

## *Jewish Apocalyptic and the Dead Sea Scrolls*

**H. H. Rowley**

**D.D., F.B.A.**

*Professor of Hebrew Language and Literature  
in the University of Manchester*

**The Ethel M. Wood Lecture  
delivered before the University of London  
on 12 March 1957**

[p.3]

When the Dead Sea Scrolls first came to light there was wide divergence of view as to the date of the composition of the non-Biblical texts which were brought to light, and dates as far apart as the second century B.C. and the Middle Ages were proposed.<sup>1</sup> The archaeologists who excavated the cave from which the scrolls came declared at first that they must have been deposited in the cave not later than circa 100 B.C.,<sup>2</sup> and this involved the conclusion that all of the manuscripts must be dated before that time, and *a fortiori* the composition of the works must be assigned to a date before 100 B.C. The evidence did not seem convincing to all archaeologists,<sup>3</sup> and non-archaeologists were not slow to express their doubts.<sup>4</sup> Since then much new evidence has come to light, and there is none today who would stand by this date. The centre of the sect at Qumran has been excavated, and has yielded evidence which now seems to establish beyond all reasonable doubt that the deposit of the manuscripts in the caves of Qumran took place shortly before A.D. 70.<sup>5</sup> This is the date to which the excavators of the first cave moved when they first excavated the centre<sup>6</sup> and to which they now keep with ever-growing assurance. A number of other caves, in addition to the sole cave which was in question at the beginning, have yielded finds, and much of the material still awaits publication. With the finds at Murabba'at and El Mird, both places situated at some distance from Qumran, we are not here concerned, since none of the texts found in these places appears to have come from the sect of Qumran, from which all the

[p.4]

---

<sup>1</sup> For a brief survey of the principal dates which were proposed, cf. my *Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1952, pp. 40-61.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. O. R. Sellers, *B.A.*, xii, 1949, p. 55; G. E. Wright, *ibid.*, p. 64; R. de Vaux, *R.B.*, lvi, 1949, pp. 234, 586 ff.; G. L. Harding, *I.L.N.*, 1st October, 1949, p. 493.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. W. F. Albright, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 115, October, 1949, p. 13 n., *The Old Testament and Modern Study* (ed. by H. H. Rowley), 1951, p. 23, and apud W. H. Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline*, 1951, pp. 57 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, 1950, p. 44 (E. Tr. by E. M. Rowley, 1952, p. 32); P. Kahle, *Die hebraischen Handschriften aus der Höhle*, 1951, p. 17, and *V.T.*, i, 1951, p. 41; G. R. Driver, Letter to *The Times*, 23rd August, 1949; W. Schubart, *Th.L.Z.*, lxxvi, 1951, col. 534.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. de Vaux, *C.R.A.I.*, 1952, pp. 173 ff., and *R.B.*, lxi, 1954, pp. 206 ff., lxiii, 1956, pp. 533 ff.; G. L. Harding, *I.L.N.*, 3rd September, 1955, p. 379.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *Manchester Guardian*, 7th April, 1952, and *Le Monde*, 9th April, 1952.

finds in the Qumran area seem to have come. With the secure dating of the deposit of the manuscripts in the caves we are forced to a pre-Christian date for the origin of the sect and the work of the Teacher of Righteousness. This does not necessarily mean that the composition of all the non-Biblical texts must be ascribed to the pre-Christian era, since it would be possible for the works of the sect to be composed at any time between the founding of the sect and the destruction of its centre and abandonment of the manuscripts in the caves.

The first of the texts to be published in full was the *Habakkuk Commentary*,<sup>7</sup> and this immediately turned the attention of scholars to a work which Solomon Schechter first published in 1910, under the title *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*.<sup>8</sup> This work had come down in two mediaeval manuscripts found in the Cairo Genizah,<sup>9</sup> which in part overlapped and in part supplemented one another. Much discussion had followed its publication, and wide differences of opinion had been expressed as to the date of the composition of the work and the particular Jewish group from which it had come.<sup>10</sup> It was generally believed that the mediaeval copies were of a much older work, and the view that it came from a pre-Christian date was taken by a number of scholars.<sup>11</sup> It contained references to a Teacher of Righteousness, who was at once connected with the Teacher of Righteousness mentioned in the *Habakkuk Commentary*, when that commentary became available, and the view that the *Zadokite Work* and the *Habakkuk Commentary* were both products of the Qumran sect was widely shared. Since then fragments of the *Zadokite Work* have been found in the Qumran caves,<sup>11a</sup> and it is now generally accepted that in all discussions of the Qumran sect the *Zadokite Work* as well as the Dead Sea Scrolls must be taken into account.

Light was soon shed on the curious fact that the *Zadokite Work* had been found in the Cairo Genizah. For attention

[p.5]

---

<sup>7</sup> Cf. W. H. Brownlee, *B.A.S.O.R.*, No. 112, December, 1948, pp. 8 ff. The text was subsequently published in facsimile and transcript in Burrows-Trever-Brownlee, *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, I: *The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary*, 1950.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, I: *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, 1910. An edition of the Hebrew text was published by L. Rost, under the title *Die Damaskusschrift* (in H. Lietzmann's *Kleine Texte*), 1933, and more recently an excellent edition with translation and notes by Ch. Rabin, in *The Zadokite Documents*, 1954. For other editions and translations into various European languages, cf. my *Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 1 n. Further translations may now be found in M. Burrows, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1955, pp. 349 ff., and T. H. Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures*, 1956, pp. 61 ff.

<sup>9</sup> One was dated by scholars in the tenth century A.D., and the other in the eleventh or twelfth century A.D. Cf. Schechter, *op. cit.*, pp. ix f.; Rost, *op. cit.*, p. 3; R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii, 1913, p. 786.

<sup>10</sup> For a short survey of the opinions expressed on these matters cf. my *Zadokite Fragments*, pp. 1 ff., 78 ff.

<sup>11</sup> For references to scholars who took this view, cf. *ibid.*, pp. 1 f.n. Before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, I had written: 'I would prefer not to attempt a closer definition of its age than to say that it fell somewhere in the last century and a half before the Christian era' (*The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 1944, p. 72, 2nd ed., 1947, p. 74).

<sup>11a</sup> Cf. M. Baillet, *R.B.*, lxiii, 1956, pp. 513 ff., where these fragments are now published.

was drawn to an ancient account of the finding of manuscripts in a cave near the Dead Sea about A.D. 800,<sup>12</sup> and it was suggested that the *Zadokite Work* might have been amongst them, and so come into the hands of Karaites, who were influenced by the texts found and also preserved them.<sup>13</sup> Other Karaite texts were found in the Cairo Genizah, and through Karaites this work might have been transmitted to Egypt there to survive, and to antedate by about half a century our knowledge of the Qumran sect from the Dead Sea Scrolls.

All this means that the Scrolls and the *Zadokite Work* should be studied together in relation to our other surviving non-Biblical texts coming from Palestine in the two centuries preceding the Christian era. But first it is necessary to establish that the relevant texts of the Qumran sect are all of pre-Christian origin. I have already said that we must not assume this, since the sectarian works might have been composed at any time down to the deposit of the Scrolls in the caves.

The Teacher of Righteousness is not mentioned in all of the texts, but figures especially in the commentaries and in the *Zadokite Work*. From the somewhat cryptic manner in which he is referred to, it would appear that the first readers of the texts might be expected to understand the situation presupposed more easily than we can, and therefore that these texts were composed fairly close to the time of the Teacher. So far as the *Zadokite Work* is concerned, this is confirmed by the fact that the coming of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel seems to have been expected about forty years after the gathering in of the Teacher of Righteousness.<sup>14</sup> It would therefore seem to be clear that this work was composed within forty years of his death. In the pre-Christian period three principal dates for the life and work of the Teacher of Righteousness have been proposed. Later dates seem to be precluded by the considerations I have already mentioned, and these dates will be left out of account here. The three

[p.6]

pre-Christian dates are: 1. the early part of the second century B.C.; 2. the time of Alexander Jannaeus, in the early part of the first century B.C.; 3. the middle of the first century B.C. I shall indicate later some of my reasons for preferring the first of these dates, but here it will suffice to say that on any of them we should probably place all the texts that mention the Teacher of Righteousness in the pre-Christian period.

---

<sup>12</sup> Cf. O. Eissfeldt, *Th.L.Z.*, lxxiv, 1949, cols. 597 ff. For the text of the account of this find, cf. O. Braun, *Oriens Christianus*, i, 1901, pp. 299 ff. Cf. also F. V. Filson, *B.A.*, xiii, 1950, pp. 96 f.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. G. Lambert, *N.R.Th.*, lxxii, 1950, pp. 199 ff.; de Vaux, *R.B.*, lvii, 1950, pp. 417 ff.; P. Kahle, *V.T.*, i, 1951, pp. 44 ff.

