Journal of Semitic Studies XXXIV/2 *Autumn 1989*

BIBLICAL PROOF-TEXTS IN QUMRAN LITERATURE

GEZA VERMES

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

It is with much affection, somewhat mingled with awe of a scholar whose keen eyes never miss the slightest imperfection, that I offer this humble contribution to Edward Ullendorff on his three score years and ten. In its original form, this paper was presented under his chairmanship as my presidential address to the British Association for Jewish Studies at its annual conference in Oxford on 18 July 1988. The oral delivery seemed to have met with his approval, and I hope that the printed version will not be a disappointment.

This essay is an echo and continuation of a paper – *Bible Interpretation at Qumran* – which I read in Berlin at the Third Congress of the European Association for Jewish Studies in July 1987.[1] The scope of the latter was restricted to a descriptive analysis of Essene exegetical documents; this time I intend to investigate the function of Bible citations in writings which do not belong to the interpretative genre.

The exegetical works, discussed by me at Schloss Glienicke in 1987, all begin with the Bible and combine or accompany it with various kinds of interpretation. By contrast, the material which is the subject of our present concern almost regularly starts with a theological or legal statement and endeavours to support it with the help of a single or combined biblical proof-text. I have collected thirty-four units handling fifty-two scriptural passages, mostly single verses.[2] There are only four cases

[1] It is due to appear in the Yigael Yadin Memorial Volume in *Eretz-Israel* XIX (1989).

[2]

Gen.	1:27	CD	4:21	Num.	10:9	M	10:2-4
	7:9	CD	5:1		21:18	CD	6:3-4
Exod.	23:7	S	5:15		24:17	CD	7:19f
Lev.	18:13	CD	5:8f		24:17-19	M	11:6f
	19:17	CD	9:8		30:9	CD	16:10
	19:18	CD	9:2		30:17	CD	7:8f (19:5)
	23:38	CD	11:18				

where two to four verses are simultaneously cited.[3] Some further statistical remarks may be of interest. In regard to the Bible, all five books of the Pentateuch are quoted (Genesis twice, Exodus once, Leviticus four times, Numbers six times and Deuteronomy eleven times). Of the Latter Prophets, Isaiah figures ten times, Ezekiel three times, Hosea three times, Amos twice, Micah four times, Nahum, Zechariah and Malachi once each. By contrast, the Former Prophets and the Writings are each attested only by a single reference to 1 Samuel and Proverbs.

Even more curious is the repartition of the Scrolls using biblical proof-texts. The Community Rule (1QS) contains three such examples; the War Rule (1QM) five; but the Damascus Document (CD) forty-three. The last remaining citation (Isa. 10:12) appears in the very fragmentary Prayers for Festivals (4Q509 275)[4] with no context whatever; hence neither the structure, nor the purpose of the argument can be identified. This, of course, implies that the evidence before us pertains either to the pre-1947 stage (the Damascus Document appeared in 1910),[5] or to the earliest Scrolls publications of the 1951-4

Deut.	5:12	CD 10:16f			54:16	CD 6:8	
	7:8	CD 8:15 (19:28)			59:5	CD 5:13f	
	7:9	CD 7:6 (19:1f)		Ezek.	9:4	CD 19:12	
	7:21f	M 10:1f			13:10	CD 8:12 (19:24f)	
	9:5	CD 8:15 (19:28)			44:15	CD 3:21-4:2	
	9:23	CD 3:7		Hos.	3:4	CD 20:16	
	17:17	CD 5:2			4:16	CD 1:13f	
	20:2-5	M 10:2-4			5:10	CD 8:2f (19:15f)	
	23:24	CD 16:6f			7:11	CD 4:10-12	
	32:28	CD 5:13f		Amos	5:26f	CD 7:14f	
	32:33	CD 8:9f (19:22)			9:11	CD 7:16	
1 Sam.	25:26	CD 9:9		Mic.	2:6	CD 4:20	
Isa.	2:22	S 5:17			2:11	CD 8:13 (19:24f)	
	7:17	CD 7:11f			7:2	CD 16:16	
	10:12	4Q509/275			7:11	CD 4:12	
	24:17	CD 4:14		Nahum	1:2	CD 9:5	
	27:11	CD 5:16		Zech.	13:7	CD 19:7-9	
	31:8	M 11:11 f		Mal.	1:10	CD 6:13	
	40:3	S 8:14		Prov.	15:8	CD 11:20f	
	50:11	CD 5:13					

