

THE SADDUCEAN CHRISTIANS OF DAMASCUS.

II. THE EXORDIUM OF THE MANIFESTO.¹

(P. 1, l. 1 to p. 2, l. 13.)

(P. 1 l. 1) AND now hearken, all ye that know righteousness,² and meditate on the works of God.³ For He has a controversy with all flesh,⁴ and He will execute judgment on all who contemn Him. For because of their treachery in that they have forsaken Him, has He hidden His face⁵ from Israel and from His sanctuary, and given them over unto the sword.⁶ Yet remembering the covenant [that He made] with their forefathers,⁷ (l. 5) left He a remnant⁸ to Israel, and gave them not over to complete destruction.⁹ And at the end of the wrath, [namely] three hundred and ninety years after delivering them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babel, has He visited them, and caused to sprout from Israel and Aaron a root of planting,¹⁰ to possess His land, and to take pleasure in the good of his territory.¹¹ And they meditated upon their sin, and they knew that they were guilty men. And they were like blind men, and like persons groping their way,¹² (l. 10) for twenty years.

¹ It will be seen that on a number of interesting points the translation here given differs from that published by Dr. Schechter.

² On this phrase see "Notes and Discussions," p. 216.

³ Comp. Job xxxvii. 14.

⁴ Comp. Hos. iv. 1; Jer. xxv. 31.

⁵ Comp., e.g., Ps. xiii. 2; lxix. 18.

⁶ Comp., e.g., Jer. xxv. 31; Ps. lxxviii. 62.

⁷ Literally, the covenant of the first ones (taken from Leviticus xxvi. 45).

⁸ The idea of the "remnant" that was to be saved is, of course, very common in the Old Testament (see e.g., 2 Kings xix. 31; Micah ii. 12); see also p. 2, l. 11.

⁹ Compare e.g., 2 Chron. xii. 12.

¹⁰ See "Notes and Discussions," p. 218 sqq.

¹¹ See EXPOSITOR for December, 1911, p. 512 note.

¹² Comp. Is. lix. 10; Deut. xxviii. 29.

And God had regard to their works,¹ for they sought Him with a perfect heart.² And He raised up for them a Teacher of Righteousness,³ in order to guide them in the way of His heart.⁴ And He made known to the latter generations that which He accomplished in the last generation among the congregation of treacherous men,⁵ [namely] those who turned aside from the way. That was the time concerning which it has been written: "As a backsliding heifer so did Israel slide back,"⁶ when there arose the man of scoffing,⁷ who dropped to [Israel (*l.* 15) waters of lying,⁸ and caused them to wander in the wilderness where there is no way,⁹ to make low the height of the world,¹⁰ and to turn aside from the paths of righteousness, and to remove the boundary which the forefathers had set in their inheritance,¹¹ in order to cause the curses of His covenant to cleave unto them, so as to give them over unto the sword, executing the vengeance of the covenant.¹² Because they had sought after smooth things,¹³ and chose deceits, and looked forward to breaches¹⁴ [of the covenant], and chose the fat and well-liking¹⁵ (or fatness and comfort) and justified the wicked

¹ Comp. Ps. xxxiii. 15.

² Comp., e.g., 1 Chron. xxix. 9.

³ Comp. Hos. x. 12 (also Is. xi. 5).

⁴ There is here a slight break in the text, not to indicate a lacuna, but to mark the beginning of a fresh paragraph.

⁵ Comp. Jer. ix. 1.

⁶ The Hebrew is a free quotation (from memory) of Hosea iv. 16.

⁷ Comp. Prov. xxix. 8; Is. xxviii. 14.

⁸ Compare, e.g., Micah ii. 6, Amos vii. 16 (the original meaning of הָטִיף is "to cause to drop," hence "to prophesy or teach"; here the idea of "dropping" is kept prominent, though "teaching" is meant.

⁹ Job xii. 24; Ps. cvii. 40 (exact quotation).

¹⁰ i.e., to lower the authority of the Law, which is regarded as the highest thing in the world; comp. Job xxii. 12, where the "height of heaven" is applied to the Deity (see also Job xi. 8, and comp. נְבוֹהוֹת שֶׁל עוֹלָם as applied to the Deity in *Tanhūma* of the pericope כִּי תִשָּׂא).

¹¹ Comp. Deut. xix. 14. ¹² See "Notes and Discussions," p. 228.

¹³ See Is. xxx. 10.

¹⁴ Comp. Ezek. xiii. 5.

