

- ¹⁵ Histoire des croyances et des idées religieuses, t. II, Paris 1978, § 223.
- ¹⁶ Cf. J. Coppens, Le célibat esséniens [dans:] Qumrân, pp. 295-303.
- ¹⁷ Cf. H.W. Brownlee, The Background of Biblical Interpretation at Qumran [dans:] Qumrân, pp. 183-193.
- ¹⁸ Les sectes juives au temps de Jésus, Paris 1960, p. 126.
- ¹⁹ Cf. E.-M. Laperrousaz [dans:] DBS, t. 9(1979), col. 797.
- ²⁰ Cf. G. Forkman, The Limits of the Religious Community. Expulsion from the Religious Community within the Qumran Sect, within Rabbinic Judaism, and within Primitive Christianity (Con. Bibl. NT, Series 5), Lund 1972.
- ²¹ Der Bund in den Qumran-Schriften [dans:] Bibel und Qumran, Berlin 1966, pp. 137-149; à ce sujet cf. N. Ilg, Überlegungen zum Verständnis von brt in den Qumrantexten [dans:] Qumrân, pp. 257-263.
- ²² Die Wurzel šwb in der Qumran-Literatur. Zur Semantik eines Grundbegriffes (BBB 46), Bonn 1975; Die Wurzel swb in der Qumrân-literatur [dans:] Qumrân, pp. 285-293.
- ²³ Recemment F. Tarabula a écrit en polonais une dissertation: La notion de hesed dans les écrits de Qumrân et quelques écrits vétérotestamentaires (diss. dactylograph. à la Fac. Théol. de la Pont. Acad. de Théol. à Cracovie, 1987).
- ²⁴ En 1987 on a annoncé la parution du nouveau volume de la Bibliothèque de la Pléiade intitulé Écrits intertestamentaires qui réunit les principaux textes qoumrâniens à côté de ceux des pseudepigraphes - parfois appelés "apocryphes". Edition publiée sous la direction d'André Dupont-Sommer et Marc Philonenko a été lancée de réclame ambitieuse: "par sa conception d'ensemble - on a écrit - comme pour son contenu, ce volume n'a pas d'équivalent en français ou en toute autre langue".
- ²⁵ Ce sont les mots de J. Coppens à l'occasion du Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense en 1976: Qu'en est le problème des analogies qumrâniennes du Nouveau Testament? [dans:] Qumrân, pp. 373-383 (voir p. 382 s.).

Phillip CALLAWAY

THE HISTORY OF THE QUMRAN COMMUNITY. AN INVESTIGATION

The purpose of my book, The History of the Qumran Community, was simply to reassess all the available data, nondocumentary and documentary, that might have some relevance for reconstructing the history of the Qumran community¹. The broad spectrum of evidence includes the site Qumran, the scripts of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Essene reports of Josephus, Philo, and Pliny, and the sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls, i.e. CD, 1QpHab, 4QpPs37, 4QpNah, 4QTest, and 1QH. At the same time this investigation was formulated as a dialogue with representatives of the current consensus on that history, that is, with those who interpret the data against a Maccabean context². Dialogue with this majority view inevitably ties one to its chronological periodization, which itself derives predominantly from the archaeological and palaeographical evidence. Participation in this dialogue is not meant a priori to discredit views outside of the consensus. Rather, the major assumption of this study is that the various bodies of evidence - used by all those concerned with the history of the Qumran community - provide the most important standards by which to evaluate each and every historical reconstruction.

Those who evaluate this archaeological and palaeographical data differently and who understand references and allusions in the sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls strictly within the context of the Roman occupation of Judaea would understandably reject the Maccabean framework and the assumptions upon which it is based³. In spite of this significant difference in viewpoints, one way to formulate the common debate is by asking whether the findings of archaeology, palaeography, and analysis of the ancient Essene reports conflict with the literary evidence from Qumran or, expressed in a more positive fashion, to what extent statements in the Scrolls are consistent with the broad

periodization deriving from the non-literary data. However one may feel about the contribution of the non-literary data, a point of common agreement seems to be the view that the burden of the historical reconstruction rests on the information preserved in the Scrolls.

