SOME REMARKS TO 1QS\textsubscript{a}, TO 1QS\textsubscript{b}, AND TO QUMRAN MESSIANISM

This article is dedicated to J. T. Milik, who is the true discoverer of the basic methods for the reconstruction of heavily damaged scrolls from scattered fragments without any help by a known parallel text. (1) His masterly editions of the “Dires de Moïse” (1Q22), and of the “Recueil des Bénédictions” (1Q28\textsubscript{b} = 1QS\textsubscript{b}), in the first volume of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert, 1955, are the decisive proof for the truth of this statement. (2) I hope very much that he will enjoy some further suggestions to his pioneering edition of 1QS\textsubscript{b}, and — together with D. Barthélemy — of 1QS\textsubscript{a}, (3) more than four decades ago.

This article (4) argues that 1QS\textsubscript{a} is the earliest rule-book of the Essenes, being composed not only prior to the so-called Damascus Document, but also prior to 1QS V-XI at least in its present form, i.e., including the secondary section VIII,15b - IX,11. (5) When 1QS\textsubscript{a} and 1QS\textsubscript{b} were completed, the Essenes already expected the future coming of the Royal Messiah close to the door. But “the priest” of 1QS\textsubscript{a} II,19, and the High Priest of 1QS\textsubscript{b}, are no messianic figures. The ideas of a future Priestly Messiah and of a future prophet according to 1QS IX,11, or 4QT\textsubscript{estimonia}, were developed by the Essenes only after the composition of 1QS\textsubscript{a} and 1QS\textsubscript{b}.

(1) In my article “Methods for the Reconstruction of Scrolls from Scattered Fragments”, in: Archaeology and History in the Dead Sea Scrolls, ed. by L. H. Schiffman, Sheffield 1990, 189-220, I described this method in some detail. Therefore, there are some references to it like “the Stegemann-method”. But the true inaugurator of this method is J. T. Milik.

(2) See the arrangement of the fragments in Discoveries in the Judaean Desert I. Qumran Cave I, by D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, Oxford 1955, plates XVIII-XIX (1Q22), and p. 119 + plates XXV-XXIX (1QS\textsubscript{b}).

(3) See ibid., p. 109 note I, and remarks like those to 1QS\textsubscript{a} II,11-12, pp. 117f, where D. Barthélemy hints to contributions by J. T. Milik.

(4) This article is the revised and augmented version of a paper with the same title, which I read at the IOQS Paris Meeting on July 18, 1992.

(5) See below, p. 496.
The argumentation of this article is based on the formal and textual evidence of 1QSa and of 1QSb with some new textual restorations or revisions of former readings. Finally, the results of this evaluation are imbedded into the history of Jewish Messianism in the second and first century BCE.

But because 1QSa and 1QSb come from the same scroll as 1QS I-XI, (6) the material evidence of the whole scroll should be presented before the special evidence of 1QSa and 1QSb can be discussed in detail.

A description of the scroll 1QS/Sa/Sb

The length of the scroll

The scroll which included 1QS I-XI had a considerable length. At its beginning, 9 cm of its opening handle-sheet survived with a sewing-seam at its left edge. (7) This handle-sheet is followed by 11 columns on 5 sheets of leather, which were sewn together. The first sheet represents columns I-III, the second columns IV-V, the third columns VI-VII, the fourth columns VIII-X, the fifth only column XI. (8) The length of this part of the scroll is about 189 cm. The next sheet with 1QSa I-II measures 29.5 cm. It is followed by a further sheet with columns I-IV of 1QSb, and by the beginning of the next sheet with 1QSb column V. (9) The total material remainders of 1QSb occupy about 72.5 cm.

Therefore, the preserved length of this scroll is about 300 cm. The handle-sheet at its beginning may have been some centimetres broader, while the former final handle-sheet is missing at all. Furthermore, 1-2 additional columns of 1QSb with the continuation of the blessing of the Royal Messiah are lost. (10) Including all these lost parts, this scroll originally should have measured at least about 350 cm.

Like some other scrolls from Qumran’s Cave 1, 1QS/Sa/Sb was hidden in its cave with the beginning of its text in the innermost layers.

---

(6) This is explicitly stated by D. Barthélémy and by J. T. Milik in their editio princeps, op. cit. note 2, pp. 107 and 119.

(7) See ibid., plate XXII.

(8) The sewing-seams between the opening handle-sheet and column I, and those between columns III/IV, VII/VIII, X/XI, are recognizable in the editio princeps, see The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark’s Monastery. Fascicle 2: Plates and Transcription of the Manual of Discipline, ed. by M. Burrows, New Haven 1951. The upper part of the sewing-seam between columns V/VI is visible on a colour-photo by J. C. Trever in: Scrolls from Qumran Cave I, ed. by F. M. Cross, D. N. Freedman, and J. A. Sanders, Jerusalem 1972, 135. The sewing-seam between 1QS, column XI, and 1QSa, column I, is portrayed on plate XXIII of the editio princeps of 1QSa, op. cit. note 2.

(9) See the evidence ibid., plates XXIII-XXIX.

(10) See below, p. 509.
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of the scroll and the final columns outside. (11) Therefore, the interior sheets with the columns 1QSa I-XI are much better preserved than the outer layers with 1QSa I-II, and 1QSb I-V. The shapes of damage in these columns attest, nevertheless, that 1QSa I-II and 1QSb I-V immediately followed 1QS I-XI according to the suggestions of D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik in the editio princeps. The question whether — or not — further sheets and columns once followed in this scroll after the end of 1QSb cannot be answered.

The sections of the scroll 1QS/Sa/Sb

The text of 1QSa and of 1QSb starts at the top of their opening columns after blanks in the bottom parts of the columns before. Furthermore, 1QSa I-II is separated from 1QS I-XI as well as from 1QSb I-V by sewing-seams. Therefore, one might argue that in this scroll different texts are only sewn together but not combined in a literary manner. But this opinion would clearly be wrong.

The scroll starts with an agenda for the yearly assembly of the Essenes’ whole Yahad 1QS I,1 - III,12. The title of this agenda is י"ל יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש Yabad. This fact is clearly evidenced as well by the beginning of the table of contents on the back of the opening handle-sheet with י"ו יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש Yabad in 1QS I,1, restored with the help of י"ו יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש Yabad in pap4QSb (4Q255) 11. (12) The designation י"ו יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש Yabad is repeated within the agenda 1QS I,16, but missing in all further parts of the scroll from 1QS III,13 onwards. Therefore, the designation “Serekh ha-Yahad” should be restricted to 1QS I,1-III,12 and should not be extended to other parts of this scroll.

The third literary entity of this scroll, 1QS V-XI, starts with י"ו יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש Yabad. Originally, this was a separate “book” introduced by י"ב יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש Yabad, see 4QSb 5,1,1 (4Q256), and 4QSd (4Q258) 1,1,1 (13), where the entire scroll starts with those words. In 1QS V,1 the former יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש Yabad. The introduction of this new opening by י"ב יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש Yabad clearly relates the section 1QS V-XI to 1QS I,1 - III,12 in the sense of a second “Serekh”, which mainly regulates the life-style within the Yahad.

In the very same redactional manner also 1QSa is related as a “third rule-book” to its predecessors 1QS I,1 - III,12, and 1QS V-XI. Its opening line starts now with the words י"ו יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש יאש Yabad. Unfortunately, no further copy of 1QSa is known. Therefore, its pre-

(11) See 1Q22, 1Q27, 1QHodayot, and 1QMilhama. Among the scrolls from Cave 4, see 4Q2, 4Q174, 4Q428, 4Q432 and 4Q401.


(13) See ibid., p. 60 (4QSb fragment 5,1) and p. 72 (4QSd fragment 1,1,1).
vious opening — or its original title — remain unknown to us. Neverthe­
less, there should be no doubt that 1QSa (a) was formerly composed
as a work of its own and (b) is now related — by הנם — to the forerun­
nine parts of this scroll.

Therefore, the literary relationship between 1QS I,1, 1QS V,1, and
1QSa I,1, evidently demonstrates that these three “rule-books” were not
only sewn together, but were combined in a secondary stage of their
literary transmission, which is now well attested by the scroll 1QS/Sa/Sb.

