

The Scrolls and the Scribes of the New Testament

Joseph H. Dampier
Johnson City, Tennessee

[p.8]

The finding of the Dead Sea Scrolls has brought with it an intense interest in the Essenes. That the existence of this party or confraternity which is designated by Josephus as a philosophic sect must have continued in Palestine with the Pharisees and Sadducees into the period described in the Gospels is almost universally taken for granted. Then why are there no Essenes in the New Testament?

The Qumran Community must have existed near the Dead Sea from at least 100 B.C. to 68 A.D. It is not mentioned in the Gospels. The size of the cemetery would indicate a sizable membership.

The solution most generally accepted is that the Essenes and the Qumran covenanters were the same people and, if not identical, were so closely identified that the one is a part of the other.

This does not answer the question of the silence of the New Testament on these contemporary religious movements or sects. A possible solution to this problem is that Qumran and/or the Essenes may have been known under more than one name and that they are present in the New Testament under a different name than in Josephus and Philo.

The Qumran sectaries (perhaps known in Josephus as the Essenes) are known in the New Testament as the Scribes. The Qumran Community hid a library of Biblical and non-Biblical manuscripts, and the ruins of the monastery has a scriptorium with desks still in place. It is rather obvious that they were scribes.

Qumran was a community of scribes, but were the Scribes of the Gospels connected with the Qumran Community? Or, were they, in some way that we do not yet understand, indirectly related?

The *Manual of Discipline* and some other references in the Dead Sea Scrolls form the connecting link of evidence which shows us the same sect. While the New Testament never uses the term 'Essene', Josephus is almost equally silent about 'Scribes', for with the exception of "holy scribes" in Jewish Wars and a single use of *grammateus* in *Contra Apion* where it is not translated Scribe he makes little use of the term.

The first question that must be answered is whether the Scribes were a party or a profession. In the Old Testament the *Soferim* were writers, keepers of the records, and in some cases evidently official recorders. The LXX translated this as Scribe *grammateus*. By the time the New Testament was written, writing must have been a more general skill, and the word 'scribe' had taken on other meanings. That some had become teachers and lawyers and doctors of the law is not to be denied. But, that the word did not have a single meaning is indicated by such terms as "Scribes of the Pharisees" (Mk. 2:13-17, Lk. 5:27-32) and "Scribes of the people" (Matt. 2:4). The inter-testament period may have worked a change in the use of the word.

The term 'scribe' in the New Testament does not refer to a trade or profession of copying manuscripts or acting as amanuensis for illiterate sections of the population. It is rather obvious that the term 'scribe' is never used to describe in any way these activities, but the term itself *grammateus* would indicate at least such an origin for the word; but, of

[p.9]

course, the use of a term at any given time is not necessarily the same as the origin of the same word. We use the term 'Mason' (Freemason) for group that are not now connected with the building trades, but we still continue to use it for those who are so employed.

The scribes appear in the Synoptics about fifty-five times,¹ The term does not appear in John except in John 8:3. The term is only used five times in the rest of the New Testament.

In nine of the fifty-five appearances of the Scribes in the Synoptics Scribes and Pharisees are identified together. The Pharisees are known as a religious party. If the Scribes are not a religious party, then the uniting of the two words might seem to be incongruous. It would be similar to our referring to the Presbyterians and the printers. It might also be significant that Scribes are never so linked with the Sadducees, This then indicates a religious community that had a greater affinity for Pharisaic doctrine than for Sadducean.

In ten instances this group is linked with the priests, chief priests, elders, etc. But, with the exception of the one instance of the nativity (Matt. 2:4), this relationship always appears after the triumphal entry. During the last week Scribes and Pharisees seem to have separated and the Scribes and Priests to have formed an alliance. Unless the Scribes were a separate religious group, how did they do this?

Scribes alone without alliances appear ten times in the Synoptic accounts. (It should be noted here that the discrepancy of the above numbers is due to some variation of terminology in the Gospel accounts.)

