

Endnotes for Part 5

Chapter 19

1. CDi.19.
2. All such ‘*casting down*’ allusions should be compared with CDiv.15-17 on ‘*Belial casting down nets to deceive Israel*’ and the corresponding material in Revelation 2:14 about ‘*Balaam teaching Balak* (two ‘*B-L*’s here) *to cast a net before the Sons of Israel to eat things sacrificed to idols* (the terms of James’ Directives to Overseas Communities in Acts) *and commit fornication*’ (also a part of these ‘*Directives*’ and banned at Qumran, specifically here in the Damascus Document); and see my article in *DSSFC*: ‘*The final Proof that James and the Righteous Teacher are the Same*’, pp. 332-51.
3. *Ps. Rec.* 1.49-52.n
4. *Ant.* 20.142.
5. *Ant.* 20.139-41 and cf. *M. Sot.* 6.8, where the actual passage being discussed is that found in the Temple Scroll, Deuteronomy 17:15: ‘*Thou shall not put a foreigner over you.*’ As we have already seen, Agrippa is so ‘*Pious*’ that those assembled on the Temple Mount cry out; ‘*You are our brother, you are our brother, you are our brother*’ three times.
6. See our Genealogy below, pp. 1010-11. There, it should be appreciated, Agrippa I (Drusilla’s father) is descended on his mother’s side from the ‘*Costobanus*’/‘*Salome*’ (Herod’s sister) or ‘*Idumaeans*’ side of the relationships (drawing us ever closer to ‘*Saulos*’, the ‘*Helcias*’/Temple Treasurers, and ‘*Julius Archelaus*’. Of course, on his father’s side, he is descended from the last Maccabean Princess (Herod’s wife by coercion) Mariamme. It is here that the Rabbinic stricture that you are ‘*Jewish*’ if your mother was ‘*Jewish*’ probably developed, but it is doubtful if the ‘*purists*’ at Qumran would have accepted such a tenuous connection. Even the Rabbinic groups would have had to have been given pause by Agrippa I’s mother, to say nothing of both Drusilla’s mother and grandmother. In any event, as Josephus attests, once her father was dead, ‘*Judaism*’ as it were, seems to have hung very lightly on her shoulders.
7. 11QLVII.15-19. This continues from the quotation of the Deuteronomic King Law (17:15) in 11QLVI.13-15. The first to have really called attention to the importance of this notation to Second Temple history was Robert Eisler. If he could have seen the Temple Scroll, he would have been very excited. Of course, one should also note 11QLXVI.8-17, where the Scroll breaks off.
8. See *Ant.* 18.253-6, 20.145-146, and *Vita* 119. Note that Bernice’s first marriage in *Ant.* 19.276-7 was to Marcus, the son of Alexander the Alabarch of Alexandria (and probably Philo’s nephew), the richest man in Alexandria. Note, too, that in *War* 2.183, Josephus tells us Herodias and Herod the Tetrarch were banished to Spain, whereas in *Ant.* 18.252, he says that they were banished to Lyons in Gaul.
9. See *Ant.* 19.363-5, 20.173-84, and cf. *War* 2.457-93. Also note how in *Ant.* 19.355-9, the inhabitants of this city even go so far as to rape Agrippa I’s still virginal daughters when they were only girls after his death.
10. *Ant.* 20.197-215. The sequentiality here is of the utmost importance and even parallels that in Acts twenty years earlier of Stephen to Saulos. Here in the *Antiquities* it goes James to the riots and finally to the enumeration of the last Priest of Jerusalem. This – including the ending here in the *Antiquities* – is all very curious.
11. *Vita* 13-16. Note Josephus begins this excursus on his trip to Rome on behalf of some priests who were sent there by Felix and who would ‘*eat nothing but dates and nuts*’ by saying he ‘*had completed his twenty-sixth year*’ – meaning it was approximately 61-63 CE just around the time of James’ stoning. It would be also well to add that this was also approximately the time Paul made his first plea to go to Rome, also just following the time of Felix’s Governorship. These link-ups are curious indeed.
12. *Vita* 16. It was not long after this that Nero Kicked his wife to death when she was pregnant, whether in Dio Cassius’ words in 62.28.1, ‘*by accident or design*.’ One always harbours the niggling suspicion that this

- child might have been Josephus, since he describes how well-received he was by Poppea and it is not clear when he finally left Rome. Only that he was back to Jerusalem in time to witness the events culminating in the Revolt against Rome.
- 13(12). *Vita* 13. As usual, these are 'certain Priests.' In addition the '*Piety of their practices*' is noted and, it should not be forgotten that under the Essene '*Piety to God*,' i. e., the First '*Love*' Commandment, just such practices are noted. It should be noted that many individuals were sent to Rome at this time to plead their cause before Caesar, including the High Priests Ananus and Ishmael ben Phiabi and the Temple Treasurer Helcias, the last two of whom Josephus actually notes in *Ant.* 20.189-96 stayed with Poppea in her own house. Our warrant is to try to figure out what the disturbance was that was causing all this disruptions and '*the Temple Wall Affair*' seems to fit all the parameters.
14. *Vita* 13.
15. As we saw, in *Vita* 364-67, Agrippa II is described by Josephus as writing him some sixty-two letters, attesting to his veracity and adding to his information in between the writing of the two works, several passages from which Josephus actually quotes.
16. We note in Acts 25:9-26:32, Paul's appeal to Caesar occurs in the presence of Festus around 61 ce and in the company of Agrippa II and Bernice, both of whom are present. In *Ant.* 20.214, the riot led by '*Saulos and Costobanus*' some 3-4 years later during the end of Albinus' Governorship when Gessius Florus was on the way to succeed him.
17. Cf John 12:10-11 with the more extensive '*plotting*' preceding it in John 11:45-54, the duplication of which shows how tendentious these accounts generally are.
18. See, for instance, the allusion to '*joining*' / '*Joiners*' (in Esther, as we have seen, an expression for converts) in CDiv.3 – in esoteric exposition of '*Leva'im*' / '*Levites*' in Ezekiel 44:15 – and 4QpNahIII.8 and IV.5, with generally the same meaning of '*convert*' or, in the case of '*Ephraim*' perhaps, those backsliders who have since come back to Judaism. One should also note '*the Joiners in the War of*' of the last decipherable line of *The Paean for King Jonathan* (4Q448) in DSSU, pp. 273-81 and '*joining*' Christ's body in 1 Corinthians 6:16-7 banning '*fornication*.'
19. Cf. Acts 6:11 with *E.I.* 2.23.16-25 and *pars.* The unexplained '*stoning*' (the penalty for '*blasphemy*') is the same in both cases, but the '*why*' is not clear. Moreover, in '*Stephen*''s case, despite the somewhat '*fuzzy*' picture of him in Acts, '*Stephen*' can hardly be reckoned a '*Jew*,' so why the stoning? One should also note the '*blasphemy*' charge depicted against '*Jesus*' in in John 10:31-91 introducing the two passages about '*the Jews plotting*' against both '*Jesus*' and '*Lazarus*' in Chapter 11 just noted above. Here the writer obviously understands more about the '*blasphemy*' charge and thinks it has to do with '*claiming to be the Christ*' or '*Son of God*' (very Pauline), though '*Jesus*' corrects them with the claim, as at Qumran and elsewhere, of multiple sons.
20. Here it is the Jews who are '*blaspheming*' while Paul and the Gentile Christians he represents are presumably doing just the opposite. One should also note the repetitive picture in Acts 13:45-50, 14:19, 17:4 (including the word '*joined*' again), 17:10-13, etc.
21. See *War* 3.536-41 and cf. Suetonius 6.19 on '*Nero*'.
- 22(25). *Ant.* 1.8-9. Despite much scholarly controversy over this, Epaphroditus was executed in approximately 95-96 CE (see Suetonius 8.14.4 on '*Domitian*' and cf. 6.49.4 on '*Nero*'), in the same upheavals which seem to have taken the life of Flavius Clemens ('*Clement*') and probably Josephus himself – this, despite the fact, that some think Josephus (and therefore a second '*Epaphroditus*') lived into the Second Century and Trajan's time, an unlikely proposition. It is for this reason, it is possible to conclude that Paul's '*Epaphroditus*,' who has entrance into Nero's household, and Josephus' '*Epaphroditus*' are identical.
23. Despite the seemingly mutually exclusive references to '*Timothy*' and '*Titus*' in 2 Timothy 1:2 and 4:10, it is difficult to escape the impression that both are the same person. *N.b.*, also, the reference to '*Epaphras*' in Philomen 1:23.
24. Cf. *War* 2.227 with *Ant.* 20.112. The former gives the figure of either '*ten*' or '*thirty thousand*' depending on the redaction; the latter, '*twenty thousand*.'
25. *War* 2.223-4 / *Ant.* 20.108. Interestingly, the latter actually calls this '*a blasphemy against God*.'
26. It should be appreciated that the *Homilies*, which came down through the Greek, begins with the Letters from Peter and Clement to James, the latter in Chapter 20 explaining that all that follows are the reports of Clement to James. The whole of Book One of the *Recognitions*, which came down through the Latin and the Syriac and contains the meeting with James and the attack on him by Paul, is missing from the *Homilies*; while the Letters are missing from the *Recognitions*.
27. *War* 2.228-31 and *Ant.* 20.113.
28. See *E.H.* 2.1.1-2 and 23.5 and *pars.*
29. See Ps. Rec. 1.72-73, where James sends out Peter from somewhere outside of Jericho on his first 'Missionary' journey to stay at the house of one Zacchaeus and confront Simon Magus in Caesarea (note that in Luke 19:2-8, Zacchaeus is '*a little man*,' '*a tax-collector*,' who shimmies up a Sycamore Tree as '*Jesus*' is passing through Jericho and invites him to stay at his house there – a very curious parallel). In Josephus

- (*Ant.* 20,142), the ‘Cypriot magician’ he calls ‘Simon’ or ‘Atomus’ is presumably also in Caesarea where he persuades Drusilla to divorce her previous husband Azizus, who had specifically circumcised himself to marry her in deference to her father Agrippa I’s wishes, and marry Felix.
30. For this squabbling between Greeks and Jews, see notes 9 and 10 above (*Ant.* 19.357–65, 20.173–84, and cf. *War* 2.457–93); for Samaritans and Jews, see *Ant.* 20.118–36.
 31. *Ant.* 20.124 and cf. *War* 2.238.
 32. *Ant.* 20.127 and cf. *War* 2.232–46.
 33. For Petronius (later the author of the *Satyricon*), see *War* 2.185–203 and *Ant.* 18.261–209; for Cestius, see *War* 1.20–21 and 2.280–564 and cf. Quadratus, the base of whose Governorship was Antioch in Syria, here in *War* 2.238–46 and *Ant.* 20.125–36.
 34. Cf. *War* 2.239–44 with *Ant.* 20.130–131. For Tacitus’ comment, see *Annals* 12.54.
 35. See n. 25 in Chapter Seven above and *San.* 32a. For how the sages led by R. Akiba brought R. Eliezer’s body back to Lydda, see *ARN* 25.3 (27a); also see *Lam R.* 1.5.31 on R. Eliezer and R. Judah going back into Jerusalem to take R. Zadok out via the Gate to Lydda at Vespasian’s bidding (*sic*) and *Suk.* 2b–3a/*Tos. Suk.* 1:1 on the construction of Queen Helen’s giant *Sukkah* there.
 36. See *Ant.* 20.130 above and *War* 2.241. Also, for the various crucifixions at Lydda in Talmudic tradition, see *JBj*, pp. 494–7 and 1018 and *Suk.* 52a–52b, which considers that ‘the Messiah ben Joseph’ – probably the Samaritan Messiah – who was supposed to precede ‘the Messiah ben Judah’ (the Judean one) was crucified there. Also, another curious *nom a clef* (probably for ‘Jesus’ or ‘Simon Magus’), ‘Ben Stada’, is mentioned in *San.* 67a – cf. *San.* 43a and *Shab.* 104b, which says he brought ‘magic from Egypt’ – as having been crucified there. For more on ‘the martyrs at Lydda’, see *B.B.* 10b and *Pes.* 50a.
 37. See pp. 101–107 above on the Samaritan ‘Messiah’ or ‘Taheb’ and Acts 9:32–43 on how Peter meets all ‘the Saints that lived at Lydda’ just prior to his ‘tablecloth vision’ in 10:1–32, among whom are ‘Dorcas’ a.k.a. ‘Tabitha’ a woman, whom quite naturally he raises from the dead!
In any event, ‘Ben Stada’ is probably another corruption of ‘the Standing One’ and one should note that for the Pseudoclementines (*Rec.* 2.7–12 and *Hom.* 2.17–32), ‘Dositheus’ (i. e., ‘Doetus’) is a Samaritan Disciple with Simon Magus of John the Baptist. For Josephus, though the ‘Doetus’ who is executed here at Lydda by Quadratus is a Samaritan, he is ‘a Leader of the Jews’ (thus). Curiously enough, in *War* 4.145–6, Josephus identifies another individual, ‘John the son of Dorcas’ (i. e., ‘Doetus’) as the ‘Zealot’ assassin who creeps into the Temple prison and assassinates Saulos’ and Costobarus’ kinsman, Antipas the Temple Treasurer who is awaiting trial as a ‘Traitor’ preceding the murders of James’ executioner Ananus ben Ananus and Josephus colleague Jesus ben Gamala that follow.
For Justin Martyr, a Samaritan himself, in the early Second Century, ‘the Sotadists’ are definitely related in 2 Apology 14–15 in some way to the Samaritan Simon Magus. Further, one cannot go but, as we have noted above, ‘Tabitha’ is definitely a variation on ‘Triathaba’, the location of the activities and Pontius Pilate’s subsequent crucifixion of the Samaritan Taheb as described by Josephus *Ant.* 18.87–89. Nor, can there be any doubt, that Dositheus is in some manner a Samaritan.
 38. See *War* 2.225–249 and *Ant.* 20.115–138 above. The point is that in *Ant.* 20.142–3 ‘Simon’ or ‘Atomus’ (i. e., ‘the Primal Adam’) is a ‘magician’ who convinces Drusilla to marry Felix, while at the same time one can hypothesize that he was the ‘Samaritan who informed’ Quadratus in Lydda that the instigators of the Jewish mob against the Romans there was ‘Doetus together with four other Religious Innovators’ or ‘Revolutionaries.’
 39. See above pp. 6–11 and 224–5.
 40. Cf. Acts 11:19–26 with *Ps. Rec.* 1.70–71.
 41. See *Ant.* 20.51 and 101 which make it clear that Helen spent large sums of money to send her treasury agents to Egypt and Cyprus to purchase grain and dried figs to relieve the famine in Jerusalem. It is Helen who comes up to Jerusalem and not necessarily Paul, but Paul may have accompanied her as the merchant Ananias who got in among her husband’s harem to convert her might have done.
 42. Cf. 1QS VIII.20–25.
 43. Since he is speaking mainly about circumcision in many of these passages, it can be assumed this is what he means, but cf. 1QpHab xi.2–15, where the subject is Habakkuk 2:15 ‘spying on their Festivals’ but which in the received Habakkuk is ‘spying on their privy parts’ (*me’oreihem*) vs. ‘me’odeihem’ – very similar spellings in Hebrew) and ends up with the assertion that ‘the Wicked Priest did not circumcise the foreskin of his heart’ and that in the end he would drink from ‘the Cup of the Right Hand of the Lord.’ One should also note that in 1QpHab xi.8–9 quoting Habakkuk 2:16, the words ‘Drink also and stagger’ are substituted for the received version, ‘Let your foreskin be uncovered,’ which however, as we just saw, is picked up in the exegesis in 1QpHab xi.13. These substitutions and transformations are too insistent to be accidental; see my article ‘Interpreting Abeit-Galuto in the Habakkuk Peshet: Playing on and Transmuting Terms,’ *DSSFC*, pp. 247–71.
 44. See, for instance Galatians 4:11–5:12 where he is making just these sorts of complaints and ends up with an expletive about ‘circumcision.’

