

SCRIPTA HIEROSOLYMITANA

PUBLICATIONS OF THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY, JERUSALEM

296.81

Rab

V. IV

VOLUME IV

ASPECTS OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

EDITED ON BEHALF OF THE INSTITUTE
OF JEWISH STUDIES IN THE FACULTY
OF HUMANITIES

BY

CHAIM RABIN AND YIGAEL YADIN

SECOND EDITION

JERUSALEM, 1965

AT THE MAGNES PRESS,
THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS

	Page
E. Y. KUTSCHER: The Language of the Genesis Apocryphon: a Preliminary Study	1
YIGAL YADIN: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Epistle to the Hebrews .	36
N. AVIGAD: The Palaeography of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Documents	56
JACOB LICHT: An Analysis of the Treatise of the Two Spirits in DSD .	88
M. H. GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN: Linguistic Structure and Tradition in the Qumran Documents	101
M. H. SEGAL: The Qumran War Scroll and the Date of its Composition	138
CHAIM RABIN: The Historical Background of Qumran Hebrew	144
SHEMARYAHU TALMON: The Calendar Reckoning of the Sect from the Judaean Desert	162
Z. BEN-HAYYIM: Traditions in the Hebrew Language, with Special Reference to the Dead Sea Scrolls	200
DAVID FLUSSER: The Dead Sea Sect and Pre-Pauline Christianity . .	215
Index of Quotations	267

cf. J. L. Teicher.
"The Teaching of the Pre-Pauline
Church - The DSS"
JJS 3, 3 1952
pp. 111 ff

THE DEAD SEA SECT AND PRE-PAULINE CHRISTIANITY

I.

The relevance of the Dead Sea Scrolls for the study of the New Testament is nowadays generally acknowledged. Several scholars have called our attention to numerous and varied points of contact between the two groups of documents. It is therefore permissible to ask: are we dealing merely with unconnected similar features or with more or less complete identifiable doctrines? We must also ask which currents of early Christianity, (as represented by different NT authors) are particularly close to the Sectarian teaching.

The second question has been partially answered by the numerous scholars who pointed out that the writings of John the Evangelist markedly resemble the Sectarian literature;¹ others have found many relevant parallels in the Pauline epistles. W. F. Albright², in summing up the situation, actually advanced our understanding of the problem: "There are many parallels between the new scrolls and the Synoptic Gospels, the Pauline letters and the remaining books of the NT, but these parallels are most numerous in the areas where the New Testament books in question parallel the Gospel of John most closely. The parallels between the new scrolls and the Pauline corpus are almost as important for our purposes as the others, since there has been a century-old tendency to put the Gospel of John as far as possible from the letters of St. Paul . . . The same ethical dualism appears throughout the New Testament, but again it is most strongly expressed by John and Paul".

A closer examination of the nature and occurrence of the parallels to the Scrolls in various NT writings yields, to my mind, the following results: 1) In contrast to the Gospel of John, the synoptic Gospels show few and comparatively unimportant parallels to the Sectarian

* I thank Dr. J. Licht for his valuable help in preparing the English version of this article, as also for much advice and criticism in other matters.

1. See especially F. M. Braun, "L'arrière-fond judaïque du quatrième évangile et la Communauté de l'Alliance", *RB* 62 (1955) pp. 5-44; R. E. Brown, "The Qumran Scrolls and the Johannine Gospel and Epistles", in *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl, N. Y. 1957, pp. 183-207.

2. "Recent Discoveries in Palestine and the Gospel of St. John", in *Studies in Honour of C. H. Dodd*, Cambridge 1956, p. 167.

writings. This seems to indicate that the Scrolls will not contribute much to the understanding of the personality of Jesus and of the religious world of his disciples.³ Talmudic literature remains our principal source for the interpretation of the synoptic Gospels — which proves, to my mind, that Jesus and his followers were nearer to Pharisaic Judaism than to the Qumran Sect.

2) There is a marked resemblance to the Scrolls in the NT Epistles⁴ and the writings of John the Evangelist. In this group Paul⁵, John the Evangelist and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews⁶ are the outstanding personalities.

3) Most of the parallels to the Scrolls occur in material which is common to all or at least to several authors of the above-mentioned group. Features peculiar to any one of these authors are not, as a rule, akin to Sectarian thought.

Our last observation — namely, that no doctrine of central importance, resembling Qumran theology (such as election or dualism) is restricted to any single NT book — seems to indicate that no single NT author (e.g. Paul) introduced such doctrines into Christian thought. Therefore a common source of influence is to be postulated. It is highly improbable that each of the New Testament authors under consideration was directly and independently influenced by the Qumran sectarians (or by Jewish circles close to them). If this had been the case, we should expect marked differences in the manner in which these ideas were worked into Christianity by the different authors, but no such differences exist. Therefore we must suppose that there existed a stratum of Christian thought which was especially influenced by Sectarian ideas, and that John the Evangelist, Paul and the authors of most other NT Epistles based themselves on the theological achievements of this stratum.

The results of our analysis tally with the results obtained by

3. On Jesus and the Scrolls see especially: K. Schubert, "The Sermon on the Mount and the Qumran Texts" in Stendahl, *op.cit* (see note 1), pp. 118-128. D. Flusser, "The Dead Sea Sect and Christianity" in *Studies in the DSS*, Jerusalem 1957, pp. 85-89 (Hebrew).

4. The exception of the Epistle of James is not accidental.

5. The detailed question of Paul's authorship of some NT Epistles is irrelevant to this inquiry. In my opinion the first Epistle of Peter is independent of Pauline influence.

6. See Y. Yadin's contribution to this volume, pp. 36-55.

Bultmann⁷, who distinguishes between two theological strata in the early Church: a) The doctrine of the Mother-Church in Jerusalem; b) "The *Kerygma* of the Hellenistic Community". The latter is, according to Bultmann, the common basis of Pauline and Johannine theology and of the doctrine of other New Testament writings as well as some Apostolic Fathers.⁸ The present paper suggests that this second stratum of Bultmann's is the one which shows, in some of its doctrines at any rate, a marked affinity to the Dead Sea Scrolls.

It is not the purpose of this paper to deal with all the theological motifs of this assumed stratum of Christianity, but only to describe the features which are common to it and to the Dead Sea Sect. Neither do we propose to discuss here the meaning of these features in their new Christian context, or their specific function in Pauline and Johannine theology. We shall endeavour merely to reconstruct point by point the Sectarian doctrine as it was taken over by Christianity. Therefore this paper will not offer exhaustive interpretations of the NT passages quoted, but only deal with aspects relevant to the present task. Full use will be made of Bultmann's results⁹ which enable us to do without extensive documentation of *theologoumena* included by Bultmann in his "Hellenistic *Kerygma*"; in such cases the reader is advised to look for detailed proof under the reference given to Bultmann's *Theology of the New Testament*. The present writer will, however, undertake to demonstrate (by extensive quotation) that some additional notions should be included in the stratum under consideration.

In the following survey of doctrines common to the New Testament and Qumran literature the individual *theologoumena* will be arranged according to their structural function in the Qumran theology, not according to their context in Christian thought.

II. DUALISM OF GOOD AND EVIL

A well-known feature of Qumran doctrine is its dualism: "In the source of Light are the origins of Truth and from the spring of Darkness the origins of Evil. And in the hand of the Prince of Lights is the rule of all the Sons of Righteousness and in the ways of Light they do walk, and in the hand of the Angel of Darkness is all the

7. R. Bultmann, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 2nd ed., Tübingen 1954. All references are to this German edition (hereafter *Bul.*).

8. *Op.cit.*, pp. 64-66; for a discussion of this stratum, see *ibid.*, pp. 66-182.

9. In the field of *analysis*; Bultmann's *synthesis* and his theological consequences are not relevant to the purpose of this inquiry.

rule of the Sons of Evil, and in the ways of Darkness they do walk." (DSD III, 19-22). A similar dualistic terminology using the images of Light and Darkness occurs in the New Testament (*Bul.* 173). Compare, e.g., Paul's words: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what common hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? And what agreement hath the temple of God¹⁰ with idols?" (II Cor. vi, 14-16). In this passage Paul stresses the absolute incompatibility of the two principles: He might thus be enlarging on the pronouncement of DSD (IV, 18) that "they (the two divisions of men) do not walk together."

For the antithesis Angel of Darkness — Prince of Lights, Paul has, in the passage quoted above, Belial-Christ.¹¹ He uses, however, the term "angel of light"¹² elsewhere, when he says that Satan himself masquerades as an angel of light (II Cor. xi, 14). The name "Belial" for the devil does not occur elsewhere in the NT, but is the common appellation of the devil in the Qumran literature. The DSD passage quoted above calls him the Angel of Darkness, because the rule of Darkness, (ממשלת חושך, ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους; Col. ii, 13; Luc. xxii, 53) is his (the name Belial is combined with the notion of the devil's rule of darkness in DSW XIII, 11). He is also the Ruler of this World according to the NT (*Bul.* p. 172-3), a notion corresponding to the term "the days of Belial's rule" which designates the present in Qumran literature (DSD II, 19; cf. DSD I, 17-8, 23-4; IV, 19; CDC IV, 12-13; VI, 14; XII, 23; DSH V, 7; DSW XIV, 9).

In the Sectarian teaching this basic dualistic outlook leads to a fundamental division of all mankind into two camps. The sect deems itself to be identical with the righteous part of humanity and calls itself the "Sons of Light." The same appellation is used for Christians by Paul and John.¹³ The corresponding Sectarian term "Sons of

10. The Temple symbolism will be discussed in the following pages.

11. According to Yadin (in this volume, pp. 45-8), the Epistle to the Hebrews argues that Christ is superior even to the Angel of Light, the protagonist of the Elect according to the Sect.

12. See Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, Jerusalem, 1955, pp. 214-5 (Hebrew).

13. John xii, 36; Eph. v, 8; I Thess. v, 5; in Luke-xvi, 8 the reference to the Sons of Light is not altogether flattering.

Darkness" for the wicked is not found in the NT¹⁴, but the idea which underlies it, namely that the wicked belong to the Evil Principle, is expressed clearly enough by John when he says that the wicked are "from the devil" (*Bul.* 173-4).

The sect expects its individual member to take part emotionally in the struggle between good and evil and commands him "to love all that (God) has chosen and to hate all that He has despised, to keep far away from all that is evil, to cleave to every good deed . . . and to love all the Sons of Light, every man according to his lot in divine counsel, and to hate all the Sons of Darkness, every man according to his guilt in divine vengeance" (DSD I, 3-11). Similarly Paul advises "to abhor¹⁵ that which is evil, to cleave to that which is good (*ἀποστουθύντες τὸ πονηρὸν, κολλώμενοι τῷ ἀγαθῷ*), to be kindly affectioned, one to another with brotherly love" (Rom. xii, 9-10). See also I Thess. v, 21-2: "Hold fast that which is good, abstain from all appearance of evil."

The principle "to love all that He has chosen and to hate all that He has despised" recurs with slight variations in the Sectarian writings.¹⁶ One of these variations could have influenced the Epistle of St. Polycarp to the Philippians ii, 2: ". . . if we shall do His will and walk in His commandments and love that which He did love, abstaining from all wrongdoing . . ."

What has been said above about the Qumran covenanter's loves and hates¹⁴, indicates that although love among members of the sect is strongly recommended, it appears to be basically an expression of the sect's dualistic concept of the world. It seems to me that some traces of this dualistic motivation can be demonstrated in some Pauline and

14. There are, however, similar terms, such as: *ὑποὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας* (Eph. ii, 2; v, 6).

15. On the use of participles in the Greek texts, see F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, 1949, § 468.

16. [לבוחר בכול אשר] ואהבתה; ולחשב את כול אשר [שנאתה] (DST XIX, 10); ולא רצו בכול אשר (CDC II, 15); צויתה ויבחרו באשר שנאתה [לה] תהלך בכול אשר אהבתה ולמאוס (DST XV, 19); בכול אשר שנאתה [הה] (DST XVII, 24). The language seems to be influenced by Isa. vii, 16. — See J. Licht, *The Thanksgiving Scroll*, 1957, p. 188 (Hebrew).

17. Cf. DSD IX, 14-21 and see Licht, loc. cit. The oath of the Essenes (*BJ* II, 139) "to hate the unjust and fight the battle of the just", alludes to a kindred concept. Josephus (*ibid.* 119) also says that the Essenes "show a greater attachment to each other than do the other sects."

Bul. → Johannine pronouncements on brotherly love,¹⁸ among Christians. For Paul, see the dualistic formulation of his words corresponding to the DSD passage, as quoted above; for John¹⁹ compare, e.g., "He that saith he is in the light, and hateth his brother, is in darkness even until now. He that loveth his brother abideth in the light, and there is none occasion of stumbling in him. But he that hateth his brother, etc." (I John ii, 9-11); "Whatsoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother" (ib. iii, 10). Christian love, of course, is not linked with hatred for one's enemies, since Jesus expressly commanded his followers to love their enemies.²⁰

III. PREDESTINATION

The Qumran sect believed that "from the God of knowledge (comes) all that is and shall be, and before their being He established all their designs, and when they become whatever they had been destined to become according to His glorious design, they fulfil their task and nothing can be changed" (DSD III, 15-6). This belief in divine predestination is linked with the belief in the division of mankind into the two lots of the wicked and the righteous (as discussed, e.g., in DSD immediately after the passage quoted). It is significant, therefore, when the author of DST addresses God: "For Thou hast created the righteous and the wicked" (IV, 38; see also XV, 14-21). Evidently, the sect believed in Double Predestination.

The significance of the doctrine of predestination in the NT has been hotly debated by Christian theologians since Augustine; we shall nevertheless have the temerity to offer a few remarks on the subject as illuminated by the Dead Sea Scrolls. For the present it will be sufficient to recall that well-known predestinational pronouncements do occur in Pauline (see *Bul.* 325-6) and Johannine (*Bul.* 368-370) writings. Therefore the stratum which both represent, inclined, to say the least, to predestinational ideas.

Some connection or affinity between early Christianity and the community of Qumran in this matter is indicated by the circumstance that in Pauline and Johannine theology the predestinational ideas are linked with dualistic motifs: "He that is from God heareth God's

18. See W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, Berlin 1952, s.v. φιλαδελφία, ἀγάπη.

19. On brotherly love among the Sectarians and according to John, see R. E. Brown, in K. Stendahl, *op.cit.* (note 1), pp. 197-9.

20. See Schubert, *op.cit.* (note 3).

words, ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not from God" (John viii, 47, cf. also, *inter alia*; *ibid.* xvii, 2-12). Similarly predestination and dualism are combined into one argument in chapter ix of the Epistle to the Romans. Paul says there amongst other things: "What if God, willing to show His wrath and to make His power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction; and that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which He had afore prepared unto glory" (Rom. ix, 22-3). Thus the Divine will "to show His wrath and to make His power known" — the manifestation of His might and glory — is the reason for double predestination. It follows that the same manifestation is the real purpose of election: "... being predestinated according to the purpose of Him who worketh all things after the counsel of His own will, that we should be to the praise of His glory." (Eph. i, 11-12; cf. also *ibid.* ii, 7). The author of DST, too, is convinced that he has been granted many wondrous gifts because God has willed to show His glory through him, "so that all His creatures shall know about the power of His might and the multitude of His mercies towards all the sons of His will" (IV, 32-3), or: "and in Thy wondrous secret hast Thou shown Thy might²¹ through me, showing wonders before many because of Thy glory and to make known Thy might to all those living" (*ibid.* IV, 28-9). The wicked, on the other hand, are predestined for a punishment which will also demonstrate Divine might: "For according to the mysteries of Thy understanding Thou didst ordain them, to smite them with great judgments²² in the eyes of all Thy creatures, that they might be a sign and a wonder to times eternal, that all might know Thy glory and Thy great might" (*ibid.* XV, 17-21). Thus

21. "A special term has been coined in DST to express this rather complicated idea; it is the verb להגביר, used frequently in the phrase "Thy showing Thy might in me", J. Licht, "The Doctrine of the Thanksgiving Scroll", *IEJ* 6 (1956), 100.

