

THE TEACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS
AND JESUS CHRIST

Some Reflections Upon the Dead Sea Scrolls

EDWARD J. YOUNG

THE fascinating discovery of manuscripts near the Dead Sea in Palestine which began in 1947 has continued to interest the scholarly and religious world.¹ Not only has the interest continued, but it has mounted steadily. A recent issue of the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, for example, is devoted entirely to a discussion of various phases of the study of the Scrolls.² In May 1955 the *New Yorker* contained a rather lengthy article on the subject, and article after article, both scholarly and popular have continued to appear.³ Dupont-Sommer has already written two books on the subject,⁴ and there has just appeared a full scale study from the pen of Millar Burrows.⁵

¹ A popular account of the discovery is given in Edmund Wilson: *The Scrolls From the Dead Sea*, New York, 1955, pp. 1-21; A. Dupont-Sommer: *The Dead Sea Scrolls, A Preliminary Survey*, Oxford, 1952, pp. 9-17 (This work is a translation by E. Margaret Rowley of the French *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte*, 1950. In the present article, reference will be made to the English edition which is a most useful introduction to the study of the Scrolls). H. H. Rowley: *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Oxford, 1952, pp. 89-125, gives an amazingly large number of references to articles dealing with the discovery of the Scrolls. In the present writer's opinion this book of Rowley's is one of the best that has been written upon the subject. It serves as an excellent introduction to the vast literature which has already arisen, and it is furthermore characterized throughout by restraint and common sense.

² Vol. LXXIV, Part III, September 1955.

³ May 14, 1955, Edmund Wilson, "A Reporter at Large: The Scrolls From the Dead Sea", pp. 45 ff.

⁴ The second work appeared in English under the title *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes, New Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, London, 1954. This is a translation by R. D. Barnett of the French, *Nouveaux aperçus sur des manuscrits de la Mer Morte*, 1953.

⁵ Millar Burrows: *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, New York, 1955. Although this work is popular in nature, it offers an excellent introduction to the study of the Scrolls. Of particular value are the translations which it contains.

Largely as a result of the studies of Dupont-Sommer, the idea has gained ground that Christianity is indebted to some of the teachings which are expressed in these newly discovered manuscripts.⁶ When the Isaiah manuscript (in the present writer's opinion, the most remarkable of all the discoveries) was first brought to light, it seemed as though the textual criticism of the Old Testament would undergo a revolution.⁷ Now, however, it is becoming clear that the Scrolls are also going to prove of great interest and importance to students of the New Testament.⁸ Are the foundations of Christianity in danger as a result of these discoveries? That is the question to which serious attention must be devoted.⁹

In an article such as this, it will be impossible to attempt to do justice to every aspect of the question, nor would the writer, even if space permitted, be qualified to discuss every aspect. We shall therefore attempt something on a much more modest scale. We shall seek to limit ourselves in the present article to a study of those documents in which mention is made of a Teacher of Righteousness, and this will involve a

⁶ Note the discussion in Wilson: *op. cit.*, pp. 77-112.

⁷ In a communication presented to the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, December 29, 1949, H. M. Orlinsky maintained that the copyist responsible for the Isaiah Scroll was not particularly careful, that the Scroll comes from a manuscript which was copied from memory and that its text was well-nigh worthless for textual criticism (See *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. LXIX, Part I, March 1950, p. vi). Some excellent remarks on the subject are given by W. J. Martin: *The Dead Sea Scroll of Isaiah*, London, 1954.

⁸ Note the remarks of Wilson: *op. cit.*, p. 99, and of Rowley: *The Dead Sea Scrolls and their Significance*, London, 1954, pp. 22, 23.

⁹ A popular article in which these questions are discussed is by a New Testament scholar, Floyd V. Filson: "What About the Dead Sea Scrolls?" in *Presbyterian Life*, October 29, 1955, pp. 8 ff. Filson concludes his article with the statement, "We welcome the historical evidence of the scrolls, but we still have to look to Christ and the New Testament for the gospel of God's grace". On the other hand a popular article by G. Lankester Harding in *The Illustrated London News*, September 3, 1955, bears the heading "Where Christ Himself May Have Studied: An Essene Monastery at Khirbet Qumran". There are two pages of illustrations over which are found the following headings: "A Building In Which John the Baptist, And Probably Christ, Studied: Khirbet Qumran" (p. 380), and "Are These the Rooms Where Christ Once Walked? — Qumran Finds." Such "popularizing" can only be regarded as regrettable.

consideration principally of the "Habakkuk Commentary"¹⁰ and the so-called Zadokite Fragments.¹¹

In the Habakkuk Commentary and the Zadokite Fragments the Teacher of Righteousness appears as an important figure. Is he in any sense a forerunner of Jesus Christ? Did the Lord adopt some of his ideas and practices? Does any particular relationship exist between the two? Does the mention of this figure in any sense detract from the uniqueness of Christianity? It is to the answering of these questions that we must direct our attention in the present article. What we may learn from a study of these matters will doubtless influence our attitude toward the Scrolls as such and their relationship to early Christianity.

THE DATING OF THE SCROLLS

For some time a controversy has been carried on with respect to the time of composition of the Scrolls.¹² By far the great majority of scholars have posited an early date, that is, a period which may roughly be described as about the time of Christ. This early date, however, has been vigorously and competently challenged, and it will be necessary to give some attention to a consideration of this challenge before proceeding to compare the teaching of the Scrolls with Christianity.

The leading advocate of a late date for the Dead Sea Scrolls is Professor Solomon Zeitlin of the Dropsie College.¹³ In the

¹⁰ Published in facsimile in *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, Volume I, *The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary*, edited by Millar Burrows, New Haven, 1950.

¹¹ Published in facsimile by Solomon Zeitlin: *The Zadokite Fragments*, Philadelphia, 1952, and in translation by R. H. Charles: *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, II, 1913, pp. 786 ff.

¹² Rowley, *op. cit.*, p. 10, correctly points out that "Three quite separate questions call for investigation: (1) when the non-Biblical texts were composed; (2) when all the manuscripts were copied; (3) when the manuscripts were deposited in the cave".

¹³ Dr. Zeitlin's learned articles have principally appeared in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, hereafter abbreviated as *JQR*. We may note Vol. XLI (1950-1951) "The Hebrew Scrolls: Once More and Finally", pp. 1-58; "The Hebrew Scrolls: A Challenge to Scholarship", pp. 251-275; Vol. XLV, No. 1, "The Antiquity of the Hebrew Scrolls and the Piltown Hoax: A Parallel", pp. 1-29; Vol. XLV, No. 2, "The Essenes and Messianic

first place he appeals to vocabulary.¹⁴ The very term מורה צדק, he claims, was coined by the Karaites, as a designation of their own teachers, in distinction from the Rabbinical teachers, whom they designated מורה שקר, teacher(s) of falsehood. Zeitlin also points out that certain other terms were in use after the catastrophe of Bar Kokba, and that the word פשר is found in Karaite literature.