<sup>14</sup> In *Zad. Work*, ix. 29 B (p. XIX, line 35, XX, line 1) there is a reference to the period from the gathering in of the Unique Teacher (for which we should probably read 'Teacher of the Community', i.e. the Teacher of Righteousness) to the coming of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel. A few lines below, in ix. 39 B (p. XX, lines 13-15) it is said that from the gathering in of the Unique Teacher until all the men of war who consorted with the Man of the Lie should be destroyed would be about forty years. It would therefore appear that the time of the destruction would coincide with the coming of the Messiah. In ix. 10 B (p. XIX, lines 10 f.) the period of visitation is said to be due to end when the Messiah comes.

The *Manual of Discipline* is less easy to place in relation to the Teacher of Righteousness, who is not referred to in it. The Teacher of Righteousness seems to have given authoritative interpretation of the Law to his followers,<sup>15</sup> but he is not said to have organized the sect. In the *Zadokite Work* there is reference to one called the Star,<sup>16</sup> who appears to have led the sect to Damascus,<sup>17</sup> and he must have lived and been the leader of the sect within forty years of the death of the Teacher. Whether he is the author of the *Manual of Discipline*, however, we have no means of knowing. In the *Zadokite Work* we find reference to the *Book of Hagu*,<sup>18</sup> which seems, therefore, to have been in existence within forty years of the death of the Teacher of Righteousness. In a fragment related to the *Manual of Discipline*, which came from Cave I, there is another reference to the *Book of Hagi*, as it is called here.<sup>19</sup> This fragment is not a part of the work called the *Manual of Discipline*, and there is some reason for thinking that it is earlier than the *Manual*. Its editor notes that the congregation of the sect is here organized on a more military basis than the community of the *Manual*, and he finds the fragment to reflect a situation which recalls the congregation of the Hasidim described in I Maccabees, while the *Manual* suggests an organization nearer to that of the Essenes as described by our ancient authorities.<sup>20</sup> The *Manual* may therefore be a revised manual, reflecting a later stage of the organization of the sect, perhaps based on earlier manuals, and its date in relation to the work of the Teacher of Right-

[p.7]

eousness is more problematical. The *Book of Hagu* or *Hagi*, which does not seem to have come down to us, may not have retained a permanent place of importance in the literature of the sect. It is probable that the two works which mention it come from dates not far apart, and it is significant that the one recalls the congregations of the Hasidim in Maccabean times, and the other comes from a date within forty years of the death of the Teacher of Righteousness.

The *Battle Scroll*<sup>21</sup> seems to me to come with certainty from the second century B.C. I am aware that its editor places it shortly before the beginning of the Christian era,<sup>22</sup> but this seems to me quite improbable. It describes an apocalyptic war in which foreign nations will be successively conquered, beginning with the Kittim of Assyria. Since we find mention of the king of the Kittim, the reference here is

---

<sup>15</sup> We are not told in so many words that he interpreted the Law, but M. Burrows rightly observes that 'since there are many indications that his followers considered themselves the only true observers of the law, it is fairly safe to infer that his authority was recognized in this area also' (*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1955, p. 146). Gaster holds that the title usually translated 'the Teacher of Righteousness' really means 'the man who expounds the Law correctly' (op. cit., pp. 261, 271 n. 18; cf. also p. 5).

<sup>16</sup> *Zad. Work*, ix. 8 (p. VII, lines 18 f.).

<sup>17</sup> This is the view of Dupont-Sommer, with whom I am in full agreement here. Cf. Op. cit., pp. 74 f- (E. Tr., p. 60).

<sup>18</sup> *Zad. Work*, xi. 2 (p. X, line 6), xv. 5 (p. XIII, line 2).

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Barthelemy and Milik, *Qumran Cave I*, 955, p. 109 (1QSa, col. I, line 7).

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 108.

<sup>21</sup> For convenience this shorter title is used, instead of the more usual *War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*.

<sup>22</sup> Y. Yadin, *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness* (in Hebrew), 1955, pp. 222 ff.

almost certainly to the Seleucids.<sup>23</sup> It is said that the Kittim in Egypt will march against the kings of the north.<sup>24</sup> We are familiar with the term 'kings of the north' for the Seleucid rulers in the book of Daniel, and it is highly probable that it has the same meaning here,<sup>25</sup> and that the Kittim in Egypt are the Ptolemies. The Kittim of this Scroll could not be the Romans, at least before the time of Augustus, since the Romans did not have a king at that time. For that matter, even after Augustus they did not use the title of king. The *Battle Scroll* describes an apocalyptic war, rather than a historical war, but it seems to have arisen out of a historical situation, and to have come from a time when the Greek or Macedonian kingdoms still existed to north and south of Palestine, and when the Edomites, Ammonites and Philistines, who accompany the Kittim of Assyria,<sup>26</sup> fell within the Seleucid domains. The mottoes to be inscribed on the banners of the warriors in the *Battle Scroll* recall the mottoes used as watchwords by the Maccabean warriors.<sup>27</sup>

We may therefore with reasonable confidence regard all these works as coming from the pre-Christian period, with

[p.8]

the possible exception of the *Manual of Discipline*, of which we shall make scant use in this lecture. Similarly the *Hymns*, which are, like the psalms of the Psalter, very difficult to date on internal evidence, will be little used. For the present we may leave undefined whether the other works come from the second or first century B.C., though I have noted some things which point to the second century.

It is time now for us to turn to the Jewish literature of the second and first centuries B.C., and to examine some of their teachings which fall under the general term of apocalyptic. The Biblical book of Daniel will be left out of account for the moment, though it falls within this period and is commonly dated in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. The books which call for mention are *I Enoch*, *Jubilees*, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, some sections of the *Sibylline Oracles*, and the *Psalms of Solomon*. It is clearly impossible for me here to go into all the complex problems of unity and dating attaching to all these books, and if I deal with them summarily it will be for lack of time.

The *First Book of Enoch* is commonly divided into several sections, which are variously dated. Charles dates chapters vi-xxxvi and the Apocalypse of Weeks (xciii. 1-10, xci. 12-17)

---

<sup>23</sup> Dupont-Sommer at first took this view, despite the fact that he identified the Kittim of the Habakkuk Commentary with the Romans (cf. *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 98; E.Tr., p. 80). More recently he has wavered in this view, and inclined to suppose that here also the Romans may be intended (cf. *R.H.R.*, cxlviii, 1955, pp. 42 f). For a criticism of this view, cf. *P.E.Q.*, lxxxviii, 1956, pp. 95 f. In dealing with the *Habakkuk Commentary* Dupont-Sommer argues that the Kittim cannot be the Seleucids, since the term 'king of the Kittim' is not used; they must therefore be the Romans, who did not have kings. But in the *Battle Scroll* there is a reference to the king of the Kittim' (col. XV, line 2). If a single interpretation of the Kittim in the two works is adopted, it can only be the Greek or Macedonian view which can be maintained.

<sup>24</sup> *Battle Scroll*, Col. I, line 4. Dupont-Sommer thinks the text here referred to the King of the Kittim, but the word 'king' is lost. Cf. *R.H.R.*, loc. cit., p. 29.

<sup>25</sup> The passage is believed by Dupont-Sommer to be based on Dan. xi. 40-45, which treats of Antiochus Epiphanes (cf. *R.H.R.*, *ibid.*).

<sup>26</sup> *Battle Scroll*, col. I, lines 1 f.

<sup>27</sup> *Battle Scroll*, col. III, lines 12 ff., and 2 Macc. viii. 23, xiii. 15.

in the pre-Maccabean period,<sup>28</sup> but I have elsewhere shown that his reasons are not convincing, or even always self-consistent, and have argued for a Maccabean date for these sections.<sup>29</sup> For chapters xci-civ, with the exception of the Apocalypse of Weeks, Charles favours the period of Alexander Jannaeus.<sup>30</sup> But here again Frey argues for a Maccabean date,<sup>31</sup> and I think this is the more probable.<sup>32</sup> For chapters xxxvi-lxxi, the Similitudes of Enoch, Charles argues for a date in the first century B.C., either between 94 and 79 B.C., or between 70 and 64. B.C.,<sup>33</sup> and for lxxxiii-xc he puts a *terminus ad quem* of 161 B.C.<sup>34</sup> Here once more Frey offers strong reasons for supposing that the Similitudes should be placed in the previous century, and

[p.9]

reflect the background of the Maccabean age.<sup>35</sup> He would assign the composition to a date soon after the death of Antiochus Epiphanes in 164. B.C.<sup>36</sup> He therefore concludes that all the principal sections of *I Enoch* come from the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, or shortly after his death,<sup>37</sup> and this view seems to me to be convincing.

