

OTHERS AND INTRA-JEWISH POLEMIC AS
REFLECTED IN QUMRAN TEXTS

STEPHEN GORANSON

Soon after the texts from Cave One at Qumran came to light, scholars from different backgrounds expressed the view that this discovery provided further evidence about the Essenes.¹ This conclusion has been almost perennially contested, and the modern literature on Qumran itself includes not a little polemic. Some, including the present writer, find that the evidence for an Essene connection has increased throughout these last five decades to such an extent that the question now is really not whether the Essenes are related to the Qumran manuscripts, but how much we can learn about that association. Although consensus is lacking on many questions, all agree that Qumran texts reflect some disagreements between ancient Jewish groups. This essay will provide a sampling of polemic concerns, especially as seen through terminology found in the Qumran texts. It will focus on the Jewish "others" and will not explore attitudes towards non-Jews. Though it would be temerarious to presume that

the final words on Qumran history have been written, this essay will attempt to place some of the relevant terms in historical context.

1. TERMINOLOGY IN THE QUMRAN TEXTS

1.1 *Appropriate and Inappropriate Terminology*

It is useful to remind ourselves that terminology found in the Qumran texts comes from a time before the known use of some now-familiar terms often used in later descriptions of Jewish, Christian, and other groups. These later terms include the Hebrew עֲרֵב in the sense of "disapproved people," originally used only of other Jews,² and the Greek ἀἵρεσις in the sense of a "disapproved group," first found in second-century Christian disapprovals of others. T2evidently developed later than the Qumran texts, i.e. after 68 CE. It is important not to retroject these and other late terms and definitions into an anachronistic context. Yet such terms are well worth noting, since they have long and intertwined histories. Without attention being paid to the complex and changing calculus of group terminology, presuppositions concerning history can easily be retrojected, distorting that history as well as causing one to overlook early terms and definitions no longer in use in any tradition which has continued to our day.

The Hebrew term עֲרֵב in the sense of "heretic" is not found in Qumran texts, nor in any others until Rabbinic literature. Martin Goodman apparently assumed that this term was in use before 70 CE, since he attempted to find a group besides Essenes who might have owned the Qumran texts by citing a text attributed to Rabbi Yohanan (y. Sanh. 29c), saying that Israel did not go into exile "until there were twenty-four groups [עֲרֵבִים] of עֲרֵבִים."³ But Reuven Kimelman

1 There is some disagreement as to who was the first to identify the discoveries as Essene. It appears that this idea occurred independently to at least two people and was held by several before it was published. A report in the London *Times* of April 12, 1948 (pg. 4) included this identification as a possibility, based on the ASOR news release (on behalf of M. Burrows, J. Trever, and W. Brownlee) of the day before. Somewhat later there appeared in print E. L. Sukenik, *Megillot genuzot* (vol. 1; Jerusalem: Bialik, 1948) which makes the same suggestion on pg. 16. Y. Yadin later wrote of his father: "Sukenik was the first who suggested the identification of the sect with the Essenes. This suggestion was later accepted by many scholars..." (Y. Yadin, *The Message of the Scrolls* [London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1957] 176). J. C. Trever wrote that Ibrahim Sowmy, brother of Butrus Sowmy, librarian at the Syrian Orthodox monastery of St. Mark, first suggested the Essene identification (J. C. Trever, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Personal Account* [3rd. reprint, with corrections; Upland, CA: Upland, 1988] 25, and in a letter of 22 Jan., 1992). Another originator of the idea has also been proposed: Y. M. Grintz, then a student at Hebrew University in Jerusalem. More important than who was first is that the idea arose early and persuaded many people who nonetheless continued to exercise independent judgement and disagree on much else.

2 See R. Kimmelmann, "Birkat Ha-Minin and the Lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Prayer in Late Antiquity," in E. P. Sanders et al. (ed.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition 2: Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981) 226-44, 391-403. Kimmelmann shows that eventually, in Babylonian Amoraic texts, the term was also sometimes applied to non-Jews, although it began in reference to (disapproved) kinds of Jews. Though excellent on the evolution of the term *minim*, this article is less persuasive on the term עֲרֵבִים and its cognates (Ναζωραῖοι, etc.).

3 M. Goodman, "A Note on the Qumran Sectarians, the Essenes and Josephus," *JJS* 46 (1995) 161-66, esp. 162. In its context of a discussion of

the negative sense of each term

has persuasively shown that Rabbi Yohanan was most likely referring to concerns of his own time and place—third-century Galilee—and to his own disputes with ׀׀׀׀׀׀׀. ⁴ Furthermore, it appears that the lingering after-effects of the temple's destruction were associated by Yohanan with Jewish-Christians. In this case the number twenty-four does not provide a census of groups, but for Yohanan is symbolic of the twelve tribes of Israel divided. In contrast, the Jewish-Christian Revelation of John presents twenty-four—in the tribes plus the apostles in the new Jerusalem (as well as in the twenty-four elders in heaven)—as Israel augmented. The point of this example is that Goodman's use of this text is anachronistic. Among the terms which are frequently used inappropriately in Qumran studies, to be noted below, are "Sadducees" and *halakha*.

On present evidence, in the Second Temple period the Greek term ἀθεοῖς had only the neutral meaning of a chosen association, and in this sense it was still used by Josephus for Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. ⁵ For example, it may well be that ׀׀׀׀׀׀׀—which, when applied to people, has only the negative and never the neutral sense of ἀθεοῖς—did not exist in Hebrew until the Greek term had developed its negative sense in Christian use. But such possibilities are of interest only for exploring the repercussions of texts such as those from Qumran upon later developments, never for moving backward in history.

Ezekiel, this saying is nominally about the destruction of the first temple, but it is frequently considered an allusion to the destruction of the second temple.