¹⁵ For the justification of this rendering see the "Notes and Discussions," p. 231, note.

one, and condemned the righteous one, (l. 20) and transgressed the covenant, and turned the statute to nought, and trooped themselves together against the life of the righteous; whereas all that walked on the way of perfection¹ their soul abhorred, and they pursued them unto the sword, and they goaded² the people to hostility. Wherefore the wrath (p. 2) of God was kindled against their congregation,³ to make desolate all their multitude, for their doings were uncleanness before Him.⁴

And now hearken unto me, all ye that enter the covenant, and I will disclose unto you⁵ [the truth] concerning the ways of the wicked: God, who loveth understanding, wisdom, and effectual working,⁶ has placed before Him prudence and understanding; they minister unto Him. Long-suffering is with Him and abundance of forgiveness,⁷ (l. 5) to make atonement for those who turn away from their sin. But power, and strength, and great wrath, with flames of fire, wherein are all the angels of destruction,⁸ against those who turn aside from the way, and despise the statute,⁹ so that there shall be no remnant or escaping for them. For God chose them not before the world's beginning,¹⁰ and ere they were established knew He their deeds, And He abhorred the generations of their pollutedness,¹¹ and He hid His face from the land,¹² to destroy them until¹³ they

¹ See "Notes and Discussions," p. 224.

² Read *ס'תו* (comp. Schechter and Lévi); on the whole passage see "Notes and Discussions," p. 223, where it is shown that we have here a graphic reference to the trial and sufferings of our Lord.

³ Comp. Ps. cvi. 40.

⁴ Comp. Ezek. xxxvi. 17.

⁵ Literally: "I will uncover the ear"; comp., e.g., 1 Sam. ix. 15; 2 Sam. vii. 27.

⁶ Comp. the praise of wisdom in Prov. viii.

⁷ The *locus classicus* for this idea is Exod. xxxiv. 6-7.

⁸ See "Notes and Discussions," p. 232. ⁹ Comp. Mic. iii. 9.

¹⁰ So probably, though construction difficult.

¹¹ See "Notes and Discussions," p. 233. ¹² Comp. p. 1, l. 3.

¹³ Omit the word *'ל* at the beginning of l. 9.

were consumed. But he knew the years of the [priestly] order¹ and the number and functions of their sections¹ (l. 10) for all the aeons that be . . .² even as to what may happen in their sections for all the years of eternity. And among all of them did He raise up for Himself men of renown,³ in order to leave a remnant to the land,⁴ and to fill the face of the world with their offspring.⁵ And He made them know His Holy Spirit through His Messiah, and He is true. And in the explanation of His name are their names. But those He hated has He caused to go astray.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.⁶

P. 1, l. 1. The stress that was laid in the *Athenæum* article for November 26, 1910, on the "personal note" that pervades the document, and which stamps it as a manifesto addressed by a religious leader to his followers, is fully endorsed by Dr. Kohler (see second page of his article). Besides the "hearken" at the beginning, we have the even more decisive "hearken ye unto me" in ll. 2, 14 of p. 2. The entire composition, in fact, produces a strong impression that one is listening to the living, earnest, and even passionate voice of a person writing in the midst of stirring events and deeply moved passions.

The phrase יודעי צדק (ye that know righteousness, taken from Isaiah li. 7) appears to be an intentional allusion to the title בני צדוק (sons of Zadok) claimed by the sectaries in an important passage on pp. 3-4 in connexion with Ezekiel xliv. 15, as has also been noticed by M. Isr. Lévi and others.

¹ See "Notes and Discussions," p. 233.

² See "Notes and Discussions," *ibid.*

³ Comp. Num. xvi. 2.

⁴ Comp. p. 1, ll. 4-5.

⁵ Comp. Is. xxvii. 6.

⁶ Although in the translation itself only ll. 1, 5, 10, etc., are indicated, the reader will easily recognise the places of the other lines of the original Hebrew referred to in this part by the quotations from the English rendering.

At the beginning of page 5 of the document, David's action in taking several wives is explained, and therefore partly excused, by a tradition that the Book of the Law was sealed and hidden away in the Ark, which had since the death of Eleazar and Joshua not been opened "till Zadok arose." It was therefore this Zadok (perhaps unhistorical, unless they confused him with the high-priest Hilkiah of 2 Kings xxii.), to whom the sectaries looked back as the founder of their body; and as one can hardly suppose that the well-known Zadok of the time of David was meant, this supposed founder must have been placed somewhere between the reign of David and the time of Ezekiel. Anyhow, the document does not endorse the traditional belief that a disciple of Antigonus b. Soko (*Aboth d' Rabbi Nathan*, chap. v.)¹ bearing the name of Zadok founded the Zadokite or Sadducean party. The tradition reflected in the manifesto accords rather (though vaguely) with the theory of Abraham Geiger (*Urschrift*, p. 20 sqq.) that that party derived its name from the founder of the ruling high-priestly dynasty. It is clear at any rate that by the sons of Zadok of the manifesto a body of priests deriving their name from a certain Biblical Zadok are meant.

M. Israel Lévi has an apt reference to the laudatory mention of the "sons of Zadok," i.e., the body of ministrant priests, in the Hebrew text of Ben-Sira (chap. li. v. 12, Strack's edition). But he exaggerates the analogy between this document and Ben-Sira's standpoint. The reason why longer laudations are bestowed by him on the priestly estate than on King David and many others is the fact that in his time the most prominent functionaries of the nation were the priests. In the new document, on the other hand, active hostility is shown to the house of David. The reference to David on p. 5 has already been mentioned, and on

¹ See Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, 2nd ed., p. 112 sqq.

p. 4, ll. 10-11 is the blunt statement that at the end of a certain period of time one should no longer adhere to the house of Judah.