In chapters vi-xxxvi we have the expectation of a world judgement, followed by the establishment of the kingdom of God, with Jerusalem and the Temple at its centre.<sup>38</sup> There is no thought of the Messiah as the head of the kingdom. This is closely similar to what we find in the book of Daniel. It does not mean that either the author of Daniel or the author of these chapters thought of the kingdom as without a leader, but that the person of the leader was not in the focus of their thought. The Apocalypse of Weeks thought of history as divided into periods, the seventh being marked by apostasy, the eighth being marked by righteousness, the ninth by the destruction of the wicked, and the tenth by the bringing in of a period of eternal bliss. The remainder of chapters xci-civ show us the wicked apostatizing and following idolatry,<sup>39</sup> and promised torment hereafter, while the righteous are promised bliss.<sup>40</sup> There is

---

<sup>28</sup> Cf. *The Book of Enoch*, 2nd ed., 1912, pp. lii f., 1 f., and *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii, 1913, pp. 170 f. On p. 171, however, he says the date of the latter section is wholly doubtful.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 2nd ed., 1947, pp. 78 ff. F. Martin, *Le livre d'Hénoch*, 1906, dates the Apocalypse of Weeks before 170 B.C., and chapters vi-xxxvi circa 166 B.C. M.-J. Lagrange, *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs*, 1909, p. 62, took a similar view, but in *Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ*, 1931, pp. 113 f., he assigns chapters vi-xxxvi to a date anterior to 125 B.C., and the Apocalypse of Weeks to circa 152 B.C. J. B. Frey, in Pirot's *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, i, 1928, cols. 358, 366, dated the former section in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, and the latter during the early Maccabean period. A. Weiser, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 2nd ed., 1949, p. 311, assigns the origin of both of these sections to the Maccabean period. O. Eissfeldt, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 2nd ed., 1956, p. 765, assigns the Apocalypse of Weeks to circa 170 B.C. For some scholars who prefer later dates cf. *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, pp. 79 f. To these may be added, R. H. Pfeiffer, *History of New Testament Times*, 1949, where chapters vi-xxxvi are assigned to circa 100 B.C., and the Apocalypse of Weeks to circa 163 B.C.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. *The Book of Enoch*, 2nd ed., pp. liii f., and *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii, p. 171.

<sup>31</sup> Loc. cit., col. 367.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. *The Relevance of the Apocalyptic*, 2nd ed., p. 56.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. *The Book of Enoch*, 2nd ed., p. liv, and *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii, p. 171.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. *The Book of Enoch*, p. liii, and *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, loc. cit.

<sup>35</sup> Loc. cit., cols. 361 f.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., col. 364

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., col. 368.

<sup>38</sup> *I Enoch* x. 6, xvi. 1, xix. 1, xxv. 4 f.

<sup>39</sup> *I Enoch* xci. 7, 9, xcvi. 7 ff.

<sup>40</sup> *I Enoch* xcix. 11, ciii. 3 f, 7 f., civ. 2 ff.

no suggestion of the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth, or of any resurrection on earth. In chapters lxxxiii-xc the history of Israel is depicted symbolically under the figure of sheep. The history culminates in a Gentile attack, until one of the sheep develops a powerful horn, against which the enemy had no power.<sup>41</sup> This is doubtless to be identified with the Maccabees,<sup>42</sup> whose victory was expected to inaugurate the kingdom of God, when the enemy should be destroyed, and the righteous dead should arise. One described as a white bull should lead them,<sup>43</sup> and he fulfils the functions of the Messiah, though the term is not used of him, and there is no mention of Davidic descent.

The Similitudes of Enoch raise problems of Christian

[p.10]

interpolation and of the interpretation of their figure of the Son of Man. In the book of Daniel the Son of Man is a figure symbolizing the saints as invested with power in the coming kingdom,<sup>44</sup> and there are some who think the Son of Man is here also a collective symbol.<sup>45</sup> Others hold that he is a transcendental figure, a pre-existent individual.<sup>46</sup> For our purpose this is not material, since nothing of this character can be found in the Scrolls. The term Anointed One, or Messiah, is found in the Similitudes,<sup>47</sup> but there is nothing to indicate that he is a human deliverer, and again the view has been expressed that this is a collective figure.<sup>48</sup>

The book of *Jubilees* is commonly dated in the second century B.C.<sup>49</sup> Albright<sup>50</sup> and Zeitlin<sup>51</sup> have argued for earlier dates, but some years ago I offered reasons for rejecting that view.<sup>52</sup> Amongst the practices on which the book of *Jubilees* lays

---

<sup>41</sup> *I Enoch* xc. 9 ff.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. E. Sehurer, *History of the Jewish People*, II iii, 1890, p. 66: 'Nothing but stubborn prejudice can prevent anyone from seeing that, by the symbolism of the lambs (xc. 6), the Maccabees are to be understood' (cf. 4th German ed., iii, 1909, p. 277).

<sup>43</sup> *I Enoch* xc. 37.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. my *Darius the Mede*, 1935 p. 63 n.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, 2nd ed., 1935, pp. 228 f, and *B.J.R.L.*, xxxii, 1949-50, pp. 178 ff.; N. Messel, *Der Menschensohn in der Bilderreden des Henoch*, 1922, pp. 3 ff. Messel eliminates the title, save in *I Enoch* xlvi. 2 ff., and xlvi. 2. Against this cf. E. Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch*, 1946, pp. 14 ff.

<sup>46</sup> So W. Staerk, *Soter*, 1933, pp. 72 ff., and *Die Erlösererwartung in den östlichen Religionen*, 1938, pp. 438 ff.; A. H. Edelkoort, *De Christus-verwachting in het Oude Testament*, 1941, p. 500; E. Sjöberg, op. cit., pp. 83 ff.; S. Mowinkel, *He that Cometh*, E. Tr. by G. W. Anderson, 1956, pp. 370 ff. Manson holds that the Son of Man is thought of as pre-existent in the purpose of God, but about to become real in the community of the saints (loc. cit., p. 186).

<sup>47</sup> *I Enoch* lii. 4.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Messel, op. cit., p. 31; Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, pp. 228 f.

<sup>49</sup> Frey, loc. cit., col. 375, places it about the middle of the century. Others put it later in the century; so Charles, *The Book of Jubilees*, 1902, pp. lviii ff.; G. Beer, in Herzog-Hauck, *P.R.E.*, 3rd ed., xvi, 1905, p. 259; K. Kohler, in *J.E.*, vii, 1907, p. 304; R. H. Pfeiffer, *History of New Testament Times*, p. 70; Eissfeldt, *Einleitung*, 2nd ed., p. 751. Weiser, op. cit., p. 302, puts it before the breach of Hyrcanus with the Pharisees. On the other hand L. Finkelstein, *H.T.R.*, xxxvi, 1943, pp. 19 ff., dates it before the profanation of the Temple by Antiochus Epiphanes, and E. Littmann, in Kautzsch's *Apokryphen and Pseudepigraphen*, ii, 1900, p. 37, dates it in the Maccabaean period.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 1940, pp. 266 f.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. *J.Q.R.*, N.S. xxx, 1939-40, pp. 1 ff, xxxvi, 1945-46, pp. 12 ff.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 2nd ed., pp. 84 ff., and *J.Q.R.*, xxxvi, 1945-46, pp. 184 ff.

emphasis is the keeping of the Sabbath,<sup>53</sup> which was prohibited by the Seleucid authorities in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes.<sup>54</sup> The observance of the Jewish food laws is also enjoined,<sup>55</sup> and we know that in the time of Antiochus there was a vigorous effort to compel the Jews to eat unclean foods.<sup>56</sup> It will be remembered that Dan. i is concerned with the same question. The author of *Jubilees* complains of idolatry,<sup>57</sup> and this again was an issue in the age of Antiochus,<sup>58</sup> when the Temple was profaned and an idol altar set up in the Temple.<sup>59</sup> Reference is made to Jews who refrained from circumcising their children,<sup>60</sup> and the practice of the rite is strongly enjoined on men. In the time of Antiochus circumcision was prohibited,<sup>61</sup> and many Jews sought to remove its traces by a surgical operation,<sup>62</sup> while others continued to circumcise their children, and brought upon themselves the dire penalty of crucifixion, with their slain children hung about their necks.<sup>63</sup> Further, the author of *Jubilees* warns his readers against being seen nude, like the Gentiles,<sup>64</sup> and we know that in the Maccabean period athletic games, in which the participants were naked, were promoted in

[p.11]

Jerusalem.<sup>65</sup> Again *Jubilees* is concerned with issues about the calendar, and it is clear that when it was written there were disputes as to the proper calendar that should be used.<sup>66</sup> Morgenstern<sup>67</sup> has brought this into association with the statement in the book of Daniel that the Little Horn, i.e. Antiochus, thought to change times and the law.<sup>68</sup> All this would seem to provide the appropriate background for the book of *Jubilees*, and a date about the middle of the second century B.C. would be more appropriate for the origin of this book than any other. By the end of the century all these issues had receded into the distance.

The book of *Jubilees* must have been written before the *Zadokite Work*, since the latter contains a reference to it and to its calendar,<sup>69</sup> which appears to have been

---

<sup>53</sup> *Jub.* ii. 17 ff., xxiii. 19.

<sup>54</sup> 1 Macc. i. 45, 2 Macc. vi. 6.

<sup>55</sup> *Jub.* vi. 7, 10 ff., vii. 31 ff., xxi. 18.

<sup>56</sup> 2 Macc. vi. 7.

<sup>57</sup> *Jub.* xi. 4, xx. 7 ff., xxi. 3 ff.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. 1 Macc. i. 47.

<sup>59</sup> On this idol altar cf. what I have written in *Studia Orientalia Ioanni Pedersen dicata*, 1953, pp. 309 ff.

<sup>60</sup> *Jub.* xv. 33 f; cf. xv. 11 ff., 26.

<sup>61</sup> 1 Macc. i. 48, 60 f.