That the New Testament does not indicate a trade or profession is shown by the following additional considerations:

First: It is almost always in the plural form. This was not true in the Old Testament where it was usually in the singular. The plural would indicate a group name.

Second: It appears with a frequency that would indicate a party. In the Synoptics the Pharisees appear 64 times; the Sadducees 8; and the Herodians 3; but the Scribes appear 61 times. This is even more significant when compared with the more common profession: Publicans 22 times; husbandmen 14 times; fishers or fishermen 5 times, and merchants 5 times. The frequency of appearance would indicate a group far more numerous than would be likely for a professional group.

Third: The precedence given the scribes in the term 'Scribes and Pharisees' indicates that the scribes were not a subservient group to the Pharisees. (It should be noted at this point that Basnage' "History and Religion of the Jews" Taylor trans., 1708, pp. 104-114

¹ The references to Scribes in the Synoptic Gospels not used in this paper include: Matt. 13:51-53; Mk. 20:18; Mk. 10:33.

presented the, idea of a scribal party in the Gospels which he connected with the doctrinal position of the Karaites.)

Fourth: Perhaps the most significant statement in the Gospels that would indicate a separate religious community known as Scribes is the fact that they had become proselyters (Matt. 23:15). This is a practice that could scarcely have existed, let alone have been worthy of condemnation, in a trade or professional capacity.

Fifth: The Scribes were known not as writers but as teachers (Mk. 1:22 and Matt. 7:29), with a developed and recognized system of

[p.10]

instruction and doctrines that were peculiarly their own. (Matt. 17:10 and Mk. 9:11) "Elijah must first come" is attributed to Scribal doctrine.

Sixth: In Matt. 5:2 Jesus demands a righteousness that shall exceed the Scribes and Pharisees. Why name two groups if these groups had a doctrinal identity? And, why do so and leave out other parties and groups whose standard of righteousness he also condemned on other occasions?

Seventh: There is a strong indication that we are dealing in the Gospel accounts with a religious party or community who have a Doctrine or program of their own but at the same time have an ability to work in close harmony with the Pharisees or the Priestly Party which was Sadducee, but not at the same time.

Eighth: The Scribal party seems to have been known among the church fathers, for evidence is found for it in several of them.

ORIGEN—(Tr 24 in Matth and in Matth 13 52 ed H. 1, 1, P. 218) "The Scribes do not deviate from the letter of the Law, but the Pharisees, who separated from others because they thought themselves much holier, pretend to interpret it."

EPIPHANIUS—(Eph. *Haer* 1, 1 H. 15) "He makes of the Scribes a particular sect for which he hath been blamed by the critics who knew no other scribes but those who had a public employ in the Synagogue." In *Panarion* he lists a number of Judaistic sects. The first three are Sadducees, Scribes, Pharisees, in that order.

RECOGNITIONS OF CLEMENT. (Recognition 1. 1, C54) Characterizes the Scribes as a particular sect of the Jews.

ST. JEROME—Refers to Shommay and Hillel as heads of two sects of Scribes and Pharisees.

Epiphanius in the Third Century said that the Essenes had been known under various names.

While it would now appear that "Scribes" might have been one of the names, it is not the purpose of this paper to argue that the Qumran Covenanters were Essenes. This has been done by others. It is the purpose to show that Josephus and others may have shown many Essene characteristics *that they admired*, and that these now serve as a basis of comparison to identify the Essenes with the people who used the *Manual of Discipline* and the Zadokite Fragment. But these same documents show many other characteristics that indicate another side to these people, and that side corresponds to the Scribes of the New Testament.

A comparison of the teachings and condemnations of Jesus that were particularly *directed to the Scribes* rather than the Pharisees shows us a community whose doctrinal and community life is also found in the *Manual of Discipline* and other documents of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

First: Corban is (Mk. 7:1-23 and Matt. 15:1-20) found in the Manual of Discipline.