⁴ R. R. Kimelman, *Rabbi Yohanan of Tiberias: Aspects of the Social and Religious History of Third-Century Palestine* (Ph.D. diss., New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1977) esp. 177-79, 205-206. The *minim* with whom he disputed were primarily Jewish-Christians.

⁵ For example: Josephus, *J.W.* 2 §162, *Ant.* 13 §293, and *J.W.* 2 §122, of each group, respectively. In a learned article read and distributed at the Nov. 1996 SBL Annual Meeting ("Did Philo of Alexandria use the Greek *hairesis*-model in his presentation of the philosophy of Moses?"), D. T. Runia suggested that a little-noticed fragment of Philo's *Quaestiones in Exodum* (4) provides the earliest negative use of the term, but attests only to a view that all heresies quarrel and perhaps are, by inference, inferior to the Torah. It is of interest that Philo uses ἀθεοῖς and cognates referring to a "school of thought" only four times, and never with the Essenes in mind. Of course, Philo does not mention the Pharisees or Sadducees. The other (neutral) uses are in *Contempl.* 29, *Plant.* 151, and *Mos.* 1 §24. It will be interesting to discuss Runia's article when it is published.

In order to determine how writers represented in Qumran texts viewed the "other," especially other Jews, one must first recognize how they viewed themselves. They saw themselves as the exclusive, true observers of Torah and as the true remnant of Judah. This exclusive claim—in effect: who we are, you are not—formed part of the polemic by defining themselves against others. Over time they became known by the Greek versions of their self-description: 'Εσσηῖοι and 'Εσσηῖοι as well as 'Οσσηῖοι and 'Οσσηῖοι. ⁶ In other words, some Qumran texts tell us they are Essene texts.

1.2 A Prominent Misunderstanding

One major and very widespread falsehood needs to be addressed. Here are two instances, though this serious misunderstanding appears in very many publications. In 1963 Karl Rengstorff wrote:

What is the explanation of the fact that the Essenes, who, it is claimed, speak, among other things, precisely about themselves and their views and customs in the Dead Sea texts but always use other names for themselves?⁷

As recently as 1995 Goodman observed: "...none of the published documents from Qumran refers to the sectarians as Essenes or by any Semitic word of similar derivation or meaning."⁸ This assertion is false for two reasons.

First, it involves circular reasoning, because, in order to declare a spelling is not present, one must first determine and announce precisely what Semitic spellings would qualify. But there is no consensus on the relevant spellings. The two most prominent guesses fifty years ago, at the time of the initial Qumran discoveries, were two Aramaic words, for "pious ones" (ס׃ן) and "healers" (ס׃ן). These were

⁶ The spellings beginning with *omicron* are from Epiphanus, *Panarion*, especially Heresy 19 where we are told they are Jews who do [τοῦ ἐῖ] everything according to the law (19.5.1). Compare Ναῦωπαῖοι/Ναῦωπαῖοι and Ζαυφῆροι/Ζαυφῆροι (the latter presumably meaning "servants/worshippers," not "sun-people," as Epiphanus guessed; see Heresy 53, and 30.3.2 for the latter spelling). The collocation 'Εσσηῖοι ἡ ὁσσηῖοι, in Philo (*Quod probus* 91), though usually translated "Essenes or saints" or the like, may reflect the uncertainty he already expressed in 75 concerning the correct spelling of the name. In other words, it may also be read as "Essenes or Osenses."

⁷ K. H. Rengstorff, *Hirbet Qumran and the Problem of the Library of the Dead Sea Caves* (Leiden: Brill, 1963) 15.

⁸ Goodman, "A Note on the Qumran Sectarians," 164.

popular guesses, in part, because two Aramaic noun endings (the absolute and emphatic plural forms) are similar to the two Greek morphologies) why this would be relevant. Recently an appearance of the Aramaic root ʾDT has been proposed in 4Q213a (Aramaic Levi^b) fgs. 3–4 6.⁹ But Robert Kugler observed: “It is, however, an impossible reading given the traces of ink on the fragment.”¹⁰ Even before this newly-proposed reading, Frank M. Cross had declared this etymology—which arose in the late sixteenth-century on the basis of a presumed (but unproven and increasingly unlikely) link with the Hasidim—as “thoroughly suitable.”¹¹

The erroneous conclusion on the supposed absence of the name Essene in the scrolls led to a derivative erroneous conclusion, that outsiders must have named them. For instance, Geza Vermes wrote: “If my interpretation, Essenes = healers, is correct, outsiders were so impressed by their activities... that they regularly and familiarly referred to them as ‘Healers.’”¹² Such suggestions were encouraged by scholars, despite the fact that not one extant ancient text uses either of these Aramaic words (ס״ד׳ and ס״ד׳ן) as a self-designation

⁹ M. E. Stone and J. C. Greenfield, “Aramaic Levi,” in G. Brooke et al., *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996) 33-35 + pl. II.

¹⁰ R. A. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi* (SBL 9; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996) 79 n.66. Furthermore, provided with the text from examination of the original fragment, Kugler explains that a “crease in the leather” makes viewing from more than one angle essential (see his Oct. 22, 1996 post to the Orion Dead Sea Scroll e-mail discussion group, which is archived at <http://orion.mscc.huji.ac.il/orion/archives/19961020.txt>). Kugler’s observations are of interest, in part because the new reading was made with the use of enhanced photographs (oral communication, Nov. 1994, from Jonas Greenfield).

¹¹ F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran & Modern Biblical Studies* (rev. ed., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980) 51 n.1. Many years ago J. J. Scaliger, *De Emendatione Temporum* (Paris: Estienne, 1583) declared the Syriac (Aramaic) root to be the source (pg. 251), and characterized the earlier proposal from the Hebrew root as a “hallucination” (pg. 252). But Scaliger later changed his mind in a work which was less influential on the later scholarly discussion, *Elenchus Trihaeretic Nicolai Serarii* (Frankfurt: Radaeus, 1605).

