

Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran

Michael Fishbane

Introduction

Almost with the first publication of the documents found in and around the Dead Sea, attempts were made to appreciate and evaluate their exegetical content.¹ As Dupont-Sommer, one of the early writers on the Qumran scrolls was quick to observe, in this remarkable corpus Mikra was subject to an 'immense labeur exégétique'.² Here, then, one could begin to glimpse something of the context out of which ancient Judaism, and its vast exegetical enterprise, was formed. To be sure, a sense of this had long been noted and its value assured. Quite well known, for example, were the inner-controversies among the earliest Pharisaic sages on assorted exegetical points;³ the diverse (if not highly stylized) exegetical contestations between the Pharisees and other groups (like the Sadducees, Samaritans and Boethusians);⁴ and the other exegetical productions – like the book of *Jubilees* – whose homiletical style and legal content could not easily be aligned with the known Pharisaic literature.⁵ Indeed, even the historical work of Josephus, in which is found the famous account of several ancient Jewish 'philosophies' (the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes) distinguished by exegetical differences, is itself replete with exegetical features and traditions.⁶ What the evidence of the Dead Sea scrolls offers then – and, indeed, offers in abundance – is primary and hitherto unknown documentation from this milieu of ancient Jewish exegesis. Not only is this material distinct from the Pharisaic mainstreams known to us, but it also provides direct

¹ Cf. Brownlee, 'Biblical Interpretation'; Wieder, 'Habakkuk Scroll'; Vermes, 'Commentaires bibliques'; Brownlee, 'Habakkuk Midrash'; and Osswald, 'Zur Hermeneutik'.

² Dupont-Sommer, *Les Ecrits qumraniens*, 319.

³ Cf. e.g. *M. Eduyot* 1:1-3; *M. Yadayim* 4:6-8; *B. T. Shabbat* 17a, 88b. In *Avot de-R. Natan* A12 (end p. 56), an individual who did not know the exegesis of purity as practiced in R. Yohanan's circle was chided: 'If this is how you have practiced, you have never eaten heaven-offerings in your life'.

⁴ Cf. e.g. *M. Menahot* 10:3; *T. Menahot* 10:25; *B. T. Menahot* 65a-66b; *B. T. Rosh ha-Shana* 13a; and *Jos. Ant.* 13:293-98.

⁵ See Albeck, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*. Cf. Nickelsburg, 'Bible Rewritten' 99-100.

⁶ See I. Heinemann, 'Josephus' Method'; and Rappaport, *Agada und Exegese*. Cf. Feldman, below, pp. (XX)-(X).

attestation to the vital role played by the interpretation of Mikra in the formation of ancient Jewish communities.

For the communities in and around Qumran, the Mikra of ancient Israel was a cherished inheritance. Virtually every book of this corpus is attested in long scrolls or assorted scraps (save the scroll of Esther), and were subject to a vast labor of learning and elaboration. This was no mere antiquarian exercise on their part. For the covenanters who called their community a 'house of Tora' (CD 7:10), this effort was rather part of a living commitment to the truth and significance of Mikra, a corpus of divine teachings whose correct interpretation provided the way of salvation (CD 14:1f.) and the knowledge of the divine plan for history (IQpHab 2:6-10). Mikra thus contained the concrete basis for proper action and requited hope, not solely because it contained the revealed teachings of God through Moses and the prophets, but particularly because the community believed itself alone to possess the proper understanding of the ancient laws and prophecies contained therein. The covenanters of Qumran thus lived the Law of Moses and longed for the Day of the Lord: in resolute confidence that their interpretation of Mikra were true and certain.⁷

The documents of Qumran thus attest to a dual commitment: a commitment to the truth of the Tora and the prophecies (that of Moses and his prophetic successors), and a commitment to the truth of their interpretation of the Tora and the prophecies (that of the founding 'Interpreter of the Tora' and his successor[s] the 'Teacher of Righteousness'). There was, then, both Mikra and its Interpretation, as guided by the head teacher and those authorized to interpret under his guidance (or the exegetical principles laid down by him). In this matter, too, the Qumranians were part and parcel of the exegetical milieu of nascent Judaism. Like them, the different Pharisaic fellowships were also organized around teachers and their interpretations of Mikra. Indeed, even within the fairly broad consensus of ancient Pharisaic teachings, and the (eventually formulated) ultimate divine authority for its modes of interpretation (*M. Avot* 1:1), sharp disagreements and even disarming confusion over its diverse results abound.⁸ Depending on the issues, differences of interpretation could also be – and were – the basis for communal subdivisions and splits.⁹ Such features are also highly characteristic of our Qumran sources, as we shall yet see, and many other contemporary analogues could be adduced. Here it may suffice to recall that in the traditions that developed around Jesus and his followers a main ingredient was the centrality of the Teacher, along with the convincing or distinctive character of his interpretations of Mikra.¹⁰ Clearly, at

⁷ This was the normative ideology, from which those of 'little faith' defected; cf. *IQpHab* 2:1-10.

⁸ See above, n. 3.

⁹ This is particularly true in matters of food piety, around which a special Pharisaic fellowship developed. For the pertinent rabbinic sources and a comparison with Qumran materials, see Rabin, *Qumran Scrolls*.

¹⁰ Cf. Matt 5:1-3; Mark 7:1-3; 1 Tim 6:3-4; Col 2:8.

this time, neither the shape of Pharisaic Judaism nor the temper of its exegetical program had been definitively set. Still and all, two points are abundantly clear:

- (1) the style of Judaism which one chose was directly related to the style and methods of its exegetical tradition; and
- (2) the authority of this tradition was the basis for the contentions anent the value and truth of the Judaisms at hand.

We are thus presented with a vast exegetical *oeuvre* in ancient Judaism – one of intense and immense significance – of which the productions of the Qumran covenanters is a valuable addition. It will therefore not be surprising to observe that these interpreters of Mikra utilized many modes of exegesis characteristic of the early Pharisaic sages. For despite the more formalized character of the latter, the fact is that their earliest exegetical efforts overlap with those of the covenanters. In addition, precisely because of the more formal character of the Pharisaic traditions, these latter provide a foil against which the more rudimentary expressions of Mikra interpretation in the scrolls can be perceived. The issue, then, is not to project Pharisaic methods of interpretation into the Qumran sources, but to utilize them (where appropriate) for reconstructing or isolating related (and contemporary) exegetical features. By the same token, both the Pharisaic and Qumran exegetical traditions can also be viewed as heirs to the earlier exegetical efforts of ancient Israel, efforts which, in their final creative and editorial stages at least, overlap these productions of ancient Judaism. For indeed, if the exegetical works of the Pharisees and Qumranians presuppose a received and authoritative Mikra, this latter is also a repository of the exegetical labor of the scribes and sages of ancient Israel. And if the former represent the earliest interpretations of Mikra as a foundation document for Judaism, 'inner-Biblical' exegesis represents interpretations of Mikra as a document *in formation*.¹¹ It will therefore be of interest to place the interpretations found in the scrolls at the cross-roads of these two great cultural stadia: ancient Israel and rabbinic Judaism. Hereby, its common and unique exegetical patterns and assumptions, the use, interpretations and notions of authority of Mikra at Qumran, can be brought into comparative perspective.

A final introductory word is in order about the categories to be employed here. For while such terms as 'use', 'authority' and 'interpretation' (in the title) provide the means for an analytical description of the role of Mikra at Qumran, such a classification must not obscure the fundamental interrelationships between them. Every use of Mikra, it may be argued, is also a reuse of it in some way, and presupposes certain notions of authority. Similarly, the notions of authority of Mikra which exist variously condition the nature, style and manner of presentation of the interpretations brought to bear on it. Accordingly, the static nature of the categories taken separately consistently presupposes their

¹¹ On the whole phenomenon, see Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*.

dynamic correlation. This consideration is all the more vital given the variety of materials to be analyzed. They differ in genre and form; in technique and terminology; and in time and tradition. Accordingly, to speak of the Qumran scrolls in monolithic terms – whether in ideology, communal formation, or uses of Mikra – would be to blanch the evidence. Moreover, if the texts are themselves diverse, their historical attribution is, in many cases, well-nigh inscrutable. For whether the *Rule Scroll* and the *Damascus Document* represent two phases of one community, or the disciplines and ideologies of several, and whether or not the contents and styles of these latter are related to the so-called *Temple Scroll*, are not matters given to clear or final determination. But since some estimation of these social-historical questions – further compounded by the questionable relationship between the covenanters and the Essenes, based on what is known about them from Josephus and Philo – has a vital bearing on the problems to be discussed here, it seems prudent to use the diverse materials at hand primarily as evidence for types of use, authority and interpretation of Mikra in and around Qumran, not as evidence for one sectarian community at any one time.

Mikra and its Uses

MIKRA AS A TEXTUAL ARTIFACT

A consideration of the uses of Mikra in the Qumran scrolls must begin with a recognition of its privileged presence as a *textual artifact*. As is well-known, the caves of the Judaean desert have yielded a vast treasure trove of hand copies of 'biblical' books. These represent the oldest manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible in our possession, with all the books of the later masoretic canon represented except for the scroll of Esther. Most of these manuscripts are preserved only in smallish scraps, or at best in several columns of texts representing a short sequence of chapters, sometimes continuous, sometimes not (depending on whether the columns are from one section of leather or from several which melded as the rolled document decomposed). The preservation of an entire book, like the great Isaiah scroll (*IQIsa^a*), is a rarity. But despite the inconsistent and incomplete evidence, there is no doubt that the preservation of Mikra was a matter of great scribal care and tradition. Great care was taken to write the texts in a clear hand; and, despite some paleographic variations over the course of time, the so-called square script in the Herodian style shows signs of stability and conventionality. The use of the older paleo-Hebrew script for writing the Tetragram in some of the sectarian compositions¹² probably represents a convention for rendering the Divine Name in a nonsacral manner, alongside such other conventions as marking four dots or writing the eu-

¹² Siegel, 'Paleo-Hebrew Characters', Cf. Demsky, above, p. 10.

phemistic *hw'h*' (*IQS* 8:14). The consistent use of the paleo-Hebrew script in some manuscripts of biblical books, like *4QpaleoEx^m* (on Exodus), presumably derives from other Palestinian scribal traditions,¹³ and is quite different from the majority of Pentateuchal manuscripts found at Qumran.¹⁴

Evidence for scribal care and conventionality in the treatment of *Mikra-as-artifact* is also reflected in such matters as the incising of transverse lines and the way the letters were 'hung' on them, as well as in such matters as line-length and spacing between letters and words. Such considerations were of very great concern to ancient Jewish scribes, as one can estimate from the material preserved in the (non-canonical) post-talmudic tractate known as *Massekhet Soferim*. Indeed, the fortunate fact that many texts (like the large Isaiah scroll) are not preserved in clean copy, and preserve many errors, erasures and over-writings intact, show how great was the concern to preserve the literary tradition in the proper, i.e. conventional and authoritative, manner. In addition, the artifacts also reveal that these texts were copied in a way to render them meaningful for the community which used them. As we shall see below, the concern for paragraphing, by joining or separating rhetorical units, reflects a clear concern by the tradents to isolate coherent thematic units; similarly, the resolution of syntactic ambiguities, by one means or another, also demonstrates that texts were not simply copied or read, but done so in an authoritative and conventional manner.

Presumably, then, it is an intense preoccupation with a text important to the community, and no mere off-hand regard for the authority of its formulations, which accounts for the expansions and harmonizations which can be found in a whole variety of Mikra manuscripts from Qumran. The complexity of these materials do not lend themselves to neat groupings of text families corresponding to such later text-types as 'Masoretic', 'Samaritan', and 'Septuagint'. There are, too be sure, observable correspondences between these types and the Qumran evidence; but the multiple alignments make any final categorization premature at this stage.¹⁵ But the variety attests to a great fluidity in the state of the text at this time, and considerable allowances for filling-in gaps of content and resolving diverse formulations. In this regard, it has even been suggested that the phenomenon of biblical paraphrases found in such MSS as *4Q154* – where diverse passages are brought together along with connecting exegetical comments – may, in fact, be 'the actual forerunner of biblical *manuscripts*'; that is, 'the scribes were influenced by literary compositions in which the editorial procedure behind the act of harmonization was already accomplished and on which the actual harmonization was based'.¹⁶ This is not certain by any means, and it is just as likely that we have different attempts in different genres to add

¹³ See Skehan, 'Samaritan Recension'.

¹⁴ For a reevaluation of these matters, see Tov, 'Modern Textual Outlook'.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Tov, 'Harmonizations', 15f.

to the coherence of the Mikra tradition at hand. It might even be the case that the paraphrases reflect speculations on textual harmonizations in scribal circles where there was greater hesitancy to insert the additions and comments into the pentateuchal text. Indeed, despite the variety of texts (in fact, precisely because of them) one is left in doubt about the attitude of the Qumran covenanters themselves. Do the variety of texts simply reflect a diversity of materials brought to their library for examination or collection (by members who came from Jerusalem priestly circles and elsewhere), *even though* the sectarians themselves only considered one fairly stable text-type to be authoritative? Or do the various Mikra manuscripts indicate a more fluid notion of the authority of the textual artifact itself, perhaps something along the lines of 'official' vs. 'vulgar' text-types?

