

## Durham E-Theses

---

*Divine presence in the yahad.: The identity of the Qumran community in relation to god according to IQS and IQH as revealed in their interpretation of biblical texts.*

Stephan Ahrnke

### How to cite:

---

Ahrnke, Stephan (2003) Divine presence in the yahad.: The identity of the Qumran community in relation to god according to IQS and IQH as revealed in their interpretation of biblical texts. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

### Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/4006/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

# **Divine Presence in the Yahad.**

## **The Identity of the Qumran Community in Relation to God according to 1QS and 1QH as revealed in their Interpretation of Biblical Texts.**

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.  
No quotation from it should be published without  
his prior written consent and information derived  
from it should be acknowledged.

Dissertation Submitted to the Department of Theology  
at the University of Durham  
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by

**Stephan Ahrnke**

March 2003

(Supervisor: Prof. C.T.R. Hayward)



- 7 JUL 2003

**Divine Presence in the Yahad -**  
**The Identity of the Qumran Community in Relation to God according to 1QS and 1QH**  
**as revealed in their Interpretation of Biblical Texts.**

Stephan Ahrnke

**Abstract**

This dissertation presents a study of the idea of Divine presence as represented in two of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 1QS and 1QH. It will attempt to demonstrate that it is a particular and distinctive idea of that presence that provides the Yahad's identity. To show how this might be so, the thesis will examine words and phrases used in 1QS/H to describe God's presence in comparison with those same words and phrases in the Hebrew Bible. At times, it will be necessary to adduce collaborating evidence, drawn from other Qumran documents (1QSa, 1QM), the LXX, the Vulgate, and Rabbinic literature. The thesis will note how scholarly literature on the Qumran documents studied here display a comparative neglect of the fundamental theme of Divine presence.

After setting out the problem, the aim, and the method of this thesis in the introduction, I outline in what way the question of Divine presence influences our understanding of the identity of the Qumran Community by reviewing scholarly literature on this question.

The study falls into four parts. In the first part, I analyse how 1QS and 1QH describe the nature and dwelling place of God. This part forms the basis for the following investigations. In the second part, I ask the question whether or not 1QS and 1QH describe a way in which the Yahad can experience God. In the third part, I investigate the relationship between God and the Qumran Community as described by 1QS/H in two ways. First, I analyse how 1QS/H picture God as the one who approaches the Community; secondly, I identify the means by which God approaches the Yahad as the principles on which the special relationship between the Community and God - a unique understanding of Divine presence - rests. In the fourth part of this thesis, I investigate how 1QS/H picture life in the Community that is based on these principles. I focus on aspects of life in the Yahad that describe the special relationship between God and the Yahad most clearly.

Finally, before concluding, I analyse the significance of the 4QS-Fragments asking the question whether the recently published fragments alter the idea of Divine presence as described in 1QS.

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents	I
Declarations	V
Acknowledgements	VI
<b>Introduction</b>	VII
1. Problem and Aim	VII
2. Method	XV
3. The Self-Identity of the Qumran Community according to the Scholarly Literature	XXIV
<b>I. God</b>	1
1. The Nature of God	1
2. The Dwelling Place of God	5
<b>I. Experiencing God?</b>	10
1. Revelations	10
1.1. יפע	11
1.2. גלה	14
1.2.1. IQS	14
1.2.2. IQH	17
1.3. נגד	18
2. Seeing God	19
2.1. נבט	19
2.2. צפה	21
2.3. דרש	23

<b>III. God Gives the Community a Special Status</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>1. רצון</b>	<b>31</b>
1.1. HB	31
1.1.1. רצון as an Attribute of God	32
1.1.2. רצון from God	34
1.1.3. The Reciprocal Notion	34
1.2. IQS	39
1.2.1. The Reciprocal Notion in IQS	40
1.2.2. Israel can Participate in רצון through the Community	45
Excursus: תמים	51
1.2.3. רצון as God's Imperative Power	58
1.3. IQH and IQM	60
1.4. Conclusion	62
<b>2. שכל</b>	<b>64</b>
2.1. HB	64
2.1.1. Human Understanding of Earthly Matters	64
2.1.2. Understanding of Wisdom	65
2.1.3. Understanding of the Law	65
2.2. IQS	65
2.2.1. The שכל of God	66
2.2.2. God Passes שכל on to the Community	66
2.2.3. Life in the Community with שכל	69
2.2.4. שכל Depending on an "Eschatological" Process?	72
2.2.5. Summary	73
2.3. IQH	74
2.4. Conclusion	78
<b>3. Knowledge</b>	<b>80</b>
3.1. Introduction	80
3.2. IQS	81
3.2.1. The Knowledge of God	81
3.2.2. God the Source of Knowledge	83
3.2.3. The Special Knowledge/Insight of the Community	86
3.2.4. The Knowledge of the Community and the Law	92
3.2.5. A Perfect Life according to the Will of God through Knowledge	93
3.2.6. God is Immanent through Knowledge	94
3.2.7. The Knowledge of a Heavenly Place	96
3.2.8. Post-Fall Knowledge - Pre-Fall Status (Gen. 3:5,22)	98
3.3. IQH	112
3.4. Conclusion	115

4. טוב	118
4.1. HB	119
4.2. IQS	121
4.2.1. טוב as an Attribute of God	123
4.2.2. טוב as Gift from God to the Community	123
4.2.3. טוב Defining Life in the Community in Relation to God. טוב the Aim and Purpose of the Community	125
4.3. IQH	130
4.4. Conclusion	132
<b>IV. Life in the Community in Relation to God</b>	<b>134</b>
1. מעון as the Dwelling Place of the Community	135
1.1. HB	136
1.2. DSS	137
1.3. Conclusion	140
2. מעמד	142
2.1. HB	142
2.2. LXX	146
2.2.1. Occurrences	146
2.2.1.1. Summary	149
2.2.2. Translations	149
2.2.2.1. Ἡ Ὑπόστασις	149
2.2.2.2. Ἡ Στάσις	151
a) Ἡ Στάσις standing for Hebrew Words which do not derive from the stem עמד	151
b) Ἡ Στάσις for עמוד	152
c) Ἡ Στάσις for עמד ('omed)	152
d) Ἡ Στάσις for עמד ('amad)	152
e) Summary	153
2.3. DSS	156
2.3.1. IQH	156
2.3.2. IQS	159
2.3.3. IQSa	160
2.3.4. IQM	161
2.3.5. Summary	162
2.4. Conclusion	163
3. יצב	166
3.1. HB	166
3.2. DSS	169
3.2.1. IQS	169
3.2.2. IQM	170
3.2.3. IQSa	171
3.2.4. IQH	172
3.2.5. Conclusion	173

4. Serving God	174
4.1. שרת	174
4.1.1. IQM	175
4.1.1.1. IQM II 1-3	175
4.1.1.2. IQM XIII 3	183
4.1.1.3. IQM XII 14 // XIX 6	184
4.1.2. IQH	184
4.1.2.1. IQH XIII 21	184
4.1.2.2. IQH VII 27	186
4.1.2.3. IQH XX 23	186
4.2. קרב	188
4.3. עמד	190
5. לפני	192
5.1. IQS	192
5.1.1. Defining the Relationship between Members of the Community and God as a Life in Company with God	194
5.1.2. Describing Aspects of the Organisation Pattern of the Community	209
5.1.3. לפני in its Simple Sense	210
5.2. IQH	211
5.2.1. Everything Stands in Relation to God	212
5.2.2. Man Stands in Relation to Affliction	213
5.2.3. The Community Stands in Relation to God	214
6. הלך	216
6.1. IQS	216
6.1.1. IQS 18	217
6.1.2. The Remaining Occurrences of הלך in IQS	228
6.1.2.1. הלך referring to the Way of Living in the Community in Contrast to the Outside World	229
6.1.2.2. הלך referring to Internal Matters of Life in the Community	230
6.2. IQH	232
6.3. Conclusion	233
<b>V. The 4QS Fragments</b>	235
<b>VI. The 4QH Fragments</b>	242
<b>VII. Final Conclusion</b>	245
Bibliography	249

The Copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without their prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

I confirm that the thesis conforms with the prescribed word length for the degree for which I am submitting it for examination.

I confirm that no part of the material offered has previously been submitted by me for a degree in this or any other university. If material has been generated through joint work, my independent contribution has been clearly indicated. In all other cases, material from the work of others has been acknowledged, and quotations and paraphrases suitably indicated.

Date: 17<sup>th</sup> of June 2003

Signature:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Steve Baker', written over a horizontal line.

## Acknowledgements

First, I want to express my sincere gratitude to Professor Robert Hayward. Not only did he make this Ph.D. possible for me in the first place, but he is also the reason why researching for and writing this Ph.D. has been such a rewarding and amazing time. I want to thank Professor Hayward for always being there when I have needed advice and help. His expertise in Biblical Studies has been invaluable.

I also owe a great deal to the Department of Theology at Durham, and have valued its friendly atmosphere. The colleagues in the department have always been ready to discuss issues relevant to my work and beyond. The "Seminar for the Study of Judaism in Late Antiquity" has provided numerous opportunities to meet international scholars, whose expertise in Biblical and Intertestamental Study has been invaluable to influence my work. I want to thank especially Professor Loren Stuckenbruck. His help and advice has been tremendously important.

My thanks go to the *Universität Heidelberg* for allowing me to use their theological library for my research. Also, the many discussions I have had in the Theology Department at Heidelberg University have helped me a great deal in developing my ideas.

I am grateful to the University of Durham for awarding me the Durham Research Studentship. Without this financial support this work would not have been possible. I also thank the College of St. Hild and St. Bede for providing me with accommodation during the period of my Ph.D. research.

Finally, I would like to thank Douglas whose friendship contributed to a great deal to the completion of this Thesis, and especially my family - mother, brother, and nanny - who have supported me throughout the years in countless ways.

## Introduction

### 1. The Problem and the Aim

The Hebrew Bible (HB) as well as 1QS and 1QH are witnesses to the relationship between God and human beings. The HB is traditionally understood as a gift from God; and 1QS and 1QH offer human accounts of God's actions in the world. Both sets of texts describe the *relationship between God and certain groups of people*. It is this relationship between humans and God that will be the centre of this study, because Divine presence is about this relationship, especially according to 1QS and 1QH.

Divine presence is (about), primarily, where God is with human beings. But although Divine presence always refers to a special relationship between God and humans, it can have different intensities. Examination of Divine presence entails describing and defining these different intensities between certain people and God. To do the idea of Divine presence in 1QS/H in comparison with the HB justice, however, we need at this point to introduce two different categories of Divine presence, the borderlines between being somewhat fluid. Thus Divine presence can mean *God's actual and immediate "being there"* with an individual or a group of people at a certain location. In this case, Divine presence is as intense as it can be for humans. But there is also another sense of Divine presence which represents a more general, and at the same time also less immediate and personal, link between God and humans. This sense of Divine presence is *the nearness of God*. It refers to God as the Divine power who is with a certain group of people by creating them, leading them, helping, punishing them, etc.. This nearness of God does not refer to a direct and immanent presence of God at one location amongst certain people. It refers generally to the relation between

Divinity and humans; the latter depends on the former; and both are separated by nature and location.

This study will show that IQS and IQH represent a new understanding of the idea of the relationship between God and humans, and of the Divine presence. This new understanding differs significantly from that found in the HB, and represents a Qumran specific idea of the matter.

According to the HB, the relationship between God and Israel is intimate. God acting in the history of Israel is what establishes this special link between God and His chosen people. Although this relationship is special, God and Israel, according to the HB, are always separated by nature and location. God is the Divine power who leads Israel. He is the Almighty God of Israel on whom Israel depends, but he does not approach Israel directly by Himself and Israel cannot approach Him directly. God's sphere, and the sphere of Israel, are separated. That means that God has to use certain means by which He can overcome this separation to a certain degree and establish special links with Israel. Amongst these means are the Covenant, the cloud, the Law, the tent of meeting, the Prophets, the Jerusalem Temple, etc.. Israel, on the other hand, also desires to overcome this separation and consequently utilises her own means by which she intends to approach God as far as that is possible for human beings. For example, they do His will, they worship Him, offer Him sacrifices, they build the tent of meeting and the Temple to give Him a place to dwell, etc.. But Divine presence amongst Israel in the sense of God's actual and immediate "being there" with Israel, is no mundane, everyday fact of life. Only on a very few occasions within the history of Israel, as it is described in the HB, does such a Divine presence seem to be

realised. Especially in the Temple, but also in God's appearances to Abraham (Gen. 15;17), or on Mount Sinai (Ex. 19; 24; 33f.), humans are described as exceptionally close to God.

Consequently, according to the HB, there are three degrees of relationship between God and Israel: a) a broken relationship caused by the unfaithfulness of Israel, b) the nearness of God as Israel can experience it throughout its history, whereby the degree of this nearness can vary according to the faithfulness of Israel, and c) a Divine presence which can be experienced directly by special chosen individuals at sacred locations.

1QS and 1QH, as this study will show in detail, change this idea of the relationship between God and human beings significantly. *They redefine God's relationship with humankind, and therefore His presence in this world.* These writings appear to represent the basic thinking of Qumran Community on this matter, thinking which is influenced by the peculiar concern of this group to identify itself over against the rest of Israel on the one hand, and against the Gentile world on the other. Even so, there is one aspect of the HB's teachings about God which 1QS/1QH do not change, and that is their perception of the nature of the Almighty. We will see below that the description of the nature of God in 1QS and 1QH is almost identical with the one in the HB. The reason for this is most likely that the Community did not seek to found a "new" religion, but to establish a new link between the God of Israel and humankind through the Community, but within the general limits of the teachings of the HB as they themselves understood it. The changes in the understanding of the relationship between God and the Community lie in another area; for according to 1QS and 1QH, the role of Israel, as now understood by the Community, has been changed and redefined considerably.

As far as Israel is concerned, the two scrolls adopt the idea that God and Israel are separated by nature and location. Not only according to the HB, but also according to the teachings of the Community, the spheres of God and Israel are separated and become only gradually closer where God approaches Israel, or Israel approaches God. But IQS and IQH go beyond this idea. According to these scrolls, the distinction between God and Israel is even greater than the Judaism of the time would have understood it on the basis of the HB material. According to IQS and IQH, Israel has moved away from God; thus the relationship linking God and Israel has weakened considerably. Consequently, according to these two scrolls, the special relationship between God and Israel no longer exists in full. Israel has lost the Divine presence, and for the most part also God's nearness in history. Neither can Israel, according to IQS and IQH, any longer interpret God's revelations correctly (especially the Law); nor does she have the ability to "accommodate" her own God. The most striking point in this respect is the Jerusalem Temple, which according to the teachings of the Community no longer qualifies as a divine dwelling.

The Community, on the other hand, claims to have precisely what Israel has lost: the ability to live in nearness to God, and even the potential to "accommodate" His presence amongst them. In fact - and this is probably the most significant claim made in IQS and IQH - the relationship between God and the Community is understood to be even more intimate than the one between God and His people Israel (*i.e.*, Israel before it moved away from Him) had ever been. The reason for this is that the Community claims to possess Divine presence a) *permanently* in the Community; and b) to a degree that was impossible for Israel. This special status in relation to God also qualifies the Community to "accommodate" His permanent presence.

But this does not mean that the Community *replaces* Israel, and for two reasons, as this study will show. First, the function of the Community indicates that it has a role in the world that differs from the one of Israel. This study will show that part of the self-understanding of the Community is the notion that the Community itself is the only means by which Israel can approach God. This leads to two consequences: a) Because Israel has lost (according to the teachings of the Community) its ability to approach God in the ways that the HB describes, it can only do so now by *joining* the Community; for it is only this Community that can approach God by the proper means and even by ways beyond those (for example, through interpreting the Law and the Prophets *perfectly*; or through life as permanent sacrifice to God). b) This ability to approach God leads to a *special function and quality* for the Community itself. Because every aspect of life in the Community and the nature of the Community itself represents *the* only means by which God can be approached by human beings, the Community takes over the qualities that other means of approach such as worship and sacrifices to God, the Temple as the dwelling place of God, etc. have in relation to God. Thus joining the Community not only enables humans to use these means to approach God, but changes both the means of approach and the members of the Community in relation to God. The result of all this is a Community which has *a unique status allowing the permanent nearness of God in the Community and qualifies the very same to "accommodate" the Divine presence.*

IQS and IQH develop another point. In the HB, the means of approach to God were understood as "isolated" human actions within the Jewish religious cult. The Community, on the other hand, replaces these means *permanently* by giving them a status in relation to God that allows the Community to live in His nearness and presence *permanently*. Even so, according to IQS and IQH, there are limits to this permanence. The Community imagines

itself in a process of becoming perfect. This means that they are presently improving their status in relation to God. This study will show that because of this process of improvement, statements about the status of the Community are ambiguous. The Community is driven by its claim *and* desire to possess and to improve its relationship with God. Hence, the idea of Divine presence in the Community by no means describes only one stage of Divine presence in the Community. On some occasions, as will be shown in detail below, the scrolls indicate a nearness of God in the Community that reflects the special status which the Community claims to have in relation to God. On other occasions, however, the scrolls seem to refer to an immediate and permanent presence of God amongst them, in the here and now.

That this claim to have and to be able to develop a special status in relation to God is central in the teachings of the scrolls and, in fact, the driving momentum of the Community, can also be seen in another fundamental change. The two most striking aspects of this world-view of the Community are that a) the Community only exists within this close relationship, and b) that it is the Yahad which claims to bring this relationship into existence: hence their claim that they can prepare their Community for God's nearness and presence by themselves. According to the HB, the special relationship with God and Israel is based on God's actions; it is He who makes both degrees of Divine presence possible: He is with Israel and He reveals Himself to Israel. Of course, He also expects Israel to act in a certain way; but these actions always remain actions that still depend on God's reaction. According to the scrolls, on the other hand, it is largely the Community's actions that directly result in an improvement in their status in relation to God. They make His nearness and presence come about in the Community. God's revelations, such as the Law and the Prophets, are no longer only the

*means by which* God can approach humans and *vice-versa*, but *witnesses* to the effect that the Community is achieving, or has already achieved, this special status in relation to God!

All this means that the desire to improve their relationship with God and the knowledge that they already have a very special and unique status in relation to God motivates, drives, and defines the Community. It is the decisive aspect of the self-understanding of the Community. According to IQS and IQH, this status leads to a nearness of God which is direct, to a high degree immediate, permanent, and *only possible in the Community*. This status gives the Community a nature that brings them very close to the sphere of God. As such the Community can serve as the closest possible link between God and humankind.

But this study will not only define the idea of Divine presence as we find it in IQS/H, hence the special relationship between the Community and God. This study will also contribute to a (re-)definition of the Community's (self-)identity.

Both IQS and IQH bear witness not only to the Yahad's relationship with God, but also to the Community's (self-)identity. This study will show that the Community defines itself only in relation to God. Its claim and desire to possess and to develop a special and close relationship with God, hence Divine presence, motivates the Community and provides it with a purpose and goal. This Divine presence gives the Community its right to exist, and, therefore, represents what gives the Community its identity towards God and the world. Divine presence represents the underlying idea of the Community's existence and provides the basis on which all aspects of the teachings of IQS/H are based.

As we will see below, various aspects of Qumran teaching (such as the Law, holiness, future expectations) have been understood by scholars to be the central theological concepts of the scrolls. This study will seek to show that they are all important and have their function within

Dead Sea Scroll teaching, but they can explain the identity of the Community only in combination and only when they are understood as assuming a prior notion of Divine presence - hence the Community's claim and desire to possess a special relationship with God.

There are two reasons presented in this study for holding this to be the case:

1. Although the idea of Divine presence, the special relationship between the Community and God, is so significant, IQS/H take it for granted and do not explicitly discuss it. This is not because it is unimportant; rather, it is the underlying idea which the writers of the scrolls assume as the basis of their entire thinking.

2. Most of the theologically significant ideas of IQS/H describe the Community's relationship with God. Although not mentioned specifically, we find that in all these ideas the desire to get closer to God, to improve this relationship and to make Divine presence possible, is the driving momentum.

This study will seek to demonstrate this, by analysing IQS and IQH in comparison with the HB.

## 2. The Method

Since Divine presence manifests itself in the relationship between the Community and God, this study will seek to describe this relationship as it is outlined in IQS/H in great detail. We will analyse all those aspects which the authors<sup>1</sup> of IQS/H use to describe this relationship. Since we are dealing with two parties, God and the Community, we will look at ways in which God approaches the Community and *vice-versa*. God's plan with and actions towards the Community, as described in IQS/H, explain to a great extent how God was perceived by the Community and the way in which it relates to Him. On the other hand, the Community's nature and its actions towards God also tells us how the relationship between the Community and God was understood. Consequently, we will investigate all those aspects that describe this relationship. We will investigate God's activity as it is understood by the Community which changes the Community and affects the Community's reception of God (cf. Part III). And on the other hand, we will focus on the Community examining how IQS/H describe its nature and life in the Community in its relation to God (cf. Part IV). But in order to draw a precise picture of this relationship, we will have to analyse first the nature of God as IQS/H describe it (cf. Part I), and ask also the question whether or not IQS/H know of ways for the Community to experience God directly (cf. Part II). Only these investigations will allow us to define Divine presence in the Community as IQS/H understand it.

There are, however, aspects that are part of this relationship which are not going to be discussed in detail in this study. Amongst these aspects are elements such as the Law, the covenant, purity, holiness, worship, and future expectations. The major reason for not

---

<sup>1</sup> For the sake of convenience I have used the general word "authors" to refer to those responsible for the production of IQS/H. As will be clear to anyone who has worked with documents from the Qumran library, the texts in our hands represent the work of scribes, editors, and copyists whose work may represent different stages of composition of these documents as they now appear. Our concern in this thesis is with the overall significance of the completed written materials as they are presented to us in their final state of reduction and composition.

investigating these important aspects of the teachings of IQS/H in separate chapters in this study is that they are based on those aspects which we will discuss especially in Part III, but also in Part IV. **רצון**, **שכל**, the idea of knowledge, and **טוב** (Part III) are in IQS/H understood in a unique way. They form the basis of the Community's special relationship with God and consequently with the world. They are, in fact, the *principles* which make the special relationship between the Community and God possible. Because it is God who gives the Community its special status in relation to Himself through these aspects, they are the basis on which the Community can claim to have its special relationship with God. They make the desire to improve this relationship possible and motivate the Community. They form the basis of the Community's right to exist.

Only on the basis of this special relationship the unique understanding of the Law, the covenant, purity, holiness, worship, and future expectations, as scholarly literature has already described, make sense: in the light of this, the law and the covenant describe God's revelation and His promise to the Community within this special relationship; purity and holiness, as we will see below, describe the special status of the Community in relation to God; worship becomes an aspect of life in a special relation to God and a means to develop this relation; and the future expectation reflects the Community's claim to have a special relationship with God inasmuch as the future age has in the Community already began. All these aspects, therefore, describe the Community's claim to be much closer to God than the rest of Israel has ever been. **רצון**, **שכל**, the idea of knowledge, and **טוב**, according to IQS/H, are the principles that make this nearness to God possible. They show what the Community is in relation to God. Aspects which we will discuss in Part IV, on the other hand, *i.e.* words and ideas that describe life in the Community in relation to God, demonstrate the effects of these principles on the Community and life in the Community

itself. They are based on these principles and will identify the Community in its special relationship with God.

The second reason for not investigating the ideas of the Law, the covenant, purity, holiness, worship, and future expectations in separate chapters in this study is that they have been dealt with in the scholarly literature in great detail.<sup>2</sup> To include sufficient investigations of them would simply be beyond the scope of this thesis.

But although the scholarly literature clearly demonstrates the significance of these concepts, it does not link them appropriately with the question of Divine presence. As we will see below, scholarly literature often takes one of them as the central theological idea of the scrolls which represents or outlines the identity of the Community. But they have not been discussed on the basis of Divine presence and its centrality for determining the identity of the Community. But because Law, covenant, etc. are important aspects of the teachings of IQS/H, and because they are related to aspects which this study will focus on, I will discuss them when necessary and appropriate, and will show how they relate to Divine presence and the Community's identity. Through this study, we will see that they are understood within the relationship between the Community and God, and that they are indeed based on the idea of Divine presence as IQS/H represent it. They all play a significant role in the attempt of the authors of IQS/H to express the Community's claim and desire to possess and to develop a special relationship with God of a kind which has not been seen before.

So, for example, the Law is understood in IQS/H, as in the HB, as revelation of God to humans. But it is now only the Community that can understand this revelation correctly. The Yahad also claims to possess additional laws that the rest of Israel cannot have (cf. for example the rules about nakedness in IQS VII 12 which go beyond later Rabbinic Halakah in their demands and set out clear forms of punishment for infringement). Doing justice

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. pp. XVIII<sup>3,4,5</sup>, XXVI-XXVIII, 50<sup>32</sup>, 72f., 85<sup>19</sup>.

becomes a quality of life in the Community in relation to God (cf. for example 1QS I 5), which gives the Community a special status before Him.<sup>3</sup>

Another example is the idea of future expectations in the Community. The authors of 1QS/H also use this concept to demonstrate the Yahad's special relationship with God by claiming that the Community is much more advanced within the "salvation-process" than the rest of Israel, and that only the Community will reach a state where absolute Divine presence amongst them will be possible (cf. 1QS IV 6-8; 1QH XI 25-36).<sup>4</sup>

The final example may be the question of purity. Purity is no longer understood as a temporary quality of an individual, but, according to 1QS/H, as part of the nature of the entire Community in relation to God. The members of the Community have a state of purity that allows them to live according to God's will which gives them a special status in relation to Him (cf. 1QS III 9) and which even allows them to accommodate Divine presence.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Cf. on Law in the DSS: P.R. Davies, *The Torah at Qumran*, in: A.J. Avery-Peck/ J. Neusner/ B.D. Chilton, *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 2: World View, Comparing Judaisms* [Handbook of Oriental Studies vl.57; Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 2001] 23-44; L.H. Schiffman, *Jewish Law at Qumran*, in: A.J. Avery-Peck/ J. Neusner/ B.D. Chilton, *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 1: Theory of Israel* [Handbook of Oriental Studies vl.56; Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 2001] 75-90; on the Halakah see L.H. Schiffman, *The Halakah at Qumran* [Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975].

<sup>4</sup> Cf. on "eschatology" as represented in the DSS for example L.H. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls. A Study of the Rule of the Congregation* [SBL Monograph Series 38; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1989]; T.S. Beall, *History and Eschatology at Qumran*, in: A.J. Avery-Peck/ J. Neusner/ B.D. Chilton, *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 2: World View, Comparing Judaisms* [Handbook of Oriental Studies vl.57; Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 2001] 125-146; J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [London: Routledge, 1997]; P.R. Davies, *Sects and Scrolls. Essays on Qumran Related Topics* [University of South Florida, 1996] especially 61-78; G. Vermes, *An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* [London: SCM Press, 1999] 163-169.

<sup>5</sup> On purity see, for example, J. Maier, *Purity at Qumran: Cultic and Domestic*, in: A.J. Avery-Peck/ J. Neusner/ B.D. Chilton, *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 1: Theory of Israel* [Handbook of Oriental Studies vl.56; Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 2001] 92-124; M. Newton, *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul* [Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 53; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985]. See on purity laws F. Avemarie, "Toharot ha-Rabbim" and "Mashqeh ha-Rabbim - Jacob Licht Reconsidered", in: M.J. Bernstein/ F. García-Martínez/ J. Kampen, *Legal Texts and Legal Issues* [Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997] 215-229.

The authors of the two scrolls often use certain key Hebrew words when they mention aspects of the relationship between the Community and God. Consequently, to determine the precise meaning, and hence the relevance of these terms for the idea of the Divine presence or nearness of God, this study will analyse these relevant Hebrew words or phrases in detail. The following words turned out to be the essential ones regarding the understanding of this relationship between the Community and God: יפע, גלה, נבט, צפה, דרש, רצון, תמים, תמים, רצון, דרש, צפה, נבט, גלה, יפע, שכל, שכל, ידע, טוב, מעון, מעמד, יצב, שרת, קרב, לפני, עמד, הלך. This study claims to take into account *all* occurrences of these and related words/phrase in IQS and IQH. It is not sufficient to focus only on those occurrences that seem to be interesting in one or another respect and to set them into relation with some few parallels. An unbalanced picture of the meaning of these words/phrases would be the result. This study will draw full pictures of the usage and meaning of these words in IQS and IQH, and where relevant also in IQSa and IQM, in order to define the relationship between God and the Community as precisely as possible.

It also will compare the meanings of these relevant words and phrases with the HB's usage, and also on occasions with that of LXX. Especially the comparison with the HB will enable us to define their meaning in the scrolls more precisely, since the usage of the Hebrew language in the scrolls depends in the first instance on its HB-usage. The authors of IQS and IQH, as we will see in detail below, a) are very familiar with the HB-material, as their continual use of it clearly shows; and b) use the HB-material purposefully employing particular methods of interpretation which it will be this study's task to analyse. Using these methods, the authors of IQS and IQH elaborate ideas from the HB which are mostly linked with the relationship between God and human beings. They use HB words or phrases that do not often, or very rarely, occur in the HB, but in contexts that are suitable for the purposes of

the authors of the scrolls; and they develop them according to their own ideas. By doing so they give their ideas "HB-authority", and at the same time are able to introduce significant, occasionally fundamental, changes. Comparison with the HB will, therefore, play a significant role in this study.

From all this, it should be clear that modern scholarly methods, in particular the historical-critical methods, may be of very limited assistance in our task. We must attempt to view the HB as the authors of IQS/IQH viewed it, as a coherent, historically accurate, and authoritative body of material whose *meaning* it is of supreme importance to establish. It is this *meaning* which the authors of IQS/IQH claim to possess.

For important reasons, this study focuses primarily on IQS and IQH and, in separate chapters, the fragments of the Community Rule and the Thanksgiving Hymns from the caves 4 and 5, and not on the entire text corpus found in the caves of Qumran.

The first reason for this is, that most of the material found in the manuscripts of the Community Rule and the Thanksgiving Hymns reflects  $\text{קִיּוֹן}$  material.<sup>6</sup> Investigating Divine Presence in these two texts will, therefore, result primarily in an understanding of the Qumranian idea of Divine presence as very central documents of the Community present it.<sup>7</sup>

Secondly, since this study claims to take into account each of the occurrences of the analysed

<sup>6</sup> Cf. for example J. Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer, Band III* [München / Basel: Ernst Reinhardt Verlag, 1996] 4,47; G. Vermes, *Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* [London: SCM Press, 1999] 46f.; A. Lange / H. Lichtenberger, Art. Qumran [TRE XXVIII, 1997] 55ff. Stegemann, however, argues that the material found in the Rules of the Community refers to the Essenes in general and not necessarily to the Qumran Community (H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* [Freiburg / Basel / Wien: Herder, 1999] 152f.).

<sup>7</sup> Generally, although scholars argue that IQS contains several rules and that some of these rules may not be originally from Qumran (cf. for literature 235ff. and also pp. XXII), this study will treat IQS as a coherent document in the attempt to establish how this document understands Divine Presence at the stage of the redaction process which it represents. Since the 4/5Q material does not alter the idea of Divine Presence as it is revealed in IQS and IQH (see pp. 235-244), I will, therefore, in the following study focus primarily on these two versions of the Rule of the Community and the Thanksgiving Hymns (IQS and IQH).

words, the consideration of more scrolls is beyond the scope of this study in two ways. Thus, if this study were to include other scrolls, we would have to establish first in what relation these stand to 1QS/H (4QS/H) to gain a precise picture of the idea of Divine presence. Thus we would have to establish the date and place of origin of these scrolls at least relative to 1QS/H and the 4QS/H material. This would certainly be a major task beyond the scope of this study. In fact, the results of this study might well serve precisely the other way around, as it were. Once we have established how Divine presence was defined in these central texts from the caves, how the relationship between God and the **יְהוָה** was understood, and what the **יְהוָה** saw as its *raison d'être*, then we may have a yardstick by which to measure the "nearness" or "distance" of other documents found in the Caves with respect to an idea on which the "theology" of the Rule of the Community and the Thanksgiving Hymns is based. It would indeed represent a major misconception of the nature of the scrolls and fragments found in the caves, if we were to postulate that "the writings not only portray each its own picture but all together a coherent account of Judaism: a world view, a way of life, and a theory of who and what is 'Israel'"<sup>8</sup>.

Thirdly, the Rule of the Community and the Thanksgiving Hymns represent documents of very different types. The former determines life in the Community in relation to God by defining the Community and by providing a divine legal system according to which life in the Community according to the will of God becomes possible. Because the Rule defines the relationship between God and the Community, it also elaborates major theological ideas. The Thanksgiving Hymns, on the other hand, contain songs which are uttered to God to praise Him. This scroll is probably designed to involve members of the Community in the worship

---

<sup>8</sup> J. Neusner, *What is "a Judaism"?: Seeing the Dead Sea Library as the Statement of a Coherent Judaic Religious System*, in: A.J. Avery-peck/ J. Neusner/ B.D. Chilton, *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 1: Theory of Israel* [Handbook of Oriental Studies vl.56; Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 2001] 7.

of God. By doing so, it describes the relationship between the members of the Community and God in a way different from, but nevertheless complementary to, that found in the Community Rule. Analysing words and phrases that are linked with the idea of Divine presence and, hence, the relationship between the Community and God, in both of these documents means that the problem can be observed from two different perspectives. Consequently, if these analyses come to the same or similar conclusions *despite* the different nature of the two texts, this conclusion is likely to be strong and reliable and will reflect the Qumranian understanding of Divine presence at least at a certain period of the history of the Community.

Finally, the method this study will use can only be applied to texts of a certain length. IQS and IQH are both comparatively complete texts that allow the development of theories concerning the meaning of words or phrases that relate to the Divine presence. It does not make too much sense to include in such a project fragments where the context of the words or phrases being analysed is not secured and where the relationship to the Community Rule and the Thanksgiving Hymns is doubtful.

However, this study will take into account in separate chapters the fragments of IQS and IQH found in caves 4 and 5 (cf. pp. 235ff. and 242ff.). Especially regarding IQS, scholars have established<sup>9</sup> that a) the text of IQS itself is incoherent to a degree that might suggest that it contains material from different periods and/or sources, and that b) the 4QS-material indicates that there were different versions of the Rule, which may either represent the Rule's development over a period of time, and/or indicate a continuing process within the  $\text{קִהַל}$  of refinement, redefinition, and re-application of the Rule. In all this, however, IQS stands out as a form of the Rule which makes sense especially, as we shall see, in its perceptions of

---

<sup>9</sup> Cf. especially 235<sub>3</sub>.

Divine presence. Indeed, the 4QS material does not alter in any way the results we arrive at in this thesis (and neither does the 4QH material), a matter which we shall presently show in detail.

Finally, this study does not claim to base its analyses on the *ultimate* version of the Rule of the Community or the Thanksgiving Hymns, but on the versions 1QS and 1QH present. Since both have been found as they are, they probably had a significant function in the Community at a certain time. It cannot be the aim of this study to establish a history of the Rule of Community or the Hymns within the entire history of the Community, but to determine what 1QS and 1QH at a certain point of their development have to say about the Divine presence. It will be the task of others to apply the methods of narrative criticism to the Rule of the Community (1QS and others) and the Thanksgiving Hymns seeking to determine the form of the texts at their original stage of its history.

### 3. The Self-Identity of the Qumran Community according to the Scholarly Literature

In this study we will see that the idea of Divine presence is inevitably linked with the question of the (self-)identity of the Yahad, because Divine presence represents the key for our understanding of the (self-)identity of the Community.

We have already defined the Divine presence as either God's nearness or His actual being in the Community. Divine presence is where God and humans/Community are as close together as possible. Divine presence is where God can be "located" in relation to the Community, and *vice-versa*. This makes the question of Divine presence into probably the most significant and pressing question of Qumran theology as represented in IQS and IQH, because it defines the *relationship* between the Yahad and God. And the Yahad is about this relationship. But the question of Divine presence does not reflect *the* central ideological component of the theology of Qumran; rather, it represents what stands behind every theological idea or concept which we find in these scrolls. Divine presence is, as this study will show, what gives the Community, at least according to IQS and IQH, its *right to exist*. The relationship between the Community and God, on the other hand, defines and describes this right to exist and, hence, is about the (self-)identity of the Community. This study will show that having a special status in relation to God is what the Community claims to be about in IQS and IQH. This special relationship with God is all that matters. It defines the Community's identity towards God and the rest of the world. This is why the idea of Divine presence, which we will discuss in this study in detail, represents the *key* to a proper understanding of this relationship and, hence, the (self-)identity of the Community.

I will now, before going into details, discuss in short a number of opinions in the scholarly literature on the (self-)identity of the Community, to demonstrate in what ways they differ from the observations of this study. Although several scholars discuss the question of the

Community's (self-)identity from various angles, they do not take into account the idea of Divine presence; neither do they focus sufficiently on the issue of the relationship between the Community and God. In fact, most do not notice the importance of these two ideas for the understanding of the (self-)identity of the Community, neither do they acknowledge Divine presence and the special relationship as the fundamental theological and existential idea of the Community that gives the Community its right to exist, its purpose, and its motivation to improve (cf. pp. XXVIf.).

There is something else in the scholarly literature on the DSS that does not seem to be compatible with the findings of this study. Often in this literature, scholars discuss certain theological ideas which occur in the scrolls, claiming that one or the other of these ideas represents the central ideological concept of the Community on which the entire theology of the Community and its (self-)identity rests. They claim that once we understand *this* particular idea we know what the Community is about. Amongst ideas that attract the attention of scholars are the covenant; the observance of the Law; purity holiness; future expectations; priesthood; worship etc.. These ideas are indeed all very important in Qumran theology. In fact, they represent the theological and ideological *structure* of Qumran identity. But, this study will show, they describe the (self-)identity of the Community only *in combination*. None of these ideas can be used separately to explain what the Community is about. The Yahad can only exist successfully by respecting all of them. But they all are embedded and based on the idea of Divine presence. They all serve to maintain and develop the special relationship that the Community claims to have with God. As such, Divine presence gives the Community its right to exist, its motivation, and its goal.

To explain these findings more precisely, I will now, before investigating the idea of Divine presence and the relationship between the Community and God in 1QS and 1QH in detail, turn to consider a few recent scholarly opinions on the question of the (self-)identity to demonstrate how the question of the (self-)identity has been approached in the scholarly literature and how this study will contribute to answering this question more precisely.

Geza Vermes in particular presents the question of the Community's (self-)identity under one theological concept. In his *Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls*<sup>1</sup>, he adduces the idea of the covenant as the basic idea of the self-understanding of the Community.<sup>2</sup> Election and holy life, worship, and future expectations are mentioned as further important religious ideas of the Community; but they are understood as subordinate to the idea of the covenant.<sup>3</sup> Covenant is a significant aspect of the theology of 1QS and 1QH. It is probably the aspect of the teachings of these scrolls that describes and defines the relationship between God and the Community most directly. But this study will show that it is not the ultimate foundational idea of these scrolls, because it does not define the Community and does not give it its purpose. Rather, the idea of the covenant can only explain the Yahad's identity in combination with the other theological components. The underlying idea of 1QS/H, however, must be seen in Divine presence and the Community's special relationship with God, which Vermes does not specifically discuss.

Concern about the self-identity of the Community is marked in the work of Hannah K. Harrington. Her article *Holiness and Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls*<sup>4</sup> explicitly disagrees with

---

<sup>1</sup> G. Vermes, *An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* [London: SCM Press, 1999].

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. 145-169.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid..

theories claiming that "purity", "the Community's apocalyptic bent", or "the fear of violating the Scripture"<sup>5</sup> are the central ideological components of the scrolls. Adding more theological ideas to this list, Harrington claims that *holiness* and the *Law* are the central aspects of the teachings of the Yahad:

"Holiness was that divine energy that could protect, sustain and enhance the community. The Torah pointed the way to holiness and the ritual purity necessary to activate it. (...) The laws of the Torah were the link to divine holiness. Laws restricting the holiness of priests were often applied to the community at large since observance of them could channel in greater holiness. Other laws regarding holiness and purity were interpreted stringently and even augmented at times in order to intensify the level of holiness within the community, and ultimately, establish a closer connection with God."<sup>6</sup>

This study will show that Law and holiness are most significant aspects of the theology of, and consequently life in, the Community. They are essential for the (self-)identity of the Community. But they are theological aspects amongst others that *only in combination* define the Community. The only idea that provides a basis for the other "ideological components" is Divine presence, and the idea of the special status of the Community in relation to God. These latter aspects are not two amongst the others; rather they give the others their purpose. Although Harrington sees that the idea of a "close connection with God"<sup>7</sup> is an issue for the observation of the Law that leads to holiness, she does not enhance the significance of this idea in the scrolls, and does not notice that the desire of the Community to engage in this special relationship with God is what first motivates it to elaborate a theology as found in IQS and IQH, and then to fulfill the will of God perfectly.

<sup>4</sup> H.K. Harrington, *Holiness and Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [DSD 8/2, 2001] 124-135.

<sup>5</sup> See for extended list of literature on these ideological components *ibid.*, 124<sub>3</sub> and 125<sub>4,5</sub>. It is beyond the scope of this study to discuss them all. But a few of them do what Harrington has done: they claim that the component that they discuss is the central theological idea of the scrolls.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.* 135.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* 135.

At this point, a further matter relating to the Community's (self-)identification arises which has been treated in scholarly literature occasionally as the central theological idea of the Yahad: the question of its relationship to the Jerusalem Temple. As we know, the Jerusalem Temple is one of the places where, according to the HB, Divine presence may be found. The DSS clearly use Temple language, and because the authors of the genuine Qumranian scrolls, like IQS and IQH, have adopted so many aspects of the Temple cult, scholars have claimed that the Qumran Community *substitutes for or replaces the Temple of Jerusalem*. If this were so, we would expect that the nature of Divine presence in the Temple and the Community would be identical. The members of the Community would actually live as if they were in the inner sanctum, the holy place where God dwells.

We shall show that IQS and IQH adopted many aspects of Temple cult and life; but we will also demonstrate that the Community by no means understood itself simply as a substitute for or a replacement of the Jerusalem Temple. This observation will have consequences for our understanding of Divine presence in Qumran, of the relationship between the Community and God, and of the (self-)identity of the Community. Three studies which have investigated this question must therefore be surveyed here.

Schiffman's study *Community without Temple*<sup>8</sup> is one of those to claim that the Community *substitutes for or replaces* the Jerusalem Temple. He is one of the very few to notice that the major purpose of the Yahad is nearness to God: "life in the sect, following its principles and its laws, would best bring humans into close contact with God"<sup>9</sup>. Schiffman has seen two major aspects of the Community's identity here: a) The Community is about bringing humans,

---

<sup>8</sup> L.H. Schiffman, *Community without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple*, in: B.Ego/ A. Lange/ P. Pilhofer (ed.), *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kultus im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* [Tübingen 1999] 267-284.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid. 272.

*i.e.* itself, closer to God; and b) this desire to get close to God affects and involves the entire lives of the members of the Community. But, first, Schiffman does not notice that this desire of "close contact" is the motivation behind the Community's existence, and, second, he makes this statement claiming that the Community itself *substitutes for* the Temple. He claims that after refraining from the Jerusalem Temple two strategies were adopted in the Community: "seeing the sect as a substitute for the Temple, and using prayer as substitute for sacrifice"<sup>10</sup>.

This study will show that the Community's identity is indeed about a close contact with God, but also that this definition of the identity of the Community and the idea of Divine presence as represented in 1QS/H makes it very unlikely that the Community understood itself at the same time as substitute for the Temple. In short, we may consider the following reasons:

a) The Community simply did not need to substitute an institution which, according to its own ideas, was impure and no longer a place of Divine presence.

b) The reason why there was no need for the Community to substitute for the Jerusalem Temple lies in their (self-)identity as the only group with a special relationship with God. The Community needs to improve its special relationship with God. In fact, this study will show that the special relationship which the Community claims to have with God, which qualifies it to be in His nearness, is already (at the stage that 1QS/H describe) well beyond the intensity of any relationship between human beings and God as described in the HB. It is this special relationship that distinguishes the Community clearly from the rest of Israel. This means that even the Temple as the place where, according to the HB, Divine presence may be possible and where, according to the HB, human beings can be as near to God as possible, cannot provide the sort of Divine presence that the Qumran Community, according to 1QS/H, claims

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid. 272.

On another occasion Schiffman suggests that "the sect is seen as a virtual temple, itself bringing sanctity to its members" (L.H. Schiffman, *Jewish Law at Qumran*, in: A.J. Avery-peck/ J. Neusner/ B.D. Chilton, *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 1: Theory of Israel* [Handbook of Oriental Studies vl.56; Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 2001] 75-90).

and desires. The relationship between God and the Yahad is even more intense than between God and the rest of Israel in the Jerusalem Temple, even if the Temple was pure in the Qumranian sense. The usage of Temple language in 1QS/H, the adoption of aspects of the Temple cult (such as the Temple worship, the hierarchy of the Temple personnel, sacrifices, etc.), is, therefore, not a result of an attempt to substitute the Jerusalem Temple, but is a means utilized by the authors of 1QS/H to express that the Community has a unique and special relationship with God which involves elements of the Temple cult, but which goes beyond the Temple idea as far as the idea of Divine presence and the relationship between God and human beings is concerned. Aspects of the Temple cult which we find in 1QS/H are, therefore, only elements of the identity of the Community and do not provide its central concept. They define the identity of the Community only in combination with the other ideas, but they are based on the idea of the special relationship between the Community and God and serve the desire to show that the Community is uniquely near to God. Hence, to claim that the Yahad substitutes the Jerusalem Temple would a) underestimate the independence and uniqueness of the Community, and b) would lead to a misunderstanding of the idea of the Divine presence, of the Community's relationship with God, and, consequently, of the (self-)identity of the Community.

c) Another argument that contradicts the thesis of Schiffman is the lack of Temple building. A Temple building in Qumran has not been found, because the Community does not aim at achieving the status of Temple personnel alone; rather, it aims at a status of perfection which can accommodate God's presence, hence His ultimate nearness. But this aim cannot be achieved through a Temple, such as the one in Jerusalem. Other conditions, according to 1QS/H, must be met (such as perfection, purity, holiness), which lie, according to 1QS/H, beyond the concept of the (pure) Jerusalem Temple, as this study will show.

Gärtner also strongly argues that the Community substitutes for the Temple.<sup>11</sup> We will discuss his theory here, because he introduces the term "spiritualization" in referring to the process of the adoption of Temple ideas in the Yahad.

Gärtner proposes that the Community claimed to be able to restore the Divine presence by replacing the Temple: "they themselves were the 'new temple'"<sup>12</sup>. As in the case of Schiffman, the evidence which this study will bring forth, will indicate that it is indeed the aim of the Community to restore Divine presence, *i.e.* to improve and to intensify its relationship with God, and Gärtner is one of the few scholars who notice this. But this aim can neither be achieved by substituting for the Jerusalem Temple, nor by adopting Temple ideas alone, because on the one hand, the Divine presence, which the Community is aiming for, goes beyond the one described in the Temple, and, on the other, the observance of elements of the Temple cult is only one means leading to the Community's aim along with all the other aspects mentioned in 1QS/H.

When discussing the problem of the relationship between "temple and its cultus" and "Law and its fulfilment"<sup>13</sup>, Gärtner suggests that the concentration on the Law as we find it in the scrolls does not mean that the concept of temple and cultus is less important. He proposes that the Community has not

"broken with the temple and its cultus in its forms; instead they transferred the whole complex of ideas from the Jerusalem Temple to the community. This undoubtedly meant that some measure of 'spiritualization' had taken place, since the idea of the temple was now linked with the community (...)"<sup>14</sup>

This word "spiritualization", as Gärtner explains,

---

<sup>11</sup> B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament. A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament* [Society for New Testament Studies, Cambridge 1965].

<sup>12</sup> Ibid. 16.; cf. also 20.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid. 17f.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid. 18.

"is used to indicate the transference of the concrete entity, the temple building, to a more 'spiritual' realm in the living community, and of the sacrifices to deeds in the life lived according to the Law."<sup>15</sup>

This study will show that the authors of 1QS/H indeed transferred ideas from the Temple to the Community. But this process is unlikely to represent a "spiritualization" in Gärtner's sense. It is right that the ideas from the Temple are in 1QS/H no longer linked with the Temple building, nor with Jerusalem. But the reason for this is not a transference of the Temple ideas onto a new and spiritual level in the Community. Rather, as I suggested above and will show in detail in this study, the reason for the adoption is that the authors of 1QS/H needed a language and elements of life in the Community to make their claim that the Community is special in relation to God. This means that the authors of the scrolls use the Temple language to express one aspect why the Community has a special relationship with God: the observance of the Laws concerning the Temple. But this does not reflect a "spiritualization", since the absence of a Temple building in the Community does not matter. Rather, the adopted ideas serve to describe the special relationship between the Community and God which does not aim at substituting for or replacing the Temple, but emphasises a) the unique status of the Yahad in relation to God and b) its unique status in the world. The adoption of the Temple ideas is only one means which leads the Community closer to God along with the other theological concepts of the Community (for example the perfection, the purity, and the observance of the Law).

In this context, Gärtner also claims regarding the function of the Law and the Temple ideas that

"the reason why the community, though isolated from Jerusalem, did not wholly abandon the temple ideal seems to have been that the entire fulfilment of the Law (...)

demanded the fulfilment of the Law in respect of the Temple as well."<sup>16</sup>

I will show in this study that the emphasis on the observance of the Law which we find in 1QS/H results primarily from the same motivation as the adoption of the Temple ideas: the claim and desire of the Community to develop a special relationship with God which allows them to be closer to Him than any other group of people, in fact than any other human being mentioned in the HB. The fact that the fulfilment of the Law involves in the HB the Temple ideas as well as in 1QS/H reflects the method of the authors of these scrolls: as long as they can base their own ideas on HB material they do so, to authorise their teachings; but they always develop the HB material and make it a servant of to their claim and desire to have this special relationship with God.

Like Gärtner, Klinzing in his detailed study *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im NT*<sup>17</sup> suggests that "die Gemeinde selbst ist der wahre Tempel (...), und der vollkommene Wandel in der Gemeinde ist das Opfer, das Gott wohlgefällt"<sup>18</sup>. Klinzing reaches his conclusion on the basis of his detailed analysis of the text where he finds that

"der übertragene Gebrauch der Tempelbegriffe ist in den Qumrantexten ganz einheitlich. An allen Stellen, an denen nicht das Jerusalemer oder das eschatologische Heiligtum gemeint ist, bezeichnen die Begriffe die Gemeinde."<sup>19</sup>

According to Klinzing, the reason why the Community claims to replace the Jerusalem Temple lies in the historical situation: because the Temple is impure, atonement for the members of the Community is only possible if the Community operates as the Temple.<sup>20</sup> And this, according to Klinzing, is the reason why the transference of Temple ideas to the Community

<sup>16</sup> Ibid. 21.

<sup>17</sup> G. Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im NT* [StUNT 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971).

<sup>18</sup> Ibid. 37.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid. 50.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. *ibid.* 89.

cannot be called "spiritualization" in the sense that the verbal elements of the cult completely replace the rituals, as H.-J. Hermisson suggests regarding phenomena in the HB.<sup>21</sup> Klinzing proposes, and this study will confirm his proposal, that the transference of the Temple ideas to the Community leads to the Yahad being part of these ideas, and not to a purely spiritual understanding of them:

"Der Kultus [in the Community] wird nicht durch eine selbstevidente Moral ersetzt, sondern das ganze Leben der Gemeinde mit in den Kultus hineingenommen. Die Umdeutungen beruhen ebenfalls nicht darauf, daß man eine gesetzliche Leistung gleichwertig an die Stelle einer anderen setzt wie bei den Rabbinen."<sup>22</sup>

This means that the Community claims that it gains a special quality by adopting and living the Temple ideas as part of daily life in the Community. But Klinzing does not state clearly that the adoption of the Temple ideas has not been undertaken to replace an impure Jerusalem Temple, but that it represents another means by which the Community claims to get closer to God. Being part of the Temple cult means, for the Community, gaining a quality that allows its members to be at least as near to God as the Temple personnel in the pure Temple once was.

The Community, according to Klinzing, justifies its claim to replace the Temple through two theological ideas: first, the divine "Geschichtsplan"<sup>23</sup>, and, second, the eschatological process<sup>24</sup>. It is interesting to see that Klinzing does not mention the observance of the Law as another aspect that either justifies the Community's claim or, as a theological idea, even replaces the actions of the Temple cult.<sup>25</sup> He suggests correctly that the observance of the

<sup>21</sup> Cf. especially H.-J. Hermisson, *Sprache und Ritus im altisraelitischen Kult. Zur "Spiritualisierung" der Kultbegriffe im Alten Testament* [Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 19; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965] 24-28

<sup>22</sup> Ibid. 146.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. *ibid.* 152f.

Law is a central aspect of the religious life in the Community, but "schließt (...) ein lebendiges Interesse am Kultus nicht aus"<sup>26</sup>. But these justifications - the predestination and the "eschatological" concept of the Community - as well as the observance of the Law and the Temple ideas represent *equally* means which the authors of 1QS/H use to describe the claim and desire of Community to have a special relationship with God that allows them to accommodate His presence.

Before investigating the idea of Divine presence in 1QS and 1QH in detail the work of one more scholar, R. Kugler,<sup>27</sup> must be mentioned. He, too, does not propose that the Community replaces the Temple as such, but "understood itself as entirely priestly and as a replacement for the Temple cult"<sup>28</sup>. The reason for this is, according to Kugler, the Community's "atoning function", "its self-designation as holy (...), as priestly", its destination "to be like the heavenly angels", its "adoption of priestly rules for purity (...) and age of service"<sup>29</sup>. All these aspects are again means that equally serve the purpose of demonstrating the Community's special status in relation to God and consequently to the rest of Israel. Even the adopted aspects of the Temple cult are used for this purpose, and cannot be understood as an idea that represents the (self-)identity of the Community, as the following analysis will demonstrate.

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid. 153.

<sup>27</sup> R. Kugler, *Priesthood at Qumran*, in: P.W. Flint/ J.C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years. A Comprehensive Assessment*, vol.2 [Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 1999] 93-116.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid. 112.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid. 112.

## I. God

### 1. The nature of God

Because Divine presence is about the relationship between human beings and God, the first step of this study will be a short investigation of the description of the nature of God as we find it in IQS/H. This description will be the basis for our understanding of the relationship between this God and the Qumran Community.<sup>1</sup> As we will see later, it is this God who influences, according to IQS/H, the Community by changing the nature of the Community in a way that allows them to improve their status in relation to Him. But first, it is important to know how IQS/H describe the nature of God with whom they have a special relationship.

We may begin by noting that the God of IQS and IQH is the God of the Hebrew Bible.<sup>2</sup> Although, as we will see below, some of the aspects of the nature of God referring to means by which God approaches members of the Community have been changed in the two scrolls indicating a closer relationship between God and humans in IQS and IQH than in the HB,<sup>3</sup> most of the classical characteristics of the God of Israel familiar to us from the HB are to be found also in IQS and IQH.<sup>4</sup>

Thus, according to the two documents IQS and IQH, God is an "eternal" being (IQS X 12). In His eternity He has "merciful favour for ever and ever" (IQS II 1). God is the "establisher

<sup>1</sup> This investigation only aims at providing the basis of the following detailed examination of the relationship between God and the Community. A full analysis of each feature of the nature of God in IQS and IQH in comparison with the HB is beyond the scope of this study.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also G. Molin, *Die Söhne des Lichtes. Zeit und Stellung der Handschriften vom Toten Meer* [Wien/München 1954] 120; J.A. Fitzmyer, *Qumran: die Antwort: 101 Fragen zu den Schriften vom Toten Meer* [Stuttgart 1993] 113.

<sup>3</sup> B. Dombrowski sees that IQS indicates a "close contact" between God and the Community but does not elaborate this crucial finding (cf. B. Dombrowski, *Erscheinung, Wesen und Ideologie der Assoziation von Hirbet Qumran nach dem "Manual of Discipline" (IQS)* [Paris/Halifax 1971] 515-531, especially 528).

<sup>4</sup> This is why the specific idea of God represented in IQS and IQH can be analysed best by a comparison with the HB. B. Dombrowski (ibid.) does not offer such a comparison and consequently does not see in what way the idea of God according to IQS is so unique.

of my well-being" (1QS X 12). He is the merciful God (1QS IV 4; XI 12,13), although readers are warned: "God may not be merciful when you entreat him." (1QS II 8). God is often mentioned in 1QH as the helping God.<sup>5</sup> He helps the psalmist of 1QH. This idea is closely related to the idea of God helping the righteous according to the Psalms in the HB.

But God is not only a caring God. He is also the God of anger (1QS II 9, 15) and wrath (1QS IV 12); and God may not forgive (1QS II 8). But despite God's anger, He is the "compassionate" God (1QS X 16) whose thoughts are holy (1QS XI 19). This holiness seems to be the basic and probably most decisive aspect of the nature of God in the scrolls. God is called the "spring of Holiness" (1QS X 12), and the scrolls talk about "his plentiful goodness" (1QS XI 14); and He is the loving God (1QS III 26).

But there is also the idea of the powerful God (1QS X 12,16), His might (1QS XI 20) and His majesty (1QS X 16). Linked with the might and the majesty of God is a feature of the nature of God that occurs in 1QS and 1QH and forms the basic idea of the relationship between God and humankind: God is the creator (cf. for example 1QS III 16,17f.,25; XI 11,17f.; 1QH V 8; VII 14f.; VIII 8; IX 7,9; XVIII 12; XIX 3).<sup>6</sup> And as the creator He is the one who leads the

<sup>5</sup> VII 16; X 7f.,21,23,31; XI 5,37-38; XII 22,24f.; XIII 6,12,16-19a,22; XVI 11,15f.; XVII 12,27-28,33.

<sup>6</sup> In 1QH IX 7, where עשה is used as the technical term for the creating act, the textual situation makes it difficult to decide what the object of the creating act is. According to E. Lohse, *Die Qumran Texte*, 112 the objects created by God are the "Geschlechter der Ewigkeit" (ה[כינותה דורות] עולם) ("...hast Du gegründet Geschlechter der Ewigkeit"). G. Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 166 translates: "all things exist from eternity". This interpretation suggests that God is understood here as the creator of everything and seems to be the more likely one because of the line's context and the understanding of God as the creator elsewhere in the scroll (cf. B. Dombrowski, *Erscheinung, Wesen und Ideologie der Assoziation von Hirbet Qumran nach dem "Manual of Discipline" (1QS)* [Paris/ Halifax 1971] 518f. on God as the "opifex machinae mundi"). J. Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener Bd.1*, 60 leaves a gap at this point!

Two lines later, 1QH IX 9, the heaven is mentioned as something that God created (ואתה נטיתה) (שמים). In 1QH XVIII 12, God is described as the creator of everything (לכבודכה עשיתה כול אלה). In 1QH XIX 3, the author does not use explicitly the term עשה for a creating act of God, but here as well God is described as the creator, and, in addition, the author mentions that God created "for his glory". 1QH V 8 defines God clearly as the creator using ברא as verb for "to create" and מעשי for the created objects (את כול מעשיך בטרם בראתם). 1QH VII 14f. refer explicitly to God as the creator of the "righteous people" (רק צדיק (15) אתה בראתה) ("only you created the righteous"). In 1QH VIII 8, it is most obvious that the idea of God the creator is present in 1QH: here the author points out that God is the one "whose work is all" (אשר מעשיך הכול).

world (1QS I 10, cf. also II 23; IV 20) and who directs everything that happens (1QH IV 21; VII 22; XII 3f.;<sup>7</sup> XV 14-15; XVIII 2, 5).

Mentioned several times in 1QH is the "righteousness" of God, another aspect of the Biblical God (cf. 1QH IV 10a,20b; IV 17; V 19; VI 15,6; VIII 9,11; XII 31,40; XV 19; XVI 2; XIX 18; XX 31). The Hebrew term employed for this attribute of God is צדקה/ך (צדקה in 1QH IV 10a,20b; VIII 9; XV 19; XVI 2; XX 31; XXI top 2)). Consequently, deeds of God are also "righteous" (מעשי צדקה (1QH XII 31; V 19; VI 16)).

Connected with righteousness is the description of God as the "just judge" (1QS I 26; X 16f.,18,20 XI 2,11,14,15,16) whose justice is forever (1QS XI 12). God's deeds and actions are just (1QS I 20; X 23; XI 3), and "all His deeds are truth" (1QS X 17).

Finally, there are features of the divine nature in 1QS and 1QH that not only describe the nature of God, but are understood to influence the members of the Community directly. Amongst them are the "glory" of God (1QS X 9; XI 20): God is called the "peak of glory". Note also "His truth" (1QS III 24; IV 20; XI 4f.), which is often mentioned in 1QH as an attribute of God (1QH VII 25; VIII 7; XI 34; XII 40; XIX 26f) and as something that the psalmist can learn from God (1QH XV 26; XIX 4,16) so that he knows it (1QH XVII 9f.; XVIII 20,29; XIX 7) and may act accordingly (1QH VI 20; VII 23; XIV 25; XVIII 30). Hence, the truth of God is a feature of the nature of God that defines a certain relationship between God and man, in as much as God passes it on to the members of the Community. We will see in the course of this study that this becomes a major characteristic of the relationship between God and the Community as described in 1QS/H.

The same function have the "wonders of God". (1QH VI 23; IX 33; XI 23; XV 27,32; XVIII 14,21; XIX 10,17,24-25,28). They are divine in origin, but they can only be understood by

<sup>7</sup> Text damaged.

people whom He has chosen also for that purpose. Through His wonders God shows humanity His greatness and power. The person who understands His wonders (in IQH the psalmist) will tell other people and nations about them,<sup>8</sup> and his nature in relation to God will change. Other features of the nature of God that influence human beings directly will be discussed in detail below: God's "will"<sup>9</sup>, His "knowledge"<sup>10</sup>, His "understanding"<sup>11</sup>, and His "goodness"<sup>12</sup>.

These aspects of the divinity, as they feature in IQS and IQH, constitute what the authors of the scrolls generally thought about God. They outline in general who this God of IQS and IQH is and form the basis of the understanding of the Divine presence since they describe to whom the Community stands in relation. This is the God the Community attempts to understand and to get closer to.

But IQS/H are using and developing, as we will see below, especially aspects of the nature of God that describe means by which God *influences* the Community. Most of these aspects describe God's nature also according to the HB. But it is the authors of IQS/H who developed these ideas indicating a special status of the Community in relation to God.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> The author expresses this thought mainly through the phrase **לספר נפל אוריכה** (IX 33; XI 23; XVIII 21; XIX 24-25).

<sup>9</sup> See pp. 31-63.

<sup>10</sup> See pp. 80-117.

<sup>11</sup> See pp. 64-79.

<sup>12</sup> See pp. 118-133.

<sup>13</sup> Molin suggests as the difference between the idea of God in the HB and IQS/H precisely the opposite. He claims that in the DSS the relationship between God and world becomes "less immediate" ("weniger unmittelbar", G. Molin, *Die Söhne des Lichtes. Zeit und Stellung der Handschriften vom Toten Meer* [Wien/ München 1954] 124). This study will show that it is the immediate nearness and presence of God that the Community desires. The idea of the nature of God represented in IQS/H reflect this.

## 2. The Dwelling Place of God

But before engaging in the investigation of those means with which God influences the Community directly according to 1QS/H, we will have to look at one particular aspect of the nature of God first. Because depending on the understanding of the dwelling place of God, the description of this place by the authors of 1QS/H might well describe a way in which God influences humans. That is to say: depending on where God is understood to dwell, he is closer to or further away from human beings, he is distant or approachable; if 1QS/H mention a dwelling of God which pictures God as approachable for the Community, this might reflect a special relationship between the Community and God. The idea of God's dwelling-place might indicate in which way the Community is understood to relate to Him.

The word that comes to mind regarding a dwelling place of God is **זבול** in 1QH XI 34.<sup>1</sup> According to 1QH XI 34, God has a "holy habitation" (**זבול קודשו**) which is full of the "truth of His glory":

(34) (...) **כיא ירעם אל בהמון כוחו ויהם זבול קודשו באמת**

(35) **כבודו וצבא השמים יתנו בקולם** (...)

(34) (...) for God will thunder with His mighty roar, and his holy habitation echoes in/with/through the truth of

(35) His glory, and the host of the heavens adds to their noise (...)

Here the dwelling place of God is called **זבול**, and in both, 1QH and 1QS, the **זבול** is associated with **קדוש** and **כבוד**. The "holy habitation", mentioned in 1QH XI 34, where God dwells, is understood as a place of holiness and glory which is full of light.<sup>2</sup> The closer

<sup>1</sup> **זבול** occurs in 1QH and 1QS only twice, in 1QH XI 34 and in 1QS X 3, where it is used referring to a place which is **קדוש** and linked with **כבוד**, and from which "lights shine".

<sup>2</sup> Passages which also associate the nature of God with "light" are 1QH XXIII top 1,2 (**אורכה**) and

context of the word combination **קודשו זבול** suggests this too: the **קודשו** of God "echoes with the truth of His glory" (**ויהם זבול קודשו באמת (35) כבודו**).<sup>3</sup> "Truth" and "glory", both being attributes of God, are mentioned in that function many times in 1QH and 1QS,<sup>4</sup> and are understood here as phenomena filling the dwelling place of God.

But **זבול** in the HB is not only a holy and glorious place of the truth of God, which is full of light, where God dwells, but is identified with heaven, which might well be a notion adopted by the author of 1QH XI 34.<sup>5</sup> The phrase **יצבא השמים יתנו בקולם** (1QH XI 35), which

1QH XXIII top 3: "for to you [God] is light" ([ **כיא אתכה אור ל** ] (3)). These lines suggest that the dwelling of God might well be understood as a place of light.

<sup>3</sup> The form **ויהם** occurs in the HB only three times (Ex. 14:24; Judg. 4:15; 2.S. 22:15). In all these cases it derives from **המם** meaning "to break", "to consume", "to destroy". It seems to be unlikely that this is the root from which **ויהם** in 1QH XI 34 derives. More likely seems to be **נהם** meaning "to groan" and "to growl" as verb and "roar" as noun. The verb does not occur in the HB in connection with heaven or similar phenomena, in fact, it only occurs as an action of a lion (Isa. 5:29; Prov. 28:15), as a sound of the sea (Isa. 5:30), and as a sound of suffering people (Ez. 24:25; Prov. 5:11). The noun refers in the HB only to the "roar" of a lion (Koh. 19:12; 20:2; cf. also 4QShir). Neither root occurs elsewhere in 1QH or 1QS. Hence, there are no indications about the background of **ויהם** and its precise meaning in 1QH XI 34.

<sup>4</sup> See p. 3.