[3] Deut. 7:21-2 in M 10:1-2; Amos 5:26-7 in CD 7:14-15; Num. 24:17-19 in M 11:6-7; Deut. 20:2-5 in M 10:2-4.

[4] Cf. M. Baillet, *DJD* VII (1982), p. 213.

[5] Cf. S. Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries: Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (1910).

vintage. In fact, with the exception of the Prayers for Festivals, about which next to nothing can be said, all the relevant passages were already available to J. A. Fitzmyer when he issued in 1961 his quasi-comprehensive study of the subject.[6] In other words, over more than quarter of a century, no fresh Qumran text employing scriptural reasoning has appeared. Those bound to include such passages, like the unpublished fragments of the Community Rule and the Damascus Document, are still inaccessibly in J. T. Milik's hands, and the by now notorious MMT, or מקצת מעשי התורה ('Some of the Torah Observances'),[7] whose edition is announced as (permanently) imminent, as well as the so-called Pentateuchal Paraphrases, are still not in the public domain owing to nearly four decades of procrastination by the editors of the series, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*. Nevertheless, although the sources are all well-known, the approach focusing on literary structure and exegetical purpose will – it is hoped – contain some fresh insights.

I. LITERARY STRUCTURE

Among the exegetical writings from Qumran, only the Testimonia, the Pesher and the rabbinic midrash-type compositions, such as the Florilegium (4Q175) and the Melchizedek document (11QMelch), display any recognizable literary structure. The Testimonia furnish, again and again, the Scripture extracts with an introduction, e.g. 'The Lord spoke to Moses, saying'. In the case of the Pesher, a biblical excerpt is followed by a formula (e.g. 'Its interpretation is that', or 'concerns', etc.) linking it to a fulfilment interpretation or a theological commentary.[8] Midrash-like compositions, on the other hand, employ a greater variety of introductory idioms prefixed either to the biblical quotation (like 'as it is written', or 'as he said'),

[6] 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and the New Testament', *NTS* 7 (1960-61), pp. 297-333; cf. also *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (1971), pp. 3-58.

[7] E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, 'An Unpublished Halakhic Letter from Qumran', *Biblical Archaeology Today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, April 1984* (1985), pp. 400-7.

[8] Cf. M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretation of Biblical Books* (1979), pp. 239-44.

or to the subsequent exegesis (e.g. 'This is', 'The interpretation of the saying concerns').[9]

The structure of compositions in which proof-texts are used, viz., the War Rule, the Community Rule and the Damascus Document, is varied and tends to be richer in technical detail.

The War Rule uses bipartite or tripartite arguments. They all appear in the context of the eschatological battle liturgy on columns 10 and 11. The bipartite form begins with a source attribution: 'He (Moses) taught us' (1QM 10:1,2) or 'Our officers shall recount that which you (God) said through Moses' (1QM 10:6), and ends with a citation from the Torah:

Thou art in the midst of us, a mighty God and terrible ... (Deut. 7:21f.)
Hear, O Israel! You draw near to battle this day ... (Deut. 20:2-4)
When you go to war in your land against the oppressor ... (Num. 10:9)

In the tripartite unit, a doctrinal statement (I) which is to be demonstrated with the help of the biblical saying, precedes the introductory formula (II) and the quotation (III).