¹² G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew: A Historian’s Reading of the Gospels* (London: Collins, 1973) 63.

related to the Qumranites or any similar association in the manner suggested.¹³

The second objection to this widespread falsehood, simply, is that the name Essene actually is there. In 1QpHab 8.1 the writer’s group consists of “all doers of the torah [תורתך עושה] in the house of Judah.” The “poor ones” are “the simple of Judah, doer(s) of the torah [תורה דתורה]” (12:4); and “the men of truth” are “doers of the torah” (7:11). 4QpPs^a presents “doers of his will [עושה רצונו]” (1–10 ii 5) in apposition with, i.e. synonymous with, the congregation of his elect; group members are “doers of torah who are in the council of the community [עושה תורה אשר בעצת החדה]” (1–10 ii 15). Many more relevant texts, which are too extensive to be discussed in detail here,¹⁴ may be cited.

The present writer takes as certain the link between Greek forms of “Essene” and the Hebrew תורה עושה; that is, the Scrolls tell us they are Essene. But, allowing for possible reservations on the part of some readers, let us restate: It is clear that some writers of Qumran texts saw themselves as members of the only group at the

¹³ E.g. the term “healers” does appear in 1QApGen 21:19-20, but of Egyptian physicians who failed to heal the pharaoh.

¹⁴ Among the relevant texts are: 1QpHab 7:11; 8:1; 12:4-5; 1QS 8:3; 4Q171 (4QpPs^a) 1–10 ii 5, 15, 23; 4Q177 5–6 18 (תורה עושה); 5Q13 (i.e. 5QSecarian Rule) 10 1 (עושה); 1Q36 7 1; 4Q470 (4QZedekiah—which may be related to 4QMMT C) 1 3 (“to perform and to cause the performance of all the torah...”); 4Q422 (4Qpara Gen/Exod) 1:6, 7 (which uses the verb עושה in its creation account, as does 4Q216 [4QJubilees^a=Jubilees 2:14]); 7:2; 4Q306 (4QMen of the People who Err) 1:1 (in T. Lim, ed. [handout], based on his 1996 SBL presentation), those who err “do not observe [the torah]”; *ʾAbot R. Nar.* A 37 (perhaps a Rabbinic echo of the name Essene via a negative presentation of a type of separatist, עושה תורה). See also restorations in various editions of 1QpMic 8–9 8; 1QSb 1:1; 4Q270 9 ii 19 (designated 2 ii 19 in DJD 18); and MassihaShab 1:6. See 4Q398 (4QMMT) 1 8 as read by B. Z. Wacholder and M. Abegg, *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 3 (Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1995) 292. Compare also 1QM 12:11; 19:3 and 1 Enoch 108:2, the last chapter of the work, sometimes considered to be an Essene addition (e.g. R. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913] 2:280).

¹⁵ This etymology has been recognized by some scholars from at least as early as J. Carion, in P. Melancthon (ed.), *Chronica* (Wittenberg, 1532) folio 68 verso: “... Essel / das ist / Operatii / vom wort Assa / das ist wirken.”

time which fully observed torah. This can readily be seen in the *Serek ha-Yahad*, in which members are admitted and re-evaluated—and at times expelled—according to their deeds of torah. The root תָּוַר is employed twenty-six times in this community rule, five times in col. 1 alone. Moreover, 1QS 8:3 speaks of a function of the group done “by means of those who practice justice [כַּעֲשֵׂי צְדָקָה].”¹⁶

1.3 *The Essenes as Others Saw Them*

If the Essenes saw themselves as Jews *par excellence*, it is not surprising that many of their contemporaries—not to mention later Rabbinic Jews and most Orthodox Christians¹⁷—disagreed. Compare the experience of the Samaritans, who insist in their own literature that their name denotes “those who keep the torah in truth,” yet who are never referred to in such manner (i.e. as שְׂרָרִיבִים) in the Hebrew Bible or in Rabbinic literature.¹⁸

But some early outsiders did view Essenes as Jews *par excellence*. For instance, Philo wrote: “Our law-giver [i.e. Moses] encouraged myriads of his disciples to live in community; they are called Essenes...”¹⁹ This author’s *Apology for the Jews* is often considered to share a source with parts of Josephus’ *Against Apion*, book 2.²⁰

¹⁶ J. Strugnell, “Notes on 1QS 1, 17–18; 8, 3–4 and 1QM 17, 8–9,” *CBQ* 29 (1967) 580–82. Strugnell proposed an alternate reading, identifying the root as תָּוַר instead of תָּוַר , which is not persuasive, but did recognize that most of the published translations were incorrect. Already in 1951 W. H. Brownlee signalled this possible translation (*The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline*, [BASORSup. 10–12; New Haven: ASOR, 1951] 31 n.7). Brownlee suggested the Essene etymology תָּוַר in various publications, but, for whatever reason, never asserted it with confidence or as more than a possibility. See, for example, his *The Mishnah Pesher of Habakkuk* (SBLMS 24; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979) 119.

¹⁷ A possible exception would be Eusebius of Caesarea, who tried to claim the Therapeutae (a group somehow related to Essenes) as early Christian monks. See the fascinating excursus on this subject in F. C. Conybeare, *Philo. About the Contemplative Life, or the Fourth Book of the Treatise Concerning Virtues: Critically Edited with a Defense of its Genuineness* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895) 285–358.

¹⁸ See, for example, M. Gaster, *The Samaritans: Their History, Doctrines, and Literature* (Schweich Lectures, 1923; London: British Academy, 1925) 5.