<sup>5</sup> In the HB, **זבל** is used only five times (1.K. 8:13; Isa. 63:15; Hab. 3:11; Ps. 49:15; 2.C. 6:2) in the sense of "dwelling" or "habitation". Three times (1.K. 8:13; Isa. 63:15; 2.C. 6:2) it refers to the dwelling of God. 1.K. 8 and 2.C. 6:2 deal with the dedication of the Temple to JHWH as an eternal dwelling place (**זבל**). This usage of **זבל** in the HB is most interesting regarding 1QH, for the Temple in Jerusalem is according to the teachings of the Qumran group no longer the place of God's dwelling, since it is impure. Yet, they use a word to refer to the dwelling of God which in the HB is used to refer to the Temple as God's dwelling. Hence, the authors of the scrolls transfer qualities of the Temple onto the place that they ascribed to God as His dwelling. We will see later that they also transfer qualities of the Temple on the Community which consequently results in a similar nature of the dwelling of God and the Community itself. This strongly suggests that it is the aim of the authors of the scrolls to emphasize that the Community qualifies as Divine dwelling, as we will see later in detail.

Isa. 63:15 indicates a similar situation. There, **זבל** is called as in 1QH XI 34 "holy" and "glorious", but in addition is located in, or even identified with, "heaven". This seems to be the place where the author of 1QS XI 34 understands God's dwelling to be, a holy and glorious place full of light. Such development of the understanding of the dwelling place of God in 1QH and 1QS is quite plausible. It again suggests a similar quality of God's dwelling and the Community itself, because, according to the teachings of the Community, only two places remain in the universe which are suitable for God's dwelling after the Jerusalem Temple became impure: heaven or the Community itself. We will see in this study on some occasions that the Community is described also as heavenly Community which shows that the authors of 1QS and 1QH intend to qualify the Community for God's presence.

Difficult in this context are two verses: a) 1.K. 8:13 where the dwelling place of JHWH, the Jerusalem Temple, is associated with "darkness" (**יהוה אמר לשכן בערפל**) (1.K. 8:12b); and b) Ex. 20:21 where **ערפל** is actually used to describe the place where God is and where Moses meets Him: **ומשה נגש אל־הערפל אשר־שם האלהים**. This means that the Qumranian idea of God's dwelling place as a place of heaven and light either constitutes a rejection of the HB's view of God's dwelling as "darkness" by the authors of 1QS and 1QH, or a different interpretation of the word **ערפל** in these scrolls. The LXX translates in both cases

follows directly the description of the dwelling place of God and which is part of this description, also points in this direction: the place where God dwells is linked (is filled) with the "host of heavens". According to 1QH XI 34, God's holy habitation is a heavenly place full of holiness and glory and His truth where there is light.<sup>6</sup>

The idea formulated in 1QH XI 34 indicates that as far as the composer of this text is concerned the Jerusalem Temple is no longer mentioned as God's dwelling place. The Temple is impure, and lacks the quality of a place where God can dwell. Likewise, the author of 1QH III 34, regards a *heavenly place* as constituting the dwelling place of God. It is there, *definitely*, where God is known to be present.

Another word that in the HB is used for "dwelling", "habitation", etc., but also for "gathering" (Ps. 1:1; 107:32) is **מושב**. It refers only once to the dwelling of God (Ps. 132:13) which is the Temple. This word is not used in 1QH, but occurs eight times in 1QS. In the latter scroll, **מושב** is used as technical term for the "gathering" of the many (**מושב הרבים איש**) (1QS VI 8,11; VII 10 (2x),11,13; VIII 26)) which occurs in key passages of the scroll. As above in case of **זבל** this usage of **מושב** indicates as well that it is the aim of the authors of 1QS to transfer qualities of the Jerusalem Temple as the dwelling of God onto the Community. They are dwelling in the Community, the Community is a dwelling, and hence also qualifies as the dwelling of God.

---

with  $\delta$  γνόφος. The Vulgate translates **ערפל** in Ex. 20:21 literally with "caligo" meaning "darkness", but also "fog"; in 1.K. 8:12 it translates with "nebula" meaning "fog" which means that the Vulgate seems to associate the dwelling place of God rather as a place where it is not possible to see Him, than as a place that is of darkness by nature. This interpretation still allows the idea of God and His actual dwelling place to be of a different nature than of darkness.

<sup>6</sup> The usage of the phrase **צבא השמים** in 1QH XI 34 also indicates that God's dwelling is identified with heaven. In the HB, this word combination is used to refer to "angels" of heaven (1.K. 22:19; 2.Chr. 18:18.).

Interesting is here especially 1QH XIV 13 according to which angels (**מלאכי פנים**) will join the ("eschatological") Community.

The same observation can be made by analysing the usage of the word **מקום** in the HB and 1QH/S. In the HB, **מקום** is a common word meaning "place" or "location", etc. It is also often used referring to the place that JHWH has chosen for Himself as place to dwell (Dtn. 12:5; Isa. 60:13; Jer. 17:12; Ez. 43:7; Ps. 24:3; Esr. 9:8). It is in a way a technical term for the dwelling place of JHWH. Especially significant at this point is Ez. 43:7. Here the **מקום** of JHWH is located in the heavenly temple, a notion which is significant in light of 1QH XI 34, because it constitutes a *Vorlage* for 1QH XI 34 that locates God's dwelling in heaven having the qualities of the Temple. But despite the links which seem to connect Ez. 43:7 and 1QH XI 34, **מקום** does not occur in 1QH. In 1QS, **מקום** is only used to refer to functions and ranks of members of the Community. As in case of **מושב**, the usage of **מקום** in 1QS suggests that the Community is understood as a dwelling that qualifies as dwelling of God, because it inherits the qualities of the dwelling of JHWH.

Although the usage of these words in 1QS and 1QH does not directly indicate whether God was understood as being present in the Community, it is significant for the understanding of the Divine presence with the Community for three reasons. First, it shows that the Jerusalem Temple does no longer qualify as God's dwelling, according to the teachings of the scrolls. Second, by transferring qualities of the Temple onto the Community, the authors of 1QH and 1QS qualify the Community as a place where God can dwell and offer the Community as dwelling place for God.<sup>7</sup> Finally, the authors of the scrolls mention heaven as the second place that qualifies as God's dwelling. Through the transformation of the qualities of God's dwelling, the Temple or heaven, onto the Community, they intend to demonstrate that the

<sup>7</sup> This does not mean, as we will see in detail below, that the authors of 1QS and 1QH understood the Community as a "substitute" for the Temple. It is their only aim to qualify the Community as His dwelling place, and not to found a new Temple.

Community has the same nature as the dwelling of God. This indicates strongly that it is the author's intention to show that the Community has the quality to accommodate God's presence and imagines itself to be close to God in His sphere.

## II. Experiencing God?

### 1. Revelations

Revelations are means by which God turns directly towards humans. Depending on how revelation is understood in 1QS/H, we might be able to establish how an important aspect of the relationship between the Community and God was understood. In what way does, according to the two scrolls, God approach the Community? Where are the differences between revelations as understood in the HB and 1QS/H? What do these revelations say about Divine presence in relation to the Community? Is God present in His revelations?

Generally we can say that the Law, the prophets, and the documents of the Qumran Community such as 1QS and 1QH themselves are seen as revelations of God through which God influences life in the Community, because the observance of God's will (see below) is one of the most important directives of the Community. But this does not indicate God's immediate presence. The Law, the prophets, and especially the regulations in 1QS have to be observed perfectly to *qualify* for His presence, not to make His presence occur. They, therefore, only account for a nearness of God that results from this relationship between God the demander and the Community the observer.

But there are - especially in the HB - particularly four Hebrew verbs denoting "to reveal" (גלה, נגד (Hif.), and ידע (Nif.)<sup>1</sup>, and יפע) that refer to God's revelation(s). An investigation of these verbs in 1QS and 1QH in comparison with the HB may shed more light on the question of Divine presence.

---

<sup>1</sup> See for ידע pp. 80-117.

## 1.1. יפע

Especially in 1QH, the verb **יפע** seems to be used to describe ways in which God can reveal Himself to the Community. **יפע** means "to shine", or in the Hif. "to let shine". This denotation, and the fact that this verb occurs nine times in 1QH,<sup>2</sup> but only once in 1QS,<sup>3</sup> indicates that it probably has a primarily poetic meaning. This affects its meaning as "revelation".

**יפע** does not seem to describe an actual physical revelation of God to the Community, but a manner in which God stands in relation to the individual psalmist who is praising Him. Revelation in this sense seems to be understood as a light-phenomenon that represents a nearness of God that the helpless individual experiences from the helping God.

This particular mode of revelation in its poetical context is expressed five times (in 1QH) through **יפע** and represents, therefore, the major sense of the word in that scroll.

Strikingly, only once, in 1QH XXIII top 6, God Himself is mentioned as the one who "shines" directly to the members of the Community:

"(...) [...] your wonderful [pro]nouncements to shine (**להופיע**) (7) to the eyes

of all those who listen (**לעיני כול שומעי**) [...] (...)"<sup>4</sup>

This line indeed seems to refer to a physical revelation of God. But the meaning of **יפע** elsewhere in the scroll and one particular occurrence of the verb in the HB (Dtn. 33:2) where God is said to "shine" to Israel through the Mosaic Law do not allow us to understand **יפע** in this line as a physical revelation.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> XII 6,23; XIII 32; XV 3,24; XVII 26,31; XIX 26; XXIII top 6.

<sup>3</sup> 1QS X 2.

<sup>4</sup> The preceding and following text of this passage is damaged.

<sup>5</sup> According to Dtn. 33:2, God "shines forth from Mount Paran" (**הופיע מהר פארן**) to Israel through the *Mosaic Law*:

ויאמר יהוה מסיני בא וזרח משעיר למו הופיע מהר פארן  
ואתה מרבבת קדש מימינו אשדת למו

The Verse is textually and theologically difficult and offers consequently room for various interpreta-

In the remaining four occurrences of **יפע** the main meaning of **יפע** occurs. Here it is never God Himself who is said to "shine" to humans, but certain phenomena closely linked with God. So, in 1QH XIX 26, it is God's *truth* that shines:<sup>6</sup>

"(...) and your [God's] truth will shine (27) for endless glory and peace eternal."

In 1QH XII 6 and 23 it is *light* through which God shines. This is the most prominent meaning of **יפע** regarding a revelation of God:

"[...] I have looked for you, and like perfect dawn you have let yourself shine to me (דופעתה לר) with per[fect] light (...)" (1QH XII 6)

"(22) (...) for (23) they do not esteem me, even though you exhibit your power on/through me and shine (ררופע) to me in your strength as perfect light. (...)" (1QH XII 23)

According to these lines **יפע** means, first, that God approaches only individuals, i.e. the psalmist, through **יפע**. Second, He does not do so *in persona*, but through or in the phenomenon of (perfect) light. **יפע** refers here to a nearness of God that occurs when a faithful individual knows that he stands in relation to his God. This relation is also indirect because it occurs through attributes of God.<sup>7</sup>

In XVII 31, for example, it is the psalmist's understanding of God's *judgement* that determines the approach:

"(...) [...] from my youth you let yourself shine (Hif.!) to me in the understanding<sup>8</sup> of your judgement,"

---

tions of its contents which is why this verse might well have been developed by the authors of 1QS/H according to their own ideas. The importance of the observation of the Law as revelation from God according to the scrolls makes it likely that this notion of **יפע** is referred to in 1QH XXIII top 6.

In contrast to the author of 1QH, the LXX avoids such an understanding of **יפע** and translates זרר with ἐπέφανεν ("to shine"), but ררופיע with κατέσπευσεν which means "to press", "to urge", or "to hasten on": καὶ εἶπεν κύριος ἐκ Σινα ἦκει καὶ ἐπέφανεν ἐκ Σηρ ἡμῖν καὶ κατέσπευσεν ἐξ ὄρους Φαραν .

<sup>6</sup> Barth suggests that it "is clearly God's salvation and truth that constitute the 'light'" (C. Barth, *art. יפע* [TDOT VI, 1990] 222) in this line. "Salvation" seems to be an interpretation of the line.

<sup>7</sup> This is the reason why in 1QH XII 6 a translation as to "come", "appear", or "be present" as Barth suggests (*ibid.* 222) does not seem to be appropriate.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. on "understanding" pp. 64-79.

This **יפע** describes God as present not through physical appearance, but near to the individual person who praises God. Hence, **יפע** constitutes a personal nearness of God for the individual member of the Community, but not an immediate presence of God at the same location as the member.<sup>9</sup>

This sense of **יפע** is confirmed by two occurrences of **יפע** (XIII 32; XV 3) where evil men who threaten the psalmist, "shine" to him, hence stand in relation to him in a threatening manner. When God "shines" to the psalmist, this threat is nihilated: hence **יפע** refers to an act of God through which He helps the individual. **יפע** refers to that nearness of God which occurs through the belief that God helps. So strong is this belief that it not only results in the experience of God's nearness, but also in the psalmist "shining" himself, according to XV 24 and XVII 26:

"(...) And I let shine myself (**והופעתִי**) in sevenfold li[ght,] in the li[ght that] you prepared for your glory." (XV

24)

"For... [...] and through your glory, my light shines, for darkness you make light (27) shine for [me... (...)]." (XVII

26)

The glory of God allows the psalmist to "shine" too: a member of the Community now has a quality that God has too. God's being with the individual through **יפע** changes the nature of the individual, inasmuch as he is closer to God; and the Community is filled with individual members of like quality. God, therefore, prepares the Community for His presence by giving its members the privilege of "shining".

<sup>9</sup> Translating **יפע** with "appearing" or "becoming visible", therefore implying a physical presence of God through **יפע**, as Martinez/Tigheelaar, *DSS I*, do throughout their translation of IQH, also seems to be misleading. **יפע** cannot be disconnected from the phenomenon of light which is an attribute of God. **יפע** means in IQH "to shine", and refers to this attribute of God that stands in relation to individuals.

This understanding of **יפע** represents a major break with the tradition found in the HB. **יפע** occurs in the HB eight times.<sup>10</sup> Here God is always the subject of **יפע**, humans never.<sup>11</sup> The first change is that according to IQH it is no longer God directly who shines, but divine attributes. The second change is that according to XV 24 and XVII 26 members of the Community have the divine quality of "shining" which, according to the HB only God can have. This shows again that it is the aim of the authors of IQH to bring God and the Community closer together. The action of God becomes an action of divine attributes, hence approachable for the Community, and the members themselves gain a divine quality, hence come closer to God in nature. God Himself seems to be understood as the one in distance; He does not "shine" and He is not mentioned by His name. But the new "divine" nature of the members of the Community, the light and glory in the Community, and the direct approach of divine attributes towards the Community, give them a status that is very near to God and qualifies them to accommodate the Divine Presence.<sup>12</sup>

## 1.2. גלה

### 1.2.1. IQS

Like **יפע**, **גלה** in IQS is not used to refer to a revelation of God to the Community *in persona*.<sup>13</sup> In fact, the verb refers rather to directives for life in the Community in relation to God and, hence, life according to His will. According to IQS, revelation (**גלה**) is limited to guide lines for life in the Community that God gives the Community through the revelation. But

<sup>10</sup> Dtn. 33:2; Ps. 50:2; 80:2b; 94:1; Job 3:4; 10:3,22; 37:15.

<sup>11</sup> In Job 10:3 this is expressed negatively: nothing can shine that is not linked with God. Hence, in the Sheol light is like darkness (Job 10:22).

<sup>12</sup> Hence, one can state that the central point of **יפע** is according to the scrolls the "experience of God's presence" (C. Barth, *art. יפע* [TDOT VI, 1990] 222), but only in the above sense, and certainly not in a "physical" or direct sense.

<sup>13</sup> **גלה** occurs in IQS eight times: I 9; V 9,12; VIII 1,15,16; IX 13,19.

through the revelation of these guide lines the Community receives also a special *insight about the nature of God*.

These directives are the Law (V 9; VIII 1,15) and the Prophets (VIII 16) and a special insight that only the Community can have (I 9;<sup>14</sup> V 12; IX 13,19). The relation between the revelation of the Law and the prophets and the additional insight of the Community is difficult to determine. The special insight revealed to the Community is on the one hand an addition to the Law and the Prophets, and, on the other hand, it seems to include them also (in light of some occurrences of גלה).<sup>15</sup> This means that the revelation of the Law and the prophets to the Community is somewhat different from the revelation of these things to Israel as a whole. God gives the Community better understanding of the Law, and the Community possesses greater insight than its fellow religionists. גלה, according to IQS refers rather to *a gift of understanding* than to revelation as such.<sup>16</sup>

This "more" that the Community receives through revelation can be seen in instances where גלה is linked with distinctive Qumranian ideas. Such "revelation" closely relates to the idea of mysteries, as can be seen in V 12 and on other occasions in IQH, for example in IQH I 21 ("He [God] opened my ears to wondrous mysteries" (גליתיה אוזני לרזי פלא)).<sup>17</sup> In VIII

<sup>14</sup> According to Leaney, this line "is part of the doctrine of the sect that important interpretations of the Scriptures are revealed at certain divinely appointed times" (A.R.C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning. Introduction, Translation and Commentary* [London: SCM Press LTD, 1966] 120).

<sup>15</sup> Schiffman suggests that "the Dead Sea Sect assimilated extra-biblical teachings through the concept of the *nigleh* ('revealed') and *nistar* ('hidden'). That which was revealed (*nigleh*) was the simple meaning of Scripture and the commandments that were readily apparent from it. These were known to all Jews. Only the sect possessed hidden knowledge (*nistar*), discovered through what the sectarians regarded as inspired biblical exegesis, regularly conducted by members of the sect." (L.H. Schiffman, *Jewish Law at Qumran*, in: A.J. Avery-peck/ J. Neusner/ B.D. Chilton, *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 1: Theory of Israel* [Handbook of Oriental Studies vl.56; Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 2001] 81; cf. also L.H. Schiffman, *The Halakah at Qumran* [Leiden: Brill, 1975] 22f.) Disagreeing with Schiffman on this issue is P.R. Davies, *The Torah at Qumran*, in: A.J. Avery-peck/ J. Neusner/ B.D. Chilton, *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 2: World View, Comparing Judaisms* [Handbook of Oriental Studies vl.57; Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 2001] 30.

<sup>16</sup> For the idea of "understanding" as gift of God see pp. 66ff.

<sup>17</sup> Zobel notes that here the Community regards foremost their own understanding as revelation and de-

16, all that the prophets revealed was achieved through the "holy spirit". And finally, "revelations" of this sort seem to be dependent on a certain time period which gives גלֵה an "eschatological" sense (I 9; VIII 15, IX 13).<sup>18</sup> There is only one occurrence of גלֵה where the authors of IQS describe in detail the affects of the "revelations" on the lives of the members in the Community. It refers to all that has been revealed from the Law "to implement truth, justice, judgement, compassionate love, and unassuming behaviour of one to another" (VIII 1f.). This means that the revelations of special insight to the Community of the Law, the prophets, and beyond are tools for a perfect life in the Community according to the will of God (cf. also VIII 15).

But, because the revelations in this sense include the Law and the Prophets, גלֵה is not simply limited to the giving of directives for life in the Community; it produces also through special understanding of the Law and the Prophets a better understanding of God Himself. Only in this sense does גלֵה refer to a "revelation" of God.

Thus "revelation" as expressed by the verb גלֵה in IQS establishes a close relationship between God and the Community because a) revelation is granted exclusively to the Community, b) it gives the Community special insight that includes all that is said in the Law and the Prophets about God, and c) it gives the Community the tools (directives) to live a perfect life in the Community according to the will of God. This perfect life in the Community might then *prepare* the Community for a Divine presence as we shall see below.

---

finis גלֵה as "the disclosure of particular secrets mediated to the apocalypticist in nocturnal vision" (H.-J. Zobel, *art. גלֵה* [IDOT II, 1975] 487).

<sup>18</sup> Cf. on "eschatology" pp. XXXIVf., 72f.

## 1.2.2. 1QH

The usage of גלה in 1QH confirms what was said about the meaning of the word in 1QS.

גלה does not refer to a revelation of God to the Community *in persona*, but to God who grants members of the Community the ability to comprehend aspects of the special relationship between the Community and Himself.<sup>19</sup> This is a special Qumranian insight that the rest of Israel does not have. Thus, גלה is used in 1QH most often in the sense of "to show" or "to make to understand". The objects of this "understanding" are not primarily understanding of the Law or the Prophets, but certain aspects that are mentioned in both scrolls as determining the relationship between God and the Community. For example, God made the psalmist understand by "opening (גלה) his eyes" (VI 16), "opening his ears" (IX 21; XIV 4), and by "opening his heart" (XX 34) to understand certain things.

First among these are attributes of God. It is said in VI 16 that "your [God's] justice is revealed to the eyes of all your creatures". According to XIII 12, God is asked to hide the psalmist from the "sons of Adam" (XIII 11) "un]til the moment of (12) revealing your [God's] salvation to me [psalmist]". And finally God is said to have "revealed [yo]ur [wonders]" to the psalmist. These statements are reminiscent of similar material in 1QS.

A second group of items that God reveals to the Community are not *directly* linked with God. They are "the paths of [truth] and the deeds of evil" (V 3), "wondrous mysteries" (IX 21), and "the instruc]tion of those who rebuke with justice" (XIV 4).

Given all this, we conclude that גלה in 1QH indicates God's gift to the members of the Community of special insight affording them the ability to understand more clearly the relationship between themselves and God. גלה establishes, therefore, a close relationship between

<sup>19</sup> גלה occurs in 1QH eleven times: IV 2; V 3; VI 16; IX 21; XIII 12; XIV 4; XIX 17; XX 34; XXIII top 4. IV 2 and XXIII top are damaged to an extent that makes comments about the meaning of גלה impossible.

God and the Community.<sup>20</sup>

### 1.3. נגד

The verb נגד used in the HB to mean "to reveal" is used neither in IQS nor in IQH. It is, therefore, unlikely that the authors of these scrolls connected an idea of a revelation, possibly even *in persona*, or an immediate presence of God in the Community with this verb. But it is used three times in IQM (X 1; XI 5,8). In XI 5, נגד is used in a manner similar to גלה in IQS. God reveals, i.e. gives understanding, to the people of Qumran through the Torah. In XI 8, certain "times of the wars" are revealed, i.e. told by a mediator. But interesting is X 1, where somebody "reveals" to the members that God will be/is in their midst. But since the context of this occurrence are "the times of war" one has to treat this occurrence with caution because religious people in battle tend to claim that their God is "with them", which refers to a very specific aspect of the helping God, but not really to an idea of God's immediate presence, and might well go beyond statements on this subject which occur in different contexts. In any case it does primarily not refer to Divine presence in the Community.

<sup>20</sup> גלה occurs only once in IQM (X 11), in the phrase מגולֵי ארזן. As in IQH, it refers to God giving humans the ability to understand some special insight.

## 2. Seeing God

God's revelations, as seen in the preceding chapter, are means by which God approaches humans. They change the nature of the individual members of the Community and qualify the Yahad for the Divine presence. As such they prepare the Community for His immediate presence in its midst. But, we must now look at the other side of this relationship between God and the Community. Once we have established that God approaches the Community directly through revelations, we will now have to analyse whether or not IQS/H mention means by which members of the Community approach God directly. An idea that has also been adopted from the HB and which might describe such an action of the Community is the idea of "seeing" God (נבט, צפה, דרש). But does this in IQS/H refer to a direct human approach to God?

### 2.1. נבט

A verb that may refer to members of the Community experiencing God or attributes of God by "seeing" them is נבט, used in IQH XVIII 20 with the glory of God as object:

(...) (20) [ ובהביטי בכבודכה אספרה (21) נפלאותיכה (...)

Throughout IQH and IQS נבט seems to indicate a special ability for understanding aspects of the relationship between God and the Community. נבט, according to IQH and IQS, describes a special insight that only the Community has.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> נבט in the HB is often used in a completely secular sense, meaning the human action of "seeing". The objects vary, but are always earthly things or people (cf. 2.K. 3:14; Isa. 22:8; 51:1; Hab. 1:13; etc.), or religious objects such as the serpent of bronze in Num. 21:6 or the "holy temple" in Jon. 2:5. Occasionally, God is the subject of נבט. In these cases, God is described as looking at the earth from heaven (cf. Ps. 102:20), or as looking on the heart of somebody, whereas humans only look on the outward appearance (cf. 1.S. 16:7).

Twice in the HB, נבט seems to refer to a human action with God as object: Ex. 3:6 and Ps. 34:6. But, in Ex. 3:6, נבט is used negatively. In this verse we are told that Moses hid his face, "for he was afraid to look at

This meaning of **נבט** can be seen in 1QH, where **נבט** occurs (apart from 1QH XVIII 20) five times (IV 27; XII 11; XVIII 3; XIX 17; XXI top 4)<sup>2</sup>. In XII 11, **נבט** is used in contrast to knowledge of the members of the Community and refers to the ungodly "seeing their mistakes". In IV 27, the meaning of **נבט** is uncertain, because the text is damaged. The object of **נבט** might be a "covenant of man" (**ברית אדם**) (?). XXI top 4 adds an interesting notion to the meaning of **נבט** that is significant especially for the next part of this study. According to this line, it is God who gives the members of the Community the ability to "see":

[...איכ]ה אביט בלוא גליתה עיני

Here, according to 1QH, **נבט** means "to understand" those aspects that are significant for the relationship between the poet and God. It refers to special insight that God gave the members of the Community; but it does not refer to a "physical" experience of God. This usage of **נבט** further confirms that for these scrolls it is not the nature of God *per se*, but the relationship between God and the Community that is paramount as most of the analyses in this study will show.

In 1QS, **נבט** is used in the same manner. It occurs in this scroll five times (III 3,7; XI 3,6,19). In each case, **נבט** refers to a special understanding of aspects of the relationship between God and the Community, based on special insight. In none of these cases does it refer to a "physical" experience of God. In contrast to 1QH, the usages of **נבט** in 1QS are more specific as to the objects of sight: these are listed in XI 6 as wisdom, knowledge, insight, justice, and glory:

---

God". In Ps. 34:6, **נבט** is in a highly poetical text part of an enumeration of blessings, praising, magnifying, and exaltations. Hence, **נבט** in this case means rather "to turn towards God", than literally "to see" Him.

<sup>2</sup> X 3 and XI 17 are badly damaged; a comment on the precise usage of **נבט** is not possible.

(6) הביטה עיני תושיה אשר נסתרה מאנש דעה ומזמת ערמה מבני אדם מקור צדקה ומקוה

(7) גבורה עם מעין כבוד מסוד בשר

In other passages, we find as objects of **נבט** (III 3) "paths of light"<sup>3</sup>; (III 7) "light of life"; (XI 3) "His [God's] wonders"; and (XI 19) the "depth of your [God's] mysteries".<sup>4</sup>

We conclude that **נבט** does not refer to a "physical" experience of God. A presence of God *in persona* in the Community in this sense is, hence, unlikely to be in the minds of the authors of the scrolls. "Seeing" means to understand certain aspects of the relationship between God and the Community. This is significant, and we keep referring to it. The question of the Divine presence according to the scrolls, is a question of the relationship between God and the Community, i.e. the nature of the Community in relation to God. Hence, in this study we will have to focus on those statements and words that describe this relationship, since it is they that carry the information about Divine presence.

## 2.2. צפה

Another verb that may refer to an experience of God by "watching" is **צפה**. This verb occurs only twice in 1QS and 1QH. 1QH XX 21 reads:

(21) כתוכחתכה ולטובכה יצפו כי בחסדכה [...]

(21) like your reproach and for your [God's] goodness they watch, for in your kin[dness...]<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> According to Ringgren **נבט** has here the character "eines sicheren Erwarten" (H. Ringgren, *art. נבט* [ThWAT V, 1986] 140).

<sup>4</sup> Ringgren suggestion that **נבט** refers in 1QS XI 19 to an "existentielles Ausschauen des Gläubigen auf Gottes Werke" (H. Ringgren, *art. נבט* [ThWAT V, 1986] 140) which does not picture the meaning of the word precisely. Here too it refers to a special understanding of the relationship between God and the Community, based on special insight.

<sup>5</sup> The end of this and the preceding line is damaged.

**צפה** is found also in 1QS IX 25:

[וב] כול אמרי פיהו ירצה ולוא יתאוה בכול אשר לוא צוהו] למשפט אל יצפה תמיד

"[and] all the words of His mouth he will relish and he will wish for nothing that He has not commanded

[and] the precepts of God he will watch permanently."

In both cases, the objects of **צפה** are attributes of God. In 1QH XX 21, it is God's goodness.

Here, **צפה** means "to expect" or "to look out for". In 1QS IX 25, it is the judgement of God.

**צפה** in the latter line is used in the sense of "keeping in mind" or "remembering" the judgement of God.<sup>6</sup> Hence, in both cases, **צפה** does not refer to a physical experience of God.

**צפה** occurs in the HB only about two dozen times, and its spectrum of denotations is limited. It is often used in the sense of the simple human action of "watching",<sup>7</sup> but also as meaning "to sentinel".<sup>8</sup> Twice **צפה** means "to keep watching" in the sense of "to take care" (Prov. 15:3; Ps. 66:7). In these two cases, God is the subject.

But significant for the meaning of **צפה** in the scrolls is the fact that the HB often used **צפה** in a prophetic context,<sup>9</sup> and occasionally in an "eschatological" sense.<sup>10</sup> This might throw light on the two occurrences of the verb here, since 1QH XX 21 especially seems to refer to a future time (cf. **ובקץ כבודכה יגילו**).

<sup>6</sup> Steins renders "beständig achthaben auf Gottes Rechtsentscheide" (G. Steins, *art. צפה* [ThWAT VI, 1989] 1092) which does not reflect the meaning of **צפה** precisely because it does not have the notion of the promise to learn permanently what the "precepts of God" are.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. 1.S. 14:16; 2.K. 9:17,20; Jer. 48:19.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Jer. 6:17; Ez. 3:17; 33:2,6,7.

<sup>9</sup> As in some of those cases where **צפה** denotes "sentinel", this can be found in Ez. 3:17 and 33:7, where the author talks about the "sentinel for the house of Israel". Mi. 7:4 mentions also the "sentinels" in a prophetic context. According to Isa. 21:6, JHWH says to the author of the text: "go, post an outlook, let him announce what he sees". The context of this verse is prophetic, so the verb **צפה** receives the meaning of a prophetic expectation.

<sup>10</sup> Apart from this, **צפה** occurs only twice in the HB with God as object, in Mi. 7:7 and in Isa. 52:8. In both cases, the word has an "eschatological" notion and does not refer to a physical experience (cf. also Hab. 2:1).

## 2.3. דרש

Another verb that may refer to a "physical" experience of God, because it means "to search for", "to seek", "to ask", or to "look for",<sup>11</sup> is דרש. Humans "looking for" God might seek to experience Him. This verb is especially interesting, because it is used differently in 1QH and 1QS.

In 1QH, דרש is used as meaning "looking for" with God as object in 1QH XII 6:

"I have looked for you. (...)"

אדורשכה

But this occurrence of דרש does not refer to the desire for a "physical" experience of God, as the use of it might suggest: the sense of the word both in the HB and throughout 1QH and 1QS suggests something rather different.

In the HB, the root דרש has the basic denotation is "to search" or "to look for". But in a cultic context it gains the meaning of "to ask for advice" or "to ask for help". The subject asks either a sanctuary, a prophet (asking for an oracle), a god in general, the Law,<sup>12</sup> or means to "consult the will of God".<sup>13</sup> Hence, given this background, דרש in 1QH XII 6 refers more likely to the desire for "advice from God" than a desire to experience Him directly.

1QH XII 6 is the only line in 1QH where דרש has God as object. It occurs 10 times in 1QH,<sup>14</sup> and is used in two different ways. Most often the subject of the verb is not the psalmist "looking for" God, but an ungodly or evil man is described as "looking for" "smoothness"

<sup>11</sup> Cf. S. Wagner, *art.* דרש [TDOT III, 1978] 294.

<sup>12</sup> Ps. 119:45, 94,155; Esr. 7:10; 1.Chr.28:8.

<sup>13</sup> Dtn. 4:29; Isa. 9:12; 31:1; 55:6; 58:2; Jer. 10:21; 29:13; Hos. 10:12; Am. 5:4,6; Zeph. 1:6; Ps. 14:2; 34:5; 77:3.

<sup>14</sup> IV 6 is damaged.

(חלקה), "deception" (רמיה), or God (X 15,32,34; XII 14,15,16). In those cases where God is the object of the search, the whole action is not a positive one: the ungodly men are described as looking for God "with a double heart" (בִּלְבָב וּלְבָב (XII 14)), or they are looking for Him amongst the idols (XII 15), or in the mouth of the "prophets of deception" (נְבִיאֵי כֹזֵב (XII 16)). So in these cases the psalmist uses the term דָּרַשׁ explicitly *not for a chosen person looking for his God*, but in respect of destructive action of ungodly people. In two lines (XII 24; XIII 9) the verb דָּרַשׁ is used as in XII 6. In XII 24 the subjects are those who let themselves be looked for by the psalmist to be included in the covenant of God. In XIII 9, the covenant is described as something which exists for those who are looking for it. God Himself is not, therefore, the object of searching in these lines.

Neither נִבַּט and צִפָּה in 1QH and 1QS, nor דָּרַשׁ in 1QH refer in any sense to a "physical" experience of God. "Seeing" or "watching" or "looking for" is not an action that indicates or leads to a personal experience of God. Nor do words referring to a revelation of God, as we have seen above, indicate such a personal experience.

The usage of דָּרַשׁ in 1QS, however, might shed more light on the matter because it indicates what Divine presence is really about in Qumran. The meaning of נִבַּט in 1QS and 1QH has already pointed at the notion where Divine presence becomes relevant. דָּרַשׁ in 1QS confirms this strongly: Divine presence is about life in the Community in relation to God. Although it is God who gives the Community the tools and quality to engage in Divine presence, from the human point of view, represented in 1QS and 1QH, life in the Community itself is the way to Divine presence. דָּרַשׁ in 1QS indicates where, in what context, and in

combination of which theological ideas this Divine presence becomes significant within the relationship between God and the Community.<sup>15</sup>

The usage of *שׂרשׂ* in IQS is very interesting, because it represents an entirely Qumranian meaning that differs also from IQH and from the meanings of *נבט* or *צפה* in IQH and IQS. In the latter cases, looking or seeking for God means to relate to attributes of God. In the case of *שׂרשׂ* in IQS, looking or seeking for God is primarily concerned with the *self-understanding* of the Community in relation to God.<sup>16</sup> Once in IQS, *שׂרשׂ* is used with God as its direct object. In one of the most significant lines elaborating the self-understanding of the Community (IQS I 1), a line that will be the focus of attention in this study several times, "looking for/seeking God" (*לדרוש אל*) is mentioned as a major duty, possibly even the purpose of life in the Community:<sup>17</sup>

(1) ל[משכיל... שים לחיו [ספר ס] רך היחד לדרוש (2) אל

Taking into account the meaning of *שׂרשׂ* in the HB and in IQH, and acknowledging that *שׂרשׂ* never refers in IQS to a desire to experience God directly either, IQS I 1 sets the tone for what follows. "Looking for/seeking God" refers to the purpose of the Community, and involves living in the Community in relation to God.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Wagner sees this significance of *שׂרשׂ* only in the legal context. *שׂרשׂ* is used "to express strict legal piety, its investigation and exposition of the law, and the relationship manifested thereby both to God and also to the covenant and the true community" (S. Wagner, *art. שׂרשׂ* [TDOT III, 1978] 307).

<sup>16</sup> On the noun *מדרשׂ* see S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* [Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah XXI; Leiden/ New York/ Köln: Brill, 1997] 76f.

<sup>17</sup> According to Martinez/Tigheelaar's edition of the text it might be the purpose of the Maskil's life in the Community. But this means that it reflects at the same time the purpose of life of every other member of the Community.

<sup>18</sup> "The Rule of Community (...) accomplishes its purpose when it motivates a man to seek God" (S. Wagner, *art. שׂרשׂ* [ThDOT III] 306).

I will translate *שׂרשׂ* with "to look for/seek", because it reflects best what *שׂרשׂ* is about: "looking for" emphasises the incompleteness of the status of the Community and the fact that they have actively to change; "seeking" emphasises that this active change is a forward movement (towards God) that gives the purpose of the

The remaining nine occurrences of **דרש** (V 9,11,20; VI 6,7,14,17; VIII 12,24) confirm this idea, because they show what "looking for God", hence living in the Community, is about. Remarkably, those aspects of life in the Community that are mentioned in IQS in connection with **דרש** are all notions found in the Shema'. By using **דרש**, IQS expounds the Shema'.

According to V 9, the "sons of Zadok", the priests of the Community, "look for" or "seek" the will of God. Acting according to the will of God is one of the most fundamental aims of the Community:

"in compliance with all that has been revealed of it to the sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant and  
look for/seek<sup>19</sup> His will<sup>20</sup>."

V 11 is talking about men who are not members of the Community. Hence, they have not "looked for" or "sought" God's decrees (**בחוקיהו**), they do not know the hidden matters. Knowledge, as further analyses will show, is a decisive element in the relationship between God and the Community:<sup>21</sup>

"(...) For they are not included in His covenant for they have neither looked for (**דרש**) nor have they  
sought/looked for (**דרש**)<sup>22</sup> His decrees to know the hidden matters in which they err."

In V 20, the spirits in the Community are mentioned as object of **דרש**. They have to be looked for/sought by the novices in the Community to become full members, to get closer to God:

---

Community its direction.

<sup>19</sup> Martinez/Tigchelaar, *DSSI*, 71 emphasise with their translation ("to interpret") a legal aspect of life in the Community. They imply that the observance of the will of God, hence a *passive reaction*, is the major issue of life in the Community. But the usage of **דרש** and numerous other aspects which I will describe in the course of this study show that it is the *active movement towards God*, hence *getting closer to God*, that defines the nature and purpose of the Community. **דרש**, therefore must mean "to look for" or "to seek" the will of God, not to interpret it.

<sup>20</sup> On **רצון** in IQS V 9 see p.44.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. on "knowledge" pp. 80-117.

<sup>22</sup> Martinez/Tigchelaar, *DSSI*, 81 emphasise again through their translation ("to examine") a static and reactive stance of the members of the Community, instead of an active motion towards God (cf. also V 20).

"(...) And when someone enters the covenant to act in compliance with all these decrees, enrolling in the assembly of holiness, they shall look for/seek (דרש) (21) their spirits in the Community (...)." <sup>23</sup>

According to VI 6, it is the duty of the Ten to look for/seek the Law. The observance of the Law is another very significant aspect of life in the Community, which also constitutes the purpose of the Community.<sup>24</sup>

"(...) And in the place in which the ten assemble there should not be missing a man to look for/seek (דרש) the Law day and night, (7) always/permanently, concerning the right conduct amongst them. (...)"

The following line, VI 7, orders the Many to read the book, to look for/seek the rules (משפט), and to bless. All these actions are major aspects of life in the Community in relation to God and reflect its purpose:

"(...) And the Many shall be on watch together/ in (the) community for a third of each night of the year to read the book and to look for/seek (דרש)<sup>25</sup> the rules (8) and to bless together/ in (the) community."

In VI 14 and 17, דרש is used in a slightly different manner. According to VI 14, דרש has again understanding (שכל) as object. But it is an important member of the Community that looks for (דרש) the understanding and the deeds of the new member. Here, דרש is understood not only as an action towards God, but also appears within the Community as an activity of those more senior in their dealing with the new members. This suggests that certain aspects of the relationship between God and the Community can be transferred in some way

<sup>23</sup> Wagner suggests that דרש in this line is a "technical term" for the examination of "the unstable, the deviant, and those ready for admission" "administered by specially ordained officers" (S. Wagner, *art.* דרש [ThDOT III] 307).

<sup>24</sup> Against J. Maier, *Qumran-Essener I*, 182<sub>464</sub> who suggests that דרש in this line refers rather to a "Torahkundigen zur Anleitung und Entscheidung in laufenden Vorgängen" (ibid.) than to a general purpose of the Community. In the latter case, דרש refers to a duty of all members to all times.

<sup>25</sup> On this occasion Martinez/Tigchelaar, *DSS I*, 83 translate with "to explain", again failing to see that דרש refers here to an action of the members of the Community towards God: by seeking the rules, i.e. finding them, understanding them (the latter in the Qumranian sense, cf. pp. 65, 69ff.), and teaching them, they come closer to God who has given them the rules and the ability to understand them.

onto the relationship between different members of the Community. The Community receives, therefore, a special quality and status:

"(13) (...) And all who freely volunteer from Israel (14) to enrol in the council of the Community, the man who has been appointed as the head of the Many, will look for/seek his understanding and his deeds. (...)"

Similar notions of **שֶׁרַר** occur in VI 17, where the Community council looks for/seeks the spirit and deeds of a new member during his first year:

"(16) (...) And he will not touch the purity (17) of the Many until they will look for/seek his spirit and his deeds until he has completed a full year. (...)"

VIII 12 is a line in which the usage of **שֶׁרַר** is special, but confirms its meaning elaborated above. In this line, it refers to a *title of an officer* of the Community: the "man looking for/seeking" (**אִישׁ הַדֹּרֵרֶשׁ**):

"(11) (...) And every matter hidden from Israel but which has been found out by the man (12) looking for/seeking<sup>26</sup>, he should not hide (it?) from them from fear of a spirit of desertion."

This means that **שֶׁרַר**, being explicitly the function or even a post of a man in the Community, is a major activity of members of the Community. Hence, it is likely that it defines the purpose of the Community and refers to a significant aspect of life in the Community that can only be fulfilled in relation to God.<sup>27</sup>

This analysis of words or phrases that describe members of the Community as "seeing" God have shown a) that Divine presence is not primarily determined through personal experience, and b) that Divine presence is a matter of God preparing the Community for His presence and

<sup>26</sup> Martinez/Tigheelaar, *DSSI*, 89 indicate through their translation ("Interpreter") that a post is referred to, but emphasise the wrong notion of **שֶׁרַר** (see above).

<sup>27</sup> In VIII 24, **שֶׁרַר** is used to refer to the action of passing a rule/law. The usage of **שֶׁרַר** here indicates that actions in the Community in general are tied in with the forward movement towards God. Passing a law, however, is definitely part of this movement, because it shows that the Community "uses" God's revelation to lead its own live according to God's will by passing laws and rules that are based on God's Law.

a matter of life in the Community preparing the very same for His presence. In other words, the relationship between the Community and God is not as much about experiencing Him, but about a change of the Community's nature that allows it to be near to God, or even to accommodate His presence. The emphasis in IQS/H does not lie on the description of members of the Community experiencing God directly, but on the attempt to demonstrate *why* and *how* the Community has a special status in relation to God that allows them also to bear His presence.

### III. God gives the Community a Special Status

In this part of this study, I will focus on aspects of the relationship between God and the Qumran Community which describe God as the one who takes actions in order to change the Community's nature, or, respectively, to give the Community the ability to change its nature in relation to God by itself so that it can prepare for His presence. This already is a significant characteristic of the aspects that I will discuss in detail in this part of the study: the actions that God undertakes not only change fundamental aspects of the Community's *nature* in relation to Himself, but at the same time, are understood to give the Community the *ability* to improve its status in relation to God. This is why they are the *principles* of the relationship between the Community and God as 1QS/H picture it: they make this special relationship between the Yahad and God possible in the first place, but also give the Community a certain ability - the certain freedom of action - which they need to develop this relationship. This reflects the motivation and drive that seems to stand behind 1QS/H which is to demonstrate to the world and the Community itself that it has a special relationship with God that qualifies it for Divine presence. It also shows the determination of the Community to engage *actively* in such a special relationship by taking the initiative away from God and transferring it onto the Community. רצון, שכל, the idea of knowledge, and טוב, as understood in 1QS/H, make the Community's (self-)identity possible. And they determine why the idea of Divine presence is the basis of this (self-)identity.

## 1. רצון

The first aspect of this relationship between God and the Community by which God turns towards the Community is the idea of רצון. Not only is this idea a central idea in 1QS/H, it is also closely related to the presence of God. It is an essential aspect of God's nature which defines to a great extent the relationship between God and the people of Qumran. רצון is the first feature of God's nature that will be analysed in this study that shows God as one who changes the quality of the Community through His gifts.

In the HB, as well as in 1QS and 1QH, it is difficult to determine precisely what רצון means. One of the reasons for this is that רצון can stand for various notions such as "will", "pleasure", "that which is pleasuring/pleasing", "favour", and "desire". These notions can be linked with either God or humans, describing רצון as either an attribute of God or of humans. An analysis of רצון in the HB, 1QS, 1QH, and 1QM will determine its precise meaning and significance in these texts. And it will demonstrate how and why רצון is so important for the relationship between the Community and God and the question of Divine presence.

### 1.1. HB

In the HB, the word רצון occurs sixty five times.<sup>1</sup> It is used in three different senses: 1. as "pleasure" or "favour", 2. as "that which is of pleasure" or "which is pleasing", 3. as "will" or "desire". In most of these senses, רצון occurs as an attribute of God as well as an attribute of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. G. Lisowsky, *Konkordanz*, 1354f.

persons.<sup>2</sup> As regards the presence of God, the former usage of רִצּוֹן, i.e. its connection with God, is the more significant. And this seems to be dominant in the HB, and certainly (as will be shown below) in the scrolls. In the HB, רִצּוֹן occurs very often in connection with JHWH, or even grammatically in combination with יהוה.<sup>3</sup> רִצּוֹן, in this sense, is an attribute of JHWH and seems to bear this connotation even when it is used in a secular sense.

Used in connection with JHWH, רִצּוֹן describes not only an aspect of the nature of God, but also the relationship between JHWH and Israel. The usage and meaning of רִצּוֹן, in the HB, is based on three foundations: 1. רִצּוֹן is first of all an attribute of God, it is divine; 2. humans can receive this רִצּוֹן from God; 3. this reception is based on a twofold motion: (a) humans need to undertake certain actions towards God, to do the "will" of God which (b) will then cause God to give them רִצּוֹן.

רִצּוֹן, therefore, not only describes the relationship between JHWH and Israel, but defines it.

### 1.1.1. רִצּוֹן as an Attribute of God.

In the HB, רִצּוֹן "finds greatest usage in theological language: to indicate divine pleasure"<sup>4</sup>.

Dtn. 33:16 mentions "the favour of the one who dwells in the bush" (וּרְצוֹן שְׁכֵנִי סִנְהוּ). In

Isa. 49:8, JHWH's "time of favour" is mentioned linking רִצּוֹן with JHWH.<sup>5</sup> Isa. 58:5

<sup>2</sup> Occurrences not referring to God are: Lev. 1:3; 19:5; 22:19,29 (cf. Lev. 1:3); 23:11; Isa. 60:10 (difficult verse; according to W. Gesenius, *Handwörterbuch*, 772, רִצּוֹן refers here to a man); Ps. 145:19; Prov. 10:35; 11:27; 14:35; 16:13,15; 19:12; Esth. 1:8; 9:5; Neh. 9:24,37 (cf. Sirach 8:14); 2.Chr. 15:15.

<sup>3</sup> It is significant to note that, in the HB, the idea of רִצּוֹן is mainly linked with the Tetragram, not with אל, אלהים, עליון, or אדוני. רִצּוֹן is an attribute of יהוה. The authors of IQH and IQS use רִצּוֹן as attribute of God, but do not link it with the Tetragram.

<sup>4</sup> G. Gerleman, *art. רִצּוֹן* [TLOT III, 1997] 1260.

<sup>5</sup> "Thus says JHWH, in a time of favour (בְּעֵת רִצּוֹן) I have answered you (...)".

mentions a "day of favour of JHWH" (וּיּוֹם רַצוֹן יְהוָה).<sup>6</sup> In Isa. 60:10, רַצוֹן is again an attribute of JHWH.<sup>7</sup> In Isa. 61:2, רַצוֹן is as in Isa. 58:5 used in the context of a period of time that JHWH determines. Here the "year of favour for God" is proclaimed.<sup>8</sup> According to Ps. 30:8, God has established the righteous psalmist "as a strong mountain" by His, i.e. God's, "favour" (בְּרַצוֹנְךָ). And in Ps. 51:20, it is the psalmist who asks God to "do good to Zion in your pleasure (בְּרַצוֹנְךָ), rebuild the walls of Jerusalem."

Especially in the Psalms (Ps. 40:9; 103:21; 143:10), but also in Ezra (Ezr. 10:11), רַצוֹן occurs in the sense of "will". In these cases, the "will" (רַצוֹן) is always the "will of God".<sup>9</sup> The psalmist is delighted to do the "will of God".<sup>10</sup> A number of verses where רַצוֹן is understood as an attribute of JHWH occur in Proverbs (Prov. 11:1,20; 12:22; 15:8). Here, רַצוֹן always carries a personal suffix referring directly to יְהוָה. Being righteous redounds to JHWH's "pleasure" (רַצוֹן). Finally, רַצוֹן is used in the context of offerings undertaken by people which lead to the רַצוֹן of God (Ex. 28:38; Isa. 56:7; 60:7; or negatively in Jer. 6:20).<sup>11</sup>

<sup>6</sup> רַצוֹן is not only, as will be discussed below, the result of actions towards God, but also the condition of those actions, bringing those who do the will of God (i.e. here those who fast at a time that JHWH determines) closer to God.

<sup>7</sup> "(...) for in my wrath I [JHWH (?)] struck you [Zion] down, but in my favour I have had mercy on you." (Isa. 60:10)

<sup>8</sup> "to proclaim the year of JHWH's favour, and the day of vengeance of our God; (...)"  
לְקַרְאֵי שְׁנַת־רַצוֹן לַיהוָה וַיּוֹם נָקָם לְאֱלֹהֵינוּ  
Cf. also Isa. 49:8.

<sup>9</sup> As far as I can see there is only one exception, Ps. 145:19 (cf. also Sir. 11:27; 32:12), where רַצוֹן is used referring to the will of humans.

<sup>10</sup> "I delight to do your will, my God; your Law is within my heart." (Ps. 40:9)

"Bless JHWH, all His hosts; His ministers who do all His will." (Ps. 103:21)

"Teach me (לְמַדְנִי) to do (לַעֲשׂוֹת) your will (רַצוֹנְךָ), for you are my God (אֱלֹהֵי); let your good spirit lead me on a level path." (Ps. 143:10)

"Now make confession to JHWH, the God of your ancestors, and do his will; (...)" (Ezr. 10:11)

<sup>11</sup> רַצוֹן in this context also relates to the one who offers (Lev. 1:3; 19:5; 22:19,29 (cf. Lev. 1:3); 23:11).

For further details see below.

### 1.1.2. רצון from God

In the HB, God also gives רצון to certain people. רצון is something that righteous people can receive from God. A few verses show this clearly. Four times רצון occurs in connection with blessings (Dtn. 33:16,23; Ps. 5:13; 103:21). In three of these cases, God gives רצון to somebody through His blessing. The HB uses in all these cases the verb ברך. In Dtn. 33:16, God is said to be the one to give רצון to the land by blessing. In Ps. 5:13, He gives רצון to the righteous,<sup>12</sup> and in Dtn. 33:23 the reader is told that Naphtali "is sated with what is pleasing/favour".<sup>13</sup> The fact that it is God who gives רצון becomes indirectly evident also in Ps. 143:10: "Teach me (למדני)<sup>14</sup> to do (לעשות) your will (רצונך), for you are my God (אלוהי); let your good spirit lead me on a level path." It is God who is teaching the righteous to do His רצון.

### 1.1.3. The Reciprocal Notion

This notion of the usage and meaning of רצון in the HB is probably the most significant for our purposes. Inasmuch as רצון is understood as an attribute of God, as a divine phenomenon, it is also something that God can give to humans. רצון represents a reciprocal notion of divine action and human response. Often God does not give רצון to people without expecting something in return: in general, that means that God expects humans to do His "will" (רצון), to live according to His "will". This notion is expressed literally four times through

<sup>12</sup> כִּי־אַתָּה תְּבָרֵךְ צְדִיק יִהְיֶה כַּצְנָה רִצּוֹן תַּעֲטֵרֵנוּ (Ps. 5:13)

<sup>13</sup> "O Naphtali, sated (שבע) with what is pleasing/favour (...)"

<sup>14</sup> למד is used often in connection with God (cf. W. Gesenius, *Handwörterbuch*, 387).

the word רצון: Ps. 40:9<sup>15</sup>; 103:21<sup>16</sup>; 143:10<sup>17</sup>; and Esr. 10:11<sup>18</sup>. In all these verses, a human being acts according to the will of God.

Where רצון occurs in this sense, the texts often also indicate what sort of human action is required to do the will of God to receive רצון from God. Interestingly, the HB mentions deeds in this context which are all highly significant features of the teachings of 1QH and 1QS. In fact they are all significant, as will be shown below, for the understanding of the Divine presence.

The first deed which comes to mind in connection with doing the will of God in the HB is obedience of the Law. Three times out of the four where רצון occurs referring to the "will of God" in the HB, observance of the Law is understood as a means by which righteous people do the רצון of God. And although obtaining רצון from God is not directly the motivation for the observance of the Law, it is mentioned as a possible result of it. Very clearly this is expressed in Ps. 40:9: לעשות רצונך אלהי חפצתי ותורתך בתוך מעי. Those doing the will of God have His Law (תורתך) in their hearts. The context of Ps. 103:20-21 indicates the same: the angels are "obedient to His spoken word" (בְּקוֹל דְּבָרֹו)<sup>19</sup> and do the will of God. Also in Esr. 10:11, doing the will of God refers to Laws of God, in this case marriage laws.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>15</sup> Translation above.

<sup>16</sup> See for details on Ps. 103:21 below.

<sup>17</sup> Translation above.

<sup>18</sup> Translation above.

<sup>19</sup> Above reading follows BHS. Different readings mentioned in *apparatus* do not influence the point discussed above.

<sup>20</sup> רצון as "desire" misleading the righteous and leading them into temptation to break the Law occurs in Esth. 1:8.

Another means by which people can turn towards God in connection with רצון are blessings.

Ps. 103:21 suggests strongly that blessing JHWH is doing JHWH's will (רצון).<sup>21</sup> Similar are prayers and praises, basic actions through which Israel turns towards its God. Sometimes, in the HB, these are also linked with רצון. They represent the most common actions towards God which lead either to God's רצון, or to the רצון of those who are praising God. The first group of such verses occurs in texts of the HB which are praises or prayers themselves. רצון is often used in prayers, praises, and Psalms uttered to God, especially in the book of Psalms (Ps. 19:5; 30:5f.; 40:9; 69:14; 103:21; 106:4; 143:10), and in Isaiah (Isa. 49:8). In a few verses of Proverbs which are praises uttered to God, those deeds of the righteous are praised which lead to the רצון of God (Prov. 11:1,20; 12:22; 15:8).

Secondly, רצון is often used in the context of offerings to God.<sup>22</sup> There are two different ways in which רצון is used in this context. Either it is the רצון of the one who offers, in which case the person can have רצון because his offering pleases God; or it is the רצון of God who receives the offerings and is pleased about them.

To the former group belong occurrences of רצון like Lev. 1:3:

"If the offering is a burnt-offering from the herd, you shall offer a male without blemish;

you shall bring it to the entrance of the tent of meeting,

to his pleasure/ favour before JHWH (לרצנו לפני יהוה)."

<sup>21</sup> "Bless (ברך) JHWH, all his hosts; His ministers who do all his will." (Ps. 103:21)

<sup>22</sup> Gerleman even calls it a "technical term" in the "priestly cultic theology" (*G. Gerleman, art. רצה* [TLOT III, 1997] 1261).

Regarding 1QS and 1QH it is striking here that the offerings which in the HB are mentioned in connection with רצון, are those which are not accepted in the Qumran Community (burnt-offering, first-fruit-offerings, etc.); yet the authors of the scroll adopted and developed the idea of the רצון in connection with offerings (see for details especially pp. 46-51).

Here, רִצּוֹן occurs in the context of a burnt-offering. Whoever celebrates these offerings according to the Law of JHWH will have רִצּוֹן. The place where the offering takes place is the "entrance of the tent of meeting" and this is where those offerings can have רִצּוֹן "before JHWH".<sup>23</sup>

Also in this context belongs Lev. 19:5:

"When you offer a sacrifice of well-being to JHWH,  
to your pleasure (לְרִצְוֹנְכֶם) you will sacrifice it."

"Well-being offerings" to JHWH lead to רִצּוֹן. רִצּוֹן becomes an attribute of a person that pleased God with his offerings. רִצּוֹן is a sign of God that He accepted the offering.<sup>24</sup> Hence, this occurrence of רִצּוֹן shows that רִצּוֹן of humans can depend on an action towards God, a life according to His will. The sacrifice and its acceptance by God gives those who offer רִצּוֹן, which elsewhere the HB understands as a divine attribute.<sup>25</sup>

The remaining occurrences are Lev. 22:19,29; and 23:11 where those have רִצּוֹן who celebrate "burnt-offerings" (Lev. 22:19), "thanksgiving-offerings" (Lev. 22:29), or "first fruit-offerings" Lev. 23:11.

On four occasions רִצּוֹן refers to the "pleasure" which God has on receiving an offering. In this context Ex. 28:38 is significant:

"(...) it [rosette of pure gold] shall always be on his [Aaron's] forehead,  
in order that there be favour/pleasure for them before JHWH."

<sup>23</sup> For details on רִצּוֹן pp. 192-215.

<sup>24</sup> This interpretation of רִצּוֹן in this verse is more likely, because of the other occurrences of רִצּוֹן in the context of offerings, than the one the NRSV favours. NRSV translates: "When you offer a sacrifice of well-being to the LORD, offer it in such a way *that it is acceptable in your behalf*" which means that רִצּוֹן is understood in the sense of offering when and as one pleases.

<sup>25</sup> This verse also becomes significant with respect to the usage of רִצּוֹן in IQS (especially IX 4,5) where the celebration of offerings results in the Community being closer to God. See for details below, pp.48-51.

(38b) לרצון להם לפני יהוה

Here, רצון involves the vestments for the priesthood: when Aaron offers on behalf of the whole nation, he must wear a "rosette of pure gold",<sup>26</sup> so that there will be "favour/pleasure" for the whole nation "before God". This latter statement is very significant: offerings and the obedience of the laws for the priesthood not only lead to Israel's pleasing God, but permit the Israelites to be "before JHWH". Sacrifice in the Tent of Meeting (cf. Temple) and in accordance with the Law leads to a life *in favour/ pleasure before God*. רצון in the HB might, therefore, have communicated this notion to the authors of 1QH and 1QS: doing the will of God, i.e. observing the Law, praising God, blessing Him, etc. will lead to רצון. And this רצון stands not only for a satisfied life in a community, but for a life in close relation to God. That the authors of the scrolls might have emphasised this occurrence of רצון is quite likely, considering their method of dealing with HB-material: as I have stated above already, one senses that the authors of 1QH and 1QS often use ideas of the HB which occur only occasionally, and develop them according to their own teachings.<sup>27</sup>

According to Isa. 56:7 offerings are also to the pleasure of God. In this verse, רצון is used in the context of the Temple (בבית תפילתי; הר קדשי), and in the Temple it is used in connection with offerings and sacrifices (עולתיהם וזבחייהם; מזבחי).

"these I will bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer;

their burnt-offerings and their sacrifices are to my pleasure on my altar;

(7b) עולתיהם וזבחייהם לרצון על-מזבחי

for my house shall be called a house of prayer for all peoples."

<sup>26</sup> It is also interesting to note that it is the priest Aaron who is celebrating the offerings. This might be reflected in the DSS by the idea that the members are a Community of priests living before God.

<sup>27</sup> See also in "Introduction".

Similar is the usage of רִצּוֹן in Isa. 60:7, but a textual difficulty makes the determination of the precise meaning of the word difficult:

"All the flocks of Kedar shall be gathered to you, the rams of Nebaioth shall minister to you, they shall ascend from/to the pleasure of my altar, and the house of my honour I shall glorify."

יעלו (7b) על־רצון מזבחי ובית תפארתִי אפאר<sup>28</sup>

Following the reading above, רִצּוֹן occurs in a construct combination with מִזְבְּחֵי meaning the "pleasure" of God's altar. Hence, רִצּוֹן would be an attribute of the altar of God, and only indirectly be connected with God. The context, of course, are offerings and sacrifices for God.<sup>29</sup>

Put negatively, רִצּוֹן occurs in a similar sense in Jer. 6:20, according to which some sacrifices are not pleasing God:

"Of what use to me is frankincense that comes from Sheba, or sweet cane from a distant land?

Your burnt-offerings are not to my pleasure, nor are your sacrifices pleasing me."

עלותיכם לא לרצון וזבחיכם לא־ערבו לי (20b)

## 1.2. IQS

The usage of רִצּוֹן in IQS represents one of the most striking cases in which the authors of a scroll adopt an idea which they find in the HB and develop it according to their own teachings. The result is a very Qumran specific usage and meaning of רִצּוֹן, which sheds light

<sup>28</sup> As *lector difficilior* this reading has to be preferred. But IQIs<sup>a</sup>, Mss, LXX, Syriac, and Targum secun- dum read על־רצון מזבחי יעלו (they shall ascend "for pleasure from my altar"). In this case the רִצּוֹן would refer to something that results in divine pleasure when offerings ascend from the altar of God. Although רִצּוֹן does not have a suffix referring to God, and it is grammatically not an attribute of God, one can assume because of the context that the רִצּוֹן of God is meant.

The question, however, why רִצּוֹן does not have a 1.sg. suffix (רִצּוֹנִי ("my pleasure")), referring to God, as one would expect here must remain unanswered.

<sup>29</sup> One observation which might be worth mentioning is that the word רִצּוֹן occurs here in the context of the description of Zion's future glory.

upon the new understanding of the relationship between God and the Community and consequently on Divine presence. We should recall that רצון in the HB occurs in three different ways: as an attribute of God, as something that people receive from God, and as a reciprocal notion of divine action and human response. These represent also the basis of the meaning of רצון in 1QS.

In 1QS, רצון occurs 12 times,<sup>30</sup> only in the senses "will" and "pleasure". The wide range of usages of the word in the HB has been narrowed down in 1QS considerably. רצון is used mainly as the רצון of God (V 1,9,10; VIII 6,10; IX 13,15,23,24; XI 17,18). Only where it means "pleasure" it is used also as an attribute of man. Generally, רצון determines the relationship between God and the Community and also the rest of Israel. It is used to demonstrate that the Community has a unique and close relationship with God. רצון is "Community-centred".

### 1.2.1. The Reciprocal Notion in 1QS

In 1QS, רצון is understood as a reciprocal notion, but it is defined differently than in the HB. As an attribute of God, רצון in 1QS is used in two senses: "will of God" and "God's pleasure". But these two meanings are, according to this scroll, related differently than in the HB. רצון as "will of God" is what dictates life in the Community. Its members are obliged to live according to this "will of God". This means to observe the Law, the prophets, and the entire catalogue of Community rules perfectly. רצון in the sense of "God's pleasure", on the other hand, is what the Community can provoke by observing the "will of God". They do so by

<sup>30</sup> K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 208; cf. also J.H. Charlesworth, *Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1991] 93,491 and elsewhere.

living a perfect life in the Community. רצון as a phenomenon that defines the relationship between God and the Community depends, therefore, according to IQS, on both God as the one who enables the Community to do His will, and on the Community as the observers. This means that one of the major changes of the meaning of רצון in IQS is that it has been entirely *legalized*. This has consequences for the relationship between God and the Community, hence the question of the Divine presence.<sup>31</sup>

רצון as an attribute of man has also been changed. It is in this sense still understood within the reciprocal notion, as shown above, but is now entirely *Community-centred* in two senses. First, רצון is initially only an attribute of members of the Community. As such it refers to a special relationship between only the Community and God. Second, since the idea of רצון has been legalized; to provoke God's and/or the Community's רצון depends, according to IQS, far more on actions of the Community itself than on God's own actions. God gives the tools that enable the Community to provoke רצון, but the Community has to live according to His will to reach רצון. Consequently the observance of the Law, the prophets, and Community rules become very important in the Community, because it is they through which the Community can improve its relationship with God.

<sup>31</sup> Amongst those occurrences of רצון in the HB which represent this facet of its meaning, only three might have served as *Vorlage* for this "legal" usage of רצון in IQS, namely Ps. 40:9; 103:21; and Esr. 10:11 where רצון occurs as the "will of God". But even the meaning of רצון represented in these verses has been changed in IQS. The trustful relationship between the individual Israelite and his God which these verses are describing by using רצון has been replaced according to IQS by the observance of the laws and the conviction that the Community has a special relationship with God. A consequence of this change is that the whole HB notion of God giving רצון to people through blessings no longer occurs in IQS.

Gerleman correctly states that רצון as "will of God" becomes dominant in the scrolls as a development of a few usages in the HB (G.Gerleman, *art. רצון* [TLOT III, 1997] 1260). This is a consequence of the "legalization" of the idea of רצון. Yet the idea of רצון in IQS cannot be understood without its meaning of "pleasure of God/Community", because only by carrying both senses can רצון determine the relationship between God and the Community in the IQS sense.

These changes can be observed especially in IQS V:

V 1

"This is the rule for the men of the Community who freely volunteer to convert from all evil  
and to be steadfast in all he commanded to his pleasure (...)."

ולחזיק בכול אשר צוה לרצונו

רצון is used here in a central line of the scroll which introduces a new section of the rules of the Community. The line identifies first those to whom the following rules apply: "the men of the Community who freely volunteer", then tells the purposes of the rule. The first purpose is "to convert from all evil", the second "to keep themselves steadfast in all he commanded to his רצון".

The second purpose, ולחזיק בכול אשר צוה לרצונו, includes רצון with a suffix referring to God and the prefixed ל. "To be steadfast in all He commanded" redounds to the רצון of God. But what exactly does לחזיק בכול אשר צוה require from the men of the Community?

חזק means in IQS either to "be strong", to "be steadfast" within the Community in all that the Community, theologically etc., requires; or to "make strong" members of the Community so that they can be perfect members with all its implications.<sup>32</sup> In V1, חזק occurs in the

<sup>32</sup> חזק is used in the DSS in two different ways. First, חזק refers to the strength it takes to turn away from evil (III 1), to the strength that is required to live a life in the Community according to rules (V1), and to the faithfulness of members of the Community to the covenant (V 3; cf. also IQH II 25). Secondly, חזק is used as a transitive verb in the sense of strengthening members of the Community so that they can be strong within the Community with all its implications. חזק is used meaning "to keep hold" (IX 14) or "to strengthen somebody" (X 26) referring to actions within the Community. In IQH, it is also used when God strengthens people (cf. IQH II 7). In IQM, חזק is mainly used in the sense of "to strengthen" (trans.) men participating in the war (cf. IQM X 5,6; XV 7; XVI 13).

former meaning. The Community has to be strong "in all that He commanded" (בכול אשר צוה).