[*1QM 11:11-12*]

(I) From ancient times Thou hast fore[told the hour] when the might of Thy hand (would be raised) against the Kittim,
(II) saying,
(III) 'Assyria shall fall by the sword of no man ...' (Isa. 31:8).[10]

It is to be noted that in none of these passages is the biblical proof-text further explained. The Pentateuch words are, or seem to be, attributed to Moses, but the Isaiah excerpt appears to come straight from God without a human intermediary.

The tripartite argument figures in the Community Rule too.

[*1QS 5:14-15*]

(I) No man shall consort with him (the wicked) with regard to his work or property .... He shall indeed keep away from him in all things:

[9] On the introductory formulae, see J. A. Fitzmyer, *op. cit.* in n. 6, pp. 7-13.
[10] Cf. also 1QM 11:5-7 citing Num. 17-19.

(II) as it is written,
(III) 'Keep away from all that is false' (Exod. 23:7).

However, 1QS uses also the fourfold structure, which is, as will appear presently, the regular form of the Qumran biblical reasoning, the final element being an explanation linking the proof-text to the statement which is to be established.

[*1QS 8:12-16*]

(I) And when these become members of the Community in Israel ..., they shall separate from the habitation of ungodly men and shall go to the wilderness to prepare the way of Him;
(II) as it is written,
(III) 'Prepare in the wilderness the way of...., make straight in the desert a path for our God' (Isa. 40:3).
(IV) This (path) is the study (מדרש) of the Torah which He commanded by the hand of Moses, that they may do all according to all that has been revealed from age to age, and as the prophets have revealed by His holy spirit.

The third example, 1QS 5:16-18, which will be considered at a later stage, follows the same pattern.

It is worth noting that in none of the three passages is the biblical source specified, the formula, 'as it is written', remaining always anonymous.

In the mass of scriptural proof-texts of the Damascus Document it is possible to grasp the constructional many-sidedness and nuances of the Qumran exegetical argument. Both the Exhortation with its sectarian doctrinal exposition and polemics, and the Statutes requiring special pleading to justify the Community's peculiar legal system, offer ample scope for the author to exhibit his rhetorical and halakhic skills. The work includes every shade in the spectrum from the pale simplicity of an implicit biblical inference to the variegated intricacies of a multi-level exegetical construct.

The least structured of these lines of reasoning utilizes a whole verse or part of it without an introductory formula indicating the presence of a quotation. The biblical words become integral parts of the author's account, possibly in a retouched version, in order to fit their new context. For instance, to illustrate the simplest form, in CD 4:10-12 a doctrinal assertion is merely backed up by an abridgement of Mic. 7:11.

[*CD 4:10-12*]

(I) When the age is completed ..., there shall be no more joining the house of Judah, but each shall stand on his watch-tower.

(III) 'The wall is built, the boundary far removed.'[11]

In a considerably more elaborate pattern, three Isaiah extracts and one from Deuteronomy are cleverly interwoven with the author's own narration, the subject being once more the wicked.

[*CD 5:13-17*]

(III.1-2) They are 'all kindlers of fire and lighters of brands' (Isa. 50:11); their webs are 'spider's webs', and their eggs are 'viper's eggs' (Isa. 59:5).

(I) No man that approaches them shall be free from guilt .... For already in ancient times God visited their deeds and his anger was kindled against their works,

(III.3-4) 'For it is a people of no discernment' (Isa. 27:11), 'for they are a nation void of counsel inasmuch as there is no discernment in them' (Deut. 32:28).

CD 8:12-13 = 19:24-6, quoting or adapting Ezek. 13:10 and Mic. 2:11, and possibly also CD 3:7-8, abbreviating Deut. 9:23, belong to this class.[12]

Of the remaining examples, there are eight tripartite and four quadripartite constructs which, from the formal viewpoint require no special comment except that in one case out of twelve the introductory formula is not of the anonymous type. In CD 3:20-4:4, instead of the usual 'as it is written', or 'as he said', one reads, 'as God ordained for them by the hand of *the prophet Ezekiel*, saying', followed by Ezek. 44:15 and its pesher-like exposition:

The Priests are the converts of Israel who departed from the land of Judah .... *The sons of Zadok* are the elect of Israel ... who shall stand at the end of days.