In contrary to the evidence of 1QS V,1, and of 1QSa I,1, the agenda
of blessings 1QSb is introduced asyndetically with the words
הברק למשכלי יבשót הלאזר א. In this case, only the material evi­
dence (a) that 1QSb is a further part of the same scroll like 1QS I-XI,
and 1QSa I-II, (b) that it was copied by the same scribe like all columns
before, and (c) that again — like in the case of 1QSa — its text starts in
the top-line of a column after a blank in the bottom part of the column
before indicates that also 1QSb was regarded by the copyist of
1QS/Sa/Sb — or already by his forerunner — as an integral part of the
whole arrangement of various, formally independent works in this scroll.

Also the section on the Two Spirits 1QS III,13 - IV,26 is asyndeti­
cally introduced by בברק למשכלי יבשót הלאזר א. Whether this
arrangement of texts is accidental, or the section on the Two Spirits was
a traditional appendix to the agenda 1QS I,1 - III,12, is questionable.
The only other manuscript which materially has a parallel text to 1QS
I,1 - III,12 followed by at least some kind of a version of the Two Spirits
is pap4QS (4Q257); but no equivalent to 1QS V-XI, or to 1QSa/Sb, sur­
vived from this scroll. (14) From 4QSb (4Q256) parallel text to 1QS I,1
- III,12 as well as to 1QS V-XI survived; but whether also the section on
the Two Spirits was included into this scroll, is still problematic. (15)

The evidence of 1QS is somewhat curious in this respect. The fact
that the column 1QS XI is written on a separate sheet with sewing-seams
on both edges has no real parallel in the larger Qumran scrolls. Further­
more, all other columns of 1QS/Sa/Sb have in the original manuscript
clear vertical and horizontal dry-lines, while there is no trace of any dry­
line on the sheet 1QS XI. (16) This curious evidence points to some kind
of secondary makeshift. How could it happen?

(14) See the complete fragmentary evidence of this scroll ibid., 68 and 70.
(15) See ibid., 60-66. The problem, whether 4QSb contained the section on the Two
Spirits or not, will be discussed by Sarianna Metso, The Textual Development of the Qum­
ran Community Rule (forthcoming). I am still hesitant.
(16) In the editions of 1QS/Sa/Sb the dry-lines are not visible as they were not
drawn by ink. But the original manuscripts show them quite clear. Usually, the original
manuscript of 1QS I-XI is in exhibition in the Shrine of the Book in Jerusalem, where the
exceptional evidence of its column XI can easily be studied.
The scroll \textit{1QSa/Sb} was prepared in the workshop in such a way that every new section in this arrangement could start on a new sheet after a sewing-seam, see \textit{1QS I}, \textit{1QSa I}, and \textit{1QSb I}. The only exception is the section \textit{1QS V-XI} which starts at the top of the second column of the second sheet of this scroll. Perhaps, the 7 columns on the second, third, and fourth sheet of this scroll were originally prepared for the text of the seven columns \textit{1QS V-XI}. But as the scribe — additionally — filled in the text of the Two Spirits in \textit{1QS III,13-26 + IV,1-26}, only 6 columns remained for the long text \textit{1QS V-XI}, and a further sheet with the single column \textit{1QS XI} must to be added at the end of this section.

At present, one can only speculate on these curious findings. Was it arbitrary to add the section on the Two Spirits to the agenda \textit{1QS I,1-III,12}, or to omit it? Did the workshop, where the sheets of leather were sewn together and prepared by dry-lines, use another \textit{Vorlage} — without the section on the Two Spirits — for the preparation of the scroll than the scribe who finally filled in the text? At least the scribe’s final misfortune to reach the end of the sheet with \textit{1QS} columns VIII-X without having been able to arrange the full text of \textit{1QS V-XI} within the sheets prepared for it — a sheet for a further column need to be inserted into the scroll — will help us to understand better some trouble with the number of lines in the columns of \textit{1QSa} and \textit{1QSb} for the former scribe and for the modern editors. (17)

\textbf{The number of lines in the columns of 1QSa/Sa/Sb}

The height of the scroll \textit{1QSa/Sa/Sb} is close to 24 cm. Regularly, each column had 26 lines, but there are some exceptions to this rule. The final 4 lines of columns XI and XIII (= \textit{1QSa II}) are unwritten as the writer started to copy the next section in the top of the following columns. The third sheet of this scroll with \textit{1QS VI-VII} was ruled in a way that 27 lines occupy just the same space as 26 lines in the columns before and afterwards. Moreover, the scribe totally skipped the three lines 7 to 9 in column VII as he experienced that the leather in the final third of those lines was rather bad: (18) his last word in line 6 had become crumbled. Later on, a corrector erased this word and repeated it in the beginning of line 7. Therefore, only the totally blank two lines 8 to 9 were not numbered in the edition with the misleading result of only 25 lines in this column instead of the true number of 27 lines. Column VIII had again only 26 lines; but the scribe created an additional line 27

(17) See below, pp. 495, 505 and 508.

(18) This damage of the sheet was caused by a bone-hole at its left edge, which is very clear in the original manuscript (see above, note 16), but can be detected also on the colour-photo of \textit{1QS} column VIII at the right hand side of lines 12-15, see the edition by F. M. Cross \textit{et alii} (op. cit., note 8), p. 141.
by a single word, which he had forgotten in the transition to the next column IX. The last preserved sheet of this scroll starts — after a sewing-seam — with column XVIII (= 1QSb V) adding within the bottom part of that column one more line to the written space of the columns before; but how many lines were regularly in 1QSb I-IV?

The most irregular evidence of this scroll is its column XII (= 1QSa I). Here 29 lines are written in a rather narrow manner within the same space of the column, which is occupied by only 26 lines in 1QS I-V and VIII-X, or by 27 lines in columns VI-VII. But the next column XIII (= 1QSa II) has again lines which are written in the same distance from one another like in 1QS I-V, or VIII-XI. Columns XIV-XVIII (= 1QSb I-V) continue the line-distances of column XIII (= 1QSa II), not the much narrower distances of column XII (= 1QSa I). The result is that columns XIV-XVII (= 1QSb I-IV) originally had only 26 lines each, not 28 lines as suggested by J. T. Milik in his edition, (19) while column XVIII (= 1QSb V) had 27 lines instead of 29 lines in the editio princeps. This reduced evidence — two lines less in each column of 1QSb — will help afterwards to establish the true length of the different blessings in this agenda. (20)

The script of 1QS/Sa/Sb

The scroll 1QS/Sa/Sb was written about 100 BCE or, at the latest, within the time-span 100-75 BCE by the same scribe who also copied the four quotations of 4QTestimonia (4Q175) on a separate sheet.

In his book The Scribal Character of the Dead Sea Scrolls Malachi Martin argued in 1958 that three different scribes shared in the final result of 1QS/Sa/Sb. According to Martin, scribe A wrote the whole text from the beginning (1QS I,1) to the end (1QSb V), while scribe B wrote the two columns of 1QSa, the top part of 1QSb III, and — perhaps — a few lines in the bottom part of 1QSb II. A third scribe C put the title of the entire scroll on the back of its opening handle-sheet. (21)

The last observation regarding “scribe C” is obvious. But there is no real difference between “scribe A” and “scribe B”. All observations of M. Martin are within the range of scribal variations of one and the same copyist. Particularly the peculiar evidence of 1QSa, where the script may look slightly different from that in 1QS I-XI, is easily to explain. After his misfortune to fill the text of 1QS I-XI into the

(19) J. T. Milik noted in his edition (op.cit., note 2): “Dans les transcriptions on a mis conventionnellement 28 lignes (et 29 pour la col. V) par colonne” (p. 119). Indeed, he continued the number of lines in 1QSa, column I, without paying attention to the larger distances between the lines in all columns after it.
(20) See below, pp. 505-509.
10 columns prepared for it — an additional sheet with column XI need to be inserted into the scroll! — the scribe tried from the very beginning of writing 1QSa to fill its text into the 2 columns, which were prepared for it. In the first column of 1QSa the scribe did not keep to the horizontal dry-lines, but, instead, put 29 lines into the space, which was prepared for only 26 lines. Furthermore, he wrote the text much narrower than in 1QS I-XI, and he continued his lines closer to the left margin than in the columns before. Only after he had completed the first column, the scribe was convinced to be able to arrange the rest of the text within the 26 lines of column II, where the script is still narrow, but keeps to the ruled dry-lines of the prepared scroll. The slightly different appearance of the hand of 1QSa compared to 1QS I-XI is much better explained if both parts were written by the same scribe than by the postulate of two different scribes.