[p.11]

Corban as condemned here is obviously not that described in Ex. 21:17 and Lev. 20:9. However the passage has not given commentators too much trouble because it is so accurately self-explanatory.

The gift was given and so did not belong to the giver. He could not use it for father or mother. But, what was given was not wholly out of his control.

The *Manual of Discipline* provides: "All who have offered themselves for his truth shall bring all their knowledge and Strength and wealth into the community." (371).²

"And all their property according to his righteous counsel". (371)

Perhaps this property was still in the name of the giver because:

"The lesser shall obey the greater with regard to wages and property" (378)

"His wealth and his wages shall be put at the disposal of the man who has supervision over the wages of the masters and he shall enter it in the account at his disposal but shall not spend it for the masters" (379)

This is at the end of the first year in the community, but at the end of the second year.

"He shall be registered in the order of his position among his brethren, for law and for judgment and for the sacred food and for the sharing of his property." (379)

"If there is found among them a man who lies about his wealth and knows it, he shall be excluded from the sacred food of the masters for a year." (380)

This wealth given to the community must have remained in some way the property of the individual for

"If he commits fraud against the wealth of the community, causing it loss, he shall repay it in full." (380)

In the penalty for leaving the community the tie was so thoroughly broken that

"If any man of the men of the community partakes with him of his sacred food, or of his wealth which he has delivered to the masters his sentence shall be like his; he shall be dismissed" (381)

Thus if a man who is dismissed for violation of the Law of Moses, those who remain

² The page numbers of "The Dead Sea Scrolls" by Millar Burrows.

“Shall not participate in his wealth” (382)

So in the Qumran Community

1. Wealth and wages were put at the disposal of the masters.

[p.12]

2. But a man could replace loss or fraud.
3. A man in the community could use his wealth to help another.
4. A man who was dismissed still had his wealth, for those who remained could not share in it.

The economic system of Qumran was Corban. If wealth was put in a common treasury and dispensed from the sum total, he had thereby profited but had prevented parents from profiting.

Second: The practice of Lustration or Baptism attributed to the Scribes is found in the Qumran Community. (Mk. 7:1-23 and Matt. 15:1-20).

In Matt. 15:2 and Mark 7:3, the custom of all the Jews is described as a washing of hands, but the point seems to have been a custom that went beyond this, for Mk. 7:4 says these people do not eat after contamination unless they wash; and cups and pots and brazen vessels are also purified by washing. (Mark 7:4 and 8). This indicates an immersion in water of both the person and the cooking utensils for ceremonial purification rather than the symbolic washing of the hands common to all Jews.

In the Damascus Document this purification is demanded: “XII Concerning purification with water: Let not a man wash in water that is filthy or not enough for covering the man. Let him not purify in it any vessel. And, any pool in a rock in which there is not enough covering, which an unclean person has touched, its water is unclean like the water of a vessel.” (359)

The *Manual of Discipline* also has the idea of such purifications.

“He will not be purified by atonement offerings, and he will not be made clean with the water for impurity; he will not sanctify himself with seas and rivers or be made clean with any water for washing.” (373)

Ceremonial cleansing is described as:

“his flesh will be cleansed that he may be sprinkled with water for impurity and sanctify himself with water for cleanness.” (373)

In the rules of the order of the *Manual of Discipline* it provides

“They shall not enter the water in order to touch the sacred food of the Holy men.” (377)

Would this not indicate that at least a part of the group who raise the question about washing of hands were those who practiced a form of self-immersion and also cooking vessels, and that the Damascus Document and the *Manual of Discipline* indicates the same practice? To this should also be added the archaeological evidence of purification indicated in the excavation at Khirbet Qumran.

The Essenes seem to have had such a custom because Hippolytus said that if they touched a member of any other sect they immediately washed.

Both Scribes and Essenes were self-baptizers. This differs from both the baptism of John and Christian baptism because these require a baptizer.

