general statement and is then isolated in order to say something about the latter (minor modification of Ishmael's No. 8).
26. *Mashal*: 'Parable', allegorical interpretation.
27. *Equivalence*: A number of equivalent significance. Thus the 40 days of Num 13:25 are equivalent to the 40 years of Num 14:34.
28. *Paronomasia*: play on cognate roots.
29. *Gematria*: denotes a calculation of the numerical value of letters.

30. *Notarikon*: division of a word into two or more; alternatively, each letter of a word is to be understood as the initial letter of another word.

31. *An antecedent that is placed subsequently.*

32. Some biblical passages pertain to an earlier time than the preceding text, and vice versa.

We do not have a text that clearly defines a codified set of rules for Qumran as we do for later Rabbinic Judaism. It is our belief, however, that thinking akin to these rules, and possibly other exegetical principles and practices, were in the minds of the community at Qumran well before the formalization of these rules within the 'Rabbinic Literature.' As we will see in the following chapters the methods of exegesis of Scripture at Qumran demonstrate an approach to Scripture that is in harmony with the exegetical rules codified in later generations. We are in agreement with Michael Fishbane in believing that the thinking behind these rules, although not codified, was in use in literature even prior to the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>75</sup> "The diversity of hermeneutic techniques and their consistent form show that the art of interpretation was highly developed in ancient Israel, and show a striking similarity to those found both at Qumran and in the ancient Near East. These features also appear in the Bible, in a similar diversity of genres."<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> Michael Fishbane, "The Qumran Peshar and Traits of Ancient Hermeneutics," in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, ed. Avigdor Shinan, vol. 1 (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1977), 97-114.

<sup>76</sup> Fishbane, "The Qumran Peshar and Traits of Ancient Hermeneutics," 112.

## CHAPTER 4

### **1QpHab – Peshar Habakkuk and the Pesharim**

#### Introduction To 1QpHab and the *Pesharim*

A group of writings was found among the sectarian literature at Qumran that have been given the designation *pesharim*. Dimant describes the categories of *pesharim*:

There are three types of *Pesharim*: a) *Continuous Pesharim*. This term designates commentaries on entire biblical books, mostly the prophets. b) *Thematic Pesharim*. These are characterized by the assembling of various biblical texts and their interpretations around certain themes.... c) *Isolated Pesharim*. These consist of a citation of only one or two verses with an interpretation using *peshar* methods and terminology, interwoven into larger compositions of a different literary genre.<sup>77</sup>

The focus of this chapter will be upon the continuous *pesharim* and more specifically upon the Habakkuk *Peshar* found in Cave 1 at Qumran.

There is a debate as to the dating of the Habakkuk *Peshar*. Wacholder dates the writing around 170 B.C.E. and argues against its use as a benchmark by which all other *pesharim* could be compared and judged. He states that, “the Qumran commentary on Habakkuk is not typical of the pesherite texts since it probably antedates the existence of the Commune and seems to reflect the earlier days of the movement. As such, it may be regarded as a prototype of the pesherite genre.”<sup>78</sup> Hartmut Stegemann, on the other hand, argues for a later date. He states that 1QpHab was the “last of the commentaries on the Prophets” written by the community at Qumran. Further, Stegemann asserts that this *peshar* is “at least a third-hand copy and comes itself from around 50 B.C.”<sup>79</sup> Horgan

---

<sup>77</sup> Dimant, "Qumran Sectarian Literature," 504.

<sup>78</sup> Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran*, 90, 196.

<sup>79</sup> Hartmut Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (Michigan: Eerdmans, 1998), 131.

states, “The script of both [hands<sup>80</sup>] is Herodian, and the time of the copying of the scroll can probably be placed in the second half of the first century B.C.”<sup>81</sup> Wise, Abegg and Cook assume that the Kittim mentioned are the Romans and that their arrival in 63 B.C.E. argues for a date around that time. They state, “The *Commentary on Habakkuk* must have been written around that time, and the latest carbon-14 tests in fact point to the first century B.C.E. as the period when the Cave 1 copy was made. (The paleographic date places the scroll late in the first century B.C.E.).”<sup>82</sup> We are inclined to agree with the arguments for a later date around the Roman arrival.

This debate is significant for our discussion in order to accurately get a picture of the use of scripture at Qumran. It has been proposed that the attention to the strict use of Scripture changed with the evolution of the community. If this were the case, then to simply use one document from a particular genre would cause a potential misinterpretation of the community’s mindset toward Scripture. We, however, have designed this project to study samples of the various genres of sectarian literature. Therefore, it is impossible to study any one genre exhaustively. We recognized the limitations of studying one single document from a genre and allowing it to be representative of the entire genre. We have limited our views to the *Pesher* on Habakkuk as a starting point and have included a few other examples from texts within the *pescharim* to show a consistency in the community’s thoughts.

1QpHab contains the commentary on the first two chapters of the prophetic book of Habakkuk. The third chapter of Habakkuk is a poem that is left out of the Qumran

---

<sup>80</sup> Horgan states that the commentary comes from two hands: 1:1 – 12:13 from one hand, and 12:13 – 13:4 from another, and cites Elliger’s work *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar*, 72-74 in support.

<sup>81</sup> Horgan, *Pescharim*, 11.

<sup>82</sup> Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 115.



*peshar* on Habakkuk. As Vanderkam notes, there is plenty of space at the end of the scroll for more to have been added. “This space suggests that the interpreter wrote as much as he intended; the poem in chapter 3 did not serve his purposes.”<sup>83</sup>

As noted earlier, this document was one of the first documents to be discovered and published from Qumran. Due to its length and relative completeness, it has become the “standard” for judging *pesharim* that were discovered later. It has been studied more frequently and in greater depth than any of the other *pesharim*, and has often served as a model for the reconstruction and interpretation of the *pesharim*. Dimant writes, “The *peshar of Habakkuk* provides the most comprehensive illustration of *peshar* patterns.”<sup>84</sup> B. D. Chilton states, “By reason of its relative completeness and the close attention it has attracted, 1QpHab is a suitable point of departure for understanding the *pesharim* generally.”<sup>85</sup> It is debated whether this scroll should be the benchmark by which the rest of the *pesharim* should be evaluated. Bernstein makes clear that the Habakkuk *Peshar* should not be placed in the realm of “possessing singularity or near-singularity.”<sup>86</sup> There is little doubt however, that this document is unique among the *pesharim* and should be carefully studied in any work done on the *peshar* materials. This piece is also “one of our main sources of information on the Teacher of Righteousness and the closer circumstances of his founding of the Essene union about 150 B.C.”<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 46.

<sup>84</sup> D. Dimant, “Pesharim, Qumran,” *Anchor Bible Dictionary* 5, 248b. See also Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 300.

<sup>85</sup> Chilton, “Commenting on the Old,” 122.

<sup>86</sup> Bernstein, “Introductory Formulas,” 30-70.

<sup>87</sup> Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 131-132.

### Defining the *Pesharim*

Horgan states, “The *pesharim* are a group of sectarian writings that present, section by section, continuous commentaries on biblical books, namely, prophets and psalms.”<sup>88</sup> The *peshar* documents themselves claim to be interpretations that God revealed to selected Qumran interpreters. The interpretations were of mysteries that had been revealed by God to the biblical writers.

The *pesharim* are so named because this word is used to introduce the interpretation sections of the scroll. Each *peshar* scroll contains two kinds of material: the citation of the biblical texts, known as the lemma, and the interpretation given to the lemma, known as the *peshar*.

The Hebrew word *peshar* appears only once in the Old Testament – in Eccles. 8:1, “who knows the *interpretation* of a thing?” There are thirty occurrences of the cognate word *peshar* in the Aramaic part of the Book of Daniel. In these occurrences, it is used concerning Daniel’s interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar’s two dreams and of the handwriting on the wall at Belshazzar’s feast. It is also used for the interpretation of Daniel’s first vision, supplied by one of the attendants at the heavenly judgment scene. The context here implies that to know this kind of “interpretation” is something that calls for wisdom.<sup>89</sup>

Qumran scholars disagree about what constitutes a *peshar*. G. Vermes points out that the word *peshar* can designate a literary work of biblical interpretation, or it can be

---

<sup>88</sup> Horgan, *Pesharim*, 248.

<sup>89</sup> F. F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1959),

used for certain types of non-literal interpretation.<sup>90</sup> J. D. G. Dunn describes *peshar* as “a narrower form of midrash.”<sup>91</sup> In 1963, according to Brooke, “J. Carmignac defined *peshar* in terms of the author’s intention of revealing the hidden sense and the mysteries of prophetic texts at the expense of the literal sense of the text.”<sup>92</sup> Brooke goes on to state, “all these characteristics are to be seen not in the tradition of midrash or commentary but in that of dream interpretation as evidenced in Daniel.”<sup>93</sup> In 1971, Carmignac acknowledged that there is no scholarly agreement as to the definition of a *peshar*. Carmignac proposed two subcategories of *peshar*: “continu,” in which there is systematic interpretation of a portion of the Bible, and “thématique,” in which texts are chosen deliberately from the whole Bible and grouped artificially around a theme. For Carmignac the one distinctive characteristic that remains is the *peshar*’s treatment of prophetic literature.<sup>94</sup>

There tend to be two ways in which *peshar* has been defined. The first has been by content and the second by genre. Those who have defined *peshar* by content are mentioned above as well as C. Roth and J. Van der Ploeg.<sup>95</sup>

Those who define *peshar* as a genre focus on the structure of the materials. For L. H. Silberman the structure of the *peshar*, is the same as the structure that defines the midrashim. And Brooke agrees: “form rather than content seems to offer the best clue

---

<sup>90</sup> G. Vermes, "Interpretation, History of., At Qumran and in the Targums," in *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible Supplementary Volume* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), 438-439.

<sup>91</sup> J. D. G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977), 84-85.

<sup>92</sup> George Brooke, "Qumran Peshar: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre," *Revue de Qumran* 10, no. 4 (1981): 483-503, 485.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, 485.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, 485.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, 486-487.

towards the determination of the genre.”<sup>96</sup> Writing against associating the *pesharim* with midrash is M. Delcor who takes a stand opposite of Brownlee. Brownlee is very much in favor of aligning the *pesharim* with the midrash.<sup>97</sup>

Where this discussion comes into our current study is seen in a comment made by F. F. Bruce in 1959 and supported by G. Vermes, in a similar comment made in 1976. Bruce, commenting on recognizable categories of interpretation such as “allegorical, moral, and so forth,” states, “The kind of *interpretation* found in the commentaries is introduced to the reader under the name *peshet*. It is with this *kind of interpretation* that we are concerned.”<sup>98</sup> Bruce seems to be placing *peshet* as a type of interpretation alongside allegory. According to Brooke, G. Vermes included *peshet* as one of the “forms of Qumran exegesis” in 1976 and then in 1977, “he defined *peshet* on the basis of content as ‘fulfillment interpretation of prophecy.’”<sup>99</sup> This emphasizes the characteristic trait of the *pesharim* in which the author’s current historical setting is brought out as the fulfillment of the prophecy being interpreted. The *Pesharim* typically ignore the prophets’ original intent and focus instead upon their own setting as that which the prophet intended.

Horgan, writing in 1979, gives a good background study to the word *peshet* and seems to take the study a step further than many of the other authors mentioned above. She traces the etymology of the word *peshet* through four consonant groups, *ptr*, *pšr*, *ptr*, *ptr*.<sup>100</sup> Horgan concludes that the word *peshet*, at its root, means “to loosen.” “In the Akkadian,” states Horgan, “the basic meaning ‘loosen’ is extended to ‘explain,’

---

<sup>96</sup> Ibid., 487.

<sup>97</sup> Ibid., 489.

<sup>98</sup> Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, 7. Italics added for emphasis.

<sup>99</sup> Brooke, “Qumran Peshet: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre,” 489.

‘interpret.’” She continues this discussion to conclude by stating, “it seems to me better to stress the nuances of the unraveling of mysteries or the ‘translating’ of symbols, and so I retain the translation ‘interpretation’ with this in mind.”<sup>101</sup> She then states the following in connection to other scholar’s definitions of this word: “Other translations of the word *peshar* include ‘meaning’ (Brownlee, Milik, Burrows, Elliger, and similarly Stegemann) and ‘explication’ (Dupont-Sommer, Vermes).<sup>102</sup>

The one fact about which all scholars agree is the connection of the *pesharim* to the tradition of dream interpretation. Brooke summarized the scholars thus:

O. Betz notes the formal links with dream interpretation in his generic description of *peshar*, L.H. Silberman compares the *pesharim* favourably with the *petirah* midrash, A. Finkel cites further biblical and non-biblical examples of dream interpretation, M. P. Miller extends the category of dream to include certain visions and prophetic material, as do F. Daumas, J. Carmignac and D. Patte. I. Rabinowitz bases his whole investigation on such an identification even including texts from the Assyrian Dream Book for his purposes and, to conclude this brief sample of authors, M. Delcor makes reference to “l’interprétation des songes.”<sup>103</sup>

Horgan also joins in the support of the *peshar* being the interpretation of dreams and more specifically the *raz* (mystery). The word *raz*, says Horgan, “is a Persian loan-word that does not occur in biblical Hebrew but is found in biblical Aramaic in Dan 2:18, 19, 27, 28, 29, 30, 47 (twice); 4:6 (English 4:9). The concept of mystery expressed by the term *raz* developed out of the idea of the ancient prophets’ being introduced in their visions into the heavenly assembly and there learning the secret divine plans for cosmic history.”<sup>104</sup> This connection between the *raz* and *peshar* is a most helpful one as will be seen in the Habakkuk *Peshar*. The *raz* was that mystery that was revealed to the prophets

---

<sup>100</sup> For more details on this word study, see Horgan, *Pesharim*, 230–236.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, 231.