Indeed, there are at least three further observations which clearly demonstrate that 1QS I-XI and 1QSa I-II were written by the same scribe:

(a) At points where we might put a comma into a sentence, this scribe tends to continue his text 2-3 millimetres above the end of the word before. This scribal custom is evidenced by 1QS I-XI as well as by 1QSa. (22)

(b) The scribe had the tendency to write two words together like one word where the Masora later on would put a small horizontal stroke between the upper part of two words, the so-called maqqeph. For example, המֶלֶךְ is written in two words in 1QS I,4.7 and V,22, but as one word — המלך — in 1QS II,1.4; V,18, and IX,13 as in 1QSa I,4.23. This peculiar scribal custom again links the different parts of this scroll with one another. (23)

(c) Last but not least, the identity of the scribe of 1QSa with that of 1QS I-XI is attested at the best by a scribal custom to which very few Qumran scribes adhered and which as yet has not been noticed in the editions or in secondary research. In 1QSa I,14 and II,12 the name מְלַאכְתָּר is written in a quite normal manner. But in 1QSa I,1.6.20 and II,2.14.20 the final two letters of this name, i.e., its component לַאכְתָּר are written in an unusual broad and tall manner. This is not a special rende-

(22) See, e.g., the higher position of המלך in 1QS II,5, of המלך in 1QS II,19, or of המלך in 1QS II,21, compared to the higher position of המלך in 1QSa II,4.5, or of המלך in 1QSa II,12.

(23) Many other words are also written like one word, see, e.g., המלך in 1QS I,5, 1QS, I.9.10, or המלך in 4QMMT (4Q397) fragment 18,12, see DJD X, Oxford 1994, plate VI. Usually these graphical findings are not noted in the editions, see, e.g., the text by E. Qimron in DJD X, p. 58, line 12 and his note on this line p. 59.
ring of God’s name הַשֵּׁם, which is in 1QS/Sa/Sb always written like all other words, but some kind of reverential writing of the name הַשֵּׁם, which became also later on in Christian codices one of the so-called nomina sacra. (24) Evidently, the same kind of reverential writing of הַשֵּׁם, which so often occurs in 1QSa, is attested as well in 1QS VIII,12, less clearly perhaps in VIII,4.11, while the other 12 examples of הַשֵּׁם in 1QS I-XI are not written in an extraordinary manner. (25) The finding of this reverential writing of הַשֵּׁם as well in 1QS I-XI as in 1QSa should be the decisive proof that both parts of this scroll were indeed written by the very same scribe.

Parallel texts

There is no need here to discuss all peculiarities of the parallel texts to 1QS/Sa/Sb from other Qumran caves, i.e., 4QSa-j and 5QS (5Q11). Only two of their findings are important for the argumentation in this article.

The manuscript 4QSe, which is represented by 4Q259 and by 4Q319 (= 4Qotot), shows a textual version older than 1QS/Sa/Sb. Instead of the calendric section 1QS IX,26 - XI,22, 4QS\textsuperscript{e} offers another calendric section, which is still orientated to the priestly office at the temple in Jerusalem. At the same time, the long passage of 1QS VIII,15b - IX,11 with its final hint to three future authoritative figures — דַּעְמַי נֵבֶא מְשֹֹ֑֫ה אַחֲוֹרִין וַרְשָׁאֵל — is still missing in 4QS\textsuperscript{e}. (26) Therefore, no hint to any messiah was included into the primary stages of literary development of 1QS V-XI.

The second, again negative finding is that nowhere in those parallel manuscripts from the Qumran caves is any hint that 1QSa and/or 1QSb were included into them, but there are, instead, indications that another text than 1QSa or 1QSb could follow after 1QS I-XI. The manuscript 4QSb (4Q256) from “herodian times” (circa 30-1 BCE) has corresponding text as well to 1QS I,1 - III,12 as to 1QS V-XI including its final hymn. Nevertheless, this manuscript is evidently not a copy from 1QS/Sa/Sb, as, e.g., it still offers ןוֹחַ דָּעְמִי מְרֹשֶׁא לְמַשָּׁלָל instead of ... וַיַּעַל וַיַּהֲדִיק וַיֹּאמֶֽר ְדַעְמִי 1QS V,1. The last fragment 4 of 4QS\textsuperscript{e} comes from the top of a column


(25) A further example of this peculiar manner of writing the name “Israel” is probably 4QM\textsuperscript{e} (4Q491) 11,1,20, where at the end of the line the top of a rather tall ם survived, see Discoveries in the Judaean Desert VII, ed. by M. Baille, Oxford 1982, 27, and plate VI.

(26) See op. cit. note 12, p. 88, the evidence of 4QS\textsuperscript{e} fragment 1,III,6.
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with remainders of its lines 1-2. (27) Line 1 has רַבִּיתֵךְ and a clear vacat afterwards, which evidently corresponds to לֵבָנְתָּהָ מֵהָיָהּ at the very end of 1QS XI,22. Line 2 has כֹּחֵל from about the midst of that line, which does not agree to the findings either of 1QSa I,1 or of 1QSb. The text of line 2 will come from the beginning of some other work or from a secondary final rubric to 1QS I-XI, which is not attested by 1QS. (28)

To sum up: no further evidence corresponding to 1QSa and/or 1QSb has been found among the other Qumran manuscripts, but only one finding — fragment 4 of 4QSb — which, perhaps, offers the beginning of another work after 1QS I-XI. Therefore, the scroll 1QS/Sa/Sb, written about 100-75 BCE, remains our only witness for 1QSa as well as for 1QSb. Did the missing of both compositions within the fragmentary relics of eleven further S-scrolls result by chance, or did those “books” pass out of use in later times?

History of research

Since the very beginnings of Qumran research most serious scholars were convinced that 1QS I-XI should contain the rules of “the Essenes” who according to Pliny the Elder lived at the northwestern shores of the Dead Sea. (29) The fact that 1QS I-XI does not explicitly mention women or wives fitted well to Pliny’s description of those Dead Sea Essenes as being unmarried.

At the same time, everybody knew the “Fragments of a Zadokite Work” from the Cairo Geniza, which were published by Solomon Schechter already in 1910 (30) and which usually are called today the Damascus Document (CD). This book was clearly composed for married people. When on 1956 the news spread that 10 fragmentary copies of this work were found in different Qumran caves, most scholars regarded CD as a secondary rule-book of the Essenes: while 1QS I-XI should have been composed for the hypothetically unmarried inhabitants of the Essenes’ “center” at Qumran, CD became related to the usually married Essenes in towns and villages all over the country.

When 1955 D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik published 1QSa and 1QSb, they already knew about the manuscripts from Qumran caves,

(27) This fragment is not yet published, but see the forthcoming book of Sarianna Metso, above note 15, with discussion of this evidence. According to the numbering of fragments from 4QSb by J. Charlesworth, op. cit. note 12, 60-67, this fragment should be number 10. Curiously it is neglected in this edition.

(28) The suggestion of a secondary final rubric is discussed by S. Metso, ibid., but remains highly speculative as there is no other example of this kind in all Qumran scrolls.

(29) The first scholar who discussed this possibility was E. L. Sukenik, Megillot Testimoni, Jerusalem 1948, p. 16f.

which correspond to CD. Now 1QSa turned out to be a third rule-book of the Essenes, copied within the same scroll like 1QS I-XI, but again addressed to married people like CD. There was no sense to create a third group of Essenes besides those at Qumran and those in the towns and villages all over the country. Therefore, they developed the suggestion that 1QSa and 1QSb should have been composed for the future of the Essenes, all the more so as the future Royal Messiah plays a prominent role in both compositions. (31) They never earnestly tested other possibilities to explain the evidence of 1QSa and of 1QSb, and up to present times almost all scholars adhere to their model. Furthermore, both scholars argued in their editio princeps that besides the Royal Messiah also the Priestly Messiah was addressed in 1QSa as well as in 1QSb, (32) and this view was followed by such influential scholars like J. Licht in his commentary on 1QS/Sa/Sb (1965), (33) or L. H. Schiffman in his monograph on 1QSa and 1QSb (1989) (34). Therefore, this is today the common opinion. But to the contrary: there is no trace of the Priestly Messiah either in 1QSa or in 1QSb, and both works were not composed for some future times, but for the present of the Essenes like the different parts of 1QS I-XI and CD. In this article, I shall discuss mainly some crucial findings in 1QSa and in 1QSb in support of this view.