It is quite clear that on this ground alone—even if there were no other reasons—Dr. Ward's idea that the document is of Pharisaic origin would have to be rejected. No Pharisaic teacher would have taken up such an attitude towards the house of David.

Equally impossible is Dr. Kohler's view that the Samaritans would describe themselves as the "sons of Zadok." There is no trace to be found anywhere that they did so, whereas the evidence for the application of the term to the ruling priestly body of Jerusalem is complete.

P. 1, l. 2. The word for God is 𐤅𐤍 throughout the document, the Tetragrammaton being apparently purposely avoided. But not much should be made of this point, as the peculiarity might be due to the mediaeval copyists.

P. 1, ll. 5-9. It ought to be admitted that of no known historical character of the period under consideration could it properly be said that as a result of his work people "meditated upon their sin, and they knew that they were guilty men." There is at any rate no evidence whatever to show that either the uncertain and shadowy Zadok or the equally uncertain, though not quite as shadowy Dositheus was a kind of John the Baptist in his day, whenever that was. Why, therefore, it may fairly be asked, dissociate this characterisation from the only known historical person whom it suits so thoroughly well? The absence of any mention of John's Baptism need cause no surprise, as stress is laid throughout the exordium on the moral and inner view of the dealings of Providence with the people rather than on the outer form employed.

That the designation "a root of planting" has a decidedly Messianic connotation is clear from several Old Testament

passages (see particularly Isaiah xi.1),¹ and the same religious leader is actually spoken of in other parts of the document (e.g., end of p. 12 and p. 20, l. 1) as the Messiah from Aaron and Israel who was expected to reappear in the latter days (may be in a representative character only). But two questions must be considered before passing on to the consideration of date: (1) How could a person, who was not a descendant of David, be regarded as a Messiah? (2) Why *from Aaron and Israel* instead of *from Aaron* alone?

(a) There is unfortunately a good deal of misconception as to the expectation of a Davidic Messiah among the Jews at the beginning of the Christian Era. The Gospels themselves show that there was a strong disposition to acclaim John the Baptist as the Messiah (St. Luke ii. 15; St. John i. 19-20), although he was, according to St. Luke's account, of priestly descent both on his father's and his mother's side.² In the "Testament of Levi," moreover, a pseudopigraphon which is expressly quoted on p. 4 of the document, the Messianic functions are definitely assigned to a priest (for a critical treatment of the text see Kautzsch's edition), and it is also well known that the Davidic descent of Jesus Himself is treated in what is now commonly regarded as an unorthodox manner in the Epistle of Barnabas, by Tatian, and possibly also in the *Didaché* (see Harnack, *History of Dogma*, i. 195).³

¹ Comp. *Testament of Judah*, xxiv. 5.

² Elizabeth's kinship with Mary (St. Luke i. 36) would hardly seem capable of counting as Davidic descent for St. John the Baptist, though it might suffice to justify the statement that he was descended from both Aaron and Israel.

³ It should also be remembered that the viith chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews exhibits a polemic in a not dissimilar strain from the generally accepted point of view (mentioning our Lord's descent from Judah, without referring to the Davidic family, and showing the superiority of His Priesthood over that of the tribe of Levi). For a decided modern echo of the view of Tatian and others see Dr. Sanday in *Hastings' Bible Dictionary*, vol. ii., p. 622.

The cause of any decided departure, on the Jewish side, from the Davidic expectation of the Messiah must, no doubt, be sought in the ascendancy of the priestly house of the Hasmonaeans from about the middle of the second century B.C. (aided, no doubt, by the title "Anointed one" which belonged to the high-priest equally with the King), though a sufficiently strong current in that direction probably set in in earlier times caused by the great prominence that was assigned to priestly ministration during the time of the Second Temple; and the Sadducees (the *בני צדוק*) of the document) would, as the active priestly ministrants of the Temple, naturally favour very strongly the continuance of supremacy in the Aaronic line. This circumstance explains why in the pseudepigraphical literature of the time,¹ excepting the "Psalms of Solomon," which are of Pharisaic origin, the Messiah is never spoken of as a Son of David.²

(b) But why is the "root of planting" described as coming "from Aaron and Israel?"—On this point it seems only necessary to repeat what was said in *The Athenæum* for Nov. 26, 1910: the priestly descent of John the Baptist "need not stand in the way of believing that there was a strain of non-priestly Israelite blood in the family" (see the note 2 on p. 219). As this particular branch of the Sadducees consisted mainly of priests and Israelites, it was neces-

¹ Comp. Dr. W. V. Hague, *The Eschatology of the Apocryphal Scriptures*, J. T. S., Oct., 1910, pp. 76-77; Charles, *The Book of Jubilees*, p. 188. Sib. iii. 47 and 288 may refer to an Aaronic line, nor is Ethiopic Enoch xc. 37 decisive. In the other passages mentioned by Charles and Hague, Judah is after all only made to play a secondary rôle, Levi being supreme (this, by the way, perhaps explains the apparent application of the title *משיח* instead of *מלך* to David in p. 5, l. 1). 4 Ezra belongs to a later period.

