

## SOME REMARKS TO *IQSa*, TO *IQSb*, AND TO QUMRAN MESSIANISM

THIS article is dedicated to J. T. Milik, who is the true discoverer of the basic methods for the reconstruction of heavily damaged scrolls from scattered fragments without any help by a known parallel text. (1) His masterly editions of the “*Dires de Moïse*” (*IQ22*), and of the “*Recueil des Bénédictiones*” (*IQ28b = IQSb*), in the first volume of *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, 1955, are the decisive proof for the truth of this statement. (2) I hope very much that he will enjoy some further suggestions to his pioneering edition of *IQSb*, and — together with D. Barthélemy — of *IQSa*, (3) more than four decades ago.

This article (4) argues that *IQSa* is the earliest rule-book of the Essenes, being composed not only prior to the so-called *Damascus Document*, but also prior to *IQS V-XI* at least in its *present* form, i.e., including the secondary section VIII,15b - IX,11. (5) When *IQSa* and *IQSb* were completed, the Essenes already expected the future coming of the Royal Messiah close to the door. But “the priest” of *IQSa* II,19, and the High Priest of *IQSb*, are no messianic figures. The ideas of a future Priestly Messiah and of a future prophet according to *IQS IX,11*, or *4QTestimonia*, were developed by the Essenes only *after* the composition of *IQSa* and *IQSb*.

(1) In my article “Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments”, in: *Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. by L. H. Schiffman, Sheffield 1990, 189-220, I described this method in some detail. Therefore, there are some references to it like “the Stegemann-method”. But the true inaugurator of this method is J. T. Milik.

(2) See the arrangement of the fragments in *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I. Qumran Cave I*, by D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, Oxford 1955, plates XVIII-XIX (*IQ22*), and p. 119 + plates XXV-XXIX (*IQSb*).

(3) See *ibid.*, p. 109 note 1, and remarks like those to *IQSa* II,11-12, pp. 117f, where D. Barthélemy hints to contributions by J. T. Milik.

(4) This article is the revised and augmented version of a paper with the same title, which I read at the IOQS Paris Meeting on July 18, 1992.

(5) See below, p. 496.

The argumentation of this article is based on the formal and textual evidence of *IQSa* and of *IQSb* with some new textual restorations or revisions of former readings. Finally, the results of this evaluation are imbedded into the history of Jewish Messianism in the second and first century BCE.

But because *IQSa* and *IQSb* come from the same scroll as *IQS* I-XI, (6) the material evidence of the whole scroll should be presented before the special evidence of *IQSa* and *IQSb* can be discussed in detail.

### A description of the scroll *IQS/Sa/Sb*

#### *The length of the scroll*

The scroll which included *IQS* I-XI had a considerable length. At its beginning, 9 cm of its opening handle-sheet survived with a sewing-seam at its left edge. (7) This handle-sheet is followed by 11 columns on 5 sheets of leather, which were sewn together. The first sheet represents columns I-III, the second columns IV-V, the third columns VI-VII, the fourth columns VIII-X, the fifth only column XI. (8) The length of this part of the scroll is about 189 cm. The next sheet with *IQSa* I-II measures 29,5 cm. It is followed by a further sheet with columns I-IV of *IQSb*, and by the beginning of the next sheet with *IQSb* column V. (9) The total material remainders of *IQSb* occupy about 72,5 cm.

Therefore, the preserved length of this scroll is about 300 cm. The handle-sheet at its beginning may have been some centimetres broader, while the former final handle-sheet is missing at all. Furthermore, 1-2 additional columns of *IQSb* with the continuation of the blessing of the Royal Messiah are lost. (10) Including all these lost parts, this scroll originally should have measured at least about 350 cm.

Like some other scrolls from Qumran's Cave 1, *IQS/Sa/Sb* was hidden in its cave with the beginning of its text in the innermost layers

(6) This is explicitly stated by D. Barthélemy and by J. T. Milik in their *editio princeps*, *op. cit.* note 2, pp. 107 and 119.

(7) See *ibid.*, plate XXII.

(8) The sewing-seams between the opening handle-sheet and column I, and those between columns III/IV, VII/VIII, X/XI, are recognizable in the *editio princeps*, see *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery. Fascicle 2: Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline*, ed. by M. Burrows, New Haven 1951. The upper part of the sewing-seam between columns V/VI is visible on a colour-photo by J. C. Trever in: *Scrolls from Qumran Cave I*, ed. by F. M. Cross, D. N. Freedman, and J. A. Sanders, Jerusalem 1972, 135. The sewing-seam between *IQS*, column XI, and *IQSa*, column I, is portrayed on plate XXIII of the *editio princeps* of *IQSa*, *op. cit.* note 2.

(9) See the evidence *ibid.*, plates XXIII-XXIX.

(10) See below, p. 509.

of the scroll and the final columns outside. (11) Therefore, the interior sheets with the columns *IQS* I-XI are much better preserved than the outer layers with *IQSa* I-II, and *IQSb* I-V. The shapes of damage in these columns attest, nevertheless, that *IQSa* I-II and *IQSb* I-V immediately followed *IQS* I-XI according to the suggestions of D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik in the *editio princeps*. The question whether — or not — further sheets and columns once followed in this scroll after the end of *IQSb* cannot be answered.

### *The sections of the scroll IQS/Sa/Sb*

The text of *IQSa* and of *IQSb* starts at the top of their opening columns after blanks in the bottom parts of the columns before. Furthermore, *IQSa* I-II is separated from *IQS* I-XI as well as from *IQSb* I-V by sewing-seams. Therefore, one might argue that in this scroll different texts are only sewn together but not combined in a literary manner. But this opinion would clearly be wrong.

The scroll starts with an agenda for the yearly assembly of the Essenes' whole Yahad *IQS* I,1 - III,12. The title of this agenda is סרך היחוד. This fact is clearly evidenced as well by the beginning of the table of contents on the back of the opening handle-sheet with [סר]ך היחוד ומן [...] as by ספר סרך [ס]פֶר׃ ספֶר׃ היחוד in *IQS* I,1, restored with the help of ספר סרך היחוד in *pap4QSa* (4Q255) I 1. (12) The designation סרך היחוד is repeated within the agenda *IQS* I,16, but missing in all further parts of the scroll from *IQS* III,13 onwards. Therefore, the designation "Serekh ha-Yahad" should be restricted to *IQS* I,1-III,12 and should not be extended to other parts of this scroll.

The third literary entity of this scroll, *IQS* V-XI, starts with וזה הסרך לאנשי היחוד. Originally, this was a separate "book" introduced by מדרש למשכיל על אנשי התורה, see *4QSc*<sup>b</sup> 5,I,1 (4Q256), and *4QSc*<sup>d</sup> (4Q258) 1,I,1 (13), where the entire scroll starts with those words. In *IQS* V,1 the former למשכיל is dropped, מדרש is replaced by הסרך, and התורה by היחוד. The introduction of this new opening by וזה clearly relates the section *IQS* V-XI to *IQS* I,1 - III,12 in the sense of a second "Serekh", which mainly regulates the life-style within the Yahad.

In the very same redactional manner also *IQSa* is related as a "third rule-book" to its predecessors *IQS* I,1 - III,12, and *IQS* V-XI. Its opening line starts now with the words וזה הסרך לכול עדת ישראל *IQSa* I,1. Unfortunately, no further copy of *IQSa* is known. Therefore, its pre-

(11) See *IQ22*, *IQ27*, *IQHodayot*, and *IQMilhama*. Among the scrolls from Cave 4, see *4Q2*, *4Q174*, *4Q428*, *4Q432* and *4Q401*.

(12) See *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents*, ed. by J. H. Charlesworth, Tübingen/Louisville 1994, 58.

(13) See *ibid.*, p. 60 (*4QSc*<sup>b</sup> fragment 5,1) and p. 72 (*4QSc*<sup>d</sup> fragment 1,1,1).

vious opening — or its original title — remain unknown to us. Nevertheless, there should be no doubt that *IQSa* (a) was formerly composed as a work of its own and (b) is now related — by וְהָה — to the forerunning parts of this scroll.

Therefore, the literary relationship between *IQS* I,1, *IQS* V,1, and *IQSa* I,1, evidently demonstrates that these three “rule-books” were not only sewn together, but were combined in a secondary stage of their literary transmission, which is now well attested by the scroll *IQS/Sa/Sb*.

In contrary to the evidence of *IQS* V,1, and of *IQSa* I,1, the agenda of blessings *IQSb* is introduced asyndetically with the words דְּבַרֵי אֱלֹהִים בְּרַכְּתָהּ לְמַשְׁכִּיל לְבָרֵךְ אֶת יְרֵאֵי אֱלֹהִים. In this case, only the material evidence (a) that *IQSb* is a further part of the same scroll like *IQS* I-XI, and *IQSa* I-II, (b) that it was copied by the same scribe like all columns before, and (c) that again — like in the case of *IQSa* — its text starts in the top-line of a column after a blank in the bottom part of the column before indicates that also *IQSb* was regarded by the copyist of *IQS/Sa/Sb* — or already by his forerunner — as an integral part of the whole arrangement of various, formally independent works in this scroll.