[11] MT reads: 'A day for building your walls! In that day the boundary shall be far removed.'

[12] CD 6:2-9 with Num. 21:18 resembles the passages listed above in that they all omit the introductory formula before the Bible text. However, in the last instance this may be due to an editorial accident, the author seemingly citing from a Pesher on Numbers.

In anticipation of the analysis of complex structures, it should be observed that one doctrinal and three legal citations attest an unusual arrangement. Instead of (I) statement, (II) introductory phrase, (III) quotation, (IV) exposition, we find a simple or extended threefold argument.

[*CD 16:10-12*]

(II) Concerning a woman's oath, inasmuch as he said,

(III) 'It is for her husband to cancel the oath' (Num. 30:9),

(IV) no husband shall cancel an oath without knowing whether it should be kept or not.

The extended threefold argument, represented by CD 8:14-16, combines two separate biblical texts in the following manner:

[*CD 8:14-16*]

(II) As for that which Moses said,

(III.1) 'You enter to possess these nations not because of your righteousness or the uprightness of your hearts' (Deut. 9:5),

(III.2) 'but because God loved your fathers and kept the oath' (Deut. 7:8),

(IV) thus shall it be with the converts of Israel .... Because God loved the first ..., so will he love those who come after them, for the Covenant of the fathers is theirs.

Compared with the normal tripartite argument where the author's thesis comes first, supported by a biblical proof, here a chosen passage of Scripture serves as foundation for a theological or halakhic inference.

This brings us to the jewels of Qumran exegetical artistry where a series of biblical quotations and interpretations are expertly intertwined to produce the teaching intended by the sectarian writer. Of the four examples, two of which (CD 7:9-21 and 19:5-13) furnish parallel demonstrations of the same statement with the help of different citations (Isa. 7:17 against Zech. 13:17), one will suffice to demonstrate the remarkable dialectical mastery of the author of the Damascus Exhortation.

[*CD 4:12-5:13*]

(I) During all those years Belial shall be unleashed against Israel,

(II) as he spoke by the hand of Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz, saying,

(III.1) 'Terror, and the pit and the snare are upon you, O inhabitants of the land' (Isa. 24:17).

(IV) Its interpretation (פשרו). These are the three nets of Belial

(ii.a) with which Levi the son of Jacob said

(iii.a) that he catches Israel by setting them up as three kinds of righteousness.

(iv.a) The first is fornication, the second is riches, and the third is profanation of the sanctuary.

(III.2) Whoever escapes the first is caught in the second, and whoever saves himself from the second is caught in the third (Isa. 24:18 reworded).

(I-A.1) The builders of the wall who have followed Precept {Precept was a Spouter

(A.1.ii) of whom he said,

(A.1.iii) 'They shall surely spout' (Mic. 2:6)}

(I-A.2) shall be caught in fornication twice (1) by taking two wives while they are alive,

(A.2.iia) whereas the principle of the creation is

(A.2.iiia) 'Male and female created he them' (Gen. 1:27);

(A.2.iib) also

(A.2.iiib) those who entered the ark went in two by two (Gen. 7:9 re-worded);

(A.2.iic) and concerning the Prince, it is written,

(A.2.iiic) 'He shall not multiply wives to himself' (Deut. 17:17) ...

(A.2.ivc) But David had not read the sealed book of the Law .... It was hidden ... until the coming of Zadok.

(I-A.3) (2) And each man marries the daughter of his brother or sister,

(A.3.ii) whereas Moses said,

(A.3.iii) 'You shall not approach your mother's sister; she is your mother's near kin' (Lev. 18:13).

(A.3.iv) But although the laws against incest are written for men, they apply also to women. When,

therefore, a mother's daughter uncovers the nakedness of her father's brother, she is his near kin.

Two comments should be added.

