

## Theory of Judeo-Christian Origins: The Last Column of the Damascus Document

ROBERT EISENMAN

*Department of Religious Studies  
California State University, Long Beach  
1250 Bellflower Blvd.  
Long Beach, California 90840*

The theory of Judeo-Christian origins does not argue that all the material at Qumran is Jewish Christian or even that most of it had to come from the first century C.E. Rather, it argues that the *last stages* of the *movement*—and contrary to some, it is a movement—responsible for the literature at Qumran is the same as or all but indistinguishable from the Jerusalem Community of James the Just from the 40s to the 60s A.D. in Jerusalem. All such terms need definition. The problem is few people have a clear understanding of what “Christianity in Palestine” means in this period; the same for terms like “Palestinian Christianity” or “the Jerusalem Church” or “the Jerusalem Community.”

From the 40s to the 60s A.D., it is doubtful that the name “Christian” was even known in Palestine. By the Book of Acts’ testimony (13:1–3—in this instance, probably accurate), Christians were first called “Christians” in Antioch. Here, it is clear the appellation is originally being applied to a Pauline community, including obviously “Greeks and Jews together”—one of Paul’s favorite linguistic allusions—even it would appear, some “Herodians,” to wit, one “Manaen brought up with Herod the Tetrarch.” I take these references on the whole to be accurate because *they make sense*, a very important consideration when evaluating claims—ancient or modern—in this field.

Acts’ description refers to the 50s of the Common Era. This means that “Christianity”—a Greek expression in any case—was not called this up to this point *in Palestine*. So what might “Christians” have been called in Palestine? They might have been called, “Nazoraicans” or “Nazarenes,” a term with clear parallels to Qumran usages relating to the idea of “keeping,” not “breaking the Law.” They may have been called “Essenes” or “Jesseans,” a term used by the fourth-fifth century Christian theologians, Eusebius and Epiphanius.

But “Essene” or its variations are not used at Qumran, unless Essenes are the “*Osei ha-Torah*,” *i.e.*, the “Doers of the Law,” which is used at Qumran—a term with particularly pregnant meaning where the Community of James is



concerned. It is possible to call the group responsible for the literature represented at Qumran, "Essene," as long as one comprehends that it was not peaceful, retiring, apolitical, and the like, which is the usual picture of Essenes, but rather something more militant.

It is possible to call it "Zealot." It also is possible to call it "Ebionite"—another little-understood term with relevance to early Christian history in Palestine, and actually used in early Church history to describe the movement and its remnants headed by or harking back to the figure of James the Just in Jerusalem. In fact, the term, *Ebion* or Ebionite, is in wide use at Qumran as a term of self-designation in numerous important published contexts and in some of the new Hymns we published in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, and as such would be more appropriate than many of these others.

It is also possible to call them "Zadokites" or "sons of Zadok"—even Sadducee, a derivative of this last. One of the problems, or, depending on one's perspective, one of the benefits of such a terminology, is the emphasis on words deriving from the Hebrew root for Righteousness/Righteous One/even Justification relating to this root cluster Z-D-K at Qumran, so much so that it must always be considered whether by "son of Zadok"—again another term relating to "Sadducee"—one is actually speaking literally, *i.e.*, with reference to a genealogical "son of Zadok," or figuratively.

For two decades, I have been at pains to point out in my work the "Righteousness" implications of this word, and parallels in Christianity, when discussing "the sons of Righteousness" or "the Righteous One" and another adumbration of this linguistic cluster, the "priesthood after the order of Melchizedek" of Hebrews. I have also been at pains to point out that the Sadducees of the Herodian period are different from the kind of Sadducees we have at Qumran, *i.e.*, we have "establishment Sadducees" and "opposition Sadducees" and the operating determinant here is their attitude towards foreign rule, foreign appointment of high priests, foreign gifts and sacrifices in the Temple, niece marriage, divorce, polygamy and the like. These are the broad, over-arching categories in this as in any period—not minor nit-picking, legal quirks, though there were these as well.

In *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (London, 1992) I refer to this corpus as the "literature of the Messianic Movement in Palestine." I also referred to it in this way in my 1983 Brill offering: *Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians and Qumran: A New Hypothesis of Qumran Origins*. In my view, that is the most appropriate way to refer to the literature we have before us, taking into account the overt Messianism of a whole range of Messianic allusions and proof texts in both previously published form and now in other more recently published ones.

What I have done in my theories—in addition to combining both "Zealot" and "Jewish Christian" hypotheses and insisting on the relation of these both, and what I call "opposition" or "Messianic Sadducees," to a pro-Maccabean

viewpoint—was to recognize the parallels, particularly in terms of vocabulary and conceptualities, with materials in the New Testament, certainly in the Letters, but to a certain extent Acts and the Gospels too. I have attempted to show that these parallels, rather than being accidental or casual, are intrinsic.

