

Jonathan G. Campbell
The Use of Scripture in the
Damascus Document 1–8,19–20



Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die
alttestamentliche Wissenschaft

Herausgegeben von
Otto Kaiser

Band 228

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York

1995

Jonathan G. Campbell

The Use of Scripture in the
Damascus Document 1-8,19-20

Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York

1995

⊗ Printed on acid-free paper which falls within the guidelines of the ANSI
to ensure permanence and durability

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Chambpell, Jonathan G. (Jonathan Goodson). 1964–
The use of Scripture in the Damascus document 1–8, 19–20 /
Jonathan G. Campbell.
p. cm. – (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche
Wissenschaft ; Bd. 228)
Revision of the author's thesis (Ph. D.)–Oxford University, 1991.
Includes bibliographical references.
ISBN 3-11-014240-6 (lib. binding)
1. Damascus document. 2. Qumran community. 3. Bible. O.T.-
Extra-canonical parallels. 4. Dead Sea scrolls. 40–Criticism.
Interpretation, etc. I. Title. II. Series: Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für
die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft : 228.
BS410.Z5 vol. 228
[BM175.Q6]
296.1'55–dc20

95-5898
CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – Cataloging-in-Publication Data

[Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft / Beihefte]
Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. – Berlin ;
New York : de Gruyter.
Früher Schriftenreihe
Reihe Beihefte zu: Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
NE: HST
Bd. 228. Cambell, Johanthan G.: The use of scripture in the Damascus
document 1–8, 19–20. – 1995
Campbell, Johanthan G.:
The use of scripture in the Damascus document 1–8, 19–20 / Jonathan
G. Campbell. – Berlin ; New York : de Gruyter, 1995
(Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft ; Bd.
228)
Zugl.: Oxford, Univ., Diss., 1991
ISBN 3-11-014240-6

ISSN 0934-2575

© Copyright 1995 by Walter de Gruyter & Co., D-10785 Berlin.

All rights reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Printed in Germany
Printing: Arthur Collignon GmbH, Berlin
Binding: Lüderitz & Bauer-GmbH, Berlin

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my former supervisor, Prof. Geza Vermes, as well as Dr. Martin Goodman, Dr. George Brooke, and Prof. Joseph Baumgarten, for the help and information they gave me during the original preparation of this study as a doctoral thesis in the University of Oxford. Moreover, I am very grateful to Prof. Vermes, Ms. Mary Betley, and Dr. Richard Crowe for the support and feedback they provided during the painstaking process of revision for publication.

Thanks are also due to Prof. Otto Kaiser who, as editor of the *BZAW* series, accepted my analysis of the Damascus Document into the series, as well as to the University of Wales, Lampeter, for granting me a term's study leave to work on this project.

Finally, it should be stated that I alone am responsible for the final shape of the examination of the Admonition which follows.

JGC

ושבחתני אני את השמחה
אשר אין טוב לאדם תחת השמש
כי אם לאכול ולשתות ולשמור
והוא ילוננו בעמלו ימי חייו
אשר נתן לו האלהים תחת השמש

קהלת ח טו

Preface

This book constitutes a revision of a dissertation accepted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University of Oxford in September 1991. It has sought to incorporate, where relevant, additional information and changes in perspective that have resulted from the release of previously unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls in late 1991, while at the same time avoiding a complete rewriting of the original study.

Essentially, it is argued that the Damascus Document 1-8 and 19-20 consistently draws upon a select body of scriptural contexts by way of citation and allusion. It is at this level that the unity of the text can be found. Moreover, this feature of the work may enable scholars to re-evaluate the historical problems that are usually associated with the Admonition and its relevance for reconstructing Qumran origins. It also raises important methodological questions about how ancient texts from the Second Temple period should be 'read'.

It may be helpful here to draw attention to a few simple points by way of explanation. Firstly, 'bible' is a term used to designate the open-ended scriptural collection of Second Temple Judaism, while 'Hebrew Bible' is reserved for the three-fold canon of later times. Secondly, the following Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek editions have been employed: K. Elliger, W. Rudolph, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, Stuttgart (1967-83); A. Sperber, *The Aramaic Bible*, I-III, Leiden (1959); A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, Stuttgart (1979); K. Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart (1979). It should be pointed out that, given their small number, quotations in Greek appear in unaccented form. As for citations in English, the New Revised Standard Version, as well as J.H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, I-II, London (1983-5), have been drawn upon, unless otherwise stated. Thirdly, the text of the Damascus Document itself has been taken from M. Broshi (ed.), *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*, Jerusalem (1992).