<sup>62</sup> 1 Macc. i. 15. Cf. also *Assumption of Moses*, viii. 3, which clearly refers to the period of Antiochus Epiphanes.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Josephus, *Antiquities* XII, v. 4 (xii. 256); cf. also *Assumption of Moses*, viii. 1.

<sup>64</sup> *Jub.* iii. 31.

<sup>65</sup> 2 Macc. iv. 7 ff.

<sup>66</sup> J. Morgenstern has considered the calendars of ancient Israel in *H.U.C.A.* i, 1924, pp. 13 ff. (esp. pp. 65 ff. for *Jubilees*), iii, 1926, pp. 77 ff., x, 1935, pp. 1 ff., and in particular the calendar of the book of *Jubilees* in *V.T.*, v, 1955, pp. 34 ff. A. Jaubert, *V.T.*, iii, 1953, pp. 250 ff., has established the agreement of the Qumran community's calendar with that of *Jubilees* (cf. also *ibid.*, vii, 1957, pp. 35 ff.).

<sup>67</sup> Cf. *H.U.C.A.*, i, 1924, p. 75 n. 68.

<sup>68</sup> Dan. vii. 25.

<sup>69</sup> *Zad. Work* xx. 1 (p. XVI, lines 3 f). Zeitlin, *The Zadokite Fragments*, 1952, p. 15, denies that this is a reference to the book of *Jubilees*; but Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents*, p. 75 n., observes that since the

favoured by the sect of the scrolls.<sup>70</sup> Here is a further subsidiary reason for bringing the age of the *Zadokite Work* into the second century B.C., when these calendar issues were alive,<sup>71</sup> and so for placing the period of the Teacher of Righteousness earlier in that century.

Unlike the book of Daniel, the book of *Jubilees* gives no hint of any resurrection from the dead. It contemplates an immortality of bliss for the righteous in the hereafter, while their bones rest in the earth.<sup>72</sup> The descendants of Levi are promised both ecclesiastical and religious power.<sup>73</sup> This does not appear to reflect approval of the position under the Hasmonaeans, when civil and religious power was in priestly hands, since immediately afterwards Judah is described as a prince over Jacob, who should be feared by the Gentiles, and who should sit on the throne.<sup>74</sup> It would seem that the thought is that the king should be subordinate to the priest.

The *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* again raise questions of integrity and interpolation, as well as of date. A recent study by a Dutch scholar has argued for a post-Christian date, later than the date of the deposit of the Scrolls in the caves.<sup>75</sup> Charles, on the other hand, argues for a date

[p.12]

towards the end of the second century B.C., between 109 and 107 B.C.<sup>76</sup> Pfeiffer more broadly ascribes the work to a date between 140 and 110 B.C.,<sup>77</sup> while Frey assigns it to the second half of the second century B.C.<sup>78</sup>

Too many vexed questions surround the *Testaments* to be discussed here. Only one or two of them can be briefly referred to, Of these the first concerns the thought of the Messiah. Several passages are held by Charles to indicate a Messiah from the tribe of Levi.<sup>79</sup> Lagrange disputes this interpretation,<sup>80</sup> but Beasley-Murray, after a careful examination, concludes that Charles is right in two instances, but that the others do not present this idea.<sup>81</sup> While he finds the idea in the *Testaments*,

---

title in the *Zadokite Work* agrees with that found in the prologue to *Jubilees*, and since fragments of *Jubilees* have been found at Qumran, there is no doubt that the book of *Jubilees* is meant.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. S. Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, pp. xvi, xix f; G. Margoliouth, E.T., xxiii, 1911-12, pp. 362 ff.; A. Buchler, *J.Q.R.*, N.S., iii, 1912-13, pp. 435.

<sup>71</sup> That calendar issues were under discussion over a long period is doubtless true; cf. Morgenstern, *H.U.C.A.*, i, 1924, pp. 19 ff. But the links with *Jubilees* make it probable that the *Zadokite Work* belongs to approximately the same stage in the discussion as *Jubilees*, and therefore point to the second century B.C.

<sup>72</sup> *Jub.* xxiii. 30 f.

<sup>73</sup> *Jub.* xxxi. 14 f.

<sup>74</sup> *Jub.* xxxi. 18 f.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 1953, where it is argued that the Testaments were composed circa A.D. 200.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, 1908, p. liii, and *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii, p. 290.

<sup>77</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 64.

<sup>78</sup> *Op. cit.*, col. 388.

<sup>79</sup> These passages are *T. Reub.* vi. 7-12; *T. Levi* viii. 14, xviii; *T. Jud.* xxiv. 1-3; *T. Dan* v. 10 f.; *T. Jos.* xix. 5-9. Cf. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, p. xvii.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. *Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ*, pp. 127 ff.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. *J.T.S.*, xlvi, 1947, pp. 1 ff.

therefore, he gives it less prominence than Charles did. On the other hand, the thought of a Messiah from Judah is also found in the *Testaments*.<sup>82</sup> Here Charles excised one of the references as an interpolation, and was doubtful of the interpretation of the other,<sup>83</sup> and Lagrange was disposed to agree that the conception of a Messiah from Judah was a later addition.<sup>84</sup> Beasley-Murray, however, finds further references to such a Messiah, and after careful examination of the evidence holds that the *Testaments* thought of two Messiahs, a priestly and a Davidic, of whom the second should be subordinate to the first.<sup>85</sup> This study was published before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, and it will be seen that a similar view has been found in the Scrolls.

It is commonly thought that the background of the *Testaments* is to be found in the position attained by the Hasmonaeen house at the time of its composition.<sup>86</sup> Here a priestly family, though not of the true high priestly line, occupied the High Priesthood and at the same time held the civil power, and ultimately took the title of king. The functions assigned to the Messiah from Levi go beyond the achievements of the Hasmonaeans,<sup>87</sup> but it is possible that the author idealized a conception which was based on what had been done by the

[p.13]

Hasmonaeans, and thought of a coming priest who would overthrow all the forces of evil. Whether he thought of him as a Hasmonaeen Messiah is, however, another question, which is raised by the Dead Sea Scrolls, and to which we must return. For the moment it must suffice to say that some fragments of a *Testament of Levi* have been found amongst the Scrolls,<sup>88</sup> and that their editor is of the opinion that they belong to an older work which was used by the author of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* for his *Testament of Levi*.<sup>89</sup> There is also a *Scroll of Benedictions*, where the Blessing of the High Priest and the Blessing of the Prince of the Community are found,<sup>90</sup> and where the editor finds reflected the thought of two Messiahs.<sup>91</sup>

In the *Testaments* Beliar has become personified as the embodiment of evil.<sup>92</sup> Beliar is a mutation of the Old Testament word Belial, which in the Dead Sea Scrolls has

---

<sup>82</sup> *T. Jud.* xxiv. 5-6; *T. Naph.* iv. 5.

<sup>83</sup> Cf. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, p. 95, where *T. Jud.* xxiv. 5-6 is excised. In the case *T. Naph.* iv. 5, he is doubtful whether the passage is an interpolation, or whether it thinks of a Levitical Messiah (cf. p. 142).

<sup>84</sup> Cf. *Le Judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ*, p. 129.

<sup>85</sup> Loc. cit., pp. 5 ff. esp. p. 9: 'More prominence is given to the Levitical Messiah than to the Messiah from Judah. Judah is subordinate yet still indispensable.'

<sup>86</sup> So Charles, op. cit., pp. li f.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. Charles's summary of the lofty prerogatives and powers of the Messiah from Levi, op. cit., p. xcvi.

<sup>88</sup> Cf. *Qumran Cave I*, pp. 87 ff.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. J. T. Milik, *ibid.*, p. 88.

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 118 ff.

<sup>91</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 122.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. *T. Reub.* ii. 1 f.; *T. Sim.* v. 3; *T. Levi* xviii. 12; *T. Jud.* xxv. 3; *T. Iss.* vi. 1, vii. 1; *T. Dan* v. 10; *T. Naph.* ii. 6; *T. Jos.* xx. 2.

its Hebrew form.<sup>93</sup> Here we find that Beliar is the lord of darkness, and that he stands over against God, Who is the Lord of light.<sup>94</sup> We are here reminded of the Scroll which describes the war of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness. Beliar is said to be destined to be fought by one who shall arise from the tribe of Judah and Levi,<sup>95</sup> and to be bound by the Messiah of Levi.<sup>96</sup> Charles omits the reference to Judah, however, and leaves only Levi in the text.<sup>97</sup>

On the question of the resurrection the author of the *Testaments* develops the thought which is found in the book of Daniel. There we read that some of them that sleep in the dust of the earth should arise, either for reward or punishment.<sup>98</sup> It is probable that the author of Daniel was thinking of the heroes of the Maccabean struggle and of their principal enemies. The author of the *Testaments* thought of a universal rising of the righteous to receive the reward of their virtues in the everlasting bliss of the New Jerusalem.<sup>99</sup>

Of the Jewish *Sibylline Oracles* only two sections in Book III concern us here, and then not very closely. In this book

[p.14]

lines 97-819 are commonly assigned to the latter part of the second century B.C.<sup>100</sup> Some years ago I advanced reasons for fixing the date of a part of this section very precisely between 129 and 122 B.C.<sup>101</sup> Lines 46-62 of this book are commonly dated in the first century B.C.<sup>102</sup>

The thought of the former of these sections on the Messiah is cast in general terms which are based largely on passages in the Old Testament, and of little value for our purpose. There is a prediction of a king from the east, who will establish universal peace, at whose coming the Jews would enjoy prosperity that would arouse the envy of the Gentiles.<sup>103</sup> They would assemble against the Jews and seek to desecrate the Temple, but would be destroyed by God.<sup>104</sup> Men would then be so impressed by the divine favour of the Jews that they would flock to the Temple and be converted,<sup>105</sup> while Jerusalem would become the centre of an everlasting kingdom.<sup>106</sup> It is possible that memories of Antiochus Epiphanes, who is elsewhere

---

<sup>93</sup> Cf. *Zad. Work* vi. 9 f. (p. IV, lines 13, 15), vii. 19 (p. V, line 18), ix. 12 (pp. VIII, line 2, XIX, line 15), xiv. 5 (p. XII, line 2); *Man. Disc.*, cols. I, line 18, II, line 19, *Battle Scroll*, col. I, line 1; *Hymns*, col. III, line 29.