45. Jerome, *Vir. ill.* 2.
46. 1QpHabxi.8-15.
47. *Ps. Hom.* 11.15.
48. 1QpHabxi.13 above.
49. See CDiii.5-12 (giving the eschatological picture of the History of Israel) and 1QSI.2, ii.13-18, iv.9-14, etc.
50. For this kind of 'building' imagery and 'puffed up' language in the Habakkuk *Peshet*, see x.9-12 on 'the Worthless City'; the Spouter of Lying 'builds upon blood' and 'the Church'; he 'erects upon Lying'; and vii.14-viii.15 on Habakkuk 2:4 introducing the all-important 'the Righteous shall live by his Faith,' 'Behold his soul is puffed up and not Upright within him,' which ends with how the Wicked Priest's 'heart became puffed up and he deserted God and betrayed the Laws for the sake of Riches' and how 'the sins' of persons like him (presumably meant to include 'the Spouter of Lying'/'Liar') 'would be doubled upon them and they would not be pleased with their Judgement.'

Chapter 20

1. Cf., *inter alia*, 1QMxi.7-14, in interpretation of 'the Star Prophecy' of Numbers 24:17-19, referring to God's 'hands' (plural), 'the hands of the Messiahs' (interpreted in terms of 'the Seers of Your/ God's Testimonies – presumably 'the Prophets'), 'the hand of the Poor One' (Ebion – singular), 'Yours (God's) hand' (singular), and 'the hands of the Poor' (Ebionim – plural), in the context of the language very much resembling that of John the Baptist in Matthew of 'setting a flame like a torch of fire in the straw until all Evil is devoured'; and 'the Visitation for their Punishments' and 'Reward by 'His (God's) hand' and 'the hand of the Prince of Lights...and that of the Angel of Darkness' in 1QSIii.14-21.
 2. 1QpHabx.9-12 above.
 3. Cf. 1QpHabxi.12-xii.12.
 4. See 1QpHabviii.9-x.5 and xi.12-xii.12 above, CDiii.21-iv.7, v.7-15, vi.11-viii.4-19, etc.
 5. Cf. 1 Corinthians 12:20 and 2 Corinthians 5:1.
 6. Of course, the same language permeates the Dead Sea Scrolls; cf., in particular, 1QpHabviii.9-x.5 and xi.12-xii.12 and CDiii.21-iv.7, v.6-15, vi.11-vii.4, and viii.3-12, etc. above. Also cf. 1 Corinthians 4:18, 6:11, 8:7, 10:7-9, 12, 28, etc.
 7. Cf. Acts 21:28, 1 Corinthians 3:9-17, and 2 Corinthians 7:1 (including the language of 'Perfecting Holiness in the fear of God' also found in the Damascus Document) with 4QMMTi.2-23.
 8. 1QpHabx.9-13.
 9. For others like J. Murphy-O'Connor in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, 1990, pp. 826-27, these are the so-called 'Judaizers' (*sic* – a derogatory euphemism if there ever was one); for *The New English Bible* of Oxford University, they are 'the Jewish Christians,' a more neutral euphemism – whatever this might mean.
 10. That James required 'written authorizations' or 'credentials,' much like modern Rabbinical 'smichut,' is made quite clear in *Ps. Hom.* 11.35, echoed in *Ps. Rec.* 4.35, but also see *The Epistle of Clement to James* 20 and variously, in particular, Paul own view of 'written credentials' in 2 Corinthians 3:1-11, comparing them to the two tablets on Sinai, which he characterizes as 'the Ministry of Condemnation' as opposed to his own 'Ministry of the Spirit in Glory.' Cf. too 2 Corinthians 5:11-12 and 10:8-18 above, where he begins his 'boasting' and condemns those 'who recommend themselves' or 'write their own letters of recommendation.'
- Note here, too, the 'works'/'labor' dichotomy, also extent at Qumran in 1QpHabx.9-13 above, 'labor' for 'the Liar' and 'works' for 'the Righteous Teacher.'
11. Cf., where all these 'coming down' to Antioch in Acts are concerned, n.b., Acts 11:27-28, where it is 'prophets' who are 'coming down from Jerusalem to Antioch.' In 13:1 'there were in the Assembly which was in Antioch certain prophets and teachers.' Regardless of whom such 'prophets and teachers' could have been thought of as being, there is no doubt that the 'some' or 'certain ones' who are 'coming down from Judea' in 15:1 (should one read here rather 'from James') and 'teaching the brothers' are the representatives of the author of precisely these kinds of 'letters of authorization' or 'recommendation' as we have been explaining.
 12. 1QpHabviii.1-3 in interpretation of the all-important Habakkuk 2:4. That it is eschatological is made clear from all that precedes it in 1QpHabvii.2-16, where the whole subject is 'the Last Generation,' 'the End,' 'the Last Age,' 'the Time of the End,' and the 'Judgement.' For more on 'the Day of Judgement' and 'the Last Days' see ix.6, xii.14-xiii.4, CDiv.4.4, etc.
 13. See Josephus' description in *War* 2.143-4. Here the word Josephus uses, a we have seen, is 'ekballonsi.'
 14. For 'the Enemy' in the Pseudoclementines, see *Rec.* 1.71 and *The Epistle of Peter to James* 2; in Matthew, see the anti-Pauline 'Parable of the Tears' 13:25-39, and in the Letter of James, see 4:4. For the 'Zealots for the Law' as the followers of James *par excellence*, see Acts 21:20.
 15. CDiii.6-7 and 9-11. Also see xix.25-6.
 16. It will be recalled that for 'Jesus' in the Gospels, this is expressed in terms of the famous 'not one jot or tittle shall disappear from the Law until all these things are accomplished' – whatever might be meant by 'being accomplished' – see Matthew 5:18/Luke 16:17; in the Habakkuk *Peshet*, this 'stumbling' idea is reflected in xi.6-8.
 17. *Ant.* 20.38-46 and *Gen. R.* 46.10 on Genesis 17:11.
 18. 1QpHabvii.11 (on Habakkuk 2:3-2:4), viii.1, and xii.4-5; for the same idea in CD ('doing according to the precise letter of the

Notes

- Torah'), see iv.8. For being a 'Doer' in James, see 1:22-6 and 2:13.
19. Cf. 1QpHabx.9-12 above.
 20. The point here is that Paul seems consciously to avoid the term 'Jew' or 'Jewish' where it relates to him. He does speak of 'being advanced in the practice of Judaism' – a new term, which he seems to have been one of the first, if not the first, to coin – in Galatians 1:13-14 where he does actually use the term 'race'/'genous' again, but again too, not 'Judah' or 'Jew' but rather unspecified.
 21. See *JBj*, pp. 502-15 and 653-56 and above, pp. 413-4 and 504-5.
 22. Cf. CDiv.11 and 1QpHabviii.1
 23. Genesis 36:32-3 and 46:21; cf. Numbers 26:38-40 and 1 Chronicles 1:43-4, 7:6-7, and 8:1-3.
 24. The point is that 'being of the Tribe of Benjamin' is an Israelite notation, while 'being an Edomite' or 'Idumaeen' is an 'Hebraic' one, so Paul ingeniously makes use of both; but the unique Biblical commonality might have been what made it all possible. While the spelling in Genesis 46:21 is slightly different than that in 36:32, still that in 1 Chronicles 7:6 and 8:1 is the same. Interestingly enough, there is even another 'Bela' listed as a descendant of Reuben in 1 Chronicles 5:8.
 25. If one wanted to be cruel here or deprecating, one could substitute the euphemism 'Judaizers' as some above prefer to do or even the more neutral 'Jewish Christians,' but those in Jerusalem at this time – the 'some from James' of Galatians 2:12 below – certainly had no knowledge as yet that they were to be called 'Christians' and all of this language reflects the new attitude of the Pauline 'Gentile Mission' or of what we would now call 'Pauline Christianity' and is retrospective. 'The Jerusalem Assembly' is more appropriate or 4QpPs 37's 'the Assembly of the Poor.'
 26. There is no comparable work found at Qumran, unless it be the Temple Scroll or even *MMT*, which are compendiums of rearranged Old Testament passages on various subjects, as Qumran is firmly against 'Traditions' – clearly, even against 'Traditions of the Fathers' – as the parody in CDi.18 and variously of 'Seekers after Halakot' or 'Smooth Things' for 'Halachot' makes plain.
 27. We have already discussed the 'Enemy' terminology of Ps. Rec. 1.71, *The Epistle of Peter to James* 3, Matthew 13:25-39, and James 4:4 above. For the 'Zealots for the Law' as the followers of James *par excellence*, see Acts 21:20.
 - 28(29).CDxx.17. There is certainly a disconnect here.
 29. For verification of this, see Romans 4:1-16, 9:7, Galatians 3:6-29, 4:28, and 2 Corinthians 11:22 as well as Paul's purported speech in Antioch of Pisidia in Acts 13:26, which uses both the 'Genous' and the 'fearing God' terminologies, to say nothing of the 'Salvation' one.
 30. CDi.14-16.
 31. *War* 2.143-4 and see my reference to Josephus' use of the same term, 'ekballonsi,' n. 13 above. We have covered the use of this 'casting out' language in all of my work over the last fifteen years, but particularly in 'The final Proof that James and the Righteous Teacher are the Same,' *DSSFC*, pp. 332-51 (first given to the Society of Biblical Literature in Chicago in 1994) and *JBj*, pp. 219-25, 505-9, and 710-59
 32. This 'slavery' and 'attachment to the flesh' imagery of Paul is a favorite one – see, for instance, Romans 1:3, 7:1-9:8, 11:14, 13:1-15, 1 Corinthians 10:18, 2 Corinthians 11:18-24, Galatians 1:16 (definitely pointing to the first or 'Super Apostles'), 6:8-13 (he writes it 'in large letters' worthy of Goebbels), Philippians 3:2 ('look out for dogs')-6, etc.
 33. Note 1QpHabvi.7 and see, for instance, 2 Corinthians 11:20 above. For the 'Belial'/'Bela'/'Balaam' allusions, see CDiv.14-17, 1QHiv.10, and variously at Qumran, Revelations 2:14, 2 Peter 2:15, and Jude 1:11, and 11QTLxlv.10 above.
 34. See 1QpHabv.12-vi.11 above.
 35. 1QpHabxi.15-xii.10.
 36. See, in general, *San.* 105a-106b.
 37. Cf. CDiv.18-20, viii.13, 1QpHabx.9-15, 1QStv.9-11, etc.
 38. Cf., for instance 1QSix.22-25 and 1QpHabx.9-12.
 39. See, for instance, how 'the Jews' seem to persecute 'Jesus,' as if he were not Jewish, in John 1:19, 5:16-18, 6:52-7:11, 8:48-57, and variously. The same for 'Stephen' in Acts 6:1-7:60; or for that matter Paul in Acts 9:22-3.
 40. See, for instance, *The Epistle of Peter to James* at the beginning of the *Homilies* 2-5.
 41. 1QSii.22-25.
 42. See below, pp. 593-6 and 11QTLxiv.9-11.
 43. The actual word Deuteronomy 21:23 uses is 'tetamme'/'to be polluted,' an expression so widespread at Qumran it would be hard to catalogue all its occurrences derivatives.
 44. 4QpNahii.7-8.
 45. See John Allegro in *DJDv: Qumran Cave IV: 4Q158-4Q186*, Oxford, 1958, whose reconstruction it originally was, and F. G. Martinez in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, Leiden, 1997, i, p. 337. But see Vermes in *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (revised edition), New York, 2004, p. 505, who (always temporizing) leaves out the reconstructed phrase 'a thing not done,' though in previous editions he had included it.
 46. See *War* 1.97-98 and *Ant.* 13.380-1.
 47. See *Vita* 420-21, *War* 2.308, 5.449-51, 7.17, and Appian, *Civil Wars* 1.116-20, Plutarch, *The Fall of the Roman Republic*, 8.1-2 on Pompey referring to this Crassus, and Seneca in *The Dialog to Marcia on Consolation* 6.20.3. Actually the events during the Spartacus Uprising appear to have been even closer to those during Alexander Jannaeus' reign – c. 71 BC; and the individual involved in its brutality, the