The Habakkuk Scroll furthermore, asserts Dr. Zeitlin, makes use of an expression of the Middle Ages בית המשפט (in the sense of "court"). It employs אל and not יהוה as a designation of God. This, according to Zeitlin, is found thirty-nine times in the Zadokite work. On the basis of vocabulary, then, Dr. Zeitlin believes that the Scrolls, and we now have particular reference to the Habakkuk Commentary, are of the Middle Ages.

In the second place, Zeitlin supports his position with the statement that during the Second Commonwealth the Jews did not write commentaries on the Bible, since at this time Hebrew was yet a living tongue, and there was no need for commentaries. Furthermore, the type of commentary found in the Habakkuk Scroll is said to lack "... form, its construction is bad, it could not have been written during the Second Commonwealth and cannot be compared to the commentaries written by Saadia Gaon or the great Karaites. It is the work of a Jew of mediocre attainments".¹⁵

What may be said concerning these arguments? It is to the credit of H. H. Rowley that he has endeavored to present an answer.¹⁶ He points out that Weis had asserted that פשר in its wider usage, as found in the Habakkuk Commentary,

Expectations", pp. 83-119 (while this article is not a direct treatment of the Scrolls, it is extremely valuable as a study of the subjects with which it deals, subjects which recent discussion of the Scrolls has brought to the fore); "A Note on the Fiction of the 'Bar Kokba' Letter", *ibid.*, pp. 174-180; Vol. XLV, No. 3, "Additional Remarks", pp. 218-229; Vol. XLVI, No. 1, "The Propaganda of the Hebrew Scrolls and the Falsification of History", pp. 1-39, and No. 2, pp. 116-180. Mention should also be made of Joseph Reider: "The Dead Sea Scrolls", *JQR*, Vol. XLI, pp. 59-70; P. R. Weis: "The Date of the Habakkuk Scroll", *JQR*, Vol. XLI, pp. 125-154.

¹⁴ Cf. *JQR*, Vol. XLVI, No. 2, pp. 132, 133.

¹⁵ *JQR*, Vol. XLI, p. 35.

¹⁶ *The Zadokite Fragments*, pp. 26-28.

that is, without being restricted to the interpretation of a dream, is a later reflection of Arabic influence. On the other hand, as Rowley indicates, Fraenkel considers the Arabic word to be a loan from Aramaic. The word is also used in the same sense in the Zadokite Fragments as it is in the Habakkuk Commentary. From this Rowley suggests that under the influence of manuscripts which came to light about 800 A. D. the word may have "... gained new currency in this extended sense" (*op. cit.*, p. 28). This is certainly a conceivable and possible explanation.¹⁷

A more convincing argument is brought forth by Rowley in a footnote in which he points out that in Accadian the words *paširu* and *pišru* were employed, not merely of the interpretation of dreams, but also of omens and signs.¹⁸ It would seem that the idea of interpretation was in itself a very ancient one. The account in Nehemiah 8 makes it clear that Ezra and the others who read endeavored to explain the Law to the people. They engaged in interpretation. Likewise, Peter at Pentecost explained the events to his hearers. The evangelist Philip explained Isaiah 53 to the Ethiopian eunuch, and the *προφήται* of ancient Greece explained or interpreted the oracles of Delphi and other oracles to the nation. The art and practice of explanation was of course old.¹⁹

¹⁷ Professor Rowley and others have maintained that the Scrolls may have been placed in the cave long before 800 A. D. In 800 A. D., according to a letter which Timotheus I, the Nestorian Patriarch, sent to Sergius, the Metropolitan of Elam (first called to the attention of recent scholarship by Eissfeldt, in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, LXXIV, 1949, cols. 597 ff., and popularly presented by Filson in the *Biblical Archaeologist*, xiii, 1950, pp. 96 ff.) a bedouin discovered some manuscripts in a cave near the Dead Sea and reported his find to the Jews. If a large number of these Scrolls were at that time removed from the cave and circulated among the Karaites, they might have influenced the latter. The difficulty in this theory, as Rowley of course recognizes, is that it does not explain why the recently discovered manuscripts were not also removed with the others. Yet this need not be an insuperable difficulty. We have no means of knowing that the cave from which the 800 A. D. find was removed is identical with one of the Ain Feschka caves. The cave in which Timotheus' bedouin found his manuscripts may have contained but a few Scrolls. There is no evidence of any wide-spread search for manuscripts at that time such as that which has characterized the past few years.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 27, n. 8.

¹⁹ Cf. Nehemiah 8:9; Acts 8:29-35. Certainly the idea of interpretation,

Weis is correct, with the exceptions to be noted later, in his insistence that the wider use of פשר as found in the Habakkuk Commentary cannot now be attested earlier. In the Old Testament the Hebrew פתרון and the Aramaic פשרא are used in the restricted sense of the interpretations of dreams, although the latter word is found in Daniel 5 where it is employed of the explanation of the mysterious handwriting upon the wall. In Ecclesiastes 8:1 the word seems also to be employed in a wider sense (פשר דבר), as a synonym for wisdom generally. A phrase similar to that employed in the Habakkuk Commentary, is found in Genesis 41:12, 18 (זֶה פְתִירוֹנוֹ). These considerations are instructive, but they do not permit us to draw dogmatic conclusions. Since the idea of Scripture interpretation is very old, we need not insist that the occurrence of פשר in the Habakkuk Commentary proves either a late or early date. It is certainly conceivable that the word might be used in this sense much earlier.²⁰

What about the term מורה צדק? According to Weis, this term first appears in a Karaite commentary from the end of the ninth century.²¹ This commentary, that of Daniel al Kumisi, is on Joel 2:23, a passage which has been too much neglected in the study of the Scrolls. The text may be translated, "... for he hath given you the former rain (מוֹרָה) for

in itself, and not merely as restricted to dreams, must have been very old.