Although צוה refers in the HB mainly to the Torah, in 1QS it refers to the Torah, the Prophets, and the rules of the Community. צוה includes every Law, rule, or statute of the HB along with the texts of the Community, all of which are considered to be what God commanded.<sup>33</sup> Consequently, what בכול אשר צוה להחזיק refers to is the fulfilment of the will of God by observing the Law, prophets, and Community rules.<sup>34</sup>

Therefore, only fulfilling the will of God by living a perfect life in the Community leads to God's רצון.<sup>35</sup> And consequently, since רצון describes the relationship between God and the Community, it is not only God Himself who defines this relationship, but the Community through its own behaviour. The perfect life in the Community receives a dominant function, because it is this life that intensifies this relationship.

<sup>33</sup> In the HB, צוה (Pi.) is used seven times in the phrase כול אשר צוה (Ex. 35:10; 38:22; Num. 15:23; Jos. 22:2; 2.S. 21:14; 2.K. 18:12; Jer. 26:8). Four times the phrase is referring to the Mosaic Law (Ex. 38:22; Num. 15:23; Jos. 22:2; 2.K. 18:12), twice to commands of God in general (Ex. 35:10; Jer. 26:8), and only once it refers to the commands of a king (2.S. 21:14).

Although צוה refers in 1QS in three instances explicitly to the Torah (V 8; VIII 15) or the Torah and the Prophets (I 3), it includes in this scroll clearly also the rules of the Community (I 17; III 10; V 22; VIII 21; IX 15,24,25). צוה, therefore, becomes a verb that is very much concerned with the daily life in the Community as a religious life following every command of God. This interpretation of צוה is strengthened through its usage in combination with חוקיו in V 22. "All that God commanded" is called here חוקיו, "His decrees", a term which, in the HB, often refers to basic statutes concerning daily matters (such as legal cases (Ex. 18:16), statutes for life in the promised land (Dtn. 4:5,8,14; 11:32), etc.).

<sup>34</sup> The difference between God's רצון and the Law, the prophets, the Community rules, hence God's revelations, is that the latter are the means by which God communicates the former to the Community. God's will became manifest in His revelation. But, because God's רצון is the penultimate power of God, it stands at the same time above everything. This means that as revelation to the Community it is open to obedience or disobedience, but as God's ultimate power it is imperative.

<sup>35</sup> The examinations of בכול אשר צוה להחזיק and the fact that רצונו carries the prefix ל show that it describes the aim and purpose of חזק, and has, therefore, to be translated with "his pleasure" and not "his will" (against Martinez/Tigchelaar, *DSS I*, 79), although רצון is used in the sense of "will" elsewhere in 1QS (cf. IX 5,13,15,23,24; XI 17,18).

## V 9.10

"(8) (...) He shall swear with a binding oath to revert to the Law of Moses, according to all that He commanded, with whole (9) heart and with whole soul to all that has been revealed of it to the sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant and seek/search for his will (לְבַנֵי צְדוֹק הַכֹּהֲנִים שׁוֹמְרֵי הַבְּרִית וְדוֹרְשֵׁי רְצוֹנוֹ) and to the multitude of the men of their covenant (10) who freely volunteer together for his truth and to walk in his will/pleasure (בְּרְצוֹנוֹ). (...)."

Both occurrences of רְצוֹן in this passage refer to the special relationship between God and the Community that רְצוֹן defines. In both cases, the relationship described by רְצוֹן clearly depends on the Law. But רְצוֹן refers to different aspects of this legalized relationship.

In the first instance, line 9, רְצוֹן means the *ultimate directing power of God*. Novices in the Community have to subscribe to this power which is described in two different ways. According to this line it is clearly the Law ("Law of Moses, according to all that He commanded"), but also everything else that reaches the Community by revelation ("all that has been revealed of it to the sons of Zadok" (לְכֹל הַנְּגַלָּה מִמֶּנָּה לְבַנֵי צְדוֹק))<sup>36</sup>. The above analysis of גְּלוּת has shown that this revelation includes Law, prophets, and documents of the Community, but also means a special insight that only the Community receives from God which allows the Community to understand their relationship with God better. This is the special insight that the "Sons of Zadok, the priests" have. And they are the ones who "interpret" God's will (רְצוֹנוֹ). This means that רְצוֹן in this line determines, as the ultimate power of God, the relationship between Community and God in two ways. First, God leads the

<sup>36</sup> Translation against Martinez/Tigheelaar, *DSS I*, 81, who translate the particle לְ which introduces the phrase with "in compliance with" and, therefore, fail to indicate that this phrase as well depends on וְיִקָּם and, consequently, has the same quality as תּוֹרַת מוֹשֶׁה. Men of the Community have to swear to the Law of Moses and to all that has been revealed.

Community according to His will through His revelations. Second, through the revelation of His will God enables the Community to act and live according to His will. Both ways lead to a special relationship between the Community and God that brings them closer together.<sup>37</sup>

In the second instance, line 10, רצון is again used as an attribute of God, but it can mean here either "His will" or "His pleasure".<sup>38</sup> In any case, this occurrence of רצון shows that God's רצון influences the whole life of the members of the Community. Their perfect life in the Community<sup>39</sup> stands always in close relationship with God through His רצון in two different ways. First, God's רצון is the ultimate directive of life in the Community. Second, through living according to "God's will", the Community can provoke "God's pleasure". This reciprocal relationship shows again that the authors of IQS claim that the Community has an exceptionally close relationship with God.

### 1.2.2. Israel can Participate in רצון through the Community

Especially in columns VIII and IX, we learn that actions of the Community on behalf of Israel (האריץ) lead to רצון of three groups of people: God, the Community, and Israel. In all these three cases, רצון depends on actions of the Community: if they live a perfect life

<sup>37</sup> This close relationship is also indicated through the use of ררש in line 9. As seen above, "consulting the will of God" can mean consulting the Law, as it often does in the HB, but it also means turning to God directly. In the HB, ways of approaching God are described in many places, but they do not claim to "interpret" this will of God: consulting the will of God is a human action which represents human helplessness. The situation according to IQS V 8f. seems to be different. The Community, at least the priests, claim to know this will, a knowledge that according to the HB humans cannot claim to have, it seems. Hence, IQS reflects an attempt to legislate for a very special relationship with God. The ability to interpret the "will of God" brings the Community much closer to God than the rest of Israel.

<sup>38</sup> Grammatically both translations are possible. And although Martinez/Tigchelaar, *DSS I*, 81 and J. Maier, *Qumran-Essener I*, 179 decide to translate with "His will", רצון carries here clearly both meanings, since it can only determine the relationship between God and the Community referring to both "His will" and "His pleasure".

<sup>39</sup> Cf. on דולך in IQS V 10 p. 229.

according to the "will of God", it redounds to God's, their own, and Israel's רצון. The rest of Israel can participate in רצון as the element determining the relationship between God and human beings only through the Community. This means that the Community is understood to function *on behalf* of Israel serving as a "bridge" between Israel and God. The most striking idea in IQS in this respect is that life in the Community is understood as a permanent offering to God on behalf of the rest of Israel that leads to רצון of all, hence improves the relationship between God and the world, but especially between God and the Community.<sup>40</sup>

This can be seen in the following lines:

#### VIII 4ff.

"(4) (...) When these things exist in Israel (5) the Community council shall be founded on truth, [ ] to be an everlasting plantation, a holy house for Israel (לְיִשְׂרָאֵל) and the foundation of the holy of (6) holies for Aaron, true witness for the judgement and by the chosen ones of pleasure (וּבְיָחִירֵי רִצּוֹן) to atone on behalf of (בְּעַד) the land (הָאָרֶץ) and to render (7) the wicked their retribution. (...)."

Here רצון is a fundamental aspect of the nature of the Community. It represents one of the aims of life in the Community in relation to God. This aim is to provoke "pleasure" of God, the Community, and Israel.<sup>41</sup> In VIII 6, "pleasure" is used as a major attribute of the members of the Community (וּבְיָחִירֵי) achieved through a perfect life in the Community according to God's will. This status of having רצון enables the Community to atone on behalf (בְּעַד)

<sup>40</sup> It is, therefore, not very likely that sacrifices were performed in the Community as some scholars argue (for example D. Bowman, *Did the Qumran Sect Burn the Red Heifer?* [RQ1, 1958/9] 73-84; F.M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995] 65; R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* [The Schweich Lectures 1959; London: Oxford University Press, 1973] 14)

<sup>41</sup> Agreeing with J. Maier, *Qumran-Essener I*, 187 ("wahrhafte Zeugen für das Gericht und Erwählte (des Wohlgefallens)", but against Martinez/ Tigchelaar, *DSS I*, 89 who suggest "will". The translation of רצון in this instance must be "pleasure", because it is not mentioned as an attribute of God; it is used similarly in IQS VIII 10; IX 4,5 (see below) where it represents a crucial meaning referring to the "pleasure" of God, *and* the Community, *and* Israel, hence cannot mean "will". Its link with sacrifices in these instances suggests this translation too.

of Israel (הארץ).<sup>42</sup> This link between atonement for Israel and רצון is a major aspect of the meaning of the word in IQS: actions of the Community lead to רצון of God and Israel (see below). "Atoning for Israel", "being a true witness of the judgement", and to "render the wicked their retribution" are major aims of the Community which show that it is understood a) to have a special relationship with God, and b) to function as a "bridge" between Israel and God.<sup>43</sup>

VIII 10<sup>44</sup>

"(...) And they shall be "to pleasure" to atone on behalf of the earth

והיו לרצון לכפר בעד הארץ

and to decide the judgement of the wickedness and there will be no more iniquity. (...)"<sup>45</sup>

VIII 10 offers the same meaning of רצון as VIII 6, and emphasises the idea that atoning on behalf of Israel leads to "pleasure" of both the Community and Israel,<sup>46</sup> which in turn leads to the רצון of God. Being a "bridge" between God and Israel, here by atoning for and judging the wickedness, is again understood as a major aim of the Community.

<sup>42</sup> הארץ, carrying an article, refers here to *Israel*, rather than "the world" (cf. A.R.C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning. Introduction, translation and commentary* [London: SCM Press LTD, 1966] 217). The Community's function as "bridge" between God and Israel as a major purpose of the Community suggests this too.

<sup>43</sup> Apart from בעד, the statement that the Community is "a holy house for Israel (ל ישראל)" suggests this function as "bridge" as well.

<sup>44</sup> According to Martinez/Tigchelaar the text of this line is difficult (some parts of the text are erased). רצון occurs in this line in a passage which has been written above the line secondarily. Hence, it is either the context in which רצון occurs, or the usage of רצון itself, which the authors of the scroll are not certain about. The meaning of רצון here is either undergoing some kind of development; or it has become a matter for debate at the time the text was copied; it occurs also 4QS<sup>d</sup>, but not in 4Q259=4QS<sup>e</sup>.

The following analysis is based on Martinez/ Tigchelaar's transcript.

<sup>45</sup> Martinez/Tigchelaar translate: "(...) And these will be accepted in order to atone for the land and to decide the judgement of the wickedness {in perfect behaviour} and there will be no iniquity. (...)."

J. Maier has: "Und sie werden zum Wohlgefallen, zu sühnen für das Land und um (des) Frevels Urteil zu fällen, und es gibt kein Unrecht mehr."

<sup>46</sup> This is indicated here clearly by the double use of the particle ל (והיו לרצון לכפר).

IX 4,5

"(3) [ ] when these exist in Israel in accordance with all these rules

to found<sup>47</sup> the spirit of holiness for truth (4) eternal,

to atone for the guilt of iniquity and for the apostasy of sin, and for the pleasure<sup>48</sup> for the earth

(לכפר על אשמת פשע ומעל הטאת ולרצון לארץ),

without the flesh of burnt offerings and without the fats of sacrifice -

the offering of (5) the lips in compliance with the decree will be like the pleasant aroma of justice,

and the perfect path (will be) like a freewill offering of pleasure<sup>49</sup> (...)"

(4) (...) ותרומת (5) שפתים למשפט כניחוה צדק ותמים דרך כנרבת מנחת רצון

Here, רצון occurs twice and means "pleasure" as in column VIII. These occurrences of the word emphasise on *Israel's* pleasure. IQS claims that Israel's pleasure depends entirely on the Community. This passage mentions three aspects that establish this link:

1. Israel can only have רצון if the Community observes its rules, hence fulfils the will of God (1.3).
2. Only when, as in column VIII, the Community atones for "the guilt of iniquity and for the apostasy of sin", i.e. for Israel's betrayal of God and His will,<sup>50</sup> Israel can have "pleasure" (1.4).

<sup>47</sup> Strikingly, although יסד, in the HB, is used in the sense of "to found" buildings (Ezr. 3:12; 2.Chr. 24:27) or cities (Isa. 54:11), it is mainly used in the sense of "founding" the earth (Isa. 48:13,16; Zech. 12:1; Ps. 24:2; 78:69; 89:12; 102:26; 104:5; Prov. 3:19; Job 38:4) or heaven (Am. 9:6) (cf. W. Gesenius, *Handwörterbuch*, 304). Taking this HB-meaning of the word into account, it is most likely that the authors of IQS IX 3ff. intended to indicate that the foundation mentioned in 1.3 is important and universal too.

<sup>48</sup> "For approval" (Martinez/Tigchelaar, *DSSI*, 91) is misleading because it does not establish the link between life in the Community and the sacrifices.

<sup>49</sup> Again against Martinez/Tigchelaar, *DSSI*, 91, who translates רצון here "to be acceptable", missing the connection of רצון with sacrifices and introducing a rendering which does not occur in the HB and so far not in IQS either.

<sup>50</sup> The other condition is that the Community exists "for the establishment of the spirit of holiness" (1.4).

3. The aspect that IX 4,5 adds to the meaning of רצון is that Israel can only gain רצון, when the Community replaces the biblical offerings.

As in the HB (cf. Lev. 1:3; 19:5; 22:19,29; 23:11), רצון serves here as *terminus technicus* for the consequence of sacrifices to God. God and the one who offers have רצון after the offerings. But in IX 4,5, the authors of 1QS interpret this HB-usage of רצון by changing in particular four aspects: a) Offerings can only result in רצון if they are offerings of the lips and not the biblical burnt offerings. b) Offerings of the lips are regarded to be undertaken *only* by the Community. c) As in VIII 6,10, the Community undertakes these offerings *on behalf of Israel*. This means that not only God and the offerer, but a *third person* benefits from the offers and obtains רצון. The Community functions here as the "bridge" between God and Israel. d) Especially the second occurrence of רצון (1.5) demonstrates that according to 1QS, not only specific offerings lead to the רצון of Israel, the Community and God, but *life in the Community as such*. Ex. 28:38; Isa. 56:7; and 60:7 appear in a completely different light. Life in the Community is generally understood according to this line and others as a permanent offering effecting רצון.<sup>51</sup>

<sup>51</sup> This idea occurs throughout 1QS.

Schiffman, describing Qumran as an "Community without Temple", also sees that in these passages (1QS VIII 5-6,8-10 and IX 3-5) life in the Community is meant. But then he continues by stating the following: "In these passages and others the sacrifices appear only figuratively." (L.H. Schiffman, *Community without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple*, in: B.Ego/ A. Lange/ P. Pilhofer (ed.), *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* [Tübingen: Mohr, 1999] 273). On another occasion Schiffman suggests that the Temple sacrifices have been replaced in the Community through prayer before the Temple itself has even been destroyed (L.H. Schiffman, *Jewish Law at Qumran*, in: A.J. Avery-peck/ J. Neusner/ B.D. Chilton, *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 1: Theory of Israel* [Handbook of Oriental Studies vl.56; Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 2001] 86f.). Schiffman in both cases notices that the Temple sacrifices have been replaced by something in the Community. But he does not mention that it is life in the Community itself which is understood as permanent sacrifice in these passages. The Community is the only sacrifice that leads to רצון of the Community, God, and Israel.

Two aspects mentioned in this passage point to the significance of the offerings of the lips for life in the Community: (1) The passage defines the aim and purpose of the Community in relation to God *and* Israel. (2) The offers are concerned with the question of purity in the Community in two ways: they no more involve blood being shed; and they are concerned about the obedience to the Law.<sup>52</sup> And clearly the comparison of the "free will offering" with the דרך תמים דרך confirms this idea: דרך תמים refers to, even defines, life in the Community.

Especially the meaning of תמים in 1QS/H indicates that life in the Community was understood as permanent sacrifice to God and has a special nature: the purity of the offering. This special nature allows the members of the Community to be near to God. תמים is used as another means of defining the Community as the only place where Divine presence is possible (cf. the *Excursus* on תמים below).

Consequently, the understanding of רצון in these lines sheds a new light upon the relationship between God and humankind. רצון is still the element that determines this relationship, but according to these lines it depends to a great deal on the behaviour and the nature of the Community. Only if life in the Community qualifies as a permanent sacrifice to God, God, the Community itself, and Israel can engage in the relationship that רצון stands for. Within this relationship described by רצון the Community has a special nature and, hence, status in relation to God that allows them to accommodate God's presence. But this definition of the relationship with God includes something else. 1QS also claims that Israel can only reclaim its

<sup>52</sup> The latter is expressed by "like the pleasant aroma of justice".

See for details and more literature on "purity" J. Maier, *Purity at Qumran: Cultic and Domestic*, in: A.J. Avery-peck/ J. Neusner/ B.D. Chilton, *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 1: Theory of Israel* [Handbook of Oriental Studies vl.56; Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 2001] 92-124, especially 108-112 and 120-124; L.H. Schiffman, *Jewish Law at Qumran*, in: A.J. Avery-peck/ J. Neusner/ B.D. Chilton, *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 1: Theory of Israel* [Handbook of Oriental Studies vl.56; Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 2001] 88-90.

special relationship with God through the Community. The Community claims to be the only means for the rest of Israel by which Israel can regain what she lost through impurity (according to IQS) and by which she can establish a new relationship with God that is even more intense and allows greater nearness to God than the one described in the HB. Israelites can gain all this by joining the Yahad.

Excursus: תמים

Because תמים is not only relevant in IQS IX 4f. and in connections with רצון, but represents an important aspect of the Community's self-understanding in relation to God, a short analysis of the word in IQS and IQH will help us to understand this aspect of the Yahad's identity.

תמים occurs twenty times (I 8; II 2; III 3,9; IV 22; VI 17; VIII 1,9,10,18,20,21; IX 2,5,6,8,9,19), mostly in cols. VIII and IX which are central for the (self-)understanding of the Community. תמים means "blameless" or "perfect" in those instances and, used as an attribute of the Community, describes the nature of the very same and implies that their quality is more advanced in relation to God than the rest of Israel; quality referring here to the nature of the Community as well as a certain behaviour or conduct of life.<sup>53</sup>

Throughout IQS, the authors of IQS describe with תמים especially two aspects in which the Community is more advanced than other groups of people: one of them refers to a notion of the Community's nature: life in the Community as sacrifice to God (1.); the other to the most

<sup>53</sup> קדוש and אמת, on the other hand, also refer to aspects of the nature of the Community in relation to God, but emphasise only particular notions of the teachings of IQS/IQH. תמים involves every action of the Community.

essential idea regarding behaviour in the Community in relation to God: the obedience to the Law and the Community rules (2.).

1. In the HB, **תמים** is employed referring to humans and God, but foremost as a technical term referring to an attribute of the sacrificial animals (cf. Ex. 12:5; 29:1; Lev. 1:3,10; 3:1:6; 4:3,23,28,32; 5:15,18,25; 9:2,3; Num. 6:14; 29:2,8,13,17,20,23,26,29,32,36 and on many other occasions).<sup>54</sup> Only "perfect" or blameless" animals can be used as sacrifices. Only the quality of **תמים** allows animals to have the privileged position in relation to God in serving as sacrifice to Him. The fact that **תמים** in IQS is used as technical term to define the nature of the Community seems to indicate that the authors of IQS wanted to give the Community and life in the Community the same nature than these sacrifices, hence a privileged nature in relation to God.<sup>55</sup> Life in the Community was understood as permanent sacrifice to God. This notion of **תמים** can be seen especially in IX 5, but the other occurrences of the word carry the same notion:

"(...) and the perfect path (**דרכ** **ותמים** **דרך**) will be like a free-will sacrifice (**מנחת**) of favour (**רצון**) (...)"

2. The second fundamental aspect of the meaning of **תמים** in IQS, which can be seen throughout the text, is that living "perfectly" in the Community means to observe the Law and the Community rules "perfectly". This does not only mean that the members of the Community observe the Law and the rules as accurately as the rest of Israel can, but it indicates that the Community, because of its special status in relation to God, can go even beyond this. **תמים** refers to a special aspect of the nature and a special ability of the Community in

<sup>54</sup> Cf. L. Koehler/ W. Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament. Lieferung IV* [Leiden/ New York/ Kobenhaven/ Köln: E.J. Brill, 1990] 1610.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. especially IQS I 8 and Gen. 17:1, pp. 217-228.

relation to God that is much more advanced than Israel's; and this brings the Community by nature closer to God than the rest of Israel.

A key text where **תמים** is used as an attribute of the Yahad is VIII 9:

"(...) and it will be a house of perfection and truth in Israel"

ובית תמים ואמת בישראל<sup>56</sup>

**תמים** is also used with this function in III 3, where the Community is called a "source of the perfect" (**בעין תמימים**) distinguishing it from others:

is also"(...) In the source of the perfect he shall not be counted. (...)"<sup>57</sup>

Also in VIII 1 we find **תמים** used as an attribute of the Community, but only of a certain group of men within it, the "council of the Community", which indicates that the quality of **תמים** is subject to development within the Community as a whole and within the Yahad. Being "perfect" means here acting according to the Law, which affects every aspect of life in the Community:

"In the council of the Community shall be twelve men and three priests, who are perfect in all that has been re-

vealed (**גלה**)<sup>58</sup> from all (2) the Law (...)."

But **תמים** is not only used as an attribute of the Community as such. It is commonly used to define the nature of life in the Community. The authors of IQS use it here in combination with **הלך** and **דרך**.

<sup>56</sup> **בית תמים** does not occur in the HB.

<sup>57</sup> **עין** also indicates that the Community in its privileged relationship with God is also understood as "bridge" between God and the rest of Israel. In the HB, **עין** is not often used describing groups of people. In Dtn. 33:28, however, it is used to refer to Israel (**עין יעקב**). The Community understood as **עין**, as "source" of or for Israel, may refer to the idea of the Community being a link between Israel and God.

<sup>58</sup> On **גלה** see pp. 14-18.

Since הלך describes life in the Community in relation to God,<sup>59</sup> תמים is used to define the nature of this life. תמים in combination with הלך occurs in I 8; III 9f.; VIII 20,21; IX 6,8,9,19.

IX 6 makes absolutely clear that ההולכים בתמים defines life in the Community. This life has a special quality in relation to God, because those leading this life are תמים:

אנשי (6) הייחד בית קודש לאהרון להיחד קודש קודשים ובית יחד לישראל ההולכים בתמים  
 "(5) (...) men of (6) the Community shall set apart a holy house of Aaron, to form a most holy Community, and a  
 house of the Community of Israel, those who walk in perfection."

"Walking תמים" means living according to the will of God and, therefore, in a special relationship with God (cf. I 8). The fulfilment of the Law and the rules is essential part of this life and can be effected or hoped for *only* in the Community (III 9f.).

According to VIII 20 and 21, "being תמים and קודש" involves the observation of the rules of the Community (המשפטים (20)) but also of what God commanded (כאשר צוה (21)).

Three more features of this Community are mentioned in this line: a) The usage of the word בית may signify that not only the nature of the sacrificial animals, but b) also the nature of the place of the sacrifices have been transferred onto the Community, and c) the Community having this nature is still serving as "bridge" between Israel and God:

"(20) And these are the rules (המשפטים) by which the men of the perfect holiness will walk (ילכו) by themselves, one with another. (21) All who enter the council of holiness of those  
 walking in perfect path/behaviour (ההולכים בתמים דרך) as he commanded (כאשר צוה), (...)."

In IX 8, "walking in perfection" is meant to be the privilege of a certain group of men within the Community:

<sup>59</sup> See details on הלך also in combination with תמים p. 230.

"and the goods of the men of holiness who walk in perfection (ההולכים בתמים) (...)"

And the following line, IX 9, describes "walking perfectly" also as a privilege, and defines it as the anti-thesis of *injustice*.<sup>60</sup> "Perfectness", therefore, is understood mainly as the perfect observance of the Law and the rules.

And finally, according to IX 19, perfect social behaviour by observing the Law and the Community rules is also part of perfect life in the Community:

"(18) (...) lead [Maskil] them with/in knowledge and in this way to teach them the mysteries of wonder and of truth in the midst of (19) the men of the Community, to walk perfectly, one with another, in all that has been revealed to them."

תמים and דרך are combined eight times in 1QS (II 2; III 9; IV 22; VIII 18,21; IX 2,5,9)<sup>61</sup>.

הדרך refers to the "path" of God. Men walking on this path *perfectly* are those who live completely according to God's will (in the Community).<sup>62</sup> This is most clear in 1QS II 2:

"the men of the lot of God who walk perfectly on all His paths (...)"

אנשי גורל אל ההולכים תמים בכול דרכיו

In III 9, the authors define that living "on the paths of God perfectly" is about obedience to the Law and cleanliness. Both give the members of the Community a special status in relation to God:

"(...) And may he steady his steps

to walk (בכול דרכי אל) perfectly (תמים) (10) on all paths of God (להלכת).

<sup>60</sup> "(8) (...) Their goods must not be mixed with the goods of the men of deceit who (9) have not cleansed their path to separate from injustice and walk on a perfect path (דרך) (וללכת בתמים) (...)"

<sup>61</sup> Cf. also IV 9.

<sup>62</sup> תמים in combination with דרך occurs in the HB too, but not very often (2.S. 22:31,33; Ez. 28:15; Ps. 18:31,33; 101:2,6; 119:1; Prov. 11:5,20; (28:18)). Interesting are Ps. 101:6 (הלך בדרך תמים) and Ps. 119:1. The latter might have served as *Vorlage* for 1QS, because here the observance of the Law is mentioned as the major task of walking on a "perfect path": "Happy are those whose path is perfect, who walk in the Law of JHWH". Also worth mentioning is Prov. 11:20, according to which "those of perfect paths are His [JHWH's] delight". This verse already indicates a special relationship between those walking on perfect paths and God which is an idea that the authors of 1QS exploited and developed according to their own teachings.

as He has decreed concerning the appointed times of His assemblies not to turn aside, (...).<sup>63</sup>

Although **דרך** is not always used in combination with **אל**, "walking **בדרך**" always happens in a positive relation to God. This can be seen best in VIII 21:

"All who enter the council of holiness (**בעצת הקודש**)

of those who walk on perfect paths (**דהולכים בתמים דרך**) as he commanded (**כאשר צוה**), (...)"

In IV 22, members of the Community are called "perfect" (**תמימי דרך**).<sup>64</sup> In this line, aspects of the perfect life of the members are mentioned:

"(21) (...) and he will sprinkle over him the spirit of truth like water cleaning from all the abominations of falsehood. And he will be immersed (22) in the spirit of cleansing to instruct the upright ones in the knowledge of the

Most High and to teach the wisdom of the sons of heaven to those of perfect path/behaviour. (...)"

IX 2 refers to a specific notion of "walking on the paths of God perfectly". It reflects a "distinct use of **דרך**, especially for the life history of an individual, whose perfection (*tom*) is the supreme goal of human activity"<sup>65</sup>. Here, it is an individual action by which a member can be judged. If he has not succeeded in doing so, he can lose his membership. "Walking on the paths of God perfectly" means, therefore, to do one's personal best to live according to the will of God:

"(1) (...) Only someone who sins through oversight (2) shall be tested (**יבחן**) two years with respect to the per-

fectness of his path (**לתמים דרכו**) and of his counsel according to the authority of the many, and shall then be

enrolled according to/in the rank in the Community of holiness."

<sup>63</sup> This also means that the perfect observation of the calendar by the Community is part of "walking perfectly on God's paths" (cf. H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus* [Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1993] 231-241, especially 239f.). It gives them a nature that becomes more and more "divine", hence brings them closer to God.

<sup>64</sup> According to Schiffman, **תמימי דרך** is used in IQSa I 28 in the same sense and in general in the scrolls "to refer to the sect" (L.H. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls. A Study of the Rule of Congregation* [SBL Monograph Series 38; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1989] 34).

<sup>65</sup> J. Bergman/ A. Haldar-Ringgren/ K. Koch, *art. דרך* [TDOT III; Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978] 292.

The same idea stands behind VIII 18, according to which a member who transgressed the Law or rules of the Community, can *regain* his status of "walking on a perfect path".<sup>66</sup>

"and must not know anything of their counsels until his deeds have been cleansed from all depravity to walk on a perfect path. (...)"

In 1QH, תמים occurs only once, in IX 36. The usage of the word is similar than in 1QS. The "perfect path" is a quality, a way of acting or living, of the just men. It describes the just men in relation to God.

Concluding, we can say that תמים in 1QS is an attribute of the Community and life in the Community. It relates the Community and its members to God. But it does so in two different ways: a) It determines the *nature* of the Community in relation to God. This nature is special and allows the Community to be much closer to God than the rest of Israel. In this sense the special status of the Community in relation to God is a gift of God. b) תמים determines the *actions* of the Community in relation to God. Keeping their special status in relation to God, therefore, and improving it, depends on the members of the Community. Regarding the rest of Israel the usage of תמים indicates that the Community plays, according to 1QS, a significant role within the salvation process of the people Israel.

Regarding the Divine presence, תמים as a quality of the Community indicates the cause and the means by which God can be present in the Community. It shows that the Community has the nature already and the ability to develop their Community even further to "accommodate" God's presence, i.e. even God's permanent and immediate "being there".

<sup>66</sup> According to 1QS VIII 13-15, studying and fulfilling the Law "prepares the דרך of God" (J. Bergman/A. Haldar-Ringgren/ K. Koch, *art.* 777 [TDOT III; Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1978] 292.

### 1.2.3. רצון as God's Imperative Power

Towards the end of 1QS, in columns IX and XI, the meaning of רצון as God's absolute and imperative power which stands behind everything that happens dominates completely. The lines in which this is expressed most clearly are XI 17,18, for רצון refers here in particular to the creative power of God:

"(17) (...) For without you no behaviour is perfect, and without your will (ובלור רצונכה) nothing comes to be.

You have taught (18) all knowledge, and all that exists is so by your will (וכול הנהיה ברצונכה היה)"

Otherwise רצון refers to the ultimate power of God, His will, according to which the *Maskil* has to do his duty in the Community. Here, רצון affects not only the life of the individual member, but the organisation pattern of the Community. The power according to which the instructor organises the Community is nothing less than the רצון of God.

IX 13

"to do the will of God in compliance with all revelation for every period; (...)."

לעשות את רצון אל ככול הנגלה לעת בעת

According to this line, the *Maskil* has not only to know the Law and the Prophets, but also all that has been revealed to the Community, an insight which distinguishes the Community from the world.<sup>67</sup>

<sup>67</sup>

See on גלה above, pp. 14-17.

## IX 15

"(14) (...) and by keeping hold/to keep hold of the chosen ones of the period according to (15) his will,  
as he has commanded; (...)."

ובבחירי העת להחזיק על פי (15) רצונו כאשר צוה

In this line the "will of God"<sup>68</sup> aims precisely at features which are central in the teachings of 1QS: the Maskil has to be concerned about the chosen ones (note the idea of election and separation from the world) according to the will of God, which manifests itself in the commands of God (requiring the obedience to the Law, because it is God's will).<sup>69</sup>

## IX 23

"(...) to do the will with every effort of one's hands (24) and with all ones power, as He commanded. (...)"

לעשות רצון בכול משלח כפים (24) ובכול ממשלו כאשר צוה

רצון in IX 13 (רצון אל), IX 15 (רצונו), and IX 24 indicate that it is here used as an attribute of God too, although it does not carry a suffix referring to God, and designates the ultimate power of God.

## IX 24

"(...) And all that happens to him he should welcome freely and he should delight in nothing except God's will."

וכול הנעשה בו ירצה בנרבה וזולת רצון אל לו יחפץ

The will of God, as the directing power of the world, is the only thing the instructor should be concerned about. It directs his actions, and it is imperative.

<sup>68</sup> The suffix attached to רצון refers to God for three reasons. First, רצון in line 13 is used as an attribute of אל (cf. also IX 24, and רצונכה in XI 17,18). Secondly, the word combination על פי, preceding רצון, occurs especially in Numbers referring to JHWH (Num. 3:16,39,51; but also Ex. 17:1) and elsewhere to the Law of Moses (Ex. 38:21; 2.K. 23:25). Finally, God's will manifests itself in commands; the verb צוה used here refers most likely to God's commands; hence, רצון refers most probably to the will of God.

<sup>69</sup> Which seems to indicate that these rules and Laws are possibly identical with the "revelations" mentioned in IX 13.

## 1.3. IQH and IQM

רצון in IQH and IQM displays the same features as in IQS, although it shows different aspects of its meaning, depending on the different types of texts IQH and IQM are. It prepares the ground for and indicates strongly that the divine presence was understood in the Community as direct and immanent.

Amongst its sixteen occurrences in IQH,<sup>70</sup> רצון refers eight times to the ultimate and absolute power of God according to which everything happens on earth and especially in the Community.<sup>71</sup> Most often רצון refers here to the creative power of God (cf. especially XVIII 2,9);<sup>72</sup> but it is also the power which allows members of the Community to have knowledge, which is probably its most frequent meaning in IQH (IX 8; XVIII 9; cf. also VI 13; XII 32f.; XIX 9 ("truth" and "mysteries")). This has implications for the poet's relationship with God, shown most clearly is VIII 20:

"(...) to purify me with your holy spirit and to bring me near in your pleasure according to the extent of your kindness [...] (...)."

(...) לטהרני ברוח קודשך ולהגישני ברצונך כגדול חסדיך [...] (...)

According to this line, close relationship between God and the members of the Community literally depends on the רצון of God, a point emphasised by the text's use of נגש (Hif).<sup>73</sup>

<sup>70</sup> IV 13,23; VIII 4,18,20,21 IX 8,10,15; XII 33; XIII 4; XVIII 2,6,9; XIX 9. VIII 3f. is damaged, making a comment on the meaning of רצון impossible.

<sup>71</sup> Also note that in contrast to IQS, רצון only once (VIII 18) is the power standing behind a law (law of purification). The usage of רצון has not been "legalised" to the same degree as in IQS: IQH is a collection of psalms, and this belongs to a genre unlike that of IQS.

<sup>72</sup> Also IV 23; IX 8,10,15; XVIII 6.

In IX 15 ((...) [רצונך]ה...) (14)), רצון represents two ideas. It is the creative power of God (translated as "will"), but it also refers to the result of the creating act (translation: "pleasure") and hence to the relationship between God and His creation.

<sup>73</sup> The verb נגש (Hif) is not common in the HB, but in Genesis it is used in the scene when Ephraim and Manasse were brought near to Israel to receive the blessing (Gen. 48:10,13). This scene describes the establishment of a special relationship between God and chosen people, an usage surely known to the author of IQH. נגש (Hif) in the HB also occurs in connection with offerings that have been brought near (1.S. 13:9; 14:34; 2.Chr. 29:23 (with לפני), most significantly with respect to the connection of רצון and the offerings, which indicates that the author of IQH VIII 20 was thinking about a close relationship between God and the Community,

In four other lines, רצון indicates a special relationship between God and the Community. A usage which does not occur in 1QS can be found in VI 13 and VIII 4, where "His pleasure" is the means by which God turns towards certain humans to influence their lives.<sup>74</sup> The significant aspect in these lines is that it is not the "will of God" that is directed towards the humans, but "his pleasure". Here, רצון presupposes that the members of the Community are fulfilling God's will *already*, so that God can turn towards them with His pleasure.

The other two lines which represent a unique usage of רצון in 1QH referring to the special relationship between God and the Community are XII 33 and XIX 9. Here, the members of the Community are called בני רצונו.<sup>75</sup> This means that it is only the Community which enjoys a relationship with God that is characterised by God's רצון. The Community lives according to God's רצון ("will") in the atmosphere of the divine רצון ("pleasure").<sup>76</sup>

In 1QH also this atmosphere is the result of living a life as a permanent offering in the Community. In VIII 21, רצון is used in combination with מעמד which is linked with the Temple

---

and an immanent divine presence in the Yahad. 1QH VIII 20 is further clarified by Ex. 21:6, where נגש is used when somebody was brought "to God" in the sanctuary:

והגישו אדניו אל-האלהים והגישו אל-הדלת או אל-המזוזה (Ex. 21:6\*).

<sup>74</sup> VI 13: (...) כי ברצונכה בא[נו]ש חגב[רתה] גורלו עם] רוח קודשך (13)

רצון does not occur in VIII 4 according to Martinez/Tigchelaar, but according to J. Maier who reads:

"Ich weiß, daß Du durch [Dein] Wohlgef[allen] am Mann vermehrt hast (...)".

<sup>75</sup> XII 33:

(...) למען ידעו כול מעשיו בכוח גבורתו ורוב רחמיו על כול בני רצונו (33)

XIX 9:

(...) ורחמיכה לכול בני רצונכה (9)

The usage of בני רצונכה might indicate that Ps. 103:20-21 might have been used as *Vorlage*, especially because it also refers to a heavenly world. According to these verses, God's hosts and ministers do His will in the heavenly world where angels dwell. The idea of the Community as heavenly place is another means by which the authors of 1QS and 1QH claim that it has a unique relationship with God (see below).

<sup>76</sup> Hunzinger in the early days of Qumran research argued that the phrase refers to the members of the Community (C.-H. Hunzinger, *Neues Licht auf Lc. 2:14* ἀνθρώποι εὐδοκίας [ZNW 44, 1952/53] 89), but then states that it means that the members are "durch Gottes Wohlgefallen in die Gemeinde der Erwählten hineingestellt" (p.90) and because of that they are "Gott angenehm" (ibid.). He fails to see, not analysing the meaning of רצון elsewhere in the scrolls, that רצון does not only refer to a special status of the Community resulting from the election of the Community, but from a life before God according to the ultimate power of God.

and the sacrifices in both the HB and in the DSS.<sup>77</sup> Thus every member has a sacred function just as the members of the **מעמד** had in respect of their daily sacrifices.<sup>78</sup>

#### 1.4. Conclusion

The analysis of **רצון** has shown that the authors of IQS and IQH claim by using this term that the Community has a special relationship with God. The idea of **רצון** is used to demonstrate that the Community has a quality that allows them to be closer to God than any other group of people. **רצון** links, according to IQS and IQH, God and the Community in reciprocal relationship. God's **רצון** enables the Community to live perfectly and hence to provoke God's, their own, and Israel's **רצון** in return. Consequently, **רצון** brings God and the Community together. We have also seen that having **רצון**, the Community receives a special insight into their relationship with God, and especially into His revelations, which shows again that they have a special status in relation to God that Israel, according to the teachings of Qumran, does not have. This special insight even manifests itself in the structure of the Community that can only be organised according to God's will through this insight. Hence, it is only they who can interpret the ultimate will of God. And it is only they who can provoke God's and their own **רצון** by living perfectly according to this will. The way in which the authors of IQS and IQH use **רצון** shows that they claim to have an uniquely close

<sup>77</sup> See for more detail on **מעמד** pp. 142-165.

<sup>78</sup> In IQM, although it occurs only twice in this scroll, it is once used in the context of offerings representing almost its usage known from the HB (IQM II 5). The "chiefs of the divisions" are supposed to "take their positions" (**יצב** (Hit.)) "to prepare the pleasant incense to God's pleasure" (**לערוך מקטרת ניהוח לרצון אל**) (IQM II 5)). This usage proves that the author(s) of the scroll(s) were familiar with this usage of **רצון**. Hence, what happens in IQS and IQH is a deliberate development of this usage according to their particular ideas.

The remaining occurrence of **רצון**, IQM XVIII 14, shows that even the events in the war described in IQM depend on the "will of God" (**לרצונכה**).

relationship with God. As such, Divine presence in the sense of God's nearness is already a fact in the Community. And not only that: especially the idea of **רצון** as the consequence of life in the Community as permanent sacrifice to God shows that, regarding the Divine presence, the authors of IQS and IQH are going even beyond this. Life as sacrifice gives the Community the quality of the offerings. As such they gain a very special status in relation to God. Also the qualities of the place where traditionally sacrifices were performed, the Jerusalem Temple, are being transferred onto the Community where permanent sacrifice in the form of perfect life in the Community takes place. This means that the Community qualifies for and expects God's immanent presence in its midst.

## 2. שכל

שכל means generally "understanding", and it is used in the HB as well as in 1QS and 1QH. It represents the second aspect of the relationship between God and the Community that we investigate in this part of this study. שכל refers to an action of God towards the Community. According to 1QS/H, this action changes the relationship between the Yahad and God significantly. In fact, the significance of שכל in the scrolls lies in its usage as something that describes the Community in relation to God. Elaborating usages of שכל in the HB, the authors of the scrolls set the Community into relation to God and, hence, define notions of the Divine presence as it was understood in the Community.

### 2.1. Hebrew Bible

שכל is used in the HB only sixteen times.<sup>1</sup> Its usage and meaning there is significant for understanding the importance of changes made to its terms of reference in 1QS and 1QH. Three aspects of שכל in the HB are worth mentioning in detail.

#### 2.1.1. Human Understanding of Earthly Matters:

In the HB, שכל is most often used in the sense of human "understanding", meaning an intellectual act or intellectual abilities. Ezer. 8:18 is a verse where this usage is most obvious: it refers to איש שכל.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> K. Lisowsky, *Konkordanz*, 1374.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also for example in I.S. 25:3; Job 17:4; Prov. 12:8; 13:15; 19:11; Dan. 8:25; 1.Chr. 26:14 etc.

### 2.1.2. Understanding of Wisdom:

In this second category, **שכל** is the general "understanding" of the *function* of the righteous in the world in relation to God, as the wisdom literature describes it (cf. for example Ps. 111:10; Prov. 3:4; 23:9). It gives the guidelines for righteous behaviour that pleases God. This is a notion that 1QS will develop (see below).

### 2.1.3. Understanding and the Law

The HB shows a link between **שכל** and the Law. 1QS elaborates this in a distinctive way (see below). Neh. 8:8 seems to be the only occurrence of **שכל** where "understanding" has the Law as object (**בספר בתורת האלהים**): people reading the Law need instruction in order to have ability to *understand* (**שכל**) it. **שכל** is therefore a means of understanding the Law.

1.Chr. 22:12 should be noted here, since what it has to say about **שכל** and the Torah is closely related to material in 1QS which we shall presently examine. Here, **שכל** is a gift of God to a man who is expected to observe the Law on the basis of the same **שכל**:

"Only, may the LORD grant you discretion and understanding, so that when he gives you charge over Israel you may keep the law of the LORD your God." (NRSV)

## 2.2. 1QS

While in the whole HB **שכל** is found only 16 times, in the comparatively brief scroll 1QS it appears 10 times, and with meaning not found at all in the HB. **שכל** in 1QS refers exclusively to the relationship between God and the Community.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> **שכל** no longer carries a secular denotation as it does in the HB (cf. J. Hempel, *Die Stellung der Laien in Qumran*, in: H. Bardke, *Qumran - Probleme. Vorträge des Leipziger Symposiums über Qumran - Probleme vom 9. bis 14. Oktober 1961* [Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963] 197).

### 2.2.1. The שכל of God

Immediately the reader of IQS is struck by the use of שכל in IV 18 to indicate a divine possession or attribute:

"(...) and God (ואל) in the mysteries of His understanding (ברזי שכלו) and in the wisdom of His glory (ובחכמת כבודו), has determined an end of the existence of injustice (...)"

שכל is an instrument of God to achieve what He considers to be necessary to be done.

### 2.2.2. God Passes שכל on to the Community

As in the case of ידע (*et deriv.*), שכל according to IQS not only is a divine attribute, but it is God who passes שכל on to the Community.<sup>4</sup> Decisively, it is only the Community that receives שכל; no one else is given this gift by God, not even Israel. Hence the very quality of the Community is affected through this gift, in a manner which is suggested in the HB only in 1.Chr. 22:12, as seen above.<sup>5</sup>

According to IQS II 3, God is asked to grant שכל חיים to the members of the Community:

"(...) May He illuminate (ויאר) your heart with/in the understanding of life (בשכל חיים) and grace you with eternal knowledge (ברעת עולמים)."

<sup>4</sup> Treating שכל together with other Hebrew words that have denotations such as "knowledge" or "understanding" etc., and looking at all scrolls at the same time, Cook sees that שכל is a gift from God in which the Community can participate (E.M. Cook, *What Did the Jews of Qumran Know about God and How Did They Know it? Revelation and God in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, in: A.J. Avery-peck/ J. Neusner/ B.D. Chilton, *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 2: World View, Comparing Judaisms* [Handbook of Oriental Studies vl.57; Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 2001] 3), but otherwise simply states that it is "generally referred to as a human endowment" (ibid. 6).

<sup>5</sup> Since the meaning of שכל as something that God passes on to certain humans is the most significant aspect of the word in IQS, it is interesting that according to 1.Chr. 22:12 God gives שכל to the king so that the king can keep the Law. This connection of "understanding" from God and the observance of the Law is a major aspect of שכל in IQS.

But it is not only the fact that **שכל** is given by God to the Community that is striking here. The usage of **שכל** in combination with **חיים** reveals two aspects of the meaning of the word. First, **שכל** is an instrument given to the Community to tackle *life as such* in the Community, and thus to live perfectly according to the will of God. **שכל** influences every aspect of life in the Community, as will be shown in detail later. But secondly, **שכל** is not just an understanding that makes practical life and being righteous in the Community, i.e. observing the Law and rules, easier, as we have seen it in the wisdom literature of the HB (see above). **שכל** in IQS is a fundamental "understanding" of life, because it is an understanding of life *in relation to God* (whereby this relation is defined by the authors of the scrolls), hence an "understanding" of the nature and function of life in the Community,<sup>6</sup> and therefore not simply a "Lebensweisheit"<sup>7</sup>. This "understanding" is unique, because it is divine and it has only be given to the members of this Community.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Weise's and Lichtenberger's definition of **שכל חיים** as "die von Gott und seiner Torah geschenkte Weisheit, die zum rechten Leben vor und für Gott im Verband der Gruppe befähigt" (H. Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde* [StUNT 15, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980] 110; M. Weise, *Kultzeiten und kultischer Bundesschluß in der "Ordensregel" vom Toten Meer* [StPB 3; Leiden: Brill, 1961] 88) is correct because it notes that **שכל** is God's gift and that it is a means by which the Community can live perfectly before and for God. But it does not encounter the notion of **שכל** according to which it is the "Weisheit" which covers the ultimate understanding of life in relation to God. Only this **שכל** enables the Community to reach a special and close status before God.

In the HB, "understanding" and "life" are linked in Prov. 16:22: "Understanding (**שכל**) is a source of life (**מקור חיים**) to one who has it, but the punishment of the fools is foolishness." The basic idea of "understanding" as an essential possession and ability for life has been adopted in IQS, but the emphasis on the relationship between the Community and God, established through the gift **שכל**, is new in the scroll.

<sup>7</sup> F. Nötscher, *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte* [Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag G.M.B.H., 1956] 57.

<sup>8</sup> This interpretation is also strengthened by the fact that in II 3 **שכל** is used in connection with **דעת עולמים**. God gives both **שכל** and **דעת עולמים** to the members. The latter, as we will see, strongly suggests this interpretation (cf. Gen. 3:5 and the usage of **ידע** (*et deriv.*) pp. 98-112.

The same sense of the the word שכל occurs similarly in IV 3:

"(...) it is a spirit of meekness, of patience, generous compassion, eternal goodness, intelligence, understanding, potent wisdom which trusts in all (4) the deeds of God and depends on his abundant mercy. (...)"

In this line, שכל is a gift from God.<sup>9</sup> It is one of the "Lebenseinstellungen"<sup>10</sup> that defines the spirit of the Community and therefore the nature of life in the Community. These "Lebenseinstellungen" are given by God and are the guide lines for life in the Community. This means that through giving שכל God again influences directly life in the Community.

In II 3 and IV 3, שכל is thus both a means by which God lets the members of the Community understand their life in the Community in relation to God; and also it is regarded as an instrument for the members of the Community to use, so as to live and act perfectly according to God's will in this Community which brings them closer to God than any other human being, including the rest of Israel. As we have seen, the HB offers only quite restricted meanings of the word שכל, and ordinary Jews living outside the Community are therefore limited in their appreciation of it. By contrast, IQS reveals a whole new dynamic sense of this word, knowledge of which brings the reader closer to God while at the same time separating him from the common mass of the Jewish people.

Once more, the purpose and method of the authors of IQS in developing usages of words or phrases of the HB according to their own ideas, seems to have two aims: first, to define life in the Community and, hence, the special relationship between the Community and God. Secondly, to specify the separation of the Community from the rest of Israel, demonstrating that the rest of Israel is separated from God, and that it is only through the Community that Israel can enter a special relationship with God again.

<sup>9</sup> Also F. Nötscher, *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte* [Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag G.M.B.H., 1956] 57.

<sup>10</sup> On רוח in this sense see also pp. 70 (IQS V 20f.), 91 and 94.

As such **שכל** in 1QS indicates the following about the Divine presence: First, God enters a special relationship with the Community by giving them **שכל**. Secondly, He gives the Community the instrument to a) understand this special relationship, hence, to be aware of its unique function in the world (as the scrolls persistently emphasise), and b) to act and live according to the will of God. Through this special understanding the Community gains a unique status and prepares the ground for an immediate presence of God.

### 2.2.3. Life in the Community with **שכל**

Most of the remaining occurrences of **שכל** define its meaning as ability to live according to the will of God by having a proper understanding of the Community in relation to God. They demonstrate in what sense **שכל** serves the Community in relation to God, and how **שכל** is significant for the hierarchical structure of the Community. These nuances of **שכל** differ from the use of the word in connection with wisdom in the HB as described above, in so far as the primary function of **שכל** in 1QS is to demonstrate that the Community has a special and close relationship with God. In the wisdom literature of the HB by contrast, **שכל** is the instrument for good behaviour in respect of other people which does not depend on a divine gift. In this latter case, such behaviour is part of a view of the world in which the relationship between helpless righteous ones and the mighty God is a matter of universal concern. In 1QS, the special relationship between the Community and God is all that counts.

V 20f. demands from the members of the Community that

"(...) they shall examine (21) their spirits in the Community, each another, in respect of his understanding (שכלו)

and of his deeds in Law (ומעשיו בתורה), (...):

"Understanding" and "deeds in Law", therefore, are standards of the members by which they get measured. שכל is that insight which allows the members to understand life in the Community in relation to God, and it influences all their actions. Observing the Law complements life in the Community according to this "understanding". That is not to say that שכל refers to the intellectual side of life in the Community, and the observance of the Law the "practical" one; rather שכל refers to life in the Community in relation to God as such, whereas the observance of the Law and the rules refer to correct behaviour in individual cases.<sup>11</sup>

VI 18

In VI 18, שכל is used in a similar manner:

"When he has completed a year in the Community, the many will be questioned about his affairs, concerning his understanding and his deeds in connection with the law

(לפי שכלו ומעשיו בתורה)

שכל again refers to this insight about life in the Community, and yet another notion of this "understanding" is added: שכל can be developed and improved by the members of the Community. A member can be judged by the level of שכל he has at the time. Hence, שכל is a

<sup>11</sup> This is clearly illustrated in HB by Neh. 8:8 (see above) and 1. Chr. 22:12, when "understanding" is used to interpret the Law. In IQS, "understanding" primarily signifies the divine gift of understanding the Community in relation to God, and only secondarily effects action that are based on the Law.

This is the reason why שכל is here not simply understood as the "understanding of the Law's requirements" (A.R.C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning. Introduction, translation and commentary* [London: SCM Press LTD, 1966] 177), neither do studying of the Law and acting accordingly lead to the "Förderung dieses Wissens [i.e. שכל]" (F. Nötscher, *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte* [Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag G.M.B.H., 1956] 56); but שכל makes this studying and acting possible in the first place.

significant measure for the authorities within the Community, which the hierarchical structure of the Community reflects.<sup>12</sup> To receive **שכל** from God to "understand" the Community and to live perfectly does not mean, however, that the Community necessarily is perfect. **שכל** is only perceived as an *ability* to understand what the Community is about (which is its relation to God) and to learn what this means for life in the Community by studying the Law, by observing the daily structure of life, by observing the daily liturgy, by observing the Law and the rules, etc. **שכל** is thus an offer from God that makes life in the Community possible in the first instance. The group still depends on the reactions of its individual members (a point where **שכל** differs from **ידע**); thus a member can be judged by his **שכל** as well as his deeds according to the Law. In sum, **שכל** has both an "intellectual" ("metaphysical") side and a "practical" one. The latter is concerned about ways of action in individual cases, the former is concerned about the vital aspect of the nature of the Community: its relation to God.<sup>13</sup>

**שכל** occurs in the same sense also in V 23,24; VI 14(,18), where it is linked with the position/function of the individual member within the hierarchy of the Community (V 21,24; VI 18; IX 15<sup>14</sup>), which depends on his **שכל** and his deeds: has he improved in understanding the Community in relation to God and hence its function for the world?<sup>15</sup> Second, **שכל** is

<sup>12</sup> Verses like 2. Chr. 2:11; 30:22 would have encouraged this Community to conceive of **שכל** in the ways described above.

<sup>13</sup> This again contrasts with the HB, where the Law is rarely understood as the object of **שכל** such as in Neh. 8:8 (cf. also Prov. 3:4; 1. Chr. 22:12). In IQS, the Law is mentioned as the complement of understanding.

<sup>14</sup> As in IX 13, it is here the Maskil who deals with the members according to their "understanding: "(...) he [Maskil] should include each man according to the purity of his hands and according to his understanding (16) promote him. (...)"

<sup>15</sup> F. Nötscher sees in IQSa I 17 and IQS V 24 the essential meaning of **שכל** on which he bases his investigation. According to this **שכל** is "vorwiegend das *theoretische* Wissen oder Verständnis (...), das für ein Amt in der Gemeinde (neben einem vollkommenen Wandel) erfordert wird" (F. Nötscher, *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte* [Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag G.M.B.H., 1956] 56). He does not encounter the significance of **שכל** for the relationship between the Community and God and the fact that **שכל** is much more than

linked with the admission process, inasmuch as the **שכל** of potential members has to be evaluated before they can enter the Community (VI 14)<sup>16</sup>: do they have already sufficient "understanding" to allow them to join?<sup>17</sup>

#### 2.2.4. **שכל** depending on an "Eschatological" Process?

In IX 13, **שכל** is used in connection with the "eschatology" of the scroll:

"to do the will (רצון) of God in compliance with all revelation for every period; to measure (ולמור) all of the understanding (את כול השכל) that has been gained/found according to the times (העתים) and (14) the decree of the period; (...)."

The subject of **שכל** in this line is the Maskil. It is the Maskil's duty to measure "all of the understanding". **שכל** is the advanced understanding of an officer of the Community. Hence, "understanding" is part of a process of learning whereby there are men that understand more than others and have, therefore, the duty to teach the rest of the members.<sup>18</sup> **שכל** is the

---

an "intellectual" or "practical" *knowledge*. **שכל** as the understanding of life in the Community in relation to God is the *conditio sine qua non* for a "vollkommenen Wandel" (ibid.) in the Community.

<sup>16</sup> "(13) (...) And anyone from Israel who freely volunteers (14) to enrol in the council of the Community, the man appointed at the head of the many shall test him with regard to his understanding (**שכל**) and his deeds (ולמעשיו). (...)"

<sup>17</sup> It is very difficult to determine to what extent an Israelite can have **שכל** if he is not yet a member of the Community. It seems that the potential for **שכל** is still embedded in every Israelite, according to the scrolls.

Weinfeld states about **שכל** in VI 14 that "it does not connote intellectual capacity but the ability to distinguish between good and evil and to acquire 'knowledge of God'" (M. Weinfeld, *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect. A Comparison with Guilds and Religious Associations of the Hellenistic-Roman Period* [NTOA 2; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986] 22<sub>81</sub>). This definition of **שכל** is only partly correct. **שכל** has a "practical" side as the ability to judge what perfect (social) behaviour is (and this includes the knowledge of the difference between good and evil). But we have also seen **שכל** refers to an intellectual ability which distinguishes the Community from the rest of Israel: **שכל** is the divine ability to understand the nature of the Community in relation to God. Furthermore, **שכל** is not the ability to "know of God". God Himself makes this knowledge possible, and IQS refers to this knowledge using רעת (see on "knowledge" pp. 80-117).

<sup>18</sup> It is worth noting that **שכל** occurs only here with the article indicating that this "understanding" of the Maskil represents an advanced, special, one.

Discussing IQS III 13ff., Hempel calls the teachings of the Maskil "prädestinatianisch - dualistische Geheimlehre" (J. Hempel, *Die Stellung der Laien in Qumran*, in: H. Bardke, *Qumran - Probleme. Vorträge des*

subject of development and improvement. This development and improvement depends on the "eschatological" process in which the Community participates (see below). The degree of understanding in the Community depends on the period of time (הַעֲתִים).

As regards the Divine presence, this suggests that the fact that the Community has this advanced "understanding" means that they have a status close to God and are able to accommodate the Divine presence. But, looking at the "eschatological" notion of שָׁכַל, this status is the subject of development. Hence, an ultimate and immediate presence of God might be understood as a future event.

#### 2.2.5. Summary

In sum, the meaning of שָׁכַל in IQS has been developed beyond the semantic range it displays in the HB. Because IQS presents a coherent usage of שָׁכַל that emphasises throughout the same notions, and because שָׁכַל occurs comparatively often in the scroll, it is most likely that the authors of IQS undertook the changes deliberately, or adopted senses of the term already current in the Community. Consequently statements or implications about the Divine presence that are connected with שָׁכַל have their purpose too.

The usage of שָׁכַל in IQS expounds especially one nuance that so many words that are significant for the question of the Divine presence have in the scrolls in contrast to the HB: the meaning of שָׁכַל is absolutely Community-centred and describes this Community in relation

---

*Leipziger Symposions über Qumran - Probleme vom 9. bis 14. Oktober 1961* [Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963] 206) and emphasises the fact that it includes past, present, and "eschatologische Vollendung" (ibid.). The teachings of the Maskil are part of a process of development in which the Community according to IQS and IQH stands, but its primary purpose is to teach the members of the Community the insight they need to get closer to God. These teachings are "geheim" insofar as they apply only for the Community by nature, but they are open to others insofar as people can join the Community.

to God. As such, שכל has a divine origin, and is given to the Community by God. In the Community, שכל serves the Community and the individual member to understand the Community in its real sense, that is in relation to God, and helps the members to act accordingly. The special status of the Community that results from this is embedded in the "eschatological" concept of the Community and includes being the "bridge" between God and Israel whereby the Yahad acts as deputy for Israel, and qualifies the Community for God's presence. Especially in IQS IX 13, the "revelatory" character of שכל within this "eschatological" concept becomes evident. The authors of IQH develop this usage of שכל. For them, as I will show below, שכל is a gift of God to the Yahad that enables the members to understand the "mysteries" since God's שכל itself is a רז (cf. above IQS IV 18). This as well gives the Community a special status in relation to God.

### 2.3. IQH

In an interesting and very decisive way, the occurrences of שכל in IQH complete and confirm the meaning of שכל found in IQS. שכל occurs in IQH 10 times.<sup>19</sup> Although the text has been damaged on three occasions,<sup>20</sup> the remaining occurrences of שכל show very clearly that it concerns the relationship between God and the Qumran Community.

Especially two aspects of the meaning of שכל become prominent in IQH: first, its usage in connection with the idea of knowledge, and second its usage as means to understand mysteries.

<sup>19</sup> IQH IV 21; V 13; VI 19,27; IX 31; XVII 31; XIX 25,28; XX 13,22.

<sup>20</sup> IQH IV 21; V 13; VI 27.

Three times in 1QH, IX 31; XIX 28; and XX 13, שכל is used in connection with דעת or ידע. This usage of שכל has possible "eschatological" overtones. In these lines, the members of the Community are pictured as constantly improving their knowledge under the influence of שכל. The level of this knowledge depends on the one hand on the individual member, but on the other on the process of development of the Community. Only in the "new age", it seems, knowledge and שכל will be absolute.

XIX 28 clearly illustrates this.<sup>21</sup>

"(27) (...) Blessed are yo[u Lord w]ho has given to your servant (28) understanding  
of knowledge (שכל דעה) (...)."

According to these two lines, שכל is the means which makes "knowledge" (דעה) possible.

But, in contrast to the meaning of שכל in 1QS, שכל refers here not simply to the "understanding" of the will of God or the Law, but articulates yet another decisive aspect of שכל:

שכל is the "understanding" of God *Himself*. God is *accessible* to the one who has שכל.

Having שכל gives thus the Community a very special status in relation to God. IX 31 expresses this thought as well:

"(...) And they will know (ידע) you according to (לפי) their understanding (שכלם)."

In this line the "eschatological" aspect of שכל becomes evident. The knowledge as well as

שכל underlies an "eschatological" concept. This ability to access God through knowledge and שכל is, as in 1QS, subject of development and improvement. It is not a fixed or perfect status given to the Community by God. God only gives the Community the ability to reach

<sup>21</sup> Cf. also XVII 31.

this status, but it is they who actively have to establish and to improve this special and close relationship between God and the Community. And, this relationship is to be brought to perfection in the future. This status which the Community gains through **שכל**, although only perfect in future time, gives them a quality in relation to God that nobody before has possessed in relation to Divine presence. This allows them to claim the ability to "accommodate" Divine presence in their midst, even if the absolute "being-together-with-God" seems to be reserved for the future age.<sup>22</sup>

The second notion of **שכל** that IQH especially develops is its revelatory character. Being an essential aspect of the "eschatological" process in which the Community stands, **שכל** is according to IQH also the means to understand the "mysteries" of God. This means that **שכל** is a means of access to the revelations of God.

This idea can be seen especially in XVII 31:<sup>23</sup>

"(...) [...] from my youth you let yourself shine to me (**הופעתה לי**) in the understanding  
of your judgement (**בשכל משפטכה**)."

IQH XX 13 on the other hand adds yet another notion to the meaning of **שכל** that pictures the Community in an even more privileged relation to God:

"You have opened within me knowledge of the mystery  
of your understanding (**רעת ברז שכלכה**), (...)"

<sup>22</sup> IQH IX 31 is the only occurrence of **שכל** where Nötscher sees that **שכל** is "entscheidend für die Gottesnähe" (F. Nötscher, *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte* [Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag G.M.B.H., 1956] 58). But he suggests that it is only the "himmlischen Geister" this "Gottesnähe" applies to (ibid.), and not the Community itself.

<sup>23</sup> On **יפע** see pp. 11-14.

In this line, **שכל** is not a means of access to God's revelations, but it is used as an attribute of God Himself. Through their knowledge (**דעת**) the Community can comprehend the "mystery of God's understanding" (**רז שכלכה**). Through knowledge the Community does not simply receive the means from God to access His revelations and His will, but it receives an instrument that is divine in origin. This instrument enables the Yahad to understand God better than any other person or group. And it also transfers its divine quality onto the Community which allows it to accommodate Divine presence.

Finally, **שכל** in IQH describes, as in IQS, aspects of the life in the Community (VI 19; XIX 25; XX 22). It is here where IQH offers more information than IQS.

In VI 19 occurs a feature of **שכל** that is well known from IQS. The "understanding" of the individual member determines his place within the hierarchy in the Community:

"(18) (...) According to (19) his [un]derstanding I bring him near, (...)."

But XIX 25 and especially XX 22 show additional notions. According to XIX 25, **שכל** enables the members of the Community to praise God, hence, to access Him in the particular IQH manner:

"(24) (...) [...] In the mouth of all of them your name is praised (25) for ever and ever they praise you in the mouth of their understanding (**שכלן**) (...)."

XX 22 literally tells what **שכל** as a gift from God is about: God "brings them [members] near" to Himself. **שכל**, therefore, not only enables the members of the Community to understand God and His will, and, therefore to hold a special relationship with Him, but effectively to live in His nearness by serving Him:

"[...] and according to their understanding (וּכְשִׁכְלָם) (23) you bring them near and in accordance with their judgement they will serve you, (...)"

This is the point where שְׂכָל as a gift from God and a special possession of the Community indicates both a special status before God that allows them to be close to God, and experience of Divine presence at a certain level of understanding.

#### 2.4. Conclusion

Concluding we can say that this survey of שְׂכָל in IQS and IQH reveals a quite different meaning of the word than most scholars suggest. As we have seen, שְׂכָל is not alternatively about a theoretical (Nötscher) or practical knowledge (Weinfeld); it is neither simply identical with knowledge of the Law (Leaney) or even dependent on the study of the Law (Nötscher). We would do the meaning of שְׂכָל no justice by understanding it, as most scholars do (cf. Nötscher, Lichtenberger, Weinfeld, Weise), as some sort of "wisdom of life" that is required to make life in a community such as Qumran possible.

The meaning of שְׂכָל in IQS and IQH goes far beyond this. שְׂכָל defines the relationship between the Community and God. It is used to emphasise that this relationship is unique and more intense than any other relationship between a human being and God. שְׂכָל is the Community's fundamental understanding of life in the Community in relation to God, an understanding that the rest of Israel does not have; only in this sense שְׂכָל can be described as "wisdom of life". שְׂכָל is the understanding of the nature and function of the Community in relation to God. The divine gift שְׂכָל is the means for the Community to establish and to

develop this special relationship with God within its "eschatological" process. שכל gives the Yahad divine quality and makes Divine presence in the Community possible and likely.

### 3. Knowledge

The idea of knowledge will be the third aspect that we will discuss in this part of the study which refers to God as the one who gives the Community a special status in relation to Himself. But like **רצון** and **שכל**, the knowledge of the Community not only changes the status of it in relation to God, but enables it to improve this status by itself. In fact, the interpretation of the idea of knowledge as we find it in the HB by the authors of 1QS/H represents one of the major differences between the understanding of the relationship between Israel and God on the one hand, and God and the Yahad on the other.

Although the idea of knowledge in the scrolls has been discussed by numerous scholars, it is worth investigating its meaning in 1QS/H again on this background. Knowledge means a special quality which, in case of the Community, results in a special relationship with God.

#### 3.1. Introduction

The idea of knowledge in 1QS and 1QH is central<sup>1</sup> and unique. The scrolls "emphasise their own kind of knowledge".<sup>2</sup> And although 1QS and 1QH reflect the same understanding of the idea of the knowledge, their interpretations of the idea differs also in a few respects. This study will begin with and emphasise the idea of knowledge in 1QS, because it is there where the uniqueness of the idea becomes most transparent, and the understanding of the idea in 1QH can be explained on the basis of 1QS. This study focuses on the usage and meaning of **ידע**, **דעת**, and **דעה**.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> According to Ringgren, knowledge is an "extremely central concept in Qumran" (H. Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran. Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [New York: Crossroad, 1995] 115).

<sup>2</sup> W.D. Davies, *Christian Origins and Judaism* [London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1962] 138.