[p.13]

This might account for the objection raised against John. The objection was not against baptism as such, but "by what authority do you baptize?" The presence of a baptizer or baptist called for an explanation.

Third: The teaching of the Scribes concerning the nature of evil appears in the Qumran Community.

In Mark 3:19-30 and Matt. 12:22-38. These accounts show that Scribes, probably in the presence of Pharisees, (Matt. 12:38) put forth the idea that they can explain what they regard as evil in Jesus and also explain his power over evil spirits. The explanation indicates a doctrine of evil that has as its basic assumption that man is under the power of personal evil spirits and that this evil source is arranged in a hierarchy. The head of this is designated in the Gospels as Beelzebub, probably a word of Babylonian origin. The reply of Jesus accepts their hypothesis but raises the question of the power over evil of some designated as "your sons".

The section of the *Manual of Discipline* on "the Two Spirits" can profitably be studied with this Scribal doctrine in mind. Evil is the result of an evil spirit. All men walk, live, and act under a spirit of truth or a spirit of error. The spirit of truth seems to be a synonym for membership in the community. While it is admitted that the spirit of error may enter the community, it is not so clear that they ever regarded the spirit of truth being found outside it.

This source of evil and error is found to be accounted for by a chief-demon known as "Belial".

"The Levites shall recount the iniquities of the Sons of Israel and all their guilty transgressions in the dominion of Belial." (372)

Some scholars have suggested that the Qumran Community were late arrivals from the Babylonian exile. Does the term 'Be-elzebub' fit into this theory? Is there a possible relationship between the terms Beelzebub and Belial? The Scribal assumption of the nature of evil that lead to the utter condemnation of the works of Jesus is the same basic assumption of the nature of evil found in the Qumran community.

The answer of Jesus about "your sons casting out demons" may also have significance, since the righteous, or members of the community, seem to designate themselves "Sons of light" (372) and (371) "Sons of truth" (375).

The community is also known as 'sons of Zadok' (Zadokite). This was a name for the whole community rather than the priests. The Damascus Document says "The priests are the captivity of Israel who went forth from the Land of Judah, and the Levites are those who joined them; and the sons of Zadok are the elect of Israel, those called by the name, who will abide at the end of days."

If the community were the 'Sons of Zadok' rather than the priests, this forms an additional possible tie, because if Zadok was not the priest then Zadok the scribe (Neh. 13:13) may have been the source of the name. In any case the scribes are "the sons".

So the Scribes have a doctrinal position on the question of good and evil that is also found in the *Manual of Discipline*.

Fourth: The organization of the community explains the denunciation of the Scribes in the last public discourse of Jesus. Mk. 12:38-40, Matt. 23: 1-39 and Lk. 20:45-47.

[p.14]

Mark and Luke direct this at the Scribes alone, while Matthew would seem to include Pharisees in at least part of it.

The denunciation of this group includes a number of things that would seem to find likeness in the Qumran community.

A. The desire to be called "Master" (Rabbin) This was the very basis of the Qumran community. Privilege, prestige and authority depended upon the candidate advancing to the rank of master.

The session of the Masters for Judgment. (378) A man could not speak a word which is not to the liking of the masters. (379)

"The lesser shall obey the greater as to wages and property," (378) Wealth was probably under the control of the masters.

"His wealth which he has delivered to the masters." (281) The sacred food is known as the food of the Masters. (380). A member could be permanently dismissed from the community for being "A man who gossips about the masters." (381)

The question of being called "Rabbi" is followed by the prohibition of being called "Father". The Gospels do not suggest any setting that would serve as an occasion of this prohibition, but in the Thanksgiving Hymns we find the term "father" used in this sense. The comment of Theo. Gaster at this point is significant. (Thanksgiving Hymns 7:6-25) "Because he compares it to the bishop being called "father in God"."

The Qumran covenanters used the term and the Scribes were condemned for it.

The Christ also denounces the Scribes for seeking chief seats (Mk. 12:38 and Lk. 20:46) It is condemned as hypocrisy rather than bad manners.