- Roman plutocrat Crassus, later followed this up in Judea, succeeding Pompey's lieutenant Gabinus there, where he proceeded to do what even Pompey had not done, *'taking away all the rest of the gold belonging to the Temple* (Josephus reckons this as *'two thousand talents which Pompey had not touched' – sic) in order to outfit his Persian Expedition*,' where in fact he was killed – see *War* 1.179.
48. See, for instance, how John 19:31-33 understands this. Josephus, too, explains this as a kind of Jewish *'scrupulousness in the matter of the burial of the dead'* to emphasize in his description of the brutalities inflicted upon the corpses of the High Priest Ananus ben Ananus and his friend Jesus ben Gamala by *'the Zealots and Idumaeans'* in *War* 4.314-352 (specifically 317) and even uses the Temple Scroll's language of *'pollution'* in describing in 4.323 how, because of these things, *'God had condemned (Jerusalem) to destruction as a polluted city and resolved to purge His Temple by fire'* – chilling words anticipating and justifying Titus' final actions against the City two years later.
49. 11QTLXIV.7.
50. There is no way to avoid this conclusion as this is certainly not the point of Deuteronomy 21:22-3, which only speaks generally about *'a man who commits a sin worthy of death'* and, here too, the point is specifically made that he is *'put to death'* first and only afterwards his body is to be *'hung upon a tree'*, clearly in some exemplary manner, to display to others the heinousness of his crime.
- Again, here too, the point is specifically made that the *'pollution'* has to do with *'his body remaining all night upon the tree'* not the act of *'hanging'* itself which is recommended as long, it seems, as the body is already dead. Once again, the Gospels seem to have this wrong as the portrayal there, in the words of John 19:31 and *pars.*, has to do with how for *'the Jews, because it was the Eve of the Preparation, the bodies should not remain on the cross upon the Sabbath for the day of the Sabbath is a Holy Day'*. Again, this was not the point of *'the breaking of the legs'* for the vast majority of the Jews – perhaps for the Romans. Who knows?
- Moreover, this point seems to have *'bled into'* the portrayal of (or *vice versa*) both the attack on James by Paul in *Ps. Rec.* 1,71-2 and his stoning, according to the account by Jerome in *Vir. ill.* 2, in which he *'had broken' either one or both 'his legs'*! That in the Temple Scroll the charges are made more specific than in any other context, namely spying on or betraying your People to foreign power and, what is even more interesting, committing a capital offence and escaping to a foreign country and thereafter cursing your People or the Children of Israel, bespeaks a very different political situation, one mainly having to do with dominion or impending dominion by foreign powers.
51. See Y.Yadin, who originally published it, in *The Temple Scroll*, Oxford, 1983, p. 362, F. García Martínez in *Near Eastern Archaeology* (63.3), 2000 on the Temple Scroll, p. 172, and B. Z. Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness*, Cincinnati, 1983, pp. 1-9.
52. Both of these situations, as described – however tentitiously – in Acts, certainly involve either fleeing abroad to escape charges of some kind, the first perhaps even causing someone's death and the second appealing to foreign power to save oneself from charges involving either sacrilege, betraying others to death, slandering one's own People, and even perhaps idolatry or blasphemy.
53. See n. 43 above and John 19:31-33 and *pars.* and *War* 4.317, all of which (as we have seen) focus however tentitiously on the issue of not leaving *'the body on the tree overnight'*. But what is rivetting here is that the Temple Scroll, LXIV.7-9, is actually different from Deuteronomy 21:22-23 and lists crimes for which it is appropriate to *'hang (a man) alive upon a tree until he dies'* (here again the caveat is that *'the corpse shall not spend the night upon the tree'*) – namely, *'fleeing to the Gentiles'* to escape an appropriate death sentence, *'cursing'* one's own People and *'the Children of Israel'* (with some justice, one could in fact describe both Paul and Josephus in this manner), and treacherous activities like *'slander'* and *'betrayal'* – all particularly appropriate to Judea in the mid-First Century (more internal dating parameters).
54. 11QTLXIV.7-13.
55. See the antagonism to backsliders, turncoats, traitors, and the like in 1Macc1:12-6, 1:36-8, 1:44-56, 3:5-7, etc. and 2 Macc 4:33-5, 5:15-6, 6:1-9, 14:3-14, etc.
56. Josephus' self-justifications in the *Vita* are numerous – see, in particular, *Vita* 62-79, 82-113, 336-367, 414-30, etc.
57. See *War* 4.335-43 above. It is hard to think that the author of Luke has not mixed up these two characters, with such similar sounding names, nor that the precision involved in making such an assertion existed concerning the Prophet Zechariah.
58. We have already discussed Saulos, Costobarus, and Antipas above, but Antipas in particular was executed by this combination of the Zealots and the Idumaeans as Ananus, Jesus ben Gamala, and Zechariah ben Barachias were (and, even seemingly, later *'Niger of Perea'*, though it is not at all clear that he was considered Jewish and not simply Idumaeans); see *War* 2.418, 556-7, 4.140-6, 314-18, 359-63, and *Ant.* 20.214.
59. 11QTLXIV.12. Though the expression *'he that is hanged is the accursed of God'* is found in the Septuagint and most Biblical redaction, the general thrust has to do with the act of *'putting him to death'*, which precedes the exemplary exhibition of

- '*hanging him upon a tree*' and in most Biblical redaction the phraseology '*upon a tree*' is missing at this point in relation to '*the accursed of God*.' The emphasis, therefore, is appreciatively different. In the Temple Scroll, Paul, and, by implication, the Gospel of John, however, the emphasis shifts to the pivotal '*hanging alive upon a tree*' (seemingly in accord with the tenor of the times), a phraseology just not found as such in received Biblical writ except here, as just noted, in the Temple Scroll. It is clearly this, therefore, which Paul is playing off as his '*Christ Jesus*' is certainly for him someone '*hung live upon a tree*.'
- On the other hand, for John and, by implication, the other Gospels, once again, their author or authors show their total ignorance of the real parameters of existence in Palestine and demonstrate that they are working off sources, largely second or even third-hand; since they misunderstand that the hurry to get the '*crucified ones*' down '*from the tree*' has nothing whatever *per se* to do with the coming '*Sabbath*' or '*Feast Day*', whether Passover or some other, but rather the general Commandment, reiterated in all sources, that the body whether dead at the time of the exemplary '*hanging*' or '*hung up alive*', according to later Roman practice, could not remain '*upon the tree over night*' – as it was this that was the affront to the God of Israel and '*polluted the Land*' weekday or Festival Day.
60. See *Septuagint*, Deuteronomy 21:22. For Paul, this reads approximately: '*Cursed (is) everyone hung upon a tree*,' while here in the Septuagint it reads: '*for everyone that is hung upon a tree is the cursed of God*' or '*Cursed is everyone that is hung upon a tree by God*' – not a precise fit. Moreover, it follows the caveat that the malefactor has already '*been put to death*' and must, therefore be taken down before sunset so as not to '*pollute the land*.'
61. These words are to be found in Galatians 3:10 and precede the quotation of Habakkuk 2:4: '*the Righteous shall live by Faith*' (not '*his Faith*') in Galatians 3:11 – the difference having to do with '*epikatapatos*' as opposed to '*kekatepamenos*.' The Septuagint reads, '*Cursed is every man that continues not in all the words of this law to do them*' and does not contain the word '*Biblio*' or '*Book*' which, interestingly enough, Paul uses. For the way the Temple Scroll renders this, see LXIV.12 above. Interestingly enough, in addition to Deuteronomy's '*of God*' above, it even adds as well '*and of men*' (plural).
62. See, for instance, the kind of phraseology he sets forth in 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:2. Not only does he know the '*Light*' vs. '*Darkness*' imagery so much in evidence at Qumran, but also that of '*the Perfection of Holiness*' of the Damascus Document, to say nothing of '*so come out from among them and be separate*' of the Community Rule and '*touch nothing that is unclean*' and '*and I will be a Father to you and you will be sons and daughters to Me*' of Hymns. There is much more, including '*the Servants of Righteousness*' of 11:15.
63. See, for instance, his comments in *War Preface* 1, 11-12, *Apion* 38-46, 82-124, and 271-96.
64. See, for instance, 1QSI.15-18 and note how the '*cursing*' begins in II.4-9 and 11-18 and continues. *N.b.*, the same expression '*not deviating to either the right or the left*' from '*the Covenant of our Ancestors*' or '*the Law and its observances*' occurs in 1 Macc 2:21-2 above.
65. This was the whole reason of our request to John Strugnell in 1989 to see the unpublished fragments of the Dead Sea Scrolls – in particular, those of the Damascus Document, to compare them with the extant work in the Cairo Genizah. Thereafter Michael Wise and myself published this all-important fragment, which was clearly the Final Column of the Damascus Document in DSSU, pp. 218-9. My commentary on it, which includes many of the points being made here, is to be found on pp. 212-18 of that volume and the particular passage, being referred to here, is what is now referred to as 4QD266, Lines 13-18. One should also compare this to the picture in Acts 20:16ff. of Paul with his contributions hurrying to get to Jerusalem in time for '*Pentecost*,' i. e., the time of the reunion of the '*inhabitants of the desert camps*.'
- One should note that the allusion here to '*breaking the boundary markers*' recalls and recapitulates the First Column of CD, which also refers to both '*removing the boundary markers*' – which seems to have been the hallmark of '*the Lying Spouter*' and '*delivering them up to the avenging sword of Vengeance of the Covenant*' and '*calling down on them the curses of His Covenant*' (CDi.16-18)
66. 4QD266, Lines 4-5. Possibly a loose quotation of Joel 2:12. Since the whole passage ends up in a kind of '*Penance Prayer*,' as does CDxx.28-32 from the Cairo Genizah, it is possible to look upon the individual practising these things as a species of '*Mourners for Zion*.' Before this, too, in Lines 3-4 is an extremely doctored quotation from Leviticus 26:31 '*Highest Heaven*' being very revealingly substituted for '*ruined cities*' – one doubts if there ever was a concept such as '*Highest Heaven*' in the days when Leviticus was written): '*I shall ascend to the Highest Heaven and there not smell the fragrance of their offerings*.'
67. For the use of this language of '*rejecting*' / '*rejection*' at Qumran, particularly in relation to '*the Lying Spouter*' and those of his persuasion (who '*rejected the Torah in the midst of their whole Assembly*' or '*Church*'), see 1QpHabv.11-12; for more general usage, but in the same tenor, see 1QpHab.10, CDVII.9, 18-19, xx.8-9, 1QSI.5-6, etc.
68. I have discussed this idea of a '*penance*' or '*repentance*' in n. 66 above, but the use of this word '*reckoned*' is all-important. It is the basis of the pivotal proof-text for Early

- Christianity from Genesis 15:6, found in Galatians 3:6 and elsewhere: 'And Abraham's Faith was reckoned to him as Righteousness' (or, in other language, 'justifying him'); but it also forms the backbone of the more-recently come-to-light (as result of our agitation) document known as 'MMT'; cf. 4QMMTii.1-2 and the concluding sentence of the Second Letter or Third Column, Lines 32-34: 'Thus, it will be reckoned to you as Righteousness, your having done what is Upright and Good before Him, for your own Good and for that of Israel.'
69. The first to have made this suggestion about James about being 'the Opposition High Priest' and the Head of 'the Opposition Alliance' was Robert Eisler and he did this on the basis of Early Church testimonies, but without the Dead Sea Scrolls which had not yet come to prominence; see his *Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist*, pp. 518-26, 540-6, etc. We have carried through these arguments in almost all our work, particularly *MZCQ* in 1983 (pp. 35-43), *JJHP* in 1986 (pp. 3-22), *JBf*, 1997, pp. 353-408 and variously, but note in particular the reference to 'the Righteous Teacher' as 'the Priest' in 1QpHabii.6-9 and, of course, the references we have just highlighted at the end of 4QD266 – the last (previously unpublished) Column of the Damascus Document. Moreover, as a concomitant of this, just noted as well, that 'the Priest' in whatever context in this Period – Rabbinic, sectarian, or even 'Christian' – always means 'the High Priest' further solidifies this identity of 'the Righteous Teacher' with 'the Opposition High Priest' / 'Zaddik' / 'Righteous One' James.
70. These are the same 'Boundary Markers' of CDi.16-18, we noted in n. 65 above, the 'breaking' or 'removal' of which seems to have been the hallmark of 'the Lying Spouter's' activities. This, in turn, just like the inverted and reversed activity of the hypothetical 'Judas Iscariot,' according to Gospel presentation, 'delivers them (not him) up to the avenging sword of Vengeance of the Covenant' and 'calls down upon them (again, not him) the curses of His Covenant.'
71. Cf. *War* 2.138-44. The materials outlined here make identification with the aggressive 'Final War' mentality at Qumran almost a certainty.
72. 4QD266, Lines 15-16.
73. Cf. 1QSt.8-12 and iii.17-iv.26 and note the description of 'Two Ways' in the *Didache* 1-6. In the latter, one actual has in the First Section, the presentation of the two 'Love' Commandments, directly paralleled in 1QSt.24-25; but also note how the description of 'the Way of Death' in Part 4 directly parallels that of 'the Spirit of Unrighteousness' in 1QSt.9-14.
74. Cf. Romans 8:1-27, 2 Corinthians 3:3-18, Galatians 4:29-5:28, etc.
75. 1QSt.5-9
76. Cf. 4Q286-7 in *DSSU*, pp. 222-29 and note line Ms. A, Fragment 1, Line 1. In normative vocabulary, this reference occurs in 4QBerii.1.
77. See 4Q287, Fragment 3, Column 2 on pp. 227-30 or 4QBer, Fragment 7, Column 2.
78. CDi.4-5, iii.10-11, vii.13, viii.1, and xix.6-16 and cf. 4QpPs 37ii.21.
79. Cf. pp. 225-38 above and Matthew 24:9, 26:15, 26:24, 27:3, and *pars*.
80. 1QSt.5-7 and cf. CDvii.9, 1QpHabxii.2-3, and 4QpPs 37iv.9-10.
81. Cf. James 3:4-8.
82. James 3:8-10. For this kind of imagery at Qumran, see CDviii.13 and the whole imagery of 'spouting' and 'the Lying Spouter' there; for specific 'tongue' imagery, aside from the 'speaking in tongues' of CDxiv.10, already alluded to above; see the text we have called (after an allusion in Column v.5), 'The Demons of Death' (4Q525 – *DSSU*, pp. 168-73), but which scholars call 'Beatitudes' / 4QBeat, i. e. 4Q525iv.21-28 ('guard against the stumbling block of the tongue').