In doing so, I have been able to adopt something of a *modus operandi*—that is, that the scriptural materials we have, with the exception of materials like the Letter of James, which Martin Luther and Eusebius (Constantine's Bishop) both felt should not be in the New Testament (they were right; it is much closer to Qumran ideology), Jude, 2 Peter, the last part of the Book of Acts, *etc.*, systematically reverse Qumran positions on almost every point. Instead of the militancy of Qumran, in Christianity as we know it, we have pacification; instead of intolerance and/or excommunication (though often Paul personally, if not doctrinally, adopts the absolutely unbending and intolerant attitude of his interlocutors), we have inclusion; instead of nationalism, cosmopolitanism; instead of zeal for the Law, antinomianism; compared to this-worldly Messianism, spiritualized Messianism; and an apocalyptic final war against all evil on the earth versus the *Pax Romanum*.

It is for this reason that the documents before us appear so strange. We are looking at them from the perspective of a Messianism that never existed in Palestine, that was retrospectively re-written into a Palestinian milieu. I have summed this up in the following simple manner: if you want the truth about what happened in first century B.C./first century A.D. Palestine, go to the Scrolls. The Scrolls are the documents that have come down to us almost in a time warp—unedited as it were—without any redaction tradition to speak of. All others must be treated with suspicion in direct proportion to the redaction process subjected to—particularly where an Empire as dominant, all-pervasive, and repressive as the Roman one is concerned.

This is as true for documents we call "Christian" as for those we call "Jewish," *i.e.*, Talmudic materials and the like. For instance, most heirs to the Talmudic tradition assume that the progenitors of the Rabbis—the Pharisees—were the popular party in the Palestine of their time. But this doesn't jibe with the facts. From the time of Judas Maccabee to that of his grand-nephew Alexander Jannaeus (an individual who now appears to be mentioned in an adulatory manner in new texts), to Pompey's storming the Temple in 63 B.C., to Herod in 37 B.C., through the revolts centering around opposition to the imposition of Roman tax at the turn of the eras, to the final uprising against Rome in 66–70 A.D., where Josephus tells us that the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Herodians invited the Romans into the city to suppress the uprising (the intermediary here was, surprisingly enough, an individual Josephus identifies as an Herodian named "Saulus"), on through to the Bar Kochba period—the people consistently ignore Pharisee advice. Typically, as the people generally are, they are nationalists or what I have been calling "Messianists." I admit, it is psychologically difficult—especially when personal predilections come into play—to come to grips with the anti-nationalist policy of the Pharisees.



It has been queried how popular the movement responsible for the literature at Qumran could have been, and the usual response is, it was an isolated community. But the literature represented by Qumran is as impressive as it is extensive, and this is to misunderstand the nature of the literature at Qumran. Certainly not everyone was able to live the wilderness life-style of extreme purity regulations demanded by the literature we have before us, but this does not mean that there was not a great deal of sympathy for people willing to do so throughout the commonwealth. Not everyone was willing to "enlist" as a Maccabean freedom-fighter, but this does not mean there was not a good deal of sympathy for people willing to do so. I would go further and contend, that anything less would be surprising, because this is the kind of militant, unbending, anti-foreign, Righteousness-oriented and purity-conscious movement usually appealing to the more nationalistically minded masses. If the movement represented by the literature is, in fact, what passes for "Zealot," then I would assume it is a very popular one indeed.

The inability to recognize the movement we have before us as having anything to do with Christianity or Christian origins in Palestine is called by some with some justice, "defending the uniqueness of Jesus," and many in the early elite in Qumran research suffered, albeit subconsciously or even what I have elsewhere termed "psychologically," from this inability. Many of the heirs to these people still do. They are looking for a familiar Jesus, but they are not going to find him in the Scrolls; therefore they automatically conclude, "the Scrolls are not Christian." However, they frame the question wrongly. What we have before us is unfamiliar almost by definition; that is what makes it so different and exciting. But it must be cautioned that it is not the documents before us that are historically defective; what is defective is the documents we are heir to and the almost childish reverence and affection with which we treat them.

It is our understanding of what is called early Christianity in Palestine that is defective, not the Scrolls. I have only tried to link the last-mentioned to familiar conceptualities and events that shine through the tradition, despite mythologization, despite quite evident overseas Hellenization, despite retrospective Hellenistic novelizing—particularly the "Righteousness" doctrine. By tracing its relationship to the Zadokite/Sadducean movement, one is able to build up an historical picture of two groups of Sadducees, one establishment (what I later termed Herodian Sadducees) and one opposition, stemming from the more normative Maccabean tradition, but destroyed and sent into opposition with the Herodian/Roman take-over.