(1) In (I-A.2), the first form of fornication is defined with the help of three Pentateuch quotations, of which the first two, Gen. 1:27 and 7:9, can be seen as the monogamous matrimonial principle of the creation, and of the renewal or new creation after the flood, and the third (Deut. 17:17) is so interpreted already in CD's David example, not to mention the clear formulation of the Temple Scroll 57:16-19.[13]

[13] Cf. on this subject my 'Sectarian Matrimonial Halakhah in the Damascus Rule', *Post-Biblical Jewish Studies* [= *PBJS*] (1975), pp. 50-6. The conclusion reached there, namely that the polemical argument of CD is directed against polygamy, has recently been questioned by P. R. Davies in *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* [Brown Judaic Studies 94] (1987), pp. 73-85. His main thesis re-states the theory put forward by J. Murphy O'Connor in 'An Essene Missionary Document', *RB* 77 (1970), p. 220, according to which the author of CD held the view that only a single monogamous marriage was lawful, and that even a widower's remarriage counted as 'fornication'. His interpretation was criticized by Y. Yadin in 'L'attitude des Esséniens envers la polygamie et le divorce', *RB* 79 (1972), pp. 98-9 and by myself in the above quoted paper. This is not the place to re-examine the whole issue since the sole question relevant here is the use of biblical proof-texts and on this point, *pace* Davies, I stand by my earlier interpretation. As a matter of curiosity, it should be noticed that he fails to discuss Deut. 17:17 and treats the David story, which is in fact an excursus on the Deuteronomy law, as the third (quasi) proof-text (p. 81), thus presenting an incomplete, and consequently weakened, argument.

Two further comments on his attempt at rebuttal. Firstly, the prohibition of divorce and second marriage, additional to that of polygamy, can be discovered in the text only by means of inference. But in a matter as unusual as this, one would expect some kind of more explicit remark such as the one appended to the deduction of a ban on a marital union between uncle and niece from Lev. 18:13 where, in fact the prohibition concerns the marriage between an aunt and her nephew: 'Although the laws against incest are written for men, they also apply to women' (CD 5:8-11). Secondly, Dr Davies's contention that the passage concerning married Essenes in Josephus (*B.J.* ii. 160-1) is relevant to the problem under discussion appears to be a red herring. Its specific message is that sexual intercourse in marriage is licit only for procreation and may not be pursued during the wife's pregnancy, or started before the definite physical onset of puberty. Monogamy, polygamy, divorce, remarriage, etc., the real questions raised in connection with the CD pericope, are simply not envisaged in the Josephus quotation. This is, it would seem, why scholars, except Dr Davies, have ignored it in their exegesis of CD 4:20-5:6.

(2) At the beginning of this chain of authoritative quotations (IV) (iia), figures an otherwise unknown saying attributed to Levi son of Jacob. Its presence among biblical proof-texts requires some explanation. Both these questions will be touched on later.

II. EXEGETICAL PURPOSE

Having surveyed the technique of the presentation of proof-texts, it still remains to investigate the aims pursued by the Qumran writers when they freely decided to supply scriptural backing for a doctrinal or legal exposition. It is of course assumed that the Bible – however this entity was defined – wielded a unique authority within the Community. Scriptural allusions which give a particular savour and weight to a statement and evoke sacred associations but do not raise the question of its evidential value, will not be investigated here. Attention will instead be centred on explicit quotations which may be divided into four classes depending on whether their purpose is:

(1) eschatological actualization;
(2) direct proof (without explanation);
(3) reinforced proof (with explanation);
(4) proof of historical fulfilment (with or without explanation).

Needless to say, in the more complex composite structures, e.g. the long passage of CD 4:12-5:13 examined earlier on, more than one kind of exegetical endeavour can simultaneously be pursued.

(1) *Eschatological actualization*

This category corresponds to the bipartite group in the structural classification. The simple aim of the author, that of the War liturgy, is to stress that the ultimate goal of the Mosaic battle regulations is to provide directives during the eschatological conflict. By reproducing, or rewording, passages from the Pentateuch, the writer conveys their supreme meaning. Changes in the biblical quotations will be discussed later.