<sup>3</sup> To analyse the idea of knowledge in 1QS and 1QH this study will only focus on derivatives of **ידע**. There are other Hebrew words which refer to similar phenomena (such as **שכל** (see above), **בינה**, **חכמה**, etc.), and which will have to be discussed separately. But they are not "synonyms" of **ידע** as Ringgren claims (H. Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran. Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [New York: Crossroad, 1995] 115); cf. for

### 3.2. IQS

Knowledge, according to IQS, involves a certain aspect of the relationship between God and humans.<sup>4</sup> When the HB mentions knowledge in connection with God, it often describes a person who is said to know certain *aspects* of God. Knowledge in this sense refers to a human who has a comprehensive understanding of certain aspects of the nature of God.

In IQS, this understanding of knowledge occurs only once, in X 16:

"I shall bless him for great wonders and to his power I shall bow and shall rely on his compassion the whole day.

And shall know (יִדְעֵהוּ)<sup>5</sup> that in his hand lies the judgements of (17) every living thing, and all his deeds are

truth. (...)"

The fact that this understanding of knowledge occurs only here is certainly due to some extent to the fact that IQS is a collection of rules, whereas the verb יִדַע in this line occurs in a psalm. But it definitely reflects another, more dominant understanding of knowledge in IQS, which is unique and so elaborated as to imply a certain understanding of the presence of God.

#### 3.2.1. The Knowledge of God

In IQS, it is not primarily the knowledge of humans which stands in the centre of attention, but the *knowledge of God*. Knowledge is understood in IQS as a divine attribute: it has a divine origin.

This aspect can be seen best in III 15:

"(...) From the God of knowledge stems all there is and all there shall be. (...)"

---

example, the meaning of שָׂכַל. W.D. Davies, in his study of knowledge in IQS, also includes other Hebrew terms than the derivatives of יִדַע (W.D. Davies, *Christian Origins and Judaism* [London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1962] 124ff.). His findings differ from this study.

<sup>4</sup> In this sense, as an aspect of the relationship between God and the Community, knowledge "should be understood in a religious sense" (M. Weinfeld, *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect. A Comparison with Guilds and Religious Associations of the Hellenistic-Roman Period* [NTOA 2; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986] 22<sub>81</sub>).

<sup>5</sup> Martinez/Tigchelaar, *DSSI*, 95 translate יִדַע not with "to know", but with "to realize". We will see in this chapter that IQS refers with יִדַע to a special *knowledge*, not to an act of "realizing".

## מאל הדעות כול הויה ונהייה

Here, knowledge is an attribute of God. It is the knowledge of the creator and leader of the world.<sup>6</sup> In IV 22,<sup>7</sup> דעת is linked with עליון ("the knowledge of the Most High") clearly indicating that it is an attribute of God. And in X 12, God is called the "source of knowledge" (מקור דעת).<sup>8</sup>

An additional significant aspect of this attribute of God is that it often occurs as an attribute of the creator of the world, as already has been shown in III 15: "all there is and all there shall be" is from the God of knowledge.<sup>9</sup> דעת is the knowledge of the creator which is the instrument to *create* but also to *lead* the world (omnipotence and omnipresence of the creator).<sup>10</sup>

The "Qumran community was accustomed to associate this expression [הדעות אל] not merely with the concept of divine knowledge *per se* but specifically with the concept of a preordaining knowledge"<sup>11</sup>. In this sense, there is a permanent nearness of God in the world, and hence in the Community, through His knowledge.

This notion of דעת can also be observed in XI 11:

"(...) By/in His knowledge (ובדעתו) everything shall come into being,

and all that does exist He establishes with His plans and nothing is done outside of Him. (...)"

<sup>6</sup> In this context Osten-Sacken talks about the "Prädikat des Schöpfergottes" (P.v.d. Osten-Sacken, *Gott and Belial. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran* [StUNT 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969] 124).

<sup>7</sup> See below.

<sup>8</sup> See below.

<sup>9</sup> The word combination אל הדעות occurs also in IQH IX 26 and XX 10 where the text is corrupt.

<sup>10</sup> Also H. Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde* [StUNT 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980] 124.

<sup>11</sup> W. Wegner, *Studies in Qumran Creation Terminology on the Basis of IQS 3:13-18 and Parallel Texts* [Madison, Wisconsin 1974] (facsimile by University Microfilms International [Ann Arbor, Michigan/ London, England: Facsimile by University Microfilms International, 1981] 40).

Wegner states correctly against the background of I.S. 2 that "in the thought sequence of the Song [I.S. 2] the fact that God has knowledge of the final outcomes of human activities would be less meaningful than the fact that God determines such outcomes" (ibid., 34). The divine knowledge is an aspect of the ultimate divine power. But, according to IQS, the divine knowledge itself is not alone what determines the events on earth. According to the scroll, only the combination of divine knowledge and *divine will* describe God as the ultimate power.

### 3.2.2. God the Source of Knowledge

But according to IQS God is not only present through his knowledge as creator. According to this scroll, God passes His knowledge on to the Community, which leads to a far more intense presence than the nearness of the creator in the world; it does not affect the universe as a whole, but exclusively the members of a distinct community. And it means that the members of the Community receive divine knowledge to some degree. God is the "source of knowledge" (X 12 and XI 3<sup>12</sup>):

X 12

"(11) (...) To God (אל) I shall say: 'My justice', (12) to the Most High (עליון):

'Establisher of my well-being', 'source of knowing' (מקור דעת)<sup>13</sup>,

'spring of holiness', 'peak of glory', 'all-powerful one of eternal majesty'. (...)"

The Community receives divine knowledge from God. The usage of the word מקור in this line suggests this too.<sup>14</sup>

The Community is in a privileged position to receive its knowledge from God. This aspect of the idea of knowledge, i.e. its divine origin, represents the fundamental understanding of

<sup>12</sup> See for details on XI 3 below.

<sup>13</sup> J.H. Charlesworth, *Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1991] 111 reads the same. K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 127 reads מעין. This is a word that in the MSS occasionally gets confused with מעון. In this case the phrase might even refer to the place of knowledge (see for the problem p. 137<sub>10</sub>).

<sup>14</sup> מקור occurs in the HB only 18 times. Often it refers to the "source of life" (Ps. 36:10; Prov. 10:11; 13:14; 14:27; 16:22), or the source of wisdom (Prov. 18:4), or it is used in a secular sense referring to a source of water (for example Jer. 51:36). In the HB, it is not used in combination with דעת. In combination with God it is only used in Prov. 14:27 where it refers to the "fear of God" as the "source of life".

In IQS we find the term five times (III 19 (מקור חושך); X 12 (מקור דעת); XI 3 (מקור דעתו), 5 (מקור צדקתו), 6 (מקור צדקה)). In III 19 and XI 3, מקור is linked with the concept of light which is understood as being a divine phenomenon. In all cases, the "source" lies in God.

In IQH, מקור occurs far more often than in IQS (16 times). The word seems to be a significant theological term.

"knowledge" in IQS. Apart from II 3; IV 4,22; IX 18 ; X 12; XI 16 where דעת or דעה are used in this manner, and which will be discussed in detail later, it is especially XI 18 where this aspect of the idea of knowledge in IQS becomes evident:

"(17) (...) You have taught (18) all knowledge (כול דעה) and all that exists is so by your will. (...)"

The דעה comes from God. God is omnipotent in and through the act of creation. God is the one who is giving the Community the knowledge.

According to IQS, God also gives His knowledge to mediators who pass it on to the other members of the Community. This can be seen in IX 17 and 18:

#### IX 17

"(...) to dispute (ולדוכיח)<sup>15</sup> truthful (אמת) knowledge and just judgement with those who choose (18) the path, each one according to his spirit, (...)."

דעת is used here similarly to דעה in IX 18 (see below) and also רצון in IQS. The knowledge is passed on to the Maskil who acts according to this knowledge. He uses this knowledge to lead the Community and passes this knowledge on to the other members. By doing so the Maskil as a leading person in the Community not only gives the members the knowledge that comes from God, but also infiltrates the organisation pattern of the Community with this knowledge.<sup>16</sup> The organisation of the Community is based on this knowledge. In contrast to רצון, knowledge is not the ultimate power of God that stands behind the Law and the rules, but it is the *divine instrument* that the Maskil as a leading person in the Community possesses

<sup>15</sup> The translation of Martinez/Tigchelaar, *DSS I*, 93 ("to reproach") is misleading. A more appropriate translation which reflects the sense in which יכח and דעת are used in this line is "to dispute" or "to argue" within a matter of justice.

<sup>16</sup> See for details of this feature below.

so as to interpret the Law and the rules, and hence to make the Community function according to the will of God. What has been discovered here is supported by IX 18:

IX 18

"(...) he should lead them in knowledge and in this way make them understand<sup>17</sup> the mysteries of wonder and truth in the midst of (בתוך) (19) the men of the Community. (...)"

The Maskil is supposed to pass on the knowledge that he received from God to the other members of the Community. Knowledge, therefore, is something that only the Qumran Community is holding (בתוך אנשי היחיד), and separates the Community from the rest of Israel.<sup>18</sup>

This aspect of knowledge in IQS also influences the idea of the divine presence. First, the knowledge the Community receives from God separates them from the rest of Israel; consequently, it seems that the scroll favours a special divine presence in the Community. Secondly, by giving the Community His knowledge, God grants the Community a status which is much closer, more immediate, to Himself than the rest of Israel possesses. This makes a postulation of a direct presence of God for the Community very likely.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>17</sup> Cf. on the significance of "understanding" (שכל) in the Community pp. 64-79.

<sup>18</sup> Discussing the meaning of אמת in this line, Kosmala states correctly that knowledge is concerned with a "truth" that is not "etwas theoretisch Wahres (...) sondern eine praktische und zu praktizierende Wirklichkeit: man muss sie tun" (H. Kosmala, *Die "Erkenntnis der Wahrheit", Hebräer - Essener - Christen* [StPB 1, 1959] 141), but does not see that knowledge has also a "practical" side. He also does not determine the function and nature of knowledge as a link between God and the Community that gives the Community a status close to God.

<sup>19</sup> W.D. Davies sees the mediator (especially in IX 10f.) from a messianic perspective which lets him associate the idea of knowledge with the "eschatology" of the scrolls (W.D. Davies, *Christian Origins and Judaism* [London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1962] 132-134). As will be shown in detail below, knowledge is, as any other aspect of the theology of the scrolls, described as an aspect of a process towards perfection. It seems that this perfection is meant to be the means by which the Community intends to become close to God, or even to prepare the ground to accommodate His presence in their midst. Only in this sense the idea of knowledge is part of an "eschatology" whereby the latter differs significantly from the one found in the NT (see below).

### 3.2.3. The Special Knowledge/Insight of the Community

According to IQS, there are two different kinds of knowledge in this world: the knowledge of men *outside* the Community, and the knowledge *of the Community* or its members.

IQS mentions the "outside" knowledge in I 11,12, where דעת refers to the knowledge that people who just enter the Community possess.<sup>20</sup> This knowledge is either expected to change, or to be perfected, once these men are in the Community. In addition, according to II 26 - III 2, if the knowledge of such people is evil, the people concerned will not enter the Community and neither will their wealth.<sup>21</sup> According to this passage, a person who walks "in stubbornness of his heart (בשרירות לבו)" cannot have the knowledge IQS is talking about.<sup>22</sup>

But this "outside" knowledge is in IQS of little concern. Theologically, only the knowledge of the Community is significant, because it defines the Community in relation to God.<sup>23</sup> According to IQS דעת is a) the knowledge of God which b) He passes on to the Community.

<sup>20</sup> Leaney does not see this function of דעת, but suggests incorrectly "mind" or "interest" as a rendering (A.R.C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning. Introduction, translation and commentary* [London: SCM Press LTD, 1966] 122).

<sup>21</sup> III 2: "His [the one who walks in the stubbornness of his heart] knowledge (דעת), his energy and his wealth shall not enter the Council of the Community (...)."

X 24f. distinguishes between an outside knowledge and the knowledge of the Community (see below).

<sup>22</sup> לב שרירות occurs in IQS 8 times (I 6; II 14,26; III 3; V 4; VII 19,24; IX 10) and refers to the evil and unclean ones.

The usage of לב שרירות in the HB also suggests that knowledge in the Community is about the *relationship* between God and the members of the Community. In the HB, שרירות לב is used five times. In each case, it is a characteristic of people who do *not* live with and before God. In Dtn. 29:18, Jer. 9:13; 13:20 it is an attribute of people committing idolatry; in Jer. 23:17; Ps. 81:13 it refers to those unfaithful to JHWH. שרירות לב belongs to the sphere without God, knowledge to those who live before Him.

<sup>23</sup> And this is why it is difficult to see in this knowledge a "dualism" as K.G. Kuhn does (K.G. Kuhn, *Die Sektenschriften und die iranische Religion* [ZThK 49, 1952] 306). K.G. Kuhn at a very early stage of Qumran scholarship tried to explain the idea of knowledge with a concept ("dualism") that does not fully apply here. The theological significance of knowledge does not lie, as Kuhn suggests, in the dualism of knowledge *inside* and *outside* the Community, but in its function as to determine the relationship between the Community and God, and hence, to define the self-understanding of the Community. According to IQS, the knowledge of the "outside world" is theologically of little significance (as can be seen also regarding סתר in V 11 (see below)).

Although the knowledge that the Community receives is not identical with the knowledge of God, it does not lose its divine nature entirely and, therefore, gives the Community a special quality in relation to Him.

This new quality is significant with respect to the understanding of the presence of God. The new status of the Community allows it to be much closer to God than anybody can be and it gives the Community the "divinity" which is the condition for any divine presence. This divine quality prepares the ground for the idea of an immanent presence of God in the Community.

In IQS, the words **רַעַה**, **רַעַת**, and **יִדַע** are used to refer to this specifically Qumranian knowledge. On some occasions the usages of these words show in what way this knowledge is special. As the special understanding of the relationship between God and the Qumran Community, it is the complete understanding of the will of God that allows the members of the Community to live a perfect life in relation to God.<sup>24</sup>

This can be seen especially in two lines:<sup>25</sup>

### III 1

"his [the one who walks in the stubbornness of his heart] soul deviates from  
the disciplines of knowledge (**רַעַת**) of just judgement. (...)"

Here, the specific Community-knowledge is the basis for the use of the Law according to the will of God. Only this knowledge enables the Community to make just judgement. Thus those outside are at a profound disadvantage, as is clear from V 11:

<sup>24</sup> See on **רַעַת** pp. 30-63.

<sup>25</sup> XI 6 also refers to the special knowledge of the Community, but negatively by mentioning the knowledge which is hidden from the "sons of man": "(5) (...) My eyes have observed what always is, (6) wisdom that has been hidden from mankind, knowledge (**רַעַת**) and prudent understanding (hidden) from the sons of man, fount of justice and well of (7) strength and spring of glory (hidden) from the assembly of flesh. (...)"

"(...) For they are not included in his covenant for they have neither sought nor looked for/sought (דרשו) his decrees (בחוקיה) to know (לידע) the hidden matters (הנסתרות) in which they err (אשר תעו)".

ידע here refers to the knowledge that results from the study of the "decrees". In this sense ידע represents a "practical" knowledge that can be learned, so enabling the members of the Community to live according to the will of God. One practical side of this knowledge is familiarity with הנסתרות. This word might indicate that such knowledge has a mysterious nature, since it refers to matters hidden from the outside world. But the HB and the scrolls suggest that it refers to knowledge of the correct interpretation of the Law.<sup>26</sup> This special insight especially separates the Community from the rest of Israel.

V 19

"(18) (...) No holy man should support himself on any deed of (19) nothingness (כול מעשי הבל)<sup>27</sup>, for nothing (הבל) are all those who do not know (ידע) his covenant (בריתו)<sup>28</sup>. (...)"

<sup>26</sup> The striking word which leads to this understanding of ידע in this line is הנסתרות. The participle niph. of סתר might refer to things which are hidden from God or God hiding things from humans. Already in the HB this usage of סתר is known: Job 3:23 (the path of life); Isa. 40:27 (Jacob and Israel's path is hidden from God); Ps. 38:10 (the psalmist's sighing is not hidden from God); etc.. In IQS, סתר occurs six times. In all these cases סתר is linked with the Qumranian concept of separation from Israel. The Community has knowledge or wisdom which is hidden from the outside world, i.e. Israel. This hiding-process is not, as one would expect looking at the usage of סתר in the HB, a matter of God, but the Community seems to be very active in divine matters again. The usage of סתר in VIII 11,12 clearly indicates what I said about the "knowledge" of the members of the Community: the knowledge separates the Community from Israel through matters which are "hidden from Israel" (נסתר מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל). In IX 17, סתר is used to express the same concept. The "instructor" is supposed to "hide the counsel of the law in the midst of the men of justice" from the "man of the pit" (16) who is the man outside the Community. According to this line, not only are some matters hidden from Israel, but, according to IX 16f., the authorities in the Community are asked to hide actively the inside knowledge from the outside world. This latter idea seems also to be expressed in X 24 (see above). But the text is corrupt where סתר is used, hence a comment is not possible. In XI 6, סתר is used again to indicate this separation between the world (i.e. especially Israel) and the Community. According to this line, the Community has "wisdom" and "knowledge" which is "hidden from mankind" (נסתרה מאנוש).

<sup>27</sup> הבל in the HB refers either to a "breath/ breeze", a "nothing", a "vanity", or a "deception" often referring to the human life or human deeds. This seems to be the denotation Martinez/Tigheelaar suggest. Or it is used in the context of offerings and sacrifices (see for references G. Lisowsky, *Konkordanz*, 378). In IQS, הבל occurs only twice in V 19 (J.H. Charlesworth, *Graphic Concordance*, 122; K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 54). Hence, it is most likely that the author of IQS had the HB-usage of הבל in mind. According to this a member of the Com-

**ידע** refers here to the understanding of the covenant with God, and reflects the special understanding of the relationship between God and the Community which enables the Community to act accordingly.

X 9

"I will sing with/in knowledge (**בדעת**) and my music shall be for the glory of God , (...)."

In this case it is the psalmist who has **דעת**. His knowledge enables the psalmist to praise God. Hence, the divine **דעת**, received from God, puts him in a position to approach God by singing. **דעת** in this sense brings the psalmist closer to the glory (**כבוד**) of God.

X 24,25

"(24) I shall remove from my lips worthless words, unclean things and plotting from the knowledge of my heart.

With prudent counsel (**בעצת תושיה**) { I shall hide } /I shall recount/ knowledge, (25) and with discretion of knowledge I shall enclose him with a solid fence to maintain faithfulness and staunch judgement according to the justice of God.(...)"

These two lines are part of a prayer to God. Line 24 describes two different sorts of knowledge. The first is the knowledge which is not really complete, the knowledge of a person who is not in the Community. The second instance in l.24 is difficult to interpret, because the text is problematic.<sup>29</sup> We might assume that knowledge is the effect of a "prudent counsel" (**בעצת תושיה**), hence a "practical" knowledge allowing a perfect life in the Community.

---

munity would not do or be anything that is "nothing" before God. Therefore, even the use of this rare word implies that it is especially and first of all the separation of the Community from the outside world, especially Israel, which the concept of knowledge in 1QS is concerned about.

<sup>28</sup> Martinez/Tigchelaar translate "the covenant" ignoring the suffix. Either the translation or the transcript is wrong. The suffix however makes sense.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Martinez/Tigchelaar, *DSS I*, 96f.

In 1.25, the effects of knowledge are described. "Faithfulness" and "staunch judgement" belong to the person who has the knowledge. In this line, it is also made clear again that דעת is linked with the "justice of God" (צדקת אל). These effects and the link with the Law demonstrate again that דעת is not only divine knowledge given to the Community by God, but this knowledge makes the existence of a perfect Community before God possible through its special insight. It affects every aspect of the Community's life. Knowledge is what makes a perfect life before God in the Community possible.

By giving the Community knowledge, God enables them to prepare the ground for His presence in the Community through living a perfect life according to His will. Hence, the Community functioning according to the rules set out in IQS is essential for divine presence in the world.

Occasionally, דעת and ידע refer to a *special insight* of the Community that has a *mystic/mysterious* quality indicating that it is not only a knowledge divine in origin, but that it includes knowledge of phenomena that people without divine knowledge cannot understand. It covers phenomena such as the "mysteries and wonders of God", "hidden matters", etc..

Because the Community's knowledge explicitly includes such things, scholars often describe it as "esoteric" knowledge.<sup>30</sup> But the mere fact that the Community's knowledge includes phenomena beyond the comprehension of humanity is not sufficient reason for defining such knowledge as "esoteric". Knowledge in IQS serves different purposes: it changes the nature of the members of the Community and the Community itself; and it allows the Community to

<sup>30</sup>

K.G. Kuhn, *Die Sektenschriften und die iranische Religion* [ZThK 49, 1952] 306.

W.D. Davies, *Christian Origins and Judaism* [London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1962], 140.

enjoy a special status in relation to God. We have seen that it is knowledge given to the Community by God, which in turn conveys special status. In this sense, knowledge according to 1QS is a "practical" knowledge, enabling the Community to live a perfect life in relation to God (cf. the occurrences above). This "practical" knowledge also includes understanding of phenomena beyond the experience of outsiders. Only in this sense might one say that knowledge in 1QS bears an "esoteric" significance.<sup>31</sup>

This insight separates the Community even further from the rest of Israel and transfers it to a sphere above this world and closer to God than the rest of the world. Regarding the divine presence, such knowledge prepares the ground for an understanding of God's presence with the Community in such a sphere.

This aspect of knowledge can be seen in:

#### IV 6

" (...) [a spirit] of concealment concerning the truth of the mysteries of knowledge (רֵזִי דַעַת). (...)"

This phrase depends on the word רֵזִי in 1.4. According to 1.6, "mysteries of knowledge" (רֵזִי דַעַת) are part of the רֵזִי. "Mysteries" in 1QS are most often called phenomena which have a divine origin and which are passed on by God exclusively to the Community. This results in special insight for the Community. As part of the רֵזִי, this special insight is also defined as part of the Community as well as the *Lebenseinstellung*<sup>32</sup> of every member. The Community and its members are permeated by it and, hence, function accordingly.

<sup>31</sup> 1QS speaks of the knowledge of another world, heaven or paradise (see below), which is "esoteric" from the point of view of outsiders.

<sup>32</sup> On רֵזִי in this sense see also pp. 68, 70 (1QS V 20f.), and 94.

## XI 3

"(...) For from the source (ממקור) of his knowledge (דעתו) he has disclosed my light (אורי)<sup>33</sup>, and in/ through his wonders (ובנפלאותיו) my eye (עיני) observed (הביטה), and the light of my heart (is(?)) the mystery of

(4) existence (ברז נהיה). (...)"<sup>34</sup>

This line mentions again God as the מקור of knowledge as in X 12.<sup>35</sup> Here it is the knowledge, or understanding of the "wonders of God" and the "mystery of existence", a usage that shows the "esoteric" notion of the idea of knowledge in 1QS.<sup>36</sup>

### 3.2.4. The Knowledge of the Community and the Law

The sense in which the knowledge/insight of the Community affects every individual member, and the Community as a whole, can be seen in the description in 1QS of the interrelation of this knowledge and the Law. According to III 1 and V 11 (see above), the special knowledge/insight is the means for understanding and use of the Law of God and the rules of the Community.<sup>37</sup> This means that because of their special knowledge, it is only the Community that can interpret the Law perfectly/correctly.<sup>38</sup> Consequently it is only the Community that can live a perfect life according to correct interpretations of the Law, and by doing so prepare the Community as the only place where an immanent presence of God is possible. Observance of the Law therefore is crucial for the Community, as many aspects of the teachings of 1QS indicate.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>33</sup> Martinez/Tigchelaar, *DSS I*, 96f. read in their transcription אורי, but translate "his light" whereby "his" refers then to God. This translation, given that the transcription of the Hebrew is correct, is wrong.

<sup>34</sup> Martinez/Tigchelaar, *DSS I*, 97 translate as follows: "(...) For from the source of his knowledge he has disclosed his light (אורי), and my eyes have observed his wonders, and the light of my heart the mystery of (4) existence. (...)"

<sup>35</sup> See for X 12 and details on מקור above.

<sup>36</sup> This דעת might even be understood as the insight in the cause of all existence: ברז נהיה.

<sup>37</sup> Also H. Ringgren, although he understands the idea of knowledge as a whole differently (H. Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran. Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [New York: Crossroad, 1995] 117).

<sup>38</sup> Regarding the prophets cf. also 1QpHab II 9f. and VII 4f..

<sup>39</sup> See for example also pp. 59, 65, 69ff., 228.

Apart from III 1 and V 11 this can be seen also in VIII 18.<sup>40</sup>

"(16) (...) And anyone of the men of the Community, the covenant of (17) the Community, who willingly deviates from all that has been commanded, cannot approach the purity of the men of holiness, (18) and cannot know (עֵד) anything of their counsels until his deeds have been cleansed from every depravity, walking in perfect behaviour. (...)"

In this case עֵד refers first of all to the simple knowledge of events in a certain institution of the Community which a member who breaks Community rules cannot have, because he is not allowed to attend them till his case is settled. But it also refers to the specific Qumranian knowledge which provides the special status in relation to God and hence enables its members to keep the Community going according to the will of God.<sup>41</sup> Negligence of a Community rule, therefore, immediately excludes a person from that status while he is still a member of the Community. עֵד not only refers to knowledge used to interpret the Law, but to divine insight, a divine status, which can be taken away from individual members.<sup>42</sup>

### 3.2.5. A Perfect Life according to the Will of God through Knowledge

As already mentioned on some occasions above (cf. especially XI 3 and 18), the special knowledge of the Community not only gives certain members a special status before God, but it is the means of living a *perfect life* in the Community according to the will of God with all its implications. This can be seen in many lines where the knowledge of the Community is mentioned, but on a few occasions it is expressed particularly.

<sup>40</sup> Also in VI 25, עֵד occurs in a simple legal sense meaning committing a crime knowingly, i.e. "wilfully" or "premeditatedly": "(24) (...) If one is found among them who has lied (25) knowingly (עֵד) concerning his possessions, he shall be excluded from the pure food of the many for a year (...)."

<sup>41</sup> See for the concept of purity pp. XVI.

<sup>42</sup> W.D. Davies states that the knowledge mentioned in this passage is "secret knowledge" (W.D. Davies, *Christian Origins and Judaism* [London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1962] 127). But the emphasis in this passage lies again on the fact that knowledge gives the Community a special status before God that can be lost, and not on the fact that for the outsiders this knowledge is incomprehensible.

This means, as far as the divine presence is concerned, that every member of the Community (and the Community as a whole) can claim that God Himself gave them the means of achieving special status before Him to prepare the Community for His presence. Every aspect of life in the Community is evaluated in relation to God, and this emerges very clearly in IV 4:

"(3) (...) it is a spirit of meekness, of patience, generous compassion, eternal goodness, intelligence, understanding, potent wisdom which trusts in all (4) the deeds of God and depends on his abundant mercy; a spirit of knowledge (רוח דעת) in all the plans of action (בכול מחשבת מעשה), of enthusiasm for the decrees of justice."

The "paths in the world" (דרכיהן בתבל) of the members of the Community (IV 2) are taken by the Community in a certain spirit (רוח). רוח is the *Lebenseinstellung*, which the members in the Community must have according to IQS to live a perfect life in the Community according to the will of God. The different attributes of this רוח, which are mentioned in the passage above, are qualities which the members of the Community must possess for this purpose. Life in the Community is supposed to happen "in the spirit of these qualities".<sup>43</sup>

### 3.2.6. God is Immanent through Knowledge

Most aspects of the idea of knowledge mentioned above prepare the ground for a direct and immanent divine presence in the midst of the Community. Sometimes in IQS, when the knowledge of the Community is mentioned, this presence seems to be defined. The authors either indicate that there is a "divine presence" in the individual member through God's knowledge, the members being full of His knowledge, and hence full of a divine entity; or

<sup>43</sup> Another occasion where this meaning of רוח can be seen clearly is IV 6: "These are the foundations of the spirit of the sons of truth (in) the world". The text is here talking about the "Lebenseinstellung" of the members of the Community which distinguishes them from the world (on רוח in this sense see also pp. 68, 70 (IQS V 20f.), and 91).

that the Community and its organisational pattern is permeated by His presence. So we find in II 3:

"(...) May he [God] illuminate your heart (לבכזה) with the discernment of life and grace you with eternal knowledge (בדעת עולמים)." "

דעת comes from God, it is "eternal" and therefore divine. The connection with לב indicates that the דעת is something that affects the whole individual member who has knowledge.<sup>44</sup> It changes the nature of the individual. God might well be understood as being in a certain way present in this changed nature of the member.

## II 22

"(21) In third place all the people shall enter in order, one after another, in thousands, hundreds, (22) fifties and tens, so that each Israelite may know (לדעת) his standing in God's Community (ביחד אל)".

This occurrence of דעת is unique, for it does not refer directly to the knowledge that God gives to members of the Community, but to the simple knowledge a member has of his place or his function (מעמד) in the Community. II 3 talks about the organisational pattern of the Community, and the דעת of the Community cannot be understood without its divine origin.

מעמד represents the post or function of every member of the Community,<sup>45</sup> and is subject to the special knowledge of the Community. Therefore, the special Qumranian knowledge also permeates the very organisation of the Community itself, which enables the Community to achieve a sense of nearness to God.<sup>46</sup> Perfect organisation, as much as the perfect life of the

<sup>44</sup> לב is certainly one of the most anthropological terms in the HB. 814 times לב is used as the לב of a human (H.W. Wolff, *Anthropologie des Alten Testaments* [Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser/ Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1994] 68). Amongst these 814 occurrences it is most often used referring to "intellectual" or "rational" functions of the "heart" (ibid. 77ff.), as well as the "will" of a human (ibid. 84ff). This indicates that knowledge in II 3 is understood to affect every aspect of the individual member.

<sup>45</sup> See for מעמד p. 159f.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. IX 17,18 where the Maskil infiltrates the organisation of the Community through his function and

individual members, makes an immanent presence of God possible.<sup>47</sup>

## XI 16

"(...) (15) Blessed be you, my God, who opens to knowledge (לדעה) (16) the heart of your servant. (...)"

God makes דעה possible. Given to the Community, it distinguishes them from others: note how לב ענדכה is used in opposition to לב שרירות cf. 1QS II 26. The place of לב ענדכה in this context implies again that the knowledge which the members of the Community receive makes a presence of God in their changed natures possible. God permeates the individual member. Furthermore, the fact that God gives knowledge is reason for the members to praise God. דעה makes it possible to approach God by praising Him.

### 3.2.7. The Knowledge of a Heavenly Place

So far we have discussed knowledge of the Community defined as the special and mysterious insight of the Community, as a special understanding of the relationship between God and the Community. Some lines in 1QS inform us why the insight of the Community is special and in what way it defines the relationship between the Community and God: the knowledge of the Community is the knowledge of a heavenly sphere.

This knowledge enables the Community to understand themselves as being in a heavenly sphere, accessible only to themselves. If heaven is the place where God dwells, the Community, by being in this sphere, can claim to be surrounded and permeated by His presence.<sup>48</sup>

---

knowledge.

<sup>47</sup> The fact that the text here literally talks about the יחד אל strengthens this observation, because this word combination signifies that God has a very special relationship with this Community. It is so close that He might well be understood to dwell in it.

<sup>48</sup> This feature of knowledge seems to incorporate the ones discussed above and to represent one of the pillars of knowledge in 1QS. It explains why knowledge and mystery are so closely related, and it reflects what the desire and purpose of the Community is: to be close to God.

The line in which this notion is expressed most clearly is VIII 9, but IV 22 also refers to this point.

### VIII 9

"(8) (...) (It will be) the most holy dwelling (9) for Aaron (מעון קודש קודשים לאהרון) with/through knowledge of them all ((עולם) כולם) בדעת for the covenant of justice (לברית משפט) to offer a pleasant /aroma/; and (it will be) a house of perfection and truth in Israel".

According to this line דעת again comes from God and it is "eternal" ((עולם) כולם). Also, דעת is a "practical" knowledge concerning the covenant and the Law (ברית משפט). It is a divine instrument for living perfectly in the Community.<sup>49</sup>

The דעת is a quality of the Community: מעון קודש קודשים לאהרון. This phrase indicates the major point of this occurrence of the idea of knowledge in 1QS. מעון in this passage indicates strongly that the authors understand the Community as a heavenly- and/or Temple-like place.<sup>50</sup> They claim to be at a place that belongs to the divine sphere where God dwells. This place does not simply belong to the world, and it separates the Community even more from the rest of Israel.

This meaning of דעת as a quality of such a heavenly- and/or Temple-like place not only suggests that such knowledge is a special, divine insight of the Community, permeating each individual member of the Community and representing the means for the Community to live a perfect life before God. It seems also to allow the Community to be part of a divine sphere as a consequence of their perfect life. This reveals something further: in 1QS, דעת is the *knowledge of a heavenly- Temple-like group*.

<sup>49</sup> See pp. 86ff.; cf. also 39-51.

<sup>50</sup> See on מעון pp. 134-141.

By claiming that the knowledge of the Community is the knowledge of a heavenly- and/or Temple-like Community, the authors of the scroll have manoeuvred the Community into the sphere of the Divine presence and allow the Community to understand God as being present with them.

#### IV 22

"(...) to instruct the upright ones in the knowledge of the Most High (בדעת עליין), and to teach the wisdom of the sons of heaven (והכמת בני שמים) to those of perfect path/behaviour. (...)"<sup>51</sup>

The Community (ישרים) receive special divine insight. But they also (the תמימי דרך) will understand the "wisdom of the sons of heaven". Hence, they claim to have heavenly insight, strongly indicating that they understood themselves as being in the heavenly sphere where God dwells.<sup>52</sup>

#### 3.2.8. Post-Fall Knowledge - Pre-Fall Status

In one line in IQS, IQS IV 26, לדעת טובן ורע occurs in the phrase

<sup>51</sup> Cf. also pp. 51ff.

<sup>52</sup> W.D. Davies does not see a link between knowledge and the heavenly world in this passage and does not deal with the significance of the quality of knowledge for the actual present time of the Community. He classifies this knowledge as knowledge of the events of the *eschaton* (W.D. Davies, *Christian Origins and Judaism* [London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1962] 129). Like H. Ringgren (see below) he does not see that the divine insight of the Community is significant for the self-understanding of the Community in relation to God at the time when it existed. Knowledge is not primarily concerned with the future status of the Community (as W.D. Davies *ibid.*, 131 suggests) but the status it has *now* in relation to God as the true representative of the rest of Israel and as the only means for Israel to (re-)establish her relationship with God.

<sup>53</sup> Line 26, where the verb ידע occurs, is the bottom line of the column. In this line, the text has been damaged on three occasions (cf. J.C. Trever, *Scrolls from Qumrân Cave 1. The Great Isaiah Scroll. The Order of the Community. The Peshier to Habakkuk* [Jerusalem: The Albright Institute of Archaeological Research and The Shrine of the Book, 1972] 132f.). For this investigation the second gap in the text is important. It follows the words לדעת טוב. Most transcriptions or translations reconstruct the text and add "ורע" and "evil" after לדעת טוב (cf. for example J. Maier, *Qumran-Essener I*, 177; G. Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* [London/New York: The Penguin Press, 1997] 103). But most of them also suggest that the gap that follows לדעת טוב is shorter than it actually is according to the photograph of Trever (*ibid.*) (cf. especially the transcript of Martinez/Tigchelaar, *DSS I*, 78). In any case, the insertion of ורע seems to be a very likely reconstruction of the text and will be used here as the textual basis. The following translation uses the following transcription which is based on the photographs of Trever (*ibid.*):

"(25) (...) For God has sorted them into equal parts until the appointed time and the new creation. He knows (ידע) the result of their deeds for all times (26) [everlas]ting and has given them as a legacy to the sons of man so that they know good [and evil ] to [c]ast the destiny for every living being according to his spirit in [ ] the visitation."

ידע occurs in this passage twice. In the first instance (1.25), it is understood as an attribute of God and refers to the predestination of human life. God "knows" what will happen. This idea of predestination is also relevant regarding the second occurrence of ידע (1.26), but here the texts talks about the knowledge of *man* (בני איש) in a very peculiar way. In fact, the phrase לדעת טוב ורע is probably one of the most interesting phrases in 1QS, because according to this scroll the idea of "knowledge of good and evil" defines the nature of the Community in a way that, on the one hand, depends on the HB-material, but, on the other, modifies the idea of the nature of the Community in a manner unthinkable to the authors of the HB. The idea of the "knowledge of good and evil" as mentioned 1QS IV 26 can only be understood on the basis of the HB, where the phrase דעת טוב ורע is found twice: in Gen. 3:5 and 3:22. These occurrences served most likely as *Vorlage* for that in 1QS IV 26. The understanding, interpretation, and modification of these biblical verses by the authors of 1QS are crucial for its meaning in 1QS IV 26. דעת טוב ורע in 1QS IV 26 needs to be understood in connection with creation, paradise, Fall, and the relationship of mankind with God in this context. דעת טוב ורע can, therefore, not *simply* be the condition for "doing good", proving the "ethical character" of the Community as Dombrowski claims.<sup>54</sup> The knowledge of

[ ] וינחילן לפני איש לדעת טוב ורע [ ] לן [ ] פיל גורלות לכול חי לפי רוחו ב. [ ] הפקודה

The investigation below will also show that this reconstruction is likely.

<sup>54</sup> B. Dombrowski, *Erscheinung, Wesen und Ideologie der Assoziation von Hirbet Qumran nach dem "Manual of Discipline" (1QS)* [Paris: Société Nouvelle des Éditions Letouzey et Ané, and Halifax: Atlantic Nova Print Ltd., 1971] 521.

good and evil, according to 1QS, is rather about the special nature of the Community that allows its members to be much closer to God than any other human beings. I will demonstrate this first by comparing 1QS IV 26 with its two *Vorlagen* in the HB; and second by taking into account also the interpretations of Gen. 3:5,22 in the Versions and the Targumim.

### Gen. 3:5

כי ידע אלהים כי ביום אכלכם ממנו ונפקחו עיניכם  
והייתם כאלהים ידעי טוב ורע

For God is knowing that on the day you eat from them (and) your eyes shall be opened  
and you shall be like God/Gods knowing what is good and evil.

To compare Gen. 3:5 with 1QS IV 26, we need to analyse four aspects in Gen. 3:5 in detail: the knowledge of God (1.), the way in which human beings can gain knowledge (2.), the comparison כאלהים (3.), and the meaning of the phrase ידעי טוב ורע (4.).

1. According to Gen. 3:5, knowledge is an attribute of God. As shown above, this feature of knowledge is central in 1QS and 1QH.

2. The striking difference between 1QS IV 26 and Gen. 3:5 is the way in which knowledge can be gained. As shown above, knowledge according to 1QS/H is a gift from God to the Community. The primary decision on whether the Community receives the knowledge that makes it special and distinguishes from others lies, therefore, solely in the hand of God. The *conditio sine qua non* for the Community to receive knowledge is twofold. First, according to its own self-understanding, the Community is *predestined* to receive knowledge from God. The Community has been elected by God and is, therefore, special *per se* and distinguishes itself by origin and nature from the rest of mankind. Secondly, as the elected group and

having received knowledge from God, the Community is asked to act according to this knowledge. This means that knowledge from God is a means by which the Community can live perfectly according to the will of God *improving* permanently its status in relation to Him.

Gen. 3:5, on the other hand, tells a different story about how mankind receives the knowledge of what is good and evil. According to this verse, knowledge is the consequence of a free-will action of the human beings themselves. The Fall changes the nature of mankind and its relation to God permanently.

To understand how this difference in receiving knowledge results in different understanding of the nature of mankind/Community in relation to God, two aspects need to be discussed in detail.

a) According to Gen. 3:5 the human free-will action that leads to knowledge of what is good and just is a *disobedience* of a command of God (Gen. 3:3). This affects the status of human beings after "the Fall". From then on, they certainly have new divine knowledge; but their new status no longer allows God to be with them. Through "the Fall", human beings lost their direct relationship with God, *i.e.*, being with God in paradise for ever. "The Fall" brought mankind divine knowledge and made it even god-like; but it also separated humanity from God.

IQS/H understand the situation of mankind, as far as the Community is concerned, quite differently. In fact, in a sense the Community claims the very opposite of what the HB asserts. Because (according to IQS/H) reception of divine knowledge is entirely dependent on a voluntary act of God, and not on any human action, and *certainly* not on any human disobedience of a divine command, the Community can claim that its members have not been tainted by the events surrounding Adam's disobedience in such a way that the Divine Presence has



left them. The Community receives direct from God its special status without the influence of evil or darkness, because God has so *predestined* this state of affairs. Elected by God, the Community is the special group of people that receives divine knowledge and at the same time can act perfectly according to this knowledge thus fulfilling the will of God. This means that the Community can *per definitionem* not fail to improve its status in relation to God which gives it a very special status in relation to God. Consequently, the Community is truly a יִחְדָּ, a *unique* institution never before seen on earth, since it possesses as a יִחְדָּ (union) both the knowledge acquired by human beings as a result of Adam and Eve's transgression and the status enjoyed by humanity's first parents as creatures living in the presence of their creator. The Israel of the HB never enjoyed anything so privileged as this.<sup>55</sup>

b) The reason why this kind of relationship has never been seen on earth before lies in the following claim of IQS and IQH:

The Community did not disobey a command of God. This not only leads to a special status of the Community, but also indicates that the Community thought that it did not lose the status which mankind was holding before "the Fall". Because IQS does not understand "the Fall" as the cause for humanity's gaining knowledge of what is good and evil, but sees all its knowledge as a direct gift from God, and because it tries to picture the Community where- and whenever it can as being in spheres closer to God than to earth, it seems very likely that IQS understood the Community as having a Pre-Fall-Status, but at the same time a Post-Fall-Knowledge.<sup>56</sup>

<sup>55</sup> That the Community understood itself to have this special status can also be seen in the Eden- and Paradise-imagery found especially in IQH XVI 4-36. Although the authors of IQH are clearly using metaphors in this column, especially lines 4 and 20 seem to indicate that the members of the Community reading or reciting the text were understood as people being at a place that is very similar to paradise (cf. also IQH V 13-19; XIV 14-18).

<sup>56</sup> Although Edmund F. Sutcliffe, S.J., *The Monks of Qumran as depicted in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [London: Burns & Oates, 1960] 72 sees a link between "the Fall" and the phrase "to do good and to do evil", he does not elaborate the idea and expects it to be significant for the question of predestination and the free will of man.

And this is why the status that the Community claims to have in relation to God has never been held by any other human being before. The members enjoy the company of God, as Adam and Eve did in paradise. But they also claim to have divine knowledge of what is good and evil which enables them to improve their status even more and to function as a "bridge" between the rest of Israel and God.

3. Gen. 3:5 identifies the status of mankind after the Fall with "being like God/s (כאלהים)".

This does not necessarily mean that human beings are all God/s, but must be taken to mean that they are like God/s inasmuch as they know what is good and evil. As we will see below, the versions and the Targumim object to this idea in general. In 1QS and 1QH, on the other hand, we find the tendency to understand the members of the Community as beings other than humans, especially angels. Although one cannot claim that this idea derives from an interpretation of Gen. 3:5, this verse certainly could have given the authors of 1QS/H the material for their claims.

4. Neither 1QS IV 26 nor Gen. 3:5 seem to define **ידעי טוב ורע** precisely. In the latter case (Gen. 3:5), this knowledge is the knowledge of humankind under the influence of evil.

**רע** and **טוב** seem to refer to all aspects of human knowledge. It means the universal human knowledge. According to 1QS, as seen above, the knowledge of the Community is understood to be more than this, because it is given by God and represents a special insight that allows the Community to live perfectly in relation to God.<sup>57</sup> The definition of knowledge in 1QS IV 26 and Gen. 3:5 will be interesting in comparison with the Targumim below.

---

He does not encounter the significance of "*knowing* good and evil" for the self-understanding of the Community as an elected group in a divine sphere.

<sup>57</sup> R. Gordis describes the nature of this knowledge. He bases his entire "new" interpretation of the idea of "knowledge of good and evil" in Gen. 3 on his interpretation of 1QSa I 9-11. He claims that the knowledge men-

## Gen. 3:5 in the Versions and the Targumim

The interpretation of Gen. 3:5 by IQS IV 26 is, as seen above, a Community-centered one and reflects a very special way of interpreting the idea of knowledge as it occurs in Gen. 3:5. Especially the fact that the authors of IQS use this HB-verse to define the Community's relation to God by distinguishing themselves from the rest of the world is so unique that we must now look at the versions and the Rabbinic literature to find out whether or not similar interpretations of Gen. 3:5 might have been circulating in the Jewish world at the time.

The versions read as follows:

LXX	<p>ἤδει γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἐν ἧ ἂν ἡμέρα φάγητε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, διανοιχθήσονται ὕμων οἱ ὀφθαλμοί, καὶ ἔσεσθε ὡς θεοὶ γινώσκοντες καλὸν καὶ πονηρὸν.</p> <p>"For God has known (pluperf.) that on whatever day you ate (2.pl.ind. Aor act.) from these, your eyes will be opened (3.pl. ind. fut.pass.) and you will be like gods (no article) knowing (part. pres. act. m.pl.) good and evil."</p>
Vulgate	<p>Scit enim Deus quod in quocumque die comederitis ex eo aperientur oculi vestri et eritis sicut dii scientes bonum et malum.</p> <p>"For God knows (pres.) that on whatever day you will eat it your eyes will be opened and you will be like gods knowing good and evil."</p>
Onkelos	<p>ארי גלי קדם יוי ארי ביומא דתיכלון מניה יתפתח עיניכון ותהון כרברבין חכמין בין טב לביש</p> <p>For it is revealed before JVJ that on the day you will eat from it, your eyes will be opened and you will be like mighty ones (who are) wise (to distinguish) good from evil.</p>

tioned in IQSa, and hence in Gen. 3, refers to "sexual experience, the normal (טוב) manifestations of the impulse and the abnormal (רע)" (R. Gordis, *The Knowledge of Good and Evil in the Old Testament and the Qumran Scrolls* (JBL 76, 1957)). Knowledge in Gen. 3 according to him, means "sexual consciousness" (ibid. 130). Gordis' conclusions cannot endure criticism, because he comes to this conclusion by *not* investigating in detail the usages of טוב and רע in the HB and the Qumran scrolls (cf. ibid 133<sup>35,36</sup>). The phrase בדעתו [טוב] ורע in IQSa I 10f. ("(9) (...) He shall not [approach] (10) a woman to know her through carnal intercourse until he is fully twe[nt]y years old, when he knows [good] (11) and evil. (...)") has to be interpreted in the same way as טוב ורע in IQS I 5 and IV 26. In both cases טוב qualifies the deeds of the members of the Community, hence their lives in the Community in relation to God. IV 25, preceding the phrase רע טוב, even mentions that God "knows the results of their [man's] deeds (מעשיהן)" which makes it very likely that טוב refers in line 26 to these deeds (see below). Also the usage of טוב in IQS I 2 indicates strongly that the word means the positive quality of the actions of the members of the Community in relation to God. רע טוב in IQSa I 10f., therefore, means the same, although used in the context of sexual relations: being in the Community for twenty years gives the member the insight to "know good and evil". Sexual relations are part of this insight.

Pseudo Jonathan

ארום גלי קדם ייי ארום ביומא (6) דתיכלון מיניה  
 ותיהוון כמלאכין רברבין דחכמין למינדע בין טב לביש  
 Because it is revealed before JJJ that on the day (6) you will eat from it,  
 you will be like great angels who are wise to know good from evil.

Neophiti

ארום גלי וידיע קר[ם] ייי ארום ביומא די תאכלון מינה ויתפתחן עיינכון  
 ותהון כמלאכין מן קדם ייי ידעין למפרשה בין טב לביש  
 Because it is revealed and known before JJJ that on the day on which you will eat from it  
 your eyes will be opened,  
 and you will be like angels from before JJJ knowing to distinguish between good and evil.

Fragment Targums

Cairo Geniza fragments are very similar to TN.

Syriaca

For God knows that on the day you ate of it your eyes are opened and you are like gods  
 knowing good and evil.

The Versions and the Targumim, like 1QS, all modify those aspects in Gen. 3:5 which are theologically difficult to understand; but a detailed comparison will show that they do so for different reasons, motivations, and goals.

Three aspects are significant in this comparison: the idea of the Fall as the condition of the knowledge (1.), the meaning of **באלהים** (2.), and the nature of the knowledge (3.).

1. We have seen that the most significant modification of the Gen. 3:5 in 1QS is the idea that the Community has the knowledge of what is good and evil, not because of the Fall, but because of their elected and special status. This is why the Community has a Pre-Fall status, and at the same time Post-Fall knowledge (see above).

This particular understanding and development of Gen. 3:5 occurs neither in the versions nor in the Targumim. In all these, the Fall is the condition of knowledge of what is good and evil. 1QS developed, therefore, its own and independent understanding of the phrase.

2. כאלהים as found in Gen. 3:5 is a different matter. The idea of human beings being like gods or even God is theologically difficult. All versions and the Targumim object to this idea to some degree and see the need for changes.

Hence, the LXX and the Vulgate, within the limits of translations, render כאלהים with either ὡς θεοὶ or "sicut dii" making sure that human beings after the Fall are only understood as god-like persons and are not identified with God Himself.

The Targumim take more liberty, change the original text, and claim that man after the Fall will neither be like God nor gods, but either like "great angels" (כמלאכין רברבין) (PJ)<sup>58</sup>; כמלאכין מן קדם ייי (N)<sup>59</sup>, or "mighty ones wise (to distinguish) between good and evil" (כרבבין חכמין בין טב לביש) (O)<sup>60</sup>.

The Targumic interpretations of Gen. 3:5 are significant for our purposes here. They are introduced into the Aramaic renderings of this verse to explain a statement in the HB which presents theological difficulties, in that it appears to compare Adam and Eve, who have transgressed a divine command, with "gods". The Targumim, resolving this difficulty, indicate that the first human pair who now have "knowledge of good and evil" are like "mighty ones", "mighty angels", "angels" who are "wise" in distinguishing between good and evil. This Targumic interpretation indicates that Adam and Eve are a) privileged above others in general yet b) remain different in nature from God(s).<sup>61</sup> In IQS, allusion to Gen. 3:5 is used not so

<sup>58</sup> According to Maher, the reading of PJ is a combination of the reading of O with "angels" (M. Maher, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis. Translated, with Introduction and Notes* [The Aramaic Bible vl. 1B; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992] 25<sub>c</sub>).

<sup>59</sup> McNamara renders "like angels before the Lord" (M. McNamara, *Targum Neofiti 1: Genesis. Translated, with Introduction and Notes* [The Aramaic Bible vl. 1A; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992] 60).

<sup>60</sup> Grossfeld translates with "like angels perceptive <to know> good from evil" (B. Grossfeld, *Targum Onkelos to Genesis. Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes* [The Aramaic Bible vl. 6; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988] 46).

<sup>61</sup> Maher notes on the verse that "all the Targums of our present verse avoid suggesting that Eve could become like God" (M. Maher, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis. Translated, with Introduction and Notes* [The Aramaic Bible vl. 1B; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992] 25<sub>c</sub>).

much to distinguish human beings from God after Adam's disobedience, but to demonstrate that members of the Community, and only those, are by nature *much closer* to God than any other human being. The Targumic modifications of Gen. 3:5 examined here show that Jews in antiquity were quite capable of understanding this verse in terms of persons endowed with angelic qualities in respect of their wisdom, a line of thought which the author or authors of IQS similarly pursued.<sup>62</sup>

While the possibility that individuals may enjoy a "Pre-Fall status" and at the same time "Post-Fall knowledge" seems to be uniquely Qumranian, the notion that people may stand as angels or angel-like beings in a special relationship with God seems to have been known also to the Targumim, and included in their interpretation of the HB.

3. Another element of Gen. 3:5 that has been changed in the Targumim is the idea of knowledge.

Rather than use Aramaic ידע to translate the corresponding cognate Hebrew verb in Gen. 3:5, the Targumim (with the exception of the Geniza fragment) use the root חכם, which can indeed mean "to know", but evidently has the strong emphasised aspect of "wisdom", "being wise" so as to know, inherent in it. In short, the Targumim emphasise Adam's and Eve's acquisition of *wisdom* in distinguishing between good and evil, a point not foreign to IQS, with its emphasis on exactly the same qualities for the Community's *maskil* and members.

<sup>62</sup> The phrase כמלאכין מן קדם ייי in N seems to strengthen this observation. It states that as angels who know good and evil man stands in a special relationship with God. This is precisely what IQS and IQH claim for the Community and it is often expressed in the scrolls by לפני (see below).

**Gen. 3:22**

The second *Vorlage* of IQS IV 26 may be found in Gen. 3:22 where **לדעת טוב ורע** occurs in the same context and with a similar meaning as in Gen. 3:5. A few aspects of the usage of the phrase in this verse are noteworthy regarding IQS IV 26:

יאמר יהוה אלהים הן האדם היה כאחד ממנו לדעת טוב ורע

ועתה פן־ישלח ידו ולקח גם מעץ החיים ואכל וחי לעולם

"And JHWH God said, Behold the man was/became like one of us to know what is good and evil, and now lest he reaches out his hand and takes also from the tree of life and eats and live forever."

Crucial again is the comparison of mankind after the Fall with God/s. In Gen. 3:22, the authors use words different from those in Gen. 3:5 to express this. They picture God *Himself* saying that mankind is **ממנו כאחד**. This may imply a) that there is more than one god, b) that the nature of mankind after the Fall changes significantly, and c) that the Fall and this change of nature are the conditions for **לדעת טוב ורע**. The similarities and difference between the meaning of the phrase "knowing what is good and evil" in Gen. 3:22 and IQS IV 26 are the same as between Gen. 3:5 and IQS IV 26. Knowing what is good and evil is in all three texts about *humans gaining a similar nature to God(s), in that they know what is good and evil*. But in Gen. 3:5,22 the condition for this similar nature is the Fall, which results on the one hand in humans possessing this knowledge; and on the other hand in a separation from God, in that they have to leave paradise. IQS adopts the idea of a changed nature of human beings, *i.e.* the Community, in that it possesses the knowledge of what is good and evil. But it claims at the same time that the Yahad keeps the status in relation to God that mankind possessed before the Fall. By doing so, IQS gives the Community an unique status in

relation to God: not only does it have a Divine nature through its Divine knowledge (*i.e.* the members of the Yahad being god-like), but it also qualifies for His presence through its new and unique nature and the place where it can dwell.<sup>63</sup>

Interesting in comparison with Gen. 3:22 and IQS IV 26 are the interpretations of the HB verse in the Versions and the Targumim:

- LXX καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς Ἰδοὺ Ἀδὰμ γέγονεν ὡς εἶς ἐξ ἡμῶν τοῦ γινώσκειν καλὸν καὶ πονηρὸν, καὶ νῦν μήποτε ἐκτείνη τὴν χεῖρα καὶ λάβῃ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς καὶ φάγῃ καὶ ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα  
 "And God said: See! Adam became/has become like one of us to know good and evil and now lest he stretch out his hand and take from the tree of life and eat and live forever."
- Vulgate Et ait ecce Adam factus est quasi unus ex nobis sciens bonum et malum nunc ergo ne forte mittat manum suam et sumat etiam de ligno vitae et comedat et vivat in aeternum.  
 "And he said: See! Adam has become like one of us knowing good and evil, now consequently that he do not stretch out his hand and take from the tree of life too and eat and live forever."
- Onkelos ואמר יי אלהים הא אדם הוה יחידי בעלמא מניה למידע טב וביש וכען דלמא יושיט ידיה ויסב אף מאילן חייא וייכול וייחי לעלם:  
 "And JWI God said: See! Adam was unique in the world of himself to know good and evil; and now perhaps he will stretch out his hand and take too from the tree of life and will eat and live forever."
- Pseudo Jonathan ואמר ייי אלקים למלאכיא די משמשין קומוי הא אדם הוה יחידי בארעא היכמא דאנא יחידי בשמי מרומא ועתידין למיקום מיניה דידעין למפרשא בין טב לביש:  
 "And JJJ God said to the angels who serve before Him: See Adam was unique on the earth as I am unique in the heavens of the height; and there are destined to arise from him those who know how to distinguish between good and evil."
- Neophiti ואמר ייי אלהים הא אדם קדמיה דברית יתיה יחידי בעלמא היך מה דאנא יחידי בשמי מרומא עתידין אומין סגיאין למקום מנה ומנה תקום אומנה] חדא דידעה למפרשה בין טב לביש  
 "And JJJ God said: "Behold, the first Adam whom I have created is unique in the world as I am alone in the heavens on high. Numerous nations are to arise from him, and from him shall arise one nation who will know to distinguish between good and evil."

63

See on the last point also pp. 135-141, 142-165.

Generally, Vulgate and LXX seem concerned to follow the Hebrew.<sup>64</sup> But the interpretations of Gen. 3:22 in the Targumim are especially interesting in comparison with IQS IV 26. Although the Targumim on Gen. 3:22 do not interpret the idea of "knowing what is good and evil" exactly as IQS IV 26 does, their interpretations of the verse offer ideas which seem to be similar to ideas found in the scroll.

In TO especially, knowing what is good and evil is not pictured as the consequence of eating the fruit of the tree of life. Rather, Adam's status of knowing what is good and evil seems to be understood as part of his created nature. That is to say that knowing what is good and evil seems to be a character of Adam in paradise: he knows good and evil *of himself*.<sup>65</sup> In this, the interpretation and development of Gen. 3:22 in TO is very similar to the understanding of the idea of "knowing what is good and evil" in IQS IV 26. According to TO, it is Adam who has this special status already in paradise; according to IQS IV 26 it is the Community that knows what is good and evil without having lost the status of humankind in paradise. The difference, however, is that in TO the disobedience - the eating of the fruit of the tree of life - is still to come, whereas according to the understanding of IQS the relationship between the Community and God will not be challenged or even destroyed by such a disobedience to God. This means that according to IQS IV 26 the Community has even a more special status in relation to God than Adam according to TO. It seems that TO and IQS IV 26 see the difficulty that HB Gen. 3:22 presents, in that it describes the *fallen* humanity as possessing *Divine* knowledge and, consequently, as being similar to God or gods<sup>66</sup> by nature.<sup>67</sup> But, whereas TO's interpretation of this difficulty pictures Adam possessing the knowledge *before* the Fall,

<sup>64</sup> Salvesen even suggests that the Targums offer the same "traditional interpretation" (A. Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch* [Journal of Semitic Studies Monograph 15, Manchester 1991], 17).

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Salvesen, *ibid.*

<sup>66</sup> PJ seems to attempt to deliver an explanation of the difficult *ממנו* by adding "to the ministers who serve before Him" (M. Maher, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis. Translated, with Introduction and Notes* [Edinburgh 1992] 29<sub>48</sub>).

<sup>67</sup> Cf. on the other hand Gen. 1:17.

1QS IV 26 exploits this difficulty in that it understands the knowledge of what is good and evil as a Divine gift to the Community that is not linked with the Fall: the Community possesses it *per se*. This is why the Community can claim, as we will see below, to possess the status in relation to God that mankind had in paradise, and, at the same time, to have a "god-like" quality. This especially qualifies the Yahad for Divine presence.

Additionally, a few details are worth mentioning here that illustrate similarities between the Targumic interpretation and the one in 1QS. Especially TO and PJ emphasise that Adam is "the only" one knowing what is good and evil. He is "unique" in possessing the ability to have this knowledge.<sup>68</sup> The word used is יחידרי (O) and יחידרי/יחידריי (PJ) which is in itself an interesting observation.<sup>69</sup> According to 1QS the uniqueness of the Community in its special status in relation to God is one of the major characteristics of the יחדר at Qumran. Both interpretations of Gen. 3:22 seem to attempt to emphasise, therefore, the uniqueness of those who have the knowledge of what is good and evil.

But it is also clear from PJ and N that despite the special ability of those knowing what is good and evil, God's sphere and the one of these human being(s) is separated. God and this human knowing what is good and evil have a similar nature, inasmuch as they both have this knowledge, but they do not dwell in the same place. In fact, the Targumim explicitly put God in heaven and man on earth. This is clearly a point - a significant point - where the interpretation of 1QS goes beyond the Targumim. According to 1QS, knowing what is good and evil and having a Pre-Fall-Status is exactly why the Community qualifies to bear God's presence.

<sup>68</sup> יחידרי has to be rendered with "unique" rather than "alone" (M. Maher, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis. Translated, with Introduction and Notes* [Edinburgh 1992] 28<sub>39</sub>) to indicate that it is the special status of Adam in relation to God that is the question here.

<sup>69</sup> Cf., for example, Isa. 42:14; 52:9 where Symmachus uses ομοσ as rendering for יחדר, and Jer. 46:12 where it uses the same for יחידרי (cf. A. Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch* [Journal of Semitic Studies Monograph 15, Manchester 1991] 18).

Finally, N mentions an aspect of Adam's destiny which almost could be taken as describing the Community. N interprets that from Adam there shall arise especially "one nation" that has the special knowledge. This means that we find in both N and IQS a development according to which knowledge of good and evil is not a characteristic of mankind in general, but of a privileged group.

Concluding, we can say that there are a few astonishing similarities between the interpretations of the idea of knowing what is good and evil (Gen. 3:22) in the Targumim and IQS IV 26. Both texts seek to emphasise that knowing what is good and evil is the privilege of a chosen group of people. Knowing what is good and evil makes humans similar to God, and gives those who have this knowledge a unique status in relation to God and the world.

But there are points in which IQS differs from the interpretations of the Targumim. IQS's interpretation is Community-centred and develops an idea of a status of human beings in relation to God through knowledge, that allows the Community to be much closer to God than any other group of people. IQS IV 26 exploits Gen. 3:22 (HB) to demonstrate the Yahad's unique and special relationship with God that allows them to be with Divine presence.

### 3.3. IQH

Knowledge in IQH has been the subject of various scholarly studies, and in general terms coheres with the picture of **קהלת** assembled above in respect of IQS.

IQH mentions knowledge of God and knowledge of humans as IQS does: God knows man and man knows (aspects of) God.<sup>70</sup> As in IQS, the knowledge of God is a divine attribute and is qualified as the knowledge of the creator (cf. IQH IX 7,19f). Knowledge is here again a

<sup>70</sup> Cf. S. Wagner, **לעת** in den Lobliedern von Qumran, in: S. Wagner (ed.), *Bibel und Qumran. Beiträge zur Erforschung der Beziehung zwischen Bibel- und Qumranwissenschaften* (Festschrift Hans Bardtke zum 22.9.1966) [Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1968] 232-252, 240.

means whereby God creates and governs the universe. Wagner recognises this, but fails to relate God's knowledge to His will, which acts as the power, the principle, governing this knowledge.<sup>71</sup> The former is a means, not a principle of action.

Regarding knowledge which humans have, *the knowledge of aspects of God's nature* is central to 1QH (IX 21; XIV 8f.; XVII 9f. (באמתכה); XIX 7 (אמת פיכה)<sup>72,17</sup>; XX 11-13; VII 13, 23 (בחר); VIII 4,11).<sup>73</sup> This is a point where the idea of knowledge in 1QH differs from that in 1QS. We have seen that human knowledge of God is only mentioned once in 1QS. Consequently, 1QH emphasises different aspects of the special relationship between God and the Community than 1QS.<sup>74</sup>

Mostly this idea of knowledge is expressed through the verb ידע. Its subject is the psalmist. As in 1QS, knowledge is understood as a privilege of members of the Community.<sup>75</sup> Through the knowledge of aspects of God's nature, the members of the Community claim to be in a *personal* relationship with God. They claim to be in a "Gottesgemeinschaft".<sup>76</sup> But this relationship with God has a different quality than that in 1QS. As a collection of psalms, 1QH follows more closely the ideas of the psalms of the HB than 1QS (cf. for example Ps. 20:6;

<sup>71</sup> Ibid. 248.

<sup>72</sup> Kosmala suggests regarding 1QH XIX 7 that knowledge is a "Gnadengabe" Gottes (H. Kosmala, *Die "Erkenntnis der Wahrheit", Hebräer - Essener - Christen* [StPB 1, 1959] 142). It is correct that God gives the knowledge to the Community, but not primarily because of grace or mercy. One of the major claims of 1QS and 1QH is that they are able to "earn" the nearness of God by themselves. Knowledge is a means by which they realize this.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. also J. de Caemel, *La Connaissance Religieuse dans les Hymnes d'Action de Grâce de Qumrân* [Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses (EphThLov) 38, 1962] 442.

<sup>74</sup> H. Ringgren does not seem to understand that 1QS and 1QH are emphasising different aspects of knowledge (H. Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran. Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [New York: Crossroad, 1995] 116). According to him, knowing God is a central aspect in both 1QS and 1QH.

<sup>75</sup> The question whether the psalmist is the "Teacher of Righteousness" is not significant here and beyond the limit of this study. Important at this point is that singing the psalms as part of the liturgy of the Community every member puts that member into the position of the psalmist.

<sup>76</sup> S. Wagner, *עדי in den Lobliedern von Qumran*, in: Siegfried Wagner (ed.), *Bibel und Qumran. Beiträge zur Erforschung der Beziehung zwischen Bibel- und Qumranwissenschaften* (Festschrift Hans Bardtke zum 22.9.1966) [Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1968] 237, cf. also 240. S. Wagner does not see that this "Gottesgemeinschaft" is not an intellectual desire, but an existential one before and in relation to God, as will be clear from our analysis below.

41:11; 135:5; Job 19:25). This is why in 1QH this special relationship is described as the one between God and the righteous in the HB, hence a *personal* one, and not as the particular relationship between God and the Community living according to and for the will of God, aiming at a special status before God. According to 1QH, the knowledge of aspects of God's nature leaves the members of the Community in an entirely earthly sphere. The special relationship is determined through personal belief, and is not constituted through the idea that the Community is a place where God Himself dwells.<sup>77</sup>

But there is a point that indicates that even in 1QH knowledge might be a means by which the Community defines its status before God: according to 1QH, God is the source of knowledge. But this notion in 1QH is not as strong as it is in IQS (cf. 1QH VI 25; VIII 11; IX 26; XIX 8; XX 10,11f.,29). According to 1QH, God has unlimited knowledge that He can use (XIX 8,28; VII 25).<sup>78</sup> He lets the members of the Community take part in this knowledge. Five times ידע (hif.) is used to express this idea (XII 27; XV 27; XVIII 14; XIX 4,16). This knowledge which God gives the members of the Community is (in 1QH, as in IQS) linked with the mysteries of God (cf. סוד אמת in XIX 4,16). Thus also in 1QH knowledge is understood as something special and in its nature close to God. And although in 1QH the idea of knowledge is not elaborated in precisely the same way as in IQS (resulting to some extent from the different genres of the two texts) it does lead to a separation of the Community from the rest of Israel. Knowledge, according to 1QH, grants the Community a special insight that comes from God.

