IN THE TEXTS
FROM QUMRAN (1)

Thus article at first tries to answer the question of how to understand אָחָרִיָּה הַכָּפָם in the Qumran texts. In a further part, some ideas on Qumranic calculations of אָחָרִיָּה הַכָּפָם are presented.

1. The use of אָחָרִיָּה הַכָּפָם in the Old Testament

Before the Qumran writings, אָחָרִיָּה הַכָּפָם had been quite a well known expression in the Old Testament; in the Hebrew part of the Bible no less than 13 occurrences exist, plus one other in the Aramaic part of the biblical Book of Daniel. אָחָרִיָּה הַכָּפָם — it is always used with the preposition ב — appears in the Torah as well as in the Prophets. (2)

Concerning the history of research, one can make a striking observation: for a long period of time, scholars translated בּּאָחָרִיָּה הַכָּפָם as “at the end of the days” or “in the last days”, understanding this expression in a specifically future-eschatological sense. (3) Again and again, the fundamental question of an Old Testament eschatology and its dating arose in this context. (4)

In the 1960s there was a turn in research history: בּּאָחָרִיָּה הַכָּפָם was now simply translated as “in the course of time, in future days” (5). This understanding is based on a linguistic analogy to

(1) I wish to express my thanks to Profs. H. Stegemann and E. Puech for their helpful remarks.
(2) הבּּאָחָרִיָּה הַכָּפָם: Ge 49, 1; Num 24, 14;Dt 4, 30; 31, 29; Isa 2, 2; Jer 25, 20; 30, 24; 48, 42; 49, 39; Ez 38, 16; Hos 3, 5; Mic 4, 1; Dan 10, 14. הבּּאָחָרִיָּה הַכָּפָם: Dan 2, 28.
(3) By following W. Staeck (1891) 547-553. On the research history cf. also E. Jenni (1964), 116-118.
(4) An early dating, for example, by H. Greiffmann (1929), 746ff; a late dating, for example, by S. Mowinckel (1956), 131.
(5) See, for example, G. W. Buchanan (1961) and H. Kosmala (1963).
the accadian inaša ahdûl umû, meaning "in future days", or similar expressions (6). The result of this finding was a de-eschatologized understanding of the Hebrew adayim which is still predominant in research today (7). The troublesome question about an Old Testament eschatology is avoided through this philological explanation.

2. The use of the words אָלֵיַּיָּהּ in the Qumran texts

The research history on אָלֵיַּיָּהּ in the Qumran texts is equivalent: first, scholars translated this term generally as "the end of the days" or "the last days" (8). Then, in recent research, one finds a tendency to use the apparently more cautious translation "in the future, in the course of time" (9). But is this correct? The caution of modern translators is caused not least by a basic uncertainty and disagreement on what we really have to understand if we translate אָלֵיַּיָּהּ with "the end of days" or "the last days"; does it include the everlasting time of salvation, as most of the scholars assume, or the last evil time, an eschatological war, the final judgment, or is it perhaps related to different aspects? A variety of explanations have been developed (10).

It seems worth adding another attempt at explaining אָלֵיַּיָּהּ, because more Qumran texts have been edited in the meantime which could not have been taken into consideration by earlier investigations. With the help of the "Preliminary Concordance..."
the accadian inaqana achrî ùmi, meaning “in future days”, or similar expressions (6). The result of this finding was a de-eschatological understanding of the phrase הנר תם שמה which is still predominant in research today (7). The troublesome question about an Old Testament eschatology is avoided through this philological explanation.

2. The use of הנר תם שמה in the Qumran texts

The research history on הנר תם שמה in the Qumran texts is equivalent; first, scholars translated this term generally as “the end of the days” or “the last days” (8). Then, in recent research, one finds a tendency to use the apparently more cautious translation “in the future, in the course of time” (9). But is this correct? The caution of modern translators is caused not least by a basic uncertainty and disagreement on what we really have to understand if we translate הנר תם שמה with “the end of days” or “the last days”: does it include the everlasting time of salvation, as most of the scholars assume, or the last evil time, an eschatological war, the final judgment, or is it perhaps related to different aspects? A variety of explanations have been developed (10).

It seems worth adding another attempt at explaining הנר תם שמה, because more Qumran texts have been edited in the meantime which could not have been taken into consideration by earlier investigations. With the help of the “Preliminary Concordan-


(7) See, for example, E. Jenni (1984), 117f. (— 1971) who rejects any eschatological meaning of the term in the Old Testament. Other scholars, as for example H. Stekhan (1976), 27-28, keep an eschatological interpretation for 4Q3 i, 28 and 10, 14 (and, in a restricted way, also for Ho 5, 3 and Ex 38, 16). The turn in the understanding of הנר תם שמה is visible in the case of W. Gesenius, Hebräisches und Aramaisches Handwörterbuch: the original translation of all the biblical הנר תם שמה evidences was “Endzeit” (1-17 editions); in the eighteenth edition (1897, ed. R. Meyer, H. Donner) הנר תם שמה is translated as “in künftigen Tagen”. The only exceptions among the hebrew biblical translations are Isa 2, 2 (= Mi 4, 1), Ex 10, 16 and Dan 10, 14 where the translation “an Ende der Tage” is still preferred.

(8) See, for example, J. Maier (1960), G. Vermeersch (1962), E. Lorre (1964), and E. Puech consistently translating “the end of the days”.

(9) J. Carmignac (1963), 527-529, established this translation and explained his idea on הנר תם שמה in many further articles, see, for example, J. Carmignac (1978). G. J. Brossiau (1960) is following J. Carmignac, but he tries to keep the eschatological aspect of הנר תם שמה in translating it as “the latter days”, see especially 199; cf. also Sh. Talmon (1989).


“THE END OF THE DAYS” IN THE QUMRAN TEXTS

ce” (11) The unpublished material can also be examined now. Therefore, all הנר תם שמה references from Qumran are included in this study.

The occurrence of הנר תם שמה in the Qumran texts is as follows: in the Hebrew texts it appears 33 times (12), plus a certain number of references where the term is only fragmentarily preserved but could be reconstructed (13). The Aramaic equivalent עניית תם הימים is not attested. All הנר תם שמה evidences occur in texts which are original Qumran texts, that means works of Essene origin (14). The occurrences are spread over the whole timespan of the Essene literary production: the oldest evidence stem from 4QMMT and 4QSa, the youngest come from the late pesharim.

The occurrence of הנר תם שמה always appears — and this is not unimportant — in the context of Scripture interpretation; often it occurs even within quotation formulas — with the preposition ב — where it expresses the temporal relation of the passage quoted from the Bible (15).

There is only one exception (16). As in the Bible, הנר תם שמה occurs in different types of texts: in liturgical texts (4QDishHam, 4Q099), in a letter (4QMMT), in community rules (4QSa, CD), and, first of all, in the exegetical literature, that is the thematical midrashim (110QMelch, 1QMidrEschat, 4QParBless) and the pesharim (4QpHab, 4QpSerm, 4QpHos, 4QpNab) (17).

A new investigation of the meaning of הנר תם שמה in Qumran is somewhat surprising if one keeps in mind the recent research tendencies:


(12) 4QSa 1, 4; 4QpHab II 5f; IX 6; 4QpSerm II 5f-6 2f-6f II 3f; 4QpHos III 10 2f; 4QpNab III 10 2f; 4QMMT I 10 2f; 4Qn MAT III 10 2f.

(13) See, for example, 4QpHos III 2f. 4QSa 1 6f. 4QpSerm II, 9f.

(14) The only exception might be 4QDishHam (4Q094). The manuscript itself dates palaeographically about 150 BC and the editor, M. Basset (DJD VII, 1982), suggested a pre-essenic origin. But see now E. Puech (1993), 565, who points to dependences of DishHam on Daniel and who wants to keep also the possibility of an (early) essenic origin of the work DishHam “…il nous semble qu’une composition essénienne ou hassidienne ne peut être exclue, si Daniel est daté de 164 (note 6).

(15) See, for example, 4QMidrEschat III 15; “upon which it is written in the book of Isaiah the Prophet הנר תם שמה concerning” (quotation of Isa 8, 11 follows), or 4QMidrEschat XI 7 “narrating concerning” upon which David said” (quotation of Ps 16, 26 seq follows).

(16) 4QSa I 1.