Chapter 21

1. 1QpHabv.8-12. One should note that this is a 'swallowing' passage about 'the Wicked swallowing one more Righteous than he'; but here the exposition is not about 'the Wicked Priest,' which is usual in 'Wickedness' vs. 'Righteousness' prophetic passages such as this; but this time the *Peshet* has to do with 'the Man of Lying' and, in fact, the exposition continues into later in the *Peshet* when it comes to describing the doctrines and the 'Amal' of 'the Spouter of Lying.'
- One should be very clear that the Hebrew word being used here, 'Edah,' actually means 'Assembly' or, as just noted, what in Greek or English goes under the title of 'Church' and this is not 'Yahad' at Qumran, which actually means 'Community' and it has strong parallels elsewhere in the literature at Qumran, particularly in the Psalm 37 *Peshet*, where the usage 'Assembly of the Poor' / 'the Church of the Poor' actually occurs several times as we have seen. 'The Liar rejected the Torah in the midst of their whole Assembly,' so this must be seen as something like what goes in the literature as 'the Jerusalem Council' or 'the Jerusalem Conference' where Paul must have been perceived by at least 'some' as doing likewise.
2. Though the explanation in 20:16 had to do with being 'anxious to avoid spending time in Asia (though he was already in Samos and Miletus) in order to get to Jerusalem, if possible, in time for the Day of Pentecost.' Since this is 'the We Document' the narrative is more straightforward, logical, and believable and 20:6 had already referred to 'leaving Philippi by ship after the Days of the Unleavened Bread' – n.b., the reference again to 'a plot being made against him by the Jews' in 20:3 'after staying in Greece for three months' and 'being on the verge of setting sail for Syria,' i. e. 'Lebanon' and 'Phoenicia.'

- But where was this 'plot'? Certainly not in 'Greece' or 'Macedonia', to where he then returned instead of at that moment 'setting sail for Syria.' The 'plot' had to be in 'Syria' or 'Jerusalem' – most likely the latter (we take this material more seriously because, as we just said, it is in 'the We Document' and much more prosaic and straightforward, lacking either exaggeration or supernatural phenomena) – but the explanation for his rushing past Ephesus also had to have something to do with 'the Silversmiths' Riot' at 'the Temple of the Great Goddess Diana' and its aftermath, already just described – tentiously or otherwise – in Acts 19:23–20:2.
3. DSSU, pp. 24–29, 68–71, and 83–89 and note that this term 'House of Judah' is particularly important as an archaism in 1QpHabviii.1–2's exposition of Habakkuk 2:4: 'the Righteous shall live by his Faith' and CDiv.10–11 on 'with the Completion of the Era of the number of these years, there being no more joining' per se to 'the House of Judah.'
 4. See JBJ, pp. 468–9, 778–83, and 951–5 and above, pp. 14–6 and 463–4.
 5. See, for instance CDi.11, ii.11, vii.16, vii.19, xx.12, etc., and 4QFlor.10–13, citing 2 Samuel 7:12–4, and Amos 9:11, and 4QTesti.5 and 12, citing Deuteronomy 18:18–9 ('the True Prophet' Prophecy) and Numbers 24:15–17 ('the Star Prophecy').
 6. See CDi.10–11, 14–21, viii.7–8, xx.9, xx.33, etc.
 7. CDi.10–11 above.
 8. CDviii.7–8 above. This imagery of 'naziri' / 'lehimazer' (vi.15) is fundamental to the ethos of the Damascus Document and, therefore, Qumran and, as a result, defines them as a 'Nazirite Community' of 'Perfect Holiness' in the Wilderness (what 'Christianity' was trying to express by its somewhat puzzling usage 'Nazarene' and its variation?).
 9. 1Qsiii.18–iv.26.
 10. Note that this term is actually used, as we have seen in 1QpHabx.8–12, to describe the 'building,' 'works,' 'service,' and 'Assembly' of 'the Spouter of Lying who leads Many astray.'
 11. See CDi.11–ii.1 and cf. 1QpHabii.1–10.
 12. Cf. CDiv.3–9.
 13. Cf. James 2:14–26 with Ko 3.113–14 on some very congenial 'People of the Book' who 'recite the revelations all the night season' and are 'of the Righteous.' See also Ko 2.25, 2.62 (evoking 'Sabaeans'), 2.82, 2.277, 4.125 (with Abraham as 'Friend'), 84.25, 103.3, etc. Of course, 'doing' is a usage one will encounter throughout the Dead Sea Scrolls, to say nothing of the Letter of James. Also see Ps. Rec. 1.69.
 14. CDxx.9–10.
 15. See CDi.12–16 above.
 16. CDxx.10–13 and cf. n. 1 above.
 17. Cf. CDvii.16–7 and 4QFlor.11–13, specifically interpreted, as we shall see in detail below, in terms of the Davidic Messiah.
 18. This usage is perhaps definitive of the relationship to points being made in Acts to the literature at Qumran. One can find it throughout the Qumran corpus, but especially in CDi.7–8, v.15–6, vii.9, viii.2–3 (here, one should appreciate that the word 'Command' is the same as 'Visit'), xiii.23–4, 1QMxi.4, xiii.10, etc.
 19. Here the 'Visitation' implies a kind of positive process – i. e., the 'Gentiles' of 'the Gentle Mission' are turning to God – a blessing; whereas in CDv.15–6, vii.9, viii.2–3 xiii.23–4 above it is for 'Judgement' or 'Destruction,' that is, it is for 'payback.'
 20. See the document we entitled, 'the Messianic Leader' (4Q285), now considered part of the War Scroll and called 4QSM; but one also encounters this 'Zemach' or 'Branch of David' language in 4QFlor.11 and the Genesis Peshar (4Q252 or 4QCommGenB)v.3–4 above.
 21. See, for instance, how a translator like G. Vermes of Oxford translates CDii.12–13 which refers to 'making known to them His Holy Spirit' by 'the hand of His Messiah.' While the usage is certainly idiomatic, Vermes (and others) translate this – in the writer's view, tentiously – as 'His anointed ones' even though all the usages surrounding it are like CDi.7–8 preceding it, singular.
- The same holds true for CDv.21–vi.1 and occurs in 1QMxi.7 directly following the citation of 'the Star Prophecy' from Numbers 24:17–9 where, knowing this directly involves what we would call 'the Messiah,' he translates this as 'by the hand of Thine anointed' – again indirectly implying plural usage (others like Garcia Martinez go further and translate it 'your anointed ones'), though here it is completely clear the adjectival and verbal usages surrounding it are singular. This is typical of attempts, subconsciously or otherwise, by a plethora of scholars to divert the public's attention away from the mundane 'Messianic' character of these texts.
- But in Vermes' case, what is more disturbing as I have already pointed out in DSSFC, pp. 357–69, the next sentence – despite its admitted arcaneness (CDii.13 – 'and he' or 'it is Truth, and in the explanation of His Name, their names' presumably 'are to be found') – is completely left out or bowdlerized into 'and He proclaimed the Truth (to them)' without any indication of missing text or lacuna. The reason for this is quite clear. The missing sentences shows completely singular usage as opposed to the plural this translator and others have given 'His anointed ones.'
- The present writer does not pretend to understand the meaning of the passage such translators so tentiously omit, but one thing is certain, all the surrounding usages are singular and the intent of the writer here has to be seen as singular. The same can be said for the War Scroll's exposition of 'the Star Prophecy.' This kind of agenda-driven translation, even going so far as to

Notes

- omit whole lines of difficult text without even an indication of it, is just confusing to the general public.
22. CDII.11-13 and cf. CDXII.23-XIII.14-10 and XIV.18-19 about the 'arising of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel' again is utterly singular in itself and all usages surrounding it, as is the reference to 'the coming of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel' in XIX.10-11 (preceding another tell-tale reference, this time to 'the First Visitation' with the express meaning of 'Destruction') and 'the standing up of the Messiah from Aaron and from Israel' in XX.1. The same is true of the reference in CDV.21-vi.1 to 'speaking rebellion against the Commandments of God (as given) by the hand of Moses and also against His Holy Messiah' (singular) and that to 'the coming of the Prophet' (i. e., 'the True Prophet' of 'Ebionite' usage) and the Messiah of Aaron and Israel' in IQSIX.11, even though the usage in such places is clearly idiomatic.
 23. Not only does Galatians 2:11-15 make it clear that 'Cephas'/'Peter' is absolutely subject to James' ruling, though Paul in his loquacious dialectical polemicizing thinks he is not, the episode in Acts 15:5-23 – the so-called 'Jerusalem Council' – which ends in James – 'the Bishop of Bishops' or 'Archbishop' as per the Pseudoclementines and other Early Church testimony – makes his 'rulings' (Acts 15:1 9) and everyone, including Paul, required to obey them.
 24. Cf. IQpHabII.8-10 and VII.4-5.
 25. Cf. CDXX.17: 'the Penitents from sin in Jacob.'
 26. Cf. Matthew 3:8-12 and *pars*.
 27. CDII.2-7.
 28. CDII.8-10.
 29. CDIV.3-4. The point is that, as I have explained elsewhere and will do so further below, 'the Nilvīm' which means 'Joiners' is another word in the Hebrew of Isaiah and Esther for Gentiles 'joining' themselves to the Jewish Community. This is something of the meaning of 'the Residue of Men seeking out the Lord and all the Peoples upon whom My Name has been called' above.
 30. See my explanations in n. 21 above.
 31. CDII.11-13.
 32. Cf. nn. 21-2 above.
 33. We have already several times commented upon the 'works' language at Qumran, but for 'works of God' see CDI.1-2, the very first line of the Genizah copy of the Damascus Document, addressed to 'all those who know Righteousness and understand the works of God.' The circularity and consistency here is impressive.
 34. CDII.14-15.
 35. CDII.16-III.12.
 36. CDIII.12-13.
 37. For this 'Heirs' language, see Romans 4:13-4 and Galatians 3:29-4:7; for the 'Rechabite,' see Jeremiah 35:2-19 and cf. IQSV.2, v.9, and CDIII.21.
 38. CDIII.18-20.
 39. See the 'building' imagery used above to attack 'the Lying Spouter' in IQpHabIX.9-10 above, but also see CDIII.19-20 on the 'building of a House of Faith in Israel' and the later material about the 'House of the Torah' in XX.10-13 as well as that on the 'Fortress of Strength' and 'the Foundation,' 'Walls,' and 'Rock' that will not 'sway or shake' in IQHVI.24-6 and VII.7-10.
 40. CDIII.19-IV.4. This is not the only place where such imagery is used, but also see IQSIV.23, CDV.4-5, VI.10-11, VIII.20-24, XII.23-XIII.1, XIV.18, etc.
 41. The point here is that the whole of Column One of the Damascus Document from the reference to God 'visited them' in 1.7 ends up in 1.8-9 with the allusion to 'and they understood their guiltiness and knew that they were Sinners' which, of course, is nothing other than 'seeking remission of their Sins' as put here in Luke 1:78. Further to these usages, also see CDIII.18 and also note XX.20 and 34 on 'Salvation.'
 42. Cf. CDVI.3-11 and VIII.21-2, directly followed in XX.1 by another allusion to 'the standing up' or 'arising of the Messiah from Aaron and from Israel' (again singular).
 43. CDIV.4-8.
 44. What we would call 'the Last Judgement' is definitely being evoked, as we shall see, in IQpHabVII.16-viii.3 (on Habakkuk 2:3-2:4), X.3-5, and XII.12-XIII.4.
 45. CDI.19-2
 46. CDIV.7-10.
 47. See CDIV.10-12 and note how this archaism for 'Jews' reappears, as we have already pointed up, in IQpHabVIII.1 above.
 48. For Paul, exclusive allegiance to 'the House of Judah' is a downright negative and he is looking forward to a Community where Greeks and Jews can live harmoniously as 'equal citizens' – cf. Romans 1:14-16, 2:9-3:1, and 10:12, 1 Corinthians 1:22-4, Galatians 3:28, and Ephesians 2:19-21 (using 'building' and 'Cornerstone' imagery).
 49. See Solomon Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, Cambridge, 1910, whose publication it originally was and our Plates nn. 55 and 71. 71 is Column I of Ms. A and 55 is Column XX of Ms. B which to some extent 'overlaps' Columns VII-VIII of Ms. A. It should be clear that the mss. in Plate 71 is in typical Babylonian block script; but actually that in Plate 55 is a somewhat older Hebrew hand (perhaps even an original – though this is sheer hypothesis).
 50. Cf. XIX.33-35 with VIII.21 which breaks off tantalizingly with the words 'the New Covenant in the Land of Damascus.'
 51. CDVI.19-VII.9.
 52. CDI.7-II.10, III.7-12, and VII.9-VIII.19.
 53. Cf. E. I. 2.23.15 and *pars*., probably based on Hegesippus' now-lost 2nd Century CE testimony; but note how in the Hebrew rendition of this Isaiah 3:10 passage (not the Septuagint which is reproduced in Greek texts like Eusebius' here), the reference in Isaiah 3:9 and 3:11 is to 'gamul,' i. e. , 'reward,' which is omitted in most Greek-language based presentations – that is, 'the reward on Evil' or 'of their hands would be paid' of 'done to them.' This is the exact