<sup>77</sup> Another feature of the idea of knowledge as it occurs in 1QH, but not in IQS, confirms this. Only in 1QH a member of the Community is said to know that "justice is not to man, nor to the son of Adam" (1QH XII 30). Behind this stands a degree of humility and personal responsibility that does not occur in IQS where the Community does everything to become "equals" of God. 1QH, on the other hand, is concerned primarily with the personal relationship between God and a member of the Community.

<sup>78</sup> Cf. S. Wagner, *J77*, 234<sub>o</sub>.

Hence, it is correct but not sufficient to say that knowledge according to IQH is a religious knowledge: it is *religious* only in the sense that it leads to a special personal relationship between a member of the Community and God, and as such, secondarily, effects the whole Community in its reception of God.<sup>79</sup>

### 3.4. Conclusion

The idea of knowledge in IQS and IQH is unique, and significant for our understanding of the Divine presence as represented in the two scrolls. According to both scrolls knowledge is primarily a *divine attribute*. God is present in the world because He created the world by the means of His knowledge. Both scrolls distinguish between a knowledge of the world and the specific knowledge of the Community. The latter is special because its origin lies in God. Both scrolls declare that God passes this knowledge on to the members of the Community which leads to a special insight for them. So far, the idea of knowledge in IQS and IQH reveals that God was understood to be near not only through His creating act and the fact that He governs the world, but also through special insight that the Community receives from Him.<sup>80</sup> But this is where the differences occur. IQH is much concerned about the knowledge

<sup>79</sup> S. Wagner says about the knowledge: "In den Hodajot prägt sich ein streng theologisches Erkenntnisprinzip aus: Nichts wird erkannt ohne deinen Willen (X 9[XVIII 9])" (S. Wagner, 1977, 242). This statement (especially on the background of the elaboration of the idea in IQS which seems to be the direction in which the idea in IQH develops too) misses the point that knowledge according IQS and IQH is not an entirely intellectual process or action in a platonic sense, but affects the status, the nature of the person receiving and using it, and hence is *an existential act before and in relation to God*. According to IQS this existential act affects the whole Community: it transfers the Community to the divine sphere where God dwells, and hence defines the status of the Community in relation to God.

Wagner also concludes that the consequences of knowledge must be deeds, i.e. the circulation of the knowledge ("Verkündigung" (ibid., 248)). This is a misinterpretation. The aim of the knowledge received from God is first of all concerned with the *Community's* acquisition of special status before God. As the "bridge" between God and the rest of Israel (cf. pp. 51-58), the Community relates also to the "outside world", but this relationship is *passive*, and a "nach-außen-drängen" (ibid., 248) of the knowledge of the Community can only be understood within this context.

<sup>80</sup> W.D. Davies claims that knowledge in the scrolls "is often not so much intellectual as practical: it is not so much understanding as obedience" (W.D. Davies, *Christian Origins and Judaism* [London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1962] 140). Against Davies, knowledge in the scrolls has a practical side. It is a means of ensuring that

members of the Community possess of aspects of God's nature, which does not primarily indicate that they claim to be in a sphere other than the world. This understanding of knowledge is similar to the HB portraying humans' approach to God, while remaining in their world at a distance from God. Knowledge according to 1QH does not *primarily* seem to be a means for the Community as a whole to receive/earn a special status before God. According to 1QH, knowledge serves to engage in a special *personal* relationship with God. In this respect, 1QH follows the biblical concept of knowledge more closely than 1QS. Hence, it indicates a uniqueness of the members of the Community, but remains within the border of "personal belief". In 1QS, however, the emphasis is different. Here, the authors focus on the divine origin of the knowledge which is passed on to the members of the Community by God. And this not only affects the personal relationship of each member with God, but the status and the quality of the whole Community in relation to God.<sup>81</sup> According to 1QS, the Community qualifies to

---

the Community has necessary equipment to acquire and retain its status before God. This includes every aspect of the daily life in the Community in relation to God. Knowledge is, therefore, to the same degree intellectual as it is practical, or "understanding" as it is obedience, because as gift from God and special insight it makes perfect behaviour "practically" possible. The divine knowledge enables the individual in the Community to observe God's will perfectly.

Also the לֵב (i.e. the intellect, see above) language suggests that knowledge has a practical side (cf. also G. Molin, *Die Söhne des Lichtes. Zeit und Stellung der Handschriften vom Toten Meer* [Wien/ München: Verlag Herold, 1954] 119).

W.D. Davies also finds an "ethical nuance" (W.D. Davies, *Christian Origins and Judaism* [London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1962] 140) of knowledge as one of its main characteristics. But according to 1QS and 1QH, knowledge is a means to improve the Community status in relation to God. It is, hence, limited to the Community and, therefore, hardly "ethical". Only as much as it is used to structure life amongst the members of the Community it may be called "ethical".

<sup>81</sup> Unfortunately not distinguishing between the different understandings of "knowledge" in the different scrolls, Cook (E.M. Cook, *What Did the Jews of Qumran Know about God and How Did They Know it? Revelation and God in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, in: A.J. Avery-Peck/ J. Neusner/ B.D. Chilton, *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 2: World View, Comparing Judaisms* [Handbook of Oriental Studies vl.57; Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 2001] 3-22) notices that God passes knowledge on to the Community and that this knowledge becomes an attribute of the Yahad. But he does not see that there are *three* aspects of knowledge that are crucial to understand this concept. Knowledge according to 1QS/H is a) God's knowledge, b) God's gift to the Community, and c) the Yahad's knowledge. Cook emphasises the knowledge of the Community as revelation, and comes to the conclusion that the perception of God's revelation by the Community is an intellectual act, i.e. knowledge (cf. especially *ibid.* 3,6f.). In doing so, he is using an understanding of knowledge which is based primarily on Greek philosophy; and he does not see that the concept of knowledge as represented in 1QS/H reflects a completely different understanding of the matter. Here, the emphasis lies not on the *human act of knowing* (by the members of the Community), but on the *being with God through knowledge/knowing as such*. Knowledge is a gift from God. It is divine in origin and transfers this divine quality to the Community. In doing so, it links the Yahad with God *through its nature*. The act of knowing is only secondarily important.

accommodate Divine presence. Twice in 1QS this qualification is defined. First, the Community is understood in terms of a heavenly and/or Temple-like Community which locates it in a divine sphere where God Himself is present. Second, the adoption and development of the idea of knowledge related to the paradise and Fall is another attempt of the authors of 1QS to demonstrate that this Community has a special quality in relation to God that allows them to accommodate Divine presence in their midst. Hence, although life in the Community underlies the process of becoming perfect and, therefore, improving the quality of the Community and its relationship with God, the quality received through and as a consequence of divine knowledge of the Community already qualifies it to accommodate Divine presence.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> Especially at the early stages of DSS scholarship knowledge, as understood in the scrolls, was seen as a condition of the *salvation* of the Community. K.G. Kuhn (K.G. Kuhn, *Die Sektenschriften und die iranische Religion* [ZThK 49, 1952] 306) points out that members of the Community can only participate in the "Heil" of the Community through this knowledge and defines the knowledge in the scrolls elsewhere in the sense that it has "den Sinn des Besitzes von besonderen Kenntnissen anthropologischer, eventuell auch kosmologischer, jedenfalls aber soteriologischer Art, des Besitzes also von Kenntnissen über göttliche Heilstatsachen, die geheim oder doch jedenfalls auf den festumrissenen Kreis einer Gemeinde begrenzt sind und die zu besitzen eben das religiöse Heil gewährleistet" (K.G. Kuhn, *Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament* [ZThK 47, 1950] 192-211, 203f.). H. Ringgren also, although he sees, discussing 1QH XII 23 and XIV 18f., that knowledge is a means by which man can come close to God (H. Ringgren, *The Faith of Qumran. Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [New York: Crossroad, 1995] 114), concludes that "the emphasis lies on (...) God's plan for salvation" (*ibid.*, 117) and that the knowledge of the Community is "a way of salvation" (*ibid.*, 119).

But the above analyses have shown that knowledge is a means by which, according to the claims of 1QS, the Community can get closer to God. This desire and claim of the Community to reach this special status is a present one. The concept of salvation, on the other hand, always aims at a future achievement. But knowledge is an aspect which is, according to 1QS, part of a development of the Community towards perfection. The difference between this development of which knowledge is a part and a salvation process lies in the following points: a) The Community is already very advanced in getting close to God. b) According to their teachings, getting closer to God depends to a much greater extent on their own teachings than on God Himself, which is what the concept of salvation suggested. c) The emphasis in the scrolls lies on the members preparing the Community for God's presence through perfectionism, and not on a forgiving act of justification of God. d) According to the scrolls, the aim of the process of perfectionism seems to be a perfect relationship with God that amounts to the immanent presence of God in the Community, not in the justification of the individual.

This means that knowledge is part of a process of development of the Community, but this process is entirely different from a "salvation" process as we know it, especially from the NT.

#### 4. טוב

We now turn to yet another significant word that has to be investigated regarding the Divine presence in 1QS and 1QH: טוב. The difficulty that arises when investigating the meaning of טוב in 1QS/H is that, on the one hand, it represents one of those aspects of the relationship between God and the Community that we discuss in this part of this study: טוב represents an action of God towards the Community; as a gift of God it changes the nature of the Yahad in relation to God. But, on the other hand, טוב represents already an element that also describes life in the Community in relation to God. Because טוב has these two aspects of meaning, I will analyse it here hoping that this investigation will not only describe the meaning of טוב in detail, but also explain the interrelation between God's actions towards the Community, the Community's changed nature, and *life* in the Community. Through His gifts, God gives the Community a special potential in relation towards Him which manifests itself in a special life in the Community. This life reflects and improves the Community's special relationship with God.

The authors of the HB and 1QS/H use טוב to describe life as led by an Israelite, and life in the Community in relation to God. This, in both cases, indicates a certain understanding of the Divine presence. But these understandings differ from each other, since the idea of טוב has been modified in the scrolls.

The investigation of טוב is also significant because it occurs in 1QS I 2, in a phrase which is crucial for the understanding of the Community in relation to God:

## לעשות הטוב והישר לפניו

Right at the beginning of the scroll (the "programme" of the Community), this phrase occurs in the context of the word combination **לדרש אל**, which refers to the purpose of the Community and means to live in the Community in relation to God, as analyses above showed.<sup>1</sup> And although the text of the Ms. between this word combination and the phrase **לעשות הטוב והישר לפניו** is not certain, the latter defines life in the Community and its purpose in relation to God too.<sup>2</sup> A significant aspect of this life is "to do good" (**לעשות**). And, since this "doing good" takes place "before God" (**לפניו**),<sup>3</sup> it is linked with the question of the Divine presence.

### 4.1. HB

Because a detailed analysis of the word in the HB is beyond the scope of this study,<sup>4</sup> I will confine mention to significant notions of **טוב** in the HB with respect to the Divine presence in comparison with 1QS and 1QH. It is important to note that I will have, therefore, to focus on those aspects of the usage of **טוב** that are important in the eyes of the authors of the scrolls.

**טוב** is a word in the HB that is used very often, 741 times,<sup>5</sup> throughout the canon. Hence, authors writing throughout the history of Israel used **טוב**, which means that the occurrences

<sup>1</sup> Cf. pp. 23-29.

Leaney in his book on 1QS does not see the significance of this phrase at all (A.R.C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning. Introduction, Translation and Commentary* [London: SCM Press LTD, 1966] 63, 120).

<sup>2</sup> The same function of the word combination and the phrase is indicated by the fact that both are introduced by **ל** followed by an infinitive.

<sup>3</sup> On **לפניו** in 1QS 1 2 see pp. 194-205.

Cf. also Dtn. 6:18; 12:28; 2.Chr. 31:20; and Eccl. 2:26.

<sup>4</sup> For literature see especially I. Höver-Johag, *art. טוב* (TDOT V, 1986), 296f.

<sup>5</sup> 738 times in Hebrew, 3 times in Aramaic (I. Höver-Johag, *art. טוב* (TDOT V, 1986), 303; H.J. Stoebe,

of **טוב** in the HB must reflect its history. **טוב** in the HB occurs with many nuances.<sup>6</sup> In general **טוב** is used as both noun, adjective, and verb (**יטב**). The meaning which is significant at this point is "good", "goodness", or "being good".<sup>7</sup> That means that **טוב** or **יטב** qualifies a thing, a person, or an action. **טוב** classifies objects in two ways: it gives them the quality **טוב**, and it usually sets the object into a satisfying relation to an outside person or institution.<sup>8</sup>

As regards the comparison with the scrolls, it is important to note that the usage and meaning of **טוב** in the HB is tied up with the creation story (cf. Gen. 1:1,4,10,12,18,21,25,31). **טוב** comes from God and through God into the creation. It qualifies the creation. This is a notion that **טוב** loses neither in 1QS nor in 1QH.

Although **טוב** comes from the creating God into the creation, it is then used in the HB qualifying objects in two different contexts: a secular one, and one in connection with God. This is a distinction within the usage of **טוב** in the HB which remains significant for the use of the word in 1QS and 1QH.

In the first context, **טוב** is used describing human matters. Things,<sup>9</sup> persons,<sup>10</sup> and actions are described as being **טוב**. This is very frequent,<sup>11</sup> and occurs especially in Proverbs and Kohelet (but cf. also Gen. 26:29; Ex. 30:7; 1.S. 1:23; 14:36,40; 2.S. 17:14 and on many more occasions).

---

*art.* **טוב** [TLOT II, 1997], 487).

<sup>6</sup> H.J. Stoebe, *art.* **טוב** [TLOT II, 1997], 487.

<sup>7</sup> H.J. Stoebe calls this meaning "religioethical" (H.J. Stoebe, *art.* **טוב** [TLOT II, 1997], 492) which seems to be the most significant one with respect to the scrolls.

<sup>8</sup> I. Höver-Johag calls the usage of **טוב** "utilitarian" (I. Höver-Johag, *art.* **טוב** [TDOT V, 1986], 304).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Gen. 40:16; Ex. 18:17; Dtn. 1:14; 1.S. 9:10; 2.S. 17:7; etc.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Gen. 24:16; 26:7; 1.S. 16:22; 2.S. 11:2; 1.K. 1:6; Dan. 1:4; etc.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. I. Höver-Johag, *art.* **טוב** (TDOT V, 1986), 304ff.

In connection with God, **טוב** is used as an attribute of God (cf. Ps. 16:2; 25:8; 34:9; 86:5; 119:68,122; 135:3; 145:9; Lam. 3:25; 2.Chr. 30:18).<sup>12</sup> This attribute effects human beings, but only those who do the will of God (cf. Ps. 73:1; 145:9; Lam. 3:25f.). Doing the will of God means to act and live in humility before God in the hope that His goodness would affect people, or in the thankfulness that it has done so. Most of the time, the HB is talking in this respect about the individual righteous who experience **טוב**. "The notion of Yahweh as the source of human well-being and prosperity is developed most extensively in the thanksgiving and historical psalms, as well as in Jeremiah (Jer. 15:11; 17:6; 33:11; 44:17; etc.)."<sup>13</sup> Ps. 118:8,9 expresses this idea too. According to these verses, **טוב** describes the benefit to those who are close to God.<sup>14</sup> It tells in what way the *status* of people changes when their life can be called **טוב** in relation to God.

As will be shown below in detail, it is this status, this idea of life of humans doing **טוב** and having **טוב** in relation to God, that the authors of 1QS and 1QH adopted, but changed significantly.<sup>15</sup>

#### 4.2. 1QS

In comparison with the HB, it is interesting to note that in 1QS the word occurs only nine times.<sup>16</sup> But these nine occurrences show that the meaning of **טוב** in the scrolls is the result

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 314.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., 314.

<sup>14</sup> Ps. 118:8,9: "it is good to take refuge in JHWH".

<sup>15</sup> A closer investigation of the usage of **טוב** in the HB shows that, where it occurs in connection with God, it is often used with the following words יהוה, לפני (בעיני), ישר, שכל, רע, רצון, עשה, ידע, ירא, נפש. Most of these turn out to be significant for the understanding of the idea of Divine presence in the scrolls.

<sup>16</sup> I 2,5; II 3,24; IV 3,26; X 12,18; XI 14 (cf. K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 79 and J.H. Charlesworth, *Graphic Concordance*, 132,194,260).

of a conscious usage of the word by the authors. Although, from the perspective of the authors of the scrolls, **טוב** in the HB has two basic senses - the secular and the one in connection with God - it nevertheless provides a wide scope of nuances.<sup>17</sup> In 1QS, however, we find that **טוב** has one function within the teachings of the scroll and has, therefore, a coherent meaning. Hence, it seems likely that the usage and meaning of **טוב** has been constructed purposefully in 1QS by modifying HB-material, and has not been developed by chance.

1QS and 1QH do not adopt the usage of **טוב** in the secular sense at all. **טוב** in these scrolls is only used in connection *with God*. **טוב**, according to 1QS, plays a major role in *the relationship between God and the members of the Community*. It describes, or even defines, life in the Community in relation to God (cf. especially 1QS X 12 below).<sup>18</sup>

In this sense, three aspects of the meaning of **טוב** can be found in 1QS: **טוב** as an attribute of God (1.), **טוב** as a gift from God to the members of the Community (2.), and **טוב** defining life in the Community in relation to God; **טוב** the aim and purpose of the Community (3.).

<sup>17</sup> I. Höver-Johag, *art. טוב* (TDOT V, 1986), 303f.

<sup>18</sup> This major aspect of **טוב** has not been recognised in the scholarly literature. In the few articles and books on the subject, **טוב** is mentioned and defined often in relation to the Dualism of Good and Evil, or Darkness and Light (cf. I. Höver-Johag, *art. טוב* (TDOT V, 1986) 316f.; F. Nötscher, *Zur Theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte* [BBB 10; Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag G.M.B.H., 1956]; F. Nötscher, *Gotteswege und Menschenwege in der Bibel und in Qumran* [BBB 15; Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag G.M.B.H., 1958]). R. Gordis narrows it even further down and claims that the phrase "knowing good and evil" means the "natural and unnatural" aspects of sexual experiences (R. Gordis, *The Knowledge of Good and Evil in the Old Testament and the Qumran Scrolls* [JBL 76, 1957] 123-138). It has not been noted that **טוב** as a *positive quality* (cf. 1QS I 2 where the phrase **טוב וישר** occurs, not **טוב ורע**), depends on God and humans, and defines life in the Community in relation to God. As such **טוב** on its own plays a significant role in the teachings of the scrolls which are primarily concerned about the unique relationship between the Community and God.

#### 4.2.1. טוב as an Attribute of God

In IQS, טוב occurs only once directly as an attribute of God, in XI 14.<sup>19</sup> But, as the following investigations will show, טוב as a divine phenomenon, which belongs to God and comes from Him, is the basic idea of its meaning and its occurrence in IQS and IQH. In IQH, this sense of the word is taken over especially from the Psalms: טוב, used as a noun, is always understood as an attribute of God, and often used in combination with the Tetragram.<sup>20</sup>

Hence, the authors of the scrolls picture טוב as a phenomenon that can only be understood in relation to God. Doing good or being good is inevitably linked with God. This indicates that neither earthly affairs, nor simply ethical or moral behaviour characterising the life of humans in relation to other humans, is the centre of concern in the scrolls; but rather the relationship between God and the Community.

#### 4.2.2. טוב as a Gift from God to the Community

The idea of טוב as something that God passes on to certain humans is already present in the HB. God's goodness influences humans.<sup>21</sup> God gives טוב or טוב things to the individual righteous.<sup>22</sup> The humans' well-being depends on God.

<sup>19</sup> XI 14: "(...) He will judge me in the justice of His truth, and in His plentiful goodness (ובכבוד טובו) always atone for all my sins, (...)"

<sup>20</sup> Na. 1:7 ("JHWH is good, a stronghold on a day of trouble; he protects those who take refuge in Him"); Ps. 25:8 (Good and upright (ישר) is JHWH); Ps. 34:9 (JHWH is טוב); Ps. 53:8 (God's name (שמך) is טוב). Cf. also Ps. 100:5; 106:1; 107:1; 118:1,29; 135:3; 136:1. Note also the phrase "the good hand of God" especially in Esra and Nehemia (cf. Esr. 7:9; Neh. 2:8 etc.).

This use of טוב in the Psalms seems to be the *Vorlage* for its employment especially in the Psalms of IQH, although there the Tetragram is not used (cf. טוב ברוב in IQH XV 30 and XIX 6, see below).

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Ps. 21:4 (God's "good blessing" for the king).

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Ps. 84:12; 85:13; 119:65.

Cf. H.J. Stoebe, art. טוב [TLOT II, 1997], 493.

Generally, the authors of IQS adopted this idea. But they changed certain aspects of it according to their own teachings. According to IQS, the recipient changed. It is now not the righteous individual who receives **טוב** from God as it is in the HB, but the members of the Community. According to the scrolls, the Community as a whole receives **טוב**, because it is *every* member to whom it is passed on. Another point where the usage of **טוב** as a gift from God in IQS differs from the HB is the way in which the recipient is described as relating to God. According to the HB, the righteous one stands before God in *humility*. He either hopes in humility for **טוב**, or He thanks God in humility that he has received it. Doing the will of God is considered as an *attempt* to please God. The teachings of IQS say differently. Here, **טוב** is a means by which the authors of IQS demonstrate that the status of the Community in relation to God is unique. According to the teachings of the Community, receiving and having **טוב** leads consequently to a special relationship with God. The idea of humility as it occurs in the HB in connection with **טוב** is no longer important. The emphasis lies now on the capabilities of the Community.

Three occurrences in IQS come into focus where **טוב** is used in this sense: II 2f.; X 12, and 18. In II 2f.,<sup>23</sup> **טוב** is part of a blessing according to which God is the one who blesses a member of the Community with "all good" (**טוב** (3) **בכול**). **טוב** as a gift from God and as part of a blessing formula defines the relationship between God and the members of the Community and separates them from the rest of Israel.

In IQS X 12, **טוב** is mentioned amongst a number of "names" of God. According to these lines, God is "my [psalmist's] justice", "establisher of my well-being", "source of knowing",

<sup>23</sup> In II 3, **טוב** occurs in a "blessing formula" of the Priestly Blessing: "(2) (...) 'May He bless you with all (**בכול**) (3) good (**טוב**), and may He protect you from everything bad (**מכול רע**). (...)'".

"spring of holiness", "peak of glory", and "all-powerful one of eternal majesty". As a result of a perfect life in the Community, God is responsible for the "well-being" of the member of the Community. **טוב** relates God and humans and, as such, refers to aspects of Divine presence.<sup>24</sup>

#### 4.2.3. **טוב** Defining Life in the Community in Relation to God. **טוב** the Aim and Purpose of the Community

In both the HB and IQS, **טוב** is used to describe life amongst certain groups of people, their aim and purpose, in relation to God. According to HB, **טוב** comes to those humans who faithfully accept God as the only God and as their personal God.<sup>25</sup> IQS, on the other hand, understands the relationship differently.<sup>26</sup>

In IQS, **טוב** represents mainly one meaning: it is used describing the aim and purpose of the Community by defining the quality of the Community in relation to God. This can be seen especially in the following lines, I 2,5; II 24; IV 3,26:

<sup>24</sup> Cf. also X 18 ("(17) (...) I shall not repay anyone with an evil reward; (18) with goodness I shall pursue man. (...)") where **טוב** characterises as Divine gift actions of the members of the Community.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. the "central confessional statement" (I. Höver-Johag, *art. טוב* [TDOT V, 1986], 315) in which **טוב** occurs many times (1. Chr. 16:34; Ps. 106; 107:1; 118;1,29; etc.; cf. also Ex. 15), and where it indicates this relationship.

According to I. Höver-Johag the usage of the confession formula also points in the direction of the Temple liturgy and is hence linked with the presence of God in the Temple (I. Höver-Johag, *art. טוב* [TDOT V, 1986], 315). This shows why **טוב** is used especially in IQH as it is and indicates its significant in respect of the Divine presence.

<sup>26</sup> It is interesting that H.J. Stoebe, when discussing **טוב** in its "religioethical sense" (see above), does not note that **טוב** describes the relationship between humans and God, but discusses **טוב** that is only possible "through the order to which the **טוב** declaration simultaneously relates" (H.J. Stoebe, *art. טוב* [TLOT II, 1997] 492).

12

The phrase **לעשות הטוב והישר לפניו** in IQS I 2 is one of the most significant phrases in IQS regarding the question of the Divine presence. "Doing what is good and just before Him" represents the whole aim and purpose of life in the Community and relates the Community in its unique way to God, as we will see in detail in the chapter on **לפניו**.<sup>27</sup> The usage of **טוב** in this line, however, shows that "doing good" characterises life in the Community. The members of the Community use the Divine **טוב** to transfer the quality of **טוב** into the Community itself by "doing **טוב**". In this sense, they give their Community a quality which is in a sense divine and makes Divine presence in the Community possible. The usage of two words in this phrase are interesting especially in comparison with the HB.

a) In the HB as well as IQS, **טוב** in combination with the verb **עשה** is used to relate human life to God. According to the HB, "doing good" fulfils the will of God.<sup>28</sup> It pleases God and allows Him to give good to people. Doing good means to be with God (cf. Ps. 14:3)<sup>29</sup>. JHWH will hear the prayers of people whose conduct is good (2.K. 20:3-5; cf. 1.S. 3:18; 2.S. 10:12//1.Chr. 19:13).<sup>30</sup> This separates the righteous from "the fools" (Ps. 53:2,4 (//Ps. 14:1,3)). "Doing good" leads to a good relationship between God and the one doing it (Ps. 86:17).

In the scrolls, we find the same idea, but the authors of IQS (IQH) changed significant aspects of it. According to the HB, **עשה טוב** describes people doing good to other people (cf. Gen. 26:29 or 1.S. 24:19). This usage is missing entirely in IQS and IQH, which indicates that in the scrolls the relationship between *God* and the Community is the centre of

<sup>27</sup> See pp. 194-205.

<sup>28</sup> The phrase occurs in the HB often and has various nuances: for a discussion of most of these see I. Höver-Johag, *art. טוב* (TDOT V, 1986), 308.

<sup>29</sup> "They all have gone astray, they are all alike perverse; there is no one who does good, not one."

<sup>30</sup> I. Höver-Johag, *art. טוב* (TDOT V, 1986), 308.

concern. Life of every member of the Community is solely oriented towards God. A direct relation to God seems to be, therefore, more important than correct social behaviour in humility towards fellow human beings, and consequently towards God. Correct social behaviour is part of living a perfect life in the Community, but it seems to be seen as a necessary means that enables the Community to reach out for God's nearness and presence. And, since the Community claims already to have a special status in relation to God, correct social behaviour is simply not as important as it is for the righteous according to the HB.<sup>31</sup>

Another notion missing in the scrolls is the notion of trust. According to Esra 7:9 and Neh. 2:8, the Israelites put their trust into the hands of God: people trust that God will recognise that they are trying to act according to His will and that they wait in humility for His reaction. Such can be seen in Ps. 37:3:

"Trust in JHWH and do good, so you will live in the land, and enjoy security."

If the notion of trust is omitted, as it were, from verses like these, then "good" becomes a quality inherent in a relationship between God and human beings in which both parties are of more or less equal status. This, in and of itself, would permit human beings to draw close to the divine presence; and something of this kind is what we discover in both IQS and IQH.

b) Since I will discuss **לפני** in detail below I will refer only to one major difference between the meaning of **לפני** in combination with **טוב** in the HB and IQS/IQH. In the HB, these words are used both in connection with God<sup>32</sup> and in a "secular" context.<sup>33</sup> The scrolls lack the latter notion completely, which again indicates that the moral and ethical pattern of

<sup>31</sup> Against Dombrowski who identifies the Community's "doing what is good" with "proving their ethical character" (B. Dombrowski, *Erscheinung, Wesen und Ideologie der Assoziation von Hirbet Qumran nach dem "Manual of Discipline" (IQS)* [Paris: Société Nouvelle des Éditions Letouzey et Ané, and Halifax: Atlantic Nova Print Ltd., 1971] 521).

<sup>32</sup> **טוב** in combination with **בעיני** and God occurs in Gen. 19:8; 2.S. 3:19,36; 15:26; 19:38; 1.S. 3:15 (יהודה יעשה הטוב בעיניו); 14:1.

<sup>33</sup> They are often used in connection with the royal court or a king (cf. 1.S. 1:23; 14:36,40; 21:23; ; 2.S. 19:19 (some Israelites),28,39; 2.K 10:5; 20:3).

behaviour between humans is not of interest anymore, but only the relationship between God and the Community.

## I 5

In IQS I 5, the dualism of good (**טוב**) and evil (**רע**) is mentioned:

"(4) (...) to distance oneself from all evil,

(5) and to become attached to all good works (...)."

The members of the Community are supposed to desire and to do the former. **טוב** is an attribute of the Community in its relation to God. The appearance of **טוב** in the phrase **לעשות והטוב והישר** suggests as much.<sup>34</sup> Doing **רע** is something that separates from the Community and hence from the special relationship with God. **רע** is an attribute of the outside world.<sup>35</sup>

## II 24

IQS II 24 is the only occasion where **טוב** is used in the context of a description of the Community as an institution itself:

" For all shall be in a Community of truth, and good humility,

and love of loyalty, and a plan of righteousness, (...)."

The context is the ranking of the members, hence the organisation pattern of the Community.

This organisation pattern naturally serves the same purpose as the lives of the members in the

<sup>34</sup> This is the only secure phrase in contrast to **טוב ורע** in IQS I 5 or IV 26, where the text is damaged.

<sup>35</sup> Although the scholarly literature stresses the dualism of good and evil as the most significant function of **טוב** in the scrolls, it overlooks the function of **טוב** as defining the self-understanding of the Community in relation to God (cf. on Gen. 3 pp. 98-112). Whereas **טוב** and **רע** are used to describe the situation in the world, **טוב** is used to define the Community. The "Kampf zwischen Gut und Böse" (F. Nötscher, *Zur Theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte* (BBB 10) [BBB 10; Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag G.M.B.H., 1956], 79,93) does not, therefore, seem to be as striking a point of the usage meaning of **טוב** regarding the Community as Nötscher seems to believe.

Community: the definition, the establishment, and the continuation of a relationship between God and humans which according to IQS can only be achieved in Qumran. טוב ענות is one of the characteristics of the Community according to II 24.

## IV 3

I QS IV 3 enumerates a couple of characteristics and aims of the Community. טוב עולמים is one of them:

IV 3: "(...) it is a spirit of humility, long-lasting wrath, great compassion, eternal goodness, understanding, intelligence, great wisdom (4) (...)."

The authors of the scroll distinguish here between two different sorts of aims of the Community: the ones that are directed towards the outside world, the others that are concerned with the Community itself. The aim directed towards the outside world is to "enlighten the heart of man". As we have seen, the Community serves as link between the rest of Israel and God. The one which is concerned with the Community itself refers to a just life in the Community which has a religious aim ("straighten out in front of Him all the paths of true justice").

## IV 26

In IQS IV 26, the distinction between good and evil (רע) comes into focus again (cf. IQS I 5):

"(...) and has given them as a legacy to the sons of man so that they know good [and evil... (...)]."

The members know this difference. This line again might be based on Gen. 3:15. The post-Fall knowledge is only given to the Qumran Community, which has still a pre-Fall status.<sup>36</sup> This knowledge makes a perfect life in the Community possible. This perfect life

means "to do good".<sup>37</sup> To do good in this sense depends on a uniquely Qumranian insight.

**טוב** characterises life in the Community and gives the members the aim and purpose of it.

#### 4.3. 1QH

The range of meanings of **טוב** and related words in 1QH is almost exactly parallel with that analysed already in 1QS. In this scroll, **טוב** again occurs in connection with the idea of knowledge (VI (12,)17), with **בעיני** (IV 24; VIII 26<sup>38</sup>), and with **הלך** (VII 21)<sup>39</sup>. But a difference lies in that whenever **טוב** is used in 1QH as an object (V 22;<sup>40</sup> XV 30; XVIII 16; XIX 6,9,31; XX 21; VII 17; XXIII 23 top)<sup>41</sup> it carries a suffix referring to God,<sup>42</sup> and hence is used exclusively as an attribute of God.

But where **טוב** occurs as a subject in 1QH (IV 24; VI 12; VII 21; VIII 26), it defines the lives of the members of the Community, which is also its major meaning in 1QS. The fact that it

<sup>36</sup> See above pp. 98-112

<sup>37</sup> Note that, Philo describing the Essenes in *Quod Omnis Probus Liber sit*, lays special emphasis on the Essense as "lovers of good" and "hating evil" (cf. Vermes/Goodman, *Essenes*, 22, 44).

P. 22: "belief that the Deity is the cause of all good, but of no evil" (Philo, *Qod omnis prober liber sit*, 84).

<sup>38</sup> According to Martinez/Tigchelaar, *DSSI*, 159 = J. Maier, *Qumran-Essener I*, 60: 1QH VIII 18; K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 79: 1QH XVI 18.

<sup>39</sup> According to Martinez/Tigchelaar = J. Maier, *Qumran-Essener I*, 57: 1QH VII 18; K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 79: 1QH XV 18.

On **הלך** see pp. 216-234.

<sup>40</sup> = K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 80: 1QH XIII 16; J. Maier, *Qumran-Essener I*, 53: 1QS V 16.

<sup>41</sup> Some of these lines are damaged.

<sup>42</sup> V 22: **רק בטובך**.

VI 17: **ידעתי ברוב טובך**.

XV 30: **ברוב טובכה**.

XVIII 16: **בגדול טובכה**.

XIX 6: **וברוב טובכה**.

XIX 9: **ובטובכה**.

XIX 31: **יחלתי לטובכה**.

XX 21: **ולטובכה יצפן**.

XXIII top 14: **מבשר [...] טובכה**.

also occurs in 1QH four times, carefully distinguished from its use as an attribute of God, shows that the authors of the scrolls were giving **טוב** this sense intentionally.

As a subject **טוב** in 1QH represents the quality of deeds of members of the Community that satisfy God. It characterises, therefore, the way of living in the Community, hence the Community itself. Only life with this quality, this characteristic, and following this characteristic allows the members to have a special and unique relationship with God.<sup>43</sup>

Thus we read in IV 24:

"(...) [so that h]e can walk (הלך) in all that you love, and loath all that [you] hate,

[and so he can do (ולעשות)]<sup>44</sup> what is good in your eyes (הטוב בעיניך)."

Doing **טוב** is doing what pleases God (בעיניך). Hence doing good is identical with living a life in the Community according to the will of God.

VII 21 shows this same understanding of **טוב**, but puts it negatively:

"For they walk on a path that is not good, they reject your covenan[nt], their soul loathes your[ ...]<sup>45</sup>,

and they take no pleasure in all (22) you have commanded, but choose what you hate. (...)"

Evil men conduct a life that is not **טוב**, hence it does not lead to God's or their own pleasure.

This line tells negatively what a life that pleases God must include: respecting the Covenant

<sup>43</sup> Becker does not see this function of **טוב**. He claims that **טוב**, like **חסד**, **סליחה**, and **רחמים** refer all to "Gottes erbarmendes Handeln am Sünder" (J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes. Heils- und Sündenbegriff in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament* [StUNT 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964] 160). **טוב**, according to this, would be exclusively an aspect of the salvation process of the Community which would lie entirely in God's hand. We have seen that, according to 1QS and 1QH, God enables the Community to participate in **טוב**, but that the Community plays a significant role itself in living a perfect life and consequently in achieving a special status in relation to God.

Furthermore, Becker claims that **טוב** refers to a "*sola gratia sub lege*" in a Jewish sense (ibid. 162). Becker's statement implies that *gratia*, as the action of God, refers to a divine power, whereas *sub lege* refers to the human, hence imperfect, attempt to live according to the will of God. We have seen on several occasions (and this seems to reflect a major aspect of the teachings of 1QS and 1QH) that 1QS and 1QH emphasise heavily the *human* action, i.e. the perfectionism in the Community, which leads to the new status, and not so much an active God leading the Community.

<sup>44</sup> Restoration according to Martinez/Tigchelaar, *DSS I*, 152.

<sup>45</sup> J. Maier, *Qumran-Essener I*, 57 inserts "[Wahrheit]".

of God, and fulfilling the Law. **טוב**, therefore, is a character of a life according to the will of God.

Although VIII 26 presents textual difficulties, this notion of **טוב** may be seen here also:

"to serve you (לעבודך) [...] <sup>46</sup> is good in your eyes. Do not turn your face away from your servant, (...)"

The word **בעיניך** indicates that this line again is talking about actions of the members of the Community that please God. Since **טוב** occurs here in the context of **עבד**, and the following text speaks about the relationship between God and the psalmist, it may qualify here as well the actions of the members of the Community and, hence, represent the aim and purpose of a life in the Community according to the will of God.<sup>47</sup>

#### 4.4. Conclusion

1. The authors of 1QS and 1QH have used **טוב** in a way reminiscent of some of its occurrences in the HB, but also in ways which clearly go beyond the range of meanings for **טוב** to be found there.
2. According to 1QS/1QH, **טוב** is divine in origin, and is communicated to members of the Community by God.
3. Members of the Community know, and are able to do **טוב**. "Doing good" means acting according to God's will by living a perfect life in the Community.

<sup>46</sup> K.G. Kuhn (1QH XVI 18) leaves a gap, and so does J. Maier (1QH VIII 18) reading: "Dir zu dienen [.....] Das Gute in Deinen Augen. (...)"

Martinez/Tigheelaar suggest: "to serve you [and to do what] is good in your eyes (...)", but mention also that the reading is preserved only "minimally" in the manuscript.

<sup>47</sup> Remaining is VI 12, where **טוב** also is understood as the result of a life that pleases God.

4. Such a life necessarily entails obedience to the Law, the Prophets, and the Community rules. The "order" for all this is specified in 1QS.
5. **טוב** then defines the Community's aim and purpose (cf. 1QS I 1-2). In 1QH, "doing good" leads to pleasing God, and so gives life in the Community its supreme meaning, since by pleasing God the members become close to Him.
6. **טוב** in 1QS and 1QH is used to define a special quality of the Qumran Community in relation to God. Once they have achieved this quality by living perfectly, they are able to accommodate the nearness of God.

#### IV. Life in the Community in Relation to God

In the first part of this study, we have investigated the nature of God and the actions of God through which He gives the Community a special status in relation to Himself. But especially investigating the meaning of **טוב** we have seen that these actions of God not only influence the nature of the Community in relation to Him, but also life in the Community as such. Through God, life in the Community receives a special nature and a special purpose, and because of that it requires a special way of conduct in the Community.

The special nature of this life is that it qualifies for nearness of God. That is to say, the members of the Community lead a life which in all aspects of it enables them to be near to God. In fact, life in the Community is understood as life in Divine presence. In this, the idea of life in relation to God is understood in a manner very different from the HB. In the latter, we find Israelites described as leading their personal lives which are affected by God especially through the creating act, their election, and sometimes their personal call. But these Israelites *react* to God's will; and are often described acting against it. This means that God is still the "distant one"; and life in relation to Him is only possible within the general distinction between earth and God's dwelling-place. 1QS/H, on the other hand, have a different picture of life in relation to God in mind. According to their understanding this distinction - the distance between God and human beings - has been neutralized in and through the Community. Life as such in the Community is possible with God and is lived in His presence. Life in the Community has been taken into a sphere where both the Community *and* God can dwell. The only idea found in the HB which might be used to explain this is the Temple. Israel would only have the status of the Qumran Community (at least to some degree) if they all lived permanently in the Inner Sanctum of the Temple. Even Temple personnel, as described in the HB,

do not live in a relationship with God which is as intense as the one of the Community. They are still "outsiders" in terms of Divine presence.

This special nature of life in the Community shapes its special purpose. Although God is the one who enables the Community to have a special status in relation to Him, it is the Community's task to foster, strengthen, and improve this special status by orientating life entirely towards what the Community considers to be essential, to improve their status in relation to God. In other words, every member has to live exactly according to the HB *and* according to the rules of the Community. Only if the members of the Yahad conduct such a life, will they prove themselves worthy and able to keep and develop their special relationship with God. But what is it that the members have to do? What kind of life are they supposed to live according to 1QS/H?

Consequently, our next logical step is to consider those words and phrases which describe the Community and the nature of life in the Yahad in relation to *God*.

### 1. מעון as the Dwelling Place of the Community

First among these terms and ideas that describe the Community and life in the Community in relation to God is מעון. 1QS VIII 8f. uses מעון to describe the Community:

מעון קודש קודשים לאהרון

What does this phrase mean? What does it tell about the place where the Community is?

What does it say about the relationship between the Community and God, hence Divine presence?

## 1.1. HB

In the HB, **מעון** occurs only 18 times. The phrase **מעון קודש קודשים לאהרון**, however, does not occur. **מעון** is used in a distinct way, and one can distinguish three different categories.

a) In analogies, Jerusalem (Jer. 9:10), the towns of Judah (Jer. 10:22), Hazor (Jer. 49:33), and Babel (Jer. 51:37) are mentioned as **מעון** ("living places") of jackals.

Na. 2:12 belongs also to this category, because here **מעון** means the living place of lions. In Zech. 3:7 Jerusalem is meant.

b) **מעון** is especially in the Psalms used referring to the "living place" of a righteous man *in* JHWH, i.e. under His protection (Ps. 71:3; 90:1; 91:9).

c) But according to the most common usage of **מעון** in the HB, **מעון** refers to the "dwelling place" of JHWH.<sup>1</sup> This must have been the understanding of the term which the authors of IQS have had in mind, because it is so obvious, so distinct, and so common.

In this category, this "dwelling place" of JHWH is either understood as being in heaven (Dtn. 26:15; Jer. 25:30; 2.Chr. 30:27)<sup>2</sup>, or in the Temple (1.S. 2:29,32; 2.Chr. 36:1536; Ps. 26:8).<sup>3</sup>

In the HB these locations are not strictly separated.<sup>4</sup>

M. Metzger analysed this ambivalence in the HB in detail and concluded that "die Frage, wie sich die Wohnstatt Jahwes im Himmel zu seiner Wohnstatt im irdischen Heiligtum verhält, wird im Alten Testament in verschiedenen Entwürfen verschieden beantwortet"<sup>5</sup>. He finds four different concepts of the problem. First, regarding Bethel, the holy place is "die

---

It is interesting that IQS is using a term to refer to the Community which in the HB is definitely linked with the Tetragram (except in 2.Chr. 30:27).

H.D. Preuß, *art. מעון* [ThWAT IV, 1984] 1029.

In Zech. 2:17 and Ps. 68:6, **מעון** means the "dwelling place of JHWH", but is not further specified.

H.D. Preuß, *art. מעון* [ThWAT IV, 1984] 1029.

M. Metzger, *Himmlische und irdische Wohnstatt Jahwes* [UF 2, 1970] 154.

Nahtstelle zwischen Himmel und Erde"<sup>6</sup>. Second, regarding the Temple of Jerusalem, the holy place ("Heiligtum") is the place "an dem der Unterschied zwischen Himmlisch und Irdisch aufgehoben [ist]"<sup>7</sup>. Third, the Deuteronomist develops the idea that heaven and earth are separated: "Das Heiligtum ist die Stätte, an der Jahwes Name anwesend ist, während Jahwe selbst im Himmel thront oder wohnt."<sup>8</sup> And finally, Metzger draws attention to Isa. 66:1, according to which an earthly sanctuary for God representing God's throne or dwelling place is neither necessary nor even possible.<sup>9</sup>

## 1.2. DSS

This fact that there is no coherent concept in the HB as to whether God's dwelling is on earth, or in heaven, or to some extent in the Temple, is precisely what the authors of IQS and IQH are taking advantage of. As seen in this study already, it is the method of these authors to adopt ideas or concepts from the HB which either occur there only a few times, or which leave plenty of room for interpretation. Describing the Community as **מַעוֹן** allows different interpretations of the nature of the Community. It may be understood as simply a special (holy) place on earth, or as temple-like, or even as heavenly. In any case, the authors of IQS and IQH indicate by calling the Community **מַעוֹן** that it exists in the nearness of God and might qualify for immanent Divine presence.

In IQS, **מַעוֹן** occurs only three times (VIII 8; X 1,3)<sup>10</sup>. The usage of the word in IQS VIII 8 is unique. Here, IQS develops the meaning of **מַעוֹן** in comparison with the HB.<sup>11</sup> It describes

---

ibid.  
ibid.  
ibid.  
ibid.

<sup>9</sup> Agreeing with K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 126, but against Martinez/Tigchelaar, *DSS I*, 74, the reading in QS III 19 has to be **מַעוֹן** and not **מַעוֹן**.

According to K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 127, **מַעוֹן** is used three times in IQS (III 19; X 12; XI 7), and x times in IQH. Difficulties occur especially in IQS III 19. In X 12, it is used in combination with **מַעוֹן קְדוֹשׁ**.

the Community as "the most holy dwelling of Aaron", thus indicating that the Community was understood as a Temple-like Community. The appearance of אֲדָרֹן suggests that too: the members of the Community are Temple personnel. Preuß suggests, therefore, that "die Gemeinde (!) [has to be understood] als Gottes Tempel/Wohnung".<sup>12</sup> This description of the nature of the Community is problematic. All VIII 8 suggests, and all other lines in which the Community is linked with the Temple indicate, is that according to IQS and IQH qualities of the Temple have been transferred onto the Community to qualify the Community to accommodate God's presence. But the Community cannot be identified with the Temple. It is neither a substitute for the Temple, nor a new Temple. Carrying the qualities of the Temple, the Community is understood as a place that can accommodate God's presence. As in the HB, it is not quite certain what the nature of this presence might be. It definitely involves His permanent nearness, but in this case, it might even refer to His immediate presence.

By contrast, in X 1 מְעוֹן is used in a completely different context. According to this line, the "dominion of light" (מִמְשַׁלַּת אֹר) will have an "appointed place" (מְעוֹן חֹקֵן). אֹר in IQS X 1 might well indicate that a dominion of God is meant, because מִמְשַׁלַּה occurs in

---

קדוּשׁ (cf. K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 127. Martinez/Tigchelaar, *DSS I*, 94 reads מְעוֹן). In XI 7, מְעִין is again used in combination with כְּבוֹד: מְעִין כְּבוֹד. These occurrences indicate that the "dwelling place of glory" might as well be the "source of glory". The impact of the usage of מְעִין on our study is little, and a discussion of whether מְעִין or מְעוֹן was used is beyond the scope of this study (for details on see H. Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde* [StUNT 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980] 127<sub>22</sub>).

<sup>1</sup> H.D. Preuß, art. מְעוֹן [ThWAT IV, 1984] 1028.

<sup>2</sup> H.D. Preuß, art. מְעוֹן [ThWAT IV, 1984] 1028. Also B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament. A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965] 25f., 27.

Weinfeld suggests that מְעוֹן קדשׁ refers to the group of "the fifteen" (VIII 1) which "represents the act and as such embodies the ideals of the whole congregation" (M. Weinfeld, *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect. A Comparison with Guilds and Religious Associations of the Hellenistic-Roman Period* [NTOA 2; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986] 74).

1QS three times (I 18,23; II 19) in combination with בליעל referring to the dominion of Belial, and in IV 19 along with the "dominion of injustice". אור might in this case refer to the opposite of these dominions: to a dominion of God, hence a place where God is near. מעון in 1QS X 1 does not, therefore, seem to refer explicitly to the Temple or heaven, but to a sphere where God dwells.<sup>13</sup>

The appearance of מעון כבוד in X 3 strengthens this observation: the lights "retire to the dwelling place of glory". Since כבוד is a phenomenon that occurs often in the HB and the scrolls in descriptions of a heavenly- and/or Temple-like place and is used to describe those places where God can dwell, מעון again refers to a sphere of God's presence.<sup>14</sup>

In 1QH, מעון occurs three times (XIII 13; XX 2<sup>15</sup>). XIII 13 presents מעון in the general meaning of "place" or "location". The psalmist praises God that He has rescued his soul from a "place of lions" (במעון אריות), hence a place where the evil is. But in XX 2, מעון is used in a way similar to 1QS which strengthens its meaning as a place of nearness to God:

"(2) [...] safely in the ho[ly] place, in rest and at ease,

(2) [...] ה לכתח במעון קורש [בשקט ושלוה]

(3)[with the eternal spirits] in the tents of glory (כבוד) and salvation (וישועה). (...)"

<sup>13</sup> H. Groß, *art.* משל [ThWAT V, 1986] 77 sees behind the usage of ממשלה only the idea "des Herrschens" and der "Verwaltung" (*ibid.*).

<sup>14</sup> Especially in the Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice כבוד is used as attribute of a heavenly sphere. Schwermer suggests that מעון in the Songs is a "liturgischen terminus technicus" (A.M. Schwermer, *Gott als König und eine Königsherrschaft in den Sabbatliedern aus Qumran*, in: M. Hengel/ A.M. Schwermer, *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult im Judentum, Urchristentum und in der hellenistischen Welt* [WUNT 55; Tübingen: Mohr, 1991] 83).

<sup>15</sup> K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 127 has also XII 5 (=XX 5) which does not read מעון (cf. Martinez/Tigchelaar, *DSS I*, 190). The translation of J. Maier, *Qumran-Essener I*, 103 does not clearly indicate a מעון in the Hebrew text either.

The usage of **מעון** in combination with **קדוש** indicates the divine quality of the place. "Eternity" and "glory" are again characteristics of the place which shows that the author speaks of a divine sphere. But the fact that the lines are not well preserved prevents us from determining whether this place is identical with the Community.

The single occurrence of **מעון** in 1QM is significant, because there (1QM XII 1) it is used to refer to the place of God's dwelling which might be identical with the Community:

"For there is a multitude of holy ones in heaven and hosts of angels in your holy place (**במעון קודשכה**)<sup>16</sup> to

[praise] your [truth]. (...)"

This usage, however, is problematic. On the one hand it seems to indicate that **מעון** in 1QS refers to the Community as a heaven-like place. The members of the Community would be, in this case, amongst the holy ones and the angels in God's presence. But the following text in 1QM suggests strongly that this **מעון** as a heavenly sphere is understood as being out of reach for the members of the Community.<sup>17</sup> Consequently, the Community is associated with a heavenly sphere in some ways. And this clearly indicates that the idea of nearness of God in the Community was accepted, probably even immanent Divine presence as in heaven.

### 1.3. Conclusion

It is not easy to determine the meaning of **מעון** in the DSS, but a certain pattern is apparent. In 1QS VIII 8, it refers to the heavenly- and/or Temple-like place that is identified with the Community, and in X 1 it refers to a sphere of God with which the Community is linked; in

<sup>16</sup> According to J.H. Charlesworth, *Graphic Concordance*, 78 and K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 127.

<sup>17</sup> Martinez/Tigchelaar, *DSS I*, 132 read **במעון קודשכה** instead.

1QM XII 1-5 is a great praise of God and heaven with all its holy ones and angels. It represents the raise of someone or something that cannot be reached by a human under any circumstances.

1QH XX 2 it refers to a holy place, and in 1QM XII to God's dwelling, but whether the Community is identical with these places is not certain.

These findings suggest strongly that the Community was seen as a place within God's sphere. It, therefore, was understood to qualify for Divine presence. We clearly found indications that the authors of 1QS, 1QH, and 1QM describe the Community by using **מעון** in a way that gives it the qualities of either heaven or the Temple. But it is not possible to determine precisely the nature of this presence. The usage of **מעון** in the scrolls, however, definitely shows that the Yahad was not simply understood as "substitute" of the Temple, and cannot be called "Community without Temple". Although transferring qualities of the Temple onto the Community, the goal of the Community lies beyond the HB's idea of the Temple. As a place in God's sphere the Community is definitely understood to qualify for a permanent nearness of God. But this nearness goes as far as to inter-link the Community's existence with God's. The existence of the Community, as 1QS/H, 1QSa, and 1QM describe it, can only be understood within its special relationship with God that qualifies it for Divine presence. This gives the Yahad its right to exist. Some of the usages of **מעון** even indicate that the Community was understood as a place of God's immanent and personal presence.

## 2. מעמד

The second word which we will analyse that is used in IQS/H and also other scrolls to describe the nature of the Community and in particular the lives of its members in relation to God is **מעמד**. Meaning generally "standing place", **מעמד** is used in 1QH, 1QS, 1QSa, and 1QM, describing the standing place of members of the Community or even the Community itself in relation to God. This usage makes **מעמד** one of the most significant terms describing the Community's relationship with God.

In order to determine the precise meaning of **מעמד**, we will in this chapter not only analyse **מעמד** in IQS/H in comparison with the HB, but also in 1QSa and 1QM and its translations in the LXX. The understanding of **מעמד** in the Septuagint reveals interesting aspects of the word's meaning in the scrolls.

### 2.1. HB

In the Hebrew Bible, **מעמד** occurs only six times: 1.K. 10:5; Ps. 69:3; Isa. 22:19; 1.Chr. 23:28; 2.Chr. 9:4; 35:15.<sup>1</sup> The senses in which the word **מעמד** is used in these six occurrences represent most of the meanings in which **מעמד** is used also outside of the HB, as we shall see presently.

The primary sense of **מעמד** may be discerned in 1.K. 10:5 and 2.Chr. 9:4 (**מעמד** **משרתיו**), where the visit of the Queen of Sheba to Solomon is described. **מעמד** denotes

---

Cf. W. Gesenius, *Handwörterbuch*, 446 and G. Lisowsky, *Konkordanz*, 841.

here: "the attendance"<sup>2</sup> of servants (i.e. "standing behind ready to serve"), and the context in which **מעמד** is used is the royal court.

In Ps. 69:3a **מעמד** denotes "standing-ground":

טבעתי ביון מצולה ואין מעמד (3a)

"I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing-ground."

**מעמד** here means literally the place where a human being, surrounded by water, can put his feet in an attempt not to drown, and forms part of a metaphor the psalmist is using. Here **מעמד** is the steadfastness which a righteous man receives from God for his faithfulness.<sup>3</sup>

Three times **מעמד** is used in the sense of "function", "position", or "post" (Isa. 22:19b; 1.Chr. 23:28; 2.Chr. 35:15)<sup>4</sup>. As we will see later, these are the usages of **מעמד** which are the most significant in comparison with the LXX and the DSS.

In Isa. 22:19b a human being (Shebna) is pulled down from his position or function in a household by God (**יהרסוך יהרסוך**). **מעמד** in this verse is used in a "secular" sense as "function" or "post".<sup>5</sup>

Significantly, according to 1.Chr. 23, David is assigning duties to the Levites and the priests. And, since God will have a house in Jerusalem, it is no longer the function of the Levites to carry and move the Tent of Meeting,

"For their place/position/function/duty shall be at the side of the sons of Aaron

for the service of the house of JHWH (...)."

(28) **כי מעמדם ליד־בני אהרן לעבדת בית יהוה (...)**

Ringgren renders with "Aufwarten" (H. Ringgren, *art.* **עמד** [ThWAT VI, 1989] 203), Koehler/ Baumgartner suggest "Aufwartung" (L. Koehler/ W. Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament. Lieferung II* [Leiden/ New York/ Kobenhaven/ Köln: E.J. Brill, 1990] 591).

According to Ringgren: "Platz wo ich stehen kann" (H. Ringgren, *art.* **עמד** [ThWAT VI, 1989] 202).

L. Koehler/ W. Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament. Lieferung II* [Leiden/ New York/ Kobenhaven/ Köln: E.J. Brill, 1990] 581.

Ringgren has "Stellung" (*ibid.*, 203).

מעמד in this case is the "function", "post", or "duty" of the Levites in the (future) Temple in Jerusalem during certain services.<sup>6</sup>

The remaining verse is 2.Chr. 35:15 where מעמד is part of a description of the celebration of the *Passover*. Within this description of the process of the Passover celebration מעמד is used to define the place where the singers are supposed to stand during a certain event in the Temple in Jerusalem (v.15):

והמשררים בני-אסף על-מעמדם כמצות דויד

"(...) the singers, the sons of Asaph, were in their place

according to the command of David (...)"

The sense of מעמד here is very close to its basic meaning (i.e. "standing place"). It refers to a "post" or "duty"<sup>7</sup> of singers in the Temple of Jerusalem during the Passover celebrations.

<sup>6</sup> The Jews at Qumran appear to have held 1.Chr. 23 in high regard. Among the many features of this chapter which seem to have influenced the Community, the following should be noted especially.

(1) According to 1.Chr. 22, king David prepares for the building of the temple, but Solomon will build it (cf. 22:6). Hence, chapter 23 describes the structure of the future temple. As seen already, the Community prepares itself for immediate and permanent Divine presence by claiming that qualities of the Temple, hence authorised by the Davidic Jewish tradition, have been transferred onto the Community.

(3)V3: Mentions the significance of the age of the Levites. Especially according to 1QS, the age of the people is a decisive condition for the membership of the Community and the right to perform certain functions within the Community.

(4) V.4: According to this verse we can see that everybody has his function in the Temple and so has every member of Qumran (cf. 1QS II 22; VI 1-8, especially 8-23).

(6) V.6: Here again the strict organisation pattern of the temple personnel is mentioned, which we find frequently in Qumran texts.

(7) V.13: According to this verse, "(...) Aaron was set apart to consecrate the most holy things, he and his sons for ever to make offerings before JHWH, and to minister to Him and to pronounce blessing in His name for ever." This verse alone mentions three aspects that became crucial in the Community: separation from the rest of Israel, life in the Community as permanent sacrifice (cf. also 1.Chr. 23:31), and blessings in God's name.

(8) V.30: Mentions praise to God every morning, and thanksgiving to God every evening. The similarity with Qumran texts is twofold: firstly, praise and thanksgiving is essential for the religious life of Israel and in Qumran. Secondly, according to both texts it is essential to pray and give thanks according to a certain "timetale" (cf. especially the significance of regular daily prayer in Qumran).

For this occurrence and for 1.Chr. 23:28 Ringgren suggests "Stellung" (H. Ringgren, *art.* עמך ThWAT VI, 1989] 202).

The significant difference in comparison with Isa. 22:19b is that here again **מעמד** in the sense of "post" or "duty" is situated in the Temple.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>8</sup> In the scholarly literature, **מעמד** is described in different ways. Apart from those scholars who discuss the meaning of **מעמד** in the Middle Ages who suggest that it is either a "council of elders" in a Sephardi community or congregation in the West after the expulsion from Spain (D. Sperber, *Ma'amad or Mahamad*, in: C. Roth/ G. Wigoder (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, vl.11 [Jerusalem: Encyclopaedia Judaica, 1971] 638) or a "board of directors of a Spanish-Portuguese congregation" (M. Schlossinger, *art. Mahamad*, in: I. Singer (ed.), *Jewish Encyclopaedia. A Descriptive record of the History, Religion, Literature, and Customs of the Jewish people from the Earliest times to the Present Day*, vl.8 [New York: Funk & Wagnalls 1901-06] 259; cf. also J. Maier, *Geschichte der jüdischen Religion. Von der Zeit Alexanders des Grossen bis zur Aufklärung mit einem Ausblick auf das 19./20. Jahrhundert* [Berlin/ New York: De Gruyter, 1972] 256), scholars can be divided into two groups: a) the ones who discuss **מעמד** in the HB, and b) those who discuss the meaning of **מעמד** in the Rabbinic literature.

a) **מעמד** in the HB has not drawn a lot of attention in the scholarly literature. E. and H. Eshel and S. Safrai state regarding 1.Chr. 23:28 and 2.Chr. 35:15 that **מעמדות** "does not function as a technical term in the book of Chronicles" (S. Safrai, *Die Wallfahrt im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels* [Forschungen zum jüdisch-christlichen Dialog, vl.3; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1981] 266; E. and H. Eshel, *4Q471 Fragment 1 and Ma'amadot in the War Scroll*, in: J. T. Barrera/ L. V. Montaner (ed.), *The Madrid Qumran Congress. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls Madrid 18-21 March, 1991*, vl.2 [Leiden/ New York/ Köln: E.J. Brill, 1992] 617).

b) Far more attention has been paid to the meaning of **מעמד** in the Rabbinic literature. Unfortunately several scholars seem to use their results of the meaning of **מעמד** in the Rabbinic literature to explain its meaning in the HB. Proper comparisons of the meaning of **מעמד** in the Rabbinic literature with the HB, the LXX, and the DSS in order to highlight its precise meaning in all of them have not been undertaken so far. According to the scholarly literature, **מעמד** in Rabbinic literature refers either to a "halt of the funeral escort on returning from burial for lamentation or consolation" (M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*, vl.1 [New York/ Berlin/ London: Choneb, 1926] 818), or to a group of men who are sent to the Jerusalem Temple as a delegation from the different parts of Israel to participate in the Temple cult on behalf of their local congregations. The definitions of **מעמד** in the latter sense differ in the scholarly literature in mainly three aspects. First, in the constellation of the group: are these men Levites, priests, and/or lay men? Second, in the description of the duties of the group. Finally, in the description of substitute cultic actions in the local congregations. E. and H. Eshel state, for example, that the "basic meaning of Ma'amadot in rabbinic literature refers to the priests, Levites and laymen who must attend in the Temple when the public offering (Tamid) is being sacrificed" (ibid., 617f.). J. Levy suggests similarly and describes the **מעמד** as "eine Abteiling von Priestern, Leviten und Israeliten, welche an den betreffenden Tagen bestimmte Gebete zu verrichten hatten, damit die Opfer wohlgefällig aufgenommen würden" (J. Levy, *Neuhebräisches und Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim. Dritter Band* [Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1883] 193; also G.F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. The Age of the Tannaim*, vl.2 [New York, 1971] 13). L.I. Ervine even states that the **מעמד** as a group of priests and laymen is "a local ceremony held when a religious priest (and other lay representatives) officiated in the Temple during an assigned week (L.I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue* [New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2000] 35). Another group of scholars suggests that the **מעמד** is only a lay delegation of the various local congregations participating in the daily offerings at the Temple to a degree possible for laymen (so C.E. Hayes, *art. Ma'amad*, in: R.J. Zwi Werblowsky/ G. Wigoder (ed.), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Jewish Religion* [New York/ Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997] 430; M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*, vl.1 [New York/ Berlin/ London: Choneb, 1926] 818; M. Schlossinger, *art. Mahamad*, in: I. Singer (ed.), *Jewish Encyclopaedia. A Descriptive record of the History, Religion, Literature, and Customs of the Jewish people from the Earliest times to the Present Day*, vl.8 [New York: Funk & Wagnalls 1901-06] 259; S. Safrai, *The Temple* [1976] 865-907, 873; E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. - A.D. 135*, vl.2 [Edinburgh: Clark, 1979] 293).

Concluding we can say that a detailed analysis of the meaning of **מעמד** in the Rabbinic literature is much needed, but beyond the scope of this study. Especially a comparison of **מעמד** in the Rabbinic literature

## 2.2. LXX

## 2.2.1. Occurrence

1.K. 10:5/ 2.Chr. 9:4:

HB: 1.K. 10:5/ 2.Chr. 9:4 מעמד משרתיו

LXX: 3.Reg. 10:5/ Par.II 9:4 καὶ τὴν στάσιν λειτουργῶν αὐτοῦ

The LXX translates מעמד with ἡ στάσις. This suggests a literal translation of the Hebrew.

Ps. 69:3:

HB: Ps. 69:3 טבעתי ביון מצולה ואין מעמד

LXX: Ps. 68:3 ἐνεπάγην εἰς ἰλὺν βυθοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ὑπόστασις

This is the only occasion where the LXX translates מעמד with ἡ ὑπόστασις.

Isa. 22:19:

HB: Isa. 22:19 והדפתוך ממצבך וממעמדך יחרסך

LXX: Isa. 22:19 καὶ ἀφαιρεθήσῃ ἐκ τῆς οἰκονομίας σου καὶ ἐκ τῆς στάσεώς σου.

Again the LXX translates מעמד with ἡ στάσις. מעמד and ἡ στάσις mean here "post" or "function". Both terms are used in a secular context.

---

with the DSS is interesting, because the Rabbinic literature describes Jewish congregations that have to survive without the Temple being available to them. The Qumran Community faces the same dilemma, only, of course, for very different reasons. But nonetheless, it would be interesting to compare the different solutions to this problem. In both, for example, the reading and observance of the Law became highly important (cf. L.I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue* [New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2000] 35).

1.Chr. 23:28:

HB: 1.Chr. 23:28      כי מעמדם ליד־בני אהרן לעבדת בית יהוה (...)

LXX: Par.I 23:28      ὅτι ἔστησεν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ χεῖρα Ααρων τοῦ λειτουργεῖν ἐν οἴκῳ κυρίου (...)

In this verse a difficulty occurs. **מעמדם** could be the noun **מעמד** with an attached 3.pl.m.suffix (meaning "their **מעמד**"), or the part. Hof. with the 3.pl.m. suffix of **עמד** (meaning "they have been put/placed"). In the former case the translation of the HB would literally be: "but/for their **מעמד** shall be to the hand of the sons of Aaron". In the latter case the literal translation would be: "but/for they have been placed to the hand of the sons of Aaron". That means that in the first case **מעמד** basically denotes "standing place". The phrase implies that there is a "standing place" in the sense of a "function" or a "duty" for the Levites (cf. v.26). In the second case, **מעמדם** as participle, the emphasis lies on the fact that somebody does something with or for the Levites, placing them under the authority of the sons of Aaron. In this case, **מעמדם** does not mean a "function" or "duty", but describes an *organisatory action*. But this latter option is unlikely, for in this case **מעמדם** would be (as we have seen) a participle Hoph. of **עמד**, and this form is very rare in the HB, occurring only in 1.K. 22:35.<sup>9</sup> The structure of the sentence and the occurrence of the form **מעמדם** suggest strongly that the former option, **מעמדם** as noun with suffix, is the better reading.

The LXX translated **מעמדם** in a very distinct manner with ἔστησεν αὐτοὺς. It does not recognise **מעמדם** as noun, nor as participle Hof., but uses 3.sg.m. Aor. Act. of ἵστημι followed by the accusative pl. of αὐτός. In this case, the verb must refer to David in v.25 as

Cf. W. Gesenius, *Handwörterbuch*, 599; L. Koehler/ W. Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament. Lieferung III* [Leiden/ New York/ Kobenhaven/ Köln: E.J. Brill, 1990] 796.

subject (translation: "that he put them to the hand of Aaron"). The LXX uses the Greek verb which is the closest in meaning to **עמד**. Although the translation of the LXX does not reflect the Hebrew, we can observe that the LXX follows the second way of interpreting **מעמד** as described above, in which case **ἔστησεν αὐτοὺς** would refer to a organisatory action in the Temple. According to the Greek text, David is placing the Levites under the authority of the sons of Aaron. The LXX avoids a Greek term which might refer to a "function" or "duty" of somebody at, or in, the Temple. The decisive point seems to be the connection of **מעמד** with the Temple. The **מעמד** in this sense implies an institution, the group of Levites, which has a function within the Temple service.