¹⁹ Philo, *Apologia pro Iudaeis* (*Hypothetical*) in Eusebius, *Præp. Ev.* 8.11.1.

²⁰ For an extensive annotated bibliography with many relevant entries, see L. H. Feldman and J. R. Levison, *Josephus’ Contra Apionem* (AGJU 34; Leiden:

Joseph Baumgarten has noted that both 4QD^e (4Q270) and Ag. Ap. 2 §202 appear to forbid intercourse during pregnancy.²¹ While Josephus presents this as though it described the practice of Jews generally, this particular portion and others in Ag. Ap. 2 appear to describe Essene practice.²² Perhaps Porphyry, followed by Jerome, was not wrong after all, when he wrote that book 2 of *Against Apion* (which he called *Against the Greeks*) was a source of information on Essenes.²³ Philo presented Essenes as an example of a group, like the Persian Magi and the Indian Gymnosophists, “in which deeds are held in higher esteem than words.”²⁴ Strabo portrayed Moses as a honorable leader whose teachings were eventually abandoned by “superstitious men... appointed to the priesthood, and then tyrannical people,” and specifically named Alexander as one such tyrant.²⁵ It may be noted here that Alexander Jannaeus has frequently been proposed as a candidate for the “wicked priest” of the Qumran texts.²⁶

Brill, 1996) 22–48. Though in his other works Josephus depicted differing Jewish schools of thought, here he presented Jews as unified.

²¹ J. M. Baumgarten, “A Fragment on Fetal Life and Pregnancy in 4Q270,” in D. P. Wright et al. (ed.), *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995) 445–48, esp. 447 n.11.

²² Briefly, for other indications, see H. St. J. Thackeray (ed.), *Josephus: The Life: Against Apion* (LCL 186; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926) 1.373 n.b (on 2 §199, on sex for procreation only; cf. *J.W.* 2 §161); pg. 375 n.d (on 2 §203, on the soul suffering in a body; cf. *J.W.* 2 §§145–46; pg. 376 n.f (on 2 §241, on absolute confidence in friends; cf. *J.W.* 2 §241); and pg. 381 n.1 (on 2 §219, on martyrdom; cf. *J.W.* 2 §§152–53).

²³ Porphyry, *De abstinentia* 4.11–13: “in the second book against the Greeks which has two books”; Jerome, *Adversus Iovinianum* 2.14.

²⁴ Philo, *Quod probus* 74, according to F. Colson (ed.), *Philo* (LCL 363; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1941) 9.52 n.1.

²⁵ Strabo, *Geography* 16.2.35–40. Strabo (39) also compared the Judaean followers of Moses to Magi and Gymnosophists (as did Philo in *Quod probus* §74), among other groups.

²⁶ That Alexander is the most likely candidate for the “wicked priest” and Judah the Essene is the most likely candidate for the “teacher of righteousness” cannot be argued at length here. But it may be observed that his reign was perhaps the most contentious time between the three main Jewish groups. *Anz.* 13 §§288–98 presents an alternate view of a dinner characterized by sectarian strife (set in John Hyrcanus’

Pliny's source on the Essenes—who may be Marcus V. Agrippa, writing ca. 15 BCE—presented them as an ideal group in Judaea.²⁷

2. ESSENES, PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES

2.1 *The Essenes*

The Essene authors of Qumran regarded one group of Jewish opponents as “seekers of smooth things [תַּרְתָּרָה וְרַחֲמָיִם].”²⁸ This has been widely and correctly recognized as a pun against those who teach תַּרְתָּרָה; here, too, the Essene group rejects them as misinterpreting torah. The recognition of this pun has been reinforced now that all the Qumran texts are available, and we can see that the Essenes never even once use the term with respect to their own legal determinations. Of course the root does appear in its Biblical Hebrew sense “to walk.” There is, therefore, no *halakah* in Qumran texts; to call Qumran legal texts *halakah* is a distortion of history.

Such is not an entirely new problem. Bernard Revel's learned and useful 1913 volume was misleadingly titled *The Karaite Halakah and Its Relation to Sadducean, Samaritan and Philonian Halakah*.²⁹ But just how many of these groups or individuals called their legal determinations “halakah”? Note also a case of modern Jewish objections to

reign) to the generally more historical *b. Qidd.* 66a account involving Alexander atests, thus attesting at a minimum, to some motivation for revisionist history.

²⁷ S. Goranson, “Posidonius, Strabo, and Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa as Sources on Essenes,” *JJS* 45 (1994) 295-98, to which may be added that T. Mommsen long ago misread an inscription, taking it to suggest that Pliny had served with the Roman army not only in Europe but also in Egypt and Palestine. But scholarship on Pliny has shown there is no reason to suppose Pliny was ever in Judaea; see G. Serbat, “Pline l'ancien. Etat present des études sur sa vie, son oeuvre et son influence,” *ANRW* II 32 (1986) 4.2069-2200, esp. 2074-75. M. Stern noted that Pliny's source reflected the administrative divisions of Judaea at the time of Herod and that Pliny only partly updated his source (*Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* Vol. 1 [Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1976] 466).

²⁸ Among the mentions of “seekers of smooth things” are 1QH^a 2:32; 4QpIsac^c 23 ii 10; 4QpNah 1-2 ii [7]; 3-4 i 2, 7; 3-4 ii 2, 4; 3-4 iii 3, 7; and compare CD 1:18, which is partly paralleled in 4Q266 2 i 21.