Those who would represent my views in a simplistic manner contend that for me all Qumran doctrines are "Christian"; this is as silly as it is inaccurate. My first book on the subject, *Maccabees, Zadokites, Christians, and Qumran*—as its title implies—traced this movement from the Maccabean into the Herodian period, and on into the early Christian era. It is too easy to reduce me to saying

all these documents are "Christian," but we must speak. In fact, none of them are "Christian," as I make clear, if we mean by Christian most of the documents that have come down to us from non-Palestinian or overseas sources we call "Christian" or the religion we define by that name.

Another key usage for this period is "the Star Prophecy" of Numbers 24:18, the importance of which I repeatedly signal. Josephus designates this prophecy in a little remarked passage at the end of the *Jewish War* as the moving force behind the uprising against Rome (as it was behind the creation of Christianity). This is reinforced by the Roman historians Suetonius and Tacitus probably dependent on him. It is found in at least three places in the published corpus, including 1) in a critical section of the Damascus Document in revealing passages bearing on the "Damascus" imagery, from which the document takes its name, and the "New Covenant" to be consecrated there—imagery also paralleled in New Testament contexts; 2) in a key passage in the War Scroll leading up to an evocation of the Messiah coming on the clouds of Heaven with the Heavenly Host, as per Daniel 7, to execute Judgement on all mankind; and 3) in the collection of Messianic prooftexts named the *Messianic Florilegium*—additional indications of just how Messianic Qumran really is.

There is also "the way in the wilderness" prophecy of Isaiah 40:3, applied in Christian scripture to the activities of John the Baptist as a forerunner for Jesus. This passage is twice referred to in columns viii–ix of the Community Rule and applied there, as well as in the Damascus Document, to the group's own activities in the wilderness—in the second-named "the wilderness camps"—in preparation for the End Time and the Day of Vengeance. There are many allusions of this kind familiar to those conversant with Christian usages. This raises the question: when would a group of this kind have been applying allusions to "the way in the wilderness" to its activities? It is hard to believe any period prior to the first century, the paleography of the Community Rule notwithstanding.

There are also allusions of this kind in the well-known Habakkuk Commentary, particularly the evocation and exegesis of Hab 2:4, with which in my view the document climaxes. Along with Gen 15:6 on Abraham's faith "being reckoned for him as Righteousness" and Is 53, it is one of the foundation pieces Christian theology. My detailed analysis of it, which is beyond the scope of this presentation, can be found in *James the Just in the Habakkuk Pesher* (Leiden, 1986). Briefly, the exegesis of it in the Habakkuk Pesher is Jamesian, and what is more, appears to be framed with knowledge of the Pauline position in mind. Again, this is extremely telling internal evidence for a first-century provenance for this document anyhow.

This is the kind of internal data that exists placing us in the first century, as opposed to external data like paleography or Carbon 14 testing, both useful, but hardly definitive. There is no indication that materials or prophe-



cies of this kind were popular at any period prior to the first century. Even if paleographic or carbon dating were to counterindicate this, given the imprecise nature of these two arts, I would find it difficult on the internal evidence to think that any document emphasizing such materials related to any period earlier than the first century without more internal *textual* evidence to substantiate this—this does not exist.

For instance, in columns iv–viii of the Damascus Document, there are attacks on the establishment incorporating very telling allusions for chronology at Qumran like “sleeping with women in their periods” and “marrying nieces.” Since these behavior patterns are described as habitual, we have applied them to Herodians and those acquiring their pollution by intimacy with them, since Herodians were regarded as foreigners and married their nieces and close family relatives as a matter seemingly of family policy. There are also references to “vipers” and “kings of the peoples,” known Roman legal terminology for petty kings in the East.

There are many more: not only has it been widely remarked, especially by the practitioners of the Zealot hypothesis some decades ago, that the military characteristics of the overseas invading armies, dubbed “Kittim” in Qumran presentations, are Roman; but in the Habakkuk *Pesher*, which uses *Ebion* to refer to the rank and file of the community—a term, of course, directly related to the name of the Jamesian tradition in early Christianity mentioned above—it is definitively stated that these Kittim “sacrifice to their standards and worship their weapons of war.”

There can be little doubt, aside from the description of their overwhelming might and ruthlessness, that this is descriptive of Romans, but even more, Romans in the imperial period, not the republican, because it was during the imperial period, not before, that Roman legions paid obeisance to their standards because of the bust of the emperor upon them. There are several others even in the Habakkuk Commentary itself and interested readers should consult *James the Just in the Habakkuk Pesher* for these parallels. There is also a comprehensive and telling emphasis on “works,” “justification,” baptism—even Holy Spirit baptism—and the New Covenant.

It may be that the Scrolls were put into the caves in 50 B.C., the implication of much consensus theorizing—an idea I find unconvincing. Are we then to assume the people responsible for these manuscripts simply ignored 100 of the most intense and eventful years of Palestinian history—but rather were intent on pronouncements, prognostications, and historical exegeses dealing with events as ancient as George Washington or Bismarck would seem to us today? In addition to not having to answer what this fanatical and wildly apocalyptic group was doing for 100 of the most exciting years of Palestinian history, consensus scholars depend on the fact that the general public just does not read the texts, and if it does, does not feel confident enough to make any sense of them.