(17) No הנר תם שמה evidences are found in such important essenic works as the Community Rule, the Hodayoth and the — originally pre-essenic — War Scroll. Also in the pre-essenic Temple Scroll הנר תם שמה is not attested.
God has (always) redeemed them (אֲבֵדָה) from out of their hand." (21)

There can be no doubt that the events reported here have a real historical background; the sudden attack(s) against the Teacher of Righteousness and his community. (22) At the time when this pesher was composed, sometime in the first third of the first century BC, the Teacher of Righteousness was already dead and the events described in our passage belonged to the past. (23) Thus, the "time of refining" (הָעַלֶּה) has already begun long ago. In (Q)MidrEschat which originates a little later than QOpp, there is further evidence with exactly this meaning of the words "the time of refining, that is the time of separation and affliction for the pious, a time of temptation and suffering in which the community has to stand the test." (24)

B) That קרא היא as a period of time reaches back into the past, is shown by other Qumran texts. The passages referred to in the following are well and largely concurrently explained in the literature, so a new demonstration of the explanation is not necessary. One of these texts is Qopp, composed not before the year 63 BC. Col. II, 2ff of this pesher alludes to the powerful influence of the Pharisees, designated as עַלֶּה עַלֶּה ("those who seek smooth things") (25) קרא היא, and harks back historically to the reign of Alexandra Salome and her sons Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II in the 70s and 60s of the first century BC. (26)

Another text is Qopp 10 IX, 6: described here are the "last priests of Jerusalem" (יִשְׂרָאֵל נַעֲשֵׂה עַלֶּה), who "gather wealth

(21) The verbal forms לָבָדָה and לָבָד (impf.) are translated here according to D. Mowinckel, Text und Satzstellung in den Psalmen, Bonn 1960, 150-152 § 24, 176 (§ 27.6) as an iterat; cf. for example E. Lonner (1986), 375. It is also possible to keep a temporal meaning (future) of these verbal forms; in this case the text should be read as a kind of prophecy (post-event) for its readers. The first solution might fit better with the character of the pesharim which were composed to show that a book of a biblical prophet has just been fulfilled.

(22) See the detailed explanation of this text by H. Stiegemann (1951), 92-94. As difficult as it is to identify the historical events with certainty (see the debate on "Ephraim" and "Manasse" in the literature), it is clear that this text is not prophecy, a prediction of things that will happen in the future, but a culmination or event about history.

(23) The dating of this pesher results first of all from formal criteria (QOpp) is close to QD, the thematic midrashim and the early pesharim as (Qopp) and from its context (for example, lack of the Kittim; 40 years mentioned in QD are not yet over, see below).

(24) (Q)MidrEschat VIII, (especially) 1-3.

(25) See for example M. Holum (1979), 158-167; even G. Frumkes (1991), 104 who is very cautious and sceptical towards any concrete historical identification of the allusions in the Qumran texts agree in this case.

(18) I am obliged to Prof. J. Strugnell who gave me the permission to use his preliminary transcriptions of QMT for my studies.

(19) According to E. Qimron/J. Strugnell (1985), 406, QMMT was addressed to Jonathan or Simon; cf. QOpp IV, 81. Jonathan seems to be more likely; for dating the Teacher of Righteousness who is assumed to be (one of) the sender(s) of the letter see below.

(20) In D 30, 31 ἔρχεται δεῦτε is inserted by the author of QMMT.
A) Already in the so-called הָנִיטָה הָנִיטָה (4QMMT), the term הָנִיטָה הָנִיטָה is related to a “presently continuing period of time” (18). The situation here is as follows: the writers of the letter address themselves to the officiating high priest of the time (19), whom they reproach a number of mistakes in cultic practice. At the end of the document (MMT C) they demand that he think over his actions, guided by the Scriptures, and to turn away from his wrong ways. The present situation is described by the aid of an eschatological interpretation of different passages from Deuteronomy: Dt 31, 29 and Dt 30, 1f (20) are quoted in a free manner, illustrating that the present time is the time of הָנִיטָה הָנִיטָה to which the Scriptures refer, the time to turn back. Thus, also the high priest is admonished to change his attitude, and that at once and presently, and to retain the right way in future for the whole period of הָנִיטָה הָנִיטָה.

Other texts also describe הָנִיטָה הָנִיטָה as a period of time in which mastering a test is at stake. The most impressive examples are given in a thematic midrash, 4QMidrEschat (4Q174 + 4Q177) which contains one third of all הָנִיטָה הָנִיטָה references in the Qumran texts. Here, it is the community that has turned away from “the way of the people” (i.e. the evil way) to the הָנִיטָה הָנִיטָה (21). It is seen as the fulfillment of different passages from the Bible (Ps 1, 1, Isa 8, 11, and Ez 37, 23) which are quoted and interpreted in this context (4QMidrEschat I, 1ff). In Col. IV, 1ff of the same work, we also find a kind of a short definition of הָנִיטָה הָנִיטָה: “...this is the time of refining...” (22)

The translation is: “...the time of refining...” (23)

The recognition that one has, in fact, to translate the passage in this way and not as “...this is the time of refining (yet) to come” — which is philologically possible as well — results from the stereotyped usage of הָנִיטָה הָנִיטָה in the Qumran texts. הָנִיטָה הָנִיטָה designates a period of history which has already begun. Probably, the best example illustrating this is found in the pesharim: 4QPsFl 11, 17-19 quotes Ps 37, 14f and interprets it as follows: “Its interpretation concerns the wicked of Ephraim and Manasseh who have (often) sought to lay hands on the priest and the men of his council at the time of refining which has come (the prophet and the righteous) upon them. But

(18) I am obliged to Prof. J. Strugnell who gave me the permission to use his preliminary transcriptions of MMT for my studies.
(19) According to E. Qimron/J. Strugnell (1985), 400f, MMT was addressed to Jonathan or Simon; cf. 4QPsFl IV, 8f. Jonathan seems to be more likely: for dating the Teacher of Righteousness who is assumed to be one of the senders of the letter see below.
(20) In Dt 30, 1f הָנִיטָה הָנִיטָה is inserted by the author of 4QMMT.

B) That הָנִיטָה הָנִיטָה as a period of time reaches back into the past, is shown by other Qumran texts. The passages referred to in the following are well and largely concurrently explained in the literature, so a new demonstration of the explanation is not necessary. One of these texts is 4QpNah, composed not before the year 63 BC. Col. II, 2ff of this pesher alludes to the powerful influence of the Pharisees, designated as הָנִיטָה הָנִיטָה (24)

Another text is 4QHab 1, 6: described here are the “last priests of Jerusalem” (25)

(21) The verbal forms פָּרַשׁ and פָּרַשֶּׁת (impf.) are translated here according to D. Mowinckel, Der Ton und der Rahmen in den Psalmen, Bonn 1960, 150-152 § 24, 175 (27: 6) as an iterativ, cf. for example E. Lousier (1980), 375. It is also possible to keep a temporal meaning (future) of these verbal forms; in this case the text should be read as a kind of prophecy (post-event) for its readers. The first solution might fit better with the character of the pesharim which were composed to show that a book of a biblical prophet has just been fulfilled.
(22) See the detailed explanation of this text by H. Strugnell (1971), 92-94.
(23) As difficult as it is to identify the historical events with certainty (see the debate on “Ephraim” and “Manasseh” in the literature), it is clear that this text is not prophecy, a prediction of things that will happen in the future, but a criticism of events about history.
(24) See for example M. Hornblow (1997), 158-162; even G. Stroumsa (1991), 14ff who is very cautious and sceptical towards any concrete historical identification of the allusions in the Qumran texts agree in this case.
and profit from the spoils of the nations”, and this wealth is given into the hands of the Kittim. The historical reference here is to the illegal enrichment of the Temple’s treasure under the administration of avaricious priests in Jerusalem and the plundering of the Temple’s treasure by the Romans in the year 54 BC. (27) This event belongs to the immediate past of the author of Qoh who composed his work around 50 BC. (28)

C In addition to all previous implications, there are also events which are expected within the time of salvation, as lying in future. First of all, this concerns the coming of the messiahs, who are still awaited in the last period of time, as in the messiahs who are still awaited in the last period of time, before the actual end. Although we have to be very careful in generalizing — especially in case of messianology in Qumran — it can be seen at least in IQSa, 4QMidEschat and 4QParal that the messiahs should come within the time of salvation, before the time of the final salvation. (29) It is the same with the building of God’s everlasting future Temple which is probably to be distinguished from the ‘Sanctuary of men”. Connected with the building of the everlasting Temple is the establishment of the kingdom of God, which is found only in 4QMidEschat. (30) By the way, the time of salvation, the time after the coming of the messiahs, is rarely reflected in the Qumran texts. (31)

Finally, one remark concerning IQSa should be made. It is true that the coming of the messiahs occurs here — at the very beginning, in col. 1, 1 — for the only time not in an exegetical context. IQSa has been understood as a rule for the future time of salvation, (32) because the text speaks of the coming of the messiahs. Irritations were caused by the striking parallels to community rules, which were indeed already in practice among the Essenes. H. Stegemann (1992) has now shown that IQSa was by no means a rule for the future time of salvation but for the immediately preceding period of time, before the actual end. (33)

(26) On the translation of as “is given” and not as “will be given”, which is also possible, cf. note 21.
(27) Cf. also 4QpHab 1, 11f. See the explanation of both texts by H. Stegemann (1971), 115-120, cf. also H. Stegemann (1983), 522.
(29) IQSa II, 111, 4QMidEschat 111, 10-13, 4QParal 111, 15-29.
(30) 4QMidEschat 111, 2-4.
(31) But see for example 4Q202 II, 5i + 7, cf. E. Pekkan (1993), 650-658, and 4QParal II, 110f.
(32) See, for example, still L. H. Schiffman (1989) and Sh. Talmon (1989), 297-300.
(33) The war against the nations (1, 21) is still to come and simpletons (1, 19) and people who are “smitten with any human uncleanness” (11, 10f) still exist. See
and profit from the spoils of the nations”, and this wealth is given 26 into the hands of the Kittim. The historical reference here is to the illegal enrichment of the Temple’s treasure under the administration of avaricious priestly circles in Jerusalem and the plundering of the Temple’s treasure by the Romans in the year 54 BC. 27 This event belongs to the immediate past of the author of Psalm who composed his work around 50 BC. 28