Finally, it should be noted that verses within independent quotations from the Masoretic Text in the body of our study are closed with a colon (:), while the Tetragrammaton is represented by 'יְהוָה'.

Contents

Acknowledgements		V
Preface		IX
1	Introduction	1-10
1.1	The Damascus Document	1
1.2	The Difficulty with the Damascus Document	4
1.3	Scripture in the Damascus Document	8
2	The Bible at Qumran	11-32
2.1	The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls	11
2.2	The Use of Scripture at Qumran	19
2.3	Schwarz on Scripture in the Damascus Document	25
2.4	The Damascus Document and Scripture	27
3	The Damascus Document and the Historical-Critical Method	33-48
3.1	Understanding Ancient Texts	33
3.2	Poetry in the Damascus Document	35
3.3	An Address to the Sons of Light	41
3.4	Literature and Culture	43
4	Scripture in the Historical Sections of the Damascus Document	49-102
4.1	The Historical Sections	49
4.2	Scripture in CD 1:1-2:1	51
4.2.1	Torah in CD 1:1-2:1	57
4.2.2	Nevi'im in CD 1:1-2:1	60
4.2.3	Ketuvim in CD 1:1-2:1	63
4.2.4	Summary	65
4.3	Scripture in CD 2:14-4:12a	67
4.3.1	Torah in CD 2:14-4:12a	72
4.3.2	Nevi'im in CD 2:14-4:12a	79
4.3.3	Ketuvim in CD 2:14-4:12a	84
4.3.4	Summary	86
4.4	Scripture in CD 5:15a-6:11a	88
4.4.1	Torah in CD 5:15b-6:11a	91
4.4.2	Nevi'im in CD 5:15b-6:11a	96
4.4.3	Ketuvim in CD 5:15a-6:11a	98
4.4.4	Summary	99
4.5	Scripture in the Historical Sections	100

5	Scripture in the Midrashic Sections of the Damascus Document	103-174
5.1	The Midrashic Sections	103
5.2	Scripture in CD 2:2-13	106
5.2.1	Torah in CD 2:2-13	109
5.2.2	Nevi'im in CD 2:2-13	112
5.2.3	Ketuvim in CD 2:2-13	114
5.2.4	Summary	115
5.3	Scripture in CD 4:12b-5:15a	116
5.3.1	Torah in CD 4:12b-5:15a	122
5.3.2	Nevi'im in CD 4:12a-5:15a	127
5.3.3	Ketuvim in CD 4:12a-5:15b	130
5.3.4	Summary	130
5.4	Scripture in CD 6:11b-8:21	131
5.4.1	Torah in CD 6:11b-7:9a	138
5.4.2	Nevi'im in CD 6:11a-7:9a	144
5.4.3	Ketuvim in CD 6:11a-7:9a	146
5.4.4	Torah in CD 7:9b-8:21	146
5.4.5	Nevi'im in CD 7:9b-8:21	148
5.4.6	Ketuvim in CD 7:9b-8:21	150
5.4.7	Summary	151
5.5	Scripture in CD 19:1-33a	152
5.5.1	A Comparison of Manuscripts A and B	153
5.5.2	Torah and Nevi'im in CD 19:1-33	158
5.5.3	Summary	160
5.6	Scripture in CD 19:33b-20:34	161
5.6.1	Torah in CD 19:33b-20:34	163
5.6.2	Nevi'im in CD 19:33b-20:34	167
5.6.3	Ketuvim in CD 19:33b-20:34	169
5.6.4	Summary	170
5.7	Scripture in the Midrashic Sections	171
6	Conclusions	175-208
6.1	The Damascus Document and Scripture	175
6.2	The Damascus Document and History	189
6.3	Mark 15:22-37 and Scripture	195
6.4	The Damascus Document, Scripture and History	200
6.5	Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1-8, 19-20	205
	Abbreviations	209
	Bibliography	213