<sup>94</sup> *T. Jos.* xx. 2.

<sup>95</sup> *T. Dan* v. 10.

<sup>96</sup> *T. Levi* xviii. 12.

<sup>97</sup> Cf. *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, p. 130.

<sup>98</sup> *Dan.* xii. 2 f.

<sup>99</sup> *T. Dan* v. 12.

<sup>100</sup> So H. C. O. Lanchester, in Charles's *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii, p. 372.

<sup>101</sup> Cf. *Z.A.W.*, N.F. iii, 1926, pp. 324 ff., and *Darius the Mede*, pp. 115 ff.

<sup>102</sup> So Lanchester, loc. cit., p. 371.

<sup>103</sup> *Sib. Or.* iii. 652 ff.

<sup>104</sup> *Sib. Or.* iii. 665 ff.

<sup>105</sup> *Sib. Or.* iii. 710 ff.

<sup>106</sup> *Sib. Or.* iii. 767 ff.

clearly referred to in this section of the *Sibyllines*,<sup>107</sup> may have influenced this in part, but it would be easy to cite passages of the Old Testament, including Ps. ii and Isa ii. 2-4, which might have influenced the writer. It is not likely that there is any direct link between this and the *Battle Scroll*, which is more concerned with the successive conquest of the nations than with their conversion. It should be added that there is no thought of a resurrection in this section of the *Sibyllines*, or of any world judgement.

The other small section to which reference has been made concerns us here only because it says that when Rome rules over Egypt 'a holy prince shall come to wield the sceptre over all the world unto all ages of hurrying time'.<sup>108</sup> Neither here nor in the section mentioned above is there any indication of the tribe from which the Messiah will arise, and there is little evidence of any relation to the sect from which the Scrolls came. This is not surprising, however, for the Sibyl

[p.15]

*lines* were composed in Greek, probably in Egypt, far from the members of the Qumran sect.

The *Psalms of Solomon* are to be dated in the middle of the first century B.C.<sup>109</sup> One of these psalms is messianic in character, and the following psalm is headed 'Again of the Anointed of the Lord'. It is the former of these, Psalm xvii, which most concerns us here. After a historical survey it describes the coming messianic age, and prefaces this description with the words: 'Behold, O Lord, and raise up unto them their king, the son of David.'<sup>110</sup> It is therefore clear that here we have no expectation of a Levitical Messiah, but only of a Davidic Messiah. The terms in which his rule is described draw freely on Old Testament ideas, as is to be expected. The Messiah will be righteous and pure and will shatter unrighteous rulers and deliver Jerusalem from Gentile oppressors.<sup>111</sup> He will reign over Israel, and no alien will henceforth be admitted to the land.<sup>112</sup> He will subject the nations to his yoke, and his rule will be marked by righteousness and holiness, and Gentiles will come from the ends of the earth to behold his glory, and will bring exiled Jews to him as their gifts.<sup>113</sup> The following psalm makes no mention of the Davidic descent of the Messiah, but describes his rule in similar terms, though with less fullness. He is conceived of as wise and righteous,<sup>114</sup> and as one who will direct

---

<sup>107</sup> *Sib. Or.* iii. 389. This interpretation was first proposed by A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Jüdische Apokalyptik*, 1857, pp. 68 ff., and has been widely followed.

<sup>108</sup> *Sib. Or.* iii. 49 f. (translation of Lanchester, loc. cit., p. 379).

<sup>109</sup> So G. B. Gray, in Charles's *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii, p. 630.

<sup>110</sup> *Ps. Sol.* xvii. 23 (21). The bracketed figures in this and the following notes give the references in the edition of O. Gebhardt, *Die Psalmen Salomo's*, 1895, and the others the references in Swete's edition in the Cambridge Septuagint.

<sup>111</sup> *Ps. Sol.* xvii. 25 (23), 41 (36), 24 f. (22).

<sup>112</sup> *Ps. Sol.* xvii. 23 (21), 28-31 (26-28).

<sup>113</sup> *Ps. Sol.* xvii. 31 f. (29 f), 34-36 (31 f.).

<sup>114</sup> *Ps. Sol.* xviii. 8 (7).

every man in the works of righteousness.<sup>115</sup> The cleansing of the land is here thought of as a preparation for his coming, rather than as its consequence.<sup>116</sup>

Elsewhere in the *Psalms* we find some reference to the hope of resurrection. It is thought of as a resurrection of the righteous only, and it is declared that the sinners will perish for ever, while the righteous will enjoy eternal life.<sup>117</sup>

We may next turn to examine briefly the ideas which are expressed in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the *Zadokite Work*. In the *Zadokite Work* we find the already noted expectation that the Messiah of Aaron and Israel should arise forty years

[p.16]

after the gathering in of the Teacher of Righteousness.<sup>118</sup> Before the finding of the Scrolls this phrase had occasioned much discussion. Charles had argued that it expressed the hope of a Messiah from the family of Herod and Mariamne.<sup>119</sup> It is unnecessary today to discuss this improbable hypothesis, which had already been generally rejected, and which is now completely out of the question.<sup>120</sup> It cannot be supposed that the sect of the Scrolls looked to the house of Herod to provide its Messiah. A more probable view was that the sect itself, which consisted of priestly and lay members, regarded itself as Aaron and Israel, and hence the Messiah of Aaron and Israel meant a Messiah who should arise from within the sect.<sup>121</sup> This is now doubtful, since elsewhere in the Scrolls we find a reference to the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.<sup>122</sup> It would therefore seem that two Messiahs were expected,<sup>123</sup> and it has been conjectured that the text of the *Zadokite Work* originally had the plural, but that a scribe of later age had altered it to the singular.<sup>124</sup>

That the sect should look for a priestly and a civil head is not surprising. Its regard for the Scriptures of the Old Testament must have made it familiar with the hope of a kingly deliverer, who should establish a world-wide rule. At the time when the Second Temple was built, Zerubbabel and Joshua stood side by side as the civil and priestly leaders,<sup>125</sup> until Zerubbabel disappeared from the scene. Kings and High Priests were anointed, and to both the term *Mashiah* could be applied. Hence in the coming time, when all Israel's foes should

---

<sup>115</sup> *Ps. Sol.* xviii. 9 (8).

<sup>116</sup> *Ps. Sol.* xviii. 6 (5).

<sup>117</sup> *Ps. Sol.* iii. 16 (12), XV. 15 (13).

<sup>118</sup> See above p. 28, n. 14

<sup>119</sup> Cf. *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii, p. 795.

<sup>120</sup> Cf. my *Relevance of Apocalyptic*, 2nd ed., pp. 75 f.

<sup>121</sup> Cf. M.-J. Lagrange, *R.B.*, xxiii, 1914, p. 135; F. F. Hvidberg, *Menigheden of den Nye Pagt i Damascus*, 1928, p. 281; and my *Zadokite Fragments*, p. 41.

<sup>122</sup> *Man. Disc.*, col. IX, line 11. L. H. Silberman, *V.T.*, v, 1955, pp.77 ff., expresses strong doubts whether the expression is here rightly understood to mean two Messiahs. He points out—what is undeniable—that the Hebrew word *mashiah* simply means 'anointed', and that when we use capital letters in our translations we import more into the word than it necessarily meant for the author, and holds that the author merely looked forward to a time when the rightful line of Aaronic priests and Davidic Kings would be restored. Since there is reference also to an expected prophet, he suggests that the author awaited a true prophet who would, like the prophets of old, indicate the right persons and anoint them. Cf. also W. S. LaSor, *V.T.*, vi, 1956, pp. 425 ff.

<sup>123</sup> On the two Messiahs cf. K. G. Kuhn, *Th.L.Z.*, lxxix, 1954, cols. 760 f., and *N.T.S.*, i, 1955, p. 168 ff.

<sup>124</sup> So J. T. Milik, *Verbum Domini*, xxx, 1952, pp. 39 f.