(2) *Direct proof*

The direct proof is structurally tripartite. The biblical citation

is not supplied with interpretative comment either because it is, or is thought to be, self-explanatory, or perhaps more often because it reproduces the right words irrespective of their original context. It is convincing because it contains the correct sounds.

Thus in 1QS 5:14-15, 'Keep away from all that is false' confirms absolutely the prohibition imposed on sectaries from maintaining any contact in matters of work and property with men of falsehood, whereas in its Exodus context 23:7 forbids specifically the laying of false charges.

CD 7:6-9 (=19:2-5) yields a particularly interesting case because, in order to support the rule stated, the biblical text is so altered that it loses its contextual sense.

[CD 7:6-9 (19:2-5)]

(I) And if they live in camps according to the rule of the Land, marrying and begetting sons, they shall walk according to the Torah and according to the statute concerning binding vows, according to the rule of the Torah,

(II) as he said,

(III) 'Between a man and his wife and between a father and his son' (Num. 30:17).

The Pentateuch passage reads, 'between a father and his daughter'. This point will be touched on again in the concluding section.

Occasionally the reader is expected to be endowed with a fertile imagination, as in CD 16:14-15 where the prohibition on devoting to the Sanctuary the food necessary for the well-being of the donor's family is justified from Mic. 7:2, 'Each hunts his brother with a חרם'.

Instead of the original, and in the new context irrelevant, meaning of 'net', the author assumes that his audience will perceive the intended play on words and understand the text as: 'Each man hunts (i.e. destroys) his brother (not with a net, but) with a votive offering' – חרם being capable of yielding both meanings.

(3) *Reinforced proof*

The most common type of Qumran exegesis assumes that a straight quotation of a biblical passage falls far short of

expressing the full, and at least partly concealed, meaning of Scripture, and in consequence cannot supply real proof. Hence, an explanation, one taught by the Sons of Zadok, is appended in order to convey the sect's peculiar doctrine. The result is normally a fourfold structure, but some of the Community's halakhic regulations are framed in a tripartite form.

For example, 1QS 5:16-18 conveys a supplementary precision in its understanding of 'wherein is he reckoned' when it proclaims that through Isaiah 2:22 free association and exchange with outsiders is declared illegal.

[*1QS 5:16-18*]

(I) No member of the Community shall follow them (the wicked) in matters of doctrine and justice, or eat or drink anything of theirs, or take anything from them except for a price;

(II) as it is written,

(III) 'Keep away from the man in whose nostrils is breath, for *wherein is he reckoned*' (Isa. 2:22)?

(IV) For all those *not reckoned in his Covenant* are to be set apart, together with all that is theirs.

The Deuteronomy law enjoining the observance of a vow must have struck the Essenes as simplistic and misleading; hence while it remained for them the guiding rule, they clothed it in halakhic detail.

[*CD 16:6-8*]

(II) And that which he said,

(III) 'You shall keep your vow by fulfilling it' (Deut. 23:24),

(IV) (a) let no man, even at the price of death, annul any binding oath by which he has sworn to keep a commandment of the Torah; (b) but even at the price of death, a man shall fulfil no vow by which he has sworn to depart from the Torah.

(4) *Proof of historical fulfilment*

Fulfilment exegesis is the chief characteristic of the Qumran *pesher* genre. However, the latter as a rule follows a biblical book verse by verse, while a historical proof-text is concentrated on a single, detached passage. Several of the extant

examples may have been borrowed from existing interpretative compositions; yet others may be *ad hoc* creations by the appropriate authors. A very typical effort to demonstrate that the punishment of the sect's apostates was divinely foreordained may be found in CD 8:8-12 (=19:21-4), containing an exegetical pun on Deut. 32:33.