The matter of seating was of vital importance to the community.

“When he enters the covenant... They shall be registered in order, each before his neighbor according to his understanding and works, so that everyone of them shall obey his neighbor, the lesser obeying the greater: and so they shall have an investigation of their spirits and their works year by year, so as to elevate each according to his understanding and the perfection of his way,” (378)

“The priests shall be seated first, and the elders second and all the rest of the people shall be seated each in his position.” (378)

“He shall not speak before his position which is written before him,” (379)

The matter of seats like that of Master concerns social, economic, and religious prestige in the community.

The scribes are denounced for making long prayers.

[p.15]

The *Manual of Discipline* provides:

“The masters shall keep watch together a third of all the nights of the year, reading the book and searching for justice and worshipping together.” (378)

The Scribes are denounced as those who compass sea and land to make a proselyte. If this does not mean making a gentile a proselyte to Israel, then the entire Qumran community is one that is built up by a system of proselytism.

The denunciation against devious oaths is connected with the system.

“He shall take it upon himself by a binding oath to turn to the law of Moses.” (377)

Did they have oaths that were not considered binding? Does the Damascus Document indicate such oaths?

“XIV He shall not swear either by Aleph or Lamed or Aleph and Daleth.” (363) ... shall be obligated by the oath of the covenant.”

The charge that they shut up the kingdom raises the question of whether ideas of the identity of the community and the Kingdom could have been in mind.

Fifth: In Mark 12:28-38, a Scribe raises the question of the greatest commandment of the Law. All the religious parties are here represented. The Pharisees and the Herodians try to trap Jesus on the question of tribute money. The Sadducees with their case of a woman with seven husbands (Matthew) apparently see the Scribes and Pharisees uniting on the question of the greatest commandment, but Mark identifies it as a Scribal question. Then Jesus asks a

question. "How is the Christ David's Son, since David calls him Lord"? Obviously, this involved a conflict if each interpretation was to be taken literally, but is it possible that Jesus was implying a peculiar Scribal doctrine concerning the Messiah?

The Qumran community had such a doctrine, "The Prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel," (383 etc.) If the Messiah was to be of Aaron, then he would be of the tribe of Levi; but if he was of the house of David, he would be of Judah.

Whether the Messiah is singular or plural seems of little consequence here. If they expected two Messiahs, then one was of Aaron; and if they expected only one, he was of Aaron. The tribe of Levi was the source of Messianic hope. This idea was still present when the letter to the Hebrews was written. Jesus is shown here as a high priest after the order of Melchizedek in order to explain his lack of Aaronic ancestry.

Is this question one with an implication that if they answer they must accept the premise of the Messiah being of Judah, and do they refuse to answer because it would contradict an established doctrinal position of the community?

Sixth: When the Scribes appear to question him in Galilee, why designate them as being from Jerusalem? (Matt. 15:1, Mk. 3:22 and 7:1),

Seventh: A Scribe offers to follow Jesus (Matt. 8:19). Jesus warns him that the "foxes have holes, the birds of the air have nests but the Son of

[p.16]

Man has not where to lay his head". Does this mean that a Scribe had security that he would have to renounce if he followed Jesus? Perhaps a monastery and a community with communal wealth?

Eighth: The argument that the Scribes are a separate party with ability to shift their alliances needs to be examined again in the light of our knowledge of the community. The first alliance is with the Pharisees. Note the following instances:

1. The Feast of Levi. Mk. 2:13-17; Matt. 9:9-13; Lk. 5:27-32.³
2. The Cure of the Sick of the Palsy. Lk. 5:17-26; Matt. 9: 1-8; Mk. 2:1-12.
3. Controversy over healing on Sabbath. Lk. 6:7.

These are all in addition to the instances already cited. With the exception of his final denunciation (Matt. 23; Mark 12; and Luke 20) they all occur before the Triumphal Entry. At this point the alliance changes.