This is what is meant by internal data taking precedence over external, including AMS Carbon 14 tests, or the paleography of Qumran studies, which is a tissue of circularity and utterly unreliable. That is why we so much wanted to publish the *Facsimile Edition of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, to “level the playing field,” so there would be no more “official” editions, which invariably contained interpretations which came to be regarded as official too—to open the debate.

The same for the library-theory of Qumran origins. The issue is not whether the materials come from Qumran or not. The group we are dealing with in these texts lives both in “wilderness camps” and in Jerusalem. That is the clear implication of the materials before us, published or unpublished. But the texts are homogeneous—the same ideas, the same concepts, the same allusions, the same unbending militancy moves from text to text across the spectrum of documents. Of course there are variations in individual style and content. For instance, one never finds a text that advocates accommodation with the Establishment or foreigners or loving one’s enemies. Also too, we have, as in some mystical texts like the one incorporating the imagery of Ezekiel’s “chariot,” a creativity of the most intense and ecstatic kind.

It is also very clear their authors are neither Pharisees nor Pauline Christians. They would have approved neither of Herod, as both Essenes and Pharisees were said to have done—all this is clear from reading the texts—nor of the Romans, as Rabbinic Judaism and Pauline Christianity appear willing to do. In these texts, we have an unbending and militant xenophobia—the same in the more mystical texts; there is no inconsistency here. Though seemingly mired in legal minutiae that to a modern mind might appear trivial, this mind-set of extreme apocalyptic “zeal” was probably the popular one. Certainly the “Zealots” were parties to it, as probably were that group now referred to as “Jewish Christians,” *i.e.*, those Jerusalem Church supporters or followers of James the Just called “zealous for the Law” in Acts 21:21. It would be like imagining, for purposes of discussion, a non-Muslim venturing into Mecca during the pilgrimage season and seeing the atmosphere of zeal and militancy reigning there. Of course, a non-Muslim could not do this; he would not be permitted. But that is just the point.

The same atmosphere held sway in Jerusalem on the Temple Mount in the period we are considering, including the same restrictions regarding “foreigners” on the Temple Mount, at least where so-called “Zealots” and the partisans of the literature we have before us were concerned. The use in other documents of the language Paul uses in Romans and Galatians to describe the significance of Abraham’s salvatory state (also used in Islam with a slightly different twist to produce similar new departures), *i.e.*, delineating the minutiae of “works that would be reckoned for you as Righteousness in the end of days,” or as Paul would have it in parallel, but more faith-oriented, allusions “as justifying you,” are of the most fundamental importance.



Now we have this incredible denouement of the Damascus Document, found in the Cairo *Genizah* almost a century ago, the Qumran parallels to which were not released for public attention until last year. Revealingly it is an excommunication text of the most extreme and unbending kind. Not only does it thoroughly embody the mind-set we are speaking of above, but it parallels similar ones embedded in that neo-Kabbalistic mystical text referred to above, and another in columns ii–iii of the already published Community Rule, again confirming the basic homogeneity of all these documents and concepts. The words here are to be pronounced “by the Priest commanding the Many”—also referred to, as we shall see, as “the *Mebakker*” or Overseer/Inquisitor below—on “anyone who rejects these Judgements based on the (exact) sense of all the Laws found in the *Tôrâh* of Moses” (lines 5–6). “Rebellion” is referred to in line 7 and lines 9–10, continuing the actual “curse” to be pronounced by “the Priest” (high priest?) on the rebellious person being “expelled from the presence of the Many.”

The notion of “rejecting the Law in the midst of the entire Congregation” is tied to a backsliding “Liar,” who is the ideological adversary of the Righteous Teacher in published texts from Qumran across the board. This adversary, who is clearly involved in a “Lying service” and whose “works” are described as being of “emptiness,” contrasts with the Righteous Teacher, who both justifies the Many and whose works bring salvation. In this final column of the Damascus Document, these allusions come full circle and are accompanied by a ban on those who reject the *Tôrâh* of Moses. Such language would certainly have been directed against a Paul, had Paul ever been to the “Damascus” this text referred to as the Damascus Document so reveres.

The text does not precisely follow any material from either of the two overlapping known manuscripts found by Solomon Schechter in the Cairo *Genizah* in 1897, though many of its allusions do. In its present form it is preserved in at least two copies. That it really is the last column of the Damascus Document can be ascertained from the blank spaces on the parchment on the left of one and the bottom of the other.