Before turning to the documents from the Qumran caves, I decided to determine the historical value of the archaeological data for the history of the Qumran community. While the finds at Qumran and within the caves do not eo ipso allow one to identify their inhabitants, they do suggest a material relationship between the caves' inhabitants (at least those who stored the Scrolls there) and the site Qumran. Both witness a material culture dating roughly from the last quarter of the second century B.C.E., to the late first century C.E.⁴ The palaeographical data is also consistent with this periodization, indicating that the sectarian Scrolls were copied in the time between the end of the second century to the end of the first century B.C.E. Of course, some of these documents may even be younger⁵. But the documents that seem to be relevant to the historical reconstruction, those alluding or referring to persons and events, are among the oldest of the Scrolls, having been copied ca. 100-50 B.C.E.⁶ 4QD was copied, according to the majority view, roughly between 75 and 50 B.C.E. By inference any persons or events alluded to in this text (the oldest witness for the medieval Damascus Document) belonged to the time before 75 B.C.E. at the earliest. While not concerned with the well-known figures of other Qumran literature, 1QS, 1QSa, 1QSB, and 4QTest were presumably copied in the period 100-75 B.C.E. Therefore, both the archaeological and palaeographical evidence is not inconsistent with the information in Josephus, who introduced the Essenes into the Jewish history of the mid-second century B.C.E. Pliny knows of a secluded group of Essenes with a growing population located near Qumran in the late first century C.E.⁷ Yet, none of these non-Qumran, literary witnesses ever mentions figures known from the Qumran texts, e.g. the Teacher of Righteousness, the Wicked Priest, the Liar, the Seekers after Smooth Things, and the Lion of Wrath. For that reason, the historical reconstruction depends that much more directly on the literary documentation that does speak of such figures. The rest of my book deals with the relevant Dead Sea Scrolls⁸.

Several passages in CD are central to the task of reconstructing the history of the Qumran community. In col. I one finds provocative chronological notes, which if taken literally, date the "plant root" (sores mata at) three hundred and ninety years after Nebuchadnezzar's capture of Jerusalem and a "teacher of righteousness" (moreh sedek) twenty years later. Accordingly, the community and its teacher would have belonged to the first quarter of the second century B.C.E. Implicitly, the Scoffer (ys hallson) and his adherents, the Seekers after Smooth Things (darsu bahalaqot), must have also been active during this time.

Nevertheless, a recurring point of controversy has been the question whether one should accept these chronological notes at face-value⁹. Without them one may follow one or two other strategies for determining the historical period of the Teacher, the Scoffer (= the Liar), and their followers. One can accept the palaeographical dating of the earliest witness to this document - 4QD - to the period 75-50 B.C.E.¹⁰ At the earliest, therefore, the author/copyist, who was apparently one of the Men of Perfect Holiness (anse temim haggodes, XX,2, 5, 7), wrote around 75 B.C.E., and those about whom he has written belong to the years before that date. Should one elect to disregard the palaeographical datings, one is forced to identify the Teacher, the Liar, and their followers with individuals and groups in the extensive period ranging from ca. 207 B.C.E. to 68 C.E. (and even this later terminus depends directly on the archaeological evidence for the end of Jewish settlement at Qumran; even the palaeographical datings stop at this date). Should one not believe that the palaeographical datings are accurate in particular, one might at least conclude that they are trustworthy in terms of the general periodization that the scripts witness. However one may view the archaeological and palaeographical data in the historical reconstruction, the historian must ultimately appeal to Qumran's documentation for the substance of any historical reconstruction¹¹.

CD speaks of a "teacher" in several passages. In seven cases (II,12; III, 13-14; VI,3; VII,4; XX,4, 28, 32), the Teacher is God. In I,11, XIX,35-XX,1, and 13-14, the Teacher seems to be a human figure of the past; in VI,11 he is apparently a person who is expected in the historical future. I,11 says that God raised up a "plant root" and later a teacher to guide it in the way of God's heart and to instruct it in God's past and future dealings with the unfaithful. In I,12-21 the Scoffer and the Seekers after Smooth Things are described quite laconically as violators of God's covenant, who were deserving of the divine wrath. Nevertheless, the Scoffer and the Teacher do not ever interact with each other, as they seem to do in 1QpHab and 4QpPs37. Rather their brief characterizations are juxtaposed or stacked, the "plant root" and its Teacher preceding the Scoffer and the Seekers after Smooth Things. Two passages in MS B have been of some interest for the historian, XIX,35-XX,1 and XX,13-14, for they are usually interpreted as referring to the Teacher's death. XX,14 concerns the destruction of the so-called "men of war", who are associated with the Liar (ys hakkazab), approximately forty years after the Teacher's death. In none of these key passages is there a clue to the identities of these figures and their followers nor is there a hint at the nature of their conflict. Only in CD does one find references to the "new covenant" in Damascus (VII,14-15, 18, VI,5, VI,18-19, XIX,33-34, and XX,11-12), and this could be a clue to the provenance of the "plant root" mentioned in I,4-12.