- sense of the culminating passages of the Habakkuk *Pesher*, given below (to say nothing of the Psalm 37 *Pesher*), on the fate of 'the Wicked Priest' because of what he had 'paid' the Righteous Teacher and those of his followers among 'the Poor.' I have also covered this in my revised version of *JHP* in *DSSU*, pp. 84-88.
54. Cf. 1QpHabxii.2-6, 4QpPs 37iv.9, and 1QSii.6-7, but also see, CDvii.9. The commonality here (and by implication the contemporaneity) could not be more pronounced.
 55. 1QpHabxii.2-6, 4QpPs 37ii.19-20, and 4QpPs 37iv.9
 56. Cf. CDxx.19 with 1 Corinthians 11:25 and Luke 22:19 (*n.b.*, this phraseology is only in Luke, reflecting Paul in 1 Corinthians).
 57. CDxx.34. Significantly, this is the last line of the last Column of Ms. B.
 58. CDv.15-16.
 59. CDvii.21-viii.3/xix.13-16 and cf. *Surahs* like Ko 74.16-48, 78.17-40, 81.1-14, 82.1-19 (the purest expression of it), etc.
 60. Cf. CDxix.6-15, again beginning with the word 'gamul.'
 61. CDxix.16 (at this point, both Mss., which have now linked up again, actually allude to 'the Way of Traitors'/'Bogdim').
 62. CDxix.6-13.
 63. CDvi.3-11 and cf. CDiii.16 (in Ms. A) and xix.34-35 (in Ms. B).
 64. CDvi.17-vii.9.
 65. CDvii.2-8.
 66. CDviii.16 and 18-9/xix.13-4, 29, 32, and xx.1. As for 'Am'/'Amim', though here the usage is singular, the usage 'Amim' and 'Yeter ha Amim' in 1QpHabix.4-7 would clearly appear to relate to groups like 'the Herodians' and 'Romans' and the context here in the Damascus Document would seem to dictate a similar conclusion. There can be little doubt it relates to the Establishment and we discuss allusions such as these 'Kings of the Peoples' and 'the Princes of Judah' in these same Columns of the Damascus Document, below pp. 767-71, 786-7, and 948-51, as well as in 'Interpreting Some Esotericisms: The Kings of the Peoples, the Princes of Judah, and Gehazi' in the Damascus Document, *DSSU*, pp. 313-31.
 67. CDviii.21-2/xix.33-4.
 68. A Synonym for 'the Righteous' – CDxx.1-3 and cf. 1QSViii.13-18 on Isaiah 40:3.
 69. CDxx.3-7. Note that this same expression 'Midrash ha-Torah' also occurs in the Qumran interpretation of 'the Way in the Wilderness' passage of Isaiah 40:3 in 1QSViii.13-18 above and, by way of summing up the whole, in the very last Column of the Damascus Document, now found in 4QD266, Line 19 – also the very last words of the whole document.
 70. CDi.14-ii.1, viii.13/xix.25-6, xx.15, and , of course, 1QpHabii.1-2, v.11, and x.9 and 1QHii.31 and iv.9-10.
 71. CDxx.2-12.
 72. Cf. CDvii.4-5 with 1QSi.13, iv.20, viii.1, viii.21, viii.25, ix.6-8, ix.19, etc.
 73. CDvi.19-vii.5. As we have repeatedly shown, Paul is not too interested in either of these 'Covenants,' though he does repeat something of the same words in his version of how the post-Resurrection appearance traditions (regardless of the interpolations involved) were communicated to him in 1 Corinthians 15:3; but not in his rendition of 'the New Covenant' tradition in 11:24-25 (his version of 'the Last Supper') which, as we have seen, in 11:23 he says he 'received directly from the Lord' (thus!) – though, of course, he never says how this happened.
 74. CDxx.12-13 and 21-22.
 75. CDvii.5-6/xix.1-2.
 76. Cf. CDxii.23-xiii.1, xiv.18, and xx.1.
 77. Cf. CDxix.10 with xix.13.
 78. CDvii.13-14. This is then followed by the quote from Amos 5:26-7 in vii.14-15 about 'exiling the Tabernacle of your King' and 'My tent in Damascus,' which is not paralleled in Ms. B and does not read anything like the received version of this passage in Amos.
 79. Cf. CDxix.9 with viii.13-14.
 80. CDviii.10-11 and xii.23-xiii.1, xiv.18, and xx.1.3-14 above.
 81. We have discussed the problem with this above in nn. 21-2 above.
 82. Cf. the verbal noun 'coming' in 'the coming of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel' in CDviii.11 or, for that matter, the 'rising,' 'arising of Zadok' in v.5 or 'the standing up' (singular) of the Messiah from Aaron and from Israel' in xx.1 above, *et al.*
 83. This is particularly true in a document like 4QFlor.11 which we shall consider in detail in the next chapter, pp. 638-645 below and which refers to 'the Branch of David who will stand up' or 'arise' (in exegesis of 2 Samuel 7:12-4, 'I will raise up your seed after you and establish the Throne of his Kingdom forever. I will be a father to him and he will be a son to me' – singular) with the *Doresh ha-Torah* who will (also) rise in Zion (a different verb – 'yakim,' which does not mean 'stand up').
 84. Cf. *DSSU*, pp. 19-23 and 4Q521ii.1-3, the references throughout are singular.
 85. See *DSSU*, pp. 76-88 and 4Q252v.3-4 expounding 'the Shiloh Prophecy' of Genesis 49:11 and the reference there to 'the coming (singular) of the Messiah of Righteousness, the Branch of David, because to him and his seed was given the Covenant of his Kingdom forever (also elaborating on 2 Samuel 7:12-14 in the Messianic Florilegium about the promises 'to the seed of David' above and, again, all singular usages). For those who think there is no Davidic 'Messiah' at Qumran, it is hard to get more specific than this and the allusion to 'the Messiah of Righteousness' is particularly significant.
 86. See, for instance, CDi.11,vi.4-11, vii.18-19, xiii.5-13, xiv.12, xx.14, 4QD266, Lines 1, 8, and 16, 1QSViii.13,vi.12-20, ix.12-21, etc.
 87. Cf. CDi.7, vii.19-20, 4Q285v.4-6 and vii.3-4, 4QFlor.11, and 4Q246i.9-ii.1.
 88. Cf. CDxix.12-13; for 'the Mourners for Zion,' see *JBj*, pp. 709, 764, 868 and above, pp. 69-

- 70, 120, 176, 241, 354-5, 446, and 557-8.
89. Cf. CDxix.10-13 with vii.21-viii.1. The reason why in Ms. B this is clearly the time of the fall of the First Temple is that these passages from Ezekiel, which can only refer to the First Temple, are specifically applied to it. The passages from Isaiah and Amos – and, for that matter, Numbers – in Ms. A are less specific and, time-wise, more general.
90. CDiv.17-vi.2.
91. Cf. CDviii.12-13/xix.24-26.
92. Matthew 3:4 and Mark 1:6. It is missing as well from Luke though perhaps the ‘camel’ part of it comes once again from Early Church testimony about the skin on James’ ‘knees becoming hard as a camel’s nobules.’ Cf. too Josephus, *Ant.* 18.116-19, a testimony which likewise is missing from the *War*.
93. That is, the ‘called by Name’ in CDii.11-12 and iv.3-4. The former, ‘He raised up to Himself men called by Name, so a Remnant might remain in the Land and fill the face of the earth with their seed,’ anticipates these lines put into James’ mouth at ‘the Jerusalem Council’ by Acts 15:16-17 perfectly as they even include references to both ‘Remnant’ and ‘Men’ (of course, this passage too is followed in the very next line by ‘He made known to them His Holy Spirit by the hand of his Messiah’).
- The latter is the exposition of Ezekiel 44:15, we should be by now so familiar with, defining ‘the Sons of Zadok’ as ‘the Elect of Israel, called by Name, who would stand up in the Last Days’ and ‘justify the Righteous and condemn the Wicked.’
- One should also note that, not only is ‘the Remnant’ language used here and throughout the Damascus Document (especially in Columns vii-viii and xix), but so too is the ‘seeking’ language, which first appears in these lines from CDi.9-11 about how ‘God considered their works, because they sought Him with a whole heart (here the precise ‘seeking out the Lord’ of Acts 15:17 above), and raised up for them a Teacher of Righteousness to guide them (‘the Guide’ language of Matthew’s ‘Blind Guides’) in the Way of His heart’ – to say nothing of the whole issue of ‘the Doresh ha-Torah’ in CDvi.7-vii20 and 4QFlor. 11-13 (also relating to Amos 9:11’s ‘fallen Tent of David,’ the presumable subject of James’ words here in Acts 15:16-17 as well), etc. With this in mind, there can be little doubt of the intertextuality of all these documents.
94. Cf. CDxix1-2 and xx.17.
95. CDiv.1-4.
96. CDvi.16 and 21 and cf. CDxix.8-10.
97. CDxx.14-15. In this connection, ‘the Man of Lying’ is once more mentioned, but the timeframe is clearly after the fall of the Temple in 70 CE since the fact of their being ‘no Prince, no King, no Judge, none to judge with Righteousness’ of Hosea 1:4 is distinctly evoked.
98. Cf. CDvii.14-18.
99. See above, p. 40-44 and the parts of the actual text of provided by Michael Baigent and Richard Leigh in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Deception*, London, 1991, pp. 77-83 as well as my article in *Midstream*, December, 1991, pp. 13-17 from the same period.
100. This is a very important proposition and relates to what I was noting above about the handwriting on Ms. B, which seems much older than that of Ms. A., identifying the latter certainly as a recension. Of these two important Columns, vii of Ms. A and xix-xx of Ms. B, materials are now extant in 4QD267 paralleling CDv-viii about ‘digging the well’ and ‘James and his brother’ (though the order reverses that of Ms. A) and ‘Ephraim separating from Judah’ (again out of order from CDvii.12-13 and ‘God visiting the Earth’ from viii.2-3). The fact that the text was not finalized at the time of the deposit in the caves means of course that CD is not the early Second Century bc document, those dominating Scrolls Studies uniformly take it to be; but rather one relatively late in the life of the Community and one still in flux at the time of its destruction or seeming destruction.
101. Aside from meaning that the text of CD was not finalized by the time of the deposit of the Scrolls, it may mean that the text we have of Ms. B is a very old one indeed and may represent a further development of the ideas, as they were expressed at the time of the abandonment of the settlement at Qumran
102. That the Scrolls are ‘Ebionite’ – though perhaps a variety of ‘Ebionitism’ unknown to our sources, except perhaps the kind of notices about ‘Sicarii Essenes’ preserved in Hippolytus – is made clear by the frequent allusion to ‘the Poor’ throughout the corpus: most notably in CDvi.21, xiv.13, 1QHii.32, iii.25, v.15-18 (*nepesh-Ebion*), v.23 (*Ebionai-Hesed* – ‘the Poor Ones of Piety’), 1QMxi.13 (in interpretation of ‘the Star Prophecy’), 1QPHabxii.3-10 (used three times in as many lines for the rank and file of the Community), 4QPpPs 37ii.10 and iii.10 (‘the Assembly’ or ‘Church of the Poor’), and now finally ‘The Hymns of the Poor’ (4Q434 and 436 – DSSU, pp. 233-240).
103. CDvii.13-15.
104. Acts 7:42.
105. CDvii.17, called ‘the bases of the statues,’ and 1QPHabii.9 and vii.5: ‘the words of His Servants the Prophets.’
106. See 4QD266iii.18-22.
107. CDvii.16-18.
108. See, for instance, the Bar Kochba coin depicted on Plate 51 above.
109. Cf. *War* 2.520 and note 6.354-57 where Josephus describes the surrender of ‘the sons and brothers of King Izates’ amid the burning of their palace whom, though supposedly angry at their disloyalty, Titus refrained from executing, but rather ‘put in chains and brought to Rome as hostages for the allegiance of their Country.’
110. Cf. CDxx.18 and 4QFlor.3.
111. CDxx.34.