The correspondences in this last column, which make it clear, that we are continuing from earlier columns, are to columns i, viii, and xv of the Cairo version. There are also interesting new materials about a convocation of those who “dwell in camps” on the third month—in Judaism, *Shavu'ot* “the Feast of Weeks,” in Christianity, Pentecost. In lines 17–19 of the text, the purpose of this very interesting convocation would appear to be not to celebrate the descent of the Holy Spirit and the abolition of the Law in favor of more Pauline Gentile-oriented doctrines and devices as in Acts 2:1ff. (see also the picture of Paul hurrying to Jerusalem to be in time for Pentecost below), but rather to *curse* all those who depart in any manner from the Law or “the *Tôrâh* of Moses.”

In lines 2–4, referring to inadvertent sin, the extant fragment begins by

insisting that the penitent bring a sin or guilt offering (presumably to the Temple) to be purified (*cf.* Lev 4). It is worth noting, that at the time of his final Pentecost visit to Jerusalem mentioned above, James imposed a similar purification or penance procedure on Paul in the Temple. Here, in the words of Acts 21:21–24 Paul was publicly to exhibit that he was “still walking in the way and keeping the Law”—all expressions found at Qumran (italics mine).

In lines 3–5 the passages adduced to support this penance for “remission of sin,” including an interlinear addition (5a), are somewhat esoteric—even a little ambiguous. Among many other key usages, one should note the reference to “the peoples” to designate those who do not follow the Law in line 10. Paul in Ro 11:13 uses a parallel term in Greek to describe himself and the people to whom he is addressing his mission, *i.e.*, “Gentiles.” I cite all these examples not to belabor the point, but to show how numerous such parallels actually are. One should also note the key use of the word *ma'asi* “reject” in lines 5–6 above about “rejecting . . . the *Tôrâh* of Moses” and a parallel word *ga'lah* in line 7 where the man “whose spirit rejects the Foundations of Righteousness” is referred to.

In the Habakkuk *Peshet* this terminology is used to describe the “Lying Spouter” who “rejects the Law in the midst of the whole congregation.” The language is paralleled, too, in the Community Rule, iii–iv, which also describes the behavior of an archetypical “son of Darkness” with “a blaspheming Tongue,” whose “soul rejects the Foundations of the Knowledge of the Judgements of Righteousness,” whose “works are abomination, whose Spirit fornication, whose Ways uncleanness, whose service (mission) pollution . . . who walks in all the Ways of Darkness.”

In i.15–16 of the Cairo Damascus Document in the midst of the long description of how the Scoffer/Comedian “poured over Israel the waters of Lying,” these “Foundations of Righteousness” are “the Pathways of Righteousness.” There, the allusion to “wandering astray in a trackless waste without a Way,” which the last column uses to describe “the Peoples,” *i.e.*, “the families (of man) and their national languages” in 10 above, is used to describe the effect of the Spouter/Scoffer’s “waters of Lying.”

The same is true for the connections between lines 12–13 about “the boundary markers which were laid down” and CD,i.18: “removing the boundary markers which the First (*i.e.*, the forefathers) laid down as their inheritance that He might call down upon us the curses of the Covenant.” Lines 13–14 of the present text again end up by “cursing” those who “cross” or “transgress” these “boundary markers.” The language parallels in these texts, as usual, are *exact*.

There are pregnant parallels of this kind in every line of the text. An interesting parallel in early Christian history would be James 2:10’s assertion: “he who breaks one small point of the Law is guilty of breaking it all.” In James, this passage is presented against a background of Qumranisms like



"keeping" (keeping the Law), "breaking"/"Breakers" (breaking the Law), "Doer"/"doing," "Light," "Judgement," etc. In the context, too, of "rejecting the Judgements about the exact sense of all the Laws found in the *Tōrah* of Moses" in line 6, the text also uses the key word "reckoned"—used in Gen 15 in relation to Abraham's faith being "reckoned for him as Righteousness"—already mentioned above: "he will not be reckoned among all the sons of God's Truth, because his soul rejected the Foundations of Righteousness."

It would be easy to appreciate how such words could be applied in a mindset of the kind represented by this text to a person teaching "the Many," that "the works of the Law" were "a curse" as in Gal 3:6–10—this in a section about Abraham's faith—or to someone, who, by making himself "a friend of man," had turned himself into "an Enemy of God." They increase the connections between the excommunication being pronounced in this text and information about "the Lying Spouter" in other texts.

The language at this point in the text is clearly that of Deuteronomy's "blessing and cursing." Just as in the Community Rule, v–vii, the expellee is not to participate in the pure food of the Community any longer (*i.e.*, according to another vocabulary circle, not keep "table fellowship" anymore); here one is not to "eat with him" (15). In the Community Rule no one is to cooperate with him in "common purse" or "service"/"ministry"; here one is not to "keep company with him" in any way or "ask after his welfare." Those who do so are to be "recorded" by the character known as the *Mebakker*—mentioned above—who is to make sure any additional "Judgement" with regard to such persons is carried out (16).