<sup>102</sup> *Ibid.*, 237.

<sup>103</sup> Brooke, “Qumran Peshar: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre,” 490.

but its meaning was not clear. It wasn't until the *peshet* was given that the total picture could be seen. Bruce puts it thus, "the *raz*, the mystery, is divinely communicated to one party, and the *peshet*, the interpretation, to another. Not until the mystery and the interpretation are brought together can the divine communication be understood."<sup>105</sup> In the *pesharim* the mysteries that are discussed were hidden in the prophetic writings and in fact were hidden from the prophets' understanding. They are mysteries that are concerned with things to come. The mysteries were revealed by God to the prophet to proclaim. Also revealed by God is the *peshet*. The *pesharim* themselves claim that the *peshet* was revealed by God, to a selected interpreter. This mystery could not be unraveled or solved by human wisdom and therefore needed the wisdom of the divine to give illumination.<sup>106</sup> "The *peshet*, then, is an interpretation which passes the power of ordinary wisdom to attain; it is given by divine illumination. But it follows that the problem which requires interpretation of this order is no ordinary problem; it is, in fact, a divine mystery."<sup>107</sup>

### Exegesis in 1QpHab

The foundation, then, in our study of the *pesharim* and more specifically in the work of 1QpHab, begins with an understanding of the principle of the *raz* and the *peshet*. According to Bruce, this understanding underlies the biblical exegesis in the Qumran commentaries.<sup>108</sup> This is most evident in 1QpHab 7.1-5, interpreting Hab. 2:1, which states:

*I will take my stand on my watch and post myself on my tower, and scan the scene to see whereof He will denounce me and what answer I might give when He arraigns me. And the Lord took up word with*

---

<sup>104</sup> Horgan, *Pesharim*, 237.

<sup>105</sup> Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, 8.

<sup>106</sup> Horgan, *Pesharim*, 237.

<sup>107</sup> Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, 8.

<sup>108</sup> *Ibid.*

*me and said: Write the vision, and make it plain upon tablets that he who runs may read.* God commanded Habakkuk to write the things that were coming upon the last generation, but the fulfillment of the epoch He did not make known to him. And as for the words, so he may run who reads it, their interpretation (*peshet*) concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God made known all the mysteries (*razim*) of the words of His servants the prophets.<sup>109</sup>

It was the belief of the community at Qumran that the revelation from God was divided into two parts and it wasn't until those two parts came together that its meaning would be made plain. It was believed that during the last days God would raise up one to interpret the words of the prophets. The Zadokite document states:

God took note of their deeds, how that they were seeking Him sincerely, and He raised up for them one who would teach the Law correctly, to guide them in the way of His heart and to demonstrate to future ages what He does to a generation that incurs His anger, that is, to the congregation of those that betray Him and turn aside from His way.<sup>110</sup>

As the community formed, they developed a belief that they were living in the final generation and that God had raised up a leader who would be able to interpret the meaning behind the mystery. "With both an inspired text – the Scriptures – and an inspired interpreter – the Teacher – The Qumran group was confident it enjoyed a great advantage over any other readers of the sacred prophecies. They convinced themselves that they alone had had the vagaries of the prophets clarified through the inspiration of their leader."<sup>111</sup>

The question this now raises is, what were the principles through which the Teacher of Righteousness exegeted Scripture in order to have what we believe they

---

<sup>109</sup> 1QpHab 7.1-5, lemma italicized in order to distinguish between the lemma and the *peshet* portions of the text.

<sup>110</sup> Zadokite Document 1.10-12.

<sup>111</sup> VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 45.

would call an “accurate” interpretation of Scripture? Did the *peshet* come through a divine encounter with God, or a divine encounter with a text? Brooke states, “Any interpreter of Scripture who wished his interpretation to be accepted is likely to have used particular interpretative techniques because they were reckoned to be valid ways of producing a meaningful interpretation.”<sup>112</sup> Brownlee, treating 1QpHab as a midrash, believes that the interpreter employed some of the exegetical techniques of the later Rabbinic Midrashim.<sup>113</sup> To support his views he has developed a list of thirteen hermeneutical principles evidenced within 1QpHab. This view has been opposed by some, such as K. Elliger, who, following Brownlee’s treatment of the exegetical methods used in 1QpHab, proceeded to critique his thirteen Hermeneutical Principles.<sup>114</sup> Elliger’s own understanding of the exegetical method used in 1QpHab is based on the order of priorities that he saw the interpreter to have: primarily the interpreter wished to use the text of Habakkuk word for word or slightly paraphrased, secondarily he would resort to atomization of the text to convey the desired interpretation, and only if there was no other way would he use other modes of exegesis (allegory, wordplay, rearrangement of the text, use of corruptions in the text, etc.).<sup>115</sup> Elliger’s view has been said to conform to the inspired dream interpretations of Daniel as noted above. Among those that hold this view of dream interpretation, it seems there is a leaning toward the view of an unmediated divine encounter with God versus a divine encounter with God through the text. Wise, Abegg and Cook comment:

---

<sup>112</sup> Brooke, *Exegesis At Qumran*, 4.

<sup>113</sup> Brownlee, “Biblical Interpretation Among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 54-76.

<sup>114</sup> Brownlee’s hermeneutical principles will be discussed later in this chapter.

<sup>115</sup> Brooke’s reading of Elliger’s work. Brooke, *Exegesis At Qumran*, 42. For more on Elliger’s views see Elliger, *Studien zum Habakkuk-kommentar vom Totem Meer*, BHT 15 (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1953), See primarily chapter 6, pp. 118-64.



Very characteristic of the Dead Sea sect was the view that the Bible was a puzzle to be solved or an enigma to be unraveled. Its characteristic word for the activity of interpretation was *peshet*, which as a rule refers to the interpretation of dreams. The biblical Daniel serves as the ideal interpreter of this type: he interprets dreams (Dan 2, 4) and visions (the "handwriting on the wall," Dan 5) not through native ability, but because God has revealed the secrets to him. The Qumran scribes understood their task in the same way: to penetrate the secrets of Scripture not through reflection on the text itself, but through openness to the revelation of God.<sup>116</sup>

We would agree with L. H. Silberman, M. P. Miller, F. F. Bruce, O. Betz and many other scholars that the two views, divine dream interpretation and textual exegesis, are not independent of each other but, in fact, dependent upon each other. M. P. Miller states, "If *peshet* is the revelation of prophetic mysteries, these mysteries are exegetically discerned. They are the product of a meditative study on biblical texts."<sup>117</sup> Brooke comments:

F. F. Bruce and O. Betz have developed understandings of the use of scripture at Qumran that allow for the supposed dichotomy between revealed interpretation and the deliberate use of exegetical techniques, a dichotomy to which Elliger's work bears witness. Bruce maintains assuredly that as 'principles' in the Qumran use of the prophets must be seen the attitude that God's revelation to the prophets could only be comprehended with the interpretation that He gave to the Teacher of Righteousness through revelation, and the notion that all the words of the prophets had reference to the time of the end which was the present.<sup>118</sup>

In looking at 1QpHab, one will quickly discover some similarities to the exegetical rules found in the *middot*.<sup>119</sup> Fishbane notes the following exegetical principles

---

<sup>116</sup> Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 114.

<sup>117</sup> M. P. Miller, "Targum, Midrash and the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 2 (1971), 53.

<sup>118</sup> Brooke, *Exegesis At Qumran*, 41-42.

<sup>119</sup> For more on the *middot* of the late Second Temple period refer back to chapter 3 of this present work. See also Brooke, *Exegesis At Qumran*, as well as Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*. For works related specifically to the *middot* and Rabbinical Hermeneutics one might begin with, Strack, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*.

at work within 1QpHab and the *peshtarim* as well as pre-Qumran literature and the Bible itself. Fishbane's list is as follows:

1. *Citation and atomization*: A text is cited in small parts and then interpreted in a current historical context.
2. *Multiple interpretation*:<sup>120</sup> More than one meaning is given to a word or phrase.
3. *Paranomasia*:<sup>121</sup> The interpretation plays on a homonymous root in the lemma.
4. *Symbols*:<sup>122</sup> A variety of symbols with typological import are found.
5. *Notrikon*:<sup>123</sup> This type of hermeneutic technique has various sub-categories; one is the interpretation of every letter. A second type of notrikon is the anagram in which the letters have been transposed.
6. *Gematria*:<sup>124</sup> This is the calculation of the numerical value of the letters of a word.<sup>125</sup>

Brownlee has also developed a list of hermeneutical principles found in 1QpHab.

His list is as follows:

1. Everything the ancient prophet wrote has a *veiled, eschatological meaning*.
2. Since the ancient prophet wrote cryptically his meaning is often to be ascertained through a *forced, or abnormal construction of the Biblical text*.
3. The prophet's meaning may be detected through the study of the *textual or orthographic peculiarities* in the transmitted text. Thus the interpretation frequently turns upon the special readings of the text cited.
4. A *textual variant*, i.e., a different reading from the one cited, may also assist interpretation.

---

<sup>120</sup> See 1QpHab 2.1-10

<sup>121</sup> See 1QpHab 11.2ff. where the graph בלע means "swallow" in the lemma and "destroy" in the pesher.

<sup>122</sup> See 1QpHab 2.10-12 where the כשרים are the כהנים and the latter are the Romans in pNah 1:3. The אפרים and the דורשי החלקה are the Pharisees in pNah 2.2. לבנון is the sect in 1QpHab 12.3f. עיר is Jerusalem in 1QpHab 12.7. This type of translation-key not only unlocks the text but also gives it an allegorical tinge. Fishbane, "The Qumran Peshar and Traits of Ancient Hermeneutics," 99.

<sup>123</sup> See Driver, *The Judean Scrolls*, 337-346 for a survey of this principle.

<sup>124</sup> Fishbane notes that "there is no certain case at Qumran, unless the letters נ מ א are computed. If so, they yield the total 91, which would be equivalent to one solar quarter, and thereby a cryptic reference to the calendrical computation system regnant among the sectarians." Fishbane, "The Qumran Peshar and Traits of Ancient Hermeneutics," 100.

<sup>125</sup> Fishbane, "The Qumran Peshar and Traits of Ancient Hermeneutics," 98-100.

5. The application of the features of a verse may be determined by *analogous circumstance*, or by
6. *Allegorical propriety*.
7. For the full meaning of the prophet, *more than one meaning* may be attached to his words.
8. In some cases, the original prophet so completely veiled his meaning that he can be understood only by *equation of synonyms*, attaching to the original word a secondary meaning of one of its synonyms.
9. Sometimes the prophet veiled his message by writing one word instead of another, the interpreter being able to recover the prophet's meaning by a *rearrangement of the letters in a word*, or by
10. *The substitution of similar letters* for one or more of the letters in the word of the Biblical text.
11. Sometimes the prophet's meaning is to be derived by the *division of one word into two or more parts*, and by expounding the parts.
12. At times, the original prophet concealed his message beneath abbreviations, so that the cryptic meaning of a word is to be evolved through *interpretation of words, or parts of words, as abbreviations*.
13. *Other passages of Scripture* may illumine the meaning of the original prophet.<sup>126</sup>

Bruce supports the use of *atomization, textual variants, allegory and reinterpretation*. Bruce proposes that, "(1) God revealed His purpose to His servants the prophets, but His revelation (particularly with regard to the time when His purpose would be fulfilled) could not be understood until its meaning was imparted to the Teacher of Righteousness. (2) All the words of the prophets had reference to the time of the end. And (3) the time of the end is at hand."<sup>127</sup>

In order to illustrate the use of these exegetical practices within 1QpHab and the *pesharim*, what follows are a few examples of the above practices. We believe that these

---

<sup>126</sup> Brownlee, "Biblical Interpretation Among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls," 60-62.

<sup>127</sup> Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, 9.

principles were used intentionally throughout the writings at Qumran and that the community believed them to be inspired.

### ***Citation and Atomization:***

Since the pesharim deal directly with the exposition of a text, their use of exegetical principles are the most obvious. The first and most obvious principle at work comes from a belief that the prophets' message is hidden and must be uncovered by the one whom God ordains for the task. The most obvious text to support this belief is found in 1QpHab col. 7 commenting on Habakkuk 2:1-2 and 2:3a. This text reads:

So I will stand on watch and station myself on my watchtower and wait for what he will say to me, and [what I will reply to] His rebuke. Then the Lord answered me [and said, Write down the vision plainly] on tablets, so that with ease [someone can read it]" (2.1-2)]

[This refers to... ] then God told Habakkuk to write down what is going to happen to the generation to come; but when that period would be complete He did not make known to him. When it says, "so that with ease someone can read it," this refers to the Teacher of Righteousness to whom God made known all the mysterious revelations of his servants the prophets.

For a prophecy testifies of a specific period; it speaks of that time and does not deceive (2.3a).

This means that the Last Days will be long, much longer than the prophets had said; for God's revelations are truly mysterious.<sup>128</sup>

The Teacher of Righteousness viewed the events spoken of by the prophets through the lens of his own historical context. "All the prophecies, so to speak, were given in code, and no one was able to break the code until the Teacher of Righteousness was given the key."<sup>129</sup>

---

<sup>128</sup> Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 119.

<sup>129</sup> Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, 10.