1QSa, an early rule-book of the Essenes

The most discussed part of 1QSa is its final section II,11-22, already labelled by J. T. Milik as “la description du banquet eschatologique” (35) and which L. H. Schiffman called “The Messianic Banquet” (36) as if one very special opportunity was viewed. In fact, the correctness of this designation is largely dependent on some readings and fillings of gaps in the lines II,11-12, and on a convincing answer to the question where this section really starts. In a very thorough recent study of this of this section É. Puech convincingly demonstrated that all former suggestions for the reading of the last word in II,11 and for the completion of the beginning of line II,12 were evidently wrong. (37) Therefore, I will not repeat his arguments, but mainly criticize his new proposals and introduce some further suggestions.

(31) See the editio princeps, op. cit. note 2, pp. 108, 121f, and 128f.
(32) Ibid.
(35) In the editio princeps (op. cit. note 2) p. 121.
As far as I know, the only author who precisely described the formal structure of this section and stated its true beginning was J. Carmignac 1963, (38) who was followed in those respects by nobody else. The first relevant observation by him was that the whole text of line II,11, except the last two words, is not the opening of the final section, but a concluding remark to the section before. (39) This is evident if one compares it to the other formulations of this kind in IQSa. Their sequence is:

\[
\text{לעשת רודה \quad II,27} \\
\text{אלד ואמשים וקריא} \quad \text{II,1-3} \\
\text{ᜰعالم אתות והשומ} \quad \text{II,8} \\
\text{כדסי אתות השומ \quad II,11} \\
\text{קריא] מטרע לעשה רודה \quad II,13}
\]

The rubric in I,27 is a long apposition to those who have “hallowed them for three days” and, therefore, are ready to obtain cultic duties; but as the text of the manuscript is defect towards the end of this line, one may not exclude the possibility that this rubric is continued by what follows. But in all other occurrences this kind of rubric is clearly concluding the text before. II,1-3 is the concluding rubric to the long section I,6 - II,3 — or, at least to I,25 - II,3. II,8 belongs to the final formulations regarding unclean persons. II,11 concludes the whole section II,3-11, and II,13 concludes the description of those priests who are admitted to the assembly. (40) There is no need at all to understand that rubric in II,11 as an opening phrase of the section II,11-22. On the contrary, this can be done only highly artificially, as it is demonstrated at the best by all the tormenting modern translations of this passage except that by J. Carmignac.

Nevertheless, against the editio princeps two alterations are commendable. The last word of line II,10 is not ממלש, but ממלש, (41) and the second word of line II,11 should become completed to ממלש. (42) The

(39) See his translation, ibid. 24.
(40) The sequence ממלש II,13 instead of the revers order in II,2 and II,11 may hint to another author, i.e., IQSa II,11-22 may be a secondary addition to I,1 - II,11 (except the last two words). Cf. the discussion on the blessing of the Royal Messiah IQbV,18ff, below p. 510.
(41) This reading is rather clear on the special photo of the left upper part of IQSa II in the editio princeps (op. cit. note 2) plate XXII. Also the photo of IQSa II by Bruce and Kenneth Zuckerman in the article of E. Puech (op. cit. note 37) p. 358 shows that the letter after ד has a very long base-stroke like a ד, while the base-strokes of the letter י are somewhat shorter in this hand. For ממלש as a technical term see IQS VII,3,5, and cf. the use of ממלש in IQS VI, 25; VII,1,16, or of ממלש IQS VIII,24; CD IX,21.
(42) In the manuscript there is a clear trace of the right bottom edge of the first letter of the word after ממלש, which fits better a ד than a ד.
final clause regarding an unclean person who is not admitted to any cultic assembly therefore reads:

“for (generally) excluded is he from the assembly of the men of renown, those who are appointed for the council of the Yahad.”

As demonstrated by J. Carmignac, (43) the final section of IQSa has three parts. The first part (lines 11-17) regulates the order of sitting, the second part (lines 17-21) regulates the order of the blessings, and a third part (lines 21-22) claims that this order must strictly become followed in every assembly of at least ten men, i.e., full members of the Essenes’ Yahad, wherever and whenever they meet for cultic assemblies. At least this final clause should effectively prevent from the idea that in the passages before (II,11-21) only one special meal was envisaged by the author of IQSa. But also the discussion of the text in lines II,11-12 will prove that such an idea would be basically wrong.

The recent suggestion of É. Puech to read and to supplement the text of IQSa II,11-12 seems to me highly artificial. His text is

which he translates: “quand {s’adjoindra} <sera révélé> [le Prêtre] Messie {à} parmi eux, [le Prêtre] entrera à la tête de toute la Congrégation d’Israël”.

The main problems of these suggestions are:

(a) The title הדגוגה is never again attested in Qumran texts including the not yet published ones. In the Old Testament there are two occurrences of הדגוגה (44), but always—like in rabbinical sources—in another sense than “to reveal oneself” and never followed by the preposition ב, which—furthermore—should come immediately after הדגוגה.

(b) The title הנשיא is never attested elsewhere. It is an artificial construct from the two titles הנשיא, a designation of the High Priest in the Old Testament, (45) and הנשיא (רכל), which sometimes designates the Royal Messiah in Qumran texts, (46) though never in the form הנשיא. (47) Furthermore, the Royal Messiah occurs two times in IQSa II,11-22, namely הנשיא הנשיא II,14, and הנשיא הנשיא II,20. Why should there be another designation of him in II,12, which were at the same time not a traditional one?

(c) Finally, the suggestions of É. Puech include at least two palaeographical problems, which may be discussed along with my own rendering of this crucial passage.

(43) See op. cit. note 38, pp. 24-26.
(44) Gen 9,21, and Prov 18,2.
(45) Lev 4,3,5,16; 6,15.
(46) See, e.g., IQSb V,18; IQM V,1; 4QpIsa 2-6,II,19; CD VII,20.
(47) CD V,1 relates to “the king” in general, not to a messiah.
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My own suggestion is that IQSa II,11-22 is basically a twin of the prescriptions in IQS VI,2-6, including in those regulations only the special case that the future יהושע יְשַׁעֵי מַשְׁאֵר may one day join those assemblies. Accordingly, I read and supply as follows:

“When they eat together, and the messiah is together with them, a priest must (always) come at the top of every congregation of Israel (or: every Israeliic congregation)”. The verifications of those renderings are:

(a) A new colour-photo of IQSa II, taken by Bruce and Kenneth Zuckerman 1994 and reproduced in black-white by E. Puech in his recent article, (48) evidently demonstrates that the third letter of the last word in II,11 is not ב, but a letter with a base stroke going downwards from right to left. E. Puech combines this letter with the forerunning one and reads ב. (49) But the base-stroke is much longer than that at the left leg of a ב in this scribal hand, and also a horizontal top-stroke of the same letter is clearly visible on the new photo. To my eyes, this letter is a clear ב, followed by a ב and some further ambiguous letter traces, (50) which might represent a ב as well as a ב, but no ב or ב. Above the right edge of E. Puech’s ב the new photo reveals an additional letter which resembles א. Therefore, E. Puech reads אתלע but in this case the additional letter should have been written at least above the left edge of his ב, if not above the small space between this ב and the following ב. Therefore, the reading of אתלע seems to me impossible. If there is, indeed, this additional letter in the manuscript, it should be a little bit damaged כ, which would change the word אתלע to אתלע�, or, perhaps, to אתלע��.

(b) From the first word in II,12 the top of a letter is preserved with some open space left of it. This letter-stroke hardly fits the — otherwise curved — left top of a ל, but fits very well to the left upper edge of a ל. Therefore, I prefer to fill in here the word ל[ל], which occupies almost the same space as the word ל[ל] above of it in line II,11. ל[ל] corresponds very well to ליל in IQS VI,2, where — like in its immediate context — the adverb ליל comes before ליל because it is emphasised there (“together they shall eat”).