22. An allusion to Ex. vii, 4: "But Pharaoh shall not hearken unto you, that I may lay my hand upon Egypt and bring forth... the children of Israel, out of the land of Egypt, by great judgements" (cf. Ex. vi, 6). Another allusion to this biblical story occurs in DST II, 23-4: להמה מאתה גרו על זמשי בעבור הכבדקה במשפט רשעים. See also DSW. XI, 8-10: להמה מאתה קימת להכבד באיבינו... וקעש להמה כסרעוה וכשלישי מרכבוהו לנו קנא. The same Exodus story is used in Rom. ix, 17-22 as a proof for Paul's doctrine concerning the destiny of the wicked; but Paul bases himself on another verse, Ex. ix, 16. See Licht, *op.cit.* (note 16), p. 69.

the fundamental division of mankind into the wicked and the righteous, with all its consequences, has no other purpose than to proclaim the glory of God.²³ The same idea is expressed, as we have already seen, in Rom. ix, 22-3.

IV. ELECTION OF GRACE

As we have seen, the sect believed that, as a result of Divine predestination, it in itself constituted the "Lot of Light", while the rest of mankind belonged to the "Lot of Darkness". The same belief can also be expressed thus: God has elected the members of the sect to belong to His lot and rejected the "Sons of Darkness". This explains the importance of the concept of election in the teachings of the sect. The sect calls its members "the Elect" or the "Elect of God" (בְּחִירֵי אֵל, DSH X, 13; see also DSD IX, 14). The same terms, ἐκλεκτοί, ἐκλεκτοὶ θεοῦ (Rom. viii, 33; Coloss. iii, 12; Tit. i, 1) are common in early Christianity (see *Bul.* 98).²⁴ Another Christian term which expresses the same notion, κλητοί, κεκλημένοι, has its parallel in the Sectarial terms קְרִיָא קְרִיָא (those called by name), קְרִיָא מְרַעַד (called to an appointed time, or to assembly), קְרִיָא אֵל (called by God).²⁵ These common terms indicate that there is some connection between the Christian and Sectarial concepts of election and warrant a closer examination of these concepts.

The relation between the idea of the divided world and the doctrine of election can best be seen in the words of the Epistle to the Colossians: "Who has qualified us for a share of the lot of the Saints in the Light, rescuing us from the power of the Darkness and transferring us to the realm of His beloved Son" (i, 12-13). A similar passage in DSD (XI, 7) says: "... from out of the company of flesh, those whom God has elected He has given to an eternal inheritance and made them share in the lot of the Saints, and with the Sons of

²³ See Licht, *IEJ* 6 (1956), 9-10.

²⁴ Bultmann thinks (op.cit. note, 7, p. 39) that these designations were already used by the first Christians in Jerusalem.

²⁵ See Yadin, op.cit. (note 12), pp. 268, 272. The term κλητοὶ ἅγιοι (Rom. i, 7; I Cor. i, 2) is to be retranslated into Hebrew as קְרִיָא קְרִיָא just as ἐκλεκτοὶ δίκαιοι (Enoch, *passim*; Greek version) corresponds to the Hebrew בְּחִירֵי אֵל (DSD II, 13). The usual Mandaean term קְרִיָא קְרִיָא describes those who belong to the Realm of Good and is also a technical term for the Mandaeans themselves. See, M. Odeberg, *Die mandäische Religionsanschauung*, Uppsala 1930, p. 17.

Heaven He has joined their company to a common-council."²⁶ The dualistic concept, which corresponds exactly to the general Sectarian doctrine, happens to be worked out more clearly in the passage of the NT. The passage from DSD makes it clear that the "Holy ones" are angels in both cases. Therefore election means amongst other things that one belongs to one company with the heavenly spirits, and is thus based on the concept of cosmic dualism, in which the two camps consist not only of men but also of spirits²⁷, or, in the words of St. Augustine, the Elect are "societas sanctorum, non solum hominum, verum etiam angelorum" (*Civ. Dei* IV, 28).

The dualistic basis of the concept of election appears even more clearly in the Epistle to the Ephesians ii, 1-8: "You were . . . under the sway of the prince of the power of the air — the spirit which is at present active within the sons of disobedience among whom all of us lived; we as well as you, when we obeyed the passions of our flesh; carrying out the dictates of the flesh and its impulses and were by nature the children of wrath like the rest of men. But . . . He . . . seated us within the heavenly sphere in Christ Jesus . . ."²⁸

The last passage, in isolation, appears to say that Christians were elected during their lifetime.²⁹ Strictly speaking the coming-over from the realm of Wickedness to the realm of Light, though actually happening now, has been preordained "before the foundation of the world"; as the same Epistle says elsewhere (i, 4-5). Rom. viii, 29-30 is more explicit: "For whom He did foreknow, He also did pre-

26. The alternative translation, which makes the object of *pan* gifts, mentioned in the previous line (see Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1955, p. 388), provides a less perfect parallel to Col. i, 12-13, but does not detract, to my mind, from the validity of the argument.

27. See Yadin, *op.cit.* (note 12), pp. 219-220, and add to the list 1QSb IV, 26' (*QI*, p. 126):

28. Though very similar, the dualistic doctrine of the Sect and the Epistle to the Ephesians differ on two important points: a) the contrast "life-death" is (as yet) absent from the Scrolls, Dt. xxx, 19-20 notwithstanding; b) the Scrolls (as known to us) do not say, in so many words, that the Elect belonged to the Realm of Evil before their election, as written in Eph. ii, 1-8 (cf. Col. i, 13; I Pet. ii, 9; Acts xxvi, 18; see also En. cviii, 11).

29. The Sect was also confronted by this problem, but its writings do not offer a solution as consistent as the Christian view (see preceding note). Though clear definitions are (until now) lacking from the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Sect evidently believed that election took place a) before the creation of the world; b) at the birth of the elect person; c) at his entry into the Sect, when it started to function actually. See also Licht, *op.cit.* (note 16), p. 142.

destine . . . whom He did predestine, them He also called; and whom He called, them He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also glorified." Paul shows here admirable ability in analyzing the concept of preordained election. The author of DST, whose manner is poetical rather than speculative, says simply: "Only Thou hast [cre]ated the righteous man and from the womb ordained him for the time of goodwill (i.e. for a time in which Thy goodwill to him will become manifest) to be kept in Thy covenant³⁰" (XV, 14-5). As he sees it, predestination functions from the womb.³¹ Paul also claims: "God who separated me from my mother's womb and called me by His grace" (Gal. i, 15). In DST the same claim is poetically elaborated: "For Thou hast known me since my father (scil. begot me) and from the womb [. . . and from the belly of] my mother Thou didst deal bountifully with me; and from the breasts of my mother Thy mercies hast Thou bestowed upon me" (IX, 29-31).³²

In Eph. i, 11 the doctrine of preordained election is expressed thus: "In whom also we have obtained an inheritance, being predestined according to the purpose of Him who worked all things after the counsel of His own will." Here predestination is stated to be the outcome or manifestation of the sovereign and autonomous Divine will.³³ Of course, in so far as this will is benevolent towards the Elect, it may be also called Divine goodwill.³⁴ In Hebrew *razon* means both "benevolence" and "will". Wherefore the author of DST says that through Divine will a man's inheritance has been increased (XVI, 4), he means mainly "goodwill", but the notion of Divine sovereignty is nevertheless unmistakable in his words (incidentally, the two passages last quoted have another characteristic concept in common, namely that of "inheritance").³⁵ The specific concept of "goodwill" or "benevolence" is equally important in Christian thought, see, e.g., Eph. i, 5 κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ. Both words cor

30. In my opinion this resembles the Christian idea of "donum perseverantiae", cf. also DST IX, 30-34.

31. See note 29.

32. The Biblical verses which correspond to these passages do not mention grace.

33. God's hidden intentions are called in Eph. i, 9 τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ and in DST I frg. 3, 7: μυστήριον.

34. See Licht op. cit. (note 21), p. 89.

35. The term ἀληθινότητα belongs to the Pre-Pauline stratum, since it occurs in the writings of Paul and also in Hebr. ix, 15; xi, 8 and I Pet. i, 4. The term (ἀληθ.) is also used by the DSS, see below.

respond³⁶ to Hebrew *raṣon*.³⁶ Those who enjoy Divine benevolence are "sanctified by His will" (Hebr. x, 10); they are therefore called the "Sons of His goodwill" (בני רצונו DST IV, 33; XI, 9). Yet another aspect of the same idea appears in the Gospel of John i, 13: "Which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

Man is therefore dependent on the sovereign Divine will. This sentiment is expressed in the prayer DSD XI, 16-7: "Establish in righteousness all his (Thy servant's) works and vouchsafe unto the son of Thine handmaid (of: of Thy Truth) whatever Thou hast granted (lit. willed) to those chosen among men to stand before Thee for ever. For without Thee no way can be perfect and without Thy will nothing is done." To God's omnipotence corresponds "humana faulty",³⁷ making man doubly dependent on God's decree: "And I, dust and ashes, what shall I design without Thy wishing it, what shall I plan³⁸ without Thy will, how shall I be strong without Thy making me stand and how shall I understand without Thy creating for me (spirit)" (DST X, 5-7).

This sentiment of the member of the sect induces the author of DST in another passage (XVI, 12; cf. *ibid.* XIV, 13) to pray that spiritual gifts be granted to him "to purify me by Thy holy Spirit and to make me approach by Thy good will according to the greatness of Thy graces." In this prayer the expression "grace" is used to amplify the notion of Divine benevolence. Actually we are dealing with two aspects of a single phenomenon: what God has willed concerning his Elect is seen by the Elect as a manifestation of Divine grace (דון חסד). The covenanters are thus called both "Sons of His will" and "Sons of grace" (DST VII, 20). Their covenant is called the "Covenant of grace" (DSD I, 8; DST *frg.* 7; cf. DSW XIV, 4; also Deut. vii, 9; Neh. i, 5; ix, 32; Dan. ix, 4; II Chr. vi, 14). In the same vein Paul mentions the "election of grace" (Rom. xi, 5).

³⁶ See J. K. Abbot, *Ephesians and Colossians* (I.C.C.), *ad loc.*, and cf. *נצח צדק* CDC III, 15.

³⁷ See the discussion of the term "flesh" below.

³⁸ See Licht *op.cit.* (note 16), *ad loc.*

³⁹ The doctrine of Election of Grace occurs in the NT only in the Epistles which bear the name of Paul. *ελεος* is not used by John; *χαρις* occurs in the Prologue, where there is a possible influence of Pauline doctrines. The non-Pauline Epistles emphasize the notion of God's mercy towards the believers (e.g. I Pet. i, 10; i, 13; iii, 7; Hebr. xiii, 9), but do not expressly state the full doctrine of Election of Grace.

The notion of grace or mercy expresses a particular aspect of Divine election, namely the idea that election is granted without any connection with human nature or deeds, without being earned, gratuitously: "For there is no difference, for all have sinned; and come short of the glory of God, being justified for nothing by His grace . . ." (Rom. iii, 22-4; cf. Eph. ii, 8; II Tim. i, 9). DST says on the same subject: "Only, by Thy goodness is man righteous (justified) and by the multitude of [Thy] mer[cy] . . . and by Thy magnificence hast Thou glorified him" (XIII, 17). Deep gratitude to God is felt throughout DST: "And all the sons of Thy Truth Thou bringest forgivingly before Thee, to [purify them] from their sins by the plenty of Thy goodness and the multitude of Thy mercies to, make them stand before Thee for ever . . ." (VII, 30-1; cf. *ibid.* IV, 33; XI, 9).

Man is thus saved from the consequences of his baseness (or sin) by Divine grace, "for by grace are ye saved through faith,"⁴⁰ and that is not of ourselves (but) the gift of God" (Eph. ii, 8). Salvation in this context is also mentioned in DST II, 23: "By Thy grace Thou didst save my soul, for from Thee is my step." In Christian thought the concept of salvation is particularly important; it can be used to summarize all the constituent notions of the doctrine of election by grace as analyzed in the preceding pages: "Who hath saved us and called, us, with, an, holy, calling, not according to our works, but according to His own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began" (II Tim. i, 9).

Christian salvation, being *per definitionem* salvation through Christ, cannot fully resemble any Sectarian notion. In the passages noted above, the sacrifice of Christ is linked several times with the doctrine of election through grace, the similarity of which to Sectarian doctrines has been demonstrated. We can understand this linking of two basically different concepts if we suppose that the doctrine of election through grace has been used to underpin theologically, or, to explain, the significance of Jesus' sacrifice on behalf of sinful man. The speculative concepts described above supplied the why and wherefore of the plain message: "Jesus has died for us." Since Christianity accepted the doctrine of election, it could not easily do without the concepts on which that doctrine was based, such as predestination and dualism.

In the NT, the statements about election of grace are concentrated

40. We are not here concerned with the Christian concept of faith. In my opinion, this notion is characteristically Christian and not derived from Sectarian thought.

in the writings of Paul ⁴¹, who seems to have conserved and developed the particular concepts which his predecessors (as we see it) took over from Sectarian thought. Paul's special interest in this line of thinking can best be explained by his attitude towards the Law. A possible consequence of the view that man is "justified for nothing by His grace" (Rom. iii, 24, see above), not by his efforts, is the conviction that the works required by Judaism, the commandments of the Law, are useless. This conclusion was not drawn by the Qumran covenanters, who were very strict in their interpretation of the Law. It is Paul who came to the conclusion that the Christian is freed from the Law since he entered the realm of grace (see, e.g., *Bull.* 258-266). ⁴²

V. CIVITAS DEI

A consequence of the dualistic attitude is, as we have already seen, that the sect identified itself with the "Lot of God." The community, closely knit together by its peculiar way of life and strict observance of the Law, is the actual realization of God's decision to separate for Himself those whom He had predestined to be righteous. Thus the dualistic-predestinational theology functions as an explanation for the social phenomenon of a separate, self-contained community, or, as we might call it, a Church.

It may be supposed that Jesus already intended to found a community of his followers, at least on the practical and organizational level. ⁴³ The early Church in Jerusalem was evidently organized as a separate Jewish sect, but the ideological basis for the concept of the Church was laid down, as far as we can see, in the later stratum of Christianity which we call Pre-Pauline, under the influence of ideas which led to similar consequences amongst the Qumran covenanters. ⁴⁴

41. See note 39.

42. It is not my intention to say that Paul's position in the matter of Law and Grace is only a personal conclusion drawn from a doctrine of election-of-grace resembling the Qumran Covenanters' teaching. Like any other independent thinker, Paul created a speculative system the inner validity and logic of which is independent of the historical circumstances of its birth. I argue merely that Paul's main theological basis was the doctrine of grace, which is also known from the Scrolls.

43. A. Hyatt, "The Dead Sea Discoveries", *JBL* 76 (1956), 8.

44. According to W. Köhler (*Dogmengeschichte* I, 1951, pp. 232, 234) the Book of Enoch is to be regarded as one of the originators of the idea of a Church. That book belongs to the broader trend from which the Qumran

The same sectarian, separatist trend which created evident tension between the Qumran covenanters and other Jews, contributed to the final severance of Christianity from Judaism.