1. At the Triumphal Entry the Chief Priests and Scribes saw the wonderful things he did. (Matt. 21:15).

³ The translation "Scribes of the Pharisees" had lead some to argue that it indicated an identity of Scribes and Pharisees. It should be noted that there is a textual problem here that must be settled before this can be assumed. (Mk. 2: 13-17).

2. The plan to kill him was by the Chief Priests and Scribes. Mk. 11:18; Mk. 14:1; Lk. 19:47; Lk. 22:2.
3. His authority is challenged by Chief Priests, Scribes, and elders. Mk. 11:27; Lk. 20:1.
4. Judas bargains with the Chief Priests, Scribes, and elders. Mk. 14:43.
5. Chief Priests, Elders and Scribes are his accusers before the Sanhedrin. Mk. 15:1; Lk. 22:66.
6. He was tried before Caiaphas where. Scribes and elders were gathered. Matt. 26:57; Mk. 14:53.
7. Chief Priests and Scribes mock him. Mk. 15:31 and Matt. 27:41.

That this was not the language of chance is shown by the exact terminology, "Scribes, chief priests, and elders," stated in the future tense in the prophetic announcement of the crucifixion and made at a time when Scribes and Pharisees were in close alliance. (Matt, 16:21-28; Mk. 8:31; Lk. 9:22).

This shift can be logically explained if we accept the premise that Scribes were a separate party. Not only that, but if we accept the possibility of an identity of the Scribal party with the Qumran community it is a very probable arrangement. That the devotion to scrupulous details of the Law of Moses and the devotion to Sabbath keeping and other ceremonies are common to Pharisees and the Qumran community goes without saying. It can perhaps be safely assumed that the doctrinal affinity of the community would be with the Pharisees.

But the organizational and political alliances could well be with the priests. The *Manual of Discipline* provides—

"Only the Sons of Aaron shall administer judgment and wealth." (383)

"There shall be in the council of the community twelve men and there shall be three priests." (381)

"In every place where there are ten men of the council of the community there shall not be absent a priest." (378)

[p.17]

"The Priests shall be seated first and elders second; then all the rest of the people shall be seated, each in his position." (378)

So the community or those who resembled it would be in a natural position to make alliances with either Pharisees or Priests and to change from one to the other.

Ninth: While many explanations might be found, it is one of the peculiarities of John's Gospel that Scribes do not appear under that name. This is, unless you count John 8:3. This raised the possibility that the author was sympathetic to the Scribes. In view of the fact that the

vocabulary has already lead some scholars to this conclusion, it might be considered a significant fact.

This raises two possibilities. The author may have had, for personal reasons, sympathy for the Scribes or he may have written the Gospel with them in mind as his readers. In view of the fact that a great deal has already been said in favor of a connection between the vocabulary of John and of the Dead Sea Scrolls, the absense of Scribes should not be overlooked.

The preceding implications based upon the New Testament and the Dead Sea Scrolls suggest the possibility that the Essenes were, as some have suggested, a combination of parties with each party having its own name and peculiar doctrines and government.

If this is accepted, then the Scribes might be one of a number of such groups.

However, it has also been suggested that the Essenes were known under different names. If this is accepted as a premise, then the Scribes might be one of the names.

The third suggested solution by many competent writers is that the Essenes, Pharisees, etc. were all parties that grew out of the 'Hasidim', "the pious ones". About sixty of these were murdered by Alcimus, who has been suggested as the "wicked priest". There is also the suggestion that an anonymous member of the sixty was the "teacher of righteousness", but the interesting point in the discussion of the idea of a scribal party is that in I Mac. 7:12 the term 'scribes' is used of the same people that are called Hasidim. While we may infer that the Essenes were originally 'Hasidim', we have here a statement that directly connects the Scribes with the Hasidim. This is further indicated in I Mac. 6:18, where Eleazar, a leading scribe, accepts martyrdom rather than be polluted by eating pork.