[*CD 8:8-12*]

(I) They have wilfully rebelled by walking in the ways of the wicked,

(II) of whom God said,

(III) 'Their wine is the venom of serpents, the cruel poison (ראש) of asps' (Deut. 32:33).

(IV) The *serpents* are the kings of the peoples and their *wine* is their ways. And *the head* (ראש) *of the asps* is the chief of the kings of Greece who came to wreak vengeance upon them.

Those familiar with the difficulties in reconstructing the history of the Qumran sect from sparse cryptic references will know the importance of such an allusion to the 'kings of Greece' (מלכי יון) rather than to the more frequently mentioned 'rulers of the Kittim'.

Since the *pesher* exegesis is one of the best known areas of Qumran studies, this single example of its use as theological proof will do. As in this case, the argument is usually quadripartite, but a few instances occur in which the presentation is either deliberately elliptic or accidentally incomplete. In an excerpt from the War Rule (11:11-12) quoted earlier (p. 496), divine annihilation of the Kittim[14] is depicted as the imminent fulfilment of Isa. 31:8, 'Assyria shall fall by the sword of no man', without any comment on the link between the two nations.

CONCLUSION

To end this general survey of the biblical proof-text in Qumran literature, two consequential remarks are required. The first, concerns the relationship between various Qumran composi-

[14] On the association of 'Kittim' and 'Assyria', cf. 1QM 1:2. The eschatological connection derives probably from an exegesis of Num. 24:24. Cf. G. Vermes, *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism* [= *S & T*] (1961, 2nd ed. 1973), p. 168.

tions, and more precisely between the Damascus Document and the Temple Scroll, and the second the notion of the Bible and the handling of the scriptural text by the sectarian theologian.

In regard to the relationship of extant Qumran exegetical writings, there is no evidence so far of one directly quoting another. In fact, none of the *pesharim* provide parallels to proof-text exegesis in other Dead Sea manuscripts. As far as I am aware, only the Florilegium from Cave 4 (4Q175 I 11-13) and CD 7:15-16 include interpretation of the same biblical text, Am. 9:11 – 'I will raise up the tabernacle of David which is fallen'. Neither of them borrows from the other, although they both reflect the same basic interpretation, associating the raising of the tent of David with the coming of the messianic Interpreter of the Torah.

By contrast, a very direct relationship is noticeable between the section of the Damascus Document (4:12-5:13) dealing with the two cases of 'fornication': marriage to two women, and between uncle and niece. Both cases, considered licit in mainstream Judaism, are laboriously demonstrated to be illegal by means of exegetical exertions. The Temple Scroll in its turn presents both subjects in simple legal terms as part of the divinely revealed Torah: the king may not take a second wife whilst the first is alive (TS 57:16-19), and a man may not marry the daughter of his brother or his sister (TS 66:17). Whether the Damascus Document depends on the Temple Scroll or vice versa remains the real question.

A more fundamental issue is that of the canon and text of Scripture at Qumran. It is often repeated that with the exception of Esther, all the books of the Hebrew Bible are attested, sometimes in scroll form, more often in fragments. But the latter again and again testify to the presence of a number of manuscripts containing the same biblical book. The fact that, save Esther, all the other titles are represented in the caves, does not however mean that they were all held to be Holy Scripture, or that only works pertaining to the traditional Hebrew canon counted as such. In particular, the authoritative status accorded to a writing of Levi son of Jacob (CD 4:15), mentioned earlier, and to the 'Book of the Division of the Times into their Jubilees and Weeks', no doubt our Book of Jubilees, Hebrew fragments of which have been found in caves 1, 2, 3, 4 and 11 at Qumran, suggest that they may have

enjoyed a privileged position in the hierarchy of the Community's religious books. Finally, the possibly 'canonical' rank of the Temple Scroll needs also to be considered if we are to arrive at a reasonable view concerning the definition of Scripture (and conceivably deutero-canonical writings) among the Dead Sea sectaries.