C) In addition to all previous implications, there are also events which are expected within the present time of salvation. First of all, this concerns the coming of the messiahs, who are still awaited in the last period of time, the Messiah, the high priest, before the actual end. Although we have to be very careful in generalizing — especially in cases of messianism in Qumran — it can be seen at least in IQSa, 4QMechilah and 4QPsAl as lying in future. The messiahs should come within the present time of salvation, before the time of the final salvation. 29 It is the same with the building of God’s everlasting future Temple which is probably to be distinguished from the Messiah ("Sanctuary of men"). Connected with the building of the everlasting Temple is the establishment of the kingdom of God 4QTemple. This is found only in 4QMechilah. 30 By the way, the time of salvation, the time after the Messiah, is rarely reflected in the Qumran texts. 31

Finally, one remark concerning IQSa should be made. IQSa occurs here — at the very beginning, in col. 1, 1 — for the only time not in an exegetical context. IQSa has been understood as a rule for the future time of salvation, 32 because the text speaks of the coming of the messiah. Irritations were caused by the striking parallels to community rules, which were indeed already in practice among the Essenes. H. STEGEMANN (1992) has now shown that IQSa was by no means a rule for the future time of salvation but for the immediately preceding period of time, the Messiah, the high priest. 33

(26) On the translation of יְסַפַּר as “is given” and not as “will be given”, which is also possible, c. note 21.
(27) Cf. also 4QPsAl I, 11f. See the explanation of both texts by H. STEGEMANN (1971), 115-120, cf. also H. STEGEMANN (1983), 522.
(29) IQSa II, 11f. 4QMechilah III, 10-13, 4QPsAl I, 1st-29.
(30) 4QMechilah I, 2.6.
(31) See for example IQSa II, 5f. 7f. 4QPsAl I, 11f.
(32) See, for example, still L. H. SCHIFFMAN (1989) and SH. TALMON (1989), 297-300.
(33) The war against the nations (1, 21) is still to come and simpletons (1, 19) and people who are “smitten with any human uncleanness” (11, 10f) still exist. See STEGEMANN (1992), 159-160.

Summary:

Summarizing the evidences of קהִלָּת הַמְּשָׁאֵל in the Qumran texts we have to conclude: קהִלָּת הַמְּשָׁאֵל does not mean the time of salvation, it also does not mean a “punctual end” of history, nor does it mean “future”. Rather, what is meant by the term קהִלָּת הַמְּשָׁאֵל is a limited period of time, that is the last of series of divinely pre-planned periods into which history is divided. This last period of time directly before the time of salvation covers aspects of the past (A), as well as aspects of the present time (B) and of the future (C). Thus, the Essenes are reporting events which already belong to the time of salvation, but which are, from the author’s point of view, events from the past; the present time of the community’s own existence is dated to the future, in early as well as late compositions; also the coming of the messiahs and the final judgement are expected to happen within the present time of salvation. 37 The best translation for קהִלָּת הַמְּשָׁאֵל in the Qumran texts is therefore “the end of the days”, or even better but more freely “the final period of history”.

3. The use of קהִלָּת הַמְּשָׁאֵל and its equivalents in “contemporary” literature

Considering these Qumran evidences, it is not surprising to see how more or less contemporary literature deals with the term קהִלָּת הַמְּשָׁאֵל:

The Targums translate the biblical הבָּקָשׁ עוֹדָא always as “at the end of the days” (בַּאֲרֵא), 34 or “at the end of the heel of the days” (בַּאֲרֵא), that is “at the ultimate end of the days”. 35 The Targums, whose origin is certainly difficult to date, therefore contain a consistent future-eschatological interpretation of the expression קהִלָּת הַמְּשָׁאֵל. The LXX has a slightly broader spectrum of translations for קהִלָּת הַמְּשָׁאֵל. There are mainly two different groups:

H. STEGEMANN (1990), 159-160; cf. also H. STEGEMANN, “Some Remarks to IQSa, IQSb, and Qumran Messianism” (paper presented to the IQS Paris Meeting 1992). According to H. STEGEMANN IQSa is the oldest community rule found in Qumran. 34 See for example the Targum Ofelias on Gen 49, 1 and Num 24, 14.
(35) See for example the Targum Onkelos and the Neophyti Targum on De 4, 30.
(36) Cf. also the eschatological understanding of this term still in the Rabbinic Literature where usually קַרְבָּנָה is the equivalent for קהִלָּת הַמְּשָׁאֵל (see for example Genesis Rabbah on Gen 49, 1).
(37) For example Gen 49, 1 and Ez 38, 16.
The number of both translations is nearly the same. A deliberately distinguishing use of both expressions — for example, one used to mean “in future” and the other “at the end of the days” — cannot be found. Rather, their use seems to reflect the particular stylistic preferences of the various translators concerned. Therefore, we have to understand ἐν ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν as an equivalent for ἐν ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν, or, put another way, for the translators “in the last days” meant the same as “at the end of the days”.

The New Testament which always uses the equivalent for ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἔρημων freely, that means in text not representing biblical quotations, favours a formulation rarely found in the LXX: the most frequent equivalent for ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἔρημων in the New Testament is ἐν (ταῖς) ἐσχάσισι ἡμέραις. This expression is used in the LXX only in the translation of Isa 2:2. Beside this, ἐν ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν — well known from the LXX — is used once in 2Pet 3, 3. There is a clear tendency in the New Testament to state formulations in the plural, although the statistical basis for this assertion is very small with only 5 references in all, singular and plural. The only expression which occurs in the singular is ἐν ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν οὐκοτότων in Heb 1, 2. It is impossible to say for sure why the formulation in the plural “in the last days” is preferred in the New Testament to the singular “at the end of the days”. Maybe, this preference was a result of the popularity of Isa 2,2 and, of course, of Isaiah in general in early Christianity, so that this term from the LXX impressed itself on the mind especially strongly. A difference in the meaning of “in the last days” and “at the end of the days” does not exist. As in the Qumran texts also, these formulations designate in the New Testament the last period of time before the actual end, (40) never the actual end itself or the time of salvation. The most important event within this last period recognized in the New Testament is the appearance of Jesus. The Epistle to the Hebrews accordingly starts with the following sentence: Μεταβαίνοντες καὶ πολυτιμώτας πάλιν ἐς θαλασσά τοὺς πατρίδας ἐν τοῖς προφητείας ἐν ὑπηκοόν τῶν ἡμερῶν οὐκοτότων ηλικίας ἐμίν ἐν γήι ἐς θάνατον κληρονόμοις πάντων, δι’ οὗ καὶ ἐποίησαν τοὺς αἰῶνας, Heb 1, 11.

4. Suggestions on the duration and limits of the ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἔρημων in the Qumran texts

One point that is nowhere explicitly mentioned in the Qumran texts is the duration of ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἔρημων. When did this period start? Perhaps with the appearance of the Teacher of Righteousness, the foundation date of the community? And when would ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἔρημων cease to have an end, that is, when will the actual end of the world come?

Speculations concerning the date of the end of the world or the duration of the world are numerous in contemporary Judaism: thus, Daniel — by interpreting Jer 25,11 — dates the exact year of the end 70 weeks of years, that is 490 years, after the destruction of Jerusalem. A particularly popular method calculated the end from the creation of the world onwards: 7000 years was the expected duration of the world,(41) or 6000 years;(42) others probably calculated with 5000 years(43) or 4231 years.(44)

That the Essenes indeed calculated the date of the end is shown by a passage in p1QHab (45) to which we will refer later on: here, a literary attempt to cope with the disappointment of the hope that the end was close at hand was undertaken; the end had not come at the calculated date.

IQQMelchisedek:

One example of such Essene calculations of the date of the end is found in IQQMelchisedek: (46) As difficult as the interpretation of this thematical midrash is in detail, the two protagonists are clear: these are the heavenly high priest Melchisedek and the “messenger of good news”, who announces the reign of Melchisedek. The important passage for the calculation of the end is found in Col. II, 6-7: the report here is of a future “Day of Atonement” on which Melchisedek will act as heavenly high priest and judge. This “Day of Atonement” is expected to take place at the end of the 10th jubilee. The proclamation of the

(38) For example Num 24, 14 and Dan 10, 14.
(39) Acts 2, 17; 2Tim 3, 1; Jas 5, 3; cf. Did 16, 3; Barn. 4, 9.
(40) That is the present time of the authors (even in 2Tim 3, 1, and 2Pet 3, 3 where — including also the future before the actual end — the future tense is used). That the equivalents for ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἔρημων in the New Testament cover aspects of the past — as the Qumran texts — is clear from Heb 1, 2; there are decades between the words of God once spoken by Jesus in ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἔρημων and the composition of the Epistle to the Hebrews.
(41) Jast Mk 7, 17; Apocal Philo. 28, 8; Midr. Tesh. Ps 90, 15. See on the calculations of the duration of the world P. Votz (1934), 143f, from whom I have taken the informations.
(42) Midr. 42; probably SiMer 33, 1; different Talmudic calculations (for example b. sanh. 97b); Samaritan eschatology (Asadr 4, 20).
(43) Presumably Asadr 10, 12.
(44) b. Abod. 9b.
(45) p1QHab VII, 1ff.
(46) Confer for the following the reconstructed text of this manuscript edited by E. Puech (1987).
4. Suggestions on the duration and limits of הִנְדָּעָה in the Qumran texts

One point that is nowhere explicitly mentioned in the Qumran texts is the duration of הִנְדָּעָה. When did the Qumran texts start? Perhaps with the appearance of the Teacher of Righteousness, the foundation date of the community? And when would הִנְדָּעָה come to an end, that is, when will the actual end of the world come?