²⁹ (Vol. 1: Philadelphia: Cahana, 1913), based on his 1912 Dropsie College diss. and “Inquiry into the Sources of Karaite Halakah,” *JQR* 2 (1911-12) 517-44 and *JQR* 3 (1912-13) 337-96.

calling a building believed to house heterodox teachings the “Shrine of the Book,” to which Joseph Baumgarten has responded.³⁰

Only three groups were big enough at the time to own the almost 900 remaining texts and to have such a long tenure at Qumran. They cannot have been or have included the Pharisees. The Qumran texts definitely do not represent the views of all contemporary Jewish groups—it was Essenes who owned the Qumran manuscripts.

The juxtaposition of the above two roots also appears in Dan 11:32, “He shall seduce with flattery [תַּרְתָּרָה] those who violate the covenant; but the people who know their God shall stand firm and take action [עָשׂוּ]” (RSV).³¹ This may have influenced Essene authors.

Essenes saw themselves as the true Judah, while the “seekers of smooth things,” identifiable as Pharisees, are also called “Ephraim” in some Qumran texts.³² In other words, the Essenes saw themselves as Judah versus Ephraim and their “false teaching” (4QpNah 3-4 ii 8). Many scholars recognized the presence of three groups soon after 4QpNah was published;³³ the identification of Essenes, Pharisees, and Sadducees in the pesharim, especially 4QpNah, is one of the most

³⁰ J. M. Baumgarten, “The Dead Sea Scrolls: a Threat to Halakah?” *Tradition: a Journal of Orthodox Jewish Thought* 1 (1958-59) 209-21.

³¹ Compare 1QH^a 4:7-8, which includes the same two roots, describing those who “flatter themselves with words” and whose works are deceitful. This is col. 12 according to the numbering proposed in É. Puech, “Quelques aspects de la restauration de Rouleau des Hymnes (1QH),” *JJS* 39 (1988) 38-55.

³² Among the mentions of Ephraim are 4QpIsac^c 4, 6-7 i 20, [20]; 4QpHos^b 2 [2], 3; 5-6 [3]; 10, 26 [1]; 4QpNah 3-4 i [12]; 3-4 ii 2, 8; 3-4 iii 5; 3-4 iv [5]; 4QpPs^a 1-10 i [24]; 1-10 ii 18; 13 [4]; 4Q379 (4QpIsos^b) 22 ii 13; 4Q382 105 1; 4Q460 5 i 2, 8, 10; and compare CD 7:12, 13; 14:1, the latter paralleled in 4Q267 11 i 3.

³³ For example, J. D. Amoussine, “Éphraïm et Manassé dans le Peshèr de Nahum,” *RevQ* 4/15 (1963) 389-96; A. Dupont-Sommer, “Le commentaire de Nahum découvert près de la Mer Morte (4QpNah): Traduction et notes,” *Sem* 13 (1963) 55-88; D. Flusser, תַּרְתָּרָה הַרְדָּה הַיְהוּדָה כַּר מְדַבֵּר [“The Judean Wilderness Seat and the Pharisees”], *Molad* 19 (1961) 456-58; D. Flusser, “Pharisäer, Sadduzäer und Essener im Pescher Nahum,” in K. E. Grözinger et al. (ed.), *Qumran* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1981) 121-66; and many others, including several listed in M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (CBQMS 8, Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979) 158-59. The texts of the pesharim used here are from Horgan, unless otherwise noted.

assured results of Qumran historical research, though a few scholars of late neglect this result. Maurya Horgan correctly observed the "almost complete agreement among the modern scholars" on the "main historical events" and identifications of 4QpNah.³⁴

2.2 *The Pharisees*

The term "Pharisees" evidently had an evolution of its own. It may be that, at the time 4QpNah was written, Essenes were as likely to be considered "separatists" (פְּרָשִׁימִים [פְּרָשִׁימִים]) as the group which at least later became known as Pharisees.³⁵ Incidentally, the symbolic view of Judah versus Ephraim is still echoed in Rev 7:4-8.³⁶

2.3 *The Sadducees*

The Qumran pesharim show that "Manasseh" was a term used for the Sadducees, the aristocratic, conservative group sometimes in control of the temple, as is described in Josephus and the New Testament.³⁷ These are the "great ones... the honored ones of the

³⁴ M. P. Horgan, *Pesharim*, 161.

³⁵ Such is the inference from 4QMMT C 7, "... we have separated from the majority of [פְּרָשִׁימִים מִרַבִּי] without conveying any apparent sense of impropriety.

A. I. Baumgarten ("The Name of the Pharisees," *JBL* 102 [1983] 411-28) suggested the original meaning of the Pharisees was *pārōšīm*, "those who specify" (pg. 420). He correctly noted that "ancient groups, as a rule, took their own names, rather than receiving derogatory names from opponents" (pg. 423). Furthermore, we may add, if Qumran texts are any indication, the self-designation may be followed by a negative pun (in this case, *p'rašim*, "separatists"), though it may not have been given by the Essenes. He also noted (pg. 415) a hostile source, Nicolaus of Damascus, describing Pharisees in Josephus *Ant.* 17 §41 as "pretending [ἵπποτοκυβητοῦν] to observe torah. This important evidence comes from the same author who later went rather far afield to advise assuming the perspectives of a martian and a character from James Joyce's fiction in order to attempt to keep Qumran and Essenes separate (see his "The Rule of the Martian as Applied to Qumran," *Israel Oriental Studies* 14 [1994] 121-42; and "He Knew that He Knew that He Knew that He was an Essene," *JJS* 48 [1997] 53-61). (Concerning the latter article, it cannot be said that Essene initiation as described in IQS or in Josephus *J.W.* 2 §§137-144 was at all a nebulous process.)

³⁶ S. Goranson, "The Exclusion of Ephraim in Rev 7:4-8 and Essene Polemic Against Pharisees," *DSD* 2 (1995) 80-85.