Within the *peshet* on Habakkuk one will quickly notice the principle of *citation* and *atomization*. Fishbane describes this feature from a structural point of view. He states, “this is the most distinguishing feature. A text is cited and then interpreted. The lemma is linked to the interpretation by a variety of nouns and (demonstrative) pronouns.”<sup>130</sup> Bruce takes this a step further and states, “in the Qumran commentary (1QpHab) the two chapters are *atomized*; each phrase is made to fit into a new historical situation regardless of its contextual meaning.”<sup>131</sup> This illustrates the first of Brownlee’s “Hermeneutical Principles.”<sup>132</sup> The most obvious characteristic found in the *pesharim* is its atomization or being broken down into small parts for a new interpretation. The *pesharist* interpreted these parts with a focus upon their own current historical context. “In order to make the biblical text applicable to a situation of his own day, the commentator simply disregards its original context, and even overrides the natural relationship of its component clauses.”<sup>133</sup> This process can be seen throughout the Habakkuk *Peshet* as well as in the *pesharim* in general. An example of this in the *peshet* on Habakkuk 1:13 can be seen where the interpreter changes the prophets’ meaning from God to the righteous remnant that “art of purer eyes than to behold evil and canst not look on wrong.” It is also not God, but “the house of Absalom”, that is upbraided for looking on faithless men and for remaining silent when the righteous man is overwhelmed by the wicked.

---

<sup>130</sup> Fishbane, “The Qumran Peshet and Traits of Ancient Hermeneutics,” 98.

<sup>131</sup> Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, 11. Italics added.

<sup>132</sup> Brownlee, “Biblical Interpretation Among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 60.

<sup>133</sup> Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, 11.

The principle of *citation* and *atomization*, is one in which the writer of the pesher is saying “this is that.”<sup>134</sup> Looking at a group of people, a person, or events that are happening, or are to come, the pesherist uses the Scripture, along with his eschatological belief, to reveal the hidden meaning in the text itself. It is this belief that allows the pesherist to set aside the prophet’s original context and to focus upon his own historical context. It is for this reason that the Teacher of Righteousness can speak of the “injustice” of his day,<sup>135</sup> the “wicked man” referring to the “Wicked Priest,”<sup>136</sup> and, in col. 2 of 1QpHab, the “traitors with the Man of the Lie, because they have not obeyed the words of the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of God.”<sup>137</sup> In each of these cases, as well as in almost every section of the scroll, the context has been shifted to the current situations facing the community and flowing out of recent events that caused the community to form and take shape.

### ***Variant Readings vs. Authorial Alteration***

With *citation and atomization* as a backdrop, other exegetical principles make more sense. For example, the use of *variant* readings allows the pesherist to use the text which makes the most sense for his current situation. The issue of textual use has been debated throughout Qumran research. Because the writer of the pesher wanted to fit the text to their situation, it has been proposed that the pesherist in fact altered the text in order to make it fit. Timothy Lim asks a very provocative question in his work, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters*. He asks, “Did the pesherists and Paul consider the biblical texts that they quoted to be holy in the sense of

---

<sup>134</sup> The phrase “this is that” is adopted from F. F. Bruce.

<sup>135</sup> 1QpHab col. 1.

<sup>136</sup> Ibid.

<sup>137</sup> 1QpHab col. 2.

being the inviolable Word of God, or did they also rework their scriptural passages in a manner similar to the rewritten bibles' paraphrasing and recasting of the biblical material?"<sup>138</sup> In his article entitled "Eschatological Orientation and the Alteration of Scripture in the Habakkuk Pesher," Lim deepens this question by asking:

Has this eschatological orientation influenced the Qumran author's understanding of the sanctity of Scripture? Did he regard his Habakkuk text as holy, in the sense of immutable, or did he alter the very wording of the text for the sake of his interpretation? And if he did indeed modify his Scripture, what are the implications for our understanding of Bible interpretation at Qumran and, more generally, the literature of the Second Temple period?<sup>139</sup>

Lim maintains that the pesherist felt the freedom to modify and alter the text. He suggests, "that the very words of the Bible were not considered to be immutable like some mathematical formula, the alteration of even one of whose components invalidates the entire equation, but were treated as malleable clay in the hands of an expert and authoritative interpreter."<sup>140</sup> It is understood, that before 70 C.E. there was not a detailed belief system about the sanctity of each letter. It was not until after 70 C.E. that Judaism, in any of its expressions, had developed an ontology of the text.

Nevertheless, Brownlee states, "the charge of deliberate alteration is hazardous." He discusses G. Molin, "who thinks that many of the variants represent conscious alterations of the text for the sake of interpretation." Brownlee, however, believes that the peculiar readings in 1QpHab were most likely found in a manuscript (or manuscripts)

---

<sup>138</sup> Timothy Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 8.

<sup>139</sup> Timothy Lim, "Eschatological Orientation and the Alteration of Scripture in the Habakkuk Pesher," *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 49 (April 1990): 185-94, 185

<sup>140</sup> Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters*, 9.

and were treated as authoritative.<sup>141</sup> Lim states, “Van der Ploeg... considered the Habakkuk text of 1QpHab a vulgar recension of the MT,” whereas “Brownlee and Stendahl... have proposed distinctive theories of eclecticism.”<sup>142</sup> This period of time was a time of textual fluidity and it would not have been uncommon for an interpreter to make use of the texts that were available to him. If one is to prove the alteration theory he/she must first be able to substantiate the use of an original text that was codified as canon.

Bruce states:

Along with this atomizing exegesis there goes at times an interesting treatment of textual variants. Where one reading suits the commentator's purpose better than another, he will use it, although he may show in the course of his comment that he is aware of an alternative reading. He has been suspected of deliberately altering the text here and there in order to make the application more pointed, but the suspicion does not amount to proof.<sup>143</sup>

Bruce substantiates his argument for variants vs. alteration with several examples; one of which is as follows:

In Habakkuk 2:5a MT reads: “Moreover, wine is treacherous; the arrogant man is puffed up.” But the Qumran commentator reads *hon* (“wealth”) for MT *hayyayin* (“the wine”) and explains the passage thus (1QpHab VIII.8-11):

Its interpretation concerns the Wicked Priest, who was called by the name of truth when first he arose, but when he ruled in Israel his heart was exalted and he forsook God, and dealt treacherously with the ordinances for the sake of wealth.

He links this interpretation with the verses immediately following, where the man who “heaps up what is not his own” (Hab 2.6) is identified with the Wicked Priest, who

Looted and amassed the wealth of the men of  
[v]iolence who rebelled against God, and took the

---

<sup>141</sup> William H. Brownlee, *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary From Qumran*, Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 11 (Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1959), 114-115.

<sup>142</sup> Lim, “Eschatological Orientation and the Alteration of Scripture in the Habakkuk Peshier,” 187.

<sup>143</sup> Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, 12.



wealth of nations, adding to himself iniquity and guilt, and acted in ab[om]inable ways, with every defiling impurity (1QpHab VIII. 11-13).

But, if the commentator had found the Massoretic reading in his text, it would have suited his interpretation equally well, for it is plain from his comment on Hab 2.15 f. that wine as well as wealth was a means of the Wicked Priest's undoing, for he "walked in the ways of drunkenness to quench his thirst."

This last passage provides further examples of the commentator's use of variant readings. The MT of Hab 2.15 f. may be rendered: "woe to him who gives his neighbor to drink, adding thy fury thereto, and makes him drunk, that he may look on their nakedness! Thou art sated with contempt instead of glory. Drink thyself and be uncircumcised! The cup in the LORD's right hand will come round to thee, and shame will come upon thy glory!" This has been felt by many editors and translators to require some emendation; in RSV, for example, "adding thy fury thereto" is conjecturally emended to "of the cup of his wrath", and "be uncircumcised" is replaced by "stagger" – a reading which finds support in the Greek and Syriac versions, and which now appears to have been found by the Qumran commentator in his biblical text.<sup>144</sup>

It is interesting to note that the alteration referred to by Lim seems only to be found in the *peshet* portion and not in the lemma. Lim is noting a change that has taken place between the citation of Hab 2.17 in the lemma and a new reading in the *peshet*. In those cases where certain words have been left out, some scholars believe this to be the equivalent of a modern day ellipsis. Lim does not agree with this assessment and states "it is best to regard this as a clear instance of authorial alteration of the biblical text for interpretation."<sup>145</sup>

We are not inclined to agree with either argument for they both fail to take account of a glaring piece of data. If the issue is authorial license and the liberty to alter a text to fit the interpreters agenda, then it would seem to me that the author would take the

---

<sup>144</sup> Ibid., 12-13.

<sup>145</sup> Lim, "Eschatological Orientation and the Alteration of Scripture in the Habakkuk Peshet," 191.

license in the lemma and remain consistent in the *peshet*. In this case cited by Lim the implication is that the pesherist had authorial license in the *peshet* but not in the lemma thus maintaining a reverence for the original text that was chosen to be used in the lemma. If the pesherist felt he could modify the text itself, why didn't he change the lemma and recite the same. Thus, we are in agreement with the use of textual variants versus arguments for the authorial alteration of an original text.

### ***Allegory***

The pesherist also makes use of *Allegory* though not as frequently as other exegetical practices in 1QpHab. Brownlee states, "Strictly allegorical interpretation is a minor element in DSH [=1QpHab]." <sup>146</sup> Patte, following Dupont-Sommer, avoids the use of the word "allegory" even though it is widely accepted by scholars such as Brownlee, O. Betz, and A. Finkel. Patte states, "we shall refrain nevertheless from using this term and keep it for a scriptural interpretation which, although similar in its methods, refers to spiritual realities rather than to concrete historical situations (present or future)." <sup>147</sup> For the purposes of this thesis, we will use the word "allegory" to describe the method used by the pesherist in interpreting certain words and phrases. And even though its use may be limited in the *pesharim*, its use outside of the *pesharim* clearly shows that it was an important practice in use by the community.

The text of Habakkuk 2:17 contains the words, "Lebanon" and "the Beasts." "The original reference was apparently to the cutting down of the cedars of Lebanon by the Chaldeans for military and other purposes, and the hunting of the animals that had

---

<sup>146</sup> Brownlee, "The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary From Qumran," 74.

<sup>147</sup> Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*, 303.

their homes there.”<sup>148</sup> With the current cultural setting of the pesherist as the focus, a literal interpretation was out of the question. Our interpreter allegorizes these words, stating that “Lebanon” refers to the society of the Yahad, and “beasts” refers to the simple-hearted of Judah who obey the Law.<sup>149</sup>

Another example of allegorical interpretation comes from the *pesher* on Micah found in Cave 1. This example, is one in which the pesherist makes a leap in allegory, interpreting the high places of Judah as the Teacher of Righteousness. The text reads “And what are the high places of Judah? Are they not Jerusalem?”

[Its interpretation con]cerns the Teacher of Righteousness: it is he who [teaches the law to] his [council] and to all those who volunteer to be enrolled among the elect people [of God, practicing the law] in the council of the community, who will be delivered from the day [of judgment].<sup>150</sup>

Allegory became a useful tool in assisting the pesherist in his eschatological interpretation. In other words, the allegory made sense to the pesherist because that is what was necessary to “unriddle the riddle,”<sup>151</sup> or to interpret the mystery (*raz*).<sup>152</sup>

### **Multiple Meanings**

Within the *pesharim*, one last exegetical example will show how the community was deliberate in their study of the text and did not rely simply on unmediated revelation from God. As noted above, scholars such as Brownlee, Bruce, Fishbane and others have proposed many types of exegesis. In addition to the use of *citation and atomization*, the

---

<sup>148</sup> Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, 14.

<sup>149</sup> 1QpHab col. 11.17–12.5 Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 122.

<sup>150</sup> Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*, 14. Bruce here uses the text from *DJD* i, p. 78.

<sup>151</sup> Lou H Silberman, “Unriddling the Riddle: A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Pesher,” *Revue de Qumran* 3 (1961): 323–64.

<sup>152</sup> For more examples of allegory see Brownlee, “Biblical Interpretation Among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 62–76.

use of *textual variants* vs. *alteration*, and the use of *allegory*, the pesherist also made use of *multiple meanings* assigned to words.

The pesherist often discovered more than one meaning in the words of the prophets. For example in 1QpHab col. 11.2-8 interpreting Habakkuk 2:15 we read:

*Woe to the one who gets his friend drunk, pouring out his anger, making him drink, just to get a look at their holy days.*

This refers to the Wicked Priest, who pursued the Teacher of Righteousness to destroy him in the heat of his anger at his place of exile. At the time set aside for the repose of the Day of Atonement he appeared to them to destroy them and to bring them to ruin on the fast day, the Sabbath intended for their repose.<sup>153</sup>

As Patte points out, “The verb “to drink” is equated with the verb “to swallow,” being understood in its secondary meaning “to destroy.” One of the clearest examples of multiple interpretations is found in col. 2 of 1QpHab commenting on Habakkuk 1:5. The text reads:

[“Look, *traitors*, and see,] [and be shocked-amazed-for the Lord is doing something in your time that you would not believe it if told” (1:5)

[This passage refers to] the *traitors* with the *Man of the Lie*, because they have not [obeyed the words of] the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of God. It also refers to the *trai[tors* to the] *New [Covenant]*, because they did not believe in God’s covenant [and desecrated] His holy name; and finally it refers [to the *traitors* in the *Last days*, they are the *cru[el Israel]ites* who will not believe when they hear everything that [is to come upon] the latter generation that will be spoken by the Priest in whose[heart] God has put [the ability] to explain all the words of His servants the prophets, through [whom] God has foretold everything that is to come upon His people and [His land].<sup>154</sup>

Here in this passage the pesherist gives three different interpretations to the word traitors. He interprets them as “the Man of the Lie,” those who went against the “New

<sup>153</sup> Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 121-122. Lemma italicized for clarity.