1 Introduction

1.1 The Damascus Document

The Damascus Document (CD) was discovered in Cairo in 1896/97 by Solomon Schechter among a large body of manuscripts (MSS) and fragments in an old synagogue genizah; it was subsequently published in 1910.¹ The work in a different edition(s) was uncovered when texts in caves of the Judean desert were found between 1947 and 1955 around the site of Khirbet Qumran.² The most important copies were the remains of eight MSS retrieved from Cave 4 (4QD^{a-h} or 4Q266-273), although a few fragments were also recovered from Cave 5 and Cave 6.³ However, due to the unavailability of the 4QD texts to the majority of scholars during most of the past forty-five years, CD, in conjunction with what were viewed to be other sectarian documents from Qumran, came to be read in lieu of 4QD as expressive of the origins, religion and laws of the Essene sect living in the Judean desert during the final third of the Second Temple period.⁴

-
- ¹ S. Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries: Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, Cambridge (1910); this was reprinted with a prolegomenon and bibliography by J. Fitzmyer in 1970. Photographs of the Cairo Genizah MSS, prepared by E. Qimron, can be studied in M. Broshi (ed.), *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*, Jerusalem (1992), pp. 9-49.
 - ² For details of the results of archaeological work in and around Qumran, see R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, London (1973); P.R. Callaway, *The History of the Qumran Community: An Investigation*, Sheffield (1988), pp. 29-51. For a complete catalogue of the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS), see G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*, London (1994), pp. 202-225; the same list also occurs in G. Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, London (1994), pp. xxxvi-lvi.
 - ³ The small fragments from Caves 5 and 6 were included in M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, R. de Vaux, *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumrân*, Oxford (Discoveries in the Judean Desert, III; 1962), pp. 128-131, 181.
 - ⁴ For an outline of the resultant consensus, see E. Schürer, G. Vermes, F. Millar, *The history of the Jewish people in the age of Jesus Christ*, II, Edinburgh (1979), pp. 555-590. For the main so-called sectarian DSS, see the relevant portions of Schürer, III.1, pp. 380-469, and below, note 11.

There have been numerous variations and permutations on this hypothesis over the years, not least concerning the precise role CD should play in such historical and ideological reconstructions.⁵ Moreover, the resultant debate is now set to intensify in view of the new access scholars now have to previously unpublished DSS, including the 4QD material.⁶ Given these complexities, it will be useful to describe CD and 4QD in a little more detail.

The Cairo Genizah evidence consists of two medieval MSS, referred to as Ms A and Ms B. The former is divided into sixteen columns (termed CD 1-16 or CD I-XVI), while the latter is made up of two longer columns (labelled CD 19-20 or CD XIX-XX). Further, in terms of style and content, the material divides naturally into two parts: CD 1-8 and 19-20, which are often called the 'Admonition' or 'Exhortation'; and CD 9-16, which is referred to as the 'Laws' or 'Statutes'.⁷ Whilst CD 19-20 in Ms B appears to be a continuation of CD 1-8, the fact that 7:5b-8:19,21b overlaps with 19:1-34a is one of the major complications within the Admonition.

As mentioned, the most important of the Qumran copies of the text are 4QDa-h or 4Q266-273.⁸ Of these, the oldest and longest is 4QDa, of some 272 lines and dating to the first half of the first century BCE; 4QDe is also substantial, although late Herodian in date. When the remains of the eight MSS are coordinated with each other, it appears that 4QD contained all of the Cairo material, along with a number of extra sections not present in the

⁵ See P.R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant*, Sheffield (1982), pp. 1-47, for a review of scholarly theses pertaining to CD.

⁶ Photographs of 4QD were made available in R.H. Eisenman, J.M. Robinson, *A Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, I-II, Washington (1991). See also B.Z. Wacholder, M.G. Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: the Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four*, Fascicle One, Washington (1991), pp. 1-59, for a reconstruction of the 4QD texts, as well as Baumgarten in Broshi, pp. 57-62, for a description of 4QDa-h.

⁷ As pointed out by J.T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, London (1959), p. 151f, the equivalent of CD 15-16 preceded that of 9-14 in 4QD, and this informs the arrangement of the translation in *DSSE*, p. 106f. Note that H. Stegemann, 'Das Gesetzkorpus der <<Damaskusschrift>> (CD IX-XVI)', *RQ* 14 (1990), pp. 409-434, argues that CD 9-16 was originally a work separate from the Admonition with which it is now joined.