Some of these questions could certainly be resolved if we had any indication whether Mikra was read-out in a synagogue liturgy. For were this the case, there would undoubtedly have been a preference for one text-type or another. Moreover, if Mikra was used in a lectionary setting at Qumran, this would also provide some context for the targum manuscripts found there, on the assumption (following later explicit rabbinic tradition)¹⁷ that such texts as *11QigLev* reflect a simultaneous translation during a prayer service. But despite the enormous importance of the Tora of Moses for study and observance at Qumran (as we shall see), there is as yet no indication of a synagogue lection, and thus no ritual setting for targumic renditions of it. This is all the more remarkable, on the one hand, given that a lectionary setting (with accompanying textual interpretation) is actually preserved in our early post-exilic sources (Neh 8), and that the very record of this event suggests that it is based on an even older liturgical procedure (possibly of exilic provenance).¹⁸ Moreover, it is also notable that rabbinic sources have preserved a tradition on this text to the effect that the custom of targumic renditions was practiced in the time of Nehemiah.¹⁹ While this specific tradition may stretch the linguistic evidence, the antiquity of vernacular renditions of Mikra need not be doubted. Indeed, the suggestion that the earliest Septuagint sources reflect a diglossic translation in a liturgical context strongly commends itself.²⁰ In any event, the targum to Leviticus (like that to Job, and others still unknown) indicate a living context of study of Mikra at Qumran, a matter which, of course, lies at the heart of the scribal enterprise as a whole.

Knowledge and study of the Tora of Moses was thus a basic prerequisite for the proper understanding and faithful performance of the commandments. Contemporary Stoics queried about the relative importance of theory and practice; and our early Pharisaic sources show a Jewish adaptation of this *topos*

¹⁷ See *M. Megilla* 4:4.

¹⁸ Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 113.

¹⁹ *B. T. Megilla* 23a, commenting on Neh 8:8.

²⁰ Cf. Rabin, 'Translation Process', 17f.

in the recurrent debates over the relative importance of study (of Tora) and practice (of the commandments). A famous rabbinic resolution of this dilemma was to prefer study, and to say that 'Tora is (the) great(er), for it leads to practice.'²¹ Such a dilemma would have been resolved quite differently by the Qumran covenanters. Faced with the question, they would have said that *both* are 'great', but that study of Tora is the greater, for without it there can be no true and proper religious practice. Study of the Tora is thus its correct study and interpretation; and only on this basis can there be legitimate and divinely authorized observance of the commandments.

The fundamental interrelationship of these themes recur in the sources. It is mentioned at the very outset of the *Rule Scroll*, where members of the community are enjoined 'to do (i.e., perform) what is right and proper before [God], in accordance with what He commanded through Moses and all His servants, the prophets . . . to perform the statutes of God . . . [and] to clarify their knowledge in the truth of the statutes of God' (*1QS* 1:3, 8, 12). And an initiate is subject to a period of examination with respect to 'his understanding and practice' (6:14), and cannot become a full member until a noviate period is passed and he is again thoroughly examined with respect to 'his spirit and practice' (6:17-18). These initiates into proper wisdom and practice are also called, in a textual variant (to 6:24), 'men of the Tora'.²² Like all members, they must ever after continue their study of the Tora and be scrupulous in performance of the rules, as revealed in the text and as exegetically derived therefrom. 'And in any settlement where there obtains [a communal quorum of] ten let there not be lacking a person who interprets the Tora (דרוש בתורה) continuously, day and night (יומם ולילה), in shifts among the fellows; and the Many shall engage diligently together one-third of every night of the year: studying the book (Mikra), and interpreting rule(s), and blessing together' (6:6-8).

Quite clearly, this legal injunction of continuous study for those who have separated themselves from sinful practices is itself an exegetical adaptation of the sapiential exhortation in Ps 1:1-2. There the truly happy person is portrayed as one who forsakes the way of the sinners and does not dwell among scoffers: 'but whose delight is the Tora of the Lord and in His Tora (בתורתו) he meditates (יודגה) day and night (יומם ולילה)'. The verb 'not be lacking' (ואל ימש) is not found in the psalm, but is found in Josh 1:8 (together with the other language of our scroll).²³ Another adaptation of this 'biblical' language occurs in a related context in the *Damascus Document*, which states that 'in any settlement where there obtains a [communal quorum of] ten let there not be

²¹ *Sifrei Deut.* 41, p. 85.

²² So Milik, reported in *RB* 63 (1956) 61.

²³ Josh 1:8 is itself an exegetical reworking of an earlier passage; see Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 384.

lacking (אל ימש) a priest versed in the book of ה'גו (CD 12:2-3). The background of this language in Psalms and Joshua suggests that this text is nothing other than the 'book of Meditation' *par excellence*, the Tora of Moses.²⁴ But the passage from IQS 8:6-8 is important in another respect. For just this regulation may indicate the liturgical context of lection and exegetical study queried about earlier. This possibility is, in fact, rendered quite plausible in the light of Nehemiah 8 itself. For just as there Ezra (a priest able 'to inquire [לדרש] into the Tora of the Lord' [Ezra 7:10]) convened the people to hear the Tora recited, which 'reading' (verb קרא) was preceded by a 'blessing' (verb ברכך) and extended by interpretations (vv. 2-9; 13-16), so does the *Rule Scroll* state that the community was convened continuously 'to read (לקרוא) the Tora, 'to interpret/inquire (לדרוש) into the law, and 'to bless (לברך) together. The specific language found in 7:6-8 may therefore be more than a mere stylistic conceit, and point to the liturgical tradition of considerable antiquity.

The need 'to return' in faith 'to the Tora of Moses', and to study it intensively, is 'because in it everything can be learnt' (CD 16:1-2; הכל מודקדק (כי בה כל מודקדק). This striking expression is somewhat reminiscent of the nearly contemporaneous remark attributed to one Ben Bag-Bag, in a classical Tannaic source: 'Turn it (the Mikra), and turn it (again), because everything is in it' (M. Avot 5:22; רכלה בה). Indeed, for both the early Pharisees and the covenanters of Qumran everything could be found in Mikra through exegesis. Concerned that they 'proceed in accordance with the Tora' (IQS 7:7), the sectarians studied the 'revealed text' (נגלה) for its 'exact formulation' (פרוש; cf. CD 6:14, 18, 20; 12:6) and explicit 'ordinance' (משפט; CD 7:7). Where this was not forthcoming, they proceeded to uncover its 'hidden' content (נסתר), according to the exegetical principles of the group (see below). In this way, everything necessary for proper legal-ritual practice could be derived from the books of Moses.

In a similar way, study of the nonlegal portions of Mikra, particularly the narratives, the psalms, and the prophecies – involved instruction in the manifest and hidden content. Thus, in group study or in homiletical exhortations, 'the Preceptor' might 'inform the Many in the way of God: instruct them in His wondrous might; and recite before them the נהירות (CD 13:7-8). This last phrase alludes to the metaphysical teachings of the Spirits and their enmity in the heavens (among the angels) and on earth (among mankind) until the final divine Judgment (see IQS 3:15-4:14; and נהייה at 3:15). These teachings bear on the relationships between cosmic and historical events, and are concerned with future events. In the same way, recollections of the mighty acts of God include both a celebration of past deeds and instruction in the events to come. What such exegetical instruction might have been like can be gauged from the material at hand. In a text like the *War Scroll*, for example, a long prayer is recited to God (IQM 9:17-16:1) in which certain past acts of power –

²⁴ For interpretations of this difficult term, see Rabin, *Zadokite Documents*, ad loc. Cf. also Dimant 'Qumran Sedarian Literature', 493 n. 57; 527.

the defeat of Pharaoh at the exodus and the defeat of Goliath by David – are used as *paradigms* for future acts of divine salvation (11:2-3, 9-10). Presumably instructions in such events, presenting them as the antitype of future divine deed, was part of ancient uses of Mikra. Similarly, a number of older prophecies recalled in this source as bearing on future events were also part of such instructions (see 10:2-5, citing Deut 20:2-4; 10:7-8, citing Num 10:9; 11:6-7, citing Num 24:17-19; and 11:11-12, citing Isa 31:8). Significantly, the *prophetic application* of these texts to future events is made *grosso modo*, and not by means of an atomization and reinterpretation of particular words, as is characteristic of the *pesher*-genre, which, of course, is also the result of intensive study of the hidden intent or true application of prophetic lemmata. Thus, just as the true application of the laws is the result of interpretative techniques and meanings revealed to the Interpreter of the Tora and his followers, so also the true application of the prophecies is the product of techniques and meanings revealed to the Teacher of Righteousness and his followers (see below).

USE OF CITATIONS AND CITATION-FORMULAE

The authority of Mikra is furthermore evident through the variety of citations and citation-formulae employed in the scrolls, and through the various ways lemmata and comments are correlated.²⁵ Indeed, the citations are used to give both *prestige* and *authority* to the legal, homiletical or prophetic comments which precede them. The materials from Mikra are introduced as that which is 'written' (כתוב) in a particular book; or they are presented as that which God, or Moses, or one of the prophets has 'said' (אמר), 'spoken' (דבר), 'told' (הגיד), 'taught' (למד), 'announced' (השמיע). The first three terms are by far the most prevalent, and begin to reflect the diversity of citation formulae characteristic of Jewish texts of the period.²⁶ In particular, one can note the emergence here of terms found in Pharisaic and classical rabbinic sources, such as the introduction of Mikra citations by כמו שכתוב ('as it is written'); כמה שנאמר ('as is said'); מגיד הכתוב ('Scripture [lit., "the writ"] tells'); and תלמוד לומר ('Scripture [lit., "the teaching"] says'). This latter is strikingly adumbrated in the scrolls in connection with the false teaching of the opponents (cf. 4QpNah 2:8).²⁷ Sometimes the citation formulae are used in the scrolls without any further attribution (e.g., CD 9:2, 5, 15; 6-7). More commonly, the writer indicates his source, either by referring to a specific 'book' (e.g., of Moses, 4QFlor 1:1; Isaiah, 4QFlor 1:16; or Ezekiel, 4QFlor 1:16), or to the

²⁵ A seminal early study on the citations and their use is Fitzmyer, 'Explicit Old Testament Quotations'. As I have not found his classification flexible or complex enough, it has not been used here. Earlier and contemporary studies on (explicit and implicit) citations in specific texts was done by Carmignac. See his 'Citations ... dans la "Guerre"', and id., 'Citations ... dans les "Hymnes"'. A more formal analysis is that of Horton, 'Formulas of Introduction'.

²⁶ Cf. Metzger, 'Introducing Quotations', Ellis, below, pp. 62ff.

²⁷ See the proposal of Wacholder, 'Qumran Attack', with earlier literature cited.

name of an ancient authority (e.g., Moses, *IQM* 10:6; *CD* 8:14; Isaiah, *CD* 4:13-14, 6:7-8; Ezekiel, *CD* 3:21, 19:11-12; or Zechariah, *CD* 19:7).

Among the *explicit* citations, two broad types of use can be discerned. In the first, the citation follows a point previously made in the text and is used to *justify* it. It therefore functions, formally, as a prooftext. But what is of particular interest is that these citations can almost never be read according to their plain-sense. Due to their recontextualization, they must each be construed relative to the point which precedes them. This is not necessarily to say that the lemmata have exegetically sponsored the point at issue, but solely to indicate that the original sense of the prooftext must be disregarded in order to understand how the writer has exegetically appropriated it. The question as to whether Mikra citation sponsors or supports the new issue must be ascertained in each separate instance: no generalization is possible. Without engaging in the specifics of exegetical practice and technique here (see below), several instances can nevertheless serve to illustrate this important matter.

LEGAL CITATIONS. At the beginning of a long list of Sabbath rules in the *Damascus Document*, the covenanter is told: 'Let no man do work on Friday from the time when the orb of the sun is distant from the gate by its own fulness; for that is what He (God) said: Guard (שמור) the Sabbath Day to keep it holy' (*CD* 10:14-15). Clearly, this citation from the Decalogue (Deut 5:12) has been adduced to justify sectarian rules concerned with determining the onset of the Sabbath day. The matter is not considered in the Mikra. But now, by determining that one should 'guard' the onset of the Sabbath by beginning it when the sun is the distance of its own orb from setting, and relating that customary procedure to Deut 5:12, Mikra is used to support the ruling. Indeed, by reading שמור as 'guarding' the onset of the holy day, and not in terms of 'heeding' the Sabbath rest (the contextual consideration in the Decalogue and the succeeding rules of the *Document*), the new rule is impliedly shown to be 'found' in the Mikra. Presumably, the custom described here preceded the biblical proof; but the rule has been so presented ('for that is what He said') as to suggest that it has been exegetically derived from the older divine law.