Also the section on the Two Spirits *IQS* III,13 - IV,26 is asyndetically introduced by וְלִמְשָׁכִיל לְהַבִּין וּלְלַמֵּד אֶת כּוֹל בְּנֵי אֹרֶר. Whether this arrangement of texts is accidental, or the section on the Two Spirits was a traditional appendix to the agenda *IQS* I,1 - III,12, is questionable. The only other manuscript which materially has a parallel text to *IQS* I,1 - III,12 followed by at least some kind of a version of the Two Spirits is *pap4QSc* (4Q257); but no equivalent to *IQS* V-XI, or to *IQSa/Sb*, survived from this scroll. (14) From *4QSc* (4Q256) parallel text to *IQS* I,1 - III,12 as well as to *IQS* V-XI survived; but whether also the section on the Two Spirits was included into this scroll, is still problematic. (15)

The evidence of *IQS* is somewhat curious in this respect. The fact that the column *IQS* XI is written on a separate sheet with sewing-seams on both edges has no real parallel in the larger Qumran scrolls. Furthermore, all other columns of *IQS/Sa/Sb* have in the original manuscript clear vertical and horizontal dry-lines, while there is no trace of any dry-line on the sheet *IQS* XI. (16) This curious evidence points to some kind of secondary makeshift. How could it happen?

(14) See the complete fragmentary evidence of this scroll *ibid.*, 68 and 70.

(15) See *ibid.*, 60-66. The problem, whether *4QSc* contained the section on the Two Spirits or not, will be discussed by Sarianna Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (forthcoming). I am still hesitant.

(16) In the editions of *IQS/Sa/Sb* the dry-lines are not visible as they were not drawn by ink. But the original manuscripts show them quite clear. Usually, the original manuscript of *IQS* I-XI is in exhibition in the Shrine of the Book in Jerusalem, where the exceptional evidence of its column XI can easily be studied.

The scroll *IQS/Sa/Sb* was prepared in the workshop in such a way that every new section in this arrangement could start on a new sheet after a sewing-seam, see *IQS* I, *IQSa* I, and *IQSb* I. The only exception is the section *IQS* V-XI which starts at the top of the *second* column of the second sheet of this scroll. Perhaps, the 7 columns on the second, third, and fourth sheet of this scroll were originally prepared for the text of the seven columns *IQS* V-XI. But as the scribe — additionally — filled in the text of the Two Spirits in *IQS* III,13-26 + IV,1-26, only 6 columns remained for the long text *IQS* V-XI, and a further sheet with the single column *IQS* XI must to be added at the end of this section.

At present, one can only speculate on these curious findings. Was it arbitrary to add the section on the Two Spirits to the agenda *IQS* I,1 - III,12, or to omit it? Did the workshop, where the sheets of leather were sewn together and prepared by dry-lines, use another *Vorlage* — without the section on the Two Spirits — for the preparation of the scroll than the scribe who finally filled in the text? At least the scribe's final misfortune to reach the end of the sheet with *IQS* columns VIII-X without having been able to arrange the full text of *IQS* V-XI within the sheets prepared for it — a sheet for a further column need to be inserted into the scroll — will help us to understand better some trouble with the number of lines in the columns of *IQSa* and *IQSb* for the former scribe and for the modern editors. (17)

#### *The number of lines in the columns of IQS/Sa/Sb*

The height of the scroll *IQS/Sa/Sb* is close to 24 cm. Regularly, each column had 26 lines, but there are some exceptions to this rule. The final 4 lines of columns XI and XIII (= *IQSa* II) are unwritten as the writer started to copy the next section in the top of the following columns. The third sheet of this scroll with *IQS* VI-VII was ruled in a way that 27 lines occupy just the same space as 26 lines in the columns before and afterwards. Moreover, the scribe totally skipped the three lines 7 to 9 in column VII as he experienced that the leather in the final third of those lines was rather bad: (18) his last word in line 6 had become crumbled. Later on, a corrector erased this word and repeated it in the beginning of line 7. Therefore, only the totally blank two lines 8 to 9 were not numbered in the edition with the misleading result of only 25 lines in this column instead of the true number of 27 lines. Column VIII had again only 26 lines; but the scribe created an additional line 27

(17) See below, pp. 495, 505 and 508.

(18) This damage of the sheet was caused by a bone-hole at its left edge, which is very clear in the original manuscript (see above, note 16), but can be detected also on the colour-photo of *IQS* column VIII at the right hand side of lines 12-15, see the edition by F. M. Cross *et alii* (*op. cit.*, note 8), p. 141.

by a single word, which he had forgotten in the transition to the next column IX. The last preserved sheet of this scroll starts — after a sewing-seam — with column XVIII (= *IQSb* V) adding within the bottom part of that column one more line to the written space of the columns before; but how many lines were regularly in *IQSb* I-IV?

The most irregular evidence of this scroll is its column XII (= *IQSa* I). Here 29 lines are written in a rather narrow manner within the same space of the column, which is occupied by only 26 lines in *IQS* I-V and VIII-X, or by 27 lines in columns VI-VII. But the next column XIII (= *IQSa* II) has again lines which are written in the same distance from one another like in *IQS* I-V, or VIII-XI. Columns XIV-XVIII (= *IQSb* I-V) continue the line-distances of column XIII (= *IQSa* II), not the much narrower distances of column XII (= *IQSa* I). The result is that columns XIV-XVII (= *IQSb* I-IV) originally had only 26 lines each, not 28 lines as suggested by J. T. Milik in his edition, (19) while column XVIII (= *IQSb* V) had 27 lines instead of 29 lines in the editio princeps. This reduced evidence — two lines less in each column of *IQSb* — will help afterwards to establish the true length of the different blessings in this agenda. (20)

#### *The script of IQS/Sa/Sb*

The scroll *IQS/Sa/Sb* was written about 100 BCE or, at the latest, within the time-span 100-75 BCE by the same scribe who also copied the four quotations of *4QTestimonia* (4Q175) on a separate sheet.

In his book *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls* Malachi Martin argued in 1958 that three different scribes shared in the final result of *IQS/Sa/Sb*. According to Martin, scribe A wrote the whole text from the beginning (*IQS* I,1) to the end (*IQSb* V), while scribe B wrote the two columns of *IQSa*, the top part of *IQSb* III, and — perhaps — a few lines in the bottom part of *IQSb* II. A third scribe C put the title of the entire scroll on the back of its opening handle-sheet. (21)

The last observation regarding “scribe C” is obvious. But there is no real difference between “scribe A” and “scribe B”. All observations of M. Martin are within the range of scribal variations of one and the same copyist. Particularly the peculiar evidence of *IQSa*, where the script may look slightly different from that in *IQS* I-XI, is easily to explain. After his misfortune to fill the text of *IQS* I-XI into the

(19) J. T. Milik noted in his edition (*op.cit.*, note 2): “Dans les transcriptions on a mis conventionnellement 28 lignes (et 29 pour la col. V) par colonne” (p. 119). Indeed, he continued the number of lines in *IQSa*, column I, without paying attention to the larger distances between the lines in all columns after it.

(20) See below, pp. 505-509.

(21) See M. Martin, *The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Bibliothèque du Muséon, volumes 44+45), Louvain 1958, volume I, p. 55.

10 columns prepared for it — an additional sheet with column XI need to be inserted into the scroll! — the scribe tried from the very beginning of writing *IQSa* to fill its text into the 2 columns, which were prepared for it. In the first column of *IQSa* the scribe did not keep to the horizontal dry-lines, but, instead, put 29 lines into the space, which was prepared for only 26 lines. Furthermore, he wrote the text much narrower than in *IQS* I-XI, and he continued his lines closer to the left margin than in the columns before. Only after he had completed the first column, the scribe was convinced to be able to arrange the rest of the text within the 26 lines of column II, where the script is still narrow, but keeps to the ruled dry-lines of the prepared scroll. The slightly different appearance of the hand of *IQSa* compared to *IQS* I-XI is much better explained if both parts were written by the same scribe than by the postulate of two different scribes.

Indeed, there are at least three further observations which clearly demonstrate that *IQS* I-XI and *IQSa* I-II were written by the same scribe:

(a) At points where we might put a comma into a sentence, this scribe tends to continue his text 2-3 millimetres above the end of the word before. This scribal custom is evidenced by *IQS* I-XI as well as by *IQSa*. (22)

(b) The scribe had the tendency to write two words together like one word where the Masora later on would put a small horizontal stroke between the upper part of two words, the so-called *maqeph*. For example, אַתְּ כֹל is written in two words in *IQS* I,4.7 and V,22, but as one word — אַתְּכֹל — in *IQS* II,1.4; V,18, and IX,13 as in *IQSa* I,4.23. This peculiar scribal custom again links the different parts of this scroll with one another. (23)

(c) Last but not least, the identity of the scribe of *IQSa* with that of *IQS* I-XI is attested at the best by a scribal custom to which very few Qumran scribes adhered and which as yet has not been noticed in the editions or in secondary research. In *IQSa* I,14 and II,12 the name יִשְׂרָאֵל is written in a quite normal manner. But in *IQSa* I,1.6.20 and II,2.14.20 the final two letters of this name, i.e., its component אַל are written in an unusual broad and tall manner. This is not a special rende-

(22) See, e.g., the higher position of ועָנוּ וְאָמְרוּ *IQS* II,5, of הַכֹּהֲנִים *IQS* II,19, or of ... לְאֵלֵימָוֶת וּמָאוֹת *IQS* II,21, compared to the higher position of וְכֹל *IQSa* II,4.5, or of יְבוּא *IQSa* II,12.