<sup>125</sup> *Zech.* iii f.

be conquered and enduring bliss should be achieved, it was natural for a sect which was deeply religious, and which had priests at its head, to expect a priest to stand beside a king, and a king to stand beside the priest. What is of more significance is that one of the texts makes it clear that the king was to be subordinated to the priest. In the fragments related to the *Manual of Discipline* we have a description of what is often termed the 'Messianic Banquet'.<sup>126</sup>

[p.17]

Here we find that the Priest presides at this banquet, and the civil anointed King is subordinate to him. The Priest partakes first, and the King is assigned a role beneath that of the priests.<sup>127</sup>

It has been maintained that the Teacher of Righteousness was believed to be the Messiah, and that his resurrection was to be expected to usher in the Messianic age.<sup>128</sup> There is no evidence of this in the texts, and only a forced exegesis can read it into any passage. It would not have been surprising, indeed, if there had been an expectation of the resurrection of the Teacher. For already in the book of Daniel there was the expectation that many of the dead would arise, to receive reward or punishment. The book of Daniel clearly came from one who cherished the faith of Israel and who resisted the attack of Antiochus, backed by the Hellenizing Jews of his time. Whatever view is taken of the date of the Teacher of Righteousness, most scholars are of the opinion that the sect of the Scrolls developed in some way from the devoted followers of the Law in the Maccabean age. Since fragments of the book of Daniel have been found amongst the Scrolls,<sup>129</sup> the sect must have been acquainted with this thought of a resurrection, and we have seen that it figures in some others of the works which have come down to us from the second and first centuries B.C., though in various forms. It would therefore not have been surprising if the sect had had a doctrine of resurrection, not alone of the Teacher of Righteousness, but of others. In fact no expectation of any resurrection, either for the Teacher or for any others, appears to have been cherished.<sup>130</sup> In the light of this absence of any thought of a resurrection for the righteous or for the wicked, it is the more improbable that the idea of the resurrection of the Teacher of Righteousness should be read into any passage by forced exegesis. Many years ago, in discussing the *Zadokite Work*, G. F. Moore observed that if the author of that work had meant to identify the dead Teacher of Righteousness with the expected Messiah, he would have expressed

[p.18]

---

<sup>126</sup> Cf. *Qumran Cave I*, pp. 109 ff. (1QSa, col. II, line 11 ff.).

<sup>127</sup> 1QSa, col. II, lines 12 ff.

<sup>128</sup> Cf. Dupont-Sommer, *Aperçus préliminaires*, p. 56 (E. Tr., p. 44). So earlier, Schechter, op. cit., p. xiii, and G. Margoliouth, *Expositor*, 8th series, ii, 1911, p. 517. This view was rejected by G. F. Moore, *H.T.R.*, iv, 1911, p. 342; J. A. Montgomery, *B.W.*, N.S. xxxviii, 1911, p. 376; J. B. Frey, loc. cit., col. 399; and since the discussion has been revived by the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, by J. van der Ploeg, *Bi.Or.*, viii, 1951, p. 13; J. Bonsirven, *Études*, cclxviii, 1951, p. 216; R. de Vaux, *La Vie Intellectuelle*, April 1951, p. 67; R. Tamisier, *Scripture*, v, 1952, pp. 37 f.; F. F. Bruce, *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 1956, pp. 88, 127.

<sup>129</sup> Cf. *Qumran Cave I*, pp. 150 ff.

<sup>130</sup> J. van der Ploeg, *V.T.*, ii, 1952, pp. 171 ff., finds the thought of the immortality of the soul and an Afterlife reflected in the Scrolls, rather than the thought of resurrection. Cf. M. Delcor, *R.S.R.*, xxvi, 1952, pp. 375 f. and *N.R. Th.*, lxxvii, 1955 pp. 621 ff.

so singular and significant a belief of the sect unmistakably.<sup>131</sup> This observation is equally relevant in connexion with the more recently found Dead Sea Scrolls.

The *Battle Scroll* describes the war whereby the nations should be successively conquered. But it is to be noted that the Kittim are present throughout to the thought of the writer. He says that after the Kittim are conquered the arms of the sect are to be led against nation after nation in a specified order, and apparently the whole war is to occupy forty years.<sup>132</sup> But thereafter he reverts to the Kittim, and throughout the rest of the work he has nothing to say about the other nations. This is very significant. I have already said that the Kittim of this Scroll must be identified with the Greeks, and this view has been held by some who have found the Kittim of the other texts to be the Romans. We are therefore definitely in the second century B.C., when it was possible to think of the Kittim in Egypt marching against the Seleucid king of the north. It is true that in the first century B.C. Demetrius III led his army from Syria against Alexander Jannaeus, but there is no reason to think that this event would arouse the nationalist feelings of the sect, and one writer who would put the Teacher of Righteousness in that age believed that the members of the sect were on the side of Demetrius.<sup>133</sup> This is on every ground improbable, and the conditions of that age would scarcely seem to provide a suitable background for the composition of the *Battle Scroll*.

It should be observed that in the *Zadokite Work* the period of forty years from the death of the Teacher of Righteousness to the messianic age was thought of as a period of tribulation and conflict.<sup>134</sup> Throughout this period there should be a Remnant maintaining its faithfulness, and by the end of the forty years all the men of war should be consumed.<sup>135</sup> It is curious that the *Battle Scroll* thinks of forty years of war before the final and universal triumph should be achieved, and the *Zadokite Work* thinks of forty years from the death

[p.19]

of the Teacher of Righteousness before the same consummation in triumph should be achieved. This suggests that the same period is in mind, and this would mean that the *Battle Scroll* was composed early in that period of forty years. For it is clear that the victory over the Kittim had not yet been effected, and this was but the first stage to be followed by more than thirty years of further conflict. There is a further reference in the fragment of a *Commentary on Psalm 37* to the end of the forty years when all the wicked should cease to exist,<sup>136</sup> and since there is a reference to the Teacher of Righteousness in this commentary, the thought would appear to be of the period of forty years from his death.

If, now, the *Battle Scroll* belongs to the second century B.C., and come from a date but a few years after the death of the Teacher of Righteousness, the work of the Teacher of Righteousness must be located in the second century. It is then not without significance that its ideas on the Messiah are much more closely related to the texts which we have examined

---

<sup>131</sup> Cf. *H.T.R.*, iv, 1911, p. 342.

<sup>132</sup> The opening section of the *Battle Scroll* speaks of seven battles against the Kittim, which are apparently to be understood of seven annual campaigns, for col. II, line 6 goes on to speak of the remaining thirty-three years of the apocalyptic battle.

<sup>133</sup> So M. H. Segal, *J.B.L.*, lxx, 1951, p. 143.

<sup>134</sup> Cf. above, p. 29, n. 14.

<sup>135</sup> Cf. *Zad. Work* ix. 39 B (p. XX, lines 14 f.).

<sup>136</sup> Cf. J. M. Allegro, *P.E.Q.*, lxxxvi, 1954, p. 71 (4QpPs 37, col. I, lines 6 f.).

earlier, coming from the second century B.C., than they are to those from the first century. On the question of the resurrection we have found that some of the second-century works at which we have looked show no expectation of it, while others develop the thought of the book of Daniel in the direction of a general resurrection of the righteous. It was not until towards the end of that century that the passage in Daniel seems to have stimulated this development. It has been said that the book of *Jubilees* contemplates an immortality of bliss for the righteous hereafter. In the Scrolls it would appear that there is a similar thought, rather than a thought of resurrection.

To some other things that link the Scrolls closely with the book of *Jubilees*, of which fragments have been found at Qumran, we shall have to return. Meanwhile we may turn to the thought of the two Messiahs in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. If one of these Messiahs in the *Testaments*

[p.20]

was thought of in terms of the Hasmonaeans, it is unlikely that the members of the sect of the Scrolls shared this idea. Such ardent supporters of the house of Zadok could not have looked with favour on the Hasmonaeon priesthood, and no Hasmonaeon could have been a candidate for the office of lay Messiah in the thought of the sect. Moreover, if the *Testaments* looked for two Messiahs, a priestly and a Davidic, this would very improbably be attributed to the time after the Hasmonaeans had assumed the title of King, if the Hasmonaeans were thought of as providing one of them. For this would involve the thought of the dethronement of the Hasmonaeans. It would therefore seem that if the thought of the *Testaments* owed something to the achievements of the Hasmonaeans, it did not involve any support of their claims.

In one passage in the *Testament of Levi*<sup>137</sup> it is said that a King should arise in Judah and establish a new priesthood, to be called by a new name. Charles interpreted this of the Hasmonaeans, and thought the new name was the revival of the title of Melchizedek.<sup>138</sup> T. W. Manson effectively answers this, and holds that the new name was 'Sons of Zadok', the reference being to Solomon's establishment of Zadok in the place of Abiathar in Jerusalem.<sup>139</sup> He therefore disposes of this Hasmonaeon hypothesis, and finds instead the conception of the Zadokite priesthood, which was so dear to the Qumran sect.<sup>140</sup>

It has been said that before the discovery of the Scrolls it was argued that the *Testaments* thought of two Messiahs, a civil and a priestly, of whom the former should be subordinated to the latter. This is precisely what we find in the Scrolls. It is quite unthinkable that the sect of

---

<sup>137</sup> *T. Levi*, viii. 14.