This *Mebakker* or "Overseer" was extensively referred to in columns, xiii–xv of the Cairo Damascus Document, as well as the same column 6 of the Community Rule mentioned above. In the latter, he is over the Community Council and functions as treasurer. In the Damascus Document he functions as a kind of "Bishop" and obviously has absolute authority over the Community and its camps. Described in earlier passages of the Damascus Document as someone, 30–50 years old, who "is the master all the secrets of men and all tongue(s) according to its (their) enumerations" (note very carefully the "tongue" and "language" significations here; CD, xiii.13–14). His word is law in everything. He is to carefully examine potential entrants, teach "the exact sense of the Law," make "Judgements," and carefully record all the matters mentioned in this document and elsewhere, particularly these "Judgements." A good example of these judgements is also provided by Document 49 of *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered*, where a member of the "camps" is given a penance for masturbation. That these camps actually existed and are of fundamental importance for understanding how "the way in the wilderness" prophecy was being applied in the Qumran corpus in anticipation of the "last times" and the final apocalyptic "vengeance" on all backsliders and idolators is of no mean significance.

The usage "the priest commanding the Many" in line 8 (and probably in line 1) should be explained as well. Since he, too, makes "Judgements" (*cf.* lines 1 and 16), he is very likely identifiable with the "Bishop" just described. If they are identical—and there seems to be every reason to think they are—then this dual role is almost indistinguishable with the dual role accorded to James the Just in early Church tradition in Eusebius and Epiphanius. Even James' title, "Bishop of Jerusalem," plus the description of him in almost all early Church sources as "high priest," resonates with the materials before us here, particularly if this "priest commanding the Many" is in addition to be considered a kind of "opposition high priest."

Finally, the issue in lines 17–18 of "cursing all those who have departed to the right or to the left from the *Tōrah*" at Pentecost is particularly interesting. For Paul in Gal 3:11–13 above, "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law" by becoming "a curse" or "cursed" (*i.e.*, "by the Law") himself. To explain or show how this could be, he cites Deut 21:23 (in a discussion flanked by citation of the two key scriptural passages from Gen 15:6 about Abraham's "faith" and Hab 2:4 "the Righteous shall live by his faith"), to the effect that a man hung upon a tree is "cursed." The language of Paul's approach mirrors the language of the approach we are encountering here. Both are operating within the framework of the "blessings and cursing" from Deuteronomy.

Paul, if one can be so bold, is *reversing* the cursing language of his opponents, who, we can assume, have also "cursed" him, throwing at them the worst affront imaginable, that their Messiah, who for the purposes of argument let us say was "hung upon a tree," was "cursed" according to the very Law they cursed him with. Therefore, this Messiah has by taking this "curse" upon himself redeemed Paul (and for him and Christianity following him, all mankind as well). I have said in all of my work heretofore, that in effect the New Testament materials familiar to us—particularly the Pauline 1) show knowledge of the Qumran position on almost every point and 2) systematically reverse almost every position of Qumran in favor of a larger, more cosmopolitan, pacifistic, pro-Roman and foreign-oriented *Pax Romanum*. At the very least, this text shows that both Paul and its authors are working within the same ideological context, but at opposing ends of the spectrum. What is more, Paul is again reversing and turning positions we find here into their mirror opposite, in the process using it to develop some of the most telling theological syntheses where history of thought in the West is concerned.

The issues before us here are that momentous and one sees how important the context we are talking about in this previously unpublished fragment really is. If this suggestion has any truth to it, one can imagine how it would have enraged the interlocutors of the kind illustrated here. James 3:10, evoking as in IQS, ii, Paul, and Lines 8–14 above, the Deuteronomic "blessing and cursing" backgrounds of the whole issue, ties, of course, this "cursing" to its nemesis "the Tongue."



The text ends, as already noted, with the evocation of an annual convocation on *Shav'ot*—in Jewish tradition, classically the commemoration of Moses' receipt of the *Torah* fifty days after going out from Egypt. Here “the Levites” and the inhabitants of all “the camps” are to gather every year for the purposes of cursing those “who depart to the right or the left from the *Torah*” (17). Again we have here a particularly vivid picture of the existence of these wilderness camps and the life led by their inhabitants in them. Parallely in IQS,ii.19ff. above, they are to curse “all the men of the lot of Belial . . . as long as the Government of Belial endures (Herod?) year by year in perfect order ranked according to their Spirit.”

In Acts 2:1, Pentecost commemorated the descent of the Pauline “Holy Spirit” with its “Gentile Mission” accoutrements of “speaking in Tongues,” etc. One should compare this allusion with the *Mebakker*'s abilities in this regard in CD,xiv.9 above, who is to “master . . . all Tongue(s) and its enumerations.” We have already noted the revealing picture in Acts 20:16ff. of Paul hurrying to Jerusalem with his *contributions* to be on time for just such an annual convocation of the early Church (*i.e.*, Community) at Pentecost. In this context he runs into his last difficulties in Jerusalem with those within the Community of a more “Jamesian” frame of mind, who cite complaints about his activities abroad and demand absolute adherence to the Law.