⁸ We follow here the sigla of Baumgarten in Broshi, pp. 57-61. It should be pointed out, however, that 4QDa,b,c,d,e,f,g,h are respectively designated 4QDb,d,a,f,e,c,g,h in WA, pp. 1-59.

medieval edition of the work. This reconstruction of the contents of 4QD can be represented in the following way:⁹

1. Address in the first person singular to the בְּנֵי אֹרֶר, exhorting them to obey Moses and separate from the מְסִיגֵי גְבוּל (cf. CD 5:20 and 8:3);
2. CD 1-8, 19-20;
3. Introduction to the Laws, with a catalogue of transgressions apparently designed to exemplify the laxity of contemporary society and paralleled at points in 11QT and 4QMMT, and an appeal to the יוֹדְעֵי צְדָקָה (cf. CD 1:1) to choose life;
4. The role of the priests in the community and regulations concerning priestly disqualifications;
5. The ordeal of the סוֹטָה;
6. Rules about skin disease, fluxes and childbirth;
7. Various agricultural laws;
8. Impure metals employed in pagan cults;
9. Some regulations on marriage;
10. CD 15-16, 9-14;
11. Penal code on discipline in the community (cf. 1QS 8:16b-9:2);
12. Expulsion ritual for use at the annual Renewal of the Covenant ceremony in the third month (cf. 1QS 2:19-25a).

Some 144 lines of the 4QD material relate to the Admonition, while 182 are from CD 9-16; a further 363 lines, not extant in the Genizah texts, are mostly of a legal nature. This means that the Qumran form of the document had an Exhortation approximately half as long as its Laws section.¹⁰

Further evaluation of 4QD and its relation to CD will require more detailed study of the 4QD data and other hitherto unpublished DSS, which have only been in the public domain for several years. Indeed, the main task of Qumran scholarship will now be to analyse this newly liberated material.¹¹

⁹ See Baumgarten in Broshi, pp. 51-57, for the basis of this layout and for the dating of the MSS.

¹⁰ Regarding the additional legal material in 4QD, of particular interest are what appear to be parallels with Josephus' description of the Essenes; see J.M. Baumgarten, 'The Cave 4 Versions of the Qumran Penal Code', *JJS* 43 (1991), p. 275, for a possible example in 4QD^e.

¹¹ For a preliminary collection of some of the most important new texts in their original language, together with an English translation, see R.H. Eisenman, M. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, New York (1992); while the transcriptions in this volume are generally accurate, care should be taken in the use of its

This will be a lengthy task, which will no doubt result in important changes to our perception of the Qumran community, Second Temple Judaism at large and the overall significance of the DSS.

Meanwhile, especially since it seems that 4QD will alter our view of the Laws rather than the Exhortation, we shall be concerned with CD 1-8 and 19-20, as well as the text which preceded this in 4QD in the form of an address, now extant only fragmentarily in 4QD^{a,b,c}, to the "sons of light". However, the scholarly energy that has been expended on the Admonition since the beginning of the twentieth century is great, and the results are varied. This is shown by the many publications discussing the text that have appeared and by the diversity of approach and hypothesis put forward.¹² It is, indeed, with not a little hesitation that we embark on another study of CD 1-8 and 19-20, and the remainder of this chapter and the ensuing two chapters are devoted to setting the scene and justifying our approach.

1.2 *The Difficulty with the Damascus Document*

In recent decades, various competing theories regarding the Admonition and its relation to other DSS and the Qumran community have been proposed, and the student of CD may genuinely be at a loss as to how to discern appropriately between them. The crux of the matter concerns Qumran origins and the role of CD 1-8 and 19-20 in reconstructing them. Largely as a by-product of this debate, some terminological confusion has evolved over designations such as 'Essene', 'pre-Essene', 'proto-Qumran', or 'Qumran', so that scholars use terms with varying nuances, depending on how the connections between the Qumran community, CD and the Essenes are viewed.¹³ Nevertheless, all who attempt to reconstruct earliest Qumran history are obliged to utilize CD, inasmuch as it seems to give important clues to this period, especially in CD 1:1-2:1.

interpretative comments. A superior English translation of many of the same new works can also be found in *DSSE*.

¹² For further bibliographical data, see S. Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries: Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, New York (1970), with a bibliography by J. Fitzmyer, and Broshi, pp. 63-83, containing a compilation of relevant works produced in the period 1970-89.

¹³ See P.R. Davies, 'The Birthplace of the Essenes: Where is Damascus?', *RQ* 14 (1990), pp. 503-520, for a helpful discussion on terminology.