At the conclusion of the Sabbath rules (11:17-19), the community is enjoined: 'Let no man offer on the altar on the Sabbath except (כי אם) the burnt-offerings of the Sabbath; for thus it is written: Apart from (מלבד) your Sabbath-offerings.' In this case, the legist is concerned to restrict offerings on the Sabbath and to justify the innovation on the basis of Mikra (Lev 23:38). However, it will be observed that in its original context the adverb מלבד ('apart from') means something like 'besides'; whereas in the new rule the term has been construed in a restrictive sense (as one can also see from the words כי אם which precede the citation). As in the preceding case, Mikra is ostensibly utilized to authorize the rule; and the passage is presented as if it represents the plain-sense of the Mikra, not its reinterpreted sense. Accordingly, one must be

cautious in assuming that where the new rules are linked to Mikra they were *in the first instance* exegetically derived from them. It is just as likely that the prooftexts, even where an exegetical dimension is predominant, are secondary justifications of customary, non-biblical procedures. This seems all the more likely where different sectarian legal injunctions are justified by nonlegal texts (cf. *CD* 11:40; *IQS* 5:17-18). The more puzzling matter is why only certain rules are (exegetically) justified, ones which are certainly not the most obvious or (to judge by rabbinic procedures), even the most conducive.

NONLEGAL CITATIONS. As just noted, rules or directives to the community are sometimes justified by nonlegal citations. These are clearly of a *post hoc* nature. Thus *IQS* 5:7-20, which prohibits consociation with nonmembers in all matters, supports its injunctions of separation with two prooftexts. The first (at 5:15), after justifying nonrelations with nonsectarians with the moral exhortation 'for he should be far (ירחק) from him in every matter (בכל דבר)', goes on to justify that point with a Mikra citation: 'for so it is written: "you shall be far (תרחק) from every false thing (מכל דבר)'"'. This citation, which derives from the moral approbation to judges in Exod 22:7, is now used to support separation from persons who can transmit impurity to a covenanter, simply on the basis of similar terms! The citation is thus made to serve an entirely new purpose; and the transformed reuse of the passage is not further explicated. In this respect, it stands apart from the second justification (at 5:17-18). For there further rules of noninvolvement are justified by a citation from Isa 2:22: 'as is written: "cease (חדלו) from Man who only has breath in his nostrils, for by what does he merit esteem (נחשב)?"'. This citation is exegetically justified by the comment: 'for all those who are not accounted (נחשבו) in his covenant, it is necessary to separate (from) them and all that is theirs.' In this striking case, a citation which speaks of the vain-glory of mortal humans is reinterpreted – on the basis of the verb נחשב (the standard term for being accounted a member, cf. 5:11) – to support separation from the impure. Remarkably, too, the universal 'Man' of the Isaiah passage is now transformed to indicate particular men, nonsectarians, in fact.

This support of one justification through a quite explicit reinterpretation of it, calls to mind *IQS* 8:13-15. In this passage, the covenanters are told of their imperative to separate from evil and 'to go to the desert, to prepare there the way of the Lord'. The language of this injunction is contrived to anticipate the supportive citation from Isa 40:3 'as is written: "in the desert prepare the way (of the Lord), straighten a highway to our God"'. Now the first clause of this citation is clearly a straight-forward biblical justification of the covenanter's decision to build a community in the Judaean wilderness. The second, however, is given a new meaning: for the word 'highway' is explicated to mean the 'study of the Tora (מדרש התורה)' in the special manner of the sect. The original rhetorical parallelism has thus been broken-up and distributed with two different senses, a regular feature, in fact, of rabbinic aggadic midrash.

PROPHETIC CITATIONS. Certainly the foregoing citation-plus-commentary from the *Rule Scroll* may be understood as the reuse of an ancient prophecy in the course of a rhetorical discussion. Many comparable instances can be found in the *Damascus Document*. There the rhetor repeatedly reviews the comments with explicit citations from Mikra, which are then reinterpreted (word-by-word) with respect to sectarian law and ideology. For example, in CD 3:18-4:4 the speaker describes how God 'made reconciliation' with sinful Israel and established a 'sure house', that those who hold fast to it have 'eternal life', as was promised to the prophet Ezekiel in Ezck 44:15. This passage is then explicated in terms of the sect, so that the special nature of sectarian triumphalism is justified through the Mikra. Or again, just following this passage, the sins 'let loose' within the post-exilic community are presented as that of which God 'spoke by the hand of the prophet Isaiah son of Amoz.' Isa 14:21 is then cited and explicated with respect to archetypal sectarian sins: 'whoredom', 'wealth', and 'pollution of the Sanctuary' (4:13-18). Through these boldly reinterpreted citations, the communal sense of history and destiny is justified and vindicated. Of the many other examples that occur, we may simply add at this point such passages as 7:9-10, where a Mikra citation adduced to justify a comment on the basis of its reinterpretation, is itself justified via another citation from Mikra. A parade instance where a series of Mikra citations, appropriately reconstructed, are used to justify sectarian hopes may be found in 4QFlor 1-2.²⁸

The second type of explicit citation in the scrolls presents Mikra first, with the comment or comments following thereafter. While there is little doubt in these cases that Mikra is being used, the citations occur in a variety of literary forms – and this effects the presentation of the lemmata. We may, accordingly, speak of the pseudepigraphic, the pesherite, the anthological, and the explicatory form in this regard. Specific exegetical examples will be considered below.

PSEUDEPIGRAPHIC FORM. In the *Temple Scroll*, related but different legal texts are variously integrated into thematic units, with their differences harmonized and exegetical innovations interpolated throughout. For example, in 11QTemp 11-29 a block of materials dealing with cultic festivals and procedures is culled from Num 28-29 (with elements from Lev 23 and other sources). Similarly, in columns 40-66 civil laws are culled primarily from the book of Deuteronomy (chapters 12-23), though with related Mikra texts worked-in. In either of the two units, the attentive reader can easily observe how the base text (Num 28-29 or Deut 12-23, respectively) organizes the diverse materials, and how the entire ensemble is reauthorized as the word of God in just this new form. They are thus pseudepigraphically represented as the instructions of God to Moses, even those Deuteronomic units where Moses (in the Tora) reports the divine word. In 11QTemp it is not Moses who reports God's instructions, but God Himself

²⁸ On this text, see now Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*.

who is the speaker. Through this reauthorization (of old laws and new interpretations) it is a rewritten book: a new Tora. In this way, the pseudepigraphical procedure in 11QTemp differs notably from that found in the masoretic text itself, where exegetical innovations and textual blends are worked into the revealed instructions presented through (Exod-Num) or reported by (Deut) Moses. A comparative examination of the practice suggests a more restrained pseudepigraphical attitude in ancient Israel, since there the examples are occasional and often stylistically unwieldy. In 11QTemp, on the other hand, the practice shows thematic and stylistic consistency. In fact, in those few cases where the pseudepigraphical transformation would result in a theologically awkward or stylistically confusing text (as, at 11QTemp 55:2ff. and 63:7-8) the formulation found in the book of Deuteronomy was left intact.²⁹ In the *Temple Scroll*, therefore, the reader confronts the text as a new Tora, even while perceiving the biblical base around which the sources and innovations were integrated. One may confidently surmise that this was the very hope and intent of the author.

PESHERITE FORM. In the so-called *pesher*-literature, as well, large blocks of Mikra are presented prior to their reinterpretation. Moreover, as also in the preceding type, the base text, now those with a prophetic locus (e.g., the words of the prophets and selected psalms), determines the structure and developments of the new text. But here the issue is not the reinterpretation of a consecution of laws, but the elucidation of consecutive lemmata from the text at hand (usually after full citations, though also after repeated citations of half-verses) with references to the present and future life of the community. The lemmata are separated from the interpretations by commentary formulae of several related types (e.g., 'its *pesher* [eschatological sense] is').³⁰ In this way, Mikra is presented as the authoritative prophetic word of God; and the commentaries on it are authorized as the true meaning or application of that word for the times at hand. Hence, whereas in the *Temple Scroll* the Pentateuch (primarily) was used as the source of new legal truth; in the *pesherim*-texts the Prophets (primarily) were used as the source of new eschatological truth. In both cases, it must be stressed, the pertinent truth is for the sectarians, and is a *reworked* and *interpreted* truth.

ANTHOLOGICAL FORM. Limited and also more extended types of anthological reuse of Mikra can be found among the Qumran scrolls, where Mikra is presented alone or before comments upon it. Among the more limited types, examples of a legal, liturgical, narrative, and prophetic character are known. Thus as part of the phylacteries found at Qumran, the four major Pentateuchal

²⁹ Discussion of the pseudepigraphic features of 11QTemp appear in the Introduction (vol. 1) and throughout the notes of the critical edition of Yadin, *Temple Scroll*. A valuable discussion of various pertinent matters can be found in Brin, 'Mikra in the Temple Scroll'.

³⁰ On the formula and its relation to Mikra and contemporary Jewish Literature, see Fishbane, 'Qumran Pesher'; and id., *Biblical Interpretation*, 444-57, and notes.

sections used in Pharisaic *tefillin* (Exod 13:1-10; 13:11-16; Deut 6:4-9; 11:13-21) are also found along with several other passages, including the Decalogue.³¹ Clearly this liturgical collection is unified thematically: all four refer to teachings which should be signs on the hand and frontlets between the eyes (Exod 13:9, 16; Deut 6:8; 11:18); and presumably the addition of the Decalogue (introduced with the words *ha-devarim ha'eleh*, 'these words', in Exod 20:1) to the ensemble is because Deut 6:4-9, which follows a recitation of the Decalogue (Deut 5:6-18), instructs the Israelite to bind *ha-devarim ha'eleh* to their arm and head. A hybrid anthology (of the versions in Exod 20 and Deut 5) has long been known in the form of the Nash papyrus;³² and now, in 4Q149 a mixed text of the two versions of the Decalogue has been found in an ancient *mezuzah*.³³

The materials found in 4Q158 provide a different case. Here there are ensembles of running text which include a number of exegetical additions. Thus in fig. 1-2 of this *siglum*, sections from Gen 32 are juxtaposed to Exod 4:27-28, along with exegetical additions; although the meaning of this juxtaposition is not immediately apparent.³⁴ More striking is the sequence in fig. 6-12, where the following ensemble is found: Exod 20:19-21; Deut 5:28-29; Deut 18:18-22 (fig. 6); Exod 20:12, 16, 17; Deut 5:30-31; Exod 20:20-26; Exod 21:1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10. Along with this running text a small number of exegetical additions can also be noted. Presumably, we have here an attempt to harmonize and integrate various texts on the theme and sequence of the revelation, the role of Moses, and the authority of his successors. In the text preserved here, this ensemble has been judged closer to the so-called Samaritan text than to the Masoretic.³⁵ Indeed, it is striking that also in the received Samaritan text the Decalogue in Exod 20 is supplemented with materials from Deut 5 and 18, as well as from Deut 27:4-7. This latter is also transformed by an addition which legitimates the Samaritan sanctuary of Shechem. This matter is lacking in 4Q158, so that a

³¹ Milik, *Qumran Grotte 4: Yadin, Tefillin*.

³² According to Greenberg, 'Nash Papyrus', 'the combination of the Decalogue and the *Shema* indicates that the text of the papyrus represents the Tora readings included in the daily morning liturgy of Second Temple times (cf. Tan. 5:1: "they recited the Decalogue, the *Shema*, etc.")'.

³³ See Milik, *Qumran Grotte 4*, 80.

³⁴ According to Tov, 'Harmonizations', 17, they are juxtaposed 'for no clear reason'. But it would appear that this *semikhat parashiyot*, or linkage of pericopae, may be due to several lexical and thematic considerations. For if we look at the preserved texts and their immediate context, there appears to be an (exegetical-homiletical?) attempt to draw a connection between several encounters: the mysterious divine encounters ((attacks?)) and the woundings of the 'leg' in Gen 32:25-33 and the mysterious divine encounters ((attacks?)) and the woundings of the 'leg' in Gen 32:25-33 and the reunions in Genesis 33 (Jacob and Esau) and Exod 4:27-31 (Moses and Aaron), on the basis of the common verbs *naga'* and *pagash*; and the common verbs *nashaq* and *pagash*, and the common adverb *liqra't*. Notably, Exod 4:24-26 is followed by vv. 27-31; and Gen. 32:25-35 is followed by ch. 33. The writer of this Qumran fragment was obviously struck by the multiple concordances (divine and fraternal encounters, with similar terminology, in both cases). Such correlations would suggest a whole area of exegetical imagination and interest.

³⁵ But 4Q158 and the Samaritan text in question (analyzed by Tigay, 'Documentary Hypotheses') are not parallel anthologies, and derive from different traditions.

cultic tendentiousness is not yet in evidence in the Qumranite anthology. Whether the latter anthology had any liturgical use is impossible to say. On the contrary, it is more probable that this integration was motivated by exegetical-harmonistic considerations. Faced with confusing elements regarding the sequence of the Sinai revelation, and the role of Moses, some sages may have tried to rewrite Mikra in order to produce a more integrated text, though its communal status remains unclear. The *Temple Scroll*, to which we turn next, is the consummate early Jewish expression of this concern for anthological integration. It achieved this through a 'rewritten Tora'.

The anthological reuse of explicit Mikra texts in *11QTemp* has several forms and variations.³⁶ In this context, we shall focus on what appears to be the two most dominant classes: (a) the limited type of reuse, where two or more texts bearing on a specific legal topic are integrated to produce a new Tora rule (with and without exegetical comments); and (b) the more extended type of reuse, where a series of the former type are unified by an older Tora sequence (e.g., the sequence of laws in Deuteronomy) to produce a new Tora.