Speculations concerning the date of the end of the world or the duration of the world are numerous in contemporary Judaism: thus, Daniel — by interpreting Jer 25,11 — dates the exact year of the end 70 weeks of years, that is 490 years, after the destruction of Jerusalem. A particularly popular method calculated the end from the creation of the world onwards: 7000 years was the expected duration of the world; (41) or 6000 years; (42) others probably calculated with 5000 years; (43) or 4231 years. (44)

That the Essenes indeed calculated the date of the end is shown by a passage in 4Qap (45) to which we will refer later on: here, a literary attempt to cope with the disappointment of the hope that the end was close at hand was undertaken; the end had not come at the calculated date.

1QIOMelchisedek:

One example of such Essene calculations of the date of the end is found in 1QIOMelchisedek. (46) As difficult as the interpretation of this thematical midrash is in detail, the two protagonists are clear: these are the heavenly high priest Melchisedek and the "messenger of good news", who announces the reign of Melchisedek. The important passage for the calculation of the end is found in Col. II, 6-7: the report here is of a future "Day of Atonement" on which Melchisedek will act as heavenly high priest and judge. This "Day of Atonement" is expected to take place at the end of the 10th jubilee. The proclamation of the

(41) TedAl 7, 17; ApokelPhil. 28, 8; MidrThall. Ps 90, 15. See on the calculations of the duration of the world P. Vorz (1934), 143ff., from whom I have taken the informations.

(42) 4Qap 11: probably SiHa 33, 1; different Talmudic calculations (for example b. Sanh. 97b; Samaritan exegesis (AsaB 4, 20).

(43) Presumably AsaB 40, 10.

(44) b. Abod. 9b.

(45) 4Qap 11, 1ff.

(46) Confer for the following the reconstructed text of this manuscript edited by E. pours (1967).
liberation definitively realized at the “Day of Atonement” happens in the first week of the jubilee that follows after the preceding nine jubilees, that is, the first week of the 10th jubilee. If we now add how long such a jubilee lasts and from which date in history these jubilees were counted, Col. II, 18 provides us with further information: in a quotation-formula, the biblical prophet Daniel occurs. Unfortunately, the quotation itself is lost; the fragment breaks off here and we can only guess that perhaps an excerpt from Dn 9, 25 was quoted in the gap. But, what is fundamentally much more important than the lost quotation is that this quotation-formula represents the oldest proof for Daniel as a recognized scriptural authority. At the time when 1IQMelchisedek was composed, about the end of the second century BC, the Book of Daniel belonged to the “canon” of the Essenes. Therefore, it may be suggested that — if Daniel is quoted as an authority in 1IQMelch — the system of calculation in 1IQMelch corresponds to that of the biblical Book of Daniel, that is, the 10 jubilees of 1IQMelch are identical with the 70 weeks of years of Daniel.(47) Thus, the 7 years — the usual duration of one jubilee — should be understood with Daniel as 7 weeks of years and the jubilees should be counted starting with Nebuchadnezzar’s siege of Jerusalem.(48) The “Day of Atonement” which is expected to come at the end of the 10th jubilee should then be calculated 10 x 7 x 7 years, that is 490 years, after this event. Following an ancient chronology — as will be shown below — this leads us in the case of the “Day of Atonement” to about the year 72 BC and in the case of the proclamation by the “messenger of good news” to about the years 121-114 BC.

Before dealing with the next text, some thought should be given to the “messenger of good news” in 1IQMelch.(49) Scholars justly propose to identify the “messenger of good news” with the “Teacher of Righteousness”.(50) In the pesher on Isa 52,7, the “mountains” are interpreted as the “prophets” who have heard the word of God and who handed it down faithfully. The quotation from Isaiah says now that “the feet of the messenger” are “on the mountains”. This can only mean that the proclamation of salvation by the “messenger” is based on the Prophets or, put another way, that the “messenger of good news” bases his announcement of salvation on the interpretation of the biblical books of the Prophets. He himself is also characterized as a person of prophetic abilities: he is the מִשְׁמַר הַרוּחַ, the “anointed of the spirit” — perhaps a better translation would be the “anointed with the spirit” — which implies that his proclamation, like that of the Prophets, is authorized by God.(51) His announcement of salvation is connected with the “comforting of those who mourn” (Isa 61,2-3 in col. II, 19). What this “comforting of those who mourn” consisted of, is said in col. II, 20: “To comfort those [who mourn], its interpretation is: to make them understand all the ages of the world (הָעָמַד בְּשָׁמָיִם)...”. Thus the messenger’s way of comforting was to give information about all the periods of history — including, of course, the final one which was the present time — based on the biblical Prophets.

P1Hab now describes the Teacher of Righteousness as the interpreter of the Prophets par excellence. P1Hab II, 5-9 tells of a certain group, “the ones who are faithless concerning the end of the days”(52) (גֵּלֵן לְשֵׁם הָאֱלֹהִים), which do not believe in the eschatological interpretation of the biblical Prophets offered by the Teacher of Righteousness.(53) That the Teacher of Righteousness might himself have calculated the date of the end on the basis of his exegesis of the Prophets — above all probably on the basis of his lecture of Daniel, as 1IQMelch has led us to suggest — seems to be mentioned in the text P1Hab VII, 1-14 already referred to above:

“...and God told Habakkuk to write down that which would happen to the final generation, but He did not make known to him when time would come to an end. And as for which He said, That he who reads may read it speedily: interpreted this concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God made known all the mysteries of the words of His servants the Prophets. For there shall be yet another vision concerning the appointed time. It shall tell of the end and shall not lie (Heb 2,3a).”

Interpreted, this

(48) The identification of the 10 jubilees in 1IQMelch with the 70 weeks of years from Daniel was proposed against the suggestion of J. T. Milik (1972), 105-126, that 1IQMelch is a third copy of the “Peshar des Periodes” (Q100 and Q131) where the history of the world is divided into 10 jubilees. This seems supported by the different use of the word יָשָׁר that functions — attested only in the formula יָשַּׁר יִשָּׁר (Q100 fig. 1, 1.7) — as a kind of title in the “Peshar des Periodes” — יָשָׁר יִשָּׁר occurs nowhere else in the Qumran texts; the pesharim and the thematic midrashim, as also 1IQMelch, have always יָשָׁר or יִשָּׁר יִשָּׁר.
(49) See for the following 1IQMelch II, 15-20.
(51) See the designations for the biblical prophets in the Qumran texts: יִשָּׁר יִשָּׁר in CD II, 12 (read יִשָּׁר יִשָּׁר), יִשָּׁר יִשָּׁר in CD VI, 1 (read יִשָּׁר יִשָּׁר), and יִשָּׁר יִשָּׁר in QM XI, 7.
(52) אַחֲרֵי הָעָמַד should be translated here with H. Stiermann (1971), 56, as “concerning the end of the days” and not, as it usually is, as “at the end of the days”, although in P1Hab IX, 6 אַחֲרֵי הָעָמַד is used in the sense of “at the end of the days”.
(53) Historically, יִשָּׁר יִשָּׁר probably can be identified with the Sadducees.
liberation definitively realized at the “Day of Atonement” happens in the first week of the jubilee that follows after the preceding nine jubilees, that is the first week of the 10th jubilee. If we now ask how long such a jubilee lasts and from which date in history these jubilees were counted, Col. II, 18 provides us with further information: in a quotation-formula, the biblical prophet Daniel occurs. Unfortunately, the quotation itself is lost; the fragment breaks off here and we can only guess that perhaps an excerpt from Dn 9, 25 was quoted in the gap. But, what is fundamentally much more important than the lost quotation is that this quotation-formula represents the oldest proof for Daniel as a recognized scriptural authority. At the time when HJOMelchisedek was composed, about the end of the second century BC, the Book of Daniel belonged to the “canon” of the Essenes. Therefore, it may be suggested that — if Daniel is quoted as an authority in HJOMelch — the system of calculation in HJOMelch corresponds to that of the biblical Book of Daniel, that is, the 10 jubilees of HJOMelch are identical with the 70 weeks of years of Daniel.(47) Thus, the 7 years — the usual duration of one jubilee — should be understood with Daniel as 7 weeks of years and the jubilees should be counted starting with Nebuchadnezzar’s siege of Jerusalem. (48) The “Day of Atonement” which is expected to come at the end of the 10th jubilee should then be calculated 10 × 7 × 7 years, that is 490 years, after this event. Following an ancient chronology — as will be shown below — this leads us in the case of the “Day of Atonement” to about the year 72 BC and in the case of the proclamation by the “messenger of good news” to about the years 121-114 BC.