The LXX seems to avoid this understanding of the **מעמד**. In the LXX, the act of **ἔστησεν αὐτοὺς** is linked with the Temple, because in v.24 the Levites are described as working in the Temple. But the LXX does not recognise an "institution" of Levites at the Temple called **מעמד** (in the HB). Is the LXX trying to avoid mentioning such an institution?

2.Chr. 35:15:

HB: 2.Chr. 35:15 והמשררים בני־אסף על־מעמדם

LXX Par.II 35:15 καὶ οἱ ψαλτωδοὶ υἱοὶ Ασαφ ἐπὶ τῆς στάσεως αὐτῶν

The LXX translates here **מעמדם** with **ἡ στάσις αὐτῶν**, and thus translates the Hebrew text literally. The singers have a **מעמד/στάσις** in the Temple when the Pesah is celebrated.

### 2.2.1.1. Summary

We can detect the following tendency. As long as the HB uses the word **מעמד** in a secular sense, i.e. not in connection with the Temple in Jerusalem (1.K. 10:5 // 2.Chr. 9:4; Isa. 22:19), the LXX translates with ἡ **στάσις**. Both terms can be explained through their basic meaning "standing place".

When **מעמד** is used in connection with the Temple, the LXX translates in one instance, 2.Chr. 35:15, with **στάσις**, in the other, 1.Chr. 23:28, with the verb ἵστημι. This may indicate that the LXX avoids **στάσις** where **מעמד** in the HB is connected with the Temple. The fact that the LXX uses **στάσις** in 2.Chr. 25:15 may then be explained as follows: Either the LXX uses ἡ **στάσις** because the emphasis in this verse lies on the actual "standing place" of the singers, not on the establishment of an institution, or the LXX avoids ἡ **στάσις** only when the **מעמד** is linked with the Levites, not with other Temple personnel (see for further details below). Either way the evidence is too little to shed more light on the intention of the authors of the LXX.

### 2.2.2. Translations

#### 2.2.2.1. Ἡ ὑπόστασις

Although Ps. 68(69):3 is the only occasion where the LXX uses ἡ **ὑπόστασις** as an equivalent of **מעמד**, it is advisable to investigate ἡ **ὑπόστασις** as it is used in the LXX.

**ὑπόστασις** occurs in the LXX 20 times.<sup>10</sup> It stands as the equivalent of 12 different Hebrew terms and, according to H. Köster,<sup>11</sup> is used in two different ways: either in its "etymologically secondary sense"<sup>12</sup>, i.e. its basic sense as "standing", or ἡ **ὑπόστασις** "is the 'underlying

F. Rehkopf, *Septuaginta-Vokabular*, 298.

H. Köster, *art. ὑπόστασις* (TDNT VIII), 572-589.

*Ibid.*, 582.

reality behind something.' As the 'plan' or 'purpose,' or as 'that which endures,' enclosed in God, ὑπόστασις is used quite precisely for a variety of Hebrew equivalents."<sup>13</sup>

The occurrence of ἡ ὑπόστασις in Ps. 68(69):3 belongs, according to H. Köster, to the first category. And indeed, the translation of מַעֲמַד with ἡ ὑπόστασις indicates that it was the aim of the translator to present a literal rendering of the Hebrew term. In Ps. 68(69):3, מַעֲמַד was understood in its basic sense: as "standing point" or "foothold". The Greek ὑπόστασις is understood in the same way. But, to call ὑπόστασις a "slavish rendering of מַעֲמַד"<sup>14</sup> leads in a wrong direction, and to offer only "Wirklichkeit" and "Standhaftigkeit"<sup>15</sup> as denotations of ὑπόστασις in the LXX is not enough.

We can conclude that מַעֲמַד in Ps. 69:3 was first of all understood in its basic sense. But in the context where it occurs, it also involves to some degree a transferred sense. It is the "basis of life", or even "life itself", which is lacking if a person is separated from God. The translation of מַעֲמַד with ὑπόστασις attempts to give the term a more "existential" meaning (cf. the usage of ἡ ὑπόστασις throughout the LXX). This interpretation of מַעֲמַד in this particular verse does not change the intention of the text, but simply "philosophises" the meaning of a Hebrew word.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., 582.

Köster offers basically three denotations of ὑπόστασις: 1. in the sense of "substance" (ibid. 580), cf. Dtn. 11:6, "immovable property" (ibid.), Job 22:20, or "basis of power" (ibid. 581), cf. Ez. 26:11. 2. in the sense of "'reality' behind phenomena" (ibid. 581) as in Ruth 1:12. 3. in the sense of "life-plan" (ibid.) as in Ps. 138:15, and "plan" (ibid.) as in Jer. 23:22; Ez. 19:5; 43:11.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., 581<sub>91</sub>.

F. Rehkopf, *Septuaginta-Vokabular*, 298.

The usage of the Greek word in the NT also indicates that the meaning of ἡ ὑπόστασις was developing towards this "existentialistic" sense (cf. W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*, 1526).

## 2.2.2.2. Ἡ στάσις

Ἡ στάσις occurs in the LXX 29 times.<sup>17</sup> 14 times out of these 29 occurrences ἡ στάσις stands for a word which derives from the root עמד (i.e. עמוד, מעמד, עמד ('omed), עמד ('amad)). Four times in the LXX ἡ στάσις is used as equivalent of מעמד. III.K.10:5; Para.II 9:4; 35:15, Is. 22:19.

## a) Ἡ στάσις standing for Hebrew words which do not derive from the stem עמד

Occurrence	Meaning	Comment
Dtn. 28:65	"standing place" for feet	Secular
Judg. 9:6	"boundary place (stone(?))"	Secular
Paral.I 28:2	"standing place for the feet of the Lord" (~"foodstool")	Lord's place to stand.
Paral.II 24:13	"state" of the house of the Lord	State of the Temple.
Neh. 9:6	"standing things"	God made everything that is "standing on it".
Si. 36(33):12	something that is standing somewhere.	Secular
Na. 3:11	"standing place" in the sense of hiding place	"Secular", similar to Ps. 68(69):3.
Ez. 1:28	beams of light	The fact that there is light at a glorious place (vision of Ez.).
Dan. LXX. 6:7(8)	"interdict" or "ordinance" (?) στασιν εστησαμεν	Context: the interdict of Darius (jurisdiction)
Dan. TH. 6:7(8)	"interdict" or "ordinance" (?) στησαι στασει βασιλικη	" " "
6:15(16)	"interdict" or "ordinance"	" " "
I Mac. 7:18	"agreement" or "interdict"	Transgression of that which has been set which is η στασις (jurisdiction).
10:72	"standing" in front of somebody	Secular
III Mac. 1:23	(?) "standing place" in the Temple	Secular use (no specific Temple-use).

## b) Ἡ στάσις for עמוד

Στάσις occurs in the LXX only once as equivalent for עמוד, in 2.Chr. 23:13. Here the meaning of στάσις is "standing place" of the king. The king has a pillar at the entrance of the Temple where he takes his stand in certain ceremonies. Hence, the context in which στάσις is used is the Temple.

## c) Ἡ στάσις for עמד ('omed)

Occurrence	Meaning	Comment
2.Chr. 30:16	"standing place"/ "post"	At the <i>festival of the unleavened bread</i> the <i>priests</i> "took their <i>accustomed</i> (κατὰ τὸ κρίμα αὐτῶν) <u>standing place</u> according to the law of Moses the man of God" (v.16) at the Temple.
35:10	"standing place"	"When the <i>service</i> had been prepared for, the <i>priests</i> stood in their <u>standing place</u> (position), and the <i>Levites</i> in their divisions according to the king's command." (v.10)
Neh. 8:7	"standing places"	Gathered together at the <i>Gate of Water</i> (שַׁעַר הַמַּיִם, v.1) the <i>people of Israel</i> learn the law while remaining at <u>their places</u> .
9:3	"standing place"	<i>Israelites</i> were assembled with <i>fasting</i> and in <i>sackcloth</i> and with <i>dust</i> on their head and on their <u>standing place</u> they read from the <i>book of the law</i> of JHWH their God. Again at the <i>Gate of Water</i> ?
13:11	"standing place"/ "post"/ "function"	The <i>house of God</i> is forsaken, because the <i>Levites</i> had not been given their portion; so Nehemiah "gathered them [Levites] together and set them into their <u>post/function</u> " in the Temple.
Dan. LXX 8:17	"standing place"	The <u>place</u> where Daniel stood after the vision.
Dan. TH. 8:17	" (identical)	" " " (identical)
10:11	"standing place" (?)	Standing place of Daniel (?).

## d) Ἡ στάσις for עמד ('amad)

Στάσις occurs in the LXX only once as equivalent for עמד ('amad), in Jo. 10:13. Here the meaning of στάσις is "place": the sun and the moon stopped at their places. Hence the usage is secular.

## e) Summary

The significant occurrences of  $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\varsigma$  for the analysis of  $\text{מעמד}$  in the DSS are those where

a) it stands for Hebrew words that do not derive from  $\text{עמד}$ , and b) where it stands for 'omed.

These occurrences show that the authors of the LXX use  $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\varsigma$  in a manner far more elaborated than  $\text{מעמד}$  in the HB. They seem to develop a phenomenon called  $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\varsigma$  that is important, especially at the Temple.

a) Used for a Hebrew word that does not derive from  $\text{עמד}$ ,  $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\varsigma$  is used mainly in a secular context (cf. Dtn. 28:65; Judg. 9:6; Sir. 36(33):12; I Mac.10:72; III Mac. 1:23), and three times in connection with theological ideas, but still in a secular sense (cf. Neh. 9:6; Na. 3:11; Ez. 1:28). Four times  $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\varsigma$  is used in a legal context meaning "that which is set", i.e. "interdict", "ordinance", or "agreement" (cf. Dan. LXX 6:7(8) and TH. 6:7(8), 15(16); I Mac. 7:18).

But  $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\varsigma$  is in these cases also used twice with a theological meaning which is significant in comparison with the HB and the DSS.  $\Sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\varsigma$  in these cases is used as "standing place" of JHWH (1.Chr. 28:2) and as "state" of the Temple (2.Chr. 24:23). These usages are significant, because they indicate that  $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\varsigma$  is used in the context of the Temple, but do not seem to represent a usage as *terminus technicus* for a theological idea. Theologically interesting for the same reason is also its occurrence in 2.Chr. 23:13, where it refers to the "standing place" ( $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\varsigma$ ) of the king at the Temple during a certain ceremony.

b) Three times  $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\varsigma$  is used as equivalent of 'omed meaning the "standing place" of Daniel where he stood during one of his visions (Dan. LXX 8:17; Dan.TH 8:17; 10:11). This usage is unique, because  $\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\varsigma$  is used neither in a purely secular context, nor is it linked with the

Temple directly. The place where Daniel is transferred to in his vision is the *στάσις*, neither world, nor Temple.

In 2.Chr. and Neh. the denotation of *στάσις* is "standing place", sometimes in the sense of "function" or "post".

Thus in both 2.Chr. 30:16 and 35:10 the subjects, i.e. the persons who have a "standing place", are the *priests*, not Levites (!).<sup>18</sup> The place where the priests have this *στάσις* is *the Temple*, as in 1.Chr. 28:2; 2.Chr. 23:13; and 24:23. Furthermore, the priests have this standing place *at a certain festival or feast* (2.Chr. 30:16 during the feast of unleavened bread, and 35:10 during sacrifices). And finally, these "standing places" or "posts" of the priests are authorised either by divine (30:16) or royal (35:10) law. *Στάσις* seems to refer to established states of affairs.

Three further aspects of *στάσις* in 2.Chr. 30:16 and 35:10 are worth mentioning. In 30:16, it is said that the priests have their "standing place" *κατὰ τὸ κρίμα αὐτῶν* (*τὸ κρίμα* denoting "judgement", "sentence", or "lawsuit"). The BHS reads *משפטים* here, which can mean "judgement", "legal matter", "law", or "custom". This means that the particular function of the priests which is described in this verse is definitely an established one, authorised not only through the Torah, but also through other rules or custom.<sup>19</sup> As a result, *עמד* ('omed) in the HB must have been understood in the same sense, as an established function of the priests at the particular feast in the Temple, and the same applies to *στάσις* in the LXX.

<sup>18</sup> Which suggests that in case of 2.Chr. 35:15 the LXX is using *στάσις*, because it does not refer to the Levites, but the singers (see above).

<sup>19</sup> Another possible interpretation would be that it is the intention of the author of the Chronicles to re-establish an institution, which had once existed, had gone into abeyance, and which he wished to revive by emphasising that the *στάσις* is based on the Law.

This idea is also strengthened through the use of the word עמד ('omed) in 2.Chr. 30:16a:

ויעמדו על-עמדם. This use of the verb עמד and the noun עמד ('omed) in combination might indicate that the author of the text is talking about an established institution.

Another indication for this understanding of עמד ('omed) and ἡ στάσις is the fact that the Hebrew and the Greek words are used in the singular, although the subject is always a number of men. The nouns thus appear as collectives, strongly suggestive of an institution of some kind.

In Nehemiah the situation is slightly different. Στάσις is used here three times (Neh. 8:7; 9:3; 13:11). Once (Neh.13:11), στάσις is used as in 2.Chr.: this verse tells us about a group of men who could not perform their duty in the Temple. Nehemiah gives them their "duty" or "function" back. Στάσις is here again an established "post" or "function", understood as a duty in the Temple. But in this case it is not the priests who have the "standing place", i.e. the "post" or function", but the *Levites*. LXX of Neh. 8:7 and 9:3 take the usage of στάσις even a step further. Here, it is neither priests nor Levites who take στάσις, but *Israelites*.

The following picture of στάσις in the LXX has crystallised: Although the LXX does not seem to have a settled idea of מעמד, it seems to develop an institution called στάσις. People who can have a στάσις are the priests or the Israelites. The place where it takes place is in the former case the Temple, in the latter the Gate of Water. Levites are only mentioned once as having a στάσις in the Temple. The occasion where the στάσις takes place is a festival described in 2.Chr. and Neh. 13:11. It is highly significant, however, that in LXX Neh. 8:7 and 9:3 the στάσις is connected with public reading of the Torah, when Israelites gather to take their stand, read Torah and learn it. When we come to examine מעמד in the DSS, the influence of these particular verses will be apparent.

### 2.3. DSS

This usage of **מעמד** in the HB and the LXX singles out the idea of **מעמד** as one that the authors of the scrolls can easily use according to their method: it occurs only rarely in the HB and its translation in the LXX signifies that the meaning of the term was not settled. The authors of the DSS can, therefore, change its meaning easily according to their own teachings. And interesting will be whether these changes are similar to the ones in the LXX.

**מעמד** occurs no fewer than 30 times in 1QH, 1QS, 1QSa, and 1QM.<sup>20</sup> The scrolls emphasise different aspects of the word's meaning.

#### 2.3.1. 1QH

**מעמד** is used 7 times in 1QH, but it occurs only once as "standing place before God".

Three times (X 22; XII 36; XIII 29) **מעמד** is directly linked with the life of the psalmist.

**מעמד** is a metaphor of the *steadfastness of the psalmist*, and provides the psalmist with a great sense of security in his life. Significant is that in all these lines it is God who gives this sense of security to the psalmist. The **מעמד** is given by God to the righteous and godly psalmist. This reflects the meaning of **מעמד** as in Ps. 69:3.

So according to X 22 the **מעמד** of the psalmist comes from God; according to XII 36 the spirit of the psalmist was established through God, and according to XIII 29 evil things bother the psalmist and cause him difficulty in keeping his **מעמד**.

According to XI 21, God ...

"(21) (...) has cleaned a perverse spirit of great sin that it may stand at the standing place

---

K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 127f.; cf. also J.H. Charlesworth, *Graphic Concordance*, 78,142,223,406.

with (22) the host of the holy ones and that it may enter into the Community (...)"

(...) ורוח נעוה טהרתה מפשע רב

להתיצב במעמד עם (22) צבא קדושים ולבוא ביחד (...)

According to this line, God cleans humans from evil, and thus enables humans to join the people of Qumran and enter the Community. The purification through God is the condition for humans to join the Community. The **מעמד** is the *membership of the Community which depends entirely on an act of God*.<sup>21</sup>

In 1QH VIII 13,<sup>22</sup> the textual situation is problematic. The text before and after **ומעמד צדק** is damaged, and the only information we can realistically acquire here is that there is a "standing place of righteousness".

In 1QH XIX 13, **מעמד** occurs in combination with **לפניכה** and **יצב**, and refers to a place where a human being (**תולעת מתים**)<sup>23</sup> is taking his stand (**יצב**) at a standing place (**לפניכה**) before God (**במעמד**):

<sup>21</sup> Ringgren sees here an "eschatological" notion and describes the meaning of **מעמד** as "seinen Platz in der eschatologischen Gemeinde einnehmen" (H. Ringgren, *art. עמד* [ThWAT VI, 1989] 203).

<sup>22</sup> = 1QH XVI 5 (E. Lohse, *Qumran Texte*; K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*).

<sup>23</sup> Line 13 does not have a subject, but refers back to the **תולעת מתים** in line 12. The term **תולעת** does not occur often, neither in the HB nor in the texts of Qumran. In both corpora it does not occur in combination with **מתים**. In 1QH **תולעת** occurs twice: XIV 34 and XIX 12. In both cases E.Lohse (E. Lohse, *Qumran Texte*, 137<sub>30</sub> and 155<sub>51</sub>) assumes that this term in combination with **מתים** refers to the sinful and weak human beings in general (according to K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 231, **תולעת** occurs only twice in Qumran texts besides 1QH: 1QM VII 11, where it is used in a completely different sense, and in frag. 53 l.). The occurrence of the term in the HB seems to indicate the same. The term occurs only 8 times in the HB (Ex. 16:20; Dtn. 28:39; Isa. 14:11, 41:14; 66:24; Ps. 22:7; Job 25:6; Jon. 4:7). Three times the term is used within descriptions of food or plants going bad (Ex. 16:20; Dtn. 28:39; Jon. 4:7). But in poetical texts **תולעת** is also used referring to human beings who are weak and sinful (Isa. 41:14), who are in difficulty and fall like a worm (Ps. 22:7), and who are in general understood as being like a worm (Job 25:6). In Isa. 14:11, the worms are even mentioned as the covering of a sinful (ungodly) human being in Sheol (i.e. the king of Babylon). The images of **תולעת** emphasise the weakness, sinfulness, and earthliness of the humans.

Hence Lohse is likely to be correct in declaring that **תולעת מתים** is a paraphrase speaking of human beings in 1QH XIX 13.

(13) ולהתיצב במעמד לפניכה עם צבא עד ורוחי [דעת] (...)

"that he takes his stand at the standing place before You with the host of eternity

and with the spirits [of knowledge] (...)."<sup>24</sup>

The meaning of **מעמד** in this line depends on the verb **יצב**. As we will see in detail below,<sup>25</sup> **יצב** refers to standing in the Community in relation to God. It means that the Community exists in God's presence. Hence, **יצב** indicates a distinct and unique nearness of God. On a more practical level this means that "taking a stand" in the Community involves undertaking one's function within the organisation of the Community and participating in the cultic-religious life of the Community. Consequently, **מעמד** refers here to a "function", "position", or "post" of a single member within the cultic-religious life in the Community in God's nearness.

In 1QH VIII 21,<sup>26</sup> the textual situation is difficult, but E. Lohse<sup>27</sup> reconstructed a text which allows an interpretation of the meaning of **מעמד**, although its meaning is problematic:

(13) עמדני [ מעמד רצ[ונך] אשר בח[רתה]

לאוהביך ולשומרי מצו[ות]יך]

(13) "with m[e standing place of [your] pl[easeure]

which [you] have ch[osen] for those who love you and keep [your] co[mmand]ments."

**רצון** refers in this line to the consequence of life in the Community as permanent sacrifice.<sup>28</sup>

**מעמד** is the function of members of the Community who live such a live as sacrifice. It,

<sup>4</sup> In 1QH XIX 3 a new psalm begins. The psalmist is talking about his own situation and the praise of God. In XIX 9 he focuses on the "sons of God's pleasure" (**בני רצונכה**); in line 10 he begins to talk about "human beings" (**אנוש**) in general, and then, in line 12, he mentions the "worm of the dead" (**תולעת מתים**) who is raised from the dust (**להרים מעפר**) by God to the "[everlasting] council" (**לסוד [עולם]**).

Cf. pp. 166-173, especially 172f.

= 1QH XVI 13 (E. Lohse, *Qumran Texte*; K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*).

E. Lohse, *Qumran Texte*, 169.

therefore, defines a very close and unique relationship between certain human beings and God.

### 2.3.2. IQS

**מעמד** occurs in IQS only three times (II 22,23; VI 12), but in a most decisive way. In the rules of the Community, **מעמד** means "function" or "position". Twice (II 22,23) **מעמד** refers literally to the "function" or "position" of a man in the Community (**יחד**).<sup>29</sup>

In II 22, **מעמד** is explicitly used in this sense:

(22) (...) לדעת כול איש ישראל איש בית מעמדו

ביחד אל (23) לעצת עולמים (...)

"(22) (...) that every man of Israel, should each

know his standing place in the Community of God (23) for eternal council. (...)"

Beginning at I.19, the author describes the order in which the people of Israel will enter the Community. Within this order, everybody knows his function and position in the Community.

**מעמד** means this "function" of every member.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>28</sup> See on **רצון** in this line p. 61f.

<sup>29</sup> Ringgren suggests that the meaning of **מעמד** in IQS may depend on its use in IQM (H. Ringgren, *art. עמד* [ThWAT VI, 1989] 203). It is more likely that the meaning of **מעמד** in IQS, probably even in IQM, depends on its adoption and development from 1.Chr. 23:28 and 2.Chr. 35:15.

<sup>30</sup> So also B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament. A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965] 8; H. Ringgren, *art. עמד* [ThWAT VI, 1989] 203.

Leaney claims a parallelism between the meaning of **מעמד** in this line and in the Rabbinic literature A.R.C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning. Introduction, Translation and Commentary* [London: CM Press LTD, 1966] 136), but does not offer a detailed analysis of **מעמד** in those texts.

In II 23, the same usage of **מעמד** occurs. **מעמד** is the function of a man in the **יחד**. Every man has his function according to the "lot", and everybody has to take his function and cannot act against the lot.

In VI 12, the author uses **מעמד** in a more specific way, to refer to a particular function within the organisation pattern of the **יחד**, but also to the qualifications of the member and their consequences.<sup>31</sup> The author is talking about a man "who has not the position of someone who questions the council of the Community":

אשר לוא במעמד האיש השואל את עצת (13) היחד

### 2.3.3. 1QSa

In 1QSa, **מעמד** is used as in 1QS, occurring 4 times (I 17,22; II 5,15), and meaning "function" or "position" within the Community.

According to I 17, every man of the Community is supposed to prepare himself for his **מעמד** to fulfil his duty according to his **מעמד**. In I 22, the author points out that every son of Levi shall be at his standing place (**מעמד**) which seems to be at a door or a gate. **מעמד** here means simply the location where the sons of Levi are supposed to stand according to their duty.<sup>32</sup> In II 5, **מעמד** is used in the sense of a position or function within the Community.

According to this line, a disabled man cannot have such a function or position "in the midst of the assembly/meeting" (**בתוך העדה**). Finally in II 15, we are told that when the Messiah

<sup>1</sup> Leaney sees in this line reason to suggest that the **מעמדות** in the Community are parts of the organisation of the Community referring to distinct groups of members (A.R.C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning. Introduction, Translation and Commentary* [London: SCM Press LTD, 1966] 189f.). Leaney transfers here the meaning that **מעמד** has according to the most common scholarly opinion in the Rabbinic literature onto **מעמד** in 1QS, which unfortunately cannot lead to an accurate definition.

Cf. also L.H. Schiffman, *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls. A Study of the Rule of the Congregation* [SBL, Monograph Series 38; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1989] 28.

comes everybody must sit before him in accordance with their "honour" and "position" (מעמד). So even in the event of the revelation of the Messiah, the order according to which everybody in the Community has his מעמד must be maintained.

### 2.3.4. IQM

Remarkably מעמד occurs in the scrolls with a meaning which cannot be found in the Hebrew Bible, with its basic sense ("standing place"), but in a context particular to this scroll.

מעמד is used 16 times in IQM,<sup>33</sup> 12 times in a military context meaning the *place where soldiers or leaders are supposed to stand in or before the battle* (II 3; IV 4; V 4; VI 1,4; VIII 3,6,17; IX 10; XVI 5; XVII 11; XVIII 13).<sup>34</sup> מעמד is the standing place or position of soldiers in the field.<sup>35</sup>

But in IQM, מעמד is also used as it is in the HB or other Qumran scrolls. Twice (XIV 6; XVII 9) מעמד appears in the sense of the *steadfastness of a member of the Community which is given to him by God alone* adopting its meaning from Ps. 69:3. Furthermore, it is interesting to note that only IQH and IQM use מעמד in this sense: IQS and IQSa do not.

<sup>33</sup> II 3; IV 4; V 4; VI 1,4; VIII 3,6,17; IX 10; XIII 16; XIV 6,8; XVI 5; XVII 9,11; XVIII 13.

<sup>34</sup> According to Ringgren, עמד in IQM means "seinen Platz in der Schlachtlinie einnehmen" and "מעמד bezeichnet dabei den Platz eines jeden" (H. Ringgren, *art. עמד* [ThWAT VI, 1989] 203).

<sup>35</sup> Cf. also Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962] 146.

Although the usage of מעמד here seems to be a rather secular one, it is used referring to a "position" of men in the *holy war* described in IQM. מעמד, consequently, has sacral connotations in IQM referring to "functions" of the members that are crucial for the "theological" development of the Community.

## 2.3.5. Summary

**מעמד** in the DSS is used in four different senses:

1. **מעמד** as steadfastness of the psalmist which is given to him by God (cf. especially 1QH X 22; XII 36; XIII 29; 1QM XIV 6; XVII 9).
2. **מעמד** as membership of the Community which depends on God (cf. 1QH XI 21; 1QM XIV 6; XVII 9).
3. **מעמד** as position or function within the Community (cf. especially 1QS II 22, 23; VI 12; and 1QSa I 17, 22; II 5,15; 1QM XII 16).
4. **מעמד** as position in the battle field in the eschatological battle (cf. 1QM II 3; IV 4; V 4; VI 1,4; VIII 3,6,17; IX 10; XVI 5; XVII 11; XVIII 13).

But no matter in which sense **מעמד** is used, it always in these scrolls relates the Community to God. In fact, what was a rare term in the HB is now used in determining every aspect of the Community and its purpose in the world in relation to God. Without this relationship, without **מעמד** in relation to God, the Community would not be able to exist. The Community, its organisation pattern, and its individuals only make sense in relation to God.

Within this group the **מעמד** gives the individual steadfastness within his relationship with God. This steadfastness is given to him by God Himself. **מעמד** referring to the membership of the individual indicates that this individual in the Community must relate to God only.

**מעמד** meaning a "function" or a "post" within the Community relates the whole organisation pattern of the Community to God alone. The functions and positions of the individual members in the Community can only be understood within the religious life of the Community. And this life is related to God and His presence as 1QH XIX 13 suggests. And finally, **מעמד**

describing the post of warriors in the eschatological battle relates this post entirely to God, for it determines God's plans with the Community, and gives the Community a special and unique relationship with God. Consequently, **מעמד** changes the nature of the Community by giving it a special quality in relation to God. The Community is filled with His nearness

#### 2.4. Conclusion

The authors of the scrolls employ again their method of adopting and developing a word that occurs in the HB only rarely and that does not show a settled meaning. In the case of **מעמד** this method allows the authors of the scrolls to a) develop their own idea of **מעמד**, b) to adopt a few aspects of the HB-**מעמד**, and c) to authorise their idea of the **מעמד** in the Yahad through the HB.

This is why **מעמד** in the scrolls becomes a significant idea that determines the Community's relationship with God and, hence, describes the identity of the Yahad. As such it means the relation in which members of the Community stand to God: depending on Him, living according to His will, and living in His nearness.

This definition of the meaning of **מעמד** in the DSS is strengthened through the observation of the usage of the word, respectively **στάσις**, in the HB and the LXX. Generally we can conclude that the LXX developed the meaning of the HB-**מעמד** into the same direction as IQS, which may indicate that the meanings of **מעמד/στάσις** at the time when LXX and DSS were composed were in dispute. But the DSS go well beyond the idea of **מעמד/στάσις** represented in the LXX, and develop a significant Community-centred idea that defines the relationship between the Community and God. A few observations, when comparing the

meaning of **מעמד** in the DSS with the HB and the LXX, demonstrate this new understanding of the term in the Yahad and its significance:

1. LXX follows the HB in using **στάσις** as an equivalent for **מעמד** in a secular sense. Neither **מעמד** nor **στάσις** are words confined exceptionally to the religious sphere. In the Scrolls, however, **מעמד** is never used in a secular sense, but always has religious connotations.
2. **מעמד** has in the DSS always religious connotations, because it is used there to describe the special relationship between the Community and God. For example, the Scrolls go beyond LXX in developing **מעמד** in the sense of "steadfastness". Only once do LXX understand **מעמד** in this sense (Ps. 69:3), whereas at Qumran this is a common meaning for the word referring to the special relationship between the individual member of the Community and God. The usage of **מעמד** in 1QM in connection with the "eschatological" battle, which can neither be found in the HB nor in the LXX, indicates this as well.
3. Both LXX and DSS develop the HB-meaning of **מעמד** and both do so in the same direction; **מעמד/στάσις** becomes in both a significant word to describe human beings in relation to God. This seems to be a tendency of the time when LXX and DSS were composed. Both refer with **מעמד/στάσις** to a certain established institution, a quality of human beings in relation to God. In both texts, **מעמד/στάσις** refer to a "function" or "post" of certain men who are on duty at a place where Divine presence is possible. But they differ in certain ways. The DSS disconnect the **מעמד/στάσις** from the HB, from Israel, and especially the Jerusalem Temple cult. **מעמד/στάσις** in the LXX and the DSS refer to different people and different

places.<sup>36</sup> The LXX refers to priests, Temple singers, and lay people, so to individuals of the people Israel who are privileged in as much as they have a special function where Divine presence is possible, hence in relation to God. The DSS refer exceptionally to members of the Community; all of whom have this special function in relation to God and can be near to God. The LXX mentions the Temple (cf. 1.Chr. 23:28; 2.Chr. 35:15) or the Gate of Water (Neh. 9:3) as the place where special nearness to God is possible by having **מַעֲמָד/στάσις**. The DSS mention only the Community itself as the place where **מַעֲמָד** and hence this special nearness to God takes place.

4. But the DSS also develop the idea of **מַעֲמָד/στάσις** represented in LXX in a sense.<sup>37</sup> We have seen above that the LXX seems to understand the **στάσις** as a function of priests, Temple singers, and certain lay people, but not Levites.<sup>38</sup> In any case, in the LXX **στάσις** is only possible for Temple personnel, for people who have a special relationship with God *per se*. But, as we have seen above, a means by which the authors of IQS/H try to demonstrate that the members of the Community have a special relationship with God is the idea that these members are understood as Temple personnel. In this case, **στάσις** in the LXX and **מַעֲמָד** in the DSS are very similar phenomena, except that **מַעֲמָד** in the DSS is entirely Community-centred.

<sup>36</sup> Another observation strengthens this theory, but it assumes that the authors of the DSS knew the traditions underlying the LXX. If the Scrolls were familiar with the meaning of **ἡ στάσις** in LXX 2.Chr. 30:16 and 35:10, they deliberately contradicted LXX when **מַעֲמָד/ἡ στάσις** is used referring to priests (see above). But, in the HB and LXX these "functions" or "posts" are described and authorised by either custom, or divine or royal law. Using the Hebrew word that refers to these "functions" or "posts" in 2.Chr. 30:16 and 35:10, the authors of the scrolls transferred the authority that stands behind these phenomena onto the phenomenon that they call **מַעֲמָד**.

<sup>37</sup> On whether or not the authors of the scrolls knew the text of the LXX and developed some aspects of the meaning of **στάσις** in there on purpose or not, we can only speculate. But it is interesting that the DSS seemed to have adopted especially the following aspect of the meaning of **στάσις** in the DSS.

<sup>38</sup> Whereas the fact that the LXX changes the meaning of **מַעֲמָד** may point to a quarrel between Levites, priests, and Temple singers, the establishment of a usage of **מַעֲמָד** such as in the DSS indicates that it is used and developed to distinguish clearly the Qumran Community from Israel, and from the Temple establishment as well.

### 3. יצב

The third aspect of the relationship between the Yahad and God which describes the Community and life in the Community in relation to God is **יצב**.

We saw in the chapter on **מעמד** how 1QH XIX 13 turned out to be crucial for the understanding of the Community and life in the Community in relation to God. But in this line, it is not only the word **מעמד** that is used to describe this relation, but also **יצב**:

ולהתיצב במעמד לפניכה

A man "*stands* at the standing place before you [God]". What does the verb **יצב** tell about the understanding of the nature of this standing place and its relation to God in 1QS/H?

#### 3.1. HB

The meaning of **יצב** in the HB is especially interesting in comparison with the DSS because in many cases it is used in combination with ideas that become essential in the DSS. Although **יצב** in the HB does not constitute a "concept" on its own, the DSS develop some of its meanings to refer to a major aspect of the Community in relation to God.

**יצב** occurs 48 times<sup>1</sup> in the HB in two main denotations: 1. "to stand firm" (cf. Dtn. 9:2; Jos. 1:5; Job 41:2),<sup>2</sup> and 2. "to take a stand". Regarding the DSS the latter sense is the significant one. It occurs in this sense 25 times in the HB and can be categorised into six groups.

1) **יצב** is used often in a "secular" context. Human beings take their stand before other human beings (Moses before the Pharaoh (Ex. 8:16; 9:13); Saul among the people (1.S. 10:23);

<sup>1</sup> According to G. Lisowsky, *Konkordanz*, 628.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. W. Gesenius, *Handwörterbuch*, 312.

Israel before Samuel (1.S. 12:7,16); taking a stand before kings is described in Prov. 22:29 and 2.Chr. 11:13). Twice **יָצַב** is used for the simple action of "standing" (2.S. 18:13,30).

2) 7 times **יָצַב** is used in a military context, describing an action of people participating in an action of war (1.S. 17:16; 2.S. 23:12; Jer. 46:4; Ps. 2:2; 1.Chr. 11:14; 2.Chr. 20:17).

3) The next category consists of verses in which God or angels take their stand before human beings. So in 1.S. 3:10, God takes His stand before Samuel, and in Nu. 22:22 the angel of JHWH "took his stand in the road" as Balaam's adversary.

Most significant is Ex. 34:5, where God takes His stand with Moses handing over the tablets of stone:

(5) וירד יהוה בענן ויחיצב עמו שם ויקרא בשם יהוה

The significance of this verse results from the fact that a human being is said to closely experience God.

4) In this group, **יָצַב** is used grammatically much as in 1QH XIX 13. On four occasions in the *Nebiim*, **יָצַב** describes an action of a human or heavenly being taking their stand *before* God: (Jos. 24:1; 1.S. 10:19; Zech. 6:5; Job 1:6).<sup>4</sup> Grammatically the only difference from

<sup>3</sup> The translation of this verse is difficult, because the subject in 5aβ and 5b is not clear. One could also assume that the subject of **וַיְחִיצֵב** is Moses, in which case Moses would stand with God and proclaim the name of JHWH. Both translations are possible. The text itself does not give any hint, except that it might be advisable to keep the given subject as long as possible; in which case the verse would run as follows: "JHWH descended in a cloud, and He took His stand with him there, and he proclaimed the name: JHWH." Hence, JHWH is the subject of **יָצַב**. But no matter which translation is to be preferred, the authors of this text describe an actual meeting of God with a human being.

<sup>4</sup> - According to Jos. 24:1, Joshua gathered the tribes of Israel to Shechem and their elders, "and they took their stand before the God":

(...) (1) וַיְחִיצֵבוּ לְפָנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים

- According to 1.S. 10:19, again after Samuel summoned the people to JHWH at Mizpah, the tribes and clans of Israel shall take their stand before JHWH:

(...) (2) וַעֲתָה תִּחַצְבוּ לְפָנֵי יְהוָה לְשִׁבְטֵיכֶם וּלְאֶלְפֵיכֶם

- According to Zech. 6:5, the four chariots (= the four winds) took their stand before אֲדֹנָי as servants:

(...) (3) מִהַחֲצִיבָה עַל-אֲדֹנָי כָּל-הָאָרֶץ

Finally, in Job 1:6 tells us that "one day the sons of God came to took their stand before JHWH, and Satan also came among them.":

(...) (4) לְהַחֲצִיבָה עַל-יְהוָה

1QH XIX 13 is that **מעמד** does not occur and instead of the Tetragram (1.S. 10:19; Job. 1:6), **אלהים** (Jos. 24:1), or **על-ארון** (Zech. 6:5) a suffix attached to **לפני** is used.

Interesting in comparison with the DSS usage of **יצב** are the subjects of **יצב** in the HB. Zech. 6:4 and Job 1:6 describe scenes in which heavenly beings take their stand before God. Adopted by the scrolls, this kind of language might suggest that it is the Community that stands before God, in a world other than the earth, as angel-like beings.

Jos. 24:1 and 1.S. 10:19 describe human beings who take their stand before God. Here it is interesting with respect to the DSS-usage of **יצב** that the verb refers to a religious gathering at a holy place (Jos. 24:1: Shechem; 1.S. 10:19: Mizpah) to receive a message from God. Adopted by the scrolls, this idea would give "life in the Community" a special nature inasmuch as it would define this life as a permanent religious gathering before God, hence very close to Him.

5) The next group of occurrences in the HB is equally important for the determination of the meaning of **יצב** in the scrolls. On these occasions (Ex. 19:17; Num. 11:16; Dtn. 31:14; 1.S. 3:10), **יצב** describes an event where Israel as the elected people gathers together at a holy place to receive messages from God through a messenger.<sup>5</sup> As in Jos. 24:1, the messenger is always a person chosen by God. Here, **יצב** refers to the institutionalised gathering of Israel next to or in front of a holy place. Transferring this idea to the Community would mean that the Community is seen as the chosen religious community that gathers permanently before God. Its leaders who are advanced in knowledge, understanding, etc. interpret the will of God to the Community.<sup>6</sup>

---

In these cases, **יצב** is not used to describe the experience of the religious leader, but of the whole people.

According to Ex. 19:17, "Moses brought the people out of the camp to meet God. They took their stand at the foot of the mountain." Moses (see above Ex. 34:5) had met God on the Mountain. Through this meeting,

6) In the final group, represented only by Judg. 20:2, **יצב** expresses an action which takes place in a political assembly: "The chiefs of all the people, of all the tribes of Israel, took their stand in the assembly of the people of God (...)." This usage is significant regarding the scrolls, because words in the scrolls describing the Community's relation to God are often used to describe the organisation pattern of the Community as well.

### 3.2. DSS

According to K.G. Kuhn, **יצב** occurs 22 times in the DSS,<sup>7</sup> once in IQS, 7 times in IQM, 7 times in IQH, and 7 times in IQSa.

#### 3.2.1. IQS

**יצב** occurs only once in IQS, in XI 16, and only here in the same way as in IQH XIX 13.

Here, the author points out that God is pleased by the elected men that they take their stand before Him for ever and ever:

(...) להחיצב (17) לפניכה לעד (...)

the mountain becomes a holy place for the people Israel. The action which is described is not a face to face experience of God for the people of Israel. They have to stay outside, they do not approach the mountain.

In Num. 11:16 a similar scene is described: God tells Moses to gather 70 men of the elders of Israel, "bring them to the tent of meeting and have them take their place there with you". The 70 elders take their stand in front of the tent of meeting without entering it. They are acting according to the messenger Moses. No face to face meeting is described. Only Moses can go into the tent and talk to God (Num. 11:17).

In Dtn. 31:14 the situation is slightly different. Again the holy place where the humans "take their stand" is "the tent of meeting" as sanctuary of the Israelites. But we cannot detect the usage of **יצב** describing a substitutional action for a real face to face experience of God, because the persons who are present enter the tent. The striking point here is that these people are elected and chosen persons who have a special religious function in the community of Israel as messengers between God and His people. According to Dtn. 31:14, Moses and Joshua enter the tent. These persons fulfil the function of priests. They are able to take their stand before God. Only here the event of the meeting is described (Dtn. 31:14): JHWH appears in the tent in a cloud. The experience of God is in his case even for Moses and Joshua indirect.

1.S. 3.10 belongs also to this category, because an event at a holy place is described: Samuel slept in the tent of meeting, exactly where the ark of God was, when he was called by God and then took his stand before Him.

K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 92.

Looking at Jos. 24:1; 1.S. 10:19; Zech. 6:5; Job 1:6, where **יצב** is used almost identically as in 1QS XI 16, it is quite likely that the authors of 1QS adopted at least to some extent the meaning of **יצב** as it occurs there. This suggests that **יצב** refers to an action that brings the members of the Community as close to God as possible. The only difference is that the nature of the "experience of God" as it occurs in the HB texts seems to be different in 1QS. First, it is no longer an isolated event, but an institutionalised and permanent one. **יצב** refers to life in the Community as an institutionalised cultic-religious gathering. Second, the nature of Divine presence as described in the HB texts might be located in the Community according to the scrolls. This means that the meaning of **יצב** defines the Community as a place of nearness to God and allows even the idea that the Community can accommodate direct and immediate Divine presence.

### 3.2.2. 1QM

In 1QM, **יצב** is used in two different ways. 4 times it is used in a military sense as description of a military action on the battle field: VIII 3,17<sup>8</sup>; XVI 5; XVII 11. This usage is adopted from the Hebrew Bible.

The second is more significant for understanding the Divine presence. 3 times **יצב** is used in connection with a sanctuary, celebrations, or offerings. According to 1QM II 3, the heads of the tribes and families of people of Qumran are supposed to take their stand "at the gates of the sanctuary" (להרתיצב תמיד בשערי המקדש). One line later, 1QM II 4 gives the advice that the chiefs shall "take their stand" for their "appointed times, on new moons and on

---

According to K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 92. Martinez/Tigchelaar, *DSSI*, 126.

Sabbaths and on all the days of the year". And finally, in 1QM II 5, we are told that the elders shall "take their stand" for the "burnt offerings" and the "animal sacrifices".

This usage does not occur in the HB, where **יצב** simply refers to the people of Israel gathering together in front of the tent of meeting or the Mountain. There is no talk about ceremonies, sacrifices, or feasts. But according to 1QM these seem to be accepted as part of the religious life of the Community in relation to God.<sup>9</sup>

### 3.2.3. 1QSa

In 1QSa, **יצב** is only used in one particular way: the subject is always a human being, and "to take a stand" (**יצב**) means simply "to gain" or "to have" a certain position within the Qumran Community.<sup>10</sup> Against the background of the usage of **יצב** in the other scrolls in comparison with the HB, this can only mean that (according to the teachings of Qumran) the relationship between the Community and God affects also the organisation pattern of the Community, since **יצב** defines actions and functions of the individual members in the Community in relation to God. As in 1QS and 1QM, **יצב** refers to the institutionalised religious-cultic life in the Community that can only take place in relation to God.

<sup>9</sup> On the understanding of sacrifices in 1QS cf. especially pp 45-51.

<sup>10</sup> 4 times **יצב** is literally used with the meaning of having a certain position or function in the Community: taking a stand in the holy community (**הקודש** (13) **ביסודות עדת** (I 12f.)), taking a stand among "the heads of the thousands of Israel" (I 14); according to I 20 a silly man cannot join the lot to take his stand over the **עדת ישראל**, and according to II 8 disabled men are not allowed to take a stand in "the congregation" (**עדת**). The latter occurrence suggests a priestly sense of **יצב**. In I 11, **יצב** is used for "taking a stand" in a trial at the court of the Community. Here the meaning of the verb is restricted to human activity. In I 12, **יצב** occurs in a military context, a usage of the word which we have seen already in 1QM. And finally in I 16, **יצב** is used again in the context of religious celebrations in the sense of "take a stand" in the services.

## 3.2.4. 1QH

Only the usage of **יצב** in 1QH does not seem to follow the pattern outlined above. Here, two different meanings of the word are revealed one of which seems to contradict its meaning in 1QS, 1QSa, and 1QM.

In 1QH XI 21, **יצב** occurs in a similar sense to that found in 1QS XI 16 and 1QH XIX 13 referring to life in the Community in combination with **מעמד**. We are told that God has cleansed the "wrong spirit",

"so that he [wrong spirit] takes his stand at the standing place with (22) the host of the holy ones (...)".

**יצב** refers here to becoming part of the Community and consequently of life in the Community.

But on four other occasions in 1QH (1QH XV 29; XVIII 11; XX 28,30), **יצב** seems to be understood differently. It still refers to life in the Community in relation to God, but the authors of 1QH suggest through **יצב** that "standing before God" is *not* possible for a human being.<sup>11</sup>

Interestingly, the action of **יצב** is always said to take place "before" an *attribute* of God, not God Himself: according to XV 29 "before the wrath of God" (להתיצב לפני ח{י}מתדה), according to XVIII 11 "before God's glory" (להתיצב לפני כבודכה), according to XX 28 "before Him who brings him to account" (ומה יתיצב לפני מוכיח), and according to XX 30 again "before the wrath of God" (ולתיצב לפני אפכה).

One reason for this different usage of **יצב** might lie in the genre of 1QH. Praising the greatness of God, the psalmist might have used **יצב** to indicate the insignificance of human

---

<sup>11</sup> The subject is either a human being (XV 29; XX 28,30) or the wondrous works of God (humans included) (XVIII 11).

beings, even those in the Community, in relation to God. A notion like this, as we have seen above, does not often occur in 1QH, and certainly not in 1QS, where the abilities of the Community as such are held in high regards. But this usage of **יצב** was probably designed to highlight that life in the Community as **יצב** is something very special which only the Qumran Community can achieve in relation to God.

### 3.2.5. Conclusion

**יצב** refers to a permanent and institutionalised cultic-religious gathering before God as life in the Community. By using **יצב** the authors of the scrolls make sure that every member of the Community and the entire structure of it stands in this relation to God. The existence of the Community only makes sense in this close relationship with God.

The comparison with the HB especially clarifies the nature of this relationship. The Community takes over the place of Israel where and when Israel is as close to God as she can be. This defines the Community as a place of permanent nearness of God and qualifies it to accommodate God's immediate and immanent presence.

The usage of **יצב** makes clear that it is the aim of the authors of the scrolls to prove that this is the *permanent* status of the Community. This desire to establish and improve this status is what motivates the Community.

## 4. Serving God

In this chapter, we will investigate another aspect of the Community and life in the Community that defines the relationship between the Yahad and God. In 1QS/H, the authors describe occasionally the members of the Community as "serving" God in one way or the other. By doing so they describe how actions of the members of the Community - aspects of the communal life - relate to God; and they define how life in relation to God in the Yahad functions. 1QS/H use mainly three verbs to express this idea: שרת, קרב, and עמד. This chapter will analyse the meanings of these words in detail.

### 4.1. שרת

In 1QH XX 23, we read as follows:

"(22) (...) [...] in accordance with their understanding (כשכלם) (23) You let them draw near (הגשתם),  
and in accordance (לפי) with their power (ממשלתם) they serve you (ישרתוכה)  
in their divisio[ns] (למפלגיהם) ] from You."

In both HB and scrolls, people are said to serve God. The questions who is serving, who is served, where the service takes place, and how the service is described is clearly relevant determining how God is conceived of a being present for those serving.

The Hebrew word used in 1QH XX 23 referring to the act of serving is שרת. This verb is significant not only because it denotes "to serve" and describes this particular aspect of the relationship between humans and God, but also because it is used in the HB in combination with several theological ideas and concepts regarding the issue of the Divine presence. Although שרת is used several times in the HB in a secular sense,<sup>1</sup> it is mainly understood as

<sup>1</sup> שרת means serving other people (cf. Gen. 39:4), serving a king (cf. 1.Chr. 27:1), or serving a prophet

an action towards God.<sup>2</sup>

שרת occurs in the Qumran literature studied here 12 times, 7 times in 1QM, three times in 1QH, once in 1QSb, and once in CD.

#### 4.1.1. 1QM

##### 4.1.1.1. 1QM II 1-3:

The most decisive passage, in which שרת occurs 4 times, is 1QM II 1-3:

"(1) The heads of the family are fifty-two. And the heads of the priests (ראשי הכוהנים) they shall rank after/below the high priest and his vicar, twelve heads, to be servants (משרתים) (2) perpetually/daily (בתמיד) before (לפני) God (אל). And the twenty-six heads of the divisions shall serve (ישרתו) in their divisions (במשמרותם). And after/below them the heads of the Levites are to serve (לשרת) perpetually/daily (תמיד), to the number of twelve, one (3) for a tribe. And the heads of their divisions, each man shall serve (ישרתו) in his division. And the heads of the tribes and the fathers of the family (are) after them to stand perpetually/daily (בשערי המקדש) (תמיד) at the gates of the sanctuary (בשערי המקדש)."

With respect to our investigation of the idea of the presence of God five aspects are significant which are mentioned in connection with the verb שרת.

a) The first has to do with the ranking of certain persons, especially the priests. In 1QM II 1-3, the "heads of the family" (l.1), the "heads of the priests" (l.1), the "high priest"

(cf. 1.K. 19:21). It is also used as a participle in the sense of "servant" (cf. 1.K. 10:5; 2.K. 4:43; Ex. 24:13).

In a "semi-secular" sense שרת is used as action of the Levites serving other priests or people, not God (Num. 1:50; 3:6; 8:26; 16:9; 18:2).

<sup>2</sup> שרת occurs in the HB with three different groups of objects. The first group is completely secular, see above p.174.

שרת is used in connection with persons, groups of people, or even things that have a certain function within the religious life of Israel. Mentioned as object of שרת twice is the priest Aaron (Num. 3:6; 18:2), the Levites serve the "congregation" (Nu. 16:9; cf. also Ez. 44:11f.), and their "brothers" (Num. 8:26), but also God. The latter seems to be the most common object of שרת in the HB. Grammatically the authors use either the Tetragram (cf. Dtn. 10:8; 1.S. 2:11,18; Joel 1:9; 2:17; Ez. 45:4; 2.Chr. 13:10), or very often a suffix which refers to God (cf. Dtn. 21:5; Ez. 40:46; 43:19; 44:15; Ps. 103:21; 104:4; 1.Chr. 15:2; 23:13; 2.Chr. 29:11). But שרת occurs also with אלהים as object (Isa. 61:6 (משרתי אלהינו)).

(1.1), the high priest's "vicar" (1.1), the Levites (1.2), "tribes" (1.3), the "heads of the tribes" (1.3), the "heads of the family" (1.3), and also "divisions" are mentioned. The text structures the people who are living in Qumran.<sup>3</sup> The emphasis of this organisation pattern depends on the religious purpose of the whole Community. The human action described by שרת is an important factor in this life as duty of the members of the Community. Serving God gives life in the Community its structure and its purpose. Serving God relates the Community to God in the Community, and, as such, שרת is significant for the understanding of the Divine presence. It shows that life in the Community brings the Community near to God.<sup>4</sup>

b) The second aspect which needs to be examined is the figure of the "chief priest" who is mentioned in 1.1. The figure of the ראשי הכוהנים and הכהן הראש might be adopted from the HB. There it occurs as כהן הראש in 2.K. 25:18; 2.Chr. 19:11, as הכהן הראש in Esr. 7:5, as ראש הכהן in 1.Chr. 27:5; 2.Chr. 24:6. In the HB, this figure of the "chief priest" is understood as a person with a leading role in the religious life of Israel.

The situation in the texts of Qumran seems to be different. Although the term ראש occurs quite often in these texts (in 1QS, 1QM, 1QSa, and 1QSB 43 times)<sup>5</sup>, it can only be found 5 times in combination with כהן, and only in 1QM (1QM II 1 (twice); XV 4; XVI 13; XVIII 5)<sup>6</sup>. In 1QM XV 4f., the "chief priest" is described as the person who reads the prayer of the time of war for all men. In 1QM XVI 13f., the figure of the "chief priest" encourages the

<sup>3</sup> The question whether 1QM refers here to one or many communities that all belong to Qumran is beyond the limit of this study and not decisive at this point.

<sup>4</sup> The organisation pattern described in 1QM II 1-3 may offer some ideas in comparison with the HB how this nearness of God may have been understood. The members of the Community are organised in a manner which reminds us of the organisation pattern of the personnel of the tent of meeting or the Temple as it is described in the HB (cf. especially the Pentateuch, but also 1.K. 5-8; 1.Chr. 21-26; 28-29; 2.Chr. 3-7; (29;) 35; Ez. 40-48). The usage of שרת as well indicates that qualities of the Tent or the Temple have been transferred onto the Community to qualify it for Divine presence.

<sup>5</sup> According to K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 197f. (cf. also J.H. Charlesworth, *Graphic Concordance*, 482).

<sup>6</sup> In XIX 11, the text is damaged.

army through the strength of God. In 1QM XVIII 5, the "chief priest" is still described in the context of the war to fulfil duties that every priest has: he is described as praising the "God of Israel" for His wondrous deeds. In this line, the "chief priest" has priestly duties as we know them from the HB.<sup>7</sup>

This usage of ראש in combination with כהן demonstrates that the authors of the scrolls understood the figure differently than did the authors of the HB. According to 1QM, the priest is important in respect of the war and not, as in the HB, in respect of religious service at a holy place such as the Temple. In 1QM, the priest is the symbol of the faithfulness of God towards the people of Qumran in the eschatological battle. This observation may be significant for understanding of the presence of God, because the "chief priest" does not seem to be

<sup>7</sup> The subjects of שרת mentioned in the HB are throughout men who are linked with the Temple. שרת is an action that belongs to the Temple. But it is interesting to see which subjects the scrolls adopted and which they did not. This as well indicates a change in the understanding of serving God. The men mentioned in the HB as those serving God are the following:

1. The כהנים (cf. 1.K. 8:11; Ez. 45:4; Neh. 10:40; 2.Chr. 5:14; 13:10; 23:6). This term is also widely used in Qumran literature, especially in 1QS and 1QM. It is interesting that the term does not occur in 1QH.

2. The "sons of Zadok" (בני צדוק (Ez. 40:46; 44:15)). In the Qumran literature the term צדוק occurs very often. בני צדוק occurs only in 1QS (not in the 4QS mss) where it refers to the members of the Community. The cultic life in the Community, possibly even life in the Community in general, is organised and directed by men who are according to the HB most important for the religious life of the Community, hence for the relationship between God and the Community. The fact that the members of the Community are called בני צדוק and are described as serving God suggests that the Community is understood to have a special relationship with God.

3. The Levites (c.f. Num. 1:50; 3:6; 8:26; 16:9; 18:2; Dtn. 10:8; 18:5,7; Ez. 40:46; 43:19; 44:11.15.17; 1.Chr. 15:2; 16:4; 2.Chr. 23:6; (29:11)) or the "levitical priests" (הכהנים הלויים (Ez. 43:19 and 44:15)). They are elected by God (c.f. Dtn. 18:5; 1.Chr. 15:2). Within the people of Israel these men have the special religious function of serving God. לויים/לויים occur as well in 1QS and 1QM as leading religious figures, *but are not mentioned serving God.*

4. אהרן (Ex. 28:35), or "Aaron and his sons" (Ex. 28:43; 29:30; 30:19f.; 1.Chr. 23:13). This name occurs only 11 times in 1QS and 1QM. It can not be found in 1QH. 8 times it occurs in CD. *They are not mentioned in the scrolls as those serving God.*

5. The "gatekeepers" (מחלקות השערים (1.Chr. 26:12)). They have a duty to minister in the house of God. Whether or not these "divisions of gatekeepers" are priestly figures, or simply temple personnel, is difficult to decide. But the fact that, in the HB, מחלקת is used for a division of "priests and Levites" (1.Chr. 23:6; 24:1; 2.Chr. 5:11; 8:14; 23:8; 31:2.15-17; Neh. 11:36), seems to indicate that these "divisions of the gatekeepers" belong to the priestly temple personnel. In all those Qumran texts which K.G. Kuhn considers in his concordance, מחלקת occurs only three times (1QM II 10; 1QSa II 1; CD XVI 3). In none of these lines מחלקת occurs with שערים. שער occurs in 1QM and 1QH. In 1QM it is also used describing the gates of a "sanctuary" (1QM II 3), but no "gatekeepers" are mentioned. In 1QH, the term seems to be understood in a rather metaphorical way, not describing actually the gates of a building.

understood as a symbol of the presence of God *at a holy place* (i.e. the human being who mediates the presence of God to the people), but as the mediator of the help of God in the eschatological war. Hence, the place of God's presence is not as much "God being with the Community" as the "helping God". Regarding שרת this may mean that the act of serving God may have lost its strong link with a holy place, and may have been understood rather on the level of personal relationship between God and the members of the Community. Divine presence, therefore, might in this instance refer to God being with the Community. The location is not significant anymore.

c) The third aspect is the "perpetual/daily" (בתמיד) service of priests לפני אל.<sup>8</sup> If the priests or the "chief priest" were indeed understood as a person serving God on a daily basis maybe following a calendar of service, and if the same figure(s) were understood in the same way in the Qumran literature, the "calendar of service" and the structure of the day of the members of the Community, i.e. living according to the regulations of the services, would be decisive elements of the understanding of life in the Community in relation to the presence of God.

In the HB, although תמיד is used often in a secular sense, it is mainly used in exactly the sense mentioned above: it qualifies *offerings or sacrifices* as *daily*.<sup>9</sup> The priestly personnel, including the "chief priest", is celebrating these daily sacrifices or offerings.

In the texts of Qumran, תמיד occurs in 1QS, 1QM, and 1QH only 11 times. In 1QM, תמיד occurs three times in the passage 1QM II 1-3, but also in II 5, where the term is used in the context of sacrifices. The author points out that the people sacrificed to "satisfy themselves perpetually/daily before Him [God] at the table of glory". In XII 14, there is no connection to

<sup>8</sup> For לפני see pp. 192-215.

<sup>9</sup> For daily sacrifices: cf. Dtn. 8:11,12,13; 11:31; 12:11. For burnt offerings: cf. Ex. 29:42; Num. 28:6,10,15,31; 39:16,19,22; Ez. 46:15; Esr. 3:5; Neh. 10:34; etc.. For food offerings: cf. Num. 4:16; Neh. 10:34; etc..

offerings. Here the author says in rejoicing that Zion, Jerusalem, and the cities of Judah shall "open perpetually(/daily) your gates that the hosts of the nations may be brought in!".

In 1QS, תמיד is not used in connection with offerings which are done by priestly personnel at a holy place. תמיד is used there in connection with the "law" (1QS VI 7), the "judgement of God" (1QS IX 25), and the praise of God (1QS X 23). The denotation of תמיד is here rather "perpetual" than "daily". If the term kept its connotation with the offerings at a holy place, and the usage of the term in 1QM seems to indicate that it did so, then it is also possible to conclude that the perpetual (daily) study of the law (VI 7), the perpetual watching of the judgement of God (IX 25), and the praise of God by telling perpetually the deeds of God (X 23) replaced the significance of the daily sacrifices or offerings at the holy place such as the Temple. This observation is strengthened through those statements in 1QS where life in the Community is understood as a permanent sacrifice to God on behalf of the rest of Israel.<sup>10</sup>

The usage of תמיד in 1QS shows that especially observance of the Law, awareness of the judgement, and praise are significant aspects of this life in Community understood and lived as sacrifice. For the meaning of שרת in 1QM II 1-3 this might mean that "serving God" is also understood as a significant aspect of this life as permanent sacrifice; and this would mean that "service" not only brings God and servants together through the faithfulness of the servants and the serving act, but orders the servants' (the Community's) nature (the nature of the sacrifice) in such a way that God is perceived as present and active on the Community's behalf.

In 1QH, תמיד is used three times (XIX 6; XX 4,7). Two of these cases strengthen the theory that in the Qumran literature the emphasis lies not so much on a perpetual or daily service at

<sup>10</sup> For details on life in the Community as permanent sacrifice see especially pp. 45-51.

a holy place, as on the permanent religious and sacred actions of the Community that constitute life in Qumran. In XIX 6, the psalmist of 1QH points out that he will perpetually(/daily) praise God's name and tell His glory. תמיד is again used to qualify the praise reminiscent of the daily offering of the Hebrew Bible. In XX 4, the psalmist talks about somebody who "bows down" and "begs" "perpetually(/daily) from time to time" (תמיד מקין לקין). Again the praise is the perpetual(/daily) action which is done by a member of the Community. In XX 7, תמיד is used in an eschatological setting. Because תמיד is in the Jewish tradition a *terminus technicus* for the sacrifices at the Temple, it refers in 1QH to the religious-sacral life in the Community that seems clearly to have been understood as a permanent sacrifice to God.

Consequently, תמיד, especially used as an adverb in 1QM II 2,<sup>11</sup> influences the meaning of שרת in 1QM II 1-3 inasmuch as it gives the latter the meaning of a significant aspect of the religious-sacral life in the Community as a permanent sacrifice to God. It also indicates that the place of this sacrifice is no longer the Temple, but the Community itself. Hence, the Community receives the qualities of the sacrifices and of the Temple which brings them both closer to God and qualifies for Divine presence.

d) The fourth significant aspect linked with שרת in 1QM II 1-3 is the word לפני.

The "heads of the priests" are called "servants permanently *before* God". As a detailed analysis of the word will demonstrate, לפני indicates that the serving act takes place in relation to God.<sup>12</sup> Serving God, therefore, describes not only a human action towards God,

<sup>11</sup> Cf. E. and H. Eshel, *4Q471 Fragment 1 and Ma'amadot in the War Scroll*, in: J. T. Barrera/ L. V. Montaner (ed.), *The Madrid Qumran Congress. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls Madrid 18-21 March, 1991*, v.2 [Leiden/ New York/ Köln: E.J. Brill, 1992] 615.

<sup>12</sup> According to the HB, the service of God can take place at the following locations:

1. "At a holy place" (בקרש): cf. Ex. 28:43; 29:30; 35:19; 39:41; Ez. 44:27. The "holy place" is either the tent of meeting (cf. Ex. 28:43; 29:30), or the (future) temple of Ezekiel (cf. Ez. 44:27). Mentioned in connection with the service and understood as being in the "holy place" is the altar (Ex. 28:43), and sin offerings (Ez.

but a permanent action of the Community in permanent company with God.<sup>13</sup> Because this serving happens in company with God it brings the Community close to Him and qualifies it for His presence.

f) The fifth aspect which is significant for the understanding of the idea of the presence of God is the function or position of the persons mentioned in 1QM II 1-3 which is indicated by the term "division" (משמרת). משמרת is used twice in 1QM II 1-3, and once in 1QM II 4. The term might be significant for the organisation pattern of the Qumran Community and indicate that the Community was understood as a group of priestly personnel fulfilling their duty in the Community.

44:27).

2. "The sanctuary" (המקדש): Ez. 44:11; 45:4. In both cases שרת is used as participle in the sense of "ministers", "the ministers of the sanctuary".

3. "House of JHWH" (בית יהוה): cf. 1.Chr. 26:12. בית is also used without יהוה in the sense of "temple" describing the place of the service: cf. Ez. 44:11; 45:5.

4. "At the gates of the inner court" (בשערי החצר הפנימית וביתה): Ez. 44:17. This phrase is literally not used in the scrolls. שער occurs 11 times in 1QM where it is used mainly in a military sense, but also in combination with מקדש (1QM II 3) referring to the "gates of the sanctuary" where the Levites (as in Ez. 4:17 the Levitical priests) fulfil their duty. In 1QH, שער is used in a completely different sense (cf. XI 17; XIV 24,31). As far as I can see חצר does not occur in the Qumran literature, neither does פנימה. The "gates of the inner court" are, therefore, not an element of the idea of a holy place in Qumran.

"Gates" are also mentioned in 2.Chr. 31:2:

"Hezekiah appointed the divisions of the priests and of the Levites, division by division, everyone according to his service, the priests and the Levites, for burnt offerings and offerings of well-being, to minister in the gates of the camp of the LORD and to give thanks and praise."

According to this verse the priests are serving God "in the gates of the camp of JHWH" (בשערי מחנה יהוה). In the Qumran literature, מחנה occurs mainly in 1QM and CD. In 1QM, מחנה is mostly used in the sense of a "military camp" (II 14; VI 10; VII 1,3,7; X 1; XIV 2; XVI 3; XVIII 4; XIX 9.), but often it is not absolutely clear whether the "military camp" is identical with a permanent settlement of sons of the light which has only peaceful purposes. Only once מחנה occurs in connection with God. According to IV 9, "camp of God" (מחני אל) has to be written on "the standard". מחנה is certainly not used for a "holy place", a sanctuary or even a temple. The reason why the usage of מחנה in the scrolls differs from the HB in this manner might be the fact that according to the teachings of the Community approaching God is a matter of the relationship between God and the members, and not primarily a matter of a certain location. The usage of מחנה in CD leads to the same conclusion, because there it always means simply a camp where people, i.e. the members of Qumran, live. The same can be found in 1QSa II 15 where מחנה refers to the camp(s) of the Community too.

5. "The tent of meeting" (אהל מועד): cf. Num. 8:26. In the scrolls, the term אהל occurs only three times. In 1QH XII 3 אהל refers to "tents of glory" (אהלי כבוד), but the preceding text is damaged, in CD III 8, it means simply tent in which people live, as it does in CD VII 15 where it is part of a quotation of Am. 5:26f..

<sup>13</sup>

See pp. 192-215.

In the HB, **משמרת** denotes "guard", "keeping, storage", "observation", but also refers to the fulfilment of cultic duties (cf. Num. 1:53; 3:28,32; Ez. 40:45; Neh. 12:45 etc.).

The occurrence of **משמרת** in the texts of Qumran is interesting, because it occurs only 4 times in 1QM and CD (1QM II 2,3,4; CD IV 1). In CD IV 1, **משמרת** occurs in a sense which we have found also in the HB: the sons of Zadok have had the duty to guard the sanctuary of God (**משמרת מקדשי**). The usage of **משמרת** in 1QM is different. Here it seems to mean "division", a certain element of the people of Qumran in battle.

This usage of **משמרת** indicates that again qualities of the Temple have been transferred onto the Community. The organisation pattern of the Community in accordance with the one in the Temple, defines the service in the Community.

#### h) Conclusion

Apart from the fact that a service to God brings humans closer to Him in the sense that they act according to religious rules and make an effort to approach Him, the usage of **שרת** in 1QM II 1-3 shows again that the Community goes far beyond this traditional idea and claims that their service brings them closer to God than any other group of people. The meaning of **שרת** refers to three different aspects of this special relationship between God and the Community. First, serving God means to trust in the helping God. This represents a notion known from the HB, but set into context shows that not only the Community as a whole but also the individual member relates uniquely to God. This is especially true in the final battle of light against darkness, where **שרת** seems to have a military sense unknown in HB, and where the Yahad join with the angels (cf. the phrase **מחנה אל**) in fighting against the forces of evil ranged against God and his sons of light. Secondly, **שרת** in 1QM II 1-3 refers to an aspect of

the religious-sacral life in the Community as permanent sacrifice to God (תמיד). This life takes place in permanent company with God (לפני). Both aspects picture the Community in permanent nearness of God, and qualify it to accommodate His presence. Finally, the authors of the scrolls transferred qualities of the Temple onto the Community. Service in the Community replaces the service in the Temple, but, as seen above, has now a different, even more intense, nature in relation to God, since along with the heavenly beings and their help the Yahad represents the powers of light in a world of darkness.