As for the textual varieties in the biblical writings as represented in the Qumran scrolls and fragments, this is not the moment to recapitulate the discussion which was the subject of my 1987 Sacks Lecture.[15] But some comments on the nature of the citations used as proof texts may be in order.

In examining the textual variations, I shall disregard points of spelling. The quotations exhibit differences not only from the Masoretic rules, but also from the spelling of other Qumran manuscripts. For instance, 1QS 5:17 in citing Isa. 2:22 uses the Masoretic לכם against 1QIsa's לכמה, but opts at the same time for the Qumranic הואה versus the הוא of the Isaiah Scroll and MT.

Our quotations tend to omit the Tetragram. It is still hinted at by four dots, without being written out fully, in 1QS's quotation of Isa. 40:3, but in three places in 1QM 'your God' replaces 'יהוה, your God'.

Also to be noted are a number of changes in word order and other slight stylistic alterations which may be due either to textual variants or to alterations unwittingly introduced by writers or copyists. In one case, 1QS 5:15, Exod. 23:7 definitely reflects the Hebrew basis of the LXX (מכול דבר = ἀπὸ παντὸς ῥήματος) against the MT (מדבר).

When it suits the author, he abridges and/or re-words his biblical text. For instance in CD 4:18-19, instead of the full text of Isa. 24:18, 'He who flees at the sound of the terror shall fall into the pit; and he who climbs out of the pit shall be caught in the snare', we read, 'Whoever escapes the first is caught in the second, and whoever saves himself from the second is caught in the third.'

Another highly noteworthy peculiarity may be seen in 1QM 10:1-2 in citing Deut. 7:21-2. The third person descriptive style – the speaker being Moses – is replaced by a second person address to God. That is to say, instead of 'the Lord

[15] G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Forty Years On* [The Fourteenth Sacks Lecture] (1987).

your God is in the midst of you' we read, 'Thou art in the midst of us'. The phenomenon recalls a type of stylistic change common in the Temple Scroll.[16]

Furthermore, a number of changes figuring in both halakhic and haggadic contexts can only be deliberate. In CD 7:8-9, the Num. 30:17 quotation is read as 'between a father and his son' instead of 'and his daughter'. Some scholars, namely Rabin and Fitzmyer, have claimed that this is a mistake since the subject, the cancellation of vows, requires the reading, 'and his daughter'. They have overlooked, however, the opening statement for which Num. 30:17 is the proof, namely that the author is dealing with the law relating to sectaries who 'beget sons'. The re-phrased biblical text supplies the evidence needed.

Likewise, instead of 'Edom shall be dispossessed, Seir also, his enemies, shall be dispossesed' (Num. 24:19), 1QM 11:7 finds a shortened and generalized 'the enemy shall be dispossessed' more appropriate to his purpose.

As for the handling of Am. 5:26-7 in CD 7:14-18, it is widely known as the twist *par excellence* of Qumran exegesis where a prophetic menace is turned into a promise of salvation by means of a tampering with the text more reminiscent of the Zohar than rabbinic midrash. Let us recall in particular that in Amos's prediction of exile 'beyond Damascus', he mentions an astral deity, *Kaiwan*, worshipped by the guilty Israelites. This allusion, fatal to the writer's thesis, is suppressed from his quotation, but reappears a couple of lines later as the Star saviour arising from Jacob.[17]

In other words, exegetical elasticity matches the textual elasticity of the Qumran Bible. It still requires an explanation. I believe this should be sought in the paramount doctrinal authority of 'the Priests, the Sons of Zadok, the guardians of the Covenant'.[18]

[16] Cf. Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* I (1983), pp. 71-3. See also G. Vermes, in E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* III (1986), pp. 411-12.

[17] Cf. *S & T*, pp. 45-6; *PBJS*, pp. 44-5.

[18] When, in a community, the ultimate legal and religious rules are based on Scripture, its text must be absolutely fixed. But if 'orthodoxy' depends on privileged priestly teaching, the particular wording of the Bible seems to be less important.