<sup>154</sup> *Ibid.*, 116. Italics and bold type have been added to emphasize the multiple meanings given to the word traitor.

covenant” and the “Cruel Israelites.” The pesherist is attaching specific meanings to an otherwise vague word in the text.<sup>155</sup>

Finally, we draw attention to Brownlee’s connection of these exegetical principles to the *middot* and “the rabbinic (or midrashic) character” of them. In his article, “Biblical Interpretation Among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” Brownlee shows the Rabbinic character of these principles by giving examples of them in early Judaism and Rabbinic literature. The connection of the exegetical principles discovered within the *pesharim* to the exegetical rules of later Judaism cannot be ignored. This connection clearly shows a community disciplined in the study of the Scriptures and who believed their interpretation to have come as a divine revelation through this disciplined study.<sup>156</sup>

---

<sup>155</sup> For further support on multiple interpretations see Fishbane, “The Qumran Pesher and Traits of Ancient Hermeneutics,” 97-114, as well as Brownlee, “Biblical Interpretation Among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 71-75

<sup>156</sup> Brownlee, “Biblical Interpretation Among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 71-75. This article expounds upon all thirteen of his hermeneutical principles not just the few we have mentioned here. Brownlee does a great job of showing the connection of the encounter with the text as the basis of the revelation obtained by the writer of the pesher.

## CHAPTER 5

### *The COMMUNITY RULE (1QS)*

#### Introduction to 1QS

A manuscript known as The Community Rule was produced around 100 B.C.E., and contains, four different sections of community rules. It was among the first seven scrolls found and has been foundational to our understanding of the sectarian nature of the community. The sheer number of copies (thirteen) of this work discovered in the caves illustrates the central nature of this work for both the community as well as its importance for our understanding of the community.<sup>157</sup> This work is in essence a “charter”<sup>158</sup> for the community laying out the rules and guidelines by which the community would be organized and function. This work has also been referred to as a “constitution.”<sup>159</sup> The opening lines of this document read as follows:

*A text belonging to [the Instructor, who is to teach the Holy Ones how to live according to the book of the Yahad's Rule. He is to teach them to seek God with all their heart and with all their soul, to do that which is good and upright before Him, just as He commanded through Moses and all His servants the prophets (1QS 1:1).<sup>160</sup>*

Stegemann in his recent work, *The Library of Qumran*,<sup>161</sup> has done an outstanding job of outlining the different parts of this document and their uniqueness. He begins by describing the first work of this scroll as *The Rule of the Community* which takes up 1QS

---

<sup>157</sup> We have chosen to continue to use the designation “community” due to the title often assigned to this scroll. It should be noted however that this work probably refers to “various groups or chapters scattered throughout Palestine and therefore it did not attach specifically to the site of Qumran.” Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 123. As noted by Wise a better designation would be the term *Yahad* meaning “unity” which was the community’s most common designation of itself. See also Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 108.

<sup>158</sup> The term “charter” comes from Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 123.

<sup>159</sup> VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 57.

<sup>160</sup> Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 126-127.

<sup>161</sup> Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 107-118.

One need not read far into *The Community Rule* (1QS) to discover the importance placed upon the Scriptures. In 1QS 1.2-3 the author alludes to the importance of “Moses and all His servants, the prophets” when he states, “He is to teach them to seek God with all their heart and with all their soul, to do that which is good and upright before Him, just as He [God] commanded through Moses and all His servants the prophets.” The author is here showing the validity of Moses and His servants the prophets as the direct communication of God Himself. The author goes on to state in 1QS 1.7-9 that “He is to induct all who volunteer to live by the laws of God into the Covenant of Mercy, so as to be joined to God’s society and walk faultless before Him, according to all that has been revealed for the times appointed them.”

In 1QS 1.11-15:

All who volunteer for His truth are to bring the full measure of their knowledge, strength, and wealth into the *Yahad* of God. Thus will they purify their knowledge in the verity of God’s laws, properly exercise their strength according to the perfection of His ways, and likewise their wealth by the canon of His righteous counsel. They are not to deviate in the smallest detail from any of God’s words... They shall turn aside from His unerring laws neither to the right nor the left.

In verse 17 all who enter “agree to act according to all that He has commanded and not to backslide.” These types of comments about the keeping of the laws of God are scattered throughout 1QS and show the importance the community placed upon the writings of Moses and the Prophets.

One of the most obvious and profound indications of the value and place of Scripture within the community is found in 1QS 6.6-8. It is here we see not only the importance of Scripture as a text but also the priority of the community’s interaction with the text. 1QS 6.6-8 states, “In any place where is gathered the ten-man quorum, someone

must always be engaged in study of the Law, day and night, continually, each one taking his turn. The general membership will be diligent together for the first third of every night of the year, reading aloud from the book, interpreting Scripture, and praying together.” These comments about the Word of God found in 1QS also indicate the significance of Scripture and the Laws of God as a foundation for the actual use of the Scriptures both implicit and explicit.

### Explicit and Implicit Use of Scripture in 1QS

Due to the limits of this thesis we will simply refer here to the explicit use of Scripture within the Rule of the Community and the formulas for introducing the conscious and deliberate use of Scripture by the author of this scroll. “The fundamental attitude of both the Qumran sect and the early Christian Church toward the Old Testament is manifested in the introductory formulae used by their writers.”<sup>164</sup> These formulas are significant because of the doctrine of Scripture they express.<sup>165</sup> J. A.

Fitzmyer notes:

Quotations so introduced obviously differ from mere allusions, in which it is often difficult to decide to what extent or degree the use of an Old Testament expression was intended by the writer to carry the impression that a reference to it was actually being made.... There is no doubt of the reference to the Old Testament, however, when the quotation is explicitly introduced by a formula.<sup>166</sup>

In 1QS one finds three times<sup>167</sup> a formula referring to “that which was *written*.”<sup>168</sup>

The first example of this is found in 1QS 5.15 where the text from Exod 23:7 “Keep far

---

<sup>164</sup> J. A. Fitzmyer, “The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament,” *NTS* 7 (1960-61): 296-333, 299.

<sup>165</sup> Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine*, 228.

<sup>166</sup> Fitzmyer, “The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament,” 300

<sup>167</sup> Patte notes that the “limited number of occurrences shows that this use of Scripture is not at all characteristic of the *Manual of Discipline*, which can be said consequently to be much less apologetic.” Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine*, 271.



curses of the Mosaic Covenant.”<sup>171</sup> The connection 1QS is making to Zephaniah 1:6 regards, “Those who turn back from following the LORD and neither seek the LORD nor inquire of him.”<sup>172</sup>

In 1QS “Scripture is implicitly used to such an extent that it could be said to be a mosaic of biblical texts.”<sup>173</sup> Throughout 1QS there are many allusions to Scripture. In these cases the reference is not so much to a specific biblical text as to a general Scriptural principle. For example, the idea that the people of God were to organize themselves into groups of “thousands and hundreds and fifties and tens”<sup>174</sup> “corresponds to that recommended by Jethro in Exodus 18.21 and is found again in the Bible at Deut. 1.15; Numbers 31.14, 48, 52; I Samuel 8.12; II Samuel 18.1, 4.”<sup>175</sup>

### Uncovering the Hidden and the Revealed

Here, as in the *pesharim*, we see the belief in the hidden and the revealed. It is in the discipline of seeking God through His statutes that one discovers the hidden laws and how to keep from error. 1QS divided the biblical laws into two categories: *nigleh* (revealed) and *nistar* (hidden). The revealed laws were laws in which the interpretation is clear to everyone. They were revealed in the text and were straightforward and explicit. The hidden laws were those laws that were hidden behind the text and must be

---

<sup>170</sup> Even though it can be debated whether or not this is a deliberate use of this text, we mention it here because of the importance it places on the study of Scripture for the community.

<sup>171</sup> 1QS 5.10-11.

<sup>172</sup> Zeph 1:6.

<sup>173</sup> Patte, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine*, 273.

<sup>174</sup> 1QS 2.21-22.

<sup>175</sup> A. R. C. Leane, *The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966), 135.

uncovered. As Dimant states, the hidden laws are “correctly understood only by the sectaries who derived it ...by means of a particular, divinely inspired exegesis.”<sup>176</sup>

This notion of the hidden things, called the “mystery,” is particularly striking.

According to Wise, Abegg, and Cook:

early Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism also embraced similar but distinct notions of “continuing revelation” not known to outsiders. This is the idea that God continued to reveal new truth in their own day and that the Bible was neither the only, nor the final, repository of his communication with humankind. Paul speaks often of “the mystery that has been hidden throughout the ages and generations but has now been revealed to his saints” (Col 1:26).

For this community, the searching of Scripture was critical in knowing the hidden laws and the mysteries. The group of “perverse men who walk in the wicked way” not only erred in the hidden laws but even in the revealed laws, they knowingly transgressed.<sup>177</sup>

For this community, the searching, knowing and the keeping of the Laws of God was a high priority and it was this, which enabled each individual to be considered a part of the community. 1QS 5.8 states that the initiate is to “take upon himself a binding oath to return to the Law of Moses (according to all that He commanded) with all his heart and with all his mind, to all that has been revealed from it to the Sons of Zadok – priests and preservers of the covenant, seekers of His will – and the majority of the men of their Covenant.”

From the *Manual of Discipline*, we discover the importance Scripture held within the community. Scripture was the foundation for all that went into the development and life of the sect. It formed the backbone of the sect and its values and was the standard by which life was lived within the community. Scripture was the key to entry into the sect.

---

<sup>176</sup> Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” 526. Here Dimant has summarized information from Schiffman’s work *The Halakha*, 75-76.

Based on how Scripture was handled, divisions were made between those who were on the inside and those who were outsiders; those who walked in the way of wickedness and those who walked in the purity of God within the Community of the New Covenant.

---

<sup>177</sup> 1QS 5.11-12.

## CHAPTER 6

### **4Q FLORILEGIUM (4QFlor)**

#### Introduction to 4Q Florilegium

4QFlor deals only with the last epoch of history and, according to Hartmut Stegemann, it “was probably composed toward the end of the reign of the Jewish Queen Alexandra Salome (76-67 B.C.).”<sup>178</sup> “Though few sectarian writings escaped the touch of eschatology, a distinction should be made between compositions entirely devoted to it and other works dealing with it only in relationship to other subjects.”<sup>179</sup> 4QFlor is one of those texts that deal specifically with the eschatological views of the community.

The distinctive characteristic of this genre is that texts are organized around a number of biblical passages that pertain to a single or a few themes. They differ from the *pesharim* in that; they are more like a “thematic commentary” versus a “continuous or running commentary”. The author of 4QFlor makes primary use of 2 Samuel and Psalms 1 and 2 with other passages being adduced for commentary and clarification. The passages may be taken from different books, or from separate parts of the same biblical book.

The eschatological documents tend to focus upon the Prophetic Scriptures. For the Qumran community, the prophets included more biblical characters than we would typically place in this category. For this community Moses and David were included in this list and when they wrote in a future tense, “it was not some indefinite expression of

---

<sup>178</sup> Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 120. Differing dates have been assigned to this scroll. Brooke cites the following: N. Avigad, based on orthographic considerations alone, places this class of scrolls roughly in the range of 50 B.C.E. to C.E. 70. For S. A. Birnbaum this work would belong at the very end of the first century B.C.E. or in the first century C.E. F. M. Cross dates the script as ca. C.E. 50. Brooke, *Exegesis At Qumran*, 83-84.

<sup>179</sup> Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” 514.

hope or vague musing; it was prophecy, and fair game for the interpretive methods that could crack open a verse and reveal its hidden meaning.”<sup>180</sup>

## Exegesis in 4QFlor

### ***Gezerah Shawah***

One of the most obvious exegetical techniques found in the *middot* and early midrashic practices, is the principle employed by the rabbis called *gezerah shawah*. Literally this means “similar category” and was used when words of similar or identical meaning occurred in any two given parts of the Law. When this was the case, both of the texts – no matter how different they might seem – would be given identical application.<sup>181</sup> The author of 4QFlor, therefore, seems to have grouped the verses that he believed spoke of the Last Days, in order to determine God’s message for the end of times.

*Gezerah shawah* can be noted in the following examples: Exod 15:17b-18 is linked to 2 Sam 7:10-11a through the common occurrence of the root נָטַע (plant); Amos 9:11 is linked to 2 Sam 7:12 through וְהִקְמֹתִי (raise up); Isa 8:11 is attached to Ps 1:1 through דֶּרֶךְ (the way); Ezek 37:23 is linked to Ps 1:1 through מִוֶּשֶׁב (the seat); and Dan 12:10 and 11:35 are linked to Psalm 2 through the root שָׂכַל (the wise).<sup>182</sup> In each of these cases, the original context is irrelevant and the author’s interpretation is made through the identification of the same words in each passage. This clear midrashic practice appears throughout 4QFlor and demonstrates well the deliberate practice of exegetical methodology.

---

<sup>180</sup> Wise, Abegg, and Cook, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 225.

<sup>181</sup> Ibid., 225-226.

<sup>182</sup> Brooke, *Exegesis At Qumran*, 166.

An explanation of a couple of the examples from above should suffice to clarify the practice of *Gezerah shawah* in 4QFlor. Amos 9:11 is linked to 2 Sam 7:12, through the word “to raise up” (והקים). Amos 9:11 reads as follows: “On that day I will *raise up* the booth of David that is fallen, and repair its breaches, and *raise up* its ruins, and rebuild it as in the days of old;” (NRSV). And 2 Sam 7:12 reads, “When your days are fulfilled and you lie down with your ancestors, I will *raise up* your offspring after you, who shall come forth from your body, and I will establish his kingdom” (NRSV).

Following the practice of *Gezerah shawah*, 4QFlor 1.10-13 connects Amos 9:11 with 2 Sam 7:12 this way:

The Lord declares to you that he will build you a house. And I will *raise up* your seed after you, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever. I will be to him as a father, and he will be to me as a son: he is the shoot of David who will stand with the Interpreter of the Law, who [will rule] in Zion in the latter days as it is written, And I will *raise up* the booth of David which is fallen: he is the booth (or branch) of David which was fallen, who will take office to save Israel (italics added to show connection).