³⁷ Among the mentions of Manasseh are 4QpIsac 4, 6-7 i [20]. [21]: 4QpNah 3-4 iii 9 (*bis*), [9]: 3-4 iv [1], 1, 3, 6; and 4QpPs^a 1-10 ii 18; 13:[4], 5.

[city]" (4QpNah 3-4 iii 8). Qumranites clearly opposed the current operation of the temple—for instance, with respect to its calendar practices. The symbology of the biblical brothers appears in the relatively more conservative and (in Essene perception) older group, the Sadducees, who are symbolized by the older brother, Manasseh. In contrast, the younger Pharisees, Ephraim, were quickly growing and were seen to be "leading many astray" (4QpNah 3-4 ii 8). Consequently, the order of prophesied retribution would come first to Manasseh, then to Ephraim, "whose cup will come after Manasseh" (4QpNah 3-4 iv 6). The Essene writer supposed that the leaders of Ephraim will receive retribution, but that "when the glory of Judah is revealed, the simple ones of Ephraim will flee from the midst of this assembly" (4QpNah 3-4 iii 4-5).

As concerns the name "Sadducees," There exists a great deal of confusion which has a long history. For instance, in his *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, Solomon Schechter wrote of a work "bearing the title *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, which title was supplied to me in a hypothesis."³⁸ Though his edition was highly important, the hypothesis Schechter supplied himself (e.g. involving a presumed preference for Zadok over David), to be brief, was mistaken.³⁹ Just two of many examples of such a widespread notion on the appropriateness of this name maybe noted. In 1983 Philip Davies wrote: "The name *Zadokite Fragments* derives from the title 'Sons of Zadok' which the sect applied, among others, to itself."⁴⁰ Eleven years later John Strugnell and Elisha Qimron stated: "The Qumranites were certainly called, in Biblical fashion, בְּרֵי יִצְחָק..."⁴¹ This widespread assumption, however, is false. Never in Qumran texts does the group

³⁸ S. Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work* Vol. 1 (Documents of Jewish Sectaries; Cambridge: University Press, 1910) v.

³⁹ It should be noted that the term "Sadducees" (and cognates) became, by medieval times, such a generic term for a disapproved group that it was a replacement term used by Christian censors of the Talmud for real and imagined references to Christians as *minim*. The term is also used variously in medieval Rabbinic and Karaitic polemic. In other words, generally, the later the reference to Sadducees, the more problematic it is to use it as evidence for second temple history.

⁴⁰ P. R. Davies, *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"* (JSOTSup 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983) 3.

⁴¹ E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994) 117.

apply the name "Sons of Zadok"—much less Sadducees or בְּנֵי זָדוֹק —to themselves. Never are the sons of Zadok mentioned as anything more than members of the group—important members though they may be; they are never the whole group.⁴² The section heading in Strugnell's and Qimron's edition ("How can the Qumranites be Identified with the Sadducees?") indicates a certain determination to force the term upon the Qumran texts in the face of the obvious difficulties.⁴³ In similar vein, Lawrence Schiffman declared confidently:

Those holding this theory [the "Essene hypothesis"] must now argue that the term "Essene" came to designate the originally Sadducean sectarians who had gone through a process of radicalization until they became a distinct sect. Alternately, they must broaden their understanding of the term to include a wide variety of similar groups, of which the Dead Sea Sect might] be one.⁴⁴

Schiffman's preference, apparently, is for the former option. The second option (perhaps more a rhetorical device than a real option) in any case, is vague (e.g. more broad than what?, similar to what?). In an otherwise learned and useful article on 4QpNah, Schiffman limits the historical usefulness of his remarks by summarily dismissing the relevance of discussing Essenes in one footnote even while considering Sadducees and Pharisees at length.⁴⁵ But there is no indication in Qumran texts that Qumranites regarded themselves as an offshoot of either Pharisees or Sadducees—though scholars often seek such a solution (formerly, it was popular speculatively to link Pharisees and Essenes as descendants of the Hasidim). In fact Essenes

⁴² This is the case whether one is persuaded or not by R. Kugler, "A Note on 1QS 9:14: The Sons of Righteousness or the Sons of Zadok," *DSD* 3 (1996) 315-20. 1QS 3:20, 22 does use the phrase "all the sons of righteousness (*sedeg*)." The latter would be relevant if "Sadducees" derived from "righteousness" rather than "Zadok," which is unlikely.

⁴³ Qimron and Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V* (DJD 10) 117. This section was finally edited by Strugnell; see the forward by Qimron, pg. ix, for an explanation of the division of editorial labor.

⁴⁴ L. H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia and Jerusalem: Jewish Publication Society, 1994) 89.

⁴⁵ L. H. Schiffman, "Pharisees and Sadducees in *Pesher Nahum*," in M. Brettler and M. Fishbane (ed.), *Minhah le-Nahum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday* (JSOTSup 154; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993) 272-90, esp. 273-74 n.1.

are, by some measures, attested earlier than either Pharisees or Sadducees!⁴⁶ This proposal firstly abandons the assured results of research, involving three sects or subsets of Judaism, and secondly retrojects the Rabbinic views of Sadducees not only to the time of the Qumran texts, but earlier, as their precursors, while at the same time tending to erase Essene history. The viewpoint that is evident in