²⁰ C. Rabin, "Notes on the Habakkuk Scroll and the Zadokite Documents", *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. V, No. 2, pp. 148 ff., has some valuable remarks on the literary genre of the Habakkuk Scroll. He appeals to the Demotic writings of about 300 B. C., particularly to a "chronicle" edited by Spiegelberg (*Die sogenannte Demotische Chronik*, Leipzig, 1914), which consists of a series of oracles, the general "technique" of which is similar to the Habakkuk Commentary. Rabin believes that there is an actual literary connection. The literary genre, he declares, is neither midrash nor commentary, but a type which may be designated *peshet* (interpretation). Rabin gives the following (v, 2-4) for comparison with Habakkuk Scroll xii, 3-4, "'Rain upon the stone, the sky being clear'. That means: the people of Egypt have been made a carnage while the sun (god) sees them, etc."

It is clear that, whatever the relationship between the two may be, the type of interpretation is similar. Rabin has performed a real service in calling attention to this text.

²¹ Weis, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

righteousness (לְצִדְקָה)". It is obvious that the words מורה צדק find their origin here. Of great interest also is Hosea 10:12, "... till he come and rain righteousness on you" (עַד יָבוֹא וַיְרַחַם וַיְצַדֵּק לְכֶם). It is clear that the designation "Teacher of Righteousness" is derived from the Scriptures themselves. It is also clear that, at least up to the present, no examples of the usage of this phrase have appeared in pre-Karaite times. If the inhabitants of the Dead Sea monastery were Essenes and if their leader did bear this designation, the designation died with them and did not reappear, as far as we now know, until the times of the Karaites. Christ was not called the "Teacher of Righteousness". Dupont-Sommer declares "The Galilean Master, as he is presented to us in the writings of the New Testament, *appears in many respects* as an astonishing reincarnation of the Teacher of Righteousness".²² As far as the designation itself is concerned, there is no connection or similarity whatever. With respect to the other terms adduced by Zeitlin, the evidence seems to support the view that they belong to the Karaitic period.

Zeitlin argues further that the author of the commentary made use of the Targum of Jonathan. He appeals to the comments on 1:16 as being based on the Targumic language. Secondly, both the Targum and the Commentary employ the word קריה of Jerusalem, and lastly the word הס in Habakkuk 2:20 is interpreted by יכלה which is based on the Targum. These are weighty considerations. What can be said about them?²³

The Habakkuk document interprets 1:16, "those who sacrifice to their standards" (המה זבחים לאותותם). It does not follow the Targum word for word, for the Targum may be translated "and bring forth incense to its standards". In place of the מסיק בוסמין²⁴ of the Targum and the וַיִּקְטֹר of the Masoretic text, the Habakkuk Scroll renders freely by זבחים. The practice of the Scroll is to interpret the Biblical text of contemporaneous events, and hence, it applies the action of sacrifice to the Kittim. Is it not possible, however, that this

²² *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes*, p. 160.

²³ Zeitlin, *JQR*, Vol. XLVI, No. 2, p. 132.

²⁴ The Targum וַיִּקְטֹר בוסמין לְסִמְנֵיהֶם.

interpretation may have served as a basis from which the Targum drew, rather than vice versa? It is difficult to say positively, one way or another.

With respect to the usage of קרייה as referring to Jerusalem, this usage may be found in the Syriac of Mark 14:21.²⁵ Is it possible, with our limited knowledge, to determine how early such an employment of the word began?

Regarding the interpretation of הָס in Habakkuk 2:20, the Targum renders it by the P^eal, וְיִסּוּפוּן which may be translated, "and let be consumed (or, they shall be consumed) from before him all the idols of the land".²⁶ The Syriac has ܕܘܫܝܢ (there will tremble), and the Arabic ليرتاع (let fear), which is based upon the LXX ἐλαβεῖσθω. One cannot but be struck by the similarity in thought between the Targum and the Habakkuk Scroll. The Targum is a prayer that earth's idols come to an end, and the Habakkuk Scroll states that God (אל) will make an end of all who serve idols and (*i. e.*, together with) the wicked from the earth.²⁷ Which, however, was the original? It is difficult to say. The Habakkuk Scroll preserves the Masoretic text but interprets it of the destruction of idolaters, whereas the Targum simply interprets it of the consuming of idols. One refers to idols, the other to idolaters. One employs a transitive verb, the other an intransitive. The evidence does not appear to be sufficiently strong to warrant the statement that there is actual borrowing or dependence, nor, if there was such dependence, which document was the earlier.²⁸

The strongest argument for an early dating of the Scrolls is archaeological. In his article "The Archeology of Qumran", Dr. James L. Kelso points out that the jars were of a type

²⁵ כַּלְמֵת 2007 סֵפֶר 2007.

²⁶ וְיִסּוּפוּן מִן הָאֱלֹהִים כֹּל דְּרִמְלֵת אֲרָעָא.

²⁷ פֶּשֶׁר עַל כּוֹל הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר עִבְדוּ אֶת הָאֱלֹהִים וְאֶת הָעֵץ וּבַיּוֹם הַמִּשְׁפָּט יִכְלֶה אֶל אֶת כּוֹל עוֹבְדֵי הָעֵצִים וְאֶת הַרְשָׁעִים מִן הָאָרֶץ.

²⁸ C. Rabin (*op. cit.*, p. 158), with respect to another point in relation to the Targum and the Habakkuk Scroll, well remarks: "Interpretations of this kind, whatever their source, were apparently used by different circles and adapted by each to their needs, not always with full cognizance of the methods on which they were originally based".

never before known.²⁹ According to Dr. Albright the clay was Roman, either Herodian or post-Herodian.³⁰ Kelso points out that the history of the monastery building falls into three periods. Since coins of both John Hyrcanus and Alexander Jannaeus are available the building was apparently built during the reign of one or the other of them. During the reign of Herod the Great it seems to have been abandoned to be reoccupied during the reign of Archelaus. As shown by the coins the second phase came to an end in June 68, after which it was remodeled and became a garrison for Roman soldiers. Finally, with the Second Jewish Revolt the building was no longer used.³¹

Within this building the same type of jars was found as was found in the cave. The presence of Roman coins made it clear that they belonged to the first century A. D. but previous to Jerusalem's destruction. It was suggested by G. R. Driver that the jars could be much older than the manuscripts.³² But it would seem that the jars were made for the very purpose of preserving and storing the manuscripts, a practice which was fairly wide-spread in antiquity.³³ The archaeological evidence, therefore, favors an early date. This is answered by Zeitlin, however, with the assertion that the scrolls were never in the cave.³⁴

In this brief survey of the question we have left aside the matter of palaeography. The study of the Nash Papyrus in a seminar devoted to the study of the Scrolls has convinced the present writer that this tiny fragment is earlier than the

²⁹ In *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. LXXIV, Part III, September, 1955, pp. 141-146.

³⁰ In Kelso, *op. cit.*, pp. 141 f.

³¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 144. Cf. also, in the same issue, Charles T. Fritsch: "Herod the Great and the Qumran Community", pp. 173 ff.

³² As reported by W. J. Martin: *The Dead Sea Scroll of Isaiah*, p. 6, this suggestion was made in *The Times* (London) of August 23, 1949.

³³ The evidence for this is given in Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

³⁴ *JQR*, Vol. XL, 1949-50, pp. 59 ff. and Vol. XLI, 1950-51, p. 57. In this latter reference Zeitlin remarks: "The Isaiah Scroll, Habakkuk Commentary, Thanksgiving Psalms, War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness were *not* found in the Judean Desert. They were brought from another country. They may have been placed in the caves for a while. They belong to the Geniza of the Middle Ages."

Middle Ages.³⁵ What, however, shall we say with respect to the question of date in general?

For our part we believe that the evidence is insufficient to determine the matter in a dogmatic fashion, although we look with favor upon an early date.³⁶ Zeitlin has raised some extremely cogent points, which in our opinion have not yet received an entirely satisfactory answer. Non-Jewish scholars, and least of all, the present writer, do not have a thorough knowledge of Rabbinics. Not only is it a field in which we are not experts, but it is one in which for the most part our knowledge is meager indeed. Dr. Zeitlin, on the other hand, is a master in this field.

However, one cannot but be impressed by the argument from archaeology, and to a lesser extent, by that from palaeography.³⁷ Our purpose in this present article is not to attempt a settlement of the question of date, but rather to discuss the relationship which the Scrolls sustain to Christianity. By way of orientation and background, however, it has been necessary to offer these general remarks on the present status of discussion concerning the date of the Scrolls.

THE SCROLLS AND CHRISTIANITY

One factor, namely the relation of Christianity to the Scrolls, has been thrust into prominence through the appearance of Edmund Wilson's book.³⁸ Mr. Wilson writes engag-

³⁵ Much has, of course, been written on the subject of palaeography. The reader is referred to the excellent bibliography in Rowley: *The Zadokite Fragments*, pp. 89-125. Of particular importance as an introduction to the whole question of palaeography is the work of Solomon A. Birnbaum: *The Qumran (Dead Sea) Scrolls and Palaeography*, Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Supplementary Studies, Nos. 13-14, New Haven, 1952.

³⁶ It must also be remembered that the Scrolls do not necessarily reflect the doctrine of the group that once lived in the Qumran monastery. They may, of course, have done so, and probably did. On the other hand, they may have at one time merely belonged to the library of the group. The evidence is not sufficient to permit much dogmatizing.

³⁷ The present writer does, therefore, look with favor upon an early date for the Scrolls (*i. e.*, near the beginning of this era).

³⁸ See note 1.

ingly, and his work is easy to read. For that very reason it is likely to have considerable influence. It is a popular account of the discovery and significance of the Scrolls, and for the most part follows the researches of Dupont-Sommer. The book is, in fact, an apologetic for a "naturalistic" or "humanistic" type of Christianity, and consequently, it is necessary to examine with some care certain of the matters which it discusses.

That for which Wilson is contending may clearly be seen from the two following quotations. "The monastery", he writes, and he has reference to the Qumran monastery, "this structure of stone that endures, between the bitter waters and precipitous cliffs, with its oven and its inkwells, its mill and its cesspool, its constellation of sacred fonts and the unadorned graves of its dead, is perhaps more than Bethlehem or Nazareth, the cradle of Christianity" (*op. cit.*, pp. 97 f.). The second quotation brings to the fore the anti-supernaturalistic bias of the book, "and it would seem an immense advantage for cultural and social intercourse — that is, for civilization — that the rise of Christianity should, at last, be generally understood as simply an episode of human history rather than propagated as dogma and divine revelation. The study of the Dead Sea scrolls — with the direction it is now taking — cannot fail, one would think, to conduce to this" (*op. cit.*, p. 108).

There is a certain amount of naïveté in Wilson's discussion of these matters. He quotes David Flusser as saying, "Les chrétiens sont dérangés. Les juifs sont dérangés aussi. Moi, je ne suis pas dérangé!" (Christians are disturbed. Jews are also disturbed. I, however, am not disturbed.) Wilson then proceeds to state, "and I had seemed to note, also, on the Christian side, a certain reluctance to recognize that the characteristic doctrines of Christianity must have been developed gradually and naturally, in the course of a couple of hundred years, out of a dissident branch of Judaism" (*op. cit.*, p. 80). He then goes on to say, "An independent scholar like Flusser, not committed to any religion, had no reason for being upset" (*op. cit.*, p. 81). The same note is sounded again on a later page, "Such an inquirer comes finally to ask himself

whether anyone but a secular scholar is really quite free to grapple with the problems of the Dead Sea discoveries" (*op. cit.*, p. 101).

Since Wilson's work will doubtless be widely read, we have felt it our duty to adduce these quotations which make clear the underlying assumptions upon which it is based. All scholars whatever their religious views have presuppositions. Mr. Wilson himself certainly has them, and they are presuppositions which apparently would rule out an intrusion of the supernatural into human history. We wonder whether Wilson has considered the implications involved in adopting the presuppositions with which he has approached the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Certainly no honest Christian need be afraid of truth wherever he may meet it.

We are grateful for many fine things in Wilson's book. He has given a delightful account of the discovery of the Scrolls, we only regret that he has seen fit to proceed upon the basis of assumptions which we regard as utterly untenable. He has called the attention of his readers to the work of Dupont-Sommer, and for this we may be grateful. Wilson does not, however, follow Dupont-Sommer in all details, and hence, we believe that it will be the part of wisdom to submit the fuller arguments of Dupont-Sommer to a careful scrutiny.

In his first work, which appeared in English under the title, *The Dead Sea Scrolls, A Preliminary Survey*, Dupont-Sommer declares, "It is from the womb of this religious ferment that Christianity, the Christian 'New Covenant', emerged. In history there are scarcely any absolute beginnings, and Christianity is no exception to the rule" (p. 98). Even more startling, however, is the declaration, "The Galilean Master, as He is presented to us in the writings of the New Testament, appears in many respects as an astonishing reincarnation of the Master of Justice" (p. 99).