We have already mentioned the significant designations "Elect of God", "The Called Ones", which are common to the sect and to early Christianity. The special position of both communities in the world is also expressed by the term "the Holy Ones".⁴⁵ Both communities also called themselves "Perfect" (תְּמִימִים, τέλειοι, ἀμόμοι).⁴⁶ The last two terms are often combined in the writings of the sect, e.g.: "the men of holiness who walk in perfection" (DSD IX, 8), or "men of holy perfection" (אנשי תמימים קדוש, DSD VIII, 20; CDC XX, 2, 5, 7; cf. *ibid.* VII, 4-5). To this corresponds the contention of Eph. i, 4 (cf. v, 27) that "He had chosen us in Him (i.e. Jesus) ere the world was founded, to be holy and unblemished (ἀγίους καὶ ἀμόμους) before Him." But what interests us specially at this point is the term "holy" as applied not only to the members of the sect, but also to the community as a whole, which is called קְהִלַּת קְדוּשָׁה ("the community of holiness")⁴⁷ corresponding to the "Holy Church" of the Christians.⁴⁸

Sect. crystallized. It mentions the "Elect of Righteousness" (ἐκλεκτοὶ δίκαιοι, i, 1 *et passim*, see note 25), the "Plant of Righteousness and Truth" (see note 65) and even the "congregation of the righteous" (xxxviii, 1) or "the congregation of the elect and holy" (lxii, 8; this might be retranslated as קְדוּשָׁה בְּחִירֵי קְדוּשָׁה). This congregation is certainly not to be identified with Israel "according to the flesh."

45. See *Bul.* 98, who is of the opinion that the designation was used by the Mother-Church of Jerusalem (p. 39). On the term קְדוּשָׁה, see also Licht, *op.cit.* (note 16), p. 173. The member of the Sect is called "man of holiness" in DSD IX, 18; there are many similar expressions in the Scrolls; see also note 25 above.

46. See the glossaries of Habermann's *Edab we-eduth*, Jerusalem 1952 (Hebrew), and Licht's *Thanksgiving Scroll*; Yadin, *op.cit.* (note 12), pp. 301, 342. The term τέλειος occurs in Paul's Epistles and also in Hebr. and Jac. and even in the Gospel of Matthew. It should be noticed that both passages in Matthew in which the word τέλειος occurs show some affinity with Sectarian thought. Mt. v, 48 polemicizes (according to Schubert, see note 3 above) with our Sect; Mt. xix, 21 states: "If thou wilt be perfect (τέλειος), give up and sell all that thou hast, and give it to the poor."

47. See *QI*, p. 113; on קְדוּשָׁה נִצְוָה see Yadin, *op.cit.* (note 12), pp. 237-8, 273. According to *Bul.* 39, ἐκκλησία is a translation of Hebrew קְהִלָּה, but H. Kosmala's remarks on the subject (to be published) should be taken into account. On ἐκκλησία in the Pre-Pauline stratum, see *Bul.* 93. On the talmudic קְהִלַּת קְדוּשָׁה and קְהִלַּת קְדוּשָׁה, see C. Rabin, *Qumran Studies*, Oxford 1957, pp. 37-52; see also Bentz's article (note 49), p. 57.

48. An expression which does not occur in the New Testament itself, but

The early Christians saw in their Church a true "body politic," an organic unit. The *raison d'être* of this body is the holiness contained in it. To express this concept, they used a number of metaphors comparing the Church to a spiritual house or to a temple (*Bul.* 99). The same tendency is expressed by similar metaphors in Sectarian writings, such as "holy edifice" (DSD XI, 8).⁴⁹ The single idea underlying all such metaphors has been recognized by St. Augustine: "Sive autem domus Dei dicatur, sive templum Dei, sive civitas Dei, idipsum est" (*Civ. Dei* XV, 19).

The Qumran literature offers not only some interesting parallels to the Christian concept of the Church as a spiritual temple, but also enables us to trace, at least partially, the gradual crystallization of this concept among Jews preceding its Christian form.

In DSW the hope is expressed that in the future the Sons of Light will take over the Temple service, so that their priests, levites and laymen "shall attend the burnt-offerings and sacrifices to set out the incense of pleasant savour (נִיחַיִם) for God's acceptance (lit. benevolence, לְרִצּוֹן אֱלֹהִים) to atone for all His community" (II, 4-5). In its expectation of the future, the sect accepted wholeheartedly the traditional Jewish view that sacrifices are essential for atonement. But, for the present, they were unable to act in accordance with this view, since the Temple service as conducted in their time by their adversaries was entirely wrong, or, as they put it, defiled (טָמֵא).⁵⁰ Their insistence on their own strict concepts of ritual purity (and their separatist tendencies) thus conflicted with their belief in the necessity of sacrifices. This conflict was resolved by the doctrine that the rites and purifications could serve as substitute for the sacrificial service⁵¹,

which is accepted by Bultmann (p. 93) as a part of the Pre-Pauline stratum of Christianity.

49. In the Scrolls published so far, the Sect is nowhere compared with the human body. On the comparison with the Temple see Q. Bentz, "Felsenmann und Felsengemeinde," *ZNW* 48 (1957), 49-77.

50. See especially DSH XII, 8-9; CDC VI, 11-13; and cf. *ibid.* IV, 15-18; V, 6-7.

51. The religious mind finds no contradiction between the view that a non-sacrificial worship is a substitute for sacrifices and the expectation of future sacrifices. Both views are actually prevalent in Rabbinic Judaism, which offers a striking example in the prayer: "May our praise be agreeable before Thee like burnt offering and sacrifice! O Compassionate One, by Thy many mercies bring Thy *shekinah* back to Zion and the Order of the (sacrificial) service to Jerusalem, and there we shall serve Thee." See Singer's *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, p. 238a. Cf. also Ps. li, 17-21. See also note 69.

or as Josephus says (speaking of the Essenes)⁵²: ("Although) they are sending gifts to the sanctuary, they accomplish sacrifices by (observance of) different purities⁵³, which they deem to be lawful, and because of this, shutting themselves out⁵⁴ from the common temple precinct, they accomplish sacrifices by themselves" (Ant. XVIII, 19). The purifications (ἀγνείαι), which can be understood as the whole communal way of life with its insistence on purity at every step, are equivalent to the actual Temple service. This is the notion which underlies and explains the assertion of DSD that the sect by its very existence functions as an agency of atonement: "When these shall be in Israel according to all these regulations for a foundation of Holy Spirit for eternal truth to atone for the guilt of transgression and the iniquity of sin and to (attain Divine) goodwill for the land more than the flesh of burnt-offerings and the fat of sacrifices; and the oblation of the lips⁵⁵ for the law is like right pleasant savour (בְּנִיחוּחַ צֶדֶק) and the perfection of way like the gift of an acceptable offering" (IX, 3-5). A comparison of the sect with the Temple follows immediately: "At this time the men of the Community shall separate a House of Holiness for Aaron to unite themselves as a Holy of Holies; and a House of community for Israel who walk in perfection" (IX, 5-6; see also V, 6; VIII, 4-11; XI, 8; cf. CDC III,

52. See also Philo's statement about the Essenes: οὐ ζῶντα καταθύοντες, ἀλλ' ἱεροπρατεῖς τὰς ἑαυτῶν διανοίας κατασκευάζειν ἀξιοῦντες (*Quod omn. prob. lib.* 1, 75).

53. διαφορότητι ἀγνείων, a learned variant of the plainer διάφοροι ἀγνείαι (various purities) BJ II, 159 (cf. Hebr. ix, 10: διάφοροι βαπτισμοί). Scholars who overlooked this simple connection translated "for the difference of sacrifices" (and indulged in speculations about "Essene sacrifices"). The reading οὐκ ἐπιτέλουσιν is absent from all ancient manuscripts; only the Latin translation (of the 6th century) and the "Epitome" (probably 10th-11th century) have it. The negation was wrongly inserted by the authors of the two adaptations, in an attempt to make the wording clearer (oral communication of the late Professor Isaak Heinemann). See also W. H. Brownlee, "John the Baptist" in K. Stendahl, *op.cit.* (note 1 above), p. 38.

54. εὐχόμενοι is to be taken medially.

55. Cf. Hebr. xiii, 15-6: "By Him therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God, continually, that is, the fruit of lips, giving thanks to His name. But to do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." For φρούτος χειλέων (fruit of the lips) cf. מְרִישַׁתוֹ in DST I, 28 and the LXX of Hos. xiv, 3 (which may be an interpretation of the difficult מַסֹּתֵינוּ שְׂתִינוּ שְׂתִינוּ). Cf. also the similar expressions in DSD X. מְרִישַׁתוֹ occurs also in DSD X, 6 and Ps. Sal. xv, 5, which has also מְרִישַׁתוֹ.

19-IV, 4). Both the context and the insistence that the "House" shall be formed by "separation"⁵⁶ clearly show that no material temple is intended; this passage (as the other similar passages) deals not with the future sacrificial service, but with the present function of the sect. The passage is a full poetical and symbolical elaboration of the idea that "perfection of way" is equivalent to the "gift of an acceptable offering", or that the Sectarial life is comparable to the Temple service.

The allegory Sect-Temple recurs a number of times in DSD; a constant set of motifs is used in several combinations and variations. Prominent among these motifs is the twofold description of the sect: it is always called: . . . for Aaron and . . . for Israel.⁵⁷ This distinction indicates the special position of the priests in the community (which is also known from direct statements about its organization). This shows another aspect of the comparison between the sect and the Temple: The sect resembles the Temple not only because its rites are equivalent to the Temple service, but also because priests are as prominent in the sect as in the Temple. Thus the concept of a spiritual temple served, to some extent, to justify the social domination of the priests in the sect although they could not function in their main traditional task.⁵⁸

This gradual, reluctant transformation of a religiosity based on Temple service can be observed in the development of the concept of "spiritual sacrifices". In the fullest elaboration of the allegory Sect-Temple in col. VIII of DSD (which will be quoted in full later), the priests of the sect are said to "offer pleasant savour" (לקריב ריח נוחח). This being a part of the analogy between the actual sect and the ideal Temple, it would be wrong to interpret the "pleasant savour" as referring to the service in the future material Temple (in contrast to DSW II, 4-5, which uses a similar expression; see above).⁵⁹ In

56. להבדל is a technical term used to describe the separation of the Sect from the surrounding world; see DSD V, 1-2; VIII, 12, *et al.*

57. בית קודש לישראל וסוד; לקודש באהרון ולבית האמת בישראל (DSD V, 6); מעון קודש קודשים לאהרון . . . ובית תמים; קודש קודשים לאהרון (DSD VIII, 5-6); בית קודש לאהרון להיחד קודש קודשים ובית יחד; ואמת בישראל (DSD VIII, 8-9); לישראל ההולכים בתמים (DSD IX, 6).

58. Thus one of these metaphors is followed by the sentence: "Only the Sons of Aaron shall rule in (matters of) Law and wealth" (DSD IX, 7).

59. The expression לקריב ריח נוחח seems to be derived from the sacrificial language of the priests of the Second Temple. It is not biblical, but similar language is used in Sir. xlv, 29, ולהקטיר ריח נוחח ואזכרה ולכפר על בני ישראל;

this context the "offering of pleasant savour" is best understood as an imagery for the rites of the sect, the "different purities" of the Essenes (as quoted above). This symbolic use of the term נִחֻחַ is quite evident from the combination כַּפֻּרֵי נִחֻחַ ("atonement of pleasant savour", DSD III, 11), which refers to rites of purification.⁶⁰ The kind of service which the priests of the sect are supposed to perform can be better understood with the aid of a passage in the Testament of Levi (a work which shows many affinities to the Dead Sea Scrolls) which describes the fourth heaven: "The angels of the presence of the Lord . . . offer to the Lord a pleasant savour, a spiritual (λογικόν)⁶¹ and bloodless offering" (iii, 5-6).⁶² Of course we are here concerned with earthly service, while the Testament of Levi describes a heavenly service; but the difference is not so great as may seem, because the sect enjoyed in any case the companionship of the angels (see above). They are expressly stated to be in one company with the Angels of the Presence (DST VI, 13).⁶³ The same statement is made in another document especially on behalf of the priests (*QI* p. 126; cf. Jubilees xxxi, 14). As the sect regarded the two services as parallel, the explanation given by Test. Levi for the "pleasant savour" offered by the angels, namely that "spiritual and bloodless sacrifices" are meant, seems also to be valid for the "pleasant savour" offered by the Sectarian priests on earth. We are thus entitled to ask whether "to offer sweet-smelling (sacrifices)" — לקריב ריח נִחֻחַ — did not acquire the sense of "sacrifices of the spirit" with the help of the facile Hebrew play on words ריח — ריח.⁶⁴

cf. DSW II, 5 עֲדָתוֹ כּוֹל עֲדָתוֹ אֶל לִכְפֵּר בְּעַד כּוֹל עֲדָתוֹ ; see also Test. Levi iii, 6, to be quoted presently; and the correspondence between נִחֻחַ צְדָק (DSD IX, 5) and זְבַחֵי צְדָק (Sir. vii, 33).

60. The passage quoted shows also the considerable changes of meaning or emphasis in the usage of נִחֻחַ. We can observe a rather subtle use of the emotional value of the old sacrificial term, which would repay a detailed investigation (see also preceding note).

61. Cf. Rom. xii, 1. λογικός means here "spiritual", see Bauer, *op.cit.* (note 18), who also quotes heathen sources for this usage; see also *Bul.* 114.

62. Charles mentions the Essenes in his commentary (*Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha* II, 306) *ad locum*.

63. See Licht (*op.cit.* note 16) *ad loc.* The hymn continues וְאֵין מְלִיץ בְּנִים לֵק [דְּוִשִׁיכָה] ("There is no mediator to Thy saints") and seems thus to ascribe to the righteous a grade higher than that given to them in Test. Levi, which says that the Angels of Presence "make propitiation to the Lord for all the sins of ignorance of the righteous."

64. A comparable explanation (but without the spiritual tendency) is

The spiritual sacrifices (πνευματικαὶ θυσίαι) are also expressly mentioned in I Pet. ii, 5. In the Epistle this concept forms part of an idealizing description of the Church as a spiritual temple. There is a close affinity between this description and the Temple-Sect allegory discussed above, especially with its fully elaborated version where the phrase "to offer pleasant savour" occurs. Thus the meaning which is implicit (to our mind) in this phrase occurs in a closely parallel text explicitly. Let us now examine the two texts to see whether they are really similar. The *Manual of Discipline* (VIII, 4-10) has: "When these things come to pass in Israel, the council of the community will be truly established for an eternal planting⁶⁵, a holy house for Israel and a foundation of holy of holies for Aaron, true witnesses for justice and the elect of (God's) will, to make atonement for the land and to render to the wicked their recompense. This is the tested wall, a precious cornerstone; its foundations will not tremble or move from their place; a dwelling of holy of holies for Aaron in the knowledge of all for a covenant of justice and to offer a pleasant savour, and house of perfection and truth in Israel to establish a covenant for eternal statutes. And they shall be acceptable to atone for the land . . ." The passage in I Pet. ii, 5-6 can be now quoted together with the corresponding phrases in the *Manual*: καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οικοδομεῖσθε

οἶκος πνευματικὸς	בית קודש לישראל (VIII 5, cf. V 6, IX 6)
	בית אמת ותמים ⁶⁷ בישראל (VIII 9)
ιεράτευμα ⁶⁶ ἅγιον	מעון קודש קודשים לאהרון (VIII 8)
	ויסוד קודש קודשים לאהרון (VIII 5-6, cf. V 6, IX 6)
ἀνεγείναι πνευματικὰς θυσίας	ולקריב ריח ניחוח (VIII 9)
εὐπροσδέκτους θεῷ	ובחירי רצון (VIII 6)
διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ διότι περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ	והיו לרצון (VIII 10)
ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον ἐκλεκτὸν	היאה חומת הבחן (VIII 7)
ἀκρογωνιαῖον ἔντιμον	פינת יקר (VIII 7)
καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταίσχυνθῆ. <i>יהו. יסודותיהו. בל יודעו יסודותיהו.</i>	ובל יחישו ממקומם (VIII 8)

This comparison demonstrates, to my mind, a literary connection

possibly רוח הנחם לשם הנחם in B.T. Zeb. 46b; but see *Siphra* Lev. i, 9. See also. Z. Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss der pal. Exegese*, 1851, p. 130 note.