² The Book of Daniel exhibits the same characteristic; nor should it be forgotten that the Servant of Yahveh in Deutero-Isaiah (though much earlier, unless Dr. Kennett's view be right) is not called a Son of David either.

sary "to assign to their Messiah an origin that would satisfy both parties."

But if John the Baptist is meant by the "root of planting," it would seem to become almost certain that the 390 years after the destruction of the Temple by the armies of Nebuchadnezzar must, as has been already suggested (THE EXPOSITOR for December, 1911, pp. 506-7) bring us down (on the chronological basis of Rabbi Yish-mā'el) to near the time we designate as *Anno Domini*. Even so, however, the discrepancy between St. Luke's account, in which John the Baptist and our Lord are stated to have been of practically the same age, and the chronology of our sectaries would be very considerable. According to them the Baptist would have begun his ministry somewhere between 5 and 7 B.C., whilst Jesus Himself entered on His work twenty years after that. But not much should in the present stage of critical inquiry be made of this difference. Other great difficulties are, on the one hand, connected with the time indications in the first three chapters of St. Luke's Gospel, and there is, on the other hand, no reason for assuming that our sectaries were not themselves a little hazy in their marks of time with regard to what happened between fifty and seventy years prior to the composition of the manifesto. The suggestion is that the true chronology may lie between the two extremes, and also that, though John's chief work may have begun at the time indicated at the beginning of St. Luke iii., he might have been in several ways prophetically active before that time.

P. 1, ll. 10-11. It is to be noted that of the "Teacher of Righteousness," who—on the explanation here defended—is also styled Messiah in p. 2, l. 12 and at the beginning of p. 6, no descent is indicated. It is, indeed, quite possible that our sectaries believed the "Teacher" to be descended from David; only in their view such a descent was neither a

recommendation nor a drawback. The personal qualification was everything, and Davidic descent would, if no advantage, be no bar either, for a descendant of David would still be an Israelite. Hence—one may suppose—their silence about it.

An almost startling confirmation of the theory that by the “Teacher” none other but Jesus is meant will be found on the note on p. 2, ll. 12–13. In this place the evidence which directly or indirectly points to the same conclusion will be collected in as concise a form as possible :—

1. The evidence from the title “Teacher” would not be decisive in itself, for Dositheus is reported by Shahrastani to have borne the title *Ilfān*, which has the same meaning; nor would the term “only [or unique] Teacher,” which is found elsewhere in the document, decide the point, although ܛܝܩܝܗ corresponds to the Aramaic ܛܝܩܝܗ, which represents *μονογενής* in the old Syriac of St. John i. 14 (in the Peshitto similarly ܛܝܩܝܗ), for Dositheus is reported to have had a similar ‘appellation (for references on the two points see Schechter, *Intr.*, p. xxiv; Kohler, p. 413, *A. J. Th.*, July, 1911).¹ But it is clear that the correspondence of ܛܝܩܝܗ with *διδάσκαλος*² which is so often applied to our Lord in the Gospels, at any rate, neutralises the inference in favour of Dositheus; and the same remark fully applies to the term “only” or “unique one.”

But the application of the title, “Teacher of Righteousness”³ (which, by the way, contains again an allusion to

¹ The title “Star” found on p. 7, l. 18 of the document is here taken to refer to a later personage who was one of the leaders of the migration to Damascus (after A.D. 70). The passage itself reads: “And the star . . . who came to Damascus.”

² It is noteworthy that *διδάσκαλος* is also applied to Jesus in the disputed passage in Josephus, *Ant.* xviii., iii. 3. That passage is, according to those who do not reject it in its entirety, held to have been worked over by a Christian hand. If so, *διδάσκαλος* must have stood in it in its original form. Remarkable also is the frequent representation of our Lord in the catacombs with a scroll in His hand to denote His office as teacher.

³ Professor Moore (*Harvard Theological Studies*, July, 1911, p. 374) confuses the idea of “Teacher of Righteousness” with that of “legislator,”

the בני צדק , the word for righteousness being צדק) to our Lord derives special strength from its connexion with what precedes. The office of the "root of planting" was purely negative. People learnt to know "that they were guilty men," but they still remained "like blind men . . . groping their way." Then came the "Teacher of Righteousness," in order to guide them in the way of His heart," and in order, as we are told at the end of the exordium here translated, to make men know the Holy Spirit.

2. A graphic reference to the tragic events which culminated in the ending of the earthly life of Jesus seems to be contained at the end of p. 1 of the document. We there read: They "justified the wicked one, and condemned the righteous one . . . and they trooped themselves together against the life of the righteous one. . . . And they goaded the people to hostility." That an historical act which was vividly present to the mind of the writer is here referred to seems beyond doubt; but to what event could the description be satisfactorily applied except to the great tragedy recorded in the Gospels? ¹ (for the goading of the populace against Jesus, see, e.g., Matt. xxvii. 27; if the view here defended is correct, "the wicked one" who was "justified" must be Barabbas).