Before dealing with the next text, some thought should be given to the “messenger of good news” in HJOMelch. (49) Scholars justly propose to identify the “messenger of good news” with the “Teacher of Righteousness” (50). In the psalm on Isa 52,7, the ‘mountains’ are interpreted as the ‘prophets’ who have heard the word of God and who handed it down faithfully. The quotation from Isaiah says now that “the feet of the messenger” are “on the mountains”. This can only mean that the proclamation of salvation by the “messenger” is based on the Prophets or, put another way, that the “messenger of good news” bases his announcement of salvation on the interpretation of the biblical books of the Prophets. He himself is also characterized as a person of prophetic abilities: he is the מַשָּׁא הַנַּחַל, the “anointed of the spirit” — perhaps a better translation would be the “anointed with the spirit” — which implies that his proclamation, like that of the Prophets, is authorized by God. (51) His announcement of salvation is connected with the “comforting of those who mourn” (Isa 61,2-3 in col. II, 19). What this “comforting of those who mourn” consisted of, is said in col. II, 20: “To comfort those who mourn”, its interpretation is: to make them understand all the ages of the world (עָקֹךְ הַמַּעֲשַׂה)...” Thus the messenger’s way of comforting was to give information about all the periods of history — including, of course, the final one which was the present time — based on the biblical Prophets.

P Hab now describes the Teacher of Righteousness as the interpreter of the Prophets par excellence. P Hab II, 5-9 tells of a certain group, “the ones who are faithless concerning the end of the days” (52) בִּלְדוֹת הֶה חֹדֶשֶׁת הָעֵדֶּנֶּה (which do not believe in the eschatological interpretation of the biblical Prophets offered by the Teacher of Righteousness. (53) That the Teacher of Righteousness himself have calculated the date of the end on the basis of his exegesis of the Prophets — above all probably on the basis of his lecture of Daniel, as HJOMelch has led us to suggest — seems to be mentioned in the text P Hab VII, 1-14 already referred to above:

“and God told Habakkuk to write down that which would happen to the final generation, but He did not make known to him when time would come to an end. And as for which He said, That he who reads may read it speedily interpreted this concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God made known all the mysteries of the words of His servants the Prophets. For there shall be yet another vision concerning the appointed time. It shall tell of the end and shall not lie (Hab 2,3a). Interpreted, this

(48) The identification of the 10 jubilees in HJOMelch with the 70 weeks of years from Daniel would speak against the suggestion of J. T. Milik (1972), 108-136, that HJOMelch is a third copy of the “Peshar des Periodes” (Q 1960 and Q 1961) where the history of the world is divided into 10 jubilees. This seems be supported by the different use of the word מַשָּׁא that functions — attested only in the formula רַע לָא מַשָּׁא (Q1960 II, 1.17) as a kind of title in the “Peshar des Periodes”. רַע לָא מַשָּׁא occurs nowhere else in the Quimran texts; the pesharim and the thematic midrashim, as also HJOMelch, have always רַע לָא מַשָּׁא or רַע לָא מַשָּׁא מַשָּׁא.
(49) See for the following HJOMelch II, 15-20.
(50) See, for example, J. T. Milik (1972), 196, cf. E. Puch (1987), 609.
(51) See the designations for the biblical prophets in the Quimran texts: הַנַּחַל מַשָּׁא in CD II, 12 (read נַחַל מַשָּׁא), מַשָּׁא הַנַּחַל in CD VI, 1 (read עֶשֶׂב), and לָא לָא מַשָּׁא in QM XI, 7.
(52) מַשָּׁא הָעֵדֶּנֶּה should be translated here with H. Stegemann (1971), 56, as “concerning the end of the days” and not, as it usually is, as “at the end of the days”, although in P Hab IX, 3 מַשָּׁא הָעֵדֶּנֶּה is used in the sense of “at the end of the days”.
(53) Historically מַשָּׁא הָעֵדֶּנֶּה likely can be identified with the Sadducees.
means that the final age shall be prolonged, and shall exceed all that the Prophets have said; for the mysteries of God are astounding. If it tarries, wait for it; or it shall surely come and shall not be late (Hab 2, 3b).

Interpreted, this concerns the men of truth who keep the Law, whose hands shall not shrink in the service of the truth when the final age is prolonged. For all the ages of God reach their appointed end as he has determined for them in the mysteries of his wisdom". (54)

Another important thing can be seen here: from the point of view of the author of pHab, the calculated date of the end has already passed by, of course, without the end actually having come. The origin of the work pHab about the year 50 BC thus supports the interpretation of the 1IQMelch-evidences given above to the effect that the coming of the end was forecast for about the year 72 BC. (55)

The Damascus Document (CD):

Besides 1IQMelch there exists another Qumran text which provides information on calculations of the date of the end, namely the so-called Damascus Document (CD). H. Stegemann (1983) has already drawn attention to this fact. (56) The beginning of the Damascus Document (CD 1, 5-11) contains a short historical review. The first epoch which is described here is the "age of wrath" (יִרְשָׁד בָּשָׂר), the 390 years of wrath following the conquest of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. But then God caused a "plant root" (מַשָּׂר תּוּנָשׁ) to shoot, whose members distinguished themselves on the one hand by their iniquity and recognizing their guilt and on the other hand by being like blind men. This "plant root" existed for 20 years until God raised them as a "Teacher of Righteousness" (רֵדֶס דְּרוּשׁ) to guide them in the right way.

There can be no doubt, that what is reported here is the rise of the Teacher's community out of its predecessor group. But there is much debate on the question whether the numbers mentioned in this text (390 and 20) have any historical meaning, or whether they are nothing else than a kind of apocalyptic play on biblical numbers. Did the group preceding the Teacher's community indeed form itself 390 years after the fall of Jerusalem, and did the Teacher's community itself come into being 20 years later?

This was hitherto justly questionable because in the year 137 BC (predecessor community) and in the year 177 BC (Teacher's community), to which the respective numbers seem to lead, no historical events can be identified which could have caused the rise of those groups.

A solution of the problem has been found by A. Laato (1992). He tries to show that the Damascus Document follows the chronological system of the Jewish historiographer Demetrius (57) which is used also as he demonstrates — 2627 years shorter than our modern chronology. (58) According to this, the striking observation can be made that the origin of the "plant root", the predecessor community, would date to the year 171/170 and that of the Teacher's community to the year 151/150. These dates fit well with those been suggested on historical grounds: the murder of Onias III, which may be expected to have been an event that could have caused the rise of the "plant root", happened in the year 170 BC. Also, Jonathan — who is supposed to have driven the "Teacher" out of his position as high priest in Jerusalem, thus causing him to found his own community — became high priest in the year 153/152 BC. (59) Although we do not arrive at a total correspondence between the dates given in the Damascus Document and the historical events, they are indeed strikingly close if we take into consideration the substantial period of time (410 years) covered by the calculation.

Another — even more precise — solution was suggested by E. Puech (1993). (60) According to E. Puech the author of the Damascus Document follows a type of chronology which is represented by 2Ba 1, 1ff dating the first siege of Jerusalem to the 25th year of the reign of Jehonias (Dioakin), i.e. 572 BC. (61) According to this chronology the second siege of Jerusalem took place 10 years later, in the year 562 BC. In this case, the foundation of the predecessor community would have taken place in the year 172 BC, (62) this is exactly the year when Menelaos became

---

(54) Translation with G. Vermes (1987), 298f, but "he has determined" instead of "he determined" because of qpHab IV, 18f, cf. also III, 18 and its context.

(55) Concerning the Teacher of Righteousness as the one who might himself have calculated the date of the end we have to add that qpHab VII, 2 (and its context) could be read as an apologetical text, which has to explain why the Teacher erred and the calculation failed. See also below "5. Conclusion".

(56) H. Stegemann (1983), 522 note 98.

(57) Third century BC. On Demetrius' chronological system see Clemens' Strom. 1, 21, 141 where Clemens follows the chronology of Demetrius.

(58) Concerning the intertestamental period. Another inaccurate chronologi- cal system is found in Daniel and Josephus which is about 70 years longer than the actual chronology.

(59) This would speak for an identification of the Wicked Priest with Jonathan, see G. Jeremias (1963), H. Stegemann (1971) and others, and not with Simon, as it is suggested by F. M. Cross (1958) cf. el al.

(60) See E. Puech (1993), 306 note 29. For the following calculations cf. table 1 and 2.


(62) 562 BC = 390 = 172 BC.
means that the final age shall be prolonged, and shall exceed all that the Prophets have said; for the mysteries of God are astounding. If it turries, wait for it, for it shall surely come and shall not be late (Hab 2, 3b).

Interpreted, this concerns the men of truth who keep the Law, whose hands shall not slacken in the service of the truth when the final age is prolonged. For all the ages of God reach their appointed end as he has determined for them in the mysteries of his wisdom".(54)

Another important thing can be seen here: from the point of view of the author of pHab, the calculated date of the end has already passed by, of course, without the end actually having come. The origin of the work pHab about the year 50 BC thus supports the interpretation of the IQQMelch-evidences given above to the effect that the coming of the end was forecast for about the year 72 BC.(55)

The Damascus Document (CD):

Beside IQQMelch there exists another Qumran text which provides information on calculations of the date of the end, namely the so-called Damascus Document (CD). H. Stegemann (1983) has already drawn attention to this fact.(56) The beginning of the Damascus Document (CD I, 5-11) contains a short historical review.