65. On this symbol in Sectarian and Apocryphal literature, see D. Flusser, "The Apocryphal book of Ascensio Isaiae", *IEJ* 3 (1953), 38, note 23.

66. *ιεράτευμα* is preferable to *εἰς ἱεράτευμα*, which seems to be a correction.

67. Compare *בית תמים* with *ναὸς τέλειος* of Barn. iv, 11.

between the Epistle and the Manual. The whole complex of ideas and phrases (which, as we have seen, existed in many variations) was transposed into a new language and a new *milieu*. Naturally it underwent some changes in the process, but these changes were not extensive and can be defined with some exactitude. The typical image of the sect as two linked houses, e.g. "a holy house for Israel *and* a foundation of Holy of Holies for Aaron" has been resolved in the Christian passage into two independent images, which can be combined but need not be, according to the textual reading which we prefer⁶⁸: "a spiritual house, a holy priesthood" or "a spiritual house for a holy priesthood." The Epistle refers, according to both readings, to an undivided Church which is described by the two terms. In the Sectarian prototype the two terms are necessary because they refer to two parts of the sect: the priests and the laity. This is so because the sect tried to achieve a resemblance to the Temple in its life. In the Christian *milieu* the concept acquired a wholly symbolical meaning. We have already observed an analogous development of the concept "spiritual sacrifices." The Hebrew text is bound by its positive attitude towards the real Temple service (in the future), it therefore prefers to use the traditional ritualistic language⁶⁹ to describe the "spiritual sacrifices" which are actually meant.⁷⁰ As the symbols of the Hebrew sacrifice had no direct emotional value for the Greek reader, the author of the Epistle (or his predecessor) preferred in this case to give the meaning rather than the full symbolism of the Hebrew.

In both texts the quotation from Isa. xxviii, 16 figures largely, with its image of the firm cornerstone. In the Hebrew text this symbol of the firmness of the Sectarian organisation is loosely connected with other poetical symbols, mainly with images taken from the Temple service. The sect is thus described from various aspects, but there is no necessary organic link between the verse with its imagery of firmness and the ritualistic symbols. As a matter of fact both notions

68. See note 66 above.

69. The expression ריח ניחוח is also used by mediaeval Jewish poets as a symbol for the synagogue service, e.g. ריח ניחוח אמרי פי לפניך צור עולמים, חלבי ודמי הנמעט בצומי תמור חלבים ודמים, קבל הגיון לבי אשר ערכת זה עשרת הימים (By the Paytan Mordecai bar Sabbethai, see *Service of the Synagogue*, London 1944, Day of Atonement, II, 224). See also note 51 above.

70. πνευματικός, in πνευματικαὶ θυσίαι, means, in accordance with general NT usage, "belonging to the Spirit", not "spiritual" as opposed to "material", I Peter ii, 5; cf. especially Phil. iv, 18 and possibly II Cor. ii, 14-16.

occur independently elsewhere in the scroll.⁷¹ The same combination of the biblical image of the cornerstone with symbols taken from the ritual occurs in the Greek Epistle, but there is no evident reason for this immediate connection. The cornerstone fits only into the larger context of the passage (I Pet. ii, 4–8) which is a series of variations on the theme "stone".⁷² This incidental combination of the Isaiah verse with the images of "holy priesthood" and "spiritual sacrifices" in *both* texts indicates, to my mind, some literary dependence of the Greek Epistle on a Hebrew prototype which resembled the passage quoted from DST VIII, 4–11. The Epistle did not translate the verse as quoted in the Hebrew source, but used the Septuagint version. As a result the passage ends with the words *καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ κατασχυθῆι*, and the allusion to firmness in the corresponding quotation in the Hebrew text — "its foundations will not tremble or move from their place"⁷³ — is lost. But the Sectarian notion that the community has to be firm, which the sect based on Isa. xxviii, 16⁷⁴, has not been lost in the Christian *milieu*; it reappears (though not in connection with the Temple allegory): the Christians have to be *τεθεμελιωμένοι* (Col. i, 23), *ἑδραῖοι καὶ ἀμετακίνητοι* (I Cor. xv, 58; Col. i, 23).

To sum up: As the Qumran covenanters thought that the Jerusalem Temple was polluted, they could not take part in the Temple service of their time. This inability to offer real sacrifices engendered an ambivalent attitude to the sacrificial rites: On the one hand the sect hoped to offer sacrifices according to its own rites and by its own priests in a purified future Temple; on the other they believed that their non-sacrificial rites (lustrations, prayers, strict observance of the Law) could serve as a full substitute for Temple service. This belief led them to speculation about the equality of the two services, to the use of symbols taken from the Temple ritual when describing Sectarian

71. The Sectarian exposition of Isa. xxviii, 16 had a life of its own in the Qumran writings; see DST VI, 25–7 (referring to the Sect); *ibid.* VII, 7–9 (referring to the individual member). The passages agree in additional points.

72. Both images, house and stone, are, of course, connected by the general idea of a building. DSD has *חומת הבחן* for the biblical *בִּחַן אֶבֶן*. The words *מוֹסַד מוֹסַד* are absent in both quotations (DSD and I Peter), but were not lacking from the Sectarian text of Isaiah.

73. The biblical *לֹא יִחַשׁ* is taken over and interpreted: *בְּלִי יוֹדְעוֹ יִסְדוֹתֵיהֶוּ* and *וּבְלִי יִחַשׁ מִמְקוֹמָם*. The word *הַמֵּאֲמִין* is left out. The Septuagint has a different interpretation of *לֹא יִחַשׁ*.

74. See note 71 above.

rites, and, finally, to the view that the sect itself was a kind of spiritual Temple. We have shown that one of the NT passages which express this concept is directly dependent on a Sectarian prototype; we have reason to believe that the concept itself came from Sectarian circles. This view, that the Church is a spiritual Temple, did not only mean for the Christians that the Church was a united body which contained holiness, but also that, being a spiritual temple, it was superior to the material Temple of the Jews. The concept thus helped in the separation of Christianity from Judaism, in a way analogous (though not equal) to its influence on the estrangement between the sect and the rest of Judaism for whom the actual sanctuary of Jerusalem was a symbol of religious unity.

VI. THE NEW COVENANT

Christianity distinguishes itself formally from Judaism by the New Covenant (καινή διαθήκη), which in its view was given to replace or fulfil the old one. The fact that the term New Covenant (ברית חדשה) was also used by the Qumran Sect (CDC VI, 19; VIII, 21; XX, 12; DSH II, 3) is generally recognised as remarkable.⁷⁵ We are now confronted with the question: do both documents mean the same thing when using this term or, if not, what is the difference between the two evidently similar concepts?

The term New Covenant has its origin in the prophecy of Jeremiah (xxxi, 30-1): "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah, not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake." Evidently both communities were attracted by the eschatological content of the biblical expression "New Covenant", especially as the prophet says that the New Covenant will be different from the old broken one. Of course both communities did not interpret literally the part of the prophecy which says that the New Covenant will be made "with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah." In their opinion this expression could not mean the whole Jewish people; they saw in it a designation of the "true Israel": these are "Israel who walk in perfection" according to the Qumran Covenanters (DSD IX, 6) or according to Paul "Israel of God" (Gal. vi, 16).

75. See the interesting comments of L. Goppelt, *Christentum und Judentum*, 1954, p. 26.

It so happens that most of our information about this concept in the sect is concentrated in the so-called *Damascus Document*. This is also the one Sectarian writing which explicitly uses the term New Covenant.⁷⁶

The concept of a New Covenant is only significant when combined with, or opposed to, the idea of an Old Covenant. This is what CDC has to say on this subject: "Remembering the Covenant of the ancestors (lit. first ones — ברית ראשונים). He caused a remnant to remain of Israel" (I, 4-5); "God remembered the Covenant of the ancestors and He raised from Aaron wise men and from Israel sages" (VI, 2-3). These are allusions to the biblical verse: "But I will for their sakes remember the covenant of their ancestors (ברית ראשונים); whom I brought forth out of the land of Egypt in the sight of the heathen" (Lev. xxvi, 45). By taking his cue from this eschatological verse, the author of CDC makes it clear that the covenant of the ancestors — or, to be exact, of the first ones — is the covenant made with all Israel on Sinai. This is called in Hebr. ix, 15 "the first covenant" (ἡ πρώτη διαθήκη). The rendering "first covenant" for "covenant of the first ones" already appears in the LXX of Lev. xxvi, 45 (ἡ διαθήκη ἡ πρώτη). We may therefore suppose that Hebr. and CDC are actually using the same biblical term, ברית ראשונים. This covenant has been broken by those who entered it, called (CDC III, 10) באי ברית ראשונים⁷⁷ (those who came into the covenant of the first ones — or the first covenant). To my mind this expression corresponds to οἱ πρότερον εὐαγγελισθέντες ("those who were told the Gospel for the first time") in Hebr. iv, 6. The generation of the wilderness is meant by both expressions, with the difference that the Epistle means only this generation, while CDC includes this and subsequent sinful generations of Israel in the concept. Both documents describe the disobedience and punishment of this particular generation.⁷⁸ I would suggest that the Greek expression is a free rendering of the Hebrew one. The Christian view, that the New Covenant is

76. In DSH II, 3, the reading is based upon a restoration.

77. This reading is preferable to באי הברית הראשונים, an invention of the mediaeval scribe.

78. CDC III, 6-9: "And their males were cut off in the desert... and they hearkened not to the voice of their Maker... and they murmured in their tents. And the anger of God was kindled against their congregation." Hebr. iv, 6: "Those who were told the Gospel for the first time failed to enter, owing to their disobedience."

in fact identical with the Gospel, was transferred to the Old Covenant on Sinai, which appears as a kind of gospel, the first one (Hebr. iv, 2).

The doctrine of the two covenants is an expression of the general Sectarian view of Israel's history. This view is expressed with admirable fullness and clarity in three interconnected passages of CDC (I, 1-11; II, 14-III, 21; V, 20-VI, 3) which describe the course and interpret the sense of Israel's history (as mentioned before, CDC furnishes most of our information about the concept of the covenant). We read in col. III that the sons of Noah went astray and were cut off; that Abraham kept the commandments of God and "handed (this tradition) to Isaac and Jacob and they kept (it) and were written down as those who love God and partners of the covenant forever" (III, 2-4). There follows a list of all subsequent generations; we are told that they all sinned and were punished. The conclusion is that "through it⁷⁹ became culpable those who came into the covenant of the first ones⁸⁰ (or: the first covenant) and were given to the sword because they forsook the covenant of God . . . But with them that hold fast to the commandments of God — who were left over of them⁸¹ — God established (i.e. re-established) His covenant with Israel until eternity" (III, 10-13). Or, in a shorter version: "For because they sinned in that they forsook Him, He hid His face from Israel and from His sanctuary and gave them to the sword; but remembering the covenant of the first ones (or: the first covenant) He caused a remnant to remain of Israel" (I, 3-5).⁸²

This remnant has been saved because (as we have seen in the preceding quotation) it kept God's commandments, i.e. remained faithful to the original covenant. This idea is in the background of the definition of the sect given in 1QSa: "The sons of Zadok the priests and the men of their covenant, who turned aside from walking in the way of the people, they are the men of His counsel who kept His covenant in (the) wickedness" (QI p. 109, I, 2-3). The characteristic expression *saru* (they turned away)⁸³, which indicates separatist tendencies, recurs in another combination with the notion of the covenant

79. It is not possible to know to what the word refers; the text is not quite in order.

80. See note 77 above.

81. I.e. the remnant of Israel.

82. See on p. 38 of my paper (quoted above note 65) an interpretation of the whole passage.

83. See Milik's note *ad loc.*, QI, p. 111-2.

in CDC VIII, 16-18: "... the penitent of Israel (who) turned from the way of the people. Because of God's love for the first ones⁸⁴ . . . , He loved those who came after them, for theirs is the covenant of the fathers (ברית האבות)." The expression "covenant of the fathers" is significant for the Sectarian view quoted above. In this view only the fathers (Abraham, Isaac, Jacob) are regarded as having been faithful to the covenant. Therefore those entering into the new covenant see themselves as heirs to the covenant of the fathers.⁸⁵ This spiritual descent from Abraham (and not from Israel generally) is also characteristic of early Christianity (see Hebr. xi; *Bul.* 96).

Not only the notion of the covenant of the forefathers, but the whole Sectarian concept of sacred history resembles the Christian view of the Old and New Covenants. Both concepts are connected with the notion that the new community (the Sectarians or the Christians) represent the remnant of Israel, as foretold by the prophets.⁸⁶ Both communities distinguished the first covenant made with the whole of Israel from the new covenant which was given only to the new community. As the sect saw it, the new covenant was made necessary because the old one had been broken. This view, explained at some length in the Sectarian writings, is not explicitly stated in the NT. Nevertheless it is to my mind implicit in the exposition of Psalm xcvi in Hebr. iii, 7 sqq., about the generation of the wilderness: this generation, "those who were told the gospel first", did not enter the Land of Promise, which in this exposition stands for the "rest" (eschatological bliss), because of their disobedience (iv, 6). But those to whom the Gospel is preached now, as it was to the first ones (iv, 2), are offered "today" the opportunity to reach the "rest" (iv, 7), on condition that "they do not harden their hearts". This means practically that the generation of the wilderness did not enjoy the blessing of the first covenant ("gospel" in the new setting) because of their disobedience: the new community is offered for a second time a covenant with its blessings. The old covenant, which was broken, shall be fulfilled in the new one. The sins which hindered the fulfilment of the old covenant shall not weigh upon the new one. The Epistle says so explicitly, adding a truly Christian motivation:

84. הראשונים (the first ones), here the founders of the Sect, not ancient Israel, cf. CDC IV, 8-9.

85. The view seems to underlie the enigmatic expression אבות אבות in DSD II, 9.

86. See J. Munck, "Christus und Israel", *Acta Jutlandica* 7, (1956), 85.

"He mediates a New Covenant for this reason that those who have been called⁸⁷ may obtain the eternal inheritance⁸⁸ which redeems them from transgressions (committed) under the first covenant" (ix, 15).

To learn of the connection between the concept of the two covenants in early Christianity and the sect, we had to rely on a single NT document, the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, which happens to be the one NT writing to mention the theme without being influenced by the Pauline concept of the New Covenant "not of the letter but of the spirit" (II Cor. iii, 6). Paul found a new meaning in the contrast between the two covenants: "For these are the two covenants, the one from Mount Sinai which gendereth to bondage..." In the lengthy discussion, Paul evidently wants to say that the other covenant brings freedom (Gal. iv, 24-31). Paul combines the notion of the two covenants with his general view of the Law and Christian freedom which we have already mentioned.