#### 4.1.1.2. 1QM XIII 3

Only once more, in 1QM XIII 3, שרת occurs with God as object:

"(...) Blessed be (ברוך) the God of Israel (אל ישראל) in/for the plan of His holiness and the works of His truth; and blessed be (וברוכים) (3) all those who serve Him (משרתיו) in righteousness (בצדק), and who know Him (יודעיו) in faith (באמונה)."

In these two lines שרת is integrated into a blessing. This blessing creates a special relationship between the members of the Community and God, because it is they who are blessed.

1QM XIII 3 does not elaborate what שרת means. But its context, its combination with the word צדק and משרתים, indicates that serving is an essential aspect of life in the Community in relation to God alongside or including having special knowledge and insight, and observing the Law, etc. It, therefore, constitutes a special relationship with God which, read on the background of 1QM II 1-3, refers to a close relationship with God.

## 4.1.1.3. 1QM XII 14 // XIX 6

Two more times שרת occurs in 1QM: XII 14 // XIX 6. In both cases the subject are "kings" (hostile kings) who are "serving" "Zion", "Jerusalem", and "all cities of Judah" (cf. XII 13). שרת refers here rather to the secular act of submission of defeated kings than an cultic or religious one.

## 4.1.2. 1QH

In 1QH, שרת occurs only three times.

## 4.1.2.1. 1QH XIII 21

שרת is part of the praise of God at the beginning of a psalm:

"(20) Blessed be You<sup>14</sup> Lord, for You have not abandoned the fatherless and despised the poor.

For Your power is [boundless] and Your glory (21) beyond measure,

and wonderful heroes (וגבורי פלא) are your servants (משרניתיכזה). (...)."

In this line the action of "serving" is not described in detail. The subjects of שרת are the "wonderful heroes". Does the word combination of וגבורי פלא indicate what שרת means in detail?

In the HB, גבור is used in the secular sense of "hero" meaning a "professional soldier" (cf. 1.S. 2:4; Isa. 3:2; Jer. 5:16; Ez. 39:20; etc.), or a "hero" in its literal or figurative sense (cf. Gen. 6:4). גבור also denotes "ruler" (cf. Gen. 10:8; 1.Chr. 1:10). Interesting regarding the meaning of גבור in the scrolls is its usage referring to the "warriors of God" or the "angels" (cf. Joel. 4:11), and for the "guards of the gates" of the Temple (cf. 1.Chr. 9:26).

<sup>14</sup> Text is difficult. אתה ברוך represents a correction of אודכזה ("I give you thanks"). The former version may have to be preferred.

In the scrolls, the meaning of גבור is difficult to explain. It occurs 24 times in 1QM and 1QH. In 1QM, it refers mainly to a "war hero" (cf. X 6). Once, this hero is even mentioned as being in the Community (XII 9). Often גבור refers to war heroes of the enemy (cf. XI 13; XII 8; XIV 8,11; XIX 10). But twice the author attaches attributes to גבור which describe the hero as an angel-like, or even godly person: in XII 10, the גבור is the "man of glory" (גבורי אלים), in XV 14 the heroes are "godly" (איש כבוד).

In 1QH, the meaning of גבור is very difficult to define, because it often occurs within paraphrases (cf. XIII 7; XIV 11). Sometimes it occurs referring to an enemy, or negative hero (cf. X 25; XVIII 24,34). Once, in XI 35f.,<sup>15</sup> the usage of גבור coincides with a meaning found in the HB referring to heavenly beings.

Concluding, one might state that in 1QH XIII 21 it is unlikely that גבור denotes "warrior" in a secular sense, for 1QH does not favour this denotation and it does not make sense in the context. גבור meaning an enemy of the Community does not seem to be appropriate either, because that would imply that the enemies of the Community are serving God in a manner which certainly is the privilege of the members of the Community. Hence, if גבור does not have a denotation in 1QH XIII 21 that does not occur elsewhere in the DSS, it refers most likely to "heroes" in the sense of a heavenly beings. In this case the denotation would be the adaptation of a usage of the term in the HB which does not occur there very often, a characteristic of the scrolls which we have observed on several occasions.

Consequently, the members of the Community as servants of God are in 1QH XIII 21 pictured as heavenly heroes. This suggests that in this particular instance the idea of serving God

<sup>15</sup> "(...) (35) the war of the heroes (36) of heaven roams over the earth (...)"

has been transferred not only from its traditional place the Temple, but also from the Community, into to a sphere that is *per definitionem* close to God: heaven. Once the scroll claims that the Community service of God takes place in heaven (no matter whether or not the author of 1QH thinks literally of a "service" using שרת in a metaphor), it reveals clearly that שרת too serves to demonstrate that the Community holds a special status in the nearness of God. In fact, the status referred to in this line is so close to God that the original purpose of service by priestly personnel, i.e. the mediation between Israelites and God, is not possible anymore. This line seems to suggest a nature and status of the Community that has lost its "link" with the world in order to engage in a sphere along with God, in His immediate presence.

#### 4.1.2.2. 1QH VII 27

Also in 1QH VII 27, the actual action of serving is not qualified:

"(26) (...) and I know that You have elected them of all, (27) and they will serve You for ever. (...)".

The subject of שרת is not clear. It might be the "righteous" mentioned in VII 15 (?). The action is certainly directed towards God. The denotation of שרת can only be given in the very basic sense of "serving".

#### 4.1.2.3. 1QH XX 23

The text of 1QH XX 23 is the following:

"(...) [...] in accordance with their understanding (כשכלם) You let them draw near (הגשתם),

and in accordance (לפי) to their power (ממשלתם) they serve you (ישרתוכה)

in their divisio[ns (למפלגיהם) ] from You."

In this line too, שרת refers to a service to God. Although the text is damaged so that the line does not have a subject, it is most likely that the members of the Community are here meant to serve God. The word כשכלם indicates as much, because it is only the members of the Community according to the scrolls that have the special understanding.<sup>16</sup>

1QH XX 23 mentions a place where this service is located: the members of the Community serve למפלגיהם. Although the meaning of מפלגיה is difficult to determine, because it occurs in the HB and the scrolls only a very few times,<sup>17</sup> its usage as the location of the service indicates that שרת is a matter of the Community. As seen above, it depends on the organisation pattern of the Community. שרת is part of the structured life in the Community in relation to God. It only can be done in the Community and it only makes sense in relation to God. Another aspect of שרת in 1QH XX 23 is that it happens "in accordance with their power".

ממשלה denotes "power" in the sense of having the superior strength over another party.<sup>18</sup>

Since ממשלה is used in the Qumran literature always in connection with an "eschatological" concept of good and evil and light and darkness, it probably has this meaning here as well. Hence it cannot refer to the organisation pattern of the Community,<sup>19</sup> but to the idea that

<sup>16</sup> Cf. p. 77.

<sup>17</sup> מפלגה occurs in the HB only once, but in a significant chapter for the understanding of the theology of Qumran: 2 Chr. 35:12. In the Qumran literature, it occurs only twice denoting "division": 1QH XX 23 and 1QS IV 17.

<sup>18</sup> In the HB, ממשלה is not common: it means "power", but also "reign"/ "dominion". Twice it is also used in connection with God (Ps. 103:22; 145:13). In the Qumran literature the term undergoes a significant change. In 1QS, 1QM, and 1QH ממשלה occurs 27 times. In general, ממשלה always means "power". It is either the power of the evil or the good. So in 1QS it is the "power of Belial" (cf. I 18,23; II 19), the power of the "angels of the darkness" (III 21,22). On the other hand it is the power of the "dukes of light" and the power of light (X 1). It is also used for man's power (III 17), and God's power (III 23). In 1QM the usage is the same. ממשלה is either the power of evil forces (I 6,15; XIV 9,10; XVII 5,7; XVIII 1,11), or the power or force of the light (X 12; XIII 10). In 1QH, the usage of ממשלה is slightly different: it is the power of the darkness, once the power of the psalmist (XV 23), and once the power of God (V 11), but also the power of spirits (IX 11,17; XX 9 ?)).

<sup>19</sup> As E. Lohse, *Qumrantexte*, 159<sub>33</sub> suggests.

whoever is serving God can do so only within the boundaries of the development of the Community.

#### 4.2. קרב

Investigating the meaning of the word שרת in the HB and the scrolls, we have discovered that שרת sets life in a particular relation to God. Serving God according to the scrolls is a significant aspect of life in the Community in relation to God. It gives the Community a special status before God that allows its members to accommodate Divine presence. In the HB, however, there are two verbs that are occasionally used in connection with שרת and that seem to describe the service in more detail. Their usage in the scrolls is very interesting as regards the Divine presence.

The first of these verbs is קרב. Its standard meaning is to "draw near". It is used in the HB often in combination with שרת (cf. Ez. 40:46; 43:19; 44:15; 45:4). In these cases the person who is serving God "comes nearer" to God to serve Him. Approaching God through קרב is the condition for serving God. קרב seems to be a *terminus technicus* for the approach of human beings towards God in His sanctuary.

Most significant is the change of the usage of קרב we can detect in the Qumran literature.

קרב occurs 18 times in 1QS, 1QM, and 1QH.

The usage of קרב in 1QS is quite extraordinary. Here, קרב is used 6 times (VI 16,19,22; VII 21; VIII 18f.; IX 15) in the sense of *becoming a member of the Community!*<sup>20</sup> To "draw

<sup>20</sup> In 1QS VI 16 קרב occurs literally with the object לעצת יחד, in VI 19 with לסוד היחד, and in VI 22 with ליחד. In VII 21, VIII 18f., and IX 15 קרב has the same meaning, but is used differently. VII 21 has

near" is no longer the approach of a human towards God in His sanctuary as an element of worship at the Temple. קרב in IQS is the formal process of "becoming a member of the Qumran Community". קרב refers to the admission process of a new member of the Community.<sup>21</sup> This means that what was "drawing near" to God in order to serve Him in the HB, is now simply the membership of the Community. This suggests strongly that the members of the Community understood themselves as temple personnel, but in a new sense. Becoming a member of the Community and living in the Community according to all the Laws and rules, therefore, replaces the cultic events at the Temple. It is life in the Community, according to the usage of קרב in the scrolls, that means approaching God in the sense of approaching Him at His dwelling place in Jerusalem. This is what life in the Community is about: to draw near to God. Living in the Community establishes, therefore, a special relationship between God and the Community. Since entering the Community is identical with drawing near to Him, the Community is the place of His nearness and presence.

But this also means that one cannot claim that the Community understands itself in any simplistic manner as the Temple or the sanctuary. As the investigation of the usage of שרת and other aspects of life in the Community have shown, the question of the location, of holy place such as Temple or sanctuary, is no longer the centre of attention. It is the relationship between God and the Community in which the nearness of God is to be found, and which depends on the way of life and the conduct of the members. The Temple has not been "transferred" to the Community; rather, certain qualities of the Temple now permit the Community to host the Divine presence.

---

ואיש כבור כפיו and IX 15 has וקרבו (19) בעצה, VIII 18f. has וקרבו ונכתב בתכוננו לקרבו.

<sup>1</sup> So קרב is not only "probably" used "in the technical sense of admission to the Brotherhood of the Sect" (M. Mansoor, *Thanksgiving Hymns*, 181<sub>s</sub>) as Mansoor carefully states, but it is used in exactly this sense describing the admission process of the Community.

קרב also occurs in 1QM (I 10; VIII 7; IX 4; X 2; XVI 6,13; XVII 11). In this text, קרב is naturally used in a military sense and in general denotes some form of participation in the "eschatological" battle of the sons of light against the sons of darkness.<sup>22</sup>

In 1QH, קרב occurs only once, in 1QH VI 14.<sup>23</sup> In line 13, the psalmist points out that God draws him nearer to His knowledge. קרב in line 14 refers to line 13:

(...) ולפי (14) קורבני (...) (13)

In this line, קרב refers to a human action towards God, but not in a cultic-religious sense as in the HB or 1QS. "Drawing near" to His knowledge means here to enter the special relationship between the Community and God. קרב means here to achieve special insights that God gives to the Community and to become consequently part of this relationship.

#### 4.3. עמד

The other verb which is used to describe the priestly action of serving God in more detail is עמד.<sup>24</sup> In the HB, עמד is used in two lines, Dtn. 18:7 and 2.Chr. 29:11, in combination with לפני.<sup>25</sup> There, it means "to stand respectfully before someone"<sup>26</sup>. According to both verses, the priests are standing before God to serve Him.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>22</sup> So for example in I 10 קרב is used in the sense of "to participate" in the battle, in VIII 7; X 2; XVI 6; and XVII 11 it seems to mean "to advance" as a military action, and in XVI 13 one might even detect the sense of "to fight".

<sup>23</sup> K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 195 mentions two lines (XIV 14(VI 14) and XVI 19(VIII 19)), but the text in the latter, XVI 19, is badly damaged. Only the two consonants [ קר ] occur (so also in *J.H. Charlesworth, Graphic Concordance*, 480). This is not evidence enough to postulate כ as the final consonant. Even K.G. Kuhn suggests that [ קר ] might derive from קרא.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. on מעמד pp. 142-165.

<sup>25</sup> Dtn. 18:7 has לפני יהוה; 2.Chr. 29:11 has לעמד לפניו with the 3. sg. m. suffix referring to God.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. W. Gesenius, *Handwörterbuch*, 598.

<sup>27</sup> Interesting regarding the comparison with the scrolls is that in the HB עמד occurs in connection with

In 1QH it is understood in the sense of "living according to the plan and will of God". Especially the occurrence of **עמד** in 1QH XII 21 offers this meaning:

(21) (...) ואשר כנפשכה יעמודו לפניכה לעד

והולכי בדרך לבכה (22) יכוננו לנצח (...)

(21) "(...) And those who according to your soul are standing before you for ever

and walking on paths of your heart will stand firmly for ever (...)"<sup>28</sup>

Hence, the same notions that were encountered regarding **קרב** in comparison with the HB can be stated here. In the HB, the "standing before God" is the manner in which a human being can approach God to serve (**שרת**) Him. The location where this "standing before God" and the service takes place is a holy place, for example the temple. In the scrolls, on the other hand, the "standing before God" refers to life in the Community in relation to God. The idea of **עמד** as well brings, therefore, the Community closer to God and indicates that this special relationship is definition, purpose, and aim of the Community.

---

several phenomena which are significant for the theological ideas of 1QH: for example with **ברית** (2.K. 23:3), with "doorpost" (Ez. 46:2), with **בסוד יהודה** (Jer. 23:18), many times with **לפני יהודה** (Dtn. 4:10; 10:8; 1.K. 17:1; etc.). **עמד** even occurs in combination with **יחד** (Isa. 50:8) in the sense of assembling for a lawsuit.

<sup>28</sup> The remaining occurrences of **עמד** do not contradict this interpretation. According to K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 166 the verb **עמד** occurs 14 times in 1QH. The usage of the term is quite clear and can be categorised. Most frequently the author uses **עמד** in the sense of "standing firmly". The author thanks God that he is "standing firmly" and can, therefore, resist evil (X 8,25,29; XVII 12; X 6). The strength for this firm standing comes from God (through God's "mercy" X 25; XVIII 6). See also XV 19 and 31, where the author states that God "put" (**עמד**) the psalmist (XV 19) or His sons (XV 31) either into the covenant (XV 19), or before Him (XV 31).

## 5. לפני

Investigating what life in the Community in relation to God is about, an analysis of the meaning of לפני in IQS/H is absolutely essential. The reason for this is that the Hebrew word לפני is generally used to define - geographically or temporally - the relationship between two objects. Used in IQS/H it often refers to the relationship between the Community and God; the Community it described to do things לפני God. This means that לפני not only refers to an *aspect* of the Community or life in the Community which relates to God, but it actually *describes* this relationship. This is why it is so important to investigate its meaning. How do IQS/H understand this relationship? What "geographical" or "temporal" notions play a role in this relationship? And what consequences does the meaning of לפני have for the understanding of Divine presence?

### 5.1. IQS

The usage of לפני in IQS is especially significant, because the rules of the Community describe life in the Community in relation to God. Used in this scroll, לפני tells how this relation was understood precisely and how the presence of God was understood. This usage of לפני differs considerably from its use in the HB.<sup>1</sup>

The usage of לפני in IQS can be subdivided into three categories:

<sup>1</sup> Against Simian-Yofre who claims that "for the most part its [לפני] meanings and usages correspond to the spectrum found in the OT" (H. Simian-Yofre, *art. פנים* [TDOT XI] 615).

1. Defining the relationship between members and God as a life in company with God in the Community.
2. Describing certain aspects of the organisation pattern (hierarchy) of the Community.
3. לפני in its simplest sense.

The meaning of לפני defining the relationship between members and God as a life in company with God in the Community occurs throughout 1QS and is the crucial meaning of לפני in 1QS. This meaning is based on, but carefully developed from, the usage of לפני in the HB. Significant for the understanding of לפני in 1QS is that it is used throughout the Priestly legislation of the Pentateuch to speak of the "position" of acts of worship and of worshippers in respect of God.<sup>2</sup> Almost all rituals take place לפני יהוה.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, they are either acceptable (or not acceptable) לפני יהוה.<sup>4</sup> The authors of 1QS use this meaning of לפני, but modify some significant aspects of this HB usage. By using לפני they demonstrate that the Community has an exceptional status in relation to God. They link the Community with the place where God dwells (the Temple), they connect the Community with worship and cultic acts, and they associate life in the Community with sacrifices. But the nature of all these associations, arising because of the usage of לפני in the HB, has been changed considerably in 1QS (and 1QH). Sacrifices are no more those offered in the Temple, but life in the Community itself is understood as permanent sacrifice to God. Worship is no more the Temple service in which Israel participates, but life in the Community as permanent worship to God. Finally, the dwelling place of God is no longer the Temple, but the

<sup>2</sup> Cf. for example Ex. 16:33; 25:30; 27:21; 29:11; Lev. 1:11; 4:18; 16:13; Num. 17:22.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the raising of the elevation-offering in the hands of the priests (Ex. 29:24,26; Lev. 7:30; 8:27,29; 9:21; 10:15; 14:12,24; 23:20; Num. 6:20; 8:11,21), the offering of the sacrificial gifts (Lev. 3:1,7,12; 6:7; 9:2; 10:1,19; 12:7; Num. 3:4; 6:16; 16:17; 17:3; 26:61), the slaughtering of the sacrificial animal (Ex. 29:11; Lev. 1:5,11; 4:4,15,24; 6:18), etc.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. on רצון pp. 31-59.

Community seeks to qualify for His presence. All these changes are initiated to give the Community a status in relation to God that allows it to accommodate Divine presence as never before.

A detailed analysis of **לפני** in IQS (and IQH) will show which HB associations were retained in the scrolls and how they were developed. It also will show how life in the Community in relation to God was understood, and how the Community qualifies for His presence.

#### 5.1.1. Defining the Relationship between Members of the Community and God as a Life in Company with God

The following texts all incorporate the major meanings of **לפני**, while emphasising different aspects of it.

#### 1QS I 2

1QS I 2, the first and probably most significant occurrence of **לפני** in IQS, reads:

(...) לעשות הטוב והישר לפניו (...)

"(...) in order to do what is good (הטוב) and just (והישר) before Him (לפניו) (...)"

Because this line is part of the "programme" of the Community, **לפני** plays a crucial role regarding the understanding of the nature of the Community in relation to God. To understand the meaning of **לפני** in IQS I 2, we will have to compare the phrase **לעשות הטוב והישר לפניו** with the HB where it occurs with minor changes only three times: Dtn. 5:18; 12:28; 2.Chr. 31:20. In two cases, the phrase is used in passages which are central to the

Jewish religion: in Dtn. 6:18 and 12:28 it occurs in connection with the Shema, a passage of the HB which was certainly familiar to most Jews!<sup>5</sup> And 2.Chr. 31:20 turns out to be crucial for the understanding of nature and purpose of the Community. In all three cases the wording of the phrase is so similar that it seems to be likely that the authors of 1QS I 2 used them as *Vorlage* for their theological purpose. In addition, in the HB the phrase is used in combination with themes that were to become central in 1QS.

Dtn. 6:18

In Dtn. 6:18, in the chapter immediately following the repetition of the Ten Commandments (chapter 5) and some time before the Law for Israel is proclaimed (especially chapters 12-26), the phrase occurs first:

Dtn. 6:18: ועשית הישר והטוב בעיני יהוה

1QS I 2: לעשות הטוב והישר לפניו

The structure of these phrases are almost identical. עשה refers in both cases to human actions or behaviour: in Dtn. 6:18 Israel's, and in 1QS I 2 the Community's.

Generally, טוב describes in both the HB and 1QS life in relation to God. But in the HB it refers to existence in dependence on the supreme God; in the scrolls it means life in the

<sup>5</sup> It is surprising how little attention has been paid to the meaning of the phrase in Dtn. 6:18; 12:28 in the commentaries on the OT (for example D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1-11* [World Biblical Commentary 6a; Dallas: Word Books, 1991] does not comment on either of the verses; G.v. Rad, *Das fünfte Buch Mose. Deuteronomium. Übersetzt und erklärt von Gerhard von Rad* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964] and W. G. Plaut (ed.), *תורה, The Torah. A Modern Commentary* [New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1981] do not comment on Dtn. 12:28).

Those scholars who comment on the phrase at all consider it either to refer to the observance of the Law (J.H. Tigay, *The JPS Torah Commentary. Deuteronomy דברים. The Traditional Hebrew Text with the JPS Translation* [Philadelphia/ Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 5756/1996] 82), or generally to a "good behaviour" before God (cf. G.v. Rad, *Deuteronomium*, on 6:18).

Community with God.<sup>6</sup> It is most likely that the meanings of **טוב** in Dtn. 6:18 and 1QS I 2 differ in the same manner: in Dtn. 6:18 describing the status of people in relation to God according to their ethical, moral, or social behaviour between humans in the expectation of a positive response from God; in 1QS I 2 defining the nature of life in the Community in direct relation to God referring to a close relationship between the Community and God.<sup>7</sup>

Two notions of **טוב** in Dtn. 6:18 indicate why the phrase was so attractive for the authors of 1QS to adopt.

a) The phrase is related to the observance of the Law (cf. Dtn. 6:17: **שמור תשמרון** **שמו** **אלהיכם**). In the HB, this relation occurs only here, which makes it very likely that the authors of 1QS adopted this phrase, since they emphasise throughout their texts obedience to the Law. But here again the authors of 1QS developed the meaning of the HB-material they use. In Dtn. 6:18, the observance of the Law and doing good and what is just are mentioned as equal actions.<sup>8</sup> In the scrolls, by contrast, the major aspect of "doing good" is fulfilling the will of God and consequently observing Law, Prophets, and the rules of the Community very carefully. In the Community the observance of the Law, therefore, results in **טוב**. This as well indicates that **טוב** in 1QS refers to a status of the Community that allows them to be close to God *per se* rather than a means by which this status can be achieved (as Dtn. 6:18 suggests).

b) **טוב** in Dtn. 6:18 is linked with the idea of the promised land. Most likely the authors of 1QS interpreted this verse according to their own ideas. Accordingly, receiving the promised land is a consequence of the observance of the Law alongside "doing good and what is just".<sup>9</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Cf. pp. 121-130.

<sup>7</sup> See especially pp. 126-128.

<sup>8</sup> BHS reads **ו** at the beginning of Dtn. 6:18 which shows that "doing good and what is just in the eyes of JHWH" is most likely equal to the observance of the Law in 6:17.

<sup>9</sup> Wright suggests about the meaning of the phrase in the OT that "there is no thought here of Israel *earn-*

In their own texts they even develop this idea, as shown in this study,<sup>10</sup> claiming that life in the Community is a permanent sacrifice to God on behalf of the rest of Israel. Only this sacrifice will then, in the end, restore the quality of the land as the promised one, but on a different level, for the Community itself might have been understood in a sense as "this land".

The meaning of *ישׁר* in Dtn. 6:18 and 1QS I 2 is very similar, apart from the fact that 1QS restricted *ישׁר* to the Community. In the HB, *ישׁר* is used in many ways based on its literal meaning "straight"<sup>11</sup>. Interesting regarding its meaning in 1QS and 1QH is that *ישׁר*, used figuratively, often refers to "human conduct" (cf. Prov. 21:8) characterising it as "just" or "upright".<sup>12</sup> *ישׁר* can, as an attribute of human beings, describe "an entire manner of life"<sup>13</sup>.

So far this is the meaning of *ישׁר* in 1QS and 1QH as well. In these scrolls, it occurs four times (1QS I 2; III 1; IV 22; 1QH X 10) referring to human conduct. In 1QS III 1 and IV 22, the members of the Community are called *ישׁריים* ("upright ones")<sup>14</sup>, in 1QH X 10 they are called *ישׁרי דרך* ("those on just/upright path"). *ישׁר*, therefore, characterises every aspect of their life. This is most likely what *ישׁר* means in 1QS I 2 as well: doing what is just means conducting a life according to the will of God, especially paying attention to the fulfilment of the Law. But the difference between the HB usage and the one in 1QS and 1QH is that in the former, as Alonso-Schökel suggests, *ישׁר* "comes to denote the type of *ethical* concerned

---

ing possession of the land by 'doing what is right and good'; rather, the land-gift was entirely grounded in the ancestral promise (18b), and given 'so that it may go well with you'" (C.J.H. Wright, *New International Commentary. Deuteronomy* [Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1996] on Dtn. 12:28).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. pp. 45-46.

<sup>11</sup> H. Ringgren/ W. Mayer/ L. Alonso-Schökel, *art. ישׁר* [TDOT VI] 465.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid. 466.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid. 468.

<sup>14</sup> The "upright ones" are also mentioned in the HB (cf. Ps. 11:7; 32:11; 33:1; 64:10; 107:42; 112:4; Prov. 2:7,21; 14:11; 15:8).

individual"<sup>15</sup>, whereas in the latter **ישר** characterises the perfect behaviour that serves as means by which the Community seeks to get closer to God. The ethical aspect of **ישר** is transferred into the background in favour of its significance as a characteristic of human conduct resulting in the special status before God.

The only grammatical difference between the phrase in Dtn. 6:18 and 1QS I 2 is **לפני**. There are two reasons why the authors of 1QS might have replaced **בעיני** by **לפני**. First, in the HB, this word occurs as a technical term in combination with the Tetragram. As shown above, **לפני** is used to speak of the majority of cultic acts in respect of God. These take place **לפני יהוה**. Hence, the authors might have wanted to avoid a term that is according to the Jewish tradition linked so closely with a) the Tetragram, and b) with the worship of **יהוה** in Jerusalem and *the Temple*.

Secondly, its meaning might not have been compatible with the ideas of the authors of the scroll for two reasons: a) **בעיני** was regarded as an anthropomorphism which needs to be eliminated.<sup>16</sup> b) **בעיני יהוה** means "*in the eyes of JHWH*". It indicates that Israel doing good and what is just (in the HB sense) do so *under the observation of God*.<sup>17</sup> Acting under the observation of God implies distance between God and the acting human in two ways: God is the authority and God is at a place other than the humans. This is what the authors of 1QS I 2 did *not* want to express with their phrase. Choosing **לפני**, they imply that the actions ("doing good and what is just" in the Qumranian sense) happen right in front of God, hence

<sup>15</sup> Ibid. 469.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Targum Onkelos on Dtn. 6:18.

<sup>17</sup> Alonso-Schökel's translation of **בעיני** ("what pleases God, 'what God (dis)approves'" (H. Ringgren/W. Mayer/ L. Alonso-Schökel, *art. ישר* [TDOT VI] 470)), therefore, represents already a good deal of interpretation and misses this point.

with God or in company with Him. Doing good and what is just means living in the Community according to the will of God in the company of God.

This allows the idea of a permanent and immediate presence of God in the Community. It refers to a completely religious life that is infiltrated by God.

Dtn. 12:28

In Dtn. 12:28 occurs almost the same phrase as in Dtn. 6:18 and 1QS I 2:

Dtn. 12:28: **כי תעשה<sup>18</sup> הטוב והישר בעיני יהוה אלהיך**

1QS I 2: **לעשות הטוב והישר לפניו**

The differences between this phrase in Dtn. 12:28 and 1QS I 2 are almost identical with the ones between Dtn. 6:18 and 1QS I 2, except that in one respect Dtn. 12:28 is closer to 1QS I 2 than to Dtn. 6:18.

The context of the phrase in Dtn. 12:28 is also Israel's obedience to the Law. Dtn. 12:28 begins with the command to Israel "to observe and to listen to all these words":

**שמר ושמעת את כל-הדברים האלה**

The obedience of the commandments of God is here understood as the *conditio sine qua non* for **למען ייטב לך ולבניך אחרריך עד-עולם**, i.e. the well-being of Israel. "Doing what is good and right" also is understood as a condition for this well-being, which seems to indicate that "doing what is good and just" means the obedience of the commandments of God and *vice-versa*. This notion of the phrase "to do what is good and just before God" does not occur as clearly in Dtn. 6:18 as it does here in Dtn. 12:28. This means that we find in Dtn.

<sup>18</sup> The *Pentateuchi textus Hebraeo-Samaritanus* reads here **הישר והטוב**, following Dtn. 6.18. The difference does not change the sense, but might indicate that the phrase which we are analysing is a common phrase (almost a liturgical phrase) which authors of the time intended to preserve. This again strengthens the theory that the HB-phrase is the *Vorlage* of the phrase as it occurs in 1QS I 2. The theory that the basic sense of the phrase has been preserved but developed in 1QS according to the theological ideas of the Community, is, therefore, even more likely.

12:28 a notion of the phrase that becomes according to the scrolls a major aspect of life in the Community: the obedience of the Law and the Rules. Dtn. 12:28 provides an idea that IQS can exploit. This makes it very likely that a) Dtn. 12:28 served most likely as *Vorlage* for IQS I 2; b) that "doing what is good and just" in IQS I 2 refers primarily to the obedience of the Law and the Rules of the Community as major task of *life* in the Community; and c) that, because "doing what is good and just" means the obedience of the Law and the Rules, and because this obedience refers to life in the Community as such, לפניו, most likely, refers here to this life in obedience *in company with God*.<sup>19</sup>

2.Chr. 31:20

The most significant HB-verse for our interpretation of IQS I 2 is 2.Chr. 31:20:

ויעש כזאת יחזקיהו בכל־יהודה ויעש הטוב והישר והאמת לפני יהוה אלהיו

"Hezekiah did this throughout all Judah; he did the good and the right and the faithful (thing) before JHWH his God."

According to this verse, it is part of Hezekiah's character that he "does what is good and what is right and what is faithful before God" in Israel. In this verse occurs almost the same phrase as in IQS I 2 and Dtn. 6:18; 12:28:

2.Chr. 31:20: ויעש הטוב והישר והאמת לפני יהוה אלהיו

IQS I 2: לעשות הטוב והישר לפניו

<sup>19</sup> The authors of IQS, using the phrase in this verse as *Vorlage*, were most likely also aware of the notion of "centralization" which is connected with this verse. According to Plaut, Dtn. 12:1-13:1 is about the "central sanctuary", whereby "all other sites and altars were to be dismantled and destroyed" (W. G. Plaut (ed.), *תורה The Torah. A Modern Commentary* [New York: Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 1981] 1419). According to the authors of IQS this would mean that this "central sanctuary" is the Community where alone "doing what is good and just before God" is possible. This notion again would add to the quality of the Community that allows them to accommodate the Divine presence.

The grammatical differences between the two phrases are minor. 2.Chr. 31:20 has an additional **וְהָאֱמֶת**, and instead of the suffix attached to **לפני** which refers in 1QS I 2 to God, 2.Chr. 31:20 reads **יְהוָה אֱלֹהָיו**. The similarities between 2.Chr. 31:20 and 1QS I 2 are much greater than those between Dtn. 6:18/12:28 and 1QS I 2, which suggests that it is 2.Chr. 31:20 that served as *Vorlage* for 1QS I 2, and that Dtn. 6:18/12:28 have been interpreted in the light of this *Vorlage*.

Decisive for our understanding of **לפני** in the phrase "doing what is good and just before God" in 1QS I 2 is the context of the phrase in 2.Chr. 31:20. We will see that what Ez. 29-32 tells about the character and deeds of Hezekiah represents in 1QS/H significant aspects of the nature, the way of living, and the function of the members of the Community. The question whether the descriptions of Hezekiah in 2.Chr. 29-32 were simply used by the authors of 1QS/H because they were convenient for their teachings which they developed independently, or whether the authors of 1QS/H deduced their ideas from the HB material, must remain unanswered, because further research is needed. But, the fact that the description of Hezekiah in 2.Chr. 29-32 can almost be used to describe the members of the Community and its purpose cannot be denied. In this sense 2.Chr. 31:20 is the *Vorlage* of 1QS I 2. Even though we cannot answer the question above here, knowing what 2.Chr. 29-32 says about Hezekiah will tell us to quite some extent what the phrase "doing what is good and just before God", and hence **לפני**, means in 1QS I 2.

2.Chr. 29-31 mentions the following aspects of Hezekiah's character, functions, and tasks which are all significant regarding the meaning of 1QS I 2:

a) Hezekiah is directly linked with David. 2.Chr. 29:2b transfers the qualities of David onto Hezekiah. According to this Hezekiah is chosen by JHWH, and it links him with the planning of the Temple.

b) Hezekiah is a king obedient to JHWH, which is why he can act according to the will of God doing what is good and just. He also does so for the Israelites so that their relationship with JHWH improves.

c) Hezekiah accomplishes certain tasks. According to 2.Chr. 29:2, the main (religious) tasks of his reign, being a king of JHWH and acting accordingly, are to cleanse the Temple, restore the Temple worship (chapter 29), to restore the Great Passover (chapter 30), and to (re)organise and provide the subsistence for the priests and Levites (chapter 31).

As we have seen already, most of these notions of the life and character of Hezekiah are aspects which are significant for life in the Community according to 1QS/H. The similarities between the description of Hezekiah in 2.Chr. 29-32 and the description of the Qumran Community in 1QS and 1QH are obvious. Being God's chosen ones is a major claim of the Community. Being actively involved in the planning of the (new) Temple is also a major concern in these two scrolls. Being obedient to God, hence fulfilling the will of God, turns out to be the major task of life in the Community (see above and below). And the scrolls also claim, as we will see, that leading this life, fulfilling the will of God, also happens on behalf of the rest of Israel. Although the Community is primarily concerned with its own relationship with God, it opens a new (and the only) path for Israel towards a renewed and improved relationship with God for those who accept to and join the Covenant. Finally, the Community has adopted literally the tasks of Hezekiah's reign, although the way it seeks to accomplish them differs. It is the Community's aim to clean the Temple, not by changing the old Temple, by replacing the Jerusalem Temple, or even by building a new Temple.

According to 1QS/H the Community seems to be interested only in providing a new place for Divine presence which is not identical with a Temple. The motivation for this in Qumran is the *Community's* desire to get closer to God, not the renewal of the Temple in Jerusalem for Israel. In order to provide the new place for Divine presence, the Community also adopts the task of restoring the Temple worship and reorganizing the Temple personnel. Liturgical life in the Community becomes central in Qumran, and the reorganisation of the priestly hierarchy becomes an important aspect in especially 1QS.

According to 2.Chr. 29-31, all these characteristics and tasks of Hezekiah make it possible that he "does what is good, just, and faithful before God". Having a special status in relation to God which he received from God (election as king) is also a condition for "doing what is good, just, and faithful", choosing the right tasks to renew and to improve his and Israel's relationship with God. According to 1QS/H the Community does precisely this. The fact that they claim to be the chosen ones, and the aspects 1QS mentions as tasks of life in the Community, have precisely this aim: to improve the relationship with God. But, in contrast to the HB, 1QS only speaks about the relationship between the Community and God. Consequently the Community is described as doing what the HB tells about Hezekiah in his attempt to get closer to God. The Qumran group attempt to provide a place that qualifies for His presence and lead their lives according to what they claim is the will of God; hence they also restore the Temple service and the Temple personnel.<sup>20</sup> But the motivation behind this appears to be quite egocentric throughout 1QS/H. Primarily, they want to put themselves in special relationship with God. Only secondarily do they offer themselves, already having this special relationship, as the "bridge" between the rest of Israel and God, for those who agree with their ideas and join the Community.

---

<sup>20</sup> Hence the Community does not simply *replace* the Temple or serve as its substitute, but transfers certain qualities of the Temple onto itself to qualify for Divine presence.

This means that "doing what is good and just" in 1QS I 2 means to be and to live like Hezekiah according to 2.Chr. 31:20, including all the aspects mentioned above. "Doing what is good and just לפני God", therefore, must mean having a special status before God that one has received as a gift from God. Further, "doing what is good and just" involves improving this status through further actions in agreement with God's will - actions which please God and have as their aim the improvement of the Community's relations with God. לפני thus not only refers to human *actions* that can be called "good" or "just" by God (and consequently by human beings measuring them with moral and ethical principals),<sup>21</sup> but *qualifies* being *and* acting/living of chosen people who are trying to improve the relationship between themselves and God in the attempt to get closer to Him. As such לפני God defines in 1QS I 2 life in relation to God as the attempt to get closer to Him by being chosen and by fulfilling especially the Law of the Temple cult. In this sense לפני can here also be translated with "in company with". Because of their special status of the Community and their way of life they are and do "in company" with God. And because of their attempt to even improve this status they qualify to live "in closer company" with God than any other person. This is how the Community prepares and achieves a status that allows them to "accommodate" Divine presence.

<sup>21</sup> It is interesting to note that the Rabbis, like the authors of 1QS, seem to have seen the need for interpretation of this verse. Only, the Rabbis attempted to explain what the phrase means in the HB context, whereas the authors of 1QS again used an ambiguity of a verse in the HB to authorise and to develop their own ideas. The latter used the phrase to emphasise the significance of the Community for the rest of Israel and to demonstrate their special status in relation to God. The former explain the phrase by defining טוב and ישר and developing "an important ethical principle from the verse, holding that it was not sufficient to do the 'right' or legal thing, but that one needed to go beyond and do also what was 'good' or moral" (W. G. Plaut (ed.), תורה The Torah. A Modern Commentary [New York 1981] 1368). Hence, the Rabbis, like 1QS, suggested a meaning of the phrase beyond the observance of the Law, but the Rabbis refer to an ethical dimension, whereas 1QS adds the dimension which it always adds to material taken from the HB: *their special relationship with God*. It is this desire to improve the relationship with God that defines in 1QS "doing what is good and just".

## Summary

According to these comparisons, לפני in 1QS I 2 means "before" God in the sense of "in company with". It refers to a special status that qualifies the Community to be close to God and to accommodate the Divine presence. And it is used in connection with people who have been chosen by God and who fulfil His will *in order to* improve their relationship with Him, respectively to get closer to Him or to qualify for His presence. The way in which the whole phrase "doing what is good and just before Him" was developed from the HB also attaches certain notions to the meaning of לפני in 1QS I 2. According to 1QS a life, *i.e.* the nature and deeds of human beings, "לפני God" means doing all those deeds that bring them closer to God, *i.e.* that please God and produce a quality that allows them to be near to God. The most significant means of achieving this is listening to the revelations of God and doing His will/Law. 2.Chr. 29-32 as *Vorlage* of 1QS I 2 specifies this even further. In the light of this *Vorlage*, such a life for closer proximity to God involves especially the fulfilment of Temple rules, *i.e.* Temple worship and Temple hierarchy (of course according to the Qumranian interpretation of them). Living in the Community like this leads to and is "doing what is good and just before God".

## 1QS I 8

לפני occurs here in the following phrase:

"in order to be unified in the council of God and walk before Him perfectly"

The analysis of the verb הלך shows<sup>22</sup> that לפני in this line means *before* God in the sense of *living* in the Community according to the will of God in the company with God.<sup>23</sup> 1QS I 8,

<sup>22</sup> See on הלך in 1QS I 8 p. 217-228.

therefore, represents the same usage of לפני as I 2, but emphasises the notion that it is the whole life of every individual member that happens לפני God.<sup>24</sup>

### 1QS I 16

Here לפני represents again the same meaning as in 1QS I 2, but focuses on the notion of the covenant:

(16) וכול הבאים בסרך היחד י(א)עבורו בברית י(א)לפני<sup>25</sup> אל

לעשות (17) ככול אשר צוה<sup>26</sup>

This is the only line in 1QS where ברית occurs in combination with לפני. It is the Community which is the covenant, and since the covenant is *before* God, the ones who are part of it are living a life *before* Him. Hence, לפני refers here, as in I 8, to a life in company with God with all its implications (such as truthfulness, righteousness, observations of the laws,<sup>27</sup> doing good, etc.) in separation from Israel. ברית, however, gives this relationship an

<sup>23</sup> לפני occurs also in the HB in combination with הלך, but in a different sense. For example in I.S. 12:2 the king is said to "walk before Israel" (המלך מההלך לפניכם), hence "to lead them".

<sup>24</sup> The idea of "living before God" is also known in the HB. But here the verbs used are not הלך as in I 8, or יצב as in XI 16f., and the meaning of the phrase is different from 1QS. One striking verse in the HB is Gen. 17:18: לר ישמעאל יהיה לפניך. Here living before God means to live as a human on earth accepted by God, and not, as in 1QS to live *in company with* God. Only 1QS gives "living לפני God" such a specific and strong meaning. A similar phrase to Gen. 17:18 occurs in Hos. 6:2: יחינו מימים ביום השלישי יקמנו ונחיה לפניך. Israel and Judah will "live before God" after their judgement. Using the same verb as Gen. 17:18 (חיה), the meaning of this phrase is closer to 1QS I 8, XI 16f., because it not only refers to a life in acceptance of God, but also to a new status of Israel and Judah after the judgement which makes life "before" God possible. The authors of 1QS might well have had this verse in mind when they developed their idea about life before God, especially because Hos. 6 mentions several aspects that became central in 1QS (such as knowledge of God (v. 3,6), love instead of sacrifices (v.6), covenant (v.7), and the defilement of Israel (v.10)). In this case the Community would have a status such as the one after judgement which would represent another aspect according to which they qualify for God's nearness. But the similarities do not seem to be sufficient to claim that 1QS used Hos. 6:2 directly as *Vorlage*.

<sup>25</sup> According to K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz*, 178, a א has been erased before לפני. J.H. Charlesworth, *Graphic Concordance*, 370 suggests the same.

<sup>26</sup> "And all those who enter in the rule of the Community shall establish a covenant before God in order to carry out (17) all that He commanded and in order not to stray from following Him out of any fear, dread, or testing (18) during the dominion of Belial. (...)" (M/T)

<sup>27</sup> This line also makes clear that life in the Community in company with God means to observe the Law

official form. It is what existed in the HB between Israel and their God, and it is now according to the teachings of 1QS restricted to the Community.<sup>28</sup>

### 1QS III 11

According to III 11, not life as such, but the "atonement" of members of the Community happens לפני God:

אז ירצה בכפורי ניהוח לפני אל<sup>29</sup>

This atonement takes place *before* God, hence it happens towards God and on the basis of His will.

The verb ירצה niph. ("to please" tr.)<sup>30</sup> indicates that here, as in 1QS VIII 4ff.,<sup>10</sup> and IX 4,5,<sup>31</sup> life in the Community is understood as a permanent sacrifice to God that pleases God. Only this sacrifice can "please" God, the Community, and the rest of Israel. This quality as a permanent sacrifice gives the Community a special status before God.<sup>32</sup> And this status is

---

and the rules of the Community. The observance of the Law is the major task of life in the Community.

<sup>28</sup> Although ברית occurs in 1QS twice in construct combinations with אל (V 8; X 10) and three times carrying a suffix referring to God (V 18,19,22), it occurs only in I 16f. in combination with לפני.

A detailed analysis of the meaning of ברית in 1QS and 1QH is beyond the scope of this study, especially since the covenant theme "sounds throughout the whole document [1QS]" (G. Forkman, *The Limits of the Religious Community. Expulsion from the Religious Community within the Qumran Sect, within Rabbinic Judaism, and within Primitive Christianity* [Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1972] 71). But it appears that this as well represents a development of the concept found in the HB, especially because the link between לפני and ברית in the HB is ambiguous. Occasionally, covenants are made לפני יהוה, but sometimes also with JHWH Himself (cf. H. Simian-Yofre, *art. פנים* (TDOT XI) 610). Forkman sees "a concept of continuity" (ibid. 72) between the ideas in the HB and the scrolls and describes only differences according to which in the HB the whole nation enters the covenant, whereas according to the scrolls the individual "after careful consideration" can decide to enter or not (ibid. 72). He does not see the changed role of the covenant idea, according to which it serves in the scrolls as yet another aspect that defines the special status of the Community in relation to God which Israel as a whole cannot have.

<sup>29</sup> "(...) Then he will be pleasing (niph.) in acceptable atonement before God (...)."

<sup>30</sup> In the HB, רצה it is often used referring to sacrifices which please God.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. pp. 48-51.

<sup>32</sup> As we have seen above, the adoption of the phrase "doing what is good and just before God" from 2.C. 31:20 indicates the same sense of לפני: referring to the status and function of the Community as a permanent sacrifice to God on behalf of the rest of Israel (cf. above).

described **לפני אל**. **לפני** refers here again to a close relationship between the Community and God.

#### 1QS V 20

In V 20, we find a usage of **לפני** that is surprising for 1QS and represents probably a relic of the HB understanding of the word. Here, **לפני** is used to refer to human existence before God in general:

"(19) (...) And all those who reject his word he shall cause to vanish from the earth and all their deeds of uncleaness (20) before him (...)."

This seems to represent the basic idea of **לפני** in the HB according to which every human exists in relation to the Creator and God Almighty. In this sense, every human action happens before God. But **לפני** in this general sense occurs only here and in 1QS XI 21.

#### 1QS XI 17

In this line, **לפני** is used as in 1QS I 2, but its combination with the verb **יצב** (hit.) adds a further notion to its meaning:

"Blessed be you my God, who opens to knowledge (16) the heart of your servant. Establish (**הוכן**) in justice all His deeds, and as it is your pleasure (**רציתיה**) to act for the chosen ones of humanity (**לבחירי אדם**), raise up the son of your handmaid to stand (**התיצב**) before you (**לפניכה**) for ever."

The elected men, i.e. the members of the Community, have an everlasting special relationship with God according to which they live *in company* with God in their Community. This usage of **לפני** indicates as well that God was most likely understood as being immanently present in the Community.

The meaning of **יצב** (hit.) in the DSS referring to life in the Community as an institutionalised cultic-religious gathering in relation to God strengthens this interpretation of **לפני**.<sup>33</sup> As such, life in the Community according to 1QS XI 17 would be understood as happening in company with God.

1QS XI 21

**לפני** in this line is used to set humans and God into relation and is, as in 1QS V 20, used in a broader sense than in 1QS I 2:

"(...) As what shall one born of a woman be considered before you"

Being still part of the blessing (cf. XI 16), it is used to say that man is nothing in comparison with God.

### 5.1.2. Describing Aspects of the Organisation Pattern of the Community.

**לפני** is used 10 times in 1QS to describe certain aspects of the organisation pattern of the Community. The fact that **לפני** occurs quite often in this sense depends to a great extent on the nature of 1QS describing the Community (as rule of the Community). But it also shows that 1QS is dealing with a deeply religious Community that is mostly concerned about its relation to God. Hence, there are two sides of **לפני** in this category: **לפני** describes the relation between two people or groups within the Community, and at the same time transfers theological significance onto the organisation pattern of the Community.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. the chapter on **יצב** (pp. 166-173) where I investigate how **הרתיצב** is used in the HB referring to an action before God or before a sacred place (Jos. 24:1; 1.S. 10:19). This might indicate that in 1QS XI 16f. the Community itself is understood as this sacred place (on **יצב** in 1QS XI 16f. see pp. 169f.).

This gives the verb **הרתיצב** the notion of "presenting oneself to God", strengthening the idea according to which life in the Community before God is understood as a permanent sacrifice. The fact that XI 17 occurs in a blessing (1QS XI 15-22) confirms this observation.

By using לפני to describe the relations of members or groups in the Community, the authors indicate that the whole structure of the Community is the condition for *and* part of the special status of the Community in relation to God. By using לפני in this manner, the organisation pattern of the Community receives a significant theological function which is to provide the framework for a perfect life in the Community *in company with God*. At the same time, the organisation pattern as it is described in IQS gives the Community the *necessary quality* to accommodate the nearness of God *per se*. By using לפני in this sense, the authors of IQS create another area by means of which the nearness of God in the Community is possible.

There are two different senses of לפני in this category. The first one is concerned with the "ranking" of the members of the Community. In four cases (V 23; VI 4,11, and 26) לפני is used to describe certain details about the ranking; one member is said to be "before" the other.<sup>34</sup>

The second usage of לפני in this category occurs five times (VI 1(2x), 10,15; VII 23). Here it refers to an action which is undertaken before certain people of the Community or even certain institutions in the Community. This usage of לפני is reminiscent of the context of a summon to appear "before" a court. This is its special meaning here, the court being "the many" (VI 1,15,23), or "witnesses" (VI 1) and "the brothers" (VI 10).<sup>35</sup>

<sup>34</sup> V 23: "and they shall be recorded one before another, according to one's insight and one's deeds, (...)."  
 VI 4: "everybody shall sit according to his rank before him [priest]".  
 VI 11: "(10) (...) And neither should he speak before one whose rank is listed (11) before his own. (...)"  
 VI 26: "(...) defying the authority of his fellow who is enrolled before him,".

<sup>35</sup> Worth mentioning is VII 23 where "being before the many" is understood as being identical with "being a member of the Community".

The only remaining occurrence of לפני is in IV 2, where it is used as part of a phrase which roughly means "to show": "(...) to enlighten the heart of man, straighten out before him all paths of true justice (...)."

### 5.1.3. לפני in its Simplest Sense.

The last category simply contains occurrences (only three) where לפני occurs in a geographical sense (somebody standing "in front" of somebody or something) or in a temporal sense (something happens "before" something else).<sup>36</sup>

### 5.2. 1QH

In 1QH, לפני is used to describe the relationship between humans and God too. It is used only in the sense of *before* God.<sup>37</sup> The sense "in company with" that is so decisive in 1QS does not occur directly. There are only a few occurrences that might relate to it. The usage of לפני in 1QH is closer to the usage of the word in the HB than the one in 1QS. The usages of לפני in 1QS and 1QH do not contradict one another, however, but emphasise different notions.

The biggest difference between the 1QS and the 1QH usage of לפני is that in the former scroll it is used to relate to the *Community* with God; this depends on the genre of 1QS, לפני defining the relationship between the Community and God as "life of the Community in company with God". In the latter scroll, לפני defines the relationship of the helpless and powerless individual and the helping and powerful God; this again depends on the genre of 1QH (hymns uttered to God), but shows also that this relationship between the individual and God is the issue in this scroll.

Generally, the occurrences of לפני in 1QH can be subdivided into three categories:<sup>38</sup>

<sup>36</sup> Occurrences here are: II 12; VII 12; (IX 22;) and carrying the temporal sense: III 15.

<sup>37</sup> Except in three cases where לפני is used within the plant-imagery in XV 23; XVI 25; XVIII 32.

<sup>38</sup> Excluding its usage within the plant-imagery (see above). Three lines are damaged to a degree that a

1. Everything stands in relation to God.
2. Man stands in relation to affliction.
3. The Community stands in relation to God.

לפני in 1QH is used rather to state that man and the Community stands in relation to evil and God than to describe what the nature of this relation precisely is. Unlike 1QS, 1QH does not define the relationship between the Community and God.

### 5.2.1. Everything Stands in Relation to God

לפני in 1QH is used to state that everything and everybody stands in relation to God, i.e. before God. Nothing exists without this relation to God. This notion of the meaning of לפני can especially be seen in IX 24:

"(23) (...) Everything (24) has been engraved (חֲקוּקָ) before you (לפניכֶה)

with the stylus of remembrance (...)."<sup>39</sup>

IV 14 uses לפני in the same manner stating that the descendants of those "who serve you [God] loyally" are before God.

But in 1QH, לפני is not simply used to refer to the fact that nothing exists on earth without relation to God, but also to the nature of this relation: dependency of the helpless and sinful human on the almighty God. This notion is lacking in 1QS entirely. לפני is used in this sense especially in XVIII 11:

"(10) (...) And who (11) among all your wonderful great creatures will have the strength

to stand (לְהִתְיַצֵּב) before you?"

---

comment on the meaning of לפני is not possible: VII 28 (Martinez/Tigchelaar) = VII 25 (J. Maier) = XV 25 (K.G. Kuhn); VIII 22,23 (Martinez/ Tigchelaar) = VIII 14,15 (J. Maier) = XVI 14,15 (K.G. Kuhn).

<sup>39</sup> The usage of חֲקוּקָ in Prov. 8:29 ("when He marked out the pillars of the earth") suggests this meaning of לפני as well: the world can only exist before God.

Also in XV 30, the helplessness of humans is indicated through **לפני**. Here it is "forgiveness" (**סליחה**)<sup>40</sup> that is needed before God that reflects human helplessness and dependence.

Another means by which the authors of IQH expresses this relationship between humans and God by using **לפני** is by relating humans to the "anger" (XV 29) or the "wrath" (XX 18,30) of God. Humans are powerless standing<sup>41</sup> before God's anger or wrath. They depend entirely on Him.

This dependence is also clear in those lines where **לפני** is used to relate the sinful humans to God the judge (final judgement). Especially in XX 28, **לפני** is used in this manner:

"(...) How will he stand (**יתיצב**) before (**לפני**) the one who reproves him (**מוכיח בו**)?"

The same usage of **לפני** seems to apply in XV 28.<sup>42</sup>

### 5.2.2. Man stands in Relations to Affliction

Theologically one of the reasons why humans are standing before God helplessly, as seen under 1., is because they stand in relation to evil as well. To fight "afflictions", humans need the help of God. This again shows the helplessness of humans and their dependence on God. According to IQH, humans exist only before the almighty God and depend on Him. The Hebrew word used for "affliction" is always **נגע** (IX 32; X 7; XII 36; XVII 12). God helps, according to these lines, the humans against (**לפני**) this "affliction". **לפני**, therefore, is here

<sup>40</sup> **סליחה** occurs only in Ps. 130:4 (cf. also Sir. 5:5). The whole Psalm is about the helpless human who depends entirely on God. In IQH, **סליחה** is used often: XIII 2; XIV 9; XV 18,30,35; XVII 13,34; XVIII 21; XIX 9,31, but only once in IQS: II 15.

<sup>41</sup> In XV 29 and XX 30, the verb used is **התיצב** (cf. p. 172). XX 18 is damaged, but reveals the same usage of **לפני**.

<sup>42</sup> "Who is like you, **אדרני**, among the gods? Who is like your truth? Who is just before you when he goes to court? (...)"

used in the sense of "against" referring to the humans relation to "afflictions" and the helping God.

### 5.2.3. The Community Stands in Relation to God

לפני in this category refers not only to the individual before God, but to the Community before God. Some interesting aspects of this relationship are revealed in the relevant occurrences. But what does not occur here is the meaning of לפני of "in company with [God]". לפני does not refer to life in the Community in company with God, as it does in IQS, but to the unique and special relationship of the Community with God in which the word does not lose its IQH-meaning describing the weak human and the almighty God.

In this category, לפני is always used in combination with either עמד or מעמד.<sup>43</sup> But the contexts of the lines where לפני occurs like this differ in a way that makes an analysis of each occurrences necessary.

In XII 21, the meaning of לפני must be seen against the background of the usage of לפני in IQH. Hence, לפני refers here primarily to the good relationship with God:

"(...) Those in your נפש stand (עמד) before you forever and those walking on the path of your heart

(22) will be established permanently.(...)"

But the notion of eternity and "walking on the path of your heart" indicate that the Community is meant to stand before the almighty God.

XV 31 is very interesting, because it defines "standing before Him" as the aim of life in the Community:

"(...) to make them stand (להעמידם) before you (לפניכה) for ever and ever (...)"

<sup>43</sup> See pp. 156-159 on מעמד, and pp. 190f. on עמד.

Forgiveness (I.30, see above) and purification are the conditions for **לפניכה עמד**. But this occurrence also refers to a special relationship only between the Community and God, not to an immanent presence of God.

XII 36 is of importance, because it gives the Community a function:

"and my spirit (ורוחי) kept firm (החזיקה) in the standing place (מעמד) against (לפני) affliction (נגע) (...)"

According to this line, being a member of the Community seems to be understood to help against (לפני) affliction by itself. Hence, the Community, or aspects of it, take over the role of the helping God. The Community becomes the stronghold against afflictions and, therefore, inherits a close relationship with God.

According to XIX 13, the Community stands in a special relationship with God:

"(...) and to stand at a place (ולדתיצב במעמד) before you (לפניכה)

with the perpetual host and the spirits (...)"

Although **לפני** is not used to refer to a life "in company with" God, this occurrence shows that the Community is closer to God than the rest of Israel and that it is the location of His nearness.

The remaining line is XV 14 where **לפני** occurs in a phrase that is very similar to the one in IQS I 8:

"(14) (...) and with your truth to straighten my steps and the paths of justice,

to walk before you (להתהלך לפניך) on the frontier (15) of I[ife] (...)"

**לפני** in this line, given its usage throughout IQH certainly refers to a special relationship between the members of the Community and God. But because this is the only occasion where **לפני** is used as in IQS, it might well be that here this relationship includes a life in company with God. His immanent presence, however, is not mentioned.

## 6. הלך

After examining the meaning of a word that is in IQS/H used to describe directly how certain actions of the Community or life in the Yahad in general related to God (*i.e.* לפני), we will now turn to a verb that is used in these scrolls to refer to life in the Community in particular. The authors of IQS/H use the verb הלך to refer to the particular way of conduct which the Community's status in relation to God requires. The usage of הלך shows that this life in the Yahad requires a special behaviour and state of mind to focus on fostering and improving the Community's special relationship with God. הלך will also show that every individual member of the Community has to engage (perfectly) in this way of life.

The following chapter will analyse the meaning of הלך in IQS/H in detail and outline how the word describes life in the Community in relation to God.

### 6.1. IQS

הלך occurs in IQS no fewer than 42 times. The significance of this verb with respect to the Divine presence lies in the fact that the authors of IQS describe life in the Community by using it very frequently; and its meaning in IQS might show in what relation life in the Community stands to God. This relationship then might indicate how Divine presence itself is understood in IQS. The importance of this verb, in fact, can be seen best at its occurrence in IQS I 8, where the purpose of life in the Community in relation to God is lined out. Here it is not only used to describe actions of the Community, but also to refer to an action carried out

לפני God. In this line, הלך occurs in the following phrase as indicating the purpose of the Community:

"to be unified in the counsel of God and to walk before Him perfectly"

להיחד בעצת אל ולהתהלך לפניו תמים

Because this occurrence of הלך is so significant in this line, this study will focus first on it, comparing the wording with the HB. We shall then investigate the remaining occurrences of הלך in 1QS.

### 6.1.1. 1QS I 8

The meaning of הלך in the phrase ולהתהלך לפניו תמים in 1QS I 8 can only be understood in comparison with and on the basis of the meaning of הלך in the HB because in the HB we can find clearly similar phrases that served as *Vorlage*.

Generally, הלך in the HB is used frequently.<sup>1</sup> The most common denotations in the qal, the piel, and the hithpael are "to walk"<sup>2</sup>, "to stroll" or "to live"<sup>3</sup>, "to go away"<sup>4</sup>, but also "to let go"<sup>5</sup> in the hiphil. In his detailed analysis of the meaning of הלך in the HB, Helfmeyer distinguishes between a "secular" and a "theological" use of the verb.<sup>6</sup> The latter is the significant one for the use of הלך in 1QS I 8, especially because, according to Helfmeyer, one of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. G. Lisowsky, *Konkordanz*, 412-424.

<sup>2</sup> W. Gesenius, *Handwörterbuch*, 180.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 181.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 181.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 182.

<sup>6</sup> F.J. Helfmeyer, *art. הלך* [TDOT III, 1974] 388-403.

Because Helfmeyer defines the meaning of הלך in the HB within a model of the literary development of the HB which does not apply for the interpretation of the HB material from the perspective of the authors of 1QS and 1QH, we need to analyse the relevant occurrences of הלך from a different perspective.

its major theological uses is in the sense of "walking before God",<sup>7</sup> and also "to live".<sup>8</sup>

In IQS I 8, we find the following phrase:

waw copula - particle ל - inf. cstr. hithp. of הלך + לפני with a suff. of 3. sg. m. (+  
adjective/adverb תמים).

The verb in the infinitive refers to the members of the Community, the suffix which is attached to לפני refers to God. In the HB, similar phrases occur seven times: Gen. 17:1; 24:40; 48:15; 2.K. 20:3; Ps. 56:14; 116:9; and Isa. 38:3. Each time with הלך in the hithpael, but not always in the infinitive. The subject is always a human being. Each time לפני follows התהלך. And in five cases (Gen. 17:1; 24:40; 48:15; 2.K. 20:3; Isa. 38:3), לפני carries a suffix. This suffix refers always to God (four times to יהוה, once to אלהים (Gen. 48:15)). In the remaining two cases לפני does not carry a suffix, but refers directly to אלהים (Ps. 56:14) or to יהוה (Ps. 116:9) as object.

There are also three more occurrences of הלך in the HB where it occurs in almost the same phrase as in IQS I 8, i.e. הלך followed by לפני which carries a suffix referring either to יהוה (to 1.K. 3:6; 9:4//2.Chr. 7:17) or to the ארון (2.S. 6:4), except that הלך occurs here not in the hithpael, but the qal.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 392f.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 393.

<sup>9</sup> 1.K. 3:6: 3. pers. sg. m. qal perf. (כאשר הלך לפניך).

1.K. 9:4: 2. pers. sg. m. qal imp. (ואתה אמתלך לפני).

2.S. 6:4: part. masc. sg. abs. qal (אחיו הלך לפני הארון).

It is the differences between the phrases in the HB and IQS I 8 that will determine the meaning of the phrase in IQS I 8.

Analysing the phrases the first observation that comes into focus is the fact that the subject in the phrases in the HB is always a human being who has a special relationship with God. It is either the chosen Abram, the father of the people of God (Gen. 17:1; 24:40; 48:15 (Abram and Isaac)), king David, the king who has been chosen by God to lead His people (1.K. 3:6; 9:4//2.Chr. 7:17), the King-prophet Hezekiah (2.K. 20:3; Isa. 38:3), the psalmist praying to God (Ps. 56:14; 116:9), or Ahio who walks before the Ark (2.S. 6:4). Hence, the ones who are "walking before God" are always distinct leaders (politically and religiously) of the chosen people of God.

The second observation is linked with the first. Since the subjects of the phrases are always men with a special relationship with God, one of the purposes of this phrase in the HB seems to be to express a very immediate, strong, and direct relationship between those chosen men and God. In all these cases, the action of "walking before God" seems to be understood as an action which is located very closely to God.

Analysing the *Vorlagen* of IQS I 8, Gen. 17:1 in particular has a special function, because its structure is almost identical<sup>10</sup> with the structure of the phrase in IQS I 8, and it seems that it is this verse in particular that the authors of IQS I 8 modify:<sup>11</sup>

"When Abram was ninety-nine years old, JHWH appeared to Abram, and said to him, 'I am God Almighty;

walk before me, and be blameless."

הַתְּהַלֵּךְ לִפְנֵי וְהָיָה תָמִים

<sup>10</sup> The only difference is that Gen. 17:1 reads וְהָיָה preceding the adjective תָּמִים whereas IQS I 8 uses תָּמִים as an adverb.

<sup>11</sup> Again I will interpret the HB-material, Gen. 17:1, from the perspective of the authors of IQS, because this is the only way to understand the modifications made by the scroll and, hence, the meaning of IQS I 8.

For a detailed analysis and scholarly literature on Gen. 17 see especially G.J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50* [World Biblical Commentary 2; Dallas, Texas: Word Books Publisher, 1994] 14-32; C. Westermann, *Genesis, 2. Teilband, Genesis 12-36* [Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament I/2; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981] 303-328, literature on pp.301-303.

Here, the "walking before JHWH" is not only based on a special relationship with God, but on the appearance of God Himself to Abram (וירא יהוה אל-אברם). Abraham "sees" JHWH, he stands "opposite" Him and experiences Him. This might mean that a revelation of God is the condition of "walking before Him". According to 1QS "walking before God" also depends on actions of God that qualify the Community to live a life before God. These actions are the predestination and the election by God. God always wanted the Community to have this special relationship with Him and has chosen it for this purpose. The adoption of the phrase "walking before God" from Gen. 17:1 gives the authors of 1QS I 8 the opportunity to emphasise that life in the Community happens in a special and unique relationship with God which God Himself established.

This leads to another significant aspect of "walking before God" that the authors of 1QS adopted from Gen. 17:1. In Gen. 17:1, "walking before God" does not simply refer to one single action of Abram, but to his *entire life*. According to Gen. 17:1, "God directs Abram to live life before him, a life in which every step is taken looking to God and every day of which is accompanied by him"<sup>12</sup>. "Walking before God" refers in Gen. 17:1 and in 1QS I 8 to the entire lives of chosen people who stand in a special relationship with God doing His will.

The reason why "walking before God" refers to the entire lives of the chosen ones lies in the nature of the *agreement* between the two parties, God and Abram/Community. This nature is described in Gen. 17:1 and 1QS I 8 in the following ways.

Gen. 17:1 introduces as agreement between God and Abram the covenant of circumcision, ברית מילה.<sup>13</sup> This covenant, according to the HB, defines a very special, very intimate, and very direct relationship between God and Abram. "Walking before God" is understood as the

<sup>12</sup> G.J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50* [World Biblical Commentary 2; Dallas, Texas: Word Books Publisher, 1994] 20.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. G. Vermes, *An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* [London: SCM Press, 1999] 146.

consequence of this agreement. Standing in this direct relationship with God means to live according to the will of God, which is why this relationship, the covenant, affects every aspect of life of those who participate in it.

At Qumran, "the concept of covenant is an important one in several of the documents found at Qumran"<sup>14</sup>. The  $\text{קנין}$  was very much concerned with "circumcision" as a state of life.<sup>15</sup>

The usage of the phrase "walking before God" indicates that the authors of 1QS claim that this covenant, once manifested between God and the Community, is now the new agreement between God and the Community.<sup>16</sup> The idea of the covenant has been adopted by the authors of the scrolls. But, following their usual method of using HB-material, the understanding of the concept of the covenant has been changed to an extent that it no longer seems to be appropriate to state that "the covenant mentioned in these works [DSS] is considered the same agreement as the one made and renewed in the Hebrew scriptures"<sup>17</sup>. Yes, the idea of an agreement between God and human beings called "covenant" is still the same. But in the scrolls the nature of this agreement is understood somewhat differently. The covenant leads to different consequences for the nature of the human beings involved than in the HB.