Chapter 22

1. Cf. 4QFlor.10-13 in exposition of 2 Samuel 7:12-14 about the promises to 'the Seed' of David and see John Allegro in *DJDv: Qumran Cave IV:4Q158-4Q186*, Oxford, 1958 above. This should certainly disabuse anyone who is suffering under the delusion that a Messianic 'Son of David' is not in evidence at Qumran.
2. 4QFlor.11-13
3. See AP article by Lee Siegel, 'Messianic-like Leader Mentioned in the Scrolls,' 11/8/91; John Noble Wilford writing in *The New York Times*, 11/8/91, 'Messianic Link to Christianity Is Found in Scrolls'; and *DSSU*, 4Q285, pp. 24-29 – in particular, Fragment 7, Lines 2-4, in exposition of Isaiah 10:34: 'Lebanon shall fall by a Mighty One,' extant as well elsewhere at Qumran in a *Pesher* ('The Isaiah *Pesher*'), the signification of which in Rabbinic literature we have also discussed above. Also see Richard N. Ostling the next year writing in *Time Magazine*, 9/21/92, 'Is Jesus in the Dead Sea Scrolls?'
4. Cf. 4QFlor.10-13 with CDVII.16-21 – more of the homogeneity which implies contemporaneity at Qumran. This would then extend its Paulinized bowdlerization in James' speech in Acts 15:16-17.
5. 4QFlor.11-13. We have discussed the significance of this verb 'standing up' above. There would appear to be three 'arise's in the reconstruction; and, if one adds, Line 10, three 'yakim's or 'establish'/'raise up's.
6. Cf. 1QpHabviii.1-3 in exposition of Habakkuk 2:4. This is a very important use of the verb 'to save'/'lehoshi'a'; for another, its verbal noun ('*Yeshu'ah*'), see, the last line of the Damascus Document, CDXX.34, above.
7. CDxix.10-11. The only difference, of course, is that here in Ms. B the verb is 'coming' while in 4QFlor.10-11, 'the Branch of David' is to 'arise' or 'stand up'. One should note again that in Ms. A of CDVII.20, in line with its quotation of Numbers 24:17, 'the Sceptre' is described as 'standing up' again.
8. Cf. CDi.7-8 with Amos 9:12 and this bowdlerization in Acts 15:17. Obviously with the new 'Pauline Gentile Mission,' there is no need any longer to emphasize the 'inheritance of the Land'!
9. The 'Zionist' aspects, of course reappear 2 Samuel 7:11-16, not only in the promise of the 'Establishment of the Throne of His Kingdom forever,' but in the instruction to 'build a House in (God's) Name.' Nor is this latter lost on the *Florilegium* i.11-12, which, combining this with Amos 9:11, now has both 'the Branch' and 'the Doresh ha-Torah' of CDvi.6-9 'rise up in Zion in the Last Days' (*sic*)!
10. Cf. CDxx.10 (which in xx.1 preceding this, as we have seen, also speaks of the 'standing up of the Messiah from Aaron and from Israel' – the only difference being that here it is 'from Aaron and from Israel' and not 'of Aaron and of Israel,' but the surrounding usages, once again as already pointed out as well, are all still singular).
11. Cf. 1QSviii.5 and ix.6 and note the whole exegesis of Psalm 89:23 and Exodus 15:17-18 in 4QFlor.1-7, which is about 'establishing the Temple for him (David) in the Last Days,' in which 'the Lord shall reign forever and ever' and in which 'no foreigners' or the like (including 'Ammonites' and 'Moabites' which would seem to imply – in the code of the time – 'Herodians') or 'lay it waste' – seemingly meaning here, too, the Temple has already been destroyed, i. e., after 70 CE.
12. 4QFlor.3-5.
13. 4QFlor.3-4 and cf. 11QTxlvi.12 and 4QMMTi.3-9 and 47-62.
14. We have already covered all these things in n. 4 and pp. 51-55 above, and variously. Since all these documents use more or less the same internal parameters and the same *dramatis personae*, they have to have been written at more or less the same time and it is a matter for the internal evidence to indicate precisely when, not the external – such as the latter may be.
15. 4QFlor.4 and cf. 1QMvii.6-7, and CDxv.17.
16. 4QMMTi.68-70.
17. Cf. 4QpNahiii.9 and iv.5, which uses the expression 'nilvi' (the same root as 'Nilvim'/'Joiners' in iii/9), addressed to 'the Simple of Ephraim' (in our view, a euphemism for groups like Pauline 'Gentile Christians' paralleling 'the Simple of Judah doing Torah' in the Habakkuk *Pesher*), expressing the hope that 'they would abandon those who mislead them and join...Israel,' which is certainly more accommodating than this regarding the 'ger-Nilvehi'/'Resident Alien.' Also see the key interpretation regarding 'the Nilvim' in CDiv.2-4, based on Isaiah 56:3-6 (and Esther 9:27) and my analysis regarding 'the Nilvim,' pp. 656-82 below and my article, 'Joining/Joiners,' 'Arizei-Go'im, and the Simple of Ephraim Relating to a Cadre of Gentile God-Fearers at Qumran,' *DSSFC*, pp. 313-31.
18. Cf. 4QFlor.5-6. This would also seem to be the implication of the new inscription (called 'A Dead Sea Scroll in Stone' and attributed, not unlike the Koran, to the Angel 'Gabriel') if it is authentic; cf. i.10-17 and A.Yardeni, 'A New Dead Sea Scroll in Stone,' *BAR*, January/February, 2008.
19. 4QFlor.6-8. Note here that the 'lelachshil' usage found here in 4QFlor.7-8 – 'He will comfort them from all the Sons of Belial who cause them to stumble' or 'cast them down on account of their sins' – also forms a key aspect of the passage in the Habakkuk *Pesher* describing what the Wicked Priest did to the Righteous Teacher and those of his persuasion on *Yom Kippur* – 'cast them down' (xi.7-8) – the parallel allusion to 'destroy them' also appearing the follow-up passage

- in 1QpHabxii.5-6 about what the Wicked Priest did to 'the Poor' (*Ebionim*), denoting the followers of the Righteous Teacher, i. e., 'plotted to destroy them.' It should not be necessary to add that this 'causing to stumble' or 'casting down' in Greek forms the central thrust of descriptions of the death of James – the followers of whom were known as 'the Poor' – in all Early Church accounts, as it does the attack by 'the Enemy' (Paul) on James in the Pseudoclementine *Recognitions*.
20. 4QFlor.9; for 'Sons of Belial' elsewhere at Qumran, see 1QHiv.10, but also see 'Anshei-Gorel Belial' in 1QSt.4-5 and 'Gedudei-Belial' in 1QMxi.8.
 21. See my Appendix to *JHJP*, pp. 87-94, 'The "Three Nets of Belial" in the Zadokite Document and "Balla"/"Bela" in the Temple Scroll' and San. 105a-106b on 'Balaami' as 'the Swallower of the People.'
 22. 4QFlor.12-13.
 23. 1QHix.35.
 - 23a. Cf. 4QFlor.10-11.
 24. Also cf. Matthew 19:21 and note the 'Perfection' doctrine throughout the documents at Qumran, as for instance 1QSt.8, ii.2, viii.9-21, ix.6-22 ('Perfection of the Way' combining the 'Perfection' doctrine with the Isaiah 40:3 'Way' doctrine), CDi.20-21 ('the Walkers in Perfection'), ii.15-16 ('the Church of the Men of the Perfection of Holiness'), xx.5-7, etc.; Also note James 1:4,-25 and 2:22 to the same effect.
 25. Cf. CDiv.2-4 with 4QFlor.11-17 and ii.3-4.
 26. For this kind of shift, see how in the Gospels (Matthew 3:17 and *pars.*), Hebrews 1:5, 5:5, Jerome's Gospel of the Hebrews, and Psalm 2:7's 'You are My son; at this moment I have begotten you,' is changed into 'This is My beloved son; in him I am well-pleased.'
 27. Cf. Ps. *Rec.* 1.71 and the 'strengthening' imagery of CDxx.18 and 33 above; but also see the 'whitening' imagery (together with the 'strengthening'), based on Daniel 11:32 and 12:10, at the end of 4QFlori.3-4 above too.
 28. Cf. 4Q246ii.1-9, obviously based on Daniel 2:46, where there is no mention of either 'David' or 'his seed' as there is in 4QFlor.10-13.
 29. The first to suggest such an interpretation was D. Flusser in his 'The Hübriš of the Antichrist in a Fragment from Qumran,' *Immanuel* 10 (1980), pp. 31-37; but it was also hinted at by J. T. Milik when he first revealed the text in Harvard lecture in 1972. Also see F. García Martínez's 'The Eschatological Figure of 4Q246' in his *Qumran and Apocalyptic*, Leiden, 1992, pp. 162-179, J. A. Fitzmyer in 'The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament,' *NTS* 20 (1972-74), pp. 382-407, and E. Puech, 'Fragment d'une apocalypse en araméen (4Q246) et le Royaume de Dieu,' *Revue Biblique* 99 (1992), pp. 116-7.
 30. Cf. 4Q246ii.5,6, and 9.
 31. See Daniel 2:40 on the 'Kingdom of Iron,' normally thought to represent the Macedonian one, 7:7 on 'the fourth beast' with 'iron teeth' and 'ten horns,' and 8:5-8 on the 'goat with one majestic horn between its eyes' – Alexander, which is even interpreted as such by 'Gabriel' in 8:21-2 – 'Yavan' of course being the Hebrew word for 'Greece.'
 32. 4QFlor.16-17 which even refers to the same passage from Ezekiel (44:7-15) which is referred to in CDiv.2-4 above in defining 'the Sons of Zadok' – more intertextuality, implying a more or less contemporaneous date and seems to refer to 'pursuing Righteousness' or 'Justification' (this is a reconstruction).
 33. 1QHxvii.29-30 (old numeration, ix.29-30).
 34. 1QHxvii.34-35/ix.34-35; for 'Ebioniei-Hesed'; see 1QHviii.23.
 35. 4QFlor.14.
 36. Cf. CDviii.9 for 'the Way of Evil Ones,' but viii.16 for 'the Penitents of Israel (another important phraseology) who turned aside from the Way of the People' – in our view, 'Herodians' and those whom they have infected, i. e., the whole Jewish Establishment from BC 50 to CE 50. This word 'People,' of course, now follows the interpretation of Isaiah 8:11 in 4QFlor.15-16 – again, more proof that both documents are operating on exactly the same wave-length.
 37. 4QFlor.15. It is after this and an unreadable portion of the text that the word 'the People' starts the Line Flor.16.
 38. That is, the 'strength' imagery in James' cognomen, 'Oblias' – though never actually decoded, thought to imply the phraseology from Psalms 'Oz le-Am'/'Strength of the People' – and the description of him in Early Church literature as providing a 'strong Bihwark'; cf. E. I. 2.23.7 and 3.7.9 and Psalms 39:11, 68:35, and 77:14; but also see Psalms 37:39, Isaiah 25:4 ('Strength to the Poor') and Habakkuk 3:19.
 39. Note the several allusions to 'by' or 'into the hand of' in the crucial section of 1QMxi.7-14 in exegesis of Numbers 24:17-19: 'the Star Prophecy' and Isaiah 31:8, which must now be looked upon as part of these 'Messianic' Prophecies: 'Ashur will fall by the sword of no mere man' – exegeses applying to 'the hand of Your Messiah(s), Your hand,' and being 'delivered into the hand of the Poor' (*Ebionim*).
 40. CDviii.8-10/xix.20-21.
 41. CDviii.4-5/xix.17 and xix.35.
 42. CDviii.21/CDxix.32-xx.7 and cf. *War* 2.143.
 43. Cf. CDi.3, i.17, vii.13, xix.10, etc.
 44. Isaiah 8:23-9:1.
 45. Cf. for instance, the passages in CDiii.21-iv.4, CDviii.12-13, CDxix.11-13, and 4QFlor.15 (here the references to 'the Book of Ezekiel,' to say nothing of 'the Book of Isaiah' which precedes it and 'the Book of Daniel' that follows it, just as we would refer to them, shows this document to be a fairly late one in terms of chronology).

Notes

46. See Daniel 11:25, 12:2 below, and 12:10-13.
47. Cf. CDiv.3-7 above and note this 'standing up in the Last Days' of iv.4 which is, in our view, an allusion to 'the Last Judgement'; also note what follows this in iv.8 about 'doing the precise letter of the Torah,' which also parallels now what follows in 1QFlorII.2-3 below about 'doing the Torah of Moses.'
48. Cf. 1QSVi.1-21, vii.1-25, and viii.18-ix.2, CDXIII.7-8 and xiv.5-11, and see its reversal in 1QpHabx.11 and 4QpNahII.8 above.
49. 4QFlorII.3-4 and see the reference to 'whitening' in Ps. Rec. 1.71 below.
50. Cf. CDiv.4 and its reversal in i.19-21, 1QpHabi.10-11, v.4-12, vii.17 (in interpretation of Habakkuk 2:4)-xii.10, 4QpPs 37ii.12-23, iv.5-22, etc. – in fact this seems to have been one of the ways in which many of these documents were chosen for exposition.
51. 4QFlorII.2.
52. Cf. CDXX.18 and 33 and Ps. Rec. 1.71.
53. See n. 38 above and Psalms 39:11, 68:35, and 77:14.
54. See E.I. 2.23.7 and 3.7.9 above.
55. See Ps. Rec. 1.71.
56. See nn. 36 and 41 above and CDVIII.4-5, viii.9, viii.16, xix.17, and xix.35
57. Not only compare this with the description of James' followers in Acts 21:21, but also see the use of this term in 1QSIi.15, iv.4, ix.23, 1QHII.15, etc.
58. Cf. CDiv.4 and 1QpHabv.4-5, 1QpHabix.9-12.
60. Hippolytus 9.21.
61. War 2.205-10.
62. CDvi.10-11, viii.17-18, xii.23-xiii.1, xiv.19, xx.i, etc.
63. 4QFlorI.7-8.
64. 1QpHabxi.8-ix.5.
65. 'The Moreh' and 'the Yoreh' are often interchangeable – since they are based on the same root in Hebrew – cf., for instance, in CDXIX.34-xx.1 and xx.13-14 as well as vi.10-11 above.
66. CDVII.20-21.
67. See 4Q246II.5-6.
68. 4QFlorI.10.
69. Acts 15:22. Note that the previous 'Barsabas' we met in Act was in 1:23, where he was the defeated candidate called 'Joseph surnamed Barsabas and known as Justus' (was this the way members of 'the Messianic family' were referred to? Is this the same person as 'Judas Barsabas' or just another name for James; see JBJ, pp. 853-63) for the supposed 'election' to succeed the 'Judas Iscariot' who had just 'fallen headlong' (like James in the Pseudoclementines when he was attacked by the 'Enemy' Paul) and 'his guts burst open' (James' head being crushed in Early Church accounts of his death?), the 'We Document' intrudes in 16:10 right after the break between Barnabas and John Mark and Paul and Acts' introduction of 'a certain Disciple named Timothy, the son of a mother who was a believe Jewish (who was this?), but whose father was a Greek'!
70. CDVI.3-4. In the original Numbers 21:18 the words 'be-mishcanotami' / 'their staves' also appear; in vi.9, this is changed into 'be-mehokkekot' for obvious exegetical reasons we shall analyse below.
71. CDVI.9. Literally 'be-mehokkekot asher hakkak ha-Mehokkek.'
72. CDIV.2 and vi.4-5. That this is obviously esoteric is borne out by the use of the same term later in the Document in different formulations; see my 'Joining/Joiners,' *Arizei-Go'im, and the Simple of Ephraim Relating to a Cadre of Gentile God-Fearers at Qumran*, DSSFC, pp. 313-31. That it is basically another form of what we would be referring to as 'repentance from sin' is made clear in CDII.5, 1QsX.21, 1QHII.8-9, vi.6, and xiv.21-22.
73. CDXX.17 and cf. the 'breaking' allusion in James 2:8-11.
74. CDVIII.16/xix.29, which make is more clear than anything else, that these 'Shavim' are repenting from sin, as in the Gospel portrayal of the followers of John the Baptist and, that there were people who could 'turn aside from' this 'Way' among them, means this is not a normative definition of 'Priests.'
75. Cf. CDIV.20-v.2 and see 11QTLVII.17-19.
76. CDv.11-16 and cf. how Paul uses this 'Deliverer out of Zion' in Romans 11:26, where he identifies 'the Israelites' or 'the Jews' as 'the Enemies' – another one of his now comical polemical reversals!
77. I have discussed these 'Kings of the Peoples' as a Roman juridical terms for the petty 'Kings' in the Eastern part of the Empire, among whom 'the Herodians' were especially prominent, above pp. 74-75, 448, 484, etc, and throughout JBJ, but see A.N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, Oxford, 1939, pp. 270-5 – the Romans being 'the Princes Gentium' / 'the Lord of the Peoples' and see Eusebius' description of the Arab King Abgar as 'the Great King of the Peoples beyond the Euphrates,' not to mention how Paul terms himself in Romans 11;1-13 as 'Ethnon Apostolos' / 'the Apostle to the Gentiles,' a variation of which Muhammad also employs. Of course the whole Chapter 11 of Romans, where Paul explains how he is 'of the seed of Abraham of the Tribe of Benjamin' is pregnant with Qumranisms, including this same 'seed,' 'Salvation,' 'snare,' 'net,' and 'stumbling block,' 'Riches,' 'zeal' and 'zealotry,' 'Branches,' 'Root' (and now 'Grafts'), 'cut off,' 'stand,' and, to be sure, 'the Deliverer.'
78. CDVIII.9-12.
79. CDVIII.8-9 and note that this 'venom of vipers' is employed in regard to 'walking in the Way of the Evil Ones' in viii.9 above. Also see my translation of documents such as CD, 1QS, and 1QpHab, which could prove particularly useful to the reader, in DSSFC, pp. 355-431.
80. Cf. n. 77 above and A.N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, Oxford, 1939, pp. 270-5
81. CDVIII.10-11/xix.23-4. This imagery is so