(c) The remaining space between לילא[ל] and ל[ל] allows not more than one single letter and a normal space between two words. (51) The-

(48) See above, note 41.
(49) See his discussion of the palaeographical evidence op. cit. (note 37), 357f.
(50) All infra-red photos of IQSa II reproduce in the final parts of lines 10-16 some letters — or traces of letters — which do not belong to this column, but to some other layers of IQSh still stuck to the back of IQSa II.
(51) The first gap in the lines IQSa II,9-13 is 4 millimetres smaller, the second gap two more millimetres smaller than the reproduction of the evidence in the editio princeps (op. cit. note 2) plate XXIV or — accordingly — on the new photo by Bruce and Kenneth Zuckerman, see above note 41.
Therefore, I suggest to fill in here not more than ידיד. The words ידיד take up a traditional formulation — see IQS VI,2 —, while ידיד adds a special aspect. Syntactically this kind of construction offers no problem. As the next word ידיד starts 2-3 millimetres higher than the final letter of ידיד, a new syntactical unit will begin there. (52)

(d) The editio princeps filled the next gap in this line by reading ידיד. But the use of ידיד in the sense “enter as the head of ...” is not attested elsewhere. The title ידיד would not fit here syntactically. Therefore, most commentators — including E. Puech — prefer to supply ידיד “(then) the Priest (= the High Priest) must enter (the room) at the top of ...”. But this supplement is one broad letter to spacious for this gap. The only satisfactory solution is to fill the gap with ידיד “(then) a priest must (always) come at the top of ...”. This corresponds well to IQS VI,3-4, where a priest (דlds) is needed wherever and whenever (at least) ten members of the Yadah gather.

The result is that the following term ידיד can no longer mean “the whole congregation of Israel”, but, instead, “every Israelitic congregation”. This fits excellently to the concluding clause of the section IQSa 11,11-22 which reads:

וכותבו יהוה על (...) להלך מעידם את עזרה להם ואмыслים

“and according to this statute [they] must act regarding all assembl[ies, if] at least ten me[n g]ather.”

This text is the same like in the editio princeps except the restoration of ידיד instead of ידיד (54) and the insertion of ידיד instead of ידיד (55) in the first lacuna of the line IQSa 11,22. The decisive evidence

(52) For this peculiar graphical custom of the scribe of IQS/Sa/Sb see above, p. 495.

(53) Instead of ידיד IQS VI,3-4, 4QSb 1,11,8 has only ידיד, see op. cit. note 12, pp. 76f.

(54) In the editio princeps (op. cit. note 2) the term ידיד was artificially derived from IQS X,14, see p. 118. In IQSa — like in all Qumran manuscripts — the singular ידיד is always written with a י, see accordingly also IQSa II,11.13. But the plural ידיד is sometimes written ידיד. The biblical evidence is listed by F. Brown/S. R. Driver/Ch. A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, Oxford 1907, 417. Corresponding Qumran evidence is ידיד 4Q329a (Mishmarot G) 1,3,4,5, and 4Q418 (Sapiential Work la) 118,3, as well as ידיד 4Q372 (Joseph Apocryphon) 3,6. The main biblical source for the meaning of ידיד in IQSa is the term ידיד, “tent of meeting (of God with His people)” Exodus 27,21 etc., which firstly became related to the temple in Jerusalem and later — at least by the Essenes — to all cultic assemblies.

(55) The supplement ידיד was a mistake of the editio princeps, as this word is usually written ידיד in IQS/Sa/Sb, see K. G. Kuhn, Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten, Göttingen 1960 101, especially also IQSa II,8.10.19. But the gap in IQSa II,22 is too short between ידיד and ידיד for ידיד. Therefore, I prefer ידיד, cf. IQSa I, 25; II,9.11.
is that הַיְּהִי מְצֻוֹת strictly refers to the prescriptions of IQSa II,11-21. This way, the possibility is finally excluded that this section might refer to only one special occasion, when “the messiah” will come one day as the host of a “messianic banquet”. But why needed the Essenes this statute at all?

If הַיְּהִי מְצֻוֹת, “the priest”, in IQSa II,19 were “the High Priest” of messianic times, those prescriptions were, indeed, meaningless. Being a descendant of King David, the Royal Messiah essentially belongs to the tribe of Judah, (56) who is subordinated to the tribe of Levi in all cultic affairs. Every Essene knew very well that — according of the hierarchic order of these tribes — the High Priest must always have superiority above the Royal Messiah at meals joining both, as well in the sitting order as in the sequence of blessings. The only possible source of problems were cultic assemblies, which were presided by simple priests: should they not leave their chairs to the socially top-ranking Messiah? This statute says no: the Messiah and his men must rank in sitting after the presiding priest and all his bretheren (IQSa II,11-17), and even the simplest priest must start eating and drinking with his blessings. The Messiah may never take over the leading role at common meals. (57)

Furthermore, the only satisfactory completion of the beginning of the line IQSa II,12 results into the fact that הַלֵּוֶשׁ, “the Messiah”, is mentioned here without any further connotation. Therefore, he must be the only messianic figure in this section, and “the priest” cannot become regarded as another messianic figure at the same time.

The result is that IQSa was composed at a time when the Essenes already longed for the coming of the Royal Messiah, but did not yet develop the concept of a Priestly Messiah. This stage of development is prior to the insertion of IQS VIII,15b - IX,11 into the former text of this work and also prior to the concept of 4QTestimonia, which also include the Priestly Messiah.

A further remark is still needed to comment on the opening section IQSa I,1-5. In his editio princeps D. Barthelemy translated in I,1 the phrase כל התורה והשם by “toute la Congrégation d’Israël” in the sense of a plenary assembly of all Israelites, and בֵּכָּֽלָּ֖ו כִּבְעַ֣רְשָׁאֲלָה by “à la fin des temps” in the sense of a future time. (58) These understandings are today basically shared by almost all scholars. Nevertheless, they will turn out to be erroneous, if the text of lines 1-5 is compared to its biblical source.

(56) This aspect is stressed still in the New Testament, see Hebrews 7,14.

(57) The common meal is probably the pattern for all cultic assemblies. This will not exclude the possibility that sessions of juridical courts during a war — see IQSa 1,26 — should become presided by the Royal Messiah like by the king in the past. Therefore, the statute could not become drawn up for every kind of assembly, but a typically cultic example must become chosen.

(58) See in the edition (op. cit. note 2) p. 111.
The exact biblical source of 1QSa 1,1-5 is Deuteronomy 31,9-13. According to that passage, all people of Israel — including their wives and children — should gather in the temple “at the end of every seven years”, “in the feast of tabernacles”, to hear and to learn “this law”. 1QSa understands “this law” in the sense of “the Torah” (= the Pentateuch), and enriches “this law” with the ordinances (חֶסֶנֶךְ) of the Essenes (I,5). But, amazingly, all the special relationships of Deuteronomy 31,9-13 to every seventh year, to the feast of tabernacles, or to the temple, are dropped in 1QSa. This way the actual meaning is clearly related to every assembly of Israel, which becomes specified in the following text of 1QSa for different kinds of assemblies in I,6ff and I,25ff.

Furthermore, there is no need at all to relate בָּאָרְאִית יְהוָה in 1QSa I,1 to some future time. Like in most of the Qumran texts this term denotes here the present time of the author, which he regards as the last period of history including the future “turn” with the coming of the messiah, the final judgement, and the start of salvation. This understanding of בָּאָרְאִית יְהוָה was thoroughly proved by Annette Steudel 1993, (59) and there is no need here to repeat her arguments.

These arguments result into another understanding of the opening line of 1QSa than the former one of D. Barthelemy. The text

ות הַמֶּרֶךְ לְעֹלָם עַד יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּכָל הָעֵדֶּנֶּדֶנֶּד הָהָיִם בֵּיתוֹ אֲדֹנָי should be translated by “And this (= the following text) is the rule for every congregation (or: assembly) of Israel during the (present) last period (of history) if they assemble [together] ...”. (60) The appropriate title of this work should, therefore, include the plural. “The Rule of Congregations”, or “The Rule for (all cultic) Assemblies”. The last kind of assemblies, which is regulated in this work, are future meals of local groups together with “the Messiah” who was believed to be close to the door.

Finally, one should basically exclude the possibility that 1QSa might have been composed as a rule-book for a future “messianic age”, as L. H. Schiffman tried to point out in his book. (61) In the time of salvation no further rules should be needed for mentally incompetent people who must become discharged from several duties (1QSa 1,19-22), nor rules for impure people who should be excluded from the (non-


(60) At the beginning of the gap in 1QSa 1,1, the restoration of the adverb יָדְיוֹ is preferable to the nominal clause יִדְיוֹ in the editio princeps (op. cit. note 2) p. 109, which is accordingly taken over by all secondary editions and by all commentators, perhaps because of the seemingly corresponding evidence in 1QS V,7, where, instead, the coming into the Yahad is envisaged.

military) congregations (1QSa II,3-11). These long sections inevitably demonstrate that 1QSa was composed for the present affairs of its author and of his Yahad, for a time when the evil was not yet destroyed within Israel.