The first epoch which is described here is the "age of wrath" ([_hot ()], the 390 years of wrath following the conquest of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. But then God caused a "plant root" ([חוט ()]) to shoot, whose members distinguished themselves on the one hand by perceived their iniquity and recognizing their guilt and on the other hand by being like blind men. This "plant root" existed for 20 years until God raised for them a "Teacher of Righteousness" ([רמס ()]) to guide them in the right way.

There can be no doubt, that what is reported here is the rise of the Teacher's community out of its predecessor group. But there is much debate on the question whether the numbers mentioned in this text (390 and 20) have any historical meaning, or whether they are nothing else than a kind of apocalyptic play on biblical numbers. Did the group preceding the Teacher's community indeed form itself 390 years after the fall of Jerusalem, and did the Teacher's community itself come into being 20 years later? This was hitherto justly questionable because in the year 137 BC (predecessor community) and in the year 177 BC (Teacher's community), to which the respective numbers seem to lead, no historical events can be identified which could have caused the rise of those groups.

A solution of the problem has been found by A. Laato (1992). He tries to show that the Damascus Document follows the chronological system of the Jewish historiographer Demetrius (57) which is as he demonstrates — 26/27 years shorter than our modern chronology.(58) According to this, the striking observation can be made that the origin of the "plant root", the predecessor community, would date to the year 171/170 and that of the Teacher's community to the year 151/150. These dates fit well with those being suggested on historical grounds: the murder of Onias III, which may be expected to have been an event that could have caused the rise of the "plant root", happened in the year 170 BC.

Also, Jonathan — who is supposed to have driven the "Teacher" out of his position as high priest in Jerusalem, thus causing him to found his own community — became high priest in the year 153/152 BC.(59) Although we do not arrive at a total correspondence between the dates given in the Damascus Document and the historical events, they are indeed strikingly close if we take into consideration the substantial period of time (410 years) covered by the calculation.

Another — even more precise — solution was suggested by E. Puech (1993). According to E. Puech, the author of the Damascus Document follows a type of chronology which is represented by 2Sa 1, 1ff dating the first siege of Jerusalem to the 25th year of the reign of Jehoiakim (dojakin), i.e. 572 BC.(60) According to this chronology the second siege of Jerusalem took place 10 years later, in the year 562 BC. In this case, the foundation of the predecessor community would have taken place in the year 172 BC, (62) this is exactly the year when Menelaos became

---

(54) Translation with G. Vermes (1987), 288, but "he has determined" instead of "he determines" because of qes IV, 14f, et al. III, 18 and its context.

(55) Concerning the Teacher of Righteousness as the one who might himself have calculated the date of the end we have to add that pQpHab VII, 2 (and its context) could be read as an apologetic text, which has to explain why the Teacher erred and the calculation failed. See also below "5. Conclusion".


---

(57) Third century BC. On Demetrius' chronological system see Clemens' Strom. 1, 21, 141 where Clemens follows the chronology of Demetrio.

(58) Concerning the intertestamental period. Another inaccurate chronological system is found in Daniel and Josephus which is about 70 years longer than the actual chronology.

(59) This would speak for an identification of the Wicked Priest with Jonathan, see G. Jeremias (1963), H. Stegemann (1971) and others, and not with Simon, as it is suggested by F. M. Cross (1958) et al.

(60) See E. Puech (1993), 306 note 29. For the following calculations cf. table 1.2 and 1.3.

(61) 597 BC = 25 = 572 BC. Cf. 4Kgs 24,8 see P. Bouyer (1969), 281.

(62) 562 BC = 390 = 172 BC.
The time which starts with the coming of the messiah is called הָרִישׁוֹ (CD XIX, 10). How long this period of “judgement” would last is never mentioned in CD. Maybe, according to IQM, another 40 years? (67) As was shown above, in the Qumran texts the coming of the messiah was seen as an event which would take place within the שְׁמֵם לְהוֹרָא (IQM, 7). Whether the time of the messiah itself, that is the judgement, was also included into the שְׁמֵם לְהוֹרָא is not absolutely sure, (68) at least the beginning, about the year 72 BC, was part of it. Concerning the שְׁמֵם לְהוֹרָא as the last period of history this means: we know its calculated “end”, that is the date of the coming of the messiah/ Melchisedek, the beginning of the final judgement. Whether שְׁמֵם לְהוֹרָא meant the whole period of 400 years (+ probably the time of the judgement) or perhaps again only the last period within these 490 years is impossible to state with certainty. It is at least striking that hardly any of the events explicitly referred to with שְׁמֵם לְהוֹרָא in the Qumran texts seems to date before the date of the community’s foundation. (69) Another thing that we have to keep in mind is that after the calculated date had passed and the “end”, the coming of the messiah, had not taken place, the Qumran texts continue to speak about this time as שְׁמֵם לְהוֹרָא too. (70)

We also have to be very careful in identifying שְׁמֵם לְהוֹרָא with similar sounding expressions from Qumran, like מִשְׁמַר הָרִישׁוֹן, (71) מִשְׁמַר הָרִישׁוֹן, (72) מִשְׁמַר הָרִישׁוֹן, (73) and מִשְׁמַר הָרִישׁוֹן. Which

(67) CD VIII, 3f speaks of a certain “day” of judgement, but this surely only as allusion to the שְׁמֵם לְהוֹרָא known from the Scripture.

(68) The formulation שְׁמֵם לְהוֹרָא seems to speak for this, otherwise one would expect an expression like “at the end of שְׁמֵם לְהוֹרָא.”

(69) But see the debated שְׁמֵם לְהוֹרָא-evidence in the דבּוֹן הָרֵי. cf. note 14. See on דבּוֹן הָרֵי now also E. CHAZON (disc 1981). According to her reconstruction the term שְׁמֵם לְהוֹרָא is found in Cd. XVI (71-2: 1: 13) where it designates the present time of the author and seems to include already the period of the Exile, see E. CHAZON 226 (text) and 233 (commentary). Cf. the reconstruction of this manuscript proposed by E. PEER (1970), 268.

(70) See, for example, קָרְבָּנָה קך, קָרְבָּנָה קך, and קָרְבָּנָה קך referring to the שְׁמֵם יִרְשָׁם to historical events after the year 70 BC.

(71) While in the case of קָרְבָּנָה V, 7-12 and קָרְבָּנָה V, 3 (cf. E. HEGERMANN [1981], 189) the term seems to designate the present time of the author, in the case of קָרְבָּנָה IV, 17 it seems to mean the time of the judgement (or is used here in an inclusive way)?

(72) קָרְבָּנָה II, 7: VII, 2, קָרְבָּנָה א, 18. 5: CD I, 12 (cf. מִשְׁמַר הָרִישׁוֹן in the same line).

(73) קָרְבָּנָה קך occurs already in the Old Testament in Dt 29, 21, and — undetermined — in Ps 48, 14; 78, 4, 6, 102, 6, but only in Ps 102, 19 it might have an eschatological meaning.

(74) קָרְבָּנָה V, 7, where it seems to designate the present time of the community and differs from the מִשְׁמַר הָרִישׁוֹן (CD XIX, 10), the time of the messiah. It is impossible to know whether also the time between the destruction of Jerusalem and the community’s foundation was designated by the Essenes as מִשְׁמַר הָרִישׁוֹן.

(75) קָרְבָּנָה V, 3, קָרְבָּנָה V, 1, 5 (7).
highpriest. The foundation of the Teacher’s community would date 20 years later, in the year 152 BC. Jonathan became highpriest in the year 159/2 BC.

If this interpretation is accepted, certain implications for an absolute chronology of Essene calculations of the date of the end result. Important information still lacking in this context is found in CD XX, 13-15. According to this text, the actual end should come about 40 years after the death of the Teacher of Righteousness: "And from the day on which the Teacher of the community was taken away (= died) until the end of all Men of War who turned around with the Man of Lies there would be about forty years". Unfortunately, we do not exactly know for how long the Teacher was living in the community. But when the Damascenes Document was composed about 100 BC, he was already dead, though his death had occurred not too long ago as some regulations concerning the admission of members show. (63) The calculation can now easily be made: if we add the 390 years from Nebuchadnezzar until the foundation of the “plant root”, the 20 years until the rise of the Teacher of Righteousness, the circa 40 years of his life in the דקן (from about 152 BC until shortly before 100 BC), and the about 40 years between his death and the end, we obtain the 490 years known from Daniel which we already met in \textit{IQMelch}. The term “about 40 years” between the death of the Teacher and the end does mean that it was thought impossible to date the end exactly, rather “about” is used here because of the historical date of the Teacher’s death, which did not happen exactly 40 years before the expected end. The biblical support for the “about 40 years” is \textit{Dan} 2, 14. It says that it took 38 years, or about 40 years, until the “Mean of War" (מדינתו ליון), who had grumbled during the time in the desert, had died.

The authors of \textit{IQMelch} and \textit{CD} seem to have awaited the end 490 years after Nebuchadnezzar, historically — according to the chronology represented by \textit{2Bar} 1, 11f — about the year 72 BC. (64) In the case of \textit{IQMelch} the heavenly highpriest Melchisedek was expected to come at that date of the “end” for the final judgement. Nothing is mentioned about the time which Melchisedek would need for his judgement. (65) In the case of \textit{CD} the final judgement, which would start with the coming of the messiahs was expected to take place about the year 72 BC. (66)

(63) \textit{CD} XIX, 32ff.
(64) This date — about 72 BC — was already suggested by H. Stegemann (1980), 322, note 98.
(65) Would it take a day, some weeks or even years?
(66) That the coming of the messiahs is still expected for the future is clear from \textit{CD} XII, 23 and XIX, 10.