In such a presentation, Acts' picture of Pentecost can be seen as the mirror reversal of the “Pentecost” being pictured here. Lines 17–18 also highlight the phrase “the exact sense of the Law”—here “Judgement”—“in all the Eras of Evil” and “Wrath” just as the Damascus Document earlier in xiii.5–6 and xiv.16ff.—these last in relation to the “Judgements” the *Mebakker*/Bishop was to make “until God should visit the earth” and “the Messiah of Aaron and Israel should rise up to forgive their sins . . .”

This language of “*doing* the exact sense of the *Torah*” is very important. It is also to be found earlier still in vi.14–15 coupled with reference to “*the Era of Evil*” and “*separating* from the sons of the Pit” (italics mine). It is also the backbone of the allusions to “*doing* the *Torah*” or “*Doers* of the *Torah*” in the Habakkuk *Pesher*'s exegesis of both Habakkuk 2:3 on “the delay of the Parousia” and Hab 2:4, “the Righteous shall live by his faith.”

The text ends by evoking the phrase “*midrash ha-Torah*,” *i.e.*, “the study” or “interpretation of the Law.” This term also turns out to be the focal point of the critical analysis in IQS,viii.15 of Is 40:3's “preparing a Way in the wilderness.” Here, too, once again the emphasis is on *doing*, *i.e.*, *doing* the “exact sense of the Law.” The actual words are: the Way “is the *study/interpretation* of the *Torah* which He commanded by the hand of Moses that they should *do* according to all that has been revealed . . . as the Prophets have revealed by His *Holy Spirit*” (italics mine).

This then ties all these documents and approaches together. Those, who in IQS,viii.14's words, “*separate* from the habitation of the men of Evil and

go out *in the wilderness to prepare the Way of the Lord!*” (italics mine) are none other than the inhabitants “of the camps” being addressed and described in the present text. The implications, where the true nature of these wilderness camps and what was really going on in the “wilderness,” are quite startling and far-reaching. One thing is certain: one has in these texts a better exposition of what was *really* going on “in the wilderness” in these times so pivotal for Western civilization than in any other more familiar literary accounts. It is *this* that the theory of Judeo-Christian origins attempts to come to grips with.

---

#### DISCUSSION OF THE PAPER

LAWRENCE SCHIFFMAN (*New York University, New York*): Just a matter of perspective. Let me begin by explaining that the issue of method here is the fundamental issue. What you essentially do is load on a whole lot of associative material that may or may not be parallel, and then deny all criteria of dating which specifies anything that we can possibly use—one by one they're all written off—then you take a fundamentally correct position (that all this stuff has got to be reevaluated and questioned) and turn it into a bunch of jumbled information, which has nothing to do with the subject at hand. Now let's take this text that you discussed at the end. You examined a fragment, a fragment in which there is not one stitch of anything that relates to the material which you presented first. By overlaying all of that stuff, you created a false impression about the context of this fragment. This fragment needs to be studied in a context of the entire Damascus Document, then you've got to ask yourself whether it fits into some other kind of theory. As to the theory itself, as far as I am personally concerned it is a lot of nonsense.

ROBERT EISENMAN (*California State University, Long Beach*): That's not the way I talk about your work. I think you should be a little more respectful.

SCHIFFMAN: This theory is unacceptable. You may be right, in which case I apologize.

EISENMAN: Let's stop playing for the camera.

SCHIFFMAN: This theory presents the notion that the entire set of documents is talking about a certain period, whereas virtually everybody believes that it dates to another period. So you must simply write off all evidence which doesn't fit in with your view. The problem with your associative technique is that most of the things we're talking about exist in Judaism from day one. Militancy, for example, versus more accommodationist approaches, existed at day one, as they exist today in American Jewish and Israeli politics, because they're part of the different views within Judaism.



EISENMAN: Exactly, that's right.

SCHIFFMAN: You can't take different views within Judaism and then pick them out and simply say that they must be matched up with somebody who happens to fit into one or another trend, whether it be Paul, whether it be James, whether it be Jesus, John the Baptist or anyone else. These people will naturally take one or another of the trends, such as the Messianic trends which existed throughout the history of Judaism, from whenever the Qumran scrolls are until the present. That's why these associations don't seem to me to be relevant at all.

EISENMAN: One thing Prof. Schiffman does is to speak so loudly and aggressively that he tends to bulldoze all of us, whether on a podium here or in the audience. It's always difficult to respond to him. His presentation of my views is so tendentious, and it absolutely fails to come to the essence of what I'm doing. He shows no knowledge of the footnotes of any of my books, which are quite massive. All I can do is recommend that he read my books. I have extensive criticisms of the paleography and of the archeology of Qumran, I don't have to go through this kind of sophomoric criticism. What he's doing, I take as a compliment. He finally picked up my theories about this establishment/opposition Sadducee idea. You know what he's doing though, because everything he says comes from his rabbinic origins. People see this material through the myopia or the eyeglasses that they're wearing. Okay, we all have eyeglasses; you want to call mine Islamic, that may be. I think Islam relates to this material more than any of the traditions that we've been talking about, at least in ethos.