(23) Many other words are also written like one word, see, e.g., מַעֲשֵׂי שׁוֹב *IQS* I,5, כֹּל בְּנֵי *IQS*, I,9.10, or וְאִפְסָתוֹב in *4QMMT<sup>d</sup>* (4Q397) fragment 18,12, see *DJD* X, Oxford 1994, plate VI. Usually these graphical findings are not noted in the editions, see, e.g., the text by E. Qimron in *DJD* X, p. 58, line 12 and his note on this line p. 59.

ring of God's name אֱלֹהִים, which is in *IQS/Sa/Sb* always written like all other words, but some kind of reverential writing of the name יִשְׂרָאֵל, which became also later on in Christian codices one of the so-called *nomina sacra*. (24) Evidently, the same kind of reverential writing of יִשְׂרָאֵל, which so often occurs in *IQSa*, is attested as well in *IQS* VIII,12, less clearly perhaps in VIII,4.11, while the other 12 examples of יִשְׂרָאֵל in *IQS* I-XI are not written in an extraordinary manner. (25) The finding of this reverential writing of יִשְׂרָאֵל as well in *IQS* I-XI as in *IQSa* should be the decisive proof that both parts of this scroll were indeed written by the very same scribe.

### Parallel texts

There is no need here to discuss all peculiarities of the parallel texts to *IQS/Sa/Sb* from other Qumran caves, i.e., *4QS<sup>a-j</sup>* and *5QS* (*5Q11*). Only two of their findings are important for the argumentation in this article.

The manuscript *4QS<sup>e</sup>*, which is represented by *4Q259* and by *4Q319* (= *4QOtot*), shows a textual version older than *IQS/Sa/Sb*. Instead of the calendric section *IQS* IX,26 - XI,22, *4QS<sup>e</sup>* offers another calendric section, which is still orientated to the priestly office at the temple in Jerusalem. At the same time, the long passage of *IQS* VIII,15b - IX,11 with its final hint to three future authoritative figures — עַד בּוֹא נְבִיא וּמְשִׁיחֵי אֲדָרֹן וְיִשְׂרָאֵל — is still missing in *4QS<sup>e</sup>*. (26) Therefore, no hint to any messiah was included into the primary stages of literary development of *IQS* V-XI.

The second, again negative finding is that nowhere in those parallel manuscripts from the Qumran caves is any hint that *IQSa* and/or *IQSb* were included into them, but there are, instead, indications that another text than *IQSa* or *IQSb* could follow after *IQS* I-XI. The manuscript *4QS<sup>b</sup>* (*4Q256*) from "herodian times" (circa 30-1 BCE) has corresponding text as well to *IQS* I,1 - III,12 as to *IQS* V-XI including its final hymn. Nevertheless, this manuscript is evidently not a copy from *IQS/Sa/Sb*, as, e.g., it still offers ... מִדְרַשׁ לְמִשְׁכֵּל instead of ... זוֹהַ הַסֵּרֶךְ *IQS* V,1. The last fragment 4 of *4QS<sup>b</sup>* comes from the top of a column

(24) See, e.g., the lists by J. O'Callaghan, "Nomina Sacra" in *Papyris Graecis Saeculi III Neotestamentariis*, Rome 1970, 71-81.

(25) A further example of this peculiar manner of writing the name "Israel" is probably *4QM<sup>a</sup>* (*4Q491*) 11,1,20, where at the end of the line the top of a rather tall ל survived, see *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert VII*, ed. by M. Baillet, Oxford 1982, 27, and plate VI.

(26) See *op. cit.* note 12, p. 88, the evidence of *4QS<sup>e</sup>* fragment 1,III,6.

with remainders of its lines 1-2. (27) Line 1 has יְבִין לְמִהּ and a clear *vacat* afterwards, which evidently corresponds to וּלְעֵצָה מִזֶּה יְבִין at the very end of *IQS* XI,22. Line 2 has כְּכֹל אֵל [ from about the midst of that line, which does not agree to the findings either of *IQSa* I,1 or of *IQSb*. The text of line 2 will come from the beginning of some other work or from a secondary final rubric to *IQS* I-XI, which is not attested by *IQS*. (28)

To sum up: no further evidence corresponding to *IQSa* and/or *IQSb* has been found among the other Qumran manuscripts, but only one finding — fragment 4 of *4QS<sup>b</sup>* — which, perhaps, offers the beginning of another work after *IQS* I-XI. Therefore, the scroll *IQS/Sa/Sb*, written about 100-75 BCE, remains our only witness for *IQSa* as well as for *IQSb*. Did the missing of both compositions within the fragmentary relics of eleven further *S*-scrolls result by chance, or did those “books” pass out of use in later times?

### *History of research*

Since the very beginnings of Qumran research most serious scholars were convinced that *IQS* I-XI should contain the rules of “the Essenes” who according to Pliny the Elder lived at the northwestern shores of the Dead Sea. (29) The fact that *IQS* I-XI does not explicitly mention women or wives fitted well to Pliny’s description of those Dead Sea Essenes as being unmarried.

At the same time, everybody knew the “Fragments of a Zadokite Work” from the Cairo Geniza, which were published by Solomon Schechter already in 1910 (30) and which usually are called today the *Damascus Document* (*CD*). This book was clearly composed for married people. When in 1956 the news spread that 10 fragmentary copies of this work were found in different Qumran caves, most scholars regarded *CD* as a secondary rule-book of the Essenes: while *IQS* I-XI should have been composed for the hypothetically unmarried inhabitants of the Essenes’ “center” at Qumran, *CD* became related to the usually married Essenes in towns and villages all over the country.

When 1955 D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik published *IQSa* and *IQSb*, they already knew about the manuscripts from Qumran caves,

(27) This fragment is not yet published, but see the forthcoming book of Sarianna Metso, above note 15, with discussion of this evidence. According to the numbering of fragments from *4QS<sup>b</sup>* by J. Charlesworth, *op. cit.* note 12, 60-67, this fragment should be number 10. Curiously it is neglected in this edition.

(28) The suggestion of a secondary final rubric is discussed by S. Metso, *ibid.*, but remains highly speculative as there is no other example of this kind in all Qumran scrolls.

(29) The first scholar who discussed this possibility was E. L. Sukenik, *Megillot Genuzot I*, Jerusalem 1948, p. 16f.

(30) S. Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, Cambridge 1910.

which correspond to *CD*. Now *IQSa* turned out to be a *third* rule-book of the Essenes, copied within the same scroll like *IQS* I-XI, but again addressed to married people like *CD*. There was no sense to create a third group of Essenes besides those at Qumran and those in the towns and villages all over the country. Therefore, they developed the suggestion that *IQSa* and *IQSb* should have been composed for the *future* of the Essenes, all the more so as the future Royal Messiah plays a prominent role in both compositions. (31) They never earnestly tested other possibilities to explain the evidence of *IQSa* and of *IQSb*, and up to present times almost all scholars adhere to their model. Furthermore, both scholars argued in their *editio princeps* that besides the Royal Messiah also the Priestly Messiah was addressed in *IQSa* as well as in *IQSb*, (32) and this view was followed by such influential scholars like J. Licht in his commentary on *IQS/Sa/Sb* (1965), (33) or L. H. Schiffman in his monograph on *IQSa* and *IQSb* (1989) (34). Therefore, this is today the common opinion. But to the contrary: there is no trace of the Priestly Messiah either in *IQSa* or in *IQSb*, and both works were not composed for some future times, but for the present of the Essenes like the different parts of *IQS* I-XI and *CD*. In this article, I shall discuss mainly some crucial findings in *IQSa* and in *IQSb* in support of this view.

### ***IQSa*, an early rule-book of the Essenes**

The most discussed part of *IQSa* is its final section II,11-22, already labelled by J. T. Milik as "la description du banquet eschatologique" (35) and which L. H. Schiffman called "The Messianic Banquet" (36) as if one very special opportunity was viewed. In fact, the correctness of this designation is largely dependent on some readings and fillings of gaps in the lines II,11-12, and on a convincing answer to the question where this section really starts. In a very thorough recent study of this of this section É. Puech convincingly demonstrated that all former suggestions for the reading of the last word in II,11 and for the completion of the beginning of line II,12 were evidently wrong. (37) Therefore, I will not repeat his arguments, but mainly criticize his new proposals and introduce some further suggestions.

(31) See the *editio princeps*, *op. cit.* note 2, pp. 108, 121f, and 128f.

(32) *Ibid.*

(33) J. Licht, *The Rule Scroll* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1965.

(34) L. H. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Atlanta 1989.

(35) In the *editio princeps* (*op. cit.* note 2) p. 121.

(36) *Op. cit.* (note 34) p. 53.

(37) É. Puech, "Préséance sacerdotale et Messie-Roi dans la Règle de la Congrégation (1QSa II 11-22)", *Revue de Qumrân* 16 (1994) 351-365.