The Christian and Sectarian ideas about the two covenants were, as we have seen, very similar, especially before Paul, but not identical. The one relevant difference is in the social significance of the covenant in the Qumran Sect. The ideal concept discussed above had its counterpart and realization in the actual life of the sect. Each new member entered the covenant formally, moreover the covenant of the sect as a whole was yearly renewed in an obligatory ceremony. Significantly, this ceremony was performed in the third month, *i.e.* in connection with Pentecost, regarded traditionally as the date of the covenant on Mount Sinai.⁸⁹ Thus, for the sect the covenant has a practical and ceremonial as well as a theological aspect. In Christianity the social aspect is weaker and the theological aspect is intensified by its ties with Christology: Christ is the sacrifice which institutes the New Covenant (*Bul.* 97).

In addition to the fundamental difference between the Christian and Sectarian concepts of the two covenants, there is a difference of degree. The sect says about itself: "And He built them a sure house (בֵּית נֶאֱמָן, cf. Hebr. iii, 1-6) in Israel, the like of which has not stood from ancient times even until now" (CDC III, 19-20). As a divine institution the sect is superior to all similar institutions which preceded it during the course of Jewish history. It regards itself as

87. See note 25 above.

88. See note 35 above.

89. J. T. Milik, *Dix ans de découvertes*, 1957, p. 77.

something new and better than traditional Judaism, but it does not go so far as the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, which argues: "By saying 'a new covenant' he antiquates the first. And whatever is antiquated and aged is on the verge of vanishing" (Hebr. viii, 13; see also II Cor. iii, 14). This extreme view of the Christians is, of course, a part of their opposition to the letter of the Law. The sect had no occasion to renounce the Old Covenant, because it never intended to give up the Law of Judaism (see especially CDC XV, 8-12). The separatism of the sect led, on the contrary, to an increase (or modification) in the strictness of *halakhab*, to the revelation of special laws: "But with them that held fast to the commandments of God who were left over of them, God established His covenant with Israel even until eternity, by revealing to them hidden things concerning which all Israel erred, His holy sabbaths and His glorious appointed times, His righteous testimonies and His true ways and the requirements of His will, which a man shall do and live thereby" (CDC III, 12-16). Practically, this meant divergent religious practices in everyday life (especially in calendar reckoning)⁹⁰ and resulted in effective separation from the rest of Jewry, while (in contrast to Christianity) the connection with the Law of Judaism was maintained. But the insistence on the validity of the laws of the New Covenant leads to a rejection of other Jews who do not interpret the Law according to the New Covenant: "For vain are all those who do not know His covenant, and all those who despise His word He will destroy from the world" (DSD V, 19-20). The appellation "vain" (הבלי) is applied by DSW to the gentiles (גויי הבלי, nations of vanity).⁹¹ Thus the sect tends to adopt the same attitude to those who rejected the covenant of the sect and to those who have no covenant at all.

This attitude is somewhat complicated by the hope of the sect to embrace all Israel in the future or, strictly speaking, to become in the future not only the true Israel, but the only Israel. Possibly some sectarians imagined that the rest of Jewry would simply be destroyed in the End-time, while others hoped for a mass-conversion to their point of view. We have a fairly explicit statement of this second attitude in 1QSa (QI, p. 109, I, 1-5), while the view that all Israel which does not belong to the sect shall be destroyed is implicit in such passages as the one quoted above: "For vain etc.", or the

90. See S. Talmon's contribution to this volume.

91. See Yadin, *op.cit.* (note 12), p. 283.

declaration in CDC that at a fixed time "there shall be no further joining to the House of Judah", because "the wall is built" (CDC IV, 10-12). The problem derives basically from the attempt to apply the concept of dualism and grace to the relations of the sect with the rest of Judaism and the notion of Israel's salvation in the future. We may suppose that the sect imagined that the utterly wicked would be destroyed, but that the majority of the people would somehow in the last minute escape damnation and enter the New Covenant. This problem, so incompletely solved by the sect, became even more complicated and pressing when confronted by Paul, who was forced to clarify the relationship between the historical Israel and his new universal community as well as the function of Divine grace towards both bodies. Hence his profound discussion of the problem in the whole of chapter xi of the Epistle to the Romans. The solution is offered mainly in vss. 28-9: "As far as the gospel goes, they are enemies of God — which is to your advantage; but as far as election goes, they are beloved for their fathers' sake."

VII. BAPTISM

The Covenant brought to the members of the sect amongst other things deliverance from sin: it is "the covenant which God established for the first ones⁹² to atone for their transgressions" (CDC IV, 9-10), or, in a more explicit statement, "God in His wondrous mysteries atoned for their transgressions and took away their iniquity" (CDC III, 18). This practically means that one of the important functions of the sect as an institution is "to atone for the guilt of transgression and iniquity of sin" (DSD IX, 4). The Christian Church has a similar function, which is, however, based on a different theological claim: it is the death of the Saviour which atones for the sins of the Christian (*Bul.* 85, 100).⁹³ This belief is often combined in Christianity with the institution of baptism, which also results in the deliverance from sin. In some NT passages (see I Pet. iii, 21; Eph. v, 25) there is a direct link between baptism and the death of Jesus, but originally the two notions were separate. This also emerges from the traditions about John the Baptist, who preached "a baptism of repentance for the remission of sins" (Mark i, 4; Luke iii, 3). The meaning of

92. See note 84 above.

93. Of course, already the first disciples of Jesus were of the view that his death brought atonement, but in the second Christian stratum the belief that the death of Christ atones for those who believe in him is typical.

this religious concept becomes evident from Josephus' description of John's baptism: "For thus, it seemed to him, would baptismal ablution be acceptable, if it were not to beg off from sins committed, but for the purification of the body, when the soul had previously been cleansed by righteous conduct" (Ant. XVIII, 117).⁹⁴ By "purification of the body" Josephus means ritual purity, which was a concept of great importance in the Judaism of the Second Commonwealth generally. This purity, according to John the Baptist, is not obtainable without the previous "cleansing of the soul", *i.e.* repentance. This idea, that moral purity is a necessary condition for ritual purity, is emphatically preached in DSD, which says about the man whose repentance is not complete: "Unclean, unclean he will be all the days that he rejects the ordinances of God... But by the spirit of true counsel for the ways of man all his iniquities shall be atoned, so that he shall look at the light of life, and by the spirit of holiness which will unite him in his truth he shall be cleansed from all his iniquities; and by the spirit of uprightness and meekness his sin will be atoned, and by the submission of his soul to all the statutes of God his flesh will be cleansed, that he may be sprinkled with water for impurity and sanctify himself⁹⁵ with water of cleanness" (DSD III, 5-9).⁹⁶ This doctrine leads to the rule: "Let him not enter the water to touch the purity of the men of Holiness, for they will not be cleansed unless they have repented from their wickedness" (DSD V, 13-4; cf. *ibid.* VIII, 17-18). The regular ablutions of the sect, which enabled its members to touch their pure food⁹⁷, were forbidden to outsiders (and to members of doubtful behaviour) because these ablutions were not considered valid unless preceded by full repentance.

That baptism leads to the remission of sins was accepted by Christianity generally (*Bul.* 135-6), but the idea that the atonement is really caused by the repentance which precedes the actual immersion⁹⁸

94. The first to interpret the NT correctly on the basis of Josephus's words was E. Meyer (*Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* I, Berlin 1924, p. 88). His view is confirmed by the Scrolls.

95. See below.

96. W. H. Burrows, "John the Baptist" in *The Scrolls* (see note 1 above), pp. 39-41. — See also S. E. Johnson, "The Dead Sea Manual", *ZAW* 66 (1954), 107-8.

97. See C. Rabin, *Qumran Studies*, Oxford 1957, pp. 7-8.

98. The outward expression of this view in the baptism of John is the

gradually weakened in the new *milieu*. When the early Church of Jerusalem introduced baptism, the connection between repentance and baptism was still clear (Acts ii, 38). There still is an indirect connection between moral purity and the significance of baptism⁹⁹ in Heb. x, 22: "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water." The similarity of this language to Josephus' description has already been recognized¹⁰⁰; now we must also compare the language used by DSD III, 8-9: "By the submission of his soul to all the statutes of God his flesh will be cleansed, that he may be sprinkled with water for impurity and sanctify himself¹⁰¹ with water of cleanness." The language, not the meaning, is similar in this case, since the author of the Epistle does not really want to say that repentance is necessary for effective baptism, but only makes use of a traditional phrase. Elsewhere in the NT Epistles and Johannine writings the connection between baptism and repentance is entirely lacking, in spite of the great importance which repentance had in Christianity from its very beginning in the teaching of Jesus (*Bul.* 73-4). In my opinion¹⁰² this loss of the element of repentance in Christian baptism can be explained by the increasing importance given to its sacramental aspect, which makes it an *opus operatum*. It is interesting to note that the Apostolic Fathers, when speaking about repentance and baptism (Barn. xvi, 8-9; Herm. IV Mand. iii, 1-2), seem to regard repentance as a result of baptism, not as a condition for it.¹⁰³

As we have seen, baptism as practised by John the Baptist and the sect had a double significance, ritual purity and atonement, or deliverance from sin. The ritual aspect naturally lost all importance in Christian baptism. Nevertheless Christian writers continued to use the language of ritual purity as a kind of poetical imagery taken over from their predecessors. Paul, e.g., addresses the gentile Christians: "But

notice that "They were baptised of him . . . confessing their sins" (Mark i, 5; cf. Mt. iii, 6). Cf. also Sibyll. iv, 165-170.

99. The notion that penitence precedes baptism is possibly alluded to in the obscure passage Hebr. vi, 1-6.

100. See A. Oepke in Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum NT*, s.v.

101. See below.

102. I hope that I shall be able to substantiate this claim in a future study.

103. On this point I remain unconvinced by A. Benoît, *Le baptême chrétien au second siècle*, Paris 1953. The notion that penitence precedes baptism reappears in Justinus, I Ap., cap. 61.

ye are washed, but ye are sanctified but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus and by the Spirit . . ." (I Cor. vi, 11; cf. i, 30; see *Bul.* 135). He uses the terms occurring also in DSD (about the backslider): "He shall not be justified . . . he shall not be purified by atonement and he shall not be cleansed by the water for impurity: he shall not sanctify himself in seas and rivers or be made clean with any water for washing" (DSD III, 3-5). Especially interesting, in this context, is the word "to sanctify" (שקדקה, αγιασθῆναι), which is used by the Jewish sect (DSD III, 4, 9; DST xi, 10) in the specific Hebrew (biblical¹⁰⁴ and talmudic¹⁰⁵) sense "to purify." We may suppose that the early Christians also used baptismal *formulae* in which the word occurred in its original sense. In NT passages connected with baptism (I Cor. i, 30; vi, 11; Eph. v, 26), however, the word seems to be used only in the non-ritualistic sense of spiritual sanctity. Nevertheless, a palpably ritualistic formula is used, as we have seen, by Hebr. x, 22: "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water." The author of the Epistle made use of this formula because it was traditional, although he was consciously opposed to the "diverse ablutions" (διάφοροι βαπτισμοί, Hebr. ix, 9-10) of the Jews, which, according to him, belong to the category of "carnal ordinances" and "cannot make the worshipper perfect as to his conscience (κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι)" (ibid.). It is therefore not surprising that I Peter (iii, 21), when speaking of baptism in terms similar to Hebr. x, 22, accepts the notion of a cleared conscience, but rejects most emphatically the notion of a purified body: the baptism is "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God (συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν)." ¹⁰⁶

Two elements in the baptism of John the Baptist and the sect were weakened in Christian baptism: ritual purity and the notion that repentance is a condition for valid baptism. A third element of Sect-

104. Some of the Septuagint translators understood that שקדקה can mean "to purify oneself" (ἀγνίσεσθαι). See LXX Num. xi, 18; Jos. iii, 5; Isa. lxvi, 17; Chron. *passim*.

105. E.g. ידיים ורגלים קידוש in Mishnah Yoma iii, 2. I have not found the root שקד for purification of the whole body in Talmudic sources.

106. The repetition of the originally Greek συνείδησις (Hebr. ix, 9; x, 22; I Peter iii, 21) shows that the Jewish baptismal formula was formulated anew by Greek-speaking Christians.

arian baptism was developed and emphasized by Christianity: the notion that baptism brings remission of sins. A fourth element common to both types of baptism, with which we have not dealt so far, is the function of the Holy Spirit at this act. It is the Spirit which according to DSD III, 6-8 effects the purification from sin. In Christian baptism the Holy Spirit is the dominant element; it is a baptism by Spirit, an act which ensures the granting of the Holy Spirit (*Bul.* 137-8).¹⁰⁷ The whole development leads from a baptism that could hardly be called a sacrament to the eminently sacramental act of Christian baptism.

VIII. SPIRIT

The dualistic doctrine of the Qumran Sect is expressed, as we have seen, in terms of "the two spirits". God "created the spirits of Light and Darkness and established upon them every deed" (DSD III, 25). The righteous, the Sons of Light, are those who belong to the Spirit of Truth, while the wicked belong to the Spirit of Evil. The same juxtaposition occurs in I John iv, 6, the Spirits being those of Truth and Error.¹⁰⁸ John also identifies this Spirit of Truth with the biblical "Holy Spirit" (John xiv, 17; 26); so does the sect (DSD IV, 21; III, 6-7).¹⁰⁹ Only the Elect, i.e. the members of the *Yahad* or of the Church, have the Spirit of Truth or the Holy Spirit bestowed upon them; it is this spirit which makes them different from others: "Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is from God" (I Cor. ii, 12).¹¹⁰

The Holy Spirit was bestowed upon all the Elect, but not to the same degree. The individual members of the chosen community differ in the grade and quality of their spiritual perfection (*Bul.* 157-8). They were granted "various powers and distributions of the Holy Spirit (*πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοί*) according to His will" (Hebr. ii, 4). DSD is even more explicit on the subject: it declares that all men inherit in the distributions (*במפלגיהן*) of the two Spirits, of Truth and Evil,

107. The relation of the Spirit to baptism will be dealt with elsewhere.

108. πνεῦμα πλανῆς corresponds to a supposed *רוח העוה כול בני צדק* (as yet not found in the texts), but cf. *ובמלאך חושך העוה כול בני צדק* (DSD III, 21-2).

109. It should be also noticed that both DSD IV, 21 and the Gospel of John speak about the granting of the holy Spirit to the Elect at the End-Time. Professor M. Buber called my attention to a possible connection between the Sectarian and Christian Holy Spirit = Spirit of Truth and the Holy Spirit in the dualistic Persian religion.

110. These words of Paul will be discussed later in this paper.

"and every action of their deeds is (determined) by their distributions, according to a man's portion, whether much or little for all times eternal" (DSD IV, 15-16).¹¹¹ The significance of "each man's portion" is clearly brought out by Paul: "Each received his manifestation of the Spirit for the common good. One man is granted words of wisdom by the Spirit, another words of knowledge by the same Spirit; one man in the same Spirit has the gift of faith, another in the one Spirit has gifts of healing; one has miraculous powers, another the gift of interpreting tongues. But all these effects are produced by one and the same Spirit, apportioning them severally to each individual as he pleases" (I Cor. xii, 7-11, cf. *ibid.* 12-31; Rom. xii, 3-8, Eph. iv, 3-16). Or, as the author of DST says more simply: "According to their understanding Thou madest them approach and according to their ability they shall serve Thee, according to their distribution[on]" (DST XII, 23). All the abilities (literally: powers) are various ways of serving God, as Paul also says in his introduction (I Cor. xii, 4-6) to the passage quoted above.