Dupont-Sommer is an ardent advocate of an early date for the Scroll which is known as the Habakkuk Commentary. On the basis of the comments on Habakkuk 2:15, he maintains that the catastrophe therein mentioned is the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey in 63 B. C. The commentary must therefore be subsequent to this time. It is, however, from a

time before the cessation of party struggles and the nomination of Octavius as emperor, probably 41 B. C.³⁹

In his second book, Dupont-Sommer is careful to indicate that he does not at all equate Jesus Christ and the Teacher of Righteousness. There are certain differences between the two, he argues, and these differences are sufficient to refute any identification of the two such as Teicher has sought to make.⁴⁰ The Teacher of Righteousness was a priest, he points out, a son of Levi, whereas Christ was not a priest, but a "Son of David". Jesus is called the Messiah, whereas the Teacher of Righteousness was described as "Messiah of Aaron and Israel". "The Teacher of Righteousness probably lived generally in Judaea; Jesus was a Galilean and His preaching took place principally on the shores of the Lake of Tiberias. The Teacher of Righteousness was a learned master, whom his followers surrounded with such a superstitious veneration that, like the disciples of Pythagoras, they would not pronounce his name; Jesus was a familiar teacher, whom His disciples and even the multitude approached with complete freedom, and whose name was neither secret nor mysterious. The Teacher of Righteousness, if one may judge by the quite monastic rule which he imposed on his followers, was a strict ascetic, no doubt charitable, but as hard on himself as on others, avoiding all contact with sinners like a pollution; Jesus mingled more with ordinary life, was more human".⁴¹

The picture of the Teacher of Righteousness which is given in the above quotation is found not only in the Habakkuk Commentary but is drawn from other sources as well. Our purpose now will be to examine that figure as he appears in the Habakkuk Commentary and then as presented in the Zadokite Fragments and to compare him with what the New Testament has to say about Christ.

It is perfectly evident that the interpretation which charac-

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 31.

⁴⁰ *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes*, p. 161. Dr. J. L. Teicher has argued that the sect mentioned in the Scrolls was Ebionite Christian, the Teacher of Righteousness was Jesus and the Man of Falsehood Paul. Cf. his recent article "The Christian interpretation of the sign X in the Isaiah Scroll" in *Vetus Testamentum*, Vol. V, No. 2, pp. 189-198.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 161 f.

terizes the Habakkuk Commentary is of a somewhat unique type.⁴² It can hardly be considered as serious and sober exegesis of the prophetic book. Very obviously the words of the prophet have had a forced meaning placed upon them, a meaning which is designed to give prominence to the Teacher of Righteousness. Whereas, for example, Habakkuk speaks of the righteous in a general sense (1:4), the commentary immediately finds here a reference to the Teacher of Righteousness. Although only half of column one is extant, nevertheless, the words are plainly visible, "he is the Teacher of Righteousness" (הוא מורה הצדק). Bo Reicke has suggested that the earlier part of the line contained the words, "The wicked, that is, the wicked priest, and the righteous . . .".⁴³ This suggestion has merit, for it is likely that both the "wicked" and the "righteous" of the text should be identified. Although the word "righteous" occurs in the text in a general sense, nevertheless, the commentary individualizes it. It is not the righteous ones generally that are in view, but rather one particular righteous individual, the Teacher of Righteousness.⁴⁴

In the commentary on 1:5 mention is made of a "Man of Falsehood" and of those who have engaged in deception with him.⁴⁵ The reason for their action is introduced by כִּי, but the text is broken. However, the next word is probably the negative, and at the end of the line occurs the words "Teacher of Righteousness (from) the mouth-of (line 3) God".⁴⁶ The

⁴² Whether the work be called commentary or midrash depends upon what one means by those terms. The work interprets the Biblical text in such a way as to apply it to events which were more or less contemporaneous with the author (*cf.* note 20).

⁴³ Bo Reicke: "Handskrifterna Från Qumran I-III", in *Symbolae Biblicae Upsalienses* (Supplement-häften till *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok*), Uppsala, 1952, p. 28, "Här kan möjligen ha stått: Den brottslige, det är den brottslige prästen (kol. viii, 9), och den rättfärdige . . .".

⁴⁴ The Commentary speaks of this Teacher throughout as an individual. We cannot therefore maintain that in the eyes of the commentator, he was merely a symbol of the powers of light and righteousness.

⁴⁵ ובוגדים עם איש הכזב.

⁴⁶ Part of the Aleph of the negative is visible. Probably we may reconstruct the text so as to obtain the following: "Because they did not believe the words of the Teacher of Righteousness from the mouth of God". The word צדק is blotted over. The ה of the article is written above the line, and apparently, there is an extra letter, possibly a ה, the horizontal stroke

verse, we are told, also has reference to those who have acted deceptively against the New (Covenant).⁴⁷ It is further said of them that (apparently כִּי־א is to be read) they have not believed in the covenant of God.⁴⁸ The verse is further said to apply to those who "have rejected (?) the covenant"⁴⁹ which they have not believed when they heard all the — (?) of the last generation from the mouth of the priest whom God has appointed (נתן) . . . to interpret all the words of His servants the prophets . . . (through) their hand God has told (ספר) all which will come to pass concerning His people . . .".

Of particular interest is the comment on 1:13b, "its interpretation⁵⁰ has to do with (על) the house of Absalom and the men of their group who were silent toward the admonitions of the Teacher of Righteousness, and did not help him against the Man of Falsehood who rejected the Law in the midst of all (people?)".

The next reference appears in the commentary on 2:2. With respect to the words "to the end that he that runs may read therein" the reference is said to be to the Teacher of Righteousness whom God "has made to know all the secrets (רזי) of His servants the prophets".

Important is the comment on 2:4, "its interpretation concerns all those who obey the Law in the house of Judah whom God delivers from the house of judgment on account of their labor and their faith in the Teacher of Righteousness".⁵¹

2:8b is interpreted of the Wicked Priest who dealt treacherously against (?) the Teacher of Righteousness and the men of his (*i. e.*, the Priest's) company.

of which is visible. The text seems to have been: מורה (ה) צדקה. There appears also to have been a slanting line over the Daleth. *Cf.* Joel 2:23.

⁴⁷ The noun before the adjective is missing.

⁴⁸ The sense is very difficult. The commentary appears to say "those who have dealt deceitfully against the New (Covenant) because (כִּי־א) they have not believed in the covenant of God". It would seem (if we are correct in supplying "covenant" before "new") that two covenants are mentioned. Apart from this one questionable passage the term "New Covenant" (הברית החדשה) does not occur in the Habakkuk Scroll.

⁴⁹ Only the final ת of this word appears.

⁵⁰ The usual formula which introduces the comments is פשרו.

⁵¹ פשרו על כול עושי התורה בבית יהודה אשר יצילם אל מביח המשפט בעבור עמלם ואמנתם במורה הצדק.