⁴⁶ The earliest relevant author is Philo, who attests to Essenes but not to Pharisees or Sadducees. Pliny (who I have argued used a source, M. Agrippa, from about 15 BCE) attests to Essenes, but not to Pharisees or Sadducees. It is, of course, not probable that all three groups began simultaneously precisely in the year 146 BCE, as might be supposed on a casual reading of Josephus *Ant.* 13 §§171-72. Rather, it is the claim of Josephus' source that the three existed then and began at some unstated earlier time. However, we must allow that this source may be mistaken and that they may not all have existed—or at any rate possibly not all by these names—at that time. I have argued elsewhere ("Posidonius, Strabo, and Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa," 295-98) that Josephus' source here was Posidonius' *History*, through the tradent Strabo, in his own *History*. Both began their histories where Polybius ended, in 146 BCE, and both, as Stoics, were favorable to Essenes whom they perceived as resembling Stoics. In *Ant.* 15 §372, as justification for recounting the story of Menahem the Essene's prophecy about the child Herod, Josephus makes his only use of the collocation "the genre of history [ἱστορίας γένος]," which probably indicates this passage which it introduced was also taken from Josephus' written historical sources. It has been suggested that Menahem the Essene may be identical with the former associate of Hillel mentioned in *m. Hag.* 2:2; Simeon the Essene (*J.W.* 2 §113; *Ant.* 17 §345-48) could possibly be identical with Simeon in Luke 2:25-35.

The earliest individual Essene explicitly attested is Judah, ca. 104 BCE (*Ant.* 13 §§311-13 and *J.W.* 1 §§78-80); the earliest explicitly attested individual Pharisees would be Pollion (*Ant.* 15 §§3, 370) and Saul/Paul, and the earliest attested Sadducee would be Ananias the priest, *J.W.* 2 §§451, 626—unless one accepts as historical the account of Pharisees and Sadducees in *Ant.* 13 §§288-98 which is evidently less reliable than the version in *b. Qidd.* 66a, which places the dinner troubled by sectarianism during the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, not John Hyrcanus. Though these attestations partly reflect happenstance of the survival of sources, they might lend caution about accepting such declarations as "...the Pharisees and Sadducees [were] certainly the most important groups of Jews in Hasmonean times" (L. H. Schiffman, "Pharisees and Sadducees in *Pesher Nahum*," 272). If one wished to consider all the reasonable options, two would be that the aristocratic Sadducees were the smallest of the three groups and that they may have originated later than the Essenes. At any rate, historians would do well to maintain independent judgement of the various groups which, it appears safe to say, all claimed to be interpreting the torah and prophets more authentically and traditionally than others.

4QPnab (and in 4QMMT) approves neither Pharisees nor Sadducees, and so must represent a third view.

2.4 *The Significance of 4QMMT (Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah)*

Already in 1980 Joseph Baumgarten had shown some parallels between the legal views in 4QMMT and what was much later subsumed under the Rabbinic description of "Sadducees." But it is important to mention at the same time that Baumgarten—the individual with the most experience in making careful comparisons of Qumranic and Rabbinic legal systems—continues to be persuaded by the Essene identity of many Qumran texts. Links between Qumran and a few Rabbinic accounts of "Sadducees," which Baumgarten himself first noticed, have been over-emphasized far beyond what he considers historically appropriate.⁴⁷

4QMMT depicts three groups: the writer's ("we") group, the addressee ("you"), and another group of Jews ("they"). The "we" group portrays themselves as the correct observers of torah—in other words, התורה בנקטת מעשי התורה, written by those who considered themselves עושי התורה. The authors of this document, as has already been observed, take a conciliatory tone towards the "you" group, and so emphasize what can be agreed on, in contradistinction with the "they" group. The Essenes ("we") separated themselves from the majority of all the other groups: Sadducees, Pharisees and, presumably, the פרושים as well. As also occurs in the pesharim, here in 4QMMT we have Essenes, Sadducees, and Pharisees. Later Rabbinic literature generally followed Pharisaic legal tradition—although without approving that name. It also tended to conflate their Jewish opponents under the name Sadducees (more precisely, סדרים), in part because they could not abide calling any opponents "observers of the torah," a distinction which they naturally assumed was applicable to themselves.

47 J. M. Baumgarten, "The Pharisaic-Sadducean Controversies about Purity and the Qumran Texts," *JJS* 31 (1980) 157-70; idem, "The Disqualifications of Priests in 4QFragments of the 'Damascus Document': a Specimen of the Recovery of pre-Rabbinic Halakah," in J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (ed.), *The Madrid Qumran Congress. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March 1991* (2 vols., *STUD* 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 2.503-13 and idem, "The 'Halakha' in *Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (MMT)," *JAOS* 116 (1996) 512-16.

3. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In summary and prospect, after fifty years of Qumran study, we can now apply more of what has been learned about movements within Second Temple Judaism to later trajectories in Judaism and in the more Jewish forms of Christianity. Rabbinic Judaism displayed some caution about some varieties of mysticism, messianism, apocalypticism, and eschatology, to some extent continuing and accompanying their differences with Essene legal perspectives.⁴⁸

In early Christianity and in the forms that were later labeled "Jewish-Christianity," there are echoes of Essene influence. For instance, among the four canonical Gospels Matthew preserves more intra-Jewish polemic than the others, as in its emphasis on observing (its view) of torah. Compare Rabbinic discussions on whether observance or study of the torah is more important, with the latter course taken as leading to observance.⁴⁹ Matthew also stresses the importance of repentance, as in 3:7-8 on John the Baptist:

But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees coming for baptism, he said to them: "You brood of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bear fruit that befits repentance [φρούρατε οὖν καρπὸν ἄξιον τῆς μετανοίας]...."