The personal differences in the gifts of the Spirit have their practical importance in communal life. They determine the social rank of each member and the kind of worship expected of him. Therefore the Qumran community was obliged officially to determine the spiritual grade — or "understanding" — of each member: "They shall be registered in order, each before his neighbour, according to his understanding and his deeds, so that every one of them shall obey his neighbour, the lesser obeying the greater; and so that they shall have an investigation of their spirits and their deeds year by year, so as to elevate each one according to his understanding and the perfection of his way or put him back according to his perversion" (DSD V, 23-4). Among the duties of the "enlightened" (משכיל) member of the sect was the duty "to differentiate and to weigh all the sons of Zadok according to their spirit . . . to judge each man according to his spirit and to let each man approach according to the cleanness of his hands and accept him according to his understanding" (DSD IX, 14, 15-16,

111. This means that grades of spirit — of the evil spirit of course — exist also among the Sons of Darkness. This concept of distribution belongs to the Sectarian doctrine of predestination (see DST I, 15-20). According to J. T. Milik, *op.cit.* (note 89), p. 78-9, fragments of an astrological composition were found in Qumran giving mathematical proportions of the participation of men in the spirits of Light and Darkness, according to the dates of their births.

18). We have no information about similar social techniques among the Christians; though Paul does include the "distinguishing of spirits" among the spiritual gifts (I Cor. xii, 10).¹¹²

The recurring examination of the spiritual grade of each member of the sect (DSD V, 24) indicates that this grade was not considered to be constant. This explains why the author of DST asks for the spirit (XVI, 6; see XVI, 11-12), although the spirit was given to him when he entered the sect (XIV, 13)—he can never be quite sure that the more coveted kind of spirit will always be at work within him. A parallel situation exists in Christianity: the Christian has been given the spirit at his conversion, but is nevertheless exhorted to desire spiritual gifts (I Cor. xiv, 1, see *Bul.* 158).¹¹³

The usage of the term "spirit" varies both in the NT and in the Qumran writings. Sometimes the "spirit" in general is mentioned; the same spirit is occasionally called the "Holy Spirit." In other passages the word "spirit" is used with different qualifications. It seems that these specific spirits are not always aspects or even poetic descriptions of the one spirit, but also occasionally individual divine gifts to the Elect. The connection between the general and the specialized concepts of "spirit" is discussed by Paul in the passage quoted above: "Each man receives his manifestation of the Spirit for the common good . . . but all these effects are produced by one and the same spirit, apportioning them severally to each individual as he pleases" (I Cor. xii, 7-11).¹¹⁴ This explanation seems to presuppose that the several spiritual gifts are distributed by the general spirit, itself beyond

112. The phrase can be also understood as referring to the examination of the utterances of spirits, i.e. prophecies, cf. I Thess. v, 19; I Cor. xiv, 29; I John iv, 1. It should be also noticed that the NT passages quoted seem to speak about distinguishing the good spirit from the spirit of error.

113. The author of DST prays to God: התערב ברות עבדך (vouchsafe(?) for the spirit of Thy servant, DST XVI, 14). This could mean that God is asked to vouchsafe for the good spirit in the Elect, to ensure that the worshipper shall be steadfast in his good ways. If this interpretation (there are others) be accepted, the phrase from DST would form an interesting parallel to II Cor. i, 22: "Who hath also sealed us and given the pledge of the Spirit (τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος) in our hearts" (cf. *ibid.* v, 5; Eph. i, 14). The Hebrew word for pledge is used in these Greek passages. The spirit is, so to speak, given as a pledge from God to the Elect one to ensure that his share in the election will not be lost (Eph. i, 14). See, however, Abbot, *op.cit.* (note 36), etc.

114. Paul's words could be construed to mean that everybody receives one single spiritual gift; but evidently this is not the Apostle's intention.

humanity. But it can also be said, as we have seen, that God grants the one Holy Spirit, or Spirit of Truth, to each of his Elect. Thus the list of spiritual gifts in the fourth column of DSD is summed up in the words: "These are the foundations¹¹⁵ of the Spirit for the Sons of Truth of the world" (IV, 6). The list includes amongst other individual gifts the "Spirit of Meekness" (IV, 3) and the "Spirit of Knowledge" (IV, 4). Both these spirits also occur in the NT. The "Spirit of Meekness" (see also DSD III, 8) is mentioned twice by Paul (I Cor. iv, 21; Gal. vi, 1); meekness (not "Spirit of Meekness") is placed in the Jewish *Treatise of the Two Ways* in a passage parallel to the list of DST just mentioned.¹¹⁶ Meekness also occurs in another list of this kind, that of the "fruits of the spirit" in Gal. v, 22-3.¹¹⁷

To the "Spirit of Knowledge" in the Manual corresponds the "Spirit of Wisdom and Revelation" (πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως) in Eph. i, 17. Knowledge is also included in the list of spiritual manifestations in I Cor. xii, 8 (cf. xiv, 6) from which we have already quoted extensively. Now we must ask what kind of knowledge is meant.¹¹⁸ What does the Elect one know, since heavenly wisdom has been granted to him? For John the Evangelist this knowledge is concentrated in Christology (Bul. 419-21); in the non-Johannine Epistles the concept of knowledge seems to be broader and to resemble the kind of knowledge which is characteristic for Sectarian doctrine. Thus Paul in I Cor. xiii, 2 speaks about prophecy and understanding of mysteries and knowledge¹¹⁹ as being all gifts of one kind. Thus

115. סודי, i.e. יסודי.

116. Didache iii, 7-8: ἴσθι δὲ πρᾶξις, ἐπεὶ οἱ πρᾶξις κληρονομήσουσιν τὴν γῆν. γίνου μακροθύμος καὶ ἐλειμῶν καὶ ἄκακος (DSD IV, 3: רוח ענוה ואורר, רוח אפים ורוב רחמים וטוב עולמים. See J.P. Audet, "Affinités littéraires et doctrinales du Manuel de Discipline", *RB* 1952, pp. 219-38.

117. On the list, see note 157. There is a connection between "spirit of meekness" and "the meek of spirit" (ענוי רוח), a description of the Sect identical with "the poor of spirit" (עניי רוח). Cf. Mt. v, 3-5: "Blessed are the poor by spirit, (i.e. ענוי רוח), for theirs is the kingdom of heaven... Blessed are the meek (i.e. ענוים), for they shall inherit the earth." — See D. Flusser, *op.cit.* (note 3), p. 88-9.

118. The best discussion of the Christian concept of knowledge is L. Bouyer, "Gnosis, le sens orthodoxe de l'expression jusqu'aux pères Alexandrins" *JTS* 4 (1953), 188-203. For the Sectarian material, see W. D. Davies, "Knowledge in the DSS", *HTR* 1953, pp. 113-139; Licht, *op.cit.* (note 21), pp. 97-9; Fr. Nötscher, *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte*, 1956, pp. 15-18.

119. As evident from the context, the definition is not Paul's, but was taken over by him.

we learn indirectly that Paul meant thereby the lore of divine mysteries. The Epistle to the Ephesians (i, 17-19) offers a broader and more explicit definition: "That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory¹²⁰, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him. The eyes of your heart being enlightened¹²¹; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling¹²² and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints¹²³, and what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward¹²⁴ who believe, according to the working of his mighty power."¹²⁵ By the gift of knowledge the Christian is made to understand the working of the divine calling or the true meaning of his election. His knowledge is the intellectual basis for his experience of being elected. This function of knowledge is not described with the same clarity in the Dead Sea Scrolls. It is nevertheless evident that the Qumran covenanters learned from their writings about the nature of their election by the sovereign power of God, so that their knowledge had practically the same function as the knowledge described in Eph. i, 17-19.

That knowledge is by its very nature restricted to the Elect, or, as John the Evangelist says, to the believers.¹²⁶ Paul's view on the subject is similar, see I Cor. ii. In the Sectarian writings we find the imagery of DST: Only the trees which were hidden and planted by

120. אִישׁ כְּבוֹד (DSW XII, 9) might possibly be compared, see Yadin, *op.cit.* (note 12) *ad loc.* and מֶלֶךְ הַכְּבוֹד (ibid. XII, 7; cf. Psalms xxiv, 7-10).

121. The expression *πεφωτισμένοις τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας* is to be interpreted with the aid of DSD II, 3: *בדעת עולמים ויחונכה היים בשכל היים ויחונכה בלכא בשכל היים ויחונכה בלכא בשכל היים*. The phrase is an elaboration of the priestly blessings prescribed in Num. vi, 25: *יָאֵר ה' פְּנֵי אֱלֹהֵי וְיַחַנְךָ*. The biblical verse is made to refer to divine enlightenment by knowledge. See DSD IV, 2: *לְהַאֲרִיר בְּלִבְבֵי אִישׁ*, also *op.cit.* note 145, pp. 135-6, and see Test. Gad v, 7.

122. Cf. DST IX, 14: "I know that there is hope in Thy mercies and confidence in Thine abundant power."

123. Cf. DST XVI, 4: "I know that in Thy benevolence toward man Thou hast increased his inheritance." See also note 35 above.

124. Cf. DST IV, 27-9: "Thou madest me know Thy wondrous mysteries, and in Thy wondrous secret hast Thou shown Thy might through me showing wonders before many because of Thy glory and to make known to all living Thy might."

125. τὸ κράτος τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ. Cf. DST IV, 32-3: "so that all creatures shall know about the power of His might (בכוח גבורתו) and the multitude of His mercy towards all Sons of His will."

126. See C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge 1954, pp. 154-169.

God are watered by the hidden perennial stream of truth; other trees, even large ones, do not send their roots to the stream (col. VIII). The Elect "were shown what [all the f]lesh of ancient [times] did not [see]" (DST, XIII, 11; cf. Mt. xiii, 17; Luke x, 24; Rom. xvi, 25-6; Eph. iii, 5; Col. i, 26).¹²⁷ This means that the knowledge of the Qumran covenanters and early Christianity is esoteric; this is also the one *theologoumenon* common to the Qumran Sect and to the personal teaching of Jesus (Mark iv, 10-12; Mt. xiii, 10-15; Luke viii, 9-10). Even so, a fundamental difference between the two systems must not be forgotten: both teach that non-believers cannot acquire true knowledge, but only the Sect draws the practical consequence of actually forbidding the publication of the secret teaching. According to DSD IX, 17, the member of the Sect is commanded "to hide the counsel of the Law among the men of wickedness" (see DSD X, 24; DST V, 24-6; CDC XV, 10-11).

The last gift of the Spirit to be dealt with here is the ability of prayer "with the spirit" (I Cor. xiv, 14-15; see *Bul.* 153). The author of DST says: "And Thou didst give into my mouth thanksgiving and on my tongue [prai]se and didst circumcise my lips by the establishment of jubilation, and I shall sing about Thy mercy and about Thy might I shall converse all the day, always I shall praise Thy name and tell Thy glory among the sons of men and in the bounty of Thy goodness my soul will be delighted" (XI, 5-7). The praise is an expression of the spirit: "Be filled with the Spirit, converse with one another in the music of psalms, in hymns, and in spiritual songs, praise the Lord heartily, with words and music" (Eph. v, 18-20, cf. Col. iii, 16). Accordingly, DST mentions a "spirit in the tongue"¹²⁸: "Thou hast created the spirit in the tongue and known its words and prepared the fruit of lips¹²⁹ before they came into being, and Thou didst put the words in a line (i.e. due sequence) and (didst order) the expression of lips' spirit in measure..." (I, 27-31). This passage clearly states the praise uttered by the Elect to be a direct gift of Divine grace, granted as a consequence of pre-ordination.

Of course, the combination "spirit of x" need not always mean a spiritual quality granted by God: Thus "spirit of mercy" (רוח רחמים, πνεῦμα χάριτος) does not mean that the Elect are made merciful by the

127. See Licht, *op.cit.* (note 16) *ad loc.*

128. See Licht, "The Doctrine" etc. (note 21), pp. 99-100.

129. See note 55 above.

spirit, but expresses several times (DST XVI, 9; Hebr. x, 29; I Clem. xlvii, 6; Test. Judah xxiv, 3) a concept practically identical with the Holy Spirit, *i.e.* the Divine spirit which is given to men by Divine mercy. The expression "spirit of holiness" is even more difficult to define. In DSD III, 7 רוח קדושה seems to mean the quality of holiness granted to man, and somehow resembles the "holy thought" of DSD IV, 4-5; it seems at any rate to be different from the Holy Spirit (רוח קדוש) described above. In Greek we find πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης used in somewhat different contexts: in Test. Levi xviii, 7 it is a perfection characteristic of the future Messiah¹³⁰, in Rom. i, 4 it seems to define the Divine quality of Jesus.

IX. FLESH AND SPIRIT¹³¹

The contrast between the flesh and the spirit as presented by the New Testament had been the subject of lively discussion by scholars even before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Three corpuses of thought had to be compared with the NT in this respect: a) the Bible and its understanding of man; b) trends of Greek thought which contrasted matter and spirit and emphasized that the human body belongs to matter (e.g. Plato); c) the Gnosis, which also finds that the body, being material, is opposed to the spirit. The question discussed was: is the position of the NT in these matters an outgrowth of one or several of these systems or an independent creation? One point was clear: the NT usage of the expression "flesh" is certainly influenced by the OT; but this need not mean that the dualistic concept was developed entirely on the OT basis. There remained the possibility of a "pseudomorphosis" of OT anthropology and of dominant Greek influence in thought, if not in language. The last possibility was emphatically rejected by P. Bénéoit¹³², who asserted that Paul's anthropology was essentially identical with the OT position.

The discussion has been newly reopened since the Dead Sea Scrolls supplied us with a fourth corpus of thought to be compared with the New Testament doctrine about the flesh and the spirit. This is so because the contrast between the flesh and the spirit is also known

130. Dependent on Isa. xi, 2, which however does not include the words רוח קדושה.

131. On this chapter see also my Hebrew article in *Tarbiz* 27 (1957-8), 158-165.

132. P. Bénéoit, "Corps, tête et plérôme dans les épîtres de la captivité", *RB* 53 (1956), 8; for literature see *ib.* note 2.

to the Qumran authors, although they do not dwell on it with an emphasis comparable to the statements of Paul. The evaluation of this new fact has already led to a controversy between two scholars.¹³³ We have to re-examine the matter because it certainly comes under the heading of possible connections between the Dead Sea Scrolls and early Christian thought. Paul is not the only NT author who dealt with the contrast between the flesh and the spirit; John the Evangelist also says that "that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit" (John iii, 6). This agreement between Paul and John makes it probable that we are dealing with a *theologoumenon* belonging to the stratum described in the title of this paper as "Pre-Pauline Christianity." Since the same *theologoumenon* also occurs in the Dead Sea Scrolls, it is quite possible that the "flesh-spirit" dualism is another point common to the two doctrines and part of the system described in this paper. The problem in this case is the occurrence of very similar doctrines in Greek (and Gnostic) thought; this makes it necessary for us to prove or disprove the possibility of an alternative (or concurrent) Greek influence on the Scrolls and the NT.