The idea that the Scribes are a party is presented by M. Jaques Basnage in his "History of the Jews". M. Basnage apparently had personal connections with the Koraites who believed themselves to be the original Scribal Party who divided from the Pharisees because they would not recognize the Oral Law and later the Mishna.

The Koraites also differed as to the calendar. They believed that only when the new moon appeared and was observed could the month begin, and so outlawed the use of astronomical tables.

The Koraites settled such disputes by an appeal to "Three able persons" and regarded authority as "divided between the High Priest and a Prophet, but the prophet was not a man inspired from heaven as Moses or Isaiah, but a skillful and experienced man". P. 107

[p.18]

This claim that the Koraites were originally scribes, lawyers, and doctors of the law coupled with such obvious likeness to the government of the Qumran sectaries needs further investigation. Particularly in light of the fact that while Prof. Millar Burrows does not believe that the Koraites were of such ancient origin as to have produced the Dead Sea Scroll, he does see evidence that the Damascus Document probably had Koraites origin. And, since the Koraites were in possession of documents that were supposed to have come from a cave near Jericho in the ninth century, he adds this interesting paragraph:

“If Kahle and Tercher are right the affinities between the Dead Sea Scrolls and the medieval Koraitic literature are to be attributed to the manuscripts found near Jericho at the beginning of the ninth century. At first sight this theory seems romantic and far fetched, but it is not impossible. Some kind of historical connection between the Koraites and the sect of Qumran must be recognized. And, this hypothesis is accreditable as any explanation that has been offered. Support for it may be seen in the fact that bits of the Damascus Document have been found in the Qumran Caves”. (P. 297-298)

The considerable number of scholars who have pointed out such connections do not seem to have considered the claims of the Koraites that they were originally “Scribes, lawyers, and doctors of the law.” Which, coupled with the idea of an authoritative but uninspired prophet brings up some interesting possibilities as to the teacher of righteousness and gives a possible Post-Biblical link between the Qumran people and the Scribes of the New Testament.

Some objections to be considered:

1. Did the Qumran community live and work beyond the confines of the monastery? References to wages, etc. in the *Manual of Discipline* would make it feasible.
2. Is it necessary to assume a close identity between the Scribes and the *Manual of Discipline*? The *Manual* must have been written very early in the history of the community. Given time, any such group is bound to change. Enlargement of numbers and increasing wealth have always had their effect on monastic orders, sects, and denominations. The *Manual of Discipline* may represent the primitive concept of the community and the Scribes the ultimate outgrowth, having, therefore, points of similarity and differences.
3. Considering the high moral standards of the *Manual of Discipline*, why would the denunciations of Jesus be directed at them.

The natural changes that time makes in any religious group would account for some of them. In Matt. 23:1-3 he seems to make it clear that he was not quarreling with the basic principles of the group but with the hypocritical conduct.⁴

The Qumran community had a built-in system to encourage hypocrisy. A man was examined each year.

“They shall have an investigation of their spirits and their works year by year so as to elevate each one according to his understanding and the perfection of his way or put him back according to his perversions.” (378)

[p.19]

It would seem that this yearly exam determined his seat at the table and perhaps his titles of respect.

⁴ “Scribe, lawyer and Doctor of the Law” might correspond to the three stages of initiation in the Qumran community.

Joseph H. Dampier, "The Scrolls and the Scribes of the New Testament," *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society* 1.3 (Summer 1958): 8-19.

Thus, to keep his place he is encouraged to intellectual deceit and hypocrisy as to conduct. However, even as it was first intended it is hard to imagine that it ever contributed to a spiritually healthy community.

© 1958 *Evangelical Theological Society*. Reproduced by permission. Readers are encouraged to visit the Evangelical Theological Society's website (<http://www.etsjets.org/>) where they can take out a subscription to the journal.

Prepared for the Web in March 2008 by Robert I. Bradshaw. Note that on page 10 the work of Epiphanius *Panarion* (a.k.a. *Haereses*) appears to be treated as two separate works.

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