The time which starts with the coming of the messiahs is called ידועה קרא (CD XIX, 10). How long this time of “judgement” would last is never mentioned in \textit{CD}. Maybe, according to \textit{IQM}, another 40 years? (67) As was shown above, in the Qumran texts the coming of the messiahs was seen as an event which would take place within the מלת קרא. Whether the time of the messiahs itself, that is the judgement, was also included into מלת קרא is not absolutely sure. (68) At least the beginning, about the year 72 BC, was part of it. Continuing the מלת קרא as the last period of history this means: we know its calculated “end”, that is the date of the coming of the messiahs/ Melchisedek, the beginning of the final judgement. Whether מלת קרא meant the whole period of 490 years (+ probably the time of the judgement) or perhaps again only the last period within these 490 years is impossible to state with certainty. It is as least striking that hardly any of the events explicitly referred to with מלת קרא in the Qumran texts seems to date before the time of the community’s foundation. (69) Another thing that we have to keep in mind is that after the calculated date had passed and the “end”, the coming of the messiahs, had not taken place, the \textit{Qumran} texts continue to speak about this time as מלת קרא too. (70)

We also have to be very careful in identifying מלת קרא with similar sounding expressions from Qumran, like כל的儿子 קרא, (71) מלת קרא (72) (מלת קרא) קרא, and קרא (73) קרא. Which

(67) \textit{CD} VIII, 3f speaks of a certain "lay" of judgement, but this surely only as allusion to the מלת קרא known from the Scripture.
(68) The formulation מבית קרא seems to speak for this, otherwise one would expect an expression like ‘at the end of מלת קרא’.
(69) But see the debated מבית קרא-evidence in the \textit{DibHar}; cf. note 14. See on \textit{DibHar} now also E. Chazon (disc 1991). According to her reconstruction the term \textit{מלת קרא} is found in Col. XVI (rg. 1-2 111-13) where it designates the present time of the author and seems to include already the period of the Exile, see E. Chazon 226 (text) and 253 (commentary). Cf. the reconstruction of this manuscript proposed by E. Pecora (1990), 56f.
(70) See, for example, \textit{QalHar} and \textit{QalVah} referring with מבית קרא to historical events after the year 70 BC.
(71) While in the case of \textit{QalHar} VII, 7:12 and \textit{QalVah} IV, 3 (cf. H. Stegemann [1980]), 193f the term seems to designate the present time of the author, in the case of \textit{IQS} IV, 17 it seems to mean the time of the judgement (or is it used here in an inclusive way?)
(72) \textit{QalHar} VII, 7:12; 8:18, 5; \textit{CD} I, 12 (of \textit{Malachi קרא ידועה in the same line}). The קרא ידועה occurs already in the Old Testament in Dt 29, 21, and — undetermined — in Ps 48, 14; 78, 4; 4, 6, 102, 9, but only in Ps 102, 19 it might have an eschatological meaning.
(73) \textit{Malachi קרא} occurs in \textit{CD} VI, 14; XII, 23; XV, 7 (cf. \textit{Malachi קרא} \textit{CD} VI, 10) and \textit{QalHar} V, 7, where it seems to designate the present time of the community and differs from the קרא ידועה (\textit{CD} XIX, 10), the time of the messiahs. It is impossible to know whether also the time between the destruction of Jerusalem and the community’s foundation was designated by the Essenes as ידועה קרא.
(74) \textit{QalVah} III, 3; \textit{QalVah} 1, 5 (7).
timespan is actually meant by them must be examined in every single case, because none of these formulations became technical terms like לוחות.

Among the other texts from Qumran there seem to be some which also allude to an eschatological 490 years/10 jubilees-scheme:

There is first of all a group of manuscripts, now counted as 4Q385-390, already mentioned by J.T. Milik (1972) who found there a system of 70 weeks of years/10 jubilees, that is 490 years, (75) just as in 1QMelch. The two largest fragments of one of these manuscripts, 4Q390, are now completely published by D. Dimant (1992). (76) As we have suggested for I1QMelch and CD, the reckoning of the 490 years seems to start with the destruction of Jerusalem and the desolation of the land. (77)

Another text which might contain this scheme has been edited by E. Puech (1992), 4QAHa bis = 4QTestLevi (78), representing possibly a copy of an Aramaic Testament of Levi. (78) At the beginning of frg. 1, 2 after a final nun the signs of a number are preserved, that is 20 + 20 + 10 + 4 + 2 (79), probably 52. E. Puech proposes to complete 50 + 2 (20) וספ and suggests that the 52 weeks might be interpreted as "weeks of years", as in Daniel, 1QMelch and also in TestLevi 16,1 and 17,1F. (80)

It seems that at least some Qumran texts calculated the date of the end in following the tradition represented by the Testament of Levi and not the Book of Jubilees. (81)

(75) J.T. Milik (1976), 254f.
(76) J.T. Milik (1976), 255, already quoted some passages of this manuscript. D. Dimant (1992) described 4Q390 as "Pseudo-Moses". She suggests that it is not a specific Qumran text, but that it comes from a "priestly-parent group" and that it dates no later than Joh. Hyrcanus (134-104 BC). By the way, D. Dimant's placement of the two big fragments of 4Q390 (first frg. 1 and then frg. 2) is absolutely right (which is important for identifying the periods). It can be verified by a material reconstruction according to the "Steigmann-Method": frg. 1 must be placed on the right side of frg. 2 at a distance of corresponding points of about 9.5 cm, cf. Pl. 24 and 25 (reduced size) which led us to conclude that the preserved fragments probably come from the middle part of the former scroll. The order of the fragments was rejected and changed from the contents point of view falsely by M.A. Knibb (1992), 170ff, referring to F. Garcia Martinez (1991), 131,133.
(77) Fig. 1. 1f has הבאר עזרא הconfirmed by 1f1. Cf. J.T. Milik (1976), 256, and D. Dimant (1992).
(78) See E. Puech (1992), 470-489 and Pl. 22.
(79) Or 2 (2) = 2, see E. Puech (1992), 482.
(80) Note that CD IV, 15f is quoting from Testament of Levi.
(81) The Book of Jubilees calculates 49 jubilees — each jubilee consisting of 40 years — from creation to Moses (49 x 40 = 1960 years). According to the Book of Jubilees 2490 (49 x 49 + 3) = 49 + 3 years — Israel enters Canaan at that time — are half of the duration of the world; 4900 years (= 100 jubilees) would be the whole duration of the world.

5. Conclusion: Some aspects of Essenic eschatology

In conclusion, some aspects of Essenic eschatology may be summarized:

From the very beginning the Essenes were conscious of living in the עמק הגויים (MTMT, QSa), probably much like pious circles before them. In the context of interpreting the Prophets — a prescribed activity among the Essenes along with interpreting the Torah (82) — they may have encountered Daniel whom they thought to be a Prophet from the Exile and whom they therefore included in their "canon" at an early time. From the Book of Daniel they gained information about the end of the עמק הגויים, and they calculated it to be 490 years/10 jubilees after the (second) siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, probably about the year 72 BC. Might this calculation have been inaugurated by the Teacher of Righteousness himself? Perhaps the Teacher realized towards the end of his life that the end of the עמק הגויים would not come during his own lifetime as it had originally been expected by him and his followers? The fact that the idea of calculating the end came relatively late in the history of the community, about half a century after its foundation, but was then the subject of intensive work, could perhaps speak for this view. Was the calculation of the end the fruit of the old age of the Teacher of Righteousness, his bequest? Maybe, after his death those calculations were adopted and pursued in more detail. In the Damascus Document, which dates shortly after the Teacher's death, the 490 years of Daniel are divided into four periods. The last of these was given as spanning about 40 years and was counted from the Teacher's death onwards. These last 40 years within the עמק הגויים became important in later Essenic works: in 4QPsH, originating from the first half of the first century BC, this period of the 40 years is seen as not yet finished. (83) In 4QMidrEsschal, very probably from the time of Alexander Salome or her sons, (84) the calculated date of the end had just passed by. While 4QMidrEsschal is marked by struggle and intensive desire to continue to believe in this date, 1QpHab shows that about 20 years later the date — ca. 72 BC — had been given up. The pesharim, aimed exclusively at proving that the end was near because a book of the Prophets was completely

(82) QSa VIII, 14-16.
(83) 4QPsH II, 6-8.
(84) Alexandra Salome 76-67 BC, Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II 67-63 BC.
timespan is actually meant by them must be examined in every single case, because none of these formulations became technical terms like הָיוָם הָיָם.