Nevertheless, these geographical notes are quite brief and add nothing that would help the historian identify the figures mentioned above.

In light of the lack of concrete information in these statements, the historian is faced with an embarrassing situation. As a result many scholars have turned to Josephus and 1-2 Maccabees in order to gain a clearer picture of the personalities and events of the early second century B.C.E. Admittedly, the documentation from Qumran may be integrated into these well-known narratives, but it need not. In fact, it is not clear whether such an approach is entirely legitimate, since Josephus and the books of the Maccabees never speak of a Teacher of Righteousness, a Scoffer/Liar, or any of the other figures known from the Qumran pesharim.

While CD apparently alludes to a few significant persons of the past from its writer's point of view, some of the pesharim - 1QpHab, 4QpPs37, 4QpNah - are chocked full of references to persons and groups: the Teacher of Righteousness, the Priest, the Men of Truth, the Doers of the Law, the Poor, the Council of the Yahad, the Wicked Priest, the Liar, the Traitors, Those Violent to the Covenant, the Seekers after Smooth Things, the Last Priests of Jerusalem, the Kittim, the Rulers of the Kittim, the Kings of Yavan, the Lion of Wrath, the House of Absalom, the House of Peleg, and a Demetrius. Clearly, these pesharim provide the historian with a welcome abundance of actors, but an equally embarrassing deficit in terms of action, plot, and characterization. A look at a few of the most important passages in the pesharim should illustrate this sufficiently.

1QpHab has always been the most important of the pesharim for answering questions about figures involved in Qumran history. In II,1-10 reference is made to the Traitors and the Liar, who did not obey the Teacher of Righteousness at some time in the past (cf. V,9-12) and to traitors to a "new covenant" and those at the End of Days. The third group of traitors are called Violent Ones of the Covenant, who will not believe what the Priest proclaims about the last generation. One has the impression that the pesharist is referring to three chronologically distinct groups that stood in opposition to each other. All of the statements about "traitors" are similar, but reveal nothing that would help the historian to identify them. The same is true for the Teacher, the "new covenant", and the Priest. One does gain the impression that the Teacher and the Priest were two different persons, who were separate from each other by some period of time. Interestingly, 4QpPs37 III,15-16 identifies the two figures. In any case, the conflict alluded to in this passage seems to be a problem concerning the authority of the Teacher of Righteousness and the Priest.

In VIII,8-13 the Wicked Priest is characterized as one who was initially known by the name of Truth, but who fell from favor once he began to rule over Israel. He became arrogant, abandoned God, disregarding the commandments for the sake of riches. This characterization reveals above all that the Wicked Priest was faithless toward Israel. The same can be said about the Last Priests of Jerusalem in IX,4-7. Later in IX,9 he is said to be guilty of some transgression against the Teacher of Righteousness and the men of his council. This transgression is left unexplained. In X,9-13 the Liar is accused in quite similar terms of having misled many peoples in order to erect a city on blood and a community on lies for the sake of his own glory. What he is supposed to have done concretely remains a puzzle.

In XI,4-8 the conflict is more detailed (cf. 4QpPs37 II,17-19; IV,8-10), but no less difficult for the historian to use. In II, 4-5 the Wicked Priest is accused of pursuing the Teacher of Righteousness to his place of exile in order to destroy him. According to II, 5-8, he appeared at the community's location (presumably this group formed the Teacher's followers at Qumran) on a Day of Atonement. Of all the passages mentioned above, this one provides the most event-like statement concerning the conflict between the Teacher and the Wicked Priest. If one understands this passage literally, one must conclude that the Wicked Priest had attempted to destroy the Teacher and his group on an unknown Day of Atonement at an unknown geographical location. Again, the historian must conclude that the nature of this information precludes attempts to identify the Teacher and the Wicked Priest as well as their adherents with known persons of the second century B.C.E. or any other century. Obviously, XI,4-8 reflects some sort of conflict, but the reasons for it, the actual course of events that transpired "at the house of his exile", and the outcome are merely alluded to and never explained. 4QpPs IV,8-10 also seems to refer to the same conflict, but says even less than 1QpHab.