As far as I know, the only author who precisely described the formal structure of this section and stated its true beginning was J. Carmignac 1963, (38) who was followed in those respects by nobody else. The first relevant observation by him was that the whole text of line II,11, except the last two words, is not the opening of the final section, but a concluding remark to the section before. (39) This is evident if one compares it to the other formulations of this kind in *IQSa*. Their sequence is:

	לעצת היחד	אלה האנשים הנקראים	I,27
...	מועד הנועדים לעצת היחד בישראל	אלה אנשי השם קריאי	II,1-3
		עדת א[נ]שי השם	II,8
	לעצת היחד	[מז]שב אנשי השם [קריאי] מועד	II,11
		[קריאי] מועד אנשי השם	II,13

The rubric in I,27 is a long apposition to those who have "hallowed them for three days" and, therefore, are ready to obtain cultic duties; but as the text of the manuscript is defect towards the end of this line, one may not exclude the possibility that this rubric is continued by what follows. But in all other occurrences this kind of rubric is clearly concluding the text before. II,1-3 is the concluding rubric to the long section I,6 - II,3 — or, at least to I,25 - II,3. II,8 belongs to the final formulations regarding unclean persons. II,11 concludes the whole section II,3-11, and II,13 concludes the description of those priests who are admitted to the assembly. (40) There is no need at all to understand that rubric in II,11 as an opening phrase of the section II,11-22. On the contrary, this can be done only highly artificially, as it is demonstrated at the best by all the tormenting modern translations of this passage except that by J. Carmignac.

Nevertheless, against the *editio princeps* two alterations are commendable. The last word of line II,10 is not מוּבְדֵל, but מְבֻדֵל, (41) and the second word of line II,11 should become completed to מְ[מז]שֵׁב. (42) The

(38) J. Carmignac, É. Cothenet et H. Lignée, *Les textes de Qumran*, volume 2, Paris 1963, 24-26.

(39) See his translation, *ibid.* 24.

(40) The sequence מועד אנשי השם [קריאי] II,13 instead of the reverse order in II,2 and II,11 may hint to another author, i.e., *IQSa* II,11-22 may be a secondary addition to I,1 - II,11 (except the last two words). Cf. the discussion on the blessing of the Royal Messiah *IQSb* V,18ff, below p. 510.

(41) This reading is rather clear on the special photo of the left upper part of *IQSa* II in the *editio princeps* (*op. cit.* note 2) plate XXII. Also the photo of *IQSa* II by Bruce and Kenneth Zuckerman in the article of É. Puech (*op. cit.* note 37) p. 358 shows that the letter after מ has a very long base-stroke like a ב, while the base-strokes of the letter ך are somewhat shorter in this hand. For מוּבְדֵל as a technical term see *IQS* VII,3.5, and cf. the use of הַבְדִּיל *IQS* VI, 25; VII,1.16, or of הוּבְדֵל *IQS* VIII,24; *CD* IX,21.

(42) In the manuscript there is a clear trace of the right bottom edge of the first letter of the word after מְ[מז]שֵׁב, which fits better a מ than a ב.

final clause regarding an unclean person who is not admitted to any cultic assembly therefore reads:

כִּי־א מִבְּדֵל [ה]־א מִ[מ]וֹשֵׁב אֲנָשֵׁי הַשֵּׁם [קְרִיאֵי] מוֹעֵד לְעֵצַת הַיָּהוּד

“for (generally) excluded is he from the assembly of the men of renown, those who are appointed for the council of the Yahad.”

As demonstrated by J. Carmignac, (43) the final section of *IQSa* has three parts. The first part (lines 11-17) regulates the order of sitting, the second part (lines 17-21) regulates the order of the blessings, and a third part (lines 21-22) claims that this order must strictly become followed in every assembly of at least ten men, i.e., full members of the Essenes' Yahad, wherever and whenever they meet for cultic assemblies. At least this final clause should effectively prevent from the idea that in the passages before (II,11-21) only one special meal was envisaged by the author of *IQSa*. But also the discussion of the text in lines II,11-12 will prove that such an idea would be basically wrong.

The recent suggestion of É. Puech to read and to supplement the text of *IQSa* II,11-12 seems to me highly artificial. His text is

אִם יתגלה [הנש]־א [המשיח אתם יבוא] הכוהן ב[רראש כול עדת ישראל

which he translates: “quand {s'adjoindra} <sera révéle> [e Pri]n[ce] Messie {a} parmi eux, [le Prêtre] entrera à la tête de toute la Congrégation d'Israël”. The main problems of these suggestions are:

(a) *יתגלה* is never again attested in Qumran texts including the not yet published ones. In the Old Testament there are two occurrences of *יתגלה* (44), but always — like in rabbinical sources — in another sense than “to reveal oneself” and never followed by the preposition *את*, which — furthermore — should come immediately after *יתגלה*.

(b) The title *הנשיא המשיח* is never attested elsewhere. It is an artificial construct from the two titles *הכוהן המשיח*, a designation of the *High Priest* in the Old Testament, (45) and *נשיא העדה* (כול), which sometimes designates the *Royal Messiah* in Qumran texts, (46) though never in the form *הנשיא*. (47) Furthermore, the *Royal Messiah* occurs two times in *IQSa* II,11-22, namely *משיח ישראל* II,14, and *משיח ישראל* II,20. Why should there be another designation of him in II,12, which were at the same time not a traditional one?

(c) Finally, the suggestions of É. Puech include at least two palaeographical problems, which may be discussed along with my own rendering of this crucial passage.

(43) See *op. cit.* note 38, pp. 24-26.

(44) *Gen* 9,21, and *Prov* 18,2.

(45) *Lev* 4,3.5.16; 6,15.

(46) See, e.g., *IQSb* V,18; *IQM* V,1; *4QpIs<sup>a</sup>* 2-6,II,19; *CD* VII,20.

(47) *CD* V,1 relates to “the king” in general, not to a messiah.

My own suggestion is that *IQSa* II,11-22 is basically a twin of the prescriptions in *IQS* VI,2-6, including in those regulations only the special case that the future משיח ישראל may one day join those assemblies. Accordingly, I read and supply as follows:

אם יוכלו [יח] ו[המשיח אתם יבוא] כוהן ב[רואש כול עדת ישראל

“When they eat together, and the messiah is together with them, a priest must (always) come at the top of every congregation of Israel (or: every Israelitic congregation)”. The verifications of those renderings are:

(a) A new colour-photo of *IQSa* II, taken by Bruce and Kenneth Zuckerman 1994 and reproduced in black-white by É. Puech in his recent article, (48) evidently demonstrates that the third letter of the last word in II,11 is *not* a ל, but a letter with a base stroke going downwards from right to left. É. Puech combines this letter with the forerunning one and reads a ת. (49) But the base-stroke is much longer than that at the left leg of a ת in this scribal hand, and also a horizontal top-stroke of the same letter is clearly visible on the new photo. To my eyes, this letter is a clear כ, followed by a ל and some further ambiguous letter traces, (50) which might represent a ה as well as a ו, but no ד or ך. Above the *right* edge of É. Puech’s ת the new photo reveals an additional letter which resembles a ג. Therefore, É. Puech reads יתגלה; but in this case the additional letter should have been written at least above the *left* edge of his ת, if not above the small space between this ת and the following ל. Therefore, the reading of יתגלה seems to me impossible. *If* there is, indeed, this additional letter in the manuscript, it should be a little bit damaged ש, which would change the word יוכלו to יושלכלו, or, perhaps, to יושלכלו.

(b) From the first word in II,12 the top of a letter is preserved with some open space left of it. This letter-stroke hardly fits the — otherwise curved — left top of a ש, but fits very well to the left upper edge of a ד. Therefore, I prefer to fill in here the word [יח], which occupies almost the same space as the word [ה]א above of it in line II,11. אם יושלכלו [יח] corresponds very well to יחד יאכלו *IQS* VI,2, where — like in its immediate context — the adverb יחד comes *before* יאכלו because it is emphasised there (“*together* they shall eat”).

(c) The remaining space between [המשיח] and [יח] allows not more than one single letter and a normal space between two words. (51) The-

(48) See above, note 41.

(49) See his discussion of the palaeographical evidence *op. cit.* (note 37), 357f.

(50) All infra-red photos of *IQSa* II reproduce in the final parts of lines 10-16 some letters — or traces of letters — which do not belong to this column, but to some other layers of *IQSb* still stuck to the back of *IQSa* II.