1QSa was the first rule-book of the Essenes with regulations for all their cultic assemblies. The agenda for their general assembly every year 1QS I,1-III,12, or their Manual of Discipline 1QS V-XI, were composed, or became developed, apart from 1QSa, or after it. In every case, they were related to other matters than 1QSa. At last, the Damascus Document was composed as the final rule-book for the Essenes about 100 BCE. (62) Afterwards, these rule-books only became copied again and again, but no longer basically revised or augmented.

1QSa, the agenda of blessings

1QSa is an agenda with several blessings without any heading or preamble. Each blessing starts with a new line after a short vacat at its beginning, if the line before was written close to its end. Only three incipits of those blessings are preserved in this rather fragmentary manuscript:

rubri barfe]a[m xemas]i] tuber 5 ha yarei a\[
... ... 
rubri barfe]a[m xemas]i] tuber 5 ha barfe]a[m xemas]i] tuber 5 ha yarei a\[
... 

In III,20 and V,18 the scribe furthermore indicated the ends of blessings by horizontal strokes on the right margin. (63) A stroke of the same kind is also preserved between lines 18 and 19 of the first column, (64) while the former textual evidence of those lines is totally lost. Nevertheless, this stroke informs us that the first blessing included only I,1-18, while the incipit of the second blessing followed in line I,19.

According to the preserved (I,1; III,20; V,18) or still indicated (I,19) incipits of blessings, J. T. Milik in his editio princeps divided the contents of 1QSa into four sections. The numbers of their lines are now shortened always by two lines in each column: (65)

(62) The original title of the so-called Damascus Document is repeated at its very end (like in the Book of Jubilees, see there 50,13). This title is דואעש תוריהד 18,20, and 4QD+ 11,11,15.

(63) 1QS XI,22 and 1QSa II,22 clearly evidence that those horizontal strokes do not indicate beginnings of sections, but, instead, their end.

(64) The right edge of this stroke with its characteristic hook is preserved on the left side of 1QSa column II after the sewing-seam, see the editio princeps (op. cit. note 2), plate XXIV. J. T. Milik correctly discussed this evidence, ibid. p. 122, but enigmatically he coordinated the beginning of the next blessing with “line 21” instead of line 19. Cf. above p. 494 with note 19.

(65) See ibid.
Jacob Licht in his commentary on *IQSb* (1965) (66) perceived the second and the third section being too long for liturgical blessings. Furthermore, he tried to find within the surviving text of *IQSb* special blessings for all the different officials who are mentioned in *IQSa*. Additionally he suggested that the sequence of the blessings should ascend from the lowest rank of some humble faithful at the beginning to highly ranking messianic figures at the end. He also dropped some minor fragments from the arrangement of J. T. Milik; but all larger fragments remained at their places according to the *editio princeps*. This subdivision of *IQSb* is followed also by L. H. Schiffman in his book of 1989. (67) The result are eight different blessings instead of J. T. Milik’s four blessings (correspondances underlined):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, 1 - I, 9 + [...]</td>
<td>Blessing of the Faithful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...] + II,20-26</td>
<td>Blessing of an Unidentified Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III, 1 - III, 6 + [...]</td>
<td>Blessing of an Official or Group of Importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...] + III,15-19</td>
<td>Blessing of an Unidentified Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III,20 - III,26 + [...]</td>
<td>Blessing of the Zadokite Priests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[...] + IV,20-26</td>
<td>Blessing of the High Priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V,1-17</td>
<td>Unidentified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V,18 - V,27+ [...]</td>
<td>Blessing of the Royal Messiah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This result is rather strange in several respects. If the blessings would ascent from the lowest to the highest rank, the High Priest should come after the Royal Messiah. Who could rank between the High Priest and the Royal Messiah? If the additional officials or groups, who are suggested by J. Licht, were important enough to become blessed individually, why are there no signifcant connotations from the biblical traditions or from contemporary Qumran texts to identify them? Why is there no regular incipit in II,26, or in III,1, if a new blessing formula begins here?

There are much more questions to the suggestions of J. Licht and of L. H. Schiffman. But the decisive argument against those subdivisions is provided by the help of the formal concept of those blessings.

Already J. T. Milik in his editio princeps pointed to the fact that all those blessings — except the last one of the Royal Messiah — were arranged according to the formal concept of the Aaronite Blessing, Numbers 6,24-26. (68) This blessing has three rubrics of two elements each, with characteristic catch-words in each element:

A developed setting of this formulation was used at the annual assemblies of the Yahad as a blessing of all the righteous 1QS II,2-4, and a still more developed negative version of it as a curse of all evildoers 1QS II,6-9. The characteristic features of both versions are (1) that all the key-words — or their negative counterparts — are strictly continued and (2) that they come in the same sequence like in the biblical model.

A special evidence of the blessing 1QS II,2-4 is that the tetragrammaton ידוע is always omitted without a substitute, while in the formally corresponding curse II,6-9 two times פֹּאָל replaces אֲבָד. (69) In 1QSb, פֹּאָל is used sometimes in traditional, or free, formulations, (70) but never in the formulaic rubrics instead of אֲבָד. According to the liturgical Sitz im Leben of 1QSb, always פֹּאָל substitutes אֲבָד without any exception (I,3; II,20; III,1.23; V,21).

The key-words of the Aaronite Blessing occur in 1QSb as follows, the surviving incipits of new blessings being indicated by ===:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 3</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>III, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 5</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>III, 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>===</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,20</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>III, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,21</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>III,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,22</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>===</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,23</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>III,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,24</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>IV,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II,25</td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>IV,25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This formal evidence clearly demonstrates that 1QSb I,19 - III,19 and III,20 - V,17 are long blessings according to the subdivisions of J. T. Milik, while the short blessings postulated by J. Licht do not agree to the formal evidence. E.g., his second “Blessing of an Unidentified Group” [...] + II,20-26 ends with repetitions of element 2b, while a continuation with elements 3a.b is missing at all. J. Licht’s next “Bles-

(68) See his notes to the different blessings, op. cit. (note 2), 121-129.
(69) 1QS II,6.8.
(70) See 1QSb III,18.21; IV,22; V,23.25.
sing of an Official or Group of Importance” III,1-6 + [...] starts with repetitions of element 3a, continued with element 3b, while elements 1a.b and 2a.b are missing at all. J. Licht’s fourth “Blessing of an Unidentified Group” [...] + III,15-19 correctly ends with element 3b, but it is at least very difficult to fill formulations with all the other elements 1a.b, 2a.b, and 3a, into the maximal 12 lines of this short blessing, as particularly the remainders of its concluding 5 lines attest only element 3b.

Those formal observations prove J. Licht’s subdivision of 1QSb into eight different blessings evidently wrong, while they definitively confirm the correctness of J. T. Milik’s former suggestions in the editio princeps.

The only serious problem of the textual reconstruction of 1QSb in the editio princeps is the transition from its col. IV to col. V. The text at the end of the line IV,26 עַדֶּנֶּכֶנֶּם והבַּדַּדַּם מִכְּהַ לַגְּדִירָהָ וּלְזַדְּקוֹ הַנִּירְכָּה was regarded by J. T. Milik as the end of a paragraph and translated “car c’est [à toi de con]fesser sa sainteté et de glorifier son nom et sa sainteté.” Immediately afterwards, col. V should start with a blank space at the beginning of its line 1, which Milik explained as indicating the beginning of a new section of this blessing within this line. (71) But, instead, Milik’s line V,2 is clearly the top-line V,1 of this column, which immediately continues the text from IV,26 by [...] בֶּדֶנֶּכֶנֶּם מִזכְּרָה הַנִּירְכָּה מ “and you (= the Zadokite priests) have separated His holy ones from[ ...]”. The distance of the beginning of line V,1 from the former top margin of the scroll is the very same like that of the beginning of line III,1. Correspondingly, the | of the column before, which survived on frg. 26, is not the end of line IV,2, but the end of line IV,1. This correction of the editio princeps definitively excludes the possibilities to identify the lines 1QSb V,1-17 as an independent blessing formula, or to start a new blessing formula somewhere in the lines V,1-8.

The material and formal analysis of 1QSb therefore results into an agenda, which contains four blessing formulas according to the subdivisions by J. T. Milik in the editio princeps. (72) But every blessing is a few lines shorter than calculated there.