Although one has good reason to despair when trying to discover traces of historical happenings in such puzzling statements, some of the language about the Wicked Priest seems to be slightly more promising. In 1QpHab VIII,9-10 the Wicked Priest is depicted as one who was apparently acceptable in his role as priest, but whose character was transformed decisively once he began to rule over Israel. Such language implies that the Wicked Priest had originally been respected by the Teacher and his community (at least from the perspective of the pesharist), but even this information does not permit one to make an identification of the Wicked Priest. My teacher, Professor Dr. Dr. Hartmut Stegemann, has presented an extensive argument in favor of viewing this figure as a Jewish high priest of the second century B.C.E.¹² He and others believe that the Hebrew noun hakkohen refers not merely to a priest but rather to an important

high priest. Furthermore, he maintains, "ruling over Israel" would practically require one to think of the Wicked Priest as a high priest. The attributive adjective harrasa refers, in his estimation, to the fact that the Wicked Priest came from a family lineage that disqualified him from the high priesthood. But if he were a high priest, the pesharist claims that "he was called by the name of Truth initially". Thus one could hardly speak of the Wicked Priest as belonging to a questionable ancestry. Stegemann uses another criterion that would help the historian to identify this "high priest" and ruler over Israel - statements about this person's death at the hands of Gentiles outside of Judaea. 1QpHab VIII,16-IX,2 refers only to his physical suffering but does not indicate who inflicted this upon him or when and where this happened. This passage does seem to be concerned with an event of the past, but elsewhere in 1QpHab (X,4-5; XI,12-18; XII,2-6; cf. 4QpPs37 II,17-19; III,7-8; IV,8-10) this same motif is used to speak of God's future judgement of the Wicked Priest and the wicked in general. This involves an implicit contrasting of the fates of the wicked and the righteous, information which by no means may be adduced as clear and unambiguous biographical information about the Wicked priest. The majority of the evidence concerning the death of the Wicked Priest seems to be wishful thinking.

4QpNah is an entirely different kind of historical source. While it does not mention the Teacher, the "plant root", and the Wicked Priest, it does seem to make a connection with recorded political history, thereby providing an invaluable chronological peg, independent of archaeology, palaeography, and the chronological notes in CD I. In I,2-8 it is said that a certain Demetrius, widely identified with Demetrius III Eukeros (95-88 B.C.E.), attempted to enter Jerusalem at the behest of a group called the Seekers after Smooth Things. By cross-referencing this passage with CD I, one can make an argument that these Seekers after Smooth Things were followers of the Scoffer (= the Liar). The logical inference from this is that this group was active during the years when Demetrius ruled. Furthermore, the reader is told that the Lion of Wrath, who "hung men up alive", took revenge on the Seekers for their having appealed to Demetrius to capture Jerusalem. Many scholars have seen a particular political event reflected in I,2-8 - Alexander Jannaeus' crucifixion of a eight hundred pharisees for their collusion with Demetrius III (Antiquities of the Jews XIII, 380; Jewish War I,97) in 88 B.C.E. This date is by coincidence consistent with the periodization inferred from the archaeological data, the palaeographical data, and the chronological notes in CD I.

Although 4QpNah may help to identify the Seekers after Smooth Things and the Liar with Pharisees and to date them in the early years of the first century

B.C.E., not one of these figures is identified by name. The Teacher and the Wicked Priest are never even alluded to. If the Seekers and the Liar were Pharisees, does that suggest that the Teacher and his followers were as well? Or were they Sadducees? Or, as usually assumed, Essenes? Even this view is problematic, for, according to Josephus (War II,8, 119-61; Antiquities XVIII,1, 18-22), the Essenes favored a politically passive stance. Since the Seekers/Pharisees were apparently involved in Jewish political history in the second and first centuries B.C.E. and Josephus associates only two parties, the Pharisees and the Sadducees, with Jewish politics at this time, it is logical, if not also historically probable that 4QpNah provides the most important clues to understanding other Qumran texts.

Two hypothetical scenarios seem to be possible. (1) CD, 1QpHab, 4QpPs37, and 4QpNah are concerned with struggles within the Pharisaic association in the second and first centuries B.C.E. (2) The Qumran documents could however be dealing with conflicts between Pharisees and Sadducees. Unfortunately, there is no evidence in the Qumran literature that allows one to fill in the many gaping holes in the larger historical picture. These two scenarios noted above, which depend on but exceed the evidence, are clearly possible, but would require additional, independent substantiation. Perhaps one might call into question the legitimacy of reading 1QpHab, 4QpPs37, and CD against the historical background in 4QpNah I,2-8.