It is interesting and important to notice that the term "flesh" in its specific meaning, with the whole complex of connected notions, does not occur in Qumran literature outside DST and the concluding psalm of DSD.¹³⁴ W. D. Davies¹³⁵, who rightly emphasizes this fact, explains it by the theory that the greater part of the Qumran writings reflects "an earlier 'uncontaminated' stage in the history of the sect before Hellenistic influences had deeply coloured its thought, while the psalms reflect a later stage, when this had taken place." The present writer¹³⁶ came, some years ago, also to the conclusion that DST and

133. G. Kuhn, "Temptation, Sin and Flesh" in Stendahl (note 1) pp. 101-8; W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls, Flesh and Spirit", *ibid.*, pp. 157-182. See also Licht, *op.cit.* (note 21), pp. 10-11, 92. — Cf. Max Weber, *Religionssoziologie* III, 1921, p. 426.

134. See also CDC III, 17, where the adversaries are described thus: הם התגוללו בפשע אנוש ובדרכי נדה.

135. *Op.cit.* (note 133), p. 165. See also E. Schweitzer, "Die hellenistische Komponente im neutestamentlichen σαρκ-*Begriff*", *ZNW* 48 (1957), 237-253.

136. "The Sect of the Judean Desert and its opinions", *Zion* 19 (1954), 100-3 (Hebrew). It may be significant that the script of DST is the latest stage of development amongst the Scrolls from Qumran, see N. Avigad, *supra*, p. 76-7.

the DSD psalm represent a later stage of Sectarian thought, partly because of their special anthropology, partly for other reasons. But the difference between the stages of Sectarian thought seemed to me perfectly amenable to explanation by inner development without the necessity of supposed outside influence.

There is indeed a basic difference between the contrast of flesh and spirit as understood by DST and the spirit-matter dualism of some Greeks. For Pythagorean, Platonic, Gnostic and similar trends, matter in itself was heavy, base and generally contemptible; their attitude to the human body was only a consequence of their general view of the universe. None of the Qumran writings, even those which do express some contempt of the flesh, shows this negative attitude towards the material world. Matter is morally neutral. The material world is regarded only as a wonderful Divine creation, worthy of admiration. The constant laws which govern this world, the "mysteries of wonder" of its creation, are contemplated as a proof of Divine might and preordainment, contrasted with human insignificance (DST I, 7-27). DSD (III, 17-18; cf. DST I, 15 and the text *QI*, p. 154, line 3) says that "He created man for the government of the world", thus betraying an almost positive attitude towards the enjoyment of material creation.¹³⁷ Of course, at the present time the world is under the rule of Belial, as we have seen, and thus, as a consequence of the *moral dualism*, it can be said that "the world is polluted by the ways of wickedness in the rule of Evil until the time of decisive judgment" (DSD IV, 19-20). The NT attitude to the world (κόσμος) is not as positive as the doctrines of the Scrolls so far published (although it is quite possible that some Qumran covenanters reached a more pessimistic position). Nevertheless, it is easier to explain the NT view as deriving not from a negative attitude to the material world in itself, but rather as a broadening of the opposition to this world which is under the rule of Satan.

Not only the world, but man, too, is polluted, according to DSD IV, 20-22, by the ways of wickedness or the "spirit of impurity." This view could possibly serve as a partial admission of the doctrine that man is impure and sinful by his very nature, a doctrine rather prominent in DST and the psalm at the end of DSD. Among ascetics who undertook, among other things, "to circumcise together the fore-skin of impulse and stiff neck" (DSD V, 5), some disgust with

137. *Ibid.*, p. 101-2.

ordinary human nature was inevitable. Thus the view is reached that man is not merely polluted by the rule of Evil, but that "human impurity" (DSD XI, 14-15) and the "sin of flesh" (ibid 12) are innate to those born of woman. Man is "a creature of clay, kneaded with water, a fundament of shame and a source of pollution, a cauldron of iniquity and a fabric of sin, a spirit errant and wayward" (DST I, 21-3). DST and the psalm in DSD use the term "flesh" to describe "the human nature at its basest, whatever is contemptible in man".¹³⁸ They also think that "to man belongs wickedness and to the fundament of flesh evil" (DSD XI, 9). Man is naturally enslaved by his criminal impulse. For Paul, too, "flesh" means baseness of human nature. He chastises his followers with the words: "For ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you envying and strife and divisions, are ye not carnal and walk as men?" (I Cor. iii, 3). The expression עוון בשר ("sin of the flesh", DSD XI, 12) recalls Rom. viii, 3. The use of the term "flesh" in this specific connotation is not restricted to Paul, but occurs elsewhere in the NT (see *Bul.* 152, 103); beside John iii, 6, already quoted, there are the common Christian expressions σαρκῶναι (σωματικαὶ) ἐπιθυμίαι; ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκός, which correspond to יצר בשר in DST X, 23.

σὰρξὸς ἐπιθυμίας

The origin of the concept "flesh" with its full theological connotation cannot be sufficiently explained by reference to some superficially similar uses of the word in the OT, nor by describing it as rationalization of some sort of sexual disgust with human nature, which might be characteristic of a community exhibiting ascetic tendencies. "Flesh" as a theological term could be coined only in the general context of the doctrine of election-by-grace accepted by both communities. As used by our sources, "flesh" means, to be precise, "humanity without the ennobling gift of Divine grace."¹³⁹ Therefore they can say that God "raised from flesh the glory" of the Elect (DST XV, 17), or: "From the company of flesh He has given those whom He has elected to an eternal inheritance" (DSD XI, 7). The Epistle to the Ephesians (ii, 3-7) states this explicitly: "... among whom (i.e. the sons of disobedience) all of us lived, we as well as you, when we obeyed the passions of our flesh, carrying out the dictates of the flesh and its impulses and were by nature the children of wrath like the rest of men. But... it is by grace you have been

138. Licht, "The Doctrine" etc. (note 21), p. 11.

139. *Ibid.*, p. 11.

saved (cf. Rom. vii, 5) . . . to display throughout ages the exceeding riches of His grace¹⁴⁰ in goodness towards us in Christ Jesus." A similar concept of election is expressed by DST: "For Thy glory Thou hast purified man from sin to make him sanctify himself¹⁴¹ for Thee from all abominations of impurity and guilt of iniquity" (XI, 10-11).

The election-of-grace, or raising from the iniquity of the flesh, functions through the Spirit granted to the Elect. Therefore it can be said that the Elect one is purified by the Spirit from his innate carnal pollution. This is another aspect of the "spirit of holiness" which, as we have seen (DSD III, 6-8), is connected with baptism. The specific purifying action of the Spirit is emphasized in the description of the final and absolute cleansing of man from sin in DSD IV, 20-22: "And then God will select the deeds of man¹⁴², and will purify for Himself the frame of man, consuming every spirit of evil from the tissues of his flesh, and cleansing him with the holy Spirit from all wicked deeds. And He will sprinkle upon him the Spirit of truth, like water for impurity, from all abominations of falsehood and wallowing in the spirit of impurity."¹⁴³ But the purifying action of the Spirit is by no means confined to the future (or to baptism), since the author of DST knows that God "sprinkled His Holy [Spirit]" upon the Elect "to atone for guilt" (frg. 2, 13; cf. VII, 7); he also requests God "to purify him by His Holy Spirit" (XVI, 12).¹⁴⁴

140. πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ (also i, 7) is the Hebrew המון רחמי a common expression in DST, where it has the same theological significance. It also appears (המון רחמי) in the Jewish Prayer Book (Singer, p. 237). This Hebrew expression is derived from the biblical המון מעיך ורחמיך ("the sounding of Thy bowels and of Thy mercies", Isa. lxiii, 15) which was shortened into המון רחמיך. In the original phrase המון meant approximately "sounding", but as used in DST, המון means multitude, cf. the parallel expressions רוב רחמים or המון רחמים or רוב סליחות or רוב סליחה (DST VI, 9, cf. *ibid.* IX, 34), see the glossary in Licht, *op.cit.* (note 16) for these terms. Hence the Greek translation πλοῦτος in Eph; and also πληθός in LXX Isa. lxiii, 15 (where מעיה is translated as "pity"); see further LXX Isa. xiv, 11.

141. See notes 104, 105 above.

142. An expression which occurs also En. xiv, 3 (on the future deeds of the Messiah).

143. The connection with John's words about the eschatological baptism by the spirit (Mark i, 8; Acts i, 5; xi, 16; Mt. iii, 11; Luke iii, 16) is sufficiently known. The DSD passage seems to imply the idea of bodily resurrection of a "spiritual body", cf. I Cor. xv, and perhaps Mishnah Sotah at end.

144. Some MSS of the NT (also Marcion) have in the Lord's Prayer (in

By the Spirit, the Elect one is not only cleansed from the pollution of the flesh, he is altogether freed from his human imperfections and made righteous, as DST says in a passage (IV, 29-33) which sums up the whole doctrine: "Who that is flesh could do aught like this, what thing formed of clay could do such great wonders? He is in iniquity from the womb, and in faithless guilt to old age. I know that righteousness does not belong to man, nor to a son of man perfection of way; to the Most High God belong all works of righteousness. A man's way is not established save by the spirit which God created for him, to make perfect the way for the sons of man, that all his creatures may know the might of His power and the multitude of His mercy to all the sons of His good pleasure."

Thus God raises whomsoever He chooses from his base carnal nature by granting the spirit. Both in the NT and in DST, there is a contrast between the presence and absence of the Holy Spirit in man who is of the flesh; it is this contrast which lies at the root of the "flesh-spirit" dualism. "So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God; but ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit — if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he does not belong to Him" (Rom. viii, 8-9; cf. ib. 4; I Cor. iii, 1-3). The flesh is unredeemed human nature, steeped in sin, the spirit is the Holy Spirit which brings redemption. Thus the Holy Spirit makes carnal man into spiritual man: this view of the Thanksgiving Scroll and the NT differs basically from the Greek and Gnostic view which regards both spirit and matter as elements inherent in the world in general and man in particular. Thus, from the theological point of view, the "flesh-spirit" dualism of the NT and some of the Scrolls should be regarded as self-sufficient and independent of Greek (or Gnostic) influence.

It cannot be denied, of course, that both views are very similar, and almost identical in their practical moral consequences. A man in contact with both Greek and Jewish thought must easily have combined these two doctrines. An instance of such combination or contamination is offered by Wisdom ix, 13-18¹⁴⁵: "For what man shall

Luke xi, 2) for "may Thy Kingdom come" the words: ἐλθέτω τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμά σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ καθαρῶσάτω ἡμᾶς. Evidently this version of the prayer was quite widespread among Hellenistic Christian communities. It can refer to the present (as in DST XVI, 12) or to the eschatological future (as in DSD IV, 20-22).

145. Professor I. L. Seeligmann called my attention to this passage; see his

know the counsel of God? Or who shall conceive what the Lord willeth? For the thoughts of a mortal are timorous, and our devices are prone to fail. For a corruptible body bears down on the soul, and the earthy frame¹⁴⁶ burdens on the mind that is full of cares. And hardly do we divine the things that are on earth, and the things that are close at hand we find with labour, but the things that are in the heavens who ever yet traced out? And who ever gained knowledge of Thy counsel, except Thou gavest wisdom, and sentest Thy Holy Spirit from on high? And it was thus that the ways of them which are on earth were made perfect, and men were taught the things that are pleasant unto Thee."

The main idea of the passage, that man cannot know the counsel of God, is Jewish. Here it is specifically motivated by a double argument: a) "For a corruptible body" etc. b) "And who ever gained knowledge of Thy counsel, except Thou gavest wisdom" etc. The first assertion (verse 15) has been recognized by scholars¹⁴⁷ as Greek: the second recalls Qumran theology. The first assertion is not only Greek in general but a direct verbal allusion to a well-known passage of Plato's *Phaedo* (81c): "and this bodily element, my friend, must be considered burdensome and heavy, and earthy and visible; and such a soul is borne down by it . . ." Plato's insistence on the earthiness of the human body recalled to our author's mind the Biblical story of man's creation from clay with its theological connotation. This theological significance of man's creation from clay is fully utilized on several occasions in DST, where it represents an organic part of the broader concept of human baseness and Divine grace, e.g.: "What then is man, earth is he, made from dust and to dust is his return, that Thou madest me understand such wonders and the secret

discussion in *Tarbiz* 27 (1957-8), 137-141. About the DSS and Sap. Sal. see also A. M. Dubarle, "Une source du livre de la Sagesse?", *Revue des sciences philos. et théol.* 1953, pp. 425-443.

146. τὸ γεῶδες σῆνος (cf. Job iv, 19). Cf. II Cor. v, 1 sqq., where Paul comes very near to the Hellenistic-gnostic type of dualism (according to *Bul.* 198-9) — a passage not quite typical of Paul's doctrine.

147. See the commentaries on Wisdom *ad loc.*, especially J. Fichtner, *Weisheit Salomos*, (in *Handbuch zum AT*) Tübingen 1938, pp. 36-9; K. Holmes in R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the OT*, 1913, I, 532, 550. — The connection between Wisdom and DST must not be understood as indication of Sectarian origin of the former, which is a typically Jewish Hellenistic composition. But the problem of a possible relationship between the Scrolls and Wisdom requires further study.

of Thy truth didst Thou make known to me. And I, dust and ashes, what shall I design without Thy wishing it, what shall I plan¹⁴⁸ without Thy will, how shall I be strong without Thy making me stand and how shall I understand without Thy creating for me (spirit)" (X, 3-7; see also XV, 21-2; XII, 11-13; 32-4). In the passage from Wisdom, we have not only an allusion to the general Jewish concept of man's creation from dust, but also the typically Sectarian combination of this concept with the idea that wisdom is unattainable by man, unless given by God, and that this granting of wisdom is a function of the Holy Spirit: "And who ever gained knowledge of Thy counsel, except Thou gavest wisdom, and sentest the Holy Spirit from on high?" What is more, the author of Wisdom adds at this point an idea which, strictly speaking, is beside the point of his argument, but which belongs to the corresponding doctrine of DST: "And it was thus (i.e. by the Holy Spirit) that the ways of them which are on earth were made perfect." The expression $\delta\iota\sigma\pi\rho\theta\acute{\omega}\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\ \alpha\iota\ \tau\epsilon\iota\beta\omicron\iota$ sounds like a translation of the Hebrew phrase in the above-quoted passage: "A man's way is not established (ודרך אנוש לוא תכון) except by the spirit which God created for him to make perfect the way for the sons of man (להתם דרך לבני אדם)" (DST IV, 31-2).¹⁴⁹

The concept of divinely granted knowledge, which the author of Wisdom used for his own purpose¹⁵⁰, figures largely in the system of DST. The author of this scroll not only mentions knowledge as one of the gifts of the Spirit (see above), but declares again and again that all he knows and tells is part of the God-granted knowledge¹⁵¹ which can be grasped only by those freed of their base human nature and granted the Spirit (see, e.g., DST XII, 11-13). The Holy Spirit is the only mediator of true knowledge, which is inaccessible to carnal man (DST XIII, 14-6; X, 3-7; XV, 21-2). The idea of knowledge by the spirit is thus also linked with the "spirit-flesh" dualism: "It is not (possible) for the spirit of flesh

148. See note 38 above.

149. Cf. DSD XI, 10-11: $\text{כִּי־אָדָם דְּרָכּוֹ וְאָנוּשׁ לֹא יִכֵּן צַעֲדָהּ כִּי־אֵל לֹאֵל הַמִּשְׁפָּט וּמִיָּדוֹ תוֹם הַדֶּרֶךְ$.

150. It enabled him to combine his own idea of the excellence of wisdom with notions taken over from other systems of thought. Another identification of wisdom and spirit occurs in Wisd. vii, 22, but there is an evident influence of the Stoic $\pi\epsilon\mu\mu\alpha$; see also Wisd. i, 5-7.