2:15 is said to refer to the Wicked Priest who pursued after the Teacher of Righteousness "to swallow him in the anger of his wrath, thou hast desired (?) his exile, and at the time of the festival of the rest of the Day of Atonement he appeared gloriously (הוֹפִיעַ) unto them to swallow them up and to make them stumble in the day of the fast of the Sabbath of their rest",⁵²

From the meager information found in the Habakkuk Commentary one may conclude that the Teacher was a

⁵² The text is difficult, and it is precarious to base too much upon it. The crucial word is לבלע which seems to express purpose. If, then, the text is rendered, "who pursued after the Teacher of Righteousness to swallow him up", it does not actually assert that he was martyred. Rowley (*op. cit.*, p. 34) cautiously states, "who seems to have suffered martyrdom". Dupont-Sommer (*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 27) translates "so as to swallow him up"; cf. also *Vetus Testamentum*, I, 1951, pp. 200 ff. Reicke (*op. cit.*, p. 38) translates, "som har förföljt Rättfärdighetens lärare för att förvirra honom". On the basis of this present passage we cannot positively assert the martyrdom of the Teacher. The words אבות גלותו are rendered by Segal ("The Habakkuk 'Commentary' and The Damascus Fragments" in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. LXX, Part 2, p. 135) as equivalent to אל בית גלותו "to the place of his exile", which rendering is also accepted by Reicke (*op. cit.*, p. 38). Segal correctly remarks: "But the Wicked Priest is not accused of having murdered the Teacher". Cf. Dupont-Sommer's full discussion in his article "Le Maître de justice fut-il mis à mort?" in *Vetus Testamentum*, I, No. 3, pp. 200-215. There has been much discussion about the verb הוֹפִיעַ. Dupont-Sommer refers it to the Teacher, "shining with divine splendour, who himself chastises the wicked city. . . . Furthermore the biblical text here commented on contains the words: so that God may see their feasts; and this text is applied by the commentator to the Master: what an extraordinary apotheosis!" (*The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 44). Cf. *The Jewish Sect*, pp. 35-37. However, this is to read a great deal into the text. Despite whatever difficulties are involved (and Dupont-Sommer has certainly stressed them, *ibid.*, p. 36), until the force of אבות גלותו is better understood than seems to me to be the case, the subject of הוֹפִיעַ would most naturally appear to be the Wicked Priest. Even, however, if the Teacher of Righteousness be taken as subject, there is absolutely nothing in the language to suggest an apotheosis, a "resurrection" or a "second coming". Rowley (*op. cit.*, p. 34) quotes J. Bonsirven (*Études*, cclxviii, 1951, p. 215, which I have not seen), "Ce n'est que par un abus de mots qu'on prétend découvrir dans les écrits de la Nouvelle Alliance un Messie divin, un Messie crucifié, un Messie qui viendra exterminer ses ennemis dans une 'extraordinaire apothéose'". Lastly, it should be remembered that the word קץ is found here in a technical sense, "time".

prophet and a priest and one who had particular knowledge of the secrets of the prophets. That the Teacher was an important figure is to be noted in the statement that he is regarded as a savior. Salvation from judgment is made to depend upon those who obey the law and who labor and have faith in the Teacher. It would be a grave mistake to seek for an identity here between the rule of the sect and Christianity. Nor, for that matter, may the sect at this point be regarded even as a forerunner. I cannot agree with Dupont-Sommer when he says, "The importance of this formula, furtive though it be, can hardly escape anyone. The Teacher of Righteousness has become for his followers the essential object of faith; it is faith in him which causes one to live."⁵³ It should be pointed out that the mention of faith is of a most incidental character. It appears simply because of the presence of the word in the text of Habakkuk itself. There is not the slightest indication in the commentary that the writer understood what Habakkuk meant by the term "faith". And the commentator himself obscures the meaning of the word by his coupling it with "works". He stresses those who keep the Law, and states that one of the grounds of their deliverance from judgment (if מבית המשפט has reference to the final judgment) was held to be their toil and their faith. How different this is from the New Testament doctrine! There is nothing here of the *sola fide* of Luther. Those who will be delivered by God, according to the commentator, are those who have toiled and have kept the law. To include faith as a ground for deliverance is in reality to deny the true character of faith. For that matter, in the New Testament faith is not made the ground for salvation, but rather the righteousness of Christ imputed to the believer and received by (not "because of") faith alone. The term (בעבור) is far removed from New

⁵³ *The Jewish Sect*, pp. 55 f. In this connection, Cullmann: "The Significance of the Qumran Texts for Research Into the Beginnings of Christianity", in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. LXXIV, Part IV, December, 1955, p. 217, remarks, "Of course, we must point out at the same time the differences: this faith in the Teacher of Righteousness is not, as for Paul, faith in an act of atonement accomplished in the death of Christ for the forgiveness of sins. In fact, the concept of faith itself is different, containing nothing of the sense of opposition to the works of the law."

Testament thought. One cannot escape the impression that the mention of faith is more or less incidental, and would not even have been thought of, had not the word itself occurred in the text of Habakkuk. Meager, indeed, is the information which can be gleaned from the Habakkuk Commentary concerning the Teacher of Righteousness.

THE ZADOKITE FRAGMENTS AND THE TEACHER OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

It would seem that the Habakkuk Commentary and the so-called Zadokite Fragments⁵⁴ sustain a close relationship one to another, and for this reason it will be necessary to learn what the Zadokite Fragments have to say about the Teacher of Righteousness. These documents, as is now well known, were discovered toward the close of the last century by Solomon Schechter and were published by him in 1910.⁵⁵

The Fragments early introduce the Teacher. They speak of God having visited the nation three hundred and ninety years after the time of Nebuchadnezzar. Since the nation was seeking the Lord, apparently in repentance for its sins, "He raised them up a Teacher of Righteousness to lead them in the way of His heart".⁵⁶ Further on, in a section which refers to the Exodus from Egypt, it is said of the Israelites that "they hearkened not to the voice of their Maker (the commandments of their Teacher) but murmured in their tents . . .".⁵⁷

In VIII:10, we read, "And save them, they shall get nothing until there arises a Teacher of Righteousness in the end of the days".⁵⁸ Of interest also is a reference in IX:8, "They shall not be reckoned in the assembly of the people, and in its

⁵⁴ Cf. note 11.

⁵⁵ *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, Volume I, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work*, Edited from Hebrew Manuscripts in the Cairo Genizah Collection now in the possession of the University Library, Cambridge, and provided with an English Translation, Introduction and Notes, Cambridge, 1910.

⁵⁶ ויקם להם מורה צדק להדריכם בדרך לבו.