- clever and yet so little understood in Qumran Studies, where the greatest flaw, as I have explained is the inability to relate to literary metaphor. It plays, as we just saw above, on the relationship of 'yayin' (wine) in Hebrew to 'Yavon' in Hebrew (Greece) and the homonyms in Hebrew 'Rosh' / Head to 'rosh' / 'poison' / 'venom.' Not, too, how much the consumption of strong drink plays in the unruly and untimely death of Alexander the Great.
82. Cf. CDVIII.12-13 with CDXIX.24-26. Once again, there are the homonyms here denoting 'wind' and 'Spirit' and one should see the differences in the two texts where the description of 'the Matif' is concerned, which shows the Damascus Document was still in a state of flux when these two documents were penned – that is, it is a comparatively late document. The text we provide here on this particular description is from Ms. A. Also see the previous description in CDIV.19-22 above which has to do with 'fornication' and 'polygamy,' a clear attack on the Herodians and not the Maccabees, since it was Herod who was this polygamist and this with a vengeance.
 83. Cf. CDi.7-8 with CDVII.18-19.
 84. CDVIII.14-18/CDXIX.17-21. The reason I call this the Palestinian form of 'Grace' is that over and over again in CD and other documents at Qumran, this concept is repeated that it is not for one's 'own sake' or what one has personally done or not done, but because of 'the Fathers,' that is, it is not a 'free gift' as Paul puts it where 'Gentiles' are concerned, but a consequence of promises God made to 'the Fathers.'
 85. 1QSviii.13-14 – 'they shall separate from the midst of the habitation of the Men of Unrighteousness.'
 86. This 'only-begotten' usage is very interesting, the more so since Josephus uses it to describe the nature of Helen of Adiabene's love for her favorite son, Izates, who circumcised himself in order to convert to Judaism contrary to the teaching of one 'Ananias' and another (Paul?) and for whom the burial monuments known as 'the Tomb of the Kings' in Jerusalem were built; see *Ant.* 20.20 and 95.
 87. 1QpHabv.11-12.
 88. Cf. 1QpHabx.9-13 with CDIII.5-12, in which are outlined those 'who deserted the Covenant' and 'did not hold fast to the Commandments of God.'
 89. CDVIII.18-21/XIX.32-33 (missing the 'Elisha' / 'Gehazi' allusion).
 90. These 'Enemies' are the ones listed in *San.* 90a and 105a-107b above.
 91. This is certainly true of the supposed allusions to 'Jesus' as 'ben Panthera,' the son of a Roman legionnaire called 'Panther,' but the best place to look for these Talmudic esotericisms and the like is in R. Eisler, *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist*, pp. 80-112 and 405-11. References such as this occur in *Yeb.* 49a and are combined in uncensored versions of *San.* 67a, which combines this with another Talmudic euphemisms for Jesus, 'Ben Stada.' Also see *Tos. Hul.* 2.22-24 and note that Morton Smith in *Jesus the Magician*, 1973, pp. 47 and 61, speaks about a tombstone found in Binkerbruck, Germany in the name of one 'Tiberius Julius Abdes Panthera, an archer from native of Sidon, Phoenicia who was transferred for service in the Rhineland in 9 CE,' a statement which is backed up to some extent in Origen's *Contra Celsus* 1.28 and Epiphanius' *Haeres.* 77.7.
 92. Cf. *San.* 107a above and the emphasis on his leprosy which was the seeming result of his selling his master's teaching; for Paul's sensitivity to the latter accusation, see 1 Corinthians 9:5-18 following his mention of 'Cephas and the brothers of the Lord'; for the former, also see 2 Corinthians 10:10 and 2 Kings 5:27.
 93. CDVI.2-11.
 94. CDVIII.21/CDXIX.34-xx.1.
 95. CDXX.1, paralleled in XII.22-XIII.1 and XIV.19 above, but also 4QD266, Frag.10.1.12. This should be clear from the verbal noun associated in all instances with the phraseology.
 96. CDVI.3-9, literally 'be-mehokkekot asher hakkak ha-Mehokkeke, and see nn. 70-71 above.
 97. CDV.16-19. This is clear from the whole ambience – particularly the references to 'Moses and his brother' and their opposition in the wilderness to 'Jannes and his brother.' Note too the parallelism here.
 98. See, for instance, the work known as *The Acts of Pilate* 5.1 and, not surprisingly, in 2 Timothy 3:8.
 99. Cf., for instance, CDi.1,i.8-9, CDi.11-14, II.4-5, II.6, IV.3-5, IV.9-10, IV.15-16, VIII.16-22, XX.17-25, 1QpHabvii.14-16, and X.12 above, etc.
 100. See *San.* 90a and 105a-107b above.
 101. CDi.14-16; for 'the Lying Spouter,' see 1QpHabx.9-13, but also CDIV.19-20 and VIII.13.
 102. CDV.20-vi.1 and VIII.3-4.
 103. Cf. CDi.13-II.1, II.16-17, III.5-12, III.16-18, IV.19-21, V.20-vi.2, VI.5-21, VIII.18-21/ XIX.32-34, XX.8-13, etc.
 104. Cf. CDV.20-vi.1, but also see II.12 and XX.1. Those who translate this otherwise are generally known.
 105. CDVI.2-5 and cf. CDi.4-6, II.2-41, and Matthew 11:15 and 13:9-43 and *pars.*
 106. Cf. CDVI.6-7 with 4QD266.19; but also see CDi.10, the 'seeking Him with a whole heart' which precedes God 'raising up for them a Teacher of Righteousness' in I.11, XX.6, and my DSSU, pp. 212-19.
 107. CDVI.4-5.
 108. 4QpNahiii.5.
 109. 'The Simple of Ephraim' as a parallel to 'the Simple of Judah doing Torah' in the Habakkuk Peshet is particularly suggestive in this regard – 'Ephraim' being 'Samaria.' See above, pp. 102-5, 366-8, 415, etc. and my article 'Joining/Joiners, 'Arizei-Go'im, and the Simple of Ephraim Relating to a Cadre of

- Gentile *God-Fearers* at Qumran,' in *DSSFC*, pp. 313–331.
110. See 'Joining/Joiners, 'Arizei-Go'im, and the Simple of Ephraim Relating to a Cadre of Gentile *God-Fearers* at Qumran,' in *DSSFC*, pp. 313–331 above and note, this was first given in 1991 to the Society of Biblical Literature, but also see *JJHP*, pp. 7, 17, 55, 68–69, and the Glossary on p. 99/*DSSFC*, p. 429.
111. See Josephus' *War* 1.6, which is addressed to just such persons further East, but also his description of the conversions of Queen Helen and her family on *Ant.* 20.17–96, pp. and *E.I.* 1.13.1–20 parallel picture of the Conversion of King Agbarus in Northern Syria and his parallels in Syriac literature.
112. Isaiah 56:3. In fact, the whole Chapter 56 of Isaiah is about the subjects being addressed here in CDVI – namely 'Keeping Judgement and doing Righteousness' (2) and 'holding fast by keeping the Sabbath and not profaning it and holding his hand back from any Evil doing' (2), the 'foreigner who joins himself to the Lord' (3), and again 'holding fast to My Covenant' (4) and not 'being cut off' (6). The parallels of these to these passages in the Damascus Document should be obvious.
113. CDIII.12–13, III.20, VI.21, VII.13–14, XIV.14, VIII.2, XIX.14, XX.18, XX.27, and XX.33.
114. Cf. CDI.11, VI.11–12 (here 'Yoreh ha-Zedek'), XX.1 (here 'Teacher of the Community' / 'Moreh ha-Yahad'), XX.14 ('Yoreh ha-Yahad'), XX.32, 1QpHab.11, V.10, XI.5, etc.
115. Cf. Eusebius, relying on Hegesippus, in his *E.I.* 2.23.7.
116. CDXX.33–34. In XX.19–20, 'those fearing God' and 'fearing his Name' are actually mentioned in the context of 'reckoning His Name and revealing Salvation' (*Yeshar*), as we saw.
117. Cf. CDVI.10–11 with 4QFlor.11–13. Once again, this kind of inter-textuality, like that above we have been illustrating, demonstrates these documents to all have been written at approximately the same time and actually very late in the life of the community. Again, this is the kind of 'internal data' we have been talking about, regardless of the more tenuous 'results' of palaeography and A.M.S. C-14 dating. Moreover, since these documents all consistently use the same allusions and the same turns-of-phrase, embodying the same 'zealous' and aggressive attitude, they are the documents of a Movement.
- But, even more to the point, as parallels to Columns XIX–XX of the Cairo Damascus Document do not yet seem to have been found among the extant finds from Cave 4, though the parallel Columns VIII–VIII to some extent have; it is perhaps a reasonable conclusion that the Damascus Document itself had not yet achieved a fixed final form and the materials that somehow made their way down to Egypt, to be found in our time in the Cairo *Genizah*, may not even have been written in their present form yet, but only after the abandonment of the settlement at Qumran.
118. Cf. CDVIII.1 with CDXIX.10–11. In VII.19–20, as we shall see below, this is 'the Sceptre that shall arise' from 'the Star Prophecy' of Numbers 24:17; but though the usage in XIX.10 is actually 'coming' and not the usual 'standing up' or 'arising'; there is no doubt, again, that the usage is singular and this is reinforced by the verbs in both cases, i. e., 'the Sceptre' as we shall see as well below, is 'the Messiah of Aaron and Israel.'
- The version in XIX.8–13 is simpler and only refers to 'the Little Ones' or 'the Meek of the Flock' of Zechariah 13:7 (followed as we saw by Ezekiel 9:4) escaping while, 'with the coming of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel' (the 'Sceptre') – very definitely singular here and very definitely 'coming' and, moreover, a vengeful war-like Messiah as in the War Scroll – 'the rest will be given over to the avenging sword of the Covenant.'
119. CDVI.5–6.
120. CDVI.9.
121. Cf. CDXX.11 and XX.30–33.
122. CDVIII.21/XIX.34–35.
123. Cf. 1QpHabXII.14 and CDXX.34 above.
124. Cf. CDXX.2 and XX.5 and note CDVI.63–11, CDVII.16–21, and 4QFlor.12–13.
125. CDVI.14–15.
126. CDVI.17–18.
127. For 'the Mebakker' at Qumran, see CDXIX.17–18, XIII.5–16, XIV.10–12, XV.7–14, 4QD266.16, 1QS VII.12–20, etc.
128. CDVII.8–9/XIX.20–25.
129. Cf. CDVII.1 and note CDV.7–8.
130. See CDIV.19–21 and VIII.12–13/XIX.24–26.
131. CDV.6 and cf. VI.17–18.
132. CDV.7–8
133. CDV.11–15.
134. For *MMT*, see II.3–33, 47–60, and 83–89.
135. CDVI.18–19 and cf. 1QpHabXI.8, which uses the same expression, calling it 'the Sabbath of their Rest.'
136. CDVI.19–20 and cf. 4QMMTII.3–33 above.
137. CDVI.19–21.
138. Cf. *War* 2.139 and *Ant.* 18.117.
139. CDVI.20–VII.1.
140. CDVII.1–4 and cf. IV.15–18.
141. CDVII.4–5; for 'Rechabites,' see above, pp. 159–68, 446–75, and *JBj*, pp. 229–42, 302–8, 467–9, etc.
142. Cf. CDVII.13–14 with XIX.4–7 and, of course, VI.21, XX.18, 27, and 33 above.
143. Cf. CDXIX.12–13 of Ms. B with VII.21–VIII.1 of Ms. A.
144. CDVII.19–21.
145. (148). Cf. 4QFlor.12–13 with 1QM XI.6–15.
146. 1QM XI.12. This same 'eating' verb is used in 1QpHab VI.7–8 to describe what 'the Kittim' (in our view, the Romans) do to 'all the Peoples year by year' – and here, too, our 'Peoples' expression again.
147. CDVII.14 and 21–VIII.1. Note in VIII.2 the used of the same 'holding fast' expression again (also XIX.14).
148. See the coin on Plate no. 51: 'Shimon Nasi Israel.' As we just saw, this 'Nasi' is mentioned in CDVII.20 in exposition of 'the Star Prophecy' of Numbers 24:17 in CD