3. The gift of the Holy Spirit as bestowed by the agency of the "Teacher" has already been referred to under (1); but mention must be made of the fact that other parts of

which, he rightly says, would not be applicable to Jesus. But the two offices are clearly distinct from each other, the former aiming at instruction in moral and spiritual principles, and the latter working for the establishment of detailed laws. Dr. Ward's idea (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, July 1911, p. 444) that the "Teacher of Righteousness" might be Mattathiah, the father of the Maccabee brothers, will, it is thought, not recommend itself to many. The Maccabees were, for one thing, fighters and upholders of the Law rather than teachers.

¹ It has been stated several times that the "Teacher" of the document died in or near Damascus; but there is absolutely no foundation for it. There is no such statement in the manifesto.

the document (see particularly p. 7, ll. 3-4) contain strong warnings against the defiling of the Holy Spirit that had been "apportioned" to them (comp. 1 Cor. xii. 11; *διαροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἕκαστῳ καθὼς βούλεται*). The belief in the gift of the Holy Spirit by the members of the body addressed was, therefore, very strongly marked; and this accords very well with one part of New Testament teaching.

4. Connected with the gift of the Holy Spirit is the moral ideal (though inseparable in their minds from the ceremonial aspect of their religion) which the sect was conscious of following. This ideal is called "perfection of holiness" (p. 7, l. 5; comp. also p. 1, ll. 20-21), and its followers are entitled, "the men of perfection of holiness" (p. 20, ll. 5, 7). The word for holiness is, of course, the same as that used in the term "Holy Spirit," and one has a right to assume that the gift bestowed by the agency of the Teacher of Righteousness was in their minds very closely connected with the ideal before them, and that they referred their high moral standard to the "Teacher" in a manner similar to the derivation of Christian saintliness from Christ in the New Testament.

5. Their attitude towards divorce and re-marriage after it would not necessarily prove Christian association, for the Zadokites in general as well as certain other sectaries held similar views on the marriage relation (see Schechter's *Intr.*, pp. xvii., xix.); but it is remarkable that the same Scriptural verse as that employed by Jesus in St. Matt. xix. 4 is also used in the manifesto (end of p. 4: "at the founding of creation male and female created He them"), whereas such an application of the verse has so far not been found elsewhere in Jewish literature (Dr. Schechter only refers to *Aboth d'Rabbi Nathan*, p. 5a, "which uses the same argument of Adam against polygamy, but does not give the verse").

6. After what has been said it seems quite natural to connect the term *הברית החדשה*, which is used twice¹ in the preserved portions of the manifesto (p. 6, l. 19 ; p. 8, l. 21 = p. 19, ll. 33-4) with *ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη* of 2 Corinthians iii. 6 and Hebrews viii. 8.² (for the origin of the idea see Jer. xxxi. 31). If this explanation of the term had no support in other characteristics of the manifesto, one could indeed interpret it differently. But the presence of so many other important indications requires us to assume that the "New Covenant" of the manifesto stands in very close relation to the identical term used in the New Testament.

7. Very important also is the extensive use made in the manifesto of the pseudepigraphical writings, in which we have of late years become accustomed to discern certain analogies with New Testament ideas, more particularly as regards the apocalyptic sections of it. Dr. Schechter rightly says "that it is among the sects severed from the general body of Judaism that we have to look for the origin of such pseudepigraphical works as the Book of Jubilees, the Book of Enoch, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and similar writings" (Intr. p. xxv.). He is no doubt right in regarding the quotations from these works as an argument against the Pharisaic origin of the manifesto. But is there any evidence to show that the Zadokites, if thought of apart from any Christian association, were in the habit of using the pseudepigraphical works in the way this is done in the document? If a connexion with the Messianic movement of John the Baptist and Jesus be assumed, the manner of treating these writings falls at once into its proper place; but apart from such a connexion,

¹ Besides several other references to the *ברית* or covenant, without the express addition of *החדשה*, or "the new."

² See also Hebrews ix. 15; xii. 24; also Matt. xxvi. 28, and parallel passages, including 1 Cor. xi. 25.

one would be here confronted with a problem within a problem.¹

P. 1, ll. 11-12. The making known of that which was actually accomplished must refer to a prophetic announcement made of some event of which the people then living had seen the fulfilment; and as the prediction was uttered "to the latter generations," and the event itself took place in "the last generation," the prophecy and its fulfilment could not have been far apart in point of time. And if the general interpretation of the document here advocated be correct (to the present writer no other interpretation is, indeed, possible), the prophecy referred to must be that of our Lord concerning the fall of Jerusalem recorded in St. Mark xiii. and elsewhere in the Gospels.