(a) *The limited type*. The rule in *11QTemp* 66:8-9 provides an instructive case in point. There we read that 'If a man seduces a young virgin who had not been betrothed – and she is permitted to him [in marriage] according to the law – and he lies with her and is caught, let the man who lies with her give 50 pieces of silver to the father of the maiden. And she shall become his wife because he raped her. He may never divorce her.'³⁷ It is obvious that here the 'legist has harmonized two distinct formulations, one rule from Exod 22:15, dealing with seduction, the other from Deut 22:28-29, dealing with rape, evidently because both deal with a young virgin who had not been betrothed. Combining related but essentially different rules, and rewriting them as one, is certainly not an innovation of our legist. Similar features are found within Mikra itself, along with exegetical comments similar to that added here (the emphasized phrase).³⁸ What is distinctive here is the consistency of this anthological reuse of Mikra in order to produce new rules. Indeed, both the deliberateness and the dexterity of the procedure suggest that for the author of *11QTemp* this was much more than a stylistic conceit. Presumably, this procedure is much more related to his concern for an authoritative representation of earlier revelations and authoritative rules. This comes through even more where the new law is presented through a vast texture of older rules (as, e.g., in the prescriptions concerning

³⁶ Brin, 'Mikra in the Temple Scroll', has offered a helpful list and analysis of types; the categorization of the 'anthologized uses' of Mikra offered by Kaufman, 'Temple Scroll', is much more nuanced but not, therefore, always more helpful. Limitations of space have led to a simpler classification here.

³⁷ On the translation of *'orasa* as 'who had not been betrothed' I follow D. W. Halivni, 'Note'. And see now his extended analysis of this rule against the background of ancient Jewish law and terminology, in *Midrash, Mishnah, and Gemara*, 30-34 and notes.

³⁸ See Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 188-97, 216-20, 228-30.

the festival of unleavened bread, which integrates citations from Lev 23:6-8; Num 17:10-16; 28:17-25; Deut 16:8; and Ezra 16:8).

(b) *The extended type.* A brief example of the 'running anthology' may be found in 11QTemp 51-52. The base text here begins with Deut 16:16ff. (rules about judges). After taking this up, the legist then provides some exegetical additions to it. Then, before continuing with the rules in Deut 16:21 (prohibiting the planting of sacred poles near the altar), the writer adds a new introduction which contains a summary of the laws which follow in 51:19-21. Upon returning to the base text of Deuteronomy, the writer cites Deut 16:21 and 22 (52:1-2) and then, quite unexpectedly, Lev 26:1 (52:2-3). This latter rule prohibits incising forms on altar stones, and is not mentioned in Deut 16:21-22. The legist was evidently drawn to it by association: since the same phraseology is used in both Deut 16:22 and Lev 16:1 to prohibit the erection of stelae by Israelites. In this manner, the writer was able both to integrate related rules in one place and to produce a Scripture without duplication. This done, the text (52:3-4) continues with the Deuteronomic issues found in Deut 17:1. Once again, it is only after a complex series of associations to other Pentateuchal passages (including those dealing with vows) that the legist in col. 55 returns to his base text, now at Deut 17:2. Clearly, the ancient Tora of Moses was of very great importance to him. One might even conclude that the very 'Mosaic' form of 11QTemp reflected one of his principle ideological concerns: to preserve the older teaching while representing it in a new and *reinterpreted* form. That is, the legist was concerned to retain the ancient Tora, though in accordance with the truth of Mikra as he and his fellows understood it and practiced it. One might further suggest that just this (anthological) form was used by the author to justify his extensive exegeses and reuse of Mikra.

EXPLICATORY FORM. There are a number of occurrences in the *Damascus Document* where a text from the Mikra is first cited in order to introduce a rule or idea, which latter is then subsequently explicated. In this way, it is again not Mikra *per se* which commands assent by the covenanters, but Mikra as exegetically clarified. In the preceding section, we saw that Mikra was cited after the presentation of a new rule or idea in order to justify it or give it legitimacy. In the following cases, the citation also serves to justify the new rule or idea – though now the citation comes first and the explication follows. In these cases we have, in fact, something akin to proto-midrashic (legal and homiletical) discourses.

(a) In CD 9:2-5, after an apodictic rule dealing with judicial execution (9:1), which is neither justified or explicated, the legist turns to a new case: 'And as to that which is said [in Scripture, Lev 19:18]: "You shall not take vengeance (לֹא תִקֹּם) nor bear rancor against your compatriot (בְּנֵי עַמֶּךָ)", and every person among the covenanters who will bring an accusation against his neighbor (רֵעֵהוּ), without [first] reproofing [him] before witnesses, or brings it up when enraged, or tells his elders to make him contemptible: he takes vengeance

(נִקְם הוּא) and (bears) rancor. For it is expressly written: "He takes vengeance (נִקְם הוּא) on his adversaries, and he bears rancor against his enemies" (Nahum 2:1)."

It will be observed that the concern of the rule, to establish procedures for reproofing fellow sinners without rancor, does not follow directly from Lev 19:18, the opening citation. That Tora passage is rather explicated with reference to the sectarian rules which (presumably) preceded it, but which it now serves to justify. In order to make his point, the exegete transforms the Mikra text into a more popular idiom. In his view, one who does not follow the rules of reproof, but delays this procedure, acts with vengeance (explained as *rape*) and rancor (explained as *intent to condemn*). There then follows a further passage, from Nahum 2:1, which justifies the explication and buttresses the first citation in a most interesting way. Most commentators read the Nahum citation as a direct and ironical use of Mikra; i.e. *you*, a covenanteer, must not bear vengeance, etc., *even though* God ('He', understood as a euphemism for the Tetragram) does. But two points suggest a different explanation. The first point is that the citation from Lev 19:18 is already read by the legist in a narrow sense (the 'compatriot' is not any Israelite, but a sectarian); the second is that just before the second lemma the legist adds that one who does not follow the new procedure of reproof, and brings the accusation up later 'takes vengeance (נִקְם הוּא)'. Since just this latter expression is also the (purported) reading of Nahum 2:1, which goes on to refer, vengeance, etc. with respect to Israel's 'adversaries' and 'enemies', one may justifiably understand this proof-text to serve an entirely new conclusion; viz., to neutralize the divine statement and reapply its content (viz., sanction) to the covenanters. The underlying argument would thus be as follows: since Scripture itself (in Nahum 2:1) says that vengeance and rancor are emotions directed against one's enemies, it must follow that the exegetical reading of Lev 19:18 as condemning such practices towards one's sectarian compatriots is fully justified. Mikra is thus exegetically used here to both establish and vindicate a new judicial procedure. Presumably, the procedure long preceded this 'midrashic proof'.

(b) A second example comes from the homiletical sphere. In CD 8:14-18, after a condemnation against those contemporaries who have falsely 'built the wall' (8:12-13), that is, who interpret and practice the Tora differently from the sect, the preacher quotes from Scripture: "And as for that which Moses said [to Israel]: "Not for your righteousness or uprightness of heart do you dispossess these nations, but [rather] because He [God] loved your fathers and kept the oath" – this is the case (וְכֵן הַמִּשְׁפָּט) with regard to the repentant ones of Israel who departed from the way of the people: because of God's love for the ancestors . . . He loves their descendants . . ." As in the preceding case, Mikra is first adduced and then explicated. Ostensibly, the preacher has simply cited the

* See Rabin, *Zadokite Documents*, ad loc.; for a broad review and analysis, see Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, ch. 6.

words of Moses. Closer examination, however, shows that Mikra has been reused in a more deliberate way. For in blending together (a selected composite from) Deut 9:5a and (a stylized rephrasing from) 7:8a the preacher has used the authority of the Tora in order to emphasize the nature of divine grace in the present era. The older words of Moses, dealing with the generation of Conquest, are now reapplied to the sectarian community and its anticipated displacement of the foreign oppressor then in the land. Indeed, those Jews who have repented and joined the community are told that their victory will not be the result of their own merit, but solely due to God's love and promise to the ancestors. The preacher thus utilizes the Mosaic lemmata and redirects their meaning to his own day. The community is likened to the ancient generation of wandering in the desert: like them they will victoriously inherit the land; and, again like them, they will be vindicated because of God's faithfulness to his ancient oath. Having reused Mikra in this exhortatory manner, the preacher closes with a repeated denunciation of the 'builders of the wall' (8:18), itself an allusion to Ezek 13:10.⁴⁰

REUSE OF BIBLICAL LANGUAGE

The sectarian ideology that it alone is the true Israel, heir of the ancient past, is no where so pervasive as in the predominance of biblical language and form throughout the scrolls. Indeed, virtually every page of text is replete with extensive uses of Mikra as a *model* of one sort or another. To explore this topic in detail would actually require a review of almost every line of sectarian composition. This is clearly beyond the scope of the present enterprise. We shall therefore limit ourselves here to three broad areas.

(1) *Mikra as Model for Language*. The dense reuse of biblical language is especially evident in the paraenetic sections of the *Damascus Document*,⁴¹ the prayers of the *Hodayot* collection, and the discursive narrative of the *War Scroll*.⁴² The interweaving of passages from all the compositions of ancient Israel not only creates a thick archaic texture, dramatizing the biblical inheritance and character of the sect; but these passages also generate a network of intertextual associations that give special resonance to the sectarian compositions. In fact, the implicit citations embedded in these texts produce a tableaux of interlocking allusions: a *new biblical composition*. Choosing somewhat randomly, let us simply cite one of the sentences that precedes the Deuteronomic

⁴⁰ On this textual image in its original context, see Fishbane-Talmon, 'Structuring of Biblical Books' 131-36.

⁴¹ Cf. Rabin, *Qumran Documents*, IX (preface), 'I am convinced that the Admonition (pp. i-viii, xx) is all of it a mosaic of quotations, both from OT and other, now lost, writings, a clever presentation of *testimonia*, not a history of the sect'.

⁴² On this text, see Carmignac, 'Citations... dans la "Guerre"', On IQS, see Weisberg-Möller, 'Some reflections'.

citations in CD 8:14-18, just considered. In 8:7-9 the preacher begins: 'And they did each one what was right in his eyes and preferred each one the stubbornness of his heart, and did not withdraw from the people [of the land and their sin], but rebelled highhandedly by walking in the ways of the wicked.' There is nothing complicated about this rebuke: it is manifestly unified in both theme and concern. No complicated or ironic clash of images is found. Nevertheless, through its composite of textual allusions, a sharper charge is generated. For one thing, the imagery of doing what is 'right in one's eyes' is standard Deuteronomic language for religious anarchy (cf. Deut 12:8; Judg 21:25), just as stubbornness of heart is a recurrent expression which conveys a censure of personal will and divine disregard (Deut 29:18; Jer 9:13). Then, too, the language of withdrawing (נָזַח) is used technically of removal from Israelite holiness (Lev 22:2) or towards pagan activity (Hos 9:10), and the choice of the verb פָּשַׁע to express rebellion and the image יָד רַמָּה to convey (highhanded) intention, respectively convey the rebellion at Sinai (Exod 32:25) and the deliberate rejection of divine commandments (Num 15:30f.). Finally, the image of going in the way of the wicked recalls the idioms of Ps 1:1, where such sinners are juxtaposed to those who follow the Tora.

It is certainly not necessary to argue that the preacher of CD 8:7-9 had just the aforementioned passages in mind (though in several cases the language is unique) to recognize that his choice of expression is deliberately allusive and richly biblical. Little would be gained by dismissing this 'biblical texture' as so much linguistic archaizing or stylistic conceit. For to separate verbal form from ideological content would be unnecessarily artificial. Since the community believed itself to be the new Israel, it also came to express itself in this authoritative manner. Thus not only through explicit citations and applications, but also through a chain of textual allusions and associations, the authority of Mikra for the covenanters' self-understanding is dramatically asserted.