(51) The first gap in the lines *IQSa* II,9-13 is 4 millimetres smaller, the second gap two more millimetres smaller than the reproduction of the evidence in the *editio princeps* (*op. cit.* note 2) plate XXIV or — accordingly — on the new photo by Bruce and Kenneth Zuckerman, see above note 41.

refore, I suggest to fill in here not more than  $\text{וְהַמְשִׁיחַ}$ . The words  $\text{אִם יָחַד}$  take up a traditional formulation — see *IQS* VI,2 —, while  $\text{וְהַמְשִׁיחַ אִתָּם}$  adds a special aspect. Syntactically this kind of construction offers no problem. As the next word  $\text{יְבוֹאֵן}$  starts 2-3 millimetres higher than the final letter of  $\text{אִתָּם}$ , a new syntactical unit will begin there. (52)

(d) The *editio princeps* filled the next gap in this line by reading  $\text{כְּוֹהֵן הַרְוֹאֵשׁ}$ . But the use of  $\text{בּוֹא רְוֹאֵשׁ}$  in the sense “enter as the head of ...” is not attested elsewhere. The title  $\text{כְּוֹהֵן הַרְוֹאֵשׁ}$  would not fit here syntactically. Therefore, most commentators — including É. Puech — prefer to supply  $\text{בְּרְוֹאֵשׁ הַכְּוֹהֵן}$  “[then] the Priest (= the High Priest) must enter (the room) at the top of ...”. But this supplement is one broad letter to spacious for this gap. The only satisfactory solution is to fill the gap with ...  $\text{יְבוֹאֵן כְּוֹהֵן בְּרְוֹאֵשׁ}$  “(then) a priest must (always) come at the top of ...”. This corresponds well to *IQS* VI,3-4, where a priest ( $\text{אִישׁ כְּוֹהֵן}$ ) (53) is needed wherever and whenever (at least) ten members of the Yahad gather.

The result is that the following term  $\text{כּוֹל עֵדַת יִשְׂרָאֵל}$  can no longer mean “the whole congregation of Israel”, but, instead, “every Israelitic congregation”. This fits excellently to the concluding clause of the section *IQSa* II,11-22 which reads:

$\text{וּכְחוּק הַזֶּה יַעֲשׂוּן לְכוֹל מֵעַדְרִים אִם יוֹעַדְרוּ עַד עֶשְׂרֵי אַנְשִׁים}$

“and according to this statute [they] must act regarding all assem[blies, if] at least ten me[n g]ather.”

This text is the same like in the *editio princeps* except the restoration of  $\text{מֵעַדְרִים}$  instead of  $\text{מֵעַרְכָּה}$  (54) and the insertion of  $\text{אִם}$  instead of  $\text{כִּי}$  (55) in the first lacuna of the line *IQSa* II,22. The decisive evidence

(52) For this peculiar graphical custom of the scribe of *IQS/Sa/Sb* see above, p. 495.

(53) Instead of  $\text{כְּוֹהֵן אִישׁ}$  *IQS* VI,3-4, *4QS<sup>d</sup>* 1,II,8 has only  $\text{כְּוֹהֵן}$ , see *op. cit.* note 12, pp. 76f.

(54) In the *editio princeps* (*op. cit.* note 2) the term  $\text{מֵעַרְכָּה}$  was artificially derived from *IQS* X,14, see p. 118. In *IQSa* — like in all Qumran manuscripts — the singular  $\text{מוֹעֵד}$  is always written with a  $\text{ו}$ , see accordingly also *IQSa* II,2.11.13. But the plural  $\text{מוֹעֵדִים/מוֹעֵדִים}$  is sometimes written  $\text{מֵעַדְרִים/מֵעַדְרִים}$ . The biblical evidence is listed by F. Brown/S. R. Driver/Ch. A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, Oxford 1907, 417. Corresponding Qumran evidence is  $\text{מֵעַדְרִים}$  *4Q329a* (*Mishmarot G*) 1,3.4.5, and *4Q418* (*Sapiential Work Ia*) 118,3, as well as  $\text{מֵעַדְרִים}$  *4Q372* (*Joseph Apocryphon*) 3,6. The main biblical source for the meaning of  $\text{מֵעַדְרִים/מוֹעֵדִים}$  in *IQSa* is the term  $\text{מוֹעֵד אֱלֹהִים}$ , “tent of meeting (of God with His people)” *Exodus* 27,21 etc., which firstly became related to the temple in Jerusalem and later — at least by the Essenes — to all cultic assemblies.

(55) The supplement  $\text{כִּי}$  was a mistake of the *editio princeps*, as this word is usually written  $\text{כִּי־א}$  in *IQS/Sa/Sb*, see K. G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten*, Göttingen 1960 101, especially also *IQSa* II,8.10.19. But the gap in *IQSa* II,22 is too short between  $\text{מֵעַדְרִים}$  and  $\text{יֹעַדְרוּ}$  for  $\text{כִּי־א}$ . Therefore, I prefer  $\text{אִם}$ , cf. *IQSa* I, 25; II,9.11.

is that *ההוא היום* strictly refers to the prescriptions of *IQSa* II,11-21. This way, the possibility is finally excluded that this section might refer to only *one* special occasion, when “the messiah” will come one day as the host of a “messianic banquet”. But why needed the Essenes this statute at all?

If *הכהן*, “the priest”, in *IQSa* II,19 were “the High Priest” of messianic times, those prescriptions were, indeed, meaningless. Being a descendant of King David, the Royal Messiah essentially belongs to the tribe of Judah, (56) who is subordinated to the tribe of Levi in all cultic affairs. Every Essene knew very well that — according of the hierarchic order of these tribes — the *High Priest* must always have superiority above the Royal Messiah at meals joining both, as well in the sitting order as in the sequence of blessings. The only possible source of problems were cultic assemblies, which were presided by simple priests: should they not leave their chairs to the socially top-ranking Messiah? This statute says no: the Messiah and his men must rank in sitting *after* the presiding priest and all his bretheren (*IQSa* II,11-17), and even the simplest priest must start eating and drinking with his blessings. The Messiah may never take over the leading role at common meals. (57)

Furthermore, the only satisfactory completion of the beginning of the line *IQSa* II,12 results into the fact that *המשיח*, “the Messiah”, is mentioned here without any further connotation. Therefore, he must be the *only* messianic figure in this section, and “the priest” cannot become regarded as another messianic figure at the same time.

The result is that *IQSa* was composed at a time when the Essenes already longed for the coming of the Royal Messiah, but did not yet develop the concept of a Priestly Messiah. This stage of development is prior to the insertion of *IQS* VIII,15b - IX,11 into the former text of this work and also prior to the concept of *4QTestimonia*, which also include the Priestly Messiah.

A further remark is still needed to comment on the opening section *IQSa* I,1-5. In his *editio princeps* D. Barthélemy translated in I,1 the phrase *כול עדת ישראל* by “toute la Congrégation d’Israël” in the sense of a plenary assembly of all Israelites, and *באחרית הימים* by “à la fin des temps” in the sense of a future time. (58) These understandings are today basically shared by almost all scholars. Nevertheless, they will turn out to be erroneous, if the text of lines 1-5 is compared to its biblical source.

(56) This aspect is stressed still in the New Testament, see *Hebrews* 7,14.

(57) The common meal is probably the pattern for *all* cultic assemblies. This will not exclude the possibility that sessions of juridical courts during a war — see *IQSa* I,26 — should become presided by the Royal Messiah like by the king in the past. Therefore, the statute could not become drawn up for *every* kind of assembly, but a typically cultic example must become chosen.

(58) See in the edition (*op. cit.* note 2) p. 111.

The exact biblical source of *IQSa* I,1-5 is *Deuteronomy* 31,9-13. According to that passage, all people of Israel — including their wives and children — should gather in the temple “at the end of every seven years”, “in the feast of tabernacles”, to hear and to learn “this law”. *IQSa* understands “this law” in the sense of “the Torah” (= the Pentateuch), and enriches “this law” with the ordinances (משפטים) of the Essenes (I,5). But, amazingly, all the special relationships of *Deuteronomy* 31,9-13 to every seventh year, to the feast of tabernacles, or to the temple, are dropped in *IQSa*. This way the actual meaning is clearly related to every assembly of Israel, which becomes specified in the following text of *IQSa* for different kinds of assemblies in I,6ff and I,25ff.

Furthermore, there is no need at all to relate אחרית הימים in *IQSa* I,1 to some future time. Like in most of the Qumran texts this term denotes here the *present* time of the author, which he regards as the last period of history including the future “turn” with the coming of the messiah, the final judgement, and the start of salvation. This understanding of אחרית הימים was thoroughly proved by Annette Steudel 1993, (59) and there is no need here to repeat her arguments.

These arguments result into another understanding of the opening line of *IQSa* than the former one of D. Barthélemy. The text

וזה הסדר לכול עדת ישראל באחרית הימים בהספן יחד

should be translated by “And this (= the following text) is the rule for every congregation (or: assembly) of Israel during the (present) last period (of history) if they assemble [together] ...”. (60) The appropriate title of this work should, therefore, include the plural. “The Rule of Congregations”, or “The Rule for (all cultic) Assemblies”. The last kind of assemblies, which is regulated in this work, are future meals of local groups together with “the Messiah” who was believed to be close to the door.

Finally, one should basically exclude the possibility that *IQSa* might have been composed as a rule-book for a future “messianic age”, as L. H. Schiffman tried to point out in his book. (61) In the time of salvation no further rules should be needed for mentally incompetent people who must become discharged from several duties (*IQSa* I,19-22), nor rules for impure people who should be excluded from the (non-

(59) See A. Steudel, “אחרית הימים in the Texts from Qumran”, *Revue de Qumrân* 16 (1993), 225-246.

(60) At the beginning of the gap in *IQSa* I,1, the restoration of the adverb יחד is preferable to the nominal clause לִיְחַד in the *editio princeps* (*op. cit.* note 2) p. 109, which is accordingly taken over by all secondary editions and by all commentators, perhaps because of the seemingly corresponding evidence in *IQS* V,7, where, instead, the coming into the Yahad is envisaged.