Another good example of *Gezerah shawah* is the connection of Psalm 1:1 to Isaiah 8:11 by connecting the phrase “the way.” Here 4QFlor reads:

Midrash of “Happy is the man who does not walk in the counsel of the wicked;” the real interpretation of the matter concerns those who turn aside from *the way* of [sinners concerning] whom it is written in the book of Isaiah the prophet for the later days, “And it will be that as with a strong [hand he will cause us to turn away from walking in *the way*] of his people.

In addition to *Gezerah Shawah* one can find other exegetical principles at work. Brooke notes that one will also find deliberate editing through *homoeoteleuton*, the practice of *paronomasia*, the possible use of *binyan ‘ab*, and the possible use of the

principle of *semukin*, as well as the principle of maintaining the double meaning intended in the biblical text.<sup>183</sup>

### ***Introductory Formulae***

As we mentioned in the chapter on the *Manual of Discipline*, the task here is not simply to uncover exegetical practices but also to illuminate from the sectarian writings an attitude toward Scripture. This was shown in the *Manual of Discipline* through the use of introductory formulas referencing Scripture. It might seem odd that we would return to this argument for a work that is an exposition of Scripture. However, even within an exposition on Scripture, the author of 4QFlor felt it necessary to give reference to the authority of Scripture.

Referring to Fitzmyer's article, he notes four times where the formula "*as it was written*" is used in 4QFlor. He cites 4QFlor. i 2; i 12; i 15 and i 16 noting the different forms of the formula.<sup>184</sup> We bring this up to show that even within a work on Scripture the emphasis on the authority of God's Word can be seen in its introductory formulae. The readers place trust in the author's words when the source of information is given. We are not much different today when we stand and say, "the Bible says...." We are attempting to give authority to what follows by stating our source.

We can conclude from 4QFlor that the author did have an encounter with the text and we propose that this encounter led him to the revelation that he believed came from God. The author of 4Qflor came to his conclusions about the end of times based not upon a mystical revelation from God in a dream about what would take place in the end of

---

<sup>183</sup> Ibid., 166-167.

<sup>184</sup> Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," 300-301.

days but from a revelation from God through an encounter with His written Word. The author believed the written Word of God was valuable for understanding his time.



## CHAPTER 7

### **TEMPLE SCROLL (11QTemp)**

#### The Scroll as a Sectarian Work

Believed by some scholars to be a pre-Essene work,<sup>185</sup> the temple scroll<sup>186</sup> (11QTemp) may have been written as early as about 400 B.C.E.<sup>187</sup> It has also been suggested that it was conceived by its author as the sixth book of the Torah. Wacholder states, “The contents, language, and form tend to confirm our understanding of the ancient testimony that the work before us was presented not merely as another of the pseudepigraphs that filled the caves of Qumran but as a rival to the Five Books of the Torah which God had handed down to Moses.”<sup>188</sup> Stegemann claims, that “the entire work is to be joined to the five books of Moses as of equal rank. In similar fashion, the foundation of the Torah, originally consisting only of the four books, Genesis through

---

<sup>185</sup> Those following the early conclusions of Y. Yadin in attributing the Qumran community to the Essenes give this label. Norman Golb in his much debated work has set out to show otherwise. For more on the controversy of scroll authorship see Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls*.

<sup>186</sup> For the purposes of this work, we have chosen to use the more common title, the Temple Scroll, given to this work by Y. Yadin. Ben Zion Wacholder, states, “In my view, ‘The Temple Scroll’ is an inappropriate title for this manuscript. It is certainly true that there are sections of the scroll devoted to a new sanctuary, its sacred city and its ritual. On the other hand, the bulk of its subject matter relates to topics other than the temple. In fact, most of the themes found in the Mosaic Torah are reiterated in our scroll.... But the basic objection to Yadin’s title comes from ancient testimony. The author of this text, as well as references to it in other Qumranic manuscripts, apparently designate our scroll as the Torah or Seper Torah, the Book of the Law.” Wacholder supports this with a statement from the Damascus Document 5:1-5 in which, this Seper Torah had been entrusted to Joshua and Eliezer, who placed it into an ark where it reposed for centuries until it was unsealed by the founder of the sect. Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran*, xiii.

<sup>187</sup> “Some scholars believe that the differences between the Temple Scroll and the teachings of the Qumran group on particular points imply that this scroll was written before the community was formed, while others consider it an integral part of the specifically Qumran library.” VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 58-59. Johann Maier states, “Among the fragments from the Rockefeller Museum, No. 43.366 probably comes from the period between 125 and 100 B.C.E. Hence the original date of composition must be earlier than this.” Johann Maier, *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation & Commentary* (England: JSOT, 1985), 1-2. See also Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 1 (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983), 386. Stegemann gives the date of 400 B.C.E., Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 96.

<sup>188</sup> Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran*, xiv.

Numbers, had earlier been supplemented by Deuteronomy as a fifth book.”<sup>189</sup> Wacholder actually ascribes to this scroll a place above the original Torah calling it the “Holy of Holies” as compared to the traditional Torah, which was regarded as “holy.” He states that “the commune of Qumran related to the sectarian Torah as has mainstream Judaism to the Five Books of Moses, the law of Israel.”<sup>190</sup>

The publishing of this document by Yadin in 1977 has shed new light on the centrality of the law in the life and thought of the community at Qumran.<sup>191</sup> The *Temple Scroll* is the longest sectarian work yet published, and is devoted to halakhic matters.<sup>192</sup> Since Yadin’s completion of his work on 11QTemp, he has been both praised and challenged on several points. His work is clearly worthy of praise and recognition as some of the finest work done to date among any of the published scrolls from Qumran.<sup>193</sup> Dwight Swanson states, “There is virtually no area of study of the Scroll which he (Yadin) did not cover, and cover well, so that anyone studying the Scroll does so in dialogue with Yadin (and this study is no exception). But due to his thoroughness and

---

<sup>189</sup> Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 96.

<sup>190</sup> Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran*, xiv.

<sup>191</sup> VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*, 58. Lawrence Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Chico, California: Scholars, 1983), 13.

<sup>192</sup> The halakhic content of this scroll has also received its share of debate. One of the leading opponents to Yadin’s views, in both the area of the scrolls sectarianism and its halakhic content is Professor Baruch Levine. See Baruch Levine, “The Temple Scroll: Aspects of Its Historical Provenance and Literary Character,” *BASOR* 232 (1978): 5-23. See also Yadin’s response to Levine in Yigael Yadin, “Is the Temple Scroll a Sectarian Document?” in *Humanizing America's Iconic Book*, ed. Gene M. Tucker and Douglas A. Knight, Society of Biblical Literature: Biblical Scholarship in North America, 6 (Chico, California: Scholars, 1980), 153-69.

<sup>193</sup> Today’s students and scholars are indebted to the monumental work of Israeli scholar, soldier, and statesman, Yigael Yadin. His work on the Temple Scroll is indisputably the best edition yet of any of the Qumran finds and a reliable basis for all further scientific research on Temple Scroll questions. Dwight Swanson, however, in his 1995 book *The Temple Scroll and the Bible*, attributes the “authoritative status of Yadin’s work” as one of the reasons why the importance of the scroll has not made a significant impact on scholarship at large. For more on Swanson’s views see, Dwight D. Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT*, In *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 14, ed. F. Garcia Martinez and A.S. Van Der Woude, (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1995), 1-2.

versatility his conclusions are usually taken to be settled.”<sup>194</sup> We agree with Swanson, that one is in dialogue with Yadin when one studies the Temple Scroll. As with any scholarly work, however, Yadin’s work has been challenged and criticized, and has, since publication, caused its share of controversial debate. The primary debate that has arisen focuses around the scroll’s sectarianism, thus creating question as to its place and significance in the Qumran community.

Yadin has dated the scroll fragments of 11QTemp to “the days of John Hyrcanus”<sup>195</sup> or a short time earlier. This dating matches the archaeological finds at Qumran, which attest that the settlement there in its sectarian form (Stratum Ia) was founded in the second half of the second century B.C.E.”<sup>196</sup> He also notes “it is entirely possible that certain sections of the scroll were composed previously and that some of the traditions embedded in it originated in an earlier period.”<sup>197</sup>

Yadin believes that the Temple Scroll originated within the Qumran community and this view has, as Swanson notes, “been perpetuated in influential works such as Vermes’ Third edition of *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, and notably, the ‘New Schurer’.”<sup>198</sup> However, we would disagree with Swanson’s claim, that Yadin’s view is “commonly accepted” today. The sectarian nature of the Temple Scroll is a hotly debated issue and among those who disagree with Yadin is Stegemann who refers to the scroll as a “Pre-Essene Work” and gives it a date of approximately 400 B.C.E.<sup>199</sup> Levine

---

<sup>194</sup> Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible*, 2.

<sup>195</sup> For more on the reign of John Hyrcanus I see E. Schurer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar & M. Black (Edinburgh: Clark, 1973), 1, 200 ff.

<sup>196</sup> Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 390. See also Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” 527.

<sup>197</sup> Yigael Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 390.

<sup>198</sup> Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible*, 2. G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Penguin, 1987). Schurer, *History*, Vol III.1 p 412.

<sup>199</sup> Stegemann, *The Library of Qumran*, 95–96. See also Hartmut Stegemann, “The Literary Composition of the Temple Scroll and Its Status at Qumran,” in *Temple Scroll Studies*, ed. George J.

has also expressed disagreement with Yadin's conclusions regarding the sectarian nature of the scroll.<sup>200</sup> Levine claims:

There is yet another *caveat* affecting Yadin's legal comparisons: They center predominantly around the Zadokite Document. There seems to be a particular affinity between the Scroll and the Zadokite Document which is not generally shared by the other acknowledged writings of the Qumran sect. Instead of assuming that such comparisons with the Zadokite Document reinforce the Qumranic provenance of the Scroll, perhaps we ought to assume that neither the Scroll nor the Zadokite Document was authored by the same group which produced the *serakim*, the Thanksgiving Scroll, and others.<sup>201</sup>

Yadin responds:

His (Levine) main contention is that the Scroll is not sectarian and contains no *halakot* deviating from those of rabbinic legislation. He makes this claim despite the striking similarity – which he too acknowledges – between the laws and language of the Temple Scroll and those of the Damascus Document. As a result, Levine arrived at the far-reaching conclusion about the Damascus Document that it too is *not* sectarian.<sup>202</sup>

Before we can address the exegetical activity in the Scroll, the implications of these arguments must first be addressed. One of the requirements for including a document in this study was that it be sectarian in nature. For the purposes of this thesis, we have defined sectarian texts as those texts that were for internal use within the life of the sect, though not necessarily written by the sect. These texts were the central documents for the formation and the life of the community. Levine has given the following definition of the term sectarian. He states, "A text may be designated sectarian if it originated with, or was adopted by an identifiable group whose members cut

---

Brooke, *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 7*, (Sheffield, Eng: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 1989), 123-48.

<sup>200</sup> Maier, Schiffman, Brooke, and Davies also disagree with the association of the Temple Scroll with Qumran and believe that it probably predates Qumran.

<sup>201</sup> Levine, "The Temple Scroll: Aspects of Its Historical Provenance and Literary Character," 12. See in response, Yigael Yadin, "Is the Temple Scroll a Sectarian Document?" 153-69.

themselves off from the prevailing religious community.”<sup>203</sup> It seems significant therefore, to determine whether or not the Temple Scroll is in fact sectarian.

### ***Dating the Scroll***

One of the central discussions concerning the sectarian nature of this scroll revolves around its date. There seems to be no debate as to the Scroll’s *terminus ante quem*. This date is provided by the palaeographic evidence of its oldest copy, which was written about the middle of the first century B.C.E.<sup>204</sup> However, it is in the *terminus a quo* of the Scroll that causes debate. Stegemann states that there is approximately half a millennium to work within when placing the composition of the Temple Scroll in history. He suggests a range from the end of the sixth century B.C.E. to the middle of the first century B.C.E.<sup>205</sup> Yadin, on the other hand, is more vague in the range he gives. He simply states that “it is entirely possible that certain sections of the Scroll were composed previously and that some of the traditions embedded in it originated in an earlier period.”<sup>206</sup>

By contrast, in his article, “The Literary Composition of the Temple Scroll and its Status at Qumran,” Stegeman concludes, “the following can be stated without such speculation”:

1. Yadin’s theory that the Temple Scroll was composed only in the second century B.C.E. within the Qumran community, perhaps by its Teacher of Righteousness personally, is definitely wrong; the Temple Scroll was

---

<sup>202</sup> Yadin, “Is the Temple Scroll a Sectarian Document?” 153.

<sup>203</sup> Levine, “The Temple Scroll: Aspects of Its Historical Provenance and Literary Character,” 7.

<sup>204</sup> Rockefeller fragment 43.366 sets, for Yadin, the *terminus ante quem* “in the days of Alexander Jannaeus, that is, no later than the reign of John Hyrcanus I (135/4-104 B.C.E.), or the beginning of the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 B.C.E.).” Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 386.

<sup>205</sup> Stegemann, “The Literary Composition of the Temple Scroll and Its Status at Qumran,” 128-129.

<sup>206</sup> Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 390.

brought into existence quite independently of those specific circumstances.

2. The best place in history for the composition of the Temple Scroll is close to the composition of the biblical books of the Chronicles, in the fourth century B.C.E. or about that time. The earliest discussible date is the second half of the fifth century B.C.E., the latest possibility in the third century B.C.E. – but not too late in it, as the Temple Scroll is still free from Hellenistic influence, and is not a polemic against Hellenism. Any more precise dating of its composition is dependent on further research.<sup>207</sup>

Fixing a date for the composition of the Scroll does not seem possible at this time.

Therefore, we must move on to the next aspect of the Scroll's sectarian nature, and ask questions regarding its use within the community.