The first Blessing of the Faithful I,1-18 does not refer to some humble people, but to all people of Israel. God’s election of Israel (I,2-3) is the highest ranking aspect at all. Therefore, also the blessing of all people of Israel must precede the special blessings of its representatives, the High Priest, the Zadokite Priests, and the Royal Messiah.

The High Priest is the main representative of Israel before God, and also the main mediator of God’s will to His people on earth. Therefore,

(71) See J. T. Milik’s translations, his notes, and his numbering of lines on fragment 26, op. cit. (note 2), 125-128.

(72) Cf. his own chart in the edition (op. cit. note 2), p. 120.
the blessing of the High Priest needs the second rank after the people of Israel as a whole. Its long text filled the 53 lines I,19 - III,19. But only fragmentary remainders from 29 lines of this long blessing survived.

After the High Priest range the priests. Nevertheless, the next blessing III,20 - V,17 is not devoted to the priests in general, but exclusively to the Zadokite priests. This evidence corresponds well to the exceptional status of the Zadokite priests in 1QS V,2.9 (still missing in 4QSb and in 4QSa !) and in 1QSa I,2.24; II,3. Of the formerly 50 lines of this blessing 32 lines survived more or less fragmentarily.

The fourth — and presumably concluding — blessing concerns the Royal Messiah. In 1QSb V,18-27 about two third of the textual evidence of these lines survived. In lines 20-23 (= Milik’s lines 22-25) this evidence now became a little enriched by a further small fragment. (73) In line 19 (= Milik 21) the restoration of its first gap in the editio princeps is disputable, as the word הילוא needs one more broad letter than the available space concedes. (74) Instead, the restoration of the name חלמוא fits well to the space and to the traces of letters. The corrected text reads

והנה אלהים יהוה ייחש לארץ מלכות עםיה ידוע

“and the covenant of Da[v]id He (= God) may renew for him (= the Messiah) to establish the kingdom of His people for eve[r]”. (75) The “covenant of David” clearly refers to II Samuel 7,16.

The original length of this blessing is questionable. The text at the end of the column stops short amidst a sentence. If this blessing had the same length like the blessings of the High Priest and of the Zadokite Priests, its text filled one and a half column after 1QSb column V, i.e., the blessing ended about the midst of column XX of the whole scroll 1QS/Sa/Sb. But the formal evidence of this blessing cannot be confirmed as it does not follow the pattern of the Aaronite Blessing. Instead, Isaia 11,2-5 and other biblical evidence is used in the beginning to formulate this blessing. Nevertheless, the Psalm of Solomon 17,1-46 demonstrates that there existed enough messianic components to produce such a rather long blessing.

J. T. Milik was of the opinion that 1QSa is a “composition livresque”, which was not used in the liturgy, (76) while L. H. Schiffman concludes that it “is a set of hymns (?) to be recited as part of the mustering ceremony to be held in the end of days” according to 1QSa I,22-25. (77) In every case the final blessing involves a figure of the

(74) See in the edition (op. cit. note 2) p. 127 and plate XXIX.
(75) Cf. the very similar formulations in 4QPatriarchal Blessings 1-4 (4Q252).
(76) Op. cit. (note 2), 120.
(77) Op. cit. (note 34), 76.
future, the coming Royal Messiah, who nevertheless could indirectly become present by a blessing of him. Why should the Essenes not have used this formula within their liturgies?

The real problem is that all the other blessings have no elements of eschatology or any connotation of the future. What survived from the Blessing of the Faithful I,1-18, or from the Blessing of the Zadokite Priests III,20 - V,17 is sufficient for a solid statement of this kind. Formally, the evidence of \textit{IQSa} is very like that of \textit{IQSB}, where only the final section II,11-22 is related to the future, while I,1 - II,11 regulate the present assemblies and some qualifications of their participants. To my mind, \textit{IQSB} should be regarded formally as a twin of \textit{IQSa}, composed according to the same pattern with a future-orientated component only in its final section.

Perhaps, the section \textit{IQSB} V,18ff with the blessing of the Royal Messiah is even a secondary addition to the three blessings before. (78) My two arguments in favour of this possibility are: (a) This blessing is the only one which does not use the Aaronite Blessing as its formal base, and (b) its introductory phrase in V,18 drops the words דַּבְּרֵי הָעַמָּים, which are attested in \textit{IQSB} I,1 as well as in III,20. How to explain those formal discrepancies better than by postulating another author?

The main result of these considerations is at least the possibility to relate the second blessing of the High Priest \textit{IQSB} I,19 - III,19 not to a future Priestly Messiah, but to the real high priest of the time of the author of \textit{IQSB}. This would correspond well to the missing of the Priestly Messiah also in \textit{IQSa}. Furthermore, in the fragmentary remainders of \textit{IQSB} I,19 - III,19 there is no trace of eschatology or any connotation of the future, but the same present orientation like in the two blessings before and after it. A further argument in favour of this view is that the Blessing of the High Priest and the Blessing of the Royal Messiah are separated by the Blessing of the Zadokite Priests III,20 - V,17. As a twin of the Royal Messiah, a future Priestly Messiah should, instead, be blessed immediately antecedent to him.

The supposition that the second blessing of this agenda refers to the real high priest of the time of its author could at least easily explain, why no further copy of \textit{IQSB} was detected within the scrolls from the Qumran caves. During his life-time the Teacher of Righteousness was by the Essenes regarded as the true high priest of Israel. (79) This blessing counted in favour of him and of his office. After his death the Essenes did not appoint a new high priest, but, instead, longed for the future coming of the Priestly Messiah as the only true successor of their Tea-

(78) Cf. above, note 40.
cher in this office. (80) Therefore, after the death of the Teacher the liturgical performance of this blessing would automatically have counted in favour of the Hasmonean high priests of that time. This implication was not acceptable, and, therefore, the agenda of blessings, as it is represented by IQSb, went out of use.

This hypothesis is somewhat speculative, but it fits to all the evidence which we have. Together with the undisputable corresponding evidence of IQSa it helps to pave the way for a new approach to the development of messianism in the second half of the second century BCE.

Some remarks to Qumran messianism

In this article the term “messiah” is strictly used in its classical understanding, i.e., its use is restricted to denote individual figures whose coming is expected in future times and who are sometimes marked as מְשִׁיחַ in Hebrew texts. A clear example of this is IQS IX,11, where the aforementioned rules will be valid לְעֹד עַד בְּנֵי אִמֵּיסְיָהוּ אָדָם וּרְשׁוֹת “until the coming of a prophet and the messiahs of Aaron and Israel”.

The Old Testament does not know this kind of messiah. Nevertheless, many predictions or passages from the Torah and from the books of the Prophets were later on understood as references to the coming of an individual messiah. The Qumran manuscripts offer many examples for this. But the question is still open, when and in which way this kind of messianism started.

The result of an evaluation of all relevant proofs is the hypothesis that there are three stages of development, which may even be firmly established in history. The first stage of development is the time up to the midst of second century BCE, the second stage the time from about 150 to about 110 BCE, and the third stage the time from about 110 BCE onwards. These are approximate dates. But at least the adduced texts were with a high degree of probability composed just within those periods.

The first stage of development

All relevant “messianic” evidence from the time before the midst of the second century BCE does not propagate an individual as a messianic figure, but, instead, always the collective people of Israel. I shall only briefly present some examples. A more erudite elaboration of this topic is contributed by Annette Steudel to this volume. (81)

(80) See ibid., 173f, 219f, and 287f.
In the *Book of Daniel*, which was finally composed 164 BCE, "one like a son of man" (7,13) turns out to be nobody else but "the people of the saints of the most high" (7,27), i.e., the collective of the pious people of Israel.

About the same time as the *Book of Daniel* the basic draft of the Qumranic *Serekh ha-Milhama* (*IQM*) was composed. (82) In *IQM* XI,6f, the later on messianic proof-text *Numbers* 24,17 is quoted for the first time in history. Here this quotation is not yet reduced to "the star out of Jacob" and "the scepter out of Israel" like later on in *CD* VII,19f. But the text is quoted in a much broader version and changed in a way that it concludes with the words "and Israel shall do valiantly". The meaning is that "the star" and "the scepter" of the biblical source are not individuals, but again the collective of the people of Israel. Only this interpretation fits also to the broader context in *IQM* X-XIV.