(2) *Mikra as Model for Composition*. In taking up this subject, it will be well to distinguish between more narrow and more extensive uses of compositional forms found in the Mikra. An example of the former is the liturgical recitation found in IQS 2:2-10. This liturgy is part of a ceremony of induction for initiates. In the course of the procedure, the priests bless the lot of those pure in practice while the Levites curse those that share the lot of Belial. What is particularly striking about these recitations is that the first is worked around a reuse of the Priestly Blessing found in Num 6:24-26, whereas the second is its inversion. The biblical form is particularly evident in the first case, though the lemmata are recited without citation formulae and supplemented asyndetically. Thus we read: 'May He (the Lord) bless you with all good; may He protect you from all evil; may he enlighten your heart with the wisdom of life; may He be gracious to you with everlasting knowledge; and may He raise up for you the face of his pious ones for everlasting peace (2:3-4).' As in many cases in Mikra and early

rabbinic literature, the ancient Priestly Blessing serves as the structure and basis for a new liturgical composition.⁴³

Another type of implicit use of Mikra deserves mention. And that is the 'anthological' composition found in many legal texts. As noted earlier, the *Temple Scroll* is particularly characterized by the coordination of related Mikra passages to expand or harmonize certain topics, and to authorize innovations through deliberate changes. For example, the rules of the paschal-sacrifice incorporate Exod 12:47-48; Num 9:3; and Deut 16:7 into a new legal mosaic. In addition, Exod 12:47, which explicitly states that 'all the congregation of Israel shall do it (viz., the sacrifice)', is supplemented by the remark (utilizing Mikra language concerning the valid age of priestly service): 'from the age of twenty and upwards they shall do it.' By this qualifying addition the previous assertion is manifestly undercut. But by weaving it into the known rules for the paschal rite, the author has also justified his procedure in the light of his (here implicit) ideology that Israel is a 'kingdom of priests'. A more limited and also more subtle form of such legal creativity can be found in the *Damascus Document*. For example, in the continuation of the aforementioned example regarding reproof (CD 9:6-8), the light indicates that vengeance involves withholding reproof 'from one day to the next (מיום ליום)', he is drawing an analogy to the law of vows in Num 30:15 where the very same phraseology occurs. In this way, the legist is able to innovate or justify a time-limit for proper reproof on the basis of the laws of Moses.⁴⁴ The Mosaic interpretation establishes an analogy: just as in the one case the vow of an unmarried or married woman is valid unless invalidated within a day by her father or husband (respectively), so is reproof valid only for the same period of time. The words מיום ליום are therefore no mere phrase. For the legist of CD it is an operative legal expression intentionally used to justify his exegetical innovation. This procedure of legal validation is quite common to the *Damascus Document*, where the technique of explicit legal justification is used as well.⁴⁵

On a more extensive plane, the broad impact of a compositional form from the Mikra is attested in different genres of the sectarian scrolls. We have already mentioned the use of the legal sequence of the book of Deuteronomy on the composition and editing of the *Temple Scroll*. We may now add that Deuteronomy strongly influenced the style and structure of the *Damascus Document*, as well. Thus, like Deut 1-11, CD opens (1-8) with a collection of paraenetic reviews of the national past, and begins various subsections with the exhortation '(and) now hear' (1:1; 2:1; 3:14). This introductory statement is also found in Deut 4:1; 6:4; 9:1; 10:12. In addition, just as Deuteronomy follows its

⁴³ See Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 329-34.

⁴⁴ See the analysis of the rabbinic literature, and the overall treatment of Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, ch. 4.

⁴⁵ Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, *passim*, and earlier in *Halakha at Qumran*, *passim*, has forcefully argued that the halakha (as against sectarian organization rules) was not only justified through the inspired interpretation of biblical texts, but derived from it as well.

historical retrospectus with a corpus of cultic and civil rules (ch. 12-26), the historical review in CD is also continued by a corpus of cultic and civic rules (9-16). No blessings and curses follow these rules, however, as they do in Deut 27-28. Instead, such a procedure is found in IQS 2:208 in the liturgical recitation just discussed.

(3) *Mikra as Model for Practices or Procedures*. The dominant impact of Mikra on the covenanters is also evident in their reuse of it to determine the nature and structure of their judiciary, for example, or the ages of service of the officers of the community in their encampments and during the final eschatological war. In this latter battle, the structural arrangement of the tribes is also modeled on the deployment of the tribes around the portable ark in the wilderness, as described in the opening chapters of the book of Numbers.

As a final example, we return to IQS 2. It will be recalled that this text includes the blessings and curses of a covenant initiation ceremony. But the reuse of Mikra goes beyond a reuse of the Priestly Blessing and a mere allusion to the blessings and curses of Deuteronomy. For the blessings and curses are recited by cultic officers deployed in two groups, just as in the covenant ceremony described in Deut 27:9-26 (and enacted in Josh 8:33-34). Like the latter, moreover, the new covenanters respond to the recitation with the words 'Amen, Amen' (2:10). Accordingly, just as this ancient ceremony was prescribed in the wilderness and performed by the people of Israel and entered the land in the days of Joshua, so it now serves as the model for all those who would go out to the wilderness and enter the special covenant of the true Israel. This reappropriation of the ceremony by the sectarian community is both more bold and more consequential than the rhetorical reuse of it centuries earlier, by the prophet Jeremiah (11:1-5).

To conclude: virtually the entirety of Mikra is used and reused by the writers of the Qumran scrolls in order to author, reauthor, and – ultimately – to authorize their practices and beliefs. In any specific composition, many diverse texts might be adduced; just as many diverse texts might be adduced to support any one point. Indeed, the justification of a line of argument from several biblical sources at once demonstrates the wide-ranging literary imagination of the composers, and the authority of the *totality* of Scripture for them. Further, it is instructive to note that certain texts were variously employed in different genres. Thus the book of Isaiah was copied for itself, and reused both in pesherite comments found in CD and in special *pesher*-compositions. Comparably, the book of Leviticus was copied for itself (even in paleo-Hebrew script), translated into Aramaic in targum form (11Q19Lev), and reused to justify prophetic pronouncements (in 11Q19Melch). And finally, the book of Genesis was copied for itself, rewritten in an expanded and legendary manner in Aramaic (1QGenApoc), and used for prophetic pronouncements. Quite evidently, the use of a text in one genre did not preclude its use in another; and the

predilection for certain texts overall (like Deuteronomy, Isaiah, or Daniel),⁴⁶ as well as specific ones (like the diverse reuses of the prophecy in Num 24:17),⁴⁷ suggests that within the sectarian communities there was something like a 'canon-within-a-canon', something of a hierarchical preference for certain texts over others. However this be, the significant matter is not solely the use or reuse of given texts, but rather their employment by authoritative teachers in authoritative ways. It is to such matters that we now turn.

The Authority of Mikra

Several distinct, though related, levels of authority recur throughout the Qumran scrolls. To begin, it must be stressed that the principle source of authority of Mikra is that it is the revelation of God, 'which He commanded through Moses and through all his servants the prophets' (IQS 1:3; cf. 8:15-16). There are thus two categories: the inspired words of Moses (the Tora) and the inspired words of the prophets (the predictions of the prophets). This bifurcation also covers the explicit citations of Mikra. As we have seen, the words or books of Moses and the Prophets (like Isaiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah) are adduced both to justify new teachings anent the Tora of Moses, and to validate new understandings of the ancient prophecies. But this valorization of Moses and the Prophets should not obscure the central fact that God alone is the principle source of authority for the community. Indeed, it is precisely because of their revealed aspect (cf. IQS 8:15-16) that the teachings of Moses and the Prophets have any authority whatever. Thus, with respect to the inheritance of Mikra, the sectarians might speak of a twofold *chain of authority*: God and His authoritative spokesmen.

But as we have repeatedly observed, the authority of the Law and Prophecies for the sectarians cannot be separated from the way in which they were interpreted. It was, in fact, precisely in the special way that the old laws were reinterpreted or extended, the old predictions reapplied or decoded, and the institutions of ancient Israel restructured or regenerated, that the covenanters of Qumran saw themselves as distinct from other contemporary Jewish groups. Moreover, just because these reinterpretations of the ancient revelations were claimed to be the *true meaning* of God's word, a proper appreciation of the authority of Mikra for the sectarians would have to supplement the aforementioned chain of authority. In addition to a chain starting with God and extending to Moses and the Prophets, one must therefore also speak of their successors: the authoritative teachers of the community. As in the earlier

bifurcation, here too a distinction may be made between legal and prophetic interpretations.⁴⁸

AUTHORITY OF THE TEACHER

The scrolls are very clear about the pivotal position of authoritative teachers in the history of the community. The group is founded by one called the Unique Teacher (מורה היחיד; CD 20:1);⁴⁹ and a turning point in the history of the sect is when God raises up 'men of understanding' from Aaron and 'men of discernment' from Israel to dig the 'well', i.e., to study and interpret the Tora (CD 6:2-11). Further reinterpreting the phrases of Num 21:18, CD goes on to speak of the true community of penitents who went out to the wilderness, where they 'sought [God]' (דרשוהו) and were instructed by the Interpreter/Inquirer of the Tora (דורש התורה). This same ideology is reflected in IQS 8:13-16, where reference is made to those who would separate themselves from sin and go to the wilderness, in accordance with the prophetic word of Isaiah 40:3: 'Prepare in the wilderness the way of * * * (the Lord), straighten a highway in the wasteland for our God.' The last clause ('straighten a highway') is further interpreted to refer to 'the interpretation of the Tora (מירש התורה) [which] He commanded through Moses, to do all that which has been revealed at each period, and which the prophets have revealed through His Holy Spirit.' Significantly, the aforementioned CD passage concludes with the remark that 'without [the "Staff" of Instruction] they [the sectarians; and all others] will not grasp [the meaning of the revelations of God] until there arises one who teaches righteousness (מורה הצדק) in the end of days.'

The role of the Teacher is equally important in the interpretation of the prophecies, as is explicitly remarked in a comment in IQpHab 2:1-9. Here we read of '[. . . the words of] the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of God.' These are words which explicate 'all that which will come upon the final generation'; words 'of [under]standing which God put in [his heart], to interpret (לפשוט) all the words of His servants the prophets.' Elsewhere, in the same text, we read that 'God informed him [the Teacher] concerning all the mysteries (רוז) of His servants the prophets . . . which the prophets spoke: for the mysteries of God are wondrous (7:4-5, 8).' Indeed, the true meaning of the ancient prophecies were not even known to the authoritative spokesman of God who revealed them in past times. Only through the interpretations of the Teacher will the community know of the final day and their ultimate vindica-

* For an attempt to place the Qumran 'chain' comparatively within the context of early Tannaic traditions, see Herr, 'Chain of Transmission'.

* Or, emending *yahid* to *yahad* (i.e. 'Teacher of the Community'). However, CD 20:32 also reads 'men of the *yahid* (Unique [one] who listen to the Teacher of Righteousness). The variation *yahid/yahad* may therefore be inconsequential, with 'community' (*yahad*) the sense in both instances. This parallelism would also align the Teacher of 20:1 with the Teacher of Righteousness otherwise a thorny problem.

⁴⁶ Cf. e.g., Bruce, 'Book of Daniel'; also Brownlee, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*.

⁴⁷ See CD 7:18-21; 4QTest 9-11; and IQM 11:5-7; also Test. Levi 18:3; Test. Judah 24:1; P. T. Taanit 4:2, 67d; Rev 22:16.

tion. Without them, the true intent of the prophetic 'words' will also not be grasped. Or, in the exultant words of one member: 'You (God) have informed us about the final times of the (eschatological) Wars through Your Anointed Ones, the Visionaries of the Fixed Times' (IQM 11:7-8).⁵⁰

REWRITING OF TORA RULES

The cumulative impression of the Qumran scrolls, then, is that its primary text, Mikra, is the product of divine revelation; and that its own texts, which extend and develop the teachings of God, in various legal-sectarian collections and in various pesherite commentaries, are also the product of divine revelation. But here a certain qualification is necessary. For while one must agree that the authority for the various legal exegeses in the *Damascus Document* and the *Rule Scroll* lies in their being the product of divine inspiration through teachers and communal members, the authority of the legal exegeses in the *Temple Scroll* lies in their purportedly being an original revelation of God (i.e., not an inspired interpretation). One may therefore see in *11QTemp* a quite different notion of exegetical authority: one which does not allow the interpretations of Mikra to appear separate from the Tora – be that through explicitly or implicitly justified exegesis, as commonly in *CD* – but deems it necessary to rewrite the Tora text itself.

The ideology of *11QTemp* that all reinterpretations of the Tora must be part of the Tora, and not simply related to it through exegetical justifications or verbal allusions, is evident not only in the form of this text, a Tora revealed by God to Moses, but also through exegetical features within the text. Of principle interest here is the reworking of Deut 17:10 ('and you will do according to the word which they shall tell you from the Place . . .') in *11QTemp* 56:34. The Pentateuchal source simply advises Israelites who proceed to the high courts to follow the adjudication of the priests and other judicial officials there. In *11QTemp* a strikingly different reading is found: 'and you will do according to the Tora which they shall tell you, and according to the word which they shall teach you from the book of the Tora, and tell you in truth from the Place . . .' Clearly, the authority of the adjudicatory words of the Pentateuchal text have been transformed in the sectarian version to mean the words found in the Tora. Indeed, all instruction must proceed from these divine words, the Tora book at hand, *11QTemp*, not from the human words of the judicial officials. *11QTemp* is thus the true Tora, for in it all things are to be found. Certainly there is reflected here a different attitude towards writing new laws – no matter how justifiable be their relation to the ancient Tora – than that known from *CD*. Moreover, it is also quite possible that we also have here a critique of the early

⁵⁰ The technical term 'fixed times' (*te'udot*) is also used in legal contexts; cf. IQS 1:9.

Pharasaic position.⁵¹ For at this time Pharisaic sages did not permit the writing down of new biblically based or justified laws, as they did later. They rather required that the new rules be derived from the Tora or related to it, but be transmitted orally. It is therefore of much comparative interest to observe that one of the most notable Pentateuchal sources from which the early rabbinic midrashically justified their ideology was Deut 17:10!⁵² Presumably, ancient polemics centered on its proper interpretation.