(61) *Op. cit.* note 34.

military) congregations (*IQSa* II,3-11). These long sections inevitably demonstrate that *IQSa* was composed for the *present* affairs of its author and of his Yahad, for a time when the evil was not yet destroyed within Israel.

*IQSa* was the first rule-book of the Essenes with regulations for all their cultic assemblies. The agenda for their general assembly every year *IQS* I,1- III,12, or their Manual of Discipline *IQS* V-XI, were composed, or became developed, apart from *IQSa*, or after it. In every case, they were related to other matters than *IQSa*. At last, the *Damascus Document* was composed as the *final* rule-book for the Essenes about 100 BCE. (62) Afterwards, these rule-books only became copied again and again, but no longer basically revised or augmented.

### *IQSb*, the agenda of blessings

*IQSb* is an agenda with several blessings without any heading or preamble. Each blessing starts with a new line after a short *vacat* at its beginning, if the line before was written close to its end. Only three incipits of those blessings are preserved in this rather fragmentary manuscript:

... דברי ברכ[ה] למשכיל לברך את יראי אל ...	I,1
... דברי ברכה למ[שכיל לברך] את בני צדוק הכהנים ...	III,20
... למשכיל לברך את נשיא העדה ...	V,18

In III,20 and V,18 the scribe furthermore indicated the ends of blessings by horizontal strokes on the right margin. (63) A stroke of the same kind is also preserved between lines 18 and 19 of the first column, (64) while the former textual evidence of those lines is totally lost. Nevertheless, this stroke informs us that the first blessing included only I,1-18, while the incipit of the second blessing followed in line I,19.

According to the preserved (I,1; III,20; V,18) or still indicated (I,19) incipits of blessings, J. T. Milik in his *editio princeps* divided the contents of *IQSb* into four sections. The numbers of their lines are now shortened always by two lines in each column: (65)

(62) The original title of the so-called *Damascus Document* is repeated at its very end (like in the *Book of Jubilees*, see there 50,13). This title is מדרש התורה האחרון, "The final midrash of the Torah", see *4QD<sup>b</sup>* 18,V,20, and *4QD<sup>e</sup>* 11,II,15.

(63) *IQS* XI,22 and *IQSa* II,22 clearly evidence that those horizontal strokes do not indicate *beginnings* of sections, but, instead, their *end*.

(64) The right edge of this stroke with its characteristic hook is preserved on the left side of *IQSa* column II after the sewing-seam, see the *editio princeps* (*op. cit.* note 2), plate XXIV. J. T. Milik correctly discussed this evidence, *ibid.* p. 122, but enigmatically he coordinated the beginning of the next blessing with "line 21" instead of line 19. Cf. above p. 494 with note 19.

(65) See *ibid.*

I, 1 - 1,18	Blessing of the Faithful	18 lines
I,19 - III,19	Blessing of the High Priest	53 lines
III,20 - V,17	Blessing of the Zadokite Priests	50 lines
V,18 - [lost]	Blessing of the Royal Messiah	10 lines [+ ? lines]

Jacob Licht in his commentary on *IQSb* (1965) (66) perceived the second and the third section being too long for liturgical blessings. Furthermore, he tried to find within the surviving text of *IQSb* special blessings for all the different officials who are mentioned in *IQSa*. Additionally he suggested that the sequence of the blessings should ascend from the lowest rank of some humble faithful at the beginning to highly ranking messianic figures at the end. He also dropped some minor fragments from the arrangement of J. T. Milik; but all larger fragments remained at their places according to the *editio princeps*. This subdivision of *IQSb* is followed also by L. H. Schiffman in his book of 1989. (67) The result are *eight* different blessings instead of J. T. Milik's *four* blessings (correspondances underlined):

<u>I, 1 - I, 9 + [...]</u>	<u>Blessing of the Faithful</u>
[...] + II,20-26	Blessing of an Unidentified Group
III, 1 - III, 6 + [...]	Blessing of an Official or Group of Importance
[...] + III,15-19	Blessing of an Unidentified Group
<u>III,20 - III,26 + [...]</u>	<u>Blessing of the Zadokite Priests</u>
[...] + IV,20-26	Blessing of the High Priest
V,1-17	Unidentified
<u>V,18 - V,27+ [...]</u>	<u>Blessing of the Royal Messiah</u>

This result is rather strange in several respects. If the blessings would ascent from the lowest to the highest rank, the High Priest should come *after* the Royal Messiah. Who could rank *between* the High Priest and the Royal Messiah? If the additional officials or groups, who are suggested by J. Licht, were important enough to become blessed individually, why are there no significant connotations from the biblical traditions or from contemporary Qumran texts to identify them? Why is there no regular incipit in II,26, or in III,1, if a new blessing formula begins here?

There are much more questions to the suggestions of J. Licht and of L. H. Schiffman. But the decisive argument against those subdivisions is provided by the help of the formal concept of those blessings.

(66) J. Licht, *The Rule Scroll* (Hebrew), Jerusalem 1965, 271-289.

(67) *Op. cit.* note 34, pp. 72-76, where he p. 72f discusses the formal reconstructions of the blessings by J. T. Milik and J. Licht. For the designations of those blessings I use mainly the English terminology of L. H. Schiffman instead of J. Licht's Hebrew terminology.

Already J. T. Milik in his *editio princeps* pointed to the fact that all those blessings — except the last one of the Royal Messiah — were arranged according to the formal concept of the Aaronite Blessing, *Numbers* 6,24-26. (68) This blessing has three rubrics of two elements each, with characteristic catch-words in each element:

וישמרך (b)	יברכך יהוה (a) (1)
ויחונך (b)	יארך יהוה פניו אליך (a) (2)
וישם לך שלום (b)	ישא יהוה פניו אליך (a) (3)

A developed setting of this formulation was used at the annual assemblies of the Yahad as a blessing of all the righteous *IQS* II,2-4, and a still more developed negative version of it as a curse of all evildoers *IQS* II,6-9. The characteristic features of both versions are (1) that all the key-words — or their negative counterparts — are strictly continued and (2) that they come in the same sequence like in the biblical model.

A special evidence of the blessing *IQS* II,2-4 is that the *tetragrammaton* יהוה is always omitted without a substitute, while in the formally corresponding curse II,6-9 two times אל replaces יהוה. (69) In *IQSb*, אל is used sometimes in traditional, or free, formulations, (70) but never in the formulaic rubrics instead of יהוה. According to the liturgical *Sitz im Leben* of *IQSb*, always אדוני substitutes יהוה without any exception (I,3; II,20; III,1.23; V,21).

The key-words of the Aaronite Blessing occur in *IQSb* as follows, the surviving incipits of new blessings being indicated by ===:

I, 3	1a	III, 1	3a
I, 5	2b	III, 2	3a
=====		III, 3	3a
II,20	2b	III, 5	3b
II,21	2b	III,19	3b
II,22	2b	=====	
II,23	2b	III,23	1a
II,24	2b	IV,21	3a
II,25	2b	IV,25	3b

This formal evidence clearly demonstrates that *IQSb* I,19 - III,19 and III,20 - V,17 are long blessings according to the subdivisions of J. T. Milik, while the short blessings postulated by J. Licht do not agree to the formal evidence. E.g., his second "Blessing of an Unidentified Group" [...] + II,20-26 ends with repetitions of element 2b, while a continuation with elements 3a.b is missing at all. J. Licht's next "Bles-

(68) See his notes to the different blessings, *op. cit.* (note 2), 121-129.

(69) *IQS* II,6.8.

(70) See *IQSb* III,18.21; IV,22; V,23.25.

sing of an Official or Group of Importance" III,1-6 + [...] starts with repetitions of element 3a, continued with element 3b, while elements 1a.b and 2a.b are missing at all. J. Licht's fourth "Blessing of an Unidentified Group" [...] + III,15-19 correctly ends with element 3b, but it is at least very difficult to fill formulations with all the other elements 1a.b, 2a.b, and 3a, into the maximal 12 lines of this short blessing, as particularly the remainders of its concluding 5 lines attest only element 3b.

Those formal observations prove J. Licht's subdivision of *IQSb* into eight different blessings evidently wrong, while they definitively confirm the correctness of J. T. Milik's former suggestions in the *editio princeps*.

The only serious problem of the textual reconstruction of *IQSb* in the *editio princeps* is the transition from its col. IV to col. V. The text at the end of the line IV,26 וקודשיו שמו ותכבד לו ותקדש לו ואתה תקדש לו was regarded by J. T. Milik as the end of a paragraph and translated "car c'est [à toi de con]fesser sa sainteté et de glorifier son nom et sa sainteté." Immediately afterwards, col. V should start with a blank space at the beginning of its line 1, which Milik explained as indicating the beginning of a *new section* of this blessing within this line. (71) But, instead, Milik's line V,2 is clearly the top-line V,1 of this column, which immediately continues the text from IV,26 by [...] וקודשיו הברלתה מן [...] "and you (= the Zadokite priests) have separated His holy ones from [...]". The distance of the beginning of line V,1 from the former top margin of the scroll is the very same like that of the beginning of line III,1. Correspondingly, the ׀ of the column before, which survived on frg. 26, is not the end of line IV,2, but the end of line IV,1. This correction of the *editio princeps* definitively excludes the possibilities to identify the lines *IQSb* V,1-17 as an independent blessing formula, or to start a new blessing formula somewhere in the lines V,1-8.