Overall, following Davies, we can see a divergence of opinion which presents us with two basic theories:

"The more long-standing of these, most comprehensively developed by H. Stegemann, is that the Qumran community originally developed from the Hasidim of the Maccabean period and became the Essenes, whereas those Hasidim who rejected the Teacher of Righteousness evolved into the Pharisees....The alternative theory, sustained by J. Murphy-O'Connor, posits an Essene movement prior to Qumran. The arrival of the Teacher provoked a split in this movement; his disciples retreated to the Dead Sea, leaving the larger body of Essenes settled throughout Palestine."¹⁴

In other words, the view represented by Stegemann and others placed the origins of the Qumran community (which was coextensive with, or the chief and only known exemplar of, Essenism) in the mid-second century BCE, and sought to create a synthesis out of material deemed to be original to the sect - particularly 1QS, the Pesharim, and CD. This, in turn, led to a reconstruction of the community's history and organization, as well as an understanding of its literature and self-identity, which viewed CD as stemming directly from the Essenes, thought to be responsible for all the sectarian DSS written over a 200-year period, at Qumran. While there have been numerous important variations as to the detail of this thesis, in one form or another it had become the consensus view by the 1960s.¹⁵ A second approach, associated with J. Murphy-O'Connor and P.R. Davies, has traced a beginning for the Essenes (or at least a claim to an origin) to some point between the exile and the first half of the second century. The above-mentioned synthesis, they have argued, does not do justice to the individual texts, especially CD, which may even be a document not original to the group among whom it was found. One particular focus of their work has concerned what is to be made of the pre-history of the sect, as narrated in CD 1:4ff, 3:12ff and 6:2ff, before the arrival of the Teacher of Righteousness. These passages seem to place it after the Babylonian exile rather than in the second century BCE, and they sit

¹⁴ P.R. Davies, 'Eschatology at Qumran', *JBL* 104 (1985), p. 44.

¹⁵ Associated with it, among others, are names such as J.H. Charlesworth, M. Knibb, J.T. Milik, H. Stegemann, R. de Vaux, and G. Vermes; see note 4 above. It should be remarked, however, that Stegemann has revised his view of Qumran origins in 'The Qumran Essenes - Local Members of the Main Jewish Union in Late Second Temple Times', in J.T. Barrera, L.V. Montaner, *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls Madrid 18-21 March, 1991*, Leiden (1992), pp. 83-186.

somewhat uncomfortably with the sort of information usually gleaned from the Pesharim.¹⁶

To complicate matters further, we may also now speak of a mid-way or third position which has in effect married elements from both of these two theses. As with the theories of Murphy-O'Connor and Davies, this third hypothesis has argued that the Qumran community was a splinter group which formed from a wider Essene movement but, more in line with the consensus view, that broader movement had a thoroughly Palestinian origin in the third or early second century BCE only. This so-called 'Groningen Hypothesis' was formulated by F. García Martínez and A.S. van der Woude and contains several distinctive features of its own.¹⁷

Of course, this distillation of three main approaches out of the immense scholarly effort that has gone into the study of the Admonition and the related issue of Qumran origins is something of an oversimplification.¹⁸ It is neither practical nor necessary, however, to enter into greater detail at this stage, for a new synthesis is likely to emerge in view of the access which scholars now have to texts released in recent years.¹⁹

Nevertheless, it appears that, in contrast to the Laws, 4QD changes little of our understanding of the overall shape of the Admonition, apart from the addition of an initial opening address. It will be helpful, therefore, to explain

¹⁶ See J. Murphy-O'Connor, 'An Essene Missionary Document? CD II,14 - VI,1', *RB* 77 (1970), pp. 201-229; 'A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document VI,2 - VIII,3', *RB* 78 (1971), pp. 210-232; 'The Critique of the Princes of Judah (CD VIII,3-19)', *RB* 79 (1972), pp. 200-216; 'A Literary Analysis of Damascus Document XIX,33 - XX,34', *RB* 79 (1972), pp. 544-564; see also Davies.

¹⁷ See F. García Martínez, 'Qumran Origins and Early History: A Groningen Hypothesis', *FO* 25 (1988), pp. 113-136, for its initial expression and, subsequently, F. García Martínez, A.S. van der Woude, 'A Groningen Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History', *RQ* 14 (1990), pp. 521-542. One element in this thesis, construing IQpHab 8-12 as portraying six wicked high priests in succession, has been criticized by T.H. Lim, 'The Wicked Priests of the Groningen Hypothesis', *JBL* 112 (1993), pp. 415-425. See below, p. 190, note 35, for further details.