### ***The Use of the Scroll at Qumran***

The mere fact that the community of Qumran did not author this work, does not eliminate it from being sectarian. One must also determine how this document was used at Qumran in order to evaluate whether or not it is sectarian. This task is not an easy one. There are debates as to the significance of this document for the community of Qumran and many of the arguments are based on the sheer number of manuscripts found at Qumran. Stegemann states:

Not a copy of the Temple Scroll exists from Qumran's main library in Cave 4, but only two copies from Cave 11, those of van der Ploeg and Yadin. As there are about ten or more copies from the different caves of the books favoured by the Qumran community, such as Deuteronomy, Isaiah, the biblical Psalms, the book of *Jubilees*, *Serek ha-yahad*, the *Hodayot*, or the War Scroll, we can deduce that the Temple Scroll was not one of the favoured books of the Qumran community, but only known to some of its members and perhaps used for some specific purposes.<sup>208</sup>

---

<sup>207</sup> Stegemann, "The Literary Composition of the Temple Scroll and Its Status at Qumran," 130-131.

<sup>208</sup> Ibid., 126.

His argument is an argument from silence and in the light of recent scholarship seems to be flatly incorrect. Even though Cave 11 has preserved the most complete texts of the Temple Scroll, fragments of the Temple Scroll have also been discovered in “Qumran’s main library,” that is Cave Four.<sup>209</sup> These types of arguments drawn from silence are dangerous. They draw conclusions about evidence that does not exist. Stegemann’s argument is of this sort.

Levine makes a distinction between two categories of writings:

- (a) writings which specifically refer to a group by name and or characterize its particular outlook and speak of its opposition to other groups; and
- (b) writings preserved by a sect and considered important by it, but which did not come into being for the express purpose of conveying the sect’s doctrinaire point of view. A sect preserving such writings obviously felt a particular affinity toward them, but such writings were not sectarian in the strict sense.<sup>210</sup>

Levine places the Temple Scroll into this latter category. Here again the evidence is weak to support the conclusion that the community simply had a particular affinity toward the document and that the document was not sectarian.

Stegemann arguing against the sectarianism of the Temple Scroll states again, “There is not one mention of the Temple Scroll’s existence in any of the other Qumranic writings, neither in the published ones nor in the unpublished. There is not one quotation from the Temple Scroll in the many Qumran scrolls which otherwise, time and time again, cite all the books of the Pentateuch as their unique law.”<sup>211</sup> In opposition to this argument Wacholder states, “The author of this text, as well as references to it in other

---

<sup>209</sup> See Emile Puech, “Fragments du plus ancien exemplaire du Rouleau du Temple (4Q524),” in *Legal texts and legal issues*, F. Garcia Martinez and A. S. Van Der Woude, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, XXIII (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 19-64.

<sup>210</sup> Levine, “The Temple Scroll: Aspects of Its Historical Provenance and Literary Character,” 7.

<sup>211</sup> Stegemann, “The Literary Composition of the Temple Scroll and Its Status at Qumran,” 128.

Qumranic manuscripts, apparently designate our Scroll as the *Torah* or *Seper Torah*, the Book of the Law.”<sup>212</sup> Wacholder supports this with a statement from the Damascus Document 5:1-5 in which, this *Seper Torah* had been entrusted to Joshua and Eliezer, who placed it into an ark where it reposed for centuries until it was unsealed by the founder of the sect. Yadin recognizes that it is hard to identify it positively within the extant writings of the sect but certain possibilities exist.<sup>213</sup>

Concerning the language of the scroll Dimant writes, “The scroll unmistakably betrays its Second Commonwealth origin.”<sup>214</sup> And Yadin states:

Although the author of the scroll laboured to imitate the phraseology of the Bible, he was not able to keep syntactical and linguistic usages in vogue at the time from infiltrating. Thus, there are conspicuous differences between the language of the Bible and that of the author.... Most significant, however, is the author’s heavy reliance on words and terms peculiar to the language of the last centuries of the Second Temple period, לשון חכמים, “rabbinic Hebrew.”<sup>215</sup>

Further, Yadin shows the use of compound verbs characteristic of several non-biblical scrolls as well as words common to Rabbinic Hebrew that are found in the later books of the Bible. He also gives examples of phrases that are characteristic of Rabbinic Hebrew and identifies words, terms and idioms typical in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Yadin goes on to show words borrowed from the Persian to express matters when there was no Hebrew term of the period that would suffice.<sup>216</sup> With all of this Yadin states, “Despite the many traits of Rabbinic Hebrew betrayed in the author’s language – which was, as we have

---

<sup>212</sup> Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran*, xiii.

<sup>213</sup> Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 393-397.

<sup>214</sup> Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” 527.

<sup>215</sup> Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 33-34.

<sup>216</sup> *Ibid.*, 34-39.



seen, replete with contemporary Second Temple usages – linguistic analysis proves without doubt that our scroll was composed by a member of the sect.”<sup>217</sup>

But Stegemann argues that, “there are clear differences between the Temple Scroll and the specifically Qumranic texts in matters of *halakhah*, style, terminology and other linguistic and literary traits.”<sup>218</sup> Against this Yadin states, “there is clear connection between the Temple Scroll and the Damascus Document.... One of the major points of similarity between the Damascus Document and the Temple Scroll, a point which serves as a focus for Levine, is the statement concerning ‘*ir hammiqda*, ‘the temple city’ or ‘the city of the temple’.”<sup>219</sup> Yadin continues his response to Levine’s arguments to show these similarities and refute many of Levine’s claims. Randall Price states:

Most scholars, beginning with Yadin, believe that there are sufficient similarities between the Temple Scroll and other Qumran documents to argue that the Temple Scroll originated at Qumran. In a similar manner, Philip Davies sees “a possible connection between events related in Ezra and Nehemiah with the formation of the Temple Scroll and the origin of the Qumran community represented in the Damascus Document.” The primary evidence for an origin with the Qumran community is the apparent use of a solar calendar in the Temple Scroll as well as affinities with the Zadokite Fragments.<sup>220</sup>

In addition to the similarities between the Damascus Document and the Temple Scroll, Yadin also shows the correlation between the Temple Scroll and the calendar of the Qumran sect. Yadin, quoting Levine, shows the lack of confidence that Levine has in his own arguments, and then proceeds to refute Levine’s claims. One such claim by Levine reads as follows:

---

<sup>217</sup> Ibid., 38.

<sup>218</sup> Stegemann, “The Literary Composition of the Temple Scroll and Its Status at Qumran,” 128.

<sup>219</sup> Yadin, “Is the Temple Scroll a Sectarian Document?” 155.

<sup>220</sup> Price, *Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 248. Davies’ Quote comes from P. R. Davies, “The Temple Scroll and the Damascus Document,” in *Temple Scroll Studies*, ed. George J. Brooke, Journal for

Even if one had explicit evidence that the Scroll's author was operating on the Qumran-Jubilees calendar, the precise provenance of the scroll would have to be established independently. After all, the book of Jubilees and the Qumran sect shared the same calendric tradition, and yet it is not being suggested that the book of Jubilees is one of the writings of the Qumran sect, strictly speaking.<sup>221</sup>

Yadin notes, "This statement as well is incorrect, for today there are many scholars who lean toward the conclusion that both the book of Jubilees and other works were written in the Qumran sect or by others akin to it."<sup>222</sup> Obviously, the debates are heated and unresolved and there seems to be less consensus in scholarship today than at the time immediately following Yadin's *editio princeps*.

### ***The New Moses***

In the sectarian literature from Qumran, we have already seen a bias toward the prophetic literature and the nature of the prophet. In Deuteronomy 18:15 it is prophesied that a new Moses will be raised up. The text reads, "The LORD your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among your own people; you shall heed such a prophet." As we saw earlier in the *Pesher* on Habakkuk, it was the belief of the community that the Teacher of Righteousness was considered to be one raised up by God to communicate to his community the message of the Lord. With the emphasis placed on the words of the prophets and the continuing revelation to the new community it is possible that the community believed the Teacher of Righteousness to be the "New Moses" to whom the word of the Lord was communicated.

---

the Study of the Pseudepigrapha, Supplement Series 7, (Sheffield, Eng: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 1989), 201-10, 209.

<sup>221</sup> Levine, "The Temple Scroll: Aspects of Its Historical Provenance and Literary Character," 11.

<sup>222</sup> Yadin, "Is the Temple Scroll a Sectarian Document?" 163, note 11.

It is commonly accepted that during the Second Temple period there was an anticipation of the coming prophet. The New Testament also describes this same expectation and anticipation. In the Gospel of John we read:

Now this was John's testimony when the Jews of Jerusalem sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him who he was. He did not fail to confess, but confessed freely, 'I am not the Christ.' They asked him, 'Then who are you? Are you Elijah?' He said, 'I am not.' 'Are you the Prophet?' He answered, 'No'.<sup>223</sup>

It is quite possible, and in our opinion even probable, that the community at Qumran viewed the author of the Temple Scroll as the New Moses.<sup>224</sup> Swanson explains, "The author of the Scroll appears to see his work within the continuing tradition of reinterpreting biblical tradition for a new era, with every expectation of its being accepted with the same authority as that which preceded it."<sup>225</sup> Ultimately, we conclude that the Temple Scroll was a sectarian document used by the community at Qumran and is therefore valuable for our use within this study. Yadin states, "No matter what our conclusions are regarding the 'canonical' status of the scroll within the sect, there is no doubt that its members held it to be of major importance."<sup>226</sup>

### Exegetical Methods in the Scroll

Within the Temple Scroll, there is a definite exegetical methodology. One will quickly discover in this scroll a distinct use of the Hebrew Scriptures. Yadin has set the stage for most scholarly discussions exegetical methodology by clearly defining five

---

<sup>223</sup> John 1:19-21.

<sup>224</sup> It is premature at this point to place too much weight on this argument as it has not yet been fully researched and substantiated in other documents from Qumran and is in its infant stage. It will possibly become the subject of future research done in connection with the sectarian nature of the Temple Scroll.

<sup>225</sup> Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible*, 6.

<sup>226</sup> Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 393.

communicate a message to his community. However, our interest in this thesis is not simply in exegetical strategies, but in the view and use of Scripture within the community of Qumran. This will establish more clearly that the revelation at Qumran flowed from a divine encounter with the text versus a mystical, unmediated divine revelation. In order to show this it will not be necessary to address all of the exegetical moves noted above by the scholars, but to simply highlight some examples of the more obvious and commonly accepted patterns and characteristics of the Scroll.

### ***Change From 3<sup>rd</sup> Person to 1<sup>st</sup> Person***

“One of the most characteristic features of the scroll is the author’s quoting of whole chapters as they appear in the Pentateuch – or in the version which he accepted – but changing their grammar to the first person to dispel any doubt that God is speaking.”<sup>233</sup> For example, when a biblical passage presents God’s words in third person – such as “and God said” – the Temple Scroll’s author has taken the liberty of changing the phrase to the first person to read “and I said.” Yadin in his work shows chapters where it is possible to detect phrasing in the first person and upon the conclusion of these examples Yadin states, “These facts are incontrovertible proof of the author’s wish to present the law as if handed down by God, and not through the mouth of Moses.”<sup>234</sup> It is interesting to note, however, that the author does not in all cases make this change to the first person. For example in cols. 13-29, where the commands related to the festivals and their offerings are given, the author of the scroll preserves the wording of the sources and writes of God in the third person. It would appear that the author retains the third person whenever the text is explicit in mentioning the words as being the words of God or, as in

---

<sup>233</sup> Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 71.

the example of Exodus 30:12-13 where the heading of the section specifies “and the Lord spoke to Moses saying.”<sup>235</sup> Nonetheless, it is clear that the author desired to present his work as the direct words of God.

Does this give evidence to unmediated revelation? We would contend that the revelation was not unmediated and independent from the text but was a rewording of the text to support the words that God had already given in the text. It is an attempt on the part of the author to validate the text as that which came from God and not Moses nor the author himself. As Swanson notes, we must take care not to “see the author as setting about at the beginning to write a new book of Scripture. Rather, he should be seen as a legal exegete who viewed the performance of his task of interpretation as inspired by God: no different from the process found within the Pentateuch itself.”<sup>236</sup>

### ***Harmonization***

Yadin suggests that *harmonization* is one of the main organizing features of the Temple Scroll.<sup>237</sup> Harmonization is typically defined as the art of bringing conflicting passages into harmony. It is at this point that there is disagreement between Milgrom and Yadin. Milgrom states, “most of the examples he (Yadin) cites should really be described as a unification process: the fusion of the various laws on a single subject into one law.... Nonetheless, there are a few combinations, three in my count, where the individual laws do conflict, necessitating true harmonization.”<sup>238</sup> It appears, that Yadin

---

<sup>234</sup> Ibid., 72.

<sup>235</sup> Ibid.

<sup>236</sup> Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible*, 7. See also M. Fishbane, “Inner Biblical Exegesis: Types and Strategies of Interpretation in Ancient Israel,” *Midrash and Literature*, eds. Geoffrey H. Hartman and Sanford Budick (Yale: Yale University Press, 1986), 19-37. On page 35 Fishbane comments on the subordination of the human exegetical voice to divine revelation.

<sup>237</sup> Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 74-77

<sup>238</sup> Milgrom, “The Qumran Cult: Its Exegetical Principles,” 170-171.

has taken some liberty with the term harmonization and has given it a dualistic approach. Swanson has summarized Yadin's use of harmonization in the following manner: "This (harmonization) takes two forms: one is the simple merging of two complementary texts, where there is duplication, by 'dovetailing and deleting,' the other is taking variant commands and harmonizing them into a single, unified whole."<sup>239</sup> Nonetheless, the term harmonization has become a standard term used in reference to the activity of the Scroll's author in the combining texts for "clarification" and "unification".<sup>240</sup> To demonstrate both of these aspects of harmonization within the Temple Scroll an example or two of each will follow.

*Unification harmonization:*

"In ordinary cases of duplication, where there are no apparent contradictions, the author solved the problem simply by merging the two texts through a process of dovetailing and deleting."<sup>241</sup> Examples of this are seen in the commands on vows and pledges found in columns 53–54 of the Temple Scroll. Here the author quotes first Deuteronomy 23:22-24 in col. 53:11-16a and then Numbers 30:3-16 in col. 53:16b-54:7. This unifying process is seen in the continuous flow from one text to the other. Yadin notes, the author of the scroll "availed himself of this method in particular when two texts were plainly complementary, and it was only necessary to quote one after the other."<sup>242</sup>

Another example of this is seen in the combining of multiple similar passages into one continuous text thus creating a new text. To demonstrate this, one need only survey

---

<sup>239</sup> Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible*, 8.

<sup>240</sup> Milgrom uses the term unification to describe his view of Yadin's harmonization.

<sup>241</sup> Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 74.

<sup>242</sup> Ibid.

col. 51.11-18 in which the combination of Ex 23:6, 8; Deut 1:16-17 and Deut 16:18-20

are seen.<sup>243</sup> The following chart will suffice to demonstrate this principle at work.

<b>Temple Scroll</b>  <b>col. 51.11-18</b>	<b>Deut 16:18-20</b>	<b>Deut 1:16-17</b>	<b>Ex 23:6, 8</b>
<p>You shall appoint judges and officials in all your towns, who will judge the people righteously. They must be impartial in judgment. They are not to take bribes or pervert justice. Most certainly bribery perverts justice, subverts the testimony of the righteous man, blinds the eyes of the wise, causes great guilt, and defiles the courthouse with iniquitous sin. You shall pursue justice and justice alone, so that you may live, entering and inheriting the land that I am about to give you as an inheritance forever. Any man who does accept a bribe and perverts righteous judgment must be put to death. You shall not fear him; put him to death.</p>	<p>You shall appoint judges and officials throughout your tribes, in all your towns that the LORD your God is giving you, and they shall render just decisions for the people. 19 You must not distort justice; you must not show partiality; and you must not accept bribes, for a bribe blinds the eyes of the wise and subverts the cause of those who are in the right. 20 Justice, and only justice, you shall pursue, so that you may live and occupy the land that the LORD your God is giving you.</p>	<p>I charged your judges at that time: "Give the members of your community a fair hearing, and judge rightly between one person and another, whether citizen or resident alien. 17 You must not be partial in judging: hear out the small and the great alike; you shall not be intimidated by anyone, for the judgment is God's. Any case that is too hard for you, bring to me, and I will hear it."</p>	<p>You shall not pervert the justice due to your poor in their lawsuits. 7 Keep far from a false charge, and do not kill the innocent and those in the right, for I will not acquit the guilty. 8 You shall take no bribe, for a bribe blinds the officials, and subverts the cause of those who are in the right.</p>

<sup>243</sup> Ibid., 75.

From the above chart, one can quickly see the similarity of all three passages of Scripture and how the author of the Temple Scroll combined them into one text instead of three separate texts.

*Clarification harmonization:*

Milgrom, following Yadin, cites three examples of this type of harmonization. He cites “covering the blood, 52.11-12 (Lev 17:13; Deut 12:23-24); war spoils, 58.13-14 (Num 31:27-28; 1 Sam 30:24-25...) and the ‘ravaged virgin’, 66.8-11 (Exod 22:15-16; Deut 22:28-29...)”.<sup>244</sup> Yadin however states regarding the ‘ravaged virgin’, that it is not a contradictory command but “touches upon two similar commands which, in the author’s opinion, deal with the same subject.”<sup>245</sup> The chart below will illustrate the clarification principle within the Temple Scroll as the author attempts to clarify the laws concerning the blood of animals that have been killed to eat. The author here brings in Lev 17:13 in order to clarify the law found in Deut 12:23-24.

<b>Temple Scroll</b> <b>col. 53.5-6</b>	<b>Lev 17:13</b>	<b>Deut 12:23-24</b>
Only restrain yourself from eating the blood. You must pour it on the ground like water <i>and cover it with earth</i> , for the blood is the life. You are not to eat the life with the blood...	And anyone of the people of Israel, or of the aliens who reside among them, who hunts down an animal or bird that may be eaten shall pour out its blood <i>and cover it with earth</i> .	Only be sure that you do not eat the blood; for the blood is the life, and you shall not eat the life with the meat. 24 Do not eat it; you shall pour it out on the ground like water.

<sup>244</sup> Milgrom, "The Qumran Cult: Its Exegetical Principles," 171. See also Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 75-77.

<sup>245</sup> Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 75.



### ***Homogenization:***

Another exegetical move is what Milgrom calls *equalization* or *homogenization*. He states, "There is yet another exegetical principle, not dealt with by Yadin, that goes beyond harmonization and which I would call *equalization* or *homogenization*. By this I mean that a law which applies to specific objects, animals, or persons is extended to other members of the same species."<sup>246</sup> Swanson disagrees with Milgrom on this point however and states, "The term 'homogenization' does not seem to fit, nor is it clearly an exegetical technique."<sup>247</sup> We would disagree with Swanson on this point, and agree with Milgrom in his deduction that 'homogenization' can in fact be seen as "the forerunner of rabbinic *binyan 'ab*" and that his analysis labeled homogenization is in fact exegetical in nature.<sup>248</sup>

The exegetical technique of *binyan 'ab* lit. 'founding of a family', was the exegetical technique used in later Rabbinic Literature as a method of extending a law in a generalized sense. For example, in Exodus 21:26,27 the laws concerning the release of a slave due to the loss of an eye or tooth is extended to 'a family' of related situations. Thus, being freed must compensate any irreplaceable loss a slave experiences.<sup>249</sup>

The question for us is not the exegetical nature of what Milgrom labels homogenization, however, but its presence in the Temple Scroll. It appears that Milgrom is attempting to extend Yadin's harmonization to a more detailed level. Milgrom has done a good job, in his article in *Temple Scroll Studies*, of citing examples of homogenization. The main topic of his article is focused on the development of this technique. It appears that the inclusion of other terms, such as 'Levites' in col. 61.7-9, is the harmonizing of other texts to support the Temple Scroll authors desired reading. At

---

<sup>246</sup> Milgrom, "The Qumran Cult: Its Exegetical Principles," 171.

<sup>247</sup> Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible*, 11.

<sup>248</sup> Milgrom, "The Qumran Cult: Its Exegetical Principles," 175.

this point, fine lines are being drawn concerning the semantics of terms and yet Milgrom's extension of Yadin's harmonization is in fact beneficial as it shows similarities between Rabbinic *binyan 'ab* and earlier Qumranic exegesis.

Milgrom cautions that "at this stage, it would be hazardous, if not presumptuous, to suggest that the author(s) of the Temple Scroll invented this principle, but its discovery does add strong support to the view, most recently articulated by Brooke, that the traditions of biblical interpretation, later systematized in the Rabbinic *middot*, have their origin in Second Temple times."<sup>250</sup> And though Swanson disagrees with Milgrom on the point of harmonization, when it comes to exegetical history they agree. Swanson states, "While we make no attempt here to establish a formal link between the methodology of the Scroll and that of later Jewish exegesis, the Scroll's use of a base text to which are added secondary and supplementary texts bears a striking resemblance to patterns of exegesis which develop over subsequent centuries."<sup>251</sup>

### ***Modifications and Additions:***

Yadin notes the use of modifications and additions, which he states are designed to clarify the halakhic meaning of the commands. He claims, "These changes are important not only in their own right in clarifying the exegetical views of the author and his sect, but also because they offer a highly developed example of this approach, whose origin can even be detected in the Massoretic text itself, and whose climax is found in the Aramaic translations of the Bible."<sup>252</sup> Swanson notes that it is at this point that we enter

---

<sup>249</sup> Strack, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, 19.

<sup>250</sup> Milgrom, "The Qumran Cult: Its Exegetical Principles," 175.

<sup>251</sup> Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible*, 232.

<sup>252</sup> Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 77.

the area of exegesis.<sup>253</sup> Yadin cites examples where this exegetical move is used. He shows its use, for the explanation of obscure texts,<sup>254</sup> to bring out the halakhic meaning of a command,<sup>255</sup> to add laws and incorporate them into the text,<sup>256</sup> and to change the order of words.<sup>257</sup>

For example we will list here two of Yadin's examples to show the interpretive nature of these modifications. The first example comes from Yadin's section entitled, "Additions Meant to Bring out the Halakhic Meaning of a Command." In col. 14.10-11 the Temple Scroll reads, "And you shall offer one male goat for a sin offering;] / *by itself it shall be offered* to make atoneme[nt for you]"<sup>258</sup> (italics added for emphasis). The italics show an addition by the author of the Scroll in order to clarify the command regarding when to sacrifice the male goat. It was to be sacrificed separately, before the other burnt offerings.

The second example comes from the section entitled, "Changing the Order of Words." Yadin here cites two instances for the purpose of showing how, "by merely changing the word order, the author of the Scroll succeeded in prescribing a law completely different from the plain sense of the text because the latter ran contrary to the doctrine of the sectarians."<sup>259</sup> In col. 28.6-9 the inclusion of the male goat offering before the cereal offering and the drink offering ordains a law whereby the male goat sin offering requires a cereal offering and a drink offering.<sup>260</sup> The second example given by Yadin shows how changing the word order of Deut. 21:22 from, "And if a man has

---

<sup>253</sup> Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible*, 8.

<sup>254</sup> Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, 77-78.

<sup>255</sup> *Ibid.*, 78-80.

<sup>256</sup> *Ibid.*, 80-81.

<sup>257</sup> *Ibid.*, 81.

<sup>258</sup> *Ibid.*, 78.

<sup>259</sup> *Ibid.*, 81.

committed a crime punishable by death and he is put to death, and you hang him on a tree...” to the reading in col. 64.8, “...you are to hang him on a tree until dead,” creates a law whereby the death is to come through the hanging on a tree. All of this illustrates the active participation of the Temple Scroll author with the text of Scripture in his creation of a “new text.”<sup>261</sup>

Therefore, is the Temple Scroll a product of unmediated revelation or Qumranic exegesis? Davies states, “The distinction between ‘revealed’ and ‘exegetical’ is one of a number of misleading issues which had dogged our understanding of 11QT.”<sup>262</sup> We would agree with Milgrom and his conclusion that the Temple Scroll is a product of its exegesis. Further, Swanson states that “the supplementary texts are thus of key importance in understanding the way in which the author *interprets* (italics added) the base text, and in revealing the special concerns of the author.”<sup>263</sup> In one sense, Brin’s conclusion that this scroll is a product of its compositional techniques is accurate in that the author has taken a base text, as well as supplemental texts, and created a new work. On the other hand, we would argue that the compositional aspects of this scroll come from the interpretive work of the author; therefore, the Temple Scroll is the results of a disciplined, divine encounter with the Scriptures.

---

<sup>260</sup> Yadin expounds upon this in Yadin, *The Temple Scroll*, chapter three section I pages 143-150.

<sup>261</sup> By “new text” we do not intend to imply that it was the authors intent to create a new Scripture.

<sup>262</sup> Davies, “The Temple Scroll and the Damascus Document,” 203.

<sup>263</sup> Swanson, *The Temple Scroll and the Bible*, 229.

## CHAPTER 8

### *CONCLUSION*

In any place where there happen to be ten such men, there is not to be absent from them one who will be available at all times, day and night, to interpret the law (Torah), each of them doing so in turn. The general members of the community are to keep awake for a third of all the nights of the year reading book(s), studying the Law and worshipping together.<sup>264</sup>

In reviewing the sectarian materials from Qumran, we have discovered a great deal about the community and their view of the Scriptures. As we have explored these writings, our minds have been opened to another culture's ways of using and handling the Word of God. In the course of our work we have concluded that the community of Qumran's beliefs about Scripture and ultimately their view of God can be seen in their direct use of and allusions to Scripture, as well as their discussions about the relevance of Scripture to their community within the sectarian writings.

We have tried to demonstrate that there is a definite link between the community's use of Scripture and their life in the community. In other words, their view of God's Word had a direct impact on their life and their beliefs about the coming end of the age. The life of the community was centered on the study of God's Word. It was through continual study and the interpretation of God's Word that the community came to understand how life should be lived in the midst of those who opposed their views.

The application of God's Word came to the community at Qumran through an exegetical encounter with the text of Scripture and not through a revelation by way of a mystical encounter directly with God. We can conclude that the community of Qumran believed the Scriptures to be God's Word to them and its relevance for their immediate

application to life was unquestioned. The difficulty lay, as was seen in the *peshet* on Habakkuk, in the process of interpreting the mystery that was contained within the text. The community believed that the text contained the answer to this mystery. They, therefore, approached the Scriptures with certain “rules”<sup>265</sup> or exegetical methods through which the mysteries could be discovered and interpreted.

In our study of four sectarian texts from Qumran, we have discovered that the authors of the Qumran literature employed exegetical principles and rules similar to those of the *middot*. In addition, we have studied the community’s use of other techniques of interpretation, as well as allusions to and discussions about the use of Scripture by the community. The following chart summarizes the primary exegetical methods in each document mentioned above.<sup>266</sup>

<b>Habakkuk <i>Pesher</i></b> <b>(1QpHab)</b>	<b>Community Rule</b> <b>(1QS)</b>	<b>Florilegium</b> <b>(4QFlor)</b>	<b>Temple Scroll</b> <b>(11QTemp)</b>
Citation and atomization	Introductory Formulas	Gezerah Shawah	Change from 3 <sup>rd</sup> person to 1 <sup>st</sup> person
Variant Readings	Explicit use of Scripture to support community rules	Explicit use formulas	Harmonization
Allegory	Implicit use of Scripture to support community rules	Paronomasia	Homogenization
Multiple Meanings	Rules concerning the continual study of the Scripture (1QS 6.6-8)		Modifications and additions

<sup>264</sup> 1QS 6.6.

<sup>265</sup> As has already been discussed, we are not stating that these rules were codified and necessarily even in the minds of the authors of the scrolls as we understand a self aware application of certain rules.

This information and the earlier discussions show that the Scriptures were not only held in high regard as providing the answers to the current cultural setting; but that these answers were to be obtained through carefully searching the Scriptures. The community at Qumran seems to have believed that when one properly employed these principles and techniques one was positioned to receive divine revelation.

The *Manual of Discipline* disclosed the importance Scripture held within the community. Scripture was the foundation for all that went into the development and life of the community. It formed the backbone, values and was the standard by which life was lived within the community. Scripture was also the key to entering into the Community of the New Covenant. It was the basis for the comparison between those who were on the inside and those who were on the outside; those who walked in the way of wickedness and those who walked in the purity of God within the Community of the New Covenant.

For us today, we view many of these exegetical practices as a poor way of handling the Word of God. In fact, many would say they demonstrate a misuse of Scripture instead of “rightfully dividing the Word of Truth.”<sup>267</sup> What then does it mean to “rightfully divide” the Word of God? For the community at Qumran, as well as for early Judaism in general, these practices were the accepted norm and even the rules by which one could in fact “divide the Word of God” and discover the mystery behind the text. Today we sit in hermeneutics classes talking about how to study God’s Word appropriately. We talk about doing inductive studies and we codify rules of exegesis or

---

<sup>266</sup> Note: This chart is not meant to be inclusive but is simply a summary of the discussion in the previous chapters. As noted in each chapter, where relevant, many other exegetical principles have also been discovered in the Qumran documents studied.

<sup>267</sup> 2 Timothy 2:15.

hermeneutics. Our rules may differ today but our intent is the same as it was for the community at Qumran. It is our desire to “rightfully divide” the Word of God so as to discover the importance of God’s revelation for us today in our culture and in the midst of people who see things far differently from the way we do.

My fear today however, is that many are setting aside disciplined exegetical practices for mystical revelation. We stand in our pulpits today and declare, “Thus says the Lord”. Where does this revelation come from? Is it a mystical, unmediated revelation or an exegetical revelation? For the community at Qumran it would appear that they had a definite exegetical encounter with the texts of Scripture. It is not my intent here to judge the validity of the exegetical methods they used but to show that they believed their methods to be valid ways of achieving God’s revelation for them and their daily lives. We can learn much from the community of Qumran and its strict adherence to the disciplined practice of “rightfully dividing the Word of Truth”.

*Be diligent to present yourself approved to God, a worker who does not need to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.<sup>268</sup>*

---

<sup>268</sup> Ibid.



### **Bibliography**

- Barstad, Hans. "Prophecy at Qumran." In *The Last Days: On Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic and Its Period*, 104-120. (Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press, 1996).
- Bernstein, Moshe. "Introductory Formulas for Citation and Re-Citation of Biblical Verses in the Qumran Pesharim: Observations on a Peshar Technique." In *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1, 30-70. (Leiden: Brill, 1994).
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Re-Arrangement, Anticipation and Harmonization as Exegetical Features in the Genesis Apocryphon." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 3, 37-57. (Leiden: Brill, 1996).
- Brin, Gershon. "Concerning Some Uses of the Bible in the Temple Scroll." *Revue de Qumran* 12, (1987): 519-528.
- Brooke, George. "Qumran Peshar: Towards the Redefinition of a Genre." *Revue de Qumran* 10, (1981): 483-503.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Exegesis At Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 29. England: JSOT, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Genre of 4Q252: From Poetry to Peshar." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1, 160-79. (Leiden: Brill, 1994).
- Brownlee, W. H. "Biblical Interpretation Among the Sectaries of the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Biblical Archaeologist* 14 (1951): 54 - 76.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran*. Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 11. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Meaning of the Qumran Scrolls for the Bible*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*. Montana: Scholars, 1979.
- Bruce, F. F. *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Holy Spirit in the Qumran Text." In *The Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society*, 49-55. (Leiden: Brill, 1969).
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London: Eerdmans, 1961.

- Buchanan, G. W. "The Priestly Teacher of Righteousness", *Revue de Qumran* 6, (1969): 553-558.
- Burrows, Millar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Viking, 1955.
- Chilton, B. D. "Commenting on the Old Testament (with particular reference to the *pesharim*, Philo, and the Mekhilta)." In *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture, Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*, ed. D. A. Carlson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988).
- Collins, John J. *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. New York: Doubleday, 1995.
- Cross, Frank Moore and Shemaryahu Talmon (eds). *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1975.
- Cross, Frank Moore, Jr. *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1958.
- Danby, Herbert, ed. "Aboth," in *The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes* (Oxford: University Press, 1933), 446-447.
- Davies, P. R. "The Temple Scroll and the Damascus Document." In *Temple Scroll Studies* 7, ed. George J. Brooke, 201-10. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha, Supplement Series. Sheffield, England: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 1989.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Qumran Sectarian Literature." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* 2, ed. Michael E. Stone, 483-550. *Compendia Rerum Iudicarum Ad Novum Testamentum*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Driver, G. R. *The Judaean Scrolls, The Problem and a Solution*, (New York, Schocken, 1965).
- Dunn, J. D. G. *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977).
- Eisenman, Robert and Michael Wise. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered: The First Complete Translation and Interpretation of 50 Key Documents Withheld For Over 35 Years*. New York: Penguin Books, 1992.
- Elgvin, T. "The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation." In *Qumran Between the Old and New Testaments* 6, 113-50. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series 290 Copenhagen Int'l Seminar. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Elliger. *Studien zum Habakkuk-kommentar vom Totem Meer*, BHT 15 (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1953).

Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Inner Biblical Exegesis: Types and Strategies of Interpretation in Ancient Israel," *Midrash and Literature*, eds. Geoffrey H. Hartman and Sanford Budick (Yale: Yale University Press, 1986), 19-37.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Jewish Biblical Exegesis: Presuppositions and Principles." In *Scripture in the Jewish and Christian Traditions*, 92-110. Nashville, Tenn: Abingdon, 1982.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Qumran Peshar and Traits of Ancient Hermeneutics." In *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* 1, ed. Avigdor Shinan, 97-114. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1977.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran." In *Mikra*, 339-377. *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* 2, Assen, Maastricht: Netherlands, 1988.

Fitzmyer, J. A. "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament." *NTS* 7 (1960-61): 296-333.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Major Publications and Tools for Study*. Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study 8. Montana: Scholars, 1977.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Responses to 101 Questions on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Paulist, 1992.

Frohlich, Ida. "Narrative Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 28, ed. Michael E. Stone and Esther Glickler Chazon, 81-89. *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature* 12-14 May, 1996. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Gaster, Theodor. *The Dead Sea Scriptures*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1976.

Golb, Norman. *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995.

Holm-Nielsen, Svend. *Hodayot : Psalms from Qumran*. Acta Theologica Danica 2. Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960.

Horgan, Maurya. *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979.

- Kapera, Zdzislaw J, ed. *Papers on the Dead Sea Scrolls Mogilany 1989* 1. Krakow: Enigma, 1993.
- Kaufman, Stephen. "The Temple Scroll and Higher Criticism," *HUCA* 53 (1982): 29-43.
- Kister, Joseph. "A Common Heritage: Biblical Interpretation at Qumran and Its Implications." In *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 28, ed. Michael E. Stone and Esther Glickler Chazon, 101-11. Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature 12-14 May, 1996. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Kittel, Bonnie. *The Hymns of Qumran : Translation and Commentary*. Edited by Douglas A. Knight. SBL Dissertation Series 50. Atlanta: Scholars, 1981.
- Kugler, Robert A. and Eileen M. Schuller, Eds. "The Dead Sea Scrolls At Fifty." In *Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature* 15. Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Qumran Section Meetings. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars, 1977.
- Leaney, A. R. C. *The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning; Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966.
- Lehmann, Manfred. "The Temple Scroll as a Source of Sectarian Halakhah." *Revue de Qumran* 9 (1978): 579-88.
- Levine, Baruch. "The Temple Scroll: Aspects of Its Historical Provenance and Literary Character." *BASOR* 232 (1978): 5-23.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Preliminary Reflections on the Temple Scroll." In *A History of the Mishnaic Law of Holy Things, Part 6*, ed. J. Neusner, 17-20. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
- Lichtenberger, Hermann. "Atonement and Sacrifice in the Qumran Community." In *Approaches to Ancient Judaism* 9, 159-71. Brown Judaic Studies. Chico, California: Scholars, 1980.
- Lim, Timothy. "Eschatological Orientation and the Alteration of Scripture in the Habakkuk Pesher." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 49 (April 1990): 185-94.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Maier, Johann. *The Temple Scroll: An Introduction, Translation & Commentary*. England: JSOT, 1985.
- Mansoor, M. *The Thanksgiving Hymns* (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1961).

- McCready, Wayne. "Temple and Temple Scroll: A Sectarian Alternative." In *Proceedings of the 10<sup>th</sup> World Congress of Jewish Studies, Division A: The Bible and Its World*. ed. David Assaf, 199-204. Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies. Jerusalem: Magnes, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sectarian Status of Qumran: The Temple Scroll." *Revue de Qumran* 11 (1983): 183-91.
- Merrill, Eugene. *Qumran and Predestination: A Theological Study of the Thanksgiving Hymns*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 8. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Milgrom, Jacob. "The Temple Scroll." *Biblical Archaeologist* 41 (September 1978): 105-20.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Qumran Cult: Its Exegetical Principles." In *Temple Scroll Studies*, ed. George J. Brooke, 165-80. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha, Supplement Series 7. Sheffield, England: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 1989.
- Milik, J.T. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea*. trans. J. Strugnell. London: SCM, 1963.
- Miller, M. P. "Targum, Midrash and the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament," In *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period*, 2 (1971): 29-822.
- Patte, Daniel. *Early Jewish Hermeneutic in Palestine*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 22. (Missoula, Montana: Scholars, 1975).
- Porter, Stanley and Craig Evans, eds. *The Scrolls and the Scriptures : Qumran Fifty Years After*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha, Roehampton Institute London Papers; Supplement Series 26, Sheffield, England: Sheffield University Press, 1997.
- Price, Randall. *Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Eugene, Oregon: Harvest House Publishers, 1996.
- Puech, Emile. "Fragments Du Plus Ancien Exempleire Du Rouleau Du Temple (4Q524)." In *Legal Texts and Legal Issues*, vol. XXIII, ed. F. Garcia Martinez and A. S. Van Der Woude, 19-64. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Rabinowitz, Isaac. "Peshar/Pittaron: Its Biblical Meaning and Its Significance in the Qumran Literature." *Revue de Qumran* 8, (1973): 219-32.
- Schiffman, Lawrence. *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Chico, California: Scholars, 1983.

- Schurer, E. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar & M. Black (Edinburgh: Clark, 1973).
- Schwartz, Daniel. "The Three Temples of 4Q Florilegium." *Revue de Qumran* 10 (1979): 83-91.
- Shemesh, A. and C. Werman. "Hidden Things and Their Revelation." *Revue de Qumran* 18 (1998): 409-27.
- Silberman, Lou H. "Unriddling the Riddle: A Study in the Structure and Language of the Habakkuk Peshet." *Revue de Qumran* 3 (1961): 323-64.
- Skehan, Patrick. "The Period of the Biblical Texts from Khirbet Qumran." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 19 (1957): 435-40.
- Slomovic, Elieser. "Toward An Understanding of the Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Revue de Qumran* 7 (1969): 3-15.
- Stegemann, Hartmut. "The Literary Composition of the Temple Scroll and Its Status at Qumran." In *Temple Scroll Studies*, ed. George J. Brooke, 123-48. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha, Supplement Series 7. Sheffield, England: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Library of Qumran: On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Stone, Michael, ed. *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. Compendia Rerum Iudicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
- Strack, H.L. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*. ed. Markus Bockmuehl. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress, 1996.
- Swanson, Dwight D. *The Temple Scroll and the Bible: The Methodology of 11QT*. Edited by F. Garcia Martinez and A.S. Van Der Woude. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 14. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Sweeney, Marvin. "Sefirah at Qumran: Aspects of the Counting Formulas for the First-Fruits Festivals in the Temple Scroll." *BASOR* 251 (1983): 161-66.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Midrashic Perspective in the Torat Ham-Melek of the Temple Scroll." *Hebrew Studies* 28 (1987): 51-66.
- Thiering, B. E. "Once More The Wicked Priest." *JBL* 97 (1978): 191-205.
- Trebilco, P. R. "Jewish Backgrounds." In *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament* 25, ed. S. E. Porter, 359-88. New Testament Tools and Studies. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

- Trever, John. "The Qumran Covenanters and Their Use of Scripture." *Personalist* 39 (1958): 127-38.
- VanderKam, James C. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today*. Michigan: Eerdmans, 1994.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Biblical Proof-Texts in Qumran Literature." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 34 (1989): 493-508.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Interpretation, History of., At Qumran and in the Targums," in *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible Supplementary Volume* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), 438-439.
- Wacholder, Ben. *The Dawn of Qumran the Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983.
- Wenthe, D.O. "The Use of Hebrew Scriptures in 1QM." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 5 (1998): 290-319.
- Wise, Michael. *A Critical Study of the Temple Scroll From Qumran Cave 11* (Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 1990).
- Wise, Michael, Jr. Martin Abegg, and Edward Cook. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. San Francisco: Harper, 1996.
- Yadin, Yigael. *The Message of the Scrolls*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Is the Temple Scroll a Sectarian Document?" In *Humanizing America's Iconic Book* 6, ed. Gene M. Tucker and Douglas A. Knight, 153-69. Society of Biblical Literature: Biblical Scholarship in North America. Chico, California: Scholars, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Temple Scroll: Introduction*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1983.