P. 1, ll. 13-17. In these lines the special causes which ushered in the catastrophe just referred to are stated. They are ascribed to the action of the "man of scoffing, who dropped to Israel waters of lying," and through whose agency the people had fallen away from all that they were bound to observe and maintain.²

Now who is meant by the "man of scoffing"? It may be confidently asserted that not only do the indications

¹ A point may also rightly be made of the prominence given to the forgiveness of sins which the Almighty had extended to the members of the "covenant" (see the note on p. 2, l. 5). Purely conjectural are the following suggestions: If the document be Judæo-Christian, the ספר הדין, or "Book of Meditation," which is several times mentioned in it, may have been a collection of *λόγια* attributed to Jesus, and the "Fundamentals of the Covenant" may have contained the principal tenets of their Judæan form of the faith. That the סבקר (translated by Schechter, and formerly also by the present writer, by "Censor") is really — *ἐπισκοπος* has also been seen by Kohler and Moore. There may therefore be here an analogy with the New Testament *ἐπισκοπος*. The word סרר, by the way, which is connected with the office of the סבקר, is probably an abstract noun formed from סרכנ ("officer" or "administrator") used in Daniel.

² Comp. Josephus, *Ant.* xviii. v. 2, where it is recorded that some of the Jews regarded the destruction of the army of Herod Antipas as a punishment for the execution of John the Baptist.

of the document justify the identification of this character (from the extreme Judaizing point of view of the sectaries) with Paul the Apostle, but that no other explanation is possible. Dr. Schechter's idea that the Hellenistic persecutions which preceded the Maccabean revolt are personified by the "man of scoffing," would in any case be excluded by the strongly marked individualistic features that are given him in the document (see. e.g. p. 4, l. 13, where he is regarded as "Belial, who is sent throughout Israel"; p. 8, l. 13; "confused of spirit and a dropper of lies"; but the title "man of scoffing," in the context in which it stands is alone sufficient to mark him out as an individual).¹ Dr. Kohler thinks that Simeon b. Shetach, who led the Pharisaic party about the time of Pompey's invasion of Palestine, is intended; but he has, in trying to prove his proposition, assigned to Simeon b. Shetach and the Pharisees of his day laxities of the School of Hillel which arose later, and which, as Rabbinic students know well, did not gain the approval of the majority of Jewish teachers before the establishment of the great synagogal council at Yabneh between 70 and 80 A.D. And even if these laxities could be laid at the door of the Pharisaic party of about B.C. 63, they would hardly furnish a sufficient handle for the denunciations contained in the document.

One cannot indeed escape the conclusion that these denunciations are in the main directed, not against a party which interpreted the Law differently and in some cases more leniently, but against a person and his following who set aside the Law altogether. The "man of scoffing" who had caused the people "to wander in the wilderness where there is no way," who "had made low the height of the world,"² who had turned men aside "from the path

¹ See also the passages referred to lower down.

² See note 10 on p. 214.

of righteousness," and had "removed the boundary which the forefathers had set in their inheritance," had—in the opinion of our sectaries—brought upon the nation all "the curses" which are in such terrible detail described in Deut. xxviii. 15–68. By no stretch of imagination surely could the Sadducees of about 63 B.C. say this against Simeon b. Shetach and the Pharisees of his day, or, in fact, against the Pharisees in any period of Jewish history. Among other expressions which cannot but refer to people who set themselves absolutely against the Mosaic Law are such as "those who turn aside from the way and despise the statute" (p. 2, l. 6), "with a tongue of reproaches opened they their mouth against the statutes of the covenant, saying they are not well-founded" (p. 5, ll. 11–12), "at the end of the destruction of the land rose up they that remove the boundaries, and they led Israel astray" (p. 5, l. 20), and "they uttered error against the statutes of righteousness, and they despised the covenant and the pledge of faith which they affirmed in the land of Damascus, namely, the new covenant" (p. 20, ll. 11–12).¹

Is it possible, one may ask, to apply all this to any but persons who advocated the abrogation of the Mosaic code in its entirety? The explanation here offered—the only sound one, it is maintained—is that the utterly misjudged and most bitterly slandered Paul the Apostle was by our uncompromising Judaisers of Damascus styled "the man of scoffing," because he was responsible for the attacks on the Mosaic ceremonial code which had remained to them an absolutely essential part of their religious life, notwith-

¹ The explanation of this passage is as follows: The new covenant as established at Damascus combined a certain form of belief in John the Baptist and Jesus with the strict observance of the Mosaic Law; but followers of Paul ("the men of scoffing," in the earlier part of l. 10) later on arose in the Damascus community and affirmed that the observance of the Law was not necessary.

standing their acceptance, in a certain way, of Jesus as the Messiah. That they, moreover, should have pursued with equally violent animosity the adherents of the Apostle ("the men of scoffing") both during his lifetime and after his departure, can, of course, not be the least surprising. Their fierce denunciation against St. Paul's non-Mosaic form of Christianity was no doubt mixed with some bitter feeling against their other enemies, the Pharisees, with whom they had several old scores to settle, and possibly also with a certain amount of vituperation against the laxities of the main body of the Sadducees, who had remained aloof from the higher aspirations of our sectaries. Nice and discriminating they were not by any means in the violence of their attack; they confused matters and exaggerated as much as they could. But no doubt should be allowed to rest on the clear fact that their denunciation was in the main—or rather almost altogether—directed against a leader and his followers who maintained that the observance of the Mosaic Law was not an essential part of true religion.