¹⁸ A number of peripheral hypotheses are untenable, especially in view of the results of radiocarbon dating of the DSS, as reported in G. Bonani *et al*, 'Radiocarbon Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls', *Atiqot* 20 (1991), pp. 25-32. These include, e.g., J.L. Teicher, 'Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer - Dokumente der jüdisch-christlichen Sekte der Ebioniten', *ZRGG* 3 (1951), pp. 153-209; R.H. Eisenman, *Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran*, Leiden (1983); B. Thiering, *Jesus the Man: A New Interpretation from the Dead Sea Scrolls*, London (1992).

¹⁹ See G. Vermes, 'The Present State of Dead Sea Scrolls Research', *JJS* 45 (1994), pp. 101-110, and, more fully, *DSSE*, pp. 1-64, for an expression of how a revised consensus may take shape.

more precisely the reasons for the divergent views mentioned above. As already suggested, the cause lies almost exclusively in the kind of significance given to various passages in CD 1-8 or 19-20, which rehearse the origin of the group being commended in the text. How they relate to each other, to other portions of CD, and to material from other DSS, usually taken as evidence for the sect's beginnings, is also important. The passages are CD 1:1-2:1, 2:14-4:12a, and 5:15b-6:11a, and they mention the *מורה צדק*, the *דורש התורה* and contain references, unique among the DSS, to the *שבי ישראל* and *דמשק*. Other portions of CD mention the same or seemingly related personages, along with their enemies and associated events (see, for instance, CD 4:19ff, 5:13-15, 7:14-21, and 8:9-13).

At this point, it should be noted that in CD the Teacher is only mentioned in CD 1:11 and 6:11; in the former he is of the recent past, while in the latter he is a figure of the future. Moreover, although most interpreters have equated a second century Teacher with the Interpreter in 6:7, this is difficult if CD 3:12ff and 6:2ff place the community's origin further into the past. As for the nomenclature *שבי ישראל*, *דמשק* and the phrase *היוצאים מארץ יהודה* (see CD 4:6f and 6:5), much depends on the extent to which such terms are viewed as literal or symbolic. Because the metaphorical is certainly involved in some way, however, it is difficult to judge between scholars' views. Thus, *שבי ישראל* is taken by many as "repentants", *ארץ יהודה* as second-century Judaism centred on Jerusalem and its temple, and *דמשק* as a cipher for Qumran. Alternatively, these terms might be seen as referring to "returnees", the actual land of Judah, and Babylon, respectively. These and other factors will be mentioned again in subsequent chapters when the detail of CD 1-8 and 19-20 is discussed.

For now, it is sufficient to note that the main problem in interpreting the Admonition centres on an apparent contradiction between a beginning for the sect which is placed a considerable amount of time after Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of Jerusalem and one set in the intervening period. More concretely, the reader is faced with the task of relating CD 1:1-2:1 to the transition from 3:10b-12a to 3:12ff, and to the similar pattern in 5:20ff and 6:2ff, and then taking into account other portions like CD 7:14-21. There is a similar two-fold picture painted of the wicked; the sins of pre-exilic generations are referred to, as well as the punishment that swallowed them up, but there are also references to more recent wickedness. An ambiguity is present which renders it difficult to make any attempt to distinguish between exilic and later generations in a consistent and precise manner. In short, an examination of CD, especially 1:1-2:1, 3:12b-4:12a, and 5:15b-6:11a, evinces a fluctuation between an origin set in the exile and one placed

considerably later on, both set against outside wickedness. While all agree that some group was in existence before the appearance of the Teacher, it is this indeterminate period, before mention of the latter and the "root of planting" in 1:7ff, which different theories have attempted to explain.

All three lines of approach outlined above have points in their favour. On the one hand, it is surely reasonable to expect CD to bear its meaning in relation to the other texts, especially the Pesharim, with which it was presumably meaningfully used by the sect at Qumran, as the synthesis of Stegemann and others has assumed. At the same time, the difficulty of accepting such a theory without compromising the detail of the text must be faced, and it is especially awkward that this problem extends to the internal consistency of the Admonition itself. It may be that, when scholars have had sufficient time to peruse and evaluate the mass of new material now at their disposal and to reassess those sectarian DSS which have been in the public domain for some time, the difficulties considered above will disappear or alter radically. This, however, is by no means certain.