Compare what Pliny wrote about Essenes in *Natural History* 5.17.4 (73), "...so fruitful for them is the repentance [*tam fecunda illis aliorum vitae paenitentia est*]..."⁵⁰ Furthermore, when Paul opposed claims that "works of the law" [ἔργων νόμου] brought justification, he may have been disputing the views of some Essenes who had

48 See, for example, M. Broshi, "Anti-Qumranic Polemics in the Talmud," in Trebolle Barrera and Vegas Montaner (ed.), *The Madrid Qumran Congress*, 2.589-600; Y. Sussmann, "The History of the Halakah and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Preliminary Talmudic Observations on *Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah*" ["התולדות ההלכה: תחילת תצפיות טלמודיות על *מִקְסַת מַעֲשֵׂי הַתּוֹרָה*"], *Tarbiz* 59 (1989-1990) 11-79; the latter is translated in an abbreviated form (lacking many detailed footnotes) in Qimron and Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4.V* (DJD 10), 179-200. See also D. Flusser, "ברכת התורה וברכת התורה" ["Some of the Precepts of the Torah' from Qumran (4QMMT) and the Benediction Against the Heretics"] *Tarbiz* 61 (1991-1992) 333-74.

49 For example, *m. 'Abot* 1.17 and *b. Qidd.* 40b.

50 A process of elimination in itself does not prove John the Baptist was, or had been, an Essene; but nor is it methodologically useful to ignore such coincidences.

become Christians.⁵¹ Essenes, it has been suggested, also influenced the author of the Revelation of John.⁵²

Whatever echoes of intra-Jewish polemic from the Second Temple period may be found, hypothetically, in later periods, it is methodologically necessary to study it first in its own right. And this is a worthwhile study to do.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amoussine, J. D. "Éphraïm et Manassé dans le Pêshér de Nahum," *RevQ* 4/15 (1963) 389-96.
- Baumgarten, A. I. "The Name of the Pharisees," *JBL* 102 (1983) 411-28.
- Baumgarten, J. M. "A Fragment on Fetal Life and Pregnancy in 4Q270," in D. P. Wright et al. (ed.), *Pomegranates and Golden Bells: Studies in Biblical, Jewish, and Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1995) 445-48.
- , "The Pharisaic-Sadducean Controversies about Purity and the Qumran Texts," *JJS* 31 (1980) 157-70.
- , "The Disqualifications of Priests in 4QFragments of the 'Damascus Document': a Specimen of the Recovery of pre-Rabbinic Halakah," in J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner (ed.), *The Madrid Qumran Congress. Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March 1991* (2 vols., STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 2.503-13.
- , "The 'Halakha' in *Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah (MMT)*," *JAOS* 116 (1996) 512-16.
- Cross, F. M. *The Ancient Library of Qumran & Modern Biblical Studies* (rev. ed., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980).
- Davies, P. R. *The Damascus Covenant: An Interpretation of the "Damascus Document"* (ISOTSUP 25; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983).
- Dupont-Sommer, A. "Le commentaire de Nahum découvert près de la Mer Morte (4QP^h): Traduction et notes," *Sem* 13 (1963) 55-88.
- ⁵¹ See, for example, J. D. G. Dunn, "4QMMT and Galatians," *NTS* 43 (1997) 147-53; and M. Abegg, "Paul, 'Works of the Law' and MMT," *BAR* 20.6 (1994) 56-61. Paul's claim to have been a Pharisee (Phil 3:5) is of interest here.
- ⁵² See the following studies: S. Goranson, "The Exclusion of Ephraim in Rev 7.4-8 and Essene Polemic Against Pharisees"; idem, "The Text of Revelation 22:14," *NTS* 43 (1997) 154-57; and idem, "Essene Polemic in the Apocalypse of John," in M. J. Bernstein et al. (ed.), *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge, 1995: Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* (STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 453-60.

- Flusser, D. פְּרִישֵׁי הַתּוֹרָה בְּיַד מַרְכָּו [“The Judean Wilderness Sect and the Pharisees”], *Molad* 19 (1961) 456-58.
- , "Pharisäer, Sadduzäer und Essener im Pescher Nahum," in K. E. Grözinger et al. (ed.), *Qumran* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1981) 121-66.
- Gaster, M. *The Samaritans: Their History, Doctrines, and Literature* (Schweich Lectures, 1923; London: British Academy, 1925).
- Goodman, M. "A Note on the Qumran Sectarians, the Essenes and Josephus," *JJS* 46 (1995) 161-66.
- Goranson, S. "Posidonius, Strabo, and Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa as Sources on Essenes," *JJS* 45 (1994) 295-98.
- , "The Exclusion of Ephraim in Rev 7.4-8 and Essene Polemic Against Pharisees," *DSD* 2 (1995) 80-85.
- Kimelman, R. "Birkat Ha-Minin and the Lack of Evidence for an Anti-Christian Prayer in Late Antiquity," in E. P. Sanders et al. (ed.), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition 2: Aspects of Judaism in the Graeco-Roman Period* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981) 226-44, 391-403.
- , *Rabbi Yohanan of Tiberias: Aspects of the Social and Religious History of Third-Century Palestine* (Ph.D. diss., New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1977).
- Kugler, R. A. *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi* (SBLEIL 9; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).
- Qimron E. and J. Strugnell. *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqsat Ma'ase ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994).
- Rengstorff, K. H. *Hirbet Qumran and the Problem of the Library of the Dead Sea Caves* (Leiden: Brill, 1963).
- Stone, M. E. and J. C. Greenfield. "Aramaic Levi," in G. Brooke et al., *Qumran Cave 4XVII: Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996) 33-35 33-35 + pl. II.
- Schiffman, L. H. *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia and Jerusalem: JPS, 1994).
- , "Pharisees and Sadducees in Peshet Nahum," in M. Brettler and M. Fishbane (ed.), *Minhah le-Nahum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of His 70th Birthday* (ISOTSUP 154; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993) 272-90.
- Strugnell, J. "Notes on IQS 1, 17-18; 8, 3-4 and IQM 17, 8-9," *CBQ* 29 (1967) 580-82.
- Vermes, G. *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels* (London: Collins, 1973).
- Wacholder, B. Z. and M. Abegg. *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 3 (Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1995).