151. The idea is expressed in the recurring formula $\text{אֵלֶּה יָדַעְתִּי מִבִּינְתְּכָהּ}$ ("these I know from Thy understanding", DST I, 21; XIV, 12; XV, 12; DSW X, 16).

to understand all these" (XIII, 13-14). This means that the flesh has a kind of spirit of its own, which is a hindrance in the attainment of knowledge. The author of DST declares that he *does not possess* this spirit of the flesh (XVII, 25)¹⁵², but attains true knowledge by the spirit given to him by God: "And I, Thy servant, have known by the spirit which Thou hast given me (XIII, 18-19).

In DST we have only scattered remarks on the subject, while Paul offers a systematic exposition of the concept of wisdom granted by divine spirit (I Cor. ii, 10-iii, 4). His exposition is useful for the understanding of Sectarian noetics, even if it differs in some important points from all Sectarian writings known to us. According both to Paul and to the Sectarials, knowledge is a preordained gift; it is "hidden (wisdom) which God preordained before the world unto our glory" and "prepared for them that love him" (I Cor. ii, 7-9). Therefore it is wisdom spoken in mystery (ib. 7), which the Elect can grasp only with the help of the Spirit given from God: "But God had revealed them unto us by his spirit: for the spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit is in him? Even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.¹⁵³ Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us by God" (I Cor. ii, 10-12). The Elect were not only given the Spirit from God but they are also lacking the "spirit of the world", just as the author of DST says that "the spirit of the flesh" is not his (XVII, 25, see above). The difference between the Sectarian term "spirit of the flesh" and the Pauline term "spirit of the world" can be understood as a result of the Christian opposition to the "world" which, as we have seen, has no exact Sectarian parallel. This comparison will also make clearer another Pauline term, ψυχικός ἄνθρωπος ("man of soul", e.g. I Cor. ii, 14), which designates those who are not spiritual (πνευματικοί) and cannot grasp spiritual wisdom. This means that ψυχικός is practically identical with σαρκικός, the carnal man, mentioned

152. According to Licht's reliable restoration (because fitting the context).

153. Paul's reasoning (a minori ad maius) recalls Wisd. ix, 16-7 (quoted above): "And hardly do we divine the things that are on earth, and the things that are close at hand we find with labour; but... who ever gained knowledge of Thy counsel, except Thou... sendest Thy Holy Spirit from on high?" Wisdom requires further study.

later on in the exposition (I Cor. iii, 1).¹⁵⁴ Thus the "soul" of the "man of soul" (*ψυχικός*) seems to correspond in Pauline anthropology to the "spirit of the world", and to the "spirit of the flesh" in DST.¹⁵⁵

The Elect one has been redeemed from the realm of the flesh, but nevertheless counts on God's forgiveness should he "stumble by the iniquity of the flesh" (DSD XI, 12). He even knows that, being human, he is sinful and that "evil belongs to the fundament of flesh" (ib. 9). Thus he is both freed from the flesh and threatened by its influence, a paradox which corresponds to the one observed upon above, that he has the spirit and still asks for it. This apparent inconsistency is resolved when we remember that the Elect one, though raised from the realm of the flesh by the spirit, remains in fact a carnal creature. The same dialectic attitude is reflected in Pauline anthropology; he says on the one hand: "when we *were* in flesh . . ." (Rom. vii, 5) and on the other hand exhorts: "Walk in the Spirit and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other" (Gal. v, 16-17). Thus the Elect one wrestles all his life with his carnal nature, but is helped in his fight by the spirit given to him. He relies on the spirit and not on the flesh, as Paul (Phil. iii, 3) and the author of DST (VII, 17-18) both declare.

The contrast between the flesh and the spirit can be combined with the opposition of the Sons of Light to the Sons of Darkness, and thus produce additional aspects of the dualistic doctrine: the Sons of Light are the Elect, and it is they that were given the spirit, while those who belong to darkness remain carnal. This is the opinion of Paul: "For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit" (Rom. viii, 5), "for as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God" (ib. 14; cf. Gal. iv, 6). John has an even sharper formulation of the idea: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit" (iii, 6). Therefore the opposition of the "fruit of light" and "deeds of darkness"

154. See A. Robertson, *The First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, (I.C.C.) Edinburgh 1914, p. 49.

155. The whole complex demands further discussion, in which we cannot engage here. The division of mankind into three grades, *σωματικοί*, *ψυχικοί*, *πνευματικοί*, is Gnostic and later than Paul.

in Eph. v, 8–11¹⁵⁶ correspond to the "fruit of the spirit" and "deeds of the flesh" in Gal. v, 19–23. Both pairs of expressions mean the same thing. The "deeds of the flesh" and the "fruit of the spirit" are also enumerated in two lists of good and bad characteristics, which resemble the lists in DSD IV, 2–14. The one which deals with the fruit of the spirit shows even literary affinity.¹⁵⁷ Nevertheless it must be pointed out that only the NT identifies the realms of righteousness and wickedness with the domains of the spirit and the flesh. In Qumran literature we may infer that there was some tendency towards such an identification, but no direct statement of it can be found. It is thus possible that the early Christian community went a step further in this matter; but it is equally possible that the signs of such a step could be found in some Jewish document as yet undiscovered.

As we have seen, the "spirit-flesh" dualism of the NT and of some Qumran writings is based on the idea that man's base nature can be ennobled by the divine gift of the Spirit. This view is near enough to the Greek (and Gnostic) view that there are two principles in the nature of man, base matter and noble spirit. The two views could be combined by some thinkers in antiquity, but must not be confused by us. There is indeed some danger to a monotheistic system in the idea that matter is base: Did not the one wise and benevolent God create all, including matter? This reflection enables us to understand why the idea that the body, being material, belongs to the devil, is dramatically denied by *Assumptio Mosis*, a book which shows some dualistic and predestinational¹⁵⁸ tendencies. According to this book¹⁵⁹, there was a dispute about Moses' body between the archangel Michael¹⁶⁰ and the Devil. The Devil argued: "This body is mine,

156. In Eph. v, 8, Christians are called "children of Light."

157. In the list of the "fruit of the spirit", ἀγάπη corresponds to רוב חסדים על כול בני אמת; χαρά = שמחת עולמים; εὐφροσύνη = רוב שלום; μακροθυμία = חכמת גבורה מאמנת ככול מעשי; πίστις = טוב עולמים; ἀγαθωσύνη = אורך אפים; ἀγαθή = טהרת כבוד מתעב כול גלולי נדה; ἐγκράτεια = רוח ענוה; ἀγαθή (?) = טהרת כבוד מתעב כול גלולי נדה. (It is interesting to notice that some texts add here ἀγαθή). There is no term corresponding to ἡλικιότης in the list of DSD.

158. See especially *Assumptio Mosis* xii, 4–5.

159. See *The Assumption of Moses*, ed. R. H. Charles, London 1897. My attention was called to this matter by S. E. Loewenstamm, to whom my thanks are due. See his paper on the subject in *Tarbiz* 27 (1957–8), 155–7.

160. He is the "Prince of Lights" of the Scrolls, see Yadin, *op.cit.* (note 12), p. 214–5.

because I rule over matter." Michael replies that we were all created by the Holy Spirit of God and that God is Lord of the spirits and of all flesh.¹⁶¹ *Assumptio Mosis* was written approximately at the time of Paul and Simon Magus, who was an early Gnostic. The view rejected in the passage is not the Greek dualistic view, but rather the gnostic standpoint, because only the Gnosis taught that matter is not merely burdensome but also the realm of satanic powers.¹⁶² Again we must ask whether the Gnostic view as opposed to the Christian-Qumranic view was purely Greek in origin, or whether it might best be explained as a final and consistent fusion of the Greek contempt for matter with doctrines about the rule of Evil in this world, the flesh and the spirit, such as were taught among the Qumran covenants and some early Christians.

X. CONCLUSION

The number and importance of the notions we have shown to be common to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Pre-Pauline Christianity mean that these points of contact cannot be explained away as incidental. Therefore the question of their historical significance has to be discussed.¹⁶³

The terms dealt with in this paper were evidently coined in the Hebrew language and passed in a Hebrew literary medium into Christianity.¹⁶⁴ They passed as true meaningful theological terms, not

161. Cf. Num xvi, 22; xxvii, 16 (in the LXX version). The formula "Lord of Spirits" is frequent in *Enoch*; cf. also רוח לכול ארון in DST X, 8 and Licht's note *ad loc.* See A. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*⁴, 1923, p. 355.

162. See H. Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist* I, 1934, pp. 146-156.

163. The Epistle to the Ephesians shows particularly numerous points of contact with the Scrolls (see next note). This observation is relevant to the question of its date; it makes the assumption of a late date highly improbable, as the strong links with Qumran theology would then be hard to explain.

164. It will be convenient to list some instances already mentioned: πλοῦτος χάριτος (Eph. i, 7; ii, 7) = המון רחמים (DST *passim*); κολλώμενοι τῷ ἀγαθῷ (Rom. xii, 9) = כול מעשי טוב (DSD I, 5); τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ (Eph. i, 9) = רוי חפצו (DST frg. 3, 7); τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας (II Thess. ii, 7) = רוי פשע (DST V, 36, see Licht's note *ad loc.*); ἡ βουλὴ τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ (Eph. i, 11) = חפצי רצונו (CDC III, 15); ἀνεύγκαι πνευματικὰς θυσίας εὐπροσδέκτους θεῷ (I Peter ii, 5) = ... קריב ריח ניחוח (DSD VIII, 9-10); ὅτι (τέκνα) τοῦ φωτός = בני אור (see above note 13); τὸ κράτος τῆς λαχῶς αὐτοῦ (Eph. I, 19) = כוח גבורתו (DST IV, 32); πνεῦμα πραΰτητος (Gal. vi, 1; I Cor. iv, 21) = רוח ענוה (DSD IV, 3); κληρος τῶν ἁγίων (Col. i, 12, angels) = גורל קדושים (DSD XI, 7-8);

as empty or vague locutions.¹⁶⁵ Neither were these terms unrelated: they combine easily into a complete religious system, which can be summed up thus:

the world is divided into the realms of good and evil; mankind consists of the two camps: the Sons of Light — actually the community itself — and those who are of the Devil.¹⁶⁶ The division is preordained by the sovereign will of God (double predestination). The Sons of Light are the Elect of Divine grace and were granted the Spirit which frees them from the sins of the flesh. Baptism functions as a means of atonement. The company of the Elect is a kind of spiritual temple; this company is constituted by a new covenant with God; this covenant is eschatological and additional to the old covenant made with Israel.

This summary contains practically all that is important in the teaching of the Qumran covenanters. It is quite possible that some — or even the majority — of the ideas taught by the Sect did not originate in the Sect, but all of them were developed in the Sect and given their characteristic formulation and full meaning; the Sect combined them into the system discussed above. This system cannot by any means be

ἀγιασθῆναι (in connection with baptism) = שְׂרַחֵל (see above); ἄγιοι καὶ ἄμωμοι (Eph. i, 4, cf. v, 27) = שְׂרַחֵל וְאֵי תְּמִים (see above). Another instance of the influence of Qumran theology on the second Christian stratum is the use of the words λύτρωσις, ἀπολύτρωσις, which correspond to the Hebrew מִדָּבָר (see LXX Psalms cxī, 9; cxxx, 7). This is the term used by the Scrolls throughout to express the notion of salvation, the obvious לָנָה (and לְנָה) being studiously avoided by Qumran authors (for some unknown reason). In the NT, ἀπολύτρωσις, which means freeing by payment, ransom, is a significant term, but it is not always used in its original Greek sense. "It is only by a forced explanation that the idea of payment can be brought in" (Abbot in *op.cit.*, note 36 above, p. 12). The difficulty disappears if we suppose that ἀπολύτρωσις in these places is not originally Greek, but a translation of Hebrew מִדָּבָר used in the Qumran manner (the literal meaning of the root מִדָּבָר being "to free by ransom").

165. See the interesting observation of Fridolin Stier, "Die Urkunden aus den Höhlen", *Hochland* 48, (1956), 425-6: "So beginnt der Sektenkanon, in feierlichen, von der Fracht theologischer Termini überladenen Perioden. Im Alten Testament ohne Vorbild, gemahnt diese Sprache an manche Partien paulinischer Episteln [Röm., Eph.]. S. Zeitlin charakterisiert diese Sätze verächtlich als blosses 'Wortgehäuf'. Es wäre besser, stilpsychologisch und formgeschichtlich zu fragen, welche Geistesverfassung hier wie bei Paulus solche Sätze prägte."

166. This summary lists only notions which actually occur in the NT; therefore the facile formulation "The Sons of Darkness" must be avoided.

described as reflecting notions accepted by Judaism generally; at some points it even contradicts Rabbinic Judaism; for instance, the idea that immersion has anything to do with the forgiveness of sins is quite foreign to the latter. We have also seen that the theological system of the Sect functioned as a kind of ideology or theoretical justification for a socially separatist movement: the Sect regards itself as the company of the "Sons of Light" and separates from the "people of wickedness" by going into the desert (DSD VIII, 13) and by living a strict communal life. The doctrine of election gives them the certainty that the separation is necessary and willed by God; their teaching, which compares their organization to the Temple, frees them from dependence on the Jerusalem Temple service and severs all ritualistic links with the rest of Jewry. All this means practically that the whole body of ideas described above could have come into Christianity only from the Qumran Sect¹⁶⁷: it is not sufficient to presume that we are dealing with ideas that were generally diffused among Jews. Of course, it is not our intention to argue that the body of ideas passed into Christianity directly from the Sect; it is quite probable that it passed through several groups and movements¹⁶⁸ (which were more or less influenced by Sectarian thought) before arriving at the points where it can be observed through some writings of the New Testament.

The doctrine of the Qumran covenanters did not retain its original function when assimilated by Christianity. The practical social consequences, the organisation of a close-knit community, is the most conspicuous item *not* taken over. Christians used whatever they learned from the Qumran doctrine mainly to establish their own anthropology and their own ideal about the Church as *Civitas Dei*. A simile equally familiar to our writings and among historians will help to describe the process: the theological structure of the Sect was taken apart and

167. This would be a highly improbable assumption if we were dealing with an obscure and unknown little sect without means of influencing Israel or the world. But the numerous points of contact with what had been known hitherto about the Essenes are a sufficient answer to this objection. The evidence of the influence of the Qumran covenanters on other men is another sign of their Essene identity: the Essenes were, of course, well-known and influential.

168. Only John the Baptist is known to us, who has been recognized by numerous scholars as being close to the Sect, but not quite identical with it. Other "fellow travellers" are the author of *Duo Viae* (see note 116 above) and the author of the *Testaments of the Patriarchs*; both have a watered-down version of the Sectarian doctrine of double predestination.

the stones re-used by early Christian thinkers to build a new and different house. Much other material also went into the construction of this new and larger edifice: both stones taken from other ancient houses (Greek and Jewish) and stones hewn out of truly original unprecedented Christian religious experience. Our image indeed ceases to be adequate at this point. The material was not only collected, but fused, refashioned and enriched by the impact of the personality and teaching of Jesus and the tremendous creative forces unleashed by the new faith. The one important instance is the Christology of the new religion, which has no true parallel. Therefore research on the Dead Sea Scrolls will never replace the study of Christian origins, but it will help us to understand some important aspects of early Christianity.¹⁶⁹

David Flusser

169. An essay by the present author on some possible conclusions to be drawn from the Scrolls in the field of Christian theology will shortly be published in *Prenves*.