1.3 *Scripture in the Damascus Document*

In the meantime, we may be sure that the statements of Milik and, subsequently, Baumgarten, that the 4QD texts generally match the Cairo MSS A and B, are correct.²⁰ This is clear, at least as far as the Admonition is concerned, now that the photographs of 4QD^{a-h} are available, although our view of the Laws of CD may change significantly in years to come.²¹ Any new approach to CD 1-8 and 19-20, therefore, which bypasses the historical difficulties outlined earlier without preempting the results of future research, is to be welcomed.

²⁰ See J.T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*, London (1959), pp. 38, 58, 60, and Baumgarten in Broshi, p. 61f.

²¹ Thus, the judgement of P.R. Callaway, *The History of the Qumran Community: An Investigation*, Sheffield (1988), p. 90, was over-cautious:

"If Milik's reconstructed outline should turn out to be correct, and the still unpublished 4Q material prevents one from checking it, the medieval manuscripts A and B would seem to represent not only a shorter version but also a qualitatively different document from that represented by the 4Q fragments. If CD originally concluded with a liturgy for the Feast of the Covenant Renewal, then one would need to reassess the document according to genre and historical relevance."

Consequently, it is appropriate at this point to turn more specifically to our own reason for embarking on a study of the Admonition, which combines an intuition with an observation by Davies. He maintains that the writer of CD found, or believed himself to have found, his message in the scriptures themselves. It is worth borrowing Davies' own words to express this:

"...this state of affairs is misconceived if CD is dismissed as a mere 'mosaic' of quotations to which no evidential value may be attached. There are certainly numerous examples of biblical phraseology which must be regarded as unconsidered and even as only part of the author's own biblically saturated vocabulary. But the cumulative force of the numerous quotations and allusions amounts to a statement that the 'plot' of CD can be read in the bible: the community, the time in which it lives, its laws, everything is anticipated, described, regulated in the bible. The conclusion is forced upon one that not only is the bible used by the community to present its appeal, but also that it was in the bible in the first place that the community found its identity".²²

Davies' conclusion here is itself problematic. What does it mean for a religious group in the second century BCE, or perhaps earlier, to consider its message as stemming from the bible? In one way or another, such would be the case for almost any group of observant Jews of the time, for it is arguable that, from at least the second century onwards, the inner tensions and conflicts within Second Temple Judaism centred largely on competing claims to represent a valid interpretation of the one commonly received corpus of revelation.²³ More practically, approaching an ancient text from a later and different perspective than that of its author, we stand outside the myth of the writer of CD, and it is notoriously difficult to judge in such matters which comes first. In other words, did a consideration of the bible lead to a particular interpretation, now found in CD 1-8 and 19-20, or were the ideas behind this interpretation projected back onto the scriptures?

Nonetheless, a reading of the text of the Admonition may lead us to wonder whether there is more to the use of scripture in the document than appears at first sight, not only as far as the quotations are concerned, but also, and perhaps more interestingly, regarding the many allusions. Indeed, it is difficult not to notice how much biblical allusion is to be found even upon a cursory reading of the work. While some of this may best be described as a superficial web of biblical language, used to impress the hearer or reader, this can hardly be said of a good deal of it. In fact, a closer look at the text shows that certain key passages keep reappearing. From this feature alone,

²² Davies, p. 55.

²³ This is expressed, e.g., in G. Vermes, *Post-Biblical Jewish Studies*, Leiden (1975), p. 38, and we shall return to it in the concluding chapter.

irrespective of whether it is appropriate to speak of the community finding its identity in the bible, as Davies has proposed, we may intuitively suspect a more developed and deliberate use of scripture than scholars have hitherto reckoned with, notwithstanding the document's apparent inconsistency on the historical level.

For now, let it be noted that a description of the use of scripture in CD 1-8 and 19-20 will be of value in itself. In any case, since no thorough examination has yet taken place in the English-speaking world, it appears to be a worthwhile task on which to embark.²⁴

²⁴ O.J.R. Schwarz, *Der erste Teil der Damaskusschrift und das alte Testament*, Diest (1965), will be considered in the next chapter.

2 The Bible at Qumran

2.1 *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls*

In view of the nature of our proposed analysis of CD 1-8 and 19-20, it will be helpful to trace an appropriate background. Firstly, therefore, we shall outline some of the ways in which the biblical MSS from Qumran have contributed to our understanding of the place of the bible within the Judaism of the Second Temple period. Secondly, we shall view summarily the work of scholars on the employment of scripture in the so-called sectarian, non-biblical DSS. Thirdly, such work will be related more specifically to the use of the bible in CD and to our own examination of the document.