<sup>138</sup> Cf. *Testaments*, p. 45.

<sup>139</sup> Cf. *J.T.S.*, xlviii, 1947, pp. 60 f.

<sup>140</sup> It should be noted that this was before the finding of the Dead Sea Scrolls and not in the interest of any theory about the Scrolls. More recently Dupont-Sommer, *Semitica*, iv, 1951-52, pp. 33 f, has argued that *T. Levi* xvii f. come from the middle of the first century B.C. and contain reference to the Teacher of Righteousness, and to the Wicked Priest of Dupont-Sommer's hypothesis, i.e. Aristobulus II. He is prepared to hold that these chapters are an addition to the work. So far as *T. Levi* viii. 14 is concerned, he holds that the Teacher of Righteousness is the priest with the new name, and that he was expected to inaugurate the messianic priesthood after his death (p. 49). This has to be read into the text, where no suggestion of it can naturally be found. What has to be read into a text on the basis of a theory can offer no support to that theory. Ch. Rabin, *J.J.S.*, iii, 1952, pp. 127 f., suggests that 'an only begotten prophet' in *T. Benj.* ix. 2 may be a reference to the Teacher of Righteousness.

the Scrolls had any use for the Hasmonaeans, or could do other than condemn their taking the office of High Priest. Their doctrine of two Messiahs was certainly not derived from the Hasmonaeans. It probably owed more to the fact that the sect venerated the priestly Teacher of Righteousness and was

[p.21]

organized under priestly leaders. It cherished the hope of a civil Messiah,<sup>140a</sup> which rested on so many passages of the Old Testament, but this hope was not attached to any present *officer* of the sect, and the civil Messiah accordingly took second place to the priestly Messiah, who would continue the office held by the head of the sect at that time and all the time.

It now seems likely, therefore, that the expectation of the *Testaments* owed something to the sect of the Scrolls. The author of the *Testaments* may have been influenced in part by the achievements of the Hasmonaeans in drawing his idealized picture, but it is improbable that he was really thinking of a Hasmonaeon Messiah. This is not to say that he was a member of the sect of the Scrolls. In the ferment of ideas in the Maccabean and post-Maccabean period, it is unnecessary to suppose that any of the groups which developed out of the people opposed to Antiochus lived *in vacuo*, and fully possible that the author of the *Testaments* was familiar with some of the ideas of the sect of the Scrolls, but developed them in his own way.

On the other hand, there is no reason to suppose that the author of the *Psalms of Solomon* felt any influence of the sect of the Scrolls. He has no thought of a priestly Messiah superior to the Davidic Messiah, and his conception is quite different from that of the *Testaments* and of the Scrolls. If the Teacher of Righteousness belonged to the first century B.C., and figured in open conflict with Jannaeus or with Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, and if he founded and led the sect of the Scrolls in that age, something of the ideas of the sect would have been known to the author of the *Psalms of Solomon*. This, of course, does not mean that he would necessarily have shared them. Nevertheless, it is worthy of note that the ideas of the Scrolls have closer links with second-century writings than with first-century writings. While I would not for a moment suggest that this is the only possible

[p.22]

explanation of this fact, it would be easily understandable if the Scrolls came from the middle of the second century B.C., and the founding of the Qumran centre fell towards the end of the century, when the sect withdrew itself from Jerusalem and from the main current of Jewish life.<sup>141</sup>

---

<sup>140a</sup> This is made quite plain in a text published by J. M. Allegro, *J.B.L.*, lxxv, 1956, pp. 174 f, where there is a reference to the rightful Messiah of the house of David.

<sup>141</sup> A. Michel, *Le Maître de Justice*, 1954, pp. 41-74, compares the ideas of the Scrolls with the literature I have here examined more fully than could be done here, and shows the close links with *I Enoch*, *Jubilees*, and the *Testaments*, and the contrast with the *Psalms of Solomon*. He observes that the best commentary on *T. Levi xvi* may be found in the *Habakkuk Commentary* (p. 47). On the other hand, he notes that whereas the *Psalms of Solomon* come from the period to which some scholars would assign the *Habakkuk Commentary*, the two works betray no sign of allusion to common contemporary events. This is not to deny, of course, any links between the Scrolls and the *Psalms of Solomon*, and Michel does not make such a denial. All writers recognize many links between the Scrolls and the New Testament, but these do not mean

We may now turn to some further reasons for this view, which seem to me to reinforce it powerfully. I have said that the book of *Jubilees* enjoins the keeping of the Sabbath, the observance of Jewish food laws, the avoidance of idolatry, the following of a right calendar, and the practice of circumcision. All of these were live issues in the Maccabean period, in a way that is not equally evidenced for any other date suggested for the book.

It may now be observed that the sect of the Scrolls also condemned idolatry,<sup>142</sup> enjoined the keeping of the Sabbath,<sup>143</sup> and was interested in the question of the calendar,<sup>144</sup> and appears to have favoured the same calendar as *Jubilees*. Here, then, we have some indications of a common background with the book of *Jubilees*, and none of these things would come with equal relevance from a background of the first century B.C. Alexander Jannaeus and Hyrcanus and Aristobulus would certainly not have commended themselves to the members of the sect, but there is no evidence that they promoted idolatry, or opposed the keeping of the Sabbath, or enforced a new calendar. I have already noted that Antiochus Epiphanes forbade the keeping of the Sabbath and appears to have enforced a new calendar, while his active promotion of idolatry amongst the Jews and conversion of the worship of the Temple to idolatrous worship is abundantly documented.

The sect of the Scrolls condemned marriage with a niece.<sup>145</sup> This, too, finds some relevance in the situation of the second century B.C. For if the Teacher of Righteousness belonged to the early part of the second century B.C., he was contemporary with the Tobiad Joseph, of whom Josephus

[p.23]

relates a disgraceful story of his marriage with his niece in circumstances that were far from creditable.<sup>146</sup> He did this while his wife, who had borne him several sons, was still alive, when there was no excuse for his conduct. It is to be noted that the sect condemned the taking of a second wife while already one wife was living, as well as marriage with a niece.<sup>147</sup> In the *Habakkuk Commentary* the House of Absalom is condemned because it gave no help to the Teacher of Righteousness against the Wicked Priest.<sup>148</sup> It has been suggested that the Tobiad family was given the opprobrious title of House of Absalom,<sup>149</sup> and this seems to me

---

that the New Testament emanated from the sect or was composed in the same age as the Scrolls. The links do not establish a common historical background, and that is what Michel is here concerned with. For other studies of the links between the Scrolls and the *Psalms of Solomon*, cf. M. Delcor, *Essai sur le Midrash d'Habacuc*, 1951, pp. 50 ff., and H. J. Schoeps, *Z.R.G.G.*, iii, 1951, pp. 327 ff. On the links between the Scrolls and the apocalyptic literature which I have considered, cf. also G. Molin *Die Söhne des Lichtes*, 1954, pp. 158 ff: Molin adopts the first-century B.C. view of the date of the Teacher of Righteousness, and also dates the pseudepigraphical works later than I have done. He therefore rightly notes the close connexions which are to be found between the two groups of literature. He does not examine the date of the pseudepigraphical works, however, as I had done before the publication of the Scrolls, or relate them to a first-century background as closely as I, following Frey and others, do to a second-century background.

<sup>142</sup> *Man. Disc.*, col. II, lines 11, 17; *Zad. Work* ix. 34 (p. XX, line 9).

<sup>143</sup> *Zad. Work* xiii. 1 ff. (p. X, lines 14 ff.), 13 ff. (p. XI, lines 4 ff.).

<sup>144</sup> *Zad. Work* v. 1 f. (p. III, lines 12 ff.), viii. 15 (p. VI, lines 18 f.), xx. 1 (p. XVI, lines 2 f.); *Man. Disc.*, Col. I, lines 14 f.

<sup>145</sup> *Zad. Work* vii. 9 ff. (p. V, lines 7 ff.).

<sup>146</sup> Cf. *Antiquities*, XII, iv. 6 (xii. 186 ff.).

<sup>147</sup> *Zad. Work* vii. 1 (p. IV, lines 20 f.).

<sup>148</sup> *Hab. Commentary*, col. V, lines 9 ff.

<sup>149</sup> Cf. Bo Reicke, *Studia Theologica*, ii, 1949-50 p. 55.

probable.<sup>150</sup> The hostility of the sect would naturally fasten on this act of one of their enemies, and the evil circumstances of this particular polygamous marriage with a niece would quicken their hostility to any such marriage.