The first difference is that the scrolls, especially 1QS, consider only the covenant between God and the Community "to be the sole valid form of eternal alliance between God and Israel"<sup>18</sup>. In fact, the way in which especially 1QS and 1QH emphasise the special relationship between the Community and God, the special nature of the Community in relation to God,

<sup>14</sup> J.C. VanderKam, *art. Covenant*, in: L.H. Schiffman/ J.C. VanderKam (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000] 152

<sup>15</sup> A detailed analysis of the idea of the covenant in 1QS and 1QH is beyond the scope of this study. I will only comment on relevant aspects of the idea.

<sup>16</sup> J.C. VanderKam, *art. Covenant*, in: L.H. Schiffman/ J.C. VanderKam (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000] 153.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 152.

Cf. also S. Talmon, *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: Between Judaism and Christianity*, in: E. Ulrich/ J. VanderKam (ed.), *The Notre Dame Symposium in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994] 13.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. G. Vermes, *An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* [London: SCM Press, 1999] 147.

and the role of the Community as the "bridge" between the rest of Israel and God, indicates strongly that the authors of these scrolls did not have a continuation or renewal of the covenant between God and Israel in mind. But they understand this covenant as an entirely new phenomenon that is mentioned in the HB only once: in Gen. 17:1. This new covenant focuses entirely on the relationship between God and the Community. This separates the Community effectively from the rest of Israel. And it affects the nature of the Community: this covenant allows the Community to fulfil perfectly all requirements that the agreement, as described in Gen. 17, demands. This fulfilment changes the nature of the Community in a way that enables it to "accommodate" Divine presence in its midst.

The second difference lies in the description of the nature of the relationship between God and human beings in the covenant. In Gen. 17:1, God is still pictured as the divine personality which stands way above the human being. The idea of "walking before God", as it occurs in the HB, means a *complete dependence on and distinction from* the divinity who is in nature and location separated from the human beings.<sup>19</sup> This idea changes radically in IQS. The authors of IQS use the concept of covenant to show that the Community is able, through predestination and its perfect life according to the will of God,<sup>20</sup> to achieve a status that allows them to be *much closer* to God than any other human being, including Abram, before. In fact, in the scrolls, it is specifically the purpose of the concept of covenant to demonstrate that the Community has the qualities necessary to be near to God. According to the scrolls, the covenant is not only an agreement, but actually changes the nature of the Community so that it can be close to God. Living in the covenant means for the Community to be able to live in God's nearness.

<sup>19</sup> Looking only at the phrase's use in the HB, Helfmeyer emphasises only the latter aspect of the verb's meaning in Gen. 17:1 (F.J. Helfmeyer, *art.* **לָלַךְ** [TDOT III, 1974] 392).

<sup>20</sup> Note that **בְּרִית** is used in the scrolls also explicitly referring to a group of people, who do the will of God, cf. for example IQS V 11,18 (cf. E. Kutsch, *art.* *Bund* [TRE VII; Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1981] 404).

The comparison between Gen. 17:1 and 1QS I 8 offers two factors that demonstrate this also.

1.) As seen above, the usage of תמים most likely indicates that Abram was understood, from the perspective of the interpreting authors of 1QS, to have the quality that תמים stands for: the quality of sacrificial animals to be sacrificed to God.<sup>21</sup> God commands Abram to be תמים,<sup>22</sup> and it is only this quality that allows Abram to engage into such a close relationship with God.<sup>23</sup> The authors of 1QS, on the other hand, adopt this idea and claim that the Community fulfils this divine commandment perfectly and permanently by living a perfect life according to the will of God. This allows them to have a status in relation to God already, particularly in the sacral/Temple/sacrificial sphere. Consequently, "walking before God and being perfect" refers to this special relationship with God. It means, in 1QS I 8, living a life according to the will of God by having a status that means to be much closer to God than any other human being. "Walking before God and being perfect" means to have a special nature that allows the nearness of Divine presence.<sup>24</sup>

2.) The second factor that may indicate that we find a different understanding of "covenant" in 1QS than in the HB is the usage of לפני. My analysis of לפני in the HB and the scrolls

<sup>21</sup> See for תמים pp. 51-58.

<sup>22</sup> Wenham calls this "an extreme demand" (G.J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50* [World Biblical Commentary 2; Dallas, Texas: Word Books Publisher, 1994] 20.), which suggests correctly that being תמים does not simply refer to a profane code of social behaviour as Westermann suggests (see below).

<sup>23</sup> Westermann suggests that תמים "könnte mit Luther: "...und sei fromm" übersetzt werden oder mit Neueren: "unsträflich", aber beide Übersetzungen geben das Hebräische Wort nicht genau wieder, das weder einen moralischen noch religiösen Klang hat, sondern bewusst *profan* ist" (C. Westermann, *Genesis, 2. Teilband, Genesis 12-36* [Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament I/2; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981] 312). Even though Westermann does not interpret Gen. 17:1 from the perspective of the scrolls, it seems to be hardly possible that the word could have been understood without its religious connotation, *i.e.* sacrifices, in Gen. 17:1. But the idea that people, who are "walking before God" being תמים, gives them a different quality that allows them to accommodate the nearness of God, is certainly a very fine example of Qumranian usage and interpretation of HB-material.

<sup>24</sup> Other usages of תמים in the HB lead into the same direction. Used as an attribute of human beings, it occurs seven times in the sense of "innocent" (Gen. 6:9; 17:1; Ez. 28:15; Ps. 37:18, Prov. 2:21; 11:5; 28:10) and also in the sense of "faithful" (Dtn. 18:13; Ps. 18:24). These denotations refer to the blamelessness of a תמים person, a characteristic that in some (HB-)sense qualifies also to be close to God.

has shown that the HB prefers to read **בעיני** ("in the eyes of") God meaning "under the observation" of God and defining God as the authority above the humans.<sup>25</sup> Even for humans in the covenant with God, God is the distant and unapproachable one. It is only in Gen. 17:1 where the authors of the HB chose **לפני** and not **בעיני**. This indicates that only here, between Abram and God, we find a special relationship. And this is precisely what the authors of 1QS use. They claim a status for the Community in relation to God that in the HB is mentioned only in this single verse. Gen. 17:1 indicates a special covenant between *one* person and God. 1QS develops this into a concept and claims it for the entire Community.

In the HB, there are a few more phrases, in 1.K. 3:6; 9:4; 2.K. 20:3,<sup>26</sup> that are almost identical with the one in Gen.17:1, but these add a few aspects to the meaning of **הלך** that are also significant for study of 1QS I 8.

1.K. 3:6 reads as follows:

כאשר הלך לפניך באמת בצדקה ובישרת לבב עמך.

According to this, elements of "walking before God" are also "truth/faithfulness", "righteousness", and "uprightness of the heart". These must be the nature and the deeds of a man who can enter the special relationship with God which is described through the phrase "walking before God".

1.K. 9:3 enumerates more elements which also constitute, or at least are linked with, a **תמים** man:

ואתה אסתלך לפני כאשר הלך דוד

אביך בתם־לבב ובישר לעשות ככל אשר צויתוך חקי ומשפטי תשמר

<sup>25</sup> See on **לפני** in 1QS I 8 especially pp. 205f..

<sup>26</sup> From his perspective Helfmeyer sees a close connection in meaning between the phrase in Gen. 17:1 and 1.K. 3:6 and 9:4 too (F.J. Helfmeyer, *art.* **הלך** [TDOT III, 1974] 393).

"Uprightness" is here as well mentioned as an element of "walking before God", as well as the notion of observing the Law.

2.K. 20:3 emphasises again other elements which are part of "walking before God":

אנה יהוה זכרנא את אשר התהלכתי לפניך באמת ובלבב שלם והטוב בעיניך  
עשיתי ויבך חזקיהו בכי גדול

"Faithfulness" appears here, along with a pointed reference to "doing good in God's sight".<sup>27</sup>

This means that doing good is part of a life (הלך) with God.

All these additional elements mentioned in connection with the phrase in the Books of Kings describe the action of "walking before God" in more detail. The interesting aspect at this point is that most of them play a significant role in the theology unfolded in IQS. Hence, it is not only the grammatical identity or similarity that shows the dependence of IQS I 8 on its *Vorlagen* in the HB, but also the fact that precisely those aspects of הלך found in Gen. 17:1 and the book of Kings are used in the scrolls and developed into fundamental notions of the teachings in the scrolls.<sup>28</sup>

This usage of הלך in IQS once more shows the method of the authors of IQS and IQH, as they adopted words or phrases from the HB with significant theological modifications.<sup>29</sup> This method is motivated by the attempt to emphasise and to prove that the Community has a special relationship with God.<sup>30</sup> Consequently, the phrase "walking before God" does not

<sup>27</sup> See on טוב in combination with בעיני especially p. 121<sub>15</sub>. On טוב in the HB pp. 119-121.

<sup>28</sup> The fact that the authors of IQS use these verses from 1./2. Kings might also indicate that they see the Community as a group located in the royal court or entourage. The adoption of certain usages of לפני (see above) indicates the same because, apart from its usage in Priestly legislation referring to acts of worship, לפני is also a term in royal vocabulary (cf. Gen. 41:46; 43:15; Ex. 9:10; 1.S. 16:22; 1.K. 10:8; 2.Chr. 29:11; etc.). In Persian times one makes respects, etc. "before" the king (cf. Aramaic Ezra/ Daniel, קדם פלכא).

<sup>29</sup> הלך is only used three times in IQS in its most common HB-meaning: "to walk" in a physical sense. The other occurrences reflect the special understanding of the word in IQS.

<sup>30</sup> Hence, one cannot claim that "der sprachliche Befund [regarding the "path-theology" in the scrolls of which הלך is a central part] unterscheidet sich sonach nur unwesentlich vom alttestamentlichen, die leichte Be-

mean precisely the same in IQS as it does in the HB. In comparison with its *Vorlagen* in the HB, "walking before God" means in IQS I 8 the following.

(1.) While in the HB the subjects of the phrase are distinct religious leaders who have a special relationship with God, in IQS I 8 the subjects are now *all* members of the Community, indicating that the Community as a whole is understood as being essential for the relationship between man (especially Israel) and God, and that it inherits a special relationship with God.

(2.) In the HB, these leaders are chosen by God (cf. Abram and David). Generally this privilege becomes transferred onto the Community in IQS; but according to IQS, election is only a condition for the Community to improve its relationship with God; in contrast to the *Vorlagen* in the HB, IQS emphasises the initiative of the members of the Community, rather than the initiative of God.<sup>31</sup> (3.) "Walking before God" in the HB is meant to be an action very close to God implying a strong, direct, and immediate personal relationship with God which still distinguishes man "geographically" and by nature from the Divinity. IQS, on the other hand, claims that the Community as a whole already has this status of a direct and immediate relationship with God. This relationship is thought to be of a permanent nature, whereas the *Vorlagen* refer rather to isolated encounters between God and human beings. (4.) In IQS, the difference between the sphere of God and life in the Community has been neglected. IQS suggests on occasions that the Community participates in the heavenly world, and is capable of ordering its relationship to God in a way not envisaged by the HB.

Some of these points become clearer when we return to a consideration of Gen. 17:1, which holds a special place for this investigation.<sup>32</sup>

---

deutungsentwicklung verläuft ganz auf der im Alten Testament gezogenen Linie" (F. Nötscher, *Gotteswege und Menschenwege in der Bibel und in Qumran* [BBB 15; Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag G.M.B.H., 1958] 74). F. Nötscher does not see the manner in which the authors of especially IQS, but also IQH, use the HB-material. Essential modifications are usually motivated by the claim that the Community has a special relationship with God that leads to nearness with Him.

<sup>31</sup> Hence, Nötscher states correctly that *הלך* in the HB is used to describe the relationship between God and Israel, whereby it is God who turns towards Israel by *הלך* (cf. Ex. 13:21; 33:14; Hab. 3:6), not Israel living towards Him, as IQS and IQH use it (F. Nötscher, *Gotteswege und Menschenwege*, 32-34).

Gen. 17:1 defines "walking before God" not as an isolated action under the observation of God, but as *life in covenant* before God. IQS I 8 adopts this notion and develops it to one of the most striking aspects of the teachings and understanding of the Community. Because the whole Community has this covenant with God, IQS subsumes under this idea all other aspects that are significant for the religious life in the Community. Living in the covenant with God means to observe the Law and the rules of the Community,<sup>33</sup> to love the truth, to be faithful, righteous, and upright, and to do good. All these aspects of being תמיים are already mentioned in the *Vorlagen* of IQS I 8, as seen above. In fact, the opening of IQS, and the legislation which follows, allows the divine command which was given to Abram to be put into effect. It is clear from IQS I 1-10 that the יחד comes into existence precisely *so that* people may "walk before God and be perfect"! But it is, according to the self-understanding of the Community, only the Community that can achieve this and that can engage in this close relationship with God.

In Gen. 17:1, a condition of the command to live this life before God is a revelation of God Himself. IQS seems to claim that only the Community has revelations, and has the means to interpret them perfectly. These means are given to them by God (revelations) through special *insight*.

Gen. 17:1 defines the special nature of the person who "walks before God". This person has to be תמיים. IQS develops this notion also, and claims that the whole Community has this nature permanently which qualifies its members to accommodate Divine presence.

<sup>32</sup> F. Nötscher (F. Nötscher, *ibid.*, 80) sees that IQS I 8 is linked with Gen. 17:1, but does not explore matters further. He also fails to see the impact of the words תמיים and לפני on the meaning of הלך (see below for details).

<sup>33</sup> Cf. especially IQS VIII 20,21; IX 12.

Gen. 17:1 is probably the only occasion where **לפני** is used in the HB to describe life in a special and close relationship with God. But 1QS develops the sense of **לפני** further, using it in the sense of "in company with", indicating that the relationship between Community and God is even more intense than the one described in Gen. 17:1.

**הלך** in 1QS I 8, therefore, means to live a privileged life in the Community with all its implications in company with God having a special status that qualifies for the permanent presence of God's.

#### 6.1.2. The Remaining Occurrences of **הלך** in 1QS

The specific 1QS usage and meaning of **הלך** can be seen best in its basic sense in 1QS VIII 13, where it means "to walk in the desert", i.e. *to live* in the desert. In 1QS, **הלך** refers to life in the Community, separated from the rest of Israel. Going to Qumran and living in the Community replaces those occasions, such as are described in Gen. 17:1, where God approaches human beings directly. Life in the Community means being in company with God *per se*, and this accounts for the fact that the path of God is no longer linked with theophanies, as F. Nötscher suggests.<sup>34</sup>

**הלך** describes two different notions of life in the Community:<sup>35</sup>

<sup>34</sup> F. Nötscher, *ibid.*, 76.

<sup>35</sup> Although **הלך** has only one meaning in 1QS, the usage of these notions is not entirely consistent. In fact, there seems to be a break in the usage between VII and VIII. The usage of **הלך** in I-VII seems to emphasise the aspect of separation between the Community and the outside world, its usage in VIII is more concerned about the social aspects of life within the Community. The break is not absolute. Usage of I-VII can be found in VIII-XI and vice-versa, but the differences are enough reason to question whether the two parts have been written by the same author. This strengthens Metso's findings who suggests, taking into account the 4QS material, that the "scribal sign at the end of column 1QS VII suggests a major break in the text here" (S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* [Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah XXI, Leiden/

### 6.1.2.1. הלך referring to the Way of Living in the Community in Contrast to the Outside World

הלך in this sense defines (politically and religiously) life in the religious Community of Qumran and separates the Community from the outside world. In this sense, הלך occurs seven times (I 6; II 14,26; V 4; VII 19,24; IX 9) in a word combination such as "walking in stubbornness of one's heart" (הלך בשרירות לב\*). Whenever this word combination occurs, it is used to demonstrate what the members of the Community are *not* like. According to 1QS "walking in stubbornness of one's heart" is a characteristic of the world members of the Community are separated from. הלך refers here to the unfaithful, or even evil, way of life outside the Community.

The same distinction is been made in 1QS through the idea of walking on *a good or evil path*. Walking on the good path stands for a life in the Community with all its implications and in a special relation to God, walking on the evil one represents life outside the Community disconnected from God. This usage of הלך occurs in III 20 referring to the "paths of light" (בדרכי אור יתהלכו) as life in the Community;<sup>36</sup> in III 21; IV 11,12 referring to the "paths of darkness" (ללכת בכול דרכי חושך) (IV 11)); and further in V 10f. speaking about the "paths of wickedness" (בדרך הרשעה) as life outside the Community.<sup>37</sup>

---

New York/ Köln 1997] 108) and that the "differences in style and vocabulary between 1QS VII and the beginning of 1QS VIII indicate that sections 1QS V-VII and VIII-IX did not originally belong together" (Ibid. 143). But an analysis of the literary development of the Community Rule material is neither the aim of this study, nor within its limits (cf. pp. 235-241; for literature see Metso, *ibid.*, 159-164, esp. 109<sup>4,5</sup>, 110<sup>6</sup>).

<sup>36</sup> Leaney renders הלך here with to "conduct themselves [Community]" (A.R.C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and its Meaning. Introduction, Translation and Commentary* [London: SCM Press LTD, 1966] 149).

<sup>37</sup> Similar, using the light-darkness imagery ("those who walk in darkness"), but not the concept of the different paths to distinguish the Community from the outside world, is XI 10.

As seen above, IQS refers to life in the Community also by combining הלך with תמים (III 9f.,<sup>38</sup> VIII 18,21; and IX 9) meaning to "live" (הלך) in the Community according to the will of God, whereby the members have a quality that gives them a special status in relation to God (תמים).<sup>39</sup> According to IX 9f., this way of life leads to a status of holiness of the members of the Community.<sup>40</sup> "Walking on God's paths" qualifies the Community to accommodate permanent Divine presence and to live in "perfection" in the permanent nearness of God.<sup>41</sup>

#### 6.1.2.2. הלך referring to Internal Matters of Life in the Community

Whenever הלך is used in this sense, it often refers to the same aspects as in I. (political and religious aspects of life in the Community), but it does so from a social perspective. הלך refers here to social behaviour in the Community according to the theological ideas of the Community. This shows that life in the Community, and the organisation pattern of the Community, can only be understood on the background of the idea of life in the Community in relation to God. This idea is the central concept that motivates and drives the Community.

<sup>38</sup> הלך in III 9f also not only refers to the "moralische Gebiet" of the "Wegtheologie" (F. Nötscher, *Gotteswege und Menschenwege*, 72), but to a life before God. The obedience of the Law is, as F. Nötscher points out correctly (ibid., 77), part of להלכת תמים נכול דרכי אל, but the aim of life in the Community is to gain nearness to God (against F. Nötscher, 77).

<sup>39</sup> Cf. pp. 51-58.

<sup>40</sup> IX 9f: "Men of holiness who walk in perfection".

For a detailed analysis of Holiness in the DSS see: J.A. Naudé, *Holiness in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, in: P.W. Flint/ J.C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years. A Comprehensive Assessment*, vol.2 [Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 1999] 171-199; and also H.K. Harrington, *Holiness and Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [DSD 8/2, 2001] 124-135; P.R. Davies, *The Torah at Qumran*, in: A.J. Avery-peck/ J. Neusner/ B.D. Chilton, *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 2: World View, Comparing Judaisms* [Handbook of Oriental Studies vl.57; Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 2001] 36-41.

<sup>41</sup> A "satzungsgemäße sittlich-religiöse Lebensführung" (F. Nötscher, *Gotteswege und Menschenwege*, 80) is, therefore, only one side of the coin. F. Nötscher does not discuss the different status that תמים indicates, and hence the significance of הלך, i.e. life in the Community, regarding a special relationship with God and His nearness.

"Walking before God" therefore, means to live in company with Him acting according to the rules of the Community.

Three times, הלך in 1QS means the social behaviour of the members in the Community with all its religious implications. "Walking" in this sense means living together with other members of the Community in accordance to the rules of the Community *to be close to God*. It refers to that sort of behaviour (life) which the teachings of 1QS require. This we find in VIII 2, where amongst "truth", "justice", "judgement", and "compassionate love", "humility to walk with another" (והצנע לכת איש עם) <sup>42</sup> is mentioned as aim of the "Community counsel" to teach the members of the Community. The same idea occurs in VIII 4, <sup>43</sup> and very clearly in IX 19, which talks about members who "walk perfectly with one another" in the Community. In VI 2, we are told that this social behaviour is significant for the members, no matter which function they have in the Community. <sup>44</sup> הלך refers here to the place where a member is supposed to be and to live according to the organisation pattern of the Community. In IX 6, "walking in perfection" refers to the everyday life of every member in the Community. Finally, הלך as a way of living influences also the "divisions" (IV 15) as part of the Community's organisation pattern.

Three times in 1QS, the rules of the Community, rather than the Law or the prophets (!), are mentioned as the basis of הלך in the sense of social behaviour. VIII 20 as an introduction to certain Laws makes this clear: "These are the laws/regulations by which the men of the perfect holiness walk amongst each other." In VIII 21, it is stated that the members of the Community "walk on a perfect path as He commanded". And finally, IX 12 as an introduction to

<sup>42</sup> The translation is based on Michah 6:8, and is usually taken to mean "walking humbly".

<sup>43</sup> "(...) and to walk with everyone in the measure of the truth and the regulation of time. (...)"

<sup>44</sup> "(1) (...) in this way (2) they shall walk in all their places of residence (...)."

rules or regulations for the "instructor" (אלה החוקים למשכיל) refers also to this meaning of הלך.

## 6.2. 1QH

Remarkably, הלך has the same meaning in 1QH as it has in 1QS despite the fact that some notions of the word's meaning are different as a result of the poetic genre of the scroll. הלך refers to life in the Community fulfilling the will of God.

There are four occurrences (XII 21,24; XIV 6f.; XV 14) where הלך clearly shows this meaning. In three of these cases, הלך occurs in combination with בדרך לבכה: walking in the path of God's heart.<sup>45</sup> Especially, the sense of the phrase in XII 21 and 24 show that life in the Community in relation to God (cf. "established permanently" (XII 21)) and to the "council of the holy ones" (XII 24) is meant. In XV 14, הלך refers also to life in the Community *in company with* (לפני) God.<sup>46</sup> But the notion "in company with God" is not as prominent in 1QH as it is in 1QS. Nevertheless, the usage of הלך in 1QS so far indicates that the Community has a unique relationship with God.

In XV 14 and in XI 20, הלך referring to life in the Community is linked with justice and righteousness, demonstrating again that the obedience to the Law/the rules is one of the most significant aspects of life in the Community in relation to God.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>45</sup> XII 21: "(...) those who walk on the paths of your heart (22) will be established permanently. (...)"  
 XII 24: "(...) Those who walk on the path of your heart have listened to me, they have assigned themselves for you (25) in the council of the holy ones. (...)"  
 XIV 6f: "(...) [...] to walk (7) on the path of your heart without injustice. (...)"  
 This phrase does not occur in the HB.

<sup>46</sup> F. Nötscher does not see the significance of the combination of הלך and לפני, nor the Qumranian meaning of לפני; and interprets both from the HB perspective. Hence he relates הלך only to good actions and behaviour, but not to a life in company with God: "Der feste sichere Schritt bedeutet hier [1QH XV 14] also die religiöse, moralische Festigkeit, Zuverlässigkeit und Vorbildlichkeit, die auch durch die Bosheit der anderen sich nicht beirren läßt." (F. Nötscher, *Gotteswege und Menschenwege*, 73 and 83).

Life in the Community fulfilling the will of God is also referred to negatively through הלך.

In XIII 25, הלך means "to defect" to the "sons of destruction", in VII 21 it refers to the life of the wicked in contrast to life in the Community.<sup>48</sup>

### 6.3. Conclusion

The usage and meaning of הלך in IQS and IQH in comparison with the HB shows that הלך is understood in a very particular way in the two scrolls *describing life in the Community in relation to God*.<sup>49</sup> As such, הלך holds essential information about the understanding of the Divine presence in IQS and IQH.

Describing life in the Community, הלך describes the lives of distinct and chosen, religiously significant people: the Community. הלך is life in the Community according to the theological concept that the scrolls provide. This means, first of all, that life in the Community is always and entirely related to God. Without this relationship it does not make sense. But הלך, especially in IQH, also indicates what this life is about. It involves especially obedience to the rules of the Community, as well as to the Law. God is present in the Community also through these rules and Laws that determine lives in company with Him.

But because הלך as life in the Community can only make sense within the relation to God that the teachings of the Community define themselves, it serves to express the separate

<sup>47</sup> XV 14 mentions the "paths of justice" (לנתיבות צדקה), and XI 20 is playing with the word מישיר: the psalmist is walking on a "plain". But מישיר also means "justice" and "righteousness" (cf. Isa. 11:4; Mal. 2:6; Ps. 45:7).

<sup>48</sup> What remains are figurative usages of הלך that are based on the major sense of הלך in IQS and IQH, but do not reveal new aspects: see XI 19; XII 33; XVI 34. VII 18 is damaged.

<sup>49</sup> It is, therefore, not sufficient to reduce the meaning of הלך to "absolut religiös-sittlichem Handeln" (F. Nötscher, *Gotteswege und Menschenwege*, 79).

nature of the Community from the outside world. הלך only describes the nature of life in the Community; for it is only there that Divine presence is possible.

הלך refers to life in the Community, a Community in a special relationship with God, building and holding a strong, direct and immediate relationship with God that goes beyond the kind of relationship between God and Israel known from the HB. This relationship is permanent, and produces and maintains a distinctive and unique Community permitting its members to experience Divine presence. Given this state of affairs, the strict separation between God's sphere and human's sphere, as demarcated in the HB, is obscured in these scrolls. Both 1QS and 1QH claim that the Community in some manner participates in the sphere of God, and that its members are well aware of the fact.

"הלך in company with God", especially in 1QS I 8, indicates that the Community has a special status as the chosen ones. It functions as a link between the rest of Israel and God; and its nature as a permanent sacrifice to God qualifies it to live *in permanent company with Him*. This implies not only the nearness of God, but an immanent presence of God in the Community.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>50</sup> H. Stegemann states that "die Union der Essener weder ein Zweckverband der in der Diaspora weilenden Teile Israels war noch eine Vereinigung für irgendwelche besonderen Zwecke im Rahmen Israels, sondern der Zusammenschluß Gesamtisraels im Heiligen Land." (H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus. Ein Sachbuch* [Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, <sup>9</sup>1993] 231). Stegemann assumes that Qumran is part of a Essene movement that had groups spread all over Israel. To deal with this controversial subject is beyond the scope of this study. But H. Stegemann's idea of the function of the Essenes regarding Israel has to be revised according to the findings above. There is a "Zweck" of the Qumran Community moving to the desert, and that is to get and to be close to God, and consequently a) to prepare the ground for His presence through a perfect life in company with Him, and b) to function as the "bridge" between the unfaithful Israel and God. Hence, the Community is not living such a life in the desert as the "Zusammenschluß Gesamtisraels im Heiligen Land", but as the bridge between God and the rest of Israel, by being the only place on earth where a close relationship with God is possible.

## V. The 4QS Fragments

As well as the 1QS material, the fragments of the Community Rule found in cave 4 offer relevant material for this study. But there are reasons why this study focused primarily on 1QS. First, 1QS is the only "complete" version of the Community Rule. A thorough analysis of words and phrases that link to the question of the Divine presence only makes sense in this extended form of the Community Rule. The 4QS material, on the other hand, is fragmentary and cannot provide the information that 1QS can. Consequently, my study is an analysis of the Divine presence in this particular scroll 1QS.

Secondly, Metso in her detailed analysis of the 1QS, 4QS, and 5QS material came to the conclusion that "on the basis of the reconstructed manuscripts, it is clear that no standard collection of the texts ever existed"<sup>1</sup> and "that it is clear that there never existed a single, legitimate and up-to-date version of the Community Rule"<sup>2</sup>. This means that 1QS has to be taken as a version of the Community Rule in its own right, no matter whether it represents the "original" or a later version. Investigating this particular scroll draws, therefore, a picture of the idea of the Divine presence as this particular scroll understands it, (and at a particular time in the history of the Community?)<sup>3</sup>

But to present a full picture of the Divine presence as it is understood in 1QS, I will now analyse the 4QS material to find out if there are differences regarding the Divine presence, and whether or not these influence what has been said about 1QS. I will analyse all fragments of cave 4 containing material of the Community rule. Their precise relationship, hence the question of their age and dependencies, has to remain in the background, because this

---

<sup>1</sup> S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* [Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah XXI, Leiden/ New York/ Köln 1997] 151

<sup>2</sup> Metso, *Qumran Community Rule*, 154.

<sup>3</sup> It is, therefore, not the aim of my study to develop yet another theory about the textual development of the Community Rule. For literature on the history of the text and its different versions see: S. Metso, *Qumran Community Rule*, 5-11, 157-164.

analysis will show that words and phrases used to express aspects of the Divine presence in 4QS are used and understood almost exactly as in 1QS; the differences between 1QS and the 4QS material regarding the idea of the Divine presence are minor, which is why these findings will not contribute much to a theory of the relationship between the Community Rule material.<sup>4</sup>

In comparison with 1QS we find the following matters relating to the Divine presence in 4QS255-264:

#### 4Q255 (4QpapS<sup>a</sup>)

Although 4QS<sup>a</sup> does not have direct parallels with 1QS,<sup>5</sup> "doing what is good and just in His presence" in 4Q255 frag.1 2f. is used and understood as in 1QS I 2. 4Q255 frag.2 5 has "to walk with perfection on all the paths of God", carrying the same meaning as in 1QS III 9.f.

#### 4Q256 (4QS<sup>b</sup>)

Relevant items mentioned here are used with the same meaning as in 1QS. They are:

לפני אל: 4Q256 II 2 = 1QS I 16).

ידע (et deriv.): 4Q256 IX 12 = 1QS V 19; 4Q256 XVIII 1 = 1QS IX 18; 4Q256 XX 5 = 1QS X 16.

הלך: 4Q256 IX 4 = 1QS V 4; 4Q256 2 = 1QS IX 19.

גלה: 4Q256 XVIII 3 = 1QS IX 19.

<sup>4</sup> For a detailed list of literature on this problem see Metso, *Qumran Community Rule*, 157ff.; also A. Lange / H. Lichtenberger, *Art. Qumran* [TRE XXVIII, 1997] 55ff.; J. Maier, *Purity at Qumran: Cultic and Domestic*, in: A.J. Avery-peck/ J. Neusner/ B.D. Chilton, *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 1: Theory of Israel* [Handbook of Oriental Studies vl.56; Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 2001] 91f.

<sup>5</sup> Metso, *Qumran Community Rule*, 106

The only relevant difference occurs in 4Q256 2, where 4Q256 omits לרצונו which is found in 1QS V 2: "(...) and keep themselves steadfast in all he commanded according to His will (...)".<sup>6</sup> Although "according to His will" and "in all that He has commanded" are both added in 1QS V 9-10,<sup>7</sup> and although the same happens in 4Q258 I 1 offering the same passage, these findings do not suggest a meaning of רצון other than what I determined for 1QS above. In any case, the reason for the differences between 1QS V 1,9-10 and this 4QS material does not seem to lie in the meaning of the word רצון, but in the content of the entire passage. The differences thus do not provide sufficient material to claim that רצון was understood differently in the different fragments.

#### 4Q257 (4QpapS<sup>c</sup>)

In col.III and IV aspects discussed in 1QS are mentioned with the same meaning:

ידע (et deriv.): 4Q257 III 1 = 1QS III 1; 4Q257 III 3 = 1QS III 2; 4Q257 V 3 = 1QS IV 6.

הלך: 4Q257 V 4 = 1QS IV 6.

It is interesting to note that a significant sentence that occurs in 1QS IV 3f. mentioning טוב עולמים, מאמנת בכול מעשי אל, חכמת גבורה, שכל, טוב עולמים is omitted in 4Q257 V.

The evidence is again not sufficient to decide whether 4Q257 objects to these aspects which describe gifts from God and means by which humans can improve their status within their relationship with God.

<sup>6</sup> Metso suggests that "according to His will" has been inserted after "in all that He has commanded" in the later 1QS, "due to their close connection elsewhere in the Rule" (Metso, *Qumran Community Rule*, 78).

<sup>7</sup> Metso, *Qumran Community Rule*, 78,80.

4Q258 (4QS<sup>d</sup>)

This is the longest 4QS document. It covers two passages that appeared to be very important for the study on the Divine presence because they contain many of the relevant terms (4Q258 VI 1-5 = 1QS VIII 6-11 and 4Q258 VII 4-9 = 1QS IX 3-9). Although there are tiny differences between 4Q258 and the 1QS material, all relevant words or phrase are used in the same way. They are:

**הלך**: 4Q258 I 4 = 1QS V 4 (cf. 4Q 256); 4Q258 VI 7 = 1QS VIII 13; 4Q258 VII 1 = 1QS VIII 24<sup>8</sup>;

4Q258 VII 7 = 1QS IX 6; 4Q258 VII 8 = 1QS IX 8; 4Q258 VIII 3 = 1QS IX 19

**ידע** (et deriv.): 4Q258 I 10 = 1QS V 19 (cf. 4Q 256); 4Q258 III 1 = 1QS VI 9; 4Q258 VI 3 = 1QS VIII

9; 4Q258 VIII 2 = 1QS IX 17; 4Q258 VIII 3 = 1QS IX 18; 4Q258 IX 8 = 1QS X 9; 4Q258 X 5 = 1QS X

16; 4Q258 IX 13 = 1QS X 12

**לפני**: 4Q258 II 2 = 1QS V 23; 4Q258 II 6 = 1QS VI 1; (4Q258 II 8 = 1QS VI 4;); 4Q258 VIII 7 = 1QS

IX 22

**שכל**: 4Q258 II 2 = 1QS V 23; 4Q258 II 4 = 1QS V 24; 4Q258 VIII 1 = 1QS IX 15

**מעון**: 4Q258 VI 2 = 1QS VIII 8; 4Q258 VI 6 = 1QS VIII 13

**תמים**: 4Q258 VI 3 = 1QS VIII 9; (4Q258 VI 5 = 1QS VIII 10;); 4Q258 VII 3 = 1QS IX 2; 4Q258 VII 6

= 1QS IX 5

**רצון**: 4Q258 VI 4 = 1QS VIII 10; 4Q258 VII 5 = 1QS IX 4; (4Q258 VIII 8 = 1QS IX 23;); 4Q258 VIII

8 = 1QS IX 24

**גלה**: (4Q258 VI 7 = 1QS VIII 15;); 4Q258 VI 8 = 1QS VIII 16; 4Q258 VIII 4 = 1QS IX 19

**טוב**: 4Q258 IX 12 = 1QS X 12; 4Q258 X 7 = 1QS X 18

Interesting to note here is that the names used for God in 4Q258 IX 12f. are identical with those used in 1QS X 12.

<sup>8</sup> Metso mentions here a difference in syntax (Metso, *Qumran Community Rule*, 87) which does not seem to influence the meaning of הלך.

There are few differences, to be noted here. Regarding the words and phrases we are investigating in this study, it seems to be the case that the 4Q fragments tend to omit some of them rather than represent them in their text. This can be seen in 4Q258 I 1, where לרצונו (1QS V 1) is omitted (cf. above); in 4Q258 II 4, where "and the perfection of his path" is left out; and in 4Q258 II 8 where לפני (1QS VI 1) does not occur. The paucity of evidence again prevents us from evaluating the findings. But does the author of 4Q258 try to avoid לפני in combination with human beings?

#### 4Q259 (4QS<sup>c</sup>) / 4Q319 (4QOtot)

This document again differs from 1QS, but without altering the meanings of the words and phrases that we are concerned with. These are:

לפני: 4Q259 II 6 = 1QS VII 23

הלך: 4Q259 II 6f. = 1QS VII 24; 4Q259 II 12 = 1QS VIII 4; 4Q259 II 4 = 1QS VIII 13; (4Q259 II 7 = 1QS IX 12;) 4Q259 III 18 = 1QS IX 19<sup>9</sup>

תמים: 4Q259 II 10 = 1QS VIII 1; 4Q259 II 17f. = 1QS VIII 9; (4Q259 III 1 = 1QS VIII 10;)

גלה: 4Q259 II 1QS VIII 1; 4Q259 II 8 = 1QS IX 13; 4Q259 III 18 1QS IX 19

רצון: 4Q259 II 15 = 1QS VIII 4; 4Q259 II 8 = 1QS IX 13; 4Q259 II 11 = 1QS IX 15

ידע (et deriv.): 4Q259 II 17 = 1QS VIII 8; 4Q259 III 15 = 1QS IX 17; 4Q259 III 17 = 1QS IX 18

דרש: 4Q259 II 2 = 1QS VIII 12

שכל: 4Q259 III 13 = 1QS IX 15

<sup>9</sup> According to Metso, 4Q259 III 17-18 offers a variant of 1QS IX 18-19 that "may indicate a change in organization of the community" (Metso, *Qumran Community Rule*, 73). But this change does not seem to give תמים הלך, which occurs as an aspect of the teachings of the wise leader in this passage, a different meaning from that in 1QS.

Three observations are worth mentioning here:<sup>10</sup> a) In 4Q259 II 17, the **מעון** of 1QS VIII 8 has been replaced by **מעון**. b) 4Q259 III omits the passages on the "study of the Law" (1QS VIII 15-19) and the passage on the regulations for behaviour in the Community (1QS VIII 20-IX 11).<sup>11</sup> c) Cols. V, VII, and X contain material that does not feature in 1QS. Interestingly, in none of these cols. do aspects which we are investigating occur. Cols. VIII and IX are damaged to an extent that makes comments impossible.

#### 4Q260 (4QS<sup>f</sup>)

Relevant terms found here have again the same meaning as in 1QS. They are:

**רצון**: 4Q260 I 1 = 1QS IX 23

**מעון**: 4Q260 II 2 = 1QS X 3

**טוב**: 4Q260 IV 5 = 1QS X 18

It is interesting to note here that 4Q260 IV 3 does not have **ידע** as 1QS X 16 has.

#### 4Q261 (4QS<sup>g</sup>)

The three short fragments are nearly identical with the 1QS material and mention the relevant terms that are understood in the same way as in 1QS:

**לפני**: 4Q261 frag.1 3 = 1QS V 23

**שכל**: 4Q261 frag.1 3 = 1QS V 23

**ידע** (et deriv.): 4Q261 frag.2 3 = 1QS VI 25

**הלך**: (4Q261 frag.5 6 = 1QS VII 12)

<sup>10</sup> Especially regarding the claim that (according to Metso) 4Q259 "preserved a more original version of the Community Rule" (Metso, *Qumran Community Rule*, 74) than 1QS.

<sup>11</sup> Metso suggests that "the whole passage of 1QS VIII 15-IX 11 is a secondary insertion" (Metso, *Qumran Community Rule*, 72). But this does not provide sufficient evidence for any claim that 4Q259 avoids aspects significant for the Divine presence which are mentioned in this passage.

4Q262 (4QS<sup>h</sup>) A and B

These are small fragments which do not contain relevant material.

4Q263 (4QS<sup>i</sup>)

Cf. under 4Q258 II.

4Q264 (4QS<sup>j</sup>)

This document contains a copy of 1QS XI 14-22 where we found several significant words regarding the Divine presence. 4Q264 has them all and does not change their meaning. They are:

**טוב**: 4Q264 1 = 1QS XI 14

**ידע** (et deriv.): 4Q264 3 = 1QS XI 16; 4Q264 5 = 1QS XI 18; 4Q264 6 = 1QS XI 6

**לפני**: 4Q264 4 = 1QS XI 17; 4Q264 9 = 1QS XI 21

**תמים**: 4Q264 5 = 1QS XI 17

**רצון**: 4Q264 5 = 1QS XI 17

**שכל** (v): 4Q264 6 = 1QS XI 18

Concluding, we may say that the usages and meaning of terms related to the Divine presence in 4QS do not alter or substantially affect what has been said about them in this study of 1QS. Where they occur in 4QS, they seem to be understood in the same way as in 1QS. The differences between the 1Q and 4Q materials that have been examined are minor; and the length of the fragments makes it impossible to make general statements about the 4Q fragments and their attitudes to the presence of God in the Community.

## VI. The 4QH Fragments

### 4Q427 (4QH<sup>a</sup>)

Items in 4Q427 which are used as in the relevant 1QH lines are the following:

**ידע** (et deriv.): 4Q427 frag. 1 3 = 1QH XIX 20; 4Q427 frag. 3 I 2 = 1QH VII 5; 4Q427 frag. 3 I 4 = 1QH VII 7; 4Q427 frag. 3 I 5 = 1QH VII 8; 4Q427 frag. 2+3 II 11 = 1QH XX 10; 4Q427 frag. 2+3 II 12 = 1QH XX 11; 4Q427 frag. 2+3 II 13 = 1QH XX 13; 4Q427 frag. 7 I + frag. 9 20 = 1QH XXVI top 15 (text restored); 4Q427 frag. 7 II 13 = 1QH XXVI bottom 7; 4Q427 frag. 7 II 14 = 1QH XXVI bottom 7 (text restored)

**הלך**: 4Q427 frag. 6 1 (text restored) = 1QH XXI bottom 2 (text restored)

**גלה**: 4Q427 frag. 7 I + frag. 9 19 = 1QH XXVI top 15

**שכל**: 4Q427 frag. 7 II 14 = 1QH XXVI bottom 8

There are, however, a few occasions where relevant words are used in 4Q427, but not in 1QH. The reason for these differences is, throughout, that the text in question is missing in 1QH. Nevertheless, 4Q427 displays in these cases the same understanding of the relevant terms as known from 1QH:

**טוב** is used in 4Q427 frag. 7 I + frag. 9 23 which 1QH XXVI top does not have. It is used as an attribute of God which influences human life. In 4Q427 frag. 7 II which is missing in 1QH XXVI bottom 6 **טוב** has the same meaning.

4Q427 frag. 7 II offers a line which does not occur in 1QH XXVI bottom, although it occurs in 4Q431 frag. 1 2. Here, **דעת** is used in the following way: "**בלוא דעת הופיע** (...)".  
**ראין נעוורת** ...[...]"

Finally, רִצּוֹן in 4Q427 frag.7 II 19 does not occur in 1QH XXVI bottom, because in the latter the text ends before this line. רִצּוֹן is used here as an attribute of God showing a meaning within the scope found in 1QH.

#### 4Q428 (4QH<sup>b</sup>)

Relevant words mentioned here are used with the same meaning as in 1QH. They are:

שָׁכַל: 4Q428 frag.8 I 1 = 1QH IX 25

שָׁכַל דַּעַה: 4Q428 frag.8 I 5 = 1QH IX 28

One difference, however, occurs in 4Q428 frag.7 8 where we find דַּעַת. The equivalent line in 1QH would be 1QH XVI 1 where only illegible traces, untranslatable readings, and a lacuna can be found. דַּעַת is used in 4Q428 frag.7 8 in a sense in which it occurs also in 1QH: it is the knowledge of the psalmist which he claims to have received from God.

#### 4Q429 (4QH<sup>c</sup>)

4Q429 offers only one relevant term. הִלֵּךְ occurs in 4Q427 frag.2 I 9 (= 1QH XIV 20) referring to the members of the Community "walking on your [God's] holy path" in contrast to the people outside the Community. הִלֵּךְ displays a meaning here that we have seen also in 1QH.

#### 4Q430 (4QH<sup>d</sup>)

In 4Q430 only one relevant item occurs which is used as in 1QH:

דַּעַת: 4Q430 frag.1 6 = 1QH XII 18

4Q431 (4QH<sup>e</sup>)

See **לע** in 4Q427 frag.7 II 4 above.

4Q432 (4QH<sup>f</sup>)

4Q432 does not contain relevant material.

Concluding we can say that words that proved to be relevant for the investigation of the idea of Divine Presence in 1QH are used in the 4QH fragments with the same meaning as in 1QH. In other words, terms related to the Divine Presence used in the 4QH fragments do not alter what has been said about them in 1QH.

## VII. Final Conclusion

1QS and 1QH redefine the idea of the Divine presence as it occurs in the HB. Divine presence becomes the major aspect of the relationship between God and humankind according to these scrolls. It is what the Community, and life in the Community, is essentially about. It is what motivates and defines this Community and its members. Divine presence, a special relationship with God, gives the Community its right to exist. To be close to God, closer than any other human can be, is the Yahad's desire and its status. Divine presence in the sense of God's nearness is a permanent characteristic of the Community. Divine presence as God's actual "being there" is a possibility in the Community and, to some degree, already a fact.

The above investigations have shown that aspects that describe in the HB the relationship between Israel and God, have been used and developed in 1QS/H to picture the special status that the Community claims to have and desires in relation to God. רצון, שכל, knowledge, and טוב are divine phenomena that, given to the Community, change its nature in a way that enables it to be closer to Him and to accommodate His presence. רצון, שכל, knowledge, and טוב are phenomena that tie the Community together with God in a manner that Judaism has not seen before. These phenomena are the principles on which the special relationship between the Community and God rests and which make this special relationship possible in the first place. מעון, מעמד, יצב, the idea of serving God, לפני, and הלך, on the other hand, are not primarily understood as principles which make the special relationship between God and the Community possible, but their understanding in 1QS/H illustrates in which way life in the Community reflects and enables the special status of the Yahad in relation to God. Thus, the way in which מעון, מעמד, יצב, the idea of serving God, לפני, and הלך are

used in the two scrolls is in two ways significant: first, it demonstrates that the Community claims to have a very special status in relation to God already, and secondly, it shows that the members of the Community claim to have the ability to *actively* maintain and to improve this special relationship with God through their lives, their behaviour, and their actions in the Yahad. It is the claim of the Community that, based on their election by God, and consequently due to God's gifts to them (the principles), it has the power to change its own nature in a way that allows it to be closer to God than any other being. In this, the idea of the Community's power to change its nature and significance in relation to God, goes well beyond the abilities of Israel and its members as described in the HB. But, according to 1QS/H, this understanding of life in the Community, this change of nature in relation to God, makes immediate Divine presence in the Community's midst possible. Thus, being a member of the Qumran Community means living in the permanent nearness of God accommodating Divine presence. 1QS and 1QH seem in many ways to be designed to demonstrate this to the outside world as well as to the members of the Community themselves.

This new and special status in relation to God defines the Community's function in the world. As the only Community that can have this status, they see themselves isolated from the rest of the world because of their special quality in relation to God. The Community's status has a divine quality that separates it clearly from the rest of the world, and brings it at the same time closer to God. But its members also claim to have a special function for Israel as a whole. The nature of the Community itself and life in the Community replaces those means by which Israel, according to the HB, was approached by God and was permitted to approach God. The Community and life in the Community is *the* link between God and Israel. And because the Community sees itself as the means of approach to God, it possesses the very quality that these Biblical ordained means themselves have.

The (self-)identity of the Community is defined, therefore, through *all* theological ideas and components mentioned in IQS/H. They all, even those we did not discuss in separate chapters (such as Law, covenant, holiness, purity, future expectations) describe the Community in its relation to God. And because these ideas and components define the Community's relationship with God, *i.e.* the way in which God approaches the Community and *vice-versa*, the (self-)identity of the Yahad can only be understood through and be based on the idea of Divine presence. Divine presence gives the Community, according to its own teachings, its right to exist; and Divine presence describes its nature within the universe. Other theological ideas elaborated in IQS/H represent means by which the authors of the scrolls attempt to demonstrate that the Community already has this special relationship with God.

The fact that Divine presence - the Community's relationship with God - provides the identity of the Community also indicates that this relationship is understood in a manner different from that found in the HB. In IQS/H, it is neither understood philosophically, nor geographically, and not even historically. As much as the identity of Israel depends on its history with God as described in the HB, the identity of the Community depends solely on its special *relationship* with Him, hence on unique Divine presence. This shows that the Community has disconnected itself from Israel not only geographically, but also through the way in which relationship with and dependency on God was perceived. The historical component of this relationship has been replaced by a claim and desire to stand in a special relationship with God. The Yahad is not about Israel's or the Community's history with God, but only about God's presence with the Yahad now and in future. The relationship between God and the Community is about a "being-together" of the Divine and the Yahad, not Divine leadership and human dependency. This becomes especially clear in the fact that the success and development of this relationship depends to a great extent (*i.e.* after God has given the Community His

gifts) on the actions of the Community, and not as much as in the HB on God Himself. According to IQS/H, the question of the relationship between God and the Community is an *existential* one in its proper sense: it is being with God, being where God is, being with whom God is, and even being how God is. In this form of "co-existence" with God, the Community has disconnected itself from the outside world and entered, according to IQS/H, a world of Divine presence which has not been seen by any Israelite before.

Concluding, we can say that Divine presence is understood in IQS/H in a new and unique way. It defines the Community and shows its special relationship with God. The Yahad is an institution that is in line with God's thinking. The Community is the place of the permanent nearness of God. And it is the only place, in a sense, between heaven and earth that qualifies for the permanent presence of both humans and God. It probably qualifies even for the actual Divine presence of God amongst the human beings in that place.

But the idea of the nearness of God and His presence in IQS and IQH also demonstrates that the idea of being close to God can drive an entire religious Community to its limits in the attempt not only to "repair" what Israel has done wrong regarding its relationship with God, but to go beyond this and to claim a special relationship between themselves and God that brings them closer together than any other Jews before. Because this status is to be gained through perfectionism, this idea affects every single aspect of life in the Community. And this also shows why the Community has this notion of "sectarian fanaticism": its members go beyond what Judaism at the time stands for, and they do so without compromise.

## Bibliography

### Sources

- E.G. Clarke with Collaboration by W.E. Aufrecht, J.C. Hurd, and F. Spitzer, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch: Text and Concordance* [Hoboken, New Jersey: Ktav Publishing House, Inc., 1984]
- K. Elliger/ W. Rudolph, *תורה נביאים וכתובים* *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, <sup>4</sup>1990]
- B. Grossfeld, *Targum Onqelos to Genesis. Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes* [The Aramaic Bible vl. 6; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988]
- R. Kittel, *תורה נביאים וכתובים* *Biblia Hebraica* [Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937]
- E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran, hebräisch und deutsch: mit masoretischer Punktation, Übersetzung, Einführung und Anmerkungen* [München: Kösel-Verlag, <sup>2</sup>1971]
- A.D. Macho, *Neophyti I. Targum Palestinense. MS de la Biblioteca Vaticana. Tomo I Genesis* [Madrid/ Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1968]
- M. Maher, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis. Translated, with Introduction and Notes* [The Aramaic Bible vl. 1B; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992]
- M. McNamara, *Targum Neofiti I: Genesis. Translated, with Introduction and Notes* [The Aramaic Bible vl. 1A; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992]
- J. Maier, *Die Qumran-Essener: Die Texte vom Toten Meer. Band I, II und III* [München/ Basel: Ernst Reinhardt Verlag, 1995/6]
- M. Mansoor, *Thanksgiving Scrolls. The Thanksgiving Hymns. Translated and annotated with an Introduction by M. Mansoor* [Leiden: Brill, 1961]

- F.G. Martínez/ E. J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition, vl.1 (1Q1 - 4Q273)*  
[Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 1997]
- , *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition, vl.2 (4Q274 - 11Q31)* [Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill,  
1998]
- A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta, vl. I et II* [Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, <sup>8</sup>1965]
- A. Sperber (ed.), *The Bible in Aramaic based on Old Manuscripts and Printed Texts, vl.1.*  
*The Pentateuch according to Targum Onkelos* [Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1959]
- J.C. Trever, *Scrolls from Qumrân Cave 1. The Great Isaiah Scroll. The Order of the*  
*Community. The Pesher to Habakkuk* [Jerusalem: The Albright Institute of  
Archaeological Research and The Shrine of the Book, 1972]
- G. Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls. English. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* [Sheffield: Sheffield  
Academic Press, 1987]
- , *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* [London/ New York: The Penguin Press,  
<sup>4</sup>1997]
- R. Weber/ B. Fischer, *Biblia Sacra: Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem* [Stuttgart: Deutsche  
Bibelgesellschaft, <sup>3</sup>1983]

## Tools

- W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der*  
*frühchristlichen Literatur* [Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, <sup>6</sup>1988]
- J.H. Charlesworth, *Graphic Concordance to the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr  
(Paul Siebeck), 1991]
- W. Gesenius, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*  
[Berlin/ Göttingen/ Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, <sup>17</sup>1959]

- Cf. E. Hatch/ H.A Redpath, *Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (including the apocryphal books)*, vl.1/2/3 [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892 (vl.1)/ 1897 (vl.2)/ 1906 (vl.3)]
- L. Koehler/ W. Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament. Lieferung II* [Leiden/ New York/ Kobenhaven/ Köln: E.J. Brill, 1990]
- , *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament. Lieferung III* [Leiden/ New York/ Kobenhaven/ Köln: E.J. Brill, 1990]
- , *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament. Lieferung IV* [Leiden/ New York/ Kobenhaven/ Köln: E.J. Brill, 1990]
- K.G. Kuhn, *Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960]
- J. Levy, *Neuhebräisches und Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim. Dritter Band* [Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1883]
- G. Lisowsky, *Konkordanz zum hebräischen Alten Testament nach dem von Paul Kahle in der Biblia Hebraica edidit Rudolf Kittel besorgten Masoretischen Text* [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993]
- F. Rehkopf, *Septuaginta-Vokabular* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989]

## Literature

- F. Avemarie, "*Toharot ha-Rabbim*" and "*Mashqeh ha-Rabbim - Jacob Licht Reconsidered*", in: M.J. Bernstein/ F. García-Martínez/ J. Kampen, *Legal Texts and Legal Issues* [Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997] 215-229
- C. Barth, art. **לפ** [TDOT VI, 1990] 220-225
- T.S. Beall, *History and Eschatology at Qumran*, in: A.J. Avery-Peck/ J. Neusner/ B.D. Chilton, *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic*

- Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 2: World View, Comparing Judaisms*  
[Handbook of Oriental Studies vl.57; Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 2001] 125-146
- J. Becker, *Das Heil Gottes. Heils- und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und im Neuen Testament* [StUNT 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964]
- J. Bergman/ A. Haldar-Ringgren/ K. Koch, *art. 777* [TDOT III, 1978] 270-293
- D. Bowman, *Did the Qumran Sect Burn the Red Heifer?* [RQ1, 1958/9] 73-84
- J. de Caemel, *La Connaissance Religieuse dans les Hymnes d'Action de Grâce de Qumrân*  
[Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses (EphThLov) 38, 1962] 435-460
- D. L. Christensen, *Deuteronomy 1-11* [World Biblical Commentary 6a; Dallas: Word Books, 1991]
- J. Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [London: Routledge, 1997]
- E.M. Cook, *What Did the Jews of Qumran Know about God and How Did They Know it?*  
*Revelation and God in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, in: A.J. Avery-Peck/ J. Neusner/ B.D. Chilton, *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 2: World View, Comparing Judaisms*  
[Handbook of Oriental Studies vl.57; Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 2001] 3-22
- F.M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995]
- P.R. Davies, *The Torah at Qumran*, in: A.J. Avery-Peck/ J. Neusner/ B.D. Chilton, *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 2: World View, Comparing Judaisms* [Handbook of Oriental Studies vl.57; Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 2001] 23-44
- , *Sects and Scrolls. Essays on Qumran Related Topics* [University of South Florida, 1996]

- W.D. Davies, *Christian Origins and Judaism* [London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1962]
- B. Dombrowski, *Erscheinung, Wesen und Ideologie der Assoziation von Hirbet Qumran nach dem "Manual of Discipline" (IQS)* [Paris: Société Nouvelle des Éditions Letouzey et Ané, and Halifax: Atlantic Nova Print Ltd., 1971]
- L.I. Ervine, *The Ancient Synagogue* [New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2000]
- E. and H. Eshel, *4Q471 Fragment 1 and Ma'amadot in the War Scroll*, in: J. T. Barrera/ L. V. Montaner (ed.), *The Madrid Qumran Congress. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls Madrid 18-21 March, 1991, vl.2* [Leiden/ New York/ Köln: E.J. Brill, 1992] 611-620
- J.A. Fitzmyer, *Qumran: die Antwort: 101 Fragen zu den Schriften vom Toten Meer* [Stuttgart: Verl. Kath. Bibelwerk, 1993]
- G. Forkman, *The Limits of the Religious Community. Expulsion from the Religious Community within the Qumran Sect, within Rabbinic Judaism, and within Primitive Christianity* [Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1972]
- F. García-López, art. **722** [ThWAT V, 1986] 188-201
- B. Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament. A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965]
- G. Gerleman, art. **727** [TLOT III, 1997] 1259-1261
- R. Gordis, *The Knowledge of Good and Evil in the Old Testament and the Qumran Scrolls* [JBL 76, 1957] 123-138
- H. Groß, art. **משל** [ThWAT V, 1986] cols. 73-77
- H.K. Harrington, *Holiness and Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [DSD 8/2, 2001] 124-135

- C.E. Hayes, *art. Ma'amad*, in: R.J. Zwi Werblowsky/ G. Wigoder (ed.), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Jewish Religion* [New York/ Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997] 430
- F.J. Helfmeyer, *art. מלך* [TDOT III, 1974] 388-403
- J. Hempel, *Die Stellung der Laien in Qumran*, in: H. Bardke, *Qumran - Probleme. Vorträge des Leipziger Symposiums über Qumran-Probleme vom 9. bis 14. Oktober 1961* [Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1963] 193-215
- H.-J. Hermisson, *Sprache und Ritus im altisraelitischen Kult. Zur "Spiritualisierung" der Kultbegriffe im Alten Testament* [Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 19; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965]
- I. Höver-Johag, *art. מלך* (TDOT V, 1986) 296-317
- C.-H. Hunzinger, *Neues Licht auf Lc. 2:14 ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίας* [ZNW 44, 1952/53] 85-90
- M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature, vl.1* [New York/ Berlin/ London: Choreb, 1926]
- G. Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im NT* [StUNT 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971]
- M.A. Knibb, *Eschatology and Messianism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, in: P.W. Flint/ J.C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years. A Comprehensive Assessment vol.2* [Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 1999] 379-402
- H. Kosmala, *Die "Erkenntnis der Wahrheit", Hebräer - Essener - Christen* [StPB 1, 1959] 135-173
- H. Köster, *art. ὑπόστασις* [TDNT VIII, 1972] 572-589

- R. Kugler, *Priesthood at Qumran*, in: P.W. Flint/ J.C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years. A Comprehensive Assessment*, vol.2 [Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 1999] 93-116
- K.G. Kuhn, *Die in Palästina gefundenen hebräischen Texte und das Neue Testament* [ZThK 47, 1950] 192-211
- , *Die Sektenschriften und die iranische Religion* [ZThK 49, 1952] 296-316
- E. Kutsch, *Art. Bund* [TRE VII; Berlin/ New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1981] 397-410
- A. Lange / H. Lichtenberger, *Art. Qumran* [TRE XXVIII, 1997] 45-79
- A.R.C. Leaney, *The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning. Introduction, Translation and Commentary* [London: SCM Press LTD, 1966]
- H. Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde* [StUNT 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980]
- J. Maier, *Geschichte der jüdischen Religion. Von der Zeit Alexanders des Grossen bis zur Aufklärung mit einem Ausblick auf das 19./20. Jahrhundert* [Berlin/ New York: De Gruyter, 1972]
- , *Purity at Qumran: Cultic and Domestic*, in: A.J. Avery-Peck/ J. Neusner/ B.D. Chilton, *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 1: Theory of Israel* [Handbook of Oriental Studies vl.56; Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 2001] 92-124
- S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* [Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah XXI; Leiden/ New York/ Köln: Brill, 1997]
- M. Metzger, *Himmlische und irdische Wohnstatt Jahwes* [UF 2, 1970] 139-158
- G. Molin, *Die Söhne des Lichtes. Zeit und Stellung der Handschriften vom Toten Meer* [Wien/ München: Verlag Herold, 1954]

- G.F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. The Age of the Tannaim*,  
 vl.2 [New York/ Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971]
- J.A. Naudé, *Holiness in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, in: P.W. Flint/ J.C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea  
 Scrolls after Fifty Years. A Comprehensive Assessment*, vol.2 [Leiden, Boston, Köln:  
 Brill, 1999] 171-199
- J. Neusner, *What is "a Judaism"?: Seeing the Dead Sea Library as the Statement of a  
 Coherent Judaic Religious System*, in: A.J. Avery-Peck/ J. Neusner/ B.D. Chilton,  
*Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading  
 of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 1: Theory of Israel* [Handbook of Oriental Studies  
 vl.56; Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 2001] 3-24
- M. Newton, *The Concept of Purity at Qumran and in the Letters of Paul* [Society for New  
 Testament Studies Monograph Series 53; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,  
 1985]
- F. Nötscher, *Gotteswege und Menschenwege in der Bibel und in Qumran* [BBB 15; Bonn:  
 Peter Hanstein Verlag G.M.B.H., 1958]
- , *Zur theologischen Terminologie der Qumran-Texte* [BBB 10; Bonn: Peter Hanstein  
 Verlag G.M.B.H., 1956]
- P.v.d. Osten-Sacken, *Gott and Belial. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum  
 Dualismus in den Texten aus Qumran* [StUNT 6; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck &  
 Ruprecht, 1969]
- W. G. Plaut (ed.), *תורה. The Torah. A Modern Commentary* [New York: Union of American  
 Hebrew Congregations, 1981]
- H.D. Preuß, art. *מענה* [ThWAT IV, 1984] cols. 1027-1030

- G. v. Rad, *Das fünfte Buch Mose. Deuteronomium. Übersetzt und erklärt von Gerhard von Rad* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964]
- B. Reicke, *Traces of Gnosticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls?* [NTS 1, 1954] 137-141
- H. Ringgren, art. **נכב** [ThWAT V, 1986] 137-140
- , art. **עמר** [TDOT VI, 1989] 194-204
- , *The Faith of Qumran. Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [New York: Crossroad, 1995]
- H. Ringgren/ W. Mayer/ L. Alonso-Schökel, art. **עמר** [TDOT VI, 1990] 463-471
- S. Safrai, *Die Wallfahrt im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels* [Forschungen zum jüdisch-christlichen Dialog, vl.3; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1981]
- A. Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch* [Journal of Semitic Studies Monograph 15; Manchester: University of Manchester, 1991]
- L.H. Schiffman, *Community without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple*, in: B.Ego/ A. Lange/ P. Pilhofer (ed.), *Gemeinde ohne Tempel. Community without Temple. Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999] 267-284
- , *Jewish Law at Qumran*, in: A.J. Avery-Peck/ J. Neusner/ B.D. Chilton, *Judaism in Late Antiquity. Part Five. The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Volume 1: Theory of Israel* [Handbook of Oriental Studies vl.56; Leiden/ Boston/ Köln: Brill, 2001] 75-90
- , *The Eschatological Community of the Dead Sea Scrolls. A Study of the Rule of the Congregation* [SBL Monograph Series 38; Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1989]
- , *The Halakah at Qumran* [Leiden: Brill, 1975]

- M. Schlossinger, *art. Mahamad*, in: I. Singer (ed.), *Jewish Encyclopaedia. A Descriptive record of the History, Religion, Literature, and Customs of the Jewish people from the Earliest times to the Present Day*, vl.8 [New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1901-06] 259-260
- E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. - A.D. 135)*, vl.2 [Edinburgh: Clark, 1979]
- A.M. Schwermer, *Gott als König und seine Königsherrschaft in den Sabbatliedern aus Qumran*, in: M. Hengel/ A.M. Schwermer, *Königsherrschaft Gottes und himmlischer Kult im Judentum, Urchristentum und in der hellenistischen Welt* [WUNT 55; Tübingen: Mohr, 1991] 45-118
- H. Simian-Yofre, *Art. פְּנִים* [ThWAT VI, 1989] 629-659
- D. Sperber, *Ma'amad or Mahamad*, in: C. Roth/ G. Wigoder (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, vl.11 [Jerusalem: Encyclopaedia Judaica, 1971] 638
- H. Stegemann, *Die Essener, Qumran, Johannes der Täufer und Jesus. Ein Sachbuch* [Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1993]
- G. Steins, *art. מַחֲמָד* [ThWAT VI, 1989] 1087-1093
- H.J. Stoebe, *art. מַחֲמָד* [TLOT II, 1997] 486-495
- F. Sutcliffe, S.J., *The Monks of Qumran as Depicted in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [London: Burns & Oates, 1960]
- S. Talmon, *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: Between Judaism and Christianity*, in: E. Ulrich/ J. VanderKam (ed.), *The Notre Dame Symposium in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 10; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994] 3-24

- J.H. Tigay, *The JPS Torah Commentary. Deuteronomy* דברים. *The Traditional Hebrew Text with the JPS Translation* [Philadelphia/ Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society, 5756/1996]
- R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* [The Schweich Lectures 1959; London: Oxford University Press, 1973]
- J.C. VanderKam, art. *Covenant*, in: L.H. Schiffman/ J.C. VanderKam (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000] 151-155
- G. Vermes, *An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* [London: SCM Press, 1999]
- G. Vermes/ M.D. Goodman, *The Essenes according to the Classical Sources* [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989]
- S. Wagner, art. *אֱלֹהִים* [TDOT III, 1978] 293-307
- , *אֱלֹהִים in den Lobliedern von Qumran*, in: S. Wagner (ed.), *Bibel und Qumran. Beiträge zur Erforschung der Beziehung zwischen Bibel- und Qumranwissenschaften* [Festschrift Hans Bardtke zum 22.9.1966; Berlin: Evangelische Haupt-Bibelgesellschaft, 1968] 232-252
- W. Wegner, *Studies in Qumran Creation Terminology on the Basis of IQS 3:13-18 and Parallel Texts* [Ann Arbor, Michigan/ London, England: Facsimile by University Microfilms International, 1981]
- M. Weinfeld, *The Organizational Pattern and the Penal Code of the Qumran Sect. A Comparison with Guilds and Religious Associations of the Hellenistic-Roman Period* [NTOA 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986]
- M. Weise, *Kultzeiten und kultischer Bundesschluß in der "Ordensregel" vom Toten Meer* [StPB 3; Leiden: Brill, 1961]

- G.J. Wenham, *Genesis 16-50* [World Biblical Commentary 2; Dallas, Texas: Word Books Publisher, 1994] 14-32
- C. Westermann, *Genesis, 2. Teilband, Genesis 12-36* [Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament I/2; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1981]
- H.W. Wolff, *Anthropologie des Alten Testaments* [Gütersloh: Chr. Kaiser/ Gütersloher Verlaghaus, 1994]
- C.J.H. Wright, *New International Biblical Commentary. Deuteronomy* [Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1996]
- Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962]
- H.-J. Zobel, *art. גלגל* [TDOT II, 1975] 476-488