In the light of the foregoing, three types of exegetical authority may be noted. 1. the writing down of new rules together with their (explicit or implicit) Scriptural justification alongside the Tora of Moses, as is common in the *Damascus Document*; 2. the writing down of new rules together with their Scriptural justification within a new Tora of Moses – as is characteristic of the *Temple Scroll*; and 3. the preservation in oral form only of new rules (at first with their Scriptural justification, later without them) alongside the Tora of Moses. Whether types 1 and 2 are so distinct as to suggest their basis in different and quite unrelated communities, is a matter for further consideration, to be weighed alongside the other linguistic and thematic considerations which distinguish *CD*, *IQS* and *11QTemp*.⁵³ Nevertheless, it is also clear that their relationship is closer than that between either of them and the Pharisaic position; or between any of these three and the Sadducean alternative. For if we can trust later rabbinic traditions, the Sadducees allowed themselves to write down new rules alongside the Tora of Moses, but were not willing to justify these fixed laws on the basis of divine Scripture.⁵⁴ Finally, these four types may be compared with a fifth: that found in the masoretic text itself, where reinterpretations and amendments to the rules of the Tora were pseudepigraphically incorporated into the text on a regular basis. The authority for these ancient Israelite innovations was thus the divine word to Moses, or Moses' own authority as teacher of the Law.⁵⁵ Only in some late circles is there the slightest hint of inspired legal exegesis.⁵⁶ On the other hand, the notable example of a divinely inspired interpretation of prophecies in Dan 9-11 is the near contemporary of this same phenomenon in the Qumran scrolls.⁵⁷

⁵¹ See the remark of Yadin, *Temple Scroll* 1, 56 and 2, 17; cf. the comments of Wacholder, *Dawn of Qumran*, 19.

⁵² Cf. Tg. Pseudo-Yonatan ad Deut 17:10-11; esp. v. 11, 'al memar oraita deyajunkhon we- 'al hilkhat dina' deyemerun lekhn, 'according to the word of the Tora which they shall teach you, and according to the halakhic rule which they shall say to you'.

⁵³ See the arguments of Levine, 'Temple Scroll'; and also Schiffman, 'Temple Scroll in . . . Perspective'.

⁵⁴ See now the discussion of Weiss Halavri, *Midrash, Mishnah, and Gemara, passim*.

⁵⁵ See Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 257-65, 530-33.

⁵⁶ *Ib.*, 539-42.

⁵⁷ On inspired exegesis in Daniel 9-11, see *id.*, 479-95.

The inspired interpretations at Qumran are also authoritative insofar as it is *only* these interpretations which carry the true divine intent of the Tora of Moses and the words of the prophets; i.e., it is *only* on the basis of the law as interpreted by the Teacher and Interpreter (and their inheritors), and *only* on the basis of the prophecies as interpreted by the Teacher, that God's will can be fulfilled and known. The sectarians believed that only they were the bearers of the esoteric sense of the ancient revelations. Thus, whereas the Tora of Moses explicitly stated that 'the hidden things (נסתרות) are the Lord's and the revealed things (נגלות) are ours and our children's forever, to perform all the words of this Tora' (Deut 29:28), the ideology at Qumran was significantly different. There the 'revealed things' were for all Jews, but the 'hidden things' were for them alone.⁸ Indeed, on their view, God revealed to the sect the hidden interpretation of the Law by which all Israel, including even its great leaders, like David, unknowingly went astray (CD 3:13; cf. 4:13-6). By following the true meaning and practice of the Law, the sectarians believed that they would not sin and would be guaranteed salvation. 'And all who will so according to the oath of God's [true] covenant, there will be surety (אמנות) for them to save them from all the snares of Doom' (CD 14:1-2); 'those who perform the Tora [according to its true interpretation] . . . [will be saved] because of their labor and trust (אמונתם) in [the teachings of] the Teacher of Righteousness' (1QP^{Hab} 8:1-3). The nonsectarians, on the other hand, will be doomed: 'for they have not been numbered in the [true] covenant . . . nor sought Him (God) by His Law, to know the hidden things (הנסתרות) by which they have gone astray for their guilt; and (indeed even) the revealed things (הנגלות) they have transgressed insolently' (1QS 5:11-12).

There is a second significant divergence between Deut 29:28 and sectarian ideology. For whereas the Pentateuchal passage refers to the performance of the 'revealed things' of the Tora 'forever', the sectarians believed that the 'hidden things' constituted a *new* revelation of interpretations of the Law. The original Law, with its conventional and traditional interpretations, was thus not abrogated but rather superseded through innovative and ongoing revelations of its meaning. It was thus not the 'revealed things' alone which had authority over sectarian practice, but the ancient revelations as understood through the inspired interpretation of its 'hidden' sense. Thus the 'chain of authority' mentioned earlier is also a 'chain of ongoing divine revelations'. Initially the Tora of Moses was revealed (and also the words of the prophets); subsequently, through the founding teachers and ongoing study of the covenanters, the hidden meanings of the Law (and Prophets) were revealed. This sectarian position is repeated in various forms. The *Damascus Document*, for example, refers to a hidden 'book of the Tora' which had been sealed up in the Ark since

⁸ Agreeing with analysis of Schiffman, *Halakha at Qumran*, 22-32; contra Wieder, *Judean Scrolls and Karaism*, 53-62.

the days of Joshua, a matter which lead to many serious sins of marital impurity (4:21-5:11);⁹ and, after referring to the special revelation of new meanings of the Law through the Interpreter of the Tora 'for the whole epoch of wickedness, and without which [the sectarians and others] will not grasp [its meaning] until he who teaches righteousness will arise in the End of Days' (6:4-11; see above), the sectarians are exhorted to 'take care to do according to the exact statement (פרוש) of the Law for the epoch of wickedness' (6:14). Similarly, in the *Rule Scroll* the sectarians are told to go to the wilderness and engage in the 'elucidation (מדרש) of the Tora [which] God commanded through Moses: to perform – [in accordance with] all that has been revealed at each period (עת בעת; 8:15-16, and cf. 9:19-20).

It would thus appear, according to these sources, that the community believed in a progressive revelation of the meaning of Mikra (the Law and the Prophets); indeed, this revelation was the sole basis for the comprehension of Mikra until the End of Days. At that time, with the fulfillment of the prophecies and the correct performance of the Tora (among the sectarians), a new epoch would be inaugurated, one which entailed either the abrogation of the Law entirely or its dispensation in some new form, depending on how one interprets CD 6:10-11 (cited just above). On the one hand, there were certainly contemporary views which expected the abrogation of the Law in the final days (1 Macc 14:41); and 4QP^{Bless} 3-5 even has a most striking formulation in this regard. But it is just as likely that the community believed in the ongoing authority of the Tora of Moses, but anticipated that its true meaning (already known to them) would in the End be revealed to all. Such a view would help explain the role of the *Temple Scroll* among the sectarian scrolls. For it would suggest that while in the present epoch of wickedness the true 'hidden' sense of the Law would be circulated privately in special sectarian pamphlets (like CD and 1QS), a new Tora of Moses, incorporating all the true meanings of it in a revised form, would be the property of all those Jews who would survive the Final War. On this view, the *Temple Scroll* would thus be the Tora for the New Age: 'the second Tora' which 'is written on the tablets' (4Q177 1:12, 14) and hidden from of old. It is therefore striking to note, in this regard, that the very group of sins mentioned in CD in connection with transgressions performed *because* this document was 'sealed up' – (1) marital impurity; (2) conveying uncleanness to the Sanctuary; and (3) gross accumulation of wealth (see 4:17-18; also 4:20-5:11 – are these emphasized in 11QT^{Temp} (for [1], see 51:17-18 and 60:15-16; for [2], see 35:10-14 and 48:14-17; and for [3], see 57:20-21). In any event, three distinct periods bearing on the ongoing and changing authority of Mikra can be discerned: Period One, when God revealed the Tora of Moses and the Prophecies to ancient Israel (the 'revealed things'), for the establishment of the Covenant and the people's salvation; Period Two, when, after sin and exile, God revealed the true Meaning of the Tora and the Prophets to the Instructor in

⁹ Wacholder, *Dawn of Qumran*, 117, has interpreted this as referring to 11QT^{Temp}.

Tora and the Teacher of Righteousness, and their repentant followers (the 'hidden things'; the 'mysteries'), for the establishment of a New Covenant and the salvation of the New Israel faithful to it; and Period Three, when, after the sin and destruction of nonsectarians, God would reveal His New Instruction (possibly the *Temple Scroll*) through the one who would teach righteousness, for the salvation of all (*CD* 20:20).⁶⁰

The Interpretation of Mikra

As we have seen, the sectarians believed themselves in possession of the True Interpretation of Mikra during the epoch of wickedness. In a sustained and repeated image, this revelation of true interpretations for the faithful is likened to a well of living water. Thus, at the outset of the *Damascus Document*, the people are told how 'God revealed' to those 'who were left over' after the exile, 'and who held fast to the commandments', 'hidden things regarding which all Israel had gone astray . . . His righteous testimonies which man shall perform and live thereby . . . ; and they digged a well for much water' (*CD* 3:12-16). Later on it is stressed how God 'raised' up 'men of understanding' and 'wisdom . . . and they digged the well . . . with the staff: the Well is the Law . . . and the Staff is the Seeker (דרוש) of the Law'; for 'without' this Well and Teaching no one can 'grasp' the true meaning of the Tora (*CD* 6:2-11). Thus the sectarian can exult: 'You have established within my heart a true foundation, waters of well for those who seek it (דרושיה); *IQH* 6:9);⁶¹ while nonsectarians, even those who 'have forsaken the well of living water' will be bereft on the Day of Judgement (*CD* 8:21a).

A vigorous dedication to the interpretation of Mikra was thus cultivated by the sectarians. They were concerned to observe the laws according to their 'exact meaning' (מדוקדק; *CD* 6:14, 16, 20), for in the Tora of Moses 'everything is stated precisely (פרוש; *CD* 13:1-2)'; just as they were concerned to 'determine (פרוש) the seasons' precisely, for such is 'stated precisely (מרוקדק) in the book of the Divisions of the Periods' (*CD* 16:2-3). With this knowledge the community was distinguished from all others. 'For everything hidden from all Israel' might be 'found by one who seeks (הדורש) [Scripture] properly' (*IQS* 8:11-12); but all others will be confounded, 'for . . . they have not sought Him (דרשוהו) [God] according to His Law to know the hidden things' (*IQS* 5:11). The sectarians regarded themselves as 'scholars (מלומדי) of the Law' (*IQM* 10:10; cf. *IQH* 2:17); but considered all others, 'who seek (דרשו) facily' (*CD* 1:18), as ones 'whose falsehood is in their study (בתלמוד); (*4QpNah* 2:8).⁶² Similarly, the sectarians regarded their interpret-

⁶⁰ Lit., '(O)bserve the covenant until the Messiah of Righteousness comes . . . the Tora with the men of the community'.

⁶¹ Interpreting *wmwh bryt* as *my bryt* (i.e., *may borel be'erot*), with Wallenstein, 'A Hymn', 280 (and n. 9).

⁶² On this phrase, see above n. 27.

ers of prophecies as 'visionaries (חזו) of truth' (*IQH* 2:15); but considered the interpretations of all others, who do not interpret 'by the Holy Spirit', as 'visionaries (חזו) of deceit' (*IQH* 4:10) and 'falsehood' (4:20). Such polemical point-counterpoint underscores the centrality of true interpretation in the proper understanding and performance of Mikra.

In earlier sections, we had the occasion to indicate the various literary forms utilized among the sectarians for the interpretation of Mikra (lemmatic, anthological, and pseudepigraphic forms, among others), as well as several of the techniques employed in their vast exegetical enterprise (scribal, legal, homiletical and prophetic). In order more fully to appreciate this achievement, a more specific focus on the *techniques of interpretation* will be offered. These techniques will be considered in a somewhat formal way, with examples drawn from earlier sections, where the texts were cited.

SCRIBAL EXEGESIS

In the course of scribal transmission, several types of exegesis were registered in the scrolls, most probably on the basis of prolonged study and reflection.⁶³ Concern for divine honor or sanctity, for example, resulted in *euphemistic* renderings of the Tetragram. Thus in *IQS* 8:14, the citation from Isa 40:3 renders the Tetragram with four dots ('the way of * * *'); whereas just earlier, where this citation is alluded to with an interpretation (to go to the wilderness), the Divine Name is rendered by the pronoun *hw'h* (8:13-14), a circumlocution also found in *CD* 9:9 and Tannaic sources (*M. Sukka* 4:5). On the other hand, in *CD* 15:1 the sectarians prohibited the substitutions *alef we-lamed* (for El, Elohim) and *alef we-dalet* (for Adonai) in oaths, as comparably in other Tannaic regulations (*M. Shevuot* 4:13). In one notable instance, *CD* 8:16 restylizes Deut 7:8 in order to avoid the divine Name; and an attempt to avoid anthropomorphic renderings results in the substitution 'before the Lord' for 'the eyes of the Lord' in *11QTemp* 53:7-8; 55:12-14), a change common in Targum Onkelos and Yonatan, and quite possibly in the masoretic text as well.⁶⁴

With respect to the substance of lemmata, scribes might indicate 'sense' by means of *paragraphing*, as in the 'unit' *IQIsa* 51:17-52:6).⁶⁵ Relatedly, scribal sense might be achieved via *phrasing*. Thus, in the aforementioned citation from Isa 40:3 in *IQS* 8:14-15, the deletion of the introit 'a voice calls' allows the teacher to use the verse to exhort the sectarians 'to prepare a way in the wilderness', i.e. to establish a community there. A similar verse-division is found in the medie-

⁶³ For scribal exegesis within the Hebrew Bible, see Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, Part 1.