- vii.17–21. It is also quoted verbatim at this point in 1QMxi.5–7 above, though the exegesis is set forth, as we saw, in terms of the ‘*no mere Man*’ citation from Isaiah 31:8 above.
149. CDviii.1–2 and CDxix.13–16 above.
150. See an allusion of this kind in CDviii.16/xix.28–xx.16, which reiterates both this ‘*Judgement*’ and this ‘*Visitation for destruction*’ over and over again.
151. CDviii.2–3/xix.15. It is important to catalogue these ‘*command*’ ‘*visitation*’ usages as we have been trying to do.
152. See DSSU, pp. 24–29 and, in particular, 4Q285, Frag. 7, Lines 1–5. When we released this text at the height of the Scrolls controversy, we were roundly criticized for not appreciating whether it was ‘*the Nasi ha-Edah*’/‘*the Branch of David*’ who was doing the ‘*executing*’ or ‘*being executed*’; but the original find and its translation was the work of Prof. Wise and his University of Chicago Team, not mine, though at the time I did not quibble with it because I did not consider this to be what was most important about the text.
- It was the height of the struggle to free the Scrolls in 1991 and those in ‘*the Consensus*’ and ‘*Official Team*’ who controlled the Scrolls at the time were saying there was little or nothing of importance in the unpublished materials. I disagreed and, in order to gainsay this, I released this text, so full of Messianic usages like ‘*the Branch of David*’, ‘*the Root of Jesse*’, ‘*the Nasi ha-Edah*’, and, in particular, ‘*woundings*’, and almost no one as stopped talking about it ever since, including those in ‘*the Official Team*’, but also others.
- Our purpose in releasing it was to show that there were important materials in the unpublished corpus that the Public had a right to see, not that we thought we had arrived at a definitive translation. On the contrary, the scholarly Community has since worked this out to its satisfaction and that was the point of the whole exercise to begin with.
153. Cf. 4Q285, Fragment 7, Line 5 and 4Q252 (The Genesis Peshet, DSSU, pp. 77–89) v.1–4.
154. 4Q285, Fragment 7, Lines 2–4.
155. Cf. CDvii.18–20 and 4QFlor.10–13 with 4Q252v.2–5 which also speaks of ‘*the Mehokkek*’, in this context, ‘*the Staff*’, and a new, but absolutely beautiful, expression, ‘*the Messiah of Righteousness*.’
156. See the coin on Plate no. 51: ‘*Shim’on Nasi-Israel*’ above, n. 148.
157. (160). Cf. CDvii.20 above and compare this with 4Q285, Fragment 7, Lines 3–4 and 4Q252v.2–4.
158. The verb in Amos 9:12 is ‘*yarshu*’/‘*possessing*’, which only differs by a single consonant from and is homophonic with ‘*darshu*’/‘*seeking*’ as we have it in James’ speech and here in the Dead Sea Scrolls.
159. CDvii.13–18. Everything is transformed here. First of all, this is not looked upon as an ‘*Exile*’, but rather an ‘*escape*.’ In addition, the ‘*beyond Damascus*’ (from which the document gets its name) of Amos 5:27 now becomes ‘*My tents of Damascus*’, an expression to be used exegetically in both these passages in CD and in Acts. Finally, ‘*the star of your god*’ of Amos 5:26 is missing altogether, but reappears and is exploited in the exegesis that follows to pave the way for the citation of ‘*the Star Prophecy*’ – incredibly fecund exegesis as we shall see.
160. Cf. CDvii.18–21 with vii.14–15.
161. Once again, we have a homophonic transformation from ‘*me-hal’ah*’ to ‘*me-ohali*’ – cf. Amos 5:28 with CDvii.14–15. This is incredibly creative and tendentious Biblical exposition – as Nietzsche might put it, ‘*philosophizing with a hammer*.’
162. Cf. CDvii.15–16 with CDiii.19 and 4Q252v.2–4.
163. Cf. CDvii.16–17 with 4Q252v.3. There is some dispute here about whether this should read ‘*the thousands of Israel*’ or ‘*the Leaders of Israel*’, for in both cases the first word is a reconstruction. Probably ‘*thousands*’ is more to the point in the context of what follows concerning ‘*the Kingdom of His People*’ in v.4. In any event, in all cases the exposition is esoteric as we can see.
164. CDvii.15–18. What is impressive here is that a basically idolatrous allusion is esoterically transformed into a negative allusion to Israel’s religion – once again, ‘*exposition with a hammer*’!
165. Cf. Acts 15:14–15 with CDvii.17 and 4QMMTiii.15–16.
166. 1QpHabii.9 and vii.5. The correspondence is almost exact.
167. Cf. CDi.7 and CDv.16, clearly using the same language as John the Baptist is pictured as using in the Synoptics.
168. Cf. CDviii.2 and 18–19 with Koran, *Surah* 82:12–19: ‘*on that Day (the Day of Judgement), the Command is Allah’s*.’
169. Cf. Acts 15:17–19 (just before the first expression of James’ directives to these ‘*Gentiles*’ or ‘*Overseas Communities*’) with 4QMMTiii.33 (the last line).
170. See *War* 1.6 and n. 116 above.
171. See nn. 77, 80, and variously above.
172. Cf. 4Q285, Fragment 7, Line 4 and 4Q252v.4 and note this incredibly original new phraseology ‘*the Messiah of Righteousness*’ – as just indicated, a definitive singular. Also see n. 153 above.
173. CDxix.6–16 – by extrapolation with all these other characterizations, again, as we have seen, clearly a singular.
174. CDviii.9–12/xix.20–24.
175. Cf. CDviii.9 with 1QpHabxi.5–6. The allusion to such ‘*hemah*’/‘*anger*’ human or divine also appears in Ezekiel 13:13 which depicts a ‘*storm*’ or ‘*torrential rain*’ not unlike, in our view, that which is portrayed in the previously-missing First Column of the Nahum Peshet in n. 177 below.
- One should also note here the ‘*rodef*’ or ‘*pursuit*’ ideology, well known to Rabbinic

- literature and even to the Modern Period where, recently, it was applied by the assassin of Prime Minister Itzhak Rabin as the reason for his act. Interestingly, too, recently high-placed rabbis have used this ideology to forbid the surrender of any land to idolators; see *Ha-Aretz*, 6/30/04: 'Top Rabbi: Din Rodef on Anyone Ceding Land.'
- Be this as it may, the ideology is to be found in *San.* 73a-74a (see also Laban's 'pursuit' of Jacob in Genesis 31:23); but what is most interesting from our point-of-view and what most might surprise the reader, 'the Rodef' or 'Pursuer' is not the one 'pursuing after' someone to kill him or her (or the like – the law also applies, for instance, to the rapist); but rather the bystander or third party who is obliged to warn or stop 'the Pursuer.' It is at this point too that the individual doing the 'pursuing' is to be judged guilty of death; in other words, here in the *Habakkuk Pesher*, it is 'the Wicked Priest' by 'the Law of the Rodef' who is guilty when the situation is framed in this manner and upon whom the death sentence is to be pronounced.
- This is exactly the case here, whether with knowledge of the Mishnaic position on this matter or just coincidentally. The author, obviously, considers the allusion to be framed in this manner purposefully. This is reinforced by exactly the same kind of linguistic presentation in *CDi.* 19-21 where those who 'transgressed the Covenant and broke the Law banded together against the soul of the Just One (James?) and against all the Walkers in Perfection' and 'pursued them with the sword' – more intertextuality demonstrating the contemporaneity of all these kinds of documents regardless of either 'the results' of palaeography or AMS C-14 dating, such as these may be.
176. *CDviii.* 1-13/xix.25-26. The point here is that 'the Spouter' is the one who 'spouted' to 'the Daubers'/'Plasterers on' or 'Builders of the Wall' and 'kindled God's Wrath against his entire Congregation' or 'Church.' In the first he is 'one of confused spirit' or 'windiness'; in the second, 'he walked in windiness' or 'the Spirit and poured out confusion' – very vivid. In both cases, he is called 'the Spouter of Lies.'
177. Cf. *Ant.* 14.22 and 28 with 4QpNah.2-11. 178. *CDi.* 14-18.
179. Cf. *CDi.* 20-21 with *CDviii.* 13/xix.25-26. This very well could be 'the Lying Spouter's Congregation' or 'Church.' Once again, it is the internal sense which must decide the meaning.
180. Cf. *CDviii.* 18-21/xix.30-33 with *San.* 90a and 105a-107b and see nn. 21 and 89-90 above.
- 181 (180). *CDxix.* 33-35.
182. *CDxx.* 2-4.
183. Cf. *CDxix.* 34-35. The same expression is used in *CDxx.* 19-20 concerning 'those reckoning His (God's) Name' and 'God-Fearers' as we have seen, but also see 4QMMTiii.33: 'reckoned to you as Righteousness' above, i. e., in Paul's language, 'justifying you.'
184. *CDxx.* 6-7, but also see ii.15-16, vii.4-7, 1QSi.15, viii.2, 18, ix.6-19, etc. and cf. especially James' instructions to Paul in Acts 21:24 that 'you show you yourself still walk regularly keeping the Law.'
185. Literally, 'House of the Torah'; cf. *CDxx.* 10 as expressed previously in *CDxx.* 6.
186. 1QSi.15-18; also see iv.9-14.
187. Cf. *CDxx.* 8-10 with Acts 15:19-29 and 4QMMTii.8-9 and iii.6-7 and 23-24.
188. *CDxx.* 10-13.
189. *CDxx.* 17-20.
190. *CDxx.* 25-26.
191. *CDxiii.* 6-8.
192. *CDxiii.* 9 and xiv.14-15.
193. *CDxv.* 8-17.
194. 1QMvii.4-5.
195. *CDxiv.* 17-19. It is hard to imagine anything that could be more 'Messianic' than this, nor that anyone could imagine this 'Messiah' in this context to be plural. Pace research in the first days of Qumran Studies, much of which now appears as tendentious as those who disagree with my approach would consider mine to be
196. 1QpHabviii.2
197. Cf. 'the Priest Commanding the Many' described in *CDxiv.* 6-7 and the new fragment in 4QD266, Fragment 11, Line 8 (see Plate 54 above and also 4QD267, Fragment 9, Lines 10-11 which parallels *CDxiv.* 6-7). It is not clear if this is or can be the same person as 'the Mebakker' or 'Bishop' or not.
198. *CDxii.* 19-23 and xiii.21-22.
199. Cf. 1 Corinthians 5:9-11 (contradicting the picture of 'Jesus' eating with 'harlots' in the Gospels) and 6:9-7:2 (including both the 'idolatry' language and, following in 7:35, that of the 'snare') with *CDiv.* 14-18 and v.7-11.
200. Cf. *CDxx.* 3 and 1QSViii.17-23.
201. *CDix.* 1-7.
202. Cf. Eusebius, *E.I.* 3.7.9 and *pars.* and our discussion of this point above, pp.136-41, *JBj*, pp. 353-64, and *JJHP*, pp. 10-12.
203. For 'the Many' (probably based on the language of Isaiah 53:11f.), see 'the (High) Priest Commanding the Many' above in *CDxiv.* 6-7, 4QD267, Fragment 9, Lines 10-11, and 4QD266, Fragment 11, Line 8, *CDxiii.* 7-xiv.6, 1QSVi.1-vii.27, viii.18-ix.2, 1QpHabx.11, 4QpNah.ii.8, etc.
204. 1QpHabx.9-12.
205. *CDv.* 17-19.
206. See *Ps. Jonathan* on Numbers 22:22 and R. Pattai, *A Book of Jewish Legends: Gates to the City*, 1981, pp. 312 and 788. Also see the *Encyclopedia Biblica* entry on 'James and Jambres,' *Apocryphon of James and Jambres the Magicians*, Leiden, 1994, Logion 34, and *San.* 105a-106b and *Men.* 35a above.
207. See *CDv.* 7-11 above and note how this is preceded by the charge of 'every man of them sleep with women during their periods' – a charge obviously directed against Herodians and the curious basis of the 'not separating clean from unclean in' and, therefore, 'polluting the Temple' charge; but also followed in v.12-

Notes

- 19 by the John the Baptist-like '*offspring of Vipers*' characterizations we have already discussed above.
208. CDv.14-15 – the addition of '*unless he was forced*' in Line 15 obviously also being significant.
209. CDv.13-14 and cf. Matthew 3:7, 12:34, 23:33, and *pars.* and n. 207 above.
210. Cf. CDvi.7-10 above and 1QSIx.23.
211. CDv.11-12.
212. CDv.12-16 and nn. 207 and 209 above.
213. See n. 184 above and CDii.15-16, vii.4-7, xx.6-7, 1QSI.15, viii.2, 18, ix.6-19, etc.
214. CDvi.11-vii.5 and note vi.15 and vii.1 as well as viii.9/xix.20 on the same subject, ending again with '*the venom of vipers*'. For the Wicked Priest '*robbing the Riches of the Poor*', see 1QpHabxii. 10 and cf. as well viii.11-12 where '*he stole from*' and '*profiteered from the spoils of the Peoples*' (in our view, Herodians – also called here '*the Men of Violence*').
215. CDv.15 and n. 208 above – this is an important exception and generally completely unappreciated because of poor translations, Hebrew to English.

Notes

Notes