First of all, let us describe briefly the biblical finds from Masada, Nahal Hever, Murabba'at and the Qumran Caves. Apart from the discovery of previously unknown sectarian documents, the biblical material from the Judaeen desert was itself the most significant discovery relating to the text of the bible for many years.¹ Of course, the group(s) responsible for this material did not leave behind a clearly demarcated collection of authoritative books, but it is likely that all of the contents of the later three-fold canon were counted as sacred writings. It is not so clear whether other additional works were viewed likewise, as might appear to be the case from passages like CD 2:6 and 16:3, which refer to forms of TL_{ev} and Jub, respectively, as though they had scriptural status. But in any case, the only part of the Hebrew Bible not in evidence in the Judaeen wilderness was Est, the significance of which is not immediately clear, although its shortness could have allowed it to perish in the desert without trace. Similarly, we may suppose that Neh was present, since remains of Ezr and 1,2 Chr were found.²

¹ Even the relatively old MS behind the standard critical edition of the Masoretic Text (MT), K. Elliger, W. Rudolph, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, Stuttgart (1967-83), is some 1,000 years younger than the MS finds around Khirbet Qumran.

² For an inventory of the biblical texts recovered from Qumran, see E. Tov, 'Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaeen Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism', *JJS* 39 (1988), p. 17, or V. Gleßner, 'Liste der Biblischen Texte aus Qumran', *RQ* 16 (1993), pp. 153-192.

The overall situation is more complicated than this brief depiction would suggest, however, and necessitates further description.

The Masada, Murabba'at and Nahal Hever material can be dealt with succinctly, because, when compared to the evidence from the Qumran Caves, it is fairly limited. Clearly, the Masada finds date from before 73/74 CE, while texts found at Nahal Hever and Murabba'at must have had an origin before 132-135 CE; *termini a quo* are less determinable.³ According to Tov, the remains of bible MSS from these sites can be characterized as proto-Masoretic and consist mostly of the Pentateuch - with Is, Ez, the Twelve Minor Prophets and Pss also attested.⁴

In contrast, the MS evidence from the Qumran Caves is of a more complex nature. This complexity is due to the large number of MSS, combined with their distribution over the several Caves and between three languages. Unfortunately, no logical or consistent arrangement by the sectaries of the material in the Caves is evident, and this problem is exacerbated by the partly accidental nature of what happened to survive in the Judaeen desert for 1,900 years. Nonetheless, it is clear that the biblical texts, and their non-biblical counterparts, are to be associated with occupation of the site of Qumran from the second half of the second century BCE until 68 CE; this is demonstrated chiefly by the archaeological links between the MSS and other artefacts found in the Caves, since the latter are in turn connected with the material culture at Khirbet Qumran.⁵ The fact that the oldest MS, 4QExod^f, from around 250 BCE, predates this period is not problematic, for we might expect the first settlers at Qumran and its environs to bring with them biblical and other MSS already in their possession.⁶ MSS in the Hebrew language predominate, in particular remains of Dt, Is, and Pss, and it may be assumed that among the texts were both those imported from elsewhere and those copied on site. Further, texts in both square Hebrew and palaeo-Hebrew are in evidence, but the former are more prevalent. Numerous Aramaic works were also discovered, including targums on Lv (4Q156) and Job (4Q157 and 11Q10),

³ For the First and Second Revolts against Rome, see J.H. Hayes, J.M. Miller, *Israelite and Judaeen History*, London (1990), pp. 636-677.

⁴ Tov, *op. cit.*, p. 16f.

⁵ Despite N. Golb, 'Who Hid the Dead Sea Scrolls?', *BA* 28 (1987), pp. 68-82, whose arguments have been countered by F. Garcia Martínez, A.S. van der Woude, 'A 'Groningen' Hypothesis of Qumran Origins and Early History', *RQ* 14 (1990), pp. 526-536, scholars are right to maintain the connection between Khirbet Qumran and the Caves.

⁶ For further bibliographical information on the oldest MSS - 4QExod^f, 4QSam^b, 4QJer^a, 4QXII^a, 4QQoh^a - see Tov, *op. cit.*, p. 8, note 9,