⁶⁴ On anthropomorphisms in the targumim, see Komlesh, *Aramaic Translations*, 103-07; Alexander, above p. 225. As regards the masoretic text, the variations between 2 Sam 22:7 and Ps 18:8b are suggestive of earlier parallels to this phenomenon.

⁶⁵ Cf. Brownlee, 'Background' 189-93.

val Masora, which presumably also reflects the original syntax of the exhortation, though for the post-exilic community in Babylon this exhortation would have been understood as an appeal to prepare for the journey through the desert to the Homeland. The rendering 'a voice calls from the wilderness . . .' in Matt 3:3, which joins the introit to the first stich of the parallelism, is thus an exegetical reworking of the lemma to support the call of John from that place. In other instances, syntactic ambiguities regarding whether a word was to be read with the preceding or following clause, a problem of syntactic determination known as *hekhre'a ha-katuv* in Tannaic sources,⁶⁶ was resolved quite differently from the masoretic procedure. Whereas in the latter tradition two words of a syntactically ambiguous construction were joined by conjunctive accents (so that the words are to be read with the preceding clause), in some Qumran texts a disjunctive *waw* may be found before the second word (so that it was to be read together with a new phrase).⁶⁷ This method of resolving ambiguity is confirmed through a comparison of the Samaritan, masoretic and Septuagint versions on certain verses,⁶⁸ and it is mentioned in talmudic and medieval Jewish sources.⁶⁹ We thus see that, even at the basic level of reading, the interpretations of a community and its teachers play a strategic role.

LEGAL EXEGESIS

As we have seen, the legal regulations of the covenanters are found in different genres: in topical collections, like the *Damascus Document*, and in biblical-style collections, like the *Temple Scroll*. In addition, these legal regulations are presented in diverse forms: with and without explicit justifications from Mikra, and within and alongside full or abbreviated Mikra citations. Quite certainly, a highly developed range of hermeneutical techniques were utilized, and it is to a review of some of these that we now turn.⁷⁰ Admittedly, these techniques are incorporated within the regulations without conceptual elaboration or terminology. It will nevertheless be of some historical interest to categorize them along the lines and terms found in the more developed Tannaic and Amoraic traditions. For by doing so, the place of Qumran interpretation within the context of ancient Jewish exegetical techniques can be more formally and comparatively observed.

1. *Linguistic precision.* Earlier, we had occasion to refer to the citation of Deut 5:12 ('Observe [שמור] the Sabbath day') in CD 10:14-15, in connection with a determination of the onset of the holy Sabbath day; and to the citation of

⁶⁶ The locus classicus is *Mekhilta de-R. Yishmael, Beshallah* 1, p. 175 (ad Exod 17:9). Further on this matter, based on evidence in *Minhat Shai*, see Blau, 'Masoretic Studies', 139.

⁶⁷ See Eilert, 'Ambiguous Scriptural Readings'.

⁶⁸ See Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 82.

⁶⁹ On the 'sture soferim', see B. T. *Nedarim* 37b, and *Arukh Completum*, 6, 189. Cf. Mulder, above p. 92.

⁷⁰ For the phenomenon in the Hebrew Bible, see Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, Part 2.

Lev 23:28 ('Apart from [מלבד] your Sabbath-offerings) in CD 11:17-19, in connection with a concern to restrict sacrifices on the Sabbath to the special burnt-offering of the Sabbath. In the first case, the citation preceded the sectarian determination; in the second, it followed it. Nevertheless, in both cases a ruling of Mikra was used to justify the new regulation on the basis of a *diyyuq*, or close linguistic examination. In CD 10:14-15 the unspecific and admonitory verb שמור was constructed to mean 'be watchful' (with respect to the setting sun; i.e., the temporal boundaries of the day), not merely 'be heedful' or 'attentive'. Similarly, in CD 11:17-19 the broadly inclusive adverb מלבד was reinterpreted more restrictively to mean 'except'. In this instance, the semantic nuance of the word is not at stake; it has rather undergone a complete change of meaning in this later period. Hence the *diyyuq* here is somewhat akin to the more formal rabbinic אלה . . . אינו technique, where a later meaning of a word replaces an earlier one (i.e., the word under discussion 'means, in fact, x').⁷¹

2. *Analogical extension or correlation.* Quite frequently in the masoretic and Samaritan versions extensions to laws are formally marked by technical terms.⁷² Similar procedures are found in the Qumran scrolls. Thus, in connection with a denunciation of forbidden marriages, CD 5:8-10 cites a version of Lev 18:13 'And Moses said: you shall not approach your mother's sister; she is your mother's kin', a rule which prohibits marriages between nephews and aunts. In Mikra, the opposite is not stated; and the Pharasaic ruling accordingly permitted marriages between neices and uncles. However, our sectarians believed that proper understanding of the meaning of Scripture led the nation to practice *zenut*, 'harlotry', by which was meant incest. The proper ruling is therefore given straightaway along with the operative principle: 'now the rules of incest are written [in Mikra] with reference to males, and apply equally to women' (lit. 'and like them [כדום]; viz., the males'). Only given here, this far-reaching principle may be assumed to have been operative elsewhere in Qumran exegesis. It would be an instance of what the rabbis called *revuta*, by which a feature of the written text – here, the masculine pronoun – was understood to 'include' something else.

Another type of legal exegetical extension may be found in the anthology of *11QTemp* 52:1-3. In it, a reference to the law in Deut 16:21 prohibiting the erection of stelae is followed by a citation from Lev 26:1. It was pointed out earlier that the link between these passages is the occurrence of the same prohibition in the same language. But the legislator had further reason to cite Lev 26:1 here, since this latter also prohibits incising forms on altars. Thus the Deuteronomic rule is extended on the basis of the priestly rule which is partly

⁷¹ E.g. *Mekhilta de-R. Yishmael, Bo* 6, p. 20 (ad Exod 12:9); and *ibid. Yitro* 4, p. 218 (ad Exod 20:1).

⁷² For the Masoretic Text, see Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 170-87; for the Samaritan Text, see Daube, 'Zur frühaltmudischen Rechtspraxis', 148.

identical to it in language. Such terminological analogies, known as *gezera shawa* in rabbinic literature, served as the basis to correlate legal formulations and extend one of them on the basis of the other. If we were to articulate the preceding exegesis in rabbinic terms, the following hermeneutical proof might be stated: since Lev 26:1 and Deut 16:21 both prohibit the erection of stelae using similar language (x), though only the former text explicitly prohibits altar incisions (y) we must infer this prohibition also in the latter text. Thus again, on the basis of a linguistic feature, more is attributed to a given passage than directly, or explicitly, stated.

In the case of CD 9:6-8, cited earlier, the legist also drew an analogy between the law of reproof (his central concern) and the laws of vows by utilizing the language of the latter ('from one day to the next') in establishing the time-limit for valid reproof. This latter is not so much a *gezera shawa* between CD 9:6-8 and Num 30:15 as an allusion to the latter, in order, on that basis, to establish a 'Mosaic' regulation with respect to the sectarian law of reproof. Such a use of the Mikra to support new regulations is closer to the rabbinic hermeneutical technique called *zekher la-davar*. A related instance of this form of intertextuality is CD 10:17-20. Hereby, the covenanter is admonished to obey the Sabbath and: 'not speak a foolish or empty word (. . . ידבר דבר; . . . [and] not lend anything . . . [or] dispute about property and gain . . . [and] not speak about matters (ידבר בדברי) of work and labor to be done (לעשות) on the morrow; . . . [and] not go out to the field to do (לעשות) the work he desires [to complete, etc.]. . .'. As the language makes clear, these new regulations are loosely derived from (or correlated with) the language of Isa 58:13. In this text, true Sabbath behavior involves not going on a journey 'to do your business (עשות חפצך)'; [and] 'not making' (עשות) a trip, nor engaging in business (חפצך) nor arranging deals (דבר דבר). Couched in the language of Mikra, the sectarian rules seem only loosely to be derived from it. Further attention to the phrase דבר דבר suggests that the legist has exegetically generated his specific new rules on the basis of the principle of *gezera shawa*. For just as דבר is used in Deut 32:47 with ריק ('empty word'), and in Deut 15:2 with ישה ('lend'), and in Deut 17:2 with כמשפט ('judgement'), so are these three terms found in CD 10:17 as well.⁷³ In this way, the explicit uses of these terms in Deuteronomy serve to extend the sense of the phrase דבר דבר in Isa 58:13 and thereby generate new Sabbath rules.⁷⁴

3. *Topical specification or restriction.* Exegetical concerns to restrict or more carefully delineate an older rule may be found both in the stylistic structure of sectarian rule formation and in the way Mikra rules have been reformulated. The formulation of the law in CD 9:17-22, dealing with the witnesses, may exemplify the first category. Here we find an opening statement made in

⁷³ See also Skolnic, 'Understanding' 9-10.

⁷⁴ For the technical terms of Isa 58:13, see Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 304n. 31; and for inner biblical reuse of Isa 58:13-14, ib., 478f.

generalizing terms ('[In] any matter concerning which a person might transgress against the Tora, and his neighbour, alone, witnesses [it]'), followed by a specification of the type of delict ('if it is a capital case'), along with subsidiary considerations (including such a transgression before two witnesses), and then a further specification of the delict ('whereas') concerning property [cases]), along with subsidiary considerations (including the number of witnesses).⁷⁵ The development is thus from the general to the specific; or, in rabbinic terms, from *kelal* to *perat*.

With respect to the formulation of the laws themselves, we noted earlier that 11QTemp 17:6-9, dealing with the rules of the paschal-sacrifice, the generalizing formulation of this practice in Exod 12:47 (addressed to 'the entire congregation of Israel') has been restricted to persons 'twenty years of age and older'. Such a 'delimitation', or *mi'ut*, is presumably supported by the use of the identical phrase יעשו אותו, 'they shall do it') in both cases. The exegetical logic would thus be as follows: just as in the citation from 11QTemp the phrase יעשו אותו serves to restrict cultic practice, so must this sense be inferred in the first case as well. By writing the restriction into the formulation of the law, the sectarian legist merely makes his hermeneutical technique explicit. In other instances, the exegetical qualification is not based on linguistic correlations between Mikra citations, but on conceptual restrictions, not specified in Mikra but now introduced into the new formulation. The insertion of the explication 'and she is permitted to him according to the law' in 11QTemp 66:8-11, noted earlier in connection with the anthological conflation thereof of Exod 22:15-16 and Deut 22:28-29 (dealing with marriage after seduction and rape), is a case in point.⁷⁶

HOMILETICAL EXEGESIS

In the category of 'homiletical exegesis' we shall by-pass those exegetical features which do not pertain to eschatology *per se*, and focus on nonlegal exegesis which occurs either within nonlegal discourses or serves to justify legal matters.⁷⁷

1. *Nonlegal justifications.* Earlier, 1QS 5:7-6:1 was referred to in connection with citations used to justify restrictive contact between sectarians and non-sectarians. Two nonlegal sources are adduced. In the first case, Exod 22:7 (admonishing judges to refrain from 'any manner [כל דבר] of falsehood') was cited to support the rule to keep apart from nonsectarians 'in every matter (כל דבר; 5:15); in the second Isa 2:22 (admonishing hearers to keep apart from 'mankind' for it is of no 'account (נחשב)' is cited to support separation from

⁷⁵ See the similar translation and remarks of Levine, 'Damascus Document' 195f.

⁷⁶ For other instances of legal clarification, see 11QTemp 43:12, and 60:4-8.

⁷⁷ For this phenomenon of 'aggadic' exegesis in the Hebrew Bible, see Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, Part 3.

those not 'accounted (נחשב)' among the sectarians (5:11, 17-18). Notably, both legal admonitions are justified by manifestly nonlegal statements. Moreover, the terminological links between each rule and citation are conceptually unrelated; so that it is only on the basis of their exegetical extension that they serve their new purpose. Other instances of this phenomenon, e.g., *CD* 9:2-5 (discussed earlier) and 11:18-21, are no less striking from a hermeneutical point of view. Presumably, these are all cases of exegetical justification *ex post facto*, and are not indicative of the exegetical derivation of laws from nonlegal sources by sectarian legists. This latter practice was forbidden by the rabbis.