A third example of this kind is another passage of *Serekh ha-Milhama*, which survived only in the manuscript *4Q491*. (83) Here a being praises its own existence as a heavenly one, reckoning itself to the angels, but not being created as an angel. In spite of the singular formulation, the collective of the people of Israel, being raised to a quasi "heavenly" status, speak here. The phenomenon is similar to the "songs of the servant of the Lord" *Isaiah* 42,1-9, 49,1-6, 50,4-11, and 52,13-53,12, where sometimes the collective of the people of Israel is spoken off like an individual.

Neither the *Book of Daniel* nor the basic draft of *Serekh ha-Milhama* (84) nor any other text from the time before the midst of the second century BCE show any consciousness of the future coming of an *individual* messiah.

A very important evidence in this respect is the exhortative letter *4QMMT* (85), which according to *4QPsalms a* IV,8f (86) the Teacher of Righteousness sent in the year 152 BCE to the Jewish ruler Jonathan with the result that Jonathan tried to kill him. At that time, Jonathan had already occupied the office of the high priest in Jerusalem. (87) The sen-

---

(84) In *IQM* V,1 the כֶּל לֶאַלֶּם is not the Royal Messiah, but only the leader of the troops of Israel in a future war. כֶּל לֶאַלֶּם does not denote the Priestly Messiah, but only the officiating high priest in the time of that war.
(87) The historical context of *4QMMT* is discussed by H. Stegemann, *op. cit.* (note 79), 49, 148-151, 172, 180, 187, 209, 218, 277, and 286f.
SOME REMARKS TO IQSa, TO IQSb, AND TO QUMRAN MESSIANISM

The order of this letter mainly criticizes the bad cultic administration of the addressee. This way he indirectly demands from the addressee to withdraw from the office of the high priest. The true high priest of Israel was the Teacher himself. At the same time he reminds the addressee to keep to the good prototype of some kings of the past, mainly the kings David and Solomon. (88) This way the sender indirectly accepts the political leadership of Jonathan in Israel, which excludes that he longed for the coming of a Royal Messiah at the same time. Therefore, 4QMMT informs us indirectly that in the year 152 BCE the Teacher of Righteousness and his Essenes did not yet long for a Priestly or a Royal Messiah.

The second stage of development

The next stage of development is marked by IQSa und IQSb. Both works should have been composed prior to the death of the Teacher about 112 BCE. Both works know very well the individual figure of the Royal Messiah, but no yet a Priestly Messiah. His future chair was still occupied by the Teacher himself who personally hoped to live up to the time of the final judgement including the coming of the Royal Messiah.

Without detriment to the fact that the Royal Messiah is well attested by IQSa and IQSb, we cannot know, whether this new figure was firstly created by the Teacher and/or his Essenes, or whether it was already traditional for them. In IQSa II,12 the Royal Messiah is introduced as מנהיג, “the Messiah”. Everybody should know about him. In this passage he is not a newly created figure on the scene. The same is true for the blessing IQSb V,18ff. This is a highly elaborated text. A vast occupation with the Royal Messiah and with the biblical sources for this figure lies behind this composition. Nevertheless, the language of this section is characteristic for the Essenes like the language of the other blessings in this agenda, and in the time-span of 3-4 decades between the foundation of the Essenes’ Yahad and the death of the Teacher the elaboration of such a blessing should by all means have been possible within a bible-orientated and learned society like that of the Essenes.

The first clear proof for the Royal Messiah in non-Essene texts is Psalms of Salomon 17, which may have been composed about 50-30 BCE, about a century later than IQSa and IQSb. For the time before, only Essene proofs for this figure exist. Therefore, the possibility that this figure was firstly created by the Essenes, or personally by their Teacher, should not be abandoned without a better explanation of the evidence. In 4QMMT the Teacher was still rather polite against his addressee as a political ruler. But after having experienced that Jonathan not only refused to withdraw from the office of the high priest, but that

(88) See the Composite Text of 4QMMT C18-24, and C25f, op. cit. (note 85), 60 and 62.
lie, instead, even tried to murder him, the persecuted Teacher may have abandoned all hope in the political abilities of Jonathan, creating instead the idea of a future Royal Messiah from the house of king David. If he decided this around 150 BCE, there remained enough time during 3-4 decades to develop this concept in the way we meet it in *IQSa* and *IQSb*.

The third stage of development

The final stage of development is attested by compositions from the time about 100 BCE, i.e., a time when the Teacher of Righteousness should have already been dead. Our three main sources for this further development are (a) the secondary passage *IQS* VIII,15b - IX,11, (b) *4QTestimonia*, and (c) the Damascus Document.

The best illustration for this development is *4QTestimonia*. (89) This document joins — without any commentary — four quotations, not according to the hierarchic positions of the relevant figures, but according to the biblical sequence of those sources. The first quotation regarding a future prophet (lines 1-8) is from *Exodus* 20,21 according to the Samaritan ordering (= *Dtn* 5,28f + 18,18f in the Masoretic text). The second quotation (lines 9-13) regarding the future Royal Messiah comes from *Numbers* 24,15-17. The third quotation (lines 14-20) regarding the future Priestly Messiah is taken from *Deuteronomy* 33,8-11. The final quotation (lines 21-30) regards a future negative figure — similar to the later “anti-christ” — and is a more developed version of *Joshua* 6,26.

Never we meet all those four figures again together in Qumran texts. For the expectation of a future negative figure this is the only early proof which is available. The other three figures we meet together also in *IQS* IX,11, where the Priestly Messiah and the Royal Messiah strictly range in their hierarchical order like often in the Damascus Document. (90)

There is no need here to discuss all the other proofs for those messianic figures in the Qumran texts. All further texts, which mention messiahs, were composed in the first half of the first century BCE. Most frequent among those figures is the Royal Messiah, next to him “the Interpreter of the Law” who should become regarded as identical with the Priestly Messiah.

Finally, only the figure of “a prophet” should be specially mentioned, for this is the single of the three figures which concept was develo-

---

(89) Edited by J. M. Allegro, *op. cit.* (note 86), 57-60 and plate XXI.

(90) See *CD* XIX,10, XX,1, XII,23 - XIII,1, and XIV,19. Against tendencies to unify both figures in those proof-texts see *CD* VII,18-21, where the Royal Messiah is clearly a figure separate of “the Interpreter of the Law” who should become regarded as identical with the Priestly Messiah.
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Ped independent from the Essenes. Besides the biblical sources we meet this prophet first in *I Maccabees* 4,46, where he is longed for to decide the fate of the stones of the altar in the temple of Jerusalem, which became defiled in the time of the high priest Menelaos. According to *I Maccabees* 14,41 also a future prophet should decide, whether or not the Maccabean ruler Simon should “for all times” — i.e., including his successors — personally combine the offices of a political ruler and of the high priest. Like in *IQS* IX,11 this future figure is not “the prophet”, but “a prophet”.

After the death of their Teacher the Essenes included the figure of this prophet formally into their staff of future judges, see *IQS* IX,11, whereas during the second stage of development the authority of the Teacher was valid even for most difficult decisions. For example: according to *CD* XIX,33 - XX,1, after the death of the Teacher nobody had the authority to decide in the case that a member of the concurrent group called “The New Covenant in the Land of Damascus” wanted to become a member of the Essenes’ Yahad. Only the future “Messiah from Aaron and (that one) of Israel”, who might start to officiate “about forty years” after the Teacher’s death in the past of the author (cf. *CD* XX,13-15), should again be able to decide in such a matter (*CD* XX,1). This example demonstrates that the Teacher was regarded as embodying the highest and comprehensive juridical rank, or seat, within all Israel, a rank which at his death become vacant.

The result: the Qumran manuscripts themselves tell us that the Essenes did not start in the year 152 BCE with their final concept of three future authorities. The figures of the Royal, of the Priestly Messiah, and that of a future prophet, were created — or adopted — step by step to compensate for actual deficits of the Essenes’ present times. Not traditional hopes in the future coming of such figures became reactivated, but challenges by actual events like the Teacher’s death urged the Essenes to bridge the gap between their present and the future time of God’s salvation by new suggestions.

Again and again the Essenes used the Torah and the Prophets to find answers to new questions. From this soil they harvested new ideas and terms to master actual problems of their present last period of history. During this time they always kept faithful to the authority of their Teacher of Righteousness, the former high priest and intentional unifier of all splinter-groups of Israel after the terrible desasters once created by the harmful high priests Menelaos, Alkimos, and Jonathan the Maccabee.

Hartmut STEGEMANN.