Among the other texts from Qumran there seem to be some which also attest to an eschatological 490 years/10 jubilees-scheme:

There is first of all a group of manuscripts, now counted as 4Q385-390, already mentioned by J. T. Milik (1976) who found there a system of 70 weeks of years/10 jubilees, that is 490 years, just as in 11QMelkh. The two largest fragments of one of these manuscripts, 4Q390, are now completely published by D. Dimant (1992). As we have suggested for 11QMelkh and CD, the reckoning of the 490 years seems to start with the destruction of Jerusalem and the desolation of the land. (77)

Another text which might contain this scheme has been edited by E. Puech (1992), 4QAHa bis = 4QTestLevi (78), representing possibly a copy of an Aramaic Testament of Levi. (78) At the beginning of frg. 1, 2 after a final nun the signs of a number are preserved, that is 20 + 20 + 10 + 4 + 2 (79), probably 52. E. Puech proposes to complete 50 + 2 (79) instead and suggests that the 52 weeks might be interpreted as “weeks of years”, as in Daniel, 11QMelch and also in TestLevi 16,1 and 17,1E. (80)

It seems that at least some Qumran texts calculated the date of the end in following the tradition represented by the Testament of Levi and not the Book of Jubilees. (81)

(75) J. T. Milik (1976), 254f.
(76) J. T. Milik (1976), 255, already quoted some passages of this manuscript. D. Dimant (1992) describes 4Q390 as "Pseudo-Moses". He suggests that it is not a specific Qumran text but that it comes from a "priestly-parent group" and that it dates no later than Job. Hycanus (134-104 BC). By the way, D. Dimant’s placement of the two big fragments of 4Q390 (first frg. 1 and then frg. 2) is absolutely right (which is important for identifying the periods). It can be verified by a material reconstruction according to the "Stephann-Methode": frg. 1 must be placed on the right side of frg. 2 at a distance of corresponding points of about 9,5 cm, cf. Pl. 24 and 25 (reduced size) which led us to conclude that the preserved fragments probably come from the middle part of the former scroll. The order of the frgments was rejected and changed from the contents point of view falsely by M. A. Knibb (1992), 170ff, referring to F. García Martínez (1991), 131,133.
(77) Fig. 1, 71 has בֵּית הָיָם הָיָם. Cf. J. T. Milik (1976), 255, and D. Dimant (1992).
(78) See E. Puech (1992), 479-499 and Pl. 22.
(79) Or 2 (2) = 2, see E. Puech (1992), 482.
(80) Note that CD IV, 15f is quoting from Testament of Levi.
(81) The Book of Jubilees calculates 49 jubilees — each jubilee consisting of 40 years — from creation to Moses 2490 (49 x 49 + 4 + 1) years — Israel enters Canaan at that time — of the duration of the world; 4900 years (20 jubilees) would be the whole duration of the world.

5. Conclusion: Some aspects of Essene eschatology

In conclusion, some aspects of Essene eschatology may be summarized:

From the very beginning the Essenes were conscious of living in the world to come (Qumran, JPS), probably much like pious circles before them. In the context of interpreting the Prophets — a prescribed activity among the Essenes along with interpreting the Torah (82) — they must at some stage have encountered Daniel whom they thought to be a Prophet from the Exile and whom they therefore included in their "canon" at an early time. From the Book of Daniel they gained information about the end of the world to come, and they calculated it to be 490 years/10 jubilees after the (second) siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, probably about the year 72 BC. Might this calculation have been inaugurated by the Teacher of Righteousness himself? Perhaps the Teacher realized towards the end of his life that the end of the world to come would not come during his own lifetime as it had originally been expected by him and his followers? The fact that the idea of calculating the end came relatively late in the history of the community, about half a century after its foundation, but was then the subject of intensive work, could perhaps speak for this view. Was the calculation of the end the fruit of the old age of the Teacher of Righteousness, his bequest? Maybe, after his death those calculations were adopted and pursued in more detail. In the Damascus Document, which dates shortly after the Teacher's death, the 490 years of Daniel are divided into four periods. The last of these was given as spanning about 40 years and was counted from the Teacher's death onwards. These last 40 years within the world to come became important in later Essenic works: in 4QpPs, originating from the first third of the first century BC, this period of the 40 years is seen as not yet finished. (83) In 4QMidrEschel, very probably from the time of Alexandra Salome or her sons, (84) the calculated date of the end had just passed by. While 4QMidrEschel is marked by struggle and intensive desire to continue to believe in this date, 1QpHub shows that about 20 years later the date — ca. 72 BC — had been given up. The pesharim, aimed exclusively at proving that the end was near because a book of the Prophets was completely...
fulfilled, originate in large numbers after the year 72 BC. They show on the one hand that the Essenes had not managed to penetrate the “astounding mysteries of God” until then and on the other that the expectation that the end was close at hand was in accordance with the biblical Prophets for the (85) Vovov

Annette Steudel.
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(85) Recently, H. Stegemann (1993), 186. suggested that after the calculated date about 70 BC had passed the Essenes established a new calculation — again on the basis of the biblical Book of Daniel — interpreting the fourth kingdom Dom 7, 23 as the Roman empire; this second calculation would lead to the year 70 CE. As H. Stegemann concudes, there is no explicit proof in the Qumran texts for such an assumption, but the striking number of copies of the biblical Book of Daniel among the Qumran manuscripts which originate to the middle of the first century CE could speak for it.
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fulfilled, originate in large numbers after the year 72 BC. They show on the one hand that the Essenes had not managed to penetrate the "astounding mysteries of God" until then and on the other that the expectation that the end was close at hand as well as the significance of the biblical Prophehs for the [85] was never given up by them.
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Table 1

| II, 6f | The proclamation of liberation happens in the first week of the jubilee that follows after the nine preceding jubilees | 562 BC |
| II, 18f | The one who proclaims the liberation is the ‘‘messenger of good news’’, the ‘‘anointed of the spirit’’ (Teacher of Righteousness?) | 121 BC |
| II, 7 | The ‘‘Day of Atonement’’ (liberation) is the end of the 10th jubilee | 562 BC |
| II, 13 | Melchisedek — heavenly high priest and liberator — will execute God’s judgement on that day | 72 BC |
“THE END OF THE DAYS” IN THE QUMRAN TEXTS

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HqMeh</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>according to the chronology represented by 2Br 1, 1ff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II, 6f</td>
<td>The proclamation of liberation happens in the first week of the jubilee that follows after the nine preceding jubilees</td>
<td>562 BC $- 9 \times 7 \times 7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 18f</td>
<td>The one who proclaims the liberation is the “messenger of good news”, the “anointed of the spirit” (Teacher of Righteousness?)</td>
<td>$\Rightarrow$ 121-114 BC (first week of 10th Juh.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 7</td>
<td>The “Day of Atonement” (liberation) is the end of the 10th jubilee</td>
<td>562 BC $- 10 \times 7 \times 7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II, 13</td>
<td>Melchisedek — heavenly high priest and liberator — will execute God’s judgement on that day</td>
<td>72 BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CD</th>
<th>Statements according to the chronology represented by 2 Ba 1, 1ff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I, 5-8</td>
<td>390 years from Nebuchadnezzar until the rise of the &quot;plant root&quot; (= predecessor group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I, 9-10</td>
<td>for 20 years this predecessor group existed &quot;like blind men&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1, 10f</td>
<td>then God caused to rise the Teacher of Righteousness (= foundation of the Teacher's community)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX, 13-15</td>
<td>about 40 years between the death of the Teacher of Righteousness and the end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|  | 562 BC  | Menelaos becomes high priest 172 BC |
|  | 562 BC  | 562 BC  |
| 172 BC  | 172 BC  | 172 BC  |
| 172 BC  | 172 BC  | 172 BC  |
| 152 BC  | 152 BC  | 152 BC  |
| 152 BC  | 152 BC  | 152 BC  |
| 112 BC  | 112 BC  | 112 BC  |
| 112 BC  | 112 BC  | 112 BC  |
| 40 BC  | 40 BC  | 40 BC  |
| 40 BC  | 40 BC  | 40 BC  |
| 72 BC  | 72 BC  | 72 BC  |

---

**BURYAL PRACTICES AT QUMRAN**

One of the important problems facing the Second Temple period scholar is: who was the Jewish community at Qumran whose history and customs are revealed by the Dead Sea Scrolls and by the archaeology of Qumran? In this article we will examine this problem by considering the Qumran cemetery and its implication (*)

---

I

The Qumran community of Jews practiced primary burial in individual graves during the first century CE, as evidenced by their cemeteries at Qumran (1) and possibly 'En el-Ghuweir (2) (fig. 1). The main cemetery of Qumran is located 30-40 m. east of the settlement and contains about 1,100 graves (fig. 2). Only 52 tombs were excavated. (3) The tombs are arranged in neat, ordered rows separated by two alleys into three plots. Each grave is marked by a heap of stones on the surface (fig. 3); (4) some have a large stone at

---

(*) A summary of this article was read at the symposium "Forty Years of Research in the Dead Sea Scrolls", University of Haifa, March 1988.


(3) De Vaux, Archaeology and the DSS, 1973, 46, Pls. XXVla, lb; Fouilles, 1953: fig. 5. Nine more tombs were excavated by S. H. Steckel, "Preliminary Excavation Report in the Qumran cemetery", Revue de Qumran 6 (1968), 323-336. But see de Vaux’s comments on this highly irregular excavation, Archaeology, 1973, 48. Anthropological research was not conducted in detail. See the reports on de Vaux, 1953, 103; 1956, 569-571; M. Haas & H. Nathan, "Anthropological survey on the human skeletal remains from Qumran", Revue de Qumran 6 (1968), 345-351.