The material and formal analysis of *IQSb* therefore results into an agenda, which contains *four* blessing formulas according to the subdivisions by J. T. Milik in the *editio princeps*. (72) But every blessing is a few lines shorter than calculated there.

The first Blessing of the Faithful I,1-18 does not refer to some humble people, but to all people of Israel. God's election of Israel (I,2-3) is the highest ranking aspect at all. Therefore, also the blessing of all people of Israel must precede the special blessings of its representatives, the High Priest, the Zadokite Priests, and the Royal Messiah.

The High Priest is the main representative of Israel before God, and also the main mediator of God's will to His people on earth. Therefore,

(71) See J. T. Milik's translations, his notes, and his numbering of lines on fragment 26, *op. cit.* (note 2), 125-128.

(72) Cf. his own chart in the edition (*op. cit.* note 2), p. 120.

the blessing of the High Priest needs the second rank after the people of Israel as a whole. Its long text filled the 53 lines I,19 - III,19. But only fragmentary remainders from 29 lines of this long blessing survived.

After the High Priest range the priests. Nevertheless, the next blessing III,20 - V,17 is not devoted to the priests in general, but exclusively to the Zadokite priests. This evidence corresponds well to the exceptional status of the Zadokite priests in *IQS* V,2.9 (still missing in *4QS<sup>b</sup>* and in *4QS<sup>d</sup>*!) and in *IQSa* I,2.24; II,3. Of the formerly 50 lines of this blessing 32 lines survived more or less fragmentarily.

The fourth — and presumably concluding — blessing concerns the Royal Messiah. In *IQSb* V,18-27 about two third of the textual evidence of these lines survived. In lines 20-23 (= Milik's lines 22-25) this evidence now became a little enriched by a further small fragment. (73) In line 19 (= Milik 21) the restoration of its first gap in the *editio princeps* is disputable, as the word דָּוִדִּים needs one more broad letter than the available space concedes. (74) Instead, the restoration of the name דָּוִדִּים fits well to the space and to the traces of letters. The corrected text reads

וּבְרִיתֵי דָּוִדִּים יַחֲדָשׁ לוֹ לְהַקִּים מַלְכוּת עִמּוֹ לְעוֹלָם

“and the covenant of Da[v]id He (= God) may renew for him (= the Messiah) to establish the kingdom of His people for eve[r]”. (75) The “covenant of David” clearly refers to *II Samuel* 7,16.

The original length of this blessing is questionable. The text at the end of the column stops short amidst a sentence. If this blessing had the same length like the blessings of the High Priest and of the Zadokite Priests, its text filled one and a half column after *IQSb* column V, i.e., the blessing ended about the midst of column XX of the whole scroll *IQS/Sa/Sb*. But the formal evidence of this blessing cannot be confirmed as it does not follow the pattern of the Aaronite Blessing. Instead, *Isaia* 11,2-5 and other biblical evidence is used in the beginning to formulate this blessing. Nevertheless, the *Psalms of Solomon* 17,1-46 demonstrates that there existed enough messianic components to produce such a rather long blessing.

J. T. Milik was of the opinion that *IQSa* is a “composition livresque”, which was not used in the liturgy, (76) while L. H. Schiffman concludes that it “is a set of hymns (!) to be recited as part of the mustering ceremony to be held in the end of days” according to *IQSa* I,22-25. (77) In every case the final blessing involves a figure of the

(73) See G. J. Brooke and J. M. Robinson, “A Further Fragment of *IQSb*: The Schøyen Collection MS 1909”, *Journal of Jewish Studies* 46 (1995), 120-133.

(74) See in the edition (*op. cit.* note 2) p. 127 and plate XXIX.

(75) Cf. the very similar formulations in *4QPatriarchal Blessings* 1-4 (*4Q252*).

(76) *Op. cit.* (note 2), 120.

(77) *Op. cit.* (note 34), 76.

future, the coming Royal Messiah, who nevertheless could indirectly become present by a blessing of him. Why should the Essenes not have used this formula within their liturgies?

The real problem is that all the other blessings have no elements of eschatology or any connotation of the future. What survived from the Blessing of the Faithful I,1-18, or from the Blessing of the Zadokite Priests III,20 - V,17 is sufficient for a solid statement of this kind. Formally, the evidence of *IQSb* is very like that of *IQSa*, where only the *final* section II,11-22 is related to the *future*, while I,1 - II,11 regulate the *present* assemblies and some qualifications of their participants. To my mind, *IQSb* should be regarded formally as a twin of *IQSa*, composed according to the same pattern with a future-orientated component only in its final section.

Perhaps, the section *IQSb* V,18ff with the blessing of the Royal Messiah is even a secondary addition to the three blessings before. (78) My two arguments in favour of this possibility are: (a) This blessing is the only one which does not use the Aaronite Blessing as its formal base, and (b) its introductory phrase in V,18 drops the words דברִי ברכֵה, which are attested in *IQSb* I,1 as well as in III,20. How to explain those formal discrepancies better than by postulating another author?

The main result of these considerations is at least the *possibility* to relate the second blessing of the High Priest *IQSb* I,19 - III,19 not to a future Priestly Messiah, but to the real high priest of the time of the author of *IQSb*. This would correspond well to the missing of the Priestly Messiah also in *IQSa*. Furthermore, in the fragmentary remainders of *IQSb* I,19 - III,19 there is no trace of eschatology or any connotation of the future, but the same *present* orientation like in the two blessings before and after it. A further argument in favour of this view is that the Blessing of the High Priest and the Blessing of the Royal Messiah are separated by the Blessing of the Zadokite Priests III,20 - V,17. As a twin of the Royal Messiah, a future Priestly Messiah should, instead, be blessed immediately antecedent to him.

The supposition that the second blessing of this agenda refers to the real high priest of the time of its author could at least easily explain, why no further copy of *IQSb* was detected within the scrolls from the Qumran caves. During his life-time the Teacher of Righteousness was by the Essenes regarded as the true high priest of Israel. (79) This blessing counted in favour of him and of his office. After his death the Essenes did not appoint a new high priest, but, instead, longed for the future coming of the Priestly Messiah as the only true successor of their Tea-

(78) Cf. above, note 40.

(79) See H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus*, Freiburg/Basel/Wien 1996, 205f.

cher in this office. (80) Therefore, after the death of the Teacher the liturgical performance of this blessing would automatically have counted in favour of the Hasmonean high priests of that time. This implication was not acceptable, and, therefore, the agenda of blessings, as it is represented by *IQSb*, went out of use.

This hypothesis is somewhat speculative, but it fits to all the evidence which we have. Together with the undisputable corresponding evidence of *IQSa* it helps to pave the way for a new approach to the development of messianism in the second half of the second century BCE.

### Some remarks to Qumran messianism

In this article the term “messiah” is strictly used in its classical understanding, i.e., its use is restricted to denote individual figures whose coming is expected in future times and who are sometimes marked as משיח in Hebrew texts. A clear example of this is *IQS IX,11*, where the aforementioned rules will be valid עד בוא נביא ומשיחי אהרון וישראל “until the coming of a prophet and the messiahs of Aaron and Israel”.

The Old Testament does not know this kind of messiah. Nevertheless, many predictions or passages from the Torah and from the books of the Prophets were later on understood as references to the coming of an individual messiah. The Qumran manuscripts offer many examples for this. But the question is still open, when and in which way this kind of messianism started.

The result of an evaluation of all relevant proofs is the hypothesis that there are three stages of development, which may even be firmly established in history. The first stage of development is the time up to the midst of second century BCE, the second stage the time from about 150 to about 110 BCE, and the third stage the time from about 110 BCE onwards. These are approximate dates. But at least the adduced texts were with a high degree of probability composed just within those periods.

#### The first stage of development

All relevant “messianic” evidence from the time before the midst of the second century BCE does not propagate an individual as a messianic figure, but, instead, always the collective people of Israel. I shall only briefly present some examples. A more erudite elaboration of this topic is contributed by Annette Steudel to this volume. (81)

(80) See *ibid.*, 173f, 219f, and 287f.

(81) See A. Steudel, “The Eternal Reign of the People of God — Collective Expectations in Qumran Texts (4Q246 and 1QM)” below, pp. 517-535.

In the *Book of Daniel*, which was finally composed 164 BCE, “one like a son of man” (7,13) turns out to be nobody else but “the people of the saints of the most high” (7,27), i.e., the collective of the pious people of Israel.

About the same time as the *Book of Daniel* the basic draft of the Qumranic *Serekh ha-Milḥama* (1QM) was composed. (82) In *1QM* XI,6f, the later on messianic proof-text *Numbers* 24,17 is quoted for the first time in history. Here this quotation is not yet reduced to “the star out of Jacob” and “the scepter out of Israel” like later on in *CD* VII,19f. But the text is quoted in a much broader version and changed in a way that it concludes with the words “and Israel shall do valiantly”. The meaning is that “the star” and “the scepter” of the biblical source are not individuals, but again the collective of the people of Israel. Only this interpretation fits also to the broader context in *1QM* X-XIV.