As a further confirmation of this view, the special form which the denunciation takes on p. 4 of the manifesto may be referred to. The leader of the anti-legalistic movement, who is in l. 13 spoken of as "Belial, who is sent throughout Israel" to pervert the nation, is there accused of fostering sexual immorality, running after wealth, and polluting the Temple. It has yet to be shown that all these accusations could with any show of reason have been levelled against Simeon b. Shetach or any other leader of the Pharisaic party. But with regard to St. Paul, the origin of the calumnies is clearly discernible. The charge of polluting the Temple is identical with the outcry against the Apostle recorded in Acts xxi. 28; "a handle for the charge of greed was probably found in his zealous endeavour to collect

money for the poor adherents of the new religion in Jerusalem ; and as for immoral teaching, it was quite enough for his enemies to point to the fact that he advocated the abolition of the Law, or they may have had before them some flagrant cases of moral aberration amongst his followers similar to that which he himself castigates in 1 Corinthians v. 1 ” (so originally in *The Athenæum* for November 26, 1910).

Dr. Ward (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1911, p. 436) objects to the application of the term “Belial” to an individual person, as that name (in the form of Beliar) is in the writings of the period given to Satan. But why should not in this particular passage “Belial” denote a person whom the sectaries believed to be actuated by the spirit of Satan ? A sufficient analogy for such an application of the name is found in the “Sibylline Oracles,” iii. 63, where Beliar as a kind of Antichrist is announced to proceed from the Samaritans. To the fanatical Judaizers of the early Church St. Paul must have appeared to be nothing less than a kind of Antichrist, so that the term Belial would be quite in its place here as denoting the great individual opponent of the sectaries, though in other parts of the document the name no doubt applies to Satan or the Destroyer.¹

Highly significant is the note of time found on p. 20 ll. 13–15 of the document. We there read : “And from the day when there was gathered in [i.e. died] the unique Teacher until all the men of war who walked with the man of lies were destroyed there were about forty years.”—There is no reason for doubting that “the man of lies” is the same as “the man of scoffing” (see p. i. ll. 14–15 : “who dropped

¹ As against Dr. Ward, it is here again maintained that in the Hebrew word for “sent” (משלח) a mocking allusion to St. Paul’s apostleship seems to stand out clearly, the root being the same as that from which the Hebrew equivalent of ἐπισκοπος is formed.

to Israel waters of lies"; also p. 8 l. 13: "confused of spirit and a dropper of lies"). The only effect of doubting this identity would be to introduce a fresh problem in the manifesto. The expressions used in the passage are, of course, adapted, in the well-known allusive style of which the document (as can be seen from the Biblical references attached to the translation) exhibits so many examples, from Deut. ii. 14-16, the religious rebels here spoken of being compared to the rebellious Israelites who were doomed to die in the desert prior to the entry of the people into Canaan; and it is remarkable that the period here assigned to the activity of the leader and that of his immediate followers is about (note the merely approximate time indication) forty years, a space of time not far removed from the result of recent critical computation (see e.g., Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, vol. iii., p. 715). For forty years or so the sectaries had attempted to withstand the attacks directed against the Mosaic ceremonial code by St. Paul and his immediate followers, and they were then making a final and most determined effort in the same direction. It was an effort, however, which for the good of humanity ended in the victory of Pauline theology.

P. 1, l. 18-p. 2, l. 1.¹ The graphic reference to the trial and sufferings of Jesus which appear to be expressed in the words: "and they justified the wicked one and condemned the righteous one," etc., has already been considered in the notes on p. 1, ll. 10-11. In this place it is only necessary to make clear the connexion with what precedes. The forsaking of the Law advocated by Paul was declared to have been the immediate cause of the catastrophe of A.D. 70; and it is now stated that that cause itself was to be regarded as a pun-

¹ A special note is required on the phrase "and they chose the fat and well-liking," lit., "the fairness of the neck," or "fair neck" in p. 1, l. 19; see Hos. x. 11, where the identical phrase is used. No emendation of the text is therefore needed (comp. Schechter and Lévi).

ishment for the nation's guilt in the action they took against "the soul of the righteous one" and all the attendant circumstances. We, therefore, here meet with the well-known idea that one guilt brings in another guilt until finally ruin is the result (see, e.g., Rom. i. 24, 26; also *Pirqué Aboth*, ii. 2: "The fulfilment of one commandment brings another in its train, and one transgression also brings another with it").

It should also be noted that in the Hebrew text of p. 1, l. 19, "And they justified the wicked one," etc.) there is again an allusion to the title of the sect in the forms derived from the root of קָדַשׁ.

P. 2, l. 5. In the sentence "to make atonement for those who turn away from their sin" one may fairly discern a distinctive note of Christian teaching. The idea is also prominent in ii. 4-5; iv. 6-7; iv. 9-10; viii. 16.