2. *Paraenetic or liturgical reapplications.* Among the sources treated earlier, three types may be recalled here. The first type involves the theological reuse of the Priestly Blessing in *IQS* 2:2-10. There the liturgical language of Num 6:24-26 was cited and reapplied in light of the sect's theology. The result is a new prayer achieved by means of covert exegesis. The lemmata and theological attributions are stylistically integrated in this new recitation, with no attempt to distinguish the one from the other. Moreover, the relationships between the lemmata (e.g., 'May He [the Lord] bless you') and their extensions (here: 'with every good') are simply introduced dogmatically. No philological relationships connect them. The same structure is also characteristic of exegetical reuses of the Priestly Blessing in Mikra and rabbinic literature.⁷⁸

In two other instances, more subtle techniques of interpretation are involved. The first of these, *CD* 8:14-18, is part of a hortatory reprise from Deut 9:5a and 7:8a. As indicated earlier, the way Mikra has been cited, abbreviated, and blended here thoroughly transforms the force and application of the paraenesis. The ancient divine words are now transferred from the generation of the first conquest to the sectarians themselves: the new Israel. In this way, the older text which stated that the land was inherited as a result of God's love for the Patriarchs, and His promise to them, is also changed. It is now because of the penitent faithfulness of an earlier generation of Jews that God determines to extend His love to their sectarian successors. The old Deuteronomic sermon has thus been exegetically redirected to contemporary times.

In another instance, Deut 1:13 has been recited and exegetically reworked in *CD* 6:2-3 in order to justify the sectarian's arrangement of courts and councils. The original Deuteronomic reference to the appointment of 'men of understanding' and 'men of wisdom' as judges is now formulated so that such persons portrayed as coming from the Aaronids and Israelites, respectively. In addition, the men are not chosen by other men, as in the Mikra, but are 'raised up' by God Himself; and these delegates are not inferior to some superior judge, like Moses in Deut 1:7, who alone will be 'informed' (lit., 'I [God] will make him understand [ושמעתי]) of the verdict, but they will themselves be 'informed' (lit., 'made to understand [ורשמיעם]) the divine will. Even more significantly, the subsequent lines make clear that such divine inspiration leads

⁷⁸ See above n. 13.

men to the new (sectarian) interpretations of Tora by which they might judge and teach the people. And so, through consummate exegetical dexterity, an entirely different model of leadership and judgement is presented: not one accomplished by wise and discerning men, with divine oracular intervention in rare instances; but one accomplished by *interpreters of the Tora*, with continuous divine inspiration through them.⁷⁹

PROPHETIC EXEGESIS

The reinterpretation of prophecy is a major exegetical feature of the Qumran scrolls, and is represented in a wide variety of genres: the *War Scroll*; the *Damascus Document*; the (*11Q*) *Melchizedek* and (*4Q174*) *Florilegium* anthologies; and, of course, in the *peshar*-literature.⁸⁰ Naturally, the style of interpretation varies in relation to the genre used. Thus in *IQM*, single verses from Mikra are reapplied globally to a new situation; in *11QMelch* and *4QFlor*, multiple verses from Mikra are grouped together and reapplied to specific topics on the basis of related thematics; and in the *peshar*-literature and *pesharite* comments in *CD*, successive verses from one book of Mikra (the prophets or psalms), or single verses from one book, are atomized into their verbal components and successively reapplied to a new situation.⁸¹ But it should also be noted that the methods of interpretation used overlap these genres, and present a more unified picture. Thus the terminology (פשר, 'its interpretation is', and variants) and atomizing style of the *peshar*-literature are also found in *4QFlor*, even as this structural form occurs with different technical terms (e.g., דרש, 'it means') to link lemmata to interpretations in the *pesharite* comments in *CD*.⁸² In addition, many of the exegetical techniques employed in prophetic reinterpretations occur in legal and homiletical contexts. Withal, the types of verbal exegesis used in the prophetic reinterpretation of Mikra do have a distinctive character. As most of these latter go against the plain-sense of the passage at hand, it is reasonable to assume that they have been developed in order to understand the true (viz., contemporary) intent of the ancient oracles, meanings which the interpreter of Habakkuk actually claims to have been unknown even to their original speakers (*IQpHab* 7:1-2). For the sectarians, both the techniques and the meanings derived thereby originate with the inspired tutelage of the Teacher of Righteousness. Indeed, their knowledge of them constitutes their hope in imminent divine vindication.

1. *Dogmatic links between lemma and interpretation.* Hereby, the claim is simply asserted that a certain contemporary event was alluded to by the ancient

⁷⁹ The institution in Deut 1:17 is itself a reinterpretation of older texts; see Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 245.

⁸⁰ On this phenomenon in the Hebrew Bible see *ibid.*, Part 4.

⁸¹ For the techniques and terms, see Fishbane, 'Qumran Peshar'; and now also Horgan, *Pesharim*, Part 2, *passim*.

⁸² Examples related to these assertions will be given below.

prophets, or that the meaning of a prophetic text is this or that. For example, Num 24:17-19, which promises that a star shall come forth from Jacob who will defeat Israel's enemy, is cited in *IQM* 11:6-7; and Isa 31:8, which announces that Asshur shall 'fall with the sword not of man', is cited in *IQM* 11:11-12, both times in connection with contemporary events; but in neither case is any verbal or textual justification for such reapplication provided. Presumably, such reuse derives from inspiration. Similarly, in the course of interpreting Amos 5:26-27, it is simply asserted that 'the king' (in the phrase 'sikkui your king') is (הוא) 'the congregation', and that 'the *kiryun* of the images' are (הם) 'the books of the prophets'. To be sure, the basis for this reinterpretation is the larger interpretative context of *CD* 7:10ff.; but, again, no ostensible textual basis for these rereadings is provided.

2. *Direct verbal links between lemma and interpretation.* In the course of reapplying a lemma to a new context, the interpreter may repeat a key word from the lemma (sometimes even retaining its grammatical form). Thus, in Hab 1:5, the prophet encourages the ancient Israelites with the pronouncement that God will soon do wonders for them, which 'you will not believe (לא תאמינו)'; while in *IQpHab* 2:3-10 this very same verse is utilized to criticize those Jews who do 'not believe (לא תאמינו)' in the covenant of God' or the prophetic words which God has 'foretold (ספר)'. In other cases, a repeated word can serve as the basis for a paraphrastic expansion and reapplication of the lemma (e.g., 3:7-10); or repeated words can link several citations which are used to support a given theme (e.g., the common verb נטע serves to link the citations from 2 Sam 7:10-11 and Exod 15:17-18 ancient a new Temple in *4QFlor* 1:2-7; and the common nouns רך in Ps 1:1 and Isa 8:11, and מושב in Ps 1:1 and Ezek 37:23, serve to link these passages on the topic of sectarian separateness in *4QFlor* 1:14ff.). The exegetical dynamics of the latter have some resemblance to the *gezera shawa* technique, considered earlier. Of related interest is the exegetical use here of one Scriptural lemma to explain another.⁸³

3. *Transformed verbal links between lemma and interpretation.* After Amos 5:26-27 is cited in *CD* 7:14-15 ('and I have exiled the sikkut [סכנות] of your king . . . from My tent [מאהל] to Damascus') to support a statement of an exile northward (itself justified by a citation from Isa 7:17), the text abruptly continues with a pun on the pagan object *sikkut*, when stating that 'the books of the Tora are the Tabernacle (*sukkat* [סוכות] of the King.' This reinterpretation is itself immediately justified by a citation from Amos 9:11: 'as He (God) said: "I will raise up the tabernacle (סוכת) of David that is fallen".' Once again, one Scriptural passage is adduced to support another; though it will be clear that in this case the intertextual chain becomes conceptually more tortuous. For one thing, the pagan objects are reinterpreted as the Tora, and an image of exile is

⁸³ On this text, see the exegetical comments of Slomovic, 'Understanding', 7f; and Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran*, *passim*.

reinterpreted by one of eschatological hope; for another, the pagan object of a 'star' (in Amos 5:26, though not explicitly cited in *CD* 7:18-20)⁸⁴ is reinterpreted as the Teacher of Righteousness, and this last on the basis of a citation from Num 24:17! The tendentious proofs notwithstanding, Scriptural texts have hereby become pretexts for new ideological agenda. The verbal puns powerfully serve to carry the logic of rhetoric forward to these goals.

In addition to puns, which fairly abound as a hermeneutical technique, a more radical use of the letters of the lemmata can be found. Here we may call attention to what the rabbis called *serus*, or the 'rearrangement' of letters in order to achieve new applications of Mikra. For example, in *IQpHab* 2:5-6 the word עמל ('work') in the lemma is transposed as מעל ('transgression') in the *peshet*. In this light, we may now add that the aforecited passage from Amos 5:27 ('from My tent [מאהל] to Damascus' does not conform to the Mikra itself (which reads: 'from beyond [מהלאה] Damascus'), so that the purported lemma is actually a reinterpretation of the passage on the basis of a hermeneutical rearrangement of the letters. One can only marvel at the exegetical *tour de force* involved, and the exegetical confidence of the new readings, even to the extent of introducing the citation from Amos 5:26-27 (a 1st person divine pronouncement with the formulaic introit: 'as He said').

4. *Typological reinterpretations.* In *IQM* 11:11-12, noted above, a passage from Isa 31:8 was adduced to support sectarian hope in a victorious eschatological war. Quite clearly, the appearance of Asshur in Mikra is now understood as a cipher for contemporary enemies of the covenanters. In a similar vein, it is generally agreed that references to the Kittim in *peshet Nahum* refer to the Romans; and that, in the same text, 'Judah' = the sectarians, 'Menasseh' = the Sadducees, the 'Deceiving Interpreters' = the Pharisees, and the 'lion' = Alexander Jannaeus.⁸⁵ These and other examples thus combine to suggest that the sectarians also read Mikra with an eye to deciphering its tribal and other references in terms of the groups and figures of the day, and that they further believed that these meanings were part of the divine intention regarding them from the beginning, only now correctly decoded.

Conclusion

In the scrolls from Qumran and its environs which we have analyzed in the preceding pages, Mikra is the literary expression of divine Truth: at once the unique resource of past revelations, and the mediating source of all subsequent ones. As found in Mikra, God's Word is an illimitable Word of Truth: for the ancestors of ancient Israel, as well as for their legitimate inheritors, the Qumran covenanters, who *alone* understand it rightly. There is thus Mikra *and* its

⁸⁴ The explicit interpretation is based on the second half of the verse, as commonly in rabbinic midrash.

⁸⁵ On this, see Flusser, 'Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes'.

Interpretation. We may understand this conjunction in two ways: as continuity and as correlation. As a matter of continuity, Mikra is succeeded by the interpretations of it. In this regard, the Qumran covenanters are both the heirs of ancient Israel and progenitors of the great culture of biblical interpretation which (in large part) constitutes Judaism. Like the former, the Israelites of old, the sectarians interpreted 'biblical' traditions (laws, theology, prophecies) in sophisticated ways, with technical terms and procedures.⁸⁶ But unlike this earlier 'biblical' interpretation in ancient Israel, which was incorporated into Mikra itself, and as part of the older genres of composition, the sectarians, similar to early Jewish practice, further developed exegetical techniques and terms, produced new 'nonbiblical' genres within which Mikra was interpreted (including rewriting the Pentateuch, as in *11QT*), and looked to Mikra as an authoritative collection of completed books whose contents were recurrently cited.⁸⁷ However, unlike their ancestors and contemporaries, the sectarians viewed the relationship between Mikra and Interpretation as a continuity of divine revelations; viz. the revelations to Moses and the prophets were succeeded by *exegetical revelations* to the authoritative teachers of the sect. Thus, for the covenanters, each period had its teachers and its books: ancient Israel had the teachings of Moses and the prophets, preserved in Mikra; and they had the inspired teachings of the Teacher and Seeker, and various new works. As the discourse on new interpretation in *CD 7* makes clear, God produces 'an instrument for His [ongoing] work.'

Turning, in conclusion, to Mikra and its Interpretation as a matter of correlation, the preceding perspective is reinforced. For the sectarians, as for contemporary Judaism, generally, there is no Mikra *without* its interpretation; indeed, there is only the Mikra *through* its *legitimate* and *proper* interpretation. On this point everything hinged. For to practice the word and will of God in society, one had first properly to understand it; and to know the plan and purpose of God in history one also had first properly to understand it. The Interpreter of the Tora and the Teacher of Righteousness, as well as all their subsequent delegates and followers, safeguarded these true understandings, the 'hidden things' of the Law and the 'mysteries' of the prophets, and gave the Qumran fellowship definition and distinction. The *yahad*, or 'community', was thus a community by virtue of its style of 'biblical' interpretation – *and the practical consequences derived therefrom*. Further, the members constituted a true community, to be vindicated by God in the End to Come, also only by virtue of their 'biblical' interpretation, *and the practical consequences derived therefrom*. For the sectarians, then, all others practiced and hoped in vain, because their interpretation of Mikra was itself vanity: without authority in technique, and so without

⁸⁶ See Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, *passim*.

⁸⁷ Only in a limited way, and only in late books were texts cited and reinterpreted in Mikra; see *ibid.*, 106-29.

authority in result. Fatefully, the sectarians believed that outside their authoritative use and interpretation of Mikra there was no salvation.

Bibliography

For survey and annotation of texts, together with listings of major publications and pertinent studies, the reader is referred to the study of DIMANT, 'Qumran Sectarian Literature', in *Compendia* II/2, 483-550. For more specific analyses, relative to the topics and texts treated in the present study, the following selection is offered:

BETZ, *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung*; BLOCH, 'Midrash'; BROOKE, *Exegesis at Qumran*; BRUCE, *Biblical Exegesis*; FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation*; GABRION, 'L'interprétation de l'Écriture'; HORGAN, *Pesharim*; PATTE, *Early Jewish Hermeneutic*.