A third example of this kind is another passage of *Serekh ha-Milḥama*, which survived only in the manuscript 4Q491. (83) Here a being praises its own existence as a heavenly one, reckoning itself to the angels, but not being created as an angel. In spite of the singular formulation, the collective of the people of Israel, being raised to a quasi “heavenly” status, speak here. The phenomenon is similar to the “songs of the servant of the Lord” *Isaiah* 42,1-9, 49,1-6, 50,4-11, and 52,13 - 53,12, where sometimes the collective of the people of Israel is spoken off like an individual.

Neither the *Book of Daniel* nor the basic draft of *Serekh ha-Milḥama* (84) nor any other text from the time before the midst of the second century BCE show any consciousness of the future coming of an individual messiah.

A very important evidence in this respect is the exhortative letter 4QMMT (85), which according to 4QpPsalms<sup>a</sup> IV,8f (86) the Teacher of Righteousness sent in the year 152 BCE to the Jewish ruler Jonathan with the result that Jonathan tried to kill him. At that time, Jonathan had already occupied the office of the high priest in Jerusalem. (87) The sen-

(82) See P. Von der Osten-Sacken, *Gott und Belial*, Göttingen 1969, 84-87.

(83) See the edition by M. Baillet, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* VII, Oxford 1982, 27, 4QM<sup>a</sup> 11,1,12-19.

(84) In *1QM* V,1 the נשיא כול העדה is not the Royal Messiah, but only the leader of the troops of Israel in a future war. כוהן הרוואש *1QM* II,1, XV,4, XVI,13, and XVIII,5 does not denote the Priestly Messiah, but only the officiating high priest in the time of that war.

(85) *Miqṣat Ma'āse ha-Torah*, edited by E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* X, Oxford 1994.

(86) 4Q171, edited by J. M. Allegro, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan* V, Oxford 1968, 42-50. See *ibid.* p. 45.

(87) The historical context of 4QMMT is discussed by H. Stegemann, *op. cit.* (note 79), 49, 148-151, 172, 180, 187, 209, 218, 277, and 286f.

der of this letter mainly criticizes the bad cultic administration of the addressee. This way he indirectly demands from the addressee to withdraw from the office of the high priest. The true high priest of Israel was the Teacher himself. At the same time he reminds the addressee to keep to the good prototype of some kings of the past, mainly the kings David and Solomon. (88) This way the sender indirectly accepts the political leadership of Jonathan in Israel, which excludes that he longed for the coming of a Royal Messiah at the same time. Therefore, *4QMMT* informs us indirectly that in the year 152 BCE the Teacher of Righteousness and his Essenes did not yet long for a Priestly or a Royal Messiah.

The second stage of development

The next stage of development is marked by *IQSa* und *IQSb*. Both works should have been composed prior to the death of the Teacher about 112 BCE. Both works know very well the individual figure of the Royal Messiah, but no yet a Priestly Messiah. His future chair was still occupied by the Teacher himself who personally hoped to live up to the time of the final judgement including the coming of the Royal Messiah.

Without detriment to the fact that the Royal Messiah is well attested by *IQSa* and *IQSb*, we cannot know, whether this new figure was firstly created by the Teacher and/or his Essenes, or whether it was already traditional for them. In *IQSa* II,12 the Royal Messiah is introduced as משיח, "the Messiah". Everybody should know about him. In this passage he is not a newly created figure on the scene. The same is true for the blessing *IQSb* V,18ff. This is a highly elaborated text. A vast occupation with the Royal Messiah and with the biblical sources for this figure lies behind this composition. Nevertheless, the language of this section is characteristic for the Essenes like the language of the other blessings in this agenda, and in the time-span of 3-4 decades between the foundation of the Essenes' Yaḥad and the death of the Teacher the elaboration of such a blessing should by all means have been possible within a bible-orientated and learned society like that of the Essenes.

The first clear proof for the Royal Messiah in non-Essene texts is *Psalms of Salomon* 17, which may have been composed about 50-30 BCE, about a century later than *IQSa* and *IQSb*. For the time before, only Essene proofs for this figure exist. Therefore, the possibility that this figure was firstly created by the Essenes, or personally by their Teacher, should not be abandoned without a better explanation of the evidence. In *4QMMT* the Teacher was still rather polite against his addressee as a political ruler. But after having experienced that Jonathan not only refused to withdraw from the office of the high priest, but that

(88) See the Composite Text of *4QMMT* C18-24, and C25f, *op. cit.* (note 85), 60 and 62.

lie, instead, even tried to murder him, the persecuted Teacher may have abandoned all hope in the political abilities of Jonathan, creating instead the idea of a future Royal Messiah from the house of king David. If he decided this around 150 BCE, there remained enough time during 3-4 decades to develop this concept in the way we meet it in *IQSa* and *IQSb*.

### The third stage of development

The final stage of development is attested by compositions from the time about 100 BCE, i.e., a time when the Teacher of Righteousness should have already been dead. Our three main sources for this further development are (a) the secondary passage *IQS* VIII,15b - IX,11, (b) *4QTestimonia*, and (c) the *Damascus Document*.

The best illustration for this development is *4QTestimonia*. (89) This document joins — without any commentary — four quotations, not according to the hierarchic positions of the relevant figures, but according to the biblical sequence of those sources. The first quotation regarding a future prophet (lines 1-8) is from *Exodus* 20,21 according to the Samaritan ordering (= *Dtn* 5,28f + 18,18f in the Masoretic text). The second quotation (lines 9-13) regarding the future Royal Messiah comes from *Numbers* 24,15-17. The third quotation (lines 14-20) regarding the future Priestly Messiah is taken from *Deuteronomy* 33,8-11. The final quotation (lines 21-30) regards a future negative figure — similar to the later “anti-christ” — and is a more developed version of *Joshua* 6,26.

Never we meet all those four figures again together in Qumran texts. For the expectation of a future negative figure this is the only early proof which is available. The other three figures we meet together also in *IQS* IX,11, where the Priestly Messiah and the Royal Messiah strictly range in their hierarchical order like often in the *Damascus Document*. (90)

There is no need here to discuss all the other proofs for those messianic figures in the Qumran texts. All further texts, which mention messiahs, were composed in the first half of the first century BCE. Most frequent among those figures is the Royal Messiah, next to him “the Interpreter of the Law” who should become regarded as identical with the Priestly Messiah.

Finally, only the figure of “a prophet” should be specially mentioned, for this is the single of the three figures which concept was develo-

(89) Edited by J. M. Allegro, *op.cit.* (note 86), 57-60 and plate XXI.

(90) See *CD* XIX,10, XX,1, XII,23 - XIII,1, and XIV,19. Against tendencies to unify both figures in those proof-texts see *CD* VII,18-21, where the Royal Messiah is clearly a figure separate of “the Interpreter of the Law” who should become regarded as identical with the Priestly Messiah.

ped independent from the Essenes. Besides the biblical sources we meet this prophet first in *I Maccabees* 4,46, where he is longed for to decide the fate of the stones of the altar in the temple of Jerusalem, which became defiled in the time of the high priest Menelaos. According to *I Maccabees* 14,41 also a future prophet should decide, whether or not the Maccabean ruler Simon should “for all times” — i.e., including his successors — personally combine the offices of a political ruler and of the high priest. Like in *IQS IX,11* this future figure is not “the prophet”, but “a prophet”.

After the death of their Teacher the Essenes included the figure of this prophet formally into their staff of future judges, see *IQS IX,11*, whereas during the second stage of development the authority of the Teacher was valid even for most difficult decisions. For example: according to *CD XIX,33 - XX,1*, after the death of the Teacher nobody had the authority to decide in the case that a member of the concurrent group called “The New Covenant in the Land of Damascus” wanted to become a member of the Essenes’ Yahad. Only the future “Messiah from Aaron and (that one) of Israel”, who might start to officiate “about forty years” after the Teacher’s death in the past of the author (cf. *CD XX,13-15*), should again be able to decide in such a matter (*CD XX,1*). This example demonstrates that the Teacher was regarded as embodying the highest and comprehensive juridical rank, or seat, within all Israel, a rank which at his death became vacant.

The result: the Qumran manuscripts themselves tell us that the Essenes did *not* start in the year 152 BCE with their final concept of three future authorities. The figures of the Royal, of the Priestly Messiah, and that of a future prophet, were created — or adopted — step by step to compensate for actual deficits of the Essenes’ present times. Not *traditional* hopes in the future coming of such figures became reactivated, but challenges by actual events like the Teacher’s death urged the Essenes to bridge the gap between their present and the future time of God’s salvation by *new* suggestions.

Again and again the Essenes used the Torah and the Prophets to find answers to new questions. From this soil they harvested new ideas and *terms* to master actual problems of their present last period of history. During this time they always kept faithful to the authority of their Teacher of Righteousness, the former high priest and intentional unifier of all splinter-groups of Israel after the terrible disasters once created by the harmful high priests Menelaos, Alkimos, and Jonathan the Maccabee.

Hartmut STEGEMANN.