The book of Daniel gives us evidence of the expectation in the second century B.C. that the kingdom of God was about to be established, and the heroes of the Maccabean struggle were sustained in their conflict by this hope. This situation could easily give rise to the dreams of the *Battle Scroll*, whereas we know of no equally appropriate setting for such expectations in the first century B.C., in connexion with the times of either Jannaeus or Aristobulus and Hyrcanus. Further, the *Battle Scroll* opens with a reference to the attack of the Sons of Light on the Edomites, Moabites, Ammonites, and Philistines. It is not without significance that in I Macc. v we are told of attacks made by Judas on the Edomites, on Transjordan, and on the Philistines. If the Teacher of Righteousness lived in the early part of the second century B.C., therefore, there is evidence that the friends and allies of the sect actually embarked on the programme of which the author of the *Battle Scroll* dreamed—including, of course, the attack on the Kittim of Assyria, i.e. the Seleucids. If, on the other hand, the Teacher lived in the first century B.C., there is no comparable evidence that the sect or its allies

[p.24]

embarked on any programme of this character. The references to the Teacher of Righteousness and the terms of the *Battle Scroll* suggest that our texts did not come from authors who wrote in calm detachment, but from men who lived in critical days—critical not for the sect alone, but for their whole world—and who fiercely cherished hopes of imminent triumph.

Attention has been drawn above to the close links of thought and background which bind the Scrolls to other literature which may be assigned with great probability to the second century B.C. It may be added that in the Scrolls and the *Zadokite Fork* we find the prince of evil indicated by the term *Mastema*.<sup>151</sup> It is to be noted that in the pseudepigraphical literature collected by Charles in his great edition, this term is used elsewhere only in the book of *Jubilees*, where it is frequently found.<sup>152</sup> Again, therefore, we find a link with second-century B. C. literature.

Further, it may be recalled that fragments of *Jubilees*, and of a *Testament of Levi*, believed to be a source of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, and also of a *Book of Noah*, believed to be one of the sources of *I Enoch*, have been found in the caves, while other fragments of *I Enoch* still await publication.<sup>153</sup> Everything points to a close association of these works with the Scrolls,<sup>154</sup> which is more easily understood if they had a common background in the events of the second and third quarters of the second century B.C.

---

<sup>150</sup> Cf. my *Zadokite Fragments*, pp. 71 ff.

<sup>151</sup> *Zad. Work* xx. 2 (p. XVI, line 5). In *Man. Disc.*, col. III, line 23, where the expression 'the dominion of his *mastema*' is used, the word is employed as a common noun, but still in association with the Prince of Darkness.

<sup>152</sup> *Jub.* x. 8, xi: 5, xvii. 16, xviii. 9, 12, xix. 28, xlvi. 2, 9, 12, 15.

<sup>153</sup> Cf. J. T. Milik, *Verbum Domini*, xxx, 1952 pp. 38 f., and *Qumran Cave I*, pp. 84 ff.

<sup>154</sup> Cf. Eissfeldt, *Einleitung*, 2nd ed., pp. 817 ff.

It will appear that an impressive case for the locating of the Teacher of Righteousness in the early part of the second century B.C. is supported by these various approaches. The ideas and interests of the sect find a relevant setting in that age, and the historical situation which could give rise to the dream of an apocalyptic war against all the nations of the earth is there. The close links with other second-century apocalyptic and messianic hopes would be fully explained. Moreover, the designation of the sect as the Sons of Zadok

[p.25]

would find a natural explanation. For we know that this was a live issue at that time. The Seleucid kings appointed Menelaus to the high priestly office, though he was not of the legitimate high priestly line.<sup>155</sup> When Alcimus came to occupy the office some of the followers of Judas were willing to welcome him because of his legitimate descent,<sup>156</sup> though they found themselves treacherously betrayed by Alcimus. All this shows, however, that the question of the true descent of the High Priest was a live issue at that time, and a sect that supported the claims of the family of Zadok would find a suitable origin here.

It lies beyond my purpose today to bring further supporting lines of evidence for this date for the Teacher of Righteousness. I have elsewhere examined the question of the Kittim in the *Habakkuk Commentary*,<sup>157</sup> and have shown that there, no less than in the *Battle Scroll*, all that we are told of the Kittim is more appropriate to the Greeks or Macedonians than it is to the Romans. I have also examined the reference to the Lion of Wrath, mentioned in the fragment of the *Nahum Commentary* as one who hung men alive, and have shown that if this refers to crucifixions, as seems most probable, it could with greater relevance be read in the light of the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes than of any event that can be adduced from the first century B.C.<sup>158</sup> For in the persecution of Antiochus parents who had circumcised their children were crucified with their slain babes hung around their necks,<sup>159</sup> and if the Teacher of Righteousness is located in the early second century B. C., then these crucified martyrs would be members of the sect and kindred groups who were opposed to Antiochus. If, on the other hand, the crucifixions are connected with Alexander Jannaeus, then they have to be dissociated from the sect, save that it is claimed that the unmentioned Teacher of Righteousness must have been amongst those crucified by Jannaeus, though he had nothing whatever to do with the others who were crucified, and we

[p.26]

have no record of his crucifixion, either in the Scrolls or in any other source!<sup>160</sup>

---

<sup>155</sup> Cf. *Studia Orientalia Ioanni Pedersen dicata*, 1953, pp. 303 ff, where I have discussed this question, on which Josephus, who declares Menelaus to have been the brother of Onias (*Antiquities* XII, v. 1 (xii. 238)), is in disagreement with 2 Macc. iv. 23 ff., and have offered reasons for preferring the latter.

<sup>156</sup> 1 Macc. vii. 12 ff.

<sup>157</sup> Cf. *P.E.Q.*, lxxxviii, 1956, pp. 92 ff.

<sup>158</sup> Cf. *J.B.L.*, lxxv, 1956, pp. 188 ff.

<sup>159</sup> Cf. Josephus, *Antiquities*, XII, v. 4 (xii. 256).

<sup>160</sup> So J. M. Allegro, *J.B.L.*, lxxv, pp. 89 ff.

It may be added that in the *Nahum Commentary* we have for the first time in the Scrolls contemporary historical persons mentioned under their own proper names. Antiochus is mentioned,<sup>161</sup> and he appears to be Antiochus Epiphanes,<sup>162</sup> though we are here told nothing about him. There is merely a simple reference to the period from Antiochus to the rise of the rulers of the Kittim. There is also a reference to a king of Greece,<sup>163</sup> who appears to be Demetrius, though the beginning of his name is lost. This Demetrius is said to have sought to enter Jerusalem with the aid of the seekers after smooth things. In the first century B.C. Demetrius III fought against Alexander Jannaeus, but it is unlikely that the sect of the Scrolls was on either side in this conflict. In the second century B.C., within a year or two of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, Demetrius I sent Nicanor to Jerusalem to secure control of the whole city,<sup>164</sup> including the Temple, and the story of his boast and subsequent defeat by Judas Maccabaeus, and the hanging up in Jerusalem of the hand that had been boastfully outstretched against the Temple is very familiar.<sup>165</sup> At this time the seekers after smooth things, who were on the side of Demetrius and Nicanor, would certainly be the enemies of members of our sect.

It is unnecessary to say more of these converging lines of evidence. In the present lecture it has been my purpose to add one more line of approach in the links between the messianic and apocalyptic thought of the Scrolls with the events and writings of the second century B.C. To have dealt exclusively with that restricted question, without reference to the other lines of approach, would have been unsatisfactory, since this evidence must be integrated with the other evidence at our disposal before its full weight can be realized. It is that integration which I have here attempted, and it seems to me to contribute materially to a case which on other grounds I have found to be strong.

[p.35]

## Abbreviations

<i>B.A.</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeologist.</i>
<i>B.A.S.O.R.</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools for Oriental Research.</i>
<i>B.J.R.L.</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library.</i>
<i>B W.</i>	<i>Biblical World.</i>
<i>Bi.Or.</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Orientalis.</i>
<i>C.R.A.I.</i>	<i>Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres.</i>

[p.36]

<i>E.T.</i>	<i>Expository Times.</i>
<i>H.T.R.</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review.</i>

---

<sup>161</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 90 (4QpNa, line 3).

<sup>162</sup> He is so identified by Allegro, *ibid.*, p. 993.

<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 90 (4QpNa, line 2).

<sup>164</sup> 1 Macc. vii. 6 ff.

<sup>165</sup> 1 Macc. vii. 47.

<i>H.U.C.A.</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual.</i>
<i>I.L.N.</i>	<i>Illustrated London News.</i>
<i>J.B.L.</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature.</i>
<i>J.E.</i>	<i>Jewish Encyclopedia.</i>
<i>J.J.S.</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies.</i>
<i>J.Q.R.</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review.</i>
<i>J.T.S.</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies.</i>
<i>NR.Th.</i>	<i>Nouvelle Revue TheologiQue.</i>
<i>N.T.S.</i>	<i>New Testament Studies.</i>
<i>P.E.Q.</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly.</i>
<i>P.R.E.</i>	<i>Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie and Kirche.</i>
<i>R.B.</i>	<i>Revue Biblique.</i>
<i>R.H.R.</i>	<i>Revue de l'Histoire des Religions.</i>
<i>R.S.R.</i>	<i>Revue des Sciences Religieuses.</i>
<i>Th.L.Z.</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung.</i>
<i>V.T.</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum.</i>
<i>Z.A.W.</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.</i>
<i>Z.R.G.G.</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Religions- and Geistesgeschichte.</i>

---

© 1957 Continuum Publishing. Reproduced by permission.

Prepared for the Web in July 2006 by Robert I Bradshaw.

<http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/>

---