⁵⁷ Plate III, lines 7, 8. The text seems to read: ולא שמעו לקול עשיהם. מצות יוריהם וירנו באהליהם. The reference is to the plates of Zeitlin's edition (note 11).

⁵⁸ Plate VI, lines 10, 11.

register they shall not be written, from the day that there was gathered in the Unique Teacher until there shall arise the Messiah from Aaron and from Israel".⁵⁹ Again in IX:39 there is further reference to the Unique Teacher, "was gathered in the Unique Teacher until all men of war were consumed who walked with the man of lies about forty years".⁶⁰

There are a few further references to the Teacher, e. g., IX:50, "But all they who hold fast by these judgments in going out and coming in according to the Law, and listen to the voice of the Teacher and confess before God . . .";⁶¹ IX:53, "and give ear to the voice of the Unique Teacher of Righteousness . . .".⁶²

It is clear that in the Zadokite Fragments the Teacher of Righteousness is to be distinguished from the Messiah.⁶³ This appears from VIII:29 particularly, "there was gathered in the Unique Teacher until there shall arise the Messiah from Aaron and from Israel". Of the Messiah it is said that "through His Messiah He shall make them know His Holy Spirit".⁶⁴ In IX:10, the Messiah appears as a military figure. In XV:4 we read, "to the period of the wickedness until there

⁵⁹ Plate XIX, line 1. The first word is not clearly legible. Apparently the text read: האסף מורה היחיד עד עמד משיח מאהרון ומישראל.

⁶⁰ Plate XIX, line 14.

⁶¹ Plate XX, lines 11, 12.

⁶² Plate XX, line 16.

⁶³ Dupont-Sommer (*Jewish Sect*, p. 54), however, contends for the identity of the Teacher and the Messiah of Aaron and Israel. He bases this assumption upon the passage 6:10-11 of the Zadokite Fragments. (Plate VI, lines 10-11: עד עמד יורה הצדק באחרית הימים. Plate XII: line 23: עד עמוד משיח אהרון וישראל.) However, it appears that the Teacher is a forerunner of the Messiah, who prepares the way for the latter, since it is only after the Teacher's death that the Messiah appears. As Charles (*op. cit.*, p. 801) remarks: "for an undetermined interval elapses between them, which is longer than forty years at all events, ix.40, but in reality nearer one hundred and forty". The best that can be said for 6:10, 11 is that it teaches a reappearance of the Teacher. It is a close parallel with 12:23, but it does not actually identify the two figures.

⁶⁴ Cullmann (*op. cit.*, p. 226) points out that the Qumran sect placed little emphasis upon the Spirit. The mention of the Spirit in this present passage of the Damascus Document (Plate II, line 12) is simply an outgrowth from the Old Testament. The Trinitarianism of the New Testament has its roots in the Old Testament and not in stray passages such as this.

arises the Messiah (from) Aaron and Israel . . ." and in XVIII:8 it is said that the Messiah will pardon our sins.

One other person appears also to be mentioned, namely, the Lawgiver, who also receives the designation Star. Of him it is said, "And the Star is he who studied the Law, who came to Damascus, as it is written".⁶⁵ The above passages, in Charles' translation, will give the reader an idea of what the Fragments have to say concerning the Teacher.

It will now be possible to make a few observations. In the first place, as has already been suggested, it seems to be clear that according to the Zadokite Fragments, the Teacher and the Messiah are not the same person.⁶⁶ The Teacher, therefore, is not regarded as the Messiah. In this respect, of course, he differs radically from Jesus, who was known as the Messiah. The designation *χριστός* in the New Testament is constantly appended after the personal name, Jesus. In the Habakkuk Commentary and in the Zadokite Fragments there is nothing at all to correspond to this practice.

Indeed, it is difficult, upon the basis of these fragments, to determine what the relationship is in which the Teacher is conceived as standing to the Messiah. Charles asserts that the Teacher prepares the way for the Messiah, but the text itself does not say this. In fact the text does not actually state the relationship, if any, which existed between the two. After the Teacher has died then, later, the Messiah of Aaron and Israel will arise.

It is, furthermore, difficult to know whether the Fragments teach the existence of more than one teacher. In I:7 the verb is very definitely in the past: "he raised them up a Teacher of Righteousness". The reference is to the period after the exile, when there was a time of repentance upon the part of the people. It would seem that the work of this Teacher was regarded as already completed. Very different, on the other

⁶⁵ Plate VII, lines 18, 19: והכוכב הוא דורש התורה הבא דמשק כאשר כתוב. It was maintained by Schechter (*op. cit.*, p. xiii) that the Star was to be identified with the Teacher. The Star was apparently the organizer of the sect who led it in its migration to Damascus.

⁶⁶ Cf. note 63. It must also be noted that Jesus is the Christ of David's line, whereas in the Zadokite Fragments the Messiah is said to be of Aaron and Israel.

hand, is that which is stated in VIII:10, "until there arises the Teacher of Righteousness in the end of the days". In this passage the figure appears to be eschatological. He has not yet appeared upon the scene of history, nor will he do so until the eschatological period begins to run its course.⁶⁷

It should be noted that this mysterious figure of the Teacher is indeed elusive. We do not even know his name. How different this is from the case of Jesus! In the Gospels emphasis is placed upon His Name. He receives the Name of Jesus, for the reason that He will save His people from their sins.⁶⁸ He is called by this Name throughout His earthly life, and His followers after His death and resurrection delight to call Him thereby. To them it is a Name filled with rich associations. On the other hand, the followers of the Teacher, if there really were such, apparently had no delight whatever in perpetuating his name. In fact, they have not even made it clear whether there were one or more who bore the designation Teacher.

From the Zadokite Fragments it is very difficult to ascertain precisely what the function of the Teacher was. Apparently he had the duty of teaching the nation the way in which God would have it walk. This, it would seem, was the function of a prophet. He was not a Teacher in his own authority, but he spake as did one of the prophets. Those who rebelled against his teaching were in reality rebelling against the way of God, and they are condemned, just as in the Old Testament men were condemned for not hearkening to the voice of the prophets. Jesus Christ on the other hand does not appear as a mere prophet. He spake as one having authority and in His own Name. There is nothing like the Sermon on the Mount in all the literature concerning the Teacher. There is not a hint that he exhibited the boldness of Jesus Christ, and that he spoke in his own name, as did the Lord.

Another point of importance must be stressed; it is that we have no sample of the instruction of the Teacher. That he spoke the way of God, or what he thought was the way of God, we may be sure, but we do not know what he said. No precepts or maxims of his have remained. Whether he was a

⁶⁷ Cf. note 63.