P. 2, l. 6. The reference to "the angels of destruction," as also several other indications of the document (e.g., p. 16 l. 5: "the angel of Mastema," which is an allusion to Jubilees x. 8), show that this section of the Sadducees (the Boëthusian section, as will be suggested in the note on p. 2, ll. 12-13) did believe in angels and spirits, in contradistinction to the main body spoken of in the New Testament.¹ They also seem to have believed in the doctrine of immortality²

¹ It is possible, however, that all that is implied in Acts xxiii. 8 is merely that the Sadducees denied the *Pharisaic* development of the doctrine of angels, which was largely based on ideas derived, not from the Hebrew Scriptures, but from Zoroastrianism.

² In *Ant.* xviii. i. 4, Josephus, says that the doctrine about the soul dying with the body "is received by but a few [of the Sadducees], yet by those still of the greatest dignity." It should also be noted that what the Sadducees are stated to have denied in Matt. xxii. 23; Mark xii. 18; Luke xx. 27; and Acts xxiii. 8, was not immortality in its purely spiritual sense, but "resurrection," which is really a doctrine of a different kind (see the concise statement of this view in Hastings' one-volume Bible Dictionary, under "Sadducees," where the inference is rightly drawn that Josephus, in the passage named and *Wars* ii. viii. 14, "overstated things in his desire to make the Jewish parties look like the philosophical schools of Greece"),

(p. 3, l. 20: "they who hold fast to it [i.e. the house of Zadok] for the life of eternity"). It is, of course, only too likely that their discipleship of Jesus—however slight it was—strengthened an original disposition to accept those beliefs.

P. 2, ll. 7-8. These lines show a distinct belief in the doctrine of predestination and election, thus again showing a decided divergence from the main body of the Sadducees (see Josephus, *Ant.* xiii. v. 9; *Wars*, ii. viii. 14). The general agreement between the document and St. Paul's teaching on predestination and election is noteworthy.

P. 2, l. 8. The conjectural reading עֲיִיָּהִם instead of מִדָּם has been here hazarded (see the Hebrew text of Isaiah lxiv. 5); or נִדְתָּם should perhaps be read (comp. p. 2, l. 1).

P. 2, l. 9. There seems to be no need of connecting מַעֲמֵד with the gnostic idea of the "Standing One" (ἑστῶς or *stans*; see Schechter, *Intro.* p. xxv.). The term is applied to Temple ministrants in 1 Chronicles xxiii. 28; 2 Chronicles xxxv. 15, and it is similarly used in Talmudical literature.

The translation "sections" in the same line finds its support in the use of the Hebrew word by the Samaritans, who employ it to denote the "sections" or "parts" of the Pentateuch.

P. 2, l. 10. If the third word of this line is not hopelessly corrupt, one may venture to regard it as a parenthesis and translate: "and it actually so came to pass"; comp. the use of the Niphal of נִיָּה in the Hebrew text of Ecclesiastes xlii. 19, and see also Proverbs xiii. 19, where נִיָּה lays similar stress on the natural accomplishment of an expectation or wish.

P. 2, ll. 11-12. We here find the sectaries applying to themselves the great promises of the chosen race. They were the true remnant; the world was to be peopled by them.

P. 2, ll. 12–13. We have now reached the climax of the great exordium, and with it what may fairly be regarded as the *locus classicus* of the document: “And He made them know His Holy Spirit through His Messiah, and He [i.e., the Messiah] is true, and in the explanation of His name are their names.” Then again reverting to the idea expressed in p. 1, l. 18–p. 2, l. 1: “But those he hated has he caused to go astray.”

The sentence: “and in the explanation of His name are their names” is a literal translation of the Hebrew as it stands. Emendations of the Hebrew have been proposed, but so far none that gives a clear meaning. Why, therefore, not accept the clear sense of the text as given in the MS. ? As nothing approaching to a satisfactory explanation of a different kind has yet been given one may conclude these notes with the remark made on this point in the *Athenæum* article:—

“The Boëthusians, who are commonly believed to have been a variety of Sadducees (see, e.g., *Jewish Encyclopedia*, vol. iii. p. 285), derived their title from a priest named Boëthos (*Βοηθός*, helper), a name, let it be remarked, which was by no means uncommon among the Jews about the time in question. But the meaning of *Βοηθός* is the same as that of the Hebrew name represented by ‘Jesus.’ The inference would, therefore, be that the section of the Zadokites or Sadducees who adopted an attitude of belief towards the Baptist and Jesus were none other than the Boëthusians (perhaps identical with the great company of believing priests of Acts vi. 7), who not unnaturally liked to dwell on the identity of meaning between their name and that of the ‘Teacher.’ Unless, indeed, a better explanation of the phrase is forthcoming, it is not too much to say that we have here come upon the true key [one of the several keys, one ought to say now] to every part of the riddle and the entire situation.”

Professor Moore says that " Boëthos . . . is probably a Greek equivalent for the name Ezra, not for Jeshua " (*Harvard Theological Review*, July, 1911, p. 372); but as the idea of " helper " is contained in both names, it would, in any case, make no difference to an allusion of this kind, as the stress would naturally rest on the meaning rather than on the particular word bearing that meaning.

G. MARGOLIOUTH.