He has refashioned the theory now that the establishment Sadducees are the Maccabees. He's just pushed my ideas; I said that this is an opposition Sadducee movement stemming from the failure of the Maccabean uprising when the Herodians came in and crushed it. Prof. Schiffman just pushed it back a little further so he could also push back his Pharisee tradition, as being accurate. He continues to hold to this idea that the establishment Sadducees are the Maccabees. He thinks what we have here is a group opposing the Maccabees, i.e., an opposition Sadducee group, diverging from and attacking the Maccabees. That is total nonsense. You used that term, 'total nonsense'. This group exhibits its nationalist, xenophobic, law-oriented ethos down the line. These are consistent, and everything we know about the Maccabean family exhibits the same characteristics, except for the one exception of Hyrcanus II, which I deal with extensively in my work.

MATTHIAS KLINGHARDT (*Augsburg University, Augsburg, Germany*): Since the whole set of ideas you presented here is made up of nonspecific parallels that do not prove what they are supposed to, there is no reasonable way for me to respond. Instead, I would like to ask you a very limited question. Which texts from the Qumran caves do reflect the history of early Christianity in your opinion, and which are just traditional material? What is the criterion for determining these categories?

EISENMAN: I didn't say that we had the history of early Christianity here, I said there are parallels. You don't see what we're doing here. The parallels are strong. The thing is that the ideas are fixed, the categories are fixed, the ethos is fixed. I don't think we're ever going to agree on the dating of these materials, but like most others, I put the pesharim in the last period of the development of this group.

I can't prove that the Community Rule came from the First Century, but if it comes from any other century I would be very much surprised, given the internal data that we have there. The War Scroll evokes the Star Prophecy, as the Damascus Document does. We have from Josephus the specific information that the Star Prophecy or 'the Messianic Prophecy,' the prophecy that a world ruler would come out of Palestine, was the moving force behind the uprising against Rome. He says that at the end of the *Jewish War*: Tacitus and Suetonius, depending on him, agree with that. Christianity obviously agrees that the Star Prophecy is very important, because it is the backbone of a lot of the material Christianity is presenting. This is the kind of data that I present to you as internal data. I have discussed the paleographic, the archeological and the carbon material elsewhere. That's all that I can tell you, Dr. Klinghardt.

KLINGHARDT: So it's your point that the early Jewish Christian theology is similar to what we find in the scrolls?

EISENMAN: Jewish Christian theology, that's Second, Third Century A.D.

KLINGHARDT: No, I'm speaking about Jewish Christian theology, First Century.

EISENMAN: The Jerusalem church of James the Just, Palestinian Christianity, yes.

KLINGHARDT: I'm absolutely pleased.

EPHRAIM ISAAC (*Institute of Semitic Studies, Princeton, NJ*): I want to express some reservation about your methodology, but your material is interesting. Since you quoted Einstein's theory I will quote Darwin's theory. He wrote a book called *The Origin of Species* according to which life evolves and everything is interrelated, so to say, but even Darwin wouldn't go as far as saying different species would mix. In other words, if you start defining what you mean by Jewish-Christianity and then looking at the other thing, aren't you really mixing the different species, and confusing the picture of interrelating cultures?

EISENMAN: I don't think there was "Jewish Christianity" in Palestine in the First Century, I never imagined such a thing. However, we have to talk, yet we don't have the proper terminology. I've tried to use the terminology "Messianic Movement in Palestine," and tried to show how this developed with the demise of the Maccabean family and the evocation of a new leadership principle, revolving about prophecies like the Star Prophecy, and some of the ones in the *Messianic Florilegium*, and so on. But that terminology—I don't think there were two Messianic Movements in the First Century with



totally opposing ideology; that doesn't work. "Ebionites" has connotations from the Third Century. I follow the Pseudoclementines, though the Pseudoclementines are as fictional as much of the material in the Gospels and the Book of Acts. We're talking about Hellenistic romantics across the board here. I don't think the Pseudoclementines are telling me anything particularly interesting except that there were some problems in the previous era.

So, we have to talk, and the *Ebionim* "the poor," is an actual term this group uses as self-designation. "The Poor" is a name for the current of thought moving about James continuing on into later Jewish Christian sources. It's as good a term as any other. No, I don't think we're mixing apples and oranges here. I don't think Jewish Christianity is an appropriate term. You can call them Zadokites; I prefer to call them what they called themselves, but I add the appellation "Messianic Sadducees." I like that one, I think it's creative. I'll stand on that.