⁶⁸ Matthew 1:21. In this respect cf. the force of Acts 4:12. No such language could be used of the Teacher.

good or a poor teacher, we do not know. His teaching has perished completely, and all that we have are a few references to him. On the other hand, the teaching of Jesus Christ has been preserved with remarkable fullness. We know what Jesus taught. "Never man spake like this man."⁶⁹

According to Dupont-Sommer, the Teacher was "judged, condemned, tortured. He suffered in 'his body of flesh': without doubt he was a divine being who 'became flesh' to live and die as man".⁷⁰ In our opinion these words are not justified. They are found in connection with the treatment of Habakkuk 2:7, 8a. The text of Habakkuk may be translated: "Because thou hast spoiled many nations, all the remnant of the people shall spoil thee...". The line on which the explanation is to be found is in part torn out, but there appears to be space for the words "The explanation concerns". There then follow the words הכוהן אשר מרר (the priest who rebelled). The next line, probably the last on the page, is missing entirely, and Dupont-Sommer suggests that we supply something like "and he persecuted the Master of Justice, who was...". The text continues, and may then be translated, "struck by him in judgments of unrighteousness, and abominable profaners (*lit.*, and the abominations of profaners) did evil things (רעים) against him (or, evil ones did against him) and vengeance on the body of his flesh".⁷¹

If we grant that the reference is to the persecution of the Teacher on the part of the wicked Priest, as we probably should, we have done nothing more than establish the fact that the Commentary teaches that he was put to death. There simply is no warrant to draw from this the conclusion that the Teacher was a divine being. There is nothing in the Commentary which permits of such an interpretation. Nor is there anything to suggest that the Teacher, being divine, became flesh.

⁶⁹ John 7:46b. Cf. Matthew 7:28, 29. Cullmann (*op. cit.*, p. 225), makes the pertinent observation: "Is it not significant that Josephus and Philo can both describe the Essenes in detail without once mentioning the Teacher of Righteousness?" This point had already been stressed by Zeitlin, *JQR*, Vol. XLV, No. 3, p. 205, Note 49a.

⁷⁰ *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, p. 34.

⁷¹ Since the word is masculine, I favor the rendering, "evil ones".

The death of the Teacher appears to be due to the Wicked Priest. It is the death of a martyr, and nothing more. By his death the Teacher brings no salvation to his people. It is not an atoning death that he dies. In the Zadokite Fragments it is stated that the Unique Teacher was "gathered in" (האסף). It is a question whether this language refers to a natural death or rather indicates that the Teacher was put to death. Dupont-Sommer argues for the latter, and Rowley thinks that the language favors it. It is possible that the language does favor, or at least permit, this view.⁷² At the same time, the context itself does not suggest martyrdom. Furthermore, in none of the Scrolls is there any hint or suggestion that the Teacher of Righteousness was crucified. There is a danger that in the enthusiasm engendered by the newly discovered Scrolls, we read into them ideas which they actually do not contain.

According to his latest work, Dupont-Sommer believes that he has found references to the Teacher in the Testament of Levi.⁷³ In fact, in chapter XVIII of this latter work, he thinks that we have the first example of the proclamation of the Teacher as Messiah. In this chapter the Priest is described as "Prophet of the Most High" and as a king who "shall arise in Judah". Dupont-Sommer sets forth his view in the following words: "It is true that in other passages of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* two anointed persons, two distinct Messiahs, are glorified. On the one hand, the Messiah, son of Levi; on the other hand, the Messiah, son of Judah. These passages belong, I think, to more ancient strata of the collection. When the Teacher of Righteousness was converted into a Messiah, the two attributes previously distinct, the Anointed

⁷² The expression is a common one to use of those who die a natural death. Unless there is some qualification in the context, there is no warrant for interpreting the word of an unnatural or violent death. In the present context I can see no reason for discovering a reference to anything other than a natural death. In this connection the death of Christ may be contrasted with that of the Teacher, "No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again" (John 10:18a). It is interesting to note that these words occur in that Gospel which Cullmann thinks sustains a relationship to the Qumran sect (*op. cit.*, p. 222).

⁷³ *The Jewish Sect*, pp. 38-57.

of Levi and the Anointed of Judah, were transferred to him in one and the same person. At least for a time, the Anointed of Judah disappears, and his royal prerogatives are transferred, not without some violence, to the Anointed of Levi, who thus becomes both King and Priest at the same time."⁷⁴

In response to this Zeitlin points out that the passage upon which Dupont-Sommer bases his view of the martyrdom is in fact a later interpolation done by the hand of Christians.⁷⁵

It is only natural that scholars under the impetus of some of the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls, will seek to find similarities in other sources also. These suggestions, however, must be examined with care, and should not hastily be accepted. For our part, we can see that there is nothing in the Scrolls which threatens the uniqueness of Christianity, or which would make it appear that Jesus Christ is One who was influenced by the doctrine of these Scrolls.

CONCLUSION

Christianity is a divine revelation. Jesus Christ is not merely one in a succession of "Christs"; He is *the* Christ, promised by the prophets of the Old Testament. At the same time, it is to be expected that the Jewish groups which were in existence in His time would have entertained Messianic hopes. These Jews were believers in the Old Testament, and they were naturally deeply influenced by it. Consequently, in their teaching we may well expect that there will be much which, at least formally considered, will bear a resemblance to Christianity.

If, therefore, it could be demonstrated that the Scrolls represented the teaching of a group which existed in the period of the Second Commonwealth, it would not in the least be surprising to discover certain ideas and practices which, formally considered, were similar to Christianity. From this, however, it does not at all follow that Christianity is merely an outgrowth or development of the teaching of the Scrolls. If there were those who before the time of Christ proclaimed that

⁷⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 53.

⁷⁵ *JQR*, Vol. XLVI, No. 2, p. 173.

they were "Christs", it is to be expected that their life would follow the pattern laid down in the Old Testament. This, however, does not mean that Christ Himself was merely another one among several Messiahs.⁷⁶

Whatever formal similarities there may be between Christianity and the Scrolls or between Christ and the Teacher of Righteousness, there are differences so profound that they cannot possibly be explained away. Jesus Christ spake unlike any other man, for the simple reason that He was unlike any other man. There is only one possible method of explaining Him, and that is not by seeking to discover similarities between certain things that He did and said and the teachings and practices of others. Not in this way is the Lord of Glory to be accounted for. Rather, we shall never understand Him unless we first acknowledge that He is what He claimed to be, the Son of Man, one with the Father, who entered into this world to minister and to give His life as a ransom in the stead of many.

Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia

⁷⁶ *Cf.* Acts 5:36 f.