In any case, each and every historical reconstruction (mine included), besides using the available documentary and nondocumentary data from Qumran, has appealed to the human imagination and desire to reconstruct a history. This desire is strong, even where the evidence is inadequate for the task. The nature of the literary evidence from the Scrolls contributes largely to that, making puzzling allusions to persons and conflicts that seem to titillate more than inform. Those who desire to view the struggle alluded to in the Qumran texts against the period of Roman occupation in Judaea must face the chronological evidence. CD I dates the Teacher, the Liar, and their respective groups to the first quarter of the second century B.C.E. 4QpNah associates the Liar's community, the Seekers after Smooth Things, with a known political event of the early first century B.C.E. The archaeological and palaeographical datings are consistent with this timeframe - 207 to 88 B.C.E. To say much more than this about the history of the Qumran community would certainly mislead those who are concerned to understand the nature of the available documentary and nondocumentary evidence.

¹ It is scheduled to appear this year (1988) as Vol. 3 in the Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series.

² Chapter I. This consensus includes many scholars: in this investigation, I enter into dialogue with Gert Jeremias, Hartmut Stegemann, Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, Philip R. Davies, and Frank M. Cross, Jr. in particular.

³ This group of scholars includes most recently Barbara Thiering and Robert Eisenman. Among earlier scholars, J.T. Teicher belongs to this camp. In a future publication, I hope to give more attention to these theories.

⁴ Chapter II.

⁵ Chapter III.

⁶ The serek literature seems to be the oldest, according to accepted palaeographical datings. Thiering and Eisenman have raised questions about the accuracy of the early datings of Qumran scripts.

⁷ Chapter IV. The relevant passages in Josephus, Philo, and Pliny (as well as 1-2 Maccabees) are evaluated.

⁸ Chapter V deals with CD; VI with 1QpHab, 1QpPs37, and 4QpNah; VII with 4QTest; and VIII with 1QH. Upon close analysis, 4QTest and 1QH prove to offer no clear testimony on the history of the Qumran community.

⁹ Philip R. Davies (The Damascus Covenant, Sheffield 1978, p. 16) provides a good summary of various views of the chronological notes in CD I.

¹⁰ See note 5 above.

¹¹ The majority of reconstructions of Qumran history depend much more on Josephus, Daniel, 1-2 Maccabees or early Christian history witnessed primarily in the New Testament than on the information preserved in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

¹² Hartmut Stegemann, Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde, Bonn 1970, pp. 98-116, 202-206, also Chapter 4 notes 328-29.

Ryszard RUBINKIEWICZ

THE BOOK OF NOAH (1 Enoch 6-11) AND EZRA'S REFORM

The Book of Enoch (1 Enoch) is a collection of the texts written in different periods and by different authors. One such text is the Noahitic Fragment (1 Enoch 6-11) belonging formerly to the cycle of Noah. At present it makes a part of the Book of the Watchers (1 Enoch 1-36)¹. The period when this text was written is difficult to establish. P. Sacchi expressed the opinion that at least the fragment 1 Enoch 6-8 was written before the year 400 B.C.² G.W.E. Nickelsburg claims that the struggles of the giants depicted in 1 Enoch 6-11 echo the wars of the diadochs after the death of Alexander the Great³. He dates the composition of the text to the turn of the third century B.C. F. Corriente and A. Piñero attribute it to approximately the beginning of the II cent. B.C.⁴ However it seems that it is possible to prove that this text dates back to the time of Ezra's reform. I have expressed occasionally this opinion in my book Eschatologia Hen 9-11 a Nowy Testament (Lublin 1984)⁵ and now I would like to develop this position.

I

The text of 1 Enoch 6-11 consists of two traditions integrated into one literary unit⁶. The first and older one (1 Enoch 6-8) is connected with the name of Shemihazah, the leader of the fallen angels who took wives for themselves and begot large giants (1 Enoch 7:1-2). We find here the theme of the benê 'elo-hîm and the giants of Gen 6:1-4 in its developed form. The second tradition (1 Enoch 9-11) is associated with the fallen angel Asael (Azazel) who is presented as a teacher of all iniquity